CHAPTER 4.

STRENGTHENING THE CORE: DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING A NEW, SUSTAINABLE WAC/WID PROGRAM

Kimberly K. Gunter, Lindy E. Briggette, Mary Laughlin, Tiffany Wilgar, and Nadia Francine Zamin
Fairfield University

In the fall of 2019, after several years of intense negotiation and development, Fairfield University opened the academic year with a brand new core curriculum—its first in over 40 years. Titled the *Magis* Core, the new curriculum transformed the first-year writing requirement, introduced Fairfield's first-ever WAC/WID program, and brought a cohort of full-time, disciplinary writing faculty to campus. This chapter attempts to capture how we set and met goals throughout times of planned transition as well as during unforeseen and unprecedented challenges. It is our hope that this shared account of ongoing program-building inspires practical and adaptable growth-oriented strategies for other emerging WAC/WID programs. To that end, our chapter emphasizes three elements from the *Magis* Core transition:

1. The assembling of a disciplinary team to operationalize the Core Writing program's pedagogical agenda;
2. A strategic plan for building a coherent, assessment-driven campus writing culture; and,
3. The inaugural WAC/WID Workshop, a professional development—and public relations—success stemming from the aftermath of the COVID pandemic.

We hope that readers may find this chapter useful in launching new curricula, programs, and professional development initiatives and may join us in considering how to sustain these programs long-term.

THE CORE WRITING PROGRAM'S TRANSITION: A NEW CURRICULUM, A NEW LABOR MODEL

Fairfield University is a private, Jesuit institution located in Fairfield, Connecticut; the student body numbers approximately 5,500 individuals, and the school is firmly rooted in traditions of humanistic inquiry. In 2014, Fairfield sought to revise its core curriculum due to a number of factors: Recent patterns indicated increasing enrollment in the professional schools, particularly the Dolan School of Business and the Egan School of Nursing and Health Studies. Due to school-specific external accreditation requirements, students majoring in programs such as engineering, nursing, and business had difficulty completing the core's required 60 credit-hours within four years; when necessary, core requirements were sometimes waived so individual students could graduate on time. In part to account for these enrollment shifts and to ensure that all students completed the same core, the university elected to revise its core curriculum.

As various core revisions were decided upon, the writing program also transformed. In the horse-trading needed to drop from a 60 credit-hour core to a 45 credit-hour core, the second of two required first-year composition (FYC) courses was eliminated. In the new core, students would enroll in one newly created FYC course that was to prepare them to complete three subsequent "writing intensive" courses. The three writing intensive courses constituted one "Signature Element" of the new core.

In 2017, Kim Gunter was recruited to Fairfield to develop this new FYC curriculum as well as what became known as the WAC/WID Signature Element. Invoking disciplinary language and best practices, Gunter made clear that WAC courses should not be classes where additional writing is simply *assigned*; instead, WAC classes should ask disciplinary faculty to *support* student writing. Gunter also proffered the addition of a WID option whereby students could complete WID sections of courses in a major and receive instruction on writing as scholars and professionals within their disciplines. This WID option added verticality to the Signature Element offerings and allowed any program on campus to participate in the newly imagined Core Writing program.

One of Gunter's priorities upon arriving at Fairfield was to create an FYC curriculum that aligned with contemporary knowledge and practices in the field. Previously, Fairfield's first-year writing program showed its age, with all students completing an expository writing class in their first semester (titled "Texts and Contexts I: Writing as Craft & Inquiry") and a writing-about-literature course in their second semester (titled "Texts and Contexts II: Writing about Literature"). While some campus constituents had assumed that the new FYC course would simply merge the previous two-course sequence into a single

three-hour experience, Gunter instead proposed a new course (indeed, the *only* new course that emerged from core revision): ENGL 1001, "Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition." This course foregrounded five threshold concepts that are aligned with five key terms from the field: process, inquiry, rhetoric, genre, and transfer (we discuss this curriculum in more detail below).

