Negotiating Expertise: A Pedagogical Framework for Cross-curricular Literacy Work

Sandra L. Tarabochia

Abstract

This article examines the function of expertise in relationships between WPAs and colleagues in other disciplines who co-develop disciplinary writing curriculum and/or writing pedagogy. I argue that scholarship on interdisciplinary expertise has unexplored implications for the work of writing specialists and disciplinary-content experts collaborating across disciplinary lines. Tapping into that research, I retheorize cross-curricular literacy (CCL) efforts as a pedagogical activity in order to sponsor the integration of literate and disciplinary knowledge among faculty experts. Unlike current calls to negotiate expertise in WAC contexts, a pedagogical framework emphasizes the interpersonal dimension of day-to-day interactions and generates relationship-building strategies in response to forces that enable and constrain successful negotiation. By treating expertise as a vehicle for reflexive inquiry, itself open to reconstruction and transformation, such a framework suggests alternative ways to research and engage in CCL relationships.

Introduction

Negotiating expertise with colleagues across campus is one of the most fruitful and frustrating tasks writing program administrators undertake. Indeed, many have addressed the paradoxical challenge of legitimizing writing expertise while working toward collaborative decision making, power sharing and decentering of authority (Gunner; Howard; Hult; Werder; White). As these scholars point out, to simultaneously claim and share expertise is tricky business for writing specialists given our historically complicated relationships with other academic disciplines. As WPAs are called upon more frequently to initiate and sustain the integration of writ-

ing across curricular contexts, what Jeff Jablonski calls cross-curricular literacy (CCL) projects,[1] the difficulty of negotiating expertise with colleagues in other disciplines becomes a more pressing challenge.

While research about the relationship between literate and disciplinary expertise emphasizes the importance of helping students integrate knowledge across disciplinary lines, effective negotiation of expertise among writing specialists and disciplinary faculty has not been fully realized. More recent attempts to theorize crossdisciplinary partnerships (e.g., Jacobs; Paretti; Paretti et al.) provide useful criteria for evaluating success and failure; however, they don't necessarily offer behaviors, strategies, or frames of mind for faculty negotiating expertise across disciplines. To meaningfully negotiate expertise, WPAs need an approach to CCL work that promotes the synthesis of multiple dimensions of expertise as a cornerstone of collaborative meaning making.

Toward that end, this essay offers pedagogy, richly conceived, as a theoretical and practical framework for interpreting and engaging expertise across disciplinary boundaries. The theory emerges from my experience as a writing specialist working with biology faculty to develop science-writing curriculum and pedagogy. Before tracing its emergence, I describe the dominant culture of expertise and how it limits knowledge integration "across conceptual and epistemological boundaries" in the contexts both of student learning and faculty interaction (Paretti et al. 74). Using extended examples from my time in the biology department, I explore benefits and limitations of existing frameworks for interdisciplinary collaboration before proposing pedagogy as an alterative theory that can more fully support the negotiation of expertise among writing specialists and disciplinary-content experts. Looking forward, I consider implications of a pedagogical framework for future CCL research.

Recognizing the Dominant Culture of Expertise

Efforts to retheorize CCL work and sponsor meaningful negotiation of expertise must contend with a dominant culture of expertise that diminishes WPAs' knowledge of (teaching) writing (Carter; Mahala and Swilky; Norgaard). In particular, the dominant culture (1) devalues writing throughout postsecondary curriculum; (2) dichotomizes teaching and research; and (3) lacks a cohesive counterargument for the relationship between writing and disciplinary expertise. In her landmark work, *Academic Literacy and the Nature of Expertise*, Cheryl Geisler documents how postsecondary institutions divorce knowledge of writing and rhetorical processes from disciplinary-content knowledge. Such "bifurcation" com-

partmentalizes the writing specialist's expertise, deeming it less valuable than disciplinary subject matter or even irrelevant for basic undergraduate education. Dichotomizing teaching and research similarly delegitimizes the expertise of writing specialists. In professional interactions with colleagues, faculty respect the tentative, evolving nature of disciplinary knowledge, while in the classroom they transmit expertise to students as a static body of specialized knowledge and methods (Mahala and Swilky 38). Positioning writing and language "outside the essential operations of knowledge-making" designates WPAs as service providers employed to solve the problem of poor student writing (39).

Writing specialists might be tempted to juxtapose this dominant notion of expertise with a "distinctive culture [of expertise] within composition, rhetoric, and writing across the curriculum" (Norgaard 44). However, the disparity between cognitive researchers who treat expertise as general knowledge and social theorists who believe expertise requires local discourse community knowledge indicates the lack of a unified theory of expertise in the field (Carter 266). Indeed, clashing cultures of expertise, in Mahala and Swilky's words, "produc[e] resistance to incorporating cross-curricular writing instruction as an integral part of higher education" because "conditions are at odds with the goal of having everyone share the responsibility for teaching students to write or using writing as a means of learning" (36). In this conflict-ridden climate of expertise, WPAs struggle to form lasting relationships with colleagues in other disciplines.

A richer understanding of how students develop expertise has begun to challenge this dominant culture. Activity theorists, for example, fuse domain content and rhetorical process knowledge, arguing that to teach writing is to engage students in the disciplinary activity systems in which writing functions (Prior; Russell). Expertise, in this view, becomes more than abstract disciplinary theory on one hand and methods of communication on the other but a multilayered "rhetorical sophistication" developed throughout (not following) students' postsecondary education (Bazerman 241; Carter; Scardamalia and Bereiter). Such theories of expertise usefully emphasize the interplay between domain content and rhetorical-process knowledge, treating expertise itself as "always constructed or 'composed'" (Norgaard 52). Scholars such as Anne Beaufort (*College Writing*; "Developmental Gains") go further, extending the scope and texture of the knowledge domains student writers can develop. More specifically, the identification of reflection (Schön; Tynjälä) and student motivation (Alexander, "Development"; "Model") as vital components of expertise broadens the range of capacities needed to develop and perform expertise.

