

Brinthaupt, T. M., Otto, S., Cirillo-McCarthy, E., & Martin, J. (2021). How can CTLs create and support a culture of faculty writing? *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 13, 17-38.

How Can CTLs Create and Support a Culture of Faculty Writing?

Thomas M. Brinthaupt, Sheila Otto,
Erica Cirillo-McCarthy, & Jason Martin

If it falls within their goals and mission, Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTLs) are typically positioned to create and support a faculty writing culture. In this paper, we wish to add to the growing research on the role CTLs play in faculty success, with a specific focus on writing. In particular, we describe how we created, supported, and enhanced a faculty writing culture on our campus. Over a three-year period, we developed a variety of short- and longer-term writing initiatives designed to meet the needs and goals of our faculty members. We describe each of these initiatives, ways that we promote them, and how these activities contribute to our efforts to provide a supportive culture for faculty writers. We close with additional possibilities for CTLs to foster and sustain a culture of faculty writing.

Introduction

Because research and creative activity is an important job requirement for most faculty members, it is important that Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTLs) include programming that fosters a culture of faculty writing (Baldi et al., 2013; Sorcinelli et al., 2013). Whereas the primary mission of most CTLs is to support teaching and learning, there are compelling reasons for centers to extend support to other areas of faculty professional development. Support for faculty writing can have returns that are both extrinsic (tenure and promotion, public recognition) and intrinsic (job and personal satisfaction) (Baldi et al., 2013).

Our CTL, the Learning, Teaching, and Innovative Technologies Center (LT&ITC), is located at a regional, comprehensive university with around 19,500 undergraduate students and 2,200 graduate students. Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU), like many similar regional comprehensive uni-

versities, once focused heavily on teaching and is now trying to increase faculty research and scholarship. Reasons for this shift include increased tenure and promotion requirements and the desire for more grant funding. In this paper, we describe how we developed a multi-pronged program that has helped to develop and support faculty writing efforts.

Our endeavor to create a faculty writing culture has been mostly ad hoc and organic, growing out of a partnership between the CTL and the library to hold a faculty writing retreat. With the popularity of the writing retreat and faculty requests for more events dedicated to writing, research, and scholarship, we (Tom, Sheila, Erica, and Jason) leveraged not only existing CTL programs and events but also other writing and scholarship expertise around the campus in a bid to create, grow, and support a faculty culture of writing. This is not an officially recognized university committee with an official charge from the Provost or President; rather, we are a group of faculty members who saw a need on campus and worked to meet it. Our CTL served as the focal point for these efforts, as we identified and cultivated writing-related resources across our campus.

We—two CTL directors, the Writing Center Director, and the Interim Library Dean—leveraged our existing formal and informal partnerships to create and support a faculty writing culture on our campus that aims to increase the research and scholarly output of our faculty. The CTL and Writing Center are both located in the library. This arrangement has led to years of working together including CTL workshops on writing groups (Writing Center Director), effective writing practices (Writing Center Director and Interim Library Dean), improving student writing (Writing Center Director), and research support (various academic librarians). All three spaces are used to host events by the other two areas, and the CTL and library partnered to start the faculty writing retreats. We also consult with our campus's Writing Across the Curriculum director. Out of these activities came a more structured effort to use our skills, expertise, and what we were already doing to help faculty in their writing efforts.

The success of the programs discussed below—in terms of faculty participation and scholarly productivity—has led to recognition and support from the Provost's Office as well as the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, but this has mostly been a labor of love; and the results so far have been impressive considering the humble origins of the undertaking.

A Faculty Writing Culture

Most definitions of “culture” include reference to social norms and behaviors that occur within a particular context, group, or society (Baldwin et al., 2006). Cultures have an element of shared goals, values, and practices within a group, institution, or society. Thus, we speak of corporate, foreign, and popular culture. These meanings inform our views on what constitutes a “faculty writing culture.” Depending on the nature of one’s institution, a writing culture potentially encapsulates one part of the professional identity of a faculty member (Elbow & Sorcinelli, 2006).

Part of any PhD program is to acculturate students to a professional culture. This process involves not only what it means to be a biologist or a sociologist, but what it means to be a faculty member. The professional culture mixes with the organizational culture of the institution, defined as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions ... considered ... as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel” (Schein, 2004, p. 17). These cultures are reflected by the statement “That is how we do things around here.”

Past reviewers have noted that CTLs can bring about institutional culture change. For example, Eble and McKeachie (1985) argue that it is useful to think of the ways that faculty development programs (such as the one described here) can alter an institution’s culture. Kezar (2018) highlights strategies that CTLs can use to implement culture change at multiple levels of higher education institutions. Good evidence also indicates that faculty development programs focused on teaching effectiveness can improve an institution’s teaching and learning culture (e.g., Condon et al., 2016). In addition, CTL support of course redesign activities can enhance an institution’s efforts to create a culture of student success (Campbell & Blankenship, 2020). These examples show that culture change can be a successful direct or indirect goal of the work of CTLs.

