

CHAPTER 12.

**BUILT TO LAST: TWO
DECADES OF SUSTAINING
WAC PROGRAMS AT CUNY**

Andrea Fabrizio

Hostos Community College, City University of New York

Linda Hirsch

Hostos Community College, City University of New York

Dennis Paoli

Hunter College, City University of New York

Trudy Smoke

Hunter College, City University of New York

When in 1999 the City University of New York (CUNY) created a university-wide Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program, WAC programs of varied sizes and ambitions had already existed throughout the country for several decades (Condon & Rutz, 2012; Cox et al., 2014). The principles of WAC pedagogy were generally determined, if still practically debated, and disseminated in journals of composition studies and collections of case studies, and singular features and measures of WAC Program assessment were in development relative to local initiatives.¹

Program sustainability, however, in theory and measure, was nascent and inchoate, though the issue gained visibility as programs at some institutions stalled, waned, reorganized, or were discontinued. David R. Russell (1997) could still find the success of WAC over the previous 27 years “surprising” (p. 3); Neal Lerner (2001) would soon re-issue the old warning against the pitfalls menacing WAC efforts. Now, over two decades later, eminent academic voices (Palmquist et al., 2020) celebrate 50 years of WAC, its “longevity and reach” (p. 9) and its “sense

1 Cf., e.g., Fulwiler & Young, *Programs That Work* (1990); Yancey & Huot, *Assessing Writing Across the Curriculum* (1997); and Anson, *The WAC Casebook* (2002), the “scenes” in which had been developed and collected over years; and, of course, Bean’s *Engaging Ideas*, first published in 1994 and now in its third edition.

of identity” (p. 5). When the question is posed if WAC will continue to flourish, continuity is a given and WAC’s potential is now one of continuous growth.

The CUNY WAC initiative, beginning as a university mandate, still exists. What features of the program’s founding framework and the related local structures adopted at the university’s individual colleges proved fundamental to their persistence as programs? What operational changes over time tempered and energized programs, or challenged and compromised them? This chapter examines how the CUNY WAC Program and representative programs at two of its institutions, Hostos Community College and Hunter College, sustained their services and institutional structures and how the profiles of these programs and their histories conform to and comment on the models of sustainability offered by Michelle Cox, Jeffrey R. Galin, and Dan Melzer (2018b) in *Sustainable WAC: A Whole Systems Approach to Launching and Developing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs* and Cox and Galin (2019) in *Tracking the Sustainable Development of WAC Programs Using Sustainability Indicators: Limitations and Possibilities*.

WAC AT CUNY: IN THE BEGINNING

CUNY is the largest urban public university in the country, with 25 affiliated degree-granting community colleges, senior colleges, and graduate schools located throughout the city’s five boroughs. Over 275,000 students attend courses yearly across the system. Sixteen of CUNY’s colleges are Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs).

When the Board of Trustees (BoT) passed the resolution that established the university’s WAC program, CUNY exemplified the cultural conflicts of the late 1990s (Cooper, 1998; Holdstein, 2001; McLeod & Miraglia, 2001). The university and its individual colleges faced public and private criticism stemming from a decades-old open admissions policy and the influx of students judged in the press and political rhetoric as ill-prepared for college work, particularly in relation to writing. The CUNY BoT, many of them political appointees, pressed for and ultimately imposed change.

Contemporaneous with the 1999 CUNY WAC mandate was a reorganization of the university to relocate remedial/developmental programs from the senior colleges to the system’s community and comprehensive colleges. This reorganization also instituted a university-wide reading/writing/quantitative analysis test, the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE), as a graduation requirement for an associate degree from the community colleges and for continued progress at the senior colleges.

In a top-down dynamic, CUNY set the university-wide goal of improving student writing proficiencies for future academic and professional work, a goal

common to all stakeholders, but the variety of cultures and climates among CUNY's then 18 campuses led to diverse implementation models. Critically, the university initiative provided the flexibility necessary for the features and framework of local campus programs to be rooted in and reflect campus culture, shaped by the individual college's institutional structure and resources.

