



# **Global Cultures, Local Writing: Collaborative Contexts: The Cornell Consortium for Writing in the Disciplines**

**Jonathan Monroe**  
*Cornell University*

Cornell University's decision in 1966 to distribute responsibility for the teaching of writing across the disciplines has contributed over the past four decades toward an increasingly rich appreciation of the importance of discipline-specific writing practices in the unending process David Bartholomae has called "inventing the university" (1985). Recognizing the enduring legacy of this decision in the work of Cornell's John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines, co-publishers *Time* magazine and *The Princeton Review* named Cornell, in the 2001 edition of *The Best College for You*, their "College of the Year" among private research universities. In singling out Cornell and three other schools—Clemson University, Sarah Lawrence College, and Longview Community College among public universities, liberal arts colleges, and two-year colleges, respectively—the issue's editors sought to reflect the diversity in higher education in the United States and the increasingly vital role writing-across-the-curriculum and writing-in-the-disciplines programs have come to play "in the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills—not just in English-lit. classes but in all disciplines" (63). Affirming the emphasis WAC and WID typically place on active learning and faculty-student interaction, the issue underscores the importance of WAC and WID programs as pivotal sites for evaluating the effectiveness of colleges and universities generally.

While it is an honor for Cornell and the Knight Institute to be recognized as a leader in developing the kind of cross-curricular, discipline-specific approach that lies at the heart of the Institute's philosophy, that recognition clearly needs to be understood as a tribute not only to the sustained commitment and effectiveness of the many teachers and administrators who have helped make writing such an integral part of learning at Cornell, but to the growing influence of WAC and WID on curricular reform and institutional change across higher education's rapidly changing landscape. Since 1997, through Cornell's annual Consortium for Writing in the Disciplines as also through its hosting of the fourth national Writing Across the Curriculum Conference in June 1999, which brought to the Cornell campus some four hundred participants from forty-seven states and seven foreign countries, the Knight Institute has expanded its efforts to encourage discipline-specific approaches to the teaching of writing both nationally and internationally. Drawing teams of faculty and administrators from throughout the United States and abroad, the Consortium has come to play an increasingly influential role over the past five years in advancing WID-based curricular reform at a wide range of colleges and universities, from such highly selective private schools as Davidson, Duke, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Princeton, and Rice, to public universities as diverse as Arizona State University-West, California State University at Monterey Bay, Dull Knife Memorial College (a Native American community college in Lame Deer, Montana), Florida A&M, SUNY-Oswego, the University of Michigan, the University of Missouri-Columbia, and the University of New Hampshire, to schools negotiating the challenges of locations as diverse as those of Temple, in the heart of Philadelphia's inner city, and the typically rural, geographically isolated schools affiliated with the Appalachian College Association.

At the heart of each institution's, as well as each discipline's understanding of its educational mission lies some sense of location, at once literal and figural, global and local, geographical and philosophical. Within the pluriverse of the university, where individual disciplines often function as the equivalent of nation-states, territorial entities shaped by internal divisions and border disputes, intra- and interdepartmental diplomacy, the life of the academy continues to get parceled out, divided up, shared, and reshaped daily, as Bill

Readings' *The University in Ruins* (1996) reminds us, through acts of writing in which faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates all participate. As an integral part of the most comprehensive school in the Ivy League and the land-grant university for the State of New York, the Knight Institute occupies an uncommon, even unique position from which to engage the developmental needs of a broad range of institutions and disciplines. In facilitating cross-disciplinary dialogue among participants from such a wide range of colleges and universities, the Consortium offers a forum for the study and development of writing in the disciplines at all levels of the curriculum, from cornerstone to capstone. For three days near the end of June in the conference facilities of the Statler Hotel, centrally located on the Cornell campus, teams from participating schools work closely with one another, with Knight Institute faculty and administrators, and with nationally-recognized external consultants. Participants convene in larger and smaller groups, make and hear presentations, gather in small work sessions, meet informally for continued conversation, provide assistance and information, and explore ideas and initiatives to take back to their home institutions. To assure meaningful collaboration over time, each institution normally participates in the Consortium for two years, sending to Cornell each June a team of three representatives—generally a college- or university-level administrator, a writing program administrator, and a faculty member from a particular discipline. In light of preliminary reports submitted by the head of each team for distribution in advance of the June meeting, the Consortium focuses each year on issues and questions which participating schools consider to be among their most pressing concerns.

