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INTRODUCTION

Since 2000, faculty roles and responsibilities have changed profoundly, with new patterns in faculty appointments, expanding workloads, and greater pressure to seek funding and publish scholarly work (Gappa, Austin, and Trice 2007). These new demands heighten the need for flexible professional development opportunities so that faculty with different needs can succeed in a more complex workplace.

A large-scale study of the field of faculty development indicates that most teaching and learning centers focus on supporting faculty in their role as teachers (Sorcinelli, Austin, et al. 2006). At the same time, research shows that faculty members encounter challenges beyond teaching that, if not overcome, can hurt their productivity and stall their careers. In particular, women faculty commonly report that a lack of support for scholarly writing is a key obstacle to a successful academic career (Grant and Knowles 2000).

In response, some centers for teaching and faculty development have created scholarly writing programs. Typically, these programs offer structured writing retreats or writing groups, both of which receive high ratings (Ambos, Wiley, and Allen 2009; Elbow and Sorcinelli 2006; Gray and Birch 2001; Sorcinelli, Gray, and Birch 2011). In fact, most of the literature on the benefits of academic writing programs focuses on intensive, highly structured interventions (Dickson-Swift et al. 2009; Grant and Knowles 2000; Gray and Birch 2001; Moore 2003; Murray and Newton 2009; Swaggerty et al. 2011). What is largely absent from the literature is a framework for faculty to participate in their own needs, in a variety of times and

At the University of Massachusetts and Faculty Development (or intensive and comprehensive community to accommodate the diverse needs, brief discussion why supporting a teaching and/or faculty development into this arena, and We then describe the breadth for scholarly writing, which can create spaces and/or faculty development can better support and ratings of overall effectiveness of programs can better meet for contact, structure, and more scholarship.

THE CASE FOR SUPPORTING WRITING

The literature on faculty practice of writing has increasingly emphasized why writing is a key part of scholarly work (Mikhailova and Nilson 2007). Many studies suggest that writing effectively is a key part of successful scholarly work (Moore 2003). New faculty, for example, making their way beyond their doctoral dissertation or article often requires technical writing skills to navigate the publishing process at every career stage, findings that are true for women faculty, who may find themselves at home (Grant and Knowles 2011; Moore 2003). Though existing interventions, they can provide support (e.g., time and space, access to peer mentoring and
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The literature is a framework for scholarly writing programs that allows faculty to participate in their own development, according to their own needs, in a variety of times and formats.

At the University of Massachusetts Amherst’s Center for Teaching and Faculty Development (CTFD), we have developed an innovative and comprehensive continuum of writing programs designed to accommodate the diverse needs of our faculty. In this chapter, we briefly discuss why supporting scholarly writing is important, why some teaching and/or faculty development centers are extending their programming into this arena, and how they are designing their offerings. We then describe the breadth of our faculty development programs for scholarly writing, which range from low-commitment, low-interaction spaces where faculty can work on their writing to personal consultations and intensive writing groups that help faculty better understand and improve their approach to writing. Our participation rates and ratings of overall effectiveness suggest that customized writing programs can better meet faculty members’ unique needs and preferences for contact, structure, and commitment, and help them produce more scholarship.

**THE CASE FOR SUPPORTING SCHOLARLY WRITING**

The literature on faculty professional development offers compelling reasons to support faculty as writers. Many campuses are putting more emphasis on research, and reappointment, tenure, and promotion are increasingly linked to publications or successful grant writing (Mikhailova and Nilson 2007). At the same time, for many faculty, studies suggest that writing effectively and productively can be quite difficult. New faculty, for example, may have little experience with scholarly writing beyond their doctoral dissertations (Boice 2000). Publishing a book or article often requires technical as well as writing-related advice to navigate the publishing process (Dickson-Swift et al. 2009). For faculty at every career stage, finding time to write is a struggle. This is especially true for women faculty, who may have wider commitments at work and at home (Grant and Knowles 2000; Dickson-Swift et al. 2009; Misra et al. 2011; Moore 2003) Though faculty developers praise scholar-initiated writing interventions, they concur that faculty benefit from institutional support (e.g., time and space to write, formal structures and programs, access to peer mentoring and writing editors) that helps sustain scholarly writing habits (Elbow and Sorcinelli 2006; Gray and Birch 2001; Moore 2003; Sorcinelli, Gray, and Birch 2011).
Undoubtedly, strategic support for scholarly writing can enhance individual and institutional prestige. The extrinsic rewards for writing and publishing scholarly work are self-evident: reappointment, tenure and promotion, professional recognition, and salary or merit increases (Mikhailova and Nilson 2007). These rewards can extend to the institution because more and better publishing enhances institutional reputation. Studies, however, report that faculty members gain intrinsic rewards as well: greater career satisfaction, strengthened relationships with colleagues, and socialization into the larger academic culture (Boice 2000; Friend and Gonzalez 2009; Moore 2003; Washburn 2008). Ultimately, fostering a culture of support for scholarly writing can improve the academic workplace, ensuring a dynamic, supportive, and productive environment for faculty.

