CHAPTER 16.

PARTNERING, SCAFFOLDING, AND ADAPTING: LESSONS LEARNED FROM A MULTI-YEAR PROJECT TO EMBED WAC ACROSS A BSN CURRICULUM

Heidi Nobles, T. Kenny Fountain, and Ashley Hurst
University of Virginia

Abstract. *In this chapter, faculty from both the School of Nursing (SON) and WAC at the University of Virginia speak to the challenges and rewards of implementing an ambitious writing-enhanced Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) curriculum. The SON's commitment to WAC within the BSN curriculum and the positive outcomes thus far have made the SON a model for other schools and programs across our university. In support of the SON's goals, the WAC initiative aims to work within the broader nursing curriculum to enhance student writing, deepen student learning, develop student confidence, and advance student professional identity.*

As anyone working in writing across the curriculum knows, partnership and adaptation make possible so much of what we do. The principles that guide our work, as articulated by the *Statement on WAC Principles & Practices* (Cox et al., 2014), speak to the mutual articulation of partnering and adapting—collaborating and revising. Often the only way to provide students opportunities to develop their "written abilities across their academic careers" and deepen their "engagement with learning" is through partnering with faculty across campus. In the process, we seek to "foster a culture that supports writing" and a "community of faculty" centered around the teaching of writing (*Cox et al.*, 2014). Perhaps nowhere is this mutuality between partnering and adapting more clearly presented than in Chris M. Anson and Pamela Flash's (2021) edited collection, *Writing-Enriched Curricula: Models of Faculty-Driven and Departmental Transformation*. They not only present an increasingly influential "writing-enriched curricula" (WEC) model for WAC programs; they also emphasize the need for partnerships that center WAC in the disciplines.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2026.2845.2.16

Throughout the collection, the authors recognize and reiterate the critical value of supporting departmental power in determining both curricular goals and assessment strategies. In defining the features of a WEC model, the authors discuss the foundational importance of locating control within a specific unit or department, which allows for effective articulation of context-specific writing expectations, practices, and target outcomes. Furthermore, supporting the development of writing curricula in one specific domain promotes departmental leadership and faculty buy-in (e.g., Anson & Flash, 2021). This essentially grassroots approach, wherein WAC leaders serve as supportive consultants—"guides, listeners, and distillers of information" (Anson & Flash, 2021, p. 8)—rather than evangelists or enforcers, provides greater agency for departments and disciplinary experts in developing curricula for their students, and it also promotes better longevity within domain-specific programs. For the larger institutions, those departments also pave the way for other units to observe and adopt/adapt methods appropriate to their own contexts.

WAC at the University of Virginia was inspired by this conception of partnership, one that invests a kind of power in and prioritizes the expertise of the disciplines and thus situates WAC leaders as guides and even learners. In this chapter, we will focus on the roles of partnering, scaffolding, and adapting in a multi-year project to design and implement a writing-enhanced Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) curriculum. More specifically, we will describe the key strategic activities of our project:

1. Gathering research-based insights on writing development and instruction recognizable to nursing faculty,
2. Leveraging existing commitments and course materials designed by nursing faculty,
3. Adding strategic tools for improving transfer across BSN courses,
4. Developing materials that adopted disciplinary language and infrastructure, and
5. Encouraging evidence-based pedagogical strategies through targeted faculty meetings and workshops.

In documenting these activities, we seek to provide transferable lessons for forming partnerships, scaffolding writing across a multi-year curriculum, and adapting both materials and expectations.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT: UVA AND THE SON

The University of Virginia (UVA) first adopted WAC in 2017, as a model to enhance the culture of writing across the institution. UVA has a total

enrollment of approximately 24,000 students (undergrad/grad combined) and about 3,000 full-time faculty. The College of Arts and Sciences offers more than 50 undergraduate degrees and concentrations and more than 25 graduate degree programs; WAC also serves another 11 schools (e.g., engineering, commerce, nursing, etc.). Our earliest tasks included networking, developing prototype projects and services, and piloting these with paired assessments.

