Mapping Community Values to Engage Departments in Linguistic Justice-Centered Writing Curriculum

by

Emily Bouza

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(English)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2024

Date of final oral examination: 4/7/2024

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Examination Committee:

Morris Young, Professor, English, Composition and Rhetoric
Caroline Gottschalk Druschke, Professor, English, Composition and Rhetoric
Catherine Vieira, Professor, Curriculum & Instruction
Diego Román, Professor, Curriculum & Instruction
Emily Hall, Director of WAC and Writing Fellows

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For my dissertation project, I partnered with the CEE department to name and act upon their shared values related to writing, social and linguistic justice, and curriculum. So first, I would like to thank the entire faculty of the CEE department, especially the Environmental division, you were such great partners for my project, and I learned so much from all of you. You truly care about your students and the future of the field, and it made me have so much hope for the future.

A big thank you to all the many teachers and mentors that led me here. Jeanne Smith, my first WC director, thank you for introducing me to composition studies in and modeling compassionate listening as a powerful tool and for recognizing and fostering my interest in writing pedagogy. Frances Crawford, thank you for hiring me for my favorite job to date, for always being ready to chat, and mentoring me through the highs and lows of my first forays into working with faculty across the curriculum and for pushing me to apply for a master's and then PhD program.

To my dissertation committee, I was so lucky to have such a great group of scholars supporting my research. Kate Vieira, for being an inspiration for projects that have impacts on lives in the way I can only hope to partially achieve and for helping me recognize what it is I have to offer in collaborations with educators. Diego Román, for your energy and passion for your work and your students, working with you always made me feel motivated. I learned about a different kind of power in language from you that inspired so much of my work. Also, the way you see the strengths in others helps to inspire all of us to be more of what you see in us, and I hope to be that kind of teacher and mentor to others. Emily Hall, for navigating not just normal trials that would come up in our admin work together, but also for figuring out covid together, it somehow felt possible working together. You always believed in my ideas and abilities in a way that pushed me to want to be even better.

And my co-advisors, I truly felt I cheated the system getting to work closely with two great scholars. Caroline Gottschalk Druschke, for constantly stretching my idea of comp/rhet as a field, and believing that I could understand your theory work and build my own. For balancing a support of my work and ideas with reminders to care for myself throughout this process. For being the cheerleader that I needed and the type of researcher that I can only hope to become. Morris Young, for being almost too available to answer emails or to meet to discuss the many hurdles I ran into, for modeling teaching approaches that I will continually draw from throughout my career, and for brushing aside doubts I had in my own abilities always as if they were silly to even consider – and for only slightly rubbing it in my face when Michigan would beat OSU.

A big shout out to the students, tutors, and writers I have worked with throughout the years, thank you for reminding me why I love this field even when I am tired and never want to write again. For always surprising me and generally reminding me why I love my job.

For grad students earlier in the program than me, thank you for mentorship, for being so willing to share tips on navigating the program and balancing life in Madison with being a grad student – especially Calley, Chris, Amanda, Kassia, Gin, Neil, and Antonio – you continue to inspire me with all the amazing things you are doing. Brenna- You have such conviction in your beliefs and care for others, I am honored you see even a bit of that in my work and it pushes me to do more for others

I am so lucky in my cohort and I have learned so much from all of you in who I am as a scholar and a person. I would not have been able to write my dissertation without our writing meetups and I have made lifelong friendships with you all. Gabbi- you truly seem to do it all but remain humble and just so easy to talk to. I feel like we have the same views on all things writing and you keep my ego in check. James- I always feel so comfortable around you and you seem to have that effect on everyone for which I am jealous. Lupe- my constant writing companion, you push me to trust my own voice, be willing to try new things, but also take time for myself, and to be happy with who I am and not try to do everything. Nat- you make me feel like life is a constant adventure, but one that we can take on headfirst with support from one another. Yinka- your insights have always astounded me and your insights on my writing have pushed me to bravely share what I found most interesting in my research and not what I thought was expected. Keli- I love working on projects with you, you have such great attention to detail and dedication to the kind of future you see for the field. Thank you for believing in me and trusting me to be part of that future with you. MK- Sometimes you hide your intelligence, but I love seeing the way your brain works and I think you are brilliant. Thanks for bringing me into your crazy wonderful life with your beautiful heart.

To my family – I am so blessed to have nothing but support from all of you. To my Wisconsin family – thanks for reminding me of who I am outside of the university and showing me that is a fantastic part of my life too. To my grandma, Boppa, for being my family member who loves education the way I do and for showing me writing is in my blood even when I get frustrated with it. To my brothers for always believing in me and always seeming to think – well it might be hard, but not for you – in a way that makes me want to make that true. To my parents – I would not be up here without you. Dad, you showed me what a hard work ethic is in a way I will only partially ever be able to emulate. Everyone's dad says they believe in their kids, but you have always backed that up and shown me you believe in my abilities and it helped me to keep going. Mom, thank you for being a constant sounding board, for showing me how to pick yourself back up when life tries to pull you down, and for always being there through every trouble I run into, big or small. You have always instilled such confidence and leadership skills in me and I am the woman I am today because of you.

ABSTRACT

In this dissertation project, I explore what it would look like to center an attention to social and linguistic justice in a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) collaboration with a department through the use of community-engaged methods. Specifically, this project asks the following questions: (1) What does a theory of the work of WAC administration, or perhaps a true theory of WAC, look like and why is such a theory necessary? (2) What does it look like to engage with units on campus as existing communities in the manner of community-engaged research? (3) Does engaging with units on campus through a community-engaged manner lead towards actions that center social and linguistic justice as a fundamental component of WAC and broader pedagogical practices? If so, what does this look like? and (4) Does discussing the values of curriculum, writing, and social and linguistic justice lead to finding intersections among these values, developing goals based on them, or affecting the way writing and language is taught? I explore these questions first by establishing a theoretical framework, then by developing a methodological framework of community engagement to use in these types of collaborations, and finally by sharing results from using these ideas with the Civil and Environmental Engineering department at the UW-Madison campus.

Through this project, my primary goal is to explore how to approach discussions of linguistic justice from the standpoint that all instructors on campuses can contribute to discussions of how to enact these ideas in their disciplinary contexts. This project has implications for WAC administrators hoping to center linguistic justice in sustainable and collaborative approaches across campuses, and also for anyone who hopes to think more critically about setting up ethical collaborations in their social justice work.

Keywords: Linguistic justice, writing across the curriculum, writing in engineering, community engagement methods, activist frameworks

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABET	the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
BIPOC	Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color
CCCC	Conference on College Composition and Communication
CEE	Civil and Environmental Engineering
DEI	Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
UW	University of Wisconsin - Madison
WAC	Writing Across the Curriculum

Chapter One: Introduction

There are few things more difficult to undertake through our scholarly work than lasting institutional change in the social spaces we occupy, but we will undoubtedly shortchange ourselves if we aim for anything less. – Juan C. Guerra (2016)

While there is a history of writing studies as being seen as a remedial (Matsuda, 2006; Russell, 2002), writing is increasingly becoming fundamental to daily lives in this digital age. Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs have often been a direct response to increasing communication requirements within professions (Russell, 2002). From its foundation, the WAC movement has resisted the reduction of writing to a remedial skill and has focused on teaching faculty how to better teach writing to their students (Russell, 2002; Zawacki & Rogers, 2004). Walvoord (1996) argues that WAC has power as a movement, and she believed in a future of WAC that could create great change on university campuses. In the quote above, Guerra is dreaming for change that would consider critical language and cultural awareness in students' development as writers and citizens.

As I started this dissertation, I wanted to think more critically about what kind of change I hoped to create through WAC efforts while also considering the methods that would enact and sustain these changes. For this reason, I focus on sharing the process of this project throughout these pages so the emphasis stays on how we can make the kind of changes we envision for writing on our campuses.

In this chapter, I share the fundamental concepts that led me to doing the project described in this dissertation. In doing so, I hope to set up the need that I saw for this project. I also hope to establish a set of fundamental concepts that should be understood and agreed upon to help situate the context for the rest of this dissertation, with the hopes that anyone who

chooses to read this dissertation can follow the arguments that I make throughout. Adler-Kassner and Wardle (2016) established threshold concepts of writing studies in their book *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* which names the core principles of knowledge in the field of writing studies with the goal of building a common basis for writing professionals and for others to learn about the field of writing studies. Similarly, I hope that naming these fundamental concepts that led me to this project will create a shared sense of common ground for reading the rest of this dissertation.

Before I share those fundamental concepts, I will briefly share an overview of my project and research questions. In this dissertation, I explore how to approach Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) work in a manner that treats departments as communities. Through treating departments as communities, I engage with the existing structures, resources, and values of these departments and work to center an attention to social and linguistic justice throughout the relationship. Seeing the department as a community also means engaging with them as a group rather than individuals, involving as many participants as possible throughout the process, gaining both their insights and investment into the efforts we work on together. Engaging the full department in discussions about both writing and social and linguistic justice in their discipline builds on specific needs and goals of the department as well as emphasizes the need for the integration of writing and social and linguistic justice throughout their curriculum. The ultimate goal of this approach is to work towards creating an inclusive, anti-racist, accessible instructional space that uses writing to explore issues of social and linguistic justice within their field throughout the curriculum of their programs.

In proposing and testing out the processes proposed through my dissertation, I asked the following research questions:

1- What does a theory of the work of WAC administration, or perhaps a true theory of WAC, look like and why is such a theory necessary? (ch2)
2- What does it look like to engage with units on campus as existing communities in the manner of community-engaged research? (ch3)
3- Does engaging with units on campus through a community-engaged manner lead towards actions that center social and linguistic justice as a fundamental component of WAC and broader pedagogical practices? If so, what does this look like? (ch4)
4- Does discussing the values of curriculum, writing, and social and linguistic justice lead to finding intersections among these values, developing goals based on them, or affecting the way writing and language is taught? (ch4)

As I describe in later chapters, I tested out these ideas by partnering with the Civil and Environmental Engineering department on my campus to name and then act upon their shared values in writing, social and linguistic justice, and curriculum. I worked with this department for over two years conducting interviews, attending and leading faculty meetings, gathering survey data, and developing resources.

I will now share the fundamental concepts that led me to this project. First, that writing is a skill that can be taught, which inspired me to pursue composition and rhetoric as a career. Then, how I started to see all faculty across campus being engaged in the teaching of writing, which is why I believe in the power of WAC. Next, how I came to community engagement as a model for ethical collaboration, which inspired the methods that I use throughout this dissertation. And finally, how translingual ideologies are fundamental to how I now teach writing, which situates how I see linguistic justice as central to WAC efforts.

Fundamental Concept One: Writing is a skill that can be taught

While I have always been a strong student generally, I was never the whiz kid in a particular subject. I loved to read, I enjoyed hearing the stories from history, math was a fun puzzle, and science captivated my curiosity, but I never really shone in a particular area more than another. I remember enjoying doing creative writing, but never really being praised for anything I wrote for school when I was younger. By the time I was in high school, I managed to get consistent "A-" grades on my essays with no explanation of what I could have done to get those last few points until perfection. By the time I started college, I knew I could write a serviceable essay within a short period of time, but I just thought there was an innate writing skill that made some people "writers," and I did not have it.

When I started working as a writing tutor at the Kent State Writing Commons, I took a course on writing tutoring with our director, Jeanne Smith, the first semester. It was in this class where I realized for the first time how little I had really been taught about writing. I came to realize that writing is a skill that can be taught and can be improved through feedback and revision. And while I loved my high school English teacher, I became frustrated that I was never taught what specific elements of my writing could have been improved upon. My first introduction to composition studies was frustration at the lack of writing instruction I had received throughout my life.

I learned from Jeanne and senior writing tutors how to equally attune to the concerns of student writers and to teach specific writing skills that would assist their revision processes. Ryan and Zimmerelli (2010) guided me through responding to each writer's individual needs and focus on more than just grammar, but on elements such as structure, organization, argument, audience. I learned that I wanted to spread writing instruction across the university so that all

students would learn to become better writers rather than think it was something they were simply incapable of doing.

Fundamental Concept Two: Instructors across the curriculum can all meaningfully engage in the instruction of writing

After graduating college, I was hired to start the writing center at a small Baptist university in Texas as part of their college-wide writing initiative. The initiative included revamping their two-semester freshmen composition sequence, adding two writing emphasis courses in every degree pathway, and then starting a writing center that would help support these courses, specifically with every student in these four courses being required to come to the writing center at least once per semester. While my boss was in charge of overseeing the initiative as a whole and worked more with faculty, I also worked with faculty across the campus to help design workshops and train our writing tutors to support such an array of courses. While there were many bumps along the way, I was continuously impressed when faculty would choose to push their students to do more with their writing in these courses, and they genuinely wanted to hear our feedback on how to best support students and help them improve their writing in every discipline from mathematics to business to recreation.

My experience speaks to the fundamental ideal of writing as being both a mode to enhance learning of content and being a skill that students need to learn within their specific disciplines (Carter et al., 2007). I also found evidence for Geller's (2009) assertion that all faculty are invested in the teaching of writing. However, I was also experiencing difficulties through this top-down approach to WAC that we often had to counter with more grassroots strategies. Certain departments debated over the definitions of what was prescriptively required for writing emphasis courses, and I attended meetings with faculty from departments who

wanted to do more to teach writing but were frustrated over the specific page requirements or definitions of learning outcomes that did not immediately fit their situation. I was excited to see how each department we worked with were able to come together to decide on their own goals for writing for their students, adapting the standards to fit their unique disciplinary contexts.

Fundamental Concept Three: Community engagement as a model for ethical collaboration

During my first year at UW-Madison I took a class taught by Annika Konrad in the spring 2019 semester titled English 706: Public Rhetorics and Community Engagement. At the time, I was starting to think more about how to fold more attention to social justice issues into my interests in writing across the curriculum and writing center studies, and I was inspired by the work of the scholars we read about in that class. As community-engaged researchers often work with communities that have been marginalized (e.g., Crabtree & Sapp, 2005; Hachelaf & Parks, 2018; Jackson & DeLaune, 2018; Rousculp, 2014; Smith & Kannen, 2015) this body of scholarship has begun to explore how to build relationships with these community members in a way that respects all parties. While building these reciprocal relationships, community-engaged research also has explored how to attune to issues of social justice through the entire collaboration (see Godbee, 2018; Grobman, Kemmerer, & Zebertavage, 2017; Jackson & DeLaune, 2018; Rousculp, 2014). The goal of these community-engaged research projects is often specifically to foreground the voices of communities and support their work towards being agents of change rather than simply subjects of study. I started to see the practices of respectful partnership building and attention to social justice from community-engaged research as a framework of methods that I wanted to draw from in my own work.

In this class, we came up with a heuristic to help describe community-engaged work. We largely developed this heuristic drawing from the work of Cushman as well as Flower, Rousculp,

and Long. This heuristic helped to describe the best practices we saw emerging from our readings on community-engaged research projects, and this same heuristic helped me think through how to work with departments as communities.

First, we decided that community engagement should always start with thoughtfully entering the community. We defined entering the community as "Approaching a community and thinking about how you first engage with the community partner(s), and how you continue to re-enter the community throughout the partnership" (Class Glossary, April 30, 2019). Entering the community in the manner of community-engaged research means finding ways to integrate the researcher into the existing structures of the community through multiple avenues. The next step is collaborating with the community. True community collaboration requires being flexible, building on mutual care and respect for one another's goals, with the community members setting the agenda and centering a collective voice through the whole process (Mathis & Boehm, 2018; Parks, 2014; Stoecker, 2013).

Collaboration with the community is where the project done with the community usually occurs in many different forms. One early stage of collaboration can take the form of a practice of community values mapping. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Action Research,* Coghlan and Brydon-Miller (2014) define community mapping as "the process and product of a community getting together to map its own assets, values, beliefs or any other selected variable." The goal is to map the community for the benefit of the community through informal practices and is opposite to mapping by authority for authority purposes through formal rules. This is meant to be an empowering process that allows for exploration and eventual action and enables the community to be able to have a stronger position in representing itself to outsiders. While there are no formal rules for community mapping, Coghlan and Brydon-Miller (2014) share that the

process usually follows these steps: “A community usually (a) self-identifies, (b) agrees to engage in mapping itself as a community, (c) identifies the primary ‘action’ or purpose for mapping, (d) decides what information to collect, (e) completes information gathering, (f) analyzes the information focusing on the ‘action; under consideration, (g) organizes and analyzes the information so that it can be meaningfully and effectively communicated and (h) uses the information strategically and as planned to achieve action.” It is a form of action research that has the capacity to significantly empower the community when negotiating with outsiders by enabling it to be in a stronger position when representing itself. Community mapping often results in an actual map as a way to organize and communicate the information gathered, but it can also result in “written documents, tables and graphs or other media forms, including oral narratives” or any combination of these formats. The process of mapping is just as important as the product as it helps bring the community together, facilitating the sharing of assets, attitudes, values, and beliefs. Community values mapping is a practice that can put issues of social and linguistic justice to the forefront of the rest of the collaborative process as it requires the community to discuss their values around these issues.

In our class heuristic, we saw that a best practice of community-engaged work was to start the entire process of building from a community-engaged perspective involves starting from a stance of a rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014) through every relationship built. This will help to center the rest of the collaborative process on social and linguistic issues that are central to the community in a manner that respects their own perspectives on these issues while making room for them to hear from the researcher as well. A rhetoric of respect requires drawing from the experience, knowledge, values, and ongoing work done by community members as well as

finding meaningful ways to involve community members into the process of developing and assessing the entire project.

We discussed in class how these elements of entering the community, collaboration, and respect could be adapted for our teaching with students, especially to draw on the cultural resources students brought to class as assets in the learning environment. I also started thinking about how to use these elements beyond single classes and into collaborations across campus, and how they might lead toward institutional change.

Fundamental Concept Four: Using translingual ideologies as a framework for writing pedagogy

I do not know remember exactly where I first started to hear about linguistic justice, but I explored concepts of translanguaging and linguistic justice more extensively through a course with Diego Román titled Curriculum and Instruction 975: Translanguaging, Power & Education. In this course, we read work from scholars from linguistics and education who were exploring the relation between language and power. This was a very diverse class where I was one of only a few students who mainly only speak one language, and I was so inspired to hear about my classmates' diverse language experiences in relation to everything we were reading for class.

Our class readings from García and Kleyn (2016), Creese & Blackledge (2019), Lee and McCarty (2015), Carvalho (2012), Leeman (2012), Kroskrity (2004), Flores and Rosa (2015), Canagarajah (2013), and Hornberger and Link (2012) highlighted how language education is always about more than just language, but also about the discriminatory ways the speakers of these languages and language varieties are viewed in society. These scholars inspired me to think about the ways we can use language diversity as an asset in the classroom, rather than a deficit that we need to accommodate in our lessons.

Within this class, I began exploring the concepts that later became the focus of my preliminary examination essay and consider how WAC and writing centers have considered language ideologies. This helped me to name what I saw as the gap in WAC that I wanted to fill with my dissertation project. Mahaffey (1998) defined WAC ideology from a historical basis as being a response to nationally perceived crises of inadequacy of student writing. Thus, Mahaffey finds that the ideologies have been to learn the communities of academic discourse, which socializes students into the university, and the rhetoric of disciplinary inquiry, in which students learn writing is argument on behalf of particular knowledge claims, providing transdisciplinary space for shared inquiry.

Donna LeCourt (1996) observed that WAC programs tend to initiate students into already normalized discourses, reproduce dominant ideologies of discourses, and elide difference, particularly race, gender, class, and nonacademic literacies. Villanueva (2001) characterized WAC as 'assimilationist,' calling for critical pedagogy to show students how to subvert disciplinary conventions even as they are learning to imitate them. These scholars led Zawacki and Cox (2014) to look at global Englishes and translingualism to argue for differentiated instruction for multilingual learners in WAC pedagogy.

Hebbard and Hernández (2020) believe that "before instructors can engage their students in exploring and challenging their views toward language, instructors must first critically interrogate their own" (p. 251). They believe that fostering a translingual ideology can allow both mono- and multi- lingual faculty reflect on their experiences, and lead to shifting from a deficit-based monoglossic ideology to a heteroglossic ideology where all students are seen as full members of their classroom and discourse communities (Blair et al, 2018; Hebbard & Hernández, 2020; Schwarzer & Fuchs, 2014). These scholars inspired me to think about the

goals that I had for writing and language as needing to consider language ideologies more critically. I also believed that even engaging in discussions of these topics would draw professors towards examining their own linguistic ideologies and help them reflect on how their linguistic experiences are similar to and differ from their students.

Central Definitions

I will take a moment here to share central definitions that guided me throughout my project. Like the fundamental concepts mentioned above, these are essential for understanding my project, but I further refined my understandings of each of these concepts throughout my project.

First, throughout this project I referred to writing in a broad sense to mean communicative acts that include traditional written language but can also include elements of visual and oral communication. CCCC (the Conference on College Composition and Communication) defines writing, stating "We will advocate for a broad definition of writing (including composition, digital production, and diverse language practices) that emphasizes its value as a human activity that empowers individuals and communities to shape their worlds" (CCCC, 2014). Wilson (2020) understands literacy as multidimensional and multisensory, including a multiplicity of social activities that "cannot be restricted merely to the act of putting pen to paper but include aspects of smell, taste, sound and particularly visuality" (p.197). In working with faculty, I would ask faculty about writing and would realize that they did not include elements of writing projects such as data visualization and oral presentations that would include posters or slide decks with written elements. I would then explain that writing pedagogy often includes attention to these types of multimodal projects and that I personally had both training and interest in viewing writing projects broadly to include these types of projects.

Next, I use the term "social justice" as an umbrella term throughout this dissertation. For the purposes of my research, I wanted to keep a loose definition of social justice as I wanted to see how my partners were fitting various ideas into the general concept of social justice and to name the values that they saw as fitting in social justice, rather than defining this for them. I hoped that by letting my partners shared their own understandings of social justice in their discipline, this would help them to broadly connect various ongoing projects to our conversations and show me what they already valued and were working on without feeling judgment for working more with particular identity groups more than others. My goal was then to see how to connect the values they were already displaying in their work and conversations about social justice to start to envision what linguistic justice might look like within the context of their disciplines. By allowing them to be the experts of what social justice looked like in their disciplines, I could partner with them to share my expertise in linguistic justice to envision what enacting those social justice values could look like for their department.

So, my broad use of social justice was a specific choice to help forward the goals of working with partners in this project through a rhetoric of respect, showing that I respected their knowledge and the work they already were doing. However, I also use this term throughout these pages in ways where a more specific definition can help readers envision what I came into this project understanding social justice to mean. When I refer to social justice, I think of it as an action, similar to Leigh Patel's definition as "the quest for the realignment and rectification of social inequalities" (90). I also draw from Virginia Schwarz's (2020) definition of "an umbrella frame that encompasses multiple approaches to teaching, learning, and being that center marginalized perspectives and advance the equitable distribution of resources" (p. 13). I try to think of social justice as across all marginalized perspectives, including but not limited to race,

sexual identity and orientation, gender, nationality, socioeconomic status, religion, (dis)ability, and ethnicity. While I would not define social justice in my interactions with participants, I would often ask clarifying questions to see how they were enacting their values, centering less privileged perspectives, and addressing identities that they may have not mentioned thus far in our conversations.

Another term I refer to throughout this project is "community," especially in relation to the idea that I came into this with the goal to work with departments or units on university campuses in the manner of communities from community-engaged scholarship. Campus units can be viewed through a more professional lens, as colleagues who work together to further the goals of the university and of their own discipline. By viewing campus units such as departments as communities in the manner of a community-engaged scholar, I was hoping to take into consideration the diversity of perspectives that individuals brought to the group and the manners by which these individuals found ways to form social ties and collaborate toward mutually agreed upon goals. As I explain further in chapter three, I draw from MacQueen et al.'s (2001) definition built during work in public health: "a group of people with diverse characteristics who are linked by social ties, share common perspectives, and engage in joint action in geographical locations or settings" (p. 1) with five core elements that create community: locus, sharing, joint action, social ties, and diversity. By looking at campus units as communities in this manner, I was able to find new ways to observe their practices and collaborate together.