The organizational culture of a college or university might focus predominately on teaching and service, predominately on research, or any mix in-between. Regardless of the institution or professional culture, faculty are still expected to write and publish, and CTLs can provide much valuable support for faculty, support that often cannot be found in other places on campus.

We define a faculty writing culture as the ways that CTLs (and institutions as a whole) acknowledge, encourage, support, recognize, and reward faculty writing. The first three elements of this definition are particularly relevant to the work of CTLs. Many institutions have mechanisms that recognize faculty writing (e.g., campus-wide author showcases, departmental lists

of recent publications) and reward that activity (e.g., university- or college-wide awards for outstanding research or creative activity). Our examination of a faculty writing culture and the ways that CTL can develop that culture focus mainly on the acknowledging, encouraging, and supporting features of this definition.

An important part of making a successful culture change is first learning about the current culture. To assess the existing culture at the beginning of our initiative, we examined levels of faculty interest in writing-related programming (e.g., participation in workshops), tracked suggestions that participants made about ways to enhance that programming (e.g., through open-ended comments on workshop or program evaluation forms), and drew upon data from our CTL needs assessment pertaining to writing support. As we moved forward, we early on publicized and promoted our “faculty writing culture” efforts. We noted in CTL invitations and announcements that specific programs or activities were “a part of the university’s initiative to create and support a culture of faculty writing. This initiative is a collaboration of the LT&ITC with the MTSU Library and the University Writing Center.” We hoped to acknowledge to faculty that our institution values productive writing and that our CTL provides writing-related resources and support for faculty of all ranks and statuses.

Faculty, Students, and Writing

To clarify the concept of a faculty writing culture, we also need to define what we mean by “writing.” Our definition is very broad and includes any product that results from faculty compositional activity. In other words, faculty writing includes things like research manuscripts, revisions and resubmissions, grant proposals, conference presentations, book reviews, book chapters, books, and many other kinds of creative products and activities.

Faculty writers, in particular junior faculty, face high stakes writing as it pertains to tenure requirements. It is in this context of high stakes faculty writing production that *Working with Faculty Writers* (Geller & Eodice, 2013) discusses faculty writing support. The authors in the edited collection detail models of best practices for establishing and supporting a culture of faculty writing across the institution. Just as importantly, the authors position faculty writing processes alongside student writing processes to strengthen the habits of mind necessary to maintain a publishing pipeline. Overall, the collection contributors see faculty writing support as a collaborative effort and

often connect multiple centers on campus to support faculty efforts: the writing center, the CTL, the library, and the writing program. We adopted this approach in creating a culture of faculty writing on our campus.

A dearth of official, organized support exists for faculty writers. Instead, faculty often seek out support unofficially by creating their own writing groups or writing partnerships. However, we have found that strategically creating such a culture with a broad array of options is very appealing to our faculty—we are providing something that gives them direction and guidance for their promotion and tenure requirements or other professional development goals. In addition, faculty have expressed their appreciation of being able to work alongside and get to know faculty outside of their department and college. Our programs offer not only a space for faculty to write but also support and guidance on goal setting and reflection. In other words, we model and reinforce practices that have been shown to be effective for faculty (Anson, 2013; Fraser & Little, 2013).

There is a modest literature on educational development programs designed to support faculty members' writing for publication (e.g., Zuidema et al., 2019). However, most of those programs are not as broad and comprehensive as the kind of culture change that we have attempted. Across programs, a common element is to recruit senior faculty members who serve as mentors and role models by sharing their writing and scholarly productivity experiences with junior faculty members. For example, Eodice and Cramer (2002) created a year-long faculty writing support program that includes monthly meetings and addressing a variety of topics. Moore et al. (2013) describe Faculty Writing Residences at Elon University—four-day, off-campus, immersive retreats, where faculty write and receive detailed feedback about their scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) projects.

The University of Massachusetts Amherst's Center for Teaching and Faculty Development offers an extensive continuum of services and support, ranging from a dedicated library space for faculty writing to summer writing fellowships (Baldi et al., 2013). Gray et al. (2018) designed a "publish and flourish" program that requires daily writing, reporting minutes of writing in a spreadsheet that is visible to all program participants, and weekly feedback from peers. Some academic libraries have attempted to create a culture of writing and research, especially for pre-tenured faculty. These efforts typically include writing groups, research groups, writing communities, and book discussion groups (Ackerman et al., 2018; Campbell et al., 2011; Stephens et al., 2011; Tysick & Babb, 2006; Wilkinson, 2013).

In summary, the creation and support of a faculty writing culture is a complicated and multifaceted venture that includes considerations of time, funding, and expertise. Because all institutions have the goal of successful student and faculty writing, culture change best occurs when all relevant stakeholders participate in the process, ideally in an organized and strategic manner.