Across UVA, we piloted the following activities:

- Individual consultations
- Targeted workshops and training sessions
- Course pilots (using a new set of "writing-enhanced" criteria
- An institutional Faculty Seminar on the Teaching of Writing
- An institutional Graduate Instructor Seminar on the Teaching of Writing
- Embedded Writing Fellows (in partnership with the UVA Writing Center)
- Student writing assessments
- Programming partnerships
- Joint research
- Curriculum scaffolding

We refined this suite of resources over time based on assessment data, but throughout our initial pilot period of five years, we saw wide variance in types and saturation of engagement, with some schools opting for an occasional workshop or to send a single faculty member to take the Faculty Seminar and others choosing higher levels of commitment. The School of Nursing (SON) approached us early on, and we were fortunate to find faculty there spearheading their own efforts to scaffold writing instruction across their four-year BSN degree program.

The SON at UVA is an intense environment, consistently placing in the top 3 percent of nursing programs nationwide. The student body is comprised of about 400 undergraduate and 400 graduate students across the bachelor's, master's, doctor of nursing practice, and PhD programs. The school's 60 full-time faculty also have clinical practices and administer residency and continuing education programs. The students, too, move quickly into practice. Our project has focused on BSN students, who by their second year are already in clinicals, where they provide hands-on nursing care to patients. Indeed, the professional practice and identity of these students has been significant in the development of writing goals and adapting to programmatic realities.

PARTNERING AS LEARNING, TRANSLATING, SCAFFOLDING … AND ADAPTING

Our experience tells us that one key component of forging WAC partnerships should be the search for common ground. Often that common ground can be found in the educational research of the disciplines and fields with which we partner. Those who work with nursing faculty will learn quickly that research into nursing education shows a well-developed WAC tradition. For nearly two decades, BSN programs across the country have successfully incorporated WAC approaches to curriculum and instruction to improve students' engagement with course content and their ability to write in their discipline. (For overviews of initiatives, see Cowles et al., 2001; Luthy et al., 2009; Mitchell et al., 2017; Silva et al., 1999; Tesh et al., 2014). Ruth Davidhizar (1993) specifically identified four reasons to teach and mentor BSN students to write more proficiently and effectively: (1) to enhance student learning; (2) to develop student confidence; (3) to develop students' skills in scholarly writing; and (4) to advance the profession. By analyzing the research literature and descriptions of actual programs, Heidi Troxler et al. (2011) offered a taxonomy of common elements of WAC initiatives in BSN programs, and their findings mirror WAC best practices. For example, most BSN programs that incorporate a WAC approach to writing instruction include short assignments, longer sequenced/scaffolded writing assignments, opportunities for revision based on faculty and peer feedback, and examples of model or successful writing (often accompanied by the use of evaluation rubrics). Recently, BSN programs have sought ways to develop students' scientific or scholarly writing abilities, using assignments that require students to engage with scholarly research (Bailey et al., 2015; Friberg & Lyckhage, 2013; Hunker et al., 2014; Mitchell et al., 2017). However, as Annette Bailey et al. (2015) have argued, mandating that all BSN students produce original, publishable, scientific research is not realistic considering students' differing levels of preparedness and reading/writing aptitudes as well as the curricular constraints of most BSN programs.

BSN students *can* develop their competence in scientific writing through assignments that require them to engage with sources, present their findings, and offer some intervention or response. Research in nursing education and WAC provides numerous examples of these assignments, such as literature reviews that increase students' proficiency in scientific writing while introducing them to the genres and research of nursing (Friberg & Lyckhage, 2013).[1] Research-based

1 For other examples of research-based/source-based writing in BSN programs, see Cowles et al., 2001 (an "ethical principle" paper); Luthy et al., 2009 (an "ethical issue paper"); Silva et al., 1999 (an issue + intervention paper); Tesh et al., 2014 ("research-based writing" similar to a literature review).

writing assignments seem to work best when implemented as part of a larger WAC-based pedagogical approach. Empirical assessment has demonstrated that effective WAC-based initiatives, like writing-enhanced or writing-intensive courses, can improve nursing students' writing competence and self-efficacy (Blakeslee et al., 2018; Miller et al., 2015). For example, Louise C. Miller et al. (2015) found that "carefully designed, scaffolded writing assignments" and "giving [students] opportunities to practice their skills" were two highly effective practices that increased students' competence and self-efficacy (p. 178).

