St. John's University

St. John's Scholar

Theses and Dissertations

1-1-2018

Integrating Emerging Writers into the Post-Remedial College: A Consideration of Accelerated Learning Programs

Meridith Anne Leo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.stjohns.edu/theses_dissertations

Part of the English Language and Literature Commons

INTEGRATING EMERGING WRITERS INTO THE POST-REMEDIAL COLLEGE:
A CONSIDERATION OF ACCELERATED LEARNING PROGRAMS

A dissertation submitted in partial

fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

to the faculty of the department of

ENGLISH

at

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

New York

by

Meridith Anne Leo

Date Submitted: _____   Date Approved: _____

_____   _____
              Meridith Anne Leo   Dr. Derek Owens

ABSTRACT

INTEGRATING EMERGING WRITERS INTO THE POST-REMEDIAL COLLEGE:
A CONSIDERATION OF ACCELERATED LEARNING PROGRAMS

Meridith Anne Leo

For nearly thirty years the field of composition studies has struggled to address the needs of at-risk students who attend the two-year community college. While some states have opted to eliminate "remediation" programs, others have developed unique approaches to working with students who need support in order to succeed in college level courses. Out of the necessity for alterations to traditional "developmental" writing courses and programs, the Accelerated Learning Program model came into existence. In 2007 at the Community College of Baltimore County Dr. Peter Adams and his colleagues set out a plan to redefine the field of traditional "developmental" writing by creating an accelerated learning model that incorporated the concepts of mainstream education alongside a co-requisite course pairing. In order to create the best opportunity for at-risk students to succeed, Dr. Adams and his colleagues linked a traditional developmental course with a standard freshman composition credit-bearing course. While the original Accelerated Learning Program model has changed over time its basic tenets and mission are the same; it is designed to help at-risk students succeed through their writing course sequence in order to persist through their educational goals. Furthermore, ALPs also attempt to reverse the negative labeling practices that at times brand students and emotionally impact their relationship to their literacy practices.

This dissertation chronicles the history of "remediation" while discussing the issues that labeling can have on students' academic lives. By reviewing a variety of approaches to traditional "developmental" writing and examining my own literacy

narrative history, I work toward defining the problems surrounding traditional approaches to "remediation" at the two-year college. Based on my experiences as a "developmental" student who becomes a teacher of "developmental" students, I began to realize how inefficient the approaches to "remediation" were at my institution. After learning about the Accelerated Learning Program, I became focused on implementing one at Suffolk County Community College, and this dissertation discusses that process. Additionally, given the negative labeling practices, I argue that instead of calling students "basic," "developmental," or "remedial," the field should pivot toward using terms that empower at-risk student writers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation became a reality with the kind support and help of many individuals. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all of them.

I am so unbelievably grateful to my partner and husband for the love and support he has shown me throughout this process. His unconditional care, concern, and encouragement have helped me see how important and valued my work as a compositionist is. While this process has been a long one, he has challenged me to work harder, think introspectively, and stretch my intellectual prowess. Because of his unconditional love and devotion, I have been able to commit myself to the challenging work I do, with the students I do it with. My life would be incomplete without my husband Christopher Rowett in it, and it is for these reasons and many more that I dedicate this dissertation to him.

I am also grateful for the support from my family and friends. I would like to express gratitude to my parents Thomas and Charlene Leo, and my sisters Aliza Leo and Kirsten Wenger. To my sister Kirsten I am immensely thankful for her encouragement that helped calm me when I needed it most; her patience and optimism inspire me to be as relentless as she is.

I am also indebted to my friend and colleague Dr. Kerri Mulqueen. It is because of her guidance and intellectual stamina that I am motivated to become a better person and academic. I am thankful for our many heartfelt conversations that inspire me to be as strong and courageous a woman as she is. I am also thankful that the stars aligned in my first year at Suffolk County Community College where I was assigned to an office with Professor Margaret Altizer who has become my confidant in life. Whether I was trouble

shooting ideas about the Accelerated Learning Program or discussing my plans for the weekend, she has lent her calming voice to offer sound advice.

I am extremely appreciative of my friends and colleagues at Suffolk County Community College. I have been overwhelmed by the support of my entire English department but specifically would like to thank Dr. Elizabeth Cone, Dr. Audrey DeLong, Dr. Douglas Howard, Dr. Leanne Warshauer, Dr. Bill Burns, and Dr. Raymond DiSanza. I would also like to thank Dr. Sandra Sprows Associate Dean of Academic Affairs for her leadership and guidance. I am inspired by her knowledge, tenacity, and focus; I hope one day to exude the same characteristics at the superior level she does. Additionally, I would also like to thank Dean Paul Beaudin the Associate VP for Academic Affairs at Suffolk County Community College. He has helped me gather data and encouraged me to push forward and create a concrete ALP model at our institution. I am thankful for his support.

This dissertation would not be complete without the help of my mentor Dr. Derek Owens. I cannot begin to express enough gratitude and thanks to him. Dr. Owens' knowledge and expertise in the field of composition studies is inspirational. I have felt honored to have him mentor me and hope that in time I may become the kind of composition practitioner that he is. I am also thankful that Dr. Granville Ganter and Professor Gabriel Brownstein agreed to act as my dissertation readers. Their advice and feedback helped shape this project into what it now is.

I hope that my dissertation inspires the field of Composition studies to continue to rethink practices that help at-risk students. Additionally, I am hopeful that teachers and administrators at the two-year college will begin to rethink the labeling practices that can deeply affect students.

Lastly, I am thankful for the opportunities I have had while working alongside some of the smartest and hardest working emerging writers I have ever met. My hope is to continue to work with at-risk students in order to assist them in their educational and professional goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

The Impact of "Basic" Writing Programs

"Basic" writing programs have had a long history in academia in part due to the inception of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. When these acts were implemented they provided funding for existing and future states so that they could offer monies to universities and colleges that specialized in agriculture. The 1890 act allocated funds that were specifically geared towards helping develop what we now know as historically black universities; this act also provided additional income to existing universities and colleges (Goldin and Katz 42). Because additional funding was provided, institutions were more adept to create specialized programs that were discipline- specific and because of the increasing number of areas of study, some curricula differences began to take shape and would lead to the division of the Senior and Junior college. The first junior college, Joliet Junior College was established in 1901 and its goals were to help students with college preparatory work (Goldin and Katz 51). While Joliet was the first junior college to create courses to help students develop their skills, it would not be the last. During the Post-WW I and WWII era there was a population explosion on community and junior college campuses as GIs returned to the United States and sought to gain access to an education that could economically uplift them. It is because of this influx of students after WW II that the CUNY system implemented open admissions and the historical basic writing program that Mina Shaughnessy discusses in *Errors and Expectations*. Open admissions and basic writing programs would become a contentious and debated issue within the CUNY system and nationwide; ultimately these programs

would meet their demise in the late 1970s, but their impact would become a mainstay especially at two-year colleges.

After CUNY was forced to eliminate basic writing programs other institutions began to explore a variety of options that could help at-risk student populations. Throughout the 1990s institutions experimented with models that included collaborative and cohort learning, writing center style approaches, smaller class size, and mainstreaming to name some. While some of these approaches were able to sustain their place in academia, many, if not most, were unable to remain a part of the college curriculum. The University of South Carolina, the City College of New York, SUNY New Paltz, and the Stretch Program at Arizona State University all provided an opportunity for practitioners to explore unique approaches to "remediation". These "basic" writing programs influenced Dr. Peter Adams at the Community College of Baltimore County to create the Accelerated Learning Program model, which incorporated some of the features that had worked so well for each of the pre-named institutions. Based on my research and the implementation of an ALP at Suffolk County Community College, I believe the ALP model represents some of the best current practices in emerging writing programs. It promotes features such as "Mainstreaming," "Acceleration," "Contextual Learning," "Heterogeneous Grouping," "Cohort Learning," "Small Class Size," "Attention to Behavioral Issues," and "Life Problems". Each of these features work to bond students to their peers, instructor, and the institution while helping emerging writers to learn through their own unique writing process. ALPs focus on individualized-student-centered approaches while promoting an autonomous learning environment. While the eight features that CCBC promotes offer additional safety nets to

at-risk students, there is always room for improvement and flexibility. Based on the work I have done thus far at Suffolk County Community College, I believe that additional support from academic counselors, along with peer mentoring may also help to further enhance this model. Because of my experiences as a teacher and emerging writing student I share the belief that an ALP can help transform emerging writers' lives by creating an opportunity for them to feel empowered about their academic path.

My Backstory

As a young girl my parents decided to uproot our family from a working-class Nassau County community and move to an affluent upper-class neighborhood in Suffolk County, New York. My parents were children of immigrants and lacked a college education. They struggled throughout their lives to make ends meet. While they consistently encouraged my sisters and me to get an education, I struggled to adjust to the new environment and community throughout my school years. I was slower than my peers and inevitably was placed in a vocational track. Because of the lack of interest, I had in academics I disengaged from my peers and studies and began to show signs of behavioral issues which almost impacted my ability to complete my high school diploma. During my first attempt at community college I was labeled a "developmental" writer because of the outcome of my placement Computerized Placement Test (CPT) score. At the time, I didn't know how deeply that would affect me. My effort to complete the "developmental" writing course was short lived and after one semester I dropped out of college and did not return for another four years.

When I decided to return to college I was determined to complete my degree in order to gain access to a career or profession that could offer me stability. What I didn't

realize was that I would have to fulfill that same "developmental" writing course that I labored with the first time around. While the second time was the charm for me in many ways the notion of being a "developmental" writer has stuck with me for a long time. Now as a teacher of writing who has focused much of my career on helping emerging writers overcome the stigma attached to negative labeling, I believe as a discipline we need to reconsider the terms we use to apply students to levels of academic discourse acquisition. By encouraging students to explore the emotions they have attached to their writing experiences, we undermine the labels that have impacted them and forcefully attempt to teach students to critique institutional practices of labeling in order to reestablish a new intellectual identity for themselves. At the two-year college specifically, I would like to see some thoughtful alterations to the traditional "developmental" writing course options and furthermore would argue that while it may be difficult to shift the language we use to identify students' writing abilities, we need to pivot away from labels that can emotionally harm our students.

Reframing and Renaming Students

In the beginning of Tom Fox's "Basic Writing as Cultural Conflict" he explores the issues that labels have and how their designation of at-risk students inaccurately represents their abilities.

> Basic writing programs have been limited by narrow definitions that misrepresent the languages and communities of their students. Virtually all the labels for basic writers are inaccurate in one way or another. 'Remedial' as Mike Rose (1985) has shown, implies metaphorically that the writer has a 'disease' or a 'mental defect' (349). 'Developmental' suggests that the writer is young and immature. And

'basic', the term I will reluctantly use, implies that these writers are simple or

stuck on some rudimentary level. (65)

Fox is one of many composition scholars to point out the problems that exist when we

start to name students who have been marginalized because of their minority status. But

the problem still exists; should we label and define students? This is a complex question

to answer and one that composition scholars have been attempting to find resolution for.

Harrington and Adler-Kassner argue that "defining 'basic writer' becomes so

complicated that it becomes virtually impossible to arrive at a definitive answer" (7). The

language of labeling has been so embedded in academic rhetoric even among those who

oppose traditional "developmental" writing courses; the field as a whole has a difficult

time renaming courses that are meant to support at-risk student populations. Labeling has

become a way for academia to sort through skill levels while creating unhealthy

hierarchies, so it is difficult to have one entire movement or shift away from labels.

While some institutions title their courses composition I or composition II there is still a

hierarchy there, -a less stigmatized one, but it still exists.

　　　　While I was labeled "developmental" and have believed that that branding is

partly what caused me difficulties as a writer and student, perhaps any label I was given

would've challenged me because of my insecurities. Perhaps because of my background

and my status as a working-class first-generation college student I would've struggled no

matter how I was sorted. And, as mentioned earlier, for part of my earlier educational

experience I was disinterested and disengaged from my studies. Nevertheless, I still

believe that the labels we use act as another layer that can make a student feel even more

like an outsider then they already do. Labels have the potential to act as barriers for students who belong to an already at-risk population. In "Discoursing Basic Writing" Bruce Horner claims that because we label "basic" writers they are viewed as "outsiders"; it characterizes them as nonthreatening, apolitical beginners or foreigners who are looking to join the American mainstream (208). While that may be how some academics view emerging writers, it would seem much more revealing to examine how students feel about being labeled "basic", "developmental", "unprepared" or "illiterate". In Linda Adler-Kassner's "Just Writing, Basically: Basic Writers on Basic Writing", she interviews two students in order to gain their perspectives on what being labeled as a "basic" writer means to them. Both students did not necessarily contest the label given to them, but Adler-Kassner also contends that the cause of their lack of reaction is because they aren't insiders of the labeling culture that exists in academic institutions. She states,

> Tom and Susan, like every other writer we interviewed for this study, don't know what "basic writer" means. I don't mean that they don't know what it means to be a basic writer--they certainly know that they're not taking first-year composition. But they don't know that they are called basic writers, or that the course they're in (ours is called "Writing Techniques") is spoken of in the field as a "basic" (or "developmental") writing course. (76)

Furthermore, she contends that as practitioners we should work to highlight this issue of labeling by integrating literacy narratives into the classroom that would provide some kind of mirror on the lives of student writers, so that they have an "Aha! That person's experience is like mine!" (Adler-Kassner 76) moment. While this works for some writers,

such as myself, she claims this approach doesn't necessarily work for other "basic" writers because it expects them to be able to identify personally to the readings, while connecting assignments to their personal literacy histories. The system of values we are asking students to read is a culturally based approach to "basic" writing that our student writers do not necessarily have; some do not share the values of the literacy narratives that they are being exposed to. Even though students struggle to understand and share a set of values, being labeled a "basic/developmental" writer can impact them in a negative way.

