

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Dissertations, Theses, and Student Research:
Department of English

English, Department of

July 2010

A REVISIONARY APPROACH TO CROSS-CURRICULAR LITERACY WORK

Sandra L. Tarabochia

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishdiss>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Tarabochia, Sandra L., "A REVISIONARY APPROACH TO CROSS-CURRICULAR LITERACY WORK" (2010). *Dissertations, Theses, and Student Research: Department of English*. 34.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishdiss/34>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Student Research: Department of English by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

A REVISIONARY APPROACH TO CROSS-CURRICULAR
LITERACY WORK

by

Sandra Lynn Tarabochia

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: English

Under the Supervision of Professors Amy Goodburn and Shari Stenberg

Lincoln, Nebraska

August, 2010

A REVISIONARY APPROACH TO CROSS-CURRICULAR LITERACY WORK

Sandra Lynn Tarabochia, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2010

Advisors: Amy Goodburn and Shari Stenberg

In this dissertation, I use qualitative research methods to study relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines in the context of cross-curricular literacy (CCL) work. Drawing on a two-year CCL project in the biology department, for which I was a participant observer, I argue that compositionists need to attend more carefully to issues that influence day-to-day interactions with disciplinary faculty in order to develop more meaningful CCL relationships. Toward that end, I offer a revisionary approach to cross-curricular literacy work that cultivates complex relationships by delaying consensus and embracing disconnection and disorientation. More specifically, I employ revisionary stance as a discursive strategy to complicate three key concepts in CCL literature and scholarship—expertise, change, and outcomes. I re-vision three texts produced during my time in the biology department in order to illuminate the complexities of negotiating expertise, recognizing change, and pursuing outcomes in CCL contexts. Given the reciprocal relationship between discursive and material change (Lee), I maintain that revision of CCL discourse can inspire revision on a pedagogical level, shaping how compositionists and disciplinary faculty participate in CCL interactions. Thus, a revisionary approach leads me to conceptualize revisionary pedagogy for cross-curricular literacy work.

I theorize revisionary pedagogy as a means of fostering pedagogical relationships in CCL contexts, complicating how relationships are framed in traditional Writing Across

the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines scholarship. The literature advances three main conceptual models of CCL, each of which embraces expertise, change, and outcomes in ways that sponsor potentially problematic relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. I draw on Composition scholars' rich conceptualization of revision (Jung; Lee; Welch) and pedagogy (Kameen; Qualley; Stenberg) to challenge the litany of next-best models and imagine alternative possibilities for relationships in CCL contexts. Revisionary pedagogy is a means of approaching material circumstances that reconstitutes how compositionists and disciplinary faculty conceive of and participate in CCL relationships.

Acknowledgments

To the following people I offer most genuine thanks:

My Chairs, Amy Goodburn and Shari Stenberg, for your encouragement, support, and tireless engagement with my work.

My past and present committee members, Chris Gallagher, Joy Ritchie, and Margaret Latta for offering your courses as spaces of wonder, experimentation, and deep inquiry and for modeling the revisionary spirit as teachers and scholars.

The amazing women of Andrews 202, Elaine, Sue, LeAnn, Linda, and Janet for your cheerful demeanor and constant patience.

Students, TAs, and faculty of the biology department, for welcoming me into your classrooms and your discipline, and challenging me to see teaching and writing in new ways.

Committed writing group members Whitney Douglas, Eric Turley, Dana Kinzy, and most especially Alison Friedow. Your thoughtful feedback and stimulating conversation continually inspired and energized my thinking.

My family, Tony, Linda, Robin, and Marty, for having faith in me and supporting my decision to be a “lifetime student.”

And to my husband Craig and son Gabriel for giving me reason to persevere, reminding me what really matters, and for making me laugh when I needed it most.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter One Metaphors for CCL Work and the Relationships They Invoke	11
Chapter Two Knowledge in Conversation: Challenges of Negotiating Expertise	44
Chapter Three Change and Be Changed: Re-visioning the Transformative Mission of CCL Work	86
Chapter Four (Re)Considering Outcomes of Cross-Curricular Literacy Work	130
Conclusion Not Another Next-Best Model: Revisionary Pedagogy and CCL Work	173
Works Cited	183
Notes	188

Multimedia Objects

Tables

1.1	Cross-Curricular Literacy Paradigms	17
1.2	Missionary Model	27
1.3	Anthropological Model	34
1.4	Critical Model	41
4.1	Three Levels of Outcomes Discourse	132

Figure

1	Handout from Meeting with Biology Faculty	149
---	---	-----

Introduction

Late in the spring of 2005, I was given an opportunity to work with the chair of the Biological Science Department to incorporate writing into a course he was teaching the following fall. It seems Oliver had approached the chair of the English Department expressing frustration with the kind of writing students were producing in his classes. The frustration with students and their writing, he explained, was common among instructors throughout his department, which suggested the need for more effective, efficient ways of supporting student writers. He offered to “buy out” a GTA specializing in Composition and Rhetoric to co-instruct his course, teaching writing so he could focus on teaching content. The collaboration would serve as a pilot; if it worked and student writing improved, he hoped to create similar collaborations in key courses throughout the major in an effort to insure biology graduates spent a significant amount of time developing their writing skills. I accepted the invitation to teach with Oliver and thus began my two-year relationship with the Biological Science Department, during which I worked in a range of contexts and capacities with different students, TAs, instructors, and faculty. My experience engaging in and reflecting on this work serves as the foundation of this dissertation.

As I soon discovered, our project constituted what Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID) scholars call *cross-curricular literacy* work. Jeffrey Jablonski, following David Russell, defines cross-curricular literacy (CCL), “as an umbrella term referring to writing that occurs in academic contexts outside of English departments” (14). While many take WAC to be similarly inclusive, he points out, others distinguish between WAC and WID or misunderstand/misconstrue the “scope,

aims, and methods of WAC” (14). With Jablonski, I find CCL a useful term for indicating the rich history, theory, and practice of both Writing Across the Curriculum *and* Writing in the Disciplines. CCL projects might include: workshops supporting faculty across the university as writers and writing teachers; the development of resources for instructors interested in teaching writing in their disciplinary courses; the funding and initiation of faculty inquiry groups through which faculty explore issues related to writing that impact their departments; collaborative teaching partnerships between English Studies faculty and faculty in other disciplines focused on the development and implementation of writing curriculum; and more.

Cross-curricular literacy initiatives like these call for flexible, creative strategies for interacting with faculty across disciplines, many of whom bring with them a range of experiences, philosophies and assumptions about student writers and the teaching of writing that differ significantly from those valued in Composition Studies. Indeed, as I worked with faculty in the biology department to develop an approach to teaching and learning writing in their discipline, questions emerged for me that revolve around three concepts central to cross-curricular literacy discourse and practice:

- ❖ Expertise: *Who am I in this context? What do I have to offer disciplinary faculty and what can they offer me? What do I have to learn? To teach? What do I know? What do I not yet know but need to understand?*
- ❖ Change: *Who or what should change through cross-curricular literacy interactions? How should change be initiated and worked toward? For what purpose? Who should decide?*

- ❖ Outcomes: *What is the purpose of cross-curricular literacy initiatives? What should they accomplish? What goals or objectives do I, a compositionist, bring with me to each project, and how do they relate to those of disciplinary faculty? In the end, how do we know if we've succeeded or failed?*

The heart of these concepts and queries, I believe, is a question about how to cultivate meaningful relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines in the context of cross-curricular literacy work. It is a question those of us in Composition Studies face with increasing frequency, as we consistently are called upon to facilitate, direct, and often develop CCL initiatives whether or not we consider ourselves knowledgeable or experienced in WAC/WID theory and practice. However, when it comes to grappling with the possibilities and challenges of developing meaningful CCL relationships, we encounter a lack of resources. As Jablonski points out: “There remains little discussion in the literature about how to conduct the day-to-day work of negotiating close working partnerships with faculty in other disciplines” (4). My dissertation project responds to this lack by focusing on CCL interactions in specific contexts in order to sponsor conversations about the challenges and possibilities of cultivating and sustaining meaningful cross-curricular relationships.

While I agree with Jablonski that CCL scholarship consists of “a substantial body of theoretical and practical knowledge about administering WAC programs” and relatively little about how to “actually negotiate, sustain, and assess successful relationships in CCL contexts” (4), an examination of CCL discourse does reveal certain frameworks that shape the way relationships often are conceived and enacted. More specifically, the literature maintains three major conceptual models for cross-curricular

literacy work, each of which suggests, often implicitly, how compositionists should position ourselves in relation to faculty in the disciplines. I discuss these models and their relevance more fully in Chapter 1, but in brief, each model—missionary, anthropological, and critical—corresponds to the three main historical “stages” of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement.¹ Each model defines itself by critiquing elements of the one(s) before it, forming a somewhat linear progression that currently culminates in Jablonski’s call for a fourth stage in which compositionists “reclaim our expertise as rhetoricians” in order to “develo[p] methods and models for translating our disciplinary knowledge to others” (190). Each paradigm implies different ways of considering my questions around expertise, change, and project outcomes, and subsequently, different ways of theorizing relationships between compositionists and faculty in the disciplines.

As I will argue in Chapter 1, there is much to be learned from these models, especially in conjunction with a deeper understanding of the historical circumstances that gave birth to them. Yet I am troubled by the persistence of such a linear narrative. I find the models insufficient in what they offer compositionists working to cultivate relationships amidst the complicated, everyday messiness of cross-curricular literacy efforts. Faced with complex questions such as: *What is the relationship between writing and “content”?* *How does institutional context impact notions of power and expertise in CCL relationships?* *How do disciplinary and institutional frameworks shape assumptions about the purposes and ends of CCL projects?*, compositionists need a flexible frame of mind—a way of conceptualizing and engaging key concepts like expertise, change, and outcomes—that interrupts the litany of next-best models. Toward that end, my project

demonstrates and argues for a *revisionary* approach to grappling with the questions and challenges of cross-curricular literacy work.

In theorizing and enacting a revisionary approach to CCL work, I draw on compositionists (Jung; Kameen; Lee; Qualley; Stenberg; Welch) who understand revision as a reflexive, social process of collaborative meaning-making that recognizes and cultivates complex relationships by delaying consensus and embracing disconnection and disorientation. This revisionary frame of mind is particularly appropriate for cross-curricular literacy work. CCL projects, by nature, expose participants to other people, processes, texts, ideas, and disciplinary habits of mind, which easily can lead to conflicts, misunderstandings or failed expectations. A revisionary approach, grounded in reflexivity, reframes the disorientation or disconnection that can result from conflicting perspectives as a starting place for collaborative meaning-making. Rather than working toward consensus (convincing disciplinary faculty to buy into composition theory and practice, for instance) compositionists can embrace identification and exploration of differences as generative processes essential to cross-curricular literacy work.

Throughout this project, I employ the term “revisionary stance” to describe a frame of mind grounded in the rich notion of revision described above. Both a rhetorical positioning and a method of engagement, revisionary stance operates on two levels: the discursive (in terms of discourses and texts), and the pedagogical (in terms of material interactions and relationships).

I demonstrate what revisionary stance might look like in the discursive realm by reflexively re-visioning three types of texts I’ve produced in the context of CCL work—reflective writing, more formal writing, and what I call “practical writing” or writing that

is part of, rather than about, cross-curricular literacy work. In doing so, I investigate the key concepts of expertise, change, and project outcomes, interrogating socially and historically constructed assumptions or “truths” that shape how each is taken up in CCL discourse, and consequently in practice.

Drawing on Foucault’s belief in the role of discourse in shaping identity, oppression and the distribution of power, Amy Lee emphasizes the potential for “revisions” like these, which begin in the realm of discourse, to extend to more material circumstances. She maintains:

[I]f we believe the nexus of power-truth-discourse produces a discourse of truth that serves to enable speakers/writers to cover up or maintain blindness to the various contradictions that structure their identities and relationships, then we cannot have material change without discursive change—the two, rather, must go hand-in-hand. While we must be conscious of not conflating the two, of not assuming they are the same or “equal,” we can recognize the necessity of both spheres of action and allow that change in one will ultimately impact the other.
(150)

Given the reciprocal relationship between discursive and material change Lee describes, I believe that revision of CCL discourse can inspire revision on a pedagogical level, shaping how compositionists and disciplinary faculty participate in CCL relationships and interactions. Likewise, revising how we conceptualize and engage in relationships (and making visible our efforts to do so) can impact how concepts such as expertise, change, and project outcomes function discursively. The revisions I offer of these concepts as they operate in and through CCL discourse urge those of us undertaking

cross-curricular literacy work not only to participate in “revising the concepts by which [we] organize [our] lives,” but also to “rethink the lived, material relations conceived of, and represented by, these words” (Lee 150). With that goal, I inhabit revisionary stance as I revise my own written texts in order to re-vision CCL discourse and ultimately the way we understand and engage in CCL relationships. I simultaneously advocate revisionary stance as a frame of mind through which compositionists and disciplinary faculty might approach their own cross-curricular literacy projects.

A revisionary approach challenges many of the rigid roles and relationships forwarded in traditional models. In particular, I offer *revisionary pedagogy* as an alternative conceptualization of CCL work—grounded in revised notions of expertise, change, and project outcomes—that sponsors more meaningful relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines. I frame CCL work as pedagogy in order to emphasize the collaborative, interactive, meaning-making characteristics that emerge when relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty are pedagogical. For my understanding of pedagogy, I turn to the relatively recent move in Composition Studies that reclaims pedagogy as a learner-centered, collaborative activity in which the teacher is a participant rather than a practitioner.

In her introduction to *Professing & Pedagogy*, Stenberg outlines several characteristics of this kind of pedagogy—it is a reflective, epistemic activity that recognizes the interplay of theory and practice; it is made and remade with each encounter among teacher-learners who constantly are changing; and it is ongoing, requiring a sustained commitment to reflexivity (xviii). Drawing on this definition, a pedagogical conceptualization of CCL work has the potential to be a useful alternative to

traditional models because it recasts compositionists, disciplinary faculty, and cross-curricular literacy as flexible, evolving entities, and the purpose/ends of CCL work as emergent from the dynamic interaction among them. Moreover, the focus on reflexivity, multi-directional change among teacher-learners, and collaborative meaning-making challenges the often rigid roles and relationships forwarded in traditional models. Importantly, I cannot and do not wish to define *a* pedagogy for CCL work. Rather, I explore possibilities for relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines that emerge when we approach CCL work as a pedagogical activity.

Re-visioning CCL relationships requires an understanding of how cross-curricular literacy interactions have been framed in the past. Toward that end, Chapter 1 examines three traditional models of CCL work—missionary, anthropological, and critical—contextualizing them within the historical moments from which they emerged, particularly in relation to chronological “stages” of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement. I trace the concepts of expertise, change, and outcomes through each model, drawing attention to how each is shaped differently (and problematically) according to the way the model frames relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. In the remaining chapters, I employ this awareness to imagine new possibilities for building pedagogical relationships in cross-curricular literacy contexts.

In Chapter 2, I use revisionary stance to study how expertise functioned in the context of a first-year honors seminar that I co-instructed with the chair of the biology department. I revisit reflective writing I produced throughout the semester, putting traditional conceptual models of CCL work in conversation with the way we perceived and enacted expertise. I complicate current notions of expertise by making visible the

challenges of negotiating meaning through day-to-day CCL interactions. Ultimately, I reframe negotiated expertise as a means of nurturing pedagogical relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines.

The idea of change is the focus of Chapter 3, as I employ revisionary stance to investigate how basic assumptions about change infuse CCL discourse and practice and influence how compositionists and disciplinary faculty interact with one another. In particular, I revisit a seminar paper in which I critiqued biology professors and their discipline for failing to adapt and change in response to CCL efforts. I identify gaps and disruptions in my argument as revisionary moments that allow me to reconsider my assumptions about what constitutes change in CCL contexts. Throughout the chapter, I enact revision as a creative process of re-imagining connections between the ideas about transformation I embrace as a Composition scholar and my lived experiences doing cross-curricular literacy work. Valuing change as tenuous and usefully chaotic, I argue, is one way to sponsor pedagogical relationships.

In Chapter 4, I look more specifically at the kinds of changes articulated and pursued through CCL efforts. Cross-curricular literacy discourse tends to frame project outcomes in programmatic terms, obscuring rich interactions on the project level. In order to make visible the influence of national and programmatic outcomes discourse on the negotiation of project outcomes, I take a revisionary stance toward a handout I designed to facilitate discussion among biology faculty about potential outcomes of our two-year project in the department. Explicit attention to outcomes negotiation on the project level, I maintain, can lead to a more flexible conceptualization of outcomes; project outcomes that are more responsive to the needs of individuals; and the cultivation

of pedagogical relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty that are mutually supportive.

In conclusion, I consider how the revision of key concepts in CCL discourse could generate new possibilities for cultivating meaningful CCL relationships. More specifically, I forward revisionary pedagogy as a way to build richer, more reciprocal relationships between compositionists and faculty in the disciplines. I offer the revised notions of expertise, change and outcomes developed throughout the dissertation as features of revisionary pedagogy for CCL work, and I explore the implications of embracing a revisionary approach to cross-curricular literacy discourse and practice for the field as a whole.

Chapter One

Metaphors for CCL Work and the Relationships They Invoke

It was a chilly afternoon in February, and I welcomed the spring-like gurgle of the indoor pond that greeted me upon entering Manter Hall. Excited and a bit nervous, I undid the buttons of my coat as I made my way to the conference room for a meeting with a small group of biology faculty members. Oliver, the department chair, organized the meeting to discuss teaching writing in biology courses and invited me to participate because I'd been working as a writing consultant in the department for several years. In addition to Oliver, four biology professors joined me at the table. Pam and Ethan taught successive courses in a major sequence (Biology 205: Genetics and Biology 207: Ecology and Evolution), Andrew was on the department curriculum committee, and James was a veteran professor with a history of designing and implementing complex writing projects for students in advanced courses.

To begin the meeting, Oliver described the history of our project, which began when the two of us co-instructed an honors seminar for non-majors in the fall of 2006. Through that experience, Oliver explained, he'd discovered a "whole array of techniques that can be brought to bear on the pedagogy of teaching writing." After that, I worked for several semesters with Ethan and the TAs for BIOS 207 developing a series of writing workshops to support students writing lab reports. Oliver told the group he was encouraged by what we'd accomplished and recommended a long-term goal of developing a writing curriculum across multiple courses in order to insure every biology student would gain experience writing in the discipline. He explained that due to

intersecting forces, including staffing issues in the English department, I would no longer be able to offer my services as a writing specialist. His objective was to establish a self-sustaining writing initiative in the department. Oliver assured his colleagues that gathering a set of writing resources and incorporating writing techniques into certain courses was “feasible,” “doable,” and “not that hard” “even for biologists.”

The professors seemed doubtful, and I remember feeling their skepticism full force when Oliver turned over the floor to me. Despite my concern about the way Oliver framed teaching writing as “doable even for biologists,” I latched on to his method of persuasion. Faculty from the School of Natural Resources (SNR) recently had undertaken a similar project, I explained, detailing their development of a department website with writing resources for students and teachers. “See,” I implored, “if they can do it, so can you.”

At first, the biology faculty wondered if they might just send teachers and students from their department to the SNR writing website. I listened as they determined that subfields and subdisciplines in biology are too diverse merely to refer writers to resources designed for a different field; they needed their own materials. Ethan, the professor with whom I had worked most closely over the last several semesters, pointed out that no one at the table had the time or the expertise to create a web resource to address writing issues. The others quickly agreed; what they needed was a common textbook that biology majors would be required to purchase early in their tenure and reference throughout the major course sequence.

From there, the discussion turned to the challenge of clarifying who exactly would teach these writing components and how. “I teach large lecture classes,” worried

the genetics instructor, “and my lab TAs are undergrads. Most of them can’t write very well, and it doesn’t make sense to spend time teaching them to teach writing when they will graduate next year.” Ethan agreed that TAs would be the most frequent users of writing resources and suggested incorporating writing instruction into the next TA workshop.

As the meeting wound to a close, the professors determined that creating a writing resource library was the most tangible, feasible action, and I should be the one to develop it. I asked when we should plan to meet again to look over some examples of sources and share ideas. They insisted I was “overestimating” their familiarity with such materials and that they wouldn’t have much to contribute. After all, I was the expert. I left the meeting feeling frustrated and disheartened. The resource library didn’t seem very ambitious, and at the time, I believed the only reason they decided to do that much was because they justifiably could pass it off to their “expert” service provider.

The meeting was a discouraging one. At the time, I interpreted the result as an indication that my first CCL project had failed. I saw faculty discounting the significant expertise they brought to teaching writing in their field and valorizing my writing expertise in order to avoid taking responsibility for articulating their own goals for student writing. Despite the substantial changes Ethan made in his own teaching and in the writing component we’d developed for BIOS 207, in the meeting he contributed to the prevailing notion that faculty lacked expertise in teaching writing. The changes I saw in him and his teaching did little to encourage lasting, department-wide change. In the end, the outcomes faculty imagined—creating a resource library, for example—seemed a

meager culmination to our pilot project, which I had imagined would inspire foundational change throughout the department both in curriculum and attitudes toward teaching.

My disappointment in the ways expertise, change, and project outcomes were engaged in that final meeting draws my attention to the ways those issues operated throughout my time in the biology department. *How did I encourage or discourage certain perceptions of expertise through my approach to working with Oliver, Ethan, and others? Where did our ideas about expertise come from and how did they play out? What changes did I expect as a result of my work in the biology department? Did I assume changes in individual faculty members would translate into broader changes in curriculum, department or discipline? How did we imagine the outcomes of our work together? Did faculty perceive the meeting a failure, as I did? Based on what criteria?*

As these questions suggest, issues surrounding expertise, change, and project outcomes emerge in complex ways when compositionists and disciplinary faculty work together on cross-curricular literacy projects. Further, how we address those issues has implications for the kinds of relationships we develop with one another. Unfortunately, CCL literature and scholarship does not typically attend to questions like these explicitly or consider how they are connected to relationship-building. What CCL discourse and scholarship does offer, however, are three major conceptual models of cross-curricular literacy work that forward different kinds of relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines. Upon closer examination, distinct ways of thinking about expertise, change and project outcomes are implicit in these three approaches to CCL work and the relationships they promote.

In order to re-vision possibilities for CCL relationships, I argue, we must revise how these terms function in discourse and practice. Central to this revisionary process is a nuanced understanding of the ways relationships have been conceived and enacted over time. Toward that end, in this chapter I pursue a deeper understanding of the circumstances that gave birth to the major conceptual models of CCL work by taking a revisionary stance toward WAC history. I examine how each model emerged in response to unique conditions, focusing on how relationships were enabled or constrained according to the ways compositionists and disciplinary faculty understood expertise, change, and outcomes.

Major Conceptual Models: An Overview

A survey of CCL literature and scholarship reveals three major conceptual models of cross-curricular literacy work—missionary, anthropological and critical. Because the unique social, political, and institutional conditions surrounding each moment correspond with the growth of the WAC movement, the models tend to be associated with different “stages” of WAC and treated as though they’ve evolved linearly over time. Each can be identified according to several characteristics, including theoretical paradigm, ideology, pedagogy, and approach to research. For example, as Jablonski points out, the missionary model embraces expressivism, values self-discovery, promotes process-based pedagogy, and encourages education-oriented research.²

As scholars have argued (see for example Russell, *Writing*; McLeod and Maimon, “WAC Myths and Realities”), the models should not be taken to represent static or incompatible approaches to CCL work. I acknowledge that the models certainly can

intersect, overlap and even inform one another in any given moment; however, I find it useful to pin them down, at least temporarily, in order to emphasize and study the various historical, social, and contextual forces that give rise to key differences among them. For example, each model represents a particular *approach* to CCL work, a way of structuring projects and taking up common CCL activities, which in turn suggests particular kinds of *relationships* between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines. The latter quality—CCL relationships—is the focus of this chapter.

Re-visioning possibilities for cross-curricular relationships requires a more robust understanding of the relationships forwarded in missionary, anthropological, and critical models. In what follows, I consider each of the models in its historical context, paying particular attention to the ways unique conditions determined how compositionists and disciplinary faculty conceived of expertise, change, and project outcomes within each stage (Table 1.1). In the remaining chapters, this investigation serves as a foundation for revising how the concepts function in CCL discourse and practice, a first and important step toward imagining new possibilities for CCL relationships.

Rhetoricians on a Mission: The WAC Movement is Born

In its most simplified form, the missionary model of CCL work promotes relationships in which compositionists embrace the role of missionaries intent on converting the “natives,” faculty in other disciplines, to WAC philosophies and techniques. Louise Smith, in her oft-cited opinion piece published in *College English* (1988), articulates the attitudes underlying stage-one missions. She argues that English

Table 1.1 Cross-Curricular Literacy Paradigms (adapted from Jablonski 186).

Model	Missionary	Anthropological	Critical
Stage	Stage One (1970s and 1980s)	Stage Two (1980s and 1990s)	Stage Three (late 1990s – 2000s)
Historical conditions	Writing considered subordinate to other disciplines, focus on writing instruction, service ethos, public/private funding	Less funding, WAC needs to stay relevant, rhetorical research into disciplines becomes popular	Composition Studies focuses on cultural studies and critical pedagogy
Philosophies/perspectives	Missionary zeal, expressivism, values self-discovery, process-based pedagogy, writing to learn techniques	Focus on observation and disciplinary research, social-constructionism, values enculturation, discipline-based pedagogy, learning to write techniques	Focus on critique, social-epistemic, values student agency, critical pedagogy, revision of disciplinary discourse/ knowledge through writing
Compositionists' goal for CCL work	Convert faculty to WAC philosophies and techniques	Understand disciplinary discourse	Critique disciplinary discourses, conventions, and pedagogies on political and ideological bases
Relationship	Compositionists are missionaries and faculty are natives	Compositionists are anthropologists studying the natives	Compositionists are cultural critics and faculty are either collaborators or resisters

departments should “house” WAC because of “our expertise in the study of the construction and reception of texts,” as well as “our expertise in composition theory and pedagogy” (391). According to Smith, we no longer can pretend

our colleagues aren’t blundering today as we did twenty years ago, novice writing teachers working in a theoretical vacuum (for instance, failing to distinguish between assigning writing and teaching it, between acquisition and learning, between product and process, between paper comments for revising works-in-progress and for editing finished products)... (391)

Despite her depiction of them as novice blunderers, Smith does admit that disciplinary faculty have expertise that is meaningful and relevant to the teaching of writing. In fact, for her it is the “overlap” between their expertise and ours “that makes WAC feasible and fun” (391). However, Smith contends, faculty in other disciplines might not always make necessary connections between their expertise and students’ composing process; they “see composition theory and pedagogy as... peripheral to their professional interests” (393). Therefore, it is up to “informed and experienced writing teachers” to convince disciplinary faculty of the need to develop writing pedagogy and to show them how (393).

Smith qualifies her claims, emphasizing that she doesn’t believe English departments should “maintain hegemony over writing instruction” (391). She believes her argument that English departments should house WAC supports a “dialogical,” “anti-colonial” view of Writing Across the Curriculum, but with definitions of “English department,” “house,” and “dialogical” that are different from how they are usually understood (390). Still, while Smith urges compositionists to “invite” colleagues across

the curriculum to join us in “dialogue” about writing and pedagogy, at the heart of her case is the assumption that writing teachers from the English department should inspire the transformation of disciplinary faculty. If we sit back and assume our disciplinary colleagues will come to us, change of their own accord, and figure things out in due time, Smith expounds, there’s no telling how long we’ll wait. Instead, she urges compositionists to get over our “professional ‘anxiety of influence’ and of *influencing*” and actively make change (394).

I applaud Smith’s energy, her confidence in writing teachers, and her rejection of the notion that in order to participate in egalitarian dialogue, compositionists must deny our unique expertise. Yet, as Mark Waldo points out:

The problem with Smith’s argument lies not so much in outcomes as approach. If the authority sees those who need her expertise as blunderers, then the atmosphere would seem ripe for extension, for faculty to be “filled with knowledge technical or otherwise,” belonging to the authority and her community. (9)

In other words, Smith’s approach to WAC embodies the complexity of the missionary mentality. Even when compositionists value and seek out collaboration, conversation and dialogue, the sense that compositionists have the kind of expertise that matters most when it comes to writing instruction easily can lead to problematic relationships with disciplinary faculty.

Current WAC/WID literature and scholarship often criticizes approaches like Smith’s “because the [missionary] role does not lend itself to the productive faculty dialogue that is part of all successful WAC programs,” or because missionary attitudes too easily lead to “self-righteous[s] proselytizing from an unexamined position”

(McLeod, “Foreigner” 111; Bergmann 146). Yet, as Smith’s example suggests, and as I show in subsequent chapters, it is not easy to dismiss or move beyond this model of CCL work even when compositionists consciously try to avoid it. Rather than attempt to shed the role of missionary in favor of a new one, I argue, we would do well to examine it more closely. Studied in the context of the conditions that made it not only effective, but sensical and even necessary, there is much to be learned from the missionary model and the relationships it enabled and constrained.

The missionary approach to CCL work grew out of a unique nexus of circumstances including social and cultural turmoil, growing institutional focus on writing and writing instruction, compositionists’ struggle to legitimize their discipline, and the birth of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement, all of which evolved over decades. The 1960s saw decreased attention to writing; composition courses were cut or reduced as higher education attended to “more pressing matters,” such as accommodating a vast generation of “baby boomers” determined to go to college (Russell, *Writing* 272). However, according to Russell, the 60s contributed several legacies that set the stage for the emergence, in the 1970s, of “the most widespread and sustained reform movement in cross-curricular writing instruction” (272).

The first legacy of the 1960s was ideological. During this time, the “communitarian vision in American social and educational thought that had spurred previous generations of curricular reformers” was revived by “the political and cultural upheaval” of the decade, inspiring a new generation of reformers (Russell, *Writing* 272-3). Russell credits theorists such as Peter Elbow, Ken Macrorie, Donald Graves, and James Moffett for “profoundly influencing” future WAC leaders who later would give

the movement “its focus on the classroom as community; its student-centered pedagogy, often with a subversive tinge; and its neoromantic, expressivist assumptions” (273).

International influences also contributed to the ideological legacy of the 60s. In 1966, British educators, whose teaching models emphasized “the linguistic, social, and personal development of the student,” met with NCTE leaders at the Dartmouth Seminar. They “fundamentally challenged” the American pursuit of “rigid disciplinary or industrial models” of education, paving the way for James Britton’s “influential theoretical framework [linking] the development of writing in the disciplines with personal writing” (Russell, *Writing* 273). This focus on student expression, personal writing, and classroom communities eventually would characterize stage-one philosophies of WAC.

Dramatic changes in the “structure and social role of mass education” constitute a second legacy of the 1960s (Russell, *Writing* 274). More specifically, racial integration and a “massive boom in higher education” that called for more and different institutions of higher learning forced educators to contend with the challenge of preparing a diverse student body, many of whom came from previously excluded populations (274). With the appearance of scholarship like Mina Shaughnessy’s study of basic writing, administrators turned to writing instruction as a means of teaching dominant language and discourse to students “whose language background was radically different” (274). Finally, in the wake of increasing “pressures for widening access” government and industry became more involved in language education, generating private and public funding opportunities that would fuel WAC for decades (275).

Perhaps most importantly for my purposes, the 1960s saw the professionalization of writing instructors as “a ‘revival of rhetoric’” that contributed to the development of a

professional identity for composition teachers (Russell, *Writing* 274). During this decade, CCCC became a professional organization in its own right, broadening its research focus beyond first-year composition to investigate wider questions around writing, teaching, and learning (274). As a result, institutions concerned with issues of literacy and access began to recognize the expertise of compositionists who were, at that time, eager to promote Composition as an academic discipline.

