CONTENTS

1

WRITING-RELATED FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR DEEP CHANGE
An Introduction and Overview

Angela Glotfelter, Caitlin Martin, Mandy Olejnik,
Ann Updike, and Elizabeth Wardle

Misconceptions of writing (and writers) have dominated higher educa-
tion for over a century—despite the best efforts of writing studies schol-
ars. More broadly, the culture around learning in US higher education
over the last fifty years has embraced what Randy Bass (2016) calls the
"disintegrative" view of learning, which "emphasizes dimensions of
education that can be commodified" (295). This disintegrative view
has moved conceptions of learning away from the complex and messy
to simpler, more linear measures of success. Combating these harmful
conceptions and approaches to teaching and learning requires methods
for helping faculty members work together to surface misconceptions
and then, in turn, intentionally design courses, curricula, programs, and
policies that enact more accurate and meaningful conceptions of writ-
ing, learning, and teaching, that is, to help faculty engage in collective
sensemaking leading to deep change around learning. Sensemaking, or
collectively looking at old ideas in new ways in order to change underly-
ing conceptions, attitudes, and even identity, is a prerequisite for enact-
ing "deep change," a process through which a person or institution
transforms both its underlying beliefs and values and its actual day-to-
day practices (Kezar 2018).

   We argue in this collection that deep change through sensemaking is
necessary if writing-related faculty development programs (Martin 2021)
want to accomplish long-standing goals such as changing the culture of
writing and learning on campus, helping all faculty take responsibility
for teaching writing, or supporting faculty in recognizing the role of
writing in learning. Changing the culture of writing and learning on
campuses is difficult work, however. Through the research and narra-
tives in this collection, we suggest writing-related faculty development

programs might be most successful at facilitating deep change if they engage intra- and interdisciplinary teams of faculty in meaningful sense-making about writing and learning. As this collection illustrates, helping faculty to first change their conceptions about how writing and learning work empowers them to then reimagine not only their individual assignments and courses but also their programmatic curricula and, in some cases, departmental culture.

In this chapter, we briefly discuss the misconceptions of writing and learning that govern current notions of higher education and explain why deep change is necessary to overcome these harmful views. We then provide an overview of the principles and curriculum of the program we designed for faculty teams through the Howe Center for Writing Excellence (HCWE) at Miami University (Ohio) to combat these misconceptions. We conclude with an overview of the remainder of this book. Our aim is to provide not *the* answer to combating misconceptions of writing and learning but, rather, to present a conceptual framework based on a set of research-based principles we have found useful in working to innovate teaching and learning with faculty from across disciplines and contexts.

A NOTE ABOUT AUDIENCE

Before we begin, we want to directly address our audience for this collection. Careful readers will note that in introducing our project above, we use the term *writing-related faculty development*. This is a term we borrowed from one of our editors, Caitlin Martin (2021), who points out in her dissertation that "the activity of helping faculty across the curriculum learn to teach writing . . . is often a part of writing across the curriculum programs, but it might also happen in teaching and learning centers, in writing centers, and even through English departments" (3). It is our hope in this collection to speak to the varied audiences Martin has pulled together through her definition: those involved in writing across the curriculum efforts, writing centers, teaching and learning centers, and any other sites where the goal is to support faculty members from all disciplines in innovating their pedagogical practices, particularly with writing.

Historically, educational developers[1] (a term we use following Cheryl Amundsen and Mary Wilson [2012], Catherine King and Peter Felten [2012], and the POD Network [2021], among others) and writing across the curriculum leaders have not participated in the same scholarly conversations. Our conferences and other professional conversations

tend to be quite separate. The POD Network annual conference, for example, attracts some writing scholars but not as many as one might expect—in 2020, only 2 presentations out of 141 explicitly contained content about writing (POD 2020)—and movement in the other direction seems even less common, with few educational development scholars attending writing studies conferences. (A notable exception is the work at Elon University, where writing studies scholars lead educational development work and encourage extensive cross-pollination in their seminars, conferences, and special journal issues).

Despite the infrequently articulated connections between the groups, we see the fields as integrally connected in both purposes and methods. Support for improved teaching—overall and of writing in particular—developed as a result of changes in the nature, focus, and students of higher education: the more higher education was opened up to the non-elite, the more concerns were raised about student "deficiencies" in general and as related to writing in particular. Calls to address perceived student deficiencies led in part to the creation of WAC in the 1970s and 1980s. Centers for teaching and learning and other related educational development efforts followed, as there came a growing recognition that "scholarship" could include teaching (Boyer 1990) and that such scholarship needed support (Matthias 2019; Ouellett 2010; Russell 2002; Sorcinelli et al. 2006).

All pedagogically focused faculty development (educational development) efforts share a commitment to student learning and a recognition that effective teaching requires development and support and is, in fact, a scholarly activity. These efforts benefit from being aligned so as to bring the most resources to bear in efforts to invite students into the work of the academy, scaffold rigorous learning opportunities, and recognize writing as one means of learning. In the Howe Center for Writing Excellence, we have increasingly collaborated with our university's Center for Teaching Excellence (especially when COVID required marshalling all available resources) to provide support and training for faculty on matters such as curriculum development, assessment, peer review, assignment design, and so forth. Both centers have benefitted, as has the larger university community.

This collection is designed to address concerns of educational developers, broadly conceived, about how to support faculty in the teaching of writing and in creating broader change around teaching and learning. Moreover, our collection aims to provide support and examples to disciplinary faculty from varied institutions who have committed themselves to improving their teaching by participating in such programs

and who are looking for examples of how to innovate their teaching with their colleagues. The accounts in part 2 of this collection, written by faculty from a variety of disciplines, provide such examples and demonstrate how faculty can enact long-term change across courses and programs with the support of educational development efforts.

