(Re)Defining WAC to Guide a Linguistic Justice Ideological Change Across Campuses

EMILY BOUZA

In 1996, Walvoord suggested that WAC scholarship had focused on micro level concerns at the level of individual faculty rather than macro level concerns such as naming the relationship of WAC with upper administration on campuses. Over two decades later, Cox, Galin, and Melzer (2018) add that little has changed, and WAC has continued to focus on adapting composition theories to the needs of individual contexts. WAC is often seen as a pedagogical approach that can be adapted to each campus and able to work with writing in any course (Russell, 2002; Zawacki & Rogers, 2012). Much of WAC work (including the work I have done in WAC) aims toward affecting already interested faculty to make a small change to one or two of their courses they will teach in the immediate future.

Yet, when I think about WAC, I am inspired to think big. As I am sure others have, when I hear "Writing Across the Curriculum" I imagine effective writing pedagogy spreading across the entire campus, and the impact that would have both on campus and in wider communities as students graduate. I see this idea of "writing" as being a gateway for all communication practices, effective teaching practices, and even greater inclusivity and access, not just the named writing skills taught in a single lesson. I hope to both assist students from all backgrounds in gaining access into disciplinary communities while also helping those communities alter their discourses and practices to reflect the diversity of their community. While these are extremely lofty ideals, I remain hopeful that WAC has the power to enact macro level change toward linguistic justice on campuses.

Though current WAC scholarship has the building blocks to help us get here, I aim in this article to name a central theoretical framing for how we could reach these lofty goals. Much of WAC scholarship focuses on adapting composition theories for curriculum across the campus, such as writing to learn, the writing process, genre theory, and grading and feedback practices (Carter, et al., 2007; Russell, 2002; Zawacki & Rogers, 2012). This type of scholarship can lead to great micro level change, helping to affect change on the level of individual faculty members' teaching practices such as assignments or assessment. However, it does not theorize the administration of WAC and thus does not help WAC administrators move toward

macro level change, or affect the way the institution fundamentally views and teaches writing (Cox et al., 2018). To make macro level change, we need a theoretical framing that names the ideological shift we hope to enact and how we can enact this change across the entire campus in a sustainable manner. Naming our goals toward an inclusive, linguistic justice informed practice should be central to what it means to do WAC so that it becomes truly fundamental in everything we do.

As I am working toward this theoretical frame in this article, I have decided to organize everything around the *what*, the *how*, and the *why* questions of WAC. Most broadly: What is WAC? How do we do the work of WAC? Finally, why do we do the work of WAC? I argue that scholarship has explored the what questions as we have been defining the movement, and the how questions as we have been doing our work, but often leaves the why questions out of our work entirely, almost as if why answers are assumed in the what and how.

In order to develop the theory that I am looking for of WAC, I will build this up in the other direction, starting by answering why we do WAC and then going to how and ending with a new definition of what WAC is under this framing. My lofty goals for WAC include affecting language ideologies across campus to work toward access and inclusivity. By starting from a stronger why statement that names this as the central mission for WAC, this will help name how to do the work and what our work in WAC even is, and thus guide the decisions I make as a WAC administrator.

Theory of WAC

I am by no means the first person to call for a theory of WAC. Walvoord (1996) noted this lack of theory 25 years ago, and so she used social movement theory to analyze the ways WAC has responded to a wide range of challenges. Walvoord argued that much of the work WAC administrators do functions on the micro level, activities such as workshops that work toward changing individual faculty, but that little work is done at the macro level to create more systemic change, through activities such as defining WAC's relationship with institutional administration. She concludes with the argument that WAC has power as a movement and that WAC must mature as an organization.

Cox et al. (2018) point to Walvoord's piece to show how the WAC movement is still functioning the same ways over 20 years later. They argue that WAC literature focuses not on the macro level discussions of the complexity of higher education, but on writing pedagogies applied through WAC work on the micro level. In their book, *Sustainable WAC,* Cox et al. develop a theoretical framework that can help explain the structure of WAC programs and the moves that WAC administrators make to develop and sustain programs on various campuses. Their framework then

aims to provide a comprehensive theoretical framework, methodology, and strategies for WAC administrators to develop, revitalize, and sustain WAC programs.

While the WAC movement has been celebrated for being flexible and adapting to each campus, these calls for sustainability and theoretical framing are requests for structure within the flexibility. WAC is easily adaptable because it is something that can be layered upon existing structures. If we are hoping to enact macro change, we need to rethink how WAC can be adaptable to various contexts but also call for greater change within the institution while doing so. While theoretical framings from existing scholarship (Cox et al., 2018; McLeod et al., 2001; Tarabochia, 2017; Walvoord, 1996) move us toward describing the work of a WAC administrator, I am left without a full understanding about why we do the work of WAC, especially in a description that somehow addresses the assimilationist critiques of WAC. Naming access and inclusivity as central to why we do WAC can give us this central goal that, while still adapting to different contexts, will name what macro change we are hoping for as we integrate WAC more fully onto our campuses.