College programs would be led by campus WAC coordinators appointed by their colleges who would report to a university dean. Tasked with building the programs on their campuses, the first college WAC coordinators in 1999, in most cases from English departments, knew each other from professional organizations, conferences, and university-level committees, if they did at all. Understanding what it meant to be a WAC coordinator, including how to negotiate the challenges of local program building while navigating CUNY policies, was an evolving collaborative experience. Under the auspices of the university's central administration, the university dean convened five coordinators' meetings a year to share strategies for meeting program responsibilities—budget, staffing, housing and visibility, pedagogy, assessment, faculty interaction, release time—and to air concerns.

To support and staff the campus WAC programs, the BoT resolution also mandated the creation of and funding for a two-year CUNY writing fellowship for graduate students from the CUNY Graduate Center. Six CUNY writing fellows from various disciplines were recruited by each college to facilitate the efforts of campus WAC programs. According to CUNY recommendations, writing fellows could support local faculty development programs at the colleges, provide instruction on a supplemental basis to student writers, and offer writing support services to departments and college administrations, such as research and curricular development. As terms of their fellowship, writing fellows could not teach classes, grade papers, assist in non-WAC-related research, or provide personal services. The writing fellow, as created, was a liminal position, advised to partner with faculty in WAC activities, and even participate in WAC-related faculty development, but who would not adopt traditional faculty roles or professional responsibilities (Hirsch & Fabrizio, 2011).

A project of foundational importance to the CUNY WAC program was the professional development of the writing fellows, which began in 2000 with a CUNY-wide week-long late-summer institute for fellows and faculty. Though most graduate students have taught in their discipline, they rarely experience professional development in writing pedagogy and WAC. To address this need, WAC coordinators collaborated on the planning, direction, and implementation of the fellows' professional development, primarily through readings, information sessions, and workshops on WAC principles and methods (e.g., assignment design, responding to student writing, tutorial methods, ESL/ELL issues,

reading across the curriculum). Fellows also received continued professional development in WAC principles and best practices under local conditions from the coordinators on their assigned campuses.

Perhaps the most strategic and decisive project of the CUNY WAC program proceeded from the university's directive that where possible the individual colleges create writing intensive (WI) courses and graduation requirements. Several CUNY colleges already had WI courses in their curricula, but most CUNY schools subsequently heeded the university's recommendation and instituted WI courses and requirements. Two models emerged: professional development programs to certify faculty as versed and accomplished in the principles of WAC pedagogy, who then designed and taught WI courses, and the certification of WI courses by college governance systems without a corresponding certification of faculty.

The programs at Hostos Community College and Hunter College provide both strikingly similar and starkly different program models in distinctly diverse local contexts (Hirsch & Paoli, 2012).

WAC AT HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE: BUILDING THE PROGRAM

Hostos Community College is an urban, bilingual college of 7,000 students serving New York City's South Bronx community, one of the poorest in the country. An HSI, Hostos enrolls an ethnically and linguistically diverse student population. Ninety-nine percent of students receive some form of financial aid. At the time of the WAC program's inception, over 75 percent of the incoming student body required some form of developmental education and/or ESL/ELL instruction (Hirsch & DeLuca, 2003; Hirsch & Fabrizio, 2011).

Before the CUNY WAC mandate was enacted, Hostos, though struggling with the developmental math and English needs of its students, had successfully enacted a FIPSE-funded project that provided some of the first quantitative and qualitative evidence of the effectiveness of WAC principles with post-ELL students (Hirsch, 1988). An earlier "Needs Assessment Survey" identified faculty attitudes and concerns about student writing: Faculty bemoaned the state of student writing, and most saw the English department as bearing responsibility for student writing abilities. Responding to the BoT mandate, Linda Hirsch, the WAC Cordinator at Hostos (a Professor of English with an expertise in ESL/ELL instruction), formed a WAC advisory committee with representatives from each department (mostly chairs) to include diverse disciplinary perspectives and establish WAC goals unique to the campus.