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR SCHOLARLY WRITING**

A review of recent faculty development literature on scholarly writing shows that colleges and universities most frequently offer structured, intensive writing retreats and writing groups. Seven studies described writing retreats, four that were sponsored by teaching and faculty development programs (Ambos, Wiley, and Allen 2009; Dickson-Swift et al. 2009; Elbow and Sorcinelli 2006; Moore 2003) and three by faculty, academic departments, or colleges (Grant and Knowles 2000; Murray and Newton 2009; Swaggerty et al. 2011). The design and implementation of writing retreats varied. Some were off-campus and residential, and others took place on campus during working hours. The retreats ranged in length from one day to five days, and their formats included periods of individual writing only, group writing only, or individual writing mixed with group sharing and discussion of manuscripts. A few retreats also included facilitation by a writing expert, editing consultation, or panel discussions by prolific faculty writers. Faculty-initiated writing retreats were generally small, with four to twelve participants, while retreats sponsored by teaching and faculty development centers tended to be larger, with as many as fifty participants (Elbow and Sorcinelli 2006; Swaggerty et al. 2011). Meals or refreshments provided not only sustenance, but also networking time (Dickson-Swift et al. 2009). Interestingly, in five of the seven structured writing retreats reviewed, the majority or all of the participants were women (the other two studies did not report the gender of participants). Women participants were more likely to report that they struggled with heavier workloads and family commitments that stood in the way of writing; they expressed concern about their writing productivity and desired support (Grant et al. 2009; Grant and Knowles 2000).

Assessments of writers’ retreats can help jump-start writing projects, interrupt blocks of time for writing with peers, and establish a community spirit. Faculty feedback suggests that faculty produced more and better work in these retreats than did participants attending regular writing workshops. Despite varied feedback, the momentum of the retreats and the community spirit they foster (Moore 2003; Swaggerty et al. 2011). Writing groups or “circles,” can be integrated into a larger workshop on writing productivity and faculty development. Writing groups, three sponsored by each sponsor and Birch 2001; Sorcinelli, Gray, and Allen 2009), two initiated by new and early-career faculty, and six faculty), meet on campus, for one to two hours each week to once each month, to share, critiquing drafts and provide feedback.

Perhaps the most successful writing retreats originated at New Mexico State University, among other campus and departmental writing workshops. The workshop, writing circles of four to six members, meet weekly for the rest of the semester, write daily and to get feedback on their work. Birch 2001; Sorcinelli, Gray, and Allen 2009).

Evaluations of structured writing retreats have shown that the noncompetitive atmosphere fosters a constructive and developmental process. Writing groups can also help faculty to schedule adequate time for committee work (Franke 2001; Frier et al. 2009) and also report significant increases in productivity and desired support (Grant et al. 2009; Grant and Knowles 2000).
For Scholarly Writing

The literature on scholarly writing has frequently offered structured groups. Seven studies described by teaching and faculty development (Allen 2009; Dickson-Swift et al. 2003) and three by faculty, academic support, and productivity and desired supportive networks of women (Dickson-Swift et al. 2009; Grant and Knowles 2000; Swaggerty et al. 2011).

Assessments of writers’ retreats indicated that such dedicated forums can help jump-start writing projects, provide needed space and uninterrupted blocks of time for writing, create opportunities for networking with peers, and establish a community of writers (Elbow and Sorcinelli 2006; Moore 2003; Murray and Newton 2009). There was also evidence that faculty produced more and better scholarship. At the same time, participants’ feedback suggested that their writing goals were often overly ambitious given the retreat timeframe, their needs as writers were too varied for a one-size-fits-all program, and they struggled to sustain the momentum of the retreat during the academic year (Ambos, Wiley, and Allen 2009; Moore 2003; Swaggerty et al. 2011).

