CHAPTER 10.

SUSTAINING WEC THROUGH PEER TUTORS

Heather Bastian

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

This chapter explores how the WEC model may be integrated with embedded peer tutors (EPTs), a staple initiative of many WAC programs. It begins by outlining the tensions between WAC and WEC and the resulting challenges. It then considers how the WEC model and EPTs might function together productively within the underlying tensions to support student learning and development and to reinforce curricular and instructional change.

Many institutions of higher education support WAC programs. As the National Census on Writing found, 53% of four-year institutions (n=642) reported that they have a WAC program and/or writing requirement beyond first-year writing (Gladstein, 2013). WAC programs take many forms and undertake a variety of initiatives, including writing-intensive courses, faculty development institutes or academies, learning communities, workshops, consultations, etc. Another common WAC initiative is embedded peer tutors (also referred to as curriculum-based or classroom-based peer tutors and writing associates, consultants, fellows, or mentors); in fact, scholars have long pointed to embedded peer tutors (EPTs) as a way to enrich and reinvigorate WAC programs (Hall & Hughes, 2011; Mulin, 2001; Mulin & Schorn, 2007; Soven, 1993). It is not surprising, then, that 151 four-year institutions reported having EPTs (Gladstein, 2013).

The WEC model also may be appealing to WAC programs as they look to enrich existing initiatives or launch new initiatives (see Anson's Introduction and Scafe & Eodice, Chapter 11 of this volume). Those who do seek to integrate WEC and WAC, however, may be met with underlying tensions: WAC initiatives tend to focus on individual faculty and student engagement at the course-level while the WEC model tends to focus on collective faculty engagement at the department-level. This does not mean that the WEC model precludes individual engagement or that WAC initiatives preclude collective engagement. Instead each has a distinct focus and emphasis that when combined

has the potential to compete with rather than complement each other, especially when either is applied or approached reductively.

Given the underlying tensions between WAC and WEC, this chapter explores how the WEC model may be integrated with EPTs, a staple initiative of many WAC programs. While this chapter focuses on EPTs, I believe it will be of use and interest both to WAC programs pursuing other initiatives and to those adopting the WEC model outside of WAC programs. I undertake my exploration in two parts. In the first part, I outline the tensions between WAC and WEC and the resulting challenges. I do so by placing the theoretical framework for EPTs in relation to the WEC model and by briefly describing the history of WEC efforts and EPTs at UNC Charlotte. In the second part, I consider how the WEC model and EPTs may productively function together and conclude by outlining concrete steps for integrating WEC and EPTs that attempt to work within the underlying tensions.

UNDERSTANDING THE TENSIONS BETWEEN EPTS AND WEC

The embedded peer tutoring model, inspired by Harriet Sheridan's work at Carleton College and Tori Haring-Smith's work with Sheridan at Brown University, is situated within WAC and WID principles with an emphasis on the shared responsibility of all faculty for writing instruction and the connection between writing and learning (Haring-Smith, 1992). In this model, EPTs are understood as potential agents of change who work to shape student writing practices and attitudes while also influencing faculty teaching practices and beliefs about writing and learning (Haring-Smith, 1992). EPTs are able to do so by working directly with students, faculty, and WAC programs. Specifically, undergraduate (and, at times, graduate) students working as EPTs are assigned to a specific course or section of a course (often a discipline-based one), they collaborate with their peers in that course or section to provide writing support and assistance, and they work in partnership with the course faculty without taking on any grading or evaluation responsibilities.

While embedded peer tutoring programs share these three key characteristics, implementation varies significantly between programs. For example, some programs assign students as generalist/WAC tutors to a course outside of their programs of study, while others ask faculty to identify students in their major or minors to work as specialist/WAC and WID tutors in their courses (see Gladstein, 2008; Haring-Smith, 1992; Macauley, 2014; Soven, 2001; Zawacki, 2008). In another example, some EPTs primarily support students outside of class by providing feedback on written assignments and meeting with students to discuss it; others provide this kind of support but also attend class to support

writing-to-learn and writing-related activities during class (see Spigelman & Grobman, 2005). In one final example, the partnerships between EPTs and faculty can range from a few meetings throughout the semester and some conversation regarding writing assignments to several meetings throughout the semester, frequent conversation regarding writing assignments and students' experiences, and even co-facilitation of activities during class.