Most important for our purposes in this collection is that all educational developers, whether focused on writing and learning specifically or teaching and learning more broadly, share a primary concern about the larger context(s) in which the faculty they support are working. This larger context has been informed for over a century by misconceptions about the nature of writing and learning to write and since the 1980s by an increasingly disintegrative characterization of learning. We turn now to these concerns about how higher education conceives of learning as the exigence for the work described in this collection.

THE EXIGENCE FOR THIS COLLECTION: THE NATURE OF LEARNING VERSUS THE CURRENT DOMINANT PARADIGMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

What we know about how learning works (including learning to write and using writing for learning) conflicts with popular conceptions and enactments of learning. What we know from the scholarship is that deep learning—the kind of learning that changes thinking and practice and that the learner is able to transfer to new contexts—is messy, time consuming, recursive, and often troublesome (Ambrose et al. 2010; Meyer and Land 2003). In order for students to learn concepts and apply them (rather than simply memorize them), they need opportunities to reflect, practice, and apply them across time and with feedback (see Ambrose et al. 2010 and the National Research Council 2000). This sort of learning is neither quick nor easy. It typically does not happen in one class or one "unit" of one class. Rather, it happens across time, across classes, and across disciplines. We know there are high-impact practices that encourage this kind of learning, such as integrative general education programs, learning communities that integrate learning experiences, writing-intensive courses across the curriculum, collaborative projects that require students to work and solve problems with others, opportunities for students to engage in meaningful research projects, experiential or community-based learning, and creating reflective ePortfolios, among others (see Kuh 2008).

We know that learning to write, like all kinds of learning, takes time and practice and that applying skills and ideas about writing in new

contexts and when writing new genres is difficult (see Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle [2015] *Naming What We Know* for a brief overview of these principles). We know there is no simple, one-time inoculation for learning to write, learning with writing, or learning in general. For students to learn in deep and meaningful ways, rather than to simply memorize or regurgitate, requires faculty members to work together to design integrative, coherent, scaffolded learning experiences across time. Student learning must take place in varied sites, as well: thus, faculty from *across* disciplines must work together to design meaningful and coherent general education programs, and faculty *within* disciplines must work together to design coherent, engaging learning experiences for their undergraduate and graduate students.

All of this work is difficult. Most faculty members want to teach well, want to encourage student learning, and want their students to write well. Still, common narratives about education, learning, and writing have created systems that get in the way of their ability to do this. Most faculty members have little exposure to scholarship and theories of teaching and learning and are instead only asked to gain expertise in their content areas. The daily work of institutions of higher education typically leaves little room for faculty members to engage together in scholarly conversations about student learning and how to facilitate it. This point about working *together* to facilitate student learning is an important one. Faculty members are generally rewarded as individuals via the traditional promotion and tenure process and tend to be treated more as independent contractors than like-minded communities of practice working toward shared goals (especially when it comes to teaching). In addition, institutions of higher education are more and more rewarded (via state funding and national rankings) for high scores on "proxy metrics" (O'Neil 2016) for learning rather than for learning itself (for example, they are rewarded for retention and graduation rates, time to degree, and employment after graduation, not for whether and how well students actually learn and can apply their learning to solving meaningful problems in the world).

Such proxy metrics do not reward institutions of higher learning for devoting resources to developing challenging curricula that ask students to engage in supported but messy deep learning. Thus, faculty members who do want to devote their time and energy to understanding how learning works and to designing innovative curricula often find their efforts unrecognized or, even worse, penalized. Administrators tend to reward curricula that are "efficient" and that develop easily measurable outcomes that can be achieved in short periods of time. Their systems

for counting programmatic value tend to focus on metrics such as credit-hour production, lower cost per credit hour, low DFW rates, and high retention and graduation rates rather than innovative curriculum designed to facilitate deep learning that cannot be easily quantified. Efficiency and accountability, not teaching and learning, are the watch-words of the day.

This tendency to prioritize efficiency and quantification over deep learning is one of the symptoms of what Bass (2016) calls the "disintegra-tive paradigm" for learning. This view of education "emphasizes dimen-sions of education that can be commodified: targeted online learning, granular or modular, driven by algorithms that deliver micro-data on student understanding, often with a diminishing role for faculty" (295). The disintegrative view of education stands in sharp contrast to a "fundamentally *integrative paradigm* for learning" that "assumes the interdependence of knowledge, skills, and the broader dispositions that constitute a way of being in the world, such as openness to learning, empathy, and resilience" (295). Bass argues that "the central tension of our time in education" is between these two visions for what education is and should be (295). Bass believes—and much of our daily experience as teachers likely confirms—that the disintegrative view is dominating our work in education. Tyler Branson (2022), in his book *Policy Regimes*, uses a slightly different lens to describe the same phenomenon, argu-ing that what we are experiencing is the result of the dominant policy regime, which he calls the "accountability regime" (22). All paradigms and policy regimes are changeable, however. Higher education has not always enacted a disintegrative or accountability approach. Branson (fol-lowing Patrick McGuinn) describes the "equity" regime that dominated education until the 1980s. That regime left school governance to local administrators and saw the role of the federal government only as pro-viding resources to promote "equity and access for poor students" (18). In the equity regime, faculty and institutions were rewarded for recruit-ing, retaining, and supporting the success of low-income students.

The point is that we are not doomed to a lifetime of conforming to the current accountability regime or disintegrative paradigm. If dominant paradigms around teaching and learning in higher educa-tion are changeable, we want to support educational developers of all kinds (and writing-related faculty developers in particular) in devoting attention to designing programs that help faculty members engage in curricular changemaking that resists the dominant narratives. Faculty members need and want opportunities to engage in meaningful schol-arly conversations that enable them to rethink student learning in their

programs and institutions. This book provides an example of one such program that considers one method faculty members might draw on to engage in meaningful work to enact deep change that runs counter to current narratives about teaching, learning, writing, and the role of higher education. There are, of course, other models that can address these same tension points and resist these narratives. We offer here one model from a writing-focused faculty development context in which we explicitly invite faculty to work together in disciplinary teams to examine principles of writing and learning theory in order to innovate curricular designs and pedagogical strategies that combat misconceptions of writing and the disintegrative narrative of higher education.