A key component of WAC at Hostos has been the development of specially-designed WI sections of multi-section courses that provide opportunities for

both formal and informal writing. Students must complete two WI sections to graduate. The WAC program established a certification model for faculty developing WI sections by running faculty professional development workshops throughout the year, assigning writing fellows to work with faculty to incorporate WAC practices into their pedagogy, and certifying faculty to create and teach WI courses at the college. The WAC program established itself at Hostos by creating its first WIs with faculty who were most interested in doing so. It assigned them a writing fellow to collaborate with, paid them a stipend, capped class enrollment at 25, and provided ongoing professional development. Each successive year more faculty worked to create WI sections.

Early on, the WAC program recruited a WI task force of faculty, separate from the WAC advisory committee, to review WI course syllabi and recommend them for WI designation to the Hostos college-wide curriculum committee. Expanding faculty responsibilities for WAC policies as well as participation in its practices created a greater understanding among faculty of the value of WAC and helped change the campus attitude in relation to student writing and writing instruction.

WAC AT HUNTER COLLEGE: BUILDING THE PROGRAM

Founded in 1870, Hunter College, one of CUNY's senior colleges, is located in Manhattan and enrolls over 20,000 students, of which some 16,000 are undergraduates, from all five of the city's boroughs. The student body is majority ethnic-minority, and over half of the school's students work while attending the college. An HSI and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institution (AANAPISI), Hunter has a large multilingual student population and commonly counts speakers of over 50 different languages among its enrollees. The schools of education, nursing, and social work are the most prominent of the college's graduate programs.

Until 1999, Hunter had multi-tiered developmental reading and writing course sequences as well as freshman and advanced composition courses, but after the university reorganization that included the creation of the CUNY WAC program, composition at Hunter, still siloed in the English department, offered no remedial component. Many professors did not feel prepared for or interested in teaching writing in disciplinary content courses. The campus mood at Hunter around academic writing was much the same as that at Hostos: Students should have learned how to write by the time they reached 200-level courses, and if they did not, it was the fault of composition courses, and they should go to the writing center.

With little administrative support, the WAC coordinator, Trudy Smoke, also the director of freshman composition and an expert in linguistic and ESL/ELL

issues, worked with faculty and departments that already had a commitment to writing, though many departments viewed WAC and writing requirements as a violation of academic freedom (Smoke, 1998). To help WAC make its way into those departments, Smoke reached out to Dennis Paoli, the coordinator of Hunter's Rockowitz Writing Center (RWC), which serves student writers across the curriculum at every level, to pool their institutional knowledge and plan the best options for WAC services (Harris, 2002). In 1994, Hunter's freshman composition program and writing center had collaborated to host a "Writing at Hunter" college conference with multi-disciplinary faculty participation; now the partnership of freshman composition and the writing center would continue in the creation of a WAC co-coordinatorship.

Two years into the CUNY WAC initiative, Hunter passed a graduation requirement for three "Significant Writing" WI courses. The W-designated class requirements were minimal: At least 50 percent of the grade must be based on writing; due dates must allow for "faculty feedback"; English 120 (Freshman Composition) must be at least a co-requisite; and the course must be regularly offered. Once Significant Writing became a graduation requirement, nearly every department in the college wanted to offer WI courses at the 100- and sometimes 200-level. Departments reviewed their courses and sought W-designation for those that reasonably met the skeletal requirements. W-designations were certified by the college senate's Course of Studies Committee, on which WAC co-coordinator Smoke served.

After courses had been W-designated, the college had little to say about who would teach them. Instruction was the province of the individual departments. Unlike Hostos, Hunter did not have a faculty certification program. As they evolved, W-designated courses were often taught by graduate students and part-time adjunct faculty who were rarely given smaller class sizes or paid for the additional hours necessary to develop the writing aspects of their courses. As contingent faculty were frequently hired late, they sometimes did not know they were teaching WI courses until the RWC notified them offering tutorial services and informing them that the WAC program could provide copies of John Bean's *Engaging Ideas* to help them develop their pedagogy. In the best cases, when departments or individual instructors requested help in developing writing-to-learn pedagogy for their W-designated courses, the WAC program, when possible, offered the assistance of a writing fellow.