As is clear from such recent publications as “The Future of WAC” (1996); *Electronic Communication Across the Curriculum* (1998); “Clearing the Air: WAC Myths and Realities” (2000); and “Writing Beyond the Curriculum: Fostering New Collaborations in Literacy” (2000), as also from related research on writing, teaching, and constructions of disciplinary knowledge by such scholars as David Russell (1991), Anne Harrington and Charles Moran (1992), Charles Bazerman (1988), Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas Huckin (1995), Julie Thompson Klein (1996), and Paul Prior (1998), the increasing institutionalization of WAC and WID programs throughout the United States and abroad has occasioned considerable re-

newed reflection during the past decade concerning their institutional stakes and consequences. At Cornell, the “centrally isolated” university whose conceptual location and philosophical mission were memorably defined by its founder as one where “any person can pursue any study,” although writing and the teaching of writing have been understood now for several decades as a university-wide concern shared by faculty and graduate students alike, with the strong support of both the College of Arts and Sciences and the University’s central administration, it is only in recent years that Cornell faculty have been asked to contribute to a program-wide articulation of their own field-based writing practices and strategies for the teaching of writing in their particular disciplines. With that purpose in mind, the Consortium served in June 1999 as an occasion for the initial presentation of roughly two dozen essays in reflective practice by Cornell faculty which I have since brought together into two books, *Writing and Revising the Disciplines* and *Local Knowledges, Local Practices: Cultures of Writing at Cornell*. Inspired by anthropologist Clifford Geertz’s *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*, the two volumes together document attempts by Cornell faculty to engage and address the diverse relationships between scholarly research and the teaching of writing across a wide range of fields.

As the title *Local Knowledges, Local Practices* suggests, those of us in the Knight Institute are acutely aware, as we work to maintain, develop, and strengthen our own programs internally, that productive dialogue concerning writing in the disciplines must respect the particularity of different writing and institutional cultures. Accordingly, when the Knight Foundation initially approached me in 1996 with the idea of “disseminating the Cornell model,” my initial response, grounded in respect for the gradual development and continual refinement of Cornell’s discipline-specific approach to writing and writing instruction over the past four decades, was to caution against assuming that our own still-evolving philosophy, administrative structures, and institutional commitments could be exported wholesale from Cornell to other institutions. Since whatever might be of value in our approach would need to be assimilated, adapted, and altered according to the local constraints and possibilities at each participating school, it would be vital to the success of the Consortium that the Institute’s underlying principle be understood, not just

incidentally and procedurally but integrally and substantively, as at once dialogical and dialectical with respect to both disciplinary and institutional difference. While offering participating schools in-depth exposure to Cornell's approach, the Consortium plays a critical role in an ongoing process of internal renewal and development, both by bringing Cornell faculty from a wide range of disciplines into a common forum and by serving as an occasion to learn from the inspiring examples and questions of participating schools. Our experience in the Consortium's rotating two-year collaborations has deepened our conviction that the politics of writing instruction and administration is always local, and that the translatability, portability, effectiveness, and capacity for development of discipline-specific approaches necessarily depend on each institution's particular histories, contexts, constituencies, faculties, administrative structures, and missions.

During the five years the Consortium has been underway, higher education has witnessed an impressive proliferation of new names and acronyms for emerging fields of study. As one moves west and to younger institutions especially, such as Arizona State University-West and California State University at Monterey Bay, familiar names and departmental designations often seem to be dissolving and recombining into new fields and subfields that threaten—or promise—to replace older, more traditional ones. In the context of the rapidly accelerating changes currently facing the academy, one of the Consortium's principal goals has been to encourage cross-disciplinary dialogue about writing at the highest levels of discipline-based practice that shape the fields in which college and university faculty of all ranks, as well as undergraduates and graduate students, must continue to find their way. With the most time-honored functions of higher education increasingly in question, dialogue of the kind the Consortium encourages across the disciplines is essential to avoid the sometimes debilitating compartmentalization and atomization that often characterize intellectual efforts shaped by acts of writing and revision at their very core.

