Becoming Landscape Architects: A Postmodern Approach to WAC Sustainability

REBECCA JACKSON AND DEBORAH MORTON

TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

REFLECTING ON PAPERS DELIVERED at the 2006 Writing Across the Curriculum conference, plenary speakers Alan Evison and Mary McMullen-Lightnote note three trends about WAC. The first, a positive development, is that WAC has gone multimodal by regularly addressing visual, voice, and virtual elements of writing and communication. Trends two and three paint a bleaker picture: WAC, Evison observes, is in the throes of "midlife crisis," having gained or retained little momentum beyond a few interested (and staunchly dedicated) folks. Verbs such as "initiate" (Warnock; Marinara, Oetjen, Kitalong), "sustain" (Heckelman, Kusi-Mensah, Cain; Galin), "revitalize" (Palmquist), and "enliven" (Mullin and Schorn; Kranidis; Kellogg), along with phrases such as "keeping the movement going" (Mullin, Thaiss, Bridwell-Bowles, Zawacki), "staying afloat" (Smitherman), and "in need of a tune-up" (Traywick, Johnson, and Brown) suggest that WAC programs need action at stasis points.

WAC folks can easily find reasons to despair, but in this essay, we provide hope for moving beyond such stasis points. We discuss cases from very different institutions enacting different WAC models, each demonstrating how local, "just-in-time," "at-the-point-of-need" tactics—in other words, emergent acts—become tools for opening gaps and fissures in seemingly impenetrable institutional situations. We take our cue from James Porter et al. who, in providing a method for institutional critique and change, remind us that "though institutions are certainly powerful, they are not monoliths; they are rhetorically constructed human designs ... and so are changeable. In other words, we made 'em, we can fix 'em. Institutions R Us" (611).

Ours is a decidedly postmodern stance: multiple perspectives, subjectivities, and realities as complex convergences of institutions, individuals, and cultures provide foundations for escaping potentially paralyzing grand narratives about WAC (see Martin and Holdstein in the pages of *Pedagogy*) that lead many to throw up their hands in the face of institutional constraints to say, "I give up" or "What can I do?" For us, postmodernism provides possibilities for change through individual actions: Individual actions, what Jean-François Lyotard might call "little narratives," challenge the dominant discourses of WAC, inserting themselves into the fissures and gaps of the institutional story to counter, resist, and reconstitute it. Individual actions become "tactics," as Michel de Certeau calls them, quotidian gestures that, in cumulative form at least, may have profound effects. Put another way, we see ostensibly insurmountable stasis points as interesting and as opportunities for changing perspectives and practices. Our tactics are small, local, often enacted "on the fly." And, yet, in a postmodern world, this is precisely their appeal—they break through the "sediment of habit and tradition" (Czerniak 110), prying open the gaps that mark the surface of even the most forbidding terrain.

We use the language of landscape architecture very deliberately here. Landscape architects study and design for compatibility with the natural and built environment and with an eye toward the "functional and beautiful" (Bureau of Labor Statistics). Postmodern landscape architecture theory, in particular, emphasizes study and design from various angles, and thus offers a framework for re-seeing and re-shaping the environment. The idea of "re-seeing" is crucial, as any picture presented of WAC, particularly if it reveals seemingly negative circumstances, is necessarily impartial, incomplete. Pictures, or "pictorialism," as Julia Czerniak explains it, "biases how a landscape appears" as it is simply a "retinal image" (110), an image left to individual (or disciplinary) interpretation. In reviewing the work of James Corner, landscape architect, and Alex MacLean, aerial photographer, Czerniak explains that by adding aerial photography to static pictures, landscape becomes more than a static image; aerial photography serves to show how landscape "works as a process" and as a "continuing activity and set of relations that change over time" (110). As Czerniak, Corner, and MacLean explain, the addition of aerial photography to landscapes reveals aspects "invisible from the ground" and reveals "the earth—the landscape—as a 'system of interrelated ecologies'" (Czerniak 111). We consider this last idea particularly important for WAC because it challenges static pictures of an environment and, instead, presents landscapes as "a 'complex network of material activity' rather than 'static and contemplative phenomenon'" (111). To these material

realities, we add social realities, a critical element of institutional landscapes. Any landscape serves variously as an "'immense construction site,' a 'working quarry,' a 'metabolic scaffolding of material transformation,' and an 'infrastructure of pure productivity'" (Czerniak 110). Thinking and acting like landscape architects, WAC participants learn to recognize and respect components of institutional landscapes, while also working to forge new paths.