The fellows came to play a pivotal role in WI course development, often working with newly hired graduate students to help them design assignments and assessments and incorporate WAC practices into their syllabi and instruction. Writing fellows provided services for departments as diverse as biology,

chemistry, economics, English, health sciences, history, philosophy, psychology, romance languages, and sociology, among others. They worked with department chairs, senior and junior faculty, adjuncts, teaching grad students, and students; participated in and led voluntary workshops for full- and part-time faculty on a variety of WAC topics (e.g., Building a W Course, The Digital Future of Academic Writing, Is Writing a Safe Space?, Ungrading, etc.); did research on ESL/ELL instruction, freshman year programs, and multi-section course instruction; consulted on departmental and course-specific writing issues, including assessment and curricular reform; represented the WAC program at meetings of the college's faculty professional development program, the Academic Center for Excellence in Research and Teaching (ACERT); and provided services to courses, including student tutorials and workshops on discipline-specific writing features (Nicolas, 2008).

CHANGES AND CHALLENGES: THE SECOND DECADE

Policy and structural changes over the years following the BoT resolution rippled through the university's WAC program. The second decade of WAC at CUNY saw two substantial program changes at the university level that presented significant challenges to the campus programs.

FUNDING

Early in its second decade, WAC at CUNY was repositioned administratively under the university's office of the dean of undergraduate education and funded through that office's Coordinated Undergraduate Education (CUE) program. The major impact of this change was funding. From their creation, college WAC programs had been directly funded by the university. After the administrative reorganization of WAC, CUE funds were disbursed to the college administrations, which determined locally what funding the college WAC program would receive. Campus WAC programs found themselves competing with other college initiatives for funding, and those not as institutionally visible and/or stable were disadvantaged. Previously, coordinators had been able to appeal as a group for WAC's importance as a pedagogy and program directly to a university dean who understood WAC as a movement as well as a line item. This new situation put pressure on coordinators, including those at Hostos and Hunter, to advocate individually with college administrators, which often meant educating them in WAC pedagogy and history as well as in the features and benefits of their WAC programs, an extra, crucial task in an expanding role.

STAFFING

A restructuring of the CUNY Graduate Center's funding for doctoral students necessitated a change in the University's Writing Fellowship, from a two-year competitive award to the single final year in a five-year Chancellor's Fellowship awarded to students upon entry to the Graduate Center. The decision to reorganize the financing of graduate education at the Center resulted in downstream programmatic changes at the university and local campus levels in the recruiting, professional development, and managing of the redesignated CUNY WAC fellows. A one-year, as opposed to a two-year, term of service to a WAC program proved a less rich experience for the fellow, deducted a year per fellow of experienced service to the colleges from the previous level, and increased the yearly demand for professional development.

Ironically, the university's continued funding of the fellowship that furnished staffing for campus WAC programs at no cost to the colleges afforded some college administrations the option to essentially defund WAC. In some cases, the WAC fellows were, with the coordinator, the entire staff of the local WAC program. This change at the top led to greater turnover in program staff, more intensive training, instances of compromised motivation, more vigilant management of fellows on the campuses, and reorganization of program services—issues that pertained and responsibilities that fell to the coordinators. At some sites, WAC program offerings and operations suffered cutbacks and/or college administrations assumed a greater role in directing services and remapping WAC to reframed local organizational structures and initiatives.

ANSWERS AND ADAPTATIONS

The work of CUNY WAC fellows with faculty, whether in a certification program or a less formal collaboration, amplifies the professional development to redound to both parties (Falchikov, 2001). WAC fellows, especially those recruited to the system's community colleges where they did not get a chance to teach as graduate students, gain experience in writing instruction for ESL/ELL students from the professional development efforts of the coordinators *and* from their own efforts participating in the professional development of faculty. In the over two decades of the CUNY WAC program, many of those fellows—upwards of 2,000—have progressed to become faculty themselves at CUNY, across the country, and internationally.