In the spring of 2001, when Susan McLeod issued her call for contributions to the present issue of *LLAD*, I was in the process of finalizing plans for our fifth annual Consortium to focus on the Institute's expanding role in the past several years within an increasingly international context. In addition to panels on "The Transition to College Writing and The Ele-

ments of Writing Instruction” and “Disciplinary Cultures and the Writing Process,” as well as presentations on First-Year Writing Seminars and advanced writing-intensive courses by Cornell faculty representing the fields of anthropology, astronomy, English, music, Near Eastern studies, neurobiology and behavior, philosophy, psychology, and sociology, the June 2001 Consortium featured a series of panels on “Global Writing,” including: 1) a report by Georg Eickhoff, frequent contributor to Germany’s *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and Professor of History at the Technische Universität Berlin, on the inaugural meeting of the new European Association of Teachers of Academic Writing (EATAW) at Groningen, The Netherlands; 2) a presentation by Susan McLeod on her work as a WID consultant in Norway; 3) a panel on writing in the disciplines in Thailand (Martha Townsend, University of Missouri-Columbia) and Singapore (Stephen Donatelli, Cornell); and 4) final reports on their collaborations with the Consortium by Queen Mary College of the University of London and The American University of Paris. It is to these latter two collaborations that I would like now to turn attention.

### **Writing in the Disciplines and Institutional Change at Queen Mary College of the University of London and The American University of Paris**

The distinctive locations of Queen Mary College of the University of London and the American University of Paris inflect the challenge of designing and implementing a discipline-specific approach to the teaching of writing in powerfully particular ways that can tell us a great deal about the possibilities and limits of such an approach in contexts outside the United States. In both cases, interest in participating in the Consortium arose in large measure from a common concern with the quality of student writing related to changing demographics. In both cases, and at AUP perhaps most dramatically, momentum toward renewed reflection on the importance of writing has been propelled by the increasingly multicultural, multilingual character of the student population and a growing consensus among faculty that deficiencies in student writing to have become obstacle to the level of intellectual work each university would like to be able to expect across all disciplines. As we shall see, approaches to addressing this common problem have taken very different paths at Queen Mary, located on the outskirts of East London, and at

AUP, in the heart of Paris, in large part as a result of the very different intra-institutional locations of the principal figures charged with primary responsibility for envisioning and implementing change.

Queen Mary's collaboration with the Knight Institute initially came about as a result of an e-mail correspondence in which Professor Leonard Olschner, a former Cornell colleague from the Department of German Studies and veteran teacher in the Institute's First-Year Writing Seminar program, expressed concern about the quality of student writing at Queen Mary. Currently chair of Queen Mary's German Department, Professor Olschner turned to Alan Evison, Director of the English and Study Skills Programme in Queen Mary's Learning Development and Continuing Education Unit, as the logical person to lead an initiative that would focus renewed attention on the teaching of writing. Located in a small basement office of Queen Mary's main humanities building, the English and Study Skills Programme is the unit at Queen Mary charged with addressing issues akin to those that are the primary concern of the small number of "basic writing" courses offered at Cornell each semester which serve roughly 150 of the University's 3000 entering first-year students.

To guarantee as much individual attention as possible, Cornell's basic writing courses have a ceiling of 12 students, as compared to 17 in our First-Year Writing Seminars. For students in these courses as well, however, roughly 80% of whom speak and write English as a second language, the focus remains, not on writing as a "skill" in the narrow sense, but on writing as a medium in and through which students are called upon to negotiate the complex intellectual demands of writing across a range of disciplines within the university. This more expansive, capacious view of writing, which tends to emphasize higher order concerns of acculturation into disciplinary cultures and the writing practices in and through which the disciplines define and continually reinvent themselves, lies at the core of the Knight Institute's vertically-integrated approach to the teaching of writing at all levels, from our extensive array of First-Year Writing Seminars and small number of Writing Workshop courses, through our advanced elective, writing-intensive English 288-89, Sophomore Seminar, and Writing in the Majors courses. While the Knight Institute understands the need to foreground issues of mechanics, grammar, and style as needed in the first year espe-

cially, its fundamental concern is with writing in this more expansive sense as a complex, heterogeneous activity at all levels of the curriculum.