Gunter also sought to underscore the fact that FYC would embody a new role on campus. Previously, "Texts and Contexts I" articulated directly to "Texts and Contexts II," and "Texts and Contexts II" then prepared students for their core literature classes. At this pivot point of core reform, however, Gunter messaged to all who would listen that ENGL 1001 was not designed to articulate to core literature classes but to *all* WAC/WID-designated courses on campus as well as upper-division rhetoric and composition courses in the rhetoric and professional writing (RPW) minor and the professional writing concentration of the English major. With FYC focused on rhetoric and composition and grounded in writing about writing approaches (Downs & Wardle, 2007; Wardle & Downs, 2013), pragmatic interpretation of "key terms" (Yancey et al., 2014), and introductory WAC/WID content (Melzer, 2014), the writing curriculum for the new *Magis* Core would foreground students' theoretical introduction to the discipline as well as a practical facility with composing knowledges and strategies.

To initiate this curricular shift, however, the Core Writing program's staffing model also required transformation. When Gunter arrived at Fairfield, 82.5 percent of FYC sections were taught by a cadre of part-time faculty, some of whom had never taken a graduate course in the field; also at that time, no WAC/WID program existed. As Gunter repeatedly advocated to administrators, it was not enough to hire a new Core Writing director, for one person does not make a program. At the same time, with savvy forethought, the emerging core proposal emphasized the importance of core courses being taught by full-time faculty. To align Core Writing to the values of the *Magis* Core and, more directly, to have the capacity to institute two new writing initiatives, Gunter argued for six new full-time rhetoric and composition hires. Additionally, Gunter began to illustrate to faculty across campus (including the provost, to whom she directly reported) that, while others had anticipated the need for full-time faculty to teach a new FYC course, they had not anticipated the professional development and support that current cross-disciplinary faculty would need in order to prepare for and succeed as WAC/WID teachers. Thus, part of Gunter's rationale for requesting six full-time positions was that all new full-time Core Writing faculty should receive reassigned time to provide support for the burgeoning WAC/WID Signature Element—a request that was eventually approved by Provost Christine Siegel. Before the first semester of the new *Magis* Core rollout, six new professors of the practice (POPs) had been hired, all holding terminal degrees in rhetoric and composition.

A few years have passed since those early discussions, and we've gained greater understanding of the nuances and challenges of our institutional ecology; particularly, we continue to recognize the benefits of a model that prioritizes expertise in the writing studies field. Namely, our labor model helps to build a stable cohort of full-time writing specialists capable of both introducing a disciplinary field to students and providing pedagogical guidance to WAC/WID colleagues. However, even while we celebrate the formation of a stable cohort of full-time writing specialists, we acknowledge that the implementation of this labor model was not without consequence for our adjunct faculty (Gunter, 2019). The move from a six-hour to a three-hour FYC requirement already meant that the need for adjunct labor in our program would be halved; the hiring of six full-time POPs (following two national searches) reduced that need even further. Adjunct faculty in Core Writing were welcomed to apply for the six full-time POP lines (and some did); however, given the disciplinary needs of the positions, none were ultimately hired into these new lines, which was a disappointment to several people across the campus community. We acknowledge the disappointment felt by some members of our community with regards to these hiring decisions, even as we as a team of disciplinary specialists move forward from a place of respectful regard.

In terms of seizing the moment of core reform in order to foster a new, robust writing culture across campus, we must also acknowledge that the remarkable support from our provost to hire a cohort of writing specialists has had far-reaching implications. As a result of this shift in labor models, in 2021, nearly 73 percent of students in our FYC course studied with a full-time faculty member who held a Ph.D. in the discipline (vs. less than 4 percent of sections being taught by faculty with the terminal degree in AY 2018). Additionally, all cross-disciplinary faculty have the opportunity to work one-on-one with a WAC/WID consultant in the development of writing pedagogies, activities, assignments, assessments, and courses. Without this support from the academic side of the university's administration, the current Core Writing program (both FYC and WAC/WID) would simply have been impossible, not to mention ill-prepared to meet the crisis of the pandemic.