We turn now to two cases that, together, show that successes come from acting upon the "truth of a present or the presence of the present," as Jacques Derrida says, a truth available or visible only at certain moments (from *Différance*). In other words, we work within the truths of the local, natural, built, social, economic, and other aspects of institutional environments. We deconstruct what many would see as stasis points in WAC landscapes in order to show how the same details that present the cases as negative can be shaped into opportunities and possibilities. Our first case demonstrates the value of this kind of postmodern thinking, illustrating how simple changes of perspective—an aerial view versus a grounded view, for example—change how we view the landscape. Our second case explicates specific tactics for change from within a paradigm of postmodern thinking. The two stories work together: broad stroke explanations can help show new perspectives, but readers stuck at a stasis point may need more specifics to transfer the solution to their own people, processes, and places. We argue that we must be present in emergent moments, present ourselves upon them, become individual agents of change, even if just for seconds at a time. We must see, be, and act, calling upon the active *différance* and using the present elements to shape our environment.

WAC as Landscape Architecture: (Re)Seeing Difficult Terrain

The following story illustrates ways in which top-down, largely conservative initiatives may be (re)seen and ultimately reconstituted at the level of actual practice. In the field and at strategic moments, WAC and writing specialists at State University re-imagined and remade institutional initiatives—extending, resisting, even subverting them. Before demonstrating this (re)seeing, however, Rebecca Jackson contextualizes the efforts that form the focus of this section in a brief history of WAC at this institution.

As is the case in many institutions, WAC at State University had a spotty history characterized by years of institutional support and intensity of faculty participation followed by years of benign neglect—times when you'd be hard pressed to find many faculty who knew what "WAC" stood for. At its height, roughly 1983–1990, WAC occupied a prominent place on campus: It began with a faculty initiative out of the College of

General Studies to invigorate writing and the teaching of writing across the disciplines. In 1984, the Department of English—which developed a WAC committee—brought in Art Young as a one-year visiting professor to guide and shape these initial efforts. Young was instrumental in developing a highly successful WAC workshop tradition that continued for many years after he left and was conducted by faculty from across the disciplines. Several WAC committee members in the English department co-authored an in-house book on WAC theories and practice. Originally funded by the College of General Studies, the book was distributed for many years to all university faculty members to support changes in their curricula. Momentum for WAC began to wane in the 1990s and was most likely the result of too little power, too little support, and too little integration, the three attributes Bill Condon argues are absolutely essential to WAC success on any campus.

Recently, however, the dean expressed renewed interest in WAC and made "writing" one key goal in the College of Liberal Arts' strategic plan. While modest, the initiative followed well-known WAC faculty development models in its emphasis on improving students' writing skills by teaching faculty across the College how to teach writing in their own classes. The dean—with support from the chair of English—asked interested faculty in rhetoric and composition to form an *ad hoc* committee to develop 20-minute presentations on key issues in Writing Across the Curriculum. Department chairs from across the disciplines were then asked to schedule at least two of these WAC presentations during regular faculty meetings.

Members of the ad hoc committee recognized the initiative as less than ideal, particularly in its form and execution. The 20-minute presentation framework meant that faculty across the disciplines would not receive any kind of substantive information about and support for their own WAC efforts, while the "mandatory" nature of the presentations precluded faculty "buy in." Perhaps those on the ad hoc WAC committee were naïve, but they believed that meaningful change was possible, despite the presence of institutional constraints that would seem to discourage (if not prohibit) any kind of change at all. In fact, we argue here that through acts of (re)seeing presumably impassable terrain—strategic actions at the local level—Jackson and others involved in this renewed WAC program were able to enact the postmodern notion of multivocality and, in so doing, work to challenge institutional barriers.

