

CHAPTER 4.

**BEYOND CONVENTIONS:
LIMINALITY AS A FEATURE
OF THE WEC FACULTY
DEVELOPMENT**

Matthew Luskey and Daniel L. Emery

University of Minnesota

While many colleges and universities employ writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in disciplines (WID) programs, the embedded and faculty-driven character of the WEC program allows for a reconsideration of faculty development activities and the roles of writing professionals. This chapter argues that the structured conversations of the WEC model both unearth tacit assumptions about disciplinary writing and student learning and often challenge persistent assumptions regarding what writing is and how it works. Much as students encounter liminality in their transitions from novice outsiders to disciplinary insiders, faculty experience their own process of change and transformation, complete with the discomfort and resistance that such transformations imply. As faculty engage each other in understanding the constitutive character of writing in shaping knowledge, they often move well beyond an interest in policing surface-level conventions. Two case studies from the University of Minnesota illustrate how faculty members in departments negotiate this transition and revise their orientations toward writing through the WEC process, and how a transformed orientation toward writing leads to engaged, thoughtful, and sustained curricular change.

Several universities can lay claim to a curricular emphasis on writing across the curriculum, from pioneers at Carleton College and Beaver College to the dozens of programs identified by the WAC Clearinghouse and taxonomized by Condon and Rutz (2012). The University of Minnesota's Writing-Enriched Curriculum (WEC) Program emerged from a Bush Foundation grant in 2007. Like North Carolina State University, it provides one of the first examples of both curricular

engagement with writing and faculty-led writing interventions in undergraduate curricula. In contrast to centrally administered WAC programs that might construct writing outcomes on behalf of departments and programs, WEC puts resources into the hands of faculty members—those most capable of making and sustaining institutional change—who design and compose their own goals for undergraduate writing and their own assessment criteria used to measure students' success. While these resources do entail some financial and administrative assistance, provided by the Office of Undergraduate Education, they are primarily interpersonal. WEC succeeds due to the collective and collaborative work between faculty, graduate students, and WAC consultants.

Departments at the University of Minnesota are enticed by the fact that WEC is a funded and non-mandated program for voluntary faculty development. However, this unique structure gives rise to two central questions: How can a program founded upon multiyear, voluntary commitments from departments and colleges thrive in a research-extensive university? What sustains WEC once enacted? We believe the answers to these questions lie in the durable partnerships and collaborations between WAC consultants and faculty members within WEC departments—partnerships that develop through frank and open discussion, what one department chair has described as a “structured conversation” bolstered by the use of data and assessments.

In this chapter, we look carefully at the features of these structured conversations and the ways in which the sequence of WEC meetings unearth long-held suppositions about writing and often change them. As Anson argues in “Crossing Thresholds: What’s to Know about Writing Across the Curriculum” (2015), despite their records of publication and their leadership in their disciplinary specialties, faculty rarely consider themselves masters of disciplinary writing. Their discourse knowledge is often “buried in the tacit domain,” operating in a manner below the surface of awareness and reinforcing persistent views that writing is a skill students should have learned earlier and should carry with them in “every writing situation without regard for disciplinary variation or convention” (p.206). Those already acculturated to disciplinary norms and practices may take the unique features of writing in their field to be identical to “scientific writing” or “good writing.” For WAC consultants who work closely with faculty through this process of (re)examining deeply held assumptions, this presents some challenges. Unexamined assumptions are laden with specific values and expectations, and these assumptions may create barriers to student success. As Anson succinctly notes, “the hard work begins in implementation” (p. 213), and “requires great sensitivity to existing (mis)conceptions of the nature of writing and the roles and purposes associated with its cross-disciplinary development” (p. 216).

To closely analyze “the hard work of implementation” that accompanies WAC work and faculty development, we extend Anson’s use of threshold concepts by drawing specifically on the concept of liminality. Liminality, an often prolonged stage of conceptual transition, provides a lens for examining faculty struggle throughout the WEC process; liminality also offers us a lens for viewing our own struggles as WAC consultants along with the struggle of many undergraduate students as they attempt to meet often tacit expectations for discipline-based writing. In order to understand the threshold-crossing character of conceptual change, we think it useful to begin with a key illustration that exposes student and faculty assumptions about writing—assumptions that are often a key impetus for the structured conversations that WEC enables.

As Flash has detailed in Chapter 1 of this volume, WEC begins by engaging faculty with survey information from departmental faculty, students, and affiliates about the attitudes, values, and practices of writing within their disciplines. A question set in the surveys never fails to elicit chatter among the faculty in our first meeting: student self-assessment and faculty assessment of students’ writing abilities. We ask students to consider the writing they do for courses in their major and to rate their abilities (“strong,” “satisfactory,” “weak,” “don’t know,” “N/A”) on fifteen common dimensions of writing, such as their ability to “use field-specific terminology, organizational formats and/or conventions,” their ability to “argue a position using a central thesis or hypothesis and evidence,” “analyze and/or evaluate ideas, texts, or events,” “integrate and correctly cite information,” and so on. Working with these same dimensions of writing, faculty answer parallel questions considering the writing students do for their courses and their impression of students’ abilities. We have administered this survey to 44 departments, programs, and colleges, hundreds of faculty and instructors and thousands of students, but we have only once seen a consistent alignment between the students’ rating of their abilities and the faculty’s rating of their students’ abilities. In that one instance, the majority of courses offered for undergraduates were staffed with instructors and graduate students, while tenured faculty taught principally in the graduate curriculum. In this department, the graduate student instructors were much like the faculty in all the other surveys who tended to take a dimmer, half-empty view of student abilities.

The examples in Table 4.1—one from a humanities discipline, one from social sciences, and one from STEM—illustrate the typical gap between students’ self-assessment and the faculty’s impressions of student writing. For purposes of this illustration, we present four of fifteen abilities, though the gap typically extends across all or most of the abilities. Each of the results represents the highest percentage of responses from the students and faculty.