Despite efforts to challenge dichotomous notions of expertise, the inter-disciplinary negotiation of expertise has not yet become a way for students "to reconceptualize writing in relation to their work" or a "mode of collabo-ration" among WPAs and disciplinary faculty (Paretti et al. 74). One rea-son may be that we've yet to explore how this rich body of research retheo-rizes cross-curricular relationships between writing specialists and experts in other disciplines. This essay offers a first step in building "a more robust theory of WPA collaborations" (Paretti et al. 102) that embraces the same integrated, multidimensional expertise we hope to foster in students, recog-nizes the interactive nature of negotiation, and generates concrete strategies for negotiation in day-to-day encounters. Because the act of theorizing from lived experience is vital to a pedagogical theory of CCL work, I begin with two extended examples to illustrate the emergent process of theory build-ing and emphasize how my vision of pedagogy both embraces and extends current theories of interdisciplinary collaboration.

Benefits and Limitations of Evaluative Frameworks

In the fall of 2006, I began a two-year project with two different faculty members in the School of Biological Science to integrate writing into their courses. During the first semester, I co-instructed an honors seminar for non-majors with Professor Chase,[2] the chair of the department. For the next several semesters, I developed writing workshops with Professor Blake, who taught a large lecture course for biology majors, and then collaborated with teaching assistants to incorporate workshops into the lab sections attached to his class. Workshops were designed to help students compose reports based on lab experiments and focused on science writing conven-tions, peer review, and sentence-level revision.

While we successfully incorporated writing into both courses, I strug-gled to negotiate expertise with one professor more than the other. Existing theoretical frameworks explain why negotiating expertise with Professor Blake came rather naturally, while Professor Chase and I were never able to put our expertise in conversation. They illuminate forces—age, institu-tional position, approach to teaching, assumptions about writing, and so forth—that impacted our relationships and ability to collaborate across disciplinary lines. Existing theories do not, however, suggest how to work within and against those forces. They offer a lens for understanding how the dominant culture of expertise operated on our relationships but not nec-essarily a scaffold (based on that understanding) for negotiating expertise in future collaborations. By looking more closely at my relationships with these two biology professors and theorizing out of my experience, I con-

ceptualize a pedagogical approach that untethers WPAs from existing constructs and empowers us to revise dominant notions of expertise.

Reciprocity vs. Integration: How Existing Frameworks Explain Failure

Several factors likely contributed to the "mixed feelings" Professor Chase and I expressed regarding the success of our collaboration. For example, the course structure subordinated my writing and teaching expertise to Professor Chase's disciplinary expertise. I taught for the first segment of each three-hour weekly session—facilitating writing activities, running peer review groups, and conducting short lessons about writing—while Professor Chase led discussions about science during the second segment. We attempted to divide assessment responsibilities as well. Though Professor Chase acknowledged the difficulty of separating writing and content, he asked me to focus on "the effectiveness of writing" when grading student work, while he assessed "the content or ideas." Choices about course design and our roles in the course bifurcated rather than integrated domain content and rhetorical-process knowledge, thwarting meaningful negotiation of expertise.

Even though Professor Chase recognized writing as a vital skill for students and scientists, he viewed writing chiefly as a communication tool rather than a vehicle for knowledge production. Professor Chase described the relationship between thinking and writing this way:

> The ideas seem to come spontaneously and clear. . . I look back over my career and think about the most innovative successful ideas I've had. . . I can remember the moment when the idea occurred to me and it came into my mind full blown. You know and the only thing that [the ideas] seem to have in common is that I was immersing myself in a flow of information. [. . .] Often then on the surface [the information] had absolutely nothing to do with the idea it stimulated. That's not the way my writing is [laughs]. Now after that happens there's a process of turning that idea, clarifying it, turning it into a—operationalizing it into an experiment or a theoretical statement and that's the part that's similar to writing. Even that, yeah, I don't know.

Here Professor Chase locates writing apart from idea formation. For him, writing seems to come after the creative work of science, communicating what has already been discovered. His distinction between writing and science governed how Professor Chase organized our course and perceived our relationship. My area of expertise, writing, was subordinated to his area of expertise, course content.

Distinct institutional positions likely influenced our struggle to negotiate expertise as well. In a post-project interview, Professor Chase acknowledged positional inequalities. "[T]he fact of the matter is that I'm a faculty member, a full professor, and you are a second-year graduate student," he admitted. However, despite his professed desire to equalize our relationship, Professor Chase reinforced our uneven power dynamic:

> I think you probably deferred to my judgment more than perhaps you should have, certainly more than I thought you needed to, okay? I wasn't going to pick an argument with all the time pressures, but there were times I expected you to argue with me. [. . .] So . . . maybe [we were] not quite equal. [Still], my sense was that we were both pretty comfortable most of the time . . . I saw you as a coinstructor, who clearly has a substantial expertise in writing and teaching writing that I don't have.

Professor Chase frames expertise in terms of argument and deference instead of integration and collaboration. While he acknowledged our inequality at the end of the project, he did nothing to address it throughout the semester, never admitting his role in perpetuating it. Moreover, blaming my lack of assertiveness for our relationship's imbalance ignores the material effects of difference on our collaborative efforts.

Beyond differences in professional rank, neither Professor Chase nor I considered how age and gender differences influenced our relationship or how institutional treatment of the hard sciences compared to the humanities might have impacted our perceptions of expertise. Thus, our inequities, as well as how we chose to respond to them (or not), prevented successful negotiation of expertise. As action research participants Toohey and Waterstone observed in their study, despite best intentions toward equity, partnership, and collaboration, Professor Chase and I ended up "articulat[ing] with and sometimes reinforc[ing] institutional and structural hierarchies" (292).

According to Paretti et al., our relationship was *reciprocal*: we respected each other and valued one another's expertise, expecting respect would translate into a "sense of equality and mutual exchange" (75). Paretti and her colleagues argue that interdisciplinary relationships "involv[e] mutual learning across disciplinary boundaries and the willingness to engage not only with new knowledge, but with new ways of constructing and valuing knowledge" (77). Because Professor Chase and I merely contributed our respective expertise to a common goal, remaining relatively unchanged by the experience, our collaboration was multidisciplinary rather than interdisciplinary (76). While these concepts explain our struggle and usefully identify our lacks, they don't generate strategies for addressing those limi-

tations. As evaluative frameworks, they don't necessarily help me decide what to *do* in future situations. By the same token, while current theories highlight conditions that sponsor meaningful negotiation of expertise, they don't always suggest how to navigate less than ideal conditions when necessary.