In the early 1970s, the waves of reform that had been building throughout the previous decade collided, producing “the widest social and institutional demand for writing instruction since the mass-education system had founded composition a century earlier...” (Russell, *Writing* 275). When *Newsweek* published “Why Johnny Can’t Write” in December of 1975, the ensuing “literacy crisis,” much like similar crises in preceding decades, revitalized “attempts to broaden responsibility for writing instruction” (276). This time, Russell notes, conditions were right to spawn a more coherent reform movement. Drawing on Britton’s arguments about language and learning and British pedagogical reform efforts, compositionists found theoretical grounding, and a name, for their organized response to the literacy crisis. Thus, Writing Across the Curriculum was born (Russell, *Writing* 275-8).

A sense of the conditions that gave rise to the WAC movement is important for understanding early approaches to cross-curricular literacy work. From its inception, WAC has clung to its roots as a social movement concerned with issues of access. Modeling itself on the philosophy of the National Writing Project (NWP), which held that teachers learn best from each other when given the opportunity to “write and talk and grow together in an egalitarian and collegial community,” WAC always has claimed an

ethic grounded in democratic, collaborative values (Russell, “Introduction” 12). At the same time, those called upon to initiate, facilitate, and sustain early WAC efforts were often part of (or soon became associated with) the budding discipline of Composition. Consequently, approaches to CCL work often were shaped by the experiences and concerns of compositionists who found themselves simultaneously fighting to forge professional, disciplinary identities and striving to uphold the collaborative ideals of the WAC movement and the field at large. To understand the missionary model fully, then, we must consider more carefully the ways the evolution of WAC coincided with the professionalization efforts of Composition as a field.

As Russell explains, WAC “contributed mightily” to the professionalization of Composition by “broadening the focus to the role of writing in whole curriculum, in the development of the whole student, and to the whole range of writing that the general composition courses were—quite unrealistically—expected, traditionally, to prepare students for” (“Introduction” 10). At the same time, it often was through WAC initiatives that compositionists came face-to-face with dominant perceptions of writing as supplemental to disciplinary work and of writing instructors as service providers. Compositionists’ efforts to counter the marginalization of writing and writing instruction met resistance from disciplinary faculty entrenched in traditional structures of the academy. “Faculty tend to retain narrow attitudes toward the role of writing in pedagogy,” Russell elaborates, “not only because of disciplinary constraints but because those attitudes reflect the priorities of academia and are reinforced by its structure of rewards” (*Writing* 295). In other words, the compartmentalization of knowledge in modern universities and the notion, rooted in current-traditional rhetoric, that “writing is

a single universally applicable skill, largely unrelated to ‘content,’” led to the conclusion that writing instruction, while vitally important, belonged outside the disciplines (Russell, “Writing” 55).

Due to this constellation of forces, compositionists involved in the WAC movement were caught in the impossible position of needing to claim and validate their unique disciplinary expertise and convince faculty that the responsibility for teaching writing could and should be shared across the university. Many stage-one compositionists doing CCL work were forced to draw on sheer will and their powers of persuasion to resist what Mahala and Swilky describe as “the dominant tendency in universities to see writing and teaching as outside the real processes of knowledge-making” (50) and the tendency to see writing instructors as service providers for the more important work of other disciplines. At the same time, they were faced with the challenge of perpetuating grassroots WAC initiatives that did not form an overarching agenda and therefore did not enjoy the permanency and cohesion that more formal structures afford. As a result of these conditions, the model for disseminating WAC became the “itinerant preacher” as compositionists took up the mission of CCL work (Walvoord qtd. in Russell, “Introduction” 12).

Influenced by British scholars such as James Britton and American researchers such as Janet Emig, in the face of faculty resistance and skepticism, compositionists clung to the knowledge that writing does have important implications for learning in every context and is integral to disciplinary meaning-making. In the vein of religious missionaries convinced of their righteousness, compositionists used research connecting writing and learning to justify the transmission of ideas, tools, and practices valued in

Composition Studies to classrooms in the disciplines and to rationalize their mission to convert disciplinary faculty. Russell observes, because

concerted efforts to promote writing in the whole curriculum are at cross-purposes with the modern university's compartmentalized, bureaucratic structure, its diverse missions, and its heterogeneous clientele...where writing infused a curriculum, it did so through the determination of individual faculty or at the insistence of maverick administrators. ("Writing" 62)

Hence, a fierce commitment to validating WAC philosophies and a dogged determination to convert faculty to WAC pedagogies and practices have come to characterize missionary models of CCL work.

For the purposes of my project, I am interested in what this history suggests about how missionary discourse and practice interanimate one another and promote particular ways of conceiving of and engaging expertise, change, and outcomes in CCL contexts. For example, in their efforts to distinguish and validate Composition as a discipline, many early WAC advocates understandably were compelled to embrace traditional formations of professional expertise defined "in contrast to the ineptitude of nonprofessionals, who [were] judged to be incapable of either understanding the skilled practices of professionals or evaluating the results of professional work" (Trimbur 137). This version of expertise usefully authorizes the knowledge and experience of compositionists as scholars and seeks to assist faculty who doubt their own expertise when it comes to teaching writing. But it leaves little room for negotiating meaning.

Instead of putting different types of knowledge and experience in conversation, missionary models privilege compositionists' expertise, creating problematic power

dynamics that stilt the possibility of collaborative relationships with faculty in other disciplines. Moreover, the tendency to wield, rather than negotiate, expertise can result in compositionists' inability to understand and demonstrate the usefulness of WAC in and across very different disciplinary contexts (Bazerman; Waldo).

In addition to particular versions of expertise, missionary approaches to CCL work also imply specific notions of change and project outcomes. The conversion mission, for example, suggests that compositionists catalyze the transformation of disciplinary faculty through CCL work. Early WAC leader, Toby Fulwiler, demonstrates the evolution of WAC's transformative philosophy. Then the newly-appointed Composition director at Michigan Tech, Fulwiler attended one of the first WAC workshops held at Rutgers University in 1977. Moved by his experiences, he instituted workshops on his home campus under the premise that if disciplinary faculty could experience WAC pedagogy for themselves, they would be convinced to create similar learning experiences for their students (Russell, *Writing* 286-7; Fulwiler "Showing").

Compositionists' confidence in their perspectives, enthusiasm for writing, and dedication to convincing faculty to adopt WAC practices and ideologies led to the devout focus on changing others. Compositionists concentrate on translating knowledge about writing into disciplinary contexts without necessarily reconsidering—let alone changing—their own established notions of writing and teaching writing. Determined to gather and sustain momentum, compositionists embracing a missionary approach often avoid interrogating their own intentions or opening themselves up to change, which limits possibilities for developing flexible relationships with disciplinary faculty.

It is easy to see how missionary assumptions about who should undergo transformation (disciplinary faculty) and toward what ends (conversion to WAC principles) might lead to certain ways of articulating and working toward project outcomes. The goal of WAC, according to many stage-one proponents, is to change “the way language is perceived and used within academic institutions” and in the process re-shape “how colleges operate and what they stand for” (Fulwiler, “Quiet” 181). Thus, outcomes in the missionary model are typically framed in terms of the broad, revolutionary, goals of compositionists, as opposed to the more contextualized goals of disciplinary faculty. The disjuncture can lead to frustration and failed expectations, putting undue strain on relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty.

Table 1.2: Missionary Model

	Compositionists' Approach
Expertise	Value teaching experience and knowledge of writing and learning over disciplinary expertise
Change	Catalyze the transformation of disciplinary faculty
Project Outcomes	Emphasize a general academic discourse community and promote WAC by converting individual faculty members

Taking a historical perspective makes visible how stage-one versions of expertise, change, and project outcomes evolved in response to conditions surrounding the birth of WAC. Missionary approaches and the relationships they encouraged were useful and necessary given the historical context of the time. However, as programs moved into the second stage of development, there emerged a growing sense that the WAC movement would need to do something more and different if it was to inspire and sustain the kind of

institutional change it sought. Toward that end, stage-two initiatives challenged missionary models and positioned faculty and compositionists differently in relation to one another.

Harnessing the Disciplines: An Anthropological Approach to WAC

In the 1980s, conditions in the academy began to change in ways that put pressure on missionary approaches to CCL work. As Russell explains, enrollments in four-year colleges dropped as baby boomers graduated and programs for integration and affirmative action became less visible; anxiety over the 1970s literacy crisis waned, replaced by a move to reincorporate core courses; and a range of “across the curriculum” educational reform movements developed under the umbrella of cultural literacy, leaving WAC one program among many that was underfunded (*Writing* 290-1). Despite the turn away from the specialization and compartmentalization of education, WAC still faced “an institution whose very structure eroded meaningful reforms” (299). According to Russell, in order to survive, WAC needed ways of “working *through* the disciplines to transform not only student writing but also the ways the disciplines conceive[d] of writing and its teaching” (emphasis added; *Writing* 299). The result was the renewed emphasis on research into disciplinary rhetorics that has come to characterize WAC’s second stage.

Beginning with Charles Bazerman’s investigation of the ways disciplinary communities use written discourse, Composition joined research movements already underway in fields such as philosophy, anthropology, and economics (among others) which focused on “the role writing plays in shaping knowledge” (Russell, *Writing* 300).

Such inquiries challenged relationships and approaches to CCL work forwarded in the missionary model. For example, stage-two scholars lamented stage-one tendencies to ignore or simplify important differences between composition discourse, theory, pedagogy and contexts and those of disciplinary discourse communities (Bazerman; Bergmann; McLeod, “Second”; Waldo). The missionary approach, with its focus on converting individual faculty and promoting a monolithic academic community, did not seem sustainable given changing perceptions of disciplinary divisions. Mark Waldo, for example, argues that “WAC’s approach with the disciplines needs to be noninvasive because they are distinct communities with their own goals, activities and values for writing” (17). Like Waldo, scholars began to see disciplinary differences as more than a matter of style or convention, but inherently connected to forms of meaning-making and knowledge production.

Drawing on the work of anthropologist Clifford Geertz, Waldo emphasizes that “academic disciplines are ‘more than just intellectual coigns of vantage’” but “are ‘ways of being in the world’ and thus taking on the work of a discipline ‘is not just to take up a technical task but to take on a cultural frame that defines a great part of one’s life’ (Geertz 155)” (9). Likewise, Linda Bergmann describes the differences between disciplinary discourse conventions as more than a matter of standards or rules, but a matter of ideals. “The differences in ideals,” she explains, “feed into differences in pedagogical practices,” which ultimately makes the question of how to approach WAC initiatives “an ethical issue because it addresses a conflict between the values of different academic disciplines (and thus of different professions) and because good practices toward one goal may run counter to good practice toward the other” (Bergman 151, 150).

Observations like these call into question the ethical implications and even the feasibility of merely translating or transporting composition pedagogy into disciplinary contexts without acknowledging essential differences between the fields.

Recognition of these important differences, in combination with a need to re-establish WAC as a fundamental part of institutions, served as the basis for the reform movement that characterizes the second, anthropological, stage of WAC. David Russell captures the sentiment of the time:

If writing is to become a central focus of pedagogy, then it must be structurally linked to the values, goals, and activities of disciplines; faculty must see a connection between encouraging better writing among their students and advancing the value and status of their disciplines—and of their own individual careers. (*Writing* 302)

Consequently, whereas the first stage of WAC was characterized by “the missionary zeal of compositionists,” as WAC moved into the second stage in the late 1980s and early 1990s, scholars began to promote a “realistic assessment of the roles written language actually takes in disciplines and disciplinary classrooms” (Bazerman 209).

The anthropological model forwards a version of CCL relationships in which compositionists, like anthropologists, study the values, beliefs, behaviors, and discourses of disciplinary “natives.” Instead of forwarding their own principles and pedagogies, compositionists operating within this model focus on researching disciplinary rhetoric. They use research findings to transfer what they know about writing and teaching writing in ways that are context-specific and usefully applicable in particular disciplinary classrooms. The philosophy underlying anthropological approaches to CCL work is that

compositionists need to study disciplinary discourses in order to adapt writing pedagogy to best support student writers in the disciplines. This model has important implications for the kinds of relationships compositionists might form with faculty in other disciplines.

For example, anthropological approaches to CCL work—grounded in the instinct to study disciplinary discourses—have the potential to promote the collaborative negotiation of expertise which can contribute to reciprocal relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. This kind of negotiation not only challenges missionary versions of expertise that ignore disciplinary differences, but embraces a rhetorically responsible approach to CCL work that strives to understand writing in context. McCarthy and Walvoord, for example, describe a collaborative approach to research in *Writing Across the Curriculum* in which compositionists and faculty in other disciplines observe each other’s classrooms and participate in a dialogue through which both parties “reevaluat[e] their assumptions about writing and learning and ... experiment[t] with changes in their classrooms” (77). This kind of research is an example of the potential benefits of an anthropological approach to CCL work.

Nevertheless, the conditions under which many CCL relationships develop can result in the application of rhetorical research findings in ways that undermine the expertise of compositionists. Mahala and Swilky explain that when compositionists are situated as “technical implementers of research conclusions about disciplinary conventions,” our expertise can be used as a means of forwarding writing “as a technology for reproducing dominant disciplinary values and discursive practices” (51). They refer to Christine Farris’s report on two disciplinary classrooms in “Giving Religion, Taking Gold: Disciplinary Cultures and the Claims of Writing Across the

Curriculum,” as a useful example. According to Mahala and Swilky, Farris was troubled by disciplinary writing assignments that “discouraged students from developing their powers of independent thinking” (48). Despite her observations and her acknowledgement that “WAC reformers ‘are charged with transforming [disciplinary] cultures’” Farris didn’t criticize the instructors or their assignments for fear of “colonizing” the disciplinary culture she was studying (Mahala and Swilky 49). Thus, anthropological models can result in unequal relationships wherein compositionists mute or de-value their own expertise in order to avoid missionary agendas or disciplinary faculty exploit writing expertise in service of their own purposes.

Just as the stage-two drive to study disciplinary rhetoric has the potential to inspire the creative negotiation of expertise, research in the disciplines can promote complex notions of change. In many cases, compositionists sincerely are impacted by their anthropological investigations and use their findings to promote reciprocally more contextualized, nuanced transformation of disciplinary faculty. Dialogue grounded in anthropological research, like the dialogic research process McCarthy and Walvoord advocate, for instance, can generate multi-directional transformation in which compositionists and disciplinary faculty change one another. Considering the way power functions in the academy and the prominent service ethos that positions writing and writing instruction in a subordinate relationship to other disciplines, however, such a dialogue is difficult to achieve.

McCarthy and Walvoord acknowledge the importance of certain conditions—tenured participants, mutual goals, and shared philosophies of teaching and learning—when cultivating reciprocal relationships through collaborative CCL research. But these

circumstances are not always the case. More likely is the kind of stilted transformation in which either disciplinary faculty make the changes compositionists demand under the guise of self-determined transformation, or compositionists transform our pedagogies and philosophies in order to remain appreciated and relevant in disciplinary contexts. In either case, anthropological relationships can be vexed by asymmetrical power dynamics and conflicting objectives that remain unidentified and unexamined.

Notions of expertise and change forwarded through the anthropological model certainly influence the ways compositionists and disciplinary faculty articulate, work toward, and assess project outcomes. Rhetorical research in the disciplines could generate insights that support negotiated outcomes wherein disciplinary discourses and pedagogies and WAC principles and philosophies inform each other. Yet, with the ongoing pressure to remain visible, viable, and funded, compositionists can feel compelled to use research findings to uphold disciplinary structures, even those that may be problematic or oppressive. Consequently, CCL relationships remain vaguely defined and inflexible, limiting possibilities for (re)imagining objectives based on the particular circumstances of individual projects.

Compositionists can learn much by considering the kinds of relationships second stage versions of expertise, change, and project outcomes enable and constrain. Studying them in context is vital to the revisionary approach I model throughout this dissertation because it invites more than criticism. Understanding the stage-two drive to learn from the disciplines might allow compositionists to harness the spirit of openness and curiosity without necessarily replicating the problematic relationships that easily can evolve from the anthropological mentality. Moreover, examining how and why stage-two approaches

emerged in response to historical circumstances creates a framework for situating the more critical philosophies of WAC's third stage.

Table 1.3 Anthropological Model

	Compositionists' Approach
Expertise	Value faculty's disciplinary knowledge, seek deeper understanding of disciplinary discourse and how students learn in different disciplinary communities
Change	Use research in the disciplines to make writing applicable in particular disciplinary classrooms OR to avoid faculty resistance by convincing them change is coming from within
Project Outcomes	Embrace goals of disciplinary faculty and develop writing pedagogy to serve disciplinary needs OR construct more rhetorically savvy arguments for forwarding own outcomes

Critical Pedagogy Across the Curriculum: WAC's Third Stage

In the 1990s, WAC scholars began advancing alternative approaches to the “reform” inspired by stage-two initiatives. Their goal, as evidenced by the 2001 collection *WAC for the New Millennium*, was to promote the evolution of WAC given “the changing scene in higher education” (McLeod and Miraglia, “Writing” 4). Essays throughout the book respond to the gloomy tone of prognosticators who described the late 90s as “higher education’s winter of discontent, a bleak time of scarce resources and few bright days” (Weimer qtd. in McLeod and Miraglia, “Writing” 2). Contributions from some of the biggest names in the field offer ways to ensure WAC’s survival by collaborating with thriving (well-funded) programs and initiatives and strategically

negotiating forces shaping higher education—assessment, technology, service learning, changing demographics, writing center scholarship, et cetera. (3). While *WAC for the New Millennium* presents a broad spectrum of reform efforts undertaken by stage-three initiatives, Victor Villanueva’s piece on the politics of literacy across the curriculum, in which he raises issues of Difference and social justice, represents the critical model that has come to define WAC’s third stage.

Just as second stage approaches to CCL work emerged, in part, as an alternative to missionary models, concerns over the implications of anthropological theories drove the critical turn of stage three. Proponents emphasize the responsibility of compositionists to bring to our cross-curricular literacy work issues of politics, Difference, and social change that pervaded Composition discourse and scholarship at the time.

Donna LeCourt, a major advocate of the critical model, grounds her version of WAC in a critique of: “1) the acculturation of students into already normalized discourses, 2) the reproduction of dominant ideologies that these discourses support, and 3) the silencing of Difference, particularly cultural, socioeconomic, and gender differences as well as alternative literacies and other ways of knowing” (390). She urges compositionists to emphasize, in the work we do with faculty and students in other disciplines, “the concern for alternative literacies and voices Other to the academy that permeates much of our discussion of writing courses in the English department” (390). As LeCourt’s argument suggests, critical models of CCL work grew out of the focus in Composition Studies on critical pedagogy, cultural studies, and poststructuralist theory (389).

Critical models such as LeCourt's position compositionists as cultural critics who analyze and critique disciplinary discourses, conventions, pedagogies, and faculty. They advocate writing assignments and classroom practices that encourage faculty and students to develop "critical consciousness" of oppressive disciplinary structures and conventions. This element of critique shapes the ways compositionists conceptualize expertise, change, and project outcomes in stage-three discourse and practice and influences how they are positioned in relation to disciplinary faculty.

Critical approaches, for instance, frame compositionists' expertise as complex and multi-faceted and as more than a mere set of writing strategies and techniques to be implemented or adapted for disciplinary contexts. Compositionists are encouraged to bring their knowledge and experience with cultural and rhetorical analysis and critique to their work in disciplinary communities. Critical approaches to WAC frame classrooms as sites wherein students and teachers engage in "messy and embroiled interchanges, [...] where knowledge is resisted, queried and produced (not merely distributed), and where students read and write to appropriate and interrogate dominant discursive practices" (Mahala and Swilky 54). In this kind of classroom, writing teachers cannot remain representatives or transmitters of expertise, but must negotiate their own expertise in relation to students' in order to make meaning.

Such a conceptual shift compels faculty in other disciplines to perceive compositionists not merely as service providers offering advice "in an exclusively technical sense" (Mahala and Swilky 39), but as scholarly who contribute critical rhetorical knowledge. As in stage-one models, compositionists taking a critical approach to CCL work seek to recognize and validate their own unique expertise. But, in an

attempt to resist the service ethos, critical compositionists determine to do more than supply writing assignments and exercises or offer “technical” advice, emphasizing instead their proficiency in rhetorical analysis and cultural critique.

This notion of expertise complicates missionary and challenges anthropological versions that simplify or devalue compositionists’ contributions to cross-curricular literacy projects. Many disciplinary faculty, especially those already embracing critical, post-structural theories in their own disciplines, certainly support critical rhetorical activities as an inherent part of teaching writing in disciplinary classrooms. However, many others are likely to resist political commitments that appear to take the place of content-driven goals and objectives. Moreover, in complicating the substance of their expertise, stage-three compositionists tend to value what they believe about language and learning over the knowledge and needs of disciplinary faculty. Thus, proponents of the critical model often must defend their approach against accusations of re-appropriating missionary relationships.

For example, Villanueva’s piece, “The Politics of Literacy Across the Curriculum,” in *WAC for the New Millennium*, works to complicate the missionary role by conceptualizing compositionists’ expertise as complex and multifaceted. He argues that along with the “obligation to proffer the social dimensions of our research, theory, and discussion,” compositionists have “the obligation to learn from those to whom we pass on our knowledge of the teaching of writing” (170). The larger goal of WAC, says Villanueva, should be to avoid “reproducing a school system that has traditionally failed to educate the woman, the poor, or the person of color at the same rate of efficiency as others” (170). In order to do so, he maintains, compositionists and faculty across

disciplines need to “use all the tools at our disposal” (170). That is, we must think of expertise more broadly and creatively.

While Villanueva’s vision of large-scale systemic change through collaboration might resist missionary versions of expertise, the overt politicization of CCL work that characterizes critical models like his does put compositionists in the position of enforcing, or at the very least promoting, social, political, and ideological commitments that are not necessarily shared by disciplinary faculty. When compositionists employ their critical rhetorical expertise to criticize disciplinary discourses and faculty, they limit possibilities for relationships based on negotiated expertise and collaborative meaning-making.

Moreover, performing critical expertise assumes that compositionists initiate and faculty undergo transformation. Critical approaches to CCL work could position compositionists to explore with disciplinary faculty philosophies of critical pedagogy, such as valuing student experience and listening with a willingness to be guided by students’ curiosities and needs. Yet all too often stage-three models re-inscribe dominant versions of critical pedagogy in which others are expected to undergo significant personal transformation while the teacher, or in the case of CCL work, the compositionist, does little changing herself. Compositionists assume that in order for faculty to accept and implement critical pedagogy with students, they must become critically conscious themselves and participate in the critical rhetorical examination of disciplinary discourses, conventions, and pedagogies. Thus, third stage conceptualizations of change can be problematic for many of the reasons feminists have taken issue with critical

pedagogy discourse in Composition Studies (see for example Gore; Luke and Gore; Stenberg).

For example, rather than learning and growing along with our disciplinary colleagues, compositionists acting as critical pedagogues in CCL contexts are positioned as the “bearers of ‘critical knowledge, rules, and values through which [we] consciously articulate and problematize [our] relationship to each other, to students, to subject matter, and to the wider community” (Giroux and McLaren qtd. in Stenberg 36). Compositionists expect faculty in the disciplines to be transformed by their “articulating” and “problematizing” into the ideal subjects of critical pedagogy discourse, “critical intellectuals.” However, as Stenberg emphasizes, drawing on Jennifer Gore, this kind of transformation is encouraged (in the case of CCL work by compositionists) without careful reflection on how the ideal subject is conceived or how one is transformed into it (36-7).

In their most reductive form, then, critical models of CCL work position compositionists as critics and disciplinary faculty as either partners who willingly participate in the critique of their disciplines (if they already agree with critical objectives), or the “unenlightened” who cannot be transformed (if they resist critical aims). In either case, critical approaches produce relationships in which faculty have little agency in the evolution of their own thinking and teaching and compositionists miss the opportunity to grow and change through interactions with faculty.

As their conceptualizations of expertise and change suggest, proponents of the critical model embrace outcomes focused on student learning in the disciplines, although faculty transformation also is important. Writing should be taught in disciplinary

classrooms, they hold, in such a way as to “allow [students] access to the conventions of dominant practices while encouraging them to develop their critical understanding of how dominant ways of knowing are relative, culturally positioned ways of knowing” (Mahala and Swilky 46). Students should be taught to use their writing as a means of challenging dominant disciplinary discourses, making space for Difference, and “enacting knowledge by reconstituting it through the multiplicity of a discursively situated self” (LeCourt 18, 19). The problem with such outcomes is twofold: 1) They ignore what critical commitments to student learning require in terms of working with faculty and the implications of that work; and 2) They are based on compositionists’ values, beliefs, and commitments and determined before any interaction with individual disciplinary faculty members.

In her critique of critical pedagogy discourse, Stenberg laments that “there is little time granted to the ‘procedure and organizations’ that will help promote a critical pedagogy or the development of critical teachers” (37). Critical theory assumes, in other words, that the accumulation of critical knowledge translates automatically to the practice of critical pedagogy in the classroom. Arguments like LeCourt’s, for example, focus on building a case for critical pedagogy, offer writing assignments grounded in critical values, and take for granted that disciplinary teachers, armed with knowledge and techniques, will be able and willing to practice critical writing pedagogy in their classrooms. The underlying assumption seems to be that if critical compositionists seek out disciplinary programs and teachers already in possession of critical knowledge, faculty will need little support from compositionists beyond assignment ideas to work toward critical outcomes. Consequently, critical models of CCL work offer little

guidance in terms of how compositionists actually might interact with faculty on a day-to-day basis to promote critical outcomes.

The lack of attention to how we can support faculty in developing particular, context-specific strategies for embracing critical pedagogy in their classrooms is related to another potential problem with the way project outcomes are framed in critical models. If outcomes are determined by compositionists who then hand over the critical theoretical knowledge disciplinary teachers presumably need in order to achieve those outcomes, then faculty in the disciplines have no part in negotiating either the theoretical knowledge nor the outcomes toward which it is applied. As a result, faculty can see critical compositionists as enforcers rather than collaborators. When outcomes are predetermined and imposed, CCL relationships become limited and strained.

Table 1.4: Critical Model

	Compositionists' Approach
Expertise	Value critical rhetorical expertise over “technical” expertise and faculty’s disciplinary or subject matter expertise.
Change	Assume students (and often faculty) lack awareness of the ways their disciplinary discourses are oppressive and why they should develop critical consciousness in order to transform themselves, the discipline, and the world.
Project Outcomes	Assume critical pedagogy is the only way to teach writing ethically; expect students, faculty and disciplines should change continuously toward that end.

Stage-three models of CCL work offer ways of understanding and engaging expertise, change, and project outcomes that are both promising and problematic. If, as Gore suggests, compositionists are to align the pedagogies we argue for, in this case critical pedagogy, with the pedagogy of our argument, we need ways of inviting

disciplinary teachers to reconstitute critical knowledge, to make room for Difference, and to negotiate with us collaboratively the ways we engage in CCL projects.

Breaking the Chain: Toward Discursive and Pedagogical Revision

As my historical survey of WAC stages and models suggests, relationships are at the heart of cross-curricular literacy work. That is, in order to engage in CCL theory and practice, compositionists must grapple with questions about how to cultivate meaningful, lasting relationships with faculty in other disciplines. One lesson to be gleaned from the history I've recounted is that attending to relationships calls for more than a steady chain of methods and models. Compositionists need instead a frame of mind, an attitude toward CCL work that is imaginative, flexible and self-aware. My goal in this chapter and throughout the dissertation is not to critique the past, but to enact the revisionary attitude I believe is necessary to develop productive relationships with faculty who seek to incorporate writing into their courses and departmental structures.

A revisionary approach to cross-curricular literacy work is promising, I argue, because it disrupts the pattern of critique-and-replace that currently characterizes WAC history by reflexively embracing the connection between discourse and practice. In this chapter, I've focused on the ways traditional models exist in and through CCL discourse, with the understanding that discourse and practice interanimate one another. Discourse, in other words, is indicative of current practice even as it shapes and reshapes possibilities for future interactions. Likewise, the material realities of day-to-day interactions inform and are informed by discursive attempts to articulate what compositionists and disciplinary faculty do when we study language and learning across

the curriculum. Identifying conceptual models as they've emerged discursively, therefore, is one way to investigate the conditions that gave rise to them and the relationships they engender. Doing so offers compositionists a richer sense of the limits and potential of various approaches to CCL work so that we strategically may cultivate more productive cross-curricular relationships.

In the remaining chapters, I put this investigation in conversation with my own experiences as a compositionist teaching and learning about writing in the biology department. I use revisionary stance to look differently at the cross-curricular literacy relationships in which I participated, paying particular attention to how my understanding of expertise, change, and outcomes shaped interactions with faculty. In Chapter 4, for example, I revisit the narrative that opens this chapter, re-examining my interpretation of the meeting in order to explore new ways to imagine and pursue meaningful outcomes for CCL projects. Allowing our material lives, experiences, and relationships to puncture and infuse the discourse, I argue, is the first step toward reconstituting the principles that guide our practice.

In Chapter 2, I study how the concept of expertise functions in and through CCL discourse before taking a revisionary stance toward my own work. I complicate existing perceptions and conceive of alternative possibilities for engaging expertise in order to promote pedagogical relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines.

Chapter Two

Knowledge in Conversation: Challenges of Negotiating Expertise

No issue has presented a greater challenge to the cultivation of meaningful CCL relationships than that of productively perceiving and performing expertise. Cross-curricular work, by nature, involves interactions among participants from across fields and disciplines who have various institutional locations and professional experiences. Indeed, these differences are responsible for the dynamic spirit that has come to characterize the Writing across the Curriculum movement. At the same time, however, learning to recognize, validate, and draw upon the various kinds of expertise participants bring to CCL projects raises difficult questions: *What sort of knowledge, experiences, or credentials does one need to teach writing? Where should writing be taught, how, for what purpose, and who should decide? What body of knowledge do writing experts possess and how is it related to dominant notions of scholarly expertise? What kinds of expertise are relevant in particular CCL contexts?*

As I explained in Chapter 1, social, cultural, and institutional climates shape how compositionists respond to questions about expertise. Stage-one missionary attitudes, for example, which emerged as WAC began to stake out disciplinary status, focused on legitimizing compositionists' scholarly identity, while second stage discourses tended to de-emphasize the expertise of compositionists in order to embrace what Barbara Walvoord calls WAC's "egalitarian philosophy" (qtd. in Jablonski 21). Stage-three approaches, in an attempt to avoid missionary and accommodationist versions, favor critical expertise grounded in poststructural and cultural theories of writing instruction

popular in Composition Studies. Manifest in this progression of metaphor-based stages and the kinds of expertise they forward is compositionists' constant struggle to negotiate overlapping interests, including: 1) the professional need for a well-defined, well-respected disciplinary identity; 2) the obligation to be true to the critical understanding of discourse and ideology underlying popular approaches to writing instruction in our field; and 3) WAC's call to uphold the democratic, collaborative values that characterize the spirit of the movement.

The traditionally vexed relationship between writing instruction and the disciplines impacts compositionists' attempts to articulate and defend who we are, what we know, and what we have to contribute to cross-curricular literacy work. For instance, dominant institutional structures and assumptions, such as the "compartmentalized, additive organization of knowledge" and the common belief that writing is a "universally applicable skill," often conflict with compositionists' understanding of how students develop as writers (Russell, "Writing" 55). Importantly, the decisions we make amid competing forces about how to perceive and perform expertise in CCL contexts determine how we are positioned in relation to the disciplinary faculty and students with whom we work.

Yet those of us participating in cross-curricular literacy projects often don't pay enough attention to the ways we engage (our own and others') expertise or the factors that shape our decisions. Uncritically enacting problematic discursive definitions of expertise can thwart meaningful relationships with faculty in other disciplines. In this chapter, I suggest that recognizing the way CCL discourse impacts compositionists' understanding of the knowledge, experiences, and sensibilities we bring to our work in

the disciplines usefully can complicate normative assumptions about expertise. Changing how expertise functions in the discourse, I argue, is an important step toward imagining new ways of perceiving and performing it in practice. Drawing attention to and revising how expertise functions discursively generates possibilities for CCL relationships by enabling compositionists to “rhetorically choose” how to enact our own and engage with others’ expertise (Jung 147).