COMPONENTS NEEDED TO FACILITATE DEEP CHANGE

If dominant paradigms—of higher education in general and as filtered down to and embodied in particular institutions—are to be resisted and changed, we benefit from an understanding of how change happens. Theories of changemaking explain that paradigm shifts are in the category of "deep change" or "second-order change," as opposed to "first-order change" or surface-level changes to practices and behaviors without the underlying conceptual shift (Kezar 2018).

Deep change describes an ongoing change process through which "underlying values, assumptions, structures, processes, and culture" transform (Kezar 2018, 71) as individuals within a system/context "[make] new sense of things" (87). Deep change involves the "transformation" of an entire system; in the case of higher education, this system could be a full institution or one of its academic departments or programs. This change process stands in contrast to "first-order" change, which occurs in a linear process and focuses on processes and behaviors rather than underlying belief systems. One reason deep change is so difficult, however, is that deep changes "are likely to encounter resistance from within and outside the institution," and "when change is too radical or is vastly different from the existing system, the change threatens the environment, thus causing it to encounter stronger resistance" (71). Because of this difficulty, deep change is fundamentally a learning process that occurs at both the individual and collective levels.

In other words, *individuals* may undergo a process of considering and reimagining their assumptions and ideas—about writing and learning, for example (and they must do so as part of deep change efforts)—but deep change *across programs and institutions* does not happen unless groups of people ("communities of practice," to use Etienne Wenger's

[2000] term) engage in this work together. One way this collective work can be facilitated is through *sensemaking*, a process through which "individuals attach new meaning to familiar concepts and ideas" or "develop new language and new concepts that describe a changed institution" (Kezar 2018, 87). When groups of people engage in sensemaking together, they shift their conceptions (for example, about the role of higher education, the nature of learning, the role of writing in learning) and then change their practices from the ground up. In other words, sensemaking leads to changed ideas and changed culture, and those changes manifest in attitudinal or cultural shifts (how groups and individuals interact with each other, the kinds of conversations that occur between individuals, and moving away from old arguments and beliefs) and structural changes (pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, policies, budgets, and other institutional decision-making structures) (Eckel 2002; Eckel and Kezar 2003; Kezar 2018). (We discuss sensemaking and change theory more in chapter 3.)

Proceeding from this work in change theory, we suggest educational developers can play a central role in paradigm shifts if they intentionally design programs that provide opportunities for groups of faculty to engage in sensemaking around teaching, learning, and writing. If program- or institution-wide culture shifts and deep change are the goal, change theory suggests educational development programs might consider the following principles for that design:

- Programs consist of *teams of people from the same program or department* so there are enough people undergoing conceptual change at the same time to shift the culture of their programs and departments. Simply working with *individuals* from programs may result in meaningful individual change but will not result in deep change across a program. (Chris Anson and Deanna Dannels's [2009] and Pamela Flash's [2016] writing-enriched curriculum practices are two of the few WAC initiatives that proceed from this central tenet.)

- These teams *have the opportunity to also engage with teams from other programs and departments.* These cross-disciplinary interactions provide a helpful means for those with shared conceptions and values to compare their ideas with others who understand teaching, learning, and writing differently. They also provide a greater likelihood that sensemaking will impact ideas and thus practices across the institution rather than simply in one department or program. Those cross-departmental interactions during sensemaking also provide opportunities for faculty from very different disciplines to become allies who share conceptions and vocabulary in future efforts to enact change on institution-wide committees and planning groups. (While nearly all educational development programs are cross-disciplinary, we do

not know of any that engage *teams* of faculty from disciplines in this cross-disciplinary engagement in intentional ways. Other programs typically consist of individuals from various disciplines attending workshops, seminars, or learning communities together.)

- The program *takes place across time, with plenty of opportunity for participants to read, think, talk, and apply ideas.* One-time workshops are unlikely to provide the necessary time for participants to reflect deeply, imagine new ways of thinking, and change their conceptions. (This practice of longer-term seminars is becoming more and more common in both WAC and educational development; Stephen Wilhoit [2013] makes this an explicit recommendation in the description of his WID seminar at the University of Dayton, noting that "changing faculty behavior, values, and commitments take time" [126]).

- The program provides participants with *theoretical frameworks for thinking about their ideas and practices and with the opportunity to engage with scholarship around teaching and learning.* The roots of the very first WAC seminars with Elaine Maimon and Harriet Sheridan were guided by this approach; faculty learning communities also function from a similar principle. Maimon (2018) argues quite persuasively that "curricular change depends on scholarly exchange among faculty members" (45). While the initial impulse might be to focus on practice, change theory suggests engaging scholarship and theoretical frameworks first is most likely to result in innovative changes to practice that have real staying power. Educational developers have been arguing for this as well. Sarah Bunnell and Daniel Bernstein (2012) describe this as "scholarly teaching, the act of systematically examining the links between one's teaching and student learning," necessitating an understanding of "teaching as an inquiry-based process"—and note that it "remains a challenging idea" (14).

As we note above, many of these principles for sensemaking projects are or have been enacted in various educational development programs (again, notably, at Elon University's Center for Engaged Learning [n.d.] through their multi-institution and multidisciplinary research seminars and publications, as well as through national projects such as the American Council on Education's [2021] ACE Transformation Labs). Our goal here is to articulate the need for *all these aspects of program design* to be facilitated *together* and *intentionally* from within an institution in order to create deep cultural shifts within that institution that resist dominant paradigms of teaching and learning and instead imagine and embody paradigms that enact what we know about how learning and writing really work.