Ways to Acknowledge, Encourage, and Support a Faculty Writing Culture

In this section, we highlight the different programs and activities developed by our CTL. Many of these activities are things that other CTLs might offer. Like others, we “argue against the idea that any single project or initiative can effect the types of change we value in faculty writer productivity” (Banks & Finchbaugh, 2013, p. 229). However, we have tried to initiate and manage these various approaches through a faculty writing culture focus. Thus, when we announce the various faculty writing programs or activities, we frequently note that these events are part of our campus’s concerted efforts to create and support a “culture of faculty writing.” Most of the features of these writing culture efforts emphasize the ways that we can acknowledge, encourage, and support faculty writing. In addition, faculty reflection is an integral part of the activities we have developed. Some of our programs help faculty understand “how” to be productive writers, and other initiatives provide opportunities for faculty to produce text. However, participation coupled with reflection is helping us build a culture of faculty writing on our campus. Table 1 provides a summary of these programs.

Culture of Faculty Writing Strategic Planning Committee

As we became more strategic in developing our faculty writing culture, we realized the need for a Culture of Faculty Writing Strategic Planning Committee. This committee is comprised of the LT&ITC’s Directors of Teaching Excellence and Faculty Development, the Associate Dean of the University Library, the Director of University Writing Center, our Writing Program Director, and the Director of our university’s Quality Enhancement Plan. This committee has been essential for fostering and enhancing our campus’s faculty writing culture, in large part through its ability to connect dif-

ferent campus services and programs, understand their perspectives, and give voice to the relevant stakeholders.

<p>Table 1 Fostering a Faculty Writing Culture</p>
--

Event/Program	Frequency	Length	Benefits
Strategic Planning Committee	Ongoing	1-2 meetings per academic term	Connect different campus services and programs and give voice to relevant stakeholders
Faculty Writing Retreats	Three times a year, between academic terms	Two full days (8:30 a.m.-4:00 p.m.)	Sustained writing; building a community of scholars; building partnerships and collaboration
Mini-Writing Retreats	Occasional, during academic term	4-6 hours	Sustained writing; building a community of scholars; building partnerships and collaboration
Faculty Writing Themed Workshops	Several times throughout the academic year	60 minutes	Increase knowledge about best practices and resources; build confidence and enthusiasm; provide opportunities for collaboration
Write-on-Site Writing Groups	Weekly	90 minutes	Regular “sacred” writing time for faculty away from their offices in a distraction-free space

Writing-Focused Faculty Learning Communities	Yearly	Monthly meetings during fall and spring terms	Build a community of scholars; provide opportunities for collaboration
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Focus	Ongoing and on-demand	Varies	Provide assessment, research design, statistical, and writing consultation
New Faculty Orientation	Yearly	Beginning of academic year	Awareness of campus's committee to faculty success and productivity
Faculty Book Groups	Several times throughout the semester	Three meetings of 60 minutes each	Increase knowledge about best practices, building a community of scholars

Faculty Writing Retreats

Writing retreats or boot camps are a popular means for encouraging and supporting faculty writing efforts (e.g., Swaggerty et al., 2011). Kornhaber et al. (2016) found that writing productivity in retreats is facilitated by the provision of protected time and space, the emergences of a sense of community and collegiality, improvements in academic writing skills, increased writing confidence and motivation, and support from the institution. Our goal was to create a series of faculty writing retreats that capitalized on these benefits.

We offer two-day faculty writing retreats during semester breaks (i.e., a week or so after the spring semester ends and two weeks before the fall and spring semesters begin). We hold the retreats in our campus's main library, which is typically quiet and not particularly busy during those times. The retreats provide participants with a time and space for up to 11 hours of writing-related work. Faculty can work individually or in groups by using the library's ample space or by reserving study rooms that are equipped with computers.

We found the retreats to be a particularly effective way to leverage our campus expertise. For example, during the retreats, we have offered 20-minute workshops on how to find a book publisher (hosted by faculty who have published multiple books), how to manage the revise and resubmit process (hosted by faculty who have served on journal editorial boards), and how to be a more productive writer (hosted by highly productive writers from a variety of disciplines). These offerings provide the additional benefit of encouraging faculty to reflect on their processes and identities as writers, while they are actively planning and implementing their writing goals.

The retreats have been very successful and popular with the faculty. For example, we cap attendance at retreats at 40 participants, and that cap is typically reached within a few days of the announcement going out. We provide morning refreshments and lunch on both days. During the lunch period, we supplement the retreat with brief mini presentations on writing and time management topics. Funding for these events is manageable (around \$1000 USD), which is provided by the LT&ITC, our Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, and the University Library on a rotating “sponsor” basis.

A related option is a writing mini retreat. This event can occur on a monthly or bimonthly basis during the academic year. It might last four to six hours on a single day. We have offered a mini retreat once, but we had limited faculty interest and participation. We are in the process of tweaking this option, by considering the best days of the semester and the weeks when faculty might be most inclined to participate. We suspect that semester timing (e.g., avoiding mid-term and final exam periods) might be an important factor in finding the ideal times for this kind of event.