Chapter Outline

In my second chapter, Theoretical Framework: (Re)Defining WAC to Guide a Linguistic Justice Ideological Change Across Campuses, I describe the need for a theoretical model of WAC that fully describes what WAC is, how it is done, and why we are doing it. I draw from the

literature to show that there is a need to better define each of these, but especially a better answer to why we are doing WAC. I then build a theory for WAC by starting from a description of why we need to do WAC work, drawing from theories of linguistic justice and the work of Writing Across Communities, and then describe how to do this work drawing from theories of vertical integration and Writing Enriched Curriculum, and then finally name a new definition for what WAC is based upon these descriptions of how and why. This chapter sets up the theory for the model I describe and test out in the rest of the dissertation.

In the third chapter, Methodology: Drawing from Community-Engaged Scholarship to Collaborate towards Dismantling Structural Inequities on Campus, I share my specific model for conducting WAC work. This model builds upon methods from community engagement to work with an entire department as a community. I share how focusing on ideas of shared values through a community values mapping approach helps to center issues of social and linguistic justice. I then describe how I have "entered the community" of the Civil and Environmental Engineering department on campus, sharing why I chose this particular group, how I developed a relationship with the department, and what I learned from the initial meetings I had with several departments across campus. Throughout this process, I engaged in practices of a rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014), community listening (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018), and collaboration to develop sustainable working relationships with the faculty of this department. I show how interacting with departments in the manner of community engagement research helps to establish trusting relationships that lead towards social justice impacts and systematic change in the department.

In chapter four, Results: Utilizing an Activist Framework to Create Change in an Engineering Department, I share the process of working with the CEE department, sharing

findings from working with this department. I pick up from chapter three to share results from interviews with faculty in the department, a faculty meeting to name their shared values, a survey to gather further input on the discussion in the meeting, the resulting statement of their values in writing, social and linguistic justice, and curriculum, and our intervention based upon these values. Throughout this chapter, I story how I brought community-engaged methods into this process, and how I now see the work of community organizing to build a base of support, listen to the needs of the group, develop leadership, and collaborate together as the vehicle for how this process was successful with this department. This chapter concludes with a summary of the process of working with this department and the implications for adapting this model for other contexts.

In chapter five, Conclusion: Envisioning the Future of WAC, I summarize the effect of this project on the CEE department and briefly share what I have done with the department since where I left off in chapter four. I briefly return to the research questions listed in this chapter and share how I see my dissertation now responding to each of those questions. I then share future directions for the work started in this dissertation. Finally, I end with some thoughts on what I hope readers will gain from reading this dissertation.

Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework

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

The following is also published as an article in The WAC Journal, Volume 34, 2024.

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

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

Though current WAC scholarship has the building blocks to help us get here, I aim in this chapter to name a central theoretical framing for how we could reach these lofty goals. Much of WAC scholarship focuses on adapting composition theories for curriculum across the campus, such as writing to learn, the writing process, genre theory, and grading and feedback practices (Carter, et al., 2007; Russell, 2002; Zawacki & Rogers, 2012). This type of scholarship can lead to great micro level change, helping to affect change on the level of individual faculty members' teaching practices such as assignments or assessment. However, it does not theorize the administration of WAC and thus does not help WAC administrators move toward macro level change or affect the way the institution fundamentally views and teaches writing (Cox et al., 2018). To make macro level change, we need a theoretical framing that names the ideological shift we hope to enact and how we can enact this change across the entire campus in a sustainable manner. Naming our goals toward an inclusive, linguistic justice informed practice should be central to what it means to do WAC so that it becomes truly fundamental in everything we do.

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

In order to develop the theory that I am looking for of WAC, I will build this up in the other direction, starting by answering why we do WAC and then going to how and ending with a new definition of what WAC is under this framing. My lofty goals for WAC include affecting

language ideologies across campus to work toward access and inclusivity. By starting from a stronger why statement that names this as the central mission for WAC, this will help name how to do the work and what our work in WAC even is, and thus guide the decisions I make as a WAC administrator.

Theory of WAC

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

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

While the WAC movement has been celebrated for being flexible and adapting to each campus, these calls for sustainability and theoretical framing are requests for structure within the

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

Why WAC

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

It is logical to start to look for this why in the foundation of the WAC movement. As we have probably all read, much of all composition studies has a history of being started out of concerns for falling literacy rates of college students, coinciding with increased admission of students from a greater variety of social classes and backgrounds (Russell, 2002). The WAC movement can be traced to a specific moment of increased literacy concerns in the 1970s, where open admissions and racial integration led to more students from marginalized backgrounds

attending college than in previous decades (Russell, 2002). Walvoord (2000) describes the beginning of the WAC program on her campus, “We started, as many such groups still do, with a concern that our students could not write papers that met our expectations for thought, organization, or mechanics” (p. 13). While each program has a unique reason for beginning, it seems to be a pattern that WAC programs start as a response to some sense of a lack of ability in students’ language skills as campuses continue to increase in student body and diversity.

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

However, over 25 years later, scholars continue to call for similar transformations to occur. As scholars like Hebbard and Hernández (2020) and Green and Condon (2020) argue, we are still in the early stages of developing ways for students from diverse linguistic backgrounds to use their full linguistic resources effectively and productively in courses across the curriculum.

In summary, the traditional answer to why we do WAC is assumed in the description of what it is, we do WAC so students learn about writing. When further questions are raised about

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

Offering Linguistic Justice as Why for WAC

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

This translingual disposition toward language informs the ideology of linguistic justice. Mihut (2022) posits that linguistic justice both "exposes monolingual standards" and "actively integrates cross-cultural rhetorics and translingual writing in the classroom" because both a "critique of monolingualism and integration of plurilingual practices and theories are essential to centering and valorizing linguistically-rich practices" (p. 269). Baker-Bell (2020) adds that linguistic justice is a call for action, not just ideas. Central to the framing of linguistic justice is that it is not just about socially defined language barriers, but all marginalized language practices, including Black language and identity (e.g., Baker-Bell, 2020), multilingual speakers (e.g., Mihut, 2020), Indigeneity (e.g., Preseley, 2022), and antiracism more broadly (e.g., Wang,

2022). Schreiber, et al. (2022) argue that linguistic justice work should move us toward a more just society in which inclusivity and accessibility allow for all students to grow and learn to amplify their own voices. They also mention that access and inclusion efforts for multilingual students must also include an awareness of ability and how racism and ableism are both parts of the restrictive, monolingual ideologies.

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

As these scholars and activists argue, issues of disability justice often overlap with issues of language, including accessible teaching practices, reading and writing modalities, and linguistic differences including ASL and braille. Many members of the disability community refer to the term "language justice" in discussions about the need for including considerations of language in making spaces accessible and inclusive. The activist organization Sins Invalid published a statement in 2021 outlining the principles of language justice, stating "Language Justice means that everyone is listened to and understood without hierarchy, stigma, or shame. It honors our right to communicate our feelings and ideas, and demands we move in mutual respect for all people regardless of whether or how they sign, speak, or otherwise convey what's on their

mind or in their heart." This definition and their additional principles highlight that the goals of language justice and linguistic justice are working toward the same key principles, that language varieties should not be hierarchized, and we ought to work toward greater inclusivity of both languages and the speakers of those language varieties.

Dolmage (2017) uses the term retrofit as a spatial metaphor to describe how disability is often handled in society. An architectural retrofit is something like adding a ramp entrance to the back of a building. The building was designed to be entered solely by stairs, so a more accessible ramp is retrofitted onto the building, often creating additional challenges such as separate entrances, creating a sense of othering for users, and still not fitting the needs of every disabled person. Similarly, when we add accommodations to a class, Dolmage argues that we are simply retrofitting the curriculum, and essentially making the disability go away rather than truly planning for all abilities while designing the curriculum.

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

all of composition theory, but because WAC has power across the campus, the consequences are much further reaching for us to be sure of working toward linguistic justice in our work.

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

In his book, *Language, Culture, Identity and Citizenship in College Classrooms and Communities*, Guerra (2016) further discusses theories that shape the WAC^2 approach. Guerra starts the book with a discussion of fluidity and fixity to show how from his own experiences as a Latinx, multilingual academic, composition teaching always must balance between the notion of giving students the skills to be fluid with their language use, but also respond to a society that has fixed rules and expectations on how language usage is judged. This maps well onto Mihut's (2022) definition of linguistic justice work as exposing monolingual standards and integrating translingual practices into the classroom. For Guerra, this means he teaches that this standard does exist, showing there is an existing fixity to how his voice has been judged as a person of

color, but that we also must move toward the fluidity that is possible in identity and voice, which is especially apparent in borderlands like Guerra's hometown.

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

From discussions of linguistic justice and WAC^2, I believe we have a stronger model for why we do WAC work, or at least why I want to do WAC work. Through teaching the fixity of disciplinary standards, we can provide access to disciplinary discourse communities. Simultaneously, through exploring linguistic fluidity, we can work with the discourse communities, including students, faculty, professionals, and other community members, to move toward a more translingual disposition toward their own language use to truly evolve with the increasing cultural diversity of those discourse communities. Thus, this disposition toward WAC

can aid students in accessing the existing discourse communities while also working with those discourse communities to be truly inclusive. Now with this foundation of why we do WAC, we next need a model for how to enact this macro level change.

How to do WAC

Much of WAC scholarship lists the different programming administrators do and might describe specifically how they conducted one type of programming, providing models for other administrators to determine effective strategies for taking on this role. While helpful for running similar events, these often focus more on micro level decisions rather than macro level strategies. Thaiss and Porter's (2010) study of WAC programs across the United States shows that across the 1,338 responses, WAC programs most often offer faculty workshops, seminars, informal gatherings, and follow-up meetings after workshops. Usually, these activities support a curricular requirement for students to write across disciplines in some sort of writing-intensive courses.

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

Offering the Departmental Model as How to Do WAC

The departmental model of WAC, or Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC), is an increasingly popular model of how to do WAC work in a way that has been shown to enact

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

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

As several practitioners attest, the conversations that occur in these faculty meetings are key to the process and are often transformational for those involved (Anson, 2021; Luskey & Emery, 2021; Sheriff, 2021). These conversations help colleagues learn from one another (Sheriff, 2021) and make tacit practices more explicit (Luskey & Emery, 2021). Anson (2021)

describes how working with departments or programs as the locus for WAC work inspires faculty to focus on writing and to integrate writing into their curriculum themselves.

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

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

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

A Need for a New What Definition of WAC

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

Previous scholarship, of course, has explored what it is to do WAC work. WAC scholarship often focuses on individual aspects of how to apply composition theory to a new context, such as how to include greater attention to the writing process and effective feedback practices in courses across the curriculum. Fewer pieces discuss WAC more broadly, helping to define and theorize WAC as its own entity outside of composition. In one such discussion of the entire movement, Thaiss (2001) focuses on the ideas of shifting definitions of "good writing" across the curriculum, but the piece does not discuss the work of a WAC administrator in relation to these shifting ideals. Overviews of WAC such as McLeod's (1987) and Anson's (2015) describe the composition theories that are fundamental for faculty who teach writing and

McLeod lists the ways that WAC administrators then do their work, but neither go into theorizing the work of a WAC administrator. As Walvoord (1996) critiques, WAC scholarship often describes the micro level choices of what to focus on in WAC programming. There are fewer macro level discussions of the programming itself, discussing topics such as how working with these faculty will affect broader curricular goals, create an ideological change on a campus, and truly affect students in the long-term.

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

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

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

New Definition of WAC

In order to work toward larger change on campuses, macro level change should be central to the definition of WAC in a way that then leads us to the definitions I have already discussed

for how and why to do to WAC. I believe that WAC can both embody the ideology of linguistic justice as modeled by the WAC^2 approach and follow the departmental model of WEC in execution, but to do so, we must first find the similarities between these two approaches to create a new definition of what WAC is.

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

Another key similarity is that both WEC and WAC^2 have a pattern of being referred to as grassroots endeavors, mainly because of the way both build WAC efforts through collaborative methods where expertise and leadership is decentralized. Both Guerra and Kells have referred to WAC^2 as a grassroots or social activist movement. WAC^2 builds directly on scholarship of community-engaged work and centers bringing the voices of students, disciplinary faculty, and community members together to make WAC goals for the campus. WEC can also be described as a grassroots approach in the way it supports departmental faculty to collaboratively create a writing plan with the WAC team. In the data gathering stage, WEC writing plans also often involve gathering voices of students and community stakeholders. Scafe and Eodice (2021) specifically elaborate on how the version of WEC on their campus has been particularly like that of a grassroots, social activist organization as they are starting with smaller conversations and

actions as they build toward a larger WEC structure with entire departments. In both WAC^2 and WEC, the WAC administrator does not make decisions on the direction of writing on their own, nor is there a need for higher administration within the university to design requirements or regulate writing curriculum. Both approaches rely on building trust, collaborating with multiple stakeholders, and creating shared goals for future initiatives, all of which harkens toward grassroots, activist approaches.

In *The Activist WPA*, Adler-Kassner (2008) argues for broadening the vision for writing program administration (WPA) to include activist work. She believes that all composition teachers and WPAs need to develop strategies for collective action to shape the stories told about their work. To do so, she encourages WPAs to start by discussing the principles fundamental to their writing program and then deciding to focus on a values-based, interests-based, or issues-based framework to guide the transformational change that they hope to enact based upon those principles. In doing so, Adler-Kassner argues that WPAs can build on these activist approaches to work toward strategic action to create long-term plans, both on the organization level and the level of individual institutions. I believe that many of these ideas of how to make writing programs more activist are highly applicable to the ways that WAC programs work to change institutional contexts, as we can see in the way that both WAC^2 and WEC can be referred to as grassroots movements.

So, to redefine what WAC is in a way that can make room for a departmental model answer to how to do WAC and a linguistic justice answer to why we do WAC, I believe we should fold in these ideas of activist WPA work, highlighting the grassroots similarity between WAC^2 and WEC. I offer then the definition of WAC as a grassroots movement that focuses on writing and communication skills as the building blocks for an ideological shift in education

practices. So, this leads us to the following as a summary of previous working definitions of WAC I summarized from the literature and my new definition of WAC I have been building through this chapter.

Table 2.1 Comparison of previous definitions of WAC and my new theorization

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

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

Enacting this Definition of WAC and Looking to the Future

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

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

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

I am still just starting to explore what this new definition of WAC means for my work, and I hope to publish more on that in the future, but for now I can share that I have started to find my allies and work with them. In working toward the departmental model, I have tried to find allies that will help me make moves to work with entire departments. To center linguistic justice through the way I do WAC, I share what linguistic justice means to me and ask how this might work alongside social justice efforts already occurring in the department in every conversation I have. In following an activist framework, the goal is to find an established group that will come together for a conversation to discuss and name shared values, interests, or issues among members of the department or other unit. The next step is to then work alongside this group to create interventions that will help them reach their goals. By starting with a shared understanding of values, interests, or issues in the department related to both writing and social and linguistic justice, every effort to act upon these can be influenced by this mutual understanding. Essentially, naming values, interests, or issues shared within the entire departmental unit can then lead you to developing catered WAC programming that intersects linguistic justice and writing in a way that forwards the goals of the group you are working with rather than developing generic programming that might or might not meet the needs of specific faculty.

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

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

I hope that by carefully naming both a how and a why, this definition of WAC can help us reach toward true change toward linguistic justice. By framing WAC as a grassroots, activist effort that works with departments toward access and inclusivity in their discourse communities, the goal and process to do macro level change on a campus is defined in a way that will provide direction for WAC administration that sustainably works toward linguistic justice. As with any

theory, I hope that others will build on these ideas and test them out to see how we can each reach our loftiest goals for true ideological change through our work.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Drawing from Community-Engaged Scholarship to Collaborate towards Dismantling Structural Inequities on Campus

In her keynote address at the 2021 Conference on Community Literacy, Brigette Rouson argued that "Community is the site and shaper of liberation" (p. 15). In her work with communities, Rouson centers intersectionality in a commitment to transformational change at the individual, interpersonal, and institutional level. When I read about the kind of work Rouson is doing in DC and the kind of change-making, liberatory work occurring in other community-engaged scholarship, I am inspired to bring these types of commitments and principles into all the communities I am a part of or work with.

Universities have always researched communities, using many of the same methods that we do today, such as observations and interviews. What is different about community engagement projects is the methodology, or the manner by which those methods are conducted. I borrow from Scott and Meloncon (2018) to define methodologies as "multidimensional, value-laden frameworks for approaching, studying, and making sense of phenomena" (p. 1). In community-engaged scholarship, scholars have developed specific manners by which to ethically work with communities, making sure to collaborate with the communities' own goals and values.

In this chapter, I aim to establish community engagement as a methodology of ethical collaboration that can be used to dismantle structural inequities, particularly across college campuses. As someone who has been interested in both the methods of community-engaged scholarship and the work of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs, I envisioned working with departments or through other programmatic units on campus as if they were communities in the same way we envision communities in community-engaged projects. By

doing so, I strive for a more wholistic approach to the writing done in different disciplines as well as a focus on the ethical dimensions of community-engaged scholarship while doing so. Many scholars attest to how doing community-engaged work has positively impacted the work that they do on campus such as enhancing their teaching skills, their commitment to working towards the public good, and their ability to collaborate (see Druschke et al., 2015; Mathis and Boehm, 2018; Sheridan, 2018). These skills are often developed through work with communities that have been historically marginalized and often left out of university contexts and thus this work often centers around more diverse voices and ways of knowing and develops methods for collaboration across difference. This wealth of knowledge should not be confined to the work in community engagement in the traditional sense, we should build upon this knowledge to better our academic spaces as well.

In this chapter, I establish the framework by which I engaged with a departmental unit on campus as a community in the manner of community-engaged research to enact change. I first outline the benefits for using this community-engaged methodology and why I believe it is particularly beneficial in a Writing Across the Curriculum context. I then outline the particular methods from community-engaged scholarship that informed my approach and show how I applied these methods to working with a department on my campus. In doing so, I show how working with the department, envisioned as a community of diverse individuals who work together towards joint action based on shared values, enhanced the WAC work that we were able to do, especially in how we were able to center social and linguistic justice throughout our work. I will conclude by summarizing how I establish community engagement as a methodology that can be used for dismantling structural inequities and share implications of this for work in other areas of campuses.

As I describe in other chapters, the project I refer to here is my partnership with the Civil and Environmental Engineering department on my campus to name their values related to writing, social and linguistic justice, and curriculum and then enact an intervention that intersects these values. This chapter focuses on naming the methodology that guided the approach I took with this group, especially as I envisioned this project and first started working with them.

Establishing Why I Draw from Community Engagement Scholarship

In this section, I will preview the arguments and scholarship that led me to use community engagement as the methodology for my project. First, I establish how I see on-campus departments as communities. I then share the connection between community engagement and social justice. Finally, I outline how these ideas of community and community-engaged methods relate to existing frameworks from WAC that also informed my work. This section will set up my later discussion of how I drew from these frameworks from community engagement in my project with the CEE department.

Campus Departments as Communities

To preface the arguments in this chapter, I will take a moment here to share how I envision campus departments and programs as communities. The Morgridge Center for Public Service (2023) on the UW-Madison campus defines community stating, "'community' may refer to a specific organization, geographic area, or collection of individuals or grassroots groups with a common goal." MacQueen et al. (2001) responded to the increasing body of community-engaged work occurring in public health by conducting qualitative interviews in collaboration with an HIV vaccine trial to define community. The common definition that emerged from analyzing responses was "a group of people with diverse characteristics who are linked by social ties, share common perspectives, and engage in joint action in geographical locations or settings"

(p. 1) which they show parallels a similar study conducted in social science (McKeown et al., 1987). MacQueen et al. (2001) found that there were five core elements to their participants that created community: locus, sharing, joint action, social ties, and diversity.

I believe that campus departments generally follow these characteristics. Typically, faculty have a shared locus in that they live within a specific geographic area near to the campus where they work, and certainly on traditional in-person campuses, they share a geographic region for their work hours on a regular basis. Every department has to work towards joint action, through work such as admissions, curriculum planning, hiring, tenure reviews, funding, and a variety of other committee work, event planning, and other initiatives. Through this work and shared location, faculty typically develop social relations as well. Also, faculty in any particular department certainly have diverse characteristics but are linked through their educational and professional experiences that give them a common perspective. Thus, campus departments easily cover the elements of locus, joint action, social ties, and diversity from MacQueen et al.'s (2001) definition of community.

Community Engagement and Social Justice

There is a rich history of community-engaged work on my current campus. The University of Wisconsin-Madison is a land grant, public school with a strong commitment to the "Wisconsin Idea" or the idea "that education should influence people's lives beyond the boundaries of the classroom" (*Wisconsin Idea*, 2023). This has generally led to public service in the Madison area through schools, cultural organizations, and non-profits as well as projects that have extended to the state, national, and global levels. The Morgridge Center for Public Service was opened in 1996 with the mission to expand the scope of public service done through the institution. They define community-based research, stating: "At its core, Community-based

Research is that which is conducted in collaboration with community members to address a community-identified question, with the goal of producing knowledge and social action, change, and/or justice. In this context, 'community' may refer to a specific organization, geographic area, or collection of individuals or grassroots groups with a common goal." The work of doing community-based learning in classes and community-based research is thus central to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, furthering their goals to positively impact the greater community while enriching the teaching and research done on campus.

Similarly, many campuses across the United States and even the world are enhancing their involvement with community-engaged projects (Millican & Bourner, 2014). This has become so common that the Carnegie Foundation has added a Community Engagement Classification and as of 2020 there are 357 institutions who have earned this status. They state that the purpose of community engagement partnerships is "to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good" (Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2022). Notice the dual purposes of enhancing the curriculum and educational environment and the social implications towards public good in this statement guiding the work of so many institutions.

In composition and literacy studies, community-based research often involves working with marginalized off-campus communities. Scholars have worked with these communities to explore topics such as building respectful relationships with different communities, literacy practices across different backgrounds, and methods for writing teachers to better meet the needs of members of these communities (Crabtree & Sapp, 2005; Hachelaf & Parks, 2018; Jackson &

DeLaune, 2018; Rousculp, 2014; Smith & Kannen, 2015). The 2016 CCCC Statement on Community-Engaged Projects in Rhetoric and Composition was created in response to the body of scholarship completed in the field in the area of community engagement and to both acknowledge the worth of this work and guide scholars in understanding, assessing, and valuing this work (Conference on College Composition and Communication, 2016). In defining community-engaged work, this statement points to how these collaborative projects must always have the goal of serving the public good and consider the ethics of working in these partnerships.

Many other disciplines also conduct community-engaged projects to work towards goals appropriate to their fields, such as in medicine to help fight health disparities (Balls-Berry & Acosta-Pérez, 2017), in engineering to lead toward social responsibility in the field (Natarajarathinam, Qiu, & Lu, 2021), and in business to support small businesses and local entrepreneurs (Ehrich, 2014). Across disciplinary contexts, community-engaged learning can help students to learn practical skills, develop an understanding of equality and social justice, and increase a sense of social responsibility (Millican & Bourner, 2014).

Through these descriptions of community-engaged learning on my own campus, in Carnegie's classification, in writing studies, and in a variety of other disciplines, each acknowledges the goal of these projects as altruistic in nature. There is an ethical component to the partnerships with these community groups in contrast to traditional research of simply studying a community as a silent, unbiased, non-participating researcher. Cynthia Gordon da Cruz (2017) analyzed and synthesized the recommendations for community-engaged scholarship from 28 different articles and websites from universities and professional organizations. Her goal was to better define community-engaged scholarship to reflect the social justice component prevalent in this work that has not always been explicitly discussed in other overviews of

community-engaged work. Thus, da Cruz defines community-engaged scholarship as "mutually beneficial partnerships between universities and communities designed with the intention to collaboratively develop and apply knowledge to address consequential social issues for the public good" (p. 365). This definition, da Cruz explains, builds from the history of this scholarship often being conducted by people of color and often contributing towards issues of racial justice. She then goes on to outline components of a critical community-engaged scholarship, which essentially "provides principles for establishing university–community coalitions that work to dismantle structural inequities in our democracy" (p. 381). These principles further outline the practices to forward social justice missions central to community-engaged work.