BUILDING A CAMPUS WRITING CULTURE

Curriculum & Transfer

The newly hired POPs were tasked with forwarding pedagogical consistency within our campus writing culture. As instructors of the new FYC course as well as WAC/WID consultants who support cross-disciplinary colleagues, our POP faculty were central in implementing disciplinary "threshold concepts,"

which became the necessary anchor for both our FYC student learning goals and outcomes *and* our mechanism for transfer of this knowledge into WAC/WID courses. Drawing from Jan H. F. Meyer and Ray Land (2003), a threshold concept operates like a portal that opens up new ways of thinking, providing transformation of an "internal view of subject matter, subject landscape, or even world view" (p. 1). While threshold concepts can be "troublesome" to learn, often because they conflict with pre-existing knowledge or understanding, once a threshold is crossed, so to speak, there is no going back.

In our ENGL 1001, five threshold concepts of writing were translated into the student learning outcomes built into the foundation of the course itself (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1. Threshold Concepts and Student Learning Goals.

Threshold Concepts	Student Learning Goals in ENGL 1001
Writing is a process	Students will demonstrate understanding that writing is a collaborative, social, situated process and will demonstrate facility with the various tasks and habits of mind required by this process.
Writing is inquiry-driven	Students will join the academic community of ideas and scholarly inquiry by thinking critically, reading analytically, and writing supported, well-documented arguments.
Writing is rhetorical	Students will demonstrate sophisticated rhetorical knowledge.
All writing is genre writing	Students will demonstrate understanding of the concepts of genre and disciplinarity and their interplay.
Transfer is essential	Students will transfer previous literacies into the course and transfer course content from the course by fostering a sense of metacognition.

As we intentionally emphasized threshold concepts within the ENGL 1001 course, key terms became "conceptual anchors" (Yancey et al., 2014, p. 42), both in making our content visible *in* the classroom and facilitating transfer *outside* the classroom. For the variety of writing stakeholders in our own rhetorical ecology, key terms like "genre" and "rhetorical situation" operationalize threshold concepts and build consistency across FYC sections.[1] On our campus, key terms also serve a role (negotiated with our colleagues) in building a common vocabulary for conversations about written communication, and these terms are made visible for students and ENGL 1001 faculty via their appearance on

---

1   We differentiate between "key terms" and "threshold concepts" using guidance from Kara Taczak and Kathleen Blake Yancey (2015): "Key terms can demarcate a field and locate its historical origin: the key term of process, for instance, is often cited as a marker for the beginning of the field. But it does not make a claim about process; it has no predicate. Threshold concepts, in contrast, build claims from key terms" (p. 141).

syllabi, assignments, daily lesson plans, the public-facing Core Writing website, and our internal-facing faculty resource content.

Since they align with specific key terms from the field—process, inquiry, rhetoric, genre, and transfer—our five threshold concepts allowed us to build a curriculum that begins in our FYC course (ENGL 1001) and continues through the next three WAC or WID courses that students complete. These five threshold concepts are meant to translate directly to the learning goals that faculty who teach WAC/WID-designated sections also build into their courses. Our professional development work for WAC/WID faculty across campus is centered around these concepts, and our primary goals gesture toward two audiences: WAC/WID faculty *and* WAC/WID students. WAC/WID professional development showcases research and best practices from writing studies to our fellow faculty across the disciplines, and we aim to make the teaching of writing more meaningful and more successful for faculty while also making writing more meaningful and expectations more transparent for their students. In this way, the threshold concepts' integration into our curriculum cultivates a common writing language across campus; additionally, this language signals students' entry and ongoing participation in a larger campus culture of writing. Students first encounter the goals and outcomes of ENGL 1001, and, ideally, they later encounter similar writing-oriented goals, outcomes, and language in at least three WAC/WID courses (See Table 4.2).