In what follows, I take a revisionary approach to writing I produced during my first semester in the biology department as a means of re-visioning the role of expertise in CCL discourse and practice. In particular, I mine excerpts from my reflective journal in which I recorded significant moments in my experience co-teaching an honors seminar for non-majors. Several questions form the basis of my inquiry: *What assumptions about our own and each other’s expertise might compositionists and disciplinary faculty bring to our work together? What role might disciplinary discourses play in shaping our assumptions about expertise? How might these assumptions influence our goals for students and our relationships with one another?*

In the next section, I develop a framework for pursuing these questions by looking more closely at the ways expertise has been discussed in CCL discourse. I point out that many scholars have theorized a kind of “negotiated expertise” that potentially could sponsor pedagogical relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. However, due to preconceived notions of “scholarly” versus “writing” expertise, negotiation is often more complicated than the discourse suggests.

Expertise in CCL Discourse

In “Resistance and Reform: The Functions of Expertise in Writing Across the Curriculum,” Mahala and Swilky describe a dominant culture of expertise grounded in the compartmentalization of people and knowledge according to disciplinary specialization. “Acquired through educational training,” they explain, “expertise is predominantly understood by faculty as a specialized body of information and specific methods of investigation” (38). This notion of expertise as specialized and separated according to disciplinary divisions informs assumptions that compositionists and disciplinary faculty bring to CCL projects about who knows what and how presumably disparate bodies of knowledge should be considered in relation to each other.

In addition to dividing expertise along disciplinary lines, there is also a traditional dichotomization of teaching and research in the academy. Faculty often distinguish between the way they perform expertise when engaging members of professional communities and when instructing students. Citing sociologist Magali Sarfatti Larson, Mahala and Swilky elaborate:

When involved in research, scholars apply expertise as a means of investigating a question, problem or issue, addressing a professional community (or several communities) through arguments that add to the community’s lore and knowledge. By contrast, when academicians teach they often assume the role of “representative of expertise,” transmitting information and “facts,” and translating principles in reductive ways. (38)

In short, faculty respect the tentative, evolving nature of disciplinary knowledge, treating scholarly expertise as dynamic and exploratory. In the classroom, by contrast, expertise

can become a static body of specialized knowledge including facts, principles, methods and theories to be transmitted and translated to students (38). The assumption that expertise means something different for scholars and teachers has implications for compositionists working with disciplinary faculty in CCL contexts.

Referencing Robert Connors, Mahala and Swilky explain that modern universities, based on the German research model, tend to privilege empirical scientific research. Because Rhetoric and Composition is grounded in the classroom rather than the laboratory, institutions often dismiss the field for being un-objective and un-scientific (58). As a result, “academicians” tend to see writing instruction as a matter of teaching students the tools to communicate disciplinary knowledge rather than a knowledge-producing form of inquiry in its own right. From Mahala and Swilky’s argument about dominant notions of expertise, we might extrapolate two possible assumptions: 1) no specific expertise is needed to teach writing, making writing instruction “the province of the non-specialist,” or 2) the specialized body of knowledge and methods needed to teach writing constitute a kind of practical or technical writing expertise, distinguishable from research-based scholarly expertise (38-9).

In the first case, disciplinary scholars can delegate writing instruction to non-specialists in order to concentrate on disciplinary content. In the second, faculty can argue that since teaching is a matter of representing or translating expertise, those with practical writing expertise should teach writing, and those with disciplinary expertise should teach disciplinary content. Writing instructors in both cases can be reduced to service providers called upon to free disciplinary instructors from the responsibility of focusing explicitly on writing in their courses (Mahala and Swilky 38-9).

Over the last several decades, compositionists have attempted to professionalize and legitimize Composition research and teaching as scholarly activities, challenging traditional assumptions that devalue or subordinate writing expertise in relation to other disciplines. As a result, disciplinary faculty and administrators more often recognize writing and what we know about writing as a form of scholarly expertise. However, regardless of whether disciplinary faculty consider writing expertise scholarly or not, they tend to locate writing and language “outside the essential operations of knowledge-making,” and treat compositionists working in CCL contexts as service providers (Mahala and Swilky 39). Because they tend to be most interested in how compositionists can improve student writing, even when faculty in the disciplines recognize and respect the scholarly knowledge compositionists’ bring to CCL projects, they still tend to treat it reductively as a kind of technical expertise reduced to exercises, activities, assignments, and other strategies for solving the problem of poor student writing.

Compositionists working in CCL contexts certainly are aware of how our expertise has been devalued historically. Indeed, as the progression of metaphorical models of CCL work illustrates, our responses to the subordination of writing expertise have been complex and varied. In making sense of the tensions surrounding how compositionists perceive and perform expertise when working with faculty in other disciplines, it is important to consider the ways the field historically has grappled with issues of professionalization and discipline formation. As John Trimbur notes, compositionists have worked hard to promote Composition Studies “as a disciplinary and disciplined project” by pointing to the volume and quality of our research and scholarship (134). As a field, we’ve labored diligently to expand the meaning of scholarship to

include teaching and administration as “disciplined applications of theory and research” (135). In other words, compositionists have strived to frame the questions, theories, and methodologies that make up the knowledge base of our field as a form of scholarly expertise. At the same time, we’ve tried to complicate traditional versions of expertise that consolidate and compartmentalize knowledge.

Trimbur locates the struggle to identify and decentralize compositionists’ expertise in the contradiction between exchange value and use value. Nowhere is this contradiction more visible, he continues, than in the “design and practice of Writing Across the Curriculum Programs” (144). Compositionists working on cross-curricular literacy initiatives simultaneously must “counter the idea that anyone can teach writing, that no particular training or professional knowledge is required,” and “make professional knowledge about teaching writing more widely accessible in the academy, to popularize it as socially useful knowledge that non-experts can draw on and enact” (144-5). In other words, we have to persuade faculty to consider our expertise scholarly while convincing them that doing so does not relegate the ability and responsibility to teach writing to compositionists alone. We have to disrupt university structures and ideologies that compartmentalize expertise and think differently about how scholarly experts from different disciplines work together.

According to Trimbur, despite (or perhaps *because* of) contradictions like these, compositionists doing CCL work are well positioned to work from within current institutional cultures and structures to rearticulate expertise. Mahala and Swilky go further, suggesting that because dominant conceptions of expertise in American colleges produce the “most intractable obstacles” to writing across the curriculum, challenging the

dominant culture of expertise should be a central focus of CCL work (35). They encourage alliances between WAC and programs such as Women's and Cultural Studies "where the dominant ideology of expertise is already being questioned" (44). There, instructors such as molecular biologist Bonnie Spanier, who are open to feminist or cultural versions of WAC, embrace more expansive views of disciplinary expertise and usefully complicate perceptions of the knowledge and sensibilities compositionists contribute to CCL projects. Instead of grounding our expertise only in the technical facilitation of writing instruction, for example, Mahala and Swilky emphasize compositionists' ability to examine disciplinary rhetoric, study and critique the "power-effects of knowledge" and question the goals of education (42).

LeCourt's critical model of WAC similarly underscores compositionists' critical rhetorical expertise, which she implies resides in our ability to recognize disciplines and students as "sites of conflict wherein competing discourses interact" (396). To her mind, compositionists should use our expertise not in a technical sense, to facilitate disciplinary writing instruction that teaches students to accommodate dominant discourses, but in a critical sense, by helping faculty teach student writers to resist or reconstitute the disciplinary discourses in which they participate. Compositionists embracing critical models of CCL work challenge dominant assumptions that tie expertise to educational training in the disciplines by recognizing and validating expertise—our own and students'—as it emerges from discourses and experiences *outside* disciplinary frameworks.

Mahala and Swilky and LeCourt acknowledge the challenges likely to result from framing writing expertise this way. Disciplinary faculty may resist contributions from

compositionists that ask them to rethink their beliefs and practices, “especially if such ideas go beyond narrowly technical advice” (Mahala and Swilky 39). Fellow compositionists also may doubt that disciplinary faculty would be amenable to critical rhetorical expertise, or worry that it reinscribes missionary models by foisting our own ideologies onto others (LeCourt 402). In response, critical scholars emphasize the existence (more prevalent than we think, according to LeCourt) of faculty and programs already “engaged in ideological critique and/or political questioning of epistemological practices” (403). To avoid forcing expertise on others, they reason, compositionists should seek out ideological and epistemological allies.

Mahala and Swilky acknowledge that the programs and faculty that embrace alternative conceptualizations of expertise are often the most marginal and powerless in the university. They point to scholars such as Gerald Graff who offer useful strategies for connecting work at the center of the curriculum by “traditional faculty whose view of expertise reflects the dominant institutional culture,” with “work at the margins where the deep goals of reform are easier to realize” (Mahala and Swilky 44). They see rhetorical research in the disciplines as a way of forging such connections and put pressure on the discipline-specific rhetorical research agenda to do more than convince faculty that supporting student writers can be good for their disciplines and individual careers (47). The goal of WAC research, Mahala and Swilky contend, should be to identify the dominant culture of expertise in relation to alternative versions and sponsor critical conversations between and within the disciplines. Doing so would challenge the dominant assumptions that define expertise in disciplinary terms by opening up the disciplines, making visible “internal” conflicts among experts, and encouraging debate

about the “validity and social effects of [disciplinary discourse] practices on the public” (Mahala and Swilky 47).

Of course, this approach to disciplinary research, like LeCourt’s critical WAC model, is likely to generate resistance to CCL work. Ultimately, though, proponents of critical versions of expertise conclude that Writing Across the Curriculum is about change and “change will always have its enemies” (Mahala and Swilky 57). In other words, embracing the transformational goals of CCL work is necessary if compositionists are to avoid de-emphasizing our professional expertise or obscuring WAC’s collaborative spirit when working with disciplinary faculty. I argue, however, that our work is just beginning when it comes to perceiving and performing expertise in ways that complicate traditional academic frameworks and uphold the collaborative, democratic values at the heart of the WAC movement. Compositionists need a way of further complicating how we understand our expertise, as well as a way of putting what we know, our specialized body of knowledge, sensibilities, and experiences, in conversation with that of disciplinary faculty. In short, we need a way of negotiating expertise.

Theories of Negotiated Expertise

The idea of negotiating expertise is not uncommon in CCL discourse and scholarship. For example, in “Where Do We Go Next in Writing across the Curriculum?” Jones and Comprone promote cross-disciplinary dialogue in which “[t]wo or more individuals representing different, though compatible approaches, value systems, or epistemologies come together to create a new solution to a problem” (Flynn and Jones qtd. in Jones and Comprone 64). This kind of negotiated meaning-making “encourages a

new, more complex approach to rhetoric itself, one that combines generalized cognitive and traditional rhetorical strategies of purpose and audience analysis and appeal with specific strategies drawn from careful research into disciplinary negotiations of text” (Jones and Comprone 65). In other words, Jones and Comprone urge compositionists and disciplinary faculty to put their knowledge and experiences in conversation in order to negotiate meaningful approaches to CCL work. Toward that end, they promote the coordination of administrative, pedagogical, and research components of WAC, suggesting not only that compositionists’ expertise should be located in each of these elements, but that it should be informed by faculty’s disciplinary expertise.

Similarly, McCarthy and Walvoord advocate dialogue-based collaborative WAC research in which “constructing knowledge in interaction is both the central activity of the research process and, at the same time, the object of research” (79). In their experience, when “teacher-researchers from two or more disciplines [work] together to shape their research questions and design systematic data collection and analysis procedures,” they unearth questions that get to the heart of WAC (78). In the collaborative research models McCarthy and Walvoord describe, faculty help each other understand “the social and intellectual dynamics” operating in their respective disciplines. Expertise is negotiated and even created as co-researchers “come to understand and perceive through each other’s perspective” (82). Examples like these certainly suggest exciting possibilities for beginning to conceive of and enact expertise as a negotiated body of knowledge that emerges from collaborative engagement.

In reality, however, because the move toward disciplinary research undergirding most visions of negotiated expertise aims to sustain WAC by linking cross-curricular

literacy initiatives with disciplinary objectives, the integration of values and ideas is not always as democratic as the above examples suggest. In fact, as Mahala and Swilky point out, the rhetoric of stage-two research often “encourages WAC reformers to mute criticisms of dominant uses of expertise on the grounds that each discipline is a culturally relative world that must be respected for its intrinsic differences” (48). In the end, they conclude, the egalitarian language underlying idealistic visions of negotiated expertise “belies a subtle division of labor between humanist writing teachers and disciplinary practitioners” (50). In other words, arguments like Jones and Comprone’s and examples like McCarthy and Walvoord’s fail to consider fully the historically vexed relationship between writing/writing instruction and other disciplines and the institutional structures and dominant assumptions about knowledge that continue to shape how expertise is perceived and performed in CCL contexts. As a result, attempts to negotiate expertise often succumb to or reinforce rather than challenge the dominant culture of expertise.

The struggle to do more than imagine negotiated expertise, I believe, results in part from the tensions I’ve illuminated around compositionists’ ongoing effort to perceive and perform our expertise productively. The challenge remains: In order for the WAC movement to survive and prosper, the sensibilities compositionists bring to CCL contexts must be respected as a form of scholarly expertise, dominantly defined; at the same time, in order to uphold the democratic ideals at the heart of the movement, we must employ our expertise to confront the dominant culture. Pursuing both of these goals at once can make it difficult for compositionists to perform expertise in ways that invite negotiation.

One way to address this challenge is to think differently about what compositionists know and do in CCL contexts. Jeffrey Jablonski’s comprehensive study

of “writing specialists”³ and their experiences participating in cross-curricular literacy relationships constitutes the most recent attempt to define writing expertise more complexly and to identify the myriad ways it can be enacted. He emphasizes the collaborative nature of CCL work, arguing that collaboration as an activity should be complicated and professionalized through “systemati[c] reflect[ion] on the role the collaborative dynamic plays in achieving WAC ends” (Jablonski 12). In doing so, he pursues a richer sense of the expertise writing specialists contribute to cross-curricular literacy projects without disengaging it from the collaborative interactions with disciplinary faculty that give it definition and meaning.

Moreover, unlike the examples described above, Jablonski situates his study of writing specialists amid the institutional structures, ideologies, and assumptions that could create barriers for collaborative CCL work. Acknowledging and contextualizing the nuances of compositionists’ ways of knowing is an important first step toward making viable both the challenges and possibilities of negotiating expertise.

Following Jablonski’s lead, I urge compositionists to reflect on the way CCL project participants engage expertise. Even further, by making our experiences public, we can encourage others to write about their experiences as well. Taken together, these complex narratives revise how expertise is defined in and through CCL discourse and open up new possibilities for perceiving and performing it in practice.

According to Trimbur, those of us working in CCL contexts have the opportunity to promote collaboratively constructed knowledge negotiated among participants “outside existing monopolies of expertise” (145). To do so, we must claim the expertise we bring with us as teachers and scholars in our field, but we also must be willing to let our

professional expertise be molded and revised as it mingles with that of disciplinary experts and becomes something else altogether. With that aim, after providing some context for my experience working with a particular biology teacher and his students, I revisit a reflective journal I kept during the fall of 2006, my first semester doing CCL work in the biology department.

Taking a revisionary stance toward the text, I examine how expertise functioned in my relationship with the professor. I listen differently to the ways I narrated and tried to make sense of my experience working with Oliver, developing a revised theory of expertise that recognizes “the incongruity of the deep goals of WAC and the dominant culture of expertise” (Mahala and Swilky 47). Ultimately, I offer a new version of collaboratively negotiated expertise that necessarily is flexible and evolving, grounded in reflexive practice and an awareness of the historical and contextual forces that give it shape.

Birth of a “Writing Expert”

I first met Oliver, scientist, faculty member, and chair of the Biological Sciences Department, in the fall of 2006. Along with other science professors, Oliver long had been frustrated with student writing in their department. In order to address the problem more directly, he decided to hire a Composition graduate student to participate in his class. I was accepted to the position of co-instructor and assigned to collaborate with Oliver in teaching BIOS 189H, Biology, Society, and Health, an honors seminar for first-year non-majors that focused on ethical implications and broad applications of the study of biological science. BIOS 189H is meant to promote an awareness of major themes in

the field and their relevance to social questions in a range of contexts, as well as to promote the ability to communicate that awareness in writing by adhering to basic science writing conventions. Oliver believes this to be an important course for students because ideally it helps them transition from high school to college and to get a sense of the kind of writing and thinking expected of them at the university level. According to Oliver, it was not important that students learn to “write like scientists,” but he wanted them to leave the course better prepared to write in their other college classes.

In the past, he’d been frustrated with students and with the course because he’d spent most of his time responding to and correcting students’ writing instead of engaging them in subject matter. While Oliver had taught “writing intensive” courses at other universities, he felt he lacked the training and support he needed to help students improve their writing. He tended to respond extensively in the margins, offer questions and corrections, or re-write entire paragraphs to show students how they might better have articulated an idea, but felt he needed more and different ideas for supporting student writers. Oliver asked me to offer strategies for improving student writing so he and the students would be free to engage more deeply in course content.

We decided I would design and teach writing activities once a week at the beginning of each 3-hour class session, modeling strategies for practicing and teaching writing as process. Oliver predicted that my job would get easier as the semester went on. Students would become better writers the more they wrote, he presumed, and each week we’d be able to spend less time on writing and more time investigating the subject matter of the course. He hoped our work in 189H would serve as a pilot project illustrating the ways writing could be incorporated into science classes across the curriculum. If we

were successful, Oliver intended to try similar kinds of collaborations among science and writing teachers in upper level courses designed for biology majors.

I was excited and nervous to be working with Oliver. He seemed to embrace the responsibility of teaching students how to write in the university, which I assumed was relatively rare among disciplinary faculty at research institutions. While I had little formal experience with WAC scholarship or practice, I sensed that how we thought about student writing and the teaching of writing in the Composition program might be different from how writing was understood and taught in other areas of the institution. I also had a sense that disciplinary faculty tended to unfairly hold first-year composition teachers responsible for teaching students to write once and for all and to blame poor student writing on the Composition Program and students themselves.

I wanted to convince Oliver and his fellow biology teachers that student writers need practice and support beyond first-year writing and that it is the responsibility of all teachers, not just composition instructors, to offer that support. Moreover, I wanted to offer science faculty concrete strategies for incorporating writing into their courses in complex ways so that they would believe teaching writing in their discipline was feasible and worthwhile. At the same time, I never had taught or even really considered writing in contexts outside of my composition classroom. I worried that what I had to offer would seem irrelevant or inapplicable to Oliver and his students. As a graduate student, I wondered how my teaching experience and understanding of Composition theory would function in relation to Oliver's experience teaching the course and his expertise as both a biologist and a writer in the discipline.

During the semester I co-taught 189H with Oliver, I kept a journal. I used the space to reflect on my work in the biology department and to make sense of my CCL experiences in relation to ideas about literacy and learning I was encountering through graduate course work. In the next section, I take a revisionary stance toward several journal entries in an attempt to illuminate the multiple forces shaping the way Oliver and I understood, embraced, and/or resisted our own and each other's expertise. My goal is to imagine a more complicated version of negotiated expertise in which the actual, messy conditions of CCL relationships—institutional structures, assumptions about writing, teaching, and disciplinary content, issues of age, gender, and institutional positioning, et cetera—become part of, rather than a detriment to, negotiation.

Toward a Discursive Re-Visioning of Expertise

In order to attend to the realities of negotiating expertise, in what follows I examine the way I interpreted my work with Oliver. The italicized sections are excerpts from my journal in which I traced the development of our relationship and reflected on the questions, problems, and conflicts that arose throughout the term. Using a revisionary lens, I look back at my entries with an eye toward identifying the overlapping forces that shaped my first CCL experiences and my representation of them. By making messy moments like these part of CCL discourse, we can begin to identify and make sense of the real challenge of negotiating expertise. In particular, the entries I re-vision in this section raise questions about how writing expertise might be defined and enacted in concert with disciplinary or scholarly expertise.

Scholarly vs. Writing Expertise

In the first excerpt, recorded during my first month teaching with Oliver, I mused about my role in the course, worrying about the feasibility of Oliver's expectations for what I could do for students and what "improvement" would look like. I began to recognize assumptions about the relationship between writing and disciplinary subject matter embedded in our vision for the course and my role in it. For example, structuring the course so I taught writing for the first half of the class before students delved into the real content with Oliver during the second suggests a problematic assumption that my expertise could be transmitted quickly and easily in service of his knowledge and goals for the course.

Oliver has clear ideas about how students should develop as writers. He has told me repeatedly that my workload should decrease as the semester goes on and students become better writers. I don't know what that means. He believes that I will teach students how to write early in the semester and they will be good writers by the end. How do I tell him this is not necessarily the case and that even if students are growing as writers over the course of the semester, it may not show up (in a way his criteria reflects) in their work? [...]

This brings me to confusion about my role in the course. I feel a bit like I have been brought in to "fix" a deficiency rather than to initiate and encourage a complicated process, a process that will look different for every student. If I do my job well, will I be essentially done near the end of the semester when students will have improved, as Oliver suggests? It certainly doesn't work that way in my 151 class. I am not certain I can tell if students have grown as writers in this discipline (or in my comp courses for that

matter). How will I have this conversation with Oliver? What if they AREN'T growing as writers and thinkers in this discipline because I am not showing them appropriate or useful ways to use writing in this context? In many ways, I feel like a student myself. I struggle to get my mind around complex biological concepts. I have the same questions as students. I empathize with them when they are stumped by a question posed or put on the spot by a question I could not answer immediately either (interesting considering one student looked at me and mouthed "help" during one excruciating silence). Without this subject knowledge, can I be a helpful sponsor for students apprenticing themselves to this discourse? (Reflective Journal, 9-26-06)

Looking back at this reflection, I notice particular assumptions about the kind of expertise I had to offer, how that expertise would be imparted to students, the influence my expertise should have on student writing, and the ways that Oliver and I planned to recognize and evaluate the extent of my impact on students and their writing. In Mahala and Swilky's terms, Oliver emphasized my *technical* expertise when he presumed I could give students strategies and show them processes they easily would pick up and put into practice. Throughout our work together he seemed aware that the exercises and techniques I offered were grounded in a complex understanding of how students grow as writers and how we might best help them develop their own writing processes. At the same time, however, Oliver appeared less interested in engaging the complexity of my expertise. Indeed, I felt like a "fixer" brought in to offer strategies and techniques that quickly and noticeably would improve student writing and help Oliver develop his teaching in a technical sense. Moreover, he assumed my role in the course slowly would diminish, freeing him and the students to focus more intently on course content.

Alternatively, I had a much more conflicted view of my expertise. On one hand, I bought into Oliver's view of technical expertise; in the beginning at least, I believed my knowledge of activities, exercises, and techniques for teaching writing was the most relevant, "translatable" aspect of my expertise. On the other hand, my sense of the purpose and potential results of sharing my expertise in this context was very different from Oliver's. Based on my commitment to teach writing as process, I saw myself initiating students' and Oliver's ongoing growth and development, rather than accomplishing significant improvement in the form of polished, technically proficient student writing, in the course of a few weeks.

The way Oliver and I each articulated our goals for student writers/writing in 189H exemplifies our disparate assumptions about the role of writing in the course, which suggests important differences in how we defined my expertise and the purposes to which it should be put. In preparation for a meeting with Oliver before the semester began, I outlined the following goals for teaching writing in the course:

- ❖ To understand writing as thinking
- ❖ To learn how to read as writers
- ❖ To understand and engage in writing as a process
- ❖ To carefully consider audience, purpose and context during each (recursive) stage of the writing process
- ❖ To understand writing as a social activity and thus to invest in the writing/thinking of classmates, learning how to respond productively, as well as to appreciate and value classmates' responses to one's own writing

- ❖ To consider how writing in the sciences may be similar or different from writing in other disciplines
- ❖ To understand the connection between global (content, idea development, organization, coherence, etc.) and local (style, mechanics, sentence structure, word choice, spelling, grammar, etc.) concerns of writers and attend critically to those concerns in one's own writing and the writing of others (published writers and classmates)
- ❖ To accomplish, or make progress, towards the goals students have articulated for themselves ("Writing Goals")

In contrast, Oliver's goals for student writing were much more product-based, illustrated by his grading criteria, which focused on: "clarity and effectiveness of writing," "coherence, quality, and originality of ideas," and "format" ("Course Grading").

Because of the differences in how we conceptualized our goals for students and their writing, I worried that Oliver would doubt my expertise when students failed to improve (and quickly) according to his expectations. Importantly, while Oliver believed we were teaching students how to be successful college writers, his criterion for assessment was very much rooted in the discursive conventions of his own discipline. He defined clarity, for example, in terms of scientific accuracy and adherence to facts and ways of reasoning accepted by the scientific community. Grounding expectations in the discursive and rhetorical nuances of the discipline made me further question the relevance of my expertise in helping students develop as writers in the sciences.

Our assumptions illustrate a tension between writing and disciplinary expertise that no doubt emerges from dominant ways of perceiving writing and the teaching of

writing in relation to other disciplines. As I've discussed, CCL scholars like Mahala and Swilky problematize dominant conceptions of expertise that can lead faculty like Oliver to make distinctions between the kind of expertise practiced by scholars and researchers in the disciplines and the kind of expertise that is translated or transmitted by compositionists brought in to teach writing. In the above excerpt, I interpreted Oliver's comment about how my role in the course should diminish over time as an indication that he saw writing as a means of communicating the work of the discipline rather than a vehicle for knowledge-making. Because of my disciplinary training, I wanted to frame writing as a medium for discovering and developing ideas, a strategy that would invite messy writing and treat it as evidence that students were thinking deeply about complex concepts. In contrast, for Oliver, poor writing got in the way of clearly communicating disciplinary ideas. "Anything not clear and reasonably well written," he explained to students during an in-class discussion about grading criteria, "will get a C or less, regardless of ideas, because poorly written ideas are not communicated effectively enough to be evaluated" ("Class Outline").

Oliver's criteria did not locate my expertise in my ability to help students embrace writing as means of grappling with course concepts. Teaching them to use writing in that way was fine as long as in the end students produced clear, concise, coherent, well-formatted prose. While I believe both ways of engaging writing are important aspects of CCL work, it was more often the latter that determined student improvement and by extension the success of our project. Consequently, the value of my expertise depended on my ability to translate knowledge about writing to students so that they could communicate more clearly what they learned about biology. This way of perceiving my

expertise in relation to Oliver's was at odds with my enthusiasm for helping Oliver understand writing and the teaching of writing more complexly, as activities that shouldn't be assessed, at least not exclusively, according to the technical proficiency of student writing.

By exploring differences in the way Oliver and I perceived the relationship between writing and the subject matter of the course, I've begun to unpack the tension between how we understood his scholarly expertise in relation to my writing expertise. Though Oliver and I entered into our relationship as co-instructors with a willingness to collaborate, the reality of our circumstances reinforced the dichotomization of expertise. Oliver's adherence to institutional ideologies that subordinate writing to disciplinary subject matter conflicted with my understanding, grounded in the disciplinary discourse of Composition Studies and Writing Across the Curriculum, that writing was integral to teaching and learning in all contexts. In short, my experience speaks back to current CCL discourse by demonstrating the true difficulty of negotiating expertise.

In the next reflective excerpt, I continue to wrestle with the complex challenge of simultaneously recognizing and validating my expertise while putting it productively in conversation with Oliver's. In particular, I question the utility of what Oliver considered my "technical expertise"—the ability to offer exercises and techniques to help students write cleaner, more scientifically accurate prose. Doing so forces me to re-consider what it means to teach writing in the context of this disciplinary classroom and what I need to know in order to do it well.

Shifting the Terms of Writing Expertise

As the following excerpt shows, when faced with the possible inapplicability of my technical expertise, my instinct was to frame my lack of subject matter knowledge as a valuable type of expertise in an attempt to confirm, at least for myself, that *not* understanding biology allowed me to understand students and better support their writing. As I grappled with my need to know more about the disciplinary context, I decided that students would benefit from the meta-cognition I practiced, and that I could offer them writing as a vehicle for developing this kind of awareness for themselves.

What does it mean for me to serve as a literacy sponsor for these apprentices when I am “mushfaking” (Gee 533) myself? Can I be a “writing expert” in the context of this discipline when I am not part of the Discourse and I am not fluent in the discourse? “Within a discourse,” says Gee, “you are always teaching more than writing or reading...you scaffold [students’] growing ability to say, do, value, believe, and so forth within that Discourse, through demonstrating your mastery and supporting theirs . . .” (530). In some ways my own apprenticeship has been useful for students and for conversations with Oliver because I do have a meta-knowledge, a sense of the differences between discourses and disciplines, which I can articulate in way students cannot. Yet, I often feel conflicted and uncomfortable negotiating my role in the complicated relationship dynamic of the classroom, particularly when I work with students one-on-one.

Gee’s idea of creating mushfaking, resistant students with their own growing meta-knowledge in order to affect social change, suggests the powerful potential of WAC/WID programs. Using writing as a tool for sense-making, communication and

reflection across disciplines can help nurture the kind of meta-thinking Gee advocates. Becoming conscious of the ways they are asked to apprentice themselves to the workings of diverse rhetorical contexts, and more importantly to the value systems underlying the range of disciplines they are exposed to throughout postsecondary education, cannot only help students understand more fully their learning processes (struggles and difficulties) in those disciplines, but provide them with a more holistic sense of how issues of knowledge, power, prestige, et cetera, function in the system of education. By helping students develop metacognitive awareness of their cross-disciplinary education, WAC/WID programs could offer students a new appreciation for difficulty, as well as the ability to resist forces that might otherwise have remained opaque and mysterious, making them more informed, self directed, active learners and citizens. (Reflective Journal, 10-24-06)

As I read this excerpt through a revisionary lens, I notice a deep worry about my ability to serve as a useful literacy sponsor for students when I am not a part of (let alone an expert in) the disciplinary discourse they wish to enter. While I felt confident teaching a writing workshop at the beginning of each class period, guiding students through processes of invention, drafting, and revision, I was less comfortable responding to specific questions about students' individual drafts. To teach workshops, I simply adapted exercises and activities (glossing, hotspotting, peer review, etc.) I used in my composition classes because they seemed general enough to be applicable in our biology seminar. Students' questions about their individual drafts, however, were more discipline-specific, and because I was co-instructing the course, I felt called upon to access a deeper knowledge than I had of disciplinary discourse, concepts, and

conventions. The tension is telling, I think, considering our first-year seminar for non-majors served as a general introduction to key concepts and questions of biological science and their relevance to public conversations. Yet even in an introductory course I sensed a disparity between disciplinary expertise and what I knew about writing.

I chose to respond to this discomfort by changing the terms of my expertise from technical expertise grounded in practical knowledge of activities and techniques for teaching and learning writing processes to meta-cognitive expertise rooted in a sense of how the power dynamics embodied in disciplinary discourses impact student learning. Looking back, I believe I embraced the shift for two reasons. First, I very poignantly felt the differences between Oliver and me as “co-instructors.” Oliver was the tenured chair of the Biological Sciences Department, which was institutionally visible and well-funded; he is a well-respected, widely published biologist and a teacher with years of experience at multiple institutions. I was a second-year graduate student in Composition and Rhetoric, unpublished, in the throes of coursework with several semesters’ experience teaching first-year writing, and unsure of how my program was perceived by faculty across the university. I was anxious to establish my expertise as complex and scholarly in order to represent my program and department well, gain Oliver’s respect as a colleague, and support the students in our class.

Secondly, I was enrolled in a graduate seminar during the semester I worked with Oliver called “Literacy Theory and Community,” in which I was introduced to issues of identity and sponsorship through literacy scholars such as James Paul Gee. As a result, I was beginning to acknowledge consciously that teaching students to read and write in a discipline is about more than invention and revision strategies; it’s about cultivating their

“ability to say, do, value, believe and so forth within that Discourse” (Gee 530). I began to recognize the significance of the discursive nuances that constituted writing in the sciences and felt unexpectedly compelled to understand the rhetoric of the discipline. At the same time, I refused to believe I had nothing to offer Oliver and his students. Gee’s theories of critical literacy helped me frame my status as disciplinary outsider as valuable and my meta-cognitive awareness of my own learning as a kind of expertise that might be useful in this context.