Following the work of da Cruz and many others, I then believe community engagement can be named as a methodology for ethical collaboration with communities in the work towards social justice. While I believe that much of this work should continue to involve communities outside of the university, there is nothing in these definitions that precludes communities on campus from this framework and campus communities would benefit greatly from this type of ethical collaboration with goals towards social justice.

I believe that WAC is in particular need of this type of commitment towards dismantling structural inequities. Scholars in WAC have been calling for a better attention to how to teach writing in a way that will not simply acculturate students into the established academic discourses and instead celebrate and build upon cultural, socio-economic, and gender differences (Geller, 2011; Guerra, 2016; Kells, 2007; LeCourt, 1996; Villanueva, 2001). Green and Condon (2020) and Hebbard and Hernández (2020) specifically call for teaching translingualism across the curriculum such that students in all disciplines will learn how to and be rewarded for enacting

their entire linguistic repertoires in their writing. There has been a lot of work around how to work with multilingual writers in the context of a WAC classroom (see Cox & Zawacki, 2011; Mallet & Zgheib, 2014; Patton, 2011). Scholars like Cox et al. (2018) add that we need to continue to explore how to better address the needs of other marginalized groups on our campuses. While I agree with this sentiment, I would argue that scholars like Green and Condon (2020) and Hebbard and Hernández (2020) have been calling for more than additional practices and resources. Instead, the call is for dismantling the structural inequities of academic spaces and rebuilding towards embracing diversity rather than simply accommodating it.

Situating these Methods within Existing WAC Scholarship

Two existing models of WAC have greatly influenced my work and how I am envisioning bringing community engagement into the WAC context: the Writing Across Communities (WAC^2) model and the Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC) model. I further describe how I draw from these two models in chapter two, but here I will summarize specifically how drawing from these two models leads into the methods I am drawing from community-engaged scholarship.

In many ways, WAC^2, as established by Michelle Hall Kells (2007) and Juan Guerra (2016) enacts many of the ethical considerations of community engagement. Kells (2007) describes how WAC^2 works from a cultural ecology approach to seek ways to connect students' home communities to their college education, especially through literacy. Through this approach, Kells has developed programming that evolved through collaboration with faculty, students, staff, and community members. To foster this diversity, WAC^2 calls for additional community-engaged classes and projects that then involve students writing for these communities and the discourse practices appropriate to these contexts rather than the traditional academic discourses.

Both Guerra and Kells speak to how WAC^2 builds upon community-engaged scholarship and can be seen as a grassroots or social activist movement.

WEC, as described by Chris Anson and Pamela Flash (2020) on the other hand, works with entire departments similar to the way I envision engaging with departmental campus units as communities. Whereas WAC programs often work with only a few writing intensive courses per major, WEC is a departmental model of WAC where the WAC administrator facilitates conversations across the entire faculty to create a writing plan that will scaffold writing instruction across the entire curriculum. This writing plan is created through conversations that occur in regularly scheduled faculty meetings rather than a sub-committee, thus engaging with the entire department to create a contextualized and specific writing plan for the department. While not described as working with the department as a community, practitioners do describe the movement as a grassroots approach and often local professionals are consulted in the creation of the plan as well as students and faculty.

The WAC^2 model has been successful in enacting collaborative social justice work in WAC, however it has not been taken up in many other schools and it does not outline a specific process that others can easily adapt for their campuses. Meanwhile, the WEC model has been taken up in many universities, but the faculty-driven model of WEC does not include a central attention to issues of social justice. Thus, I believe that Writing Across the Curriculum programs can benefit greatly from the ethical framework central to community-engaged scholarship. This framework brings together the attention to social justice from the WAC^2 model and the process of working with a community similar to an entire department from the WEC model. If community-engaged scholars can find ways to collaborate with a variety of different communities, I believe there is a lot to learn about how writing scholars can collaborate with

colleagues in different areas of their campuses. And if these collaborations can lead towards social justice efforts to dismantle social inequities outside of the university, there are great lessons we can learn about how to enact this sort of change on campuses.

Enacting Community Engagement with the CEE Department

Centering community engagement as a guiding ethical framework shaped every decision that I made throughout my work with the CEE department on my campus. In this section, I will describe how the concepts of rhetoric of respect, entering the community, and collaboration in particular shaped this project. While I am focusing on how the community engagement methodology shaped how I began this project in this chapter, I first wanted to give an overview of the entire research process for context.

My goal going into this work was to partner with a department using a community engagement approach to help them name their values around writing, social justice, and curriculum and then help them enact an intervention that would intersect these values. I hoped that using a community engagement approach would help facilitate conversations and then action that would center social justice and writing together through their curriculum in a manner that was contextualized to their discipline and the needs of their students. The way that community-engaged scholars center the voices, experiences, and knowledge of the community members they work with, I wanted to center the voices of the faculty who are disciplinary experts and experienced teachers who are already invested in both teaching writing skills and forwarding social justice in their work.

To do this work with a department as a community, I decided to pilot the following plan with one department on my campus:

1- Reach out to potential contacts and partner with a department

2- Enter the community
3- Interview faculty
4- Do a Community Values Mapping activity within a department meeting
5- Survey to follow up on ideas from the meeting and interviews
6- Collaboratively develop a description of the group's writing, social justice, and curricular values based on all collected data
7- Work with the department to make a plan for and enact interventions based on intersections among these values

In this chapter, I focus on the first two steps and how I set up for the third to show how the community-engaged methodology set up the type of work that I was able to do with this department. I share how a rhetoric of respect helped with finding which department to partner with on my campus, how community listening practices helped with entering the community of this department, and then how collaboration and community values mapping guided the approaches I established for the rest of this project. I hope that in doing so, this methodology of community engagement will be helpful for scholars in any number of campus positions to think about how to work with other units on campus and how to productively center social justice issues through those collaborations.

Step One: Reaching Potential Partners through a Rhetoric of Respect

As I was starting this project, I knew that I was looking to partner with a department that would enthusiastically embrace the ideas of my project. My plan was to start with a strong partner with the idea that the success of working with one department would act as an exemplar to then spread these ideas to other departments. This meant I needed a department that both wanted to increase their students' writing and was invested in social justice conscious methods of

doing so. Because I needed the department's full involvement, I needed to find somewhere I would be able to find several allies who were invested in the project, not just an individual or two.

I also decided to start looking into STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) departments. Partially, this was because I have some background in science and have then been partnered with STEM faculty throughout my career for different WAC endeavors and I wanted to continue to build upon this experience. I also wanted to partner with a STEM department because from my experience, they tend to have a desire to increase their curriculum around social justice and writing, but they are eager to find guidance from others on how to do so as they don't often feel they have particular expertise in teaching these topics with their students. In other words, I felt that I could find a community of scholars who were eager for my help, and I would have the background and experience to provide that help.

Through my work doing outreach for our campus writing center and through suggestions of colleagues, I created a list of potential contacts in six different STEM departments on campus. These were typically faculty members who held some type of leadership role in their department and had taught at our school for several years, meaning they were well-established within their department. I sent each of these contacts an email explaining who I was, how I knew them, and why I wanted to speak to them, namely, to discuss potentially partnering with their department to do a research project related to writing and social and linguistic justice. Each contact graciously agreed to meet with me to discuss my project and to share a bit about whether they thought their department might be a good partner for my project.

As I went into these meetings, the guiding idea I drew upon from community-engaged scholarship was a rhetoric of respect. Rousculp (2014) states that a rhetoric of respect requires

drawing from the experience, knowledge, values, and ongoing work done by community members as well as finding meaningful ways to involve community members into the process of developing and assessing the entire project. She developed this concept through her work in starting a community writing center through the Salt Lake City Community College. She found that transformation occurred not mediated by the tutoring staff but emerging through the relationships that they developed. I found this a useful frame for approaching these faculty conversations, because it helped me focus on developing a relationship rather than a traditional pitch of my ideas. I went to each of these meetings eager to learn from these contacts about the particular work already occurring in these departments, focusing on their ongoing work and their knowledge of the status of that work rather than going in and just sharing that they needed my help.

Through these meetings, I learned that each of the contacts on my list, again representing six distinct departments on campus, were individually interested in the ideas of my project. Many shared that they personally agreed that the students in their department needed to have more training and practice in writing. They also each shared that their departments had recently done work towards social justice initiatives including recruiting strategies for more diverse students and faculty, discussion groups around the department climate, and bringing speakers and curriculum into their departments on topics related to social justice issues within their discipline. Each contact responded enthusiastically to my questions about the work they were doing in their department related to social justice issues, and I quickly learned that while some departments might outwardly show more or less active engagement with social justice issues, faculty in each of these programs are very much aware of a need for this work. My contacts all were eager to share the progress their programs have made and then admit the work still needing to be done. I

believe if I had instead gone in immediately sharing why their programs needed to better attune to issues of linguistic justice I see as existing across all departments, they would have felt on the defense and might have not been as receptive to hear about my project and share about the work they are already doing.

While each individual contact seemed to believe in the mission of my project, several stated right away that they did not think that their department was ready for a project like mine. They stated reasons such as an over-burdened faculty that were not open to new initiatives, needing to do more initial social justice work before building on that for a project like mine, and general faculty resistance to changing curriculum to include more writing instruction, mainly citing large class sizes. I also spoke to a department that was very enthusiastic about my project, but after I met with them a few times, I realized they were already doing much of the work my project might suggest such as writing projects included throughout their coursework, increasing attention to historical injustices within their discipline, and focusing more on genre conventions than general Standard Academic English.

When I went to meet with the Civil and Environmental Engineering (CEE) department for the first time, I was able to schedule a meeting with several stakeholders within the department, and they immediately were making a case to me for why I should want to work with them. They told me about their many initiatives towards social justice issues in their department and how they believe writing skills are crucial for their field. They believed that they needed additional support to think about how to integrate more writing into their department and they wanted guidance on the next steps that they could make to be a more socially just department. This is also a medium-sized department with an enthusiastic faculty who are active and efficient in completing initiatives within their program and are eager to do more.

By drawing from a rhetoric of respect, I believe this initial meeting I had with contacts from CEE set up for future success in my project. They know that my background is not in engineering, and the way I was asking questions from the beginning showed them I would listen to their specific needs. They were eager to share about the work they are already doing, but they also respected my input and were excited to engage with my project to continue to work towards their department goals. Because of the types of questions I was asking, they also quickly pointed me to additional faculty in their program and showed me that they are an active community who respect the work of their colleagues. A rhetoric of respect led me to leading with questions rather than answers, collaboration rather than authoritative work, and adaptability rather than rigid, set plans.

Step Two: Entering the Community

As I started meeting with members of the CEE department, I saw how this department in particular acted as a community. I worked primarily with the Environmental division of the Civil and Environmental Engineering department within the College of Engineering at UW-Madison. The entire department has 34 full-time faculty and the Environmental division has around 14 faculty. The department offers a variety of undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees and currently has about 550 undergraduate students and 170 graduate students. The largest recent initiative for the department has been to establish an Environmental Engineering B.S, and they are working on gaining accreditation for this program from ABET (the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) in the 2024 accrediting cycle. The department has also been working on a variety of DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) efforts including forming a student committee named JEDI, or the Justice Equity Diversity Inclusive committee, that has been articulating DEI issues for the department and pushing for faculty to be accountable to

these. They are also working towards recruiting more diverse students and having a structure and culture for those students to succeed in their programs.

The main way that I have entered and observed the community of the CEE department is through the main way that faculty also regularly see one another, through their monthly faculty meetings. The CEE department has division meetings with the structural and environmental divisions meeting separately for an hour and then a joint hour department meeting every month. After attending many of the Environmental division meetings over the past two years, I have observed this group acting as a community. They productively debate issues and work towards action collaboratively. They have a shared understanding of the needs of their students to become successful engineers. They also joke with one another, discuss the crazy Wisconsin weather and habits of students on campus, and share updates about their home lives. The group has a variety of professional and cultural backgrounds, and they respect these differences and learn from one another in their discussions and work. While I believe every campus department could be described as a community, this division in particular seems to be a true community that has shared experiences and regularly works well together. Under MacQueen et al.'s (2001) schema for defining community, this division in particular has a locus in these meetings, shares a commitment to student learning, works toward joint action in their department, has social ties to one another, and has diversity in professional and identity-related characteristics, so they demonstrate all five of the core elements of being a community.

Community-engaged scholarship often discusses the concept of "entering the community" as they speak about engaging with the community of their project. While this is partially about the initial engagement with the community, it is also considered an ongoing, cyclical step where the researcher continuously finds ways to integrate into the structure of the

community through multiple avenues. Watters, Hannien, and Hardin (2011), in sharing about their community-based entrepreneurial program, state:

> The best community-based research requires that the professional researchers adopt an attitude of humility when entering the community. If researchers seek information from community partners, they need to be honest with the community about their intentions and motives. They must be willing to accept moments of disagreements and resistance. Likewise, the community participants must be willing to be honest and to follow through on activities for which they have agreed to participate. Relationships between communities and the academy should be measured by impact and outcomes on the communities and individuals served, not only by the academic outcomes achieved.

This humility when entering a community harkens back to the concept of rhetoric of respect, drawing from the expertise of the community members. This also seems to add a concept of not only respecting that knowledge but purposefully lowering your own sense of expertise to remember that you are there to learn and grow, entering with humility that allows the researcher to change their own beliefs and practices, accepting that resistance will occur, and to focus on mutually agreed projects and the impacts of those projects on the community members served by them. Additional scholars share advice about the importance of entering the community in these types of projects. Adkins (2011) adds that there is a period of uncertainty when entering new communities and Feigenbaum (2011) shares the importance of entering communities with care to avoid the many horror stories of community projects. Fletcher, Hammer, and Hibbert (2014) find that communities are more receptive to outsiders entering communities when those outsiders are there to assist in roles that the community members do not have the expertise or desire to perform. Throughout these scholars, balancing how to enter the community to show that you

have something to offer while also having a great sense of humility and respect for the community members is a careful balancing act towards successful partnerships.

I certainly did not enter the community of this department all at once, and this concept of integrating with the community is something that I have had to return to throughout this project. I learned you have to tell people multiple times that you would like to be invited and included in different areas to get on their radar. For example, I had been working with the department for a good part of a year before someone thought I might want to act as a "community member judge" for the senior students' presentations of their capstone projects. But I also learned that part of this process is really about trusting the community members to tell you when and where you will be most welcome. I thought that since I was an academic working with another academic community, they might be quicker to integrate me into their community. However, as much as they might trust you to attend, they also are protecting your project as well. Most of the discussions around successfully "entering the community" seem to be cautionary in nature. Feigenbaum (2011) notes the need for better strategies for successfully entering into community spaces in community literacy work, citing the many horror stories in the literature. He notes the need for mechanisms to develop and sustain a civic commitment to the expertise, goals, and benefits of the community partnership. Adkins (2011), in discussing her work with an Amish community, shares how there is a period of uncertainty as someone new enters the community, and that in the Amish community in particular it is important to know a person and where they come from.

As I started this project, I was convinced that I should be working with the entire department, attending the faculty meetings for the whole CEE department and working with the entire faculty on this project. I was invited to meetings with different faculty and then eventually

the executive meeting for the department to talk about approving my project. They decided that the best place for me to work was with the Environmental division, which is a little under half of the faculty for the whole department. Part of me wanted to argue for the greater reach of my project if I met with the whole department. But I reminded myself that I was working *with* the community, and I needed to trust what they were telling me about their own community that I had just met.

I now realize that this was a very strategic and smart decision. By meeting with the Environmental division, I spoke to faculty who teach courses that all CEE undergraduate students are required to take, despite their focus. The contacts that I had already established were actually all in this part of the department and were eager to support my project. I also was given substantial time within their division meetings to discuss my project at multiple stages throughout the process. If I had been trying to meet with the whole department, I would never have been able to have the type of lengthy, constructive discussions that we were able to have in the division meetings. I also learned that the environmental side of the department is highly focused on environmental justice and thinking through how to teach all of their students to address social issues in their work. While I would have found faculty interested in discussing social justice issues in the other half of the department, I learned that there would have been more debates about how much these issues needed to be addressed in every class. By working with the Environmental division, we were able to focus more on what it would look like to address these issues in engineering classes and come up with solutions that could apply across the curriculum rather than being stuck on the same debates that probably have been happening for several years.

In other words, by trusting the people who already knew the community I was entering, I was able to enter into the spaces most conducive to doing the type of work that we all were hoping would happen in the department. And by continuing to find ways to enter into the community of the department, I have been able to meet more and more faculty from the department and even the College of Engineering to share what work we have been doing and learn more about the work happening in other areas. As I write this chapter, I am continuing to see ways that I can enter the community and spread what started as a smaller project into other areas of this department and the greater community of the college. To do the type of work that I wanted to do with this project, I would not have been successful if I tried to enter into too much of the community all at once. I continue to have greater success by trusting the members of the community and entering the spaces that I am invited into, gradually widening my reach rather than starting too strong and therefore meeting greater resistance before I would have barely started.

So, entering the community here builds again on the concept of a rhetoric of respect. As I chose to work with the CEE department, they were choosing to work with me as well. This was very formal in the way I went to an executive faculty meeting and was approved to work with them, but also through the many informal steps that took me to this meeting in my discussions with several faculty members and even in the connection I had to these faculty through the work of my advisor with them before me. Part of respecting a community is taking their advice on how to enter and re-enter into community spaces. I learned to trust their advice on the best spaces for my project to foster before it could grow into other areas. By starting small, we were able to focus on our goals for writing and social justice creating a strong core to the project as it then is beginning to spread and thus grow and adapt in new areas.

Preparing for Steps 3-7: Collaboration

So far, I have shared how when reaching out to different departments, the concept of rhetoric of respect helped me in this process being able to set up the type of relationships I needed where I could learn from potential partners just as much as they were learning from me. I've then shared how choosing the department that I worked with built on the concept of entering the community, which involved building on this respectful relationship to establish trust and learn how to best listen to the community and enter into it in stages to best accomplish the type of structural change I was hoping to initiate. While I will not discuss the results of my work with this department in this chapter, I will now share the ideas from community-engaged scholarship helped guide the rest of our work together. Again, I believe that ideas from community-engaged scholarship that helped me to do my work may help to inspire other people who are trying to create structural change towards social justice on campuses and in other spaces.

As I mentioned before, the main goal of my project was to first define the community values of this group around writing, social and linguistic justice, and curriculum, and then work on at least one intervention that would help them enact an intersection of these values. These are projects that I could not simply do for the department but needed to collaborate with them through every step. I have met individually with faculty in the department as well as faculty and administrators throughout the greater college. I have also met with and maintained contact with the entire Environmental division as a group through faculty meetings, surveys, and emails. In order to work towards structural change within the division, I relied on collaboration with individuals and the community of the division as a whole.

I was guided again in my collaborative work with the department by the concept of rhetoric of respect. I specifically was helping guide the faculty in naming the values of their own

department, so of course I needed to trust their ability to name and share these values with me. I also had to respect their timeline as well as negotiating for my own needs to complete the project. This idea of trusting the disciplinary expertise of faculty is nothing new for WAC scholarship. It is common for WAC scholars to negotiate expertise with disciplinary faculty, helping draw out and name their disciplinary expertise about writing in their fields while helping by providing the writing language to describe those disciplinary norms and share ideas of how to teach these norms (see Anson, 2015; Hall, 2009; Norgaard, 1999). While many scholars have discussed how to negotiate between the disciplinary expertise of faculty and the writing and pedagogy expertise of the WAC practitioner, these discussions do not include a consideration of how to center social and linguistic justice, discussing the need for these concerns in writing pedagogy, the particular history of and current concerns for social justice issues in the discipline, and the expertise the WAC practitioner may be able to offer in addressing these concerns in their teaching and administration.

Again, I believe that community-engaged scholarship can provide practical tools and methods for centering social justice throughout our collaborative efforts. Community-engaged scholars also discuss this need for negotiation of expertise and carefully positioning oneself with this community. As Arola (2006) notes in a review of several works in community literacy, we need to be careful when working with communities to avoid appearing as an expert or as authorities with ethnocentric assumptions. Instead, as Douglas (2017) discusses in their work on a community based collaborative archival project, we need to situate ourselves as equal collaborators, creating reciprocal relationships in order to minimize the potential for hierarchies. Douglas adds that key to this type of collaboration is the need for open dialogue, listening to the

various expertise of the collaborators, and creating a space for negotiation of ideas and commitments.

A practical tool that I was using to collaborate with the department and center faculty expertise was community values mapping. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Action Research,* Coghlan and Brydon-Miller (2014) define community mapping as "the process and product of a community getting together to map its own assets, values, beliefs or any other selected variable." The goal is to map the community for the benefit of the community through informal practices and is opposite to mapping by authority for their purposes through formal rules. This is meant to be an empowering process that allows for exploration and eventual action and enables the community to be able to have a stronger position in representing itself to outsiders. The process of mapping is just as important as the product as it helps bring the community together, facilitating the sharing of assets, attitudes, values, and beliefs.

I most often found community mapping as a method used in environmental or ecology projects to specifically map the values of the community, often called community values mapping. For example, Druschke, Booth, and Lundberg (2019) used community values mapping as a piece of the cross-disciplinary methodology coined "Q-rhetoric" they developed for their stream management and restoration work. For their methodology, mapping would start with semi-structured interviews to gain participants perspectives on arguments for and against the type of restoration they were investigating. They then would gather participants into three different workshops of about thirty participants each to have them draw their ideas onto paper maps and prioritize their perspectives on the restoration effort. The resulting maps can then be used in further discussions with the community stakeholders to discuss restoration and to continue to revise local views. Druschke et al. (2019) drew on the work of Raymond et al.

(2009), who also used community values mapping as part of their research. They looked at the values and threats of specific locations within the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin regions and created a physical map after interviewing community members, marking these specific values and threats for the regions. In both cases, the values mapping helped the communities name shared beliefs and then use that map as a tool for change they wanted for their community.

The CEE department was interested in and invested in this idea of values mapping from the beginning of the project, which I think was critical for us to collaborate successfully together on this step that took considerable work to put together. The values mapping was especially apt for this department that is accustomed to working towards accreditation standards and continually has to name what they are doing as a department to reach standards set from outside their university while still maintaining a sense of their own ingenuity in creating an excellent program.

In building towards mapping the values of this department, one concept that was especially helpful in the type of collaborative work that we are doing was Jackson and DeLaune's (2018) "community listening." Jackson and DeLaune define community listening as "a literate act that engages listeners as collaborators in meaning making across multiple sites. These listeners work together with storytellers to construct and sustain cultural knowledge by building storied connections across difference... It invites us to listen differently, with a community rather than to a community or for a community" (p. 41-42). Jackson developed this concept through her work with Dorothy Whitehorse Delaune and their Kiowa Clemente Course in the Humanities they co-teach at the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma. She describes how her role in this community becomes working alongside Dorothy and other

members of her community to draw connections. In this form of community listening, meaning is not developed as an argument put forward by the speaker, instead connections and meaning are created collaboratively between listener and speaker. This helps to draw the community into a deeper relationship with one another through the telling and retelling of stories.

This goal to deepen relationship with one another works in tandem with a social justice orientation. Jackson and DeLaune go on to explain "If community-writing scholars and advocates seek social justice through their work with diverse communities at intersections of identity that include place, race and ethnicity, class, and gender, then community listening helps us to honor the dynamism operating at these intersections" (p. 42). They describe community listening as a decolonial practice to not settle meaning, and therefore silence Indigenous voices, but rather as a means of "recovery and resistance that provide possibilities for decolonizing academia and community writing in multiple ways" (p. 41). This practice of community listening has been taken up by other scholars in community-engaged projects, notably Hubrig (2020) invites scholars to use the concepts of community listening and storytelling in community literacy work, especially that with disabled BIPOC communities. Hart Micke et al. (2023) build from the frame of community listening to create their frame of epideictic listening, and this helped them to decenter the speaker's role as the sole meaning maker in their work with Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC) faculty meetings.