As members of the ad hoc WAC committee, for example, WAC members used suggestions from disciplinary faculty but were free to decide the focuses of their presentations. They were strategic in making these decisions, choosing topics both integral to WAC theory and practice and able to challenge and reshape misconceptions,

particularly those about student writing and behavior. The "Plagiarism" presentation provides an excellent example. In a survey soliciting preferences for WAC presentations, Liberal Arts faculty expressed a (not surprising) preference for information about student plagiarism, particularly how to find and punish it. The presentation itself, however, was designed both to acknowledge and upset these expectations, to focus attention not on the often overzealous hunting down of plagiarists but on the ways in which faculty might inadvertently contribute to the problem. In this scenario, provocative examples and quotations from Rebecca Howard's work on plagiarism reframed the discussion and advanced very different causes for a problem most instructors see as originating with students. The goal, here, was not to dismiss disciplinary faculty members' concerns; rather, the goal was to help them (re)see the landscape and its topology, to provide them with alternative pathways.

Presentations on the writing center and on evaluating student writing—two additional WAC presentations—extended the kind of (re)seeing and reframing work begun in the "Plagiarism" presentation. As the faculty member who developed the "Evaluating Student Writing" presentation, Jackson tried to dispel faculty notions about increased workload—a common concern—as well as reshape attitudes about what constitutes "good" writing and about how students learn to write in the disciplines. She sought to change the focus of conversation from student deficiency to expanded notions of literacy and to teaching practices that might reflect these expanded notions. Clearly, these were very small gestures in an institution rife with what those of us in WAC would consider unenlightened attitudes about writing. But it was a start, a response to seemingly impossible institutional constraints that puts the ball back in the WAC folk's court. They were, in Carl Herndl's words, "tactical intervention[s] in the dominant culture" (467), opportunities to see differently and act accordingly.

In fact, these very WAC presentations created inroads that, in typical postmodern fashion, the WAC folks at State University could not have anticipated in the beginning. For instance, Jackson was later asked to conduct a WAC workshop during the College's two-week long Multicultural Institute for selected faculty interested in transforming their courses. She saw this as an opportunity for action, a "small, tantalizing moment" (Knoblauch) in which to revise a relatively conservative, "safe" institutional WAC initiative. Faculty were asked to engage "standard" WAC issues—learning to write and writing to learn—but they were also prompted to ask a different kind of question, one Victor Villanueva proposes in a recent article on the politics of literacy across the curriculum: "How do we convey writing in a way that doesn't alienate?" (166). Thus, in one institution at one particular moment in time, WAC advocates seized (hidden)

opportunities in a top-down initiative to (re)envision a more radical institutional stance, one that emphasized multiple literacies, multiple competencies, and reformed pedagogies.

Tools for WAC Landscape Architects: (Re)Mapping Difficult Terrain

Our first story demonstrates how to see gaps and fissures within sediments of habit and tradition not as fault lines, places where we might fall through the cracks, but as sites for excavation, discovery, (re)mapping, and building: We learn to see, (re)see, and reconstitute with a new presence in each moment given to us, regardless of its circumstance. Our second story demonstrates specific strategies for excavating gaps and fissures. In this way, we extend discussions of the value of postmodern thinking for WAC most recently represented at the eighth annual WAC conference. Here, participants showcased moves toward individual action and emergent strategies, discussing either multimodality made possible through technologies or—as we concern ourselves with, here—engaging affordances of postmodernism via constructivism, collaboration, consensus-building, and notions of both de-centering and multiplicity. Discussing collaboration, for example, Dilek Tokay emphasizes the importance of "effective dialogues" among stakeholders, while Chris A. Burnham, Michele Auzenne, and Ricardo Jaquez argue the value of "negotiation" for consensus building. To aptly capture the spirit of such shared visions and actions of WAC in a postmodern paradigm, Kristi Apostle, Shawn Apostle, and Moe Folk suggest the phrase "consensus across the curriculum."

Hearing highlights and syntheses of success stories might provide hope, but not knowing how to see and what to do at stasis points can trigger skepticism, disbelief, and apathy—a kind of "pie in the sky" resignation that effectively shuts down active approaches to local problems. We understand this response and offer our second case as a partial solution. This story, like the first, illustrates de Certeau's "tactics," ways of moving *in situ* within a postmodern paradigm of change to construct successes. These successes can then emerge like Foucaultian frameworks of strategic agency for [historical] change.