In short, I embraced the type of knowing, promoted by Mahala and Swilky, that aims to disrupt the dominant culture of expertise by “represent[ing] academic writing as an activity receptive to student perspectives and intentions” (51). I wanted to teach students to think across their experiences as writers in the university so they might develop a more conscious, critical sense of the discourses they were asked to accommodate. In a similar vein, Mahala and Swilky believe all writing teachers should resist roles as “technical facilitators of research conclusions about disciplinary conventions” and “feel empowered to draw on personal knowledge and research that situates dominant practices among oppositional alternatives” (51). I did resist the role of technical facilitator and attempt to use my status as disciplinary outsider to frame discursive practices in biology as one set among various alternatives, but I didn’t feel empowered.

The ideas about discourse and power to which I was exposed in my graduate seminar caused me to put pressure on traditional assumptions about knowledge that would judge my expertise according to how well I taught students to internalize “dominant disciplinary values and discursive practices” (Mahala and Swilky 51). I fell

short, however, of Mahala and Swilky's call to frame writing "as an opening where the heteroglossia of disciplines (and of WAC pedagogies) [could] come under public scrutiny" (51). I sensed that Oliver may have resisted had I openly performed my expertise in this way, since he wanted our students to learn to write at a university level—not necessarily to examine or critique the discourse of his discipline. Moreover, my uncertainty and lack of confidence in my expertise made me hesitant to hold it up for scrutiny and revision.

Perhaps because of these fears, I never invited Oliver to consider with me how exactly our goals aligned or to explore ways of negotiating different perceptions of our expertise in connection with one another. As a result, we never fully mined the expertise each of us brought to the project or imagined what new kinds of expertise we might have developed by putting them in conversation. Instead, I continued to try to accomplish his vision of student improvement while subtly designing activities to complicate his and students' understanding of how writing could/should function in our class.⁴

While there are things I might have done differently if I'd been thinking more consciously about expertise when working with Oliver, the purpose of reflexively re-reading journal entries in this chapter is not necessarily to critique my approach to cross-curricular literacy work or suggest what I should have done to negotiate expertise better. Rather, a revisionary approach seeks to recognize and sponsor sustained reflection on the dominant culture of expertise as a first step toward revising it. This process of revision counters current discourse, which argues for negotiated expertise without demonstrating what negotiation looks like in the context of actual, messy, CCL projects. The battle to

(re)negotiate expertise should be embraced continually as an integral part of CCL work, and in order to revise discourse and practice, our struggles must be reflexive and public.

In the final set of entries, I continue to examine the forces that enable and constrain negotiated expertise in CCL contexts. This time, I consider how my focus on meta-awareness as a valuable way of knowing led me to acknowledge and value my own *critical rhetorical expertise*—my ability to perceive the teaching and learning of writing in 189H in relation to broader academic contexts and to think critically about how the discursive and pedagogical conventions in biology influence student writers.

From Awareness to Critique: Enacting Critical Rhetorical Expertise

As I began to recognize and embrace my critical commitments and the approaches to CCL work they inspired, I framed my expertise so as to justify particular interpretations of student experience, critique teaching and learning in 189H, and promote my vision of the critical purpose of WAC. In order to examine each of these intentions fully, I've separated this last entry into three parts: in part one, I shaped one student's description of a classroom moment into a justification for my critique of teaching and learning in that moment; in part two I further developed my analytical lens, forwarding a more explicit critique; and in part three I expanded my critique into an argument for the kind of expertise compositionists should embrace in order to teach writing responsibly across the university. Once again, I shifted the terms of my expertise, this time from meta-cognitive awareness to critical rhetorical knowledge, and once again, the way I perceived and performed my expertise had implications for the kind of relationship I was able to cultivate with Oliver.

I recorded the first entry in this series near the middle of the semester. Students had just submitted a formal writing assignment, and Oliver was disappointed with their performance. He had collected excerpts from their papers and planned to talk with them as a class about how they might revise particular sentences in order to be more clear, concise, and accurate. One student, Taylor, reflected on her experience of a classroom moment that occurred when Oliver asked the class to revise a sentence excerpted from her paper. I found the moment and Taylor's analysis of it striking and framed it in my journal as an example of how Oliver was not teaching writing in ways commiserate with my disciplinary values; he didn't emphasize the connection between writing and thinking or value difficulty as part of, rather than a determinant to, those processes. Embracing my critical rhetorical expertise, in part one of the entry I construct an interpretation of Taylor's description of her experience that sets me up to critique Oliver and his teaching.

“One of the most memorable and valuable moments I experienced in this class regarding the development of my education,” Taylor writes, “was when phrases from our collectively hideous essays were projected on the white board.” Taylor was embarrassed to find that one of her sentences had been chosen but points out that “after analyzing it, I was able to grasp a theory I had misinterpreted and misconstrued in my writing.” In some ways it sounds as though Taylor learned something valuable about how readers in this discipline (represented by Oliver of course) make sense of and judge her writing. Yet she goes on to write: “Normally I would not have thought twice about that filler phrase, but due to the in-depth evaluation of our writing conducted in this class, I was able to better myself with the correct information.” Taylor concludes: “I plan on getting a

better grasp on the information I write about before I write about it.” (Reflective Journal 10-31-06)

Although I used direct quotes from Taylor’s course narrative to describe her experience of this classroom moment, I clearly shaped her narrative to serve as justification for the critique I planned to construct. Taylor’s analysis of the classroom moment was actually quite positive—she called it one of the most memorable and valuable of her education, arguing that Oliver’s evaluation of her writing helped her better herself. While I acknowledged that Taylor *might* (“in some ways”) have learned something valuable, I framed her plan to better understand scientific concepts and ideas before she writes about them as evidence that the classroom moment could not have been as positive as she claims. I projected shame onto this student even though she never explicitly claimed to be embarrassed. Put another way, I presented Taylor’s experience so as to suggest that whatever she thought she learned was not enough. I devalued her desire to get a “better grasp” on the “correct information” before she writes because I saw those intentions as antithetical to what I wanted her to learn—that writing is a way of thinking, a medium for learning instead of a tool for communicating the right information once it is attained.

I did not see a space for my disciplinary values and expertise in this classroom moment between Oliver and Taylor. I struggled to consider how my commitment to teaching students to use writing as a tool for thinking might be put usefully in conversation with Oliver’s emphasize on clarity and conciseness. As a result, I treated our stances, grounded in different understandings of writing expertise, as incompatible. Uncertain what to make of the displacement of my expertise and the conflict between my

goals and Oliver's, I embraced a critical lens through which I could critique Oliver and his teaching practices.

In the second entry of the series, I drew even more directly on my critical rhetorical expertise as an analytical lens, juxtaposing what Taylor should have learned in this moment with what I believed she actually took away.

So much is going on here. This learning moment could have been so fruitful. We could have had discussions about the relationship between thinking and writing, the challenge of representing our thinking in writing, how to perform thinking in writing, etcetera. Instead, Taylor came away with the understanding that at first she was missing the "correct" information and now she had it. She does not value her writing as a movement, as a process of making thinking visible in order to come to understanding. She learned to think twice about "filler phrases" and to be embarrassed by her "hideous" work. Of course Oliver was complicit (as was I) in Taylor's experience of the moment this way.

Here, I established my goals for the course as criteria for evaluating the "fruitfulness" of the learning moment Oliver created in class. I did not acknowledge Oliver's learning goals for students or how this particular class activity was designed to support them. As I think about it now, I realize Oliver wanted his students to understand the particular importance of word choice in scientific discourse and to learn how to read their own writing carefully and critically so they could revise for clarity and accuracy. Because clarity and accuracy are connected intimately in scientific writing, when students are ambiguous or unclear, not only do they make it difficult for readers to understand their writing but they inadvertently may misrepresent complex scientific concepts. More

than a matter of stylistic revision, then, imprecision often caused students to make claims that were, in Oliver's words, "fundamentally wrong." Oliver expertly designed this particular activity to help students consider the nuances of disciplinary discourse conventions in the context of their own writing, yet I judged the exercise on the extent to which it encouraged (or failed to encourage) students to see writing as a way of thinking.

When I experienced tension between Oliver's goals for students and my own, my instinct was to dichotomize them and argue that Oliver's approach to teaching writing was wrong and mine was right, but it is not that simple. Embracing my own expertise shouldn't require that I devalue Oliver's. By the same token, recognizing the value of the lesson Oliver planned for students need not mean discounting my commitment to teaching writing as a vehicle for thinking and learning. On the contrary, negotiating expertise calls for the disruption of rigid binaries and struggles between right and wrong. It demands the recognition of various types of knowledge grounded in different disciplinary frameworks. Most importantly, it invites us to value and make space for all kinds of expertise.

In my journal, I acknowledged that Oliver and I both were complicit in what I deemed a failed learning moment, but in reality, I contributed very little to class that day. Oliver taught while I merely observed. It never occurred to me at the time to consider why I was watching rather than facilitating a discussion about writing and revision—topics I usually taught in 189H. Looking back, perhaps Oliver chose to lead the discussion himself because, for him, it was a matter of teaching students what it means to be clear, concise, and accurate in scientific discourse—ideas he felt more qualified to examine with students. Oliver's decision to teach the lesson likely provoked my worry

that I lacked the kind of disciplinary expertise I needed to be useful to him and his students. Concerned that my technical writing expertise was not applicable in 189H, perhaps I experimented with critical rhetorical expertise in my journal because I was more confident in the ways of thinking it invited and because it positioned me in the more powerful role of critic.

As critic, I concluded that even though Taylor and Oliver deemed the classroom moment a success, it fell short of my vision for teaching and learning writing in this course. Taylor may have deepened her understanding of biological concepts, learned to diagnose her own writing, and recognized the need to understand complicated concepts fully in order to write about them clearly and accurately; but she also learned to see writing as a tool for communicating fully formulated thoughts, rather than as a medium for thinking, and to see difficulty as an obstacle to learning rather than an essential part of coming to know. Rather than give me pause, the fact that Oliver and Taylor saw the moment as useful was only further evidence of their inattention to the oppressive nature of disciplinary discourse and pedagogy. My determination to dichotomize and label expertise precluded productive negotiation.

Looking differently at this text, I can see the influence of critical models of CCL work wherein compositionists define their expertise in terms of familiarity with cultural and rhetorical analysis and use it to criticize and condemn the oppressive nature of disciplinary discourses and pedagogical practices. I critiqued Oliver's focus on accuracy, clarity, and precision under the premise that adhering to these values prevented him from fostering students' complex understanding of writing as a process of thinking and learning. He failed to use writing to promote learning in his class, I concluded, and

ultimately fell short of his own goal of improving student writing. By framing my expertise as knowledge of teaching and learning broadly conceived, I granted myself the authority to argue that correcting student mistakes and criticizing their lack of understanding was not the best way to empower student writers in our class.

In this entry as well as in the class, I didn't overtly promote the critical agenda that typically characterizes stage-three approaches to CCL work. Grounded in dominant versions of critical pedagogical theory in Composition Studies, critical WAC models often advance writing as a means of making systematic social and cultural critique part of teaching and learning in the disciplines. In line with critical pedagogues such as Henry Giroux, they often endorse a vision of WAC pedagogy as "directive" and "performative," a kind of "sphere" where issues of politics, social action, and civic responsibility are discussed openly (7). While I didn't advocate cultural critique or attention to the role of scientific discourse in perpetuating social inequalities explicitly, my evaluation of Oliver does take its cue from critical arguments such as LeCourt's that accuse certain versions of WAC of supporting academic discourses that are "restrictive and totalizing" (390).

Implicit in my critique of Oliver and his teaching is the contention that activities like his—ones that teach students to reproduce "clear, concise" academic discourse—ultimately "acculturat[e] students into already normalized discourses, ... reproduce[e] dominant ideologies that these discourses support, and ... silenc[e] difference ... as well as alternative literacies and other ways of knowing" (LeCourt 390). In short, through my interpretation of Taylor's narrative and the classroom moment itself, I exaggerated (perhaps even fabricated) Taylor's shame and used it as evidence that Oliver's approach to teaching scientific discourse conventions was oppressive and potentially dangerous.

What I seem to neglect, however, is the way in which the very assumptions I made about disciplinary discourse and pedagogy operate within what Jennifer Gore calls a “regime of truth” that positioned the theorist (me) in a dominant relationship with the teacher (Oliver), who I then positioned in a dominant relationship with his students. In other words, my goals for students led me to enact a kind of expertise that stymied my relationship with Oliver. I forwarded a discourse of critique without including Oliver in the conversation and without considering the ways that discourse functioned to preclude meaningful reflection or self-analysis.

By embracing the role of critic, I dismissed Oliver’s objectives and teaching strategies, thwarting possibilities for the meaningful negotiation of expertise. At the same time, perhaps because of our institutional roles and the roles we’d assumed in the classroom, Oliver devalued my knowledge and experience as well. Not only did he take the lead in the class discussion, he didn’t even invite me to participate in the conversation about student writing, my presumed area of expertise. Thus, in reading my journal entries, I still value my commitments to process pedagogy that teaches students to embrace writing as a vehicle for thinking and learning. What I realize is that my decision to critique Oliver’s approach for failing to align with my own was not a useful way to make myself heard or to create space for the expertise I had to offer.

In the final excerpt from this series, I located my critique of Oliver and his teaching in a larger vision for WAC. I emphasized that compositionists have a responsibility to contribute more than our technical knowledge of writing activities to disciplinary classrooms if we are going to help students and faculty broaden their understanding of the role of writing in teaching and learning. Moreover, I implied that

failure to do so perpetuated the oppressive function of disciplinary discourses. By delineating what should *not* be the main thrust of WAC/WID efforts, I identified potential ways of perceiving compositionists' expertise; in the end I held up an ability to understand relationships between students and teachers as compositionists' ultimate contribution to CCL initiatives.

As [experiences such as Taylor's] suggest, bringing writing activities into a disciplinary course is not enough. All of the double-entry journal assignments, drafts, peer workshops and revision plans in the world will mean little if students continue to find only misery, shame, and physical pain when they sit down to write. This felt difficulty is not only a detriment to them as developing writers, but also inhibits their ability to learn in the disciplines and grow as confident, imaginative thinkers. Perhaps because they narrowly perceive writing as only ever a tool for communication, they feel more deeply and personally their outsider status. [. . .]

For me, the most exciting thing about WAC/WID initiatives is not the possibility of helping students write "better" in a range of contexts, nor is it the valuing of writing as a process of drafting in order to produce a "better" finished product. It is not even (or at least not only) the idea of helping students achieve a more reflective, meta-awareness of their work as students across curricula and discourse communities. The most meaningful potential for WAC/WID programs is the space they create for writing in disciplinary courses to help teachers and students understand one another differently.

(Reflective Journal, 10-31-06)

This last entry offers a snapshot of my struggle, throughout the semester I worked with Oliver, to determine what sort of writerly expertise I brought to our project, how to

validate my expertise in relation to Oliver's, and how most productively to put our expertise in conversation in order to create meaningful learning experiences for student writers. In it, I expanded my disciplinary critique into a broader argument about the purpose of WAC efforts, surveying possible ends toward which writing expertise might be put—better student writing, student awareness of their role in disciplinary discourses, richer relationships between students and teachers in the disciplines, et cetera. In the end, I positioned myself as an expert in teaching and learning with a responsibility to help students and teachers in the disciplines interact more productively.

A range of forces, always in flux—from literacy theory to student narratives and complicated classroom moments—shaped how I conceptualized and enacted expertise throughout the semester. Examining these often invisible influences has illuminated real-life obstacles to the ideal of negotiated expertise often touted in CCL scholarship. For example, despite my sense of their interconnectedness, throughout my journal I dichotomized rather than intertwined Oliver's and my expertise. I treated his attempt to teach writing as antithetical to my goals for the course, critiquing it in order to justify what I had to offer and point out that I better knew how to teach writing in his course.

Alternatively, drawing attention to Oliver's willingness and ability to teach his students the meaning of clarity, conciseness, and accuracy when writing about science might have illuminated two things: first, that Oliver articulated qualities of all good writing in disciplinary terms, and second that he did have effective strategies for supporting his students as writers in his discipline. These observations might have generated conversations about how our goals for students influenced our understanding of the kind of expertise each of us needed to contribute.

How did Oliver's claim that we were teaching students to be good college writers, despite his focus on disciplinary conventions, shape what kind of writing expertise he thought was relevant to our project? If we had realized he actually was defining "good writing" in terms of disciplinary conventions, how would that have changed the kind of expertise needed to support student writers? Exploring questions like these could have helped us consider how different kinds of expertise can be mutually informing. We might have begun to negotiate expertise with an awareness of the complex forces that shaped how we originally understood and performed it, as well as a clear sense of what type of expertise was called for in our particular situation.

In addition to illuminating the challenges compositionists and faculty face in negotiating expertise, taking a revisionary stance to my journal entries has forced me to think more carefully about the place of students in discourse and scholarship about expertise. Looking back, I am troubled by my eagerness to speak for Taylor, in fact to forward an interpretation of her experience that directly conflicts with her own. Uncritically embracing certain kinds of expertise, my revision suggests, can lead to problematic claims about student experience, assuming for instance that disciplinary discourses and writing pedagogies are oppressive to them. What are the alternatives? Where does student knowledge and experience fit in the negotiation of expertise in cross-curricular literacy projects?

I am not the first to look to students as vital contributors to WAC discourse, theory and practice. In describing their vision of WAC's research agenda, for example, Mahala and Swilky advocate an approach that strives "to illuminate how writing often poses itself for students as a struggle to negotiate between competing discourses and

ways of knowing—not only those of the university, but those of the home, of religion, of ethnicity, of mass culture, etc.” (56). Undergraduate students uniquely are positioned to navigate the rhetorical, discursive, and pedagogical practices of multiple disciplines at once, equipping them with a valuable experientially-based expertise. Research that taps into student experiences, according to Mahala and Swilky, “can help make faculty more ethically and politically aware as they learn how the practice of their expertise in teaching interacts, and often conflicts, with ways of knowing students have internalized” (56). By the same token, LeCourt’s critical WAC model invests student writers with the power “of resisting and/or changing the constitution of the discourse through [their] subject positions in other discourses” (396). She argues that students embody expertise “gained in discourses not necessarily constituted in relationship to the discipline” that can be harnessed as a force for challenging and revising dominant disciplinary and discursive ideologies (399).

Likewise, I believe students’ unique knowledge and experiences can be rich resources for complicating institutional definitions of expertise that are compartmentalized and grounded in the disciplines. In order to make students part of the discursive revisioning I’ve begun here, compositionists must recognize when and how students are represented in our attempts to articulate what we know and what we bring to cross-curricular literacy projects.

Negotiating Expertise through Pedagogical Relationships

In this chapter, I’ve used revisionary stance to develop a more complex understanding of negotiated expertise. Re-visioning my own reflective texts enabled me

to look with new eyes at the complexities that emerge as expertise is negotiated in CCL contexts. Likewise, I urge compositionists to take a revisionary approach to the material circumstances of their own cross-curricular literacy projects. Using revision to make the familiar strange creates opportunities for compositionists to contemplate the ways our commitments shape our perceptions and performances of expertise in CCL relationships. Drawing on that awareness, we deliberately and strategically can perform various ways of knowing in order to identify and attend to “productive discomfort” as part of an ongoing, collaborative process of negotiation in which compositionists and faculty “identify, question, play with, and revise” our thinking about expertise (Jung 148). I argue that, when understood in this way, negotiated/negotiating expertise serves as a key element of revisionary pedagogy for CCL work.

As part of revisionary pedagogy, the negotiation of expertise should be a reflexive activity. That is, participants’ interaction with one another should initiate a recursive process of turning inward to contemplate the values, beliefs and experiences that constitute what each “knows” and then turning back outward to put one’s knowledge-in-process in conversation with others’. Donna Qualley describes this kind of reflexive engagement as an alternative approach to sense-making. Rather than justify the relevance or superiority of what we know, “making sense” of a situation, question, or project invites us to treat “expert” conclusions “as tentative, partial, approximate, and open to further examination” (24). In terms of CCL work, when compositionists and faculty (and students) in other disciplines engage expertise for the purpose of sense-making, we 1) explicitly articulate the location out of which our respective expertise grows, 2) acknowledge the tentativeness of conclusions based on our expertise, and 3)

seek out each other's expertise as a means of revising initial conclusions in order to develop a more complex approach to the project at hand.

Ultimately, re-defining negotiated expertise as part of revisionary pedagogy for CCL work creates new possibilities for relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. Reflexive negotiation of expertise illuminates and complicates the tension between professionalizing writing expertise and challenging the dominant culture of expertise, positioning compositionists not as missionaries or accommodationists but as collaborative sense-makers. Significantly, the discursive revisioning of expertise I've developed throughout this chapter shapes and is shaped by the material relationships that unfold in CCL contexts. In the next chapter, I continue to explore the potential of revisionary stance to reconstitute the discursive and material realms of cross-curricular literacy work. I focus on a more formal argument I composed during my time in the biology department, this time in order to investigate how the notion of change operates in CCL discourse and practice.

Chapter Three

Change and Be Changed: Re-visioning the Transformative Mission of CCL Work

On the most foundational level, Writing Across the Curriculum is about *change*. Built on what David Russell calls a “tradition of reform,” WAC initiatives focus on “changing the way both teachers and students use writing in the curriculum” (McLeod, “Introduction” 3). However, as Russell points out, changes in the use of writing ultimately call for more substantial shifts in the organization of modern academia, as well as in common “methods of regulating access to coveted social roles” (“Writing” 53). In other words, in order to improve student writing, teachers must change their classroom practices, which requires that they embrace alternative theories of teaching and learning. These localized changes, in turn, have the potential to challenge larger institutional structures and ideologies. Thus, change, in the context of cross-curricular literacy work, is multifaceted and complex, engendering questions like: *Who or what should change as a result of CCL interactions? How should change be initiated and worked toward? And who should decide the purpose(s) of such change?*

Relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines are shaped according to how questions like these are answered. For example, critical approaches to CCL work often embrace transformative visions of change. Derived from traditional theories of critical pedagogy as they emerged in Composition Studies, critical models charge compositionists with the ethical responsibility to transform disciplinary faculty and students. By illuminating and speaking back to the oppressive nature of disciplinary discourse, compositionists are to help our colleagues and students in the disciplines

develop critical consciousness or the ability “to rethink their experiences in terms that both name relations of oppression and also offer ways to overcome them” (Giroux 72). As transformative intellectuals, compositionists in the critical model seek to convert others by awakening them to their own and others’ oppression. Within this paradigm, change is understood as an activity initiated by compositionists, who determine its purposes and means. It is taken for granted that *others*—disciplinary faculty, students, curriculum, pedagogies, et cetera—undergo the transformation.

The above scenario limits cross-curricular relationships in several ways. First, disciplinary faculty and students may resist and/or resent the transformation compositionists envision and disengage from CCL projects altogether. Second, stage-three proponents address the possibility of resistance by urging compositionists to work with faculty who already share critical objectives, which restricts who we can develop relationships with in the first place. Lastly, even when disciplinary faculty, students, pedagogies and/or curricula are transformed, the fact that change moves in one direction—from compositionists to the disciplines—shuts down possibilities for dialogue, negotiation, and collaboration, cornerstones of the WAC movement’s egalitarian spirit.

Despite the dangers of forcing our vision of change on others, compositionists cannot ignore the role we have in defining and bringing about change through CCL interactions. As Donna LeCourt points out, “presuming that we should resist *any* attempt at change in our colleagues’ ideological investments similarly masks the investments we already make in WAC work and leads to an inaccurate picture of our position [...]. If change is not included as part of WAC work,” she continues, “we effectively silence ourselves as much as the missionary model silences our colleagues”

(403). Thus, compositionists must face questions about change head on, including how various visions of change enable and constrain meaningful relationships with disciplinary faculty.

While questions about change are often at the center of CCL literature and scholarship, rarely do scholars and/or practitioners investigate specific visions for change or consider the implications of our choices. Too often the means and ends of change remain implicit, as the discourse offers ways to sponsor and sustain change but not necessarily strategies for examining its consequences or repercussions. Identifying accepted visions of change embedded in CCL discourse is the first step toward revising the problematic relationships they may prompt. Toward that end, in this chapter, I identify several assumptions about change embedded in CCL discourse:

- ❖ Change is *revolutionary*; small-scale changes (in student writing, classroom practices, etc.) ultimately must lead to large-scale changes (in theories of teaching and learning, in the form of educational reform, etc.).
- ❖ Change is *inherently good* and progressive; change means improvement, forward motion, and so needs not be defined specifically.
- ❖ Change is *one-directional* and *outwardly focused*; compositionists assume that we effect change while others (faculty, students, curriculum, structure of education) undergo it.

Assumptions like these can thwart meaningful relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines, but they have become so ingrained in CCL discourse that they remain unacknowledged and un-interrogated. In order to imagine new possibilities

for CCL relationships, we must revise the discourse by making visible the material realities of grappling with questions of change in practice.

In that vein, this chapter examines an argument I composed based on my time in the biology department. The paper served as my final project in a graduate seminar and as a draft of a journal article intended for publication. In it, I appropriate what I now see as a common narrative or script for arguments in WAC/WID literature and scholarship. Taking a revisionary stance toward the text, I identify assumptions about change embedded in the narrative structure. Subsequently, I offer a more representative, complex example of how change functioned in my experience with a biology faculty member as a way of disrupting popular scripts and complicating implicit assumptions about change.

Before turning to the seminar paper, I flesh out the three common assumptions about change, pointing out that while questions regarding purposes and processes of change often are raised in CCL scholarship, they tend not to be explored in context or in depth. Nuanced, contextualized ways of wrestling with change, I contend, must become part of CCL discourse if we are to explore possibilities for developing more meaningful relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. Examples like mine usefully complicate how change functions discursively and encourage compositionists to think more consciously about how we understand, work toward, and represent change in discourse and practice.

Representations of Change in CCL Discourse

According to Walvoord, it is because of WAC's "change agenda" that we've come to understand it as an educational reform movement geared toward altering institutional cultures and attitudes about writing ("Future" 59-60). At the same time, our colleagues across the curriculum have associated WAC with more localized, context-specific change, such as improving student writing. As a result, compositionists and faculty in other disciplines often expect CCL efforts to lead to different kinds of change: Disciplinary faculty want change in student writing, but compositionists realize that in order for that to happen, changes in attitudes, behaviors, pedagogies, theories of teaching and learning, and even institutional structures and ideologies must take place as well. That is, compositionists tend to bring a sense of the interconnectivity between small-scale and revolutionary changes to our work that disciplinary faculty don't necessarily share.

The conflict may be traced back to the 1970s when the educational reform movement grounded in holistic views of language officially was named *Writing Across the Curriculum*. As Toby Fulwiler points out, the movement was actually based on several premises about language and learning, emphasizing a "mutually dependent symbolic network not easily divisible into discrete entities, skills, achievements, or outcomes" ("Quiet" 181). However, the title *Writing Across the Curriculum* "caught on first because, of all the language modes, writing seemed to be the most easily understood and abused in school curricula" (181). Fulwiler mentions this disjunction only briefly, determining to "dance with what brung us," but I believe it explains, at least in part, why compositionists and disciplinary faculty so often cling to different assumptions and expectations when it comes to change ("Quiet" 181).

According to Fulwiler, the basic premises of WAC should sound “to reasonable people who care about student learning...pretty much like God, mother, and apple pie” (“Quiet” 181). In actuality, however, they “threaten business as usual” because WAC challenges the way faculty understand and engage (or not) with student writing in their courses and poses institutional, educational, curricular, and pedagogical choices that bring political issues to light (181-2). The tension Fulwiler observes indicates complex differences between the histories and experiences that compositionists and disciplinary faculty bring to their understanding of “writing.”

Compositionists typically associate the study of writing and the teaching of writing with broader issues of language and learning, whereas disciplinary faculty often perceive writing as a generalizable skill that can be transmitted to students. Disciplinary faculty don’t always understand or support compositionists’ contention that in order “to effect real change in abilities as basic as writing and learning” instructors in the disciplines must “alter as well their perceptions of other dimensions of the academic community” including: “1) the role of language in learning, 2) their relationship to students in the classroom, 3) their interactions with colleagues in other disciplines, and 4) the nature of the academic institution itself” (Fulwiler, “Quiet” 179). In short, the term *writing* in the writing across the curriculum movement masks for disciplinary faculty more revolutionary goals regarding language and learning.

Compositionists’ failure to acknowledge the connections we draw between small-scale changes in classroom practices and large-scale conceptual shifts that call for institutional and ideological changes can lead to conflicts with faculty in other disciplines. What’s more, confidence in the inherent goodness of their visions for change

can obscure the need to articulate specific characteristics or to consider their goals in relation to the needs or expectations of disciplinary faculty. As I will show, because WAC is a decentralized movement without clearly defined overarching objectives, CCL literature gestures toward a vague notion of revolutionary change-for-the-best without explicitly detailing specifics or acknowledging potential consequences.

In “The Foreigner: WAC Directors as Agents of Change,” Susan McLeod takes for granted that the goal of WAC directors should be to “bring about change in the university” (108). She argues, much as I do in Chapter 1, that the kind of change embraced through CCL work can be influenced by metaphors that “shape reality for us in ways we may not intend” (108). After examining the problematic relationships incited by several common metaphors, McLeod urges WAC directors to think of themselves as “change agents,” who “aim at helping students improve their writing, but do so by working to change university curricula and faculty pedagogy ...” (112).

McLeod does not acknowledge the potential disconnect between her vision for change and the needs and expectations of disciplinary faculty. In an endnote, she points out that the term “agent of change” originally was used in the 1960s to describe the role of Peace Corps volunteers and caused political difficulties for the organization because the countries volunteers visited didn’t necessarily desire change (McLeod 115). However, she does not explore the ways in which her use of the term to describe WAC directors in CCL contexts might re-inscribe similar dynamics because of conflicting visions for change between compositionists and faculty.

Instead, McLeod steadfastly embraces a vague vision of revolutionary change. “What the WAC director as change agent is after,” she declares, “is an educational

revolution at the university level...” (McLeod 114). The assumption here permeates CCL discourse: Change at the heart of WAC is ultimately revolutionary and inherently good. CCL discourse and scholarship refers to change imprecisely as improved curricula, pedagogies, theories and ideologies, without clearly defining what that actually entails. As a result, compositionists and faculty often bring different, unarticulated visions of change to CCL efforts, straining our relationships with one another. Alternatively, we would benefit from more instances in the discourse where assumptions are articulated explicitly and examined reflexively.

For now, the belief that the change pursued through CCL work is revolutionary and inherently good can lead compositionists to internalize other assumptions about change, namely that it is *one-directional* and *outwardly focused*. More precisely, by presuming that our vision of change is inherently good, compositionists justifiably can exempt ourselves and our objectives from the possibility of revision. Our goals for change are in everyone’s best interest, so the (unconscious) reasoning goes, therefore those others, not we, need to be transformed.

The notion that change should be focused outward and move in one direction undergirds arguments for WAC even when CCL scholars explicitly value and respect disciplinary differences. Waldo’s inquiry-based approach to WAC consultancy provides a complex example. His focus on inquiry and collaboration potentially could make questions about change more explicit in CCL interactions. After all, he argues that compositionists should resist forcing our goals and ideologies on others and instead seek out and align ourselves with “the values and goals for writing within the varying [disciplinary] communities” so that faculty “sense the process of change is coming from

within them, not without them” (10). His method, in which compositionists are “question askers, collaborators, and listeners,” appears flexible and open to different conceptualizations of change (10).

Writing consultants in first-year writing workshops open to all faculty at the University of Nevada, Reno, ask questions to help faculty 1) “choose a class in which they would like to try a writing assignment”; 2) “isolate one or two goals for learning in the class”; 3) “list concepts, problems, or processes important to understanding course material”; and 4) “decide between goals or concepts ... in designing their assignment” (Waldo 11). According to Waldo, throughout this process “faculty collaborate with each other and with WAC personnel, but make all of the most consequential decisions about the assignment themselves” (12). The sequence of workshop activities is inquiry-based and works to “shift the locus of expertise, and the responsibility for teaching writing, from us [writing consultants] to them [disciplinary faculty]” (11). Compositionists in Waldo’s model do not control what kind of change occurs or how; they don’t deliver assignments to faculty or dictate how they should incorporate writing into their courses.