Why WAC

The easy answer for why we teach writing across the curriculum is simply so that students learn through the act of writing and learn to write in their disciplines, essentially write-to-learn and learn-to-write, core fundamental ideas to the WAC movement (see Carter et al., 2007; McLeod et al., 2001; Russell, 2002). However, this is still missing why writing is essential for all students, or why we focus on writing specifically as the skill that needs to be developed and why this benefits our students.

It is logical to start to look for this why in the foundation of the WAC movement. As we have probably all read, much of all composition studies has a history of being started out of concerns for falling literacy rates of college students, coinciding with increased admission of students from a greater variety of social classes and backgrounds (Russell, 2002). The WAC movement can be traced to a specific moment of increased literacy concerns in the 1970s, where open admissions and racial integration led to more students from marginalized backgrounds attending college than in previous decades (Russell, 2002). Walvoord (2000) describes the beginning of the WAC program on her campus, "We started, as many such groups still do, with a concern that our students could not write papers that met our expectations for thought, organization, or mechanics" (p. 13). While each program has a unique reason for beginning, it seems to be a pattern that WAC programs start as a response to some sense of a lack of ability in students' language skills as campuses continue to increase in student body and diversity.

As scholars have begun to question the nature of why we are doing WAC work, many explore whether our work is more assimilationist versus truly inclusive. The

WAC movement has "been critiqued for its tendency to standardize, accommodate, and lose critical reflexivity" (Geller 2011, drawing from Kells, 2007; LeCourt, 1996; Mahala, 1991; Schroeder, Fox, Bizzell, 2002; Villanueva, 2001). LeCourt (1996) argued for a third stage of WAC in which we would remedy the problems of assimilating students into existing standards and thus silencing their differences. She argues that the focus on learning content through writing and learning to write through disciplinary conventions are ways to enculturate students into the existing linguistic conventions across the curriculum. She adds that students are often eager for acceptance and validation in their chosen fields and thus will internalize the ways of thinking of that discipline rather than draw from the ways of thinking they already possess.

However, twenty-eight years later, scholars continue to call for similar transformations to occur. As scholars like Hebbard and Hernández (2020) and Green and Condon (2020) argue, we are still in the early stages of developing ways for students from diverse linguistic backgrounds to use their full linguistic resources effectively and productively in courses across the curriculum.

In summary, the traditional answer to why we do WAC is assumed in the description of what it is, we do WAC so students learn about writing. When further questions are raised about why WAC is done, we are then led to these questions of whether traditional models of WAC are assimilationist in nature. Scholars are critiquing why we should do WAC if all it does is assimilate students into the existing discourses and structures of the disciplines rather than allowing students to use their full linguistic repertoires and ways of knowing. As a response to these critiques, I offer linguistic justice as an answer for why we do WAC.

Offering Linguistic Justice as Why for WAC

To fully explore a theoretical framing for WAC that is not assimilationist in nature, I turn to the ideology of linguistic justice, as have many others in composition studies (see Baker-Bell, 2020; Frost et al., 2020; Perryman-Clark, 2021; Schreiber, et al., 2022). This body of scholarship asks us to move beyond multilingual dispositions toward language where we still teach toward one assumed norm that is deemed higher in societal value (Horner et al., 2011). Instead, the call is to move toward a translingual disposition toward language in which multilingualism is considered the norm and all communication is deemed an act of translation (Canagarajah, 2013; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Horner et al., 2011).

This translingual disposition toward language informs the ideology of linguistic justice. Mihut (2022) posits that linguistic justice both "exposes monolingual standards" and "actively integrates cross-cultural rhetorics and translingual writing in the classroom" because both a "critique of monolingualism and integration of plurilingual practices and theories are essential to centering and valorizing linguistically-rich

practices" (p. 269). Baker-Bell (2020) adds that linguistic justice is a call for action, not just ideas. Central to the framing of linguistic justice is that it is not just about socially defined language barriers, but all marginalized language practices, including Black language and identity (e.g., Baker-Bell, 2020), multilingual speakers (e.g., Mihut, 2020), Indigeneity (e.g., Preseley, 2022), and antiracism more broadly (e.g., Wang, 2022). Schreiber, et al. (2022) argue that linguistic justice work should move us toward a more just society in which inclusivity and accessibility allow for all students to grow and learn to amplify their own voices. They also mention that access and inclusion efforts for multilingual students must also include an awareness of ability and how racism and ableism are both parts of the restrictive, monolingual ideologies.

While ableism has been less explored through the frame of linguistic justice, I will turn here to the discussion of access in disability studies, as a comprehensive linguistic justice framework needs to incorporate discussions of ability and because the work in disability studies helps to make sense of what is missing in current WAC frameworks. Similar to linguistic justice, disability justice "pushes past solely access, assimilation, inclusion and equality, to justice and liberation" that is not simply a "kinder, gentler oppressive system or only access to the current violent system we have" (Mingus, 2014, p. 109). Disability justice is calling for liberation of all people, across ability as well as other social markers such as race (see also Berne et al., 2018; Konrad, 2021; Ramp Your Voice, 2020; Simpkins, 2018; Sins Invalid, 2021; Yergeau, 2018).