DEVELOPING RECOGNIZABLE RESEARCH-BASED INSIGHTS

Because WAC approaches were already consistent with expert nursing practice, the question for us became, how do we tap into this expertise and make it recognizable? For decades, scholars of WAC have demonstrated that one way faculty in the disciplines can better appreciate their role in teaching writing is by helping them make explicit their own disciplinary expertise (Carter, 2007). Recent work by Angela Glotfelter et al. (2020) describes an "expertise-based" faculty seminar model that incorporates the threshold concept approach to help faculty recognize and develop their expertise in the genres, conventions, and practices of their disciplines. Building from this, Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle (2022) offer a research-based approach to WAC, specifically faculty development, that provides disciplinary faculty opportunities to make explicit their tacit knowledge as a form of expertise development. Heidi Nobles and T. Kenny Fountain were inspired by this appreciation for the role of expertise and also influenced by the sociologist of science Robert Evans's conception of expertise (Collins & Evans, 2007). For these scholars and others, expertise is not an all-or-nothing, have-it or don't-have-it characteristic. Often expertise involves making tacit knowledge explicit, so that one can have not only know-how and know-what, but also what might be described as "know-how-about-what." Our faculty in the disciplines often do not realize what they know, how to make that knowledge explicable, or how to translate that knowledge into pedagogy.

After reviewing the research literature in our field and in educational psychology, and after researching what other universities and colleges required in similar writing-enhanced or writing-intensive courses, we came up with the following *research-based insights* that shaped both our larger approach to WAC at UVA and also our work with the SON. By taking widely recognized, evidence-based findings in our field and coupling them with writing research in nursing, we were able to develop a kind of mantra, if you will, that we used to center our various workshops, seminars, and consultations:

> We all learn to improve our writing (capacities & products) through *repeated practice* over time, with *multiple occasions* to *write* and *revise* our work in light of *meaningful feedback* and *instruction* that is informed by the *knowledge, skills,* and *habits of mind* we are working to develop.

This is not a blindly original idea, and that is exactly the point. In our work with faculty across the disciplines, we would break this insight down into a set of practices that could be incorporated in courses and even labs and mentoring relationships across disciplines:

1. Inclusion of deliberate, focused practice in writing through multiple occasions to write. (Graham et al., 2016; Kellogg & Whiteford, 2009; Klein et al., 2017)
2. Incorporation of some type of multi-step drafting process for major writing assignments. (Galbraith & Baaijen, 2018; Sommers, 1980; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002)
3. Opportunities to revise one's writing in response to meaningful feedback. (Anderson et al., 2015; MacArthur, 2017; Traxler & Gernsbacher, 1993)
4. Guidance, instruction, or mentorship that models the ways of thinking, reading, and writing students are expected to develop. (Carter, 2007; Santangelo et al., 2017; Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006).

The last of these, of course, leaves a great deal to unpack. In our specific project with nursing, we enacted this modeling for students through forms of instruction including teaching for transfer and pedagogies centered on the development of genre knowledge.

SCAFFOLDING RESEARCH-BASED INSIGHTS INTO A WAC CURRICULAR FOCUS

In supporting the SON, our WAC team (comprised of writing and rhetoric faculty and nursing faculty) faced the ongoing challenges of transfer, and we have seen how varying approaches to embedding writing in a curriculum can promote or discourage transfer. In the 2012 issue of *Educational Psychologist*, contributing authors focused on these challenges for transfer, exploring approaches across disciplines and pedagogical stances. In the issue's final article, David N. Perkins and Gavriel Salomon (2012) synthesize the entire collection along with outside research to identify a series of bridges that educators can adapt to promote transfer: "detecting a potential relationship with prior learning, electing to pursue it, and working out a fruitful