Cognitive Flexibility and Knowledge Production: How Existing Frameworks Conceptualize Success

The semester following my experience with Professor Chase, I developed and facilitated writing workshops in the lab sections of Professor Blake's large lecture course on evolutionary biology. Institutionally speaking, Professor Blake and I were closer than Professor Chase and I had been. Professor Blake was young, untenured, and new to the department. He read about science pedagogy and often mused about new class activities he'd developed. He attended WAC workshops on our campus and initiated conversations with students and fellow professors about writing instruction in the department. Not surprisingly, Professor Blake and I negotiated our expertise more easily than Professor Chase and I did. In the following transcript excerpt, Professor Blake reflects on a faculty grant-writing workshop as he considers how to teach biology students to write lab reports. Our exchange demonstrates, on a faculty level, the characteristics of interdisciplinary expertise scholars have promoted in terms of student learning—the fusing of domain content and rhetorical process knowledge, a willingness to employ multiple layers of expertise (including reflection), and the co-construction of meaning.

> Sandy: I liked your idea too of having a description of the audience somewhere on [the handout], trying really hard to . . . keep it rhetorical. You know, like this is why you need to write . . . because your audience is going to be wondering . . . this, this, and this.

> Professor Blake: Yes. No, that's a good point because that's what comes across. [The grant writing workshop facilitator] spends like four hours in the seminar on exactly that . . . say your audience is a bunch of people who don't want to read this; they were assigned to read this; they are reading it because they have to read it. Whereas a research paper you choose to read. You are flipping through a journal and you say, "Oh, this looks interesting!" and you choose to read it. Grant proposals are assigned to reviewers so it's a tougher audience . . . very focused on audience. That's not reflected in the outline [we have for students]. And we would need to put that same audience

emphasis. I think you are right; I think a little statement about audience on there, but also maybe including a little presentation from the TAs.

Sandy: Yeah. Part of the first writing workshop this semester was to say, "What are the rules of science that you know?" and we put those on the board, and we sort of complicated those and saw which ones conflicted . . . and I am wondering if we could adapt that to this [new idea we have]. So talk some about who the audience for the lab reports is going to be throughout the semester and then say, "Okay, based on what you know about lab reports, what do you think this audience would need to know in an introduction?" And just have a brief discussion where [students] can sort of throw out their ideas, keeping it audience based—[which] I think is something we thought about doing this time, right, having them think through it and then giving them the outline.

Professor Blake: What you're saying is not . . . we were trying to get them to come up with this outline by brainstorming, and I think what I'm reading now is . . . to get to this [outline] [students] actually need to think about the audience first. Let's have them brainstorm about audience and then say, "Here's an effective tool that we think communicates that." It's . . . I'm really asking them to do two steps at once by having them try to come up with this and they're finding it frustrating.

Professor Blake's memory of the workshop led us to actively negotiate a new approach to teaching lab-report writing. I understood the need to demystify disciplinary writing conventions, and he internalized the value of a rhetorical approach to teaching writing. Rather than assert our own or defaulting to one another's expertise, we each underwent "internal revision,"[3] leading to what Donna Qualley, drawing on Thomas Newkirk, calls "earned insights," or the "kind of understanding whose essential truth is only realized or more fully grasped as it is made manifest through the individual's experience and contemplation of that experience" (35).

Professor Blake's newness to the profession, in contrast to Professor Chase's established career, might partially explain the former's receptivity to new ideas (Jacobs 69). More importantly, Professor Blake's willingness to bring his own writing experiences to bear on our integration of writing and disciplinary content contributed to and inspired the negotiation of expertise. Our relationship was interdisciplinary as opposed to reciprocal, Paretti et al. suggest, because we "engage[d] in an intellectual exchange

that synthesize[d] elements of [one another's knowledge] domains to create new knowledge" (80). However, while these observations describe the characteristics of our relationship, they don't suggest *how* we were able to develop and embrace the qualities that enabled us to successfully negotiate expertise. I'm left wondering how I might proactively sponsor those characteristics in future relationships when they don't come so easily.

As I hope these examples have shown, extant theory usefully describes circumstances that enable or constrain interdisciplinary collaboration and by extension negotiation of expertise in CCL contexts. When used for evaluation or identification, the frameworks don't generate strategies or frames of mind for productively navigating future interactions. When used pedagogically, however, current frameworks can empower WPAs and disciplinary-content experts to theorize from experience and imagine alternative approaches to future situations.

Room to Negotiate: Retheorizing CCL Work as Pedagogy

To conceptualize a pedagogical theory of CCL work, I draw on the move in composition studies to understand pedagogy as "the reflexive inquiry that teachers and learners undertake together" (Gallagher, *Radical* xvi). This formulation challenges traditional views that presume pedagogy is transmitted by instructors to students in classroom settings, framing it instead as what happens anytime learners (of all kinds) participate in "shared knowledge building" (*Radical* xvi). In this view, pedagogy is the process and product of creative, collaborative interaction among participants who are simultaneously teachers and learners. While certainly collaborative, pedagogy is more than collaboration; it brings a focus on multidirectional learning to collaborative activities. Terms such as "critical colleagueship" (Gallagher et al.) or "participatory professionalism" (Gallagher, "We Compositionists") might seem more appropriate for describing faculty relationships, especially for faculty who feel a pedagogical approach positions them as students in a subordinate sense. However, I choose to theorize faculty relationships as pedagogy in order to actively disrupt conventional, hierarchical, one-directional conceptions of teaching and learning both within and outside the classroom. Doing so challenges our dominant culture of expertise by resisting static binaries between teacher as powerful expert and student as passive novice and supports revisionary approaches to teaching and learning inspired by the WAC movement.