Regardless of this variation between programs, the embedded peer tutoring model seeks to support both students as writers and faculty as writing instructors with EPTs directly interacting with students and faculty. In doing so, they serve as connections between faculty and students and also between faculty and the WAC program. It is in the in-between spaces that EPTs occupy where scholars locate EPTs' potential to act as agents of change. By operating in what scholars refer to as intersections, interstitial positions, gray spaces, and middle spaces, EPTs resist, disrupt, and, at times, transform common binary relationships—e.g., teacher/student, teaching/learning, expert/novice, generalist/specialist, and content/writing—that structure how the university and those within it operate (Carpenter et al., 2014; Gladstein, 2008; Hughes & Hall, 2008; Mulin et al., 2008). Scholars have suggested that working in and from these in-between spaces provides EPTs and, by extension, those with whom they work insight into disciplinary and pedagogical practices. As Mullin et al. (2008) demonstrated, EPTs can "help raise the visibility of assumptions and practices for all, making evident the hidden complexity of the community practices necessary to master written knowledge in a discipline" (para. 3) by prompting faculty to recognize their "expert blind spots" (see Sheriff, Chapter 6 of this volume). By resisting binary relationships, EPTs, especially those who work with students and faculty during class, also can decenter the power relations and hierarchy typical to a classroom by encouraging tutors, students, and faculty to work together as active participants in knowledge construction and composing practices (Spigelman & Grobman, 2005). Whether EPTs are working to make the implicit explicit or to decenter power relations, they ideally engage in what Gladstein (2008) has called a "cycle of inquiry and dialogue" to create "symbiotic relationships" (p. 3) between faculty, students, and WAC programs and act as agents of change.

Like EPTs, the WEC model seeks to affect instructional and curricular change by adopting foundational principles of WAC and WID; however, there are four key differences between the WEC and EPT models that result in the underlying tensions I noted above. The first difference between the models is the primary driver of change. In the WEC model, faculty drive change by articulating and interrogating their understanding and conceptions of writing and writing instruction throughout a series of structured conversations facilitated by a WAC/WEC consultant (see Flash, Chapter 1 and Luskey & Emery, Chapter

4 of this volume). In the EPT model, students acting as EPTs drive change by operating in the in-between spaces to provide formative feedback to their peers on their writing and to faculty on their instructional practices and student experiences. A second difference is the primary location of change. The WEC model seeks to affect change at the department level with faculty participating in structured conversations during departmental meetings. The EPT model seeks to affect change at the course level with faculty, EPTs, and students participating in conversations outside of class and, at times, during class. The third difference between the two models is the source of change. While the WEC model is data-driven with locally collected data serving as the driving source of change (see Flash, Chapter 1 of this volume), the embedded peer tutoring model is experience-driven with student and EPT experience serving as the driving source of change. These three differences taken together result in the fourth difference, the kind of change each model seeks to initiate. Both models seek to achieve curricular and instructional change, but each takes one as its primary focus and starting point. The WEC model with its focus on faculty engagement with local data at the department-level works to achieve curricular change by integrating writing across the curriculum of a program of study (see Flash, Chapter 1 of this volume). The EPT model with its focus on student engagement and experience at the course level works to achieve instructional change by integrating writing into the pedagogy of a class and a faculty's teaching practices. Neither model advocates stopping at curricular or instructional change; rather, the WEC model sees curricular change as a way to instructional change and the EPT model sees instructional change as a way to curricular change. These four differences pose potential challenges when the two models are integrated, as the EPT model's focus on individual engagement at the course-level has the potential to work against collective engagement at the department-level.