The leadership team at the HCWE designed one such program with these principles in mind. In the following section, we provide a brief overview of the program, which is one example of how educational development programs with the goal of deep change can be designed,

implemented, and facilitated. We assume, of course, as we say above, that there are many other ways to enact the preceding principles. Our goal here is to demonstrate what *one* enactment looks like and then to illustrate throughout the collection what the results of that enactment have been.

THE HOWE FACULTY WRITING FELLOWS PROGRAM

The Howe Faculty Writing Fellows Program (hereafter referred to as "the Fellows Program") was established at Miami University in spring 2017. It is carried out by Elizabeth Wardle (the director of the Howe Center for Writing Excellence), Ann Updike (the associate director from 2013 to 2021), and doctoral students from the composition and rhetoric program who serve as graduate assistant directors (coauthors and editors of this collection Angela Glotfelter, Caitlin Martin, and Mandy Olejnik have all served in this capacity). In designing the system, we were guided by a passionate belief about what education systems should be designed to do: they should teach for deep learning and critical thinking that is transferable across contexts and that will enable learners to be productive and innovative citizens in a democracy. In our role as an educational development support center serving the entire university, we want to advocate for what Tone Solbrekke and Ciaran Sugrue (2020) describe as *higher education as and for public good*. To model those principles for faculty, we sought to design a space for reflection, dialogue, and deep learning where faculty could grapple with ideas about the role of education, how learning works, the nature of learning and knowledge in their disciplines, and the role of writing in that system. In these efforts, we were guided by learning theory, the threshold concepts framework, and decades of scholarship about writing.

The Fellows Program proceeds from the deep change principles we outline in the previous section, which are enacted in the following specific ways.

Deep changes in curriculum and institutional writing culture require stakeholders to change—or at least bring to conscious awareness—their conceptions of writing. Participants can best engage in this critical reflection when they engage as *departmental teams* (of at least three members). Together, as departmental teams, they are better able to name and draw on their shared assumptions, values, and expertise. Moreover, after the program, the team has a greater likelihood of making changes in their larger departmental cultures than a lone faculty member would.

Departmental teams' ways of thinking and acting are colored by their community goals and purposes and by the history of their work together. This is true of their methods for working, as well as for their conventions for writing and communicating. However, faculty experts who have long been enculturated into their disciplinary and professional communities of practice are often unaware of how specialized their ways of thinking, practicing, and writing are—and thus how strange those practices can be for outsiders, newcomers, and learners (McCarthy 1987). They also, as chapter 12 illustrates, may be unaware of the built-in biases of their conventions and practices. Thus, expert faculty have implicit knowledge[2] (Ambrose et al. 2010) and can often see their genres and conventions as "genres in general" (Wardle 2004) rather than specific embodiments of disciplinary practice and values that mediate activity. We have found faculty can more easily bring their conceptions, values, and beliefs to conscious awareness against the *backdrop of disciplinary difference.* Thus, every Fellows cohort consists of teams from at least two and as many as five different programs or departments. This enables participants to see similarities and differences across their communities of practice.

Participants need to be engaged as scholars in thinking about teaching and learning. Most faculty want their students to engage in deep learning, but typical faculty members in US universities have little or no background in pedagogy or learning theories, having focused primarily on disciplinary knowledge during graduate training. Thus, we believe providing opportunities for faculty to engage with research about how learning works enables them to rethink their practices *for themselves* in light of and coupled with their own disciplinary expertise. The program therefore begins by providing a *framework for thinking about learning and expertise* (the threshold concepts framework, discussed more below), and then introduces participants to research and theory about how learning works, the role of writing in learning, and the nature of writing itself. Participants spend the first two-thirds of the seminar thinking about theory and naming their expert practices. Seminar activities help faculty explore their ideas and uses of writing, unpack their disciplinary knowledge, and see themselves as experts in writing by making *explicit* what they already know implicitly about writing and learning in their disciplines. This framework therefore positions faculty as the experts in disciplinary writing who are best able to make decisions about and to teach disciplinary writing conventions, values, and beliefs to their students.

Participants need time to engage ideas and reflect on what they are learning. Thus, the cohorts *meet regularly and intensively* for one and a half hours weekly for a full semester (about fifteen weeks), or for three

hours daily for two or three weeks in the summer, in order to discuss and explore ideas and practices of writing in their own lives, disciplines, and teaching.

For deep change to occur, those who have engaged in sensemaking need *opportunities to put their new ideas and shared conception into practices that will have an influence beyond individual classrooms.* Thus, teams spend the final third of the semester engaged in a changemaking project of their choosing, which they present to the other teams and invited stakeholders on the last day.

The HCWE Faculty Writing Fellows Program relies heavily on the threshold concepts (TC) framework, though it is clearly possible to design sensemaking projects that rely on other conceptual frameworks, and we hope readers will imagine what those might be. We have had success with the threshold concepts framework, as the accounts in part 2 of this book illustrate. For that reason, we want to spend a short time here explaining what it is and how it works well with learning theory and conversations around teaching. However, we want to emphasize we are not arguing for a threshold concepts approach to all educational development. Rather, we are arguing that *some* robust conceptual framework around teaching and learning should serve as the backbone for team and cross-disciplinary sensemaking, and the work of this book illustrates how the threshold concepts framework serves that role in our program.