When I initially started college, I didn't understand what the term "developmental" writer meant, but several weeks into the semester I started to realize why I was in a non-credit class and what that said about my abilities as a writer. What I'm arguing, is that even though students are not initially aware of the labels we have assigned to them, that doesn't mean they will not eventually pick up on ques during their academic experiences that help them piece together how that label could define them. Because of the dilemma labeling can cause, I think that my own institution should consider alterations to how we approach our at-risk emerging writers. I would like to eliminate labels altogether and would encourage institutions to do away with developmental or basic writing classes and instead require all students to take a two-semester composition based writing course, but I don't know that at this point in time I would get administrative support to make that move. Because I feel bound to the standards and requirements still in place at my institution I share Adler-Kassner's suggestion that examines whether students consider the labels that are given to them. She believes that in order to fulfill our responsibilities to students we need to help them

develop strategies they can use to contest the negative labels they have been given. In her conclusion Adler-Kassner proposes that we:

> tell basic writers what we mean when we identify them as such. For instance, we might start by naming courses what they are, rather than using polite euphemisms for them. (Again, our basic writing course is called "Writing Techniques.") But of course, "basic writing" is itself another term that is laden with meaning that needs to be unpacked. Thus, we might accompany these modified names with descriptions of the courses (particularly of their goals), and distribute these to students before they take the exams that affect their placements. While many institutions may do this, many others (including my own) rely on other people to do it for them-admissions officers, orientation coordinators, or counselors. But rather than hand over this small but significant responsibility, I would argue that we should do it ourselves. (83)

Adler-Kassner does not necessarily advocate the use of labels, but because they still exist at some institutions she calls for composition specialists, not administrators to be the negotiators of the terms that are associated with student writers.

Implementing an Accelerated Learning Program has shown me that there are unique and new strategies that can help emerging writers explore their literacy process. Furthermore, ALPs provide moments to explore the language of labeling; after students have had time to acclimate to the semester we discuss and they write about how they came to be in a "developmental" class. It is in these writing moments that they can share their feelings about the class, its title, and their relationship to the process of being

labeled. Based on my discussions with students I believe that teachers of writing should consider the terms we use to define students writing abilities. At least once a semester during the ALP pilot process I had students staying after class to talk about how they really wanted to succeed in college, but they believed being in a "developmental" class had injured their psyche. I took these individual conversations to heart and began to incorporate these once personal conversations into the curricula in order to give students power over the language that has marked them. ALPs do not necessarily annihilate all emotional distress from labeling, but they do have a strong potential to reshape faculty and student perceptions of non-credit writing courses. After the ALP pilot period was over I realized that it wasn't enough to mainstream students in a co-requisite ENG 101 course, but that I would have to rename the non-credit course altogether. By renaming the developmental course the emerging writers workshop I wanted to shift away from an institutional labeling history that has been in existence since the inception of remediation at the college.

Terminology such as "basic," "developmental," and "remedial" are fundamentally problematic and vague terms that have been highly contested and criticized yet some people continue to use them to describe student populations. Not only am I suggesting a new term be used to identify this group of writers, but throughout this dissertation I will privilege the term emerging writers to refer to writers who have either taken part of an accelerated model or who have been labeled as a "basic", "developmental", "unprepared" or "illiterate" student. I privilege this term not only because it has fewer negative connotations associated with it, but because I believe that every writer, myself included, is emerging from a stage, state, or identity in order to advance themselves and develop a

newer critical consciousness based on experiences they have had in writing and in life: every incoming student is entering and emerging into the college culture. I believe that as an emerging writer when we rise forth from a condition in order to progressively position ourselves we gain access to opportunities. This term emerging writer represents the population of students that I have worked with at Suffolk County Community College; but because the field as a whole has not moved away from labeling students as "basic" or "developmental" there are moments in this dissertation where I reference "traditional developmental courses" or I use the term "remediation" in order to refer to the past movement as a whole. For instance, when discussing Mina Shaughnessy, I am intentionally referring to "basic" writers and writing because that terminology was so central to her work. I do this to separate, discuss, or analyze other opinions about how traditional "developmental" writing has been described, but in no way, do I license these terms that have become outdated and misaligned with the field of composition and rhetoric.

Methods and Approach

The purpose of this study is to summarize the origin and history of Accelerated Learning Programs; tell the story of how one was created at a two-year community college while researching the results of this initiative; and propose future modifications based on the research findings. In addition, this study explores the impact that ALPs have had on emerging writers at Suffolk County Community College and the new ideas and suggestions that can help develop and grow Accelerated Learning Programs. Furthermore, by researching and discussing ALPs I hope two-year colleges will work harder to align their programs with practices that serve writers' needs in order to help all

students "compete to complete" their degrees. Suffolk County Community College's adoption of an ALP may further impact student success as well as student perceptions of writing. I observed students from the fall 2015 cohort in order to reflect on my practices as a teacher and program developer. I looked specifically at this cohort for several reasons. First, our fall enrollment is consistently stronger than in the spring semester; therefore, there was a larger sample size to draw observational notes from. Additionally, as a community college we have a transient population where students stop and start their coursework and in the fall semester there tends to be a lower student withdrawal rate; whereas in the spring I can lose almost half of my students, in the fall I tend to retain my initial enrollment size. While sample size was a valuable variable in choosing the fall, I also wanted to look at first time students who directly placed in ENG 010 developmental writing who hadn't taken the course yet. From the student sample there was only one student who had previously taken ENG 010 so the perception of student writing hadn't been altered by any previous college course experience. From this overview, any reflections referenced throughout this dissertation will help to give a voice to student perceptions of writing and my analysis about those insights.

The questions I wanted to answer to examine the effects of adopting an ALP were:

- ❖ What can an instructor gain from acting as a program designer and teacher of emerging writing?
- ❖ Is there adequate support at the two-year college to implement a sustainable ALP?
- ❖ What pedagogical practices does an instructor use to align an ALP cohort with "college level writers"?

What is autoethnography and why is it relevant for this study? According to "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity", autoethnography is defined as "an autobiographical genre of writing and research that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural. Back and forth autoethnographers gaze, first through an ethnographic wide-angle lens, focusing outward on social and cultural aspects of their personal experience; then, they look inward, exposing a vulnerable self that is moved by and may move through, refract, and resist cultural expectations" (Ellis and Bochner 739). Due to the experiences I have had as a teacher of emerging writing, I am able to consciously reflect on how personal and cultural aspects of my experiences intersect with the expectations I have for students' writing. The authors of this article explain that by utilizing a reflective methodology a researcher is able to look deeply into their own practices and interpret how personal selves and stories influence an approach to teaching (Ellis and Bochner 740). Reflexivity allows a researcher to look in a meaningful way at inter-personal relationships and even further explore personal narrative writing that can expose the dual or pluralistic identities that a teacher/researcher uses in their daily lives. The study of the self and the methods I am proposing aim to explore the possible relationships between teacher, practitioner, and program designer.

I intend to use an autoethnographical method by way of reflexive and narrative writing, so that I can explore the use of language and experience in a specific culture and moment at Suffolk County Community College. According to "Narrative Inquiry Multiple Lenses, Approaches, Voices", Susan Chase claims that "researchers new to this field will find a rich but diffuse tradition, multiple methodologies in various stages of

development, and plenty of opportunities for exploring new ideas, methods, and questions" (651). By approaching this study through an ethnographic eye, I will be able to examine and draw conclusions from my reflective notes. I do not intend to look at student writing or discuss their specific processes throughout the semester; instead, my aim is to discuss and narrate the experiences that occurred in the classroom pedagogically. Furthermore, my goal is to use this study as an opportunity to further self-reflect upon my own pedagogical philosophy, as well as how I assess the work of my students. According to "Fieldwork, Culture, and Ethnography", "the fieldworker must display culture in a narrative, a written report of the fieldwork experience in self-consciously selected words" (Maanen 4). For my part I will be studying my observation and field notes that I took throughout the entire creation of the ALP pilot and I will further examine notes I took throughout the creation of a concrete course that mirrors an ALP model. I will look introspectively at my pedagogical approaches to make meaning of ALP and how I went about establishing our own emerging writers workshop course.

To examine the choices, I make as an instructor I will not only take notes throughout the length of the study, but will devote my time to writing micro-narratives that reflect on my thoughts and experiences as an emerging writer who teaches emerging writers. Borrowing Clifford Geertz's discussion of "thick description" which he claims is a way of *thinking and reflecting* and the *thinking of thoughts* (10) and further his claim that "the ethnographer 'inscribes' social discourse; he writes it down" (16), I need to be conscious of how my notes interpret what I observe based on my own biases as an emerging writer. With this in mind I also needed to consider how my transcriptions impacted the students in the ALP cohort. Therefore, I discussed this study with the

students in the beginning of the fall 2015 semester and I explained that my approach for the study is an autoethnography which will reflect on the choices I've made as an ALP instructor.

By implementing an Accelerated Learning Program at Suffolk County Community College, I found that as an instructor who acts as a program designer and teacher of emerging writers there needs to be flexibility when negotiating these different roles. At times I found myself thinking about bigger issues with the pilot, such as when and what kind of teacher training should we develop or how we should organize our portfolio reading, but these issues were separate from in-class practice and pedagogy. Even though they were on my mind, I had to table those complex programmatic details in order to stay in the moment in-class. Mentally there was a constant negotiation between the pedagogical action in the classroom and my ideas about shaping what the ALP would look like from the coordinator stance. While I contemplated these larger issues, and worked on finding a balance between instructor and program designer, I also found that having the support of colleagues was helpful in implementing the ALP. On multiple occasions I spoke with deans who gave me access to information that would help me support the need for the ALP. Having some data that showed our success enabled me to prove that a new course could be beneficial for our students. Access to this data along with the help of administrators who walked me through the course proposal process was vital. As a junior faculty member, the course proposal process was something new to me, having administrators who supported and guided me in the course proposal writing helped streamline the process. In addition, to the data and informational support I received, I also found that when teaching faculty and administrators invest in an ALP,

they are more apt to help with budgetary or classroom space constraints that sometimes get in the way of creating new and innovative course ideas. Campus budgets expand and contract each year so by having administrators on your side who are in control of the budgets can help tremendously. Lastly, when incorporating an ALP that champions mainstreaming emerging writers alongside students who directly placed into credit-bearing courses it requires an instructor to re-shape their pedagogical practices. In the past the use of current traditional pedagogies that focused on rote drills assigned to fix grammatical errors in students writing, is no longer valuable. To align an ALP cohort with "college level writers" an instructor needs to treat emerging students just as they would a "college level writer" because that is what they are. Instructors should consider individualized-student-centered approaches that help writers learn autonomous self-assessment practices while collaborating with others. Additionally, by promoting a continual recursive approach to the writing process students can learn to take ownership over their own unique writing process. By encouraging ALP students to self-reflect they may learn to rethink or reimagine their writing when assigned specific writing tasks.

Overview

In chapter one I provide a historical grounding about how "remediation" came to be a part of the higher education curriculum. I will discuss several Ivy League institutions that implemented "remediation" approaches and will discuss the role of the junior and two-year college. Further I will reference labeling theories and the stigma that can be attached to the classifications we use to sort students' abilities. In addition, I will discuss how "remediation" became a more common practice during open admissions and the dilemma it has caused for academics who support and oppose it. It is in this context that I

will reference the CUNY wars which caused tension within academia and provoked experts in the field of composition and rhetoric to research alternative writing course options that could help at-risk students.

Chapter two discusses my own experiences as a student, writer, and practitioner. It is in this section that I will show moments of my life in order to present a literacy narrative that forms the reasons for why I have focused on an at-risk population of emerging writing students at a two-year college. In this chapter I will also review six literacy narratives that are commonly referred to in the field of emerging writing and composition studies. Examining literacy narratives that have helped frame discussions surrounding at-risk students will reinforce the idea that inspecting one's past relationship to literacy can help students and academics revisit and re-contextualize their identities to reshape their ever-changing connection to literacy.

In chapter three I will describe the history and impact of new approaches to emerging writing courses. I will focus on writing courses/programs that predated acceleration models such as The Writing Studio at the University of South Carolina, The Enrichment Pilot Project at City College of NY, Supplemental Writing Workshop Program at SUNY New Paltz, and the Arizona State University Stretch program. Understanding this history will provide an opportunity to consider the constant discursive flow of programmatic changes in emerging writing courses in higher education. I believe that these early alternative writing courses/programs are a thoughtful way for practitioners to reimagine traditional "developmental" writing courses.

Chapter four will look specifically at programs which include accelerated models such as the Accelerated Learning Program and the California Acceleration Project. I will

explain how and why these programs were developed and the reasons for why they have caught on at colleges and universities on a national scale. I will not only discuss the inception of acceleration, but will focus on the Community College of Baltimore County's ALP and the features they believe have helped to make it successful. Further, I will argue how an ALP model will benefit a particular institution, Suffolk County Community College.

It is in chapter five that I will discuss my initial idea to establish an Accelerated Learning Program. The information in this chapter will be narrative and descriptive in nature and will present the steps I took to incorporate changes to our writing sequence at Suffolk County Community College. Essentially this section describes in detail collaborative work that occurred during committee meetings, individual developments I worked on that implicated serious alterations in our approaches to the teaching of emerging writing, and institutional struggles that I intercepted. A portion of this autoethnography will look specifically at how one starts up an ALP, and this chapter discusses that in detail. I will suggest that the adoption of an Accelerated Learning Program is useful and valuable to students at a two-year community college. I will argue that the new course should be entitled the "Emerging Writers Workshop" in order to move away from the labels that have negatively impacted our students. Here I will argue that by scaling up and increasing the amount of ALP sections offered each semester, Suffolk County Community College will be able to alter the traditional writing sequence which has been in place for over fifteen years in order to reflect nuances in the field of composition and rhetoric. Here I will weigh our initial design of the ALP and discuss possible alterations that would better suit the student population at our institution.

In the last section of this dissertation I will provide my conclusions and reflections about the usefulness of an Accelerated Learning Program at the two-year community college. In this section I hope to reveal how valuable programs such as an ALP are and that they can inspire and challenge college students. By setting the standards high we are challenging students to meet them and through observation I have noticed that when students are placed with a difficult obstacle instead of a sub-par one, they are more than willing to meet that task head on. This conclusion will argue that an ALP can assist student writers in rethinking and reconstructing their relationship to writing while honoring their past histories.

As a teacher at the two-year college I am focused on helping students who are working towards a goal that will help advance them personally or professionally. How they view and define that advancement is up to them. At this point, as a practitioner at the two-year college my goal is to facilitate an educational experience that helps students work towards a democratic approach to examining one's identity and its relationship to writing. I believe that at this point if I re-imagine some traditional, vocational, non-credit courses, and shift the approaches towards accelerated models of learning, I can help our students gain the access they so desire when they begin their academic careers. This dissertation project has worked towards those goals.