Andrea Fabrizio was a writing fellow at Hostos Community College from 2003 to 2005; Linda Hirsch was, as she had been from the beginning of the university's WAC initiative and continues today, the campus coordinator. As

fellows are in a liminal state in relation to faculty, so are coordinators in relation to fellows, being both managers and mentors. In providing the fellows at Hostos with program structure and organization, modeling for them appropriate communication, demonstrating transparency while directing and conducting their on-campus professional development, and being dependably available to them when needed, Hirsch not only supervised the fellows but instilled in them the values of WAC practice. In working with faculty, Fabrizio not only gained experience in academic collaboration, problem-solving, and the reciprocal learning inherent in the work, but she engaged with disciplinary structures and ideologies outside her previous acquaintance, found cross-disciplinary channels and overlays, and discovered the range of faculty and student preparation for and predisposition toward writing in a discipline (history) other than her field of study (Hirsch & Fabrizio, 2011).

Given the significance of that experience, Fabrizio came to appreciate the professional development opportunities offered by the university and the local program as practical lifelines and occupational learning. When her fellowship ended in 2005, she was hired as an adjunct lecturer at Hostos, a substitute instructor from 2005-2007, and, upon completion of her Ph.D. in 2008, an assistant professor of English. The vocational trajectory from fellow to WAC-ready faculty member demonstrates a continuity that has scaffolded CUNY's WAC program, a trajectory that reaches to institutions and programs both nationally and globally.

In the continuity of Hirsch's coordinatorship there accrued additional value. What Fabrizio gained from Hirsch's mentoring was not only a grounding in WAC principles and expertise in its practices, but a host of leadership skills: advocacy, authority, community-building, delegating, goal-setting, and managing multiple perspectives, among numerous others. When funding and fellowship changes at the university level brought pressures to bear on the local programs, the response at Hostos was already at hand: Fabrizio had joined Hirsch as co-coordinator of the WAC program in 2009. As a team, they have effectively met the challenges of the expanded responsibilities of WAC program management and administration.

At Hunter, the response to the budgetary and staffing challenges was program expansion—expanding the number and the curricular reach of the WAC fellows. Having one of the largest and most interdisciplinary programs in romance languages in the university, Hunter was serviceable as an assignment for WAC fellows from the Graduate Center's programs in French, Latin American, Iberian, and Latino Cultures, and comparative literature with an Italian doctoral specialization and for international students from those linguistic backgrounds who otherwise might be difficult to place in suitable programs. The already popular services fellows provided became more widespread and visible across Hunter's curriculum, supporting a specialized certificate program in translation and

organizing a student writing conference in Spanish. The enhanced prominence of the fellows burnished WAC's image at the college and helped buttress the program's arguments for its stability and future.

THE WHOLE SYSTEMS APPROACH: BUILDING SUSTAINABLE WAC PROGRAMS

To capture the ambitious scope and dynamic of CUNY WAC, the authors of this chapter adapted and applied Michelle Cox, Jeff Galin, and Dan Melzer's (2018a; 2018b) "Whole Systems Approach." Their methodologies yield applicable heuristic models: the whole systems methodology for transformative change (in which stakeholders develop and transform a program through the recursive stages of Understand, Plan, Develop, Lead); the WAC anthrosphere (applying critical perspectives on WAC programs as Human/Social, Support/Economic, and Natural/Institutional systems); and the DPSIR Framework for Problem-Solving (recognizing *Driving Forces*, *Pressures*, *State Indicators*, *Impacts*, and *Responses* that determine program reactions to emergent needs) (Cox & Galin, 2019). These methods help stakeholders identify Sustainability Indicators (SIs) that in turn aid faculty, students, and administrators in determining and addressing the sustainability of a local WAC program or project.

WAC PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY AT CUNY/HOSTOS/HUNTER

Appearing near a milestone year for the CUNY WAC program, the *Whole Systems Approach* presented itself as an opportunity for the CUNY and college programs to gauge their progress and staying power. Mapping onto certain features of the heuristics was immediate and obvious. For example, "involving stakeholders" in the Whole Systems Approach Planning stage of WAC at the university, given the size of the institution and the tradition of faculty expertise in composition studies, was dealing from one of CUNY's strengths, as it was at Hostos when Hirsch recruited a WAC Advisory Committee. Accumulated local "lore" and shared theoretical perspective were operationalized in the creation of the position of CUNY WAC coordinator (North, 1987). Together early cohorts of coordinators engaged collaboratively to "Understand" WAC in the complex, interwoven contexts of CUNY and their local campuses and "Plan," i.e., define their roles and envision their programs, which they would then "Develop" (Cox et al., 2018a; 2018b).