As these scholars and activists argue, issues of disability justice often overlap with issues of language, including accessible teaching practices, reading and writing modalities, and linguistic differences including ASL and braille. Many members of the disability community refer to the term "language justice" in discussions about the need for including considerations of language in making spaces accessible and inclusive. The activist organization Sins Invalid published a statement in 2021 outlining the principles of language justice, stating "Language Justice means that everyone is listened to and understood without hierarchy, stigma, or shame. It honors our right to communicate our feelings and ideas, and demands we move in mutual respect for all people regardless of whether or how they sign, speak, or otherwise convey what's on their mind or in their heart." This definition and their additional principles highlight that the goals of language justice and linguistic justice are working toward the same key principles, that language varieties should not be hierarchized, and we ought to work toward greater inclusivity of both languages and the speakers of those language varieties.

Dolmage (2017) uses the term retrofit as a spatial metaphor to describe how disability is often handled in society. An architectural retrofit is something like adding a ramp entrance to the back of a building. The building was designed to be entered

solely by stairs, so a more accessible ramp is retrofitted onto the building, often creating additional challenges such as separate entrances, creating a sense of othering for users, and still not fitting the needs of every disabled person. Similarly, when we add accommodations to a class, Dolmage argues that we are simply retrofitting the curriculum, and essentially making the disability go away rather than truly planning for all abilities while designing the curriculum.

I believe that too often we might be doing work of retrofitting and accommodating diversity in WAC as well. When we make arguments of how to develop strategies for multilingual writers or other marginalized groups of students, we are retrofitting a strategy for these particular students onto the existing curriculum rather than adjusting the curriculum design itself. Like adding a ramp to a building, we are adding additional avenues into the academy that often require extra effort such as working to remove dialectal differences and style from people of marginalized identities. We need to instead start from a curriculum that allows for access to all —a theoretical understanding of writing that works toward linguistic justice for all students. Building from a basis that accounts for linguistic justice, we can instead design a theory for WAC that already accounts for the diversity of our student body. Truly this has implications for all of composition theory, but because WAC has power across the campus, the consequences are much further reaching for us to be sure of working toward linguistic justice in our work.

For a model for how to start to think about linguistic justice in WAC, I turn to Writing Across Communities, or WAC^2, as developed and theorized by Michelle Hall Kells and Juan Guerra. Kells (2007) describes WAC^2 as "a cultural ecology approach seek[ing] to cultivate critical awareness of the ways that literacy practices are shaped by ever-shifting sets of economic, political, social, cultural, and linguistic factors" (p. 93). WAC^2 is built from this cultural ecology approach, meaning it resists culture-blind modes of discourse production, seeking ways to connect students' home communities to college literacy education. Thus, this approach builds structures to support linguistic justice by cultivating critical literacy practices and foregrounding student experience and knowledge. Kells has done this work through incorporating voices of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community members into the discussion of what it really means to do WAC on her campus.

In his book, *Language, Culture, Identity and Citizenship in College Classrooms and Communities*, Guerra (2016) further discusses theories that shape the WAC^2 approach. Guerra starts the book with a discussion of fluidity and fixity to show how from his own experiences as a Latinx, multilingual academic, composition teaching always must balance between the notion of giving students the skills to be fluid with their language use, but also respond to a society that has fixed rules and expectations

on how language usage is judged. This maps well onto Mihut's (2022) definition of linguistic justice work as exposing monolingual standards and integrating translingual practices into the classroom. For Guerra, this means he teaches that this standard does exist, showing there is an existing fixity to how his voice has been judged as a person of color, but that we also must move toward the fluidity that is possible in identity and voice, which is especially apparent in borderlands like Guerra's hometown.

Speaking specifically to WAC, Guerra (2016) describes how his theorization relates to the writing across difference discussions (see Daniel et al., 2022) as these discussions call for proponents to acknowledge the values of the linguistic, cultural, and semiotic resources that students bring with them to a campus. WAC^2 draws from these student resources by involving students themselves, as well as faculty, staff, administrators, and community members, into developing WAC initiatives, working together to build cultural awareness rather than socialize new writers into existing dominant academic discourses. In practice, WAC^2 calls for more community engaged classes and projects on campuses that require students to write the genres relevant to communities outside of the university (Kells, 2007), thus better attuning to the discourse practices of communities rather than solely traditional academic discourses. Guerra (2016) states that the ultimate goal is always to find ways to contribute to the cultivation of students as citizens in the making by integrating the language and cultural practices from their communities of belonging and the tools they acquire in the writing classroom each time they engage the challenges of everyday living.

From discussions of linguistic justice and WAC^2, I believe we have a stronger model for why we do WAC work, or at least why I want to do WAC work. Through teaching the fixity of disciplinary standards, we can provide access to disciplinary discourse communities. Simultaneously, through exploring linguistic fluidity, we can work with the discourse communities, including students, faculty, professionals, and other community members, to move toward a more translingual disposition toward their own language use to truly evolve with the increasing cultural diversity of those discourse communities. Thus, this disposition toward WAC can aid students in accessing the existing discourse communities while also working with those discourse communities to be truly inclusive. Now with this foundation of why we do WAC, we next need a model for how to enact this macro level change.