At the same time, however, there is an assumption that disciplinary faculty should be the ones to change their assignments and classroom pedagogies. Waldo admits his goal is to “problematize (in the Freirean sense) parts of the curriculum” and delineates additional objectives for consultancy including helping faculty change their assignments in order to “mak[e] the deeper language and cognitive structures of their disciplines more accessible to students,” and helping students “think critically within and about their disciplines. [...] Our questions admittedly encourage these outcomes,” Waldo concedes, “as do the model assignments we use during the workshops” (12, 13). In short, while

Waldo's approach is "non-invasive," collaborative, and inquiry-driven, his goal is still to change students and teachers in the disciplines. In Waldo's model, consultants might adjust their *approach* to CCL work so that faculty believe change is coming from within, but change remains something they initiate rather than undergo.⁵

A philosophy of listening and learning like the one underlying Waldo's inquiry-based approach was behind the stage-two push toward rhetorical research in the disciplines. Indeed, second stage reform efforts are perhaps the closest compositionists have come to challenging common conceptions of change as outwardly focused and one-directional by considering how we, and our visions of change, might be altered through CCL interactions. However, one of two things tends to occur when compositionists study disciplinary discourses: 1) We do research in order to construct a more rhetorically savvy argument for writing in the disciplines, in which case we uphold our own visions for change, but consider how to make them seem more desirable for disciplinary faculty; or 2) In order to avoid disciplinary or institutional resistance, we swallow our ideologies and visions for large-scale change, offering faculty what CCL consultant George Kalamaras calls the "how-to" activities without any discussion of the accompanying worldview (9). In either case, change, if it happens, remains outwardly focused and one-directional.

In the spirit of observation and integration, compositionists in Waldo's model are similar to McLeod's "change agent" in that they try to "mak[e] their knowledge about teaching writing not something to be imposed but something to be discussed, perhaps broadened through dialogue with disciplinary experts" (McLeod 112). Disciplinary faculty are encouraged to experiment with changes in their classrooms and reflect on those changes with each other and with WAC consultants. The assumption, however, is

that change in classroom practices naturally leads to the kinds of conceptual shifts at the heart of WAC work. CCL scholars justify their visions of change by presuming that they are in the best interest of faculty. Waldo, for instance, claims that compositionists' goals for change actually "merg[e] with the disciplines themselves" and suggests that by "creat[ing] an atmosphere for faculty to develop and refine their own ideas about writing" compositionists can achieve more substantial and permanent change that is both localized and revolutionary (11,13).

The notion that our goals ultimately "merge" with disciplinary faculty reinforces assumptions about the inherent goodness of our objectives and absolves compositionists of any need to reflect on or revise our visions of change. Not surprisingly then, despite their emphasis on collaboration, inquiry, and listening, neither Waldo nor McLeod makes visible what the "broadening" of compositionists' knowledge might look like or how the determination to "listen and learn" might lead us to reconsider how we define change in CCL contexts (McLeod 112). Neither explores how we ourselves might be changed through the process of inquiry and collaboration. In effect, then, what they offer are rhetorical strategies for engaging with disciplinary faculty in ways that dissipate resistance by convincing faculty that they control who or what changes, how and toward what end. Thus, change remains outwardly focused on faculty, students, curricula, and pedagogy in the disciplines and one-directional as compositionists initiate and others undergo change.

Certainly not all disciplinary faculty would agree that the kinds of changes compositionists promote "merge" with their goals for student writing and student writers in their classes. Indeed, LeCourt admits that she has been accused by her colleagues in

Composition of reproducing the missionary model so often critiqued in CCL discourse—if faculty resist and compositionists enforce a critical vision of change, then compositionists become missionaries, or in critical pedagogy parlance, “transformative intellectuals,” intent on converting the unenlightened. In response, LeCourt contends that it is actually the assumption that disciplinary faculty automatically would reject a critical approach to writing instruction that positions faculty as subjects to be transformed and compositionists as missionaries. In fact, she counters, many faculty already are “engaged in critique and/or political questioning of epistemological practices” and are primed to apply their critical processes discursively (LeCourt 403). Moreover, most faculty who choose to get involved in WAC do so because they want to help their students learn better and provide access to their disciplines, particularly for students who traditionally might be excluded, and critical approaches “fin[d] fertile ground in such educators” (403). In other words, LeCourt upholds Waldo’s claim that compositionists’ and disciplinary faculty’s visions for change often do merge whether we realize it or not.

I appreciate LeCourt’s generous perception of our colleagues in other disciplines and second her concern that routinely predicting faculty resistance might dismiss the intellectual complexity they demonstrate in cross-curricular literacy work. By the same token, though, it seems problematic to assume automatically that our visions of change align with one another. As I’ve illustrated, the conceptualizations of change embraced by compositionists and disciplinary faculty often are based on fundamentally different notions of writing and the WAC movement. Moreover, our perceptions tend to remain unarticulated or even unconscious, resulting in conflicts or challenges we don’t even realize can be traced back to contradictory visions of change. Because we cannot assume

that our goals for change merge *or* conflict, open recognition and negotiation of our respective visions must become central to CCL work.

I propose we examine the assumptions underlying visions of change we often unconsciously bring to our work. If left unexamined, each of the assumptions I've emphasized here—that change is revolutionary, inherently good, one-directional and outwardly focused—can lead to problematic relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines, ultimately limiting possibilities for what cross-curricular literacy work can accomplish.

In what follows, I urge compositionists to embrace the possibility that we might be subjects as well as catalysts of change through CCL interactions. With Kalamaras, I believe it is the process of change, rather than our initial commitments or their effects, that is at the heart of cross-curricular literacy work (2). By identifying and grappling with conflicts when they emerge, compositionists can begin to “value *potential* change, rooted in the interplay of apparent contradictions, as generative chaos” (Kalamaras 10).

According to Kalamaras:

The real issue ... is ultimately not whether a consultant affects institutional change, but rather how she views the institution and its relationship with her own agenda, and how she negotiates these often dissonant perceptions to shape writing-across-the-curriculum practices. (11)

Taking my cue from Kalamaras, my goal in this chapter is to make visible the tenuousness and complexity of change in a particular CCL context in order to revise the way change functions in CCL discourse. Toward that end, I revisit a project I developed based on my work with a biology professor and TAs in spring 2007. In the next section, I

describe the overlapping contexts that gave birth to my project. I then examine excerpts from the project in order to interrogate assumptions about change underlying my argument. Rather than smoothing over the rich, messy moments of conflict or treating them merely as fodder for self-critique, I embrace revision as a creative process of re-imagining connections between the ideas I embraced as a Composition scholar attempting to write into CCL discourse and my lived experiences doing cross-curricular literacy work.

Overlapping Contexts

The multiple, overlapping contexts in which I was thinking and writing during my time in the biology department are significant because each offered me a different way of conceptualizing change—change in student writing, change in education, and change through Writing Across the Curriculum. While I was not necessarily thinking consciously about these visions of change at the time, my instinct was to put them in conversation with each other. As I will show, my subject position in each of these contexts, and in particular my attempts to carve a place for myself as a scholar contributing to the field of WAC, shaped how I combined my experiences and objectives across contexts.

Teaching the Lab Report: Change as Improved Student Writing

After working with me to pilot a writing component in the honors seminar for first-year students, Oliver initiated a plan to teach writing in a 200-level course to ensure that all biology majors learned to write in a disciplinary context. In spring 2007, he

introduced me to Ethan, the instructor of Biology 207: Ecology and Evolution, and we discussed what kinds of writing activities would be useful to students learning to write biology lab reports. BIOS 207 is the fourth required course for biology majors and ideally attracts sophomores and juniors. However, because students tend to be more interested in other requirements, such as genetics and microbiology, and because the course is notoriously difficult, students typically put it off until they are seniors. As a result, we worked with students who had been exposed to the discipline over several years, had decided on a disciplinary focus, and needed to pass the course to graduate on time.

About 50 students took the course, which required them to attend a lecture session for one hour three times a week, as well as one of the five lab sections that met for 3-4 hours once a week. Three biology graduate student teaching assistants were assigned to work with undergraduates in lab sections. In the past, student writing involved the composition of four lab reports over the course of the term. Ethan suggested we dedicate one hour a week or one lab every couple of weeks to writing. For each “writing lab” the TAs and I would teach a mini-lesson in composition, which students could use to develop reports on the lab experiments they were working on at the time. Students usually struggled to write, Ethan explained, despite their eagerness to learn and follow the “rules” for composing lab reports; we discussed how lacking a sense of rhetorical or disciplinary rationale might make it difficult for students to understand and apply seemingly random rules. Ethan pointed out that most students were far enough along in their program to have a sense of the epistemological foundation of biological science but needed to learn how to translate that understanding into writing.

Before the semester started, I created five writing workshops based on major activities I do with student writers in my composition classes and what I learned from working with Oliver and his students the previous semester. For each workshop or “writing lab,” I included a description of how TAs might teach the workshop along with a handout to guide student writers. Workshops included: “What is Scientific Writing?,” in which students discussed and glossed a published report; three “Peer Review Workshops,” for which students wrote author’s notes and practiced peer review conversations; and a sentence-level revision workshop. In addition, I suggested we have students compile writing portfolios and write midterm narratives reflecting on their development as writers, but this ultimately seemed like too much paperwork for TAs and the portfolio plan never came to fruition.

Ethan and the TAs read the workshops I composed and offered ideas for revision. As the semester began, I collaborated with the TAs to introduce the first activity, glossing, to students and then rotated through the different lab sections as a support person while students and TAs got used to the peer review process. My role, I believed, was to listen to the issues the TAs and Ethan observed in their students’ work and help them design strategies and activities to address those issues. In other words, our goal was to make changes to the lab sessions so they would provide more support for student writers, who could then write better lab reports.

Pedagogies and Difference: Changing Education

At the same time I was working with Ethan and his TAs to develop a writing component for BIOS 207, I was enrolled in English 986: Pedagogies and Difference, a

graduate seminar in the English department designed to “explore theories related to socially constructed differences and their importance to how we imagine and enact pedagogies for reading and writing” (Goodburn). Throughout the semester we studied theories of teaching and learning that foregrounded the role of Difference, drawing on our experiences as teachers and students to illustrate and complicate what we were reading.

We were encouraged to embrace the subject matter in ways that were personally meaningful and relevant to us. I used the course to think about disciplinary differences in writing and the teaching of writing across the curriculum, as well as to consider the extent to which socially constructed differences could or should be a focus of cross-curricular literacy work. At the time, I was developing a definition of “critical rhetorical education,” or CRE, which I described as an “interdisciplinary approach to teaching that nurtures in students a ‘rhetorical intelligence’ (Petraglia and Bahri) enabling them to deliberate and communicate critically and ethically as they work toward personal development and social change” (Tarabochia, “Critical” 2). I discovered in the seminar that issues of Difference are an integral part of writing and teaching writing and that students need certain sensibilities in order to draw on their own and other’s differences in respectful, meaningful ways. Critical Rhetorical Education, I believed, was an approach to postsecondary education that embraced and valued Difference.

In English 986, we read Barbara DiBernard’s “Teaching What I’m Not: An Able-Bodied Woman Teaches Literature by Women with Disabilities,” Brenda Jo Brueggemann’s “An Enabling Pedagogy,” excerpts from Zan Goncalves’s *Sexuality and the Politics of Ethos in the Writing Classroom*, and other pieces in which teachers and students, most from English Studies, engaged in critical rhetorical education. Learners in

these examples reflected on their own experiences, assumptions, and beliefs, thought and wrote about Difference, and considered how to communicate responsibly with others. As I studied these pieces, I felt a disconnect between the potential of CRE and the kind of teaching and learning I was witnessing, and in some cases supporting, in the biology department. It sometimes seemed we were teaching biology students to devalue their experiences and beliefs, to appropriate disciplinary discourse even when it obscured Difference, and to adhere to rhetorical “rules” they didn’t really understand. Studying pedagogies of Difference in my seminar inspired me to explore the challenges raised by the kind of educational change I advocated. What would it take, I wondered, to promote CRE not just in Composition programs or English departments, but across disciplines?

Staking My Claim: WAC as a Vehicle for Change

While I was exploring possibilities for CRE in English 986, I was in the process of preparing for my comprehensive exams. At my institution graduate students build our own reading lists around questions in the field we’d like to pursue and then write essays and compile portfolio materials representing our thinking, teaching and research around those questions. Based on my experiences in the biology department, I knew I wanted to focus in some way on Writing Across the Curriculum. At the time, I was reading Harriet Malinowitz, Bonnie Spanier, and Donna LeCourt, among others. As a result, I began to think about the relationship between critical rhetorical education and cross-curricular work. In a narrative reflecting on my exam research, I wrote:

Is that what we need to teach students when it comes to rhetorical intelligence—how to find the part of them that speaks to a part of the audience? Is that always

possible given purpose and context? I wonder what that question means when exploring possibilities for taking up issues of Difference in disciplinary classrooms. Should/can pedagogies of Difference infuse each and every course? [...] When we think about the differences in pedagogies, epistemologies, [and] assessment practices across disciplines, must we ask how those differences are grounded in “Difference”? (“Course Narrative”)

The excerpt illustrates my thinking in progress as I attempted to put the theories and concepts I was learning as a graduate student staking out a place for myself in the field in conversation with my experience as a writing consultant in the biology department. I tried to articulate the questions that emerged when I considered my commitment to CRE in the context of WAC, bolstered by my discovery of scholars from the field who substantiated my critical vision.

Preparing for my comprehensive exams was a unique moment because I felt both free to explore relationships among the questions and ideas that most challenged and intrigued me and compelled to begin carving out my professional identity and to contribute usefully to the field through research and scholarship. In combination, feeling free to imagine and compelled to contribute led me boldly to embrace possibilities for using WAC as a vehicle for educational change.

Colliding Contexts: An Argument for Revolutionary Change

The text I examine in the remainder of this chapter, my final project for English 986, grew out of my thinking, writing and interactions with others in these three overlapping contexts. In it, I pursued the relationship among critical rhetorical education, Difference, and writing across the curriculum, and began to develop an argument for

using WAC as a vehicle for CRE. The goal of postsecondary education, I maintained in the paper, should be to change students by enabling them to become active, responsible, civic participants with a nuanced understanding of Difference, defined broadly in terms of race, class, gender, age, religion, politics, et cetera, and even discipline. But that vision of education can be realized only if students are taught rhetorical strategies for deliberation and civic participation in contexts beyond first-year writing and English departments, which requires a change in disciplinary pedagogy. Since WAC already functioned as a vehicle for university-wide educational reform, I reasoned, it easily could become a medium for promoting my particular vision for critical rhetorical education. My goal for the final project, then, was to flesh out the possibility and argue for the necessity of what I called “CRE across the curriculum.”

The assignment prompt invited us to “pursue individual projects related to our interests in pedagogy and Difference (which could include academic essays, scripts, creative nonfiction, course portfolios, social justice projects, etc.)” (Goodburn). As a graduate student about to achieve candidacy, I felt institutional pressure to contribute to my field through publication, so despite the great latitude in purpose, form, and content, my final project for 986 took the form of a journal article. Because I planned to argue for large-scale changes in education, I imagined *Liberal Education* as a possible forum for the piece. My choice of journals is also significant; I chose *Liberal Education*, not necessarily a WAC/WID journal, because I associated the goals of CCL work with the revolutionary revision of postsecondary education.

In the next section, I show how the journal article I drafted as a result of my thinking and writing in overlapping contexts forwarded a vision of change that didn't

necessarily represent the complex reality of my relationship with Ethan. By reading excerpts from that text through a revisionary lens, I recognize my appropriation of a narrative script popular in CCL discourse and examine the assumptions about change embedded within it. While these patterns can be useful, I argue, compositionists should be aware of the logic rooted within them and reflect on the extent to which they represent actual experiences of change in cross-curricular relationships.

Shaping an Argument for Change

This first excerpt is from the introduction to the paper I wrote for English 986. In it, I supported the argument made by Rhetoric and Composition scholars that WAC must be *rhetoricized* in order to achieve its ambitious goals. In other words, I urged compositionists to reveal oppressive disciplinary structures and ideologies to students and faculty as rhetorical, rather than natural, and therefore open to revision. Assuming the inherent validity of my vision, I framed my work in the biology department as evidence that rhetoricizing WAC aligns with faculty goals but is limited by disciplinary conventions and faculty resistance.

[A]s Rolf Norgaard points out in “The Prospect of Rhetoric in Writing Across the Curriculum,” “movements like writing to learn and writing in the disciplines, have tended to shape WAC to accommodate disciplinary epistemologies and pedagogies, most often to the detriment of any kind of interdisciplinary rhetorical education” (149). Students focus on learning to write appropriately in their discipline, on acquiring the rhetoric—the language, symbols, styles and forms, valued in their fields of study—without investigating the implications of disciplinary rhetoric for its creators and

audiences. According to Norgaard, in order to achieve the ambitious ends of a rhetorical education responsive to the discursive needs of our nation (world?), we must “rhetorize WAC” by which he means we “must approach disciplinary expertise, curricular structures, and prevailing institutional arrangements in explicitly rhetorical terms” (156). In other words, students should not learn the rhetoric of their disciplines without engaging the rhetorical exigencies of which they are a part.

In this essay, I will use my experience working as a writing consultant in the Biological Science Department to explore the problems and possibilities of using Writing Across the Curriculum initiatives to meet the ends of rhetorical education. My work with a professor, students and TAs in a particular lab course will serve as a case study through which I will develop a richer vision for critical rhetorical education (CRE), illustrating where pedagogical goals in the disciplines intersect with those of CRE and examining the habits, assumptions and disciplinary structures that complicate the potential for CRE across the curriculum. (“Critical” 1-2)

As I read this excerpt now through a revisionary lens, I realize that I built my argument from the outside in—that is, I offered a vision of Writing Across the Curriculum and then critiqued disciplinary habits, assumptions, and structures for “complicating” the potential of my vision. I bought into the idea of an interdisciplinary rhetorical education that would not only teach students to write in the disciplines, but also would encourage them to think critically about the implications of disciplinary rhetoric. Moreover, I claimed it should be the responsibility of compositionists to bring to the teaching of writing across the curriculum a focus on how rhetorical issues influence knowledge and knowledge production in disciplinary communities. I avoided taking a

missionary approach by emphasizing that faculty needn't resist my critiques and suggestions because in order to reach their goals it was in their best interest to follow my advice. This excerpt served as a foundation for the argument I built throughout the paper for fundamental changes in disciplinary structures, conventions, and pedagogies in service of my vision for CRE across the curriculum. Significantly, I positioned myself to develop and employ a critique of the students and teachers I worked with in the biology department in support of my argument for critical rhetorical education.

The way I framed my case in this excerpt illuminates my (perhaps unconscious) sense, at the time, of what it meant to participate in CCL discourse. More specifically, I presumed that in order to contribute meaningfully to professional conversations about cross-curricular literacy work I needed to offer: 1) a large-scale vision of what WAC should be; 2) an explanation as to why the vision had not yet been realized; 3) a plan for what compositionists should do to remove obstacles and achieve the vision; and 4) a response to potential accusations that my vision reproduced missionary approaches to CCL work. In accordance with this narrative structure, I developed an argument that WAC should become a vehicle for CRE, claiming that WAC didn't yet serve this function because critical, rhetorical elements were missing from current methods of teaching and learning writing in the disciplines. Compositionists should convince disciplinary faculty to change their pedagogies, I insisted, and push for institutions to change their approach to postsecondary education. Finally, in order to avoid behaving like a missionary, I argued that changing faculty to achieve my vision of education wasn't a matter of conversion because CRE actually would serve disciplinary and institutional goals.

In the remainder of this chapter I investigate the forces that led me to construct my argument according to this particular narrative structure. I suggest that assumptions about change are embedded in and perpetuated by this pattern of argument, which is quite common in CCL literature and scholarship. In addition, I examine how overlapping contexts and my understanding of the rhetorical situation in which I was writing shaped the decisions I made about how to represent my work in the biology department.

Putting Ideas and Experiences Together

Looking back, it's clear that a range of intersecting forces shaped my assumptions about how to construct an argument for WAC as a vehicle for CRE. Throughout the semester, I was searching for a way to connect the ideas from English 986 and my exam research that resonated with me with my experiences doing CCL work in the biology department. Because of the way I was thinking about and working toward change in these three contexts, and because I had been immersed in versions of change forwarded in CCL discourse, I turned to a common narrative pattern as a template for my argument. While I certainly take responsibility for crafting my argument, at the time I didn't think consciously about the forces shaping the choices I made. It felt "natural" to present my argument the way I did, which suggests I had internalized, at least to some degree, common assumptions about change and the discursive patterns in which they operated. Interestingly, it not was not until I tried to write a formal manuscript for which I envisioned a professional audience that I felt drawn to this particular narrative structure.

Playing with the same ideas in a different context led to different results. For example, as I developed questions for the "exam" through which I would achieve

candidacy and carve out my professional identity in the field, I considered the possible connection between ideas of Difference, rhetorical education and my experiences in the biology department as fodder for inquiry. In a note to my chair attached to a draft of my booklists, I wrote:

What is attractive to me about [teaching rhetorically] is that it is the kind of education that cannot happen in 15 weeks in the composition classroom. I am wondering how WAC can teach teachers to teach rhetorically while also teaching them how to teach rhetoric ... which they were already doing, better.

Interestingly, Petraglia and Bahri, in an attempt to explain the absences in their collection, call for work that develops conversations around rhetoric education and “the rhetoric of science, and the rhetoric of race, difference, diversity, and so on. . .” (10). In some ways, that is what I want my lists to help me do—to develop a working definition of CRE in a way that raises some of these questions/problems I have with the way it is being conceived by others, and to take up issues of rhetoric(al) education across disciplines and issues of Difference and diversity that collections like theirs fail to address. (“Letter”)

In the context of developing my reading lists and composing questions to guide my dissertation research, I “wonder[ed],” found potential arguments or connections “interesting,” and “attractive,” sought to develop “working definitions,” “raise questions/problems,” “take up issues,” and provisionally proposed what I might want to do “in some ways.” I was experimental, I tried on ideas, made observations, posed questions.

In contrast, in the context of the seminar paper that I intended for publication, I made claims and presented critique in order to advocate for revolutionary change. The difference, I imagine as I look back now, had to do with my understanding of these contexts and my sense of purpose in each one. The process of composing booklists and questions to guide my dissertation project felt exploratory and inquiry-driven, while drafting an article for an education journal felt like a performance according to which I would be accepted or rejected from the professional academic community I was trying to enter. Each circumstance led me to interpret my experience in BIOS 207 differently in relation to my commitments to CRE. Looking back now, I am troubled by my decision to use critique in the journal article as the main lens for representing my time in the biology department. Taking a revisionary stance to the text allows me to examine more carefully the factors that influenced my decision.

Internalizing the Pattern

My understanding of what constituted a worthy performance as a newcomer to the discourse undoubtedly was shaped by the WAC/WID texts I was reading at the time. For example, I had just read LeCourt's argument for a critical model of WAC and Harriet Malinowitz's feminist critique of writing in the disciplines, each of which offered a version of the structured argument I tried to reproduce in my seminar paper. Both scholars argue for visions of WAC that encompass revolutionary goals. They critique disciplinary writing pedagogies that thwart those goals and advocate for changes in disciplinary teachers, students, pedagogies, and curriculum in order to achieve more critical ends.

LeCourt's argument exemplifies the chain of logic I identified above, common in CCL discourse. To begin, her critical model represents a revolutionary vision for WAC. She supports her argument by critiquing oppressive ways of teaching writing in the disciplines, claiming, for example, that teaching students to accommodate disciplinary conventions reinforces disciplines as technologies of power. Compositionists can embrace the critical model, she maintains, by convincing disciplinary faculty to respect and seek out student knowledge, experience, and authority rooted in non-disciplinary contexts. That is, faculty, students, assignments, and pedagogies in the disciplines must change in order to achieve a critical vision for WAC. LeCourt addresses accusations that her argument could sponsor missionary relationships by asserting that the critical approach to WAC would fulfill faculty's goals for student writers/writing.

Similarly, Malinowitz forwards a new vision for Writing Across the Curriculum rooted in critical, revolutionary objectives, offering women's studies as "an alternative model on which WAC can define and construct itself" (294). Like LeCourt, she criticizes writing in the disciplines for lacking a critical element:

Yet as WID now exists, it doesn't help students critically assess how forms of knowledge and method are hierarchically structured in disciplines so that some achieve canonical or hegemonic status while others are effectively fenced out. In the absence of such a critical framework, students are easily beguiled by the mystique of dominant knowledge systems, which are bolstered by and in turn legitimate asymmetrical social, material, and ideological arrangements. (293)

In order to disrupt disciplinary hegemonies, Malinowitz continues, compositionists need to convince faculty in the disciplines to change the way they structure their courses and

interact with students so that systematic critique becomes integral to teaching and learning.

Also like LeCourt, Malinowitz admits that her vision for WAC “will necessitate vast curricular change and will not endear [compositionists] to their departmental hosts” (310). Whereas LeCourt de-emphasizes the resistance, Malinowitz embraces it, arguing that potential proponents should reflect on their interests, goals, and values before deciding if it is worth the risk to work toward revolutionary change in the truest sense.

In the first excerpt from my seminar paper, I reproduced the pattern LeCourt and Malinowitz demonstrate. I offered a new vision of WAC rooted in revolutionary goals; critiqued current disciplinary structures; provided strategies for compositionists to change those structures; and addressed potential accusations that I could be forwarding a missionary agenda. Undoubtedly, LeCourt and Malinowitz shaped my sense of the moves I needed to make to contribute meaningfully to the discourse. They influenced the connections I made between ideas for WAC and my experiences in the biology department.

As I explain in the following section, embedded in this pattern are assumptions about who or what should change, how, and for what purposes through CCL initiatives. I argue that by unconsciously appropriating the narrative structure, I reproduced visions of change that were limiting in terms of the kinds of relationships they enabled and constrained and did not necessarily represent the complex ways change functioned for Ethan and me.

Representing Change

In the following excerpt from my seminar paper, I continue my critique of the biology department, focusing on the failure of biology faculty to teach writing so as to uphold my vision for WAC and achieve their own learning goals for students. As the excerpt demonstrates, in adhering to the popular narrative patterns in CCL discourse, I unconsciously assumed that change should be revolutionary, inherently good, focused outwardly on disciplinary faculty, students, curriculum, pedagogies, discourses, et cetera, and one-directional. Taking a revisionary stance, I tease out these assumptions, consider their relationship to the form my argument takes in the seminar paper, and reflect on how fully my text represents the rich, complicated ways change operated in my actual experiences in the biology department.

While instructors in 207 were certainly teaching rhetoric—helping their students learn to make appropriate scientific arguments according to audience, purpose and context—they were not teaching rhetorically. Students and teachers never investigated the way the rhetorical conventions they were learning implied certain ways of being and knowing in the world. They never explored the implications of scientific writing for them as students, for professors, [or] for the world outside their classroom walls, investigations particularly essential in scientific study considering “the role of scientific forms of writing and forms of scientific expression in both fostering genred and racialized knowledge and in favoring particular kinds of participation and participants” (Bazerman et al. 79). That is, due to the epistemological and pedagogical structures of the discipline in addition to instructors’ often vague understanding of the ways they themselves learned to write in their field, teachers of BIOS 207 were not incorporating

critical rhetorical education into their curriculum despite the similarities between the principles of CRE and their pedagogical goals for biology students. (“Critical” 6)

This excerpt is representative of the critique of the biology department I built throughout the seminar paper. Once again, I pursued a particular chain of logic popular in WAC literature and scholarship. By distinguishing between teaching rhetoric and teaching rhetorically, I reproduced the dichotomy between accommodationist approaches to WID that teach students how to appropriate disciplinary discourses versus critical models that disparage such tactics for failing to identify and challenge “certain ways of being and knowing in the world” forwarded in the disciplines. I cited Bazerman, an established, respected WAC/WID scholar with a particular expertise in studying scientific discourse, in order to support my implicit claim that forms of writing and expression in science are particularly dangerous and demand critical attitudes toward CCL work. I valued “teaching rhetorically” over “teaching rhetoric” and condemned biology faculty and instructors for not making the kinds of pedagogical changes my vision for WAC and their goals for students demanded. Like LeCourt, I urged disciplinary teachers to conduct and assign critical rhetorical investigations so that students might recognize the oppressive nature of scientific discourse.

This narrative pattern is based on and perpetuates certain assumptions about change. Most obviously, the move to critique disciplinary teachers, pedagogies, discourses, and “ways of knowing,” embraces outwardly focused, one-directional change. I focused on providing evidence for my critique, citing Bazerman for example, rather than reflecting on the criteria on which those criticisms were based. I assumed the changes I proposed were inherently good because they seemed to coincide with current

visions of CCL work forwarded in the discourse and because I believed they were commensurate with what biology faculty wanted for students in their discipline. But as I look again at my attempt to illuminate the connections between the objectives of faculty and critical models, I wonder how well I really understood what faculty wanted. Earlier in the paper, I wrote:

According to the professor, the “labs were designed to teach the process of science,” the most challenging parts tending to be “the twin tasks of analysis and writing.” The professor and TAs emphasized “critical thinking and problem-solving” skills as important learning goals and hoped that students would leave the lab experience able to “think critically and creatively about concepts.”

According to the professor, ultimately, students in BIOS 207 “should be able to look at their data, abstract the relevant parts from the statistical noise, communicate that in biological words, and then abstract that particular result to the greater theories and issues in the discipline.” (“Critical” 3)

In other words, I claimed that Ethan’s “expression of the skills and sensibilities [he] want[ed] students to develop in BIOS 207 convey[ed] a pedagogical vision very much in line with the goals of CRE” without articulating exactly *how* (“Critical” 4). I could have interpreted Ethan’s objectives as indicative of a traditional approach to writing in the disciplines in which students learn how to think and write like scientists without necessarily critiquing disciplinary discourses or power dynamics. However, recent CCL literature and scholarship clearly resists both traditional approaches to WID and missionary models that dismiss faculty objectives even when (especially when) they conflict with those of compositionists. Therefore, in an attempt to align myself with the

revolutionary purposes of WAC as I understood them and to avoid accusations of forwarding a missionary agenda, I chose to construe Ethan's emphasis on critical thinking and student contribution to the discipline as critical aims in line with my own.

"Moreover," I continued in the paper, "the professor's motivation to invite me to participate in planning and teaching the lab sections speaks to his understanding of the significance of writing in the rhetorical work of science" ("Critical" 4). Put another way, I presented Ethan's participation in the project as evidence that his vision for writing in his courses and the discipline merged with the philosophy and values of the WAC movement when, as I argued earlier in this chapter, disciplinary faculty and compositionists quite often hold conflicting interpretations of the purposes of writing across the curriculum. Ultimately, to use Krista Ratcliffe's words, I searched Ethan's goals *for* intent so I could make them appear to fit with and corroborate my vision for change in the biology department rather than interpreting them *with* intent, that is with the intent to understand Ethan's purpose(s) and examine my own (205).

According to the logic of my argument, once I established that faculty (whether they realized it or not) really valued the same things I did when teaching students to write in their discipline, I was justified in examining how and why they needed to change in order to achieve "our" vision. I defined criteria for change and focused it outward, on disciplinary faculty and curriculum, as well as on "epistemological and pedagogical structures of the discipline," since they represented obstacles to achieving the goal I'd determined. Furthermore, because I was satisfied with the inherent goodness of the end goal, I didn't feel obligated to reflect on my objectives or my role as change agent. I was content with the notion that change should move in one direction: I articulate what needs

to change and biology faculty comply. The implications of this version of change for my relationship with Ethan are problematic because they suggest a stringency that belies the fluid, flexible, collaborative acts of negotiation that characterize the most productive cross-curricular literacy interactions.