Mapping onto the sustainability model's "WAC Anthrosphere," the CUNY initiative built and sustains itself as a "Human/Social system" by empowering coordinators to return to campuses and create WAC as an institutional system within the curricula of their colleges. Additionally, it empowers coordinators to advocate

for their programs with administrators who constitute the local campus economic system. When Smoke recruited Paoli to co-coordinate the program at Hunter, the coalition with the writing center not only expanded the local social system of WAC but also bolstered the “Support/Economic system” by securing space (infrastructure) for meetings and services (space is scarce on a Manhattan campus) and connected WAC with a stable and amenable “curricular ecology and resource system” with which it shared principles and mission, establishing a “pedagogical footprint” as a “Natural/Institutional system” (Cox & Galin, 2019).

In relation to any program goal or stressor, at any stage in the Whole Systems Approach or from any of the WAC Anthrosphere’s perspectives, multiple Sustainability Indicators (SI) can be identified. Cox and Galin (2019) caution that any list of possible SIs be qualified and ultimately selective to ascertain the key SIs to track. WI courses, especially as meeting a requirement, are historically a key SI for WAC, and were a critical project in the Develop stage of the CUNY WAC program. As an example of meeting a goal, Hostos currently offers over 130 WI sections representing a wide range of disciplines and levels. Unlike senior colleges, which might require that WI courses be upper-level, Hostos permits students to enroll in select WIs if they are taking a developmental writing course. Each department and academic program offers WI sections taught by the primarily full-time faculty who created them. Sustainability is indicated by few waiver requests, which is evidence that enough courses exist to meet demand. As an example of addressing a stressor, without benefit of a certification process contingent faculty were often thrust into teaching Hunter’s WI courses, which created an opportunity for WAC outreach, fellow placement, and professional development workshops.

The DPSIR heuristic applied to the CUNY WAC program reveals a fundamental dynamic of the model: The *Driving Force* behind several of the most crucial problems is budgetary and created at the university level; the *Pressure* created by those forces is felt locally on campus programs; the *State Indicators* are numerous and include less CUNY-level fellows professional development, less local program funding, and more group interviews during fellow recruitment; the *Impacts* include increased responsibilities for coordinators, some of them passed on to the WAC fellows; and the *Response* is almost always the increased commitment and labor of the coordinators and the fellows.

As an example of a response driven by a local force, turnover in a college’s upper administration over the course of a decades-long program requires renewed, often redundant, educating and advocacy efforts by WAC coordinators. The possibility of a difference in vision for the program proceeding from the provost’s or vice president’s office can require re-examination of institutional ties and collaborations, inquiry into areas of possible negotiation, re-focused data

collection and ally recruitment, or resignation (in both senses). Over the course of twenty years, there have been 14 associate provosts, deans, and assistants to the president overseeing WAC at Hunter College, the constant adjustment to new administrators and agendas applying pressure to the program, especially since 2012, when the program budget became part of the packaged CUE budget to be allocated by the college administration. This revolving-door reporting structure, particularly in the context of the falling-off from the program's collaborative relationship with a WAC-friendly dean, resulted in dire impacts, particularly to WAC program budgets, which grew smaller and were assigned later. The Hunter WAC program's response to the instability of administrative structure was continuity. The co-coordinators remained steadfast, advocating from shared principles, maintaining partnerships with departments and academic programs, which in turn advocated for WAC.

In an extraordinary global example of the DPSIR dynamic, the driving force of COVID-19 exerted many urgent pressures on higher education, proliferated negative state indicators, caused severe impacts, but as evidence of its maturity, the WAC program at Hostos was able to respond and sustain its faculty WI certification model by adapting a modality already in place, expanding use of an online certification platform for adjunct faculty, facilitated by WAC fellows, to certify all faculty during the pandemic.