In *Professing & Pedagogy*, Shari Stenberg, drawing on Gallagher, Paul Kameen, Amy Lee, and Donna Qualley, articulates several characteristics central to my view of pedagogy:

> (1) Pedagogy is knowledge-making activity that involves the interplay of visions and practices, both of which require reflection; (2) pedagogy is dependent on learners and is remade with each encounter, as the students and the teacher change; (3) pedagogy cannot be finished . . . Rather, it requires an ongoing commit [sic] to learning and reflexivity. (xviii)

Stenberg writes about teacher development in English Studies, but her formulation of pedagogy is equally relevant for WPAs engaged in CCL work. Embracing pedagogy—as a knowledge-making activity that sponsors ongoing learning and reflection—can shift the way we perceive and perform expertise with colleagues in other disciplines. It can guide us to embrace the characteristics and activities of interdisciplinary expertise we've long promoted for students—those identified but not scaffolded by existing collaborative frameworks. More specifically, a pedagogical framework enables WPAs to:

1. work within and against a dominant culture of expertise that compartmentalizes knowledge and devalues writing expertise;

2. embrace the integration of multidimensional domains of expertise;

3. attend to the interactive function of expertise as it unfolds through daily encounters among differently positioned experts; and

4. generate tangible, adaptable strategies for negotiating expertise across disciplinary lines.

In what follows, I elaborate on these affordances and explain how they support writing program administrators' efforts to cultivate meaningful partnerships with colleagues across disciplines.

A pedagogical approach to CCL work empowers WPAs to recognize and resist the dominant culture of expertise. As Lee points out, pedagogy intersects material and discursive realms, working simultaneously for meaningful revision in theory, practice, discourse, and action (150). In Gallagher's words, "Pedagogy is theory producing, rather than theory applying" (*Radical*, xvi). That is, a pedagogical framework, grounded in Deweyan pedagogical progressivism, resists unconscious application of existing theory, instead encouraging "teachers and learners [to] collaborate in the construction of their objects of study" (Gallagher, *Radical* xvii). In a CCL context, rather than applying or carrying out existing objectives and theories, writing specialists and disciplinary-content experts coconstruct goals for a particular project as well as the philosophies to guide that work (See Text Box 1). By undertaking that constructive process, we are more likely to

recognize the constraints of dominant cultures of expertise—ones that urge us to privilege disciplinary expertise or embrace reductive forms of writing expertise—and find ways to resist it. As we purposefully change our practice we interrupt and revise the discourse surrounding CCL work; likewise changes in the discourse encourage ongoing revision of practice.

Text Box 1. Revising the Dominant Culture of Expertise

The focus on Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC), as originally conceived at the University of Minnesota, illustrates one way writing specialists and disciplinary content experts might coconstruct subject matter and begin to revise (in discourse and practice) the dominant culture of expertise. In an effort to infuse writing meaningfully into the curriculum for all degrees and majors, writing specialists at the University of Minnesota *join* disciplinary faculty in describing discipline-specific writing values and implementing plans for change. Rather than deliver disciplinary writing curriculum, writing specialists at UM attend department meetings where they pose questions, document conversations, and help imagine possibilities. As a result, faculty are able to identify valued characteristics of student writing, map existing curriculum, determine if/when/how writing is taught, develop and pilot new curricular sequences, design assessment mechanisms, and specify needs for support. This process (creating a plan to integrate writing, implementing new curriculum, assessing it, revising it, and assessing it again) takes several years. During that time the writing specialist serves not as a change agent, but as an "academic anthropologist" studying and constructing disciplinary writing curriculum alongside faculty members. Everyone involved both teaches and learns as the locus of expertise shifts among participants. (See wec.umn.edu for more about WEC at the University of Minnesota.)

The process of knowledge construction and revision at the heart of theory building draws on multiple dimensions of expertise and encourages participants to creatively imagine the range of expertise we can contribute (See Text Box 2). Uncovering multiple ways of knowing requires an interactive form of reflection, what Gallagher, invoking Qualley, calls *reflexive inquiry*, a dimension of expertise commonly valued for student learning but underutilized in faculty collaborations. Reflexive inquiry happens when teacher-learners "take stock together of how they construct knowledge, how

they make meaning" (Gallagher, *Radical* xvii). Rather than legitimize individual knowledge—as dominant notions of expertise would have us do—reflexive sense making invites CCL participants to treat "expert" conclusions "as tentative, partial, approximate, and open to further examination," useful only to the extent that they function in conversation with others (Qualley 24).

Text Box 2. Multiple Dimensions of Expertise: The Role of Reflexive Inquiry

Suppose a writing specialist wants to convince a chemistry professor to assign reflective writing in her lab, but the professor is more concerned with how students communicate ideas clearly in their lab reports. The writing specialist could try to push the behavior on her colleague based on the legitimacy of her own expertise, or she could default to the professor's disciplinary knowledge and focus on teaching students surface-level features of lab reports. Alternatively, the two decide to think reflexively together about their various perspectives, where they come from, and what they accomplish. The colleagues treat their views as tentative rather than conclusive and consider how they inform one another. The writing specialist draws on her position as a disciplinary outsider to invite the chemistry professor to better articulate what kind of thinking she wants communicated clearly in student lab reports. The professor draws on her experiences as a writer in the discipline to clarify and refine her own expectations as she communicates them to students. By integrating their expertise, they are able to revise the idea of a reflective journal to fit the professor's notion of scientific inquiry. They have students write to reflect and inquire and tie that process concretely to the goal of clear communication in lab reports.

In addition to broadening perceptions and performances of expertise, a pedagogical approach to CCL work goes beyond conceptual identification of conditions that enable or constrain the negotiation of expertise to generate practical means of engagement. In fact, a pedagogical framework urges WPAs and disciplinary-content experts to make deliberate decisions about how to perform expertise (See Text Box 3). Julie Jung's notion of pedagogical performance provides a useful illustration. In *Revisionary Rhetoric, Feminist Pedagogy, and Multigenre Texts*, Jung identifies several teacher subject positions, including The Dummy, The Hard Ass, and The Martyr.[4] When she treated the subjectivities as rigid identities, Jung realized, they unconsciously influenced her classroom practice and research, often with unin-

tended effects. However, distinguishing and labeling them allowed her to act more purposefully according to particular teaching or research goals. Like Jung's teacher subjectivities, traditional roles for writing specialists—the missionary, the anthropologist, the cultural critic[5]—constitute identities with corresponding versions of expertise that can have unintended effects on CCL interactions. Naming available subjectivities and identifying the pedagogical genres they inspire empowers WPAs to rhetorically choose among them, to "play with them," in order to achieve particular pedagogical purposes (Jung 147).