Given this perspective and the facilitating role of Queen Mary's English and Study Skills Programme in arranging my first consulting visit to the college in 1999, it is not surprising that the first issue to arise concerned the implications of a "skills" approach to thinking about writing across the curriculum. While the initial momentum for Queen Mary's participation in the Consortium had come through correspondence with my former Cornell colleague from Queen Mary's German Department, the decision to invest the English and Study Skills Programme with primary responsibility for encouraging renewed attention to writing across the college and the university predetermined to some degree in advance the amount and speed of progress that could be made in developing and implementing a university-wide, discipline-specific approach. Perceived as the closest equivalent Queen Mary had available to an American-style WPA, the position of director of the college's English and Study Skills Programme—a soft-money, limited term appointment located both literally and figuratively in the basement of the university's hierarchy—was charged with the challenging assignment of galvanizing "from below" the necessary good will, resources, and consensus to address writing as a "skill" in the expanded sense a writing-in-the-disciplines approach implies.

While my first two visits to Queen Mary included one-on-one meetings with individual faculty members, department chairs in the humanities, and a pair of higher level administrators (with PhDs in chemistry and physics, respectively) who in the first case already understood well and in the second quickly grasped the stakes of thinking about writing in a more capacious way beyond the "study skills" model, the central administration's reluctance to interfere with the autonomy of individual departments relegated the burden of developing a faculty consensus in support of a writing-in-the-disciplines approach to the Director of English and Study Skills. In an attempt to generate momentum in support of the English and Study Skills director's efforts, I gave a talk on the Cornell program which drew only a handful of faculty, in part owing to an event that same day and time devoted to a new UK-wide initiative focusing on renewed attention to pedagogical concerns generally within research universities such as Queen



Mary. Most striking to me during this first presentation of Cornell's WID approach at Queen Mary was the discouragement attending faculty expressed concerning the paucity of writing-focused interaction with undergraduates. While one or two faculty recalled a time "before Thatcher" when writing was considered to be an integral part of the process of student learning, the consensus among the self-selected group attending their first WID workshop was that student writing had since devolved into a mere assessment tool, within the framework of a UK-wide movement towards standardized outcomes, that actively discouraged faculty from focusing on student writing as an integral part of the learning process within and across the disciplines. The skills approach to teaching writing was embedded in a larger culture within higher education in the UK that would need to be challenged from within by faculty committed to restoring student-faculty interaction focused on the process of writing, rather than solely on writing as product, as a means of acculturation into the disciplines. Despite the fact that the work of James Britton and other British scholars once served as a major source of inspiration for the development of the writing-across-the-curriculum movement in the United States, it was clear on this first visit that an emphasis on WID at Queen Mary would have to be imported from the American context through a process of consensus-building among the faculty from the ground up.

Quickly understanding what was at stake in rethinking the skills approach, Alan Evison set about this delicate process by identifying on faculty in the humanities who seemed most receptive to the idea of increased faculty-student interaction focused on substantive, process-oriented writing assignments. Accordingly, in the second summer of Queen Mary's participation in the Consortium, Evison brought with him to Cornell two members of the faculty, one in English and one in Spanish, who were committed to offering two courses in the coming year as part of a small pilot initiative in writing in the disciplines. When I returned to Queen Mary to lead a faculty workshop the following spring, the fruits of Evison's efforts at consensus-building were dramatically in evidence. Two years prior, my initial visit had elicited participation from only a handful of curious faculty for whom the idea of teaching writing through the disciplines was still a foreign concept, albeit one that resonated with the experiences of some in the days before the advent of a national standards movement that had

relegated writing to the role of documentation and display of knowledge rather than an integral part of learning. In the two years in between, meanwhile, a university-wide WID culture had developed to such a degree that I encountered a packed seminar room of some thirty faculty, graduate students, and administrators, including Sally Mitchell, the new coordinator of the university's WID initiative who had been hired on three-year funding thanks to the efforts of Evison and the university's Learning Development Unit.