A word about the role of transfer in WAC/WID may be useful here: While the need for disciplinarily-grounded attribution transfers across virtually all disciplines on campus and while we speak with our cross-disciplinary colleagues about FYC's teaching of attribution and documentation as rhetorical and transferable skills, we find that transfer is inherent and ubiquitous in the very existence of a WAC/WID program. Our work in building a WAC/WID program is the work of "placing discrete courses within broader contexts" (Moore, 2012, pp. 21-22) so that faculty across campus can see that the writing teaching/learning they are doing with their students is connected to the writing teaching/learning happening across campus. These articulations of transfer naturally inform our consultations with and designs of professional development for both FYC and WAC/WID faculty.

Over and over again, through our work with faculty and students in ENGL 1001 and our work with faculty who teach WAC/WID-designated courses, we strive to reiterate and foster these threshold concepts in order to strengthen a coherent writing culture across campus. This programmatic cohesion leads to more effective teaching of writing across all disciplines and, hopefully, to stronger student writers working in and emerging from all departments at Fairfield (where the achievement of the latter will be examined through our planned WAC/WID assessment activities, discussed below).

Table 4.2. Threshold Concepts, FYC Goals, and WAC/WID Goals.

Threshold Concepts	ENGL 1001 Goals	WAC/WID Goals
Writing is a process	Students will demonstrate understanding that writing is a collaborative, social, situated process and will demonstrate facility with the various tasks and habits of mind required by this process.	Students will respond to and use responses to drafts in revision, in this and other ways demonstrating metacognitive awareness about their writing.
Writing is inquiry-driven	Students will join the academic community of ideas and scholarly inquiry by thinking critically, reading analytically, and writing supported, well-documented arguments.	Students will use writing as an instrument of inquiry across a variety of writing situations, both formal and informal.
Writing is rhetorical	Students will make choices reflecting awareness of purpose, audience, and the rhetorical context in which they write.	Students will demonstrate sophisticated rhetorical knowledge.
All writing is genre writing	Students will engage in writing that responds to content or other texts in the discipline in ways that deepen student understanding of and facility with the genres of the discipline.	Students will demonstrate understanding of the concepts of genre and disciplinarity and their interplay.
Transfer is essential	Students will transfer previous literacies into the course and transfer course content from the course by fostering a sense of metacognition.	[All goals above apply to transfer as well as the final WAC/WID goal regarding attribution.] Students will use and cite texts and other sources of information in ways considered appropriate in the field.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES

As our role in the new core took shape, we understood that concurrently building a new FYC curriculum *and* a new WAC/WID program required developing resources for students and faculty (both faculty who teach in rhetoric and composition and faculty who teach across the curriculum). While concurrently developing two programs was daunting, we also recognized the unique opportunity to support coherence across FYC and WAC/WID. Our first step toward doing so was to create a public-facing resource that could be used by students and faculty in rhetoric and composition courses and in WAC/WID classes as well. Thus, we created FairfieldCoreWriting.org.

We articulated several goals in creating this central website. Thereon, we seek to educate students and faculty about Fairfield's new writing curriculum, showcasing ENGL 1001, "Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition," as a foundational course for the WAC/WID classes that students will complete in their time as undergraduates. Additionally, we drill down into the curriculum, supporting students and faculty across the university in understanding threshold concepts, employing key terms, and practicing principles of rhetoric, writing, and disciplinarity. We also seek to make it easy for faculty to understand the learning goals for WAC/WID classes and the guidelines for applying for WAC/WID designations for their courses.

In creating this custom, in-house educational tool for our local context at Fairfield, though, our primary motivation is pedagogical. Our Fairfield Core Writing website functions as a teaching tool for both students and fellow faculty across the disciplines. For example, ENGL 1001 faculty can assign pages from the website for their students to read before discussing a concept like "genre" in class. Similarly, when a cross-disciplinary faculty member asks about genre (related to the WAC/WID outcome of "disciplinarity and genre"), we can point them to the same resource.