Table 4.1. Faculty and student assessments of students’ writing

A Humanities Department Rate the strength of writing done (for courses that count towards the major) in terms of the following:	Strong	Satisfactory	Weak	Don't know	N/A
Use field specific terminology and formats		Students	Faculty		
Argue a position using a thesis or hypothesis	Students	Faculty			
Analyze and/or evaluate ideas, texts, or events	Students		Faculty		
Integrate and correctly cite information	Students		Faculty		
A Social Science Department Rate the strength of writing done (for courses that count towards the major) in terms of the following:	Strong	Satisfactory	Weak	Don't know	N/A
Use field specific terminology and formats		Students	Faculty		
Argue a position using a thesis or hypothesis	Students		Faculty		
Analyze and/or evaluate ideas, texts, or events	Students		Faculty		
Integrate and correctly cite information	Students		Faculty		
A STEM Department Rate the strength of writing done (for courses that count towards the major) in terms of the following:	Strong	Satisfactory	Weak	Don't know	N/A
Use field specific terminology and formats		Faculty Students			
Argue a position using a thesis or hypothesis		Students	Faculty		
Analyze and/or evaluate ideas, texts, or events		Students	Faculty		
Integrate and correctly cite information	Students	Faculty			

Such perception gaps are likely familiar to WAC professionals. Students approach their self-assessment from the vantage point of how far they've come, whereas faculty approach their rating of students from the vantage point of how far they have to go. A quick glance might also suggest this gap is indicative of cognitive biases, or, more cheekily, of student grade inflation and faculty members' predispositions to complain. It may also reveal discourse expectations and standards reflective of the demographics and educational experience of faculty, which differ from current undergraduate populations. However, it's often the case in our first WEC meeting with faculty, when these results are discussed, that faculty perceive this gap as something more substantial—namely, an incomplete or insufficient understanding of the conventions and rigors of disciplinary discourses. This excerpt from an M1 meeting in a social science discipline is symptomatic of such a view:

F1: It seems the vast majority of students think they are good writers, suggesting they are not getting accurate feedback in the first-year writing course.

WAC Consultant: Why would that suggestion be limited to the first-year writing course? Why do you think students have a stronger opinion of their skills?

F2: So maybe it's that we are asking them to do scientific writing when the excellent writing they were doing in the first year was just not as complicated. Students often tell me they have always been told they are good writers, and they are not. I feel they are reaching back to high school when they were top of the class.

F3: Maybe they were doing creative writing and we are asking them to do something in a new domain here.

F4: In my freshman class, the majority of them have never written more than five pages and they are not prepared to write a research paper at all. (WEC meeting Fall 2014)

In response to the WAC consultant's prompting question, the faculty braid two common strands. The first, voiced by Faculty 1 and more bluntly by Faculty 2, is that prior student writing has lacked critical feedback and instruction—a failure of general writing instruction. The second, expressed by Faculty 2, 3, and 4, is that students have lacked exposure to the modes and genres important to writing in the discipline—a failure of genre-specific writing instruction. Both strands might seem reductive and dismissive of students' educational backgrounds, especially the perception that prior student writing has been primar-

ily “creative” rather than academic. Nevertheless, these sentiments, commonly voiced in early WEC conversations, speak to a persistent frustration about student writing that emerges when faculty begin the WEC process.

We begin with the WEC survey and the spirited faculty discussion it fosters in the first WEC meeting because it illustrates a crucial gap between student and faculty assessment of writing ability, and it uncovers persistent differences in attitude, outlook, and experience that accord with our understanding of the transformative character of threshold concepts. We view these initial differences as highlighting important conceptual and epistemological divisions between faculty and students, between experts and novices, indicative of those who have already been initiated in disciplinary discourses and those who have yet to experience a process of acculturation. These liminal spaces are marked by a lack of shared vocabulary, expectations, and awareness, and often engender mutually expressed frustration, leading to reductive and totalizing statements, such as the faculty member’s claim that “students often tell me that have always been told they are good writers, and they are not.” Alternatively, consider this representative comment from a student in a social science discipline, which appears in the open response section of the WEC survey: “There’s a guessing process on what [faculty] want which is probably my most frustrating thing because I do the paper in one shot—no drafts allowed—and it’s like, well, I hope that’s what they wanted because that’s what they’re getting” (WEC student survey response, 2015).

Identifying and traversing these liminal spaces is at the heart of the University of Minnesota’s WEC model. To theorize this space, we turn to the educational literature of threshold concepts, driven by the efforts of Meyer and Land (Meyer & Land, 2006; Meyer et al., 2010) and extended by Adler-Kassner and Wardle in their edited volumes, *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* (2015) and *(Re)considering what We Know: Learning Thresholds in Writing, Composition, Rhetoric, and Literacy* (2019). A number of international conferences and a quickly expanding bibliography (<https://www.ee.ucl.ac.uk/~mflanaga/thresholds.html>) attest to the powerful allure of threshold concepts for examining complex educational processes. In working with this literature, we share Perkins’ view (as cited by Land 2015) that the appeal of threshold concepts lies essentially in their heuristic value, that “threshold concepts work better when more exploratory and eclectic than categorical and taxonomic” (p. xiii). Drawing on their heuristic value, we maintain that the WEC model affords extensive and sustained opportunities for faculty, students, and WAC consultants to encounter and engage with liminal states of understanding, especially when it comes to the complex relationship between writing and conceptual and disciplinary knowledge.

Given the confines of this chapter, however, we focus primarily on the liminal features of WEC work as it applies to the faculty members in departments with whom we work. Artifacts of the WEC process, including meeting transcripts, rating reports, surveys, and sections of departmental writing plans are often laced with faculty members' bold assertions and convictions alongside genuine, open-ended questions, which are subsequently re-examined, further qualified, and often revised. We maintain that these oscillating points of view evidence the liminal state, described by Turner in *The Ritual Process* (1969) as "generative" and "speculative," that provides an opportunity for sustainable and structural change (cited in Hyde, 1998, p. 121). That is, though liminality is no guarantee of transformation, it is the catalyst if such a transformation is to occur.