The Threshold Concepts Framework as One
Conceptual Foundation for Sensemaking

The threshold concept (TC) framework is well aligned with a concern for integrative education as a public good that "[enables] students to make connections and integrate their knowledge, skills, and habits of mind into an adaptable and critical stance toward the world" (Bass 2017, 145). In fact, Ray Land (2016) calls the framework "a counter-discourse to the commodification of learning" because of "its emphasis on transformation through troublesome knowledge and shifts in subjectivity" (18–19). In other words, it asks disciplinary experts to name and interrogate their ways of thinking and practicing for the explicit purpose of creating more effective teaching and learning environments. The TC framework is influenced by research on learning transfer (Perkins and Salomon 1988, 1989, 1992; Tuomi-Gröhn and Engeström 2003) and also has led to a great deal of scholarship examining the role of learners' prior knowledge and experience in their learning and the nature of liminality and recursivity in learning these most difficult disciplinary

ways of thinking and practicing (see, for instance, the massive bibliography maintained by Michael Flanagan on pedagogical research that uses threshold concepts theory as a foundation: www.ee.ucl.ac.uk /~mflanaga/thresholds.html).

While disintegration has become "common sense" in the way we talk about and enact education today, threshold concepts theory presents a way to name and challenge problematic "common sense" beliefs (Cousin 2006). The theoretical framework is well suited to tackling the task of naming and showing a better alternative to disintegrative visions of education. Further, because of its theoretical lineage, the TC framework aligns with the field of writing studies' deep commitments to seeing learning and transfer of knowledge through writing as complex and context bound (Driscoll 2011; Gorzelsky et al. 2017; Moore 2017; Wardle 2009).

The threshold concepts framework emerged from a United Kingdom national research project centering on characteristics for strong teaching and learning within disciplines (Cousin 2006). Ray Land, Glynis Cousin, Jan Meyer, and Peter Davies (2005) define threshold concepts as "concepts that bind a subject together, being fundamental to ways of thinking and practising in that discipline" (54). They are "akin to a portal" and "[open] a new and previously inaccessible way of thinking about something" (53). Threshold concepts, then, fundamentally change the way a learner views and approaches a subject, and learners internalize threshold concepts as they come to fully participate in a discipline. The resulting threshold concepts framework recognizes each discipline entails some learning thresholds through which newcomers to the discipline must struggle to pass in order to do the work of that discipline. Threshold concepts thus represent transformational ways of understanding, interpreting, or viewing something (Meyer and Land 2003). They are ways of thinking *and* ways of practicing. They entail and embody disciplinary values and epistemologies. Most important for our purposes in this collection, TC theorists recognize that learning threshold concepts is time intensive, recursive, messy, and troublesome. There is no linear path to learning threshold concepts, and learners can struggle in a liminal space for some time as they engage threshold concepts not just by reading but by doing. When students are in uncomfortable liminal spaces, they need support from a variety of teachers and mentors who all recognize learning is hard and are willing to together create safe and scaffolded environments for that learning. TC theorists devote extensive time to the nature of learning in liminal spaces and how to design learning environments that support students through this work. If we want students to learn ideas that transform their understanding of

particular subject matter and the world around them, the TC framework reminds us there is no shortcut, there are no proxies for measuring learning, and learning must be integrated. The disintegrative view of education is deeply at odds with what TC theory and other learning theories tell us about the nature of transformative learning.

The implications of this framework for teaching and for learning are profound. In a higher education paradigm that values efficiency and accountability, commodifies learning, and encourages teachers to disaggregate the learning process, teachers and program directors need a conceptual framework that supports them in designing courses and course sequences, learning activities, and assessments that encourage and support messy, troublesome, recursive learning across time. Teachers need support for designing learning environments that plunge students into uncertainty and for helping students embrace that uncertainty when they have been trained more often to follow directions (Wardle 2012). The threshold concepts framework directly embraces the messiness of deep and transformative learning and simply accepts that such learning cannot easily be commodified and is difficult to measure; evidence of threshold concepts having been learned lies in how people view and conceptualize what they see and what they then do in response to those conceptions. In nearly every way, an educational experience designed around threshold concepts is antithetical to the disintegrative view of learning and to the accountability paradigm. It recognizes learning is messy, cannot easily be quantified, and is not particularly efficient. Learning must happen in context and over time with members of a community who share ways of thinking and practicing.

We are not the first to argue for the relevance of the threshold concept framework to educational development in general or even to writing across the curriculum faculty development efforts. As Meyer (2012) notes in an article for a special 2012 issue of *Journal of Faculty Development* specifically devoted to threshold concepts, "From the outset the TCF [threshold concepts framework] has attracted the attention of the faculty development community" (9) (the "outset" he refers to being the foundation of the framework developed by Meyer and Land in two seminal papers in 2003 and 2005). And Chris Anson (2015), in *Naming What We Know*, outlines threshold concepts that might inform WAC work. The concepts Anson names have been taken up in scholarship by Bradley Hughes and Elisabeth Miller (2018) and Christopher Basgier and Amber Simpson (2019, 2020), among others. The way we use the threshold concepts framework in Fellows, however, is somewhat different, as we explain below.

The Fellows Curriculum

The HCWE Fellows seminar begins with an introduction to threshold concept theory with short readings, minilectures, discussion, and activities for teams to identify their own disciplinary threshold concepts (Cousin 2006; Meyer and Land 2003). Next, participants are introduced to threshold concepts of writing from *Naming What We Know* (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 2015), followed by discussion and activities to examine how they use writing in their professional and daily lives. By interrogating their own practices, uses, and forms of writing, faculty come to understand the myriad ways that writing is used to achieve multiple purposes and that those forms follow their purpose or function. A final activity in this segment asks faculty to consider how this new understanding could inform their use of writing in the classroom beyond the often limited purposes and forms frequently assigned.