Following Mitchell's expert introduction and my remarks on the Cornell program, the focus of the workshop turned to presentations on writing-intensive courses offered that fall and spring by the two faculty members who had attended the Consortium, as well as a graduate student teacher in history and a professor of English. Having secured support from key departments and individual faculty, as well as the approval and encouragement of the university administration to secure temporary outside funding for the development of a WID approach at Queen Mary, Evison brought with him to the June 2001 Consortium Catherine Haines, the Assistant Director of Education and Staff Development. Although the future of WID at Queen Mary, including funding for the positions of director of English and Study Skills and project coordinator of WID, continues to rely on soft money, Evison's efforts to develop a WID culture "from the basement up" have yielded remarkable progress to date toward embedding a WID culture within the university. With the necessary funding, as recent expressions of interest in the Consortium from Anglia Polytechnic University and the University of Warwick suggest, Queen Mary can serve as a national innovator in a field which, in Evison's words, "does not yet have disciplinary status in the UK" (5). In the context especially of the first annual meeting of the European Association on the Teaching of Academic Writing (EATAW) at Groningen in June 2001—in which Sally Mitchell participated as a representative of Queen Mary, and on which the 2001 Consortium received a report from Georg Eickhoff—Queen Mary's cultivation of a WID approach is a promising development for curricular reform focused on the teaching of writing in higher education both throughout the UK and on the continent.

Where the absence of a process-oriented, writing-intensive approach to learning in the disciplines throughout the UK led to the development of a WID approach at Queen Mary

from the ground up, AUP's cosmopolitan, Franco-American location— geographically situated at the heart of the French capitol but fully embedded philosophically in the American tradition of a liberal arts education—permitted the development of a discipline-specific approach from the opposite direction. Following an initial contact established by my colleague in Comparative Literature, Jonathan Culler, who was then on leave in Paris, AUP's collaboration with the Consortium gained its initial momentum through an exchange with then AUP Vice President Andrea Leskes prior to her departure to become Vice President of the American Association of Colleges and Universities. Having become familiar with the work of the Knight Institute and the Institute's annual Consortium through a visit to AUP by AAC&U President, Carol Schneider, who had attended the Consortium in June 1999, Leskes set in motion the collaboration between AUP and the Knight Institute which led to my initial visit in February 2000. Prior to Leskes' departure for AAC&U, which coincided with the arrival of a new president at AUP, Leskes handed over responsibility for a process of sweeping General Education reforms to Celeste Schenck of AUP's Department of Comparative Literature. Where Alan Evison faced the challenge at Queen Mary of making the case for a WID approach to the university's administration by garnering faculty support from an institutionally marginal location, Schenck's position as a leader of the Gen Ed reforms movement and a full professor in Comparative literature made it possible for her to gain a consensus among AUP faculty and administration and push through a WID-based model with remarkable speed, roughly within a year of my initial visit to AUP in February 2000. Where my initial visit to Queen Mary had involved introducing WID principles and examples to a small group of faculty, the talk I presented on my first visit to AUP took place in front of a large audience that included faculty from a broad range of disciplines and representatives from the university's central administration, including AUP's new president. Significantly, my first encounter with a number of those in attendance had taken place earlier that day through a brief presentation and question-answer period before the university's Gen Ed committee.

Interest in the Consortium and in the development of a WID culture thus arose at AUP in the context of a university-wide revisioning not only of the role of writing within the

university, but of the university's mission broadly conceived. As Queen Mary's growing investment in writing in the disciplines has been motivated in part by the increasingly multicultural, multilingual student population that has resulted from the mandate for broader access to higher education throughout the UK, AUP's interest in incorporating a WID approach within the frame of its university-wide Gen Ed reforms has also been conceived as a way of responding to the dramatic demographic changes affecting the character and quality of education at a university that now counts 100 nationalities among its 800 undergraduates. Where Queen Mary had no structure of support for writing instruction apart from the English and Study Skills unit prior to its collaboration with the Consortium, AUP's attempt to address the increasing demands of ever-growing numbers of ESL students at the university had given rise to an elaborate Intensive English Program which some faculty had come to perceive as an obstacle to general immersion in the intellectual substance of the university. Against the IEP's intricate, intensely stratified, remedial approach to addressing English-language communication skills, a WID-approach held forth the possibility of engaging AUP students of all linguistic backgrounds from the outset in the kind of sophisticated, intellectually substantive, meaningful undergraduate experience the university's faculty across the disciplines have to offer.