connection" (p. 248)—or "detect, elect, and connect." In doing so, educators can minimize the losses that occur when students learn content only as a transitory means to an end and can instead promote "knowledge to go" that students continue to use and apply well beyond any specific assignment or class. Writing studies, and especially WAC, has taken up Perkins's and Salomon's call for more research into writing pedagogies that include positive transfer and discourage negative transfer (Moore & Bass, 2017; Nowacek, 2011; Yancey et al., 2014.). One widely recognized way of encouraging positive transfer is to provide students with a common or shared language, a set of "writing concepts or key terms," in the words of Liane Robertson and Kara Taczak (2017), that students can use to label, reflect on, and come to understand their own writing. If keyed to the kinds of writing students will do across their academic careers, these shared writing concepts can aid transfer.

To translate theory into practice, we began adapting these transfer principles to our ongoing work with the School of Nursing. In working closely with faculty in the SON, we all came to realize that most of the groundwork for WAC had already been laid. Because faculty in the School of Nursing (SON) were already incorporating writing in many of their courses, and many nursing faculty had taken our institution's four-day Faculty Seminar on the Teaching of Writing, WAC efforts had already made a much larger impact in the SON than in other schools and disciplines at the university. Working together and partnering with other nursing faculty, we three decided to focus our WAC efforts on the following:

1. To identify the building block moves—critical skills, ways of knowing (Carter, 2007), discursive conventions—prized by the SON, the larger discipline, and its professional organizations. We did this by adapting language from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) The *Essentials: Core Competencies for Professional Nursing Education* (2021) into a set of larger writing-related moves and capacities that BSN students should learn to develop.
2. To emphasize commonalities across courses to facilitate transfer, turning those key ways of knowing into what Anne Beaufort, expanding on Perkins and Salomon (1989), called "mental grippers" (2016, p. 25). Mental grippers can be understood as ways of presenting knowledge, skills, and capacities that resonate with students and make it easier for them to "detect, elect, and connect" (Perkins & Salomon, 2012, p. 250).
3. To focus on writing instruction as guidance and mentorship in specific conventions and ways of knowing that nursing faculty already knew (thus making the implicit explicit for themselves and their students).
4. To encourage the continuation of writing assignments that exemplify what Michelle Eodice et al. (2016) identify as "meaningful writing

> projects." That is, many of the major writing assignments in the BSN courses offered students "opportunities for agency," "for engagement with instructors, peers, and materials," and "for learning that connects to previous experiences and passions and to future aspirations and identities" (Eodice et al., 2016, p. 4).

This particular focus provided the space for us to collaborate with the SON to create an approach that would work for their BSN program.

DISTINCTIVE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR BSN STUDENTS

BSN students enter into a high-stakes profession from day one. In recent years, nursing students have been taking on work that would be demanding at any time but is particularly grueling in this time of an ongoing nursing shortage. When these nursing students begin clinical rotations in their second year, they are not working in a simulation setting; they are in clinical settings with live patients. Furthermore, they follow a structured curriculum throughout their four years with limited room for meandering; the curriculum is science- and clinical-heavy (e.g., courses included anatomy, microbiology, chemistry, pathophysiology, and pharmacology; students also perform hundreds of hours in clinical rotations); and students must take rigorous, national board-certification exams in their fourth year. Upon passing, they are in demand in the workforce as nurses on the frontline. This reality was on full display during the pandemic (and not incidentally, the third year of our project), when the SON worked intensely to prepare graduating nurses to meet the medical demands of a massive public health crisis.

The SON faculty have communicated repeatedly the critical role of writing for their profession. The urgency of writing is tied, for them as for us, to critical thinking and communication: nursing students must learn to read texts and situations attentively; to identify and work with high-quality research sources; to synthesize material and formulate effective responses; and to communicate clearly with other professionals, with policy makers, with patients, and with the general public. Our institution's nursing faculty and leadership opted to take on the project of scaffolding writing across their BSN program to improve those outcomes in ways that would be manageable and enduring.