Viewed rhetorically, adopting constructivist approaches means internalizing and enacting multiplicity as well as collaborative, consensus-building, and bottom-up thinking; it means designing institutions and programs rhetorically. Adopting constructivist approaches for purposes of moving beyond stasis points means sometimes making small, individual acts outside of an institution's *topoi*—its commonplace tropes, acting on *kairos*—the right time—rather than tradition; it

means, among other things, finding "exigence" in what Bitzer would call the "rhetorical situation." Put simply, moving beyond stasis points successfully means identifying the commonplace institutional tropes, finding the gaps and fissures, contextualizing them within exigencies for change, and acting at the opportune time to shape difference. As JoAnne Yates and Wanda Orlikowski observe, kairos, "as enacted," arises "when socially situated rhetors choose and/or craft an opportune time to interact with a particular audience in a particular way within particular circumstances" (109). We argue that rather than follow well-worn paths, WAC practitioners can create *kairotic* moments, becoming landscape architects who (re)see, (re)map, and/or (re)maneuver the land, designing situations to make them possible and appropriate.

Michael Fullan's work is particularly relevant here, as he recognizes the importance of committing to and managing change in what we refer to as landscapes, particularly in educational settings. His most recent work, a collaboration with Peter Hill and Carmel Crévola, *Breakthrough,* models large-scale educational reform based on assets and abilities already present in an environment and made possible by enacting, among other things, continuous feedback, change, collaboration, and communication. The model relies on balancing local action and global learning. This way of thinking, discussed elsewhere by Etienne C. Wenger, *et al.* and by Chris Argyris and David A. Schön, means that we not only recognize continuous change and its possibilities but that we also reflect and act.

Susan McLeod and Eric Miraglia summarize and frame Fullan's work as appropriate for WAC and they identify WAC lessons for this new schema, a framework for use at an institutional level that they call the "postmodern paradigm for change." Enactments of postmodern thinking, being, and acting in the world translate into several lessons, lessons we use to transform landscapes that pay homage to both the natural and built circumstances of their institutions. We repeat McLeod and Miraglia"s summary of the "postmodern paradigm for change," here, and we explicate these lessons more specifically for WAC in later sections. The lessons, as brought to us by McLeod and Miraglia, sketch the foundation for positive constructions. Our use of their sketch helps demonstrate to other WAC directors how to use the sketch to transform these foundational principles into action and new landscapes.

Fullan's "Postmodern Paradigm for Change" Summarized by McLeod and Miraglia for WAC
Lesson One: *You can't mandate what matters* (the more complex the change the less you can force it)

Lesson Two: *Change is a journey not a blueprint* (change is nonlinear, loaded with uncertainty and excitement, and sometimes perverse)

Lesson Three: *Problems are our friends* (problems are inevitable and you can't learn without them; vision and strategic planning come later—premature visions and planning blind us to other possibilities)

Lesson Four: *Vision and strategic planning come later* (premature visions and planning blind us to other possibilities)

Lesson Five: *Individualism and collectivism must have equal power* (there are no one-sided solutions)

Lesson Six: *Neither centralization nor decentralization works alone* (both top-down and bottom-up are necessary)

Lesson Seven: *Connection with the wider environment is critical for success* (the best organizations learn externally as well as internally)

Lesson Eight: *Every person is a change agent* (change is too important to leave to the experts) (McLeod and Miraglia, 20)

Put simply, these lessons acknowledge that "linear theories of cause and effect" (20) are ineffective, unrealistic, or untenable in that they ignore local context and lived realities. In the next section, we demonstrate how these lessons work as tactics for transitioning from seeing to acting—for being landscape architects.

WAC as Landscape Architecture: Excavating Difficult Terrain
Unlike the situation in our first case, the institution in our second story commands national acclaim for their full-fledged WAC, WID, and writing-intensive courses. Given such solid success, readers might wonder "where's the difficulty?" Deborah Morton's story demonstrates what might happen when varied levels of support and multiple perspectives co-exist without consensus, and it shows how opportune maneuvers in small moments could be used to build shared meaning and to design and redesign our institutional landscapes. This second story is a typical "things gone wrong" tale wherein participants who take McLeod's and Miraglia's suggestion to learn to see through Fullan's "postmodern paradigm of change" begin to transform their environments: WAC participants look for the cracks and crevices and use those as sites to begin excavating the same-old same-old attitudes and behaviors that prevent them from communicating with one another in order to establish goals for the WAC/WID experience. In this second story, the participants realize that if they do not re-imagine ways for working and communicating with others that they cannot even reach their

goals of offering this WAC/WID course, much less turn it into an opportunity worthy of the praise it receives by its description on paper and its imagined realities.