How to Do WAC

Much of WAC scholarship lists the different programming administrators do and might describe specifically how they conducted one type of programming, providing models for other administrators to determine effective strategies for taking on this

role. While helpful for running similar events, these often focus more on micro level decisions rather than macro level strategies. Thaiss and Porter's (2010) study of WAC programs across the United States shows that across the 1,338 responses, WAC programs most often offer faculty workshops, seminars, informal gatherings, and follow-up meetings after workshops. Usually, these activities support a curricular requirement for students to write across disciplines in some sort of writing-intensive courses.

This study and other scholars (e.g., McLeod, 1987) have helped to name the typical events that encapsulate WAC work, and in doing so have provided models for the complicated work of WAC administration. Nonetheless, I would argue that these descriptions only start to skim the surface on how we really do WAC work. Naming the various programing events and approaches gives a broad view, but a theory of WAC administration would go further to describe how we could enact sustainable macro level change. If we hope to create an ideological change toward linguistic justice across campus, we need a model for how to do WAC that answers questions of how to enact a macro level change across an entire campus.

Offering the Departmental Model as How to Do WAC

The departmental model of WAC, or Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC), is an increasingly popular model of how to do WAC work in a way that has been shown to enact macro level change on different campuses. The WEC model developed out of a need to integrate writing assessment goals throughout the curriculum, truly affecting the way writing is taught as a consistently developing skill and shifting the ideology around writing education on a campus (Carter, 2021). Rather than writing intensive models that are difficult to sustain and isolate writing instruction into specific courses within the major (see Anson and Dannels in Cox et al., 2016; Holdstein, 2001; White, 1990), WEC encourages a more scaffolded writing instruction by working with all faculty within a department. In doing so, WEC is building a framework and theory for how to do WAC work in a way that has greater uptake and is sustainable.

Flash (2021), who started the highly successful WEC program at University of Minnesota, defines WEC, stating "In essence, WEC is a facilitated process designed to support the integration of relevant writing and writing instruction into departmental curricula and to increase the rate at which students' writing meets local faculty expectations" (p. 18). Flash (2021) states that the first step of WEC always involves working with departments or programs to develop a writing plan based on faculty discussions and locally collected data from that group. The writing plan includes "characteristics of writing in the broad discipline, writing abilities expected of graduating majors, curricular address of expected writing abilities, methods and criteria used to assess writing, and proposed activity and support" (p. 24). After building this plan, the WAC administrator helps the department put it into action.

As several practitioners attest, the conversations that occur in these faculty meetings are key to the process and are often transformational for those involved (Anson, 2021; Luskey & Emery, 2021; Sheriff, 2021). These conversations help colleagues learn from one another (Sheriff, 2021) and make tacit practices more explicit (Luskey & Emery, 2021). Anson (2021) describes how working with departments or programs as the locus for WAC work inspires faculty to focus on writing and to integrate writing into their curriculum themselves.

The WEC approach truly makes macro changes because it is changing faculty ideologies through these conversations, but also because it encourages vertical integration of writing. A vertical integration of writing instruction goes beyond individual classes, bridging first-year composition with courses taught throughout degrees, with the goal to scaffold writing development (Anson, 2006; Hall, 2006). The WEC model shows how this vertical integration can occur through an "ongoing cycle of creating, implementing, and assessing undergraduate writing plans" (Flash, 2021, p. 23). These writing plans put the responsibility of writing teaching on disciplinary faculty while giving them the resources and support needed to follow through on their goals.

WEC has been taken up in multiple contexts, and the book *Writing-Enriched Curricula* includes twenty contributors from nine different schools with references throughout to other institutions that have adopted the WEC model. I recently attended the 2022 WEC Institute, hosted by Pamela Flash, Matt Luskey, Dan Emery, and Heidi Solomonson from the University of Minnesota. The event was attended by 225 participants from over 80 schools. As this institute showed, WEC has been taken up throughout many programs, with even more showing interest in the model. From attending presentations and engaging with conversations throughout the institute, I could tell that the WEC model looks different on various campuses, often depending on financial and staffing affordances and constraints, but at its core each of these programs are working toward the macro level work of engaging with full departments to develop plans that include writing throughout degree programs.

From the WEC model, we have a strong approach to answer how to enact macro level change through WAC administration. A departmental model, which requires facilitated conversation with faculty from entire departments to work with a WAC expert to develop and enact a plan for writing in their discipline, has already been successfully adapted to many different campuses and is truly affecting the ideologies around writing on those campuses in macro level ways.

A Need for a New What Definition of WAC

The WEC model provides a successful model for how to integrate a macro level change on campus, but it is missing a core attention to linguistic justice as why we

are enacting the WEC structure. Similarly, WAC[2] provides a model for how to center linguistic justice in WAC, but it is missing a description of how to institute this ideology across campus in a sustainable manner. I now will build toward a definition of what WAC is in an attempt to bridge these two models, describing WAC in a way that will allow the departmental model then to be how we enact WAC and linguistic justice as why.