To further complicate the integration of WEC and EPTs, recent scholarship has called into question the extent to which and with whom EPTs can act as change agents. Scholars consistently find that students generally benefit from and experience positive change as a result of working with and as EPTs (see, for example, Hughes et al., 2010; Ragaignon & Bromley, 2011; and Spigelman & Grobman, 2005). What is less consistent among scholars, however, is the extent to which they find that EPTs can and do influence faculty beliefs and attitudes, instructional practices, and curriculum (Cairns & Anderson, 2008; Hall & Hughes, 2012; Webster & Hansen, 2014; Zawacki, 2008). Some scholars find that EPTs lead to transformative changes in faculty attitudes and practices while others find little to no change and, in some cases, outright resistance to change. This range of experience makes sense given Zawacki's (2008) finding in her exploration of three case studies that it is difficult for EPTs to affect change

when "a teacher is not fully invested in the WI aspects of the course and/or has deeply ingrained beliefs about 'good' writing and appropriate goals for student writers" (p. 4). When faced with situations like these, EPTs may be able to affect small, surface level changes to assignments, as Zawacki (2008) discovered, but they often lack the experience and level of understanding "to engage the teacher in more complex discussions of his assignment expectations and desired writing outcomes for his students" (p. 6).

In my own work to integrate EPTs and the WEC model in the Communication Across the Curriculum Program (CxC) at UNC Charlotte, I have witnessed the tensions and challenges that arise when combining the two models, but I also have identified some benefits. Before I joined CxC in 2016, Chris Anson coordinated with the then director from 2009–2010 to lead four volunteer departments through structured discussions to develop WEC plans. This pilot effort continued as other departments elected to undergo the WEC process, and in 2014–2015, CxC adopted the embedded peer tutoring model to complement—not replace—existing WEC efforts. The intention was that EPTs were to be closely linked to WEC plans as curricular support and financial incentive (CxC funded the EPTs). Departments identified key courses in their WEC plans where students would benefit from additional peer support. EPTs were assigned to those courses and embedded into the course curriculum and classroom. Departments selected and hired upper-level students, typically from their majors, to serve as EPTs. The intended outcomes were that EPTs would provide their peers with discipline-specific writing support and would provide the faculty and departments with feedback on how students were experiencing the changes initiated by WEC plans.

By the time I joined CxC as associate director (a year after a new executive director joined the program), twelve departments had participated in the WEC process and six of those departments were working with EPTs. All of this work was and continues to be elective. WEC plans and efforts in several of the departments were waning. The six departments working with EPTs were still engaged with their WEC plans to some extent, but the intended connections between the departments' WEC plans and EPTs had either weakened or failed to take hold. EPTs were providing their peers with feedback on writing assignments but only some were attending classes and providing faculty and departments with feedback regarding their WEC plans. Instead of working together, the WEC plans and EPTs diverged with some departments continuing curricular conversations with little to no connection to their use of EPTs and with other departments focusing on their use of EPTs and particular courses with little forward movement on their overall curriculum and WEC plans.

As the executive director and I entered this milieu, we witnessed some challenges that arise when integrating EPTs and WEC. The biggest challenge for us

was maintaining a focus on curricular change at the departmental level while EPTs support particular courses in a department. Curricular conversations in some (but not all) departments became focused and stuck on EPT supported courses, which made shifting the department's attention to change across the curriculum and into other courses a challenge. When attention remained focused on a few courses and not all faculty within a department taught those courses, department-wide efforts in which most if not all faculty participated were difficult to maintain. Issues of ownership and dependency also presented challenges, but we witnessed them to a much smaller degree. While the embedded peer tutoring model advocates that EPTs complement, never replace, faculty writing instruction and feedback, in a few cases, faculty were relying on EPTs as the primary means of writing instruction and feedback. In these cases, faculty were not necessarily altering their own instructional and feedback practices or the course curriculum in response to WEC plans but, instead, were relying on EPTs to provide writing instruction and feedback outside of class. These challenges, most likely, are not surprising given the underlying tensions between WAC and WEC, and they certainly resonate with concerns raised in EPT scholarship. Moving between individual engagement at the course-level and collective engagement at the department-level proved difficult with departments gravitating toward one end of the spectrum.

While we saw that integrating EPTs and WEC presented challenges, we also identified positive aspects of integration at our institution. Most notably, EPTs allowed CxC to maintain a physical connection to the classroom and presence in the department. EPTs presence in the classrooms allowed us to gain insights into how WEC plans were and were not moving forward; EPTs, in this sense, have served for us as a sustainability indicator (see Galin, Chapter 8 of this volume) of a department's progress and investment in WEC plans. For example, when a department's use of EPTs has radically changed or has departed from standard practices, this indicated to us that the department's WEC plan had either changed, or more likely, waned. This has been especially helpful for CxC because we are an elective program and do not have a formal standing body through which WEC plans are reviewed and approved, and, as a result, our WEC process is less structured and has less oversight than at other institutions. We also found that EPTs' physical presence in the department often allowed us as CxC directors to keep department and faculty focus on or, more often, return focus to writing, curriculum, and pedagogy by creating some consistency and stability in CxC's work with departments. For example, we can request meetings with chairs and faculty to discuss their consultant use but also use these meetings to inquire about the status of WEC plans or about other relevant curricular developments. As another example, we can offer departments professional develop-

ment opportunities that relate to working with EPTs but focus on pedagogical and curricular changes that support EPT integration and WEC rather than on EPT practices.