Text Box 3. Pedagogical Performance: Purposefully Enacting Expertise

> A colleague of mine in the School of Social Work emphasizes how important it is for social workers to move fluidly between roles when working with clients. Professors in the department take great care to train students to competently perform a variety of roles—teacher, counselor, advocate, case manager, resource provider, and so forth. According to my colleague, the ability to move between roles is a great strength as it allows social workers to meet the unique needs of a situation. While I wouldn't necessarily compare CCL work to social work, the professional situations are similarly complex in that they require purposeful flexibility. Because few compositionists, at least traditionally, are trained to be writing consultants in CCL contexts, we enter relationships with disciplinary-content experts without a full sense of the roles available to us or strategies for moving among them. Moreover, when we do move among roles, it is often either to persuade OR better understand disciplinary colleagues. A pedagogical framework allows multiple purposes, encouraging CCL participants to make choices among various roles according to pedagogical goals.

The focus on pedagogical purpose distinguishes Jung's performance of expertise, grounded in reflexivity and collaborative meaning making, from performances of expertise rooted in rhetorical persuasion (Hartelius) or translation (Jablonski). While WPAs must certainly draw on what Jablonski calls "rhetorical knowledgeability" to make our knowledge meaningful in CCL contexts, a myopic focus on the rhetoric of expertise can easily work against efforts to simultaneously decenter and validate our authority (14, 190). Alternatively, attending to the pedagogical dimension of expert performance urges CCL participants to do more than convince one another

of the legitimacy of what we know. It invites us to seek out creative ways to position ourselves as experts in conversation with one another.

In sum, a pedagogical framework supports the negotiation of expertise among writing specialists and disciplinary-content experts more fully than current theories of CCL work because it (1) works within and against the dominant culture of expertise, (2) sponsors the integration of multiple dimensions of expertise, (3) attends to expertise as emergent from interactions among knowers-in-process, and (4) generates adaptable strategies for perceiving and performing expertise for the purpose of negotiation. Knowing and valuing a pedagogical approach to CCL work isn't enough, however. Faculty colleagues need practical ways to enact the characteristics I've described and actively negotiate expertise.

Reflexivity and Purposeful Action: A Pedagogical Framework for Interdisciplinary Collaboration

A useful pedagogical framework guides participants to embrace the "pedagogic significance" of interdisciplinary interactions (Van Manen, *Researching* 2). The following heuristic tool represents one way to enact the framework in CCL contexts. It takes the form of a strategic series of questions designed to facilitate pedagogical activity (see appendices). As "a set of topics for systematic consideration," the heuristic aims to help participants learn from past experience; as a "set of discovery procedures for systematic application," it sponsors a reflexive approach to new situations (Johnstone 9). Figure 1 offers a graphic representation of how the heuristic might function to sponsor pedagogical relationships between writing specialists and disciplinary-content experts in the context of CCL projects.

In the spirit of experiential, interactional views of teaching and learning (Van Manen, *Tact*; Dewey) I locate participants, subject matter, and context at the heart of a pedagogical approach to CCL work; those categories appear in the circle at the center of Figure 1. Participant questions concentrate on personal/professional circumstances and identity characteristics (age, gender, race, etc.) of the writing specialist and disciplinary-content expert. They examine the interactional nature of expertise—how relationships shape and are shaped by people involved. Subject matter questions deal with the project itself, the work at the heart of the collaboration. These questions invite participants to consider what they know about writing, disciplinary content, and their integration. Finally, context questions attend to contextual forces—institutional structures, dominant discourses, departmental or programmatic relationships, and so forth—that shape interpersonal interactions.

Figure 1. Visual Representation of A Pedagogical Approach to CCL Work

Specific questions in each category are shaped by three main purposes that correspond to key moments in a CCL project. As indicated by the outer circles in Figure 1, questions motivate self-inventory before the project begins, collaborative inquiry during the project, and reflection for transfer when the project is over. Participant, subject matter, and context questions in the self-inventory category (See Appendix A) establish a foundation for reflexivity and future negotiation of expertise. For example, a writing specialist might ask herself what kind(s) of expertise she hopes to contribute to the project or identify personal circumstances that might shape the roles and responsibilities she is able to take on. Similarly, she might consciously consider what she (thinks she) knows about fellow participants. How might professional circumstances like lack of tenure or identity characteristics like

age or gender shape her relationships with colleagues? By the same token, subject matter and context questions during self-inventory concentrate on what participants already know about writing, disciplinary content, and project goals. They reveal hidden assumptions and force participants to consider possible ramifications of present circumstances.

Questions designed to support collaborative inquiry facilitate active knowledge production and negotiation of expertise during the project (See Appendix B). Questions such as "What are we learning about each other as our project evolves?" and "How can we work within and against constraints?" prompt participants to take stock of progress toward goals, track evolving beliefs, address restrictive forces, and evaluate the overall function of their relationship. Here participants consider multiple, potentially untapped, dimensions of expertise and discuss roles and responsibilities in relation to expectations. Collaborative inquiry questions are important because they encourage metacognitive awareness during the project when (ideally) participants can still alter processes, behaviors, or expectations.

Questions encouraging reflection for transfer invite participants to look back on their experiences as the project ends (See Appendix C). Inspired by Anne Beaufort's questions "to facilitate positive transfer of learning," they prompt participants to articulate the individual and collective learning that results from interdisciplinary collaboration (*College Writing* 182). These questions emphasize the importance of knowledge production (rather than translation or application) as the process and product of pedagogical activity. Since pedagogy "is dependent on learners and remade with each encounter" (Stenberg xviii), knowledge constructed in this moment doesn't constitute a set of best practices, but rather motivates creative attention to engagement processes. By asking questions such as "Did we discover dimensions of expertise we hadn't anticipated?" and "What new knowledge have we gained and how does it relate to what we thought we knew about writing?" participants not only come to understand the integration of writing and disciplinary content more deeply, but also generate important insights that will inform future interdisciplinary work.

While the heuristic emphasizes purposes for reflection according to key moments in a project, it is designed to function recursively rather than linearly. In Figure 1, arcs connect the purposes to show how they motivate one another. The arcs form a circle, indicating how crucial moments in one CCL project become part of participants' lived experience and inform how they approach future projects. In other words, the heuristic embodies the recursive motion of pedagogical activity where learning and reflection are ongoing, integrated processes that empower participants to work within and against traditional cultures of expertise.