Previous scholarship, of course, has explored what it is to do WAC work. WAC scholarship often focuses on individual aspects of how to apply composition theory to a new context, such as how to include greater attention to the writing process and effective feedback practices in courses across the curriculum. Fewer pieces discuss WAC more broadly, helping to define and theorize WAC as its own entity outside of composition. In one such discussion of the entire movement, Thaiss (2001) focuses on the ideas of shifting definitions of "good writing" across the curriculum, but the piece does not discuss the work of a WAC administrator in relation to these shifting ideals. Overviews of WAC such as McLeod's (1987) and Anson's (2015) describe the composition theories that are fundamental for faculty who teach writing and McLeod lists the ways that WAC administrators then do their work, but neither go into theorizing the work of a WAC administrator. As Walvoord (1996) critiques, WAC scholarship often describes the micro level choices of what to focus on in WAC programming. There are fewer macro level discussions of the programming itself, discussing topics such as how working with these faculty will affect broader curricular goals, create an ideological change on a campus, and truly affect students in the long-term.

In an attempt to gather data to better define WAC, Thaiss and Porter's (2010) aforementioned survey on WAC programming resulted in 1,338 responses from schools across the U.S. After analyzing the results on how programs directors defined their work, Thaiss and Porter concluded that WAC can be defined as:

> an initiative in an institution to assist teachers across disciplines in using student writing as an instructional tool in their teaching. The program strives to improve student learning and critical thinking through writing and to help students learn the writing conventions of their disciplines. (p. 562)

The idea of needing complementary elements of both writing-to-learn (e.g. Carter et al., 2007) and learning-to-write (e.g., Britton, et al., 1975; Emig, 1977; Forsman, 1985), throughout the curriculum pervades through much of WAC scholarship. We also see in this definition that WAC is an initiative to support teachers throughout the institution. I notice here that WAC is aimed at individual faculty rather than changing larger curriculum or even directly affecting students or administrators, again focusing on the micro changes more than the macro.

New Definition of WAC

To work toward larger change on campuses, macro level change should be central to the definition of WAC in a way that then leads us to the definitions I have already discussed for how and why to do to WAC. I believe that WAC can both embody the ideology of linguistic justice as modeled by the WAC[2] approach and follow the departmental model of WEC in execution, but to do so, we must first find the similarities between these two approaches to create a new definition of what WAC is.

While very different, the WEC and WAC[2] models have several key similarities. First, both work toward macro changes at the university through affecting the ideologies around writing on campuses. WEC focuses more on vertical integration of writing and WAC[2] focuses more on shifting views of writing toward a cultural ecology approach that encourages linguistic justice, but these both affect ideologies around writing and are more complementary than at odds with one another. Also, in both of these approaches, a greater attention is given to genre and audience, writing the genres typical to disciplinary discourse communities and communities off campus rather than focusing solely on typical academic writing genres.

Another key similarity is that both WEC and WAC[2] have a pattern of being referred to as grassroots endeavors, mainly because of the way both build WAC efforts through collaborative methods where expertise and leadership is decentralized. Both Guerra and Kells have referred to WAC[2] as a grassroots or social activist movement. WAC[2] builds directly on scholarship of community engaged work and centers bringing the voices of students, disciplinary faculty, and community members together to make WAC goals for the campus. WEC can also be described as a grassroots approach in the way it supports departmental faculty to collaboratively create a writing plan with the WAC team. In the data gathering stage, WEC writing plans also often involve gathering voices of students and community stakeholders. Scafe and Eodice (2021) specifically elaborate on how the version of WEC on their campus has been particularly like that of a grassroots, social activist organization as they are starting with smaller conversations and actions as they build toward a larger WEC structure with entire departments. In both WAC[2] and WEC, the WAC administrator does not make decisions on the direction of writing on their own, nor is there a need for higher administration within the university to design requirements or regulate writing curriculum. Both approaches rely on building trust, collaborating with multiple stakeholders, and creating shared goals for future initiatives, all of which harkens toward grassroots, activist approaches.

In *The Activist WPA*, Adler-Kassner (2008) argues for broadening the vision for writing program administration (WPA) to include activist work. She believes that all composition teachers and WPAs need to develop strategies for collective action to shape the stories told about their work. To do so, she encourages WPAs to start

by discussing the principles fundamental to their writing program and then deciding to focus on a values-based, interests-based, or issues-based framework to guide the transformational change that they hope to enact based upon those principles. In doing so, Adler-Kassner argues that WPAs can build on these activist approaches to work toward strategic action to create long-term plans, both on the organization level and the level of individual institutions. I believe that many of these ideas of how to make writing programs more activist are highly applicable to the ways that WAC programs work to change institutional contexts, as we can see in the way that both WAC[2] and WEC can be referred to as grassroots movements.