Chapter 1: "Developmental" Writing Defined in the Field

There is an intense history that the junior college/two-year/community college, emerging writing courses and programs have undergone and I believe it is important to identify and examine the terms and philosophies that reflect these histories. By exploring the beginnings of the junior college, its relationship to open admissions, the dilemma of remedial writing, and the definitional characterization surrounding labeling while looking at how writing courses have transformed, I think as a discipline we will be better equipped to acknowledge and perhaps alter the stigma attached to labeling.

The Role of the Junior /Two-year College/Community College

According to Gerald Graff, American universities have been growing at a steady pace since 1900 (155), but junior colleges did not begin to establish themselves until there became a need for them. Junior colleges were initially designed to prepare high school students for senior college level work, but some evolved to offer associate's degrees in the arts or sciences, while others have become technical sites or vocation schools (Kane and Rouse 64). Presently, there is not a clear distinction between the junior, two-year, or community college; therefore, I will discuss them interchangeably in this chapter. It is important to note that while community colleges have become a permanent staple in American society, they didn't become prominent until there were shifts in higher education, industrialization leading to more specialization, and later on the inception of the GI Bill. These cultural, economical, and intellectual shifts began to shape the landscape of universities while working towards creating educational opportunities and access to those who were typically deemed non-traditional students.

It was during the latter part of the 19th century that colleges and universities began to increase the number of subjects taught in order to become in line with the needs of American society. What initially incited changes were the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The 1862 act provided monies for existing and future states so that they could offer funding to universities and colleges that specialized in agriculture. Meanwhile the 1890 act were funds geared towards helping develop what we now know as historically black universities; this act also provided additional income to existing universities and colleges (Goldin and Katz 42). Ultimately, the Morrill Acts were developed to legitimize teaching certain subjects in colleges that seemed appropriate for the needs of society or community (Roueche 24). Because additional funding was provided, institutions were more adept to create specialized programs that were discipline- specific. Goldin and Katz claim that "state institutions in the 19th century were more practically and, often, more scientifically orientated than were their private counterparts, in large measure because of the commitment to provide goods and services of value to citizens and local industrial interests" (51). Because of the increasing number of areas of study, some curricula differences began to take shape and would lead to the division of the senior and junior college.

The initial appearance of junior colleges began after the civil war in 1865 in an attempt to broaden literacy; however, many of these colleges were segregated and would remain that way for quite some time. Then in the early 1900s as there was a large influx of immigrants there became increasing pressure to alter the existing higher education structure (Lewiecki- Wilson and Sommers 444). But in 1901 it was William Rainey Harper who officially coined the term "junior college" (Garrison 58). Harper, the

founding president of the University of Chicago "developed a plan to separate the first two years of college from the second two years, he started a movement that would revolutionize higher education" (Kane and Rouse 64). His plan was modeled after the Germanic educational system and the goal was to develop after high school education that took the form of junior colleges, which would teach students basic skills or preparatory material (Kane and Rouse 64). Joliet Junior College was established in 1901 and was the outcome of a collaboration between Joliet High School and the University of Chicago. According to Roueche's *Back to the Future: Getting Here from There*: the goal of Joliet junior college was thought to be an extension of high school so that graduates could have additional time to prepare themselves socially and academically for "Senior College" (25). Harper's model made him most commonly known as the father of the American junior college and he influenced others such as Alexis F. Lange, the dean of the School of Education at the University of California at Berkley, and David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University to join forces and authorize public school districts to offer the first two years of college work (Roueche 25). As time went on other institutions followed suit, which led to an increase in the number of junior colleges nationwide. Additionally, as the junior college became more popular and the number of students attending schools increased, the role of junior colleges became a space to embrace a population of students who in the past may not have had access to higher education.

While the initial goals in developing junior/community colleges were preparatory work, the Commission on Higher Education, initiated, by President Truman, formalized the concept, and the junior college community curricula began to focus not only on

general education, but also prepared students to transfer to four-year colleges (Morest 320). In a 1927 article by Leonard Koos entitled "The Junior-College Curriculum" he claims that the most frequent course offerings at junior colleges are "in English and public speaking, foreign language, mathematics, science, the social subjects, and psychology and philosophy" (Koos 661); it was estimated that offerings within this range were appropriate for the arts students in a junior college (Koos 661). Furthermore, Koos states that at the junior college level curriculums should offer students the ability to transfer and thus there should be a standardization of curriculums that is related to general education. He goes on further to argue that the word "general" relates to training that is unspecialized (Koos 665). As time progressed some ideological curricular shifts have taken place, but some have remained the same. While some community colleges still offer general education, such as my own, we also offer specialized courses and programs that students could transfer to four-year institutions. Vanessa Smith Morest nicely articulates the wide variety of curricular changes that have happened at the junior and community college. According to Morest's "From Access to Opportunity: The Evolving Social Roles of Community Colleges", she argues that:

> community college missions include long and short-term occupational education leading to degrees and certificates, liberal arts education leading to degrees and transfer, non-credit education aimed at skills development or self-improvement. But, in recent decades, community colleges have expanded their roll in pre-collegiate education (including remediation or developmental education), Adult Basic Education, English as a Second Language, coursework for high school students, and even Baccalaureate degrees. (320)

Again, Morest's description fits well within the confines of my own institution, although we do not yet offer Baccalaureate degrees. The curriculum at community colleges is ever changing and thus has required faculty to remain flexible. While Koos' analysis of junior colleges in 1927 shows an awareness of how education can act as a democratic space to support students (669), he may have found it difficult to predict the dilemma that the junior college would face after the end of World War II.

During the 1960s there was an explosive population increase at community colleges due to the return of WW II veterans using their GI Bill benefits. While some argued that "veterans may not have come to college if it weren't for special funding the fact remained that they did flood college campuses" (Roueche 27). Furthermore, the Truman Commission on Higher Education in 1947 declared that all citizens regardless of race, sex, religion, color, geographical location, or financial condition, should be offered a post-secondary education. These events set the stage for growth and development at the community college that would never be witnessed again (Roueche 28). Because of these significant statutes community colleges were forced to face and make changes that would directly impact the teaching of writing at the two-year college. Roueche argues that colleges had to develop some basic democratic philosophical assumptions about how to offer a comprehensive education system and these philosophical assumptions are that, "education is necessary for the maintenance of democracy, education is essential for the improvement of society, and education helps to equalize opportunity for all people" (Roueche 26). This would become a hefty endeavor and while the increase in population changed the landscape of the community college, the inception of open admissions and

remedial writing had already held a presence in some of the most elite universities in America.

Open Admissions and "Remedial" Writing

Even though junior and community colleges existed since the early part of the 20th century not all had access to an education they provided. According to Roueche even after the late 19th century when institutions were given funding through the Morrill Acts "they still did not admit minorities, [and] offered few opportunities for women, and were geographically inaccessible to many students" (24). And while open admissions and remediation is typically linked to the influx of GIs after World War II there is a rooted history of open admissions and remediation that existed prior to the intense arrival of many "non-traditional" students to the two-year college (Beyond Graduation 8). Each year at different conferences, department meetings, college-wide meetings, and even at dinner parties I hear how frustrated people are with students' lack of ability to write. Students can write, but the expectations for the kinds of writing that some desire them to produce is misaligned with the evolution of writing. I don't expect these attitudes about student writing to change because as Joseph Trimmer argues, "anyone who studies the history of remediation in American education discovers quickly that the problem is not new" (3). In the mid-to-late 19th century and thereafter concerns over the "illiteracy" of students at Harvard, the University of California, Yale, and Dartmouth became alarming and instigated institutions to find a cure to remedy the situation (Trimmer 3). Many elite, private, and public institutions needed to address the "issues" they were seeing with writing and some had unique approaches.

"Remediation" at Harvard

Arguably, for quite some time Harvard has had a reputation as being one of the most prestigious Ivy League intuitions in the nation, but like other institutions it has had to make accommodations to assist its student body in the area of writing and composition. According to James Berlin's *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900 – 1985*, he states that Charles William Eliot, Harvard's president from 1869 to 1909, considered writing to be a central tenet to the new elective curriculum (20). In 1869 Eliot believed and expected that lessons should be created that would "'remedy students' errors in punctuation and paragraph structure" while emphasizing a "moral superstructure" (Stanley 2). So, in 1874 the freshman composition course at Harvard was established, but Rose contends the course was created in "response to the poor writing of upperclassmen [which] spread rapidly" ("Language of Exclusion" 342). By 1894 the freshman composition course was the only requirement besides a modern language course and by 1897 it was the only required course in the curriculum that functioned in a two-semester sequence (Berlin 20). While the goal of the course was to help students with their "basic skills" Graff argues that the establishment of the Harvard Composition course was an attempt to maintain the traditional culture of Harvard, which was being "threatened by the loss of social exclusiveness and of the protection of the classics" (66). While the issue of remediation and un-prepared students became a volatile issue at numerous institutions, at Harvard these issues were closely linked to enrollment. For private and public institutions, the size of enrollments were and are closely tied to admissions standards and to funding (Soliday "Politics of Remediation" 32). This became a constant teetering battle between the quality of students

especially at Ivy League institutions versus the student's ability to pay tuition for the preparation of college level work ("Politics of Remediation" 33). Eventually Harvard began to use a "forensic system" which many other colleges shifted to in order to enact an elective system that would emphasize writing requirements college wide from entrance to graduation (Soliday "Politics of Remediation" 36). Even though elite institutions seemed to need to maintain strict admission standards, remedial writing courses maintained in place. According to Berlin:

> no group of entering students-not Harvard's or Columbia's or Michigan's or Stanford's-has ever been able to manage the rhetorical tasks required in college without the college providing instruction in writing. As a result, the English department has been forced to continue to teach writing to freshmen even as some of its members simultaneously disavow its responsibility for doing so. This protest is always loudest, of course, when enrollment is high, and is conspicuously muted during periods when low enrollment makes the freshman writing course a safeguard against unemployment. (24)

While Harvard had been known as an innovative leader in the teaching of writing because of their inclusion of the freshman English/composition class, in the late 19th century, other institutions had developed their own unique ways to approach the diverse student body that was impacting their curriculum and pedagogical process.

"Subject A" at the University of California

While Harvard had worked to implement a freshman composition class in the late 19th century, California had laid witness to the strong impact that admissions and enrollment had on the college curriculum. While these shifts have taken place throughout various time periods, each have impacted perceptions of student writing. In Jane Stanley's *The Rhetoric of Remediation* she states that because of the population explosion due to GI Bill benefits, along with refugee and immigrant migration to California, there had been complaints about the literacy levels that caused a disruption of the social equilibrium because of the new changes to the student demographic (2). Because of these cyclical changes in population, California began to explore alternative options to collegiate English instruction. In as early as 1880 the University of California began construction of a composition course that would later on be labeled Subject A. While the goal of Subject A was to be a temporary solution, this was not the case.

Subject A developed because of the changing population needs, but additionally was believed to be temporary if faculty at the University of California worked with local high schools to remedy the problems with writing (Stanley 4). In 1883 Cornelius Beach Bradly and Charles Mills Gayley joined the ranks at the University and were the first to suggest curriculum changes in the high schools. Gayley, who was an assistant professor at the University of Michigan, drew from a certification program that had been established at Michigan in response to complaints about weak writing skills student college entrants were displaying (Stanley 4). According to Stanley under this certification program "university faculty presented a list of texts and a curriculum to the high schools, and periodically sent professors to visit high school classrooms to certify that the

curriculum was being followed" (4). This became a popular approach in numerous schools in the Midwest and it was believed that if the University of California enacted such a program they might be able to combat the writing concerns they had been seeing. But despite the certification's popularity the University of California continued to see college entrants with weak writing skills and who professors deemed a "continued disappointment" (Stanley 4). Therefore, the Subject A course was developed and acted as a basic composition course for those students who needed help with their writing skills.

The inclusion of the Subject A course at the University of California was thought to be short-lived even during the heightened population increase in the years that followed World War II. Stanley claimed that at California there was a "myth of transience" which consistently illustrated a limited sense of reality pertaining to the needs of students. She claims that in 1967 this myth is illustrated when the chairman of the Committee on Subject A at UC Berkeley claimed that the Subject A course at some point will "expire from malnutrition" (5). However, one hundred years later the Subject A requirement and remedial coursework has been heavily mandated; yet schools in the University of California system had noticed a decrease in the proportion of students needing remediation (Stanley 5). There were valid reasons for this decrease.

First, Soliday states that according to Alice Roy, even though there is an increase of diversity within the California State University system, composition programs that support these diverse populations have been downsized (Soliday "Politics of Remediation" 181). Second, California enacted Proposition 209 in 1995 which abolished affirmative action policies in tiered systems. Tiering has taken place since the junior college came into existence and refers to a hierarchal educational structure that is

designed to relegate certain college coursework to specific institutions; for example, two-year college, four-year colleges that are separate from research institutions are expected to cover different curriculums some which are privileged over others. This leads to the last reason for a decrease in remediation in California and that is that remediation and traditional developmental writing had become the responsibility of the two-year college which is thought to be on the lower end of the tiering system. Soliday cites Marian Bagdasarian, a trustee for the California State University system whereas she believes that remedial classes "belong in the community colleges" (qtd. in Soliday 111). While a part of the inception of Subject A was to help advance student writers it seems that remediation in the California system has taken a whole new direction. It could also be argued that the initial inclusion of remediation in California and elsewhere has deep roots linked to admissions policies, enrollment, the rhetoric of exclusion and financial benefits to certain institutions depending on the tier they reside in. Like Harvard and the University of California, during the period of 1920-1960 Yale instituted its own take on how to deal with "remedial" writers.

Yale's "Awkward Squad"

The upswing of remediation had been in full gear at several institutions including Yale beginning in the early 1900s. Soliday notes that private intuitions were always in need of tuition income in order to survive, even at elite institutions ("Politics of Remediation" 32). Thus, admission standards and enrollment deeply impacted college culture and they continue to do so today. While Harvard and California negotiated their standards, and created their own approaches to maintaining student enrollment by incorporating remedial courses to include their students, Yale had a different approach. In

1905 as a result of diminishing standards at Yale they decided to create an honors courses movement; the goal was to "upgrade the quality of work by stratifying groups within the institution" (Soliday "Politics of Remediation" 32). This stratification has continued to exist today and has been standardized through the placement process. According to Ritter "stratification [is the] classification and division of students' abilities as they align--or misalign--with the values and objectives of the particular institution" (17). She goes on to argue that stratification is part of the reason basic writers have historically existed and while Yale, along with other private institutions, utilized other labels to identify students within this stratification they are still part of the "academic/intellectual leveling" that has led to discrimination (Ritter 17). Later on, this tradition would continue at other institutions until it became somewhat commonplace, especially at two-year colleges.