Faculty Writing Themed Workshops

There are many possible topics for writing-themed workshops for faculty (e.g., Faery, 1993; Smith & Leppma, 2017; Soven, 1998). For several years, our CTL has offered faculty workshops that address research and writing. Among our workshop topics are the following: forming and facilitating effective faculty writing groups, developing the mindset and practices for research and scholarship, conducting and publishing a SoTL project, developing and maintaining successful research collaborations, and developing interdisciplinary research and writing partnerships. We have also partnered with our campus Data Science Institute to offer workshops that encourage and facilitate interdisciplinary research collaborations, particularly big data

research projects. Some of our workshops include a “speed dating” component, where faculty can meet others with similar goals and writing practices. These workshops are typically an hour in length, and we offer several of them on a yearly basis. During the 2017-2019 academic years, approximately 200 faculty members participated in these workshops. We also record the presentations and add them to our workshop video archive YouTube channel.

Weekly Writing Groups

Researchers have shown that writing groups can be an effective way to foster a faculty research culture and increase faculty productivity (e.g., Faery, 1993; Hoelscher, 2011; Johnson et al., 2017; Lee & Boud, 2003). For several years, our CTL has offered weekly 90-minute writing groups in the CTL’s space during the fall, spring, and summer terms. The writing group format follows a “write-on-site” model--participants work only on their own projects and use the weekly time for their own purposes. There is no reading of or comments on other participants’ work. This model does not appeal to all faculty members, but there is a subset of 15-20 faculty who regularly participate in and benefit from these groups.

The weekly groups provide a regular time and place for writing that participants view as locked in and “sacred” (like their schedule for teaching a class). This program seems to work best for people who can benefit from the structure of a regular weekly writing period and the support associated with that period. All participants are encouraged to keep a log of their writing activities. We offer the groups as a separate location for writing, which takes faculty members away from their offices and the distractions that are likely to occur there.

To complement the writing retreats and weekly writing groups, we add all participants to a “course” through our learning management system. This course hosts a large collection of writing-related resources, including a link to submit weekly writing logs (for writing groups), as well as a folder of comics about writing and short videos (e.g., kittens, puppies, and penguins) for mood enhancement. We also encourage participants to take advantage of the discussion area. In this area, we have topics such as a goals and accomplishments file, maintaining writing momentum during the semester, how to set and meet deadlines, and writing during social distancing. We also created a “Resources for Writing and Research While Working from Home” module that includes links to articles on faculty writing, work-life balance

tips, and blog posts (from one of the campus's prolific book authors) on starting a book project and navigating the book contract process.

We also encourage and support (e.g., through workshops and by offering our CTL's space) discipline-specific and traditional writing groups in which participants review each other's work and serve as accountability checkers for their writing efforts (Schick et al., 2011; Skarupski & Foucher, 2018). These writing groups usually operate independently from our CTL and function at the college or departmental level. Thus, there is little, or no, time and effort associated with their management for our CTL.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, when our library and CTL spaces were closed, we were still able to offer our writing retreats (as four-day events) and weekly writing groups in a virtual format. Because we already had our online writing group "course," it was easy for us to transition to virtual meetings. With both the retreats and weekly groups, we begin each day with an optional Zoom meeting where faculty can check in, say hello, give updates, and talk about their goals. Continuing these programs has allowed us to provide the benefits of organized writing times for our faculty, even though these Zoom sessions lack some of the advantages of the face-to-face meetings we held in the physical space of our library or CTL. Offering these writing opportunities has also kept our CTL on the "radar" of our faculty who may be struggling with their writing during unusual and uncertain times.

Writing-Focused Faculty Learning Communities

There is a modest literature on the ways that faculty learning communities (FLCs) can foster faculty writing (e.g., Francis et al., 2017; Richlin & Cox, 2004). By including collaborators and friendly supporters in the writing process, faculty can be much more successful and prolific in their writing endeavors.

Our developing culture of faculty writing supports such efforts at making the writing process a collaborative, more successful, less painful endeavor. At our institution, most of the ideas and proposals for FLCs come from our faculty in response to an annual call. As part of this process, we occasionally receive and support proposals that are devoted to effective faculty writing. Among the FLCs we have funded and coordinated in the past that address aspects of faculty research and writing are "Writing in the College of Business" and an "Interdisciplinary Faculty Learning Community." These FLCs consist of 8-10 members who meet once a month during the academic year.