Writing groups or “circles,” sometimes linked to or preceded by a workshop on writing productivity, also figure prominently in the literature of faculty development. We examined five recent articles on writing groups, three sponsored by teaching and learning centers (Gray and Birch 2001; Sorcinelli, Gray, and Birch 2011; Washburn 2008) and two initiated by new and early-career faculty themselves (Franke 2001; Friend and Gonzalez 2009). Like writers’ retreats, writers’ groups vary in design and implementation, although most groups are small (three to six faculty), meet on campus, follow a regular schedule (meeting once each week to once each month), and typically use the time to share writing drafts and provide feedback on one another’s manuscripts.

Perhaps the most successful model for structured writing groups originated at New Mexico State University’s teaching center and has been emulated at the faculty development center at Brigham Young University, among other campuses. Both centers regularly host a writing expert to conduct a half-day, on-campus writing workshop that encourages daily writing, record-keeping, and sharing writing with peers. After the workshop, writing circles of three or four faculty meet for one hour weekly for the rest of the semester to support one another’s efforts to write daily and to get feedback on what gets written each week (Gray and Birch 2001; Sorcinelli, Gray, and Birch 2011; Washburn 2008).

Evaluations of structured writers’ groups show that they offer a safe, noncompetitive atmosphere for writing, a view of writing as a collaborative and developmental process, and individual and group accountability. Writing groups can also help with time management—encouraging faculty to schedule adequate time for writing amidst teaching and committee work (Franke 2001; Friend and Gonzalez 2009). Several studies also report significant increases in productivity—in the frequency of
completion of writing projects, in accepted publications, and in progress made on larger works (Gray and Birch 2001; Washburn 2008). The chief limitation of structured writing groups appears to be the difficulty in sustaining them over time. Because of other work commitments, conference travel, and family vacations, attendance may be spotty, and writers may struggle to maintain the group’s commitment to a regular writing and feedback cycle (Washburn 2008).

STARTING WITH ASSESSMENT

Needs assessments can help centers identify their greatest assets and challenges, as well as solicit new ideas for programming (Sorcinelli 2002). In 2006, the CTFD conducted a needs assessment to better understand the ways in which the Center could support faculty across disciplines and career stages. The assessment consisted of an online survey, focus groups with faculty at every rank, and interviews with deans, chairs, and administrators. In response to the feedback collected, we began to expand our scholarly writing offerings in 2007 with two new programs, each offered during the summer. “Publish and Thrive” was an in-person group of pre-tenure faculty that met bi-weekly with a local writing coach, while “Start Your Summer Write” was a wholly online month-long group, also comprised of pre-tenure faculty, led by a nationally-known writing coach. Originally, our intention was to compare summative feedback from both pilot groups to determine which one should continue the following year. However, we learned that faculty appreciated and benefitted from different aspects of the two programs due to their own unique work habits, writing challenges, career stages, and career advancement scenarios (e.g., plans for tenure, sabbatical, and promotion).

The data collected from our needs assessment and pilot programs drew our attention to the growing demand for not only more writing opportunities, but also a flexible range of opportunities that could accommodate the diversity of needs, interests, challenges, and preferences of faculty from our university’s eighty-eight departments and nine schools and colleges. Some faculty, for example, wanted to improve their productivity by discussing their writing habits and progress on their projects in small accountability groups. Others simply wanted a quiet space where they could work on their manuscripts.

As a result, we expanded our offerings over time to create a continuum of scholarly writing programs that takes into consideration the three design features most often requested by faculty:

1. Preferences for contact (e.g., writing fellowships).
2. Preferences for commitments (e.g., writing fellowships).
3. Preferences for structured writing groups

Figure 2.1 shows the continuum of the varying degrees to which commitment, and structure.
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1. Preferences for contact (e.g., solo, one-on-one, writing group).
2. Preferences for commitment (e.g., one-time retreat, intensive, online writing fellowship).
3. Preferences for structure (e.g., unmediated writing space, highly structured writing groups).

Figure 2.1 shows the continuum of programs we have developed, and the varying degrees to which those programs offer personal contact, commitment, and structure.