MAPPING TOWARD NEW GOALS

Before proposing any particular intervention, Ashley Hurst (associate professor in the SON and also the student learning assessment coordinator) stepped back and created a map of the existing curriculum. She reviewed the BSN degree

plan as a whole alongside recent program syllabi to identify where writing was already taking place. This step proved pivotal. Up to that point, faculty had associated "writing" with "research papers," which was daunting and left invisible a significant portion of existing writing instruction and activity. What the map highlighted instead was that (a) writing was already happening in most non-science focused classes and (b) the assignment types included research papers but also reflective journaling, case analyses, ethics case studies, history papers, op-ed pieces, research posters, and patient assessments. The map also exposed a severe lack of coordination among courses with regard to transfer, including mismatches in assignments (i.e., more than one course assigned "reflective writing," but the definitions of those assignments were starkly different between courses). Students, Hurst also found, were frustrated and felt they had "too much writing."

After reviewing this data, the SON and WAC first prioritized building better coordination of courses to improve transfer. One important precedent: nursing classes already leverage transparency for transfer of physical skills; our goal was now to help students see connections not only between assignments within a given class, but across their classes.

Our adaption took shape in response to how participants engaged with the initial model: We began our first year with a type of "metagenre" (Carter, 2007) that we identified by studying SON writing assignments—the research-report-respond model. We encouraged faculty and students to think about each writing task as incorporating some or all these larger rhetorical moves, such as identifying research, summarizing that research, and responding to or implementing a plan based on that research. While our audience seemed to "understand" the model, they never embraced it fully; the model seemed to be another item to memorize and take on, rather than something that could work organically with their existing activities. One problem with this approach was that the research-report-respond metagenre seemed external to the languages and practices of the nursing profession; rather than being endogenous to the field, it was an exogenous add-on. The next year, we pivoted to promoting a "Write to Learn/Write to Communicate" (W2L/W2C) model, which framed writing in more accessible, transferable terms that faculty and students could readily apply across their courses. This shift effectively internalized the work of writing within their own teaching practices, making it part of what they already did rather than something imposed from outside. This adaption, as we discuss below, gained better traction with the nursing faculty and students. Once the W2L/W2C framework became integrated into faculty practice, we shifted our focus to sustaining that framework through consistent, discipline-specific messaging. Rather than adding new requirements, we built on existing faculty meetings and consultations to circulate common language around writing goals.

ROLL-OUT INFRASTRUCTURE

What proved most effective were a few simple but consistent points of contact:

- **Brief WAC messaging:** A short spot at the annual opening nursing faculty meeting to review WAC highlights and requests; occasional notes in faculty-wide announcements; and prompts during assessment meetings to connect program goals with writing outcomes.
- **Targeted engagement:** Once-a-semester "lunch and learns," small-group consultations on assignments, and invitations to participate in our Faculty Seminar on the Teaching of Writing.

These touchpoints made it possible to normalize WAC discussion without adding administrative burden. We found opportunities to talk to nursing faculty about designing writing assignments to improve student performance, guiding students in writing with sources, streamlining feedback, and assigning writing for transfer across the BSN curriculum, all guided by research-based insights

When we realized that our research-report-respond metagenre was not an effective way to characterize the major moves of nursing writing, we turned to the AACN's *The Essentials: Core Competencies for Professional Nursing Education* (2021) as a bridge. We identified key skills within *The Essentials*—explore, consider, reflect and generate, synthesize, and apply—that paralleled WAC's "Write to Learn" and "Write to Communicate" distinctions. This linking of WAC concepts to nursing's professional outcomes provided a shared framework for talking about writing as both a mode of learning and a form of professional communication. To make that connection visible and usable, we created two cut-and-pasteable visuals—our "Write to Learn/W2L" and "Write to Communicate/W2C" stickers (see Appendix). Faculty could embed them in syllabi or assignments to signal how a given task functioned rhetorically and cognitively. In all our messaging, we highlight the pedagogical value of these two kinds of writing: W2L assignments help students think through content and can often be graded for completion, while W2C assignments benefit from explicit scaffolding, feedback, and criteria for final communication.