Participants then explore how disciplinary values and epistemologies are enacted in disciplinary writing conventions. The participants read Ken Hyland (2000) and John Swales (1990) to acquire language and a process for examining disciplinary texts, and then they perform a cross-disciplinary genre-analysis activity. Participants exchange research articles with participants from another discipline and look for what they find similar, surprising, or strange in regards to how citations work, what counts as evidence, how evidence is presented, and so forth. This activity, seemingly more than any other, helps participants conceptualize how difference plays out in writing across disciplines and how much variety there is. Participants gain a new appreciation for students who move between multiple disciplines daily and begin to realize that, as teachers, they must explicitly name for both themselves and their students what they mean by writing and "good writing." With this new understanding, each team defines "good writing" in their disciplines and explains it to the other teams to check its clarity for outsiders.

In the next stage, participants read and discuss theories of learning (Ambrose et al. 2010), specifically the role of prior knowledge, stages for moving from novice to mastery, experts' implicit knowledge, and knowledge transfer. We follow up with activities to identify all the ways they use writing when researching, learning something new, and writing a research article. After unpacking all this implicit knowledge, participants read and discuss ideas for scaffolding, teaching with writing, and responding to writing (Bean 2011). They practice scaffolding a course concept or assignment previously packed with implicit knowledge and

skipped steps (their invisible assumptions) in an effort to make the implicit explicit for students.

In the final third of the semester, teams discuss among themselves what changes they would like to see surrounding teaching and learning in their programs or departments and then identify a project on which to work. These projects range from designing brand-new courses to designing and aligning course sequences to researching where and how writing is assigned across their majors to designing workshops they will facilitate for their departmental colleagues who did not participate in the Fellows Program, redesigning departmental assessments around ePortfolios, and more. (A full list of projects is included in appendix A.) Teams present their projects to the full cohort on the last day as part of a final showcase; the audience also includes invited guests such as department chairs, deans, associate provosts, and departmental colleagues. (A complete semester schedule is included in appendix B.)

Once the program ends, the teams return to their departments and implement their changes. We have continued to support their change efforts through a variety of changing initiatives, which have included:

- follow-up workshops to give Fellows time and space to continue redesigning their courses and assignments;
- alumni lunches to create space for discussing their ongoing work with Fellows from other cohorts;
- Chairs Leadership and Change Reading Group, for Fellows who are department chairs, to discuss books on change theory;
- grants to support their continued work, conference attendance, and publications;
- peer writing associates for their courses;
- training for their graduate teaching associates;
- departmental workshops.

Our program, then, includes a constellation of ongoing support for Fellows alumni, which they've cited as important and helpful to their continuing understanding of how learning and writing work in their disciplines and classrooms.

Readers interested in how to design a similar program within their own institutional contexts will find some suggestions in the concluding chapter of this collection (chapter 14). Here we want to emphasize that the costs of such an approach are important considerations but need not be prohibitive, and the semester-long design could be adapted to a shorter series or set of workshops distributed across time. What matters most are the *transferable organizing principles*:

- engaging faculty members in programmatic teams, enabling them to think beyond their own individual courses;
- providing opportunities for faculty from various disciplines to compare and contrast their practices and values in order to bring them to conscious attention;
- working from a theoretical framework that centers the difficulties of learning and invites faculty to consider how to collectively design coursework across time that invites students into the ways of thinking and practicing of a discipline.

The goal is to engage groups of faculty in group sensemaking that can result in deep change around teaching and learning—first within departments and programs and then across so many departments and programs that the changes take hold at the institutional level. As we describe in the next two chapters, we have worked with numerous departments and teams since 2017 and have achieved promising results, which the accounts in part 2 of this collection, written by Fellows alumni, serve to illustrate.

OVERVIEW OF THE REMAINDER OF BOOK

This book is organized into three parts. The remainder of this part, "Developing and Researching Models for Deep Change through Educational Development Programs," continues with a chapter that overviews research collected from Fellows Program alumni regarding their conceptual and practical changes after participating in the program. In that chapter, we describe how moving from change in one classroom to change in a full program (and later, change across a full institution) is difficult. This is the challenge we take up in chapter 3, outlining the difficulties of engaging in deep change efforts, including limited support and reward for faculty leadership.

Having established in part 1 the framework for deep change focused educational development, provided data about the impact of one such project, and described the challenges to deep change, we then provide in part 2 a series of accounts written by Fellows alumni, "Accounts of Faculty-Led Change Efforts." First, teams of economists and philosophers outline in chapters 4 and 5 how they underwent conceptual shifts in their thinking about writing, teaching, and learning that, in turn, helped them enact deep and fundamental changes across their departmental curricula. Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 look more deeply at how the threshold concepts framework helped faculty members design effective (albeit messy and liminal) learning environments for students. In chapter 6, two

gerontologists describe their efforts to name their field's threshold concepts and work to enact them across their graduate curriculum in order to invite students into the work of their fairly new and deeply interdisciplinary field. In chapter 7, three psychologists describe how they came to recognize that their expectations of student writers and their practices for assigning research writing to students were deeply misaligned with how professionals in their field write—and how they worked to reimagine learning environments that provide the same supports, time, and scaffolding professional psychologists have. In chapter 8, three art historians describe several threshold concepts they identified together and how they worked to engage students in the messy challenge of giving words to what they see. In chapter 9, one of those art historians discusses yet another threshold concept, Otherness, and how he invites students to grapple with it despite their own discomfort. In chapter 10, a historian describes the challenges inherent in historical thinking and why these challenges can make coherent curricular design difficult.

The next set of accounts shifts focus to the macro level, asking readers to take a critical and reflective stance in thinking about both threshold concepts and large-scale change. In chapter 11, three scholars of American, Latino/a, and Caribbean studies outline how they embraced the difficulties of inviting students into an interdisciplinary field that is, through its own history, contentious and disunified. Their discussion of using writing to teach students to engage the threshold concepts of their field illustrates the ways institutional positioning can influence a program or department's work. In chapter 12, a psychologist and woman of color describes her own painful journey to engage the threshold concepts of her field, only to realize what this process cost her. She urges readers to critically engage their fields' foundational ideas and gatekeeping practices, asking whose values they embody and who they silence or exclude. In chapter 13, three teacher education scholars describe their department's painful journey in addressing systemic racism, not only in their field and its efforts to make pedagogy appear value free but also in their own department, where a faculty member was recently outed in a quite public way for long-standing racist beliefs he enacted across decades of training future teachers. These accounts illustrate some of the many difficulties changemakers can expect to encounter when they try to enact change beyond their own individual classrooms.