Given the history of CxC at UNC Charlotte and our observations regarding EPT and WEC integration within this context, we are at a point of reflection as a program. EPTs are the primary way in which CxC can financially support and incentivize elective WEC and WAC efforts; our administration has a strong interest in funding student employment on campus since many UNC Charlotte students need to work to support themselves and, at times, their families. As a result, EPTs continue to be an important element of WEC planning with existing and new departments and a thriving element of the CxC program at large. We need to decide how to move forward as a program taking into consideration our historical context and current institutional reality. Rather than abandon WEC efforts or EPTs or allow them to develop and function as separate branches of our program, we have elected to try to navigate the tensions and challenges integration present because we also see potential and opportunities for student learning and curricular change that integration may bring.

NAVIGATING THE TENSIONS BETWEEN EPTS AND WEC

In this exploratory section, I consider how the WEC model and EPTs might function together productively to support student learning and development and to reinforce curricular and instructional change. This exploration, admittedly, imagines ideal circumstances and best-case scenarios but doing so has allowed me to develop some concrete steps that CxC plans to take to realize the potential and address the challenges of EPT and WEC integration.

Integrating WEC and EPTs introduces a student dynamic to the WEC process that could work to further support student learning and development. Students serve as EPTs and EPTs serve as peer educators for students by providing one-on-one writing and learning support. The WEC model focuses on providing direct support for faculty development, which makes sense—more informed beliefs about teaching and writing and more effective curriculum and instructional practices support student writing development and learning. Certainly faculty play a crucial role in student learning and development; however, peer teaching and feedback can play an equally important and different role in student development and learning. It is important to note here that I am not advocating nor does any EPT scholarship advocate that EPTs replace faculty teaching and feedback or that faculty outsource their work to EPTs; rather, EPTs should complement faculty teaching and feedback by providing a different kind of learning experience for students. Ideally faculty teaching and feedback and

EPT peer support mutually reinforce each other, allowing students to engage more deeply with a writing-enriched curriculum.

EPTs provide direct support for students by engaging their peers in conversation about their writing and development as they meet with them either one-on-one or in small groups. EPTs' peer status and non-authoritative position provides for a different kind of social context and learning experience for students, one that tends to be more collaborative and active in nature than traditional, teacher-led learning contexts (Bruffee, 1995; Spigelman & Grobman, 2005). Additionally, EPTs' in-between status as neither an expert nor a novice provides them with a language and perspective that may be more accessible to their peers (Mulin et al., 2008). This kind of peer support has been found to have a positive impact on student learning and development. Regaignon and Bromley (2011) found that students who work with EPTs demonstrated measurable and statistically significant improvement in their writing over the course of the semester while students who did not work with one did not. Students who work with EPTs also report gaining insight into disciplinary academic genres and language as well as confidence in their own abilities (Buyske, 1995; Mulin et al., 2008; Spigelman & Grobman, 2005).

In addition to supporting student learning and development, integrating EPTs and WEC could help to reinforce curricular and instructional change at the department level by providing faculty support at the course level. One way EPTs could do so is by prompting faculty to engage in reflective practice at the course level that complements the reflective practice occurring at the department level. Throughout the WEC process, departmental faculty, facilitated by a WEC consultant, engage in structured, locally situated discussions in which they articulate and interrogate their conceptions of writing and writing instruction. The WEC consultant provides essential support for engaging faculty in this reflective activity at the department level. EPTs could provide another, complementary source of support for engaging faculty in reflective activity at the course level. While the WEC consultant works "behind the scenes to enable and mediate productive reflection" focused on conceptions of writing and writing instruction (Flash, 2016, p. 247), the EPT could work "on the scene" as a facilitative partner to enable productive reflection focused on instructional practices and student learning. For example, EPTs can provide faculty with immediate feedback on their instructional practices that are informed by their changing conceptions of writing and writing instruction so that they can continue to reflect on and refine both their instructional practices and conceptions of writing instruction.