We would like to acknowledge three premises that guide our argument. First, evident in our earlier reference to Anson's chapter, "Crossing Thresholds," our line of reasoning is premised on the view that those interested in the development of student writing must recognize and take seriously the distinct rhetorical situations in academic writing that cannot be blithely attributed to a student's lack of familiarity with the textual features or discursive conventions of academic writing. Indeed, our work remains deeply informed by a view shared by many other WAC practitioners that thinking and writing are both inextricable and situated. To write well in one's field, one must think well in the field; likewise, good writing reflects good thinking, not simply grammatical correctness, compliance with standard written English, or citational accuracy. Second, we, as WAC consultants, must also acknowledge that as inveterate outsiders to the disciplines and departments we work with, we often confront and negotiate our own liminal understanding of the rich and various disciplinary conventions and epistemologies that shape discursive practices. WEC imposes a productive humility on WAC consultants who, though steeped in writing pedagogy and genre theory, lack advanced training in many of the disciplines. While this chapter focuses on ways that our faculty colleagues grapple productively with liminal views of writing and conceptual knowledge, we witness this liminality from our own liminal vantage as well. As other contributors to this volume describe in their chapters, WEC work often raises questions of ethos for WAC consultants. This, in turn, leads to our third premise, which is that our own liminality with disciplinary concepts and discourses enables us to approximate students who are themselves apprenticing in their disciplinary fields. Although student writing samples drive much of the discussion throughout the WEC process, students, themselves, are rarely present in the conversation. Their voices emerge indirectly in survey responses, often quite cogently and plaintively describing their own liminal experiences with writing in their majors. Consider, for example, these two responses from students in a social science discipline:

I've found an intimidating barrier to entry in the language and presentation in the professional literature whenever I've needed to reference such resources, which brilliantly sabotages my confidence of ever completing the assignment that required their use in the first place. I understand that I am not likely the target audience for the literature and, instead, it is probably meant for real [experts]. . . .

It has been implied, if not explicitly stated, that the writing we do should be a contribution to the field. Personally, this seems impossible. Probably I am not creative enough to find a writing topic to research that anybody would consider a worthwhile contribution to [the field]. But even if I could find such a topic, I feel that my education has left me with few tools to articulate, let alone perform, a coherent analysis. (WEC student survey responses, 2013).

By proxying student perspectives in WEC meetings, we can often question faculty assumptions about students, whether innocent, dismissive, or callous. Unearthing these assumptions allows faculty members to recognize this liminal condition, unsettling their views about student work or student efficacy.

Such liminal understandings of the relationship between writing and conceptual and disciplinary knowledge influence multiple stakeholders—faculty, students and consultants—throughout the WEC process in different ways. After developing our theoretical framework for liminality, we describe how it characterizes faculty experiences throughout the WEC process, and we offer two case studies that illustrate how engagement with liminal views about conceptual knowledge and writing can produce transformative conceptual and structural changes.

BETWIXT AND BETWEEN: LIMINALITY AND WEC

Throughout the threshold concept literature (Meyer & Land, 2006; Meyer et al., 2010), liminality is a complex term used to describe a condition or space that learners move through as they acquire new conceptual understanding. As such, this movement is characterized as transitional, fraught with uncertainty, characterized by imitation, mimicry, frustration, and resistance, and marked by a sense of loss. As conceptually and ontologically unsettling as it may be, liminality is essential for sustained transformation. Drawing on anthropologists Turner (1969) and van Gennep (1960), Meyer, Land, Timmermans, and others (in Meyer et al., 2010) offer a useful vocabulary for describing stages of liminality and transformation (pre-liminal, liminal, post-liminal) in relation to conceptual

learning, maintaining that such stages entail frequent oscillation among them. While examples cited in Meyer and Land (2006) like “opportunity cost,” “heat transfer,” or “limit,” are noted for their “irreversible” effects—once learned, they are hard to unlearn—they are also characterized by the prolonged wavering in understanding that accompanies their learning. Unfortunately, awareness of and empathy for this oscillation between states of understanding can be scarce from those with conceptual mastery, due to the “integrated” and “bounded” features of threshold concepts. As Meyer and Land explain, the integrative nature of threshold concepts “exposes the previously hidden interrelatedness of something” (2006, p. 7). Furthermore, “It might be that such boundedness in certain instances serves to constitute the demarcation between disciplinary areas, to define academic territories” (Meyer & Land, 2006, p. 9). This divide between insider and outsider, expert and novice, poses a number of teaching challenges, as Ambrose et al. (2010) have shown. That is, conceptual mastery often leads to tacit understanding and an “unconscious competence” (Ambrose et al., 2010, p. 96) that can make it challenging for experts to recall how they learned their discipline—including all the gradations of evolving understanding they moved through—and, therefore, difficult to identify with the needs of learners. In her chapter in this volume, Stacey Sheriff draws on studies in social and cognitive psychology to describe this condition of unconscious competence as “the curse of knowledge, the curse of expertise, and expert blind spots.”

As Flash has noted previously (2016) and in Chapter 1 of this volume, WEC work is fundamentally about surfacing and animating the characteristics, abilities, and values important to the disciplines with which we work. Through the use of surveys, samples, and curricular matrices, the WEC model fosters the loose but directed conversational interplay of agreement and disagreement among colleagues, who seldom find the opportunity to talk in sustained fashion about teaching and learning in their discipline. This conversation between disciplinary experts (our colleagues), facilitated by disciplinary outsiders (us), is primarily focused on disciplinary competencies that are often not yet realized by disciplinary novices (our students). These conversations may at times become particular (e. g., whether engineering writing demands third-person address) or dismissive (e.g., whether capitalization errors are symptomatic of reading issues), especially when differences between faculty and student perceptions emerge. Ultimately, they are in the spirit of exposing what Perkins (2006) describes as the “episteme,” the “underlying game” that disciplines use to justify, explain, inquire, design, and validate their forms of knowledge.

Perkins’ underlying game calls to mind other characterizations of faculty development efforts concerned with WAC/WID pedagogy, outcomes assessment, and conceptual learning and the crucial role that facilitation plays throughout

the process. Consider Carter's (2003) description of work with outcomes-based assessment plans at North Carolina State, one where the "writing and speaking professional's" role is to help faculty make their "insider knowledge and expertise explicit" (p. 5), as well as Anson's characterization in the Introduction to this volume that WAC consultants must often push against faculty members' unchallenged, "tacit-level assumptions about writing and writing instruction." Similarly, Middendorf and Pace (2004) describe their productive work with faculty learning communities at Indiana University as a prolonged process of disciplinary "decoding," stimulated by the use of role-playing and interviewing where faculty from divergent fields delve "deeply into the specifics of thinking and learning in their disciplines" (p. 2). Drawing on genre theory and research and her experience directing WAC programs, Soliday (2011) argues that students learn more when they have "direct access to well-defined social situations typical of an expert's practice" (p. 68). For Soliday and her WAC colleagues, defining such practices emerges out of the negotiation between disciplinary faculty and English Studies or rhetoric experts.