Structured and flexible, the heuristic encourages WPAs to explore options for fostering pedagogical relationships. As Barbara Johnstone points out, "There is no fixed way of following [the procedures of a heuristic]" and no guarantee they will lead to a specific outcome (10). Given particular project parameters, certain questions may be more useful than others. Participants who meet only once, for example, might not have time to explore collaborative inquiry questions during their project. By the same token, spontaneous interactions may not allow for a careful self-inventory beforehand. Therefore, WPAs can adapt and arrange the questions according to particular circumstances.

The flexibility of the approach also allows WPAs to explore questions individually or with disciplinary colleagues. While mutual engagement with questions is ideal (particularly for collaborative inquiry questions posed during the project), disciplinary-content experts are not always able to engage in the deep reflection and inquiry that make up the heart of pedagogical activity (Jablonski 57–61). Knowing when, how, or whether to engage disciplinary colleagues in collaborative reflexive inquiry requires "pedagogical tact" (Van Manen, *Tact*). Because the heuristic foregrounds the relationship-building process, it helps writing specialists recognize opportunities to invite faculty to cultivate pedagogical relationships and be more creative about how we extend those invitations. At the same time, the heuristic supports a process that allows writing specialists to recognize instances when a pedagogical relationship is unlikely so we can make more informed, proactive decisions about when to move forward with collaborations and when to decline involvement.

I cannot claim my relationship with Professor Chase would have been dramatically different had we used the heuristic. However, I do believe foregrounding the reflexive process would have made it possible for us to identify and wrestle more productively with challenges we faced. In this case, Professor Chase likely would have been open to reflection and discussion; regardless, the heuristic would have helped me more strategically navigate factors influencing our (in)ability to negotiate expertise. As I hope my experience with Professor Chase makes clear, I do not intend the heuristic to be a panacea for difficult CCL relationships but rather a framework for recognizing and grappling with forces impacting the negotiation of expertise, forces that might otherwise remain hidden or uninterrogated. It demonstrates how retheorizing CCL work as pedagogy shifts how WPAs understand past experiences, approach current relationships, and imagine future interactions with colleagues in other disciplines. That shift in understanding calls for new methods for investigating cross-curricular literacy relationships.

The Promise of a Pedagogical Framework: Some Implications

Understanding how experts navigate what Kameen calls the "transformative equation of pedagogy" calls for closer attention to day-to-day interactions among writing specialists and disciplinary faculty (32). However, as Jablonski points out, WAC/WID literature currently lacks careful examination of daily exchanges despite their impact on relationship building. Some scholars focus on negotiation in a programmatic sense, not necessarily an interpersonal one (Jones and Comprone; Mahala and Swilky); others promote valuable inquiry-based practices but don't show *how* interactions and transformations take place (Fulwiler; McCarthy and Walvoord; Kaufer and Young; Waldo). Jablonski fills a gap in the scholarship by emphasizing collaboration in day-to-day interactions and bringing rich dimensions of writing expertise to light. However, his goal is not to capture the *inter*subjective realities we need to understand in order to support pedagogical engagement among writing specialists and disciplinary-content experts.

To flesh out the intersubjective dimension of pedagogical activity, we need research methods that capture interpersonal exchanges among participants. Conversation analysis (Hutchby and Wooffitt; ten Have) or discourse analysis (Johnstone; van Dijk), for example, could shed light on how writing specialists and disciplinary faculty build relationships through the pedagogical negotiation of expertise. Composition researchers already use such methods to investigate interactions around writing. Laurel Johnson Black, for instance, employs sociolinguistic methodologies to examine the ways teachers and students use speech genres to organize relations with one another in writing conferences. Beth Godbee studies the social context of one-with-one writing center consultations, using conversation analysis to explore what she calls "the transformative power of collaborative writing talk" in the face of institutionalized racism (xx). Rebecca Nowacek uses "Bakhtinian theories of language and cognition" to build "a discourse-based theory of interdisciplinary connections" among students and teachers in a team-taught interdisciplinary course ("Toward" 368; "Discourse-Based"). Grounded in a social-constructivist paradigm, these research goals and methods resonate with my pedagogical framework by attending to the interplay among language, relationships, discourse, and action.

Admittedly, discourse-based qualitative research is complex and time consuming. Researchers need participants who are willing to be video/audio recorded during interactions that are likely unfamiliar, complicated, and challenging. We need funding for data collection and transcription as well as time to engage in recursive data analysis that involves checking interpretations against participants' lived experiences. Nevertheless, the

research is possible, underway, and yielding important insights. Indeed, Huckin, Andrus, and Clary-Lemon emphasize the promise of critical discourse analysis (CDA) as an ideal research methodology for scholars in our field "analyz[ing] new and expanding contexts and texts" (117). In this case, extending sociolinguistic methods to CCL contexts would allow researchers studying everyday interactions between writing specialists and disciplinary-content experts to capture talk as text, remaining attuned to strategies of engagement that could be adapted for future situations. This discursive focus is significant. Because expert practitioners are not always able to consciously identify specific interactional strategies, they may not emerge through narrative anecdotes or traditional forms of qualitative data collection such as observations and interviews. In short, studying CCL interactions on a discursive level illuminates the pedagogical process of negotiating expertise, enabling researchers and practitioners to more fully understand and engage in that process.

Pedagogy is at the heart of what we do as writing program administrators. We explore with great energy and rigor pedagogical possibilities for building meaningful relationships with students in our classrooms, programs, and institutions. The framework I've described here usefully scaffolds the teaching and learning we do with colleagues in crossdisciplinary contexts as well. If we are to help students develop the interdisciplinary expertise they need to participate in a world defined by globalization and internationalization (Gustafsson et al.), we must learn to negotiate that expertise ourselves. A pedagogical approach to interdisciplinary collaboration supports postsecondary educators of all kinds as we take on this important work.

Acknowledgments

Notes

1. I use the term cross-curricular literacy (CCL) in place of the more standard WAC/WID because this term, which Jablonski borrows from David Russell, encompasses both WAC and WID as well as a range of emergent initiatives, including Communication Across the Curriculum (CAC), Writing Across Com-

munities (WAC), and Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC), that call for the kind of interdisciplinary interaction/collaboration I take up in this essay.

