SECTION 1. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

The first section in this collection explores the impact of WAC programs on faculty development. Regardless of other changes or evolutions throughout its history, a core component of any WAC initiative has been, and always will be, supporting faculty with writing instruction. The six chapters in this section highlight different models of engaging faculty in the teaching of writing—from offering classroom workshops to partnering with faculty teaching writing-intensive courses. In these chapters, we learn about a diverse range of programs that are reshaping how writing is taught on their campuses and, by extension, making education more accessible to students from a variety of backgrounds and experiences. We hear from WAC coordinators about programs that they have built from the ground up as well as about programs that have evolved—or are considering their need to evolve—based on assessments of their faculty development work. Ultimately, the chapters in this section are concerned with how faculty across the disciplines understand writing pedagogy and how they think about and enact aspects of writing instruction in their classes, including assignment design and expectations as well as the connection between writing and learning.

Olivia R. Tracy, Juli Parrish, Heather N. Martin, and **Brad Benz** open this section by providing insights into what faculty learn as a result of sustained WAC work, specifically the impact of classroom workshops on supporting disciplinary faculty in teaching writing. With workshops, for example, some faculty take away new and innovative ways of thinking about the composing process and how to engage students with genres and discourses; others leave with an appreciation of the work while still expecting instruction to be carried out by writing centers and WAC programs directly (i.e., conducting the same workshop term after term in a class). In this chapter, Tracy et al. report on research into the current classroom workshop model at the University of Denver and on their development of a spectrum of orientations to represent faculty engagement with this model: *a services seeker*, *a status quo seeker*, and a *knowledge seeker*. This spectrum provides a framework for understanding faculty motivations for partnering with a WAC program and illuminates potential limitations of a workshop model for faculty development. Tracy et al. examine some of the reasons that workshops don't accomplish the goals of faculty development, including the tendency for workshops to address the immediate needs and context of a particular class.

Kamila Kinyon, Alejandro Cerón, and **Dinko Hanaan Dinko** then introduce readers to another way that WAC is enacted on the University of Denver

campus: the University of Denver's Ethnography Lab (DUEL), an innovative space that fosters interdisciplinary collaboration around ethnographic research practices. Composed of "ethnographers from multiple disciplines and at various stages in their academic or public careers" (p. 33), DUEL offers an exciting model for how to dismantle disciplinary silos and build connection and trust across multiple stakeholders. The result is a rich, generative, sustainable initiative where faculty and student ethnographers can work toward solving pressing social problems. This chapter shares the perspectives and experiences of three stakeholders involved in DUEL: a writing professor, an anthropology professor, and a geography graduate student. Their discussions of various DUEL projects illustrate how faculty development can be a collaborative and inclusive endeavor that draws on the backgrounds, skills, and experiences of all involved.

Continuing with the theme of finding common ground, **Christopher Basgier** and **Leslie Cordie's** chapter applies a threshold concept framework to the assessment of faculty members' knowledge about writing and writing pedagogy at Auburn University. Based on the results of a quantitative inventory for assessing specific threshold concepts in WAC, Basgier and Cordie offer preliminary insights into one way to conceptualize and actively measure how faculty think about writing skills and how such skills are learned. Their findings emphasize the contextual nature of WAC threshold concepts as well as how interconnected and hard to disaggregate they are in the minds of faculty, including WAC experts. Basgier and Cordie exemplify the need to continue to innovate in our work with faculty across disciplinary and academic spaces, including in our methodological approaches, in recognizing that narrative and reflective practice are important tools for faculty development. This work becomes a critical behind-the-scenes aspect of faculty development because of the dynamic nature of evaluating program effectiveness in rapidly-changing academic environments. "Through narrative methods," they argue, "we can see how faculty encounter difficult WAC concepts, wrestle with them, test them, and (ideally) eventually internalize them as principled ways of thinking about disciplinary writing pedagogy" (p. 55). In an era of austerity, where WAC coordinators are often positioned to defend and justify their work and programs, Basgier and Cordie's inventory proves interesting and useful for considering new assessment approaches and strategies that demonstrate impact.

The next two chapters take a different approach to the theme of faculty development by illustrating how WAC can be integrated into the curriculum vertically. Helping readers conceptualize what program-building might look like "on the ground" with key institutional partners, **Kimberly K. Gunter, Lindy E. Briggette, Mary Laughlin, Tiffany Wilgar,** and **Nadia Francine Zamin** explicate the development of Fairfield University's first-ever WAC program, intentionally

designed to support and strengthen a new core curriculum. In their chapter, Gunter et al. showcase the transformation of their university's first-year writing requirement as well as the integration of writing intensive courses across the curriculum, all of which required a robust faculty development initiative. Like Basgier and Cordie, Gunter et al. use threshold concepts to structure curriculum design—with both faculty development and student learning in mind—and the systematic reflection demonstrated in this chapter models an important practice for ensuring program sustainability, particularly when entering into or emerging from times of transition. Gunter et al. argue that threshold concepts lead to better writing instruction because "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" (p. 64). This chapter is instructive for other WAC programs striving to align with best practices in WAC and writing studies while in the process of adapting to new institutional circumstances.

Similarly, **Elizabeth Baxmeyer, Rikki Corniola, William Davis, Gloria Poveda,** and **Christopher Wostenberg** discuss the development of a novel WAC program at the College of Health Sciences within California Northstate University, where faculty train students for the complex writing situations in which healthcare practitioners engage. Taking an interdisciplinary and collaborative approach in developing a writing curriculum that aligns across all disciplines at the university, Baxmeyer et al. explain how their program achieves cohesion and consistency in the student experience of writing, from lab reports to community-engaged projects: "Students find consistent language across courses and disciplines in terms of assessments, expectations, and outcomes, and faculty see direct connections between their work and that of their colleagues" (p. 75).

In addition to emphasizing the value of shared language to organize faculty development initiatives and strengthen a vertical curriculum, both accounts of these new programs demonstrate the challenging demands on WAC administrators who have to juggle being writing experts across multiple fields, while also balancing curricular and support needs for students at various levels of their academic careers.

Concluding this section, **Ming Fang, Kimberly Harrison,** and **Christine Martorana's** chapter describes the program they built at Florida International University, which is currently the largest Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) in the United States. Their chapter offers an important framework for thinking through the various ways partnerships might be made—from those born out of shared interest, to those imposed from administrative bodies—and strategies for capitalizing on the benefits such partnerships offer. Fang et al. highlight that a multi-pronged approach to strategic partnerships keeps their WAC program institutionally relevant and can aid them in working toward institutional

transformation. Through their chapter, we learn the ways in which such relationships are beneficial in "supporting faculty as they shift from the assumption that monolingual student writers are the norm," which is crucial for mobilizing inclusive writing pedagogies that are shaped by the assets of "a multilingual, multicultural student body" (p. 90).