Among these rich characterizations, we find Perkins' "epistemological game" when coupled with Meyer and Land's work, the most trenchant for underscoring an inextricable relationship between knowing a discipline and communicating a discipline. When previously tacit rules or insider practices are articulated through the WEC process and when these practices are described in concrete criteria and implemented into classroom and curricular interventions, then students have the chance to "play the game knowingly" (Perkins, 2006, p. 40). Students arrive in their majors with diverse educational experiences, linguistic practices, and orientations toward language and learning. For all students, learning a new epistemological game entails learning a new discourse. As Land (2015) observes, changes in conceptual understanding for students are "invariably and inextricably accompanied by changes in their own use of discourse." Likewise, a student's "encounter with an unfamiliar discourse or different uses or forms of language" can transform their "understanding of particular phenomenon" (p. xi).

For many faculty, this interrelationship between conceptual learning and conceptual discourse disrupts two interrelated pedagogical assumptions: (1) writing should be taught and evaluated distinctly from course content; and/or (2) the bulk of writing instruction should be handled by writing experts. For faculty accustomed to thinking of writing as a discrete, rule-governed and reproducible skill—something that should have been mastered by students before their class—the process of clarifying phrases like "clear writing" can be taxing or seem overly deliberative. Moreover, unearthing tacit assumptions about clear writing in chemistry, nursing, environmental science, or civil engineering re-

quires negotiation, rethinking, and consensus-seeking collaboration, typified in this exchange from an M1 meeting in a STEM field:

F1: I have noticed some correlation between those students with technical abilities and exhibiting a better way of thinking leading to better writing.

WAC Consultant: Do others agree? (Several disagree.) So, there may be some students who are really technically savvy and may be unable to communicate their ideas?

F2: And it is also the other way around.

F3: But these two things are not contradictory.

F4: To write well here means being able to demonstrate linear thinking in your prose. Being able to take an argument and work through it is the same as the way you are walking through a problem-solving solution. And I think it's what [F1] was talking about with someone who thinks clearly can see from here, to here, to here, to here. (WEC unit meeting transcripts, 2008–2019)

Though they have not yet reached consensus about the “correlation” between writing and conceptual thinking, such exchanges are productive and potentially transformative. In effect, they expose previously unspoken disagreements among faculty members who come to recognize disciplinary knowledge as contested, context-specific, and steeped in epistemological, conceptual, cultural, and genre-based assumptions.

Faculty rating and discussion of student writing samples—key artifacts of WEC’s triennial assessment process, as Pamela Flash details in this volume—further underscore and potentially challenge assumptions about the relationship between writing and conceptual understanding. When faculty members identify students’ struggle in writing on capstone projects, they point to symptomatic features, such as patch writing, citational pastiche, imitative discourse, and murky reasoning. Such features are aligned with a failure to realize desired writing abilities, such as summary, synthesis, and integration and use of evidence.

However, when they are pressed to diagnose those symptoms, faculty members begin to draw on a conceptual and epistemological framework:

Students were stringing beads on a garland rather than drawing conclusions or exploring critical responses, strengths, and weaknesses.

Students seemed like they slapped in a mathematical model (provided by a faculty mentor) but might not always have understood it.

Many students made unfounded connections between given information and legislation; they leaped to these inferences and made surface statements with nothing to back them up. (WEC Rating Reports, 2008–2019)

The three comments above are culled from separate rating reports in different disciplines. Significantly, all three comments begin to unpack what a seemingly generic writing ability, such as synthesis or analysis, looks like when enacted in a disciplinary context. Breaking through a commonly presumed or tacit understanding of such writing abilities often signals a more substantial transformation.

In the case studies that follow, we elaborate on what this transformation entails for faculty grappling with the relationship between academic writing, disciplinary conventions, and epistemological beliefs. In the first case study, we describe how faculty in Agronomy and Plant Genetics wrestled productively with the effort to clarify and articulate what conceptual understanding entails, particularly in regard to the status of knowledge claims and the role of persuasion in the field. Working through their liminal understanding over the course of several WEC meetings, the faculty developed writing abilities and criteria that they have now carefully linked to disciplinary ways of knowing. This alignment by the faculty signals an important and sustainable conceptual shift that is possible when faculty engage in WEC. The second, longer case study chronicles the art history department's WEC efforts over several years, where we see how the faculty's intense engagement with WEC and the fruitful struggle to articulate student-facing writing abilities aligned with disciplinary and epistemological values. While recognizing this alignment is an end in itself, this process of understanding and making meaning explicit also fueled a structural transformation of the undergraduate experience of majors. This structural transformation entailed meaningful curricular revision, ongoing collaboration, and communication among colleagues, investigation, experimentation, and assessments of success. In an academic context where faculty work is often seen as individually conceived and achieved, the collective work of envisioning meaningful writing in the discipline reinvigorated and reinforced the commitment of the department to its students.

CASE STUDIES IN LIMINALITY AND TRANSFORMATION

A LARGER ROLE FOR WRITING: AGRONOMY AND PLANT GENETICS' WEC STORY

In developing the initial writing plan for the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, a conversation about discourse conventions revealed critical,

liminal features of mature disciplinary writing. In their initial WEC survey results, faculty noted that while professional affiliates and students rated persuasive writing as important modes of writing in the field, faculty and TAs emphasized descriptive, analytical, and critical writing skills as significantly more important. Faculty members observed that one key challenge among several that student writers faced was balancing the roles of scientist and advocate. While agronomy involves significant lab work, governed by the attitudes and practices of bench science, the field also involves working with stakeholders in the agriculture industry, where persuasive appeals are more common and the technical details of scientific inquiry are translated into market decisions.

Typically, a WAC practitioner might be tempted to furnish language regarding the relationship between writing conventions, purpose, and audience, leading to a predictable insistence that writers should be able to address multiple stakeholders. By contrast, the WEC consultant allows the dilemma to play out in a conversation among faculty. In accounting for differences between faculty and affiliate responses, two instructors addressed the complexity of persuasion:

F1: I think “Persuasive” comes out differently in certain groups.

F2: We are selling ideas, marketing, and promoting best practices through extension.

F1: But “persuasive” might imply biased. We need to keep persuasion separate from critical evaluation. Their conclusions need to be more evidence- and data-based. (Agronomy meeting transcripts, 2013–2014).