Given that, as Zawacki (2008) has found, EPTs have limited success when faculty already have deeply ingrained beliefs about writing and writing instruction, faculty may be more receptive to EPTs' feedback on instructional practices

and student experiences if that feedback aligns with their new understandings of writing and writing instruction and their overall WEC plan. Faculty may even be more inclined to actively seek out and act on EPT feedback if they understand how EPTs fit into their WEC plans and overall departmental curriculum and if both EPTs and faculty are working from similar understandings of writing and writing instruction and developing them with each other.

Another way EPTs could provide support for curricular and instructional change at the course level is by serving as teaching (not grading or evaluative) partners with faculty during class. When working with faculty and students during class, EPTs, as Spigelman and Grobman (2005) have noted, provide both instructional support and development because "they may introduce teachers to composing theory, writing center theory, and peer group theory; they may guide instructors to clarify their expectations, offer more consistent instruction, or develop more coherent writing assignments" (p. 9). Serving as instructional support and development allows EPTs to help facilitate instructional practices that may be new or unfamiliar to a faculty member, such as small-group work or discussions, peer reviews, or workshops. For example, an EPT could co-facilitate with a faculty member a peer review or a workshop focused on a particular aspect of disciplinary writing. When serving as a teaching partner, EPTs, again, would not replace faculty. Instead they would help support students and faculty during class as they undertake new instructional practices and curricular changes that are informed by their changing conceptions of writing and writing instruction and WEC plans.

EPTs' presence in classrooms and in departments also could serve as physical reminders of WEC plans to further reinforce curricular and instructional changes. By attending the classes in which they serve as EPTs, their physical presence alone could prompt faculty to make connections to writing that they might overlook otherwise. Not only can EPTs attend the classes that they support but they also attend other classes in the department as students. Since faculty tend to select students from their own departments to serve as EPTs, other faculty often have students in their classes who serve as EPTs in other classes. Faculty need reminders of the WEC work they have done and plan to do, especially when other institutional initiatives and departmental demands compete for their attention. EPTs with their physical presence in the classroom and department could serve as daily reminders of a department's commitments to writing, writing instruction, and their WEC plan.

These are the ways in which I have imagined EPTs and the WEC model could work together productively to support student learning and development and to reinforce curricular and instructional change. In brief, EPTs introduce student-to-student learning to the WEC process so that both students and faculty re-

ceive support for WEC plans. EPTs provide students and faculty with feedback to support their development as writers and teachers. Faculty reflective activity could benefit from both the WEC program support and the EPT perspective, much like faculty benefit from the academic librarian perspective (see Chapter 10, this collection). When EPTs encourage reflective activity at the course level through feedback on assignments and student experiences, they would build on the reflective activity facilitated by the WEC consultants occurring at the department level. Employing students from departments as EPTs also could serve to reinforce curricular and instructional change by providing faculty with physical reminders of their writing and curricular commitments and WEC plans.

I acknowledge that this ideal portrait of integration is complicated by the underlying WAC and WEC tensions and challenges that result when faculty move between individual engagement at the course level and collective engagement at the department level. These tensions and challenges most likely cannot be eliminated. I anticipate that maintaining a department's focus on curricular change at the departmental level when EPTs support particular courses in a department will continue to be challenging. I also anticipate that some faculty may rely on EPTs for writing instruction and feedback instead of altering their own instructional and feedback practices. However, I do not believe EPTs and the WEC model must be a zero-sum game. While course-level engagement may compete with faculty's department-level engagement, it need not negate or undercut it, and I have developed a few concrete steps that CxC has begun to take or intends to take to navigate the underlying tensions between WAC and WEC and address challenges that integrating EPTs and WEC pose.