Drawing from this concept of community listening from Jackson and DeLaune and the examples of these scholars, I was able to focus on shared meaning making and to highlight the diversity of voices and opinions rather than choose a single dominant voice. This practice helped to articulate the manner by which I was able to create shared meaning from multiple participants while also contributing to the conversations as a participant as well. This helped me to center an

attention to social and linguistic justice, as I was able to highlight the voices and perspectives of multiple partners in my research while also contributing to the conversations myself so that I could share my own understanding of linguistic justice and how I saw it drawing connections between ideas I was hearing from others. Throughout interviews, attending meetings, leading a faculty meeting discussion, sending out and reading through survey responses, and returning to additional faculty meetings and individual meetings for feedback, I was keenly aware of the importance of the need for careful and attentive listening. I was not a passive listener nor was I the Socratic teacher already anticipating the answers I expected to hear before they were given. I brought in my own stories and interpretations from my own research and teaching experiences as an active part of working towards creating meaning together out of our discussions. The more that I used these methods of community listening, the more I felt like I was becoming part of this community, where we listened and respected ideas from one another while ultimately working towards creating meaning through a sort of discussion-based consensus. I never had to worry that we would forget to center an attention to aspects of writing and social justice that I thought were important, because I brought these issues up in drawing connections between what I was hearing from others. I also never had to worry that the final values we named for the group would not truly reflect the department, because they came up with and were involved in every step of naming these values for themselves. Community listening in the context of my project helped guide me to ask questions to draw out initial stories about the values in the department and then ask and share insights along with other members of the group to facilitate our shared development of stating the values for this community.

Conclusion

As I shared before, da Cruz (2017) defines a critical community-engaged scholarship as one which "provides principles for establishing university–community coalitions that work to dismantle structural inequities in our democracy" (p. 381). These structural inequities certainly exist on college campuses, and to make progress in creating positive change we need to have principles to follow to do this work.

Through sharing the ways that I began this project, I hope that there are many specific insights useful to readers about doing this type of work, but I would like to go back to how I am defining community engagement as the methodology for this project. Community engagement guided my decisions throughout this process, and I hope that others will use this methodology as a way into making social justice change occur in spaces, both off and on-campus. While there are a plethora of concepts that can be borrowed from community engagement to inform this overall methodology, I particularly was guided by the concepts of a rhetoric of respect, entering the community, collaboration, community values mapping, and community listening. By trusting and respecting the community of faculty I was working with, I was able to center an attention to issues for both writing and social justice simultaneously without ever taking on an overly authoritative role that might have made faculty more resistant to this type of work. Broadly, I believe by starting partnerships by stating your own goals while also maintaining the attitudes of respect and humility we have learned from community engagement, we can successfully collaborate together towards the structural changes we hope to see on campuses.

As I continued to partner with the CEE department, they equally shared opportunities with me that are related to social justice issues and general curricular change they want to see in the college just as much if not more than writing related opportunities. While I come from a

writing background, the CEE faculty always refer to me and introduce me to others by mentioning my work towards social justice *and* writing. Surprisingly, this has not once been met with reactions of trepidation or nerves, but instead with interest and even excitement. This definitely is related to the campus that I am on and the people that I have had the privilege to meet, but I also think it has a lot to do with the ways that I have approached doing this work with this community. I continue to be guided by a rhetoric of respect and community listening, remembering to listen and ask questions more than I talk and to listen to and learn from each new person that I meet. While I do not find perfect partners in this work in everyone I meet, I do continuously learn from each person the importance of writing and social justice in their work. Structural change is always going to be a slow process, but by working with communities rather than individuals, this work becomes a collaborative effort and shared responsibility of the group to make this change together.

Chapter Four: Results

Utilizing an Activist Framework to Create Change in an Engineering Department

In contrast to the often deprecating stories we hear in the news about student writing, Adler-Kassner (2008) urges writing program administrators to reframe the narratives about student writing and to "consider[ing] how we might use strategies developed by community organizers and media strategists to shift those frames" (p. 5). In this chapter I aim to share the story of working with one division on my campus as a piece of this goal, to reframe not just how we see student writing, but also how we see faculty outside of writing departments as potential partners towards centering writing and social justice in curriculum.

While I started to share the process of working with the Civil and Environmental Engineering department in chapter three, that chapter was more about the approach I took in starting to engage with that department and what I learned within the first two months of setting up this project with them. In this chapter, I will share the details of the collaboration with the Environmental division of this department and the process and results of working with these faculty members in particular. Although my main arguments are more about methods that are applicable to doing the work of WAC, I will start this chapter with a brief overview of the status of integrating social justice concerns into technical communication scholarship and engineering education, as writing education in engineering is often seen as done through technical communication courses. This will help to further contextualize the work I did specifically with the engineering department that I describe in this chapter beyond the literature I have reviewed in previous chapters up to this.

Technical Communication and Social Justice

Writing instruction in engineering is typically done under the umbrella of technical communication. Though technical communication could be seen as one area of writing that happens across the curriculum, as subfields of study, technical communication and WAC each act as their own subarea of writing studies that speak to one another on occasion rather than one being a subdiscipline to the other. As I have discussed earlier in this dissertation, in writing across curriculum (WAC), there have been many discussions on the need for integrating social justice into WAC. As I argue in chapter two, a full integration of social justice and WAC could result in both providing greater access into discourse communities for a wider diversity of students as well as work with those discourse communities to be more inclusive in nature. To make this structural change, we will need vertical integration of these ideas throughout the curriculum, following models such as that of Anson and Flash (2021) with the writing enriched curriculum (WEC) or departmental model of working with faculty from entire departments to create and enact a writing plan for their department. The WEC program at the University of Minnesota has worked with several engineering departments to create initial and updated writing plans including their departments of Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering (2021), Computer Science and Engineering (2017), Electrical and Computer Engineering (2022), Industrial Systems Engineering (2018), and Mechanical Engineering (2020).

In technical and professional communication, there has been a turn towards social justice over the past two decades (Moore et al., 2021). Shelton (2020) discusses the need for this work as becoming more aware of the "human actors and the political stakes of communicating specialized knowledge to general audiences" as well as "grappl[ing] with those people and their politics in pursuit of ethical and socially just responsible outcomes" (p. 20). In her dissertation,

Christen (2022) argues that despite this turn to social justice in technical communication, uptake of social justice into the curriculum has remained low and needs greater support for instructors to do this work in their classes. As Christen (2022) discusses, technical communication as a specific area of writing studies is seen as having been started with engineers in their need to communicate with the communities of their work. So, discussions of the social justice turn in technical and professional communication is especially pertinent to engineering.

Engineering and Social Justice

In engineering, in particular, there has been a push for an increased attention to social justice curriculum. Engineering undergraduate programs are accredited under ABET (the Accreditation Board for Engineering Technology), a worldwide organization that currently accredits 4,564 programs at 895 schools in 40 countries (ABET, 2022). In one effort towards social issues, ABET has developed the Engineering for One Planet (EOP) opportunity, which is a learning initiative with the goal to work towards environmental sustainability. This initiative started in 2019 and while its main focus is on sustainable environmental solutions for the modern world, it also acknowledges the ties of these issues to underrepresented and marginalized communities and mentions several times the overlap for these concerns and the need to work with these communities to contextualize environmental concerns with those often most impacted by these issues. While there is no specific mention of social justice, there is a definite attention to working with groups of people who have historically been left out of engineering decisions.

ABET has also made statements about their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). They have developed a framework for DEI that outlines commitments to overall ABET operations, ABET volunteers, ABET staff, and ABET accredited programs, of which their goal is to “prepare students to succeed in and contribute to a diverse global workforce and

workplace environment" (ABET, 2021b). They are currently piloting 40 institutions to do accreditation reviews that include DEI criteria in the 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 accreditation cycles. They plan to review these piloted programs in relation to ongoing political climates, hoping to forward these elements while also not adding barriers to accreditation for programs in political climates that might have legislation that poses legal risk for full implementation of the DEI criteria.

At the onset of this research, however, there were only vague references to assessment criteria that might specifically pertain to DEI issues in the ABET criteria for programs like UW-Madison who are not included in this pilot program. These criteria include "an ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts" and "an ability to function effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish goals, plan tasks, and meet objectives" (ABET, 2021a). While many programs might interpret an attention to ethics and to working well on a team as a need for considering social issues and working across diversity, these are not required in the current wording of the criteria. There is also a specific ABET criterion that names communication: "an ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences" which is interpreted to mean both written and oral communication. All three of these criteria were mentioned throughout my process of working with the CEE department at UW-Madison as being related to the work we were doing with this project.

Outside of ABET, many others have been calling for greater attention to issues of social justice in engineering education as well. Hess et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review

through the *Journal of Engineering Education* and determined that there is a "critical mass" of scholars exploring the intersection between ethics and issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in engineering education. Ethics has long been a component of the ABET criteria, and this study found that social justice is a "prominent lens" for students to connect ethics and DEI. Hess et al. (2024) conclude that engineering has profound moral implications, but that consideration of ethics and DEI connections are influenced by structural and individual factors. They also found that engagement strategies including "liberal education and service-learning (Berg & Lee, 2016), the ethics of technology and anthropology (Hughes et al., 2020), inclusive innovation (Li et al., 2019), and community-based participatory research (Lambrinidou et al., 2014)" taught students empathy crucial for connecting ethics and DEI issues in their work (p. 156).

As I will detail below, this turn to DEI within engineering was very apparent with the faculty within the Environmental division that I partnered with for this project. In general, administrators and faculty throughout UW-Madison's Engineering College shared how they see themselves as a top, forward-thinking engineering program, and they stay well informed of the conversations happening across the country. Many faculty shared a desire to be leaders and examples for other schools in their efforts to incorporate DEI into their program.

Activism and Storytelling Methods

In the rest of this chapter, I will share the results of working with the Environmental division, picking up with where I left off in chapter three. I developed the approach for working with this division based on the community-engaged methods I describe in chapter three, including concepts of rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014), entering the community, community listening (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018), community values mapping, and collaboration. While I described WAC as a grassroots effort in chapter two, I drew less on activist framing for setting

up the methods for this project. As I analyzed my data, I realized that the activist frameworks described by Adler-Kassner (2008) helped to describe the way that change occurred through this project, and so I frame this chapter through that lens.

Adler-Kassner (2008) drew from the work of several community activist organizations to describe concepts from activism that she posited could help writing program administrators to make change on their campuses. She described three methods for community organizing: interests-based, values-based, and issues-based organizing. By using the model of community values mapping, I was using a version of the values-based approach to organizing in which change starts with discussing and formally stating shared values of the group that lead toward long-term strategic plans. Adler-Kassner (2008) describes interests-based, values-based, and issues-based organizing as all starting with a sharing of common goals, and this is done through conversations of values for values-based organizing. All approaches require building a strong, self-sustaining base of supporters, listening to this group, building alliances, and developing leaders from this base of support. As I describe the process and results of working with the Environmental division faculty, I will share how I was guided by the methods of community engagement I outlined in chapter three and how I now am interpreting this work through the lens of community activist frameworks.

I will share the results of working with this department through a storytelling method. Storying as methodology is highly common in community-engaged research (see Bloom-Pojar, 2022; Cagle, 2021; Carlson, 2023; Covington et al., 2023; Druschke et al., 2022; Jackson & DeLaune, 2018; Novotny & Opel, 2019; Royster & Kirsch, 2012), making this an apt choice given my use of community engagement methods for this project. Many of these scholars engage in a process of storytelling with the communities they are collaborating with for their work, but

all of them use storying as a method for sharing the work that they did with these communities. Royster and Kirsch (2012) argue for the feminist importance of valuing the lived experience of the researcher as well as the research participant through storying the process of the research. Building on their work, Novotny and Opel (2019) share their personal stories through the research process as part of their feminist participatory action research practices of "research as care." Meanwhile, Covington et al. (2023) employ the method(ology) of counterstorying as a component of critical race theory to share the stories counter to the dominant narratives. There is a theme forming here of using storying as a way to enact social justice, to share stories of peoples lived experiences and how these stories shape the perspectives of both the researcher and the research subjects rather than reducing research participants to pieces of data. Cagle (2021) argues that "researchers should tell stories about their methods in order to reflect on research ethics." In sharing the story of her research methods, Cagle believes that the narratives we tell about our research have reality-shaping power and therefore are a powerful tool of analysis. Following these examples, I share my research process through storying. I hope in doing so, I reflect on my own positionality within this process and also share a narrative of how each step of the research process built upon one another.

Narrating this Project

As I already describe in chapter three, I started this project by reaching out to STEM departments on campus that I or my advisors had contacts with. I shared that I wanted to talk to them about social justice and writing in their departments and potentially partner on a project with their department in both of these areas. The initial plan I shared with these contacts was as follows:

1. Partner with a department, gaining approval from the entire department to work together
2. Attend faculty meetings to introduce myself and the project
3. Interview interested faculty to gain a better understanding of the status of social justice work and writing curriculum within the department
4. Work together within faculty meeting(s) to name values within the department around social justice, writing, and curriculum through a process called Community Values Mapping
5. Finalize these values through a follow-up survey sent to all faculty and revisions through additional meetings. This would result in a formal statement of their values that they could use in a variety of ways in the future
6. Develop interventions that would address multiple areas of social justice and writing in their department and work together to enact at least one larger or several smaller interventions based on time and resources

The focus of this plan was to get the faculty to discuss together about their values and name them, hopefully starting conversations and creating formal statements that would continue to impact the department long after I would no longer be directly involved with them. A great attention was on developing trust and community. By doing this project, the idea was to build off the work already occurring in the department and get the faculty to a place where they relied on one another and their shared values more than on me as an outsider who would only be working with their department temporarily.

Backstory

After meeting with faculty from several departments across campus, I decided to partner with the Civil and Environmental Engineering (CEE) department within the College of Engineering on my campus. At the time of the start of this study, the entire CEE department had 34 full-time faculty and the Environmental division had around 14 faculty (loosely defined as many have affiliates or work across areas within the department). The CEE department offers a variety of undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees and at the start of this study, had around 550 undergraduate students and 170 graduate students.

As I established in chapter three, I chose to work with this department and division because they were already interested in and invested in the work of writing and social justice integration into their curriculum, but they were also especially interested in getting more input in how to do this effectively. They were also highly collaborative with one another and were eager to move my project forward with tangible next steps along the way. While I went into the project willing to be flexible depending on the department needs and culture, in practice I was able to follow these steps as I had laid out at the beginning with only slight variation as I started to get to the final step and continued to integrate myself more into the community of the department and the college along the way.

The biggest initiative the department had been working on at the time I started this project was the establishment of a new Environmental Engineering undergraduate degree. This initiative included a myriad of smaller tasks including deciding overall goals for the program, developing specific courses, and recruiting students. Thus, as the faculty discussed other elements related to the typical running of their department, they were consistently thinking about how this program worked alongside these other areas, both expanding and providing

opportunities to rethink their teaching practices. When I started this study, this new undergraduate degree program had not gone through the first cycle of accreditation with ABET, and they were working to certify the environmental engineering program for the first time and were up for re-certification for their other programs in the 2023-2024 school year. As I mentioned above, this included criteria in communication, ethics, and working on teams that this group all interpreted as relating to our project.

Building a Base of Support through Initial Introductions

Step one was to set up the partnership with the department, so this was the part in the process where I was vetting multiple departments, choosing one, and then gaining their approval to work with me. As I describe in chapter three, in community engagement, this would be called the initial steps of entering the community, but the researcher continues to enter the community in new ways throughout the relationship. I went to several initial meetings with CEE department members before eventually gaining approval to move forward with the project from their administration council. These meetings were of course before I started my IRB approval, so I have only personal anonymized field notes and memories of this process. I went into these meetings with the goals of following community-engaged practices such as rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014), community listening (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018) and establishing trust. I now see these initial steps also as starting to build a base of support and listening to the community from the frameworks of activist organizing.

As I described in chapter three, I saw this department as a community defined as a diverse group of individuals who work together towards joint action based on shared values. I engaged in learning about and getting involved with this community through community listening and a rhetoric of respect in these early meetings by sharing my initial goals for the

project, but then asking questions and listening to hear how these goals would fit in with the work already occurring in the department. From these meetings, I started to learn more about the department and they shared elements of their department that would be relevant to my research. Faculty were well aware of the history of "poor racial decisions" (anonymous quote from my field notes) that had occurred within civil engineering in the past. The faculty I met with were eager to share their efforts towards social justice, including doing work with communities throughout Wisconsin, introducing the history of racial injustice in the field to students, teaching ethics in a designated ethics and professionalism course, and improving inclusivity within the department through efforts headed by a graduate student committee and recruitment efforts. These meetings also held discussions of the value of writing within engineering and how writing is occurring throughout several courses within the undergraduate majors, but these faculty consistently lamented that it was "not enough." They seemed especially invested in social justice efforts and were excited that they could partner improving writing alongside increasing their work in this area by doing his project with me.

I believe the manner I went into these meetings set the foundation for the rest of this project. Following practices of community listening (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018) and a rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014), led me to methods that community activists would frame as building a base of support. Through these meetings, I established a sense of allyship with the faculty by listening to their concerns and goals and building a shared investment into this project. These meetings included several faculty who continued to be vocal and active throughout the entire process of this project, and the two faculty members who agreed to be interviewed attended some of these initial meetings. Thus, community connections formed during these initial meetings were essential in setting up the rest of the project.

Increasing Project Investment through Interviews

After I gained approval for working with the CEE department, specifically in the Environmental division, I introduced myself formally in a division meeting and then sent out requests for interviews. My goal in these interviews was to learn a bit more about the work already happening in the program to help with leading the whole division through a community values mapping activity at the end of the semester. Building off of the community-engaged model of research I outline in chapter three, I went into these interviews with a specific interview protocol (see Appendix A), but the actual interviews were much more open-ended and conversational and therefore included a lot of diversions from the original protocol. As I discuss in more detail in chapter three, I was guided by Jackson and DeLaune's (2018) concept of community listening, which involves a process of co-constructing meaning through listening and contributing to a shared understanding of concepts together. So, while I had the goal of answering questions I came in with, I also wanted to share some of my initial ideas about linguistic justice and the teaching of writing in response to their answers as we started to imagine the next steps of the project together. I realize now that this process was also working to further listen to the community and then develop leadership within the framework of activist organizing, as I will further describe below.

During the interviews, I asked questions to get a better sense of the writing and social justice initiatives already happening in the department and to start to ask about the goals for continuing to build on these initiatives. This included discussions of what was happening in the interviewees' teaching, what they perceived as occurring in other classes, and what was happening outside of class such as larger discussions about programs and curriculum and other initiatives towards social justice such as recruitment and admissions and special events. Many of

my contributions involved asking more specific questions about their work, sharing connections I saw between ideas, and contributing ideas about writing pedagogy that I have seen work in other contexts.

My interviews were with two faculty within the CEE department, who I will refer to as Melanie and Arthur. Both interviewees are tenured professors, have held a variety of administrative and teaching roles within the department, and have worked in the department for several years. I would have been happy to interview additional faculty, but these were the two who had the availability and responded to email requests. As the department has a limited number of faculty that take on these administrative positions, I will not share any other demographic information about these interviewees to help preserve their anonymity. The main goal I had going into these interviews was to gain a better insight into the department so that I could facilitate the conversations during our values mapping meeting with the whole division, and I believe these two well-established faculty members were able to well prepare me with the knowledge I needed to do so.

Going into this project, one of my research questions was whether discussing social justice, writing, and curriculum would lead to finding intersections among these areas. What was really interesting to find in these interviews was how quickly both Melanie and Arthur shared how writing and social justice goals in the discipline are intertwined. As I asked questions about writing, they would bring in ideas about social justice, and vice versa. This might have been partially because they knew the goals of my project and had been familiar with my project for several months by the time we did these interviews. However, I was surprised by just how eager they both were to think through with me how writing instruction and assignments might be related to the ongoing work and goals the department has towards social justice, as they saw a

relation between the critical thinking in the act of writing as related to the critical thinking and problem solving needed for addressing issues of social justice in their discipline. I will share in the next few paragraphs how our discussions of writing turned to discussions of social justice, how our discussions of social justice included ideas about writing and communication, and finally how Melanie and Arthur responded to hearing about linguistic justice for the first time and brought these two areas together with thinking through this term.

The first thing both Melanie and Arthur stressed when I asked about writing was the need for more writing instruction for their students. They shared that instructors have difficulties including more elements of writing in their teaching both because of the time required and class sizes. Arthur also mentioned that he hears some faculty share that they do not feel capable of assessing or teaching writing. Arthur and Melanie, however, each shared multiple examples of shorter and longer writing assignments they have used in various courses. They both also spoke on how engineers need to do problem solving and how they each see problem solving and writing as interconnected. They also both shared how social justice issues are problems that do not have simple solutions and are perhaps best addressed through writing about them. They were both eager to think through with me how writing instruction and assignments might be related to the ongoing work and goals the department has towards social justice as an engaging way to bridge "writing-to-learn" as a way to think about social justice issues while also "learning-to-write" in appropriate genres for their discipline.

As we discussed social justice issues in the field and the goals towards this, Melanie and Arthur shared a lot of great work already occurring in the department. They were doing work to increase racial diversity in their student body while partnering this with ways to make sure those students felt more included and welcome after entering the program. Melanie mentioned that the

efforts of the JEDI (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion) committee are discussed in every faculty meeting. At the time of the interviews, eliminating the GRE requirement for graduate students was being debated in faculty meetings as an access measure, and this has since been passed. There has also been an ongoing speaking series which focused on Anti-Asian discrimination that semester following the covid pandemic. Melanie and Arthur both also shared examples of incorporating discussions of environmental justice[1] into their teaching and how others in their department are equally committed to this goal.

Our discussions around social justice centered on the importance of social issues, especially in their discipline. Arthur discussed at length the need for engineers to work for the community. In the senior capstone course, students work on teams on a design project to meet a community need, many of which have been in response to actual community partnership led projects and have won awards for the department (see Thuss, 2022; Thuss, 2023; Ziemer, 2018). Arthur and other faculty have also partnered with the community through the UniverCity Alliance in introductory and intermediate level courses within the program. Arthur tied this work into discussing the need for problem solving with the community as engineers and that he hopes his students learn they are meant to serve the community as engineers. He sees communication skills as key in this collaboration with communities.

[1] The CEE faculty I spoke with seemed to follow the EPA's definition of environmental justice: "Environmental justice means the just treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of income, race, color, national origin, Tribal affiliation, or disability, in agency decision-making and other Federal activities that affect human health and the environment so that people:

- are fully protected from disproportionate and adverse human health and environmental effects (including risks) and hazards, including those related to climate change, the cumulative impacts of environmental and other burdens, and the legacy of racism or other structural or systemic barriers; and
- have equitable access to a healthy, sustainable, and resilient environment in which to live, play, work, learn, grow, worship, and engage in cultural and subsistence practices" (US EPA, 2015).

Melanie expanded more on the importance of working with the community for student development. She said:

> Especially the engineering we do, it's done for the people…to serve people and intersects with people. And so being able to teach that in classes and have students be able to articulate, not just…interpret the data, but what does that actually mean and how it impacts people and thinking about those intersections… I think there's some ways to make people better engineers… That's why we do what we do, it impacts people and so we need to build that in, but that's easy to say, hard to do maybe.

Melanie shared this as an explanation for the importance of bringing critical discussions of environmental justice into her classes. She is considering a pedagogical practice of having a short in-class lecture on an environmental justice topic and then having students write a short writing assignment related to this lecture. In this way, students would critically think through this issue, and consider how they would problem solve through similar scenarios in their careers. She also mentioned that this would give students additional shorter writing assignments throughout the semester rather than just writing one larger assignment at the end of the class. Melanie is showing her understanding of writing as a way for students to enact critical thinking and learn to apply lessons on environmental justice to their future careers.