So, to redefine what WAC is in a way that can make room for a departmental model answer to how to do WAC and a linguistic justice answer to why we do WAC, I believe we should fold in these ideas of activist WPA work, highlighting the grassroots similarity between WAC[2] and WEC. I offer then the definition of WAC as a grassroots movement that focuses on writing and communication skills as the building blocks for an ideological shift in education practices. So, this leads us to the following as a summary of previous working definitions of WAC I summarized from the literature and my new definition of WAC I have been building through this article.

Table 1. Comparison of previous definitions of WAC and my new theorization

	Previous Working Definitions	New Theorization
What	An initiative to aid faculty in teaching writing as both a skill and mode of learning across all curriculum.	A grassroots movement that focuses on writing and communication skills as the building blocks for an ideological shift in education practices.
How	Tends toward description of micro level change through efforts such as workshops, trainings, Writing Intensive courses, and overall changing individual faculty through mainly voluntary events.	Using a collaborative approach within each departmental or programmatic unit on campus, facilitating conversations to build and enact a curricular plan based upon shared interests and values within the specific disciplinary contexts.
Why	Either assumed in the what and how descriptions and therefore not discussed, or left as a question of whether we are being assimilationist in WAC.	To enact linguistic justice through access and inclusivity in discourse communities–Access through teaching the fixity of certain communication norms and Inclusivity through shifting the ideologies of these spaces toward fluidity in language practices to reflect the diverse members of those communities and the audiences of their discourse.

Thus, within this new what, how, and why definition of WAC, there is a framework for macro change toward linguistic justice folded into the foundation of how WAC is conceptualized. Instead of retrofitting strategies to work with additional groups of students, this framework takes the necessary step to name linguistic justice as fundamental to the core of WAC work. Thus, by doing so, scholars and activists will center an attention to race, Indigeneity, ability, and other marginalized identities throughout what it means to do WAC.

Enacting this Definition of WAC and Looking to the Future

In practice, this new definition of WAC might lead to a variety of practices on different campuses, as suggested in the grassroots nature of the work. I hope that this definition inspires WAC practitioners to try out many new practices toward linguistic justice and ideological change on their campuses, but I will briefly outline some ideas here of how I could see this take form.

First, this new framing would mean that we are leaning into the concepts of an activist framework throughout WAC efforts. Broadly, I would suggest that WAC administrators continue to explore the work of activist groups, especially those active in the communities near their campuses, and find ways to collaborate with these groups when appropriate and to emulate their practices to create similar impacts for marginalized community members on campus. WAC administrators can also draw from practices typical to community engaged research in composition to find practices for how to engage with faculty, staff, students, and community members to explore writing practices together and create collaborative goals toward linguistic justice and writing curriculum (for a non-exhaustive list, see Crabtree & Sapp, 2005; Hachelaf & Parks, 2018; Jackson & DeLaune, 2018; Rousculp, 2014; Smith & Kannen, 2015).

A large part of grassroots efforts involves first finding allies. Many experienced WAC administrators might have a ready list of their strongest supporters. I would also suggest brainstorming who you would like to be your allies on and off campus, including faculty, staff, or students, and then networking with them. In meetings with potential allies, I have had the greatest success in asking a lot of questions to learn about the work and goals of others while also honestly sharing my own goals and values. I also find it helpful to have a tangible next step by the end of the discussion so both parties know how to build on the discussion.

I am still just starting to explore what this new definition of WAC means for my work, and I hope to publish more on that in the future, but for now I can share that I have started to find my allies and work with them. In working toward the departmental model, I have tried to find allies that will help me make moves to work with entire departments. To center linguistic justice through the way I do WAC, I share

what linguistic justice means to me and ask how this might work alongside social justice efforts already occurring in the department in every conversation I have. In following an activist framework, the goal is to find an established group that will come together for a conversation to discuss and name shared values, interests, or issues among members of the department or other unit. The next step is to then work alongside this group to create interventions that will help them reach their goals. By starting with a shared understanding of values, interests, or issues in the department related to both writing and social and linguistic justice, every effort to act upon these can be influenced by this mutual understanding. Essentially, naming values, interests, or issues shared within the entire departmental unit can then lead you to developing catered WAC programming that intersects linguistic justice and writing in a way that forwards the goals of the group you are working with rather than developing generic programming that might or might not meet the needs of specific faculty.

I could see this grassroots activist approach working along a spectrum to fit different campus environments, working with entire departments or smaller groups on a campus. In the manner of activism, the WAC administrator's role would always be that of a grassroots organizer, not telling departments or other units what they value, but facilitating their discussions to bring forward their various ideals and pointing them to resources to expand their knowledge and interventions that would enact their values.