Each opportunity on the continuum is carefully designed to address the varying programming preferences of our faculty while also maximizing faculty time and campus resources. Not every program is right for everyone, but somewhere along the continuum is a scholarly writing opportunity or combination of opportunities that can meet the needs of most interested faculty. What follows is a brief description of each offering, in order of degree of faculty contact, commitment, and structure, followed by an assessment of effectiveness through faculty participation rates and/or faculty’s qualitative and quantitative evaluations.

CONTINUUM OF OPPORTUNITIES

- Faculty Writing Place (individual activity, low commitment, unstructured): Cosponsored by our Center and the campus library, the Faculty Writing Place is a quiet, comfortable, fully-wired common space for
faculty, based on the notion that writing may be a solitary activity, but writers do not need to isolate themselves to get things done. Tucked away in a corner of the library, the room provides faculty with space to review research materials, sort through notes, start a new manuscript, or revise an existing one. It is equipped with comfortable tables and chairs, a computer and printer, a dry erase board, reference books, and writing supplies. Faculty members share the space with colleagues pursuing the same goals, and sometimes use it as a meeting place for team writing sessions. The most important aspect of the Faculty Writing Place—the focus provided by the room itself—can be replicated on many campuses at minimal cost simply by identifying a room that can be designated for faculty writing.

- Mini Writing Retreats (group activity, medium commitment, low structure): Our writing retreats have evolved over the years from offering formal writing workshops to offering time and space to help faculty work on their scholarly writing. Though the Faculty Writing Place is great for faculty who are self-motivated and require only a quiet location in which to work, some faculty find it more productive to attend scheduled writing sessions. For these writers, the CTFD offers three Mini Retreats each semester, each held in the Teaching Commons on the top floor of our campus library. Mini Retreats provide a more defined structure for writing and the shared sense of purpose afforded by a group of peers working together in proximity. Although a CTFD staff member and a Teaching Commons student worker are on site to make sure everything goes smoothly—e.g., greeting faculty, helping them get settled, passing out tickets redeemable for refreshments and light snacks at the ground floor café, and remaining available to address concerns over the course of the day—faculty frequently mention that the value of Mini Retreats is the structure they provide. A space with a regular, well-publicized schedule of dedicated writing days provides both consistency and momentum for faculty writers and their various projects.

- Writing Retreats (group activity, medium commitment, medium structure): For the past twenty years, the CTFD has hosted an Annual Faculty Writing Retreat at the end of the academic year. Originally codesigned with a noted writing professor who served as a faculty associate to our Center, the annual retreat encourages faculty to begin their summer with a full day of generative writing in an environment free from the pressures of their normal routines. As such, the annual retreat is held offsite at a proximate, affordable and quiet conference center overlooking a stream. The day begins with a brief ten-minute welcome, after which faculty set to work on their projects. A separate room is available for collaborative work. Participants gather at lunch to discuss their process, products, and plans. The CTFD also offers full-day writing retreats in August and January so faculty can make progress on their scholarly projects before the semester begins and their schedules become crowded. We advertise these retreats as opportunities to plan the semester, fine-tune syllabi, and put the finishing touches on writing projects working which, like the Mini Retreats, are in the Teaching Commons, feature a bag lunch discussion about the craft of writing on projects. Although the details sometimes from year to year, they over winter and summer breaks are our faculty’s productivity pattern.

- Professional Development Workshops (group activity, high commitment, high structure): The CTFD medium commitment, medium has complemented our writing professional development workshops in focused ways. For example, presentations on the academic dissertation into a book, and sharing about writing projects with pre-tenure diversity and development has faculty on writing productivity and job satisfaction. Similarly, a packet of presentations on time management and faculty writers. The CTFD typically a year and often shares sponsors.

- Summer Online Writing Fellowship (high commitment, high structure): Studies show that faculty who engage in chart their progress, and share. Taking this research into consideration, we offer a month-long summer online writing fellowship program. Fellows established online written progress online, regularly peer in the program, and tend to meet other participants through an in-person mid-month consultation. The fellowship has led to the formation of small groups of faculty writers, who opt to operate online or in the fall, we host a summer retreat.