For an outsider to the discipline, this razor-thin distinction between communicating conclusions drawn from critical assessment of data (unbiased) and advocating for a position or outcome (potentially biased) might be difficult to perceive. For a writing expert, the presumption of bias-free interpretation may seem naively positivist. However, for a disciplinary novice, the distinction is an important gateway into the epistemology of the field. Knowledge claims based on experimental and observational evidence held persuasive value precisely in their perceived status as discrete, measurable facts. These facts could then be marshaled as quantitative evidence in a persuasive narrative or conclusion to the degree that they can be described as rigorously as possible. This demand for technical rigor eventually emerged as a strong preference for quantitative data analysis.

The faculty member who had previously articulated caution regarding the language of persuasion in the field also expressed a potentially challenging atti-

tude about the value of writing in the field, suggesting that less writing was often an effective measure of technical understanding. In the words of this faculty member:

F1: Students should get the ideas across with as little writing as possible, using more graphics, figures, and other ways of conveying complicated ideas in a smaller space. This needs to be in the appropriate style for the purpose and audience. (Agronomy meeting transcripts, 2013–2014).

Initially, the speaker draws a clear distinction between the task of writing and the task of representing data using visuals and figures, suggesting that the former can and should be limited when figures and other representations of data provide sufficient evidence. This faculty member's conventional understanding of writing as prose sentences illuminates a division of communicative labor between visual representations of quantitative data and prose descriptions of it. This tendency to communicate data visually (rather than in prose sentences) is justified in the name of efficiency: to convey complicated ideas in a smaller space. For students who may be more familiar with elaboration as a strategy of explanation and less familiar with designing visual information, these expectations run up against conceptions of how writing works and what constitutes effective writing. Although students may have a face value understanding of concision (use fewer words), they may not yet understand how an expert writer or reader of their writing might view visual representations of data as a means of achieving brevity. The conversation turned to the types of data visualization that were typical of the field and the specific audiences to whom such visuals were directed. Faculty were comfortable generating examples and most of these were met with casual affirmation. The list was expansive and included descriptions of simple tables to complex multivariate regressions.

The WEC Consultant then turned from this list back to the questions of appropriateness and purpose, which led to a number of specific data analysis abilities. In developing their own list of student writing abilities, these discussions led to explicit attention to writing and quantitative analysis as elements of their writing plan:

- acquire, select, and manage data,
- summarize data using descriptive statistics and represent these in figures and tables,
- use basic spreadsheet functions,
- accurately describe relationships based on quantitative evidence and statistical tests,

- use quantitative data to support arguments and connect data to real world situations. (Agronomy Department meeting transcripts, 2013–2014).

At face value, the faculty member featured above seems to suggest mere concision as a virtue (using fewer words). However, the actual appeal in their quotation is to the use of different modes of written expression in the design of graphics and figures. The second sentence alludes to the rhetorical features of communicating with data. When the faculty member invokes the language of purpose and audience, and even in the description of “appropriateness” as the characteristic feature of success, the conversation begins to surface the taken-for-granted assumptions about the ways data representation and presentation demonstrate mature competence in the field. For a faculty member, the virtue of conciseness is an effect of the effective graphic representation of data, and thus the avoidance of prose as a means of conveying information.

In their M2 meeting, the attention to visual communication was deepened with explicit attention to the mechanisms by which students used quantitative reasoning to develop the charts and figures that constituted “evidence” for critical conclusions.

F4: How do quantitative skills relate to the ability to write a reasonable argument? Is this in our coursework?

F1: I don’t think students are getting this in our curriculum extensively. More and more students will encounter big data sets and they will need to access the correct type of data and assess the quality before analyzing and drawing conclusions from it. This could be placed strategically, as in the survey we saw that some classes are doing this.

F2: Undergraduates can do this if you give them time to discuss it. In AGRO 1XXX we do an exercise where they have a scientific study and a series of questions to answer about the study.

F3: I think we need to be more explicit with these quantitative writing abilities. The most important is using quantitative evidence to support an argument. (Agronomy Department meeting transcripts, 2013–2014).

The explicit elaboration of these features of effective writing helped significantly in transforming faculty attitudes toward student writing. This more explicit understanding of data use was expressed later in the faculty conversation.

In our M3 conversation, this distinction between data novices and experts was expressed in developmental terms:

F2: Students tend to have a black and white view of the world, and we need them to appreciate the shades of gray. Often when students find apparently conflicting data, they just don't know what to do with it. (Agronomy Department meeting transcripts, 2013–2014).

In this statement, the faculty member's generalization points more clearly to the necessary transformation of student's understanding that comes from appreciating the complexity of data analysis. While novices confronted with contradictory data are initially paralyzed, experts view contradictory data as a typical component of refining understanding. Another faculty member pointed to this initial paralysis as a liminal state and opportunity for learning:

F1: Students appreciate the chance to talk about contradictory data and see data sets from multiple viewpoints. Then students can see that there are elements of different ideas that can be integrated to make a more precise point. (Agronomy Department meeting transcripts, 2013–2014).

A third faculty member extended the metaphor in the same meeting:

F3: I want students to go beyond being critical about what the data says and think of some other interpretations; more than just what the data looks like—reach back in their mind to relevant concepts and experiences. (Agronomy Department meeting transcripts, 2013–2014).

Despite the initial dismissal of effective writing in agronomy as “as little writing as possible,” the initial list of departmental criteria reflects a change in orientation to the role of writing in the field and the ways students developed as writers. The conversation enacted by the department began with an expansion of what counts as writing and thinking further about the relationship between text, data, and image in student writing. The turn to the persuasive authority of graphic representation underscored the need for an integrated approach to writing, quantitative reasoning, and data use. Attention to information seeking, data management, and the use of statistical tests were described as features of academic writing in agronomy, as well as research more broadly. By allowing faculty to describe the unstated assumption of the status of measurable evidence, the department was able to avoid the trap of conventional and glib attention to the audience and focus on the

complex interactions of fact claims, their justifications, and their relationship to changes in attitude or action.