Writing this article is partially a selfish endeavor, as I specifically created a definition for WAC that helps describe and set up the type of work that I want to do in my career. Thus, I fully believe there are other equally valid definitions of WAC that could describe the work that others wish to do in their careers. However, what I offer here has significant implications for the field. First, if we are working against assimilationist framings of WAC, we need to better define why we are doing WAC before naming the how and what of our programs; otherwise we are simply retrofitting new strategies on top of a non-accessible framework. I believe that the WAC[2] approach offers a strong why foundation for doing this, but in the nature of this cultural ecology approach, each individual program will have to consider what this might mean for their specific communities on and around their campuses. Second, the departmental WEC approach is a highly sustainable way to enact macro change on campuses, but it should build upon a strong definition of why this change needs to occur through an attention to linguistic justice. And finally, successful composition programming broadly, and WAC programming specifically, can follow activist approaches to enact grassroots change across campuses. By naming WAC as activist and grassroots in nature, we can focus on both how we are doing work by comparing it to activist organizing and why we are doing our work as activism implies naming the social change toward which we are working.

I hope that by carefully naming both a how and a why, this definition of WAC can help us reach toward true change toward linguistic justice. By framing WAC as a grassroots, activist effort that works with departments toward access and inclusivity in their discourse communities, the goal and process to do macro level change on a campus is defined in a way that will provide direction for WAC administration that sustainably works toward linguistic justice. As with any theory, I hope that others will build on these ideas and test them out to see how we can each reach our loftiest goals for true ideological change through our work.

References

Adler-Kassner, L. (2008). *The activist WPA: Changing stories about writing and writers.* Utah State University Press. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/usupress_pubs/29

Anson, C. M. (2006). Assessing writing in cross-curricular programs: Determining the locus of activity. *Assessing Writing, 11*(2), 100–112.

Anson, C. M. (2015). Crossing thresholds: What's to know about writing across the curriculum. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* (pp. 203–219). Utah State University Press.

Anson, C. M. (2021). Introduction: WEC and the strength of the commons. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation* (pp. 3–14). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Anson, C. M., & Flash, P. (Eds.). (2021). *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.

Berne, P., Morales, A. L., Langstaff, D., & Invalid, S. (2018). Ten principles of disability justice. *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly, 46*(1), 227–230.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, T., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). *The development of writing abilities (11-18)*. Macmillan Education.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relation.* Routledge.

Carter, M. (2021). Foreword. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation* (pp. vii–xi). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Carter, M., Ferzli, M., & Wiebe, E. N. (2007). Writing to learn by learning to write in the disciplines. *Technical Communication, 21*(3), 278–302.

Cox, M., Galin, J., & Melzer, D. (2018). *Building sustainable WAC programs: A whole systems approach, 29,* 64-87.

Cox, M., & Zawacki, T. M. (Eds.). (2011). WAC and second language writing: Cross-field research, theory, and program development [Special issue: WAC and Second Language Writing]. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(4).

Crabtree, R. D., & Sapp, D. A. (2005). Technical communication, participatory action research, and global civic engagement: A teaching, research, and social action collaboration in Kenya. *Reflections: A Journal of Rhetoric, Civic Writing and Service Learning, 4*(2).

Daniel, J. R., Malcolm, K., & Rai, C. (2022). *Writing across difference: Theory and intervention*. University Press of Colorado.

Dolmage, J. T. (2017). The retrofit. In *Academic ableism: Disability and higher education* (pp. 67–97). University of Michigan Press.

Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. *College Composition and Communication*, *28*, 122–128.

Flash, P. (2021). Writing-enriched curriculum: A model for making and sustaining change. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation* (pp. 17–44). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171.

Forsman, S. (1985). Writing to learn means learning to think. In A. R. Gere (Ed.), *Roots in the sawdust: Writing to learn across the disciplines* (pp. 162–174). National Council of Teachers of English.

Frost, A., Kiernan, J., & Blum-Malley, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Translingual dispositions: Globalized approaches to the teaching of writing*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Geller, A. E. (2011). Teaching and learning with multilingual faculty. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(4), 1–19.

Green, N.-A. S., & Condon, F. (2020). Letters on moving from ally to accomplice: Anti-racism and the teaching of writing. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R. Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25* (pp. 277–292). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Guerra, J. (2016). *Language, culture, identity and citizenship in college classrooms and communities*. Routledge.

Hachelaf, A. A., & Parks, S. (2018). Dreams of twiza as transnational practice: Managing risk, building bridges, and community partnership work. *Composition Forum, 40.*

Hall, J. (2006). Toward a unified writing curriculum: Integrating WAC/WID with freshman composition. *The WAC Journal*, *17*(1), 5–22.

Hebbard, M., & Hernández, Y. (2020). Becoming transfronterizo collaborators: A transdisciplinary framework for developing translingual pedagogies in WAC/WID. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R. Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches*

to teaching learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25 (pp. 251–273). The WAC Clearinghouse.

Holdstein, D. H. (2001). "Writing across the curriculum" and the paradoxes of institutional initiatives. *Pedagogy*, *1*(1), 37–52.

Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, C. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication, 63*(2), 269–300.

Jackson, R. C., & DeLaune, D. W. (2018). Decolonizing community writing with community listening: Story, transrhetorical resistance, and Indigenous cultural literacy activism. *Community Literacy Journal, 13*(1), 37-54.