We have had an FLC devoted to the works-in-progress collaborative idea. This FLC follows in the tradition of and augments the popular Faculty Writing Groups and Writing Retreats. In contrast to our concurrent writing groups, in which faculty are given a quiet place and writers work independently but simultaneously on their projects, in this facilitated works-in-progress FLC, faculty interacted with each other, set writing goals, and subsequently read and responded to each other's writing projects. Such organic opportunities for developing faculty collaboration are focal in supporting and growing a culture of writing through FLCs.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Focus

Another way that our CTL supports our faculty writing culture is through our advocacy for a SoTL focus (Hutchings et al., 2011). Some CTL have created faculty writing retreats and residencies for SoTL projects (e.g., Felten et al., 2009). Others have argued for ways to incorporate SoTL projects into the culture of research-oriented universities (e.g., Asarta et al., 2018). For faculty whose research focus is not on teaching and learning, SoTL projects provide them with a publication option that they can use to supplement their disciplinary writing. We make this emphasis explicit through our communications and workshop offerings. We also encourage all our FLCs to include a SoTL component.

New Faculty Orientation

Another facet of our faculty writing culture efforts is to highlight the availability of our various programs as part of the New Faculty Orientation program (Sorcinelli et al., 2009). We address writing in two workshops for new faculty. Our CTL has an hour with new hires early in the fall term. During that meeting, we include a section on the ways that we acknowledge, encourage, and support faculty writing. Experienced faculty who have participated in our faculty writing programs give personal "testimonials" about the benefits of involvement. Describing these programs allows us to "plant a seed" with new faculty as they are learning to adjust to their new job and to juggle their teaching, research, and service responsibilities.

A second workshop for new faculty, held during the spring semester and conducted by our Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, outlines other campus resources available to faculty, including grant writing work-

shops and proposal consultations. Anecdotally, we frequently receive comments from the new faculty about their appreciation for these writing culture efforts. These comments likely reflect, at least in part, the anxieties and difficulties new (as well as more seasoned) faculty have in balancing their teaching, research, and service responsibilities (Pope-Ruark, 2017).

Faculty Book Groups

Another feature of our faculty writing culture efforts is offering book groups that focus on faculty writing. Most of our book groups meet three times over a month for one hour per session, during which a facilitator guides eight to 10 participants through a discussion of the chosen book. Book groups are very popular on our campus, with most groups filling within minutes of being advertised. Some groups continue to meet informally after the scheduled meetings have been completed.

Whereas many of our CTL book groups focus on teaching practices, we also have groups that read and discuss books on effective academic writing. Books on writing that are likely to appeal to faculty members include: Robert Boice's *Professors as Writers*; Elizabeth Rankin's *The Work of Writing*; Anne Lamott's *Bird by Bird*; Ralph Fletcher's *Breathing In, Breathing Out: Keeping a Writer's Notebook*; Stephen King's *On Writing*; and Natalie Goldberg's *Writing Down the Bones*. The Writing Center Director and Interim Library Dean led a faculty book group on Boice's *Professors as Writers*. The eight faculty members in this group represented most of the colleges across the university. (A second book group could have been convened from the waiting list.) The group met three times during an academic term and worked through hands-on activities and held lively discussions on how to balance teaching, writing, and service. It also examined some of the best ways to overcome the common emotional, motivational, and time management obstacles between faculty and a completed manuscript. The success of the book group spawned a well-attended and highly rated workshop on faculty writing best practices that was based on Boice's book and book group participant feedback and reflections.

Other Ways CTLs Can Foster a Culture of Faculty Writing

Although we are pleased with the fruits of our efforts thus far to create a faculty writing culture, there are still many other activities we might con-

sider. For example, Pifer et al. (2014) describe a faculty scholarship symposium. At these meetings, faculty provided updates on their scholarly work and discussed their goals for the coming weeks.

Although we have not yet explored ways to support the writing efforts and scholarly preparation of graduate students, we think this is another area where our writing culture could expand. Although we include teaching preparation as part of our “preparing future faculty” programming, we have not yet focused on ways to facilitate productive writing habits for graduate students. CTLs might consider whether the creation of a “faculty writing center” is a realistic option. Such a center could include writing mentors, reviewing services, writing coaches, etc.

Many of our faculty have voiced their appreciation for these efforts, not simply because it gives them focused time to write but because it helps them connect with their colleagues to create support groups and a community of scholars on campus. We have heard anecdotally that faculty participants in these activities have started their own writing groups or similar efforts/activities in their departments or colleges to support their colleagues and create a writing culture. These groups reflect our CTL’s “bottom-up” approach to culture change, which is in part a reflection of our limited staff and resources.

To improve our writing-related programs and activities, we typically ask our workshop, retreat, book group, and writing group participants if there are other ways that we can support our faculty writing culture. For example, in our post-retreat evaluation survey, we include the following open-ended question: “During this Retreat, we talked about our efforts to create a ‘Culture of Faculty Writing’ at MTSU. Do you have any ideas on how we can meet this goal?” Responses to this question have been very helpful in identifying new workshop topics and additional writing-related titles for our book groups. In other words, our approach has been to rely on our faculty to reflect upon the usefulness of our writing culture programming and to identify gaps in our efforts. Our culture change efforts, once again, reflect a “bottom-up” rather than a “top-down” approach. Our CTL staff and the members of our strategic planning committee solicit and implement additions to our writing culture activities that come primarily from our faculty.