A new faculty member at Research University was assigned to teach a fledgling WID course that we'll call "Writing." Writing faculty greeted nearly 75 students from five sections of a discipline-specific course, which we'll call "Discipline"[1], who convened in a large lecture hall for one hour a week for three semesters in order to obtain upper-division writing credit. In other words, structurally at least, this was a WID course because one hour of the six-hour Discipline course was allotted to writing. In fact, the WID course earned internal and external bragging rights for Discipline precisely because writing experts taught writing within Discipline's courses. Unfortunately, in practice, the writing component remained disconnected from Discipline in physical and intellectual spaces. While students met the majority of their time in a collaborative workspace, they were asked to leave this space to attend the writing component. Leaving each of five Discipline sections and joining together for only one hour a week made it improbable that students or Writing faculty could connect writing to their ongoing disciplinary activities.

Internally, professors from both disciplines agreed with students who complained loudly or who dissented quietly: This "collaboration" wasn't working. Students did not like leaving their class space or time. Writing faculty did not like teaching 75 students from different sections at one time for one hour a week without being connected to Discipline sections. Numerous other disagreements surfaced. Discipline faculty did not like being asked to spend time meeting with Writing faculty when they occasionally requested more information about disciplinary projects so that they could connect the writing to that work: Writing faculty members assigned to the course, "are the experts," they argued, and they should not need to meet with others to "do their job." Complicating the matter further, students disliked their Writing grade averaging into their Discipline grade—it "ruined" their Discipline grade in their eyes. Writing faculty disliked Discipline professors communicating different messages about Writing to their respective sections: One professor substituted her own readings for Writing's, another told students not to read Writing's assignments at all, and a third created her own writing prompts and suggested Writing faculty and other writing instructors grade the responses.

Even though Discipline faculty disagreed about how to approach writing in the course, few participated when Writing faculty tried to pry open the terrain by calling

---

[1] In order to retain anonymity and afford readers to more easily imagine their own circumstances, we use "Discipline" as the course name.

meetings for input about the course and its re-design. In theory, it sounded like a fine idea to bring stakeholders together in space and time to negotiate a direction; in practice, however, even the suggestion undermined Discipline faculty's faith in Writing faculty. Rather than view this as an opportunity for faculty to collaborate and negotiate a shared vision and to set an agenda, Discipline's faculty saw the more feminist, organizational leadership approach to work as a picture of poor leadership and of indecisiveness on the part of Writing faculty. Consequently, rather than attend meetings for faculty, Discipline's faculty members began attending Writing portions of the classes, outwardly scrutinizing details during class and in front of students. Ed White might welcome the feature-length story as one more piece of evidence that WAC just doesn't work.

Resolution did not begin to emerge until Writing acknowledged the type of change in perspective offered from Jackson's story and the lessons offered by Fullan, nor did change begin until Writing maneuvered within ostensible stasis points. Rather than throw up hands in defeat, Writing (eventually) approached the problem strategically, at the point of need, relying on the postmodern paradigm of change to improve the situation. First, everyone had to face it: Writing faculty members ignored one of the lessons many WAC practitioners ignore in the "postmodern paradigm of change" because they set out "too soon with a vision and plan"—six times, in this case. The course had been taught differently each semester for three years. Each term began with an energetic, "We got it!" Yet, by the end, students rebelled, largely because of those spatial and intellectual disconnects but also because Writing grades "ruined" Discipline grades, a problem exacerbated by beliefs that they [students] "were not going to need to write much, anyway" and by their own faculty's interventions. While the strategy and vision should have emerged organically from the convergence of collaborations, these had instead been orchestrated by writing faculty who set the WID agenda and expected Discipline to simply show up. Each disconnect presented opportunities either to react or to understand and to (re)maneuver.