We conclude the collection with Part 3, "Taking Stock and Moving Forward." In chapter 14, we glean lessons from the case studies and provide some suggestions for educational developers who may want to engage in similar efforts. We offer an afterword that considers the origins

of the disintegrative paradigm and how its terms and framing impede efforts to make meaningful, grassroots change within higher education.

CONCLUSION

We offer this book as one optimistic example of how educational development programs can be explicitly designed to enable groups of faculty to lead from research-based principles of teaching and learning, reflect about their positionality and disciplinary practices, and work to enact an integrative view of learning via sensemaking and distributed leadership. Changing cultures (and conceptions) is hard work and takes a long time. It is also work that cannot be done by one person, instead requiring teamwork and collaboration across programs and units. But we are confident that challenging the disintegrative view of higher education and learning *is* possible and that meaningful changes *can* be made. We also believe there has never been a better time for this work than now, as the future of higher education seems to hang in the balance.

NOTES

1. Peter Felten, Alan Kalish, Allison Pingree, and Kathryn M. Plank (2007) define educational development as "helping colleges and universities function effectively as teaching and learning communities" (93). The Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network prefers the use of the term "educational development" over "faculty development" for the ways it encompasses the wide breadth of the work POD Network communities engage in, which spans across levels, audiences, and subfields.
2. Ambrose et al. (2010) use the term "expert blind spots" to refer to the invisible assumptions held by experts who are no longer aware of all they know and therefore do not always teach this tacit knowledge to students.

REFERENCES

Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Elizabeth Wardle, eds. 2015. *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies.* Logan: Utah State University Press.

Ambrose, Susan. A., Michael W. Bridges, Michele DiPietro, Marsha C. Lovett, and Marie K. Norman. 2010. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Council on Education. 2021. "Ace Transformation Labs." https://www.acenet.edu/Programs-Services/Pages/Professional-Learning/Transformation-Labs.aspx.

Amundsen, Cheryl, and Mary Wilson. 2012. "Are We Asking the Right Questions?: A Conceptual Review of the Educational Development Literature in Higher Education." *Review of Educational Research* 82 (1): 90–126. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312438409.

Anson, Chris M. 2015. "Crossing Thresholds: What's to Know about Writing across the Curriculum." In *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies,* edited by Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth A. Wardle, 203–19. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Anson, Chris M., and Deanna P. Dannels. 2009. "Profiling Programs: Formative Uses of Departmental Consultations in the Assessment of Communication Across the Curriculum." In "Writing Across Disciplines and Assessment: Activities, Programs, and Insights at the Intersection." Special issue, *Across the Disciplines* 6. https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/assessment/anson_dannels.cfm.

Basgier, Christopher, and Amber Simpson. 2019. Trouble and Transformation in Higher Education: Identifying Threshold Concepts through Faculty Narratives about Teaching Writing. *Studies in Higher Education* 45 (9): 1–13.

Basgier, Christopher, and Amber Simpson. 2020. Reflecting on the Past, Reconstructing the Future: Faculty Members' Threshold Concepts for Teaching Writing in the Disciplines. *Across the Disciplines* 17 (1/2): 6–25.

Bass, Randall. 2016. "Well-Being, Disintegration and the Rebundling of Higher Education." In *Well-Being and Higher Education: A Strategy for Change and the Realization of Education's Greater Purposes*, edited by Donald W. Harward, 295–99. Washington, DC: Bringing Theory to Practice. https://bttop.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Well-Being-and-Higher-Ed-FINAL-PDF.pdf.

Bass, Randall. 2017. "Coda: Writing Transfer and the Future of the Integrated University." In *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Jessie L. Moore and Randall Bass, 144–54. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bean, John. 2011. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom.* 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Branson, Tyler. 2022. *Policy Regimes: College Writing and Public Education Policy in the United States.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bunnell, Sarah L., and Daniel J. Bernstein. 2012. "Overcoming Some Threshold Concepts in Scholarly Teaching." *Journal of Faculty Development* 26 (3): 14–18.

Cousin, Glynis. 2006. "An Introduction to Threshold Concepts." *Planet* 17 (1): 4–5. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.11120/plan.2006.00170004.

Driscoll, Dana Lynn. 2011. "Connected, Disconnected, or Uncertain: Student Attitudes about Future Writing Contexts and Perceptions of Transfer from First Year Writing to The Disciplines." *Across the Disciplines* 8 (2): 1–29.

Eckel, Peter D. 2002. "Assessing Change and Transformation in Higher Education: An Essential Task for Leaders." *Metropolitan Universities* 13 (2): 80–93.

Eckel, Peter D., and Adrianna Kezar. 2003. *Taking the Reins: Institutional Transformation in High Education.* Westport, CT: American Council of Higher Education/Praeger.

Elon University Center for Engaged Learning. n.d. https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/.

Felten, Peter, Alan Kalish, Allison Pingree, and Kathryn M. Plank. 2007. "Toward a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Educational Development." In *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional and Organizational Development*, edited by Douglas Reimondo Robertson and Linda B. Nilson, 93–108. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Flanagan, Michael. 2020. *Threshold Concepts: Undergraduate Teaching, Postgraduate Training, Professional Development and School Education: A Short Introduction and a Bibliography from 2003 to 2018.* www.ee.ucl.ac.uk/~mflanaga/thresholds.html.