Another possibility is the development of a formal “writing plan” template modeled after professional development plans. A detailed and extensive writing plan (e.g., based on time management skills, productive writing best practices, goal-setting, monitoring of progress, and consultation with a senior mentor) might be useful for addressing the writing challenges that faculty members face.

One possible new direction for our institution is to expand and diversify our types of faculty writing groups. Our strategic planning committee has also considered a “faculty day of writing,” perhaps in conjunction with the National Council of Teachers of English initiative called The National Day on Writing held each October. We have advertised this event to our campus community, but we have not yet developed specific programming to align with it. Another possibility is to participate in and organize events around the Academic Writing Month program (Khoo, 2016), held annually during the month of November.

We have also considered developing a type of virtual writing and support group. One option is using social media platforms such as Facebook (Scott et al., 2019). Finally, because our university employs many contingent faculty, we should consider how to support the research and writing goals of non-tenured instructors. Guglielmo and Gaillet (2013) note that professional development opportunities for contingent faculty can often lead to scholarly publications, particularly in the SoTL area.

When other CTLs want to enhance their faculty writing culture, the impetus for that culture change needs to be considered carefully. For example, we wonder whether our ad hoc/organic efforts might be more effective if we had first obtained the explicit support of and blessing from upper administration (e.g., Deans and Provost). CTLs might be able to do more and have more of an influence in establishing and improving a faculty writing culture with the support of higher ups. On the other hand, the “bottom up” approach we employed may have its advantages (e.g., greater faculty buy-in when they are not pressured to participate).

CTLs also need to consider whether developing faculty as writers falls within their mission. We realize that there are unique institutional features and histories that will inform this decision. Although our CTL’s primary role is to advance best teaching practices, we also see faculty writing as an important part of professional development and success. Because our Office of Research and Sponsored Programs mainly provides support for internal and external research and funding opportunities, we felt that our CTL could complement their efforts while also fulfilling our mission to support faculty professional development.

Evidence of Writing Culture Effectiveness

As we reflect on potential indicators of the effectiveness of our efforts, the strategic planning committee realized that we need to keep better records of

attendance at events and conduct more thorough assessment of those events, particularly with respect to perceptions of and shifts in our institution's writing culture. Part of the difficulty here is defining "writing culture." We are considering aspects that include faculty perceptions of institutional support for writing, awareness of our CTL's efforts to facilitate effective writing, the extent to which writing support has filtered down to the college and department levels, and objective metrics tapping participants' writing goals and outcomes. Unfortunately, we did not directly assess these features prior to starting our faculty writing culture initiative. Thus, we are unable to compare faculty data from before the initiative with current perceptions or productivity.

There are some options we might pursue to assess better our culture change efforts. We could, for example, compare the writing productivity of frequent participants in our writing-related programming to their departmental colleagues who have not taken advantage of those activities. Such an approach is problematic, since we cannot control who does and does not participate in our programs, resulting in potential selection bias that would limit any conclusions we might want to make.

Another approach would be to compare whether participating in our activities has helped individual faculty to be more productive. However, these data would tell us more about the effectiveness of those activities than the broader question of institutional and CTL support for a writing culture. We could also assess the number of faculty participants in our programming who started their own writing groups or similar efforts/activities in their departments or colleges. These data would provide an indirect indication of the extent that our culture change efforts are spreading.

Although we have not surveyed our faculty regarding their perceptions of writing support and the culture of writing we are creating, we have post-participation data from the writing retreats. These surveys are anonymous, so we are unable to report on faculty characteristics of the respondents. However, faculty participants for the retreats typically come from all the university's colleges and most of the departments.

The post-retreat data (see Table 2) show that faculty are very positive about their experiences with the retreat, with ratings of all the items significantly above the scale midpoint. It is clear from these data that, at least for this program, we are doing a decent job of addressing faculty needs with respect to their writing activities. As noted earlier, these surveys have also provided us with a variety of fruitful responses to the open-ended question about other ways to enhance a faculty writing culture.

Table 2
Post-Participation Data from Faculty Writing Retreat Events

Measure	Mean	SD	t
I am happy with the amount of writing that I was able to complete during the retreat. (N = 177)	4.44	0.60	31.88
Overall, my time during the retreat was well-spent. (N = 177)	4.65	0.49	44.78
I was able to complete the major goal(s)/project(s) I had for this writing retreat. (N = 78)	4.12	0.82	11.99
I would participate in another writing retreat like this one in the future. (N = 177)	4.84	0.46	53.04
The library was a good place/space to hold the writing retreat. (N = 177)	4.86	0.36	67.72
The timing of the writing retreat worked well for me. (N = 177)	4.67	0.62	36.06

Note. Data from 7 retreats; ratings were based on 5-point Likert scales (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*); we compared means to the scale midpoint (3); all *ps* < .001.