Between the 1920s and 1960s traditional developmental writing became a cause for concern at Yale, but they did not require a universal writing course; instead students were asked to seek out the English department for "a dose of remediation" (Soliday "Politics of Remediation" 43). Due to the increases in need for additional support students at Yale during this time underwent what Ritter calls a "'political process' of social construction in that they were marked as 'deficient'--and given a label publicizing that deficiency, the 'Awkward Squad'" (Ritter 17). Yale seemed to enact a nonchalant attitude about the presence of Yale's "Awkward Squad". The "Awkward Squad" was a non-credit course that was developed to provide "remedial" instruction for students who had illustrated deficient writing in the freshman literature course. Furthermore, the course did not receive any official recognition even though it is referenced in some department documents where it is presented in a derogatory light (Ritter 21). The "Awkward Squad"

was designed as a place for students to improve their skills, so students spent their time with tutors who focused on mechanics and grammar until they acknowledged that students were prepared to re-enter the mainstream classes. The time period in which students were relegated to the "Awkward Squad" was fully dependent on the tutors which could cause difficulties for students. In terms of curriculum design, the time the "Awkward Squad" spent working with tutors could be viewed as a skill lab that would become attached to a first-year writing course (Ritter 23). While the basic writing course originally known as the "Awkward Squad" at Yale was renamed, for over forty years its designation remained in the English curriculum (Ritter 21) and furthermore its very existence was in some ways the genesis of labeling students in non-credit courses.

The Dartmouth Writing Clinic

While Harvard and Yale worked to implement their own freshman composition courses in the late 19th century, clearly, they were not the only Ivy to do so. Dartmouth College also required its undergraduates to take a first-year writing course however they believed that the issues students were having could not simply be solved with one writing course. In addition to or as an alternative of the traditional remedial course, they developed a Writing Clinic in 1939 (Lerner 14). To a large extent the Writing Clinic served as a space that according to today's standards would be considered a Writing Center. According to Lerner, the Writing Clinic at Dartmouth was a space where faculty could refer students who were having difficulties in any college course where writing was required and where a student could focus on issues of organization, sentence structure, or mechanics (Lerner 15). While writing centers across the nation flourished in the 21st century, Dartmouth was only able to sustain the Writing Clinic from 1930- 1960. Lerner

argues that because "poor branding ultimately did in" the center, but additionally the perception of students writing abilities were at odds with the expectations of the elite institution (15). While it was the faculty at Dartmouth that initiated the development of the clinic, in many ways they were also the culprits of its demise.

The clinic was proposed by a senior student at Dartmouth, Peter Dardozo who wanted to create the clinic on an ad-hoc basis for undergraduates to utilize voluntarily at their disposal. Dartmouth, at the time, had a two-semester writing sequence, but Cardozo believed that his peers held "tremendous enthusiasm" for writing outside of the traditional classroom setting (Lerner 15). Cardozo was the most productive director of the Writing Clinic and after his time at Dartmouth, there was less attention and time spent working on the clinic's initial goals, which in some ways may have led to its downfall. In 1949 the Committee on Student English began to examine student writing and its impact on the Dartmouth brand. The outcome of their findings was a belief that students writing was "deplorable", had weak organization, and there were problems with grammar, usage and spelling. The committee argued that the clinic was not prepared to adequately help the number of students with the diverse needs they required (Lerner 16). Furthermore, they assigned the writing clinic as a kind of punishment for students who could not uphold the expectations that Dartmouth required which created a negative association of the work that the Writing Clinic initially sought out to do. The committee also encouraged the kind of sorting that other institutions had begun to incorporate. Lerner states, "as described in the committee's 1953-54 report students [are] prone through ignorance to write badly; illiterately, can have their ignorance dispelled by the Writing Clinic" and further that "there were two classes of student writers: the careless and the

ignorant" (17). I would think that it would come as no shock to the faculty at Dartmouth that the Writing Clinic would be unable to sustain itself and in 1959 the clinic would cease to exist. The committee launched a request in its 1959 memo to the Executive Committee of the Faculty, requesting that because of large class sizes, lack of faculty, and a need for curriculum reform they were in need of a program administrator to oversee these changes (Lerner 22). The request was denied and afterwards committee members seemed to give up on herding students to the Writing Clinic (Lerner 23). Even though the clinic did not survive the politics of remediation and the negative perceptions of student writing at an elite institution, the clinic acted as a model for what a writing center could be if it had appropriate administrative and faculty support. Furthermore, the Committee on Student English was steadfast in their request for a position that even nowadays would be difficult to gain.

While the students and faculty at Dartmouth felt the Writing Clinic no longer held a necessary position, the existence of it is a "testament to the power of writing instruction and everything it represents" (Lerner 29). Remediation and open admissions had a soft entry into the private and public sector but

> as early as the mid-1800s universities were calling for an end to the admission of students with 'defective preparation'. [Yet] between the Civil War and WW I "remediation" was widespread in American colleges. Furthermore, the positions that writing held in the late 19th century and well into the 1960s led to "remediation" being absorbed by the two-year college. (Beyond Graduation 10)

The responsibility of traditional developmental writing and the concept of remediation slowly transferred to the two-year college because elite institutions worried about their branding, and quite frankly did not want to promote resources to remediation (Ritter 18). The complexities of how traditional remedial composition courses began have led to their long-standing history in the academy. Soliday notes that "it is often said that freshman English [composition] became the universally required course at the turn of the century" ("Politics of Remediation" 37) and it has continued to be that way for some institutions, especially my own. But the perception of freshman composition which was synonymous with remediation has altered over time; more so, when it became the responsibility of the two-year college. It was during the 1960s that two-year colleges witnessed yet another wave of enrollment increases that led academics like Mina Shaughnessy to examine an unknown field of struggling writers that she would later name "basic" writers.

Open Admissions and "Remedial" Writing starting in the 1960s

Language, literacy practices, and learning are some of the core tenets that drive education at any level. Throughout time, shifts in higher education have invoked changes in the approaches and perceptions of language, literacy practices, and learning while creating a space to explore and research how students acquiesce to the academy. James Berlin argues that,

> literacy has always and everywhere been the center of the educational enterprise. No matter what else it expects of its schools, a culture insists that students learn to read, write, and speak in the officially sanctioned manner. It is for this reason that rhetoric, the production of spoken and written texts, and poetic, the interpretation

of texts, have been the indispensable foundation of schooling, regardless of the

age or intellectual level of the student. (1)

While open admissions and calls for remediation are typically associated with changes to

policies in higher education in the 1970s, as early as the mid-1800s American universities

were calling for an end to the admission of students with "defective preparation".

Between the Civil War and WWI remediation was widespread (Beyond Graduation 10),

but it wasn't until the rapid increase of students into colleges and universities in the wake

of open admissions in the 1970s that "accentuated a perceived need for writing

instruction and influenced research curriculum reform in English and across the

disciplines" (Mutnick "Writing in an Alien World" xii). During the 1920s and throughout

the 1960s remedial courses didn't necessarily act as a placement mechanism or a standard

prerequisite required of any first-year freshman writing course, but instead acted as a

"rather amorphous site to which students were remanded by their writing instructor"

(Ritter 21). It was during the first wave of population increases after World War II that

institutions believed there was a need to alter how open admissions functioned in order to

place students according to standards they presumed appropriate.

In 1965 with the increase in population attendance at institutions nationwide,

President Johnson articulated the need for additional higher education opportunities for

lower and middle-income families and program assistance for small and less developed

colleges. The first step was the creation of the Title I of the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act which provided "federal aid for educationally disadvantaged students from

low income families" (Beyond Graduation 17). The next step towards creating and

strengthening educational resources for colleges and universities was the Higher Education Act; it also worked to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education (McCants "The Early History of the Higher Education"). While this act provided financial assistance for students, it also allotted funding towards programs that were thought to help students in their academic pursuits. It was in 1970 when the "New York State legislature modified its community college funding formula to provide more generous subsidies for colleges that implemented a program of full opportunity otherwise known as open admissions" (Beyond Graduation 19). Strickland claims that many basic writing programs "sprang up" and were motivated by an anxiety about a decline in the skills of the traditional college student (26); by creating an open-door policy at institutions in New York skills driven courses began to emerge in relationship to the new population and student demographic. These open-door policies as well as the diverse student body challenged teachers of writing and required nuances in pedagogical and theoretical approaches. Mina Shaughnessy notes the need for changes in her seminal work on struggling writers in *Errors and Expectations*. Shaughnessy chronicles the impact that open admissions had and the attitude that some colleagues and administrators associated with students. Because the changes came quickly many had to "guess in the dark about the sorts of programs they ought to plan for students they had never met, and the reluctances of teachers, some of whom had already decided that the new students were ineducable" (Shaughnessy 1). The hesitation from faculty and administration created an environment for Shaughnessy to explore how students and teachers reacted in the open admissions environment.

Students attending open admissions schools in the CUNY system in the 1970s would've undergone a placement process similar to the one that continues to exist at my own institution where I teach. Students would take an exam that would assess their reading, writing, and math and be sorted into one of three categories. Some would be ready for college level credit bearing courses which is what typical CUNY instructors were prepared for, while others were on the cusp of prepared, but had "flat competency and needed some support; the last grouping was comprised of students who tended to end up in 'bonehead English'" (Shaughnessy 2). These students are the ones that were labeled basic writers and "who appeared by college standards to be illiterate" (Shaughnessy 3). Shaughnessy argues that she labels these students as "basic" writers while others may call them "remedial" or "developmental", but either way these students and the basic writing enterprise are the "frontier, unmapped" and because teachers of writing are the "pedagogical West" they will settle the frontier and learn how to teach even in the midst of "shortcomings" (4). *Errors and Expectations* is Shaughnessy's guidebook for other teachers of writing who were traversing the difficult and new landscape of open admissions in a time when the American education system was in the midst of drastic and necessary changes. She argues however that basic writing students "write the way they do, not because they are slow or non-verbal, indifferent to or incapable of academic excellence, but because they are beginners and must like all beginners, learn to make mistakes" (Shaughnessy 5). This point of inexperience has been furthered by Bartholomae's concept of "Inventing the University" which posits that students need time to acquiesce to the academic language that is expected of them. Further Bradford and Bizzell believe that writers sometimes lack maturity and are thus unprepared for college

work. In "What Happens When Basic Writers Come to College?" Patricia Bizzell suggests that, basic writers are those who are least prepared for college and whose appearance makes them students who are "aliens" in the college community. Bizzell argues that these students experience the greatest distance between their home dialects, standardized forms of English, and the privileged dialect in school. For many of these students they believe that if they can grasp the grammatical forms of writing then they will solve their problems (294). Shaughnessy's focus was to look specifically at the errors basic writers made in their writing and attempted to figure out how those errors impacted students' abilities to grasp standard academic discourse.

Furthermore, the outcome of Shaughnessy's work led to moments of self-reflection. The initiation of open admissions and consequently basic writing at CUNY required teachers of writing to consider the needs and capabilities of students to "become better teachers" (Shaughnessy 292). While Shaughnessy has received criticism for how she labeled students and a perceived lack of sensitivity for a minority student population, she makes it clear that teachers of writing need "to look at ourselves and the academic culture we are helping them to assimilate [to] with more critical eyes" (292). In her conclusion to *Errors and Expectations* she charges the field of writing to "venture into new fields" where one could become a scholar in the field of psycholinguistics, learning theory, or discourse analysis in order to better know the people and students that they are teaching writing to (Shaughnessy 293). During the historical, social, and political climate of the early 1970s, Shaughnessy shows a genuine concern for an at-risk student population, but is also focused on igniting institutions and faculty who are inexperienced with the diverse group of writers they would be working aside. She believes that

practitioners should transcend traditional expectations in order to deepen the realizations of democracy while negotiating a space in academia that can accomplish the new student enterprise known as basic writing (Shaughnessy 294). It was Shaughnessy's passion to work with an at-risk student population in a tumultuous time in the American educational system. *Errors and Expectations* sought to highlight realistic approaches to conceptualizing error while spotlighting that the curriculum of composition and writing needed revision to serve a diverse student body.

While Shaughnessy's work has been controversial and continues to draw alternative viewpoints about her goals, Bartholomae argues in "Released into Language Errors, Expectations, and the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy" that she taught teachers to "understand the problems and achievements of basic writers at a time when both were hidden to the profession and in doing so she made possible a new kind of college English class-- a class for academically unprepared students that could provide both access to college reading and writing tasks and an orientation to the goals and values of academic life" (37). Furthermore, he contends that Shaughnessy was interested in not just teaching skills but helping students understand context and purpose so that they could "begin their lives anew" (Bartholomae 37). While her life and legacy focused on highlighting the struggles that student writers had, open admissions and remediation at CUNY would not survive. In 1978 CUNY discontinued its policy of open admissions (Strickland 26). This move created a lot of hostility not just at CUNY, but institutions nationwide; however, the fire that ignited with the end of open admissions would continue to playout in the discipline for years to come.

The CUNY Wars

City College in New York has had a long-standing history of providing educational opportunities for its residents. In 1847 a proposal was made to establish the free academy of higher education which sought to provide an academic curriculum that was comparable to those offered at Ivy League institutions. Initially access to the free academic was for all qualified boys and then later in 1870 girls could attend what is now Hunter College (Beyond Graduation 12). When open admissions was implemented in 1970 it was a defining moment for CUNY; because of population increases in the 60s the institution began catering to a large minority population. Due to the increase in diversity, Shaughnessy's work with writers had been at the forefront of basic writing pedagogy, but when CUNY began to struggle with maintaining its diversity in the midst of academic expectations, controversy began to cloak the once democratic ideologies that led to open admissions. After 1970 and throughout the next thirty years CUNY would face not only a fiscal crisis that would threaten open admissions and remediation courses, but issues would arise relating to racial and cultural tensions surrounding programs like Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge (SEEK) and College Discovery (CD) (Beyond Graduation 12). Tensions would eventually escalate and strain the relationship between students, faculty, and administration.