- List of Professional Editors (individual commitment, high structure): Finally, the CTFD professional editors and coach can provide scholarly writing assistance. They offer a range of services, including proofreading, editing, and manuscript preparation. The website to further ensure that the Fellows refers writers to a helpful online source of Virginia’s Teaching Resources, or coach. Faculty generally pay for these services.
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- Professional Development Workshops (group and individual activity, medium commitment, medium structure): In recent years, the CTFD has complemented our writing spaces and retreats with a range of professional development workshops that support the writing process in focused ways. For example, an author and editor has given presentations on the academic publishing market and converting a dissertation into a book, and she has held individual consultations about writing projects with pre-tenure faculty. A consultant on faculty diversity and development has led workshops for pre- and post-tenure faculty on writing productivity as it relates to career advancement and job satisfaction. Similarly, a productivity consultant has given campus presentations on time management, an extremely important topic to faculty writers. The CTFD typically brings in one external speaker per year and often shares sponsorship and expenses with other units.

- Summer Online Writing Fellowships (group activity, high commitment, high structure): Studies indicate that faculty produce more scholarly writing when they engage in brief, daily writing sessions, chart their progress, and share their work with others (Boice 2000). Taking this research into consideration, the CTFD has offered a month-long summer online writing program administered by two local writing coaches and experienced instructors. As part of the program, Fellows established concrete summer writing goals, tracked their writing progress online, received online guidance from a coach and peers in the program, and interacted with the writing coach and other participants through an in-person kick-off meeting and/or a mid-month consultation. The success of these online writing groups has led to the formation of smaller, self-directed groups that continue to operate online (at a minimal expense to faculty) after the end of the fellowships.

- List of Professional Editors (individual activity, high commitment, high structure): Finally, the CTFD maintains on its website a list of professional editors and coaches for faculty who want personalized scholarly writing assistance. Profiles for the editors include education credentials, relevant work experience, areas of expertise and interest, services offered, preferred work process, and rates. All editors submit three faculty references, which we check before adding them to the website. To further ensure productive work relationships, the CTFD refers writers to a helpful online tip sheet, authored by the University of Virginia’s Teaching Resource Center, on how to choose an editor or coach. Faculty generally pay for editorial and coaching work using
some combination of start-up funds, small research or faculty development grants, or their own personal resources. Faculty have successfully used the list of professional editors to fine-tune grant proposals, journal articles, book chapters, and full-length manuscripts. A list of editors requires occasional updating but otherwise is an inexpensive and valuable resource for faculty.

OUTCOMES AND IMPLICATIONS
Perhaps the most telling outcome of our scholarly writing continuum is that faculty show up in droves for every program we try, and they eagerly suggest more and more possible offerings. From 2007 to 2011, the programs across the continuum have drawn over 823 non-unique participants, 98 percent of whom were faculty, department chairs, or deans (the other 2 percent were professional staff or graduate students). As mentioned, the faculty development literature indicates that scholarly writing programs are particularly helpful for female faculty (Dickson-Swift et al. 2009; Grant and Knowles 2000), and our participation numbers certainly reflect this assertion. Notably, from 2007 to 2011, 68 percent of the participants in our scholarly writing programs have been women, whereas women as a whole constitute 41 percent of UMass Amherst’s instructional faculty. In addition, faculty of color have comprised 28 percent of our program participants, whereas faculty of color as a whole constitute 19 percent of our instructional faculty (University of Massachusetts Amherst, Office of Institutional Research 2012). Interestingly, we have discovered that scholarly writing programs do not appeal only to pre-tenure faculty who need to establish productive writing habits to attain tenure. More than 36 percent of our participants have been associate and full professors, a strong indication that scholarly writing programs can engage, encourage, and support faculty across all ranks.