Conclusion

We strive to provide programming that meets the needs of a broad range of faculty members of all ranks and statuses. We try to create opportunities

that are not discipline-specific, leaving those activities up to the relevant college or department (e.g., disciplinary writing groups). Our programs include sustained activities (e.g., strategic planning, FLCs), shorter-term writing events (e.g., workshops, weekly writing groups, book groups), intensive writing events (e.g., writing retreats), and on-demand support (SoTL consultations).

One of the interesting effects of our strategic efforts to support faculty writing is that faculty members attest to the usefulness of those efforts to their colleagues. Through word-of-mouth, there seems to be an increase in faculty awareness of the writing resources and opportunities we offer. In this way, a subtle shift in the writing culture on our campus has been occurring. A culture change is rarely brought about by fiat. Thus, we developed and implemented a range of activities both to encourage and support faculty writing, believing that ongoing participation in these activities, combined with reflection, can lead to a shift in culture. We now need to address ways to measure accurately and creatively our faculty's perceptions of our institution's writing culture.

References

- Ackerman, E., Hunter, J. & Wilkinson, Z.T. (2018). The availability and effectiveness of research supports for early career academic librarians. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(5), 553-568.
- Anson, C. (2013). Beyond the curriculum: Supporting faculty writing groups in WAC. In A. E. Geller & M. Eodice (Eds.), *Working with faculty writers* (pp. 21-37). University Press of Colorado.
- Asarta, C. J., Bento, R., Fornaciari, C. J., Lund Dean, K., Arbaugh, J. B., & Hwang, A. (2018). The scholarship of teaching and learning: Changing the dominant narrative about (and in) research institutions. *Journal of Management Education*, 42(6), 731-748.
- Baldi, B., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Yun, J. H. (2013). The scholarly writing continuum: A new program model for teaching and faculty development centers. In A. E. Geller & M. Eodice (Eds.), *Working with faculty writers* (pp. 38-49). University Press of Colorado.
- Baldwin, J. R., Faulkner, S. L., Hecht, M. L., & Lindsley, S. L. (Eds.). (2006). *Redefining culture: Perspectives across the disciplines*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Banks, W. P., & Finchbaugh, K. B. (2013). Experiencing ourselves as writers: An exploration of how faculty writers move from dispositions to iden

- tities. In A. E. Geller & M. Eodice (Eds.), *Working with faculty writers* (pp. 228-245). University Press of Colorado.
- Campbell, R., & Blankenship, B. B. (2020). Leveraging the power of course redesign for student success. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, 39(2). <https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0039.203>
- Campbell, K., Ellis, M. & Adebonojo, L. (2011). Developing a writing group for librarians: The benefits of successful collaboration. *Library Management*, 33(1-2), 14-21.
- Condon, W., Iverson, E., Manduca, C., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty development and student learning: Assessing the connections*. Indiana University Press.
- Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through faculty development: An analysis of effective programs and practices*. Jossey-Bass.
- Elbow, P., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2006). The faculty writing place: A room of our own. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38(6), 17-22. <https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.38.6.17-22>
- Eodice, M., & Cramer, S. (2002). Write on! A model for enhancing faculty publication. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 18(4), 113-121.
- Faery, R. B. (1993). Teachers and writers: The faculty writing workshop and writing across the curriculum. *WPA, Writing Program Administration*, 17(1-2), 31-42.
- Felten, P., Moore, J., & Strickland, M. (2009). Faculty writing residencies: Supporting scholarly writing and teaching. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 1, 39-55.
- Francis, D. M., Colbry, S. L., Hoyle, A. G., Ratmansky, L. A., Sheety, A. S., & Szpara, M. Y. (2017). Opting into a Faculty Scholarship Community: Benefiting productivity and personal well-being. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 31(3), 51-60.
- Fraser, G., & Little, D. (2013). Talking about writing: Critical dialogues on supporting faculty writers. In A. E. Geller & M. Eodice (Eds.), *Working with faculty writers* (pp. 73-92). University Press of Colorado.
- Geller, A. E., & M. Eodice, M. (Eds.). *Working with faculty writers*. University Press of Colorado.
- Gray, T., Madson, L., & Jackson, M. (2018). Publish & flourish: Helping scholars become better, more prolific writers. *To Improve the Academy*, 37, 243-256. doi:10.1002/tia2.20081