Prior to open admissions policies at CUNY, the SEEK and CD programs recruited economically and educationally disadvantaged students for admittance. Students were provided with counseling and compensatory educational benefits and CUNY depended on these programs to carry out their institutional goal of integrating minorities into higher education (Beyond Graduation 22). Some of the problems with SEEK were that it sought

to create identifiable populations that included "severely unprepared students" which reinforced the stereotype of the "underqualified minority student"; it also relied on "dangerous double standard[s] in admissions" because ultimately it granted "benefits to those economically disadvantaged students who did [the] worst in high school" (Beyond Graduation 24). According to Soliday because of institutional conflicts and missions, programs like SEEK that provided assistance and support for at-risk students were deeply affected ("Politics of Remediation" 99). While the end of open admissions seemed to be looming it wasn't until the late 1990s that legislators would gain enough political movement to directly shift remediation from the responsibility of CUNYs four-year institutions to the two-year community colleges; however, this shift created even more problems than anyone could've imagined.

Due to the constant struggles within CUNY and between Mayor Giuliani and Governor Pataki about whether open admissions and remediation would remain, the field of composition and rhetoric waged an internal battle. Throughout the 1990s what ensued were divisions in the field about whether traditional developmental courses should continue to be offered to students that were deemed "unprepared" based on placement procedures and practices that sorted through student's abilities. But many academics ideological positions varied about whether basic writing programs remained to help students or help institutions. In Bartholomae's "The Tidy House: Basic Writing in the American Curriculum" he argues strongly that,

> basic writing programs have become expressions of our desire to produce basic writers, to maintain the course, the argument, and the slot in the university community; to maintain the distinction (basic/normal) we have learned to think

through and by. The basic writing program, then, can be seen simultaneously as an attempt to bridge AND preserve cultural difference, to enable students to enter the 'normal' curriculum but to insure, at the same time, that there are basic writers. (8)

Furthermore, basic writing courses construct an identity of difference that Mutnick, Horner, and Lu believe presents these students as "other", and not an accurate representation of the struggle and conflict that they undergo in the classroom. Mutnick claims that the "other" is "situated on the academic margins and that the construction and institutionalization of basic writing [are] sociohistorical, economic, and political" (xiii). Meanwhile according to Horner, public discourse circled around open admissions and labeled students as "'barbarians': outsiders by virtue of their racial and/or ethnic identity and illiteracy who threatened the university" because they lacked the qualifications the university set (207). Lu cites other labels used by CUNY faculty such as Geoffrey Wagner who named open admissions students as "dunces, misfits, hostile mental children, and the most sluggish of animals" (qtd. in Lu 891). Mutnick, Horner, and Lu all argue that basic writing occupies a complex, position in composition studies and that the struggle of coming to terms with appropriate pedagogical approaches should be the focus for the field. Identifying students in demeaning ways does not acknowledge the historical space that impacted the incorporation of open admissions and remedial writing. Yet these CUNY wars ensued and some academics positioned themselves on the left and others on the right; it seems like the overall goal of the mission of higher education became

entrenched in discrimination, a lack of patience and an inability to be aware of others positions and experiences in life.

While arguments have swirled around whether traditional basic/developmental writing courses should still exist, it is certain that they have had a history that has provided a space within the discipline to study how open admissions and remedial writing impacted institutions, teachers, and students. In the *Politics of Remediation* Soliday argues that,

> "Remediation's" fragmentary but persistent presence in all types of schools is evidence of the strange bargains that institutions struck when confronting the increasing complexity of academic literacy. To achieve exclusivity-and thus, in many cases, to gain coveted funding from foundations that were the single greatest source of gifts before the 40s- colleges did not reject students but deployed various remedial traditions to establish standards after admission and before graduation. (42)

Because institutions such as Harvard, the University of California, Yale, and Dartmouth relied heavily on funding to support them and thus did not reject students who didn't meet their standards, they incited the substructures of remediation nationwide. The fiscal reliability, the use of labels at these schools, and contradictory approaches to teaching writing all remained a staple in approaching student writers and programs that supported remediation. All the tension that remediation had developed over the course of one hundred years had come to a head in the late 90s. While some scholars in the field remained steadfast in their belief about the state of basic writing, others were unsure of

the future that remediation would have. Soliday was one academic who remained steadfast in her opinions about remediation and the politics of it, but at times Bartholomae seemed wishy-washy about where he stood. In "The Tidy House: Basic Writing in the American Curriculum" he argues that as a discipline we have constructed courses that teach and enact a rhetoric of exclusion in order to carve out a space in English studies that would enable research in this area. And that basic writing in many ways was molded out of the liberal project in order to champion empowerment, but in doing so it has produced the label of the "other" and has confirmed "existing patterns of power and authority" that were meant to be overthrown (Bartholomae 18). Then Bartholomae questions whether he believes the arguments he has made and argues "yes and no, and sometimes yes and no at the same moment" (18). This cross talk about the state and status of basic writing is one not just that Bartholomae engaged in but one that the discipline itself has been wrangling with since its inception.

There have not been any easy answers to the role and goals of traditional basic writing programs and courses, which made it difficult for the field as a whole to come to a consensus about whether it should remain or depart from higher education. Perhaps because it began in a time when it was needed it might not be necessary anymore. While the field hemmed and hawed over the dilemma of remediation, ultimately as Lewiecki-Wilson and Sommers explain open admissions would meet its demise:

> in May 1998, the mayor and the governor successfully 'push[ed]' the board of trustees to ban all 'remedial' courses at the city's 11 senior colleges, apparently shifting these courses to the six community colleges, which 'are already filled to overflowing'. Incoming students who do not pass gateway placement exams in

reading, writing, and math will be barred entrance, ending the open admissions

policy established in 1970. (439)

While many academics were vocal about changes to remediation from the 1960s and well

into the 2000s "legislators and boards of trustees across the country dismantl[ed]

remedial programs in the name of raising standards and composition scholars [continued

to] debate the pros and cons of basic writing, [but] it seems increasingly important to

remember that basic writing emerged at a particular historical moment" (Mutnick "The

Strategic Value" 71). For some institutions, such as Suffolk County Community College,

basic writing and developmental writing courses remained a part of the curriculum and

continued to impact student's ability to access courses beyond the non-credit sequence.

According to Roueche, "remediation" and the concept of "second chance" opportunities

were tied directly to the junior/two-year college and it was believed "that these programs

were essentially the keys to offering second chance-low achieving students a chance to

remediate their basic skills" in order to increase the likelihood that they would be

successful in college (72). These terms such as "second chance", "basic",

"developmental", "unprepared" all continued to emphasize the value that institutions saw

in labeling student writers.

The Tentacles of Circumstance

Each year the outcome of placement exams assign or deter incoming students to

college- level writing courses. And each year as I walk into my traditional developmental

writing class I know that I will be tasked with the charge of igniting my students' interest

in writing even though they and I know they will not receive credit for the course. Over

the past several years I've thought a lot about the identity problems our students face as I have also faced them. Richard Williamson best describes my current feelings about teaching at the two-year college:

> if the two-year college were a person, we would say that it has grown up with an identity problem. Not surprisingly, it has matured into an institution with incurable multiple personalities, though because of that, it isn't an "institution" in the usual sense. It's hard to imagine an academy that denies admission to no one and promises all who enter that they will overcome any educational deficiencies and emerge as firefighters or chefs, cinematographers or astronomers. Perhaps because it's so unlikely, the community college has turned out to be the "institution" ideally suited to serve a postindustrial populace chronically afflicted with feelings of powerlessness, bewilderment, and displacement. (38)

The idea of sorting out students through the scores of a placement exam seems counter-productive to what the ideal goal of an open access institution stands for. And so, when I walk into that writing classroom on the first day I know what I will face. It will be students who are angry, students who are hurt, and a lot who just don't care. They are all equally capable, but there is something that has happened to them probably throughout their educational lives that has landed them in a situation that has only continued to disengage them from intellectual work that they should find meaningful. Layton describes our students in a way that many teachers of emerging writing can relate to. She states, "some students have a sense of neglect written in their cells--the way they have learned to slump in constricting tab-chair, the way they stop seeing even with their eyes

open-the certain knowledge they radiate that their lives are not worth fighting for".

(Layton 31). Where does this intense neglect that students have come from? In part the

consistent labeling that they may have experienced throughout their school years has

created an internalized emotional feeling that they equate to their intellectual capabilities.

Here, I am drawing specifically from the self-theories of labeling theory and entity theory

which encompasses helpless response patterns. I believe that psychologically and

emotionally students become conditioned at an early age and link their intelligence to

their ability or inability to perform within the social academic structures that educators

have created for students. Mattson and Roll-Pettersson cite K. Taube's work to discuss

how students can look back on their school years and draw conclusions about the

experiences they had. They claim that the psychological impacts linger with students

whether they are "with or without some form of linguistic weakness, a poor start in

reading and writing may result in children refraining from it. That they do so is to avoid

seeing themselves as stupid and failures. The road away from negative self-image is a

long one; once negative self-perceptions are established they are extremely difficult to

reverse" (qtd in Mattson and Roll-Pettersson 240). What I mean here is that students lack

a sense of motivation because it has become a normal behavior for them to engage in.

     About mid-way through each semester at my institution, teachers of traditional

developmental writing tend to find one another and have office venting sessions. I have a

tendency to seek out one of my closest colleagues who also teaches traditional

developmental writing and I complain about the behaviors my students' exhibit which

I'm sure are common at other institutions. I have the traditional complaints, such as: they

came to class without a draft, they didn't write down the deadline I gave them, they came

to class extremely late, they didn't hand in their homework, etc. All of these behaviors and my own complaints frustrate me because I perceive those student behaviors as deviant and at times I become personally offended that students aren't doing the work when I know they're capable of it. In part there are reasons for why these students behave in these ways. According to Cullen and Sreberny, "the central tenet of labeling theory is that deviance is an ascribed or conferred state. Actors become "deviant" when those around them label, define, or categorize the actors as such." (5). By labeling students "remedial" "developmental" or "underprepared" we are in fact defining these students as deviant. There is a self-imposed and an external expectation that when students come to college they should be able to score well enough on a placement exam in order to enroll in a college level writing class. But when they do not, students are faced with a kind of psychological and or emotional stress.

Even though I had negative intellectual experiences I never fully understood how much the use of labels like "developmental", "basic", "unprepared" or "remedial" could impact students. There is a strong rhetorical history of labeling that has led students to feel an emotional and intellectual transience that consistently emerges throughout their education. This isn't something that occurs as students suddenly enter the collegiate atmosphere; it is a rhetorical environment they have been raised in. In "Labeling: Student Self-Esteem and the Stigma of a Label" Sowards contends that "individuals are not naturally deviant in their actions and behaviors until a social group defines them that way. Essentially, labeling theory suggests that people define and construct their identities based upon society's perceptions of them" (1). I am connecting labeling theory to a hypothesis in that students have a self-fulling prophesy (see Merton 1948) from early

academic experiences. Further support of this notion is noted in Jean Anyon's "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work", where she posits that students are sorted depending on social class status early on. She states, "scholars in political economy and the sociology of knowledge have recently argued that public schools in complex industrial cities …make available different types of educational experience and curriculum knowledge to students in different classes" (Anyon 67). From an early age students are conditioned to respond to negative experiences in a specific way. Researchers chronicled their findings in "Believing is seeing: how people's beliefs influence goals, emotions and behavior" and explain that, "children with a helpless response to challenging situations tended to denigrate their abilities and blame their intelligence for failures, saying things like 'I guess I'm not very smart' and 'I'm no good at things like this'" (Teunissen and Bok 1065). These are the same things we hear from college level emerging writers. These students have learned to believe that behavior or deviancy has landed them in a non-credit class. I have heard students say to me that if they just paid attention more in high school, if they studied more, if they tried harder than maybe they would not be in a remedial class and they would feel "less stupid". Teunissen and Bok ascribe students like these as ones that are more comfortable "holding an entity theory [which] leads one to set performance goals and to harbour concerns about performing well and making a good impression" (1064). Students with helpless pattern behaviors simply become overwhelmed and stifled by the emotional reaction they have to being labeled incompetent. By labeling students "remedial" or "developmental" they begin to link this to deviancy in the very context of their everyday life, so emotionally these students shut down in the classroom and academically they give up. They believe

so strongly that they can't do it, that they don't bother trying after a while. What is relevant about labeling and entity theory and its relationship to remedial writers is that it gives context and helps explain to educators and administrators why students react the way that they do. For most students being labeled holds a set of societal complexities that can cause emotional stress that may be detrimental in their academic and professional lives. Steele and Aronson describe this as a stereotype threat which is when students feel anxiety about expectations and stereotypes that are consistently associated with the group they belong to. Some students internalize this anxiety and become fearful which in turn can lead to a diminished interest and lack of motivation academically (Steele and Aronson 797). This kind of hit to a student's self-esteem is something that may take them years to overcome, but for those of us who work in education we sometimes forget that. Even I, the emerging writer forgot that.

Some academics would believe that this kind of academic emotional upset isn't their problem. Over the years I've heard many professors and colleagues say that they can't be accountable for every wounded emerging learner. And I understand that to a certain extent, but we can control how we communicate to our students. And we can control our reaction to students who struggle with different writing moments. And we can control what we call students who struggle. And we can control how we react to behaviors that we view as deviant. When students are given the chance to succeed and come out of the negative rhetorical labeling fog they have been stifled by, they can achieve anything. I feel it is my job to help facilitate that ideological and emotional shift to help them succeed. By exploring a definitional characterization of the terms that are

associated with at-risk student writers, we may better understand the need to alter the language we use and associate with emerging writers.

The Linguistic Characterization of at-risk Students

Labeling students according to their abilities has been going on for quite some time in the American educational system. During the 1920s at Yale the "Awkward Squad" label had been used in a derogatory way to describe struggling student writers and this seems to be one of the first instances where student's identities were marked in a demeaning way. Roueche argues that "early on, remedial generally referred to those college courses designed to bring students to academic skill levels needed to successfully negotiate beginning college-level work" (50). The notion of remediation was to strengthen those students' skills who had been weak in order to bring them up to the traditional standard. Colleges desired to make nontraditional students into traditional students so those most concerned created educational models that would enable these nontraditional students to participate and "remedial" courses specifically were designed to remove academic "deficiencies". Since the inaugural use of the term "Awkward Squad", the linguistic characterization and naming of students has undergone an etymological evolution that in some ways attempts to mirror actual skill assessment, but in others only creates negative stereotypes and perceptions about students' actual abilities. Ultimately the "university's ability to label a group of students 'remedial' is a powerful rhetorical tool" and this kind of rhetorical tool has successfully been defined and defended its usage (Stanley 6). Stanley argues "I am convinced that the well-published lamentations about students' 'illiteracy' (and later, 'deficiency'; and later,

'need for remediation'; and recently, 'underpreparation') have accomplished important political-that is to say rhetorical –work for the university" (6). Labeling students has become the definition for how institutions have come to view their status, but that doesn't accurately represent how all writing teachers see their students' abilities.