FROM ISLANDS TO AN ARCHIPELAGO: STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION IN ART HISTORY

In art history, students, faculty, and affiliates strongly agree on the importance of writing. In heralding the centrality of writing, the stakeholders are often alike, nearly indistinguishable. Consider these responses to the WEC survey's question about the importance of writing to the discipline:

1. I cannot stress enough how important writing is in art history. Your writing needs to be strong if you want to make people read and care about art.
2. Writing is extremely important in art history. It is the medium through which we meet visual representations with texts and this is a complicated process.
3. Art history is a discipline based primarily on being able to synthesize thoughts so that they can be presented to other scholars in an effort to share and promote knowledge. Having strong writing abilities is necessary to succeed in the field.
4. To me [writing is] more important than learning about art history. (Art History survey reports, 2013)

Although it is difficult to distinguish the student from the faculty member, in these next responses, also pulled from the WEC survey, the student and the faculty perceptions are quite distinct:

1. I still don't fully know what is expected of me and I am now writing my senior paper. I am not a natural at the style of writing expected of me for art history papers, and I have no clue how to utilize bibliographic notes. It is all a bit frustrating for me.
2. Most of our students have basic writing skills, but at the same time, written assignments often seem to be thrown together at the last minute and do not reflect high levels of thinking.
3. It is late for me since I am close to graduation. Right now, it will be done through self-learning. That is very sad.
4. I have the impression that writing is a chore for students, and they do not view it as a tool or method that can help them clarify their thoughts. (Art History survey reports, 2013)

The divide separating students from faculty becomes readily apparent when respondents are asked to consider writing expectations and performance in the

undergraduate Art History curricula. The liminal language of struggle, mimicry, and frustration manifest themselves in phrases, such as “I have no clue,” “a bit frustrating,” “seem thrown together,” “very sad,” “writing is a chore.” During the first faculty WEC meeting, these differences were engaged head on, producing candid yet unresolved moments:

F1: Students say that many professors have no patience or time; that observation is grounded in fact. There is not time for this. That feeling reflects practical concerns that are true.

F2: It can be individual but not systemic. It’s the structure we have to work with.

- **F3:** Am I teaching them writing or art? Obviously, there is overlap; they are not mutually exclusive. Sometimes we forgo one for the sake of the other if students are demonstrating knowledge.

In this brief exchange, time becomes a stand-in for many pressures faculty experience in teaching students to write and to think as art historians. Whether it is an individual or a systemic issue, a lack of time becomes a *de facto* justification for the tacit. As Perkins has pointed out (2006), tacit knowledge and tacit strategies benefit experts because they are efficient. But tacit knowledge also presents keen challenges for learners, especially those who know enough—the “consciously incompetent” (Ambrose et al., 2010, p. 96)—to know they have been excluded. As students in the previous passages indicate, they experience the tacit expectations about writing in art history as a form of neglect: “I still don’t know what is expected of me”; “it will be done through self-learning, that is sad.”

As a number of contributors to this volume articulate, WEC is a process of making tacit practices more explicit and dynamic (Anson; Flash; Sheriff; Scafe & Eodice). This often poses challenges for faculty members who must recollect how they learned those practices and then name them. The difficulty of decoding, as Middendorf terms it, or moving from a state of unconscious to conscious competence (Ambrose et al., 2010) is apparent when faculty are asked: “What specific writing abilities should art history majors be able to demonstrate upon graduation?” The first draft of abilities generated by the art history faculty is full of insider language that assumes quite a bit from would-be learners:

By the time they graduate, students should be able to:

1. Describe works of art and the experiences of art. “This painting is 10 x 2 and predominantly blue” describes what it is, but students should also be able to describe what it’s like to experience that work of art, to walk around it (quantitative description versus qualitative)

while indicating their awareness of subjectivity. They should be able to navigate a lack of Truth without sacrificing validity/accuracy.

2. Perform art history: writing is the performance of art history.
 - a. Think historically and understand the historical specificity of arguments; Understand that “art history is the only ‘disposable’ history, burden of contextualizing”
 - b. Understand history through an object rather than applying it.
3. Write in a way that is appropriate to the art objects, with appropriate decorum, and recognize the different choices they could be making. (Art History Meeting transcript, 2013-2019)

For many readers, as for many undergraduate art history majors, these abilities are apt to be troublesome and create more dissonance than clarity. The trouble stems from the complex nexus of concepts and actions. In order to “navigate a lack of truth without sacrificing validity/accuracy” and “understand that art history is the only disposable history,” one must be familiar with concepts such as “validity” and “disposable history” as well as the ways those concepts are activated by the discipline. Furthermore, it is not enough to have inert knowledge, to know what the terms refer to; one must also know how to display “a way of knowing” with the concepts. As first drafted, the abilities above do not signal or describe what successful activation looks like in writing.

So, what does it look like when one writes “in a way that is appropriate to the art objects, with appropriate decorum, and recognize the different choices they could be making”? This is a question a WEC consultant might typically ask in a faculty meeting—often on more than one occasion—as a way to proxy the confusion students encounter when expectations are tacitly or elliptically expressed. “Appropriate” and “in a way” imply tacit understanding, enforcing a division between novice and expert and reinscribing the very sentiments expressed by the students and the faculty in the survey. For the faculty, students seem to be “throwing together ideas” or not using writing as “a tool to clarify their thoughts.” For some students, lacking access to the “appropriate decorum,” writing remains mystifying, characterized as an independent and sad struggle.

How did art history work through this liminal stage, this negative and self-perpetuating loop? Over the course of three subsequent meetings, the art history faculty engaged in a number of frank discussions, frequently character-

ized by open-ended questions. One prominent thread of discussion concerned the flatness of the art history curriculum, a challenge the WEC process often exposes that extends to quite a few other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. Because some students are enrolled in 1000-level, 3000-level or 5000-level courses *simultaneously*, and some students declare their major late in their undergraduate career, an intentional sequence of courses, a coherent curricular path, was identified as a key issue.

F1: How big a problem do we think the variance at each level is? Or, does this variation reflect the nature of the things we do and can, therefore, be considered a strength in our department?

F2: The diversity of our curriculum overlooks the fact that *we are all art historians*. We have a commonality of approaches but our curriculum seems more focused on the islands, our personal areas of expertise. . . . We don't have any courses that look at art historical writings in diverse fields, ways of thinking about art history, ways of writing about the visual. Maybe we should.

F3: Should there be an undergraduate methods course or an undergraduate senior project that everyone takes that is focused on writing?