The linking of WAC concepts to nursing skills and capacities only worked because the nursing faculty's write-to-learn and write-to-communicate assignments already required students to enact those capacities in and through those writing tasks. We made those stickers widely available to faculty for inclusion on their syllabi and assignment sheets. In all our messaging, we review the key features and pedagogical benefits of these two types of writing assignments, where we discuss W2L assignments (such as writing summaries, responses, or reflection, taking notes toward analyzing a case, or brainstorming for a longer project) as "building

block" work to help students think through content. W2L assignments, accordingly, can often be graded for completion only; students may receive only peer feedback in person or on discussion boards; and faculty need not be concerned with features such as poor organization or grammar. With W2C assignments (literature reviews, problem-solution papers, research proposals, posters, and presentations), we talk about strategies for scaffolding that allow for a drafting-feedback-revision cycle; we also talk about establishing clear and reasonable criteria early on, then letting that criteria guide both formative and summative assessment.

Having these "stickers" and circulating them among the SON faculty offers a few advantages: First, W2L/W2C concepts are now part of the sustained discourse surrounding writing in the BSN program. Second, when faculty consent to put the stickers on their assignments or syllabi to indicate which set of skills they are prioritizing in that situation, the goals become more apparent to the faculty members themselves, which promotes greater awareness and alignment of profession-specific expectations. And third, by repeating these two simple visual indicators across the BSN curriculum, we can reinforce writing concepts and a shared language designed to facilitate transfer, in that students can recognize the recurrence of the two assignment types across their courses.

ASSESSMENT CHALLENGES AND FUTURE STRATEGIES

Managing assessment over a four-year curriculum can be challenging, as the number of and changes in co-factors can complicate meaningful data collection and analysis. In the years we review here, we had been scheduled to conduct a follow-up assessment on student papers in 2020. Unfortunately, due to the pandemic, students were writing in dramatically different circumstances than in the initial assessment in 2019, and we could not justify making any policy or curricular changes based on our inevitably inconsistent assessment data.

In our case, too, the writing assignments and circumstances of the first-year students are quite different from those of the fourth-year students, so at this time, we are not yet able to compare longitudinal scores. That is, first-year students currently write a series of low-stakes W2L papers with minimal research requirements during a relatively spacious time, whereas fourth-year students write more polished W2C research papers but during a time when they are necessarily focused on their national licensing exams.

For the next period of our WAC-BSN project, then, we are working toward the following assessment goals:

1. **Alignment across courses**. We have identified three courses that include or could appropriately include similar writing assignments (in the first,

second, and fourth years). Most of these are taught by multiple faculty across sections with reasonable continuity. We are working progressively with the groups of faculty members across these courses to revise one assignment in each course, to ensure continuity in the skills students will demonstrate at each level.

2. **Assessment timeline**. We plan to conduct new assessments with these revised assignments across a five-year period, studying baseline results in Fall 2024 and then observing outcomes again in Fall 2026 and Fall 2028. We hope these assessments will speak to whether our interventions are working to support the SON faculty's goals for their students' writing development across the full BSN curriculum.
3. **Faculty confidence measures.** We plan to conduct bi-annual surveys to measure faculty confidence with regard both to teaching writing in their content courses and to the efficacy of WAC in the BSN.

This partnership between the SON and WAC has been mutually enriching. We in WAC have greatly benefited from our partnership with the SON, as we have gained valuable insights into practices in which the nursing faculty excel—among these, their own self-awareness of their institutional culture, demands, and constraints, which has improved our recognition of often less-visible parallels in other schools and programs. The situations in which they write, as well as the genres and conventions they use to navigate those situations, have expanded and enhanced both our understanding of and the availability of models for text creation across fields. As Chris M. Anson and Pamela Flash (2021) suggest, too, we have found that the visibility and success of the BSN project has invited interest from other schools; and we now have a pool of resources that we can adapt across other disciplines.