KEY SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS FOR THE CUNY/ HOSTOS/HUNTER WAC PROGRAMS

Dan Melzer, in discussing sustainability and WAC in an interview, noted:

My own career reinforces for me that a WPA identity is less about individual roles or individual personality and more about building structures and working collaboratively... [and the reforms] had a lot to do with changing the structure of the system and very little to do with my own identity. (Polk, 2020, p. 90)

While agreeing with Melzer that the importance of collaborative work cannot be overstressed, the authors of this chapter maintain that the personality of the coordinators does matter (Condon 1997, as cited in Holdstein, 2001). The CUNY writing fellow and WAC programs were seeded by the mandate but were sustained by commitment and care. WAC coordinators must be aware, committed, creative, persistent, and stubborn as well as flexible. They must be present and put in the time. Newly assigned WAC coordinators take on the role like deer in the headlights—eyes open to the opportunity but stunned by the magnitude

and significance of the responsibility and the consequences of program failure. Meetings of WAC coordinators have evolved to become a fostering environment and a major factor in the sustainability of the college programs. The two programs featured here have grown into WAC ecologies that are sustainable, dynamic, and able to surmount multiple challenges, and bear witness to leadership as a key SI for WAC programs (Basgier et al., 2020; Palmquist et al., 2020; Thaiss & Porter, 2010; Walvoord, 1996; Walvoord, 2018).

When Smoke and Paoli recently retired, they were fortunate to recruit a faculty member in the philosophy department, Daniel Harris, who had been a WAC fellow at LaGuardia Community College, to be coordinator of Hunter's WAC program. Harris has taken the program digital, prioritized fellow experience, scheduled fewer but longer campus professional development meetings, and grown the demand by faculty and departments for the services of the fellows. Absent certification, Hunter's WI requirement has claim to integrity and sustainability primarily through faculty appreciation of the efforts of the college's cohorts of WAC fellows (Fodrey & Mikovits, 2020; Polk, 2020). As the success of Harris and Fabrizio (now chair of the Hostos English department) demonstrates, the engagement of graduate students in professional development and the provision of WAC program services is another key indicator in the sustainability of CUNY's WAC program.

The structure and location of CUNY facilitates the close collaboration of coordinators and WAC fellows, and from this collaboration flow many of the various programs' local projects. WAC programs at colleges without these advantages might profitably seek collaboration with WAC program coordinators through site visits and online platforms. Schools without graduate programs might create administrative positions in WAC for contingent faculty with WAC experience. If the CUNY model cannot be adopted, it may be adapted relative to its key components.

Prominent among the key indicators is CUNY's Board of Trustees' mandate that there be a university-wide campus-based WAC program. In solving problems and surmounting obstacles at the college level, in arguing for resources or exhorting faculty and fellows to embrace WAC pedagogy, coordinators have always been able to point to the mandate, to the university's vision of itself as a progressive institution at which students learn by writing. As WAC enters upon its next generation of practice and practitioners at CUNY, that vision endures.

REFERENCES

- Anson, C. (2002). *The WAC casebook: Scenes for faculty reflection and program development*. Oxford University Press.