For both Arthur and Melanie here, they shared an understanding that working for diverse communities means thinking through how to best communicate with those communities. They shared the importance of community input on their projects and ensuring that those community members would have an accurate understanding of their projects so they could weigh in on the decisions made during these processes. As they brought up ideas about communicating with diverse communities, I shared that I wondered how this might relate to the idea of linguistic

justice and defined this term for them. Neither of the interviewees were familiar with the term linguistic justice. However, they immediately connected to this term and had ideas about what this could mean for civil and environmental engineering. They both immediately saw the benefit of discussing linguistic justice within the discipline and their work, and they saw this as part of serving the community. Because they are used to the term "environmental justice" they seemed to easily jump to the idea of linguistic justice being a similar move to connect social justice to language as environmental justice connects social justice to environmental issues. Arthur specifically shared an example about a Hispanic community near Milwaukee and how bringing in students to engineering who could then better communicate with these types of linguistically diverse communities would be so helpful for better inclusive practices within the work they are doing for these communities. They both connected to the idea of using linguistic justice as a way to help their teaching of writing to eventually lead engineering students to better serve diverse linguistic communities.

While I met my initial goal of learning more about the department through these interviews, I realized that these interviews served additional purposes in this process. First, these interviews were productive spaces for Melanie and Arthur to start thinking through these ideas and were able to both name the great work they are already doing and think about how to expand on that further. In discussing writing, social justice, and linguistic justice, both interviewees were using this interview space to brainstorm and reflect on how to better incorporate writing and social justice into their curriculum as part of the problem solving and community work that they see as essential to their field. Arthur told me how much he appreciates being able to have conversations like the one in our interview to think through and discuss ideas. Melanie used our interview as a time to think through how to incorporate more writing into the reflection or

application of social justice lessons she is thinking of including in future lessons. By following the practices of community listening (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018), I asked follow-up questions and shared connections I was seeing among their responses and other experiences I have had with writing instruction to not just gather a tally of what is already happening in the department and the discipline, but also to speculate together about possible futures that would build from the work already happening and the values they were naming.

Second, because I was asking questions in these interviews that would again come up in the meeting with the whole division, Melanie and Arthur were already thinking through these concepts and were eager to build on these discussions. I will describe this more in the next section, but Melanie and Arthur both brought up ideas from our interview in the later community values mapping meeting. Melanie and Arthur did not dominate the discussions during the meeting, but because we had already discussed these topics before the meeting, they came to the meeting with confidence that they had already refined these ideas before our meeting and that I had already clarified some of these ideas further with the questions I followed up with in our interview.

I had initial contact with Melanie and Arthur in the initial meetings I had with the department, and then these interviews gave us a sustained chance to develop shared interest and ideas together. Beyond the practical help these interviews gave me in understanding more about the department, these interviews furthered the process of community organizing as described by Adler-Kassner (2008). Melanie and Arthur could already be counted as part of the base of support for this project from our initial meetings, and so I was able to use these interviews as a space to listen to the needs and concerns of the community I was organizing with. I also believe that by having this sustained conversation of listening, encouraging ideas, and brainstorming

together, I helped to establish leadership as described within the community organizing framework. I believe these connections with Melanie and Arthur helped to lead towards finding more connections between writing and social justice and generally generating more values to discuss in the meeting.

Discussing and Naming Community Values in a Division Meeting

After these interviews, my next step was to facilitate one of the Environmental division meetings to discuss and map out their values relating to writing, social justice, and curriculum. As I discuss further in chapter three, I drew on the concept of community mapping or community values mapping (see Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014; Druschke et al., 2019; Raymond et al., 2009) to draw the faculty into both the process and the product of mapping their values around writing, social and linguistic justice, and curriculum in the department. While I went into this meeting thinking about this method from community-engaged research, I now see how similar this is to the values-based approach to activism as discussed by Adler-Kassner (2008) in which "change is framed in the long-term, strategic values held in common by a group" (p. 92). Adler-Kassner describes value-based organizing as highly strategic because the focus is on long-term moves that will be grounded in these shared values. Adler-Kassner argues that this focus on what the group does want, rather than what they do not want, helps to focus the group to have a narrative to build change from this shared vision.

At the time of this meeting, the division was still conducting most of their meetings fully on Zoom because of the Covid pandemic, so I was able to use this format to my advantage in setting up the structure of the meeting. At the recommendation of Melanie from our interview, I sent out a description of the plan for the meeting ahead of time with the questions that I planned to ask during the meeting so that participants could start to consider these questions before the

meeting, especially if they liked the individual processing and thinking time (included as Appendix B). Then, during the meeting, the division head had just a few brief announcements and I was then able to use the rest of the time of the meeting, which meant I had just under the full hour.

I structured the meeting as follows:

1. Introduced myself and the study again and checked everyone had filled out the consent forms before starting to record.
2. Stated the goals for the day and reminded everyone of the next steps of the project.
3. Prompted faculty to brainstorm for a few minutes about the values for writing in their discipline with guiding questions (see Appendix B).
4. Asked everyone to add the top values from their list to a shared google document and read others' additions.
5. Guided a discussion on common values and any outliers, working on refining and clarifying values and generally learning from and collaborating with one another.
6. Repeat steps 3-5 for social justice and then curricular values (with less time allotted for generally connecting this to greater curriculum values).
7. End with prompt to lead us to think about overlaps in the three.

I built this design specifically to allow for all voices in the meeting to have multiple opportunities to participate. I again was guided by the principle of community listening (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018) and used my role as facilitator to bring more people into the conversations and ensure we were all having a chance to read and listen to one another before adding to the conversation. I contributed less to these conversations than in the interviews, but as we were striving to share space in this meeting, each individual including myself had less speaking time.

In the rest of this section, I will first share some trends I saw across the whole meeting. I was nervous going into this meeting because it was such a crucial element of this project and I really wanted it to go well, and so I have several bigger observations to share about how this meeting felt like a successful conversation. I then briefly share some observations from the discussions around writing, social justice, and curriculum. I kept these observations brief as the finer details are summarized well in the results from the survey and the eventual values statement, and I also expand on those ideas when talking about those aspects of the study as well.

Ten faculty attended this meeting out of the fourteen that are in this division, which was considered a high attendance. While facilitating the meeting I did not have a chance to take many field notes, but I did note the general collegiality during this meeting and how the participants were eager to hear from and learn from one another, even asking follow-up questions to one another. For example, when the professor who oversees the capstone design course mentioned the design project, other faculty asked more about the length and type of writing involved in this project and the type of support students receive leading into this project. Another faculty member asked for more details about the type of writing engineers do in the field, as a few of the participants have had solely academic careers. Participants also referred to others' comments and built on previous comments to add additional details from their own experiences, making the discussions conversational rather than individual statements.

I find the move toward learning from one another in the meeting as noteworthy, as Arthur mentioned that he does not have a lot of these opportunities to have these types of discussions about teaching practices and possibilities. At times the participants were gearing the conversation to me, as if teaching me about nuance within their discipline, especially after I asked a question. I believe this helped to spark conversation and having someone who was obviously not an expert

in the room helped them to detail elements of their everyday writing and teaching practices. This was balanced by that element of asking questions of one another, pointing out elements of what they found interesting or helpful from others' comments, and building towards greater refinement and understanding of their values together. This sense all seemed to stem from a rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014) that was already present in this division. For example, I frequently heard things like "I think [previous speaker]'s point is exactly like right. Yeah…" or when another participant said "Yeah, I think I mean, that's maybe the point [additional speaker] was making about not overstating or extrapolating from your results" before they then further explained this concept in the context of their own teaching. This group was also respectful of not interrupting one another or apologizing when they did, such as saying "A lot of—Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead…" as this speaker let the previous person finish their thought before they then added their idea after. There were also moments where participants would invite someone who might be a bit quieter into conversation, such as "I think maybe [colleague's name] can weigh in on this." This group had obviously developed a culture of respect for one another within these meetings that played into the success of this meeting in particular.

I also noted that this format worked well because there was engagement at every level. Participants wrote on the google doc and commented on one another's statements there, added comments to the chat feature through zoom, and spoke up during the discussion section without any one voice dominating the conversation. These faculty seemed committed to writing as fundamentally important for their field and worthy of this type of discussion. They were also well versed in social justice discussions and were eager to expand on this, especially as they were still newly considering their new Environmental Engineering degree, but also were interested in how this affected their other undergraduate and graduate courses.

While the way that I attended this meeting to guide discussions about writing is similar to the faculty meetings discussed in the WEC model, I believe this focus on values creates a notable difference in the atmosphere of these meetings. When developing what would later become the Writing Enriched Curriculum model, Carter (2021) discusses attending faculty department meetings and finding great value in giving faculty space to complain – about writing, teaching, the writing of their students, assessing the writing of their students, administration, etc. – before then moving to more productive conversations about what to do about this. While drawing from this advice, I did want to give faculty space to air their complaints without immediately trying to dissuade or solve them. However, I also had just this one full meeting to have this lengthy discussion, and I find that focusing on discussing our roles as teachers, rather than the failings of students, is much more generative for conversations about teaching practices that are already working or could be improved upon.

With just testing out this process once, I cannot be sure if this was due to the dynamics of this particular group of faculty members or to the nature of how we conducted the meeting together and everything leading to it, but there were very few complaints brought up throughout this meeting. There were more jokes and laughs than complaints, which seemed more directed at the field or good-naturedly towards one another than at students. Of the few complaints brought up, many were met with immediate responses of possible solutions, such as mentioning wanting to assign more writing and group work being a solution though it has its own difficulties. Another complaint in the google doc, “I find remarkable similarities between my 12-[year old] son’s writing and the writing of my 20-[year old] engineering students” was given the space in the document to be read by all, but then was not addressed during our discussions. I do believe the division’s culture of collegiality as well as their history of productively making changes for

the department played into the focus on values and productive solutions for how to work with students during this meeting. This is also a relatively diverse group of faculty in terms of age, professional experience, research interests, gender, and race, and they seemed to know how to value this diversity as a resource in both this meeting and other meetings that I attended and observed.

I also believe that the way I had integrated myself with the community of this group helped to keep the atmosphere light and trusting, as they knew that I was there to listen without judgement and help them think towards solutions. Finally, I believe the way the meeting was structured to allow for individuals to all share, but then the focus of discussions was centered on values, really moved the focus towards positive discussions of what they hoped for and what they could learn from one another rather than solely on what was not already working. This seems to align with Adler-Kassner's (2008) argument on the merit of values-based organizing being that organizers then focus on a shared vision and creating a narrative for what they want versus what they do not want.

I went into this meeting wondering if there were going to be disagreements over some of the values brought up. However, through our discussions there was more of a discussion of refining values and agreeing with one another rather than debating which values perhaps were more or less valued among the group. In discussing writing, we moved from several comments on concise writing and style to a better understanding of what style of concise writing the faculty are looking for, but also an idea of an expected audience that needs a balance of precision with brevity. This discussion around style was the most involved, tying together many seemingly dissimilar comments on the google doc. Most of the other threads met with general agreement and not much follow up discussion. This included a need for "basic writing" skills such as topic

sentences, to teach less technical genres such as grants and personal statements, and how techniques such as scaffolding and looking at examples can be helpful tools for teaching writing.

In our discussion of social justice, there was again a lot of agreement among participants in seeing similar threads across their comments. Toward the end of our time allotted for discussing social justice, one participant brought up how there is an assumption that native English speakers would be better at writing. Specifically, he said "I see the assumption that native English speakers are good writers and non-native speakers are not." Another added that they see this in nonnative English speakers all the time, where students who come from multilingual backgrounds have "baggage" about not sounding smart. Another then added how we have a bias to privilege certain "sentence structures and ways of saying things that echo things we've read." He shared a resource he has suggested to students is a phrase bank to help them with their academic writing, but he worries that this is further privileging just one version of English even further and he doesn't know the best way to both help students with their academic writing while not playing into this system.

I was so excited to hear this discussion thread, and part of me wanted to pursue it further and still wishes that I had, but I also was watching our time and knew that addressing this more fully was not possible within the context of this meeting. I shared "there's not one right answer for things like that" and that I would love to keep talking about that, but I then moved us along to discuss curriculum and bring together the threads of our whole conversation. I was encouraged to see multiple faculty contribute to these ideas related to linguistic justice after only quickly hearing a definition of the term in my introduction to this section of the meeting. I see this as evidence that people from diverse fields of study all can share specific ways linguistic justice would benefit their field, as I discuss with further examples in Bouza et al. (2022). Specifically

here, these faculty had an awareness of these issues in their field and how certain varieties of English are privileged over others.

We had the least time left allotted to discuss curriculum, and my goal with asking about curriculum more broadly was mostly to situate our discussions of writing and social justice into the larger learning goals that they have in the department. Because we had less time, and the google doc had a lot of general agreement, I directed the end of our time together to follow an interesting thread I noticed in one comment, and then moved us to think about bigger trends across the discussion and what writing intervention could be helpful in reaching some of these values. Arthur brought up again the idea from our interview that several skills need to be more thoroughly integrated across coursework in addition to writing.

Another participant seemed to believe the direction of this meeting meant that the group was now in agreement about the need for more writing instruction. He said: “And it seems like if we're going to be incorporating more writing the entire undergraduate curriculum, doing it with an eye towards having them ready for capstone or future scientific careers.” I found this to be a really encouraging note to end on, as I certainly did not push the idea that more writing needed to be done in the department and the discussion was more about the values around writing and social and linguistic justice than pushing for any particular change to occur. Adler-Kassner (2008) warns that the values-based approach to organizing can focus too much on long-term strategy at the detriment of shorter-term, more immediate tactics. The nature of this department seemed to lead towards making change more quickly, so they were primed to not have this be as much an issue in this particular group. I also believe that the focus on writing, social justice, and curriculum helped this discussion stay grounded in practical ideas of what these values could look like in the classroom. Finally, we went into this project with the goal of working towards an

intervention, and the discussion at the end of the meeting was about finding connections across the values with the goal to help lend towards this idea of what actionable steps we could then take. This quote shows this participant was already thinking about the need to enact these values in a way to prepare students first for their senior capstone design project and then their future careers. On the google doc, other participants added the need for including case studies that included elements of social and environmental justice, developing effective rubrics for writing assessment, providing examples of effective and less effective writing for students that also showcase diversity, and working through issues of how to have the time to assess writing. Again, this shows they were thinking about actionable next steps and were inspired by the discussions to be thinking about practical solutions for enacting these values in their teaching.

The organizing work to build a base of support certainly led to the success of this meeting. The participants were already familiar with me and were ready to discuss both writing and social justice within this one meeting, meaning they knew that we were looking at these topics simultaneously and were not surprised by either topic. They also knew this was meant to be a discussion rather than an outsider coming in and lecturing about these topics. The multiple community contacts I had made during initial meetings and the interviews meant that by the time of this meeting, many of the participants had already been thinking about this project for over an entire semester and had buy-in with the project. By gaining investment with faculty members during the initial meetings and then further discussion of these topics with Melanie and Arthur during the interviews, I had started to cultivate leadership beyond myself as the facilitator in the meeting, and many of these participants were especially vocal during the meeting; Melanie and Arthur in particular helped to bring up points we had already discussed to move conversations into refining and expanding on some of the values others were bringing up. Our discussion was

focused on values, not complaints, and on refining and expanding upon ideas, rather than debating differing views. The excitement at the end of the meeting about how to enact these values helped to lead into the next stages of the project, and I believe participants were eager to consider these topics further in their own teaching outside of the immediate contexts of this project based on the ideas that they were sharing in our discussion.

There were faculty who were less familiar with my project during this meeting who were brought further into the base of support to this project, while others were more familiar and started to take ownership of these ideas and took on a voice of leadership within the meeting. In the framework of values-based organizing, we were setting up for long-term strategies by naming these values with support of a base group from this community, listening to the needs and concerns of that community, and starting to foster leadership within the group.

Listening to Community Input through a Survey

In order to build on the productive and engaging discussion of the division meeting, I made sure to quickly pull together the follow-up survey and send it to all of the division the following day with the hopes to get a higher response rate. My goal with the survey was to synthesize a list of the values discussed both on the google doc and in the meeting and then have all participants rank the values as “most important,” “important,” “less important,” or “I do not agree with this value” so I got a better sense of how much agreement there was on each of the individual values brought up in the meeting. I mostly drew the list of values from each category from the google doc, preserving much of the wording as it was originally stated, and then revised these as needed to combine similar values from different participants on the google doc. No values were discussed during the meeting that were not also written on the google doc, but I did refine a few values to better reflect our discussion, again drawing from wording used by

participants. I also included a few short answer responses for participants to add any value that might be missing from the list and to share overlaps that they saw among these values. The survey instrument is shared as Appendix C.

I received responses from seven anonymous participants. The division has about 14 members, so this is a response rate of 50%. Because this survey was based on a discussion during a full division meeting, and then was followed up with feedback in later division meetings, I believe the 50% response rate gave me a range of opinions within the division enough to create the draft of their values for the next step. Also, because this was a long survey, with 32 multiple choice questions and seven short answer responses, I believe that this was a high response rate for a follow-up, temperature survey and I believe I was able to get this high of a response because of the community organizing that had occurred until this point and the general enthusiasm for the project within the division.

I was most interested to see if there were values that participants did not agree with in their responses to this survey. The only value that received more than one response of "I do not agree with this value" was in the writing category: "Writing should be in third person (no using 'I')." The use of passive voice and third person versus the use of active voice and first person is an ongoing discussion in STEM. Because five of seven respondents did not agree with this value and another respondent marked it as "least important" I felt it was appropriate to leave this out of the statement of values without needing further discussion.

It was encouraging to see that besides this one value, there was general agreement with the other values mentioned, and just a variety of levels of importance attached to various values. Respondents were especially in agreement with the values around social justice and seemed to

highly agree with those statements in their responses, ranking them all as “highly important” or “important.”

As this division meeting was at the end of a spring semester, I took the summer to analyze my data thus far including field notes, interviews, the google doc and transcript of the recorded community values mapping meeting, and the survey responses. As I promised at the end of the spring semester, I used all of the data I had gathered to that point to create a draft of a statement of their values and then suggest possible interventions to act upon these values.

Utilizing Feedback to Finalize a Statement of Values

When I next met with the division in the following semester, I brought a draft of a statement of their values based upon all of our work together thus far. I tried to maintain language from faculty participants in this statement as much as possible. Generally, I included all values that received a majority of responses as “highly important” or “important” from the survey, and then used language from field notes, interviews, and the discussion in our community values mapping meeting to transition between ideas.

I had about twenty minutes within a division meeting to share this draft and ask for feedback. In the draft version, I included the written statement of their values as well as a report of the findings from the survey to help show how I got to this statement from their responses and discussions. I also added to this document a list of ideas of possible interventions that I could do with them to act upon the values, which I developed directly from concerns and ideas that had been brought up by faculty during previous discussions. Finally, I included some additional campus and online resources on this document for faculty to use even after I was no longer able to work with the department. I include this document as Appendix D.

Immediately, the faculty responded positively to this values statement; my field notes for that meeting state “enthusiasm! … discussion on values positive.” The main feedback that they had for the document was a request to tie the statement more specifically to language from the ABET accreditation criteria. I had mentioned the criteria related to communication in the section about the values around writing after the discussions of the importance of the criteria from Arthur during our interview, so I was not surprised when they requested even more attention to how these values reflected criterion from those accreditation standards.

As I mentioned, the department had just created the Environmental Engineering B.S. and they were working towards getting this accredited in the first accreditation cycle in the next couple of years, so this was especially on their minds. The ABET criteria is rather vague about both writing and social justice concerns, and I had already discussed with several members of the department that the goal is really to just demonstrate that the department is meeting the standards rather than exceeding them in any significant way. Thus, this could be seen as an unnecessary move, placating standards that do not push programs to do the type of writing and social justice work that these faculty were naming as valued in this statement. However, I had additional conversations with faculty who had hopes that ABET would move towards naming diversity, equity, and inclusion concerns in their standards in the future, and there is evidence of this move in their literature, as I mention earlier in this chapter. Several faculty members mentioned that the more they tie this into existing ABET criteria, they hope that ABET might even look to their program as an exemplar of how to continue to revise these criteria in the future. I also was encouraged that the faculty wanted to tie the language in this statement into the ABET criteria because I thought it spoke to a potential for this to be a living document that they will continue to return to as they make decisions about curriculum after I no longer am assisting with their

program. One faculty commented that tying this statement more into ABET criteria would "anchor importance" in this statement, demonstrating how they valued this statement beyond the confines of our time doing this project together.

After this feedback, I made revisions to the statement to further tie in the ABET criteria related to ethics and working with diverse teams, and this final statement again can be viewed as Appendix D. Adler-Kassner (2008) warns the values-based approach can result in lengthy discussions over word choice and make for slower progress towards action. This was definitely not the case in this project; the faculty focused on a few suggestions of revisions for bigger ideas, but they did not debate over specific wording, and they were eager to move to the step of an intervention. I believe this is partially due to the nature of an engineering department that tends to focus less on specific language and more on decisive action, as I observed while attending division meetings where they often discussed many other issues of concern in the department. I also believe the way I used wording gathered and synthesized from faculty in the department helped the faculty to agree with the way I wrote up the values statement without as much debate.

Enacting Change through the Creation of Shared Rubric Criteria

In the meeting where I shared the first draft of the values statement, I also read through my ideas for possible interventions and had the faculty decide which they wanted to do together. As I shared my ideas for possible interventions, I named some as larger projects in which I could facilitate one intervention that would have effects for the whole division and some as options where I could do multiple smaller interventions that would affect a few courses or faculty in particular. As I was reading through the options, a few faculty whispered among themselves, and as I finished, they immediately then shared with the group how a shared rubric sounded especially helpful. The way I worded this suggestion was: "Facilitate discussions in faculty

meetings towards making a shared rubric for grading writing assignments in CEE. This rubric would be developed based on conversations around inclusive feedback and grading practices for effective CEE writing and then could be easily adapted to the needs of individual courses and assignments."

Without much additional discussion, there was wide agreement that the division wanted to choose this option. They had previously mentioned difficulty in naming criteria for assessing writing beyond "I'll know it when I see it" type of statements, and they liked the idea that this would allow them to come up with criteria easily for additional writing assignments in the future, standardize some of their language across the division for how they assessed writing, and would facilitate "efficient" assessment for writing in their large courses. They specifically mentioned the impact this would have on integrating their stated values across the degree programs and facilitate discussions of where writing happens in the department and how it is evaluated.

This quick move towards creating shared rubric criteria follows the values-based organizing model discussed by Adler-Kassner (2008), where the creation of shared values then tends to lead to strategic decisions rather than a short-term tactic. These shared rubric criteria can be used as a long-term intervention to address multiple concerns faculty had about increasing attention to writing and social justice in their teaching. It also directly builds from the values statement to tie these into the assessment of writing for students throughout the program.

As a first step in creating this shared rubric, I requested faculty send me several examples of existing writing assignments and accompanying rubrics or other assessment criteria that they were already using. I received ten examples from eight faculty. For a division where I frequently heard laments of how there needed to be more writing instruction and assignments, I was encouraged to see such a variety of assignments as examples. I believe faculty were more willing

to share these examples with me because of the relationship we had developed thus far. They knew that I was there to support their work and would not judge their existing assignments and assessment criteria because of the rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014) we had established. While I received examples from Melanie and Arthur, I also received several examples from other faculty. At this point, I had attended several division meetings, as well as did occasional other small projects such as serving as a community judge for senior capstone projects and attending lectures in the college, so I believe I had built a wide base of support that led to more faculty taking on ownership of this project.