SPEAKING BACK TO THE FIELD

Our experience affirms WEC's emphasis on departmental ownership while extending it in two pragmatic ways:

1. **From ownership to legibility.** Locating control within the unit is necessary but not sufficient; the curricular metalanguage for writing must also be *legible across courses* so faculty and students can connect prior learning. In our case, the shift from an external metagenre to a simple, transferable distinction (W2L/W2C) internalized writing work within existing practices rather than adding an exogenous template.
2. **From initiatives to infrastructure.** Sustainable uptake hinged on low-burden, recurring touchpoints (brief faculty-meeting inserts,

assessment-meeting prompts, semester "lunch and learns," small-group consultations, seminar invitations) that normalized a shared vocabulary without adding administrative load. Visible cues (the W2L/W2C stickers) then made the conceptual linkage operational at the syllabus and assignment level.

From this experience, we offer a practical heuristic for WAC and WEC implementers. Sustainable writing initiatives begin by translating WAC principles into discipline-legible categories, normalizing them through recurring, low-burden routines, making them visible with simple cues, and assessing them through aligned tasks distributed intentionally across the curriculum over time.

For the field, this BSN project affirms that sustainable WAC requires both conceptual clarity and infrastructural patience. Partnering, scaffolding, and adapting are not preliminary phases but ongoing habits of disciplinary translation that can help WAC practitioners in any context build legible, resilient writing pedagogies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Lois Myers and Carrie Worcester in the University of Virginia's Office of Institutional Research and Analytics, who have managed—graciously and masterfully—our assessment process throughout this project. We are also grateful to Bethany Coyne and Sara Hallowell, BSN program directors, for their support throughout this process, and to all of the participating BSN faculty members for their intelligence, fortitude, and commitment to student development.

REFERENCES

Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (2022). *Writing expertise: A research-based approach to writing and learning across disciplines*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PRA-B.2022.1701

American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (2021). *The essentials: Core competencies for professional nursing education*. https://www.aacnnursing.org/Portals/0/PDFs/Publications/Essentials-2021.pdf

Anderson, P., Anson, C., Gonyea, R., & Paine, C. (2015). The contributions of writing to learning and development: Results of a large-scale multi-institutional study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *50*(2), 199–235.

Anson, C. M., & Flash, P. (2021). *Writing enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2021.1299

Bailey, A., Zanchetta, M., Velasco, D., Pon, G., & Hassan, A. (2015). Building a scholar in writing (BSW): A model for developing students' critical writing skills. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *15*(6), 524–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2015.07.008

Beaufort, A. (2016). Reflection: The metacognitive move towards transfer of learning. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *A rhetoric of reflection*. Utah State University Press.

Blakeslee, A., Hines, S., Primeau, S., McBain, A., Versluis, J., & McCaffery, R. (2018). Reading and writing in nursing education. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice, 8*(6), 56–65.

Carter, M. (2007). Ways of knowing, doing, and writing in the disciplines. *College Composition and Communication, 58*(3), 385–418.

Collins, H. M., & Evans, R. (2007). *Rethinking expertise*. University of Chicago Press.

Cowles, K., Strickland, D., & Rodgers, B. (2001). Collaboration for teaching innovation: Writing across the curriculum in a school of nursing. *Journal of Nursing Education, 40*(8), 363–367.

Cox, M., Chaudoir, S., Cripps, M., Galin, J., Hall, J., Kaufman, O. B., Lane, S., McMullen-Light, M., Poe, M., Redd, T., Salem, L., Thaiss, C., Townsend, M., & Zawacki, T. M. (2014). *Statement on WAC Principles & Practices.* The WAC Clearinghouse. https://wacclearinghouse.org/principles/

Davidhizar, R. (1993). Mentoring nursing students to write. *Journal of Nursing Education, 32*(6), 280–282. https://journals.healio.com/doi/abs/10.3928/0148-4834-19930601-13

Eodice, M., Geller, A. E., & Lerner, N. (2016). *The meaningful writing project: Learning, teaching, and writing in higher education*. Utah State University Press.

Friberg, F., & Lyckhage, E. D. (2013). Changing essay writing in undergraduate nursing education through action research: A Swedish example. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, *34*(4), 226–232.

Galbraith, D., & Baaijen, V. (2018). The work of writing: Raiding the inarticulate. *Educational Psychologist, 53*(4), 238–257.