In sum, by revisiting my seminar paper through a revisionary lens, I've identified common narrative patterns in CCL scholarship that are rooted in assumptions about change and can lead to problematic relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines. Because these scripts remain pervasive yet unexamined, unproductive approaches to change become internalized and perpetuated in CCL discourse and practice even when they don't capture the messy reality of cross-curricular literacy work. In the next section, I look more closely at my work with Ethan in order to make visible the complexity of negotiating change through day-to-day interactions.

Drawing on interview transcripts, I point out that while our grappling with change was more complicated than I originally represented in my seminar paper, common assumptions about change still influenced our relationship in significant ways. By better representing such nuanced, multifaceted exchanges, I argue, compositionists can put productive pressure on the narrative structures through which we describe and define our work. Interrogating these common patterns can reveal the ways they emerge from and reinforce problematic assumptions about change. Through this process, compositionists might begin to think differently about where, how, and why change occurs through CCL efforts.

Capturing the Complexity of Change

When I reflect on my seminar paper in relation to my experience in the biology department, I am struck by my tendency to smooth over the complexities of how change functioned in my relationship with Ethan. Despite my efforts to paint the department as a fortress of rigid structures that resisted change and faculty as unreflective and incapable of articulating or achieving meaningful goals for students, change *did* occur. In what follows, I examine what Kalamaras calls the “tenuous” moments of change that took place during my work with Ethan. Because change in these moments doesn’t necessarily fit with common notions of change I’ve identified in CCL discourse, it was easy for me to focus “on the problematic dimension of the tenuousness rather than its significance” (Kalamaras 10). By recognizing the potential in these moments for bi-directional, multifaceted change, I challenge current versions of change (like those embraced through critical models of CCL work) that focus outwardly on others and generate new possibilities for what change might look like in CCL contexts. I value the unique changes that actually took place in my experience with Ethan and consider how embracing those changes might have impacted our relationship.

(Re)seeing Change

The act of incorporating writing workshops into lab sections of BIOS 207 was a substantial change I took for granted in my critique of Ethan and his colleagues. The course was a requirement for majors in biological science, which means alterations to the course had the potential to change department curriculum permanently. In addition, Ethan cut or pared down several lab experiments in order to make room for the workshops and

give students time to draft, peer review, and revise their reports. TAs glossed articles with their students, modeled workshops, responded extensively to drafts, and even shared excerpts from their own writing in progress, constituting a significant change in lab pedagogy.

Just as disciplinary structures were not as inflexible as I suggested, Ethan's approach to change was much more complicated than I made it out to be. Though in my seminar paper I attributed to teachers little more than a vague sense of how they learned to become writers in the discipline, Ethan actually demonstrated a deep awareness of his writerly development and often reflected on his experiences as a teacher and learner as he made decisions about how to incorporate writing into the course. For example, in a discussion about how to describe the audience of student lab reports in BIOS 207, Ethan drew on his own experience as a writer. As we considered whether to give students an outline explaining reader expectations for each section of the report or to encourage students to imagine audience characteristics for themselves, Ethan made a case for the outline by recalling a faculty grant writing workshop he'd attended recently. The facilitator gave participants a handout outlining what readers expect in each paragraph of a proposal, which Ethan found invaluable as a writer new to the genre. He described his experience like this:

One of the things I've found really useful Yeah, here is the outline for an NSF grant proposal. This to me is a genre shift. Partly because I did my graduate work in Canada and then came back to the US, I wrote fewer grants, fewer to no grants, basically, compared to graduate students who are trained here, who often write a grant proposal at the end of their graduate work to try to get a couple of additional

years of funding. So I really knew nothing of this [genre]. It's radically different in structure from a journal article which I hadn't really realized until I went to this seminar and [the facilitator] gave this outline ... these are not the hard and fast rules but here is what people are expecting. Here is a formula that works.

(Personal Interview)

As his comments show, not only did Ethan remember how useful he found the detailed outline as a writer, but he made insightful connections between what he was asked to do as a novice grant writer and what he asked students to do when assigning lab reports in his course. He mused about the challenges of genre shifting and his need for others more familiar with the rhetorical situation of grant writing to explain audience expectations.

In addition to demonstrating his self-awareness as a writer and teacher, Ethan's reflective approach to decision-making challenges me to contextualize my approach to teaching writing in his discipline and motivates me to think differently about how we both were positioned in terms of change. I didn't just offer a strategy or technique that Ethan could either accept or reject. Rather, he worked hard to situate my ideas in the context of his discipline, department, classroom, and particular group of students. Ethan often thought out loud, vocalizing his process of reflection and deliberation, which allowed me to see my ideas from his perspective. Consequently, as the following conversation illustrates, we were able to consider, develop, and revise teaching materials and lesson plans collaboratively. When we listened to one another, I realize now, we opened ourselves up to change and to be changed.

Sandy: I liked your idea too of having a description of the audience somewhere on there, trying really hard to, even though this is an outline, make it sort of—

keep it rhetorical. You know, like this is why you need to write ... because your audience is going to be wondering ... this, this, and this.

Ethan: Yes. No, that's a good point because that's what comes across. [The grant writing workshop facilitator] spends like 4 hours in the seminar on exactly that—says your audience is a bunch of people who don't want to read this; they were assigned to read this; they are reading it because they have to read it.

Whereas like a research proposal—or sorry a research paper—you choose to read, you are flipping through a journal and you say, “Oh, this looks interesting!” and you choose to read it. Grant proposals are assigned to reviewers so it's a tougher audience ... very focused on audience. That's not reflected in the outline [we have for students]. And we would need to put that same audience emphasis. I think you are right; I think a little statement about audience on there, but also maybe including a little presentation from the TAs

Sandy: Yeah, or it could be as quick as—This semester ... part of the first writing workshop was to say, “What are the rules of science that you know?” and we put those on the board, and we sort of complicated those and saw which ones conflicted and things like that—rules of writing in science, you know? And I am wondering if we could adapt that to this [new idea we have]. So talk some about who the audience for the lab reports is going to be throughout the semester and then say, “OK, based on what you know about lab reports, what do you think this audience would need to know in an introduction?” And just have a brief discussion where [students] can sort of throw out their ideas, keeping it audience-based and then give them—[which] I think is something we thought about doing

this time, right, having them think through it, right, and then giving them the outline.

Ethan: What you're saying is not—what we were trying to get them to do was come up with this outline by brainstorming, and I think what I'm reading now is ... to get to this [outline] [students] actually need to think about the audience first. Let's have them brainstorm about audience and then say, "Here's an effective tool that we think communicates that." It's—I'm really asking them to do two steps at once by having them try to come up with this and they're finding it frustrating
(Personal Interview)

Using Ethan's experience as a springboard, in the above exchange we talked about different options for helping students think rhetorically about what kinds of information typically is included in each section of a lab report. As my comments in the conversation suggest, I began to understand why Ethan was so determined to give students an outline, a desire I previously had interpreted as too heavy-handed and overt. I ended up validating his experience while still emphasizing audience and keeping the outline focused on the rhetorical. Ethan incorporated my suggestion into his own experiential framework as a workshop participant and corroborated the importance of a sense of audience based on his own developmental process.

As a result of our willingness to listen to each other, collaborate, and change, neither Ethan nor I completely abandoned our vision of what sort of guidelines to offer students. Rather, we put our commitments in conversation and negotiated an activity we hoped would be relevant and meaningful for students in our particular context.

Ultimately, classroom practice in Ethan's course changed, but the change was negotiated

collaboratively rather than forced. Moreover, we maintained a revisionary spirit that kept us open to future changes as evidenced by Ethan's conclusion: "I think it could work. I feel like it's an experiment. Next year we should try this and see if it works better than what we did this year, and then maybe we want to try it again" (Personal Interview).

The narrative pattern I appropriated in my seminar paper did not allow for this nuanced depiction of change. I painted my argument in broad strokes, forwarding a revolutionary vision of CRE and critiquing disciplinary structures and faculty habits of mind. The birds-eye view presented a clear picture and a smooth chain of logic, the result of which was the perpetuation of problematic assumptions about change. On the contrary, here I offer a magnifying glass, zooming in to see the grains and gaps in material relationships. Seen up close, change becomes more complicated but also more exciting and generative. Importantly, as I show in the following section, the magnifying lens is reflective, giving compositionists an opportunity to examine our place in the process of change.

Multi-Directional Change

As I've demonstrated, my critique in the seminar paper of Ethan, his department, and the discipline failed to capture their depth, complexity, and openness to change. Similarly, my critical ethos obscured the different ways I wrestled with change myself. While I certainly was subject to and negotiated change more complexly than my seminar paper suggests, looking more closely at my experience does reveal the presence of common assumptions about change that influenced my relationship with Ethan.

Working with Ethan face-to-face over time, I experienced differences between our disciplines, values, and pedagogical frameworks and had to develop ways of responding to the resulting conflicts. Often the changes I made were strategic; I became more rhetorically savvy, for example, in my effort to help establish a writing component in Ethan's course. After reviewing the writing workshops and handouts I initially drafted for use by TAs and students, Ethan invited me to his office for a discussion about language. He took issue with words such as "experience," "like," and "value" that I had used to frame guidelines for peer response. The TAs didn't like using "workshop" as a verb and considered the word "glossing" to be jargon. Scientists want to think they are after the truth and are being logical and objective, Ethan explained, so my language was just too subjective and experientially based. We needed to find a way to implement the ideas behind the workshop so they would work in the context of a biology course.

Through this experience and others, I quickly realized that I couldn't force change on Ethan, his TAs or his students, but discovered that he would consider adopting or adapting my ideas if I offered them as suggestions in an environment of collaborative negotiation. While this certainly embraces a more realistic, process-oriented view of change, it does little to challenge the underlying assumptions I've worked to deconstruct throughout this chapter. Like Waldo, I was willing to revise my *approach* without consciously reflecting on the visions of change toward which I was working.

Moreover, my tendency to perceive Ethan's process of considering and adapting my suggestions as steps toward the change I desired indicates I was operating under the assumption that my vision was the right one (inherently good). I embraced outwardly focused, one-directional change when I assumed it was Ethan who needed to be

transformed. I was prepared to respect the process as long as it was moving toward the end I had in mind. However, as I will explore more fully in the next chapter, when it seemed as though Ethan and other faculty members' processes of change stalled or diverged from my objectives, I quickly became frustrated with our lack of progress. In short, while my approach to change was more nuanced and complex in actual day-to-day interactions with Ethan than I suggest in my seminar paper, common assumptions about change did impact our relationship and limit how we engaged in and assessed our work together.

Still, my realization of the need to change my approach is important because it deepened my understanding of our differences and invited dialogue about our goals for students. As Ethan and I negotiated revisions to the workshop language, I began to understand that these semantic issues were indicative of larger epistemological and ideological differences between our disciplines. Through our deliberations, we began to better articulate our goals for our work together. In the end, we named the first workshop "Glossing," even though it potentially sounded like jargon, because Ethan agreed that the word named a process significantly different from summarizing or paraphrasing, one that was important in helping students read like writers.

Re-visioning my experience with Ethan illuminates the complex role change played in our relationship. Each of us inspired and undertook change in nuanced ways, according to our particular situation. Yet when I tried to make our experience public in the form of a journal article, I appropriated discursive structures that didn't adequately capture the way change functioned for us. I was not reflexive in the way I embraced change in practice nor the way I represented it in writing.

Change as Process and Potential

According to Kalamaras, what is most important when it comes to affecting change through CCL efforts is how consultants negotiate “dissonant perceptions” (like the ones I experienced when working with Ethan and in revisiting my seminar paper) in order to develop meaningful approaches to our work. He calls for more examples in the literature of

the inner dialogue a consultant might experience as she finds herself negotiating her own ideology with that of teachers in other disciplines, particularly when her ideology conflicts with theirs, and perhaps more significantly—and ironically—when it encounters the consequences of its own practice. (Kalamaras 11)

Taking a revisionary approach to my seminar paper has enabled me to make visible for myself and others the inner dialogue Kalamaras describes. By making revisionary investigations like these part of CCL discourse, compositionists can disrupt narrative patterns in literature and scholarship that have become internalized, normalized, and thus invisible. In doing so, we flesh out our assumptions about change and hold them up for examination, asking how they might enable or constrain meaningful CCL relationships.

Like Kalamaras, I don’t believe compositionists need to abandon the ideological commitments grounding our visions of change. I do not advocate dismissing our goals for change or the ideologies that inform them. Rather, I encourage compositionists to “make them more complex by including an apparatus for self-critique that, in effect, deepens the dialogic” (Kalamaras 12). In this way, “the tenuousness of change can indeed become generative” for “it is the inner dialogue between a consultant’s perception

of an institution's constraints and her own ideology where institutional change begins" (12). Compositionists should not get bogged down in this "inner dialogue" of self-critique or stop advocating for meaningful lasting change, both localized and revolutionary. But we should try to "value *potential* change, rooted in the interplay of apparent contradictions as a generative chaos" (Kalamaras 10). Toward that end, in this chapter, I embraced the "tenuousness of change" (12). Doing so has made visible, I hope, the chaos that so often characterizes the most exciting CCL initiatives, framing it as a generative force that can inspire discursive and material re-visioning of how we understand and work toward change.

Dominant narrative patterns in CCL discourse and scholarship frame change as revolutionary and outwardly focused on disciplinary teachers and students. When we assume our large-scale goals for WAC efforts inherently represent progress and change for the better, compositionists have no reason to consider changing ourselves or adjusting our visions for cross-curricular literacy work. But as I've shown, this version of change does not capture fully the creative ways project participants negotiate change, nor does it recognize meaningful changes that can be small and incremental. Striving for this kind of change can lead to unreflective critique that limits possibilities for individual projects and stifles relationships among participants.

Alternatively, by capturing the nuances of change as it functions in the day-to-day interactions of CCL work, we can begin to construct new representations of change and revise how it functions in discourse and practice. When compositionists and disciplinary faculty recognize the potentiality and accept the usefully chaotic nature of change, it becomes a multi-faceted, multi-directional, collaborative activity. Undertaken in this

way, change sponsors pedagogical relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines.

Along with negotiated expertise, multi-directional, multi-faceted change is part of revisionary pedagogy for cross-curricular literacy work. I continue to conceptualize revisionary pedagogy in Chapter 4 by investigating the forces that shape how compositionists and disciplinary faculty define and pursue particular outcomes through CCL efforts.

Chapter Four

(Re)Considering Outcomes of Cross-Curricular Literacy Work

Articulating and perusing particular outcomes for cross-curricular literacy initiatives is a complicated endeavor. The outcomes projected onto (and sometimes demanded of) CCL efforts often conflict according to the needs and expectations of multiple stakeholders. For example, faculty and students tend to focus on the outcomes of teaching and learning, while administrators emphasize accountability:

as we move up the hierarchy, further away from the classroom, evaluation gradually but inexorably turns into accountability—into the ability to document a program’s effectiveness, to lay out the benefits it offers to different stakeholders, and to justify a program’s existence or continued growth. (Condon 31)

As William Condon explains, those involved in CCL work are under constant pressure to develop, engage, and represent outcomes that are responsive to the overlapping interests of others, and the stakes are high as the ability to satisfy multiple stakeholders can determine the fate of cross-curricular literacy projects and programs. Moreover, how compositionists and disciplinary faculty negotiate numerous, overlapping, and conflicting outcomes also has implications for the relationships we cultivate with one another.

In addition to the expectations of physical stakeholders such as faculty, students, and administrators, compositionists developing CCL projects are influenced, though perhaps more implicitly, by outcomes discourse in WAC/WID. That is, the way outcomes function discursively in the language and literature of the field shapes how we engage in and represent cross-curricular literacy work. By becoming more conscious of discursive influences, compositionists and disciplinary faculty can develop more flexible

ways of defining and working toward meaningful outcomes and building more productive relationships.

Toward that end, I examine CCL outcomes discourse in three tiers: 1) on a *national* level in terms of the *WAC movement*; 2) on an *institutional* level in terms of *WAC programs*; and 3) on a *project* level in terms of *individual people* working together to accomplish cross-curricular literacy goals (Table 4.1). While outcomes discourse can take many forms in relation to each level, I've chosen here to focus on particular sites of discourse. On the national level, I consider discourse in the form of books and guides for WAC/WID efforts; I examine programmatic texts such as websites as an example of institutional discourse; and treat project documents such as meeting handouts as sites of outcomes discourse on the project level.

As I will show, the idea of sustainability is central to outcomes discourse and negotiation on all three levels. On a national level, the *WAC movement* seeks to sustain the motivation to improve teaching and learning writing across and throughout postsecondary institutions. *CCL programs* strive to sustain local conversations about writing by obtaining funding, working with other academic programs, and responding to challenges and circumstances unique to their campuses. They work within particular institutional contexts to keep writing visible and make their programs responsive to the needs of local teachers, administrators, and students. Within individual *CCL projects*, sustainability means contending with busy schedules, varied experiences and expertise, and different needs and interests in order to maintain the commitment and enthusiasm of participants and achieve multi-faceted goals for writing in disciplinary classrooms, departments and curricula. The way sustainability operates on any one level shapes the

way outcomes are framed and embraced on the other levels as well, and the chain of influence is not a closed system. On all three levels compositionists and disciplinary faculty must contend with interests and demands of multiple stakeholders including government agencies, administrators, institutional entities, employers, politicians and other community leaders.

Table 4.1 Three Levels of Outcomes Discourse

Levels	Agent of CCL Work	Outcomes	Discourse
National	WAC Movement	Broadly defined, focused on survival of movement	Books and guides for strengthening and sustaining programs; includes examples of how programs negotiate outcomes according to institutional context
Programmatic	WAC Programs	Locally negotiated based on institutional needs and resources	Websites, mission statements, programmatic documents, stories of negotiating outcomes; part of national discourse and influences project outcomes
Project	Individual Participants	Shaped by overlapping outcomes defined by various stakeholders	Project descriptions, progress reports, conference/workshop presentations, “practical documents” including handouts, emails, etc.; may become part of programmatic discourse, but rarely described in national discourse

For the purposes of this chapter, it is important to note that on a project level, individual participants are influenced by national discourse (in the form of guides for strengthening programs and forums like the WAC listserv) as well as programmatic discourse (in the form of websites, mission statements and other programmatic documents). These discourses often reinforce one another, but they also can conflict, forcing project participants to grapple with overlapping outcomes and visions of sustainability. National and programmatic discourses, along with other external forces, significantly impact outcomes negotiation, but ultimately compositionists and disciplinary faculty continually must determine and assess specific project outcomes through their daily interactions. That is, cross-curricular literacy project outcomes are developed in relationship.

However, CCL discourse and scholarship offers few examples of what day-to-day outcomes negotiation looks like among project participants. Consequently, compositionists may not attend as carefully to the range of forces—including national and programmatic discourses of sustainability—that influence project outcomes. They may approach projects with visions for outcomes that conflict with faculty expectations or aren't fully responsive to local circumstances. The result can be misunderstandings among project participants about their roles and responsibilities and ultimately strained relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. Further, because compositionists tend not to write reflexively about outcomes negotiation on the project level, their stories don't become part of programmatic or national discourse, perpetuating the lack of attention to the ways outcomes function among project participants.

Revising how outcomes operate in national and programmatic CCL discourse, I maintain, usefully can complicate how project outcomes are determined and pursued. I urge project participants to be more reflexive when negotiating intersecting outcomes and defining and working toward sustainability so that explicit identification of the origins and implications of outcomes expectations can become part of CCL discourse on all levels. In an attempt to do just that, in this chapter I take a revisionary stance toward a text I created as part of my CCL project in the biology department. I examine the complicated forces and discourses that overlapped to shape how outcomes functioned in and through my relationship with biology faculty. In particular, I explore how different notions of sustainability influenced how we determined and assessed project outcomes. It is my hope that broadening CCL discourse on all levels to include conscious, reflexive negotiations of project outcomes eventually will shift how we think about and participate in CCL relationships. Before re-visioning my experience in the biology department, I take a closer look at outcomes discourse on national, programmatic, and project levels.

Survival of the WAC Movement: National Outcomes Discourse

In broad terms, discourse regarding the outcomes of cross-curricular literacy work is concerned with the survival of the WAC movement so that writing remains integral to postsecondary education. Therefore, in order to understand the shape and function of national CCL outcomes discourse, it is necessary to examine certain characteristics of the national Writing Across the Curriculum movement. In “The Future of WAC,” Barbara Walvoord uses research on “social movement organizations” as a frame for considering long term planning for writing across the curriculum. While she admits that WAC is

different from the women's or civil rights movements, "its change agenda and its collective nature" make it worth studying as a type of movement (59). Walvoord's frame is useful for thinking about how and why outcomes are conceptualized on national, institutional, and project levels. In particular, interpreting WAC within the "movement" frame illuminates certain conditions that set the stage for the discourse of sustainability so prominent, if understated, in WAC literature and scholarship.

First, WAC emerged as a decentralized movement without a unified national agenda. As Walvoord explains, to understand the reason for this lack, it is important to note that unlike many traditional movements, WAC was not sparked by a "flare of rebellion against a defined oppressor" but instead defined itself by "a quiet and local flowering" of initiatives (61). Instead of striving to become a national organization with a well-articulated, unified agenda, WAC extended its reach "by the springing up of campus WAC programs" (61).

At the same time, like the interdisciplinary writing movements that came before it, WAC was born in response to calls for greater access to the university and thus faced, in its infancy, tough questions about the purpose and means of education (Walvoord 61). Due to decentralization, from the beginning, questions about "equality, literacy, democracy, diversity, knowledge, power, and liberation," have been addressed within the institutional contexts of local programs (61). While there could have been (and still might be) benefits to articulating common goals for CCL work, because WAC programs developed as distinct arms of a decentralized movement, they tend to explore "a plethora of goals and philosophies," and enjoy, in place of a unified agenda, "strong local ownership and the flexibility to work for local change" (Walvoord 62).

Like many grass-roots movements, WAC focused on individual and behavioral rather than structural change; and since it is difficult to identify assessment mechanisms that demonstrate a direct relationship between cross-disciplinary writing strategies and student learning, WAC programs focused on changing the behavior and attitudes of faculty members. High levels of faculty autonomy, a general devaluing of writing instruction by many department heads and university administrators, and a dearth of resources for CCL work forced an emphasis on intrinsic rewards rather than extrinsic compensation as motivation for change. As Walvoord points out, the lack of an extrinsic reward system meant there was no need to define what kinds of behaviors were worthy of reward, so “successful” outcomes were never articulated explicitly (64). Because the work of WAC took place in local programmatic contexts, and because there existed no exigency for identifying the parameters of success, “the goals and outcomes of WAC [as a movement] could remain vague” (64).

Beginning in the 1970s, the need to focus on writing instruction across the curriculum led to the establishment of WAC programs across the country. However, despite the freedom and flexibility afforded to programs by the decentralization of the movement un-tethered to a national organization, over time local programs often found themselves in danger of extinction. They constantly were “vulnerable to cooptation, becoming special interest groups, settling for narrow goals and limited visions, or simply being wiped out in the next budget crunch or the next change of deans” (Walvoord 62). Because the survival of the movement depends on the flourishing of programmatic initiatives that often struggle to exist, national discourse focuses on making programs sustainable. The need to help programs remain institutionally visible and viable has been

ingrained in CCL discourse for so long it often remains invisible. The sustainability discourse is worth acknowledging, however, because it influences how programs imagine and pursue outcomes for CCL efforts.

Sustainability is a rather vague term, the exact meaning of which is defined by individual programs according to institutional context. In general though, programmatic sustainability requires the maintenance of a visible, active, well-funded campus presence dedicated to conversations and initiatives related to teaching and learning writing across disciplines. Sustainability could mean a fully established, independent WAC program with a director who reports right to the dean, or it could take the form of an interdisciplinary body of energized faculty meeting for regular brownbag discussions about cross-curricular literacy issues. While individual programs must determine the best way to achieve sustainability according to institutional circumstances, to be sustainable, all programs must contend with outcomes imposed upon them from a variety of sources including institutions, administrators and even politicians.

In response to this need, WAC literature expounds with guides for nourishing, maintaining, and/or reviving new or struggling programs. Collections like McLeod's *Strengthening Programs for Writing Across the Curriculum* (1988) and the more recent *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs* (2001), contribute to the national sustainability discourse by addressing issues of funding, assessment, recruitment, and other challenges of accomplishing overlapping and sometimes conflicting outcomes. In this vein, WAC literature emphasizes the importance of successfully navigating multiple outcomes if programs want to maintain institutional viability.

In “Continuing Funding, Coping with Less” (included in McLeod’s *Strengthening*), for example, Keith A. Tandy warns WAC directors that “we had better recognize early on that strong traditions and forces around us are automatically engaged against the longevity of our programs” (55). He goes on to explain that private and government funding agencies usually award “seed money” to “grant-worthy” programs with the expectation that institutions will “absorb successful programs into their ongoing funding” (56). Tandy points out that many programs must achieve outcomes that make them worthy of start-up funds from soft money sources, as well as outcomes that make them successful according to institutional criteria. They must appear established with a record of proven accomplishments, while attending to “the tradition among both academic administrators and funding agencies of wanting something new roughly every twenty-four months” (55). Tandy goes on to offer program directors strategies for negotiating these different expectations in order to earn continuous funding and achieve sustainability. Like Tandy’s piece, much WAC literature recommends ways of navigating the countless forces pressuring CCL outcomes. However, it is up to local programs to decide what will sustain their initiatives given particular institutional contexts.

In short, decentralization is essential to the survival of the WAC movement. In keeping WAC from becoming a monolithic force governing from above, it has enabled programs to negotiate their existence strategically in all kinds of environments. At the same time, the lack of a centralized movement invested with the power and influence that might come from a shared outcomes agenda has left local programs even more vulnerable to the forces (such as the de-valuing of writing and writing instruction by institutions, administrators, and disciplinary faculty) that challenge their survival. Emergent from this

unique tension, the discourse of sustainability that infuses CCL literature and scholarship includes examples of how individual programs creatively take up the discourse and make it their own. Thus, the national outcomes discourse emphasizes sustainability but leaves it to programs to work out the details.

Programmatic Sustainability: Institutional Outcomes Discourse

As evidenced in CCL literature, WAC programs of all shapes and sizes work within the sustainability discourse to define for themselves programmatic outcomes that allow them to survive and prosper in their unique local contexts. At St. Norbert College, for example, John Pennington and Robert Boyer describe a WAC program that “situates writing as a moral and civic responsibility” and remains visible and viable by complementing the university’s “mission to provide for a values-centered curriculum” (87). Pennington and Boyer provide a careful description and institutional history of their “Catholic, liberal arts college of 2000 students in Wisconsin” before describing how they fused the moral and civic outcomes of WAC with those of their particular institution. Having “situated WAC firmly within the college’s identity,” they proclaim, “the college now pays attention to WAC because it defines who and what we are” (97). The two urge other programs to consider framing WAC as a moral and civic duty, adding that “programs should be based on reflective strategies that provide a sound foundation for writing that is integral to the mission of any institution of higher learning” (Pennington and Boyer 98). Their article is a perfect example of how programs think reflexively about sustainability as they negotiate context-specific outcomes that fit the needs of their particular program, students, and institution.

In his article, “Inquiry as a Non-Invasive Approach to Cross-Curricular Writing Consultancy,” Mark Waldo demonstrates how his program took a different approach to remaining sustainable according to institutional circumstances. He describes how writing consultants at the University of Nevada, Reno, took an inquiry-based approach to CCL work, linking writing to the disciplines “in order to end the marginalization of writing and make it a part of the fabric of all majors” (6). For Waldo, survival of WAC on his campus and throughout the nation requires sparking and sustaining “the active learning and commitment of faculty who sense the process of change is coming from within them, not without them” (10). He goes on to explain the process of consulting through inquiry used at UNR to sustain faculty investment in WAC and insure the sustainability of the program. According to surveys designed to document outcomes, the program is a success. Faculty at UNR assign more writing and report student improvement between lower and upper division classes in writing-related categories. Students confirm faculty impressions, reporting increased confidence and improved performance when it comes to writing and learning.

Reading Waldo’s story next to Pennington and Boyer’s illuminates how different programs consciously consider and adapt outcomes as they determine what sustainability means in their particular institutional contexts. Perhaps in Waldo’s case, the program at UNR already enjoyed administrative support but struggled to maintain faculty interest. Based on the conviction that in order to be sustainable, WAC must “harness the efforts of the disciplines,” the WAC program at UNR defined a desired outcome—the active learning and commitment of faculty who believed they were motivating change—and then developed and assessed an inquiry-based approach to CCL work in order to achieve

that outcome (6). Alternatively, given their circumstances, Pennington and Boyer needed to garner institutional support in order to sustain the momentum of writing across the curriculum on their campus. They decided to connect CCL initiatives with the civic mission of their institution as a way to make teaching writing part of the fabric of the university. In each instance, context-specific programmatic outcomes were negotiated in order to achieve broadly conceived goals of sustainability.

Situated descriptions of how individual programs achieve sustainability by contextualizing outcomes in relation to institutional needs are not uncommon. Fulwiler and Young's *Programs that Work: Models and Methods for Writing Across the Curriculum*, for example, serves as a "sourcebook" where readers can "browse through a real range of program possibilities" and "make their own comparisons and contrasts" (5). Representatives from all types of programs and institutions, from the writing-to-learn program at Prince George's Community College, which serves a diverse student body of 36,000 over 130 locations, to the small, business-oriented program at Robert Morris, a private college in Pittsburgh, describe the history, development, and organization of their WAC initiatives in relation to the distinct missions of their institutions. The stories of how programs internalize the sustainability discourse for their own purposes and negotiate local outcomes, always are contextualized carefully and situated in local contexts.

When compositionists and researchers write about how different programs negotiate overlapping outcomes, a wide range of examples becomes part of the national sustainability discourse. Readers faced with decisions or challenges as they work to sustain their own programs find a plethora of possibilities to consider in light of their

needs and interests. At the same time, as programs adapt and revise the national discourse for their purposes, they create their own institutional outcomes discourse in the form of programmatic documents including mission statements, program descriptions, reports, websites, et cetera. Such documents shape how individuals working on particular CCL projects conceptualize and work toward outcomes of their own.

Intersecting Forces: Negotiating Project Outcomes

On a project level, individuals also must contend with multiple intersecting and sometimes conflicting forces as they imagine and work toward outcomes. In some ways, negotiation of project outcomes can be even more complicated because compositionists work directly with disciplinary faculty and must consider faculty needs and expectations in relation to countless other programmatic and institutional influences. However, WAC literature rarely includes accounts of how compositionists and disciplinary faculty interact to determine project outcomes. More often, scholars present visions for maintaining programmatic sustainability and use project examples to illustrate the benefits of and challenges to achieving that vision.

For example, Jones and Comprone argue that “permanent success in the WAC movement” will come about only through “curricular and pedagogical dialogue” that combines teaching and research “in a way that encourages joining conventional knowledge and rhetorical acumen” (61). For them, to remain effective, programs must coordinate their administrative, pedagogical, and research aspects (61). Jones and Comprone flesh out their programmatic vision of sustainability by delineating four specific goals for successful WAC programs, including: 1) “link[ing] discipline-specific

research across the curriculum...with program development”; 2) “establishing a central administrative unit to manage WAC programs”; 3) “leaven[ing] the missionary zeal of composition teachers for process learning” with research into disciplinary writing conventions; and 4) “us[ing] research into disciplinary conventions to create more effective rhetorical approaches in WAC courses” (63-5). They go on to offer a “representative anecdote” examining a particular project at Michigan Tech involving collaboration with engineering faculty that presumably worked toward several of these goals.

They describe how Jones deviated from the traditional workshop model common in their program by interacting one-on-one with engineering faculty who already included writing in their courses. Jones’s work with engineering faculty was based on the premises that writing-to-learn strategies should be combined with the conventions of writing in engineering disciplines and that the writing of academic and professional engineers should influence how writing was taught in WAC courses if the program was to be maintained (Jones and Comprone 65-66). They point out that learning goals for the courses were determined collaboratively and that Jones and engineering faculty worked together to create assignments, discuss and incorporate workplace conventions into the assignments, and match up writing-to-learn strategies with disciplinary conventions.