I noticed that there were two main approaches to creating rubrics in these examples: rubrics that typically assessed shorter assignments and assessed the piece as a whole, and rubrics that typically assessed larger projects and might even include oral and multimodal components that assessed different sections of the project and writing components separately (e.g., 20% of the grade going toward the creation of appropriate figures for the assignment, with specific criteria for what this should look like). After reviewing the existing language and standards faculty were using for assessing writing, I created a master list of rubric criteria that I grouped around common themes, bridging the values statement of both writing and social justice components with categories that would align with the writing projects I was seeing faculty assign.

When I brought this master list to the faculty, they carefully read through the list, and did not have any suggestions of anything in particular that was missing, but I knew that this list of possible assessment criteria would seem a bit abstract without being tied to specific assignments as examples. One faculty member commented that this list aligned well with multiple ABET criteria in communicating, ethics, design, and broader impacts of engineering design. Another

mentioned that this list would be helpful in discussions across the curriculum to see alignment across courses and where there were gaps in covering certain skills more consistently.

I then asked for two volunteers to provide their assignments as models where I could work with them to revise their rubrics for writing assignments to draw from these shared criteria. One professor volunteered with a shorter assignment and one with a longer project so that I could do an example of a comprehensive rubric and a section-based rubric. After I reviewed these assignments, I met with each of these faculty to discuss my process and gain their feedback on how their existing assessment worked in the past. Finally, I created a final version of a document listing the rubric criteria, providing these two examples of how to draw from those rubrics with comments to point out choices I made, and a short list of advice for using rubrics for writing assessment. I include this final document as Appendix E.

One of these faculty had not shared assignments in the initial round where I reviewed examples, perhaps because they knew they wanted the type of feedback and help with creating new rubrics that I was offering by using them as examples. The other was the current division head – the division had a new chair each year on a rotating basis and each of these division chairs lent great support to my project. In this manner, I believe that I had built the base of support within the division to allow for a new faculty member to feel comfortable with being an example for this document, and I worked well with cultivating leadership alongside the existing leadership in the division to have the very busy division chair offer to be the other example for this document.

I met with the division for the final time at the end of the spring 2023 semester. They were very thankful for all of the work I had done with them. I shared the final document of the shared rubric criteria and examples, and at least four different faculty made comments about how

this was very useful and at least three courses were specifically mentioned as they shared how this could be used in the future. The values statement and shared rubric criteria documents remain live and accessible by all faculty within the department.

Briefly, I will note my intention towards reciprocity here. Community-engaged scholars debate the nature of true reciprocal relationships (see Druschke et al., 2015; Mathis & Boehm, 2018; Sheridan, 2018), as there are always ethical considerations when working with communities to determine how much they are benefitting from the relationship in comparison with the academic who is benefitting professionally in multiple ways. Time and labor on each part always should be considered as well as how much each party had in the decision of the reciprocal benefits. While this project spanned several years, the labor on my part was met with time taken out of faculty meetings, individual meetings, and responses to emails by the division. My benefit from completing my dissertation balanced with the creation of the values statement and the shared rubric criteria that the faculty will be able to draw on for years. The faculty were able to decide on this intervention, and then put in additional labor in the creation of this document as well. Overall, I believe that we worked together to make this project a reciprocal relationship where we both benefitted from the results.

Discussion of Project Results

The process of working with this division shows one version of a collaborative relationship which centered an attention to both writing and social justice. By narrating the steps of working with this division, I hope to highlight better the ways that each step of this project fed into the next, and the effects that this had on the eventual outcomes of this project. I also hope to narrate how I entered with community-engaged methods in mind, but now see the work throughout this process as fitting within a community activist framework and perhaps start to

show how these frames complement each other for anyone who might want to draw from these methods in the future.

As I shared in this storying of the project, I believe that each subsequent step of this project was made possible or made more successful by the manner in which the previous step occurred. The concepts of rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014) and community listening (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018) guided the manner I worked with this division, where I trusted and respected their expertise and decisions, listened to their stories and values, and contributed to a shared conversation about writing and social justice education that we created together through multiple interactions. These faculty showed their engagement with this project through the way that they continually had high interaction with both discussions in meetings and with requests I had for their time outside of meetings such as with the survey and for requests for assignment examples. They also exhibited trust in me and with one another by sharing their opinions, questions, and ideas during discussions and being willing to share assignment and assessment examples. The engagement in the project and trust established with this group resulted in a values statement and assessment rubric criteria that exhibit a strong sense of shared investment in writing and social justice issues and tying these to the curricular needs of the department through connections to the ABET accreditation standards.

This process also followed concepts of community organizing as outlined by Adler-Kassner (2008) in the manner by which we organized a base of support, cultivated leadership, and used an approach of values-based organizing. The initial meetings started the base of support that started the strong commitment to this project, and specifically that led me to have two great volunteers to be interviewed. By the manner of community listening used during interviews and meetings exhibited the method of listening to the community's needs and concerns of activist

organizing. Activist organizing requires cultivating leadership, and I saw this happening with interviewees Melanie and Arthur becoming more vocal throughout the values mapping meeting, division chairs stepping in to share email messages, invite me to additional meetings, and share their own assignments as examples. The base of support for this project seemed to grow at every stage of this project by the way that so many voices were heard discussing this project and engaging in the activities. I also saw this base of support having possibilities of growing outside of just this division in conversations I had with community engineers engaged with the department, upper administration within the college of engineering, and additional staff and faculty across campus.

The trust and community listening that had occurred through each step made the statement of values easy for me to write and took just one round of targeted feedback to revise in a manner that anchors this statement in long-term accreditation concerns within the division. I believe that this division was already a collaborative and supportive community of scholars before I started working with them, but I also believe that the methods of community engagement and activist organizing that I observed happening through this process facilitated the generative conversations and outcomes of this project in the form of the statement of values and the shared rubric criteria.

Implications for this division and for engineering education

While I focus throughout this chapter more on the process of this project in a way that I hope will be beneficial for administering similar relationships across any campus programs, I will take some time here to summarize the effects I saw this project having on this specific division and the implications this might have for engineering education more broadly.

First, this process helped the faculty to create shared language and refinement of concepts that they use to teach and assess writing. One example of this was the movement from describing writing as needing to be concise, to stating that writing actually needs precise descriptors and should be “clear, concise, and precise.” Another example is the way they were able to name specific audiences that read writing produced in their field and how this affects the way students need to learn to write in their classes. This all led to increased discussions on the need to scaffold writing instruction throughout the curriculum. Faculty learned more about the senior capstone project and the writing that engineers do in the field, and they came to a shared understanding of the need to integrate more opportunities for writing assignments throughout the curriculum to help prepare students for these future writing projects.

While the division had a shared commitment and understanding of the need for social and environmental justice going into this project, they were eager to discuss these concerns and how to address them in their teaching, and they used this opportunity to share ideas on how to do this including assignments and activities that incorporated more writing. The creation of a formal statement of their shared values around social justice seemed to help solidify the discussions they have been having for several years. Throughout discussions with these faculty, I learned more about how engineers see their work as serving the community, and how these faculty understand this to be a basis for why it is so important for them to attune to social and environmental justice issues so that they can better do this work.

The discussion of writing and social justice together led to fruitful ideas for teaching both of these ideas. Several faculty shared the need for more examples of writing as models for their students, and how these models could also represent diverse authors for the students to read. Faculty also shared how writing assignments are better utilized for the teaching of environmental

justice issues as they allow for students to think through how they would better address similar environmental justice issues within their own future careers.

This project also started important conversations about the need for linguistic justice within the field. Faculty shared an awareness of how standards for language come from a history of certain language varieties and language speakers being privileged over others. Multilingual faculty reflected to the group how this affects their own writing. Faculty were also able to start to discuss the dissonance between trying to help students succeed in the discipline with their language being judged by these arbitrary privileged language standards while also wanting to help students preserve their own language and identity.

While these discussions did not lead to specific solutions, the creation of the shared rubric criteria started to address the concerns for how to assess writing within the disciplinary context as it is while still attuning to social justice values within the division. These rubric criteria help faculty to have a model of assessing writing based on their shared values. Thus, these criteria help faculty focus their assessment less on arbitrary ideals of Standard Academic English and instead on what they chose to value within their own division, including attention to social justice concerns.

Limitations

The CEE department was an exceptionally great partner for this project, and I chose to work with them for several reasons that certainly led to the successes of our collaboration. The CEE department was committed to social justice issues and has been working towards DEI efforts for several years. The department administrators guided me to work with the Environmental division in particular because they knew the nature of the division was all in agreement on the importance of DEI efforts. They were also eager to discuss writing and how to

integrate writing more into their curriculum. Finally, this is a division where faculty work well together and have a history of success with quickly completing projects as a team. Altogether, this was an ideal group to partner with for this project.

The success of the Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC) program depicts a model for how this process of starting with one highly interested department can have rippling effects for an entire campus. The University of Minnesota started their WEC program in 2006 with two departments and have now reached 50 programs as of 2023, nearly every department on campus, without any element of a top-down requirement to take part in WEC from higher administration at the university.

While I knew that I would be finishing my degree before I could grow this type of programming on this campus, I already can see how the success of working with this department could ripple into other areas of campus. As I worked with this particular department, I started to have meetings with administrators and staff within the college of engineering who were very interested in this work. I also have informally discussed this project in networking across campus and have met several faculty and members of programs like the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Mentoring who were interested in this project. I did not pursue these leads as I was wrapping up my research, but I can already see how success with one department opens up doors to work with additional programs. While some of these programs might bring up specific barriers that I did not encounter with this initial department, I would argue that those barriers are interesting opportunities to further engage in collaboration and other strategies from activist organizing and community-engaged scholarship.

Another limitation in this project is the extent to which I engaged with social justice and environmental justice concerns more than specifically addressing issues of linguistic justice that

inspired me to do this work. While the rubric that we created together starts to offer an antiracist approach to writing assessment, I did not take a lot of opportunities to discuss linguistic justice and do much on the side of educating these faculty more on linguistic justice. I do think that discussing social justice issues as a starting place to get into more discussions of linguistic justice is a great place to start on common understanding and can facilitate community listening practices where those with more familiarity with social justice issues in a particular discipline can collaborate with someone who has more expertise in linguistic justice to create a shared idea of what linguistic justice could look like in that particular discipline. But I worry that I did not get into the discussions of linguistic justice as much as I could have.

While I did use community listening practices in the way I contributed to discussions during meetings with ideas about teaching writing, this was always balanced with me trying to listen to the knowledge and expertise of the faculty more than I would talk myself. I believe many of my contributions, including defining linguistic justice for the faculty and asking about their thoughts of its use in their field, did add to our conversations that started to discuss these topics. However, I was told multiple times that these faculty have a lot to balance between their teaching and research commitments, and this is a department where research typically does not involve projects related to the education of students. Without funding to provide for doing additional work outside of the meetings I attended, I did not feel it would be reasonable to request that faculty do outside reading that would have helped to facilitate greater conversations about linguistic justice in their field.

I also knew of few resources to provide them to help facilitate these conversations that would have been more applicable to engineering or even STEM more broadly. There are great conversations happening about linguistic justice in composition studies, and reading these would

definitely help inspire discussions of what this would look like for these faculty. However, when I knew they were already not likely to have time to do much reading, I did not have ready resources that they could turn to that would make a quicker bridge to applying these concepts in engineering contexts.

That all said, I certainly could have done more to bring in these conversations myself. Kelsey Hawkins (2024) discusses how a change in leadership at her writing center led to staff meetings where writing tutor staff tried to start discussions about linguistic justice and tutoring, but leadership often hindered these discussions. Hawkins reflects on her own role in these meetings where she did not step in more to support her co-workers. She shares that she learned not to rely on scholarship to do the work of convincing these administrators of the need for linguistic justice and instead to address her own white fragility and that of her administrators in these meetings. This includes raising and supporting voices of marginalized peoples and using rhetorical listening as part of these discussions. While I was not facing the kind of opposition to discuss linguistic justice that Hawkins is discussing, I too feel that I might have let my reliance on scholarship hinder me from addressing linguistic justice more specifically in some of these meetings. I could have done more to support the faculty who brought up the difficulties in deciding how to foster linguistic diversity in their students' writing even just in affirming that this is a topic a lot of people are discussing and sharing why it is important to keep considering. I also could have followed up with more practical solutions after this meeting, especially more explicitly naming the project of our rubric creation as partially addressing these concerns, but also how even naming this dissonance between teaching for acceptance in the current standards and striving to support more linguistic diversity in classroom spaces is a great first step and discussion to have with students.

Lucia Pawlowski (2024) discusses her work in addressing linguistic justice across her campus, and names a schema for where groups are at in these discussions as falling either in "linguistic diversity, linguistic equity, or linguistic diversity." She then uses this evaluation of where they already fall in these discussions to determine what to bring to the group to help push them into the next stage. I think I was too complacent in the great social justice work already being done in this department and I could have done more to help push them to keep doing more. I believe in repeating this type of work in the future, I should use initial meetings and interviews to gauge where a group is within Pawlowski's schema and then follow her advice on how to help the group move towards the next stage of working towards linguistic justice in their department. By assessing where the department is already at in this schema, it would help me better prepare for what I could contribute during larger faculty meetings. In this way, I could be better prepared to help facilitate a move into the next stage of that schema and initiate ongoing discussions of what linguistic justice could look like for their departments.

Implications of Project for WAC

As Dan Emery, Melinda Lindquist, and Deanna Koepp (2022) discussed in their presentation "Investigating Antiracist, Equitable, and/or Inclusive Writing Assessment" at the 2022 Writing Enriched Curriculum Institute, the WEC model needs to be leveraged to attend to antiracism, equity, and inclusivity, as these concerns were not built into the way the model was designed. They also said that WEC avoids the "activist space." Rebecca Kersner and Ibrahim Shelton (2022) added in their presentation "Approaching Anti-Racist Facilitation" that they have encountered issues with the "facilitative" and "friendly conversation" model of WEC discussions when participants bring up "racist, culturally disrespectful, or deficit-based thinking" and they

facilitated a generative discussion on how to respond to these moments in the presentation I attended.

The model that I story in this chapter utilizes many features of the WEC process. I worked with an entire program to think about writing throughout their curriculum. I also facilitated discussions within their existing faculty meetings, allowing them to name for themselves what writing looks like in their field and their curriculum. However, the WEC model relies on faculty to name their own goals around writing to the point that issues of social justice are only brought into the conversation if a member of the faculty addresses it themselves. In this project with the CEE department, we all agreed to discuss writing and social justice together from the onset, and this on its own shaped a lot of the project. Pairing this focus with concepts such as community listening, rhetoric of respect, and values-based organizing, models one way to approach change making on campus in a manner grounded in an attention to ethical collaborations and focus on social justice implications.

In "The Difficulty of Believing in Writing Across the Curriculum" Anne Ellen Geller (2009) considers a more optimistic approach to WAC by using Elbow's (2008) concept of methodological believing to assume that all faculty do writing and teach writing. If you base WAC on this concept, then she suggests a form of true dialogue with faculty that involves taking the time to listen through any inner thoughts writing administrators might have about writing being taught differently than they would suggest and allowing for differences in opinions to exist in dialogue rather than moving quickly to persuasion. I went into this project with my own methodological believing to assume that this department was already doing the teaching of writing as well as work towards social and linguistic justice. While I think I could have contributed more of my own ideas at times about linguistic justice into these conversations, I

think I also left room for these faculty to discuss what this looks like in their discipline. By starting with a belief in the work and values already present in this community, we were able to name the values they shared and further build upon these values together.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

Envisioning the Future of WAC

When I have shared some of the findings of this project at conferences and other events, I often have reactions of surprise that I partnered with an engineering department that was equally enthusiastic about working on writing and social justice. Others seem to believe that I had a unique experience with a special department, but that other STEM departments would be less inclined to want to do this type of work. When I look back at my initial notes, I remember the excitement that these faculty had about this project. I believe that telling them I wanted to work on either social justice or writing alone would not have been met with this response but hearing that they could work on these two elements together with one project was what drew them into working with me and sustained their commitment to this project throughout the two years of this project. Yes, this *was* a unique experience with a great group of faculty. However, I have had conversations with faculty from a wide variety of programs across campuses, and I have received a lot of positive responses to this idea of pairing two essential elements of writing and social justice into one project that works bottom-up from their own needs. I am hopeful that this unique experience described in this dissertation could become many unique experiences with other programs who are willing to commit to this type of work as well.

In this conclusion, I will first return to the questions I asked in chapter one and synthesize my answers to these questions. I will then share my plans for how to expand on this work in the future. Finally, rather than ending with formal implications, I end with a note on what I hope readers will leave with after reading the entirety of this dissertation.

Answering My Research Questions

The questions I asked in chapter one are as follows:

1. What does a theory of the work of WAC administration, or perhaps a true theory of WAC, look like and why is such a theory necessary?
2. What does it look like to engage with units on campus as existing communities in the manner of community-engaged research?
3. Does engaging with units on campus through a community-engaged manner lead towards actions that center social and linguistic justice as a fundamental component of WAC and broader pedagogical practices? If so, what does this look like?
4. Does discussing the values of curriculum, writing, and social and linguistic justice lead to finding intersections among these values, developing goals based on them, or affecting the way writing and language is taught?

First, I established in chapter two the necessity for a theory of WAC and named this theory. I argue that WAC has been seen more as a movement than a sub-discipline, and this has led to much of WAC scholarship being more about how to adapt composition theory for the context of writing in a variety of disciplines than theorizing the work of the WAC administrator. We can see some scholars starting to do the work of theorizing WAC (see Cox et al., 2018), but what I felt was left out of these theories was basing those in a discussion of why we do WAC. I then establish linguistic justice as the reason we do WAC, building from composition scholars who name the importance of linguistic justice (see Baker-Bell, 2020; Mihut, 2020) and specifically the work of Guerra (2016) and Mihut (2022) who name linguistic justice as both exposing the monolingual standards by which language use is judged while also sharing with students the possibilities for using translanguaging practices within their writing. In establishing what this means for WAC, I then name the goal of WAC to enact linguistic justice through

access and inclusivity in discourse communities–access through teaching the fixity of certain communication norms and inclusivity through shifting the ideologies of these spaces towards fluidity in language practices to reflect the diverse members of those communities and the audiences of their discourse.

Naming this as why we do WAC then led me to bring together the department-based, vertical integration approach to WAC from Writing Enriched Curriculum (Anson & Flash, 2021) and the cultural ecology approach to WAC from Writing Across Curriculum (Kell, 2007) to suggest that WAC administrators can enact WAC by using a collaborative approach within each departmental or programmatic unit on campus, facilitating conversations to build and enact a curricular plan based upon shared interests and values within the specific disciplinary contexts. And to bridge this approach to WAC with the goal of WAC, I then named WAC as a grassroots movement that focuses on writing and communication skills as the building blocks for an ideological shift in education practices.

Circling back to the first research question, defining WAC, suggesting an approach for WAC, and naming why we are doing the work of WAC, was specifically helpful for doing the rest of my project and research. This articulates what WAC is, how it is done, and why it is done, to both focus my work within WAC and in naming what I do, how I plan to do it, and why I plan to do it that way to stakeholders across campus and to off-campus communities. While this theory leaves room for adaptability to specific contexts, it gave me the foundation for how to approach programs on my own campus and gave them an idea of what I wanted to do and how I planned to work with them. This theory also helped me focus in on my main goals throughout the process of working on this project and knowing how to prioritize the many directions this work could have gone.

This leads into the second question: What does it look like to engage with units on campus as existing communities in the manner of community-engaged research? I worked with the Civil and Environmental Engineering (CEE) department for this project, focusing with the Environmental division. I went into this project thinking that working with a community on campus would look different than the communities often described in community-engaged research in notable ways, but the more I looked back through my research notes, I realized they are not any more different than other communities are from one another. While I did establish initial trust with the faculty quickly, I was already part of their larger campus community in the way some researchers are part of the communities they research. Entering the CEE community required establishing trust and continuously entering new parts of their community in stages. I had to learn to listen and trust what they were telling me about their own community and how to work best with them. I learned to balance my own respect for their authority with a community listening approach (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018) that gave me room for sharing my own expertise.

This leads into question three: Does engaging with units on campus through a community-engaged manner lead towards actions that center social and linguistic justice as a fundamental component of WAC and broader pedagogical practices? If so, what does this look like? Unsurprisingly, because I went into this project with a plan for discussing writing and social justice and the CEE department approved this plan from the start, yes, we were able to center social justice with our discussions of writing instruction. What was interesting was how linguistic justice became a product of our other discussions around broader social justice concerns in their department. Through this process, I found out about the social justice concerns in the field, mainly around diversity and inclusion in academics and professions and better serving diverse communities, and their concerns around environmental justice specifically,

addressing how to better serve both marginalized peoples and the environments they live in through engineering projects. Starting with conversations about these concerns and values, we then discussed how writing can be a way for students to think through social issues in their future work, for instructors to make for more accessible and equitable learning environments through the way writing is taught and assessed, and for engineers to better communicate with diverse communities. There was a lot less of me teaching these faculty about concepts around writing instruction and linguistic justice, and much more focus on highlighting practices already being done and how to expand on these in ways that helped to highlight their values.

Finally, these concepts lead into question four: Does discussing the values of curriculum, writing, and social and linguistic justice lead to finding intersections among these values, developing goals based on them, or affecting the way writing and language is taught? The easy answer to this is yes, we were able to find intersections among their values. The faculty shared multiple ideas for what would be helpful for them in doing more teaching of writing, and several of these also addressed social justice concerns as well. I proposed multiple possible interventions to the faculty, and shared that I could help them with one bigger intervention since I was doing this on my own time without additional support that would give me the time to do more with them. Their choice of developing a shared rubric to use to assess writing was a great choice that was pretty unanimously chosen from multiple faculty in this meeting. The rubric is a direct reflection of their values around writing and social justice and provides them with language to assess writing stylistically and concepts they write about social justice in that writing. The rubric also provides language for assessing writing from a linguistic justice informed place in which the focus is on disciplinary conventions separate from generic expectations of a Standard Academic English that of course disadvantages those with less privileged dialects of English.

Future Directions

Naming specific programmatic goals was not part of the scope of this project but could be a great way to extend this work in the future. The Writing Enriched Curriculum model always involves moving from discussions in faculty meetings into creating a concrete plan for writing for the department. Creating a plan in this way leads to a lot of additional questions, for example, what does this plan include? How would such a plan go through approval? Who would have oversight for this plan? Would there be some kind of assessment after a designated time to see how well the plan is working? As a single graduate student taking on this initial project, I knew a bigger plan in the manner of a WEC project was not feasible. As I move forward with this work, I wonder how, or if, a plan could be created out of discussions around values. How could a bigger plan be made for the department while still maintaining the grassroots, community approach of this model? Would departments be willing to do this type of project with the idea that we would be working toward a curricular plan of some sort, and if so, what additional support for the WAC administrator and for the faculty working on this would be necessary to make this feasible? There is a big question of how to enact something like this without overburdening the WAC administrator or the faculty who would put more work into a plan like this, which likely would involve faculty who are already pulled into many different projects and might include marginalized faculty members who are too often called to do additional labor like this type of work.

Moving forward, I also have questions about community and this work. For this project, I mainly worked with the community of the faculty members of the Environmental division in the CEE department. I asked early in the process about the possibility of bringing in student voices to the project, but the faculty shared they had not been successful with trying to do something

similar with doing a version of a campus climate survey for students in their department. Further on in this project, I had students in my own classes who were part of this program who shared some of their individual insights into my research and I also had the chance to talk to some engineers from the community who get involved with the department through events like the senior capstone design projects. I wonder how naming community more broadly to include student and community member voices might affect the work of naming values within a department, and then how we might act upon those values together.

Final Thoughts

It is too easy to be discouraged in doing the work of writing instruction in higher education. There is legislation going in effect across the country actively dissuading the kind of work I propose in this dissertation. Locally, I see examples of students I tutor who receive overly harsh marks on their writing, assignments that have racist undertones, and discussions about the state of higher education that leave me utterly worried about both my personal career path as well as the direction of education. Too often I briefly share a description of my research and hear that it sounds like a great idea that just wouldn't work in the listener's particular field of study. Students tell me they are more worried about grades and future careers than preserving their voice. There are so many reasons not to be optimistic about the kind of work I propose in this dissertation.