2. The names of participants have been changed to protect their rights to privacy.

3. For her understanding of "internal revision," Qualley draws on Donald Murray's *Learning by Teaching*, in which he describes reading as a process of discovery in which engagement with texts leads readers to new ideas by synthesizing new information with past experiences (35).

4. Jung describes the "The Dummy" as the part of her that "feels inadequate among department's literary 'theory heads'"; "The Hard Ass" as the part of her teaching self who "fears being taken advantage by students"; and "The Martyr" as the part of her who "wrongly believes in her own indispensability." See Jung 123–26 for more detailed (and charming) descriptions of these and several other subjectivities.

5. Jablonski offers an extended discussion of these three prominent roles, each of which corresponds to a major stage of the WAC movement. While each responds to a particular historical context, the roles encompass potentially problematic treatment of participants' expertise. The missionary seeks to convert disciplinary faculty to composition pedagogy; the anthropologist conducts rhetorical research in the disciplines in order to better understand disciplinary contexts and translate writing expertise more convincingly or adapt writing expertise to disciplinary needs; and the cultural critic embraces critical pedagogy as a means to encourage faculty and students to critique disciplinary discourses. See Jablonski for more about these roles and the corresponding stages of WAC out of which they emerged.

Works Cited

Alexander, Patricia. "The Development of Expertise: The Journey from Acclimation to Proficiency." *Educational Researcher* 32.8 (2003): 10–14. Print.

—. "A Model of Domain Learning: Reinterpreting Expertise as a Multidimensional, Multistage Process." *Motivation, Emotion, and Cognition: Integrative Perspectives on Intellectual Functioning and Development*. Ed. David Yun Dai and Robert J. Sternberg. Mahwah: LEA, 2004. 273–298. Print.

Bazerman, Charles. "From Cultural Criticism to Disciplinary Participation: Living with Powerful Words." *Writing, Teaching, and Learning in the Disciplines*. Ed. Anne Herrington and Charles Moran. New York: MLA, 1992. 61–68. Rpt. in *Writing Across the Curriculum A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Terry Myers Zawacki and Paul M. Rogers. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2012. 239–45. Print.

Beaufort, Anne. *College Writing and Beyond: A New Framework for University Writing Instruction*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2007. Print.

—. "Developmental Gains of a History Major: A Case for Building a Theory of Disciplinary Writing Expertise." *Research in the Teaching of English* 39.2 (2004): 136–85. Print.

Black, Laurel Johnson. *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference.* Logan: Utah State UP, 1998. Print.

Carter, Michael. "The Idea of Expertise: An Exploration of Cognitive and Social Dimensions of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 41.3 (1990): 265–86. Print.

Dewey, John. *Experience and Education.* New York: MacMillan, 1938. Print.

Fulwiler, Toby. "Showing, Not Telling, at a Writing Workshop." *College English* 43.1 (1981): 55–63. Print.

Gallagher, Chris W. *Radical Departures: Composition and Progressive Pedagogy.* Urbana: NCTE, 2002. Print.

—. "We Compositionists: Toward Engaged Professionalism." *JAC* 25.1 (2005): 75–99. Print.

Gallagher, Chris W., Peter M. Gray, and Shari Stenberg. "Teacher Narratives as Interruptive: Toward Critical Colleagueship." *Symploke* 10.1/2 (2002): 32–51. Print.

Geisler. Cheryl. *Academic Literacy and the Nature of Expertise: Reading, Writing, and Knowing in Academic Philosophy.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1994. Print.

Godbee, Beth. "Small Talk, Big Change: Identifying Potentials for Social Change in One-with-One Talk about Writing." Diss. U of Wisconsin-Madison, 2011. Print.

Gunner, Jeanne. "Decentering the WPA." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 18.1–2 (1994): 8–15. Print.

Gustafsson, M., A. Eriksson, C. Räisänen, A. Stenberg, C. Jacobs, J. Wright, B. Wyrley-Birch, C. Winberg. "Collaborating for Content and Language Integrated Learning: The Situated Character of Faculty Collaboration and Student Learning." *Across the Disciplines* 8.3 (2011): n. pag. Web. 10 December 2012.

Hartelius, E. Johanna. *The Rhetoric of Expertise.* Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011. Print.

Howard, Rebecca Moore. "Power Revisited." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 16.3 (1993): 37–49. Print.

Huckin, Thomas, Jennifer Andrus, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon. "Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetoric and Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 64.1 (2012): 107–29. Print.

Hult, Christine. "Politics Redux: The Organization and Administration of Writing Programs." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 18.3 (1995): 44–52. Print.

Hutchby, Ian, and Robin Wooffitt. *Conversation Analysis.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity, 2008. Print.

Jablonski, Jeffrey. *Academic Writing Consulting and WAC: Methods and Models for Guiding Cross-Curricular Literacy Work.* Cresskill: Hampton P, 2006. Print. Research and Teaching in Rhetoric and Composition.

Jacobs, Cecilia. "Towards a Critical Understanding of the Teaching of Discipline-Specific Academic Literacies: Making the Tacit Explicit." *Journal of Education* 41 (2007): 59–81. Print.

Johnstone, Barbara. *Discourse Analysis.* 2nd ed. Malden: Blackwell, 2008. Print.

Jones, Robert, and Joseph Comprone. "Where Do We Go Next in Writing Across the Curriculum?" *College Composition and Communication* 44.1 (1993): 59–68. Print.

Jung, Julie. *Revisionary Rhetoric, Feminist Pedagogy, and Multigenre Texts.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2005. Print. Studies in Writing & Rhetoric.

Kameen, Paul. *Writing/Teaching: Essays Toward a Rhetoric of Pedagogy.* Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2000. Print.

Kaufer, David, and Richard Young. "Writing in the Content Areas: Some Theoretical Complexities." *Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing: Rethinking the Discipline.* Ed. Lee Odell. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1993. 71–104. Print.

Lee, Amy. *Composing Critical Pedagogies: Teaching Writing as Revision.* Urbana: NCTE, 2000. Print. Refiguring English Studies.

Mahala, Daniel, and Jody Swilky. "Resistance and Reform: The Functions of Expertise in Writing Across the Curriculum." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines.* 1.2 (1994): 35–62. Print.