By way of assessing the project, Jones and Comprone allege that it engendered “insights into how these combined strategies might become part of a rhetorical approach to writing across the curriculum” (66). In addition, they claim the project generated “the kind of interactive dialogue that has produced sounder knowledge of what engineering discourse conventions are and how they work, and has helped produce more rhetorically-

effective assignments” (67). Still, Jones and Comprone lament that “the project has yet to establish the kind of research base that will provide the strategic knowledge we need to complete the job” (67). The “job” they want to complete is the implementation of their programmatic vision. In other words, Jones and Comprone articulate several outcomes based on a particular plan for their program and then use those outcomes to assess their project with engineering faculty and evaluate the extent to which the project accomplished or made progress toward programmatic objectives.

What is missing, for me, is an account of how Jones and the engineering faculty negotiated outcomes for their work together. It is not clear how the participants envisioned, worked toward, or evaluated outcomes for their particular project. *Did Jones collaborate with the engineers to articulate the “premises” on which their interaction was based? How did the goals of the WAC program relate to the engineers’ goals for their teaching? For student writing/writers? How did programmatic goals relate to outcomes imagined or expected by the administration and other bodies responsible for funding and support? Were the programmatic goals discussed explicitly with the engineering faculty in the process of determining outcomes for their individual projects? What did that discussion look like?*

Foregoing questions such as these, Jones and Comprone assume that the programmatic outcomes they articulate were appropriate and meaningful in the context of the project they describe, and perhaps they were. Yet because readers do not see the negotiation of programmatic outcomes on a project level, we are left to wonder about their applicability, whether there was tension among competing outcomes, and how participants negotiated potential conflict. Because Jones and Comprone’s article

exemplifies much CCL literature and scholarship, compositionists rarely have access to stories of how national and programmatic discourse impacts project outcomes or how outcomes are affected by the myriad expectations that come to bear on interactions with faculty. Due to this lack, compositionists don't attend as carefully as we should to the forces shaping project outcomes. Unexposed to rich possibilities for navigating project outcomes, we have fewer resources as we determine how best to respond to our own unique circumstances.

Despite the lack of visibility, outcomes negotiation on a project level has important implications for relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. Tales of how project participants develop outcomes amid overlapping influences are essential to a renewed focus on CCL relationships because it is often at the project level that relationships are messiest and most immediate.

In the next section, I examine my experience working with biology faculty to determine the outcome of our two-year CCL project in the department. In doing so, I shift the focus of typical anecdotes from the programmatic to the project level. I take a revisionary stance to a handout I created for the meeting described in the narrative that opens Chapter 1. Here, I re-vision my interpretation of the meeting, focusing on the complex array of forces that influenced how I imagined, worked toward, and evaluated the outcomes of our project. More specifically, I argue that my unconscious application of the sustainability discourse led me to imagine outcomes that positioned me in less-than-productive relationships with faculty. Studying the connection between intended outcomes and CCL relationships inspires a reconstitution of the way project outcomes are

conceptualized discursively, which, in turn, revises the kinds of material relationships available to compositionists and faculty.

Toward Discursive Revision

In what follows, I look with new eyes at the handout I created to facilitate discussion among biology faculty, illuminating the complexity with which outcomes operate on a project level (Figure 1). Whereas in previous chapters I focused on texts I'd written to reflect on or describe our CCL project, here I focus on a "practical text," one written *for* rather than *about* CCL work, to demonstrate how assumptions about outcomes influence the way relationships are imagined, framed, and enacted in CCL contexts. As in the other chapters, I am not interested in revising the text itself; my goal is not to describe the handout I should have used in that meeting or to offer a new and improved handout for the future. Rather, I re-vision this text with an eye toward recognizing how national and programmatic discourses, as well as a range of other forces, shaped my vision of project outcomes. I ground my revision in reflection, striving to move beyond self-critique to consider implications for my relationships with faculty.

The meeting for which I composed the handout took place in the spring of 2008. I had been working in the department for almost two years at the time and had decided, in consultation with my graduate advisors, to return to teaching in the composition program. Since I no longer would be consulting with biology faculty, instructors or students, the meeting was scheduled to determine the results of our two-year project and decide the next step to ensure writing would become more integral to biology courses and curriculum. In previous semesters, I'd worked side by side with biology faculty and TAs,

co-developing and co-instructing their courses. However, during my final semester in the department, I served as a consultant, meeting with TAs to discuss their experiences teaching writing in lab sections and participating in conversations with faculty about continuing to emphasize writing in their discipline.

As I explain in Chapter 1, I initially interpreted the results of the meeting as evidence that our project had failed—faculty complained about student writing, cited lack of time and expertise as reasons why they could not take responsibility for continuing to focus on the writing initiative in their department, and ultimately concluded that what they needed most was a resource library (that I should compile) for teachers or students interested in writing in the sciences. By taking a revisionary stance toward the text used to frame that meeting, I realize that what I interpreted as failure actually might suggest a disconnect between how faculty members and I conceived of outcomes and sustainability. As I will show, our differing perceptions led to a conflict in the kind of relationship we imagined for ourselves and ultimately what we could accomplish through our project.

Forces Shaping Outcomes

Before looking more carefully at the handout itself, I identify some of the forces that shaped my expectations for the meeting and for this group of faculty. While I certainly was impacted by countless influences, I will focus on the following: 1) national outcomes discourse as represented in WAC literature and scholarship; 2) programmatic outcomes discourse forwarded by the budding WAC program on my campus; 3) my own values and commitments grounded in Composition Studies; and 4) my experiences

working with biology faculty and TAs. Whether I was conscious of them or not, these forces informed the outcomes vision underlying the rhetorical choices I made on the meeting handout.

The national outcomes discourse emerges out of a vast body of CCL literature and scholarship as well as from the WAC Clearinghouse, conversations on the WAC listserv, and the International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference. As I've mentioned, guides to strengthening programs are another place where the outcomes discourse explicitly is visible. McLeod and Soven's *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to Developing Programs* is a good example of how the sustainability discourse materializes through suggestions for establishing and maintaining programs. In Chapter 2, Barbara Walvoord explains that faculty dialogue and faculty ownership should be the "core of the enterprise" for any WAC program. She goes on describe her "faculty dialogue model," in which initiators: share power and ownership; begin with self-identified needs and concerns of faculty; resist the role of "expert" in favor of engaging "colleagues in a mutual exchange"; and have faith that meaningful change, such as curriculum development, will occur as a result of the dialogue (14).

According to the discourse, WAC workshops are often the best way to sponsor faculty dialogue. Joyce Neef Magnotto and Barbara R. Stout (Chapter 3 of the same volume) argue that workshops are an ideal medium for complicating faculty assumptions about student writing because they encourage faculty to

Resource Library Meeting
Tuesday, February 19, 2008

Sandy Tarabochia

What we have done so far:

Developed five writing workshops to be incorporated into the Ecology and Evolution lab schedule designed to help students write better lab reports and develop long term writing habits that will benefit them as writers in the sciences.

1. What is good scientific writing? (reading a science article)
2. Glossing (reading published and peer writing *as* writers)
3. Peer Review (revision: getting and giving useful feedback)
4. "The Science of Scientific Writing" (responding to readers' needs)
5. Sentence level revision (reading/revising for grammar, mechanics and style)

What we have found:

Making writing an integral part of a course (and of curriculum for a major) requires even more than creating a set of workshops to pass along from semester to semester. It means thinking differently about teaching and teaching writing in science. It means committing to a sustained, collaborative effort to support students and instructors by developing resources for writing and teaching writing in the discipline.

Where we can go from here (long term):

Much like designing a research project, we might begin by defining the question or problem you want to take up (*What do you notice about student writing? What hypotheses can you propose to explain the central question/problem?*) and laying out your objectives (*What are your individual goals for teaching writing in your courses? What are your goals as a department for teaching writing across courses?*) We might then begin to identify several actions we can take to reach those objectives (*What are 2 or 3 things we can do right now? How will we evaluate the outcome of our actions in relation to the problem and objectives?*).

A possible model:

Faculty in the School of Natural Resources worked collaboratively to develop a website that serves as a resource for students writing and instructors incorporating writing in Natural Resources courses. In order to create the site faculty had conversations about:

1. how they define "good" writing in and across courses;
2. how they assess and respond to student writing with the qualities of "good" writing in mind;
3. how they frame writing in the discipline for themselves and for students (storytelling);
4. how writing impacts students as majors and as members of the field once they've graduated;
5. useful ways of incorporating writing into courses with different subject matter and learning goals (low stakes and high stakes writing);

What we can do today:

One way to spend our time today might be to determine what we want to accomplish over the next two months. We might decide to commit to two more "brainstorming" meetings in order to articulate your goals and establish a plan of action in response to those goals. We might choose texts we want to read together (published texts or student texts) as a way to open discussion about writing in science. Another possibility is to continue to explore additional models of ways faculty in other departments have gone about studying writing in their disciplines by looking at examples or inviting faculty to share their experiences.

Figure 1: Handout from Meeting with Biology Faculty

reexamine pedagogies in light of WAC values: writing as a means of learning; the interdependence of composing processes and written products; the merits of different kinds of writing; respect for the ideas of every writer; and an appreciation of writing as socially, cognitively and rhetorically complex. (32)

Interestingly, Magnotto and Stout urge compositionists seeking to sponsor dialogic workshops to consider (or create) a program before working with groups of faculty. Articulating programmatic outcomes, they imply, is vital to the long-term success of both the project and the program (33).

Though the discourse frames outcomes advice in programmatic terms, faculty dialogue and the general spirit of the WAC workshop seemed like worthy goals for my project in the biology department as well. Taking my cue from WAC literature like this, I strived to create in the context of our particular project the conditions that make programs sustainable according to the discourse. More specifically, I internalized advice that compositionists should position ourselves in relation to faculty as facilitators or guides with a deep understanding of disciplinary discourses and pedagogical needs. While these are not necessarily problematic objectives in and of themselves, they presented challenges when I applied them to our project without considering how my situation with biology faculty was different from the circumstances surrounding the kinds of programs scholars like Walvoord and Magnotto and Stout were addressing.

In addition to being shaped by national discourse (in the form of literature describing successful, sustainable programs) my strategies for structuring the meeting reflect the values and objectives articulated through the programmatic discourse of the “official” WAC program on my campus. The Faculty Leadership Writing Initiative

(FLWI) was launched in the fall of 2007, when I had been working in the biology department for one year. Funded by a Program of Excellence grant and directed by a tenured faculty member in Composition and Rhetoric, FLWI was designed to sponsor faculty-led inquiry into writing across the university and across the state. According to the website, the purpose of FLWI is to “provide a coordinated program of professional development to help instructors in any discipline and across grade levels to integrate writing into their courses in order to enhance student learning” (FLWI).

The cornerstones of FLWI are writing inquiry groups (WIGs) in which faculty from a particular discipline gather to investigate a question or concern around writing. The website offers the following description: “The Writing Inquiry Groups follow a flexible curriculum based on faculty interests and needs. Some groups may choose to focus on writing as it relates to shared curricular or programmatic goals, while others may work on instructional revision” (FLWI).

As these descriptions suggest, FLWI encourages each WIG to articulate the exact parameters for their project. At the same time, the program establishes several overarching outcomes. Every group is required to:

- ❖ Demonstrate concrete evidence of improved attention to writing, which will be presented at a [spring] conference
- ❖ Reflect on, assess and document the changes made as a result of this inquiry, including the rationale that shaped your learning. (FLWI)

Even though FLWI asks WIGs to demonstrate evidence, present their findings, and assess and document change, they give groups space to determine the scope of their projects for

themselves. The website offers several possibilities. WIGs might choose to explore the following options as they work toward the assessable outcomes listed above:

- ❖ Examine how writing relates to learning goals in an individual course, program, or school
 - ❖ Reflect on current practices of writing instruction to determine possibilities and challenges
 - ❖ Articulate a goal for more effective writing instruction in a particular setting, whether developing a new initiative or revising current practices.
- (FLWI)

As evidenced by these flexible options and outcomes, FLWI, like most programs, adapted values forwarded in national outcomes discourse for its own purposes. The initiative clearly values dialogue and the collaborative workshop environment, encouraging faculty investment by giving inquiry groups autonomy over their individual projects. As the national discourse suggests, the compositionist in charge of FLWI serves as a facilitator and guide, providing guidance and a sense of the general outcomes groups should work toward. “[C]areful not to push a rigid, preconceived agenda for the workshop, and [to] avoid the trainer or ‘missionary’ stance,” she acts as the “initiator” Walvoord describes (16). WIGs aren’t exactly workshops but share characteristics of workshops as they often are described in the discourse. They encourage careful consideration of disciplinary learning goals and writing pedagogies, attention to improved writing, articulation of objectives for writing instruction, and reflection on changes made.

A commitment to inquiry, collaboration, reflection, and long-term change infuses FLWI's programmatic discourse. Many of these ideals are rooted in the field of Composition and Rhetoric, which is not surprising given that FLWI is "centered in the writing expertise of the Composition Program" and headed by a full-time tenure-track Comp/Rhet faculty member. As a teacher and graduate student in the Composition Program, FLWI's philosophies resonate with me. I had similar goals for my work in the biology department. I wanted to inspire faculty investment and autonomy, encourage inquiry and reflection, and serve as an initiator of CCL efforts in the department rather than as an expert director or service provider. While these objectives are certainly valid, the models I had for embracing my values and commitments in a CCL context were framed in programmatic terms.

CCL discourse and scholarship focuses on program sustainability and offers examples of how compositionists negotiate their commitments with those of others to develop programmatic outcomes. In addition, more locally, I had FLWI as a model that demonstrated how to represent commitments like mine in our unique institutional context—but again, in programmatic terms. I didn't realize or reflect on the fact that I applied programmatic outcomes to our project in the biology department. Important differences between program examples and our project caused tension in the ways faculty and I imagined and assessed the outcomes of our work.

My experience working with Oliver and Ethan was another key factor that influenced the expectations I had for faculty during the meeting and throughout the semester. Both professors were excited to work with me. They prioritized their teaching, sincerely wanted to learn strategies for developing writing pedagogy, and welcomed me

into their classrooms and professional lives. Both Oliver and Ethan believed it was possible to improve student writing and took responsibility for supporting student writers in their courses. Both were invested not only in making changes in their individual classrooms, but in larger scale curricular and departmental changes as well. While Oliver and Ethan certainly saw the value in attending to teaching and learning writing in their courses and in the department, both seemed surprised by the complexity of that endeavor. After our first semester working together, the professors commented on the time and energy needed to focus on writing. They began to understand the task of working with student writers as more complicated than merely fixing their writing. Each reflected carefully on their experiences and developed ideas about how they would revise their approach the next time.

Working with Oliver and Ethan led me to attribute certain commitments and assumptions to the professors gathered around the conference table. I assumed they genuinely were invested in addressing issues of writing in their department and willing to dedicate some time to the endeavor; I assumed they were attending the meeting because they were frustrated with student writing but could be convinced (relatively easily) to complicate their irritation; I assumed they saw me as a colleague and facilitator whose expertise could be put in conversation with their own. Even when my predictions were accurate, each faculty member had a different set of circumstances, sometimes supporting and sometimes thwarting productive incorporation of writing into their classes. The realities of their professional teaching and research lives did not always coincide with the outcomes I imagined for our work together.

In the next section, I explain how national and programmatic outcomes discourse, my training in the field of Composition and Rhetoric, and my experiences working with Oliver and Ethan influenced my construction of the handout and how I hoped the document would function in the meeting.

Composing a “Practical Text”: Revealing Implicit Outcomes

From talking with Oliver, I knew that not everyone at the meeting was aware of the work we had been doing in the department over the last two years. I expected that faculty might be skeptical of the feasibility of incorporating writing into science curriculum or have trouble imagining what it might look like. I wanted to give participants who were unfamiliar with our project a sense of what we’d accomplished. In section one of the handout, “What we have done so far,” I emphasized that incorporating writing into sciences courses was doable, because we’d done it. I chose to name the actual writing workshops we developed for BIOS 207 to illustrate specifically how writing could fit into a lab course and get faculty thinking concretely about how writing could work in the classes they were teaching.

My work with Oliver and Ethan and the national sustainability discourse suggested that as a facilitator, I would need to both recognize and complicate faculty goals for writing. Thus, in explaining what the workshops were designed to do, I linked short term goals (better student writing), with more complicated, long-term goals (better student writers). National and programmatic discourse also shaped my understanding of my role in the meeting and the project. I knew faculty would resist mandates enforced by an outsider and recalled WAC philosophies that encouraged compositionists to seek out

and draw on knowledge of the disciplines to make WAC initiatives seem relevant and sustainable to disciplinary faculty. In addition, I appreciated the way the director of FLWI supported faculty projects without directing them. In this first section, therefore, I attempted to establish my ethos, particularly for those faculty who didn't know me, as someone with knowledge of writing who had worked in their department, was familiar with their discipline, and understood their needs.

As a graduate student in Composition and Rhetoric and a writing teacher trained in the Composition program at my particular university, I've developed an understanding of the complexities involved in teaching writing and am committed deeply to reflexive pedagogy. Thus, I supported FLWI's emphasis on collaboration and sustained faculty investment in WAC efforts. But, after observing Oliver and Ethan's surprise at the time and energy attention to writing demands, I felt compelled to foreground an argument about what it would take to incorporate writing into individual courses and department curriculum. I worried that faculty would assume that we'd done the work of creating writing workshops already and simply could pass them from course to course. I hoped to complicate preemptively any notion that I could offer a quick solution to their frustrations about student writing and emphasize that supporting student writers in their department demanded not only a sustained effort on their part, but changes in the way they perceived teaching and writing. I designed section two of the handout to address these concerns. Anticipating faculty resistance to my call for substantial dedication and change, I labeled section two "What we have found" hoping to validate my argument by framing it as research findings I'd discovered with biology faculty.

Influenced by the philosophy behind FLWI's writing inquiry groups, in section three of the handout, I offered a long-term, inquiry-based approach to incorporating writing into biology curriculum. I introduced a process of defining the problem, developing objectives, and carrying out action, emphasizing that questions should be at the heart of every step. My goal was to offer faculty a framework for inquiry so that they would have a plan for making progress as they delved into the complex questions they would need to explore along the way. Cognizant of the call in WAC discourse to sustain CCL initiatives by harnessing the power of the disciplines, I tried to connect my commitment to sustained inquiry with the scientific research process I assumed would resonate with this group of faculty. I hoped this section would serve as an outline, if not for the meeting, then for the work this group would undertake over the course of the semester.

In section four of the handout, I offered "A possible model," for our group's work together. I anticipated the need simultaneously to prepare faculty for the complexity of attending to writing in their department and to convince them that it was possible and worth doing. To reiterate the feasibility of incorporating writing into a scientific discipline, I shared an example of how faculty from the School of Natural Resources (SNR) developed their own writing resource. I hoped this would provide one possible, tangible outcome of their efforts and once again reinforce how questions and conversations among faculty were vital to developing a material product. My strategy in this section was informed by the process FLWI established for writing inquiry groups. FLWI guidelines for WIGs encourage faculty dialogue and autonomy while stressing the importance of question-posing and inquiry. Likewise, by emphasizing the kinds of

discussions SNR faculty generated while developing their website, I argued for both the complexity and potential payoff of cross-curricular work.

In the final section of the handout, I tried to re-focus faculty attention on what we could accomplish through the meeting itself. Given the depth of the work we were undertaking, I urged faculty to make a plan and commit to a long-term project to ensure ongoing effort over the course of the semester and (ideally) beyond. The emphasis on faculty dialogue, so prominent in sustainability discourse, influenced my goals for this section. I suggested we read and discuss writing theory and encouraged faculty to share their experiences and concerns, both common elements of WAC workshops. I hoped to spark conversation that day that would build community among faculty and entice them to gather again. Drawing on the spirit of WIGs and popular theories of communication in my field such as Linda Flower's intercultural communication, I proposed brainstorming sessions with the goal of initiating a process of collaborative problem-solving.

Faculty Response

Ultimately, I designed my handout to help faculty identify some questions and challenges at the heart of teaching writing in their discipline, connect with one another based on shared concerns and dedication to teaching, and generate the motivation they would need to continue the work Oliver and I began years earlier. Faculty did start talking about their experiences, frustrations about student writing, and concerns with the unique challenges of addressing writing in their discipline. However, they seemed less interested in long-term planning or inquiry-based problem-solving and more focused on immediate, tangible results. I narrated the bulk of the meeting more fully in Chapter 1;

most important for my discussion of outcomes here is how each faculty member challenged my vision for the meeting and their future work by making visible how their personal circumstances shaped their sense of what was possible.

Oliver and Ethan, the faculty members with whom I'd worked most closely, seemed particularly eager to expand the work we'd begun by generating dialogue among faculty teaching courses in sequence. Other attendees, like Jacob, had been incorporating writing into their courses for a long time and even had conducted and made public studies about teaching writing usefully and manageably in the large lecture courses common in the sciences. Still others, like Pat, the instructor of BIOS 205, the course students took before Ethan's 207, were most concerned with the feasibility of changing how students used writing in her class when TAs, whose writing skills also often were questionable, were responsible for much of the grading. While I saw their various concerns as fodder for conversation and inquiry, they struggled to find a solution that would respond to their different needs.

Furthermore, I hadn't considered the professional circumstances under which faculty were working—some were tenured faculty teaching one or two courses, others were pre-tenured, instructed to focus on establishing a research agenda, while still others were non-tenure track working to balance substantial teaching loads. These unique circumstances and my failure to consider them led to a conflict between how I imagined outcomes for our meeting and how faculty did. While I saw the work we'd done already as a springboard for dialogue and project planning, others wanted to know what solutions we had to offer based on our findings. Faculty craved a practice or structure that easily could be implemented across courses to improve student writing.

Their initial reaction to part four of the handout (“A possible model”), for example, was to put a link to the SNR electronic writing resources on their department website for biology students and instructors to access. Convinced that faculty in their department would struggle with issues of time, motivation, and expertise when it came to incorporating writing into their classes, they wanted a tangible, permanent resource that would be available for instructors and students if and when they needed it. The group decided to create a physical writing resource library with textbooks, teaching ideas, and some writing theory, and make it available to interested faculty, TAs, and students. Or rather, they decided I would create the library. In short, faculty expectations were very different from the ones I imagined that focused on sustained dialogue and project planning.

Re-visioning Expectations for CCL Work

In taking a revisionary stance toward this CCL text, I realize that the differences between how I hoped my handout would facilitate the meeting with biology faculty and how the meeting actually unfolded resulted from divergent expectations. More precisely, faculty members and I applied different frameworks for thinking about outcomes. In addition, despite our mutual pursuit of long-lasting and widely effective results, we conceptualized sustainability differently according to our positions and stakes in the project. Finally, our conflicting notions of outcomes and sustainability led us to make contradictory assumptions about our roles in the project and relationship with one another. Reading the handout through a revisionary lens, I explore each of these

realizations further before offering an alternative interpretation of the outcomes of our meeting and my work in the biology department.

Conflicting Outcomes

As I've shown, the outcomes underlying my construction of the meeting handout were influenced heavily by national and programmatic CCL discourse. Most obviously, the emphasis on faculty dialogue, inquiry, and collaborative problem-solving forwarded by national discourse, as well as FLWI's programmatic discourse, shaped the strategies I used to motivate and support faculty. The problem was we were not working within programmatic structures. Faculty at the meeting were not part of a writing inquiry group; in fact the biology department had been invited to participate in FLWI and declined. In short, our work was based on a set of circumstances very different from the ones that would motivate an interested group of disciplinary faculty members to form a WIG.

Faculty who formed WIGs applied for the program with the understanding that they would develop a project and initiate and sustain conversations about writing with the support of the FLWI director. As a stipulation of their participation, groups knew they would be asked to demonstrate, reflect on, and present "evidence" of their work together at a gathering of their peers. Biology faculty, on the contrary, chose not to form a WIG because they worried about having the time to develop a finished product in one short year. They had not done the organizing work needed to establish a WIG. Ethan and Oliver initiated hallway conversations about writing with their colleagues and regular brownbags focused on department issues sometimes led to larger discussions of teaching and writing. Otherwise, to my knowledge our meeting was the first time faculty

officially had gathered to talk about the CCL work that had been going on in their department for almost two years. Perhaps they felt they could forego the inquiry-based structure FLWI offered, which required self-motivation, because they had me to help them address issues of writing in their department in ways that seemed more direct and product oriented.

Moreover, my relationships with individual faculty members and with the department were different from the relationships WAC workshop leaders developed with attendees or the ones the FLWI director established with WIG participants. I served as much more than a resource, for example, when I worked with Oliver and with Ethan to develop materials for, and in some cases co-instruct, their courses. Our objectives had been grounded in particular courses and (at least in the beginning) my role had been to take the lead in developing and implementing writing pedagogy, while Oliver and Ethan focused on course content. I worked with one faculty member at a time, rather than a group, so we rarely were forced to connect our specific course objectives for writing with the interests or concerns of faculty in the wider department. Ultimately, rooted in national and programmatic CCL discourse, many of the commitments I forward on my handout were the very reasons faculty chose not to be part of programmatic efforts.

I still value the commitments on which my objectives were based—inquiry, collaboration, faculty dialogue and autonomy, sustained efforts, et cetera. But I now see that I made decisions about how to present and support those commitments based on the ways they functioned in other contexts—in national and programmatic discourse, for example. As a result, the outcomes underlying my approach to the meeting and the ways I suggested we achieve them were not always appropriate for our given situation. The

outcomes I forwarded were rooted in CCL discourse, which, as I've argued, centers on programmatic sustainability. Yet it was not my focus on sustainability per se that led to tensions with faculty. Rather it seems the conflict between their product-oriented outcomes and my process-orientated goals created a disconnect in how we imagined what it might mean to develop a sustainable project given our circumstances.

Different Notions of Sustainability

Even though our outcomes conflicted, we all seemed to value sustainability, yet we had different perceptions of what that entailed in the context of our project. As I've shown, my definition of sustainability was influenced by a range of forces including the way FLWI adapted and applied national outcomes discourse for programmatic purposes according to institutional needs and resources. For me, sustainability required disciplinary faculty to commit to a recursive process that involved: 1) articulating a felt need, 2) complicating simplistic understandings of that need, 3) exploring possible responses and their implications, 4) choosing and reflecting on particular actions, and 5) generating sustained dialogue aimed at continuous (re)articulation of needs as they evolve and change. To be sustainable, the process had to be motivated and maintained by members of the department; I, or others in the English department, could serve as resources but should not control the disciplinary project. In order to achieve this kind of sustainability, I realized, I had to convince faculty that taking up the issue of writing in their discipline was "doable," that it would lead to practical strategies for addressing their concerns, but that it required continued conversation and revision.

Faculty response to my description of the SNR website illustrates a key difference between how we defined sustainability. My idea of making CCL work in the biology department sustainable included constant, active participation by faculty, consistent evolution or growth as the project changed according to the needs and experiences of participants, and consultation with the English department as a supplemental, rather than essential, resource. On the contrary, biology faculty recognized that an ongoing project would be difficult to sustain given the demands of teaching and research and lack of compensation for teaching writing in their department. Sustainability for them meant a permanent resource that would be accessible to all students and instructors, even if they couldn't be part of a formally structured inquiry. An ideal, sustainable outcome for them was the collective adoption of a practice (use of a shared writing handbook) or structure (writing resource library) that would at least make writing more visible to instructors and students throughout the department. In short, they viewed sustainability in terms of what was feasible to accomplish given constraints on their time and ability to maintain long-term effort.

Such limitations don't necessarily lend themselves to the process work I imagined or the kind of pedagogical activity I've promoted throughout this dissertation. Still, they represent real restrictions that needed to be acknowledged and addressed before we could negotiate viable outcomes. Yet none of us articulated for ourselves or each other our visions of sustainability or how they shaped our outcomes expectations. Consequently, we weren't able to embrace the similarities in our mutual goal to develop sustainable efforts or negotiate outcomes responsive to our shared objective.

(Mis)Construing Relationships

Analyzing the meeting handout through a revisionary lens, I realize our disparate definitions of sustainability influenced how biology faculty and I positioned ourselves in relation to one another. Because we defined sustainability differently, we harbored different expectations for the outcomes of our project. Each outcome we imagined called for a different kind of relationship; as a result, we developed perceptions of our roles and responsibilities that were not always compatible. My use of pronouns throughout the handout illuminates my struggle to position myself in relation to faculty given our overlapping and sometimes conflicting ideas of sustainability and project outcomes.

For example, when describing the long-term process in section three, I used the pronoun “we” to locate myself as an active member of the initiative—“*we* might begin by,” “*we* might then identify actions *we* can take.” In accordance with the ways compositionists’ roles are framed in CCL discourse, I positioned myself as a motivator and facilitator whose job was to offer faculty a place to start and a framework for moving forward. I emphasized my presence in the meeting, offering to help them determine “2 or 3 things *we* can do right now” and indicated that I would join faculty again when it was time to evaluate the success of future outcomes—“how will *we* evaluate the outcome.” It is almost as if I imagined myself in the role of the Composition faculty director of FLWI, who often joins writing inquiry groups to help them come up with a project plan that can be accomplished in a semester, leaves the groups to their projects, and then gathers groups together to celebrate, share, and take stock of their accomplishments.

Just as there were moments when I located myself among faculty, at other times, I tried to extract myself from the project and reinforce faculty agency and expertise.

Internalizing the idea, reiterated in CCL discourse, that sustainability requires self-motivated faculty who claim their own expertise as teachers and writers in their discipline, I challenged faculty to take the lead in identifying questions and laying out objectives. I used the second person plural pronoun—“what do *you* notice about student writing,” “what hypotheses can *you* propose,” “what are *your* individual goals,” and “what are *your* goals as a department”—in order to emphasize that project outcomes should be based on faculty’s sense of the problem, their ideas for responses to that problem, and their unique goals and objectives.

Not only did I alternate between first and second person plural pronouns when indicating action, I referenced different groups with the first person “we.” Sometimes, as in sections one and two, I referred to myself and the biology faculty I’d already been working with over the past several years. I tried to create a supportive, knowledgeable ethos by assuring faculty new to the project that members of their department had a hand in the initiative from the beginning. At other times (sections three and five), I tried to cultivate a sense of solidarity by using “we” to indicate those of us gathered around the meeting table.

This kind of uncertainty surely disoriented faculty as they tried to decide how to attend to writing in their discipline. On the one hand, I encouraged them to take control and define for themselves goals and objectives for their continued work. On the other, I (perhaps implicitly) imposed my own agenda on them, which included self-guided inquiry sustained over time. Many at the meeting were worried about time commitments and felt they lacked the expertise to design and carry out their own inquiry, sentiments perhaps indicated in their decision to decline participation in FLWI. The consequence of

this complex intersection of circumstances and agendas was a disconnect in how faculty and I imagined our roles in the meeting and within the larger project. While I felt I should be a facilitator and guide, encouraging faculty to tap into their own knowledge and experiences, faculty saw me as a resource that was about to be withdrawn. They wanted the benefit of my expertise, which they felt they lacked, before it was no longer available.

Our struggle to establish mutually beneficial relationships limited our ability to articulate and work toward useful outcomes as well. In the end, I gathered citations for items that were to constitute a writing resource library for faculty and TAs. At this time, I don't know if the library is used regularly, still exists, or even if it was created in the first place. Faculty began a conversation about adopting a writing guide to be used by students throughout their major course sequence, but again, I've not heard what came of these initial discussions. I've not worked in the department for several semesters now, and while I understand that individual faculty members continue to make questions about teaching writing central to their pedagogical practices, to my knowledge little formal or collective activity has taken place.

In re-visioning the handout and my interpretation of the meeting itself, I recognize the need for compositionists to be more aware of the forces influencing the outcomes expectations we bring to CCL projects. At the same time, in order to develop pedagogical relationships in the context of cross-curricular efforts, disciplinary faculty also must be reflexive about their objectives and open to revision. In the classroom, there are things teachers can do to sponsor revisionary pedagogy. Julie Jung, for example, treats various approaches to teaching as "performance genres," juxtaposing them in order

to generate the kind of disruption that urges students to reflect on their expectations for the class and the roles of teachers and learners (147). Ultimately, though, students repeatedly must choose to do revisionary work (Jung describes in detail an instance in which a student felt alienated by her pedagogy and decided to drop her class). Similarly, compositionists can strive for reflexive conversations in which project outcomes are negotiated and revised collaboratively. For example, we can juxtapose conflicting outcomes explicitly, make visible the disciplinary logics behind our objectives, and ask questions that encourage faculty to do the same. But disciplinary faculty must take responsibility as well.