However, after reading this dissertation, I hope that readers will leave with a sense of optimism. I shared in chapter one that I went into this project with lofty goals about the way that WAC can lead an ideological shift towards linguistic justice on campuses. That we can do the work of providing a path for greater accessibility into discourse communities and simultaneously work toward greater inclusive practices to occur within those discourse communities. While

these are very lofty goals, I think part of how they can become reality is with a bit of methodological believing (Elbow, 2008; Geller, 2009). I essentially went into this project believing that departments on my campus held values around writing and social justice that were already informing their work. I believed that although they might not have the language for the term linguistic justice, that they cared about the values around this concept and were already starting to work towards linguistic justice in some of their practices. And with this department, it worked out. I leaned into a rhetoric of respect (Rousculp, 2014) and was guided by the faculty in this program to learn about the great work and future visions they have, while letting them guide me how to proceed toward the goals of our project. I engaged in community listening practices (Jackson & DeLaune, 2018) to name their overlapping values of writing, social justice and curriculum. We collaborated together in creating a formal statement of their values and then building from this to create a shared rubric that enacts those values for their students' writing. Throughout the process, faculty were engaged in our discussions, learning from one another, and envisioning how to enact social justice through their teaching.

I do not envision others perfectly following the exact model that I set for working with the CEE department, and I will be adapting this for different contexts myself. I do hope that this dissertation encourages and provides options for how to enact a few key principles. First, centering linguistic justice in our work rather than adding it on as an additional consideration. By naming linguistic justice as the reason I do WAC, and really the rest of my writing pedagogy, this has since guided me to think about how every discussion about writing is related to providing access into discourse communities and encouraging inclusivity within those discourse communities, so everything in the ways and content of my teaching are serving these goals. This centering helps guide my decisions and encourages me to be more explicit in the ways that I

discuss writing with both my students and colleagues as part of linguistic justice and how I seek input on how we can all better work together toward these goals along the way.

Second, I encourage asking others about their social and linguistic justice values and work they are already doing. Depending on context, this question might look different, but part of finding allies in doing this work means listening more than talking. We are very much still in the early stages of figuring out what linguistic justice looks like in different contexts. By asking questions and interrogating these concepts together, we will find allies in naming what linguistic justice looks like and what it can do for different discourse communities. I have had the most resistance to concepts of linguistic justice when I try to explain it quickly. When I take the time to first listen and ask questions that help me find overlap in what the other person is already doing and valuing in their work, we then move into much more dynamic conversations about the role linguistic justice can play within their context.

Finally, I hope readers see the potential power in our work. Everybody writes and communicates. Every teacher hopes to inspire and impart knowledge to their students. Every administrator is hoping to increase retention and decrease time-to-degree. Writing scholars uniquely have the expertise to aid in all of these and so many other goals. While I will always be encouraged to see composition scholars move into administration positions on campus, we also need to recognize the power in grassroots and activist organizing to enact change across campus, fostering allies, developing leadership, and collaborating to create change.

References

ABET. (2021a). *Criteria for accrediting engineering programs, 2022—2023*. ABET. https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/criteria-for-accrediting-engineering-programs-2022-2023/

ABET. (2021b). *Diversity, Equity & Inclusion | ABET*. ABET. https://www.abet.org/about-abet/diversity-equity-and-inclusion/

ABET. (2022). *History | ABET*. ABET. https://www.abet.org/about-abet/history/

Adkins, T. (2011). Researching the "Un-Digital" Amish Community: Methodological and Ethical Reconsiderations for Human Subjects Research. *Community Literacy Journal*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.25148/CLJ.6.1.009405

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

Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (2016). *Naming What We Know, Classroom Edition: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*. University Press of Colorado. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1vbd1v0.5

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

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

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

Anson, C. M., & Flash, P. (Eds.). (2021). *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2021.1299

Arola, J. (2006). Research Methodologies in Community Literacy. *Community Literacy Journal*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.25148/CLJ.1.1.009538

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

Balls-Berry, J. E., & Acosta-Pérez, E. (2017). The Use of Community Engaged Research Principles to Improve Health: Community Academic Partnerships for Research. *Puerto Rico Health Sciences Journal*, *36*(2), 84.

Basgier, C., Cox, M., & Hendrickson, B. (2020). The formation of a professional organization for writing across the curriculum. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R. Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25* (pp. 33–43). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

Berg, D. R., & Lee, T. (2016, June 26). *Incorporation of liberal education into the engineering curriculum at a polytechnic*. 2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition. https://peer.asee.org/incorporation-of-liberal-education-into-the-engineering-curriculum-at-a-polytechnic

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

Bloom-Pojar, R. (2022). Co-creating stories of confianza. *Community Literacy Journal*, *17*(1), 104–107.

Bouza, E., Abbott, C., Coller, I., Contractor, A., Doan, A., Eble, J., Fulton, O., Gall, A., Garelick, S., Gunaratnam, S., Harris, Z., Ju, X., Kwan, C., Lee, G., Lor, K., Majidi, H., McCormack, T., Oleszczuk, M., Robinson, M., & Zukerman, L. (2022, December 13). Disciplinary writing interviews and the need for linguistic justice across professions. *Another Word: From the Writing Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison*. https://dept.writing.wisc.edu/blog/disciplinary-writing-interviews/

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

Broussard, W. (2006). Classroom as Community: Shooting for Excellence and Intercultural Discourse. *Community Literacy Journal*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.25148/CLJ.1.1.009535

Cagle, L. E. (2021). The ethics of researching unethical images: A story of trying to do good research without bad things. *Computers and Composition*, *61*.

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

Carlson, E. B. (2023). “I have always loved West Virginia, but...”: How archival projects can complicate, build, and reimagine place-based literacies. *Community Literacy Journal*, *17*(2), 25–48.

Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (2022). *The Elective Classification for Community Engagement*. Carnegie Elective Classifications. https://carnegieelectiveclassifications.org/the-2024-elective-classification-for-community-engagement/

Carter, M. (2002). A process for establishing outcomes-based assessment plans for writing and speaking in the disciplines. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines, 6,* 4-29. https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.2003.6.1.02

Carter, M. (2021). Foreword. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation* (pp. vii–xi). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2021.1299.1.2

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

Carvalho, A. (2012). Code-switching: From theoretical to pedagogical considerations. In S. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States (pp. 139–160). Georgetown University Press.

Chavis, D. M., & Lee, K. (n.d.). *What Is Community Anyway?* Stanford Social Innovation Review. Retrieved March 24, 2023, from https://doi.org/10.48558/EJJ2-JJ82

Christen, J. (2022). *Designing our own support: Grassroots course design efforts for social justice in technical and professional communication* [Ph.D., The University of Arizona]. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2759080512/abstract/DC0FFA3C232D4A11PQ/1

Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering. (2019, March 29). *WEC Plan: Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering*. Writing Enriched Curriculum Writing Plans. https://drive.google.com/file/d/14SuOf4tSvbFbOUC-fqSJgZFvZR3OtyMo/view?usp=sharing&usp=embed_facebook

Coghlan, D., & Brydon-Miller, M. (2014). *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research*. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446294406

College of Engineering - UW-Madison. (n.d.). *About: civil and environmental engineering*. College of Engineering - University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved August 22, 2023, from https://engineering.wisc.edu/departments/civil-environmental-engineering/about/

Collins, P. S. (2001). *Community Writing: Researching Social Issues Through Composition*. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Community-Writing-Researching-Social-Issues-Through-Composition/Collins/p/book/9780805838343

Computer Science and Engineering. (2017, March 9). *WEC Plan: Computer Science and Engineering*. Writing Enriched Curriculum Writing Plans. https://drive.google.com/file/d/14uUhKqDW1q9eugKCEKC1PwXW1mnq0bUa/view

Condon, F., & Young, V. A. (Eds.). (2016). *Performing antiracist pedagogy in rhetoric, writing, and communication*. WAC Clearinghouse.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2012, November). *CCCC Vision Statement*. Conference on College Composition and Communication. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc-about/

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2016). *CCCC Statement on Community-Engaged Projects in Rhetoric and Composition*. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/community-engaged/

Covington, B., Turner, C. R. H., & Bieron, J. (2023). "You call it honor, we call it dishonor." Counterstorytelling & Confederate monuments in isle of Wight County, Virginia. *Community Literacy Journal*, *17*(2), 4–24.

Cox, M., & Zawacki, T. M. (Eds.). (2011). WAC and Second Language Writing: Cross-field research, theory, and program development [Special issue: WAC and Second Language Writing]. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(4). https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/special/ell/

Cox, M., Galin, J., & Melzer, D. (2018). Building sustainable WAC programs: A whole systems approach, *The WAC Journal, 29,* 64-87. National Council of Teachers of English.

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

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2019). Translanguaging and Public Service Encounters: Language Learning in the Library. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*(4), 800–814.

Cushman, E. (1996). The rhetorician as an agent of social change. *College Composition and Communication, 47*(1), 7-28. https://doi.org/10.2307/358271

da Cruz, C. G. (2017). Critical Community-Engaged Scholarship: Communities and Universities Striving for Racial Justice. *Peabody Journal of Education, 92*(3), 363–384.

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

Denny, H. (2010). Queering the writing center. *The Writing Center Journal 31*(1), 95-124.

Denny, H., Nordlof, J., & Salem, L. (2018). "Tell me exactly what it was that I was doing that was so bad": Understanding the needs and expectations of working-class students in writing centers. *The Writing Center Journal, 37*(1), 67-100.

deWinter, J. (2014). Keyword Essay: "Community Management." *Community Literacy Journal, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.25148/CLJ.8.2.009314

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

Douglas, W. (2017). Looking Outward: Archival Research as Community Engagement. *Community Literacy Journal*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.25148/CLJ.11.2.009132

Druschke, C. G., Booth, E. G., & Lundberg, E. (2019). Q-Rhetoric and controlled equivocation: Revising "the scientific study of subjectivity" for cross-disciplinary collaboration. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *28*(2), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2019.1583377

Druschke, C. G., Dean, T., Higgins, M., Beaty, M., Henner, L., Hosemann, R., Meyer, J., Sellers, B., Widell, S., & Woser, T. (2022). Stories from the flood: Promoting healing and fostering policy change through storytelling, community literacy, and community-based learning. *Community Literacy Journal*, *16*(2), 107–120.

Druschke, C. G., Marie, M., Pittendrigh, N., & Rai, C. (2015). Assessing long-term impact of service-learning on graduate instructors. *Reflections*, *14*(2), 22–50.

Ehrich, K. (2014). Business unusual: Transforming business school curricula through community engagement. *Metropolitan Universities*, *25*(1), Article 1.

Elbow, P. (2008). The believing game or methodological believing. *The Journal of the Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning.*, *14*(Winter 2008-2009), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.7290/jaepl14koxv

Electrical and Computer Engineering. (2022, February 9). *WEC Plan: Electrical and Computer Engineering*. Writing Enriched Curriculum Writing Plans. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RP2PqViThChDVY9Gxqm_sduET9YTxeBw/view

Emery, D. L., Lindquist, M., & Koepp, D. (2022, May 5). *Investigating anti-racist, equitable, and/or inclusive writing assessment* [Panel]. 2022 WEC Institute.

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

Engineering for One Planet. (2020). *The engineering for one planet framework: Essential learning outcomes for engineering education*. engineeringforoneplanet.org/

Feigenbaum, P. (2011). Tactics and Strategies of Relationship- Based Practice: Reassessing the Institutionalization of Community Literacy. *Community Literacy Journal*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.25148/CLJ.6.2.009412

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

Fletcher, F., Hammer, B., & Hibbert, A. (2014). "We Know We Are Doing Something Good, But What Is It?": The Challenge of Negotiating Between Service Delivery and Research in a CBPR Project. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 7*(2). https://doi.org/10.54656/ZRYK7626

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

Flower, L. (2008). *Community literacy and the rhetoric of public engagement*. SIU Press.

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

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

Garcia, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments* (pp. 9–33). Routledge.

Geller, A. E. (2009). The difficulty of believing in writing across the curriculum. *The Journal of Assembly for the Expanded Perspectives on Learning*, *15*(6), 12.

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

Getto, G., Leon, K., & Getto-Rivait, J. (2014). Helping To Build Better Networks: Service-Learning Partnerships as Distributed Knowledge Work. *Reflections*, *13*(2), 71–95.

Godbee, B. (2018). Pedagogical too-muchness: A feminist approach to community-based learning, multi-modal composition, social justice education, and more. In K. Blair & L. Nickoson (Eds.) *Composing feminist interventions: Activism, Engagement, Praxis*, The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado.

Green, N. S., & Condon, F. (2020). Letters on moving from ally to accomplice: Anti-racism and the teaching of writing. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R. Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at, 25*, (pp. 277-291). The WAC Clearinghouse.

Grobman, L., Kemmerer, E., & Zebertavage, M. (2017). Counternarratives: Community writing and anti-racist rhetoric. *Reflections*, *17*(2).

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

Guerra, J. C. (2008). Cultivating transcultural citizenship: A writing across communities model. *Language Arts*, *85*(4), 296-304.

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

Hart Micke, S., Sowa, A., Davies, L., Graboski, E., & Piñón, M. (2023). Epideictic listening: From a reflective case study to a theory of community ethos. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2023.2246949

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

Hall, J. (2009). WAC/WID in the Next America: Redefining Professional Identity in the Age of the Multilingual Majority. *The WAC Journal*, *20*, 33–49.

Hawkins, K. (2024). Confronting resistance to linguistic justice: Developing white racial stamina in the writing center. *The Peer Review, 8*(1). https://thepeerreview-iwca.org/issues/issue-8-1-featured-issue-enacting-linguistic-justice-in-through-writing-centers/confronting-resistance-to-linguistic-justice-developing-white-racial-stamina-in-the-writing-center/

Hebbard, M., & Hernández, Y. (2020). Becoming transfronterizo collaborators: A transdisciplinary framework for developing translingual pedagogies in WAC/WID. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R. Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25* (pp. 251–273). The WAC Clearinghouse.

Hendrickson, B. (2013). [Review of consortium] *The hard work of imagining: The inaugural summit of the National Consortium of Writing Across Communities*, by Albuquerque, NM. *Community Literacy Journal 7*(2), 115-118. doi:10.1353/clj.2013.0000.

Hess, J. L., Lin, A., Whitehead, A., & Katz, A. (2024). How do ethics and diversity, equity, and inclusion relate in engineering? A systematic review: Journal of Engineering Education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *113*(1), 143–163. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20571

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

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and Transnational Literacies in Multilingual Classrooms: A Biliteracy Lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(3), 261–278.

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

Hubrig, A. (2020). "We Move Together:" Reckoning with disability justice in community literacy studies. *Community Literacy Journal*, *14*(2), 144-153. https://doi.org/10.25148/14.2.009042

Hughes, J., Plaut, E., Wang, F., von Briesen, E., Brown, C., Cross, G., Kumar, V., & Myers, P. (2020). Global and local agendas of computing ethics education. *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education*, 239–245. https://doi.org/10.1145/3341525.3387423

Industrial Systems Engineering. (2018, March 19). *WEC Plan: Industrial Systems Engineering*. Writing Enriched Curriculum Writing Plans. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1AmEe4hfx9czNZnNLDxr_YKedHumMoW_D/view

Jackson, R. C., & DeLaune, D. W. (2018). Decolonizing community writing with community listening: Story, transrhetorical resistance, and Indigenous cultural literacy activism. *Community Literacy Journal*, *13*(1), 37–54. https://doi.org/10.1353/clj.2018.0020

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

Kersnar, R., & Shelton, I. (2022, May 6). *Approaching antiracist facilitation* [Facilitated Discussion]. 2022 WEC Institute.

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

Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language Ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Blackwell Publishing.

Lambrinidou, Y., Rhoads, W. J., Roy, S., Heaney, E., Ratajczak, G. A., & Ratajczak, J. H. (2014). Ethnography in engineering ethics education: A pedagogy for transformational listening. *Association for Engineering Education - Engineering Library Division Papers*, 24.542.1-24.542.27. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2317705754?parentSessionId=GSgNmUsULnerPE1tKLlfmPrDL3Q54AcjyD76sRy5v%2Fo%3D&pq-origsite=primo&sourcetype=Conference%20Papers%20&%20Proceedings

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

Lee, T., & McCarty, T. (2015). Bilingual-multilingual education of indigenous peoples. In W. Wright, S. Boun, & O. Garcia, *Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 409–427). Wiley.

Leeman, J. (2012). Investigating language ideologies in Spanish as a heritage language. In S. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States* (pp. 43–60). Georgetown University Press.

Li, H., Xie, Y., Yang, S., & Xu, R. (2019, June 15). *A new approach in abolishing poverty: A case study and construction strategy for integrating inclusive innovation into engineering ethics education*. 2019 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition. https://peer.asee.org/a-new-approach-in-abolishing-poverty-a-case-study-and-construction-strategy-for-integrating-inclusive-innovation-into-engineering-ethics-education

Long, E. (2008). *Community literacy and the rhetoric of local publics.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

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

MacQueen, K. M., McLellan, E., Metzger, D. S., Kegeles, S., Strauss, R. P., Scotti, R., Blanchard, L., & Trotter, R. T. (2001). What Is Community? An Evidence-Based Definition for Participatory Public Health. *American Journal of Public Health*, *91*(12), 1929–1938.

Mahaffey, C. J. (2000, February). *Critiques of Writing Across the Curriculum: Current and Alternate Ideologies*. Great Plains Alliance for Computers and Writing Conference, Vermillion, South Dakota.

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

Malinowitz, H. (1997). A Feminist Critique of Writing in the Disciplines. In S. Jarratt & L. Worsham (Eds.), *Feminism and Composition: In Other Words* (pp. 291–312). Modern Language Association.

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

Mathis, K. E., & Boehm, B. A. (2018). Chapter 6. Building engaged interventions in graduate education. In K. L. Blair & L. Nickoson (Eds.), *Composing feminist interventions: Activism, engagement, praxis* (pp. 115–133). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2018.0056.2.06

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The Myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English, 68*(6), 637-651.

McKeown, C. T., Rubinstein, R. A., & Kelly, J. G. (1987). Anthropology, the Meaning of Community, and Prevention. *Prevention in Human Services, 5*(2), 35–64. https://doi.org/10.1300/J293v05n02_03

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

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

Mechanical Engineering. (2020, September 15). *WEC Plan: Mechanical Engineering*. Writing Enriched Curriculum Writing Plans. https://drive.google.com/file/d/19iqFxT9KdB6RQTUSCQDIOwbECUV38qNF/view

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

Millican, J., & Bourner, T. (2014). *Learning to Make a Difference: Student-community engagement and the higher education curriculum*. National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (England and Wales). http://www.learningandwork.org.uk/?redirectedfrom=niace

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

Moore, K. R., Jones, N. N., & Walton, R. (2021). Contextualizing the 4Rs heuristic with participant stories. *Technical Communication, 68*(4), 8–25.

Morgridge Center for Public Service. (2023). *Community-based Research*. Morgridge Center for Public Service. https://morgridge.wisc.edu/faculty-and-staff-get-connected/community-based-research/

Natarajarathinam, M., Qiu, S., & Lu, W. (2021). Community engagement in engineering education: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *110*(4), 1049–1077. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20424

Norgaard, R. (1999). Negotiating Expertise in Disciplinary "Contact Zones." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, *3*(2), 44–63. https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.1999.3.2.04

Novotny, M., & Opel, D. S. (2019). Situating care as feminist rhetorical action in two community-engaged health projects. *Peitho*, *22*(1). https://cfshrc.org/article/situating-care-as-feminist-rhetorical-action-in-two-community-engaged-health-projects/

Parks, S. (2014). Sinners welcome: the limits of rhetorical agency. *College English*, *76*(6), 506-524.

Patel, L. (2016). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315658551

Patton, M. D. (2011). Mapping the gaps in services for L2 writers. *Across the Disciplines*, *8*(4). http://wac.colostate.edu

Pawlowski, L. (2024). Introducing linguistic antiracism to skeptics: A scaffolded approach. *The Peer Review*, *8*(1). https://thepeerreview-iwca.org/issues/issue-8-1-featured-issue-enacting-linguistic-justice-in-through-writing-centers/introducing-linguistic-antiracism-to-skeptics-a-scaffolded-approach/

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

Presley, R. (2022). Dis/Locating linguistic terrorism: Writing American Indian languages back into the rhetoric classroom. In B. R. Schreiber, E. Lee, J. T. Johnson, & N. Fahim (Eds.),

Linguistic justice on campus: Pedagogy and advocacy for multilingual students (pp. 58–71). Multilingual Matters.

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

Raymond, C. M., Bryan, B. A., MacDonald, D. H., Cast, A., Strathearn, S., Grandgirard, A., & Kalivas, T. (2009). Mapping community values for natural capital and ecosystem services. *Ecological Economics*, *68*(5), 1301–1315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.12.006

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

Rouson, B. (2022). 2021 Conference on Community Writing Keynote Address: Liberating Powers: Community Building in Word, in Deed: Community Literacy Journal. *Community Literacy Journal*, *16*(2), 14–21.

Royster, J. J., & Kirsch, G. E. (2012). *Feminist rhetorical practices: New horizons for rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies*. SIU Press.

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

Ryan, L., & Zimmerelli, L. (2010). *The Bedford guide for writing tutors*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins.

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

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

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

Schwarz, V. M. (2020). *(De) Norming Classroom Merit: Grading Contracts as an Assessment Genre*. (Publication No. 28088751) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Scott, G. (2008). Collins, Paul. Community Writing: Researching Social Issues Through Composition. *Community Literacy Journal*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.25148/CLJ.3.1.009486

Scott, J. B., & Meloncon, L. (2018). Manifesting Methodologies for the Rhetoric of Health & Medicine. In L. Meloncon & J. B. Scott (Eds.), *Methodologies for the Rhetoric of Health & Medicine* (pp. 1–23). Routledge.

Shelton, C. (2020). Shifting out of neutral: Centering difference, bias, and social justice in a business writing course. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *29*(1), 18–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2019.1640287

Sheridan, M. P. (2018). Chapter 11. Knotworking collaborations: Fostering community engaged teachers and scholars. In K. L. Blair & L. Nickoson (Eds.), *Composing Feminist Interventions: Activism, Engagement, Praxis* (pp. 213–234). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2018.0056.2.11

Sheriff, S. (2021). Beyond “I know it when I see it”: WEC and the process of unearthing faculty expertise. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of*

faculty-driven and departmental transformation (pp. 145–165). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

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

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

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

Stoecker, R. (2005). *Research methods for community change: A project-based approach*. Sage Publications.

Strand, K., College, H., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). Principles of Best Practice for Community-Based Research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *9*(3), 5–15.

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

Thaiss, C. (2001). Theory in WAC: Where have we been, where are we going? In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing across the curriculum programs* (pp. 299–325). National Council of Teachers of English.

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

Thuss, A. (2022, November 10). Senior capstone design course for civil engineers wins 6th NCEES award. *College of Engineering - University of Wisconsin-Madison*. https://engineering.wisc.edu/blog/senior-capstone-design-course-for-civil-engineers-wins-6th-ncees-award/

Thuss, A. (2023, November 17). CEE Capstone course wins 7th NCEES Award for renewable energy project. *College of Engineering - University of Wisconsin-Madison*. https://engineering.wisc.edu/blog/cee-capstone-course-wins-7th-ncees-award-for-renewable-energy-project/

US EPA. (2015, February 13). *Learn About Environmental Justice* [Overviews and Factsheets]. https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/learn-about-environmental-justice

Villanueva, V. (2001). The politics of literacy across the curriculum. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 165–178). National Council of Teachers of English.