One of the goals in incorporating basic writing programs was to help introduce students into the traditional writing expectations of the academy, but with the increasing numbers of at-risk students who had a wide variety of life experiences, colleges began to realize the benefit of the "remedial" function (Roueche 50). After the "Awkward Squad" label was handed out, and then later in the midst of CUNY's open admissions programs, labeling became commonplace in academia. The idea of sorting through students by ways of the placement process made it easier to manage the large influx of students. Shaughnessy's work at CUNY began with the intent to help students overcome obstacles that would impede their ability to progress academically because of the lack of linguistic preparation they had. Her use of the term "basic" became a conventional way to describe at-risk writers. In "The Language of Exclusion" Mike Rose found some additional ways to contextualize the term "basic" and "remedial". He states,

> it has been difficult to trace the educational etymology of the word "remedial", but what I have uncovered suggests this: Its origins are in law and medicine, and by the late nineteenth century the term fell pretty much in the medical domain and was soon applied to education. 'Remedial' quickly generalized beyond the description of students who might have had neurological problems to those with broader, though special educational problems and then to those normal learners

who are not up to a particular set of standards in a particular era at particular

institutions. (Rose 349)

Furthermore, he argued that this term was problematic because it was a linguistic tag that

would be associated with one's character, intelligence, morals, and good taste (Rose 354).

And students who were identified "to be literate [were thought] to be honorable and

intelligent. Tag some group illiterate, and you've gone beyond letters; you've judged

their morals and their minds" (Rose 354). These connotations about one's character play

into the difficult and complex issues surrounding remediation in a social, cultural, racial,

and political climate that seemed disrespectful of the array of experiences students

brought to the classroom. When educational institutions represent students, or prospective

students, and their writing in particular ways as "literate" or "illiterate", "college

material" or "remedial", "skilled" or "unskilled" in negative ways it calls into question

the political role of educational institutions (Horner "Discoursing" 199). These binary

statuses were emphasized because students of open admissions were seen as outsiders

and that they were the problem, not the institution that should've worked to help them.

Horner argues in "Mapping Errors and Expectations for Basic Writing", that basic

writing students aren't necessarily beginners because that assumes a level of maturity that

cannot be assessed in the complexity of their writing and so furthermore "it is

increasingly clear that it makes equally little sense to think of many of them as 'foreign,'"

(34). These terms that have run the gamut; from the "Awkward Squad" in the 1920s, to

"basic writer", "developmental" or "remedial" writer in the mid to late 1960s, to other

more degrading terms such as "childlike" (Barthomolae "The Study of Error 254),

"savage" (Roueche "Shifting Paradigms" 72), "sluggish of animals" (Lu 891) and I could continue, ultimately harm students. None of these terms help our students feel confident about their abilities as writers and none thoughtfully welcome them into an academic arena that is a new world and experience for each and every student. As Rose and others have argued the reason these labels have existed is to create a brand that has more to do with politics than it does pedagogy.

Basic writing programs developed out of a necessity and have evolved into exclusionary practices that began to disregard whether they thoroughly benefited students in various institutions with diverse needs. Mutnick states that "to offer basic writing-or any writing-courses in sufficient quantity and quality to support open admissions and other nonexclusive policies would require major reform in higher education" (xv). Recently there have been some reforms which led to alternative approaches, but in the early 2000s while attending Suffolk County Community College I was placed into a developmental writing class. By exploring my own experiences as a writer, developmental student, and teacher alongside other influential literacy narratives, I hope to shed light on the valuable experiences that struggling, at-risk students have so that academia and the two-year college specifically will begin to rethink current approaches to emerging writers.

Chapter 2: Developmental Writing According to a Developmental Writer

Early Lessons

In 1987 my parents moved from a working-class neighborhood in Nassau County to an upper-class community in Suffolk County, Long Island. The move was extremely traumatic for me. Growing up in Nassau county I was close with my neighbors and had many childhood friends, but moving to Suffolk County meant a new life and a new environment that a child such as I wasn't prepared for.

When I started first grade at Otsego Elementary School in Dix Hills I was shy, cautious, and non-social. All of the other children knew one another and I was the outsider. I sat in the back of the room and didn't speak a word for the first few months. Naturally I started to get picked on, but I've always had a hard shell. Even as a child I did not intimidate easily and I had an innate ability not only to control my emotions, but hide them as well. I was and am very good at internalizing my feelings; it's a protective mechanism that has grown stronger over time. But back in first grade my teacher Mrs. Ritter was about to challenge that.

It was the fall. I was starting to get used to taking the bus without too much peer harassment, but the schoolwork was not getting any easier. I was definitely slower than everyone else. I had a hard time staying focused and there was a lot more independent in-class work required, which I was not used to. I vaguely remember starting off one particular morning with a spelling test that I studied all week for, but there was one word that I knew would give me trouble: *Christmas.* My mom said I should know how to spell this word. I couldn't remember so I took a piece of paper, folded it in half, wrote the

word Christmas and put it in a perfect position in my desk so that I'd be able to see it during the test. Test distributed. Test accomplished. Test score perfect. I was feeling really confident even though I cheated; I knew it was the wrong thing to do. The next literacy assignment of the day was one that had to do with wig-wams. What the heck was a wig-wam? No explanation. No description of Native Americans, their history, or their relationship to wig-wams. Mrs. Ritter explained that we were to write a story about wig-wams and we should be as creative as possible. On the chalkboard she had her own "creative" wig-wam story that she read aloud, which received praise from other students. We had forty-five minutes. Write your own wig-wam story. I sat there for what felt like forever, a lifetime. I looked around the room and everyone else was busy going at it. Their faces showed expressions of glee, self-satisfaction, and overall confidence. Then there was me. I was sweating and at one point wanted to throw up. I didn't know what to write. I didn't know what to do. I started to think I was stupid…really stupid. Everyone else came up with something to write so why couldn't I? I took a deep breath and looked around the room again and that's when it happened. I looked up at the chalk board and realized there was a story right in front of me. I copied it word for word, handed it in, and didn't give it a second thought.

Several weeks passed by before we were gathered to the rainbow reading carpet to talk about our writing. Most of my peers were really excited, but I knew exactly what was about to happen. Mrs. Ritter sat in her chair which overlooked all of us. From her lofty seat she gazed down at each of us. She talked about the wig-wam assignment and how proud she was of "most of us." Then she started to give back our essays. One-by-one she called each of us up. Every time she gave back an assignment she would offer some

kind of personal commentary: "Oh Jessica, what a wonderfully descriptive essay. Nice Job!" I patiently listened as each and every one of my peers received their essays; honestly, I started to zone out of the situation. Listening to everyone receive so much praise just got lame after a while. At some point I looked around the room and realized I was the only one without my paper. And then there was the soliloquy from Mrs. Ritter: "Oh this student. Well this student. I can't believe what she did. She has no creativity, she has no original idea, and she stole my idea for our assignment. Just terrible! Meridith please come up and collect your essay." I grabbed my paper out of her hand as she glared at me. I wouldn't cry. She couldn't make me cry. I swallowed hard and went back to my desk. I didn't talk much for the rest of the school year.

Early on in my childhood, school and the idea of academics became a turn off for me. Part of the reasons were due to my personality. I wasn't outgoing and it took me a long time to trust people. When we moved from one school district to another the adjustments I had to face and the new people I had to meet and learn to trust, made things very difficult for me. Also, my working-class roots and the attitudes my parents had directly conflicted with my affluent peers and teachers. I learned early on that teachers' and students' attitudes about education varied from the ones I had known. These ideological differences coupled with my shy and introverted personality, influenced me to link intelligence to my class position. In Jean Anyon's "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work" she contends that, "students from different social class backgrounds are rewarded for classroom behaviors that correspond to personality traits allegedly rewarded in the different occupational strata-the working class for docility and obedience, the managerial classes for initiative and personal assertiveness" (67). Further,

Anyon draws from Michael Apple's work who argues that knowledge and skills lead to social power and reward (Anyon 67). In this new school district teachers seemed to value creativity and students were expected to be autonomous. Throughout my elementary and middle school years there was a conventional system of beliefs that focused on these ideals. Students were expected to figure things out with little direction. In Mrs. Ritter's class my inability to compose a creative and expressive wig-wam story led to a shaming exercise that impacted my relationship to education and writing. This incident made me question my sense of worth as a student and I have linked my feelings of alienation to my writing abilities. Unfortunately, while I had more negative academic experiences, the wig-wam writing moment is one that has stuck with me my entire life. I use this narrative to talk to students in my own classes about how our relationship to writing whether good or bad can mark us, influence us, and if we let it, define us. As a young student I was able to skim by as a below average student and continued to struggle with the feeling of being academically shamed and rejected; furthermore, these early experiences marked my perceptions and attitudes toward higher education.

Lessons Learned

I graduated from high school early. I was not a stellar student by any stretch of the imagination. I was bored in high school and this was in part because I had the normal distractions and preoccupations that are associated with teenage life. In my junior year of high school while all of my peers were working on college applications and making plans for their first year away from college, I was working full-time and saving money so I could get an apartment. My priorities were very different from my middle-to-upper-class school-mates. While getting an education was emphasized in my family, the act of how

that happened was unclear to me. Even though I despised the thought of going to college, my parents, like so many, convinced me that I should attend college for one semester in order to feel things out. I was in many cases the typical community college student. I went and took a placement exam and the outcome required I start my freshman year in a non-credit developmental writing course. At the time I really didn't understand the difference between credit and noncredit courses and furthermore couldn't wrap my head around how my inability to pass it would directly impact my perception of education and academia for quite some time.

My recollection of the developmental writing class is a bit blurry, but I do remember a significant amount of grammar instruction that emphasized the use of what I can now characterize as a monolithic discourse. Further, I had a difficult time connecting to the writing assignments because they didn't matter to me; they weren't relevant to my life or experiences. On more than one occasion the instructor belittled the opinions I had or the language I would use. She would say, "There's no such word as *gavone*. That's just some slang word you heard at home." When I failed ENG 010 developmental writing in the spring of 1999 I dropped out of college. I felt defeated after the negative experience I had in that developmental class and therefore wouldn't return for another four years only to have to complete the same developmental writing course in order to *really* begin my college career. I hated the fact that I had to take the same class again, and I hated the term "developmental"; internally it impacted the way I perceived myself as a writer. While I'm not one to outwardly admit this to anyone, even though I do so now, inside I struggled throughout the rest of my undergraduate and part of my graduate academic career in part because I was labeled as a "developmental" writer. And this

labeling was not the first moment when I felt like an outsider; it had been a consistent

experience throughout my education starting in elementary school.

There were numerous factors that influenced my approaches to academia. Being a

first-generation college student, my parents were limited in the workings of higher

education and while they tried to be supportive, I'm not sure they knew how to do that in

productive and positive ways. Additionally, as a working-class child attending k-12

school in an affluent community with a majority of other students who seemed innately

smart, got whatever they wanted, and had parents with professional careers, complicated

things. My parents had working class jobs, we received hand-me down cloths while my

peers were wearing Donna Karen, Tommy Hilfiger, and Calvin Klein. In high school I

took the school bus every day while most of my friends drove their own Mercedes or

Porsche to school. The class divide was very clear and influenced the way I viewed

intelligence and wealth. Ultimately, I allied intelligence with wealth and success; things I

had limited experiences with. The early social and cultural exposure that I had

academically helped and hurt me throughout my school years. Ultimately, various class

differences and my resultant insecurities helped contribute to difficulties I had

academically and many community college students deal with similar feelings.

My wig-wam experience in 1st grade was not the last academic letdown I would

have. In 3rd grade the elementary school I attended suggested I go to summer school in

order to work on my slow cognitive abilities. I was particularly bad in math and while I

enjoyed creative writing, I had a difficult time accomplishing genre based writing tasks

that were critical and analytical in nature. I also had a speech impediment that wouldn't

be corrected until my latter high school years. While I wasn't made fun of or bullied

much by my peers, I was constantly told that my speech impairment was related to my intellectual ability. Throughout elementary and middle school, I was continually hauled out of class for one-on-one speech lessons; none of which improved the impairment. By the time I reached high school I was placed into "Resource Room", which was an added extra period of small group class time with a tutor. While I bonded well with my peers and the adult tutor, there was a negative stigma associated with going to resource room. By the time I got to the community college I felt stupid and incapable of the expectations required. Being labeled a "developmental" student was an extra-layer that reminded me about all the past negative experiences I had had. An outcome of these insecurities was that I was extremely shy in all of my literature and writing courses. I never offered any opinions or thoughts verbally during class discussion for the fear that someone would realize I was a "developmental" learner. I learned to internalize my ideas and thoughts in order to emotionally deal with the intellectual shame I had. While labeling didn't help make me feel better as a student, there were a number of social, cultural, physiological, and emotional reasons for why I associated my intellectual abilities with the term "developmental". These feelings started at an early age and carried over into my graduate work where I tried to finally deal with them.

Writing graduate term papers and my Master's thesis was a grueling undertaking so much so that the semester before I undertook one of my first grueling writing tasks I experienced the direct impact of my "developmental" beginnings. While my Master's degree was focused on literary studies, I was encouraged to complete a certificate program that would expose me to courses in Writing and Rhetoric. On the first day of the *Theories of Composition* class I looked around the room at the small class of six and I

was intimidated and rightfully so. For the first hour or so the instructor asked us to individually introduce ourselves and talk for ten minutes about all of the experiences we had with writing, teaching writing, tutoring, and the field of composition and rhetoric. I learned quickly that I was the youngest and most inexperienced academic. In the small class of six I was the only one who hadn't taught a class of my own, hadn't worked in a writing center, and I was the only student who experienced a developmental writing class. Throughout the course at times I felt lost and confused, but worked extremely hard to keep up with the class. When our final paper was due the instructor asked if I would meet her at a coffee shop so we could discuss my paper. I remember feeling excited that I was finally being guided in a more direct way. I met the professor and thought the meeting would be a place for me to discuss my ideas and how I could develop them more, so I wanted to talk about the theories we had learned and how I could apply them to my own teaching. Instead the exchange left me wondering if I would ever be able to make it as an academic. During the initial part of our conversation the professor asked me about the writing classes I took when I was a student at a community college. I told her that I took a developmental writing class and then a freshman composition class, but after that I wasn't required to take anymore writing classes. That was when the professor wanted to talk to me about "Things I hadn't learned because I was a "developmental" writer". The professor wanted to go over the ways I could organize my ideas and how I could use highlighters or post-it's to map out ideas and then organize them into more cogent sections. The professor wanted to discuss my sentence level writing, syntax, and grammar. The professor was concerned with my use of passive voice and encouraged me to be more assertive through the use of active voice. At no point did we discuss the

content of my writing. At no point did the professor use encouraging rhetoric to help me feel even the slightest confidence about my writing. The meeting ended with a weak pep talk about how I shouldn't worry about being a developmental writer because there are a lot of us out there. After she left, I sat in the coffee house for a while. I was embarrassed. I couldn't believe she called me a "developmental" writer; I couldn't believe she used the same label that I had been branded with in the past. My insecurities as a writer were continuing to mark and label me in a way that made me feel unsure of myself and my future as a teacher.