Writing recognized that resolving the situation meant finding shared meaning, but finding shared meaning meant getting faculty from both disciplines in a room together and, as readers might imagine, this was no small feat. First, everyone felt that it was too late for conversations. Both disciplines already perceived the "other" as the problem. Writing felt it most prudent to abandon the WID course all together, moving to sites where Writing faculty could excel rather than stagnate. Here is where a seemingly counterintuitive lesson in the postmodern paradigm for change emerged: In structured, autocratic environments, problems equal enemies that often stem from poor planning, inexact execution, or other incompetence; conversely, the postmodern paradigm for

change positions "problems as friends," a perspective already familiar from Jackson's story. We propose that even if friendship seems too unlikely, WAC folks can at least see problems as allies. Learning from and in the postmodern paradigm for change requires dispensing of universal ideals, notions that mistakes reveal ineptitude, and the anxiety of perfection. (Re)seeing the course would take identifying allies and friends as well as the fissures and gaps of problems. Understanding the problems meant analyzing rhetorically: actively listening, researching qualitatively, and analyzing environments as English faculty analyze texts. Writing faculty became rhetorical detectives who examined acts, scenes, agents, agency, and purposes (Burke) in order to find ways in through gaps and fissures and to use those to start conversations about negotiating for shared meaning about Discipline + Writing. This meant increasingly engaging in conversations when passing in the hallway, visiting office hours of other faculty, talking to students who stayed after class for their own purposes. Detective work often entails silence, too: resisting urges to tell people how writing should work and instead hearing about problems in all of their frustrating or ignorant or truthfully painful detail, and, of course, seeing from multiple views. At the moment Writing faculty felt most vulnerable and frustrated, they asked for feedback from everyone involved instead of defending themselves.

Thinking strategically, Writing eventually brought the writing coordinator and Discipline's chair into the conversations, particularly from a problem-solving framework. To explain the situation from the perspective of the postmodern paradigm of change, Writing could mold the landscape, which, in this case, meant bringing unbiased people and decision-makers to the construction site. Discipline aired their concerns and placed blame, thus they felt heard and invested. Through the process, each person at the meeting came to identify what that individual could do to improve the situation. In the end, Discipline faculty could see where they may have contributed to the problems: 75 students in a separate room for a writing component could not excel, Discipline faculty could not assign their own work for the writing component, and Writing faculty would not serve as graders for Discipline's course. Meeting facilitators used the faculty's frustration with Writing, turned it into frustration with the course, and then used that to ask Discipline faculty what they might do differently to make the course better. In befriending problems, participants learned two other lessons in the postmodern paradigm for change: Writing faculty "tried to mandate what mattered" and they did not "afford individualism and collectivism equal power." Fullan refers especially to problems of top-down directives to make something matter. Morton's situation did not suffer from a top-down directive; Morton's situation suffered from one discipline trying to mandate what mattered to another. Discipline faculty value

writing for both communicative and epistemic purposes. Some Discipline faculty even refer to their work as "building an argument." In Morton's situation, Writing faculty undermined what could have been a productive start because they began by directing Discipline rather than working to build consensus.

Do not be fooled. Creating one-sided solutions stems from acts of trying to mandate what matters, yes; it also happens by default, results from inaction, as in the writing component. In three years, all relevant Discipline faculty received invitations to meetings. Except for the last semester, only two of them, who were coordinators for their curriculum, came. This lack of participation resulted in writing faculty determining what mattered, but it did not work. Using decision makers in each department to get people at the meeting and beginning by pointing to problems on writing's side got the attention of Discipline faculty. Asking them to identify what they could and would do to effect change got them invested. From this conversation a new course model emerged—one shared by faculty in both disciplines and all individuals in the room because each person could see themselves and their program in the solution.

The tactic, here, grown from the lessons already mentioned, involved making people first want to join the effort. As Morton's case illustrates, sometimes getting people to listen means not being the expert in the room but being humble. This often means giving up disciplinary or institutional stardom, giving up the dream of being a goddess, as Haraway sees it, and instead dreaming of being part of a collective. Tactics come from shared versus traditional leadership practices, where people become heroes in their own territory so that everyone has room to excel in some way.