First, CxC intends to work with departments more closely in terms of their EPT use so that EPTs are clearly integrated into WEC plans as a complementary form of support for curricular and instructional change. In other words, whether EPTs are introduced as a support during the first iteration of a WEC plan or later ones, EPTs must be clearly connected to departmental WEC efforts. What this means in practice is that the rationale for EPT use in certain courses should be articulated, connected to larger curricular revisions, and incorporated into the assessment plan. During later iterations of the WEC plan, EPT use should be evaluated and revised along with other WEC efforts. This might mean that EPTs move to other courses in the curriculum or that their use is paused for a period of time while curricular changes are occurring. EPTs need not be a permanent form of support but rather one that develops along with the WEC plan. When working with EPTs, departments also should have a plan for their use of EPTs in their WEC plans that includes 1) the departmental selection process for EPTs, 2) departmental expectations for faculty working with EPTs, and 3) accountability measures for faculty working with EPTs. This is especially

important when EPTs are assigned to a course and faculty are expected to work with EPTs without explicitly opting-in.

Second, I have developed detailed policies regarding EPTs' responsibilities, explicitly outlined expectations for faculty and EPT partnerships, and developed a brief online faculty training to help guide EPT integration into WEC plans. Without clear policies and expectations, as CxC has found, departments and faculty "may be prone to seeing [EPTs] through the lenses they know, such as lab assistant, intern, TA, or adjunct" (Macauley, 2014, p. 47). While EPT responsibilities and faculty partnerships will vary across institutional contexts and should incorporate flexibility (Cairns & Anderson, 2008), I have observed that students, EPTs, and faculty have stronger partnerships when EPT responsibilities include meeting with students outside of class in one-to-one or small group consultations to provide feedback on written assignments and attending class to support faculty and students during writing-to-learn and writing-related activities. I also have observed that faculty and EPT partnerships benefit when faculty and EPTs meet at the beginning of the semester and then establish regular check-ins to share observations and feedback and when they collaborate as teaching partners to develop and co-facilitate writing-related activities during class.

Third, CxC intends to retain primary control of EPT training but also plans to work more closely with departments to communicate the importance of a shared training among all EPTs and to support supplemental training by departments if needed as part of their WEC plans. EPTs benefit when interacting with others from across the disciplines during shared training since it highlights disciplinary differences and connects them with a larger community of peer educators. Hall and Hughes (2011) have concluded that EPTs need at a minimum "practical, applied knowledge about reading and responding to student writing and about holding effective conferences with students" (p. 27). They further recommended that EPTs have some knowledge about how writing abilities develop so that they can provide both students and faculty with feedback (2011, p. 27). CxC is best positioned to provide this kind of training. We also have added to our EPT training explicit attention to partnerships with faculty by providing EPTs with clear guidelines for those partnerships and by role playing common situations and ways in which to provide faculty with feedback. What this training looks like will vary across institutions and be highly dependent on the students employed as EPTs. Some programs have credit-bearing courses that EPTs take (Hall & Hughes, 2011). Others, like CxC, offer intensive training at the beginning of the semester (to which we invite faculty to join us for lunch on one day) and follow it up with professional development and other activities throughout the semester.

I propose these steps here to help reduce the challenges that arise when integrating EPTs into WEC because, as I hope to have demonstrated, the embedded peer tutoring and WEC models have the potential to work together in ways that are productive. Given the underlying tensions between the two models, I doubt that all risk and challenges can be eliminated. These steps attempt to work within the tensions between WEC and WAC so that they work together rather than compete with each other. As CxC adopts these steps, develops new ones, and assesses our efforts, we will discover the extent to which integration of EPTs and the WEC model is successful, but in the meantime, I am hopeful that this exploration and concrete steps will be of use to other WAC programs that are considering adopting the WEC model and imagining how the WEC model may be integrated and interact with existing elements of their programs. I also am hopeful that this exploration will be of use to those adopting the WEC model who are considering the kinds of incentives that they can offer to departments for undertaking this work.