Because of this experience and others, I understand what my students feel and may continue to experience in the future. At times I think they are afraid, feel intellectual and academic shame, and they convince themselves they are incapable of succeeding. Emerging writers are vulnerable students who can be doubly at-risk and susceptible to feelings of alienation and inadequacy. While teacher's intentions can be well-meaningful, they can also backfire and have negative consequences. I worry about how students perceive themselves. Even now whenever I have to write a paper of any kind I mentally freeze, I second guess anything I write, and I always think that I am not a good writer, and that I'll never be smart enough. When I observe my students, I can see that they are having moments like I had and it hurts to watch them struggle. These labels that we give to students and that were given to me stick and can continue to impact writers throughout their lives. Labels can lead to insecurities and a lack of confidence. It's not that these writers can't write, it's not that I can't write. It is the psychological effects that labeling can have which impacted my ability to write. But with greater sensitivity, we can be

better prepared with approaches that support such at-risk students, which can make more inclusive learning environments.

It was only until I started working as a tutor and then instructor in an Educational Opportunity Program that I realized how much students struggled with the stigma of being labeled; it didn't take long before I realized how much they associated their abilities with these labels. Let me be clear: not all writers are prone to dealing with the lingering effects of labeling, but one student internalizing a negative label is one too many for me. And so, my first experience with traditional developmental writers was when I taught a two-week instructional class for a group of students who participated in an Educational Opportunity Program at the two-year college where I am now employed. Educational Opportunity Programs

> emerg[ed] out of the Civil Rights movement, EOP and similar programs have helped to compensate economically and academically disadvantaged students to not only gain admission to colleges and universities by providing them with a leg up, but to also academically and financially support them through college completion. In New York, for example, it has been reported that over 100,000 students have been served since the statutory adoption of HEOP, one of four Opportunity programs founded in the late 1960's. (Somchanhmavong ii)

At Suffolk County Community College, the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) is designed to provide academic support to students enrolled full-time in a curriculum. Students admitted to EOP may need additional academic support and counseling throughout their time at the college and will be provided with supplementary support.

Furthermore, students will participate in a "5-week summer program, which begins in July, provides a college orientation and intensive review of reading, writing, computer and mathematic skills" ("EOP Program Highlights and Eligibility"). It was during two weeks of the summer program that I worked with approximately twenty-five students whose abilities varied, but all were labeled "basic" or "developmental". In order for them to gain additional one-on-one tutoring throughout the semester, EOP students had to participate in two weeks worth of instructional classes. I was familiar with the terms "basic" and "developmental" and during my instructor orientation was told that I should expect most students that were in EOP and in the summer classes were "remedial" students, but that designation would be assigned based on the outcome of the EOP student's placement score.

On the very first day before instruction was provided, each student took a placement exam for reading, writing, and math comprehension. This placement exam was the standard Accuplacer that all incoming students at our institution take at the beginning and at the end of the two-week course. The hope was that within the two-week period students might improve upon their Accuplacer score. The belief was that if students were prepared with group and individual instruction they might place out of traditional developmental courses altogether. Although Susan Headden's "How the Other Half Tests" acknowledges that in some contexts students can increase their scores, "because they don't know what's coming, most students don't prepare for the tests, even though studies have shown that a review course can raise scores enough to place students at a higher developmental level or keep them out of remediation altogether." But within two weeks? Internally I think I knew that there was no way two weeks could make up for a

lifetime of difficulties these students had with literacy and learning, but as a green academic I was up for the challenge. I set up a curriculum based on what I valued as a compositionist and thought that would help students do better on the placement exam. I myself hadn't taken the placement exam in a very long time and couldn't remember what the test consisted of, but I believed that didn't necessarily matter. I believed that if I designed a curriculum that would help these writers gain a better grasp of college level writing that they would do better on the exam. Boy was I wrong! Throughout the two weeks I discussed the writing process with students and I had them work on multiple drafts; we discussed the kinds of genres that writers are asked to compose within; we examined the notion of audience and its impact on the language and style that we used to convey an idea.

Toward the end of the two weeks I was excited and nervous for them to re-take the placement exam. After all the students finished the exam, the director of the summer program sat everyone down and gave them a print-out of their initial and most recent scores. Only two of my students increased their writing score by a couple of points; all the other students scored the same or less than their initial score. I felt terrible and there was a big part of me that was really embarrassed. The outcomes I had for these students were misaligned with the expectations that others had of them. My goal was for each of them to feel confident as a writer, but I felt like I let them down. In reflection I realize that the student's writing was being accessed based on sentence level errors and comprehension of these errors. The placement exam consisted of sentence level structures and students needed to identify problems or successes in these sentences and this was in no way what I was teaching them. As Shaughnessy notes in *Errors and Expectations,*

errors do not necessarily impair the meaning, but when patterns are identified students may understand these errors. Further she states that, "correctness is by no means all the work of a composition course" (158) and I would further argue that while the placement exam is asking only for correctness it is not a good measure of what college level writing courses require. It took me some time to realize that my own perceptions of the kind of writing that those EOP students should have been engaged in was completely different than what the Accuplacer tested them on. The placement exam is problematic for EOP students and traditional developmental students in that it examines standard grammatical syntactical skills that are not taught in the classroom at Suffolk County Community College. Furthermore, the exam does not take into account the range of experiences and hardships that some students have had. EOP students come to the table with unique and diverse challenges. Most if not all come from a place of financial hardship, they are students whose lives are on the margins, and they have some level of unpreparedness which makes them an at-risk population. Admittance to EOP offers these at-risk students the ability to succeed and overcome the financial and educational hurdles that other traditional developmental students may not have.

Why am I telling my own emerging writing and teaching narrative? What value could or do I think it should have? Emerging writers have a variety of experiences, but how many return to teach in the place they came from? The ongoing struggles I have with writing and the teaching of it directly challenge my desire to continue the difficult and challenging work of a teacher of writing. Shedding light on the concerns our emerging students have is key to helping them move forward with the professional and academic goals that they may have. And my personal experiences as an emerging writer have been

a staple throughout my professional interests. They are so embedded in my thought and writing process that it would only seem natural for them to impact my professional academic goals. Being labeled as a "developmental" writer who teaches "developmental" writers I believe that some students are conditioned and labeled based on their race, gender, geographical location, and or social class status. This kind of educational hazing process is not unusual, but instead has been experienced by many other prominent writers and academics. Their experiences are chronicled in literacy narratives and focus on issues of exclusion and alienation and the reactions they have had as students and academics.

A Tradition of Exclusion

Kass Fleisher's *Talking Out of School: Memoir of an Educated Woman* focuses on her academic experiences and the tumultuous relationship she has had with literacy, identity, and power. Throughout Fleisher's early childhood she narrates the contentious and somewhat abusive relationship between her and her mother and because of her mother's abusive and dysfunctional personal life there was a lack of parental support which influenced Fleisher's own transient academic beginnings. She flip-flops on deciding what she wants to do in her future, but loves to read and write. However, her enjoyment for writing and reading clash with what her family sees as valuable learning that should be acquired. At times Fleisher and her brother are sent to spend time with their mother's family which she identifies as "white trash" (94) and she experiences an ongoing battle with her grandfather about whether she will be allowed to read while she is visiting. He claims that Fleisher is too bookish and talks "about how dumb I can be, how clumsy, how I lack common…his voice follows after me" (89). These early exchanges with her family are seeds for future class consciousness and confusion. It is

difficult to negotiate one's position when it seems impossible to reconcile them. Fleisher states, "one foot in intellectual boot camp, the other in underclass, underkempt, undereducated, overly Old-Spiced anti-intellectualism. The left foot doesn't know what the right foot is doing, even as they smoothly two-step" (106). Many academics, especially ones from working-class means walk this treacherous tight rope throughout their careers. Having experienced this myself I know how emotionally and intellectually challenging it is to try and marry two worlds that are unable to find common ground. Negotiating class position alongside literacy is something Fleisher struggled with even though her mother worked in the education field.

When Fleisher was in grade school her mother taught at the school she attended and was involved with the local NEA chapter and the union's labor issues. This complicated Fleisher's ability to be social with her peers, impacted her academically, and she was constantly seeking a sense of belonging either at home or at school. Fleisher writes, "I maintain two lives, keep two separate pieces" (90); throughout her memoir she attempts to fit into these two lives, but constantly feels "shunned" by her mother and by fellow academics. The narrative is non-linear at times so the reader is shown moments of emotional upheaval attached to this shunning and academic advancement, which lead to a sense of alienation and self-loathing. From start to finish there are numerous moments where Fleisher blames her naiveté on her intellect. She will say to herself "*what a Dumb Bunny!*" (248) in reference to situations that disempower her or leave her feeling unequal to those around her. The separation she feels from her family is because of her intellectual growth and the separation she experiences in academia is because she is still straddling two different worlds. This kind of disjointedness leaves her feeling like the

more educated one becomes the further from their family they become. She states, "*that's* an institution-*there*-and *this* is an institution-*here*. The more time I spend *there*, and the more I go *there* by way of attempting to escape *here*, the farther away-the point is too obvious to bother with, really-*the farther away I get from here*" (98). As Fleisher escalates her social class status she has a rude awakening about what life leaves behind and what one is really stuck with. Through her teaching she struggles to help students understand these issues with position and social class along with other complexities linked to identity; by challenging her students to explore and examine race, gender, and sexual orientation she cathartically wrestles with how institutions treat faculty members with these complicated identities.

Academia was not what she thought it would be and it is clear that she was disappointed by the power struggles that an academic often suffers through. The constant tug-of-war that is played between students and faculty create a powerful intellectual and academic hierarchy. It is one that Fleisher experiences while teaching at various institutions. While in Idaho she attempted to connect the mostly Caucasian student population with minority students in order to help the student body learn and understand one another. At another institution she proposed radical course ideas by incorporating a class entitled "The Literature of Revolution". The course readings, student-centered approach, and course assignments caused such a stir that Fleisher's own teaching position was in jeopardy (208). Ultimately her autobiography tells a story about her climb up the academic ladder and how the process of education leads to alienation from family and potential partners. Her autobiography works to present these issues in a way that will offer alternative views to the traditional middle class academic journey. Her perspective

sheds light on the troubling experiences some endure in order to enter an arena where they feel they might never belong. Fleisher puts her experiences and conflicts in direct dispute with an institution where one is discriminated against, censored, and unsupported. The very title of her memoir *Talking Out of School* is an idiom for how Fleisher views education, identity, and the exclusionary status that drives it. The title is recognition that she is an outsider who doesn't have a right to say anything about the challenges of a negative educational history because she is from a working-class position. However, Fleisher does of course talk out of school in order to counteract the "judgement of authority" in order to break down barriers that can be associated with educational experiences. Her autobiography illustrates the classic features that many other writers and academics face when they attempt to gain access to an education that is outside the realm of familial understanding. While Fleisher's memoir struggles with class identity, Jane Thompkins autobiography *A Life in School: What the Teacher Learned* is able to avoid social tensions because of her upbringing in an upper-to-middle class family-- but she struggles throughout her life with emotional anguish she attaches to her schooling.

Similar to other narratives including Fleisher's, Jane Thompkins is concerned deeply with the state of education and how schools prepare students for life. She believes that students and faculty often forget that we are people first and that the lives of our students are really important. Thompkins argues throughout her preface that we should help students intellectually grow by showing them life skills that they can use in different circumstances. She states, "I'm speaking here of an attitude toward learning that accepts the importance of inner life. An approach to teaching that acknowledges the humanness of both teachers and students" (Thompkins xiv). According to Thompkins, schools

condition students to become a certain way and this is done through emotional manipulation. Students are made to feel anxiety, fear, and apprehension; this is done in order to secure a structure that requires students to obey rules and follow the direction of teachers. In her preface she writes that, "school by definition, conditions us to believe that there are others who know better than we do; it encourages and often forces us to give up our own judgment in favor of the judgment of those in authority (xix)". Like Fleisher, Thompkins' narrative *A Life in School* also depicts negative stressful educational experiences that began as a young child and followed her throughout her academic life.

Thompkins weaves several issues throughout *A Life in School* that help the reader connect to the physical and emotional experiences she faced as a student. She focuses on emotional stress, self-isolation, and the impact that authoritarian structures in academia had on her. While Thompkins discusses how she physically resembles most of white America she still claims to feel different inside (10). She describes this difference through her reactions to emotional situations; she has a constant fear of being yelled at by a teacher or being singled out and made to feel humiliation. This anxiety causes her to literally endure physical pain that impacts her ability to accomplish tasks in the classroom. At times, she feels so wrought with anxiety and fear yet she has no way to control or overcome it; Thompkins claims that she was never "taught how to recognize and face fear" (7). This inability to face her fears caused a lot of anxiety and made her self-conscious, which led Thompkins to self-isolate in order to cope with her emotions. While in graduate school at Yale she felt isolated from other students: "except for my roommates and a few other people, I never really knew the other students; in class they

seemed intimidating, and at parties they made snide comments and knowing remarks that confirmed the impression" (77). Thompkins is comfortable with solitude for a time, but when she begins to transition from student to teacher she learns how difficult it can be to negotiate one's voice and the power associated with it.