Glotfelter, A., Updike, A, & Wardle, E. (2020). "Something invisible … has been made visible for me." An expert-based WAC seminar model grounded in theory and (cross) disciplinary dialogue. In L. Bartlett, S. Tarabochia, A. Olinger, & M. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25* (pp. 167–192). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.0360.2.10

Graham, S., Harris, K. & Chambers, A. (2016). Self-regulation and writing: Meta-analysis of the self-regulation processes in Zimmerman and Risemberg's models. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 211–226). Guilford Press.

Hunker, D., Gazza, E., & Shellenger, T. (2014). Evidence-based knowledge, skills, and attitudes for scholarly writing development across all levels of nursing education. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 30*(4), 341–346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2013.11.003

Kellogg, R. T., & Whiteford, A. (2009). Training advanced writing skills: The case for deliberate practice. *Educational Psychologist, 44*(4), 250–266.

Klein, P., Arcon, N., & Baker, S. (2017). Writing to learn. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 243–256). Guilford Press.

Luthy, K., Peterson, N., Lassetter, J., & Callister, L. (2009). Successfully incorporating writing across the curriculum with advanced writing in nursing. *Journal of Nursing Education*, *48*(1), 54–59.

MacArthur, C. (2017). Instruction in evaluation and revision. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 272–287). Guilford Press.

Mitchell, K., Harrigan, T., Stafansson, T, & Setlack, H. (2017). Exploring self-efficacy and anxiety in first-year nursing students enrolled in a discipline-specific scholarly writing course. *Quality Advancement in Nursing, 3*(4). https://doi.org/10.17483/2368-6669.1084

Miller, L. C., Russell, C. L., Cheng, A. L., & Skarbek, A. J. (2015). Evaluating undergraduate nursing students' self-efficacy and competence in writing: Effects of a writing intensive intervention. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *15*(3), 174–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2014.12.002

Moore, J., & Bass, R. (Eds.). (2017). *Understanding writing transfer: Implications for transformative student learning in higher education*. Stylus.

Nowacek, R. (2011). *Agents of integration: Understanding transfer as a rhetorical act*. (Studies in Writing and Rhetoric). Southern Illinois University Press.

Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1989). Teaching for transfer. *Educational Leadership, 46*(1), 22–32.

Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (2012). Knowledge to go: A motivational and dispositional view of transfer. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(3), 248–258.

Robertson, L, & Taczak, K. (2017). Teaching for transfer. In J. Moore & R. Bass (Eds.), *Understanding writing transfer: Implications for transformative student learning in higher education* (pp. 93–102). Stylus.

Santangelo, T., Harris, K, & Graham, S, (2017). Self-regulation and writing: Meta-analysis of the self-regulation processes in Zimmerman and Risemberg's models. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 174–193). Guilford Press.

Silva, M., Cary, A., & Thaiss, C. (1999). When students can't write: Solutions through a writing-intensive nursing course. *Nursing and Health Care Perspectives, 20*(3), 142–145.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(4), 378–388.

Tesh, A. S., Hyde, Y. M., & Kautz, D. D. (2014). A writing intensive introductory course for RN to BSN students. *Nurse Educator*, *39*(1), 6–7. https://doi.org/10.1097/nne.0000000000000008

Thaiss, C., & Zawacki, T. (2006). *Engaged writers, dynamic disciplines: Research on the academic writing life*. Boynton/Cook.

Traxler, M. & Gernsbacher, M. (1993). Improving written communication through perspective-taking. *Language and Cognitive Processes, 8*(3), 311–334.

Troxler H., Jacobson J. C., & Oermann M. H. (2011). How baccalaureate programs teach writing. *Nursing Forum, 46*(4), 280–288. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6198.2011.00242.x

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing*. Utah State University Press.
Zimmerman, B. & Kitsantas, A. (2002). Acquiring writing revision and self-regulatory skill through observation and emulation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(4), 660–668.

APPENDIX: WRITE-TO-LEARN/WRITE-TO-COMMUNICATE STICKERS