This story also highlights the importance of yet another lesson from the postmodern paradigm for change: The effort had to "centralize and decentralize, use top-down as well as bottom-up." In a decentralized way, as we discuss earlier, Writing had to ask for and learn to hear the many voices from Discipline faculty and students. As in our first story, in a centralized and top-down way, Writing relied on the administrative people in the room to pull others together. Discipline faculty did not show up to other meetings, but when their chair and the writing coordinator called the meeting, Discipline faculty came. Faculty had too many other responsibilities going on to use their energy on something they neither respected nor prioritized in any way, thus the need to rely on this top-down impetus for getting them at the site. Moreover, the interdisciplinary group needed someone to establish boundaries and needed confidence in whoever set those boundaries. Until all participants could see themselves in solutions, though, the problems would remain, so they all had to meet together at the same time, to see Writing demonstrate that all had been heard and had been designed into a blueprint for change.

(Re)Seeing, (Re)Mapping, (Re)Maneuvering

Both cases also demonstrate another lesson of the postmodern paradigm for change: "change is a journey." No matter how well you plan, the journey is nonlinear and uncertain. The tactic, here, is to let mission- or value-oriented moves direct action, strategizing in small increments. This relates to the lesson that "success stems from connecting to the wider environment." In other words, we must keep local ends in mind according to circumstance but also as they have been negotiated and informed by the expertise and best practices of the disciplines and players involved. So, when Jackson talks of plagiarism, she begins with the dean's directive to give the workshops and discipline's suggestions for workshop topics, mediated by WAC faculty's expertise in the discipline of writing and the experiences of pedagogy. Those connections to the wider environment create opportunities that when acted upon provide scaffolding for reaching new levels of understanding and negotiations.

In our second story, Discipline and Writing initially kept only the wider environment of each discipline in mind. Each needed tactics to negotiate differences in order for agreeable and viable solutions to emerge. The next iteration of Writing will be a client-based class where Discipline professors and their projects serve as clients for the Writing component. Students will write in their own discipline, simultaneously learning in both. Students will write to learn in order to think about solutions to their projects and to learn multiple ways of thinking and seeing more generally. The projects will serve as an impetus for writing, but writing instructors determine assignments based on goals and desired outcomes. It will be a learning-based rather than a checklist approach (genre, "check," documentation style, "check," thesis, "check" etc.)

We end with what we see as Fullan's call to action: "Every person is a change agent." As change agents in a postmodern paradigm this means learning new skills: negotiation versus communication, multivocality versus monologues, local decisions versus grand visions, audience-involved (Johnson) versus system-centered (as explained in Johnson User-Centered), and small opportunities versus authoritative directives. As change agents, we must continuously survey our local context, disciplinary values, personal and professional goals, institutional realities, consistently living and acting within dynamic connections and configurations that surround us and of which we are part. To return to a geographic metaphor, those of us dedicated to WAC sustainability must become landscape architects: We must learn to (re)see, (re)map, and (re)maneuver the landscape before us.

Works Cited

Apostel, Kristi, Shawn Apostel, and Moe Folk. "Consensus Across the Curriculum: Using WAC to Develop Interdisciplinary Communication within Groupwork." Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Argyris, Chris and David A. Schön. Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice. NY: Prentice Hall, 1995.

Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1–14.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Landscape Architects." *Occupational Outlook Handbook.* 4 August 2006. 18 April 2006. www.bls.gov/oco/ocos039.htm.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives.* NY: Prentice-Hall, 1945.

Burnham, Chris, A. Michele Auzenne, Ricardo Jaquez. "Negotiating Pedagogical Change in a WAC-Based Engineering Curriculum Revision." Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Condon, Bill. "Accommodating Complexity: WAC Program evaluation in the Age of Accountability." *WAC for the New Millennium.* Eds. Susan McLeod et al. Urbana: NCTE, 2001. 28–51.

Czerniak, Julia. "Challenging the Pictorial: Recent Landscape Practice." *Assemblage* 43 (1998): 110–120.

De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Trans. Steven F. Randall. Berkeley: U California P, 1984.

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference.* Trans. Alan Bass. NY: Routledge, 2004.

Evison, Alan, and Mary McMullen-Light. "Responses to WAC 2006 and Reflections on WAC 2008." Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 20 May 2006.

Fullan, Michael, Peter Hill, and Carmel Crévola. *Breakthrough.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2006.