In consulting with AUP about the institutional changes taking shape through the Gen Ed review then underway, I was especially intrigued, from my dual perspective as a comparatist and Director of Knight Institute, by the AUP Department of Comparative Literature's pivotal relationship to the possibility of implementing a WID approach. Since in AUP's decidedly international context the Department of Comparative Literature has held the kind of proprietary relationship to "good writing" typical of English Departments in the United States at non-WAC/WID institutions, the possibility of redistributing responsibility for the teaching of writing at AUP across the disciplines necessarily involved rethinking the role of Schenck's fellow comparatists. As Cornell's English Department from 1966 forward relinquished its exclusive ownership of writing instruction, without relinquishing its indispensable share of responsibility vis-à-vis other departments, AUP's Department of Comparative Literature would need to give up what Schenck has described as its "literary

Freshman English monopoly” (2), embracing in its place the potential benefits of colleagues from other departments devoted to the common enterprise of a writing-intensive approach to learning in the disciplines at all levels of the curriculum.

While my initial visit to AUP in February 2000 led, in the words of Schenck’s June 2000 report to the Consortium, to “a stepped set of writing objectives spanning the four-year curriculum,” including “a first-year, writing-intensive, content-rich, interdisciplinary seminar, followed by the current literature sequence . . . a junior ‘writing in the major’ course, and a capstone course, also writing-intensive” (2-3), consensus-building for such a comprehensive agenda turned in part on the compromise solution of leaving in place the traditional sophomore-level Great Books sequence taught by Comparative Literature faculty which for years had constituted the core writing requirement beyond the many layers of remedial courses offered by the IEP. In leading the initiative to loosen the grip of an emphasis on remediation in IEP courses in favor of an approach that would entrust responsibility for the teaching of writing to faculty across the disciplines, Schenck understood that the role of writing would need to be radically reconfigured throughout the entire curriculum. Writing would need to be conceived henceforth as neither a rudimentary mechanical skill students need to master before engaging substantive intellectual concerns, nor as the exclusive property of a tradition of belles-lettres, but as an integral concern of all disciplines at all levels.

With this understanding as a guiding principle, and thanks in part to a successful Mellon Foundation proposal during the first year of the university’s participation in the Consortium, Schenck was appointed in fall 2000 to the newly created position of Associate Dean of Curriculum Development. Under Schenck’s assertive, effective leadership, AUP proceeded with extraordinary purposiveness and efficiency over the next six months to develop a university-wide consensus in favor of a sweeping set of changes that are currently in their first year of implementation. By April 2001, when I returned at AUP’s invitation to introduce and moderate a panel of four Cornell faculty from as many disciplines (anthropology, government, philosophy, urban and regional planning), the university was well on its way to putting in place the most innovative of its new curricular reforms, an exciting constellation of so-called “FirstBride” courses: “Consumption”; “Paris Was a Woman”;

“Reading the Marketplace, Reading the Text”; “The History of Communications and the Communication of History”; “The Making and Unmaking of National Identities”; “Trade: Crossroads of Human Experience”; “The Sounds of Music”; and “Identities: Prose and Performance.” Co-taught in linked interdisciplinary pairs by faculty from the fields of business administration, communications, comparative literature, drama, English, history, music, political science, and social anthropology, these sixteen courses fold the benefits of Cornell’s content-based, discipline-specific First-Year Writing Seminars into the development of discrete “learning communities” with a ceiling of 20 AUP first-year students each.