McCarthy, Lucille P., and Barbara E. Walvoord. "Models for Collaborative Research in Writing Across the Curriculum." *Strengthening Programs for Writing Across the Curriculum.* Ed. Susan H. McLeod. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988. 77–89. Print. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 36.

Norgaard, Rolf. "Negotiating Expertise in Disciplinary 'Contact Zones.'" *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 3.2 (1999): 44–63. Web. 12 April 2012. http://wac.colostate.edu/llad/#1.3.

Nowacek, Rebecca S. "A Discourse-Based Theory of Interdisciplinary Connections." *The Journal of General Education* 54.3 (2005): 171-95. Print.

—. "Toward a Theory of Interdisciplinary Connections: A Classroom Study of Talk and Text." *Research in the Teaching of English* 41.4 (2007): 368-401. Print.

Paretti, Marie. "Interdisciplinarity as a Lens for Theorizing Language/Content Partnerships." Ed. Magnus Gustafsson. Spec. issue of *Across the Disciplines* 8.3 (2011): n.pag. Web. 12 Apr. 2012.

Paretti, Marie, Lisa McNair, Kelly Belanger, and Diana George. "Reformist Possibilities? Exploring Writing Program Cross-Campus Partnerships." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 33.1–2 (2009): 74–113. Print.

Prior, Paul A. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1998. Print.

Qualley, Donna. *Turns of Thought: Teaching Composition as Reflexive Inquiry.* Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1997. Print.

Russell, David. "Activity Theory and Its Implications for Writing Instruction." *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction.* Ed. Joseph Petraglia. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995. 51–78. Print.

Scardamalia, Marlene, and Carl Bereiter. "Literate Expertise." *Toward a General Theory of Expertise: Prospects and Limits.* Ed. Karl Anders Ericsson and Jacqui Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. 172–94. Print.

Schön, Donald. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987. Print. Jossey-Bass Higher Educ. Ser.

Stenberg, Shari. *Professing & Pedagogy: Learning the Teaching of English.* Urbana: NCTE, 2005. Print. Refiguring English Studies.

Have, Paul. *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide.* 2nd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2007. Print.

Toohey, Kelleen, and Bonnie Waterstone. "Negotiating Expertise in an Action Research Community." *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning.* Ed. Bonny Norton and Kelleen Toohey. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 291–310. Print.

Tynjälä, Päivi. "Writing, Learning, and the Development of Expertise in Higher Education." *Writing as a Learning Tool: Integrating Theory and Practice.* Ed. Päivi Tynjälä, Lucia Mason, and Kirsti Lonka. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001. 37 Päivi 56. Print. Studies in Writing. 7.

van Dijk, Teun A., ed. *Discourse as Social Interaction.* London: SAGE, 1997. Print.

Van Manen, Max. *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy.* Albany: SUNY Press, 1990. Print. SUNY Ser. in the Philosophy of Education. Print.

—. *The Tact of Teaching: The Meaning of Pedagogical Thoughtfulness.* Albany: SUNY P, 1991.

Waldo, Mark L. "Inquiry as a Non-Invasive Approach to Cross-Curricular Writing Consultancy." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 1.3 (1996): 6–22. Web. 12 Apr. 2012. http://wac.colostate.edu/llad/#1.3.

Werder, Carmen. "Rhetorical Agency: Seeing the Ethics of It All." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 24.1–2 (2000): 7–26. Print.

White, Edward M. "Use It or Lose It: Power and the WPA." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 15.1–2 (1991): 3–12. Print.

APPENDIX A

Questions for Self-Inventory

Participants

About Self (writing specialist)
What are my circumstances (personal, professional)?

(How) are these likely to influence my engagement in the project?

How do I feel about this project (excited, nervous, unprepared, frustrated, wary)?

Which of my identity characteristics (age, race, gender, etc.) might come into play during this project? Why/how?

What expertise do I have to contribute to this project?

About Colleague

What do I know about the disciplinary-content expert's (personal, professional) circumstances?

(How) are they likely to influence his/her engagement with the project?

Which of his/her identity characteristics (age, race, gender, etc.) might come into play during this project? Why/how?

What expertise does this person have to contribute to the project?

Subject Matter

What do I know/believe about (teaching) writing?

What do I know about my colleague's discipline (content, conventions, etc.)?

Where does that knowledge come from?

What are my goals for the project? Why?

Context

In what context (institutional, programmatic, departmental) will our project take place?

What other stakeholder expectations should we consider as we move forward?

What aspects of our context are likely to enable or constrain progress?

Appendix B

Questions for Collaborative Inquiry

Participants

What are we learning about each other as our project evolves?

(How) are our individual circumstances impacting our work together?

Do we need to adjust expectations, roles, or responsibilities based on that impact?

What identity characteristics are impacting our relationship/project?

Do we need to adjust our behavior or goals given the impact?

What kind of expertise is each of us contributing to the project?

Are there different or additional dimensions of expertise we could draw on?

Subject Matter

(How) are we experiencing the relationship between writing and disciplinary content?

What assumptions about writing, disciplinary content, or their relationship are changing (or should change) as our project evolves?

What goals are we pursuing (individually and together)? Are the goals mutually beneficial? Do we need to revise our goals as the project evolves?

Are we making progress toward our goals?

Context

What aspects of our context are supporting our collaboration? The project?

How can we better capitalize on those aspects?

What aspects of our context are constraining our collaboration or limiting the project?

How can we work within or against those constraints?

Appendix C

Questions for Reflection for Transfer

Participants

What did we learn about each other and/or about working across disciplines during this project?

How did our identities and/or circumstances influence our interactions?

What kind of expertise did each of us contribute to the project?

Did we discover dimensions of expertise we hadn't anticipated?

Were there dimensions of expertise that went untapped? How come?

Subject Matter

What did we learn about writing through this project?

What did we learn about the discipline?

How did we learn what we learned through this project?

How does this new knowledge relate to what each of us (thought we) knew about writing and/or the discipline?

What does each of us want to remember to consider or do the next time we work on a CCL project?

Context

What aspects of our context supported our collaboration and the project?

(How) did we draw on those aspects? How might we draw on them in the future?

What aspects of our context constrained our collaboration or worked against the project?

(How) did we successfully challenge those aspects? How might we challenge them in the future?