Galin, Jeffrey R. "Hybrid WAC Programs: Insuring Sustainability and Institutional Reform." Context and WAC Program Design. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 18 May 2006.

Haraway, Donna Jeanne. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and the Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature.* NY: Routledge, 1991. 149–182.

———. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women : The Reinvention of Nature.* NY: Routledge, 1991. 183–202.

Heckelman, Ronald, Martina Kusi-Mensah, and Christine Cain. "Sustaining CAC, WAC, and WID at a Two-Year College: Montgomery College, Conroe, TX." Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Herndl, Carl. "Tactics and Quotidian: Resistance and Professional Discourse." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 16.3 (1999): 455–470.

Holdstein, Deborah H. "'Writing Across the Curriculum' and the Paradoxes of Institutional Initiatives." *Pedagogy* 1.1 (2001): 37–52.

Howard, Rebecca Moore. *Standing in the Shadow of Giants: Plagiarists, Authors, Collaborators.* Vol. 2. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 1999.

Johnson, Robert R. "Audience Involved: Toward a Participatory Model of Writing." *Computers & Composition* 14.3 (1997): 361–76.

———. *User-Centered Technology : A Rhetorical Theory for Computers and Other Mundane Artifacts.* Albany: State U of New York P., 1998.

Kellogg, David. "Reforming a WID Program from Within an English Department." Enlivening WAC and WID Programs. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Knoblauch, C.H. "Critical Teaching and Dominant Culture." *Composition and Resistance.* Eds. C. Mark Hulbert and Michael Blitz. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1991. 12–21.

Kranidis, Rita. "Reclaiming WAC—A Community College Story." Enlivening WAC and WID Programs. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.* Trans. G. Bennington and B. Massumi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P., 1984.

Marinara, Martha, Dawn Oetjen, and Karla Saari Kitalong. "Constructing Engagement: Initiating Communication Across the Disciplines at a Large Urban University." Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Martin, Eric V. "WAC Paradoxes Revisited: A Program Director's Response." *Pedagogy* 1.2: 275–86.

McLeod, Susan, and Eric Miraglia. "Writing Across the Curriculum in a Time of Change." *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Programs.* Eds. Susan McLeod et al. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2001. 1–27.

Mullin, Joan, and Susan Schorn. "Enlivening WAC Programs Old and New." Enlivening WAC and WID Programs. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Mullin, Joan, Chris Thaiss, Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Terry Myers Zawacki. "Keeping the WAC Movement Going: A Workshop for Veteran WAC Directors." Pre-Conference Workshop. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Palmquist, Mike. "Assessing an Integrated, Technology-Supported Approach to WAC: 14 Years and Counting." Revitalizing WAC in Changing Curriculums. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Porter, James, et al. "Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change." *CCC* 51.4 (2000): 610–642.

Smitherman, Carey. "Staying Afloat: Beginning a WAC Program Amidst a Sea of General Education Reform." Revitalizing WAC in Changing Curriculums. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Tokay, Dilek. "Effective Dialogues and Encouragement for WIC/WAC." Issues and Centers for Excellence at High Schools. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Traywick, Deaver, Melissa Johnson, and Dale Brown. "A Tune-Up for CACP: Can Department-Level Workshops Revive a Struggling Program in Mid-life Crisis?" Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 18 May 2006.

Villanueva, Victor. "The Politics of Literacy Across the Curriculum." *WAC for the New Millennium.* Ed. Susan McLeod et al. Urbana: NCTE, 2001. 165–178.

Warnock, Scott. "Initiating the Conversation: Using (Some) Tech Expertise as a Way to Talk Writing on Campus." New Technologies for a Twenty-First Century WAC. Writing Across the Curriculum Conf. Madren Center, Clemson U, Clemson, SC. 19 May 2006.

Wenger, Etienne C., William Snyder, Jeffrey Pfeffer, and Robert Sutton. *Harvard Business Review on Organizational Learning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2001.

White, Edward M. "Shallow Roots or Taproots for Writing Across the Curriculum?" *ADE Bulletin* 98 (1991): 29–33.

Yates, JoAnne and Wanda Orlikowski. "Genre Systems: Chronos and Kairos in Communicative Interaction." *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre: Strategies for Stability and Change.* Eds. R. Coe, L. Lingard, T. Teslenko. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2001: 103–21.