- Basgier, C., Cox, M., Falconer, H. M., Galin, J., Harahap, A., Hendrickson, B., Melzer, D., Palmquist, M., & Sheriff, S. (2020). The formation of a professional organization for writing across the curriculum. In L. E. Bartlett, S. L. Tarabochia, A. R. Olinger, & M. J. Marshall (Eds.), *Diverse approaches to teaching, learning, and writing across the curriculum: IWAC at 25* (pp. 33–43). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.0360>
- Bean, J. C. (2011). *Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom*. Wiley.
- Condon, W., & Rutz, C. (2012). A taxonomy of writing across the curriculum programs: Evolving to serve broader agendas. *College Composition and Communication*, 64(2), 357–382. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43490756>
- Cooper, S. E. (1998). Remediation's end: Can New York educate the children of the “whole people”? *Academe*, 84(4), 14–20. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40252307>
- Cox, M., Chaudoir, S., Cripps, M., Galin, J., Hall, J., Kaufman, O. B., Lane, S., McMullen Light, M., Poe, M., Redd, T., Salem, L., Thaiss, C., Townsend, M., & Zawacki, T. M. (2014). *Statement of WAC principles and practices*. <https://wac.colostate.edu/principles/>
- Cox, M., Galin, J. R., & Melzer, D. (2018a). Building sustainable WAC programs: A whole systems approach, *The WAC Journal*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2018.29.1.03>
- Cox, M., Galin, J. R., & Melzer, D. (2018b). *Sustainable WAC: A whole systems approach to launching and developing writing across the curriculum programs*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cox, M., & Galin, J. R. (2019). Tracking the sustainable development of WAC programs using sustainability indicators: Limitations and possibilities. *Across the Disciplines*, 16(4), 38–60. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2019.16.4.20>
- Falchikov, N. (2001). *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. Routledge Falmer.
- Fodrey, C., & Mikovits, M. (2020). Theorizing WAC faculty development in multimodal project design. *Across the Disciplines*, 17(1/2), 42–58. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.1-2.04>
- Fulwiler, T., & Young, A. (1990). *Programs that work: Models and methods for writing across the curriculum*. Boynton/Cook.
- Harris, M. (2002). Writing center administration: Making local, institutional knowledge in our writing centers. In P. Gillespie, A. Gillam, L. Falls Brown, & B. Stay (Eds.), *Writing center research: Extending the conversation* (pp. 75–89). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hirsch, L. (1988). Language across the curriculum: A model for ESL students in content courses. In S. Benesch (Ed.), *Ending remediation: Linking content and ESL instruction in higher education* (pp. 676–689). TESOL.
- Hirsch, L., & DeLuca, C. (2003). WAC in an urban and bilingual setting: Writing-to-learn in English y en Español. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.2003.6.3.09>
- Hirsch, L., & Fabrizio, A. (2011). The writing fellow/faculty collaboration in a

- community college: Paradigms of teaching and learning across the curriculum. In J. Summerfield & C. Smith (Eds.), *Making teaching and learning matter: Transformative spaces in higher education* (pp. 145–170). Springer.
- Hirsch, L., & Paoli, D. (2012). The City University of New York: The implementation and Impact of WAC/WID in a multi-campus US urban university. In C. Thaiss, G. Bräuer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobcsik-Williams, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 439–454). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2012.0346>
- Holdstein, D. H. (2001). “Writing across the curriculum” and the paradoxes of institutional initiatives. *Pedagogy*, 1(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-1-1-37>
- Lerner, N. (2001). A history of WAC at a college of pharmacy. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 5(1), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.2001.5.1.03>
- McLeod, S. H., & Miraglia, E. (2001). Writing across the curriculum in a time of change. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 1–27). National Council of Teachers of English.
- Nicolas, M. (2008). *(E)Merging identities: Graduate students in the writing center*. Fountainhead Press.
- North, S. M. (1987). *The making of knowledge in composition: Portrait of an emerging field*. Boynton/Cook.
- Palmquist, M., Childers, P., Maimon, E., Mullin, J., Rice, R., Russell, A., & Russell, D. R. (2020). Fifty years of WAC: Where have we been? Where are we going? *Across the Disciplines*, 17(3/4), 5–45. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.3.01>
- Polk, T. (2020). Something larger than imagined: Developing a theory, building an organization, sustaining a movement. *The WAC Journal*, 31. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2020.31.1.04>
- Russell, D. R. (1997). Writing to learn to do: WAC, WAW, WAW—Wow! *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 2(2), 3–8. <https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.1997.2.2.02>
- Smoke, T. (1998). Collaborating with power: Contradictions of working as a WPA. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 21(2/3), 92–100. <http://associationdatabase.co/archives/21n2-3/21n2-3smoke.pdf>
- Thaiss, C., & Porter, T. (2010). The state of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and results of the U.S. survey of the international WAC/WID mapping project. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(3), 534–570. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40593339>
- Walvoord, B. (1996). The future of WAC. *College English*, 58(1), 58–79. <https://doi.org/10.2307/378534>
- Walvoord, B. (2018). Foreword. In Cox M., Galin, J. R., & Melzer, D. (Eds.), *Sustainable WAC: A whole systems approach to launching and developing writing across the curriculum programs* (pp. ix–xi). National Council of Teachers of English.
- Yancey, K. B., & Huot, B. (1997). *Assessing writing across the curriculum: Diverse approaches and practices*. Ablex.