In keeping with the spirit of recent research on curricular reform and the place of writing within higher education by Applebee (1996), Crowley (1999), Miller (1999), and others, the Consortium has emphasized from the outset the integral role of an ongoing dialogue involving both faculty and administrators as a key to meaningful curricular change. While what is too often and too loosely called “good writing” may involve certain features that command respect across the disciplines, I have preferred as director of the Knight Institute to emphasize the value of questioning familiar assumptions of commonality among the disciplines, if for no other reason than to encourage the disciplines to speak for themselves and develop as many diverse stances toward writing as a university can effectively accommodate. Deeply rooted as it has been in the particular history and ethos of the development of writing in the disciplines at Cornell, the Consortium remains committed to the understanding that participating schools will best be served, as the examples of both Queen Mary and AUP demonstrate in their very different ways, by encouraging innovative local adaptations to a discipline-specific approach that are responsive to their distinctive histories, particular locations, and institutional missions. Just as there is no effective one-size-fits-all approach to teaching writing across the disciplines, so also in the application of a discipline-specific approach to writing instruction from one institution to another.

As all contexts are at once global and local, so too are the wide-ranging acts of writing that take place within higher education. While there are many paths to successful institutional change, from basement-up to top-down and in between, the possibility and speed of such change may vary greatly depending on the intra-institutional locations of those entrusted

with responsibility for design, coordination, and implementation. The Consortium's efforts to encourage WAC and WID within both national and international contexts have succeeded precisely to the extent to which they have respected not only what disciplines and institutions of higher learning may have in common, but also the site-specific constraints and opportunities offered by particular locations, including both the diverse geographical contexts and demographics of different institutional locations and the foreignness of particular disciplines to one another, whether in the United States or abroad. What has proven indispensable in each case—and here WID's understanding of the importance of engaging faculty across the disciplines offers an exemplary model for meaningful change generally—is an ongoing, always at once globally and locally overdetermined conversation. Only through sustained internal conversations such as those the Consortium has helped advance at Queen Mary and AUP can the necessary sense of mutual ownership emerge that is at once the prerequisite, required course, and outcome of enduring change.

## Works Cited

- Applebee, Arthur N. *Curriculum as Conversation: Transforming Traditions of Teaching and Learning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *When a Writer Can't Write*. Ed. Mike Rose, New York: Guilford, 1985. 134-165.
- . "What Is Composition and (if you know what that is) Why Do We Teach It?" *Composition in the Twenty-first Century: Crisis and Change*. Eds. Lynn Z. Bloom, et al., 1996. 11-28.
- Bazerman, Charles. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.
- Berkenkotter, Carol and Thomas N. Huckin, eds. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates 1995.
- Britton, James. Ed. *English Teaching: An International Exchange*. London: Heinemann Educational, 1984.

- Crowley, Sharon. *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998.
- Evison, Alan. Report on Writing in the Disciplines at Queen Mary College, University of London following the Cornell Consortium for Writing in the Disciplines. July 2001.
- Geertz, Clifford. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Harrington, Anne and Charles Moran, eds. *Writing, Teaching, and Learning in the Disciplines*. New York: Modern Language Association, 1992.
- Klein, Julie Thompson. *Crossing Boundaries: Knowledge, Disciplinarity, and Interdisciplinarity*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1996.
- McGrath, Ellie, et al., eds. "But Can They Write?" *The Best College for You*. *Time* and *The Princeton Review*. August, 2000: 63-74.
- McLeod, Susan and Elaine Maimon. "Clearing the Air: WAC Myths and Realities." *College English*. May 2000: 573-583.
- Miller, Richard. *As If Learning Mattered: Reforming Higher Education*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998.
- Monroe, Jonathan. *Local Knowledges, Local Practices: Cultures of Writing at Cornell*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002 (forthcoming).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Writing and Revising the Disciplines*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002.
- Parks, Steve and Eli Goldblatt. "Writing Beyond the Curriculum: Fostering New Collaborations in Literacy" *College English* 62.5 (May 2000): 584-606.
- Prior, Paul A. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998.
- Readings, Bill. *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1996.
- Reiss, Donna, Cynthia Selfe, and Art Young. *Electronic Communication Across the Curriculum*. Urbana: NCTE, 1998.
- Russell, David R. *Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 1970-1990: A Curricular History*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1991.
- Schenck, Celeste. Report on Writing in the Disciplines at the American University of Paris. Cornell Consortium for Writing in the Disciplines, June 2001.



Swales, John. *Other Floors, Other Voices: A Textography of a Small University Building*. Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998.

Walvoord, Barbara. "The Future of WAC," *College English* 58 (1996): 58-79.