F4: With a new class that is not required, what compels students to take it? (WEC Art History Department meeting transcripts, 2014)

This excerpt reflects the genuine inquiry and interplay of agreement and disagreement at the core of WEC work. We think, too, that it captures an important liminal scene for the faculty. Nothing here is settled, not even the decision about whether or not to make its curriculum more intentionally sequenced, or whether such options are even feasible. Yet several key ideas emerge in this conversation, ones that would spur significant and transformative action. One idea, for example, begins to germinate when the second faculty member describes the department as diverse in personal interests though potentially unified by a shared identity (“we are all art historians”) and by their discipline’s “commonality of approaches.” These claims are coupled with the observation that there are no courses focused on “ways of writing about the visual,” an acknowledgment that might lead one to ask how it would be possible for students to demonstrate the third ability above, to “write in a way that is appropriate to the art objects, with appropriate decorum, and recognize the different choices they could be making.” Naming the unresolved issues—engaging with the liminal—was a necessary condition in order for the faculty to pursue three broad areas of implementation:

1. Articulating and communicating writing expectations for students
2. Developing resources to support articulated writing expectations
3. Establishing a coordinated senior capstone experience

Over the course of the first year in WEC meetings and through the drafting of its first-edition writing plan, the art history faculty returned to its initial list of desired writing abilities and significantly unpacked them. A key shift from the first draft to later versions has to do with audience. Though writing plans are often written for the benefit of the departmental faculty, art history's elaboration of its original list of abilities—the act of “translating criteria into prose,” as one faculty member described it—seems especially attuned to student concerns voiced in the initial WEC survey. Here is how the first ability above (“They should be able to navigate a lack of Truth without sacrificing validity/accuracy”) was articulated in the subsequent first-edition writing plan:

Art historical writing does not simply describe what all viewers presumably see or what the writer thinks is self-evident; it works *to teach the reader how to see the work*. Moreover, such writing directs the reader's eye over a work of art as a means to assert something particular about it; as a form of knowledge. Similarly, students should be able to describe texts and artifacts—how it feels to read them, leaf through them, touch them, to be moved or changed by them; how they produce revelation or disillusionment, frustration or clarity. In keeping with this inherently subjective task, the student should combine an awareness of the lack of a single Truth about what art is or how it is experienced, what texts and artifacts are or how they may be interpreted, with a dedication to the validity and accuracy of written description and analysis (emphasis in the original). (Art History, Writing Plan, ed. 1)

The elaborated prose in this passage now offers more direction for students. It assigns a rhetorical purpose to description (“to teach the reader how to see the work”), and it names what a text does when it is effectively describing a work (“directs the reader's eye,” “asserts something specific”). It also clarifies the enigmatic “navigate a lack of Truth,” by providing more inclusive language about the subjective work of art history. Notice, for example, the shift away from “indicating an awareness of subjectivity” in the original to “should combine an awareness of the lack of a single truth . . . with a dedication to.” In the latter passage, the “inherently subjective task” that characterizes writing in art history is contextualized, not presumed. It is more attuned to the apprentice. Ultimately, more

inclusive language connects the student writer with their audience and the student writer with the discipline's affective and intellectual commitments. Just as important, this passage, as with the writing plan in general, offers more guidance to the faculty members themselves. Without abandoning the original ability, it provides more language for how one might teach the "appropriate decorum" to students. In effect, it amplifies the observation from one faculty member that a "commonality of approaches" can be useful for linking the islands of professional practice. Indeed, as the opening sentence makes clear, it is crucial to move beyond what writers (student and faculty alike) might think "is self-evident."

But words without actions are not very sustainable. The second key change to emerge from the faculty-centered WEC discussions in art history concerned the need to provide more concrete support for students in meeting the writing abilities and expectations. Though adding new courses (e.g., "ways of thinking about art history," "ways of writing about the visual") proposed in the third faculty meeting was unlikely for a unit with declining majors, the development of online resources became a strong alternative. Beginning with its first-edition writing plan and developed in subsequent ones, the faculty committed themselves to pooling and sharing resources in support of the writing abilities they articulated. Some of these resources are culled from other universities, and some are fashioned by faculty in response to student-articulated needs. For the frustrated student, who lamented that they were not "natural at the style of writing expected of me for art history papers," who had "no clue how to utilize bibliographic notes," one faculty member has created an online tutorial on effective citation practices that unpacks the rhetorical, technical, and ethical reasons that inform attribution practices along with the distinguishing features of footnotes, endnotes, and a bibliography. "Notes and bibliographies are gifts," she informs the viewer, most likely a student in art history, "accept them from and give them to others." The tutorial provides examples of common citational concerns from undergraduate projects, uses effective analogies comparing established citational practices with digital literacies (e.g., footnotes are like hyperlinks), and makes a compelling case for what might seem like obscure formatting elements by emphasizing how inconsistent, or messy formatting can function like a "dirty bathroom in a restaurant" by souring your experience of the meal. Attentive and responsive to its audience, the resource now serves as a tool used by students and other faculty.

The third change to emerge out of the WEC meetings has been consequential, and it has provided a model for other WEC departments on campus. As the excerpt from the third faculty meeting indicates, faculty were concerned students lacked systematic exposure to the methods and practices that shape research writing in art history. This lack of exposure was attributed to the "flat curriculum" and a dearth of methods-oriented courses. The discussion also

raised the question of why a student would be compelled to invest more in a senior project near the end of their degree. In the fourth WEC meeting, faculty returned to this discussion; this time, they began to coalesce around the idea of a senior project that required more structure and more investment from the department itself. Again, the genesis for researching, developing, piloting, assessing, and the eventual revising of a major project course emerged out of a liminal moment, one where faculty acknowledged their current lack of investment and their need to alter their departmental culture:

F1: We have all voiced some dissatisfaction with the capstone project which can sometimes feel like a capstone and sometimes like a paper revision. This might be our departmental culture that doesn't quite value it as a capstone experience so students do not know that it is a synthesis of the skills they have learned.

F2: The current capstones are not fabulous and they come in last minute. I don't think it would take too much to show that we value these documents using prizes or outside reviewers, or even publishing them in some way.

F3: For [students] to know that the entire audience is the full faculty, that each one of us reads their work, could be in addition to the prize idea. We could also then publish the best one on the website.

F1: Yes, we could have a nomination system and each of us would end up reading maybe six per year.

F4: It is great if they have a destination (the prize idea) but if they don't know how to get to the destination, they haven't worked on their writing enough, thought about their writing enough . . . [we need] something along the lines of a course, putting [students] in the same room and talking, workshopping their writing with each other, reading examples of art-historical writing.