Pedagogical relationships are not automatic, but the possibilities that can result remain promising. What might have happened if biology faculty and I had been more explicit about our expectations and more reflexive about their origins and implications? What if we had acknowledged the relationships implied by the outcomes we proposed and examined the benefits and limitations of those roles? Could identifying the myriad forces, those obvious and those less visible, that shaped our visions of project outcomes have been a way to articulate, consciously and collaboratively, more meaningful project objectives and relationships?

Revising Outcomes Discourse: Exploring New Relationships

The decentralization of the WAC movement has been key to its survival as individual programs define for themselves what it takes to be sustainable in unique institutional contexts. CCL literature and scholarship represents well the various ways programs adapt and revise outcomes discourse for their own purposes. Indeed, the

flexible negotiation of programmatic outcomes has become integral to cross-curricular literacy discourse. Individuals working on the project level also must develop creative ways to navigate multiple, overlapping expectations, but examples of that process are much less visible in CCL discourse and scholarship. When they do occur, project goals tend to be discussed and assessed in terms of programmatic objectives, which can be problematic when doing so obscures the tensions that arise when compositionists and faculty envision conflicting outcomes. Consequently, compositionists don't always reflect on the ways our own and faculty's expectations for particular projects impact the relationships we build together.

Throughout this dissertation, I've argued for closer attention to cross-curricular relationships. One way to foreground relationships in CCL discourse and practice is to think differently about how we imagine and work toward outcomes. The revisionary process, when made visible and public, can reconstitute the ways outcomes function discursively, which in turn influences the material realities of CCL work. In my case, taking a revisionary stance toward a text I created as part of my work in the biology department has led me to rethink the concept of sustainability.

I believe in the goals forwarded through national and programmatic CCL outcomes discourse. Now, I also am able to recognize the smaller but vital ways that biology faculty sustain CCL efforts in their department. After the meeting, one faculty member sent me an email in which he shared writing assignments he'd been using with students in his biology courses for years. He explained his recent attempt, inspired by an Achievement Centered Education initiative on our campus, to study the feasibility of assigning writing in large lecture courses. When I asked to hear more about his

experiences, he invited me to a weekly meeting of faculty and grad students who enjoy coffee and conversation about a range of topics including writing in the sciences.

At first, I treated the email as an interesting side note unrelated to my project in the department. After all, this professor had been attending to issues of writing in his courses before I arrived and seemed content to keep doing what he was doing.

Originally, he'd framed his work to spark conversation in the department and even curricular change, but as far as I could tell, little had come of his efforts. In a sense, his email was discouraging. If this kind of work had been going on in the department for so long and faculty had failed to establish an organized effort toward departmental changes, what hope could I have for change now? A revisionary approach drives me to interpret the email differently. I now see it as evidence of sustained, if somewhat isolated, attention to issues of writing. The professor's efforts were self-motivated, usefully connected to broader university goals, and documented in a way that could, when they were ready, appeal to his more skeptical colleagues.

In addition, months after the meeting, I had lunch with Ethan, who proudly described his continued efforts to revise the writing component in BIOS 207 by incorporating portfolios, Wikki's, and other writing-based pedagogical strategies into his lecture and lab sections. Even though the department didn't form an official FLWI WIG, I was invited to collaborate with Ethan and several TAs to present our work at a FLWI workshop dedicated to writing in the sciences. Despite my disappointment with the result of our meeting, Ethan was finding ways to carry on our work, revising it, extending it, and sharing his progress with others.

My inability to recognize these efforts as evidence of sustainability led me to interpret the outcome of our meeting as an indication that faculty were not interested in developing or sustaining a long-term project. What's worse, I treated the meeting as a culmination of my work in the department, the outcome of which determined if writing would continue to be important to faculty and students, and thus whether or not I had succeeded as a CCL consultant. Re-visioning my experience, I've come to think differently about outcomes and sustainability. First, sustainability need not be a grand commitment to an "official" project; it can start with individual faculty who continually accept the challenge to make teaching and writing part of their professional lives. Perhaps my work in the department did something to encourage Ethan's commitment and interest, which continues to benefit students and the department. In that way, our project was a success.

Second, I've come to realize the articulation and pursuit of project outcomes is a great opportunity for compositionists and disciplinary faculty to have explicit conversations about our expectations for CCL efforts and explore together possible roles and relationships we could assume in the process. Just as I cannot enforce my own outcomes as a measure of our project's success, faculty in the disciplines have a responsibility to recognize potential limitations of their own objectives. By putting our outcomes visions in conversation and embracing the spirit of negotiation and revision, we generate new possibilities for what our cross-curricular literacy projects ultimately might accomplish.

Not only has re-visioning my experience helped me appreciate the nuances of what we accomplished through our project in the biology department, it has helped me

imagine new possibilities for negotiating outcomes that attend to the people and parameters of a given project. First, had we been more conscious of the forces that shaped the outcomes we projected onto the meeting, we might have been better prepared to adjust them according to the needs and interests of the group. While I anticipated that my and faculty's vision of outcomes probably would conflict, I addressed this on my handout by foregrounding my outcomes in hopes of preemptively changing theirs. For their part, faculty seemed to cling to their product-focused outcomes, justifying them with un-interrogated assumptions about time and expertise.

We all needed a better sense of how to acknowledge and genuinely consider outcomes different from our own. Encouraging more explicit articulation of possible outcomes, for example, could have supported collaborative consideration of what was meaningful or promising about each in relation to the other. Ultimately, an awareness of the ways national and programmatic sustainability discourse influences CCL projects can sponsor more flexible ways of imagining and working toward outcomes and the exploration of multiple possibilities for achieving sustainability.

As a movement, WAC can be vague about its outcomes because it is a grassroots initiative wherein programs find their own way to negotiate outcomes in unique contexts. However, more examples of how sustainability and outcomes are discussed on a project level would allow compositionists and faculty to build pedagogical relationships through which we might continually negotiate outcomes consciously and collaboratively. In sharing my experience, I've filled a void in the literature and paved the way for others to make their grappling with outcomes on the project level more explicit so that we may

continue to consider reflexively how outcomes discourse shapes and is shaped by CCL relationships.

Conclusion

Not Another Next-Best Model: Revisionary Pedagogy and CCL Work

Evidenced by McLeod and Soven's *Composing a Community* (2006), as well as by much of the scholarship I've drawn on throughout this dissertation, the history of WAC often is told through "stories of pioneers" (Jacket Copy). Many founders of WAC have become consultants, in the physical sense, by visiting campuses, giving talks, and facilitating workshops, and in the discursive sense, by writing about their experiences in order to generate a body of flexible best practices. These are useful records and suggestions, to be sure, and we have much to learn from those who continue to pave the way for CCL. However, as I've shown, up until now the story of WAC has been told as a series of progressive stages, each stage corresponding to one of three main conceptual models of CCL work. Scholars in each stage traditionally have made space for, justified, and supported their model by critiquing the one(s) that came before. Consequently, WAC has seen a litany of next-best models, each useful in many ways, but none directly addressing the most immediate question facing the current generation of compositionists called upon to initiate and sustain CCL efforts: *How do we cultivate meaningful relationships with faculty in other disciplines?*

Our generation can address this question and break the progression of next-best models by thinking differently about WAC's history in relation to its present and future. The revisionary process my project demonstrates and promotes enables compositionists to read and write CCL discourse and scholarship in ways that foreground the relational aspect of our work. Interpreting traditional conceptual models of cross-curricular literacy

work through a revisionary lens illuminates how discursive conceptualizations of expertise, change, and project outcomes shape relationships. This alternative reading creates opportunities for revising how the terms function in discourse and practice and for re-visioning what kinds of relationships are possible. A revisionary frame of mind draws on and reconstitutes the methods and models that historically have characterized Writing Across the Curriculum, re-forming them in response to the immediate needs of a new generation of cross-curricular literacy teacher-scholars.

An understanding of the symbiotic relationship between discourse and practice underlies my argument for a revisionary approach to CCL work. Just as revising the discourse leads to new possibilities for engaging in CCL interactions, changing how we participate in CCL relationships can spark discursive revision. In this sense, revisionary stance becomes a means of building and sustaining material relationships in CCL contexts. When compositionists bring a revisionary frame of mind to cross-curricular literacy interactions we enact *revisionary pedagogy*. Revisionary pedagogy as an approach to CCL work is not another next-best model but a collaborative activity that is reflexive, recursive, and sustainable. It fosters *pedagogical relationships* with faculty that are mutually affirming, adaptable, self aware, and open to ongoing revision.

Through much of the dissertation, I enact revisionary stance as a means of rhetorical positioning in relation to discourse and texts. Whereas individuals can employ revisionary stance as a textual strategy, the pedagogical aspect involves interaction among learners. That is, compositionists sponsor and build revisionary pedagogy *with* faculty in other disciplines. Like Stenberg, I understand pedagogy as a “knowledge-making activity” that is “dependent on learners and is remade with each encounter”

(xviii). Thus, revisionary pedagogy necessarily will look and feel different in each CCL encounter.

While I cannot offer one clear vision or description of what a revisionary approach to CCL work is like in practice, the revised versions of expertise, change and outcomes developed in Chapters 2-4 serve as a foundation for revisionary pedagogy for CCL work. In order to cultivate pedagogical relationships with disciplinary faculty, compositionists must:

- ❖ reflexively negotiate expertise as a means of sense-making through dialogic interaction with others.
- ❖ catalyze and undertake change flexibly as a multi-directional and productively chaotic process integral to CCL efforts.
- ❖ imagine and re-imagine outcomes with disciplinary faculty, attending to how contexts and discourses overlap, conflict with, or support one another in shaping expectations for our work.

Reconceptualizing expertise, change, and outcomes in pedagogical terms emphasizes the relational aspect of cross-curricular literacy interactions. It is impossible to embrace negotiated expertise, multi-directional change, and flexible outcomes without attending to the daily relations between compositionists and disciplinary faculty. Revisionary pedagogy constitutes both the process and product of that endeavor.

Engaging CCL work as revisionary pedagogy foregrounds relationships between compositionists and faculty in ways WAC discourse and scholarship typically hasn't. In her recent review of "scholarly research on writing across the curriculum and writing in the disciplines," Vicki Tolar Burton describes "gaps in the research system" that open up

promising directions for inquiry. Singling out David Russell's chapter in *WAC for the New Millennium*, Burton delineates the need for more "case studies, richer discipline-specific studies of writing, [and] more consideration of the relation between academic and workplace writing," adding transnational writing across the curriculum and communication across the curriculum to the list as developing areas of WAC research (592, 594). These are certainly vital and potentially fruitful lines of inquiry to pursue. However, with the exception of a vague reference to "faculty, departmental, and university development activities" (Burton 592), current calls for research don't explicitly attend to the relational aspect of CCL work, yet, relationships between compositionists and faculty in other disciplines are an integral part of cross-curricular literacy efforts regardless of our research agenda.

For example, Burton points to the rhetoric of experience and the politics of diversity as significant gaps in current CCL scholarship. Though she doesn't specifically mention the importance of relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty, the example she gives to illustrate the need for research on gender issues in writing in the disciplines is telling. Burton describes the experience of an untenured WAC director who reviewed the assignment of an engineering professor that included stereotypical and sexist representations of women in the workplace. The WAC director urged the professor to change his assignment and when he refused, reported him to Affirmative Action.

The WAC director in Burton's example didn't intend to investigate issues of gender when he began working with the engineering professor. The conflict he experienced was not caused by faculty resistance to any critical agenda he forwarded. Still, conflict did arise around gender issues and the director felt compelled to take

punitive action against a disciplinary faculty member. Burton uses the scenario to argue for greater attention to the role of gender in CCL contexts, which it certainly demands, but the situation also unearths ways Difference, in this case gender, can complicate relationships between compositionists and disciplinary faculty, whether it is foregrounded purposefully or not. Burton's example begs the question: *How can WAC pursue any research agenda without attending to the day-to-day complexities of cross-curricular literacy relationships?*

Like Burton, Thaiss and Porter conclude their report on the state of WAC/WID with a list of "new and continuing questions for research" that don't acknowledge the role of relationships explicitly. Their questions focus mainly on administrative issues such as changing programmatic leadership, designing budgetary proposals, and understanding the function of cross-departmental policymaking committees (563). Embracing CCL work as revisionary pedagogy extends these essential lines of inquiry by invoking their relational dimension. Attention to relationships addresses the questions our generation finds most pressing and opens up additional directions for inquiry by building on questions like Thaiss and Porter's. We might ask, for instance: *How do programs maintain existing relationships and continue to cultivate new ones when changing leadership? How do WAC directors establish interdisciplinary relationships in order to make a case for funding? What role, if any, do compositionists have in cross-departmental policy-making committees and what kinds of relationships do committee members foster among themselves?*

Because questions like these emerge prominently in the day-to-day moments of CCL efforts whether we attend to them or not, consciously considering relationships in

cross-curricular literacy discourse and practice is not such a radical move. A revisionary approach invites compositionists to write about our daily interactions with disciplinary faculty in ways that make visible the complexity of our work. It implores us to reflect deliberately on our literature and scholarship so that we can draw connections between the approaches we advocate and the kinds of relationships they enable or constrain. Revision as a strategy for reading and writing WAC discourse helps us resist the urge to critique and replace past methods and models and instead re-imagine them critically and creatively through a revisionary framework. Revisionary pedagogy extends this process of discursive revision into the everyday practices of compositionists and disciplinary faculty working to cultivate meaningful relationships with one another. As our relationships and interactions change, the language we use to describe and make sense of them changes too. Ultimately, re-visioning CCL work means placing discursive terms and concepts in conversation with the material realities of practice so that they continually evolve and change in concert with one another.

In addition to bringing a relational element to the field's current research agenda, a revisionary approach to engaging CCL discourse and practice calls for new lines of inquiry. My project focused on discursive revision, demonstrating how reflection on CCL discourse in relation to practice has the potential to reconstitute the terms of cross-curricular literacy work, and gesturing when appropriate toward the pedagogical implications of a revisionary frame of mind. But a more in-depth investigation of pedagogy in practice is an important next step. Questions might include:

- ❖ *How might revisionary pedagogy play out among compositionists and faculty in other disciplines?* With revision at its center, the concept of revisionary pedagogy itself is open to change. Because pedagogy is a complex activity dependent upon learners, revisionary pedagogy will look different in every CCL encounter. As different learners embrace revisionary pedagogy in different contexts for different purposes, they will develop new language for describing their relationships and interactions. That language will (re)constitute discourse and practice as they evolve and change in concert with one another. Putting multiple experiences in conversation will (re)define possibilities for revisionary pedagogy continuously.
- ❖ *How might disciplinary faculty experience, respond and contribute to a revisionary framework?* Faculty in the disciplines are an important part of a revisionary approach to CCL work. Compositionists can do the reflective work of discursive revision among ourselves, but revisionary pedagogy is a collaborative activity engaged with faculty. So, we must acknowledge and value the way faculty experience and shape pedagogical relationships. As I revised this manuscript, Ethan was kind enough to read drafts of the introduction and Chapter 3. “I had no idea you were plotting such a revolution!” he good-naturedly exclaimed in response, “If I’d known I would have worn chainmail to our meetings” (Message). Ethan’s reaction reiterates many of the issues I’ve taken up through this project, including how compositionists and disciplinary faculty can interpret the goals and results of CCL initiatives in drastically different ways. Even though the goal of my

project was to represent reflexively and re-vision my work with Ethan, his reaction upon reading what I'd written was to wish he had protected himself against my intentions. Voices like Ethan's need to be part of the process if we are to engage and revise revisionary pedagogy for CCL work ethically. How can we make faculty contributions and experiences more visible in CCL discourse and practice?

- ❖ *Could/should approaching CCL work as revisionary pedagogy change the way compositionists, WPAs, and other WAC directors interact with each other and function as a community?* Strong community among those charged with initiating and sustaining CCL work is one reason for the continued success of the WAC movement. From the beginning, CCL folks sought each other out for encouragement and advice, forming networks and special interest groups. The tradition continues today with forums such as the annual International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference, the WAC listserv, and the WAC Clearinghouse. While teaching and research certainly are central to the WAC community, until now, we've mainly treated CCL work as a matter of administration. Framing CCL relationships as pedagogical shifts the terms of our work. As we consider how best to support one another in our pedagogical endeavor, we might borrow strategies from departments, programs, and faculty development efforts designed to sponsor teaching communities in different contexts.

- ❖ *How might pedagogy-focused research in other fields be useful in theorizing and participating in pedagogical relationships in CCL contexts?* Jeff Jablonski recently has invoked the teacher research movement and Lee Schulman’s categories of teacher knowledge in an effort to reframe the knowledge and sensibilities “writing experts” contribute to CCL work. He experiments with a teaching metaphor for cross-curricular literacy relationships in order to investigate what kind of “pedagogical content knowledge” CCL consultants possess. My argument for revisionary pedagogy builds on Jablonski’s metaphorical comparison and calls for new ways of studying the work of compositionists and disciplinary faculty in CCL contexts. How might compositionists adapt teacher research strategies for studying our interactions with faculty in the disciplines, for example? What can we learn from the research methodologies in teacher education programs or from techniques developed by the Peer Review of Teaching Project⁶ to help educators document and inquire into their teaching?
- ❖ *How can compositionists best sponsor a revisionary approach to CCL work? What kind of institutional support is necessary?* In drafting and revising this manuscript, I’ve come to realize just how many opportunities I’ve had to reflect on my teaching as a graduate student and TA in Composition and Rhetoric. Countless experiences—from my TA workshop to teaching internships in writing theory and practice seminars, from facilitating programmatic assessment to serving as Associate Coordinator of the Composition Program—have informed my approach to teaching and learning

and shaped the pedagogies I develop with fellow learners in multiple contexts. Based on these experiences, I appreciate how difficult it can be to cultivate pedagogical relationships with disciplinary faculty without disciplinary and institutional structures to support meaningful “learning encounters” among teachers across the university (Stenberg 135). A revisionary, pedagogical approach to cross-curricular literacy work makes teaching and learning visible in ways that could put pressure on institutions to develop and formalize systems that recognize and sponsor reflective teaching. But institutional change is likely to be a slow process at best. In the meantime, perceiving and engaging in CCL initiatives as pedagogy also allows us to think differently about resources and institutional structures already available for supporting pedagogical relationships among teachers.

However we take up questions like these, I implore compositionists to document and share our lived CCL experiences. Tales of how those of us dedicated to the spirit of WAC attempt to cultivate pedagogical relationships will not always be success narratives. They undoubtedly will unearth conflict and raise more questions. Still, stories of revisionary pedagogy in CCL contexts must become part of the discourse that shapes them, for it is through this process that compositionists, along with our colleagues across the university, will re-vision the future of cross-curricular literacy work.

Works Cited

- Bazerman, Charles, Joseph Little, Lisa Bethel, Teri Chavkin, Danielle Fouquette, and Janet Garufis. *Reference Guide to Writing Across the Curriculum*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor, 2005. Print.
- Bazerman, Charles. "Review: The Second Stage in Writing Across the Curriculum." *College English* 53 (1991): 209-12. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda. "Missionary Projects and Anthropological Accounts: Ethics and Conflict in Writing Across the Curriculum." *Foregrounding Ethical Awareness in Composition and English Studies*. Ed. Sheryl Fontaine and Susan Hunter. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1998. 144-59. Print.
- Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987. Print.
- Brueggemann, Brenda Jo. "An Enabling Pedagogy." *Disability Studies: Enabling the Humanities*. Ed. Sharon H. Snyder, Brenda Jo Brueggemann, and Rosemarie Garland Thomson. New York: MLA, 2002. 317-26. Print.
- Bullock, Richard and John Trimbur, eds. *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1991.
- Burton, Vicki Tolar. "Activity systems, Genre, and Research on Writing Across the Curriculum." *College Composition and Communication* 61.3 (2010): 583-96. Print.
- "Class Outline." BIOS 189H: Biology, Society, and Health. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. 2 October 2006.
- Condon, William. "Accommodating Complexity: WAC Program Evaluation." McLeod, Miraglia, Soven, and Thaiss 28-51. Print.
- Connors, Robert J. "Rhetoric in the Modern University: The Creation of an Underclass." Bullock and Trimbur 55-84. Print.
- "Course Grading, Criteria, and Format for Papers." BIOS 189H: Biology, Society, and Health. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Fall 2006.
- DiBernard, Barbara. "Teaching What I'm Not: An Able-Bodied Woman Teaches Literature by Women with Disabilities." *Teaching What You're Not: Identity Politics in Higher Education*. Ed. Katherine J. Mayberry. New York: New York UP, 1996. 131-54. Print.
- Faculty Leadership Writing Initiative*. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. n.d. Web. 5 May 2010.
- Farris, Christine. "Giving Religion, Taking Gold: Disciplinary Cultures and the Claims of Writing Across the Curriculum." *Cultural Studies in the English Classroom*. Ed. James A. Berlin and Michael J. Vivion. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1992. 12-22.
- Flower, Linda. "Talking Across Difference: Intercultural Rhetoric and the Search for Situated Knowledge." *College Composition and Communication* 55.1 (2003): 38-68. Print.
- Flynn, Elizabeth, and Robert Jones, with Diane Shoos and Bruce Barna. "Michigan Technological University." Fulwiler and Young. 163-80. Print.
- Fulwiler, Toby. "The Quiet and Insistent Revolution: WAC." Bullock and Trimbur 179-87. Print.

- . "Showing, Not Telling, at a Writing Workshop." *College English* 43.1 (1981): 55-63. Print.
- Fulwiler, Toby, and Art Young, eds. *Programs that Work: Models and Methods for Writing Across the Curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1990. Print.
- Gallagher, Chris W. *Radical Departures: Composition and Progressive Pedagogy*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2002. Print.
- Gee, James Paul. "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction and What Is Literacy?" *Journal of Education* 171.1 (1989): 5-25. Rpt. in *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Ellen Cushman, Eugene R. Kintgen, Barry M. Kroll, and Mike Rose. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 525-544. Print.
- Giroux, Henry A. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.
- Giroux, Henry A., and Peter McLaren. "Teacher Education and the Politics of Engagement: The Case for Democratic Schooling." *Harvard Educational Review* 56.3 (1986): 213-38.
- Goncalves, Zan. *Sexuality and the Politics of Ethos in the Writing Classroom*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2005. Print.
- Goodburn, Amy. "English 986 Pedagogies and Difference." Course Syllabus. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Spring 2007. Print.
- Gore, Jennifer. *The Struggle for Pedagogies: Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth*. New York: Routledge, 1993. Print.
- Graff, Gerald. *Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts Can Revitalize American Education*. New York: Norton, 1992. Print.
- Jablonski, Jeffrey. *Academic Writing Consulting and WAC: Methods and Models for Guiding Cross-Curricular Literacy Work*. Research and Teaching in Rhetoric and Composition. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2006. Print.
- Jones, Robert, and Joseph Comprone. "Where Do We Go Next in Writing Across the Curriculum?" *College Composition and Communication* 44.1 (1993): 59-68. Print.
- Jung, Julie. *Revisionary Rhetoric, Feminist Pedagogy, and Multigenre Texts*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2005. Print.
- Kalamaras, George. "Effecting Institutional Change through Writing Across the Curriculum: Ideology and Inner Dialogue." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Boston. March 21-23. 1991. ERIC ED 332 220.
- Kameen, Paul. *Writing/Teaching: Essays toward a Rhetoric of Pedagogy*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2000. Print.
- LeCourt, Donna. "WAC as Critical Pedagogy: The Third Stage?" *Journal of Advanced Composition* 16.3 (1996): 389-405. Print.
- Lee, Amy. *Composing Critical Pedagogies: Teaching Writing as Revision*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2000. Print.
- Luke, Carmen, and Jennifer Gore, eds. *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Magnotto, Joyce Neff, and Barbara R. Stout. "Faculty Workshops." McLeod and Soven, *Writing* 32-46. Print.

- Mahala, Daniel, and Jody Swilky. "Resistance and Reform: The Functions of Expertise in Writing Across the Curriculum." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*. 1.2 (1994): 35-62. Print.
- Malinowitz, Harriet. "A Feminist Critique of Writing in the Disciplines." *Feminism and Composition Studies: In Other Words*. Ed. Susan C. Jarratt and Lynn Worsham. New York: MLA, 1998. 291-312. Print.
- McCarthy, Lucille P., and Barbara E. Walvoord. "Models for Collaborative Research in Writing Across the Curriculum." McLeod, *Strengthening* 77-89. Print.
- McLeod, Susan H. "The Foreigner: WAC Directors as Agents of Change." *Resituating Writing: Constructing and Administering Writing Programs*. Ed. Joseph Janangelo and Christine Hansen. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1995. 108-116. Print.
- , ed. *Strengthening Programs for Writing Across the Curriculum*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 36. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988. Print.
- . "Writing Across the Curriculum: An Introduction." Introduction. McLeod and Soven, *Writing* 1-11. Print.
- . "Writing Across the Curriculum: The Second Stage and Beyond." *College Composition and Communication* 40.3 (1989): 337-43. Print.
- McLeod, Susan H., and Eric Miraglia. "Writing Across the Curriculum in a Time of Change." McLeod, Miraglia, Soven, and Thaiss 1-27. Print.
- McLeod, Susan H., Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, Christopher Thaiss, eds. *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Programs*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2001. Print.
- McLeod, Susan H., and Elaine Maimon. "Clearing the Air: WAC Myths and Realities." *College English* 62.5 (2000): 573-83. Print.
- McLeod, Susan H., and Margot Iris Soven, eds. *Composing a Community: A History of Writing Across the Curriculum*. Lauer Series in Rhetoric and Composition. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor, 2006. Print.
- McLeod, Susan H. and Margot Soven, eds. *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to Developing Programs*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992. Print.
- Message to author. 28 April 2010. E-mail.
- Norgaard, Rolf. "The Prospect of Rhetoric in Writing Across the Curriculum." *Making and Unmaking the Prospects for Rhetoric*. Sel. Papers from Rhetoric Society of America Conf., 1996, Tucson, AZ. Ed. Theresa Enos. Mahwah: Erlbaum, 1997. 149-56. Print.
- Pennington, John, and Robert Boyer. "A Reflective Strategy for Writing Across the Curriculum: Situating WAC as a Moral and Civic Duty." *The WAC Journal* 14 (2003): 87-100. Web. 5 May 2010.
- Personal Interview. 8 May 2007.
- Petraglia, Joseph, and Deepika Bahri, eds. *The Realms of Rhetoric: The Prospects for Rhetoric Education*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2003. Print.
- Qualley, Donna. *Turns of Thought: Teaching Composition as Reflexive Inquiry*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1997. Print.
- Ratcliffe, Krista. "Rhetorical Listening: A Trope for Interpretive Invention and a 'Code of Cross-Cultural Conduct.'" *College Composition and Communication* 51.2 (1999): 195-224. Print.

- Russell, David. "WAC's Beginnings: Developing A Community of Change Agents." Introduction. McLeod and Soven, *Composing* 3-15. Print.
- . "Where Do the Naturalistic Studies of WAC/WID Point? A Research Review." McLeod, Miraglia, Soven, and Thaiss 259-98. Print.
- . *Writing in the Academic Disciplines: A Curricular History*. 2nd ed. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002. Print.
- . "Writing Across the Curriculum in Historical Perspective: Toward a Social Interpretation." *College English* 52.1 (1990): 52-74. Print.
- Smith, Louise. "Why English Departments Should 'House' Writing Across the Curriculum." *College English* 50.4 (1988): 390-94. Print.
- Spanier, Bonnie B. "Encountering the Biological Sciences: Ideology, Language and Learning." *Writing, Teaching and Learning in the Disciplines*. Ed. Anne Herrington and Charles Moran. New York: MLA, 1992. 193-212. Print.
- Stenberg, Shari. *Professing & Pedagogy: Learning the Teaching of English*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2005. Print.
- Tandy, Keith A. "Continuing Funding, Coping with Less." McLeod, *Strengthening* 55-60. Print.
- Tarabochia, Sandra L. "Course Narrative." English 986: Pedagogies and Difference. Professor Amy Goodburn. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Spring 2007.
- . "Critical Rhetorical Education Across the Curriculum." Seminar Paper. English 986: Pedagogies and Difference. Professor Amy Goodburn. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Spring 2007.
- . Letter to Amy Goodburn. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Spring 2007.
- . "Making Difficulty Visible." Course Activity. BIOS 189H: Biology, Society, and Health. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Fall 2006.
- . Reflective Journal. English 882: Literacy Theory and Community. Professor Joy Ritchie. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Fall 2006.
- . "Writing Goals." Notes for meeting with Professor of BIOS 189H. 17 August 2006.
- Thaiss, Chris, and Tara Porter. "The State of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and Results of the US Survey of the International WAC/WID Mapping Project." *College Composition and Communication* 61.3 (2010): 534-70. Print.
- Trimbur, John. "Writing Instruction and the Politics of Professionalization." *Composition in the Twenty-first Century: Crisis and Change*. Ed. Lynn Z. Bloom, Donald A. Daiker, and Edward M. White. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1996. 133-45. Print.
- Villanueva, Victor. "The Politics of Literacy Across the Curriculum." McLeod, Miraglia, Soven, and Thaiss 165-78. Print.
- Waldo, Mark. "Inquiry as a Non-Invasive Approach to Cross-Curricular Writing Consultancy." *Journal of Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 1 (1996): 6-22. Print.
- Walvoord, Barbara. "The Future of WAC." *College English* 58.1 (1996): 58-79. Print.
- . "Getting Started." McLeod and Soven, *Writing* 12-31. Print.
- Welch, Nancy. *Getting Restless: Rethinking Revision in Writing Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1997. Print.
- Writing Across the Curriculum in Natural Resources*. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. n.d. Web. 12 May 2010.

Notes

¹ See Jablonski for a summary of the stages of WAC in relation to the theoretical paradigms described in James Berlin's history of Composition Studies, *Rhetoric and Reality*.

² See Jablonski for a comprehensive comparison of the models in eleven categories (186).

³ Jablonski uses the term "writing specialists" to refer to writing teachers and WPAs in postsecondary institutions who participate in interdisciplinary, collaborative consulting activities (3). I consider compositionists participating in cross-curricular literacy initiatives to be "writing specialists." However, I use "compositionists" throughout the dissertation in order to recognize that those of us called upon to initiate, facilitate and develop CCL initiatives are so often from composition programs and to emphasize the significance of Composition's rich history as a field and a discipline in how we approach our work.

⁴ For example, in order to complicate Oliver's claim that poorly written ideas were not clear enough to be evaluated, I created an in-class writing activity called "Making Difficulty Visible" that asked students to read informal writing they'd produced for "break[s] in logic, moments when word choice seems ambiguous, unclear, or inappropriate for scientific audiences" and to treat those moments as "indications of thinking in process [that] can serve as hotspots or places to do more thinking and writing" (Tarabochia, "Making").

⁵ It is possible that Waldo and the consultants at UNR are open to change, but he does not make that aspect of their work or the kinds of changes they've experienced visible in his piece. I argue that not only should compositionists seek out opportunities to undergo change, but we also need to demonstrate the changes we experience in literature and scholarship so that "change" in CCL discourse might come to mean more than transforming disciplinary faculty and pedagogy.

⁶ Peer Review of Teaching Project (PRTP) provides faculty with "a structured and practical model" for inquiring into and documenting the intellectual work of teaching. Faculty create course portfolios through which they investigate course objectives in relation to student learning as well as departmental and institutional goals. Portfolios are made public for peer review via an electronic database where colleagues across the country can respond to each other's work and participate in conversations about teaching. See the PRTP website for more: <http://www.courseportfolio.org>