The website also includes a lexicon of key terms in rhetoric and writing studies, supporting our aim of fostering a common language across campus. We pitch this lexicon to faculty across all disciplines as language we use with students in the FYC course; if WAC/WID faculty use the same terms, we suggest, they can get to where they're going faster because the students will already be familiar with the term or concept. Not only does making use of this lexicon facilitate transfer, but it also nurtures a culture of writing on campus in which we are deeply invested. If transfer is "applied or adapted learned knowledge in new contexts" (Moore, 2012, p. 22) and rhetorical studies rests on the premise that words and rhetoric are "altering reality, not by the direct application of energy to objects, but by the creation of discourse which changes reality through the mediation of thought and action" (Bitzer, 1968, p. 4), then it stands to reason that a shared lexicon could create a common cognitive understanding about rhetorical concepts across campus that would facilitate transfer from "discrete courses within broader contexts" (Moore, 2012, pp. 21-22). We have attempted to make visible to both faculty and students that our lexicon, threshold concepts, and WAC/WID outcomes are all intertwined and recursively referential.

It's true that, to some extent, all of our work as Core Writing faculty and WAC/WID consultants helps to foster a culture of writing on campus, but the website offers a public-facing focal point to stabilize and reiterate foundational terms/concepts from the field. We use the website to establish the basics and set the tone for our programs, and we continually update it as our local needs,

contexts, and practices change. In this way, the website becomes part of a feedback loop as we build, run, and assess the success of our initiatives.

WAC/WID Workshop Week

The above narrative is meant to capture the initial growth of our program as well as the challenges and opportunities of concurrently building two new, interlocked curricular initiatives (a new FYC course and a WAC/WID program). Here we'd like to pause to offer an example of our professional development—a workshop that unexpectedly took place in the early days of COVID quarantining and that has now become an annual event.

In May of 2020, we were scheduled to partner with our teaching and learning center and offer a two-day course design institute for faculty who were interested in creating WAC/WID courses. We realized, however, that traditional, in-person models of professional development would be impossible, and we seized a kairotic moment, proposing a new model for a workshop that would foreground WAC/WID scholarship while also providing a more pragmatic "how to" approach for faculty attempting to create and implement new writing courses. We asked ourselves: *What do faculty need from our WAC/WID program right now? What might a week-long workshop during a pandemic even look like? How can we re-see this moment as an opportunity to gain faculty buy-in as well as to foster long-term deployment of WAC/WID pedagogies across campus?*

When we first advertised what would become our annual WAC/WID Workshop Week, we saw more interest from faculty than we had anticipated. Keeping in mind the impact we could potentially have across various disciplines on our campus, we decided to scaffold writing studies scholarship along with best practices in WAC/WID pedagogy into a series of five half-day workshops. We began broadly with current theories in WAC/WID and progressively narrowed to more specific pedagogical practices (e.g., assignment development and sequencing, ideas for low-stakes writing-to-learn strategies that might support high-stakes writing-to-communicate genres, best practices in response to student writing, etc.). Given that many of our faculty found themselves teaching online for the first time, we also offered a workshop on teaching writing with digital tools, and our closing workshop gave faculty a chance to share their new course plans and "a-ha moments" from the week. We calculated that our week-long approach might allow workshop leaders and participants to better connect with each other as we navigated pandemic teaching and considered WAC/WID practices, and it would allow our colleagues to connect practical applications of writing studies scholarship to the needs of students in Fairfield's new WAC/WID Signature Element.

Over the course of that first WAC/WID Workshop Week, we watched as faculty from a range of departments tried on new pedagogical vocabulary (such as *scaffolding*, *assessment*, and *writing-to-learn*) and new key terms related to composing (such as *disciplinarity*, *genre*, and *rhetoric*), and we witnessed several epiphanies. It was a high point during the difficult context of the pandemic to hear faculty begin to meaningfully use rhetorical terms and WAC/WID concepts in reference to their own courses and assignments. Furthermore, going by concrete numbers, that first workshop week was even more impressive; our 22 participants successfully redesigned 29 courses using information and practices we covered in our various sessions. Our colleagues on the WAC/WID subcommittee, which vets new applications, even lauded the strengths of participants' courses versus the applications typically received from faculty who had not engaged in this professional development.