Walvoord, B. E. (1996). The Future of WAC. *College English*, *58*(1), 58–79. https://doi.org/10.2307/378534

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

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

Watters, A., Haninen, P., & Hardin, J. M. (2011). Developing a Community-Based Research Network for Interdisciplinary Science: The Alabama Entrepreneurial Research Network. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.54656/EVYD5066

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

Wilson, A. (2000). 'Absolutely truly brill to see from you': Visuality and prisoners' letters. In D. Barton & N. Hall (Eds.), *Letter writing as a social practice* (pp. 179–198). John Benjamins Publishing Company. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/wisc/detail.action?docID=622783

Wisconsin Idea: University of Wisconsin–Madison. (2023). https://www.wisc.edu/wisconsin-idea/

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

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

Ziemer, T. (2018, December 3). Energizing impact: UW-Madison engineering students design sustainable system for rural school. *College of Engineering - University of Wisconsin-Madison*. https://engineering.wisc.edu/news/energizing-impact-uw-madison-engineering-students-design-sustainable-system-rural-school/

Appendix A

This is the protocol I developed for any interview with faculty before the community values mapping meeting. I adjusted this to follow-up with specific areas of expertise and interest during conversation for each interview, but made sure to generally ask each of the questions as listed below.

Interview Questions – Initial Discussion of Departmental Values

Beginning script: Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed! My goal today is to get a better sense of the department/program before we have our meeting where we map out the writing, curricular, and social and linguistic justice values for your department/program. I am sure that you have had many discussions within and outside of these meetings already on these topics, so I am hoping to get a better sense of the discussions you have already had, recent, current, or future initiatives that have occurred based on these discussions, and whether there are any issues currently under debate or consideration to be aware. I have questions to help guide this interview but hope that you will also go off the script of these questions as much as needed to help fill in more about this topic to help me prepare for the department/program meeting.

1. Please describe your roles in the department and the courses that you typically teach.

2. Strategic plan and certification process – who develops these and what attention to curriculum, writing, DEI was given in the most recent iteration to your knowledge?

3. What are current/recent curricular initiatives/changes that the department/program is working on?

4. What discussions has the department/program had around writing instruction?

5. Where does writing and writing instruction typically happen in the different majors in the program?

6. What is important for a writer in your field that might be different from the general education requirements?

7. What are current DEI (social and linguistic justice) discussions/initiatives in your department/program?

8. What are social and linguistic justice issues that are of particular importance to your field?

9. How does language/writing and language/writing instruction relate to DEI issues within your teaching and the work of your field?

Appendix B

This is exactly the document I sent to faculty before the division meeting. Faculty could review it before the meeting, and then I followed this exact protocol as outlined during the meeting.

Questions You Will Be Asked at the Upcoming Community Values Mapping ESE Meeting

*This is the basic outline of what I will be asking at the upcoming ESE division to help your group map out the writing, social and linguistic justice, and curricular values within your department.

I will guide everyone through three rounds of first reflecting on several questions, then sharing the top values on a shared document, and then discussing the trends and differences we see in everyone's answers. You are not required to read and prepare responses ahead of time but doing so might help you think of stronger responses. Everyone will also have the chance to follow-up on what we discuss through a survey I will send out after the meeting. *

Round One: Writing

Consider the following questions to help you start to define the basic values that you have around writing within Civil and Environmental Engineering and for your students.

- Why is writing important for your field?
- What will students typically have to write in their careers after graduating from CEE?
- What are some fundamental writing skills that students would need to know to write successfully in their future careers (those writing skills that might not be covered in a gen-ed writing course)?
- What makes for a truly successful writer in your field? (perhaps think of what makes writing more persuasive and effective for the contexts of your field)

Round Two: Social and Linguistic Justice

Consider the following questions to help you start to define the basic values that you have around social[2] and linguistic[3] justice within your discipline and for your students.

- What are DEI or social and linguistic justice issues that are especially important to consider in your department/program in your daily teaching practices (i.e. what is important to consider towards making your classroom/departmental spaces an inclusive and accessible space for all students)?
- What are DEI or social and linguistic justice issues that are especially important to consider as part of the content within your field (i.e. social and linguistic issues that are specific to your field's past, present, and/or future)?
- What DEI or social and linguistic justice values do you hope all graduates of your program will consider when making decisions in their future careers?

Round Three: Curriculum

Now let's briefly tie this to larger curricular values within the department/program. Consider the following questions to help you start to define the basic values that you have around curriculum for your students.

- What do you think is fundamental to having a successful curriculum for students in this major(s)?
- What are other skills like writing that students should develop throughout their time in CEE? (e.g. oral presentation skills, statistical analysis, etc.)
- What do you think is crucial in future evolutions of the curriculum in your department?

Final Discussion: Working Across Categories

If we have time, we will also start to answer the following questions, or they might be something to further consider on the follow-up survey and in future discussions.

- What overlaps, or potential for overlaps, do we see in these three categories (perhaps in naming a value that relates to multiple categories, or goals for future class projects that could cut across multiple categories)?

---

[2] We'll broadly define social justice as fairness in society across all identity and socioeconomic backgrounds taking into consideration human rights, access, participation, and equity.

[3] Linguistic justice recognizes that power dynamics shape how language dialects of more privileged peoples are unjustly privileged and deemed more appropriate in certain settings over other forms of languages and works towards fairness in how language varieties are perceived and used in society.

- How does thinking through the values for these categories relate to activities you do (or hope to do) with students in the courses that you teach?
- Do you have any ideas for what I, or other writing specialists, could do to help you better reach towards these values with your students?

Appendix C

After the department/program meeting, I followed up with the faculty so that they had a chance to expand on their discussion from the meeting and each individually rank the importance of the values that we discussed. No question was required, other than one to confirm that they had filled out a consent form before answering.

Follow-Up Survey for after CVM Department Meeting

I greatly appreciate all of you filling out this quick survey to follow-up and flush out your thoughts from our meeting, helping us better articulate the writing, social and linguistic justice, and curriculum values for the department. If you did not attend the meeting, please fill-out the consent form to participate in this research study here (linked to consent form).

Writing

We first discussed values around writing in the department. Here is a summary of the values that we discussed. Please rank the importance of these values. (Option to rank as “most important,” “important,” “less important,” or “I do not agree with this value”)

- Engineers need to write towards targeted audiences, including both public or technical audiences
- Writing should be clear, concise, and precise
- Writing should be dispassionate, taking out flourishes or adjectives that could be interpreted in different ways
- Writers should express confidence in sure statements and communicate appropriate skepticism for theories
- The basic structural components of writing such as topic sentences are fundamental to writing successfully
- Students should be able to read and follow rubrics or assignment guidelines
- Students should also be able to write genres outside of technical pieces such as personal statements
- Students should be able to emulate models of good writing
- Writing should be in third person (no using "I")
- Information should be written in the appropriate sections to help for documents not being read linearly
- Successful writing should help to explain ideas, discoveries, terms, data, and models to broad audiences

If you would like to add any explanation to your rankings or further articulate these values in some way, you may do so here:

DEI/Social and Linguistic Justice

We then discussed values around DEI and social and linguistic justice in the department. As a reminder, we defined linguistic justice as (add definition used in meeting). Here is a summary of the values that we discussed. Please rank the importance of these values. (Option to rank as "most important," "important," "less important," or "I do not agree with this value")

- Working against the assumption that engineers are all white men and so incorporating examples contrary to this
- Learning the environmental justice issues for public health, safety, and welfare and how different marginalized groups of people are unjustly affected by these issues
- Considering accessibility in the design of infrastructure
- Understanding there is a bias towards thinking native English speakers of historically white, male, privileged backgrounds are smarter and better writers, but that this is tied with other implicit biases that we need to work against
- Being open to different styles and dialectal differences in what is considered academic English (historically dominated by white, male voices)
- Coaching students to provide feedback on writing that does not make assumptions about people's identities and focuses more on the work presented than dialectal differences in writing style
- Sharing more examples in case studies that represent students' home communities
- Teaching students to be wary of unconscious biases when making proposals
- Making more inclusive classroom spaces where International students and students of other marginalized backgrounds are more likely to speak up or otherwise contribute during class
- Teaching the need for community input in engineering plans

If you would like to add any explanation to your rankings or further articulate these values in some way, you may do so here:

Curriculum

Finally, we discussed values around curriculum in the department. Here is a summary of the values that we discussed. Please rank the importance of these values. (Option to rank as "most important," "important," "less important," or "I do not agree with this value")

- Urging students to think of creative or innovative new solutions to problems
- Needing to reinforce introductory content throughout the curriculum, such as decision making, probability and statistics, verbal and written communication
- Including examples of strong writing and having students reflect on what makes those examples effective
- Needing to keep up with the latest advancements in technology
- Relating what they learn in the classroom to real world scenarios
- Including instruction on how to give effective oral presentations
- Ensuring all students have broad coverage of different subdisciplines so they are able to work in the interdisciplinary nature of the field
- Having the ability to understand the implications of remote work on team building/products
- Developing the skills to work effectively in diverse teams
- Developing quantitative analysis skills
- Recognizing the ethics and consequences of engineering decisions

If you would like to add any explanation to your rankings or further articulate these values in some way, you may do so here:

Synthesis

Please share how you think these values inter-relate:

How should these values guide your own work?

How should these values guide the work of the department/program?

If there is anything else you would like to share about this process, you may do so here:

Appendix D

The following is the revised statement of values for the Environmental division of the Civil and Environmental Engineering department at UW-Madison. I also include the section with possible next steps, additional resources, and findings from the survey that led to this statement. This document is the version shared with the faculty from this division, and they maintain access to this as a google doc.

CEE Community Values Findings and Possible Next Steps

Summary of Findings

Curricular-

The CEE department is working towards vertical integration of skills throughout the curriculum, such that students will continue to develop skills taught in introductory courses throughout their degree. This is part of how students form the necessary ability for engineers to continue to acquire and apply new knowledge as life-time learners. These skills include probability and statistics, computational skills, design, problem-solving, decision-making, oral presentation, writing, and the ability to work in multidisciplinary and diverse teams. In addition, the department is committed to an attention to social and environmental justice, both in structure of the department as a whole and as a skill for students to develop awareness of social and environmental justice issues in the discipline. Developing these skills and awarenesses will aid students in understanding the technical, legal, economic, and other nontechnical constraints that engineers need to consider that also have social and environmental consequences.

Writing-

One of the seven ABET student outcomes is an ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences, and engineers both in academia and in the field need to write well to be successful. Including writing throughout the curriculum is integral to developing this outcome, and writing projects can also include a combination of the other skills students should develop through CEE degrees. Effective writing in this field should help to explain ideas, discoveries, terms, data and models to broad audiences. The writing should be clear, concise, and precise. Engineers need to write towards targeted audiences, and so students should be able to write technical genres as well as other genres outside of technical writing such as personal statements.

Social and Environmental Justice-

The CEE faculty value social and environmental justice within their own work and their teaching. These values fall in line with the ABET criteria to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts as well as the criteria to work on teams to create an inclusive environment. The following is a shared list of the social and environmental justice values most pertinent in CEE:

- Learning the environmental justice issues for public health, safety, and welfare and how different marginalized groups of people are unjustly affected by these issues
- Considering accessibility in the design of infrastructure
- Sharing more examples in case studies that represent students' home communities
- Teaching students to be wary of unconscious biases when making proposals
- Making more inclusive classroom spaces where International students and students of other marginalized backgrounds are more likely to speak up or otherwise contribute during class
- Teaching the need for community input in engineering plans

Suggestions on how to enact upon the above statement

What I can do, possibly one of these on my own or multiple of these with the help of Delta interns or other support from your department:

- Offer a workshop for faculty where we walk through tips and design low-stakes writing assignments for smaller, more frequent writing and/or develop rubrics for writing assignments to help with more efficient grading of writing, and how to do this in a way that is inclusive and accessible for students from a variety of backgrounds.

- Offer a workshop on how to develop writing assignments that meet multiple learning outcomes for the class and strategies on how to add these with efficient and inclusive grading practices.

- Provide asynchronous material for either workshop mentioned above and follow up with providing feedback for faculty members who then develop their own course material from this workshop.

- Facilitate discussions in faculty meetings towards making a shared rubric for grading writing assignments in CEE. This rubric would be developed based on conversations around inclusive feedback and grading practices for effective CEE writing and then could be easily adapted to the needs of individual courses and assignments.

- Work with a course or a couple of faculty to design writing assignments that help students think through environmental justice issues relevant to course material.

- Offer a workshop for CEE students on a topic such as writing personal statements or public-facing writing that allows them to develop skills in writing for this genre and practice writing to broader, more inclusive audiences.

- Develop a resource bank of assignment descriptions and activities that faculty have used to reach writing and social justice learning outcomes in a variety of courses throughout the department as examples for others

- Please suggest any other ideas you might have as well!

Other resources available on campus (even after I graduate!):

- The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program regularly offers faculty consultations, so at any time a CEE faculty member can meet with a member of the WAC team to help with developing writing assignments, activities, or grading criteria/feedback practices. https://dept.writing.wisc.edu/wac/request-a-consultation/

- The Writing Across the Curriculum program also offers a resource book on a variety of topics related to writing instruction with examples from a variety of disciplines, including engineering https://dept.writing.wisc.edu/wac/resources-for-instructors/

- The Writing Center regularly offers the option to have a Writing Center team member to design a workshop or presentation where they will come to your class and lead students through developing a writing skill relevant to your course and/or lead them through in-class workshopping of their own writing. https://writing.wisc.edu/instructor/outreach/

- The Writing Center also offers workshops on a variety of topics and one-on-one tutoring for students with their writing. These programs are both developed with attention to disciplinary differences and attention to access and inclusivity. https://writing.wisc.edu/workshops/ https://writing.wisc.edu/make-a-writing-appointment/

Additional online resources:

Writing in Civil and Environmental Engineering specific resources:

- The Writing Plan for the Civil, Environmental, and GeoSciences Engineering department at the University of Minnesota
- Writing for Success - An Engineer's Guide online guidebook
- Writing in Engineering guides from Purdue OWL, including details on engineering report writing
- Communicating as an Engineer guide from the WAC Clearinghouse
- Technical Writing for Engineers online book

Writing for large classes - strategies to help fit writing in with large classes such as smaller writing assignments, alternative grading practices, and group work:

- Using Writing in Large Classes

- Integrating Low-Stakes Writing in Larger Classes
- Writing Assignments for Large Classes

Detailed findings from the division meeting and follow-up survey

Top shared values:

Writing

- Engineers need to write towards targeted audiences, including both public or technical audiences
- Writing should be clear, concise, and precise
- Successful writing should help to explain ideas, discoveries, terms, data, and models to broad audiences
- Students should also be able to write genres outside of technical pieces such as personal statements

Social and Linguistic Justice

- Learning the environmental justice issues for public health, safety, and welfare and how different marginalized groups of people are unjustly affected by these issues
- Considering accessibility in the design of infrastructure
- Sharing more examples in case studies that represent students' home communities
- Teaching students to be wary of unconscious biases when making proposals
- Making more inclusive classroom spaces where International students and students of other marginalized backgrounds are more likely to speak up or otherwise contribute during class
- Teaching the need for community input in engineering plans

Curricular

- Urging students to think of creative or innovative new solutions to problems
- Needing to reinforce introductory content throughout the curriculum, such as decision making, probability and statistics, verbal and written communication
- Including examples of strong writing and having students reflect on what makes those examples effective
- Including instruction on how to give effective oral presentations
- Developing the skills to work effectively in diverse teams
- Recognizing the ethics and consequences of engineering decisions

Also noteworthy values, with some agreement:

Writing

- Writing should be dispassionate, taking out flourishes or adjectives that could be interpreted in different ways
- Writers should express confidence in sure statements and communicate appropriate skepticism for theories
- The basic structural components of writing such as topic sentences are fundamental to writing successfully
- Students should be able to read and follow rubrics or assignment guidelines
- Students should be able to emulate models of good writing
- Information should be written in the appropriate sections to help for documents not being read linearly

Social and Linguistic Justice

- Working against the assumption that engineers are all white men and so incorporating examples contrary to this
- Understanding there is a bias towards thinking native English speakers of historically white, male, privileged backgrounds are smarter and better writers, but that this is tied with other implicit biases that we need to work against
- Being open to different styles and dialectal differences in what is considered academic English (historically dominated by white, male voices)
- Coaching students to provide feedback on writing that does not make assumptions about people's identities and focuses more on the work presented than dialectal differences in writing style

Curricular

- Relating what they learn in the classroom to real world scenarios
- Ensuring all students have broad coverage of different subdisciplines so they are able to work in the interdisciplinary nature of the field

Appendix E

This is a version of the document still shared with the division. That document is a shared google doc, so I adjusted comments from that document to be footnotes and blue font to be italics for the formatting needs of this dissertation.

Shared Criteria Developed from Previously Determined CEE Community Values

Intended for use in creating rubrics with shared language to assess student writing (and other assignments) across the curriculum

I would love for anyone to reach out with ideas on how to use this, requests for feedback, sharing rubrics you created from this, ideas on how to share this with a wider audience, etc! -Emily Bouza ebouza@wisc.edu

Communicating Effectively to Diverse Audiences

- Writing contains strong transitions and connections between sections
- Terms are clearly defined for a range of audiences
- Problem/Issue clearly explained and solutions were offered reasonable to context
- Major findings were summarized in a clear way for multiple audiences

Explain Ideas, Discoveries, Terms, Data and Models

- Project goals are clearly stated
- Clear and correct analysis of results
- Reasonable conclusions are drawn
- Problem/issue discussed connects to course learning objectives
- References, graphics, and figures are integrated effectively, are of high quality, and use effective descriptive captions all to contribute to greater understanding

Writing is Clear, Concise, and Precise

- Includes precise data and specific contexts rather than vague descriptors
- Writing includes language clearly understandable, easy to read for all audiences
- Writing was kept concise and revised to reduce redundancy (give estimate of max word/page limit)
- Tone was appropriate for audience and consistent throughout
- Transitions are made between sections as well as within paragraphs for paragraph unity

Writing Follows Genre Conventions

- Includes sections with specific headings that informatively break up longer sections (list sections of that genre here for students)
- Includes appropriate references, figures, and/or graphics for the genre

- Necessary background information is explained in the appropriate section (introduction)
- Format conventions were followed (list here)

Writer Considers Issues of Social and Environmental Impact

- Details the effect of project on historically marginalized communities
- Considers different communities with competing interests for project
- Considers the environmental impact of the project
- Considers accessibility in design
- Project takes into consideration community input

Example One: Shorter Writing Assignment Graded Comprehensively

Assignment:

Each student will write 2 brief essays (approximately 500 words each for undergraduates, 1500 words for graduates) on the themes of environmental disasters, risk assessment and decision-making, and ethics. Students may select a topic for each theme from a provided list or alternate topic with approval. Essays should summarize the topic, relevant and unique characteristics and challenges, importance to society, and provide a critical critique.

Past Grading Criteria:
Style: Length, Formatting, Appropriate Language, References
Coverage: Summary of Disaster, Influence of Disaster on Engineering Practice, How the Disaster could have been prevented, Other areas of disaster as appropriate
Quality: Concepts appropriately explained, tables and figures are relevant and used to further the analysis

Possible rubric using shared language criteria from above:

Communicating Effectively to Diverse Audiences[4]	
• [5]Terms are clearly defined for a range of audiences[6]	/10[7]
• Problem/Issue clearly explained and solutions were offered reasonable to context	/10[8]

[4] Categories are the same as the named categories above, and then chose the bullet points under each category that best fit this assignment

[5] Chose bullets from each section that best fit this assignment

[6] Example: technical and non-technical audience. Might be good to specify

[7] Adding feedback is great - adding a column for comments next to each component, adding a spot between sections for comments, or even just circling the specific items they need to work on (ex: circling "range" from range of audiences and when not catered well for public audiences)

[8] Points always adjustable for your own class

Explain Ideas, Discoveries, Terms, Data and Models	
• Clear and correct analysis of *the disaster and how it could have been prevented*[9]	/10
• Reasonable conclusions are drawn on *the influence of the disaster on engineering practice*	/10
• Reference at least 5 sources in APA, both in-text and at end of paper, integrated effectively to support ideas	/10
• Graphics and figures are integrated effectively, are of high quality, and use effective descriptive captions all to contribute to greater understanding	/10
Writing is Clear, Concise, and Precise	
• Writing includes language clearly understandable, easy to read for all audiences	/10
Writing Follows Genre Conventions	
• Format conventions were followed: *12pt font, single-spaced, 1-inch margins, pages numbers are included*	/10
Writer Considers Issues of Social and Environmental Impact	
• Details the effect of *disaster* on historically marginalized communities	/10
• Considers different communities with competing interests for project	/10
• Considers the environmental impact of the *disaster*	/10

Example Two: Longer Assignment Graded by Sections

Assignment: Students are given a semester-long project to each apply pertinent field and analytical techniques for assessment of an environmental issue related to the

[9] text left in italics for this example to show where altered from shared criteria to fit expectations for this class (can just keep all black text when assigning in class)

course, such as “Lake Winnebago Drinking Water Monitoring” or “Pharmaceuticals in Wastewater.” Components of project include:

- Class presentation as if classmates are stakeholders for the topic, including a PowerPoint
- Preparatory materials for classmates of about two hours including at least two pertinent research journal articles
- A four-page handout summary of the approach used to assess the scenario.

Possible rubric[10] using shared language criteria from above:

Preparation Materials[11] Materials help other students prepare to act as stakeholders by providing information that considers:	
Social and Environmental Impacts[12] • Includes details about the effect of project on historically marginalized communities • Considers different communities with competing interests for project • *Prepares students to act in role to* consider community input	/30[13]
Prepared for Class Discussion[14] • *Posted in a timely manner* • *Provided enough background to understand issues discussed by project team*	/20
Group Presentation Presentation is catered towards potential stakeholders. Provides background information, field and analytical approach, and a plan for interpreting results.	
Genre Conventions for Presentation[15]	/10

[10] Note: I liked how students in this class had the opportunity to provide feedback to one another. I suggest using the same rubric for students and faculty assessment - it helps everything stay consistent and clear and makes it easier for final grading

[11] This example is broken down per part of the greater project. You could also break down by sections in a longer paper.

[12] Used categories from shared criteria and chose relevant bullet points, rewording slightly as necessary

[13] Again points are just a suggestion, but here I gave ten points for each bullet point

[14] Might need new section like this one to allow grading for things not typical to all assignments that is not included in general criteria in master list

[15] Could add criteria here for presentations such as pacing, projection, slide design, etc.

• Necessary background information is explained *to frame the need for the water quality study*	
Explain Ideas, Discoveries, Terms, Data and Models • Clear and correct analysis of *the setting and the water quality problem* • Problem/issue discussed connects to *course content including state and federal regulations* • *Approach to study design was logical to address the issue* • *Laboratory methods considered state-of-the-art technologies and adequately addressed the water quality questions in the study* • Clear and correct analysis of results	/50
Communicating Effectively to Diverse Audiences *(Stakeholders)* • Problem/Issue clearly explained and solutions were offered reasonable to context • Major findings were summarized in a clear way for multiple audiences	/20
Handout 4 page handout should give brief background, expand on methods and provide references for key information used during the presentation	
Writing is Clear, Concise, and Precise • Writing includes language clearly understandable, *especially for stakeholders and their level of preparation* • Writing was kept concise and revised to reduce redundancy • Tone was appropriate for *stakeholders* and consistent throughout	/30

General Rubric Building Advice:

- Using shared language from other classes will help student know what to expect and prepare for across classes
- When students see very specifically what they will be graded on, they tend to focus more on those components in their writing
- Using rubrics can make grading more efficient, but only if you do make sure the rubric fits the assignment well
- Short, specific written feedback can take just a moment to write down and can help students see where to improve
- Positive comments also help students see what went well to replicate in the future

- Asking students to assess their own work and/or their classmates can help them grow in their own writing skills and can make your grading more efficient

Link for this doc: https://docs.google.com/document/d/11u-c4hDx5elriM7PZO_7yzfkI4LTf8Ggfu0m5V-a3O0/edit?usp=sharing