Kells, M. H. (2007). Writing across communities: Deliberation and the discursive possibilities of WAC. *Reflections*, *11*(1), 87–108.

Konrad, A. M. (2021). Access fatigue: The rhetorical work of disability in everyday life. *College English*, *83*(3), 179–199.

LeCourt, D. (1996). WAC as a critical pedagogy: The third stage. *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory*, *16*, 389–405.

Luskey, M., & Emery, D. L. (2021). Beyond conventions: Liminality as a feature of the WEC faculty development. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation* (pp. 95–120). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Mahala, D. (1991). Writing utopias: Writing across the curriculum and the promise of reform. *College English*, *53*(7), 773–789.

Mallett, K. E., & Zgheib, G. (2014). Campus internationalization: A center-based model for ESL-ready programs. In T. M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 387–413). The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.

McLeod, S. H. (1987). Defining writing across the curriculum. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, *17*(1–2), 19–24.

McLeod, S. H., Miraglia, E., Soven, M., & Thaiss, C. (Eds.). (2001). *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing across the curriculum programs*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Mihut, L. A. (2020). Enacting linguistic justice: Transnational scholars as advocates for pedagogical change. In A. Frost, J. Kiernan, & S. Blum-Malley (Eds.), *Translingual dispositions: Globalized approaches to the teaching of writing* (pp. 269–294). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Mingus, M. (2014). Reflection toward practice: Some questions on disability justice. In C. Wood (Ed.), *Critiques* (pp. 107–113). May Day.

Patton, M. D. (2011). Mapping the gaps in services for L2 writers. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(4).

Perryman-Clark, S. M. (2021). Does the universe tilt to the side of linguistic justice? When, where, and how? *Writing Program Administration*, *44*(2), 100–110.

Presley, R. (2022). Dis/Locating linguistic terrorism: Writing American Indian languages back into the rhetoric classroom. In B. R. Schreiber, E. Lee, J. T. Johnson, & N. Fahim (Eds.), *Linguistic justice on campus: Pedagogy and advocacy for multilingual students* (pp. 58–71). Multilingual Matters.

RampYourVoice. (2020). *Ramp Your Voice: Empowering People with Disabilities.* RampYourVoice. https://www.vilissathompson.com

Rousculp, T. (2014). *Rhetoric of respect: Recognizing change at a community writing center.* National Council of Teachers of English.

Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history* (2nd ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

Scafe, R., & Eodice, M. (2021). Finding writing where it lives: Departmental relationships and relationships with departments. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation* (pp. 235–251). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Schreiber, B. R., Lee, E., Johnson, J. T., & Fahim, N. (Eds.). (2022). *Linguistic justice on campus: Pedagogy and advocacy for multilingual students*. Multilingual Matters.

Schroeder, C., Fox, H., & Bizzell, P. (Eds.). (2002). *ALT DIS: Alternative discourses and the academy*. Heinemann.

Sheriff, S. (2021). Beyond "I know it when I see it": WEC and the process of unearthing faculty expertise. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation* (pp. 145–165). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Simpkins, N. (2018). Towards an understanding of accommodation transfer. *Composition Forum*, *39*. https://compositionforum.com/

Sins Invalid. (2021, June 8). *La justicia de lenguaje es justicia para personas con discapacidades/ Language justice is disability justice*. Sins Invalid. https://www.sinsinvalid.org/

Smith, C., & Kannen, V. (2015). 'At-risk' of what? Rewriting a prescribed relationship in a community literacy nonprofit organization: A dialogue. *Reflections, 14*(2).

Tarabochia, S. L. (2017). *Reframing the relational: A Pedagogical Ethic for Cross-Curricular Work*. Conference on College Composition and Communication/National Council of Teachers of English.

Thaiss, C. (2001). Theory in WAC: Where have we been, where are we going? 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. 299–325). National Council of Teachers of English.

Thaiss, C., & Porter, T. (2010). The state of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and results of the U.S. survey of the international WAC/WID mapping project. *College Composition and Communication*, *61*(3), 534–570.

Villanueva, V. (2001). The politics of literacy across the curriculum. 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. 165–178). National Council of Teachers of English.

Walvoord, B. E. (1996). The future of WAC. *College English*, *58*(1), 58–79.

Walvoord, B. E. (2000). Getting started. In S. H. McLeod & M. Soven (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs—The WAC Clearinghouse* (pp. 12–31). Colorado State University.

Wang, Z. (2022). Autoethnographic performance of difference as antiracist pedagogy. In B. R. Schreiber, E. Lee, J. T. Johnson, & N. Fahim (Eds.), *Linguistic justice on campus: Pedagogy and advocacy for multilingual students* (pp. 41–57). Multilingual Matters.

White, E. M. (1990). The damage of innovations set adrift: Change for the worst. *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin*, *43*(3), 3–5.

Yergeau, M. R. (2018). *Authoring autism: On rhetoric and neurological queerness*. Duke University Press.

Zawacki, T. M., & Rogers, P. M. (2012). *Writing across the curriculum: A critical sourcebook*. Bedford/St. Martin's.