Flash, Pamela. 2016. "From Apprised to Revised: Faculty in the Disciplines Change What They Never Knew They Knew." In *A Rhetoric of Reflection*, edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, 227–49. Logan: Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.7330/9781607325161.c011.

Gorzelsky, Gwen, Carol Hayes, Ed Jones, and Dana Lynn Driscoll. 2017. "Cueing and Adapting First-year Writing Knowledge: Support for Transfer into Disciplinary Writing." In *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning*

in Higher Education, edited by Randall Bass and Jessie L. Moore, 113–21. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Hughes, Bradley, and Elisabeth L. Miller. 2018. "WAC Seminar Participants as Surrogate WAC Consultants: Disciplinary Faculty Developing and Deploying WAC Expertise." *WAC Journal* 29: 7–41.

Hyland, Ken. 2000. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. New York: Longman.

Kezar, Adrianna. 2018. *How Colleges Change: Understanding, Leading, and Enacting Change*. New York: Routledge.

King, Catherine, and Peter Felten. 2012. "Threshold Concepts in Educational Development: An Introduction." *Journal of Faculty Development* 26 (3): 5–7.

Kuh, George D. 2008. *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Land, Ray. 2016. "Toil and Trouble: Threshold Concepts as a Pedagogy of Uncertainty." In *Threshold Concepts in Practice*, edited by Ray Land, Jan H. F. Meyer, and Michael T. Flanagan, 11–24. Rotterdam: Sense.

Land, Ray, Glynis Cousin, Jan H. F. Meyer, and Peter Davies. 2005. "Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge (3): Implications for Course Design and Evaluation." In *Improving Student Learning, Diversity and Inclusivity*, edited by Chris Rust, 53–64. Oxford: Oxford Center for Staff and Learning Development.

Maimon, Elaine P. 2018. *Leading Academic Change: Vision, Strategy, Transformation*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Martin, Caitlin. 2021. "Facilitating Institutional Change through Writing-Related Faculty Development." PhD diss., Miami University.

Matthias, Laurie R. 2019. "Faculty Development: A Review of the (Relatively Recent) Literature and Implications for Christian Higher Education." *Christian Higher Education* 18 (4): 260–75.

McCarthy, Lucille P. 1987. "A Stranger in Strange Lands: A College Student Writing Across the Curriculum." *Research in the Teaching of English* 21 (3): 233–65.

Meyer, Jan H. F. 2012. " 'Variation in Student Learning' as a Threshold Concept." *Journal of Faculty Development* 26 (3): 9–13.

Meyer, Jan, and Ray Land. 2003. "Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge: Linkages to Ways of Thinking and Practising within the Disciplines." *ETL Occasional Report 4*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh. http://www.etl.tla.ed.ac.uk/docs/ETLreport4 .pdf.

Meyer, Jan H. F., and Ray Land. 2005. "Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge (2): Epistemological Considerations and a Conceptual Framework for Teaching and Learning." *Higher Education* 49 (3): 373–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-6779-5.

Moore, Jessie L. 2017. "Five Essential Principles about Writing Transfer." In *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Jessie L. Moore and Randall Bass, 1–12. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

National Research Council. 2000. *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

O'Neil, Cathy. 2016. *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. New York: Crown.

Ouellett, Mathew L. 2010. "Overview of Faculty Development: History and Choices." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 2nd ed., edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglass L. Robertson, 3–20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perkins, David N., and Gavriel Salomon. 1988. "Teaching for Transfer." *Educational Leadership* 46 (1): 22–32.

Perkins, David N., and Gavriel Salomon. 1989. "Are Cognitive Skills Context Bound?" *Educational Researcher* 18 (1): 16–25.

Perkins, David N., and Gavriel Salomon. 1992. "Transfer of Learning." In *International Encyclopedia of Education*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Pergamon.

POD Network: Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education. 2020. "Schedule." https://drive.google.com/file/d/109aRDF5E4WI6qL4TCqO-Q93cqWXd2hFN0/view.

POD Network: Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education. 2021. https://conference.podnetwork.org/schedule-2021/.

Russell, David. 2002. *Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 1870–1990: A Curricular History*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Solbrekke, Tone Dyrdal, and Ciaran Sugure. 2020. *Leading Higher Education As and For Public Good: Rekindling Education as Praxis*. New York: Routledge.

Sorcinelli, Mary Deane, Ann E. Austin, Pamela L. Eddy, and Andrea L. Beach. 2006. *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Swales, John M. 1990. "Research Articles in English." In *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, 110–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tuomi-Gröhn, Terttu, and Yrjö Engeström. 2003. *Between School and Work : New Perspectives on Transfer and Boundary-Crossing*. Advances in Learning and Instruction Series. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Wardle, Elizabeth. 2004. "Can Cross-Disciplinary Links Help Us Teach 'Academic Discourse' in FYC?" *Across the Disciplines* 1. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/articles/wardle2004.pdf.

Wardle, Elizabeth. 2009. "'Mutt Genres' and the Goal of FYC: Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the University?" *College Composition and Communication* 60 (4): 765–89.

Wardle, Elizabeth. 2012. "Creative Repurposing for Expansive Learning: Considering 'Problem-Exploring' and 'Answer-Getting' Dispositions in Individuals and Fields." *Composition Forum* 26 (Fall). https://compositionforum.com/issue/26/creative-repurposing.php.

Wenger, Etienne. 2000. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilhoit, Stephen. 2013. "Achieving a Lasting Impact on Faculty Teaching: Using the WPA Outcomes Statement to Develop an Extended WID Seminar." *The WPA Outcomes Statement: A Decade Later*, edited by Nicholas N. Behm, Gregory R. Glau, Deborah H. Holdstein, Duane Roen, and Edward M. White, 124–35. Anderson, SC: Parlor.