As June 2021 approached—with yet another pandemic version of end-of-semester rituals—we hosted the second iteration of our Workshop Week and were excited by similarly successful results. This time, after reviewing the courses submitted by 15 faculty participants, we gained 25 newly approved WAC/WID courses. And we were even more encouraged by participants' strikingly positive feedback. Anonymous comments from faculty participants in the June 2021 WAC/WID Workshop Week include:

- I really loved the myriad ways that through the workshop I am able to identify how writing is a continual process and included in all aspects of our lives.
- I hope that through including more varied writing opportunities students will come closer to identifying who they are, to seeing themselves in relation to a global society, continue to grow in their empathy and come closer to what it means to be human by expressing this through their work in the discipline of the class and through writing itself.
- My hope is that teaching a WAC/WID course will build a community of writers, rather than students and instructor.

Emerging here is the theme that writing is a social process that exists within a larger contextual system and an expansive community of writers. The articulation of that stance is in itself a big win for us and is but one example of the qualitatively different ways in which we now talk about writing with our cross-disciplinary colleagues.

Assessing Our Program

To explore how we use assessment to develop and sustain a new campus culture of writing, it is useful to briefly describe how we conduct assessment in our

foundational course, ENGL 1001. The goal of assessment at this level is three-fold: First, we use assessment to observe students' engagement with the course's student learning outcomes (SLOs). Second, we use assessment to regularize those self-reflective and self-assessing behaviors that can be so valuable when building, sustaining, and revising a program. Third, we use assessment practices at this level so that we can describe with evidence (to ourselves and other stakeholders) what is actually occurring in our classes.

The method of our programmatic assessment begins with appointing an assessment team of usually four to five full-time Core Writing faculty members. Whether we use direct or indirect assessment methods depends upon our priorities for the year. When we have conducted direct assessment, we have examined randomly selected samples of students' culminating course portfolios; when we have conducted indirect assessment, we have examined faculty artifacts from each section of ENGL 1001. We tackle student learning goals and outcomes for ENGL 1001 singly or in pairs and use an expert rater model; the assessment team norms ahead of each rating session, uses a shared rubric to guide rating scores, and rates artifacts' engagement with SLOs on a 5-6 point Likert-style scale.

Currently, we use four mechanisms to close the loop on our FYC assessment activities: (1) We regularly share our assessment findings and recommendations in program and departmental meetings; (2) we reinvest our assessment findings into the Core Writing program by incorporating findings into our faculty development programming; (3) we continue to refine and revise our assessment tools (including the rubric and selection of artifacts); and (4) our assessment activities and findings are reported to external stakeholders. We have been fortunate to work with various bodies on campus to further close the loop on our assessment activities, whether those initiatives take the form of conversations with campus librarians regarding information literacy across the disciplines or partnerships with faculty development handbook committees the leadership of which have asked us to lead well-attended, annual faculty development luncheons attended by perhaps one-third or more of all university full-time faculty.

Looking ahead, we have two main goals for assessment activities to further develop and sustain a culture of writing on our campus. The first focus for sustainable future assessment activities concentrates on an annual assessment institute comprised of full- and part-time faculty from the Core Writing program. In this institute, we would expand our direct and indirect assessment methods. For example, we hope to expand how we conduct indirect assessment and consider student and/or faculty reflections, focus groups, student surveys, and interviews. This avenue for program assessment offers largely collaborative opportunities for data analysis and the making of recommendations. Ideally, it would lead to an annual cycle of co-led faculty professional development. The second, broader

focus for sustainable future assessment activities lies more directly in the WAC/WID program. Here, a WAC/WID assessment team consisting of both WAC/WID and disciplinary specialists from across the curriculum would be formed. This team would conduct annual cycles of assessment of WAC/WID SLOs via direct and indirect means, this work ideally leading to annual cycles of three professional development workshops (one to close the loop on the previous year's SLOs, one to support the current year's SLOs, and one to lay the foundation for the following year's SLOs). In the long term, it is our hope that both of these assessment initiatives might lead to longitudinal studies of students' composing and faculty's teaching of writing at Fairfield. In all of these efforts, our purpose is always to grow and support a coherent culture of writing on campus, in part by building architectures to sustain this work.