I wish to close by acknowledging Soven's (1993) survey of embedded peer tutoring initiatives in which she found that administrators "must be tolerant of the 'less than perfect'" because these initiatives entail several different and ultimately uncontrollable moving parts (p. 67). When combining the uncontrollable moving parts of the embedded peer tutoring model with the uncontrollable moving parts of the WEC model, one must be even more tolerant of the "less than perfect." However, I side with Zawacki's optimism when it comes to the "less than perfect." Zawacki (2008) has argued that even though not all EPT and faculty partnerships are successful in reaching the WAC goals of transforming faculty teaching practices and influencing curricular change:

> negotiations around assignment and response practices that occur between teachers and their [EPTs] ultimately lead to a better understanding of overall learning and writing goals for student writers. In that way, every [EPT] placement, even those that are less than successful, becomes part of a network for change, thereby helping us to build and sustain the rich culture of writing at our institution. (p. 13)

Integrating EPTs and the WEC model has the potential to support student learning and development and to reinforce curricular and instructional change. Ideally and in the best-case scenarios, EPTs and WEC plans would work harmoniously and mutually reinforce each other, but even when in reality the integration is "less than perfect," I believe that it still can contribute to a network for change at an institution that helps to build and sustain a culture of writing.

REFERENCES

Bruffee, K. (1995). Peer tutoring and the "conversation of mankind." In C. Murphy & J. Law (Eds.), *Landmark essays on writing centers* (pp. 87-98). Hermagoras Press.

Buyske, S. G. (1995). Student communication in the advanced mathematics classroom. *Primus, 5*(1), 23-32.

Cairns, R., & Anderson, P. V. (2008). The protean shape of the writing associate's role: An empirical study and conceptual model. *Across the Disciplines, 5*. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2008.5.2.07

Carpenter, R., Whiddon, S., & Dvorak, K. (2014). Guest editor introduction: Revisiting and revising course-embedded tutoring facilitated by writing centers. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 12*(1). http://www.praxisuwc.com/from-the-guest-editors/

Flash, P. (2016). From apprised to revised: Faculty in the disciplines change what they never knew they knew. In K. Yancey (Ed.) *A rhetoric of reflection* (pp. 227-249). Utah State University Press.

Gladstein, J. (2008). Conducting research in the gray space: How writing associates negotiate between WAC and WID in an introductory biology course. *Across the Disciplines, 5*. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2008.5.2.02

Gladstein, J. (2013). The national census of writing. https://writingcensus.swarthmore.edu/

Hall, E., & Hughes, B. (2011). Preparing faculty, professionalizing fellows: Keys to success with undergraduate writing fellows in WAC. *The WAC Journal, 22*, 21-40. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2011.22.1.03

Haring-Smith, T. (1992). Changing students' attitudes: Writing fellows programs. In S. H. McLeod & M. Soven (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. 123-131). Sage.

Hughes, B., Gillespie, P., & Kail, H. (2010). What they take with them: Findings from the peer writing tutor alumni research project. *Writing Center Journal, 30*(2), 12-46.

Hughes, B., & Hall, E. B. (2008). Guest editors' introduction. *Across the Disciplines, 5*. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2008.5.2.01

Macauley, W. J., Jr. (2014). Insiders, outsiders, and straddlers: A new writing fellows program in theory, context, and practice. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 12*(1), 45-50.

Mulin, J. (2001). Writing centers and WAC. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 179-199). National Council of Teachers of English.

Mulin, J., & Schorn, S. (2007). Enlivening WAC programs old and new. *WAC Journal, 18*, 5-18. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2007.18.1.01

Mulin, J., Schorn, S., Turner, T., Hertz, R., Davidson, D., & Baca, A. (2008). Challenging our practices, supporting our theories: Writing mentors as change agents across discourse communities. *Across the Disciplines, 5https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/special/fellows/*. https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/special/fellows/

Regaignon, D. R., & Bromley, P. (2011). What difference do writing fellows programs make? *WAC Journal, 22*, 41-63. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2011.22.1.04

Soven, M. (1993). Curriculum-based peer tutoring programs: A survey. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 17*(1-2), 58-74.

Soven, M. (2001). Curriculum-based peer tutors and WAC. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 200-223). National Council of Teachers of English.

Spigelman, C., & Grobman, L. (2005). Introduction: On location in classroom-based writing tutoring. In C. Spigleman & L. Grobman (Eds.), *On location: Theory and practice in classroom-based writing tutoring* (pp. 1-13). Utah State University Press.

Webster, K. & Hensen, J. (2014). Vast potential, uneven results: Unraveling the factors that influence course-embedded tutoring success. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 12*(1), 51-56.

Zawacki, T. M. (2008). Writing fellows as WAC change agents: Changing what? Changing whom? Changing how?" *Across the Disciplines, 5*. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2008.5.2.05