Even though Thompkins had negative experiences that caused her physical and emotional pain, she somehow decided to join the ranks and become a teacher. But she argues she modeled her teaching practices based on some of the positive experiences she had with teachers. She never used "the metaphoric whip, but inspired, encouraged and praised" her students (6). While she attempted to mirror this approach, it did not always come easy to her so instead Thompkins began to think of teaching as a kind of performance with power. She states that, "to be the one everybody looked at and had to obey, to be standing alone, up in front, performing while other people paid attention was the only thing I knew to aim for" (54). While performing worked for a period of time Thompkins also realized that in order to surrender one's authority and engage in a student-centered approach she needed to give her power over to students so that they could talk and learn from one another. She writes, "to perform in order to survive existentially is backbreaking work; to give up the burden of performance, an inexpressible relief" (65). Thompkins narrates that as a student and novice teacher she begins to have this awakening about her upbringing and while she was from upper-class means, she still suffered the same kind of difficulties that Fleisher and others did, but in a different way. Like many female literacy narratives discuss, there is a narrowed focus on success and sometimes this requires an academic to ignore or pretend to ignore outside distractions in order to become successful, which might be described as academic

naiveté. Fleisher experienced this as did Thompkins; she claims, "all I could really see was school and what school demanded. The need to get good grades, to climb a ladder that led to approval, kept me from noticing what else was going on" (Thompkins 74). Ultimately Thompkins' autobiography continues to examine the emotional stake that academics have and she believes that "most institutions of higher learning in our country do not address the inner lives of their students, except as a therapeutic stopgap" (220). What we can learn from Thompkins' narrative is that students of varying degrees and social statuses struggle with identity formation. There is no concrete formula that helps identify the difficulties students face. Some of these students may become academics like Fleisher, Thompkins, and others and thus, may be afforded the possibility to narrate and examine the difficulties they faced, but many others go without this opportunity to explore the identity restrictions that class or caste have on their identity formation. As an instructor I genuinely care about my students and I find excitement in the rhetorically intimate exchanges that I have with my students who are working to overcome a myriad of challenges that I may or may not know about.

Similar to Fleisher and Thompkins, bell hooks has a keen sense of class consciousness that permeates several of her experimental semi-autobiographical books. In *Where We Stand: Class Matters, Bone Black and Wounds of Passion* hooks focuses on racial, gender, and class tensions that influence many students especially those in higher education. Each of these narrative pieces are experimental in that they not only show glimpses of hooks's relationship to literacy, but they put it in direct conversation with critical issues in society that relate to race, class, and gender. In all three of these texts

there are moments where a reader can piece together separate narrative experiences in order to understand how hooks has developed a love for reading and writing.

hooks' main focus of *Where We Stand* is to explore and reflect on class situation in order to make sense of experiences she had as a young child, a college student, and ultimately a professor. In *Where We Stand: Class Matters* hooks contends that she wrote this autobiography, "about class in an effort to clarify my own personal journey from a working-class background to the world of affluence, in an effort to be more class conscious" ("Where We Stand" 8). She makes a strong argument in her introduction that class is not a position that many consider, but it is one that can silence or embolden one's situation. Class, gender, and race are tightly connected and hooks believes that one monolithic prevailing discourse is held in high esteem. hooks states that, "the domain of academic and/or intellectual discourse about class is still mostly white, mostly male" ("Where We Stand" 7). This position is the overarching theme that sets up sections of her *Where We Stand* and helps explain her connection and perspective when it comes to literacy and learning.

As a young child hooks' experiences with status and education were bound to the relationships she had with the women in her lives. Her mother was a charismatic "wild person" who would soon be tamed. In reference to her mother she states, "a girl without proper education, without the right background, could only change her status through marriage" ("Where We Stand"13). Like her mother, hooks' grandmother Baba had "a sharp tongue, a quick temper, and the ruthless wit and will needed to make everything go her way" ("Where We Stand"13). While neither woman was formally educated they passed on oral narratives about their experiences. Story-telling was a large part of hooks'

youth and her literacy practices. She states, "Baba did not read or write. Telling a story, listening to a story being told is where knowledge was for her. Conversation is not a place of meaningless chitchat. It is the place where everything must be learned-the site of all epistemology" ("Where We Stand"16). This kind of storytelling is vital for hooks in that it allows women's voices to be heard and takes them out of a place of silence. In the introduction to *Bone Black* hooks writes,

> to understand the complexity of black girlhood we need more work that documents that reality in all its variations and diversity. Certainly, class shapes the nature of our childhood experiences. Undoubtedly, black girls raised in materially privileged families have different notions of self-esteem from peers growing up poor and/or destitute. It's vital then that we hear about our diverse experience. There is no one story of black girlhood. ("Bone Black" xiii)

The strong women in hooks' life used their own oral and historical narratives to document their experiences in an effort to elevate and encourage hooks to further her education.

hooks' experiences in college as a student are narrated and discussed differently in each of the aforementioned texts. While attending college she was one of the few minority students at Stanford University while completing a bachelor's degree, then at the University of Wisconsin-Madison for her Master's degree, and also when she completed her Ph.D. at the University of California Santa Cruz. During these different academic periods she was confronted with the issue of social status and at times felt class shamed ("Where We Stand" 42). It became clear to her that there was a distinction

between those that had and those that had not and that the perception of working-class folks was based on stereotypes. She notes that many of her peers at Stanford believed working-class people had no value, and that they were feared and hated by those with more affluence. hooks soon realized that in order to fit in she would have to conform to the white monolithic standards that were set by the institution. She contends that, "poor students would be welcome at the best institutions of higher learning only if they were willing to surrender memory, to forget the past and claim the assimilated present as the only worthwhile and meaningful reality" ("Where We Stand" 37). Like Fleisher and Thompkins, hooks struggled between two worlds: the academic world which provides a wealth of knowledge and financial stability while the personal life causes challenging consequences when one becomes awakened to the reality of their class, gender, or racial position. The discrimination that hooks experiences because she is black and from the South makes her feel isolated and alienated. She feels she can never show her true self even if she is around her peers. Using the third person to discuss how she felt hooks states "mostly she is alone. And if she is in a group you might say she is always performing" ("Wounds of Passion"60). Her inability to bond with her peers while feeling like an outsider is a theme throughout and something that many working class academics can relate to. hooks offered some of the most thought-provoking scholarship on race, class, and gender, and her literacy narratives speak to issues that many minority students have experienced.

As a white working-class woman, I know that I am constantly negotiating the class boundaries of my birth and still struggle to feel a sense of belonging. hooks' writing, while poetic, honest, and thought-provoking helps readers feel like they aren't

alone and that bond is one that students from at-risk circumstances want to feel. Fleisher, Thompkins, and hooks speak to the female position as student and professor, but other voices such as Richard Rodriguez's also focus on the marginalization of minority students and the difficult negotiation that students feel when they are faced with opposing binary identities.

Richard Rodriguez's seminal text *Hunger of Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez* presents an autobiographical account that intersects with other literacy narratives, but explores the impact that language can have on one's identity. Rodriguez records this assimilation by mapping the linguistic changes he experienced as a young child. Richard Rodriguez was born to Mexican immigrants in California where he was formally educated in the Catholic system. Early on Rodriguez felt isolated and alienated from people in his community. He recounts being one of the only Latino families which made him feel like a "foreigner" (17), but he had a strong bond with his family. Although language separated him from others in the public domain, language connected his family together and helped him form his private self that made him "dependent on voices at home" (17). These voices gave him comfort, but they also created dichotomous identities that he had to learn to negotiate. Rodriguez writes, "for me there were none of the gradations between public and private society so normal to a maturing child. Outside the house was public society; inside the house was private" (16). For most of Rodriguez's autobiography the tension between the public and the private, the English and the Spanish, the educated and the un-educated never reconciles itself. Rodriguez believes that this polarization is due to the educational approach of bilingual education, which forced non-native speakers like him to make a choice early on.

As Rodriguez grew older he was exposed to a bilingual education system which meant he had to work on his public identity (English). Learning the language of his public identity led him to feel as though he was betraying his family, which only led to more division. For a young child this linguistic assimilation can be emotionally taxing, Rodriguez claims "I would have been happier about my public success had I not sometimes recalled what it had been like earlier, when my family had conveyed its intimacy through a set of conveniently private sounds" (25). Slowly Rodriguez begins to separate himself from his culture and family by learning English and by using Spanish less and less. For any child this process cannot be an easy one and would certainly lead to confusion or even anger and such was the fate for Rodriguez: "I grew up victim to a disabling confusion. As I grew fluent in English, I no longer could speak Spanish with confidence" (28). These early educational experiences that required Rodriguez to perform an emancipation of his personal identity and intimate cultural roots created a lingering impact on the way he perceived himself and his family.

Later in life it became clear to Rodriguez that education not only changed him, but changed the dynamic of his family. After stumbling upon Richard Hoggart's *The Uses of Literacy*, he realized that there were other students who had experiences just like him; something termed a "scholarship boy" (46). This helped Rodriguez contextualize his somewhat traumatic experiences; "for the first time I realized that there were other students like me, and so I was able to frame the meaning of my academic success, its consequent price-loss" (46). As a working-class child of Mexican immigrants, many years of schooling created a cultural, linguistic, and intellectual divide between him and his parents. At some point Rodriguez purged himself of memories and self-isolated in

order to distance himself from his past (51). This alienation and isolation are repeatedly discussed and addressed in these literacy narratives. These feelings seem to be continuous events that are reactions to assimilation or social mobility. Ultimately it became too painful and embarrassing to be around people that Rodriguez felt were uneducated and somewhat inferior to him and the teacher-nuns he had idolized (52). While both his mother and father were able to read and write in English and Spanish, his mother was the sole parent that encouraged him to get an education. Rodriguez focused his time on his studies and believed strongly that reading was a way to educate oneself, but for his parents "reading was something done out of necessity and as quickly as possible" (58). The value that Rodriguez put on literacy and learning was not something both parents could understand and even though his mother encouraged him to get an education Rodriguez portrayed her support as empty-minded. In other words, it is one thing to tell someone to get an education, but it is another to have an understanding of that process. As Rodriguez, Fleisher, Thompkins, and hooks discuss in their narratives, an education can lead to social mobility, but it can also lead to isolation, alienation, and angst about where one belongs. This kind of identity crisis, while tragic, wouldn't have happened if it weren't for Rodriguez's educational experiences. His continual reflection about how language and life collide help readers understand how some of our students who speak multiple languages feel.

Like hooks and others, Rodriguez's narrative focuses on how language and learning can elevate one's social status, but extinguishes an intimate bond between one's personal family life and the culture of their origin. Rodriguez also highlights the consequences of bilingual education and briefly discusses issues with the standardization

of the English language and the unforeseen consequences of other linguistic discourses such as "Black English". While Rodriguez values "Black English" as a private language he doesn't believe it "should be a language of public instruction" (33). Contrary to this school of thought is Keith Gilyard's *Voices of the Self: A Study of Language Competence*, where he discusses the struggles he had with his identity and the language communities that govern it. Unlike Rodriguez, Gilyard argues that while students should have access to Standard English they should also be able to "maintain their own sense of identity" (11) and that pedagogically teachers should work to find ways to encourage this linguistic compromise.

Keith Gilyard's *Voices of the Self* mixes his autobiographical exploration of language and its impact on the somewhat double life he led with an analysis of these narrative experiences in order to better help educators work with African American students (13). Gilyard's narrative also recounts how as a native black speaker he was able to acquire Standard English skills. It is through this code switching that he was able to develop a communication strategy which enabled him to maintain two identities that he separated with two names (13). On his first day at PS 149 Raymond Keith Gilyard had the ability to create an image of himself for his peers and classmates. As one of two children of color in his classroom it seemed comfortable for him to create this separate identity:

> nobody had ever called me Raymond before. Uptown it was always Keith or Keithy or Little Gil. Raymond was like a fifth wheel. A spare. And that's what I decided to make those people call me. *They cannot meet Keith now. I will put*

someone else together for them and he will be their classmate until further notice.

That will be the first step in this particular survival plan. (43)

Like many students there is a level of trust that must be established in order to feel comfortable and as a minority student in a predominately white school this was how Raymond accomplished his boundaries. Raymond believed by creating these multiple identities he could juggle his identity for survival (43). In addition, academically if Raymond kept up with his peers he believed he could fit in (44). This sense of belonging and wanting to fit in is one that other academic literacy narratives refer to. Perhaps belonging leads less to bullying or even enhances a student's confidence; for Raymond fitting in meant being able to perform for the teacher, his peers, and his family (46-47). If he could correctly answer questions or outwit his peers, he felt as if he belonged in *that* school alongside *those* students. It was not long after he learned to navigate his classmates that he met a boy named Lonnie that helped him develop the persona of Keith. Lonnie represented aspects of black culture that Raymond was not getting at school from his immediate classmates. Gilyard wanted someone like him in his class "now if he could only be in my class. I always thought Lonnie Blair was as smart as any kid I knew. He just wouldn't take much of an interest in school" (54). While Keith continued to pal around with Lonnie it started to become abundantly clear that his behavior would get in the way with the expectations his mother had for him and it would impact his education. Ultimately Lonnie represented resistance to the white monolith and Keith felt comfortable being around him and the black culture that signified a part of his identity.

Throughout Gilyard's autoethnographical piece he positions his two identities as one that represents the white world and one that represents the African-American community. One represents the academic with its Standard English and standardized structures and the other his street discourse, which was much more familial and intimate. Because these two communities and identities are constantly grappling with one another Keith struggles to figure out where he belongs. His narrative compels the reader to consider how difficult a choice it would be to ask a child to choose between two worlds. And we can see how this psychologically and emotionally causes Keith difficulty in school and at home. Gilyard claims that, "home provided still more difficulties to resolve and there were no easy resolutions. I had lumps to take there also" (55). The constant negotiation that Gilyard faces comes to a head after his mother attends a parent-teacher conference. It is in this moment that Gilyard's two worlds collide as she finds out about several incidents where he was disciplined for bad behavior (60). Gilyard's narrative illustrates how even the best of intensions can indeed harm a young child. In the end, Gilyard is arguing for an equitable educational experience for all students that takes into account the variety of discourse communities that they come from. He states, "black children, like all people, make decisions based on vested interests. If they were to perceive that the social dialectic were in their favor, learning another dialect could not be a major problem" (74). As Gilyard's narrative presents this underlying tension he experiences, he is intimating that the American educational system should create a more inclusive linguistic environment that also works to combat emotional damage that can occur because of these dueling rhetorical choices. One such academic who has spent time deeply invested in the issues Gilyard raises is Mike Rose.

Mike Rose's *Lives on the Boundary* draws from his immigrant status and experiences, but more so because of his attempt at an objective perspective as a teacher who observes at-risk student writers. In the opening to his narrative he presents an image of a student who signed up for