OPPORTUNITIES & CHALLENGES GOING FORWARD

As our campus tries to establish what a new normal might look like during a period that we hope soon to describe as "post-COVID," we find ourselves pausing to reflect on the last four years of enormous change, challenge, and success in Core Writing's FYC course and our WAC/WID initiative. In ENGL 1001, we have a new curriculum which our assessment activities suggest prepares students far more effectively for the writing that they do across campus, and we know that much of this success can be attributed to the faculty in our classrooms. We have gone from having 7.7 percent of our FYC sections taught by full-time faculty with a Ph.D. in rhetoric and composition in AY 2018 to 72.9 percent in AY 2021. We are also seeing our course caps decrease, with the cap in ENGL 1001 set at 17 for AY 2022, with a goal of 15 by AY 2024, and with the caps in WAC/WID-designated sections set at 20. Moreover, since our WAC/WID program officially launched in fall 2019, at least 20 percent of all full-time Fairfield faculty have now participated in at least one *multi-day* WAC/WID professional development workshop, with many others having attended our one-time events such as brown bags, drop-in sessions, or back-to-school consultations. Now in the midst of planning future workshops and having only just begun our third year of the new *Magis* Core, we are approaching our 175th WAC/WID-designated course, and with over 200 sections offered just this year, we find our ethos and our relationships across campus are strengthened.

We are not without challenges, however. Like most programs across the country, we face smaller budgets due to COVID's impact, and even before COVID, we found reassigned time for POP faculty receding. With ironic backlash now occurring perhaps in part due to our success, we sometimes face questions like, "Why do you continue to need so many resources when you now have so many

WAC/WID-designated courses?" Thus, we find ourselves pausing to reflect and make deliberate decisions about just what the next four years will look like.

While growth of the program has been a driving force for the last four years—and not just for us but also for the administrators to whom we report—we find ourselves now asking not only how to grow the culture of writing at Fairfield but how to sustain and nourish it by maintaining faculty relationships, increasing student engagement, and building equitable, functional administrative systems. We seek to achieve long-term sustainability for the program not simply by considering practical matters (e.g., offering enough WAC/WID sections so that students can readily complete core requirements), though those matters are, of course, important. However, we find these day-to-day concerns no more important than considering what social justice (part of our university's mission) or sustainable labor conditions must look like in WAC/WID programs. We ask ourselves to anticipate and prepare for challenges that we foresee facing in our local conditions (e.g., will our resources continue to recede?) but also to leverage the privilege that we recognize that we have when compared to so many colleagues working in far less supported writing programs. In short, now that we have some successes and the momentum that comes along with them, we ask ourselves how we might effect, sustain, and build upon 50 years of WAC/WID scholarship—on our campus, in our community, and in our discipline.

REFERENCES

Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, *1*(1), 1–14. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40236733

Downs, D., & Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions: (Re)envisioning "first-year composition" as "introduction to writing studies*.*" *College Composition and Communication, 58*(4), 552–84. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20456966

Gunter, K. (2019). Advocacy, independence, and the painful kairotic moment for rhetoric and composition. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, *43*(1), 54-72. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A646110306/AONE?u=maine_oweb&sid=googleScholar&xid=b08ab21e

Melzer, D. (2014). *Assignments across the curriculum: A national study of college writing.* Utah State University Press.

Meyer, J. H. F., & Land, R. (2003). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving Student Learning: Theory and Practice Ten Years* On (pp. 412-424). Oxford Brookes University.

Moore, J. L. (2012). Designing for transfer: A threshold concept. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 26*(3), 19-24. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/designing-transfer-threshold-concept/docview/1143304893/se-2

Taczak, K., & Yancey, K. B. (2015). Threshold concepts in rhetoric and composition doctoral education: The delivered, lived, and experienced curricula. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 140–154). Utah State University Press.

Wardle, E., & Downs, D. (2013). Reflecting back and looking forward: Revisiting teaching about writing, righting misconceptions five years on. *Composition Forum, 27*(10). http://compositionforum.com/issue/27/reflecting-back.php

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition and sites of writing.* Utah State University Press.