F2: We can really do all of this in the same step. We have this one-credit class, make them come in for an hour per week, make it more systematic on writing instruction, have external reviewers, people in the real world, have a prize, the work will be seen by others, that we as a department take it seriously.
(WEC meeting 4, 2014, March 5)

At first glance, the proposed solutions focus on extrinsic rewards or pressures—prizes, publications, outside reviewers—that can be fairly easily imposed

on students with little additional work from faculty. However, as the conversation progresses, the fourth faculty member acknowledges that prizes and publications can only happen after students have participated in a community of writers, “in the same room and talking, workshopping their writing with each other.”

Since AY 2014–15, building and supporting a community of research and writing for undergraduate majors in art history has been a core objective for the unit and a key success. All art history majors now complete a three-credit research project that includes weekly workshops with students, facilitated by an advanced graduate student, along with structured time for each student to meet with their faculty mentors one-to-one throughout the semester. At the end of each term, students give public presentations of their work at an event attended by faculty, students, advisors, affiliates and family members. Faculty introduce the students, framing the student talk with comments and praise for efforts and insights. To attend such an event is to encounter faculty sentiments significantly different from those expressed at the outset of their WEC efforts, when some faculty members fretted about the pressures of time to address writing and research issues, and questioned openly whether a “departmental culture” would ever connect the “islands of expertise” that characterized the teaching and course options in the undergraduate curriculum. Art history’s third-edition writing plan captures how this significant structural shift occurred, how the department moved through a liminal stage to enact key curricular and departmental changes.

Students are now far more aware of our WEC-defined skills and, so also, more self-aware about their individual capabilities with them. . . . This awareness has been enhanced not only in the classroom, where, each semester, faculty and TAs are encouraged to hand out our writing criteria and use them in designing and grading assignments, but also in our advising efforts and in our new “Welcome Packets” for recently declared majors.

Our end-of-semester senior capstone presentations have become widely attended events, which not only send our seniors off with a sense of accomplishment against a rigorous disciplinary benchmark, but also illustrate its value to our undergrads. (Art History Writing Plan, ed. 3)

The case studies in agronomy and plant genetics and art history offer two distinct examples of how the WEC process engages in structured conversations that can challenge and change faculty assumptions and behaviors about teaching writing. Recognizing and understanding the liminal quality of the WEC process can fundamentally change the ways in which scholars of writing have conceived of faculty participation and buy in. These shifts in thinking can lead,

in turn, to substantive course and curricular revisions within undergraduate departments, or what Scafe and Eodice in Chapter 11 of this volume describe as the vital results of co-inquiry, “the almost magical ability of work to lead people to insights that no amount of abstract discussion or lecturing could induce.” The WEC process varies within departments, shaped in manifold ways by the different disciplinary cultures we work with, making it difficult to measure the precise interventions that produce conceptual shifts. Nevertheless, our review of meeting minutes and transcripts demonstrates that the WEC process creates the conditions of possibility for conceptual change.

The language of assessment often describes programmatic change idealistically as an efficient and ever-evolving process where loops are exposed and neatly closed. Despite this attractive and appealing description, it belies the liminal reality when faculty authentically confront and reconsider how they have come to know their field and how they should teach it. Not all conversations bear fruit, and not all liminal experiences lead to transformation. But a willingness to keep engaging in the dialog is how sustainable change happens. As Pamela Flash details in this volume, WEC conversations—neither purely spontaneous, nor rigidly scripted—remain the bedrock for this process. In the absence of a singular protocol or scripted exercises designed to produce conveniently shared outcomes, the consultative process—the structured conversation at the core of the WEC project—requires a variety of approaches, strategies and frequent adjustments, and it demands a willingness to pursue multiple, at times contradictory, lines of thinking as expressed by faculty participants. WEC endeavors succeed when the dialog remains open and ongoing among WAC consultants and faculty members and when it is underwritten by the consideration of undergraduate writing samples, student, faculty and stakeholder surveys, curricular matrices, and triennial ratings of capstone-level papers. Across diverse disciplines and programs, WEC conversations provide data for an evidence-based discussion of faculty and student assumptions about writing and the time and space to consider why it is that faculty and students believe what they believe.

REFERENCES

- Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies*. Utah State University Press.
- Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (Eds.). (2019). *(Re)considering what We Know: Learning Thresholds in Writing, Composition, Rhetoric, and Literacy*. Utah State University Press.
- Agronomy Department meeting transcripts. (2013–2014) Writing-Enriched Curriculum Program, University of Minnesota.
- Ambrose, S. A., Lovett, M., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching*. Wiley.

- 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*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.27514/PER-B.2021.1299.1.3>
- Anson, C. M. (2021). The new grass roots: Faculty responses to the writing-enriched curriculum. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.27514/PER-B.2021.1299.2.02>
- Art History Department meeting transcripts (2013-2019). Writing-Enriched Curriculum Program, University of Minnesota.
- Condon, W., & Rutz, C. (2013). A taxonomy of writing across the curriculum programs: Evolving to serve broader agendas. *College Composition and Communication*, 64(2), 357-382.
- Flash, P. (2016). From appraised to revised: Faculty in the disciplines change what they never knew they knew. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *A Rhetoric of reflection* (pp. 227-249). Utah State University Press.
- 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*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.27514/PER-B.2021.1299.2.01>
- Hyde, L. (1998). *Trickster makes this world: Myth, mischief and art*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Land, R. (2015). Preface. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. xi-xiv). Utah State University Press.
- Meyer, J. H. F., & Land, R. (Eds.). (2006). *Overcoming barriers to student understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge*. Routledge.
- Meyer, J. H. F., Land, R., & Baillie, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Threshold concepts and transformational learning*. Sense Publishing.
- Perkins, D. (2006). Constructivism and troublesome knowledge. In J. H. F. Meyer & R. Land (Eds.), *Overcoming barriers to student understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge* (pp. 33-47). Routledge.
- Scafe, R., & Eodice, M. (2021). Finding writing where it lives: Departmental relations and relations with departments. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.27514/PER-B.2021.1299.2.11>
- Soliday, M. (2011). *Everyday genres: Writing assignments across the disciplines*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- 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*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.27514/PER-B.2021.1299.2.06>