We designed the assessment of our programs to reflect the individual character of each offering and, in most cases, the position of the offering along our continuum. For low-commitment, low-structure programs, we collect comments informally or through suggestion boxes. For more structured events and programs—such as large writing retreats, professional development workshops, and online writing groups—we conduct a standard survey. Since 2007, the overall satisfaction rating of our annual faculty writing retreat has never dropped below 4.74 on a 5-point scale, and it has reached a high of 4.97, making it one of our Center’s most popular programs. Participants in our “From Dissertation to Book” and “Mechanics of Publishing” workshops, when asked the degree to which the events were “informative,” rated them as 4.28 and 4.78 on a 5-point scale. Student scores for our Summer Online Faculty Writing Workshops have been higher than 4.21 on a 5-point scale. For the most part, though, the scores were significantly higher, reaching a high of 4.76. Faculty members who have attended these programs include scholars, professional writers, and experts in the field of scientific writing. The response to our scholarly writing programs has been universally positive, but our effort to build on each year’s program must also consider the unique needs of each group and for the faculty developers. For example, with a program, there is inevitable participation, even with a different assortment of participants. Even so, they can choose the program that best fits their needs. We observed that a multi-faceted program must be maintained against equipment issues such as noise problems. A calendar of events, for example, must consider multiple audiences. In short, for us, the program must be a continuum of work. As with all programs, we have had a particular interest in the program’s effect on the decision to pursue tenure in the academic environment. Finally, because we are not in the business of promoting our own faculty members, we have a particular interest in the impact of our programs on the faculty’s career. Our annual writing retreat is a great opportunity for on-campus faculty members and their research partners. One of our goals is to encourage the participation of underrepresented groups, including students and faculty members from minority backgrounds. We have also developed a series of workshops and retreats that focus on specific areas of research, such as qualitative and quantitative research methods, as well as grant writing and publishing. We have also collaborated with other institutions and organizations to expand the reach of our programs. We have been able to leverage our resources to reach a broader audience, and we have been able to develop partnerships with other organizations to provide additional support for our participants. Overall, the success of our scholarly writing programs has been due to our commitment to providing high-quality, engaging, and relevant programs that meet the needs of our faculty members and students. We have been able to achieve this through our collaborations, partnerships, and willingness to adapt to the changing needs of our participants.
which the events were “informative and worthwhile,” rated the programs as 4.28 and 4.78 on a 5-point scale, respectively. The overall satisfaction scores for our Summer Online Writing Fellowships have remained higher than 4.21 on a 5-point scale over the past three years and have reached a high of 4.76. Faculty survey data reveal that tangible outputs from these programs include significant progress on journal articles, conference proposals, grant submissions and reviews, reports, monographs, textbooks, and chapters.

The response to our scholarly writing programs has been exceedingly positive, but our effort to build a continuum of opportunities has presented some challenges. For one, the desire to create offerings that fit as many individual needs as possible can lead to some confusion about the nature and purpose of each program, both for the faculty participants and for the faculty developers. For every twenty people who are happy with a program, there is inevitably one who would prefer a different size room in which to write, on a different day of the week, and sometimes even with a different assortment of colleagues. Faculty developers can avoid confusion by having a clear conception of how a program fits into the continuum, and fully explaining the range of offerings to faculty so they can choose the program that best fits their needs. We have also observed that a multi-faceted scholarly writing program requires constant attention and administration to succeed. Retreat locations must be maintained against equipment failures and environmental inconveniences such as noise problems. A list of academic editors must be kept current, and editors must receive guidance on university reimbursement procedures. A calendar of events must be maintained and advertised to multiple audiences. In short, for a continuum of programs, there must be a continuum of work. As with everything, success lies in the details.

Finally, because we are not immune to the fiscal and staffing pressures now common at most colleges, universities, and teaching centers, we have had a particular interest in developing programs that are neither expensive nor labor intensive, that incorporate faculty volunteers and expertise, and that are cosponsored with campus partners. For many years, our annual writing retreats were co-hosted pro bono by an on-campus faculty member and writing expert. Currently, all writing retreats except for our annual retreat in May are held in the Teaching Commons of the library, a space that is adeptly managed by a librarian who heads our undergraduate teaching and learning services and for which we do not need to pay a fee. The local writing coaches who have managed our Summer Online Writing Fellowship program in recent years are personally familiar with our faculty and have offered in-person
coaching opportunities as well as an inexpensive, faculty-initiated, self-directed online writing group option for those interested in extending their online writing experience at their own cost. To the degree that we are able, we have countered our limited resources with resourcefulness.

CONCLUSION

As the literature illustrates, faculty development support for scholarly writing can take different forms—each one potentially valuable, but none that alone can possibly satisfy the particular writing needs of all faculty. A scholarly writing continuum comprised of programs with varying degrees of contact, commitment, and structure, however, allows faculty to identify their own areas for professional growth and choose the intervention that best fits their needs. Maintaining a continuum of programs may require steady attention, but doing so allows centers for teaching and faculty development to better support the rising productivity demands on our campuses.
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