- Guglielmo, L., & Gaillet, L. L. (2013). Academic publication and contingent faculty: Establishing a community of scholars. In A. E. Geller & M. Eodice (Eds.), *Working with faculty writers* (pp. 210-227). University Press of Colorado.
- Hoelscher, K. (2011, January 28). Revising a writing group. *Inside Higher Ed*. Available at <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2011/01/28/revising-writing-group>
- Hutchings, P., Huber, M. T., & Ciccone, A. (2011). *The scholarship of teaching and learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact*. Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, L., Roitman, S., Morgan, A., & MacLeod, J. (2017). Challenging the productivity mantra: Academic writing with spirit in place. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(6), 1181–1193.
- Kezar, A. (2018). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Khoo, T. (2016). How my university runs Academic Writing Month (#acwrimo). *The Research Whisperer*. Available at <https://researchwhisperer.org/2016/10/25/how-my-university-runs-academic-writing-month-acwrimo/>
- Kornhaber, R., Cross, M., Betihavas, V., & Bridgman, H. (2016). The benefits and challenges of academic writing retreats: An integrative review. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(6), 1210-1227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1144572>
- Lee, A., & Boud, D. (2003). Writing groups, change and academic identity: Research development as local practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), 187-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507032000058109>
- Moore, J. L., Felten, P., & Strickland, M. (2013). Supporting a culture of writing: Faculty writing residencies as a WAC initiative. In A. E. Geller & M. Eodice (Eds.), *Working with faculty writers* (pp. 127-141). University Press of Colorado.
- Pifer, M., Reisboard, D., Staulters, M., Li, X., Gozza-Cohen, M., McHenry, N., Schaming, S., & Gilio, B. (2014). Finding the motivation: The evolution of a faculty scholarship symposium. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 28(1), 9-18.
- Pope-Ruark, R. (2017). *Agile faculty: Practical strategies for managing research, service, and teaching*. University of Chicago Press.
- Richlin, L., & Cox, M. (2004). Developing scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning through faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 97, 127–135. doi:10.1002/tl.139
- Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

- Schick, K., Hunter, C., Gray, L., Poe, N., & Santos, K. (2011). Writing in action: Scholarly writing groups as faculty development. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 3, 43-63.
- Scott, C. E., Ritter, N. L., Fowler, R. M., & Franks, A. D. (2019). Developing a community of academic writers: Using social media to support academic accountability, motivation, and productivity. *Journal of Literacy & Technology*, 20(2), 61-96.
- Skarupski, K. A., & Foucher, K. C. (2018). Writing Accountability Groups (WAGs): A tool to help junior faculty members build sustainable writing habits. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 32(3), 47-54.
- Smith, M. C., & Leppma, M. (2017). The manuscript completion workshop: Supporting professional development of tenure track faculty members. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 31(2), 43-48.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., Gray, T., & Birch, A. J. (2013). Faculty development beyond instructional development. In J. E. Miller & J. E. Groccia (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy* (Vol. 30, pp. 247-261). Jossey-Bass.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., Yun, J., & Baldi, B. (2009). *Mutual mentoring guide*. University of Massachusetts Institute of Teaching Excellence and Faculty Development. Available at <https://www.umass.edu/tefd/sites/default/files/2016-tefd-MM-2016-10-7.pdf>
- Soven, M. (1988). Beyond the first workshop: What else can you do to help faculty? *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 36, 13-20.
- Stephens, J., Sare, L., Kimball, R., Foster, M., and Kitchens, J. (2011). Tenure support mechanisms provided by the Faculty Research Committee at Texas A&M University Libraries: A model for academic libraries. *Library Management*, 32(8), 531-539.
- Swaggerty, E., Atkinson, T., Faulconer, J., & Griffith, R. (2011). Academic writing retreat: A time for rejuvenated and focused writing. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 25(1), 5-11.
- Tysick, C., & Babb, N. (2006). Perspectives on...writing support for junior faculty librarians: A case study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(1), 94-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2005.10.005>
- Wilkinson, Z. (2013). Rock around the (tenure) clock: Research strategies for new academic librarians. *New Library World*, 114(1), 54-66.
- Zuidema, L. A., Daichendt, G. J., & Fulcher, K. (2019). Supporting teaching faculty as scholars: A developmental model. *Christian Higher Education*, 18(1-2), 78-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15363759.2018.1543246>

Thomas M. Brinthaupt is Professor of Psychology and Director of Faculty Development in the Learning, Teaching, and Innovative Technologies Center at Middle Tennessee State University. He publishes often on the scholarship of teaching and learning and organizes the campus writing groups and retreats for faculty. He can be reached at Tom.Brinthaupt@mtsu.edu. **Sheila Otto** is Associate Professor of English and Director of Teaching Excellence in the LT&ITC at Middle Tennessee State University. She coordinates faculty workshops and book groups. She can be reached at Sheila.Otto@mtsu.edu. **Erica Cirillo-McCarthy** is an Assistant Professor of English and directs the Margaret H. Ordoubadian University Writing Center at Middle Tennessee State University. Her research has been published in *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, *the Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies*, and in multiple edited collections. She can be reached at erica.cirillo-mccarthy@mtsu.edu. **Jason Martin** is an independent scholar and researcher living in St. Petersburg, FL. In addition to his writings on leadership, he has organized faculty writing retreats, co-facilitated a book group on faculty writing, and co-presented a workshop on faculty writing. He can be reached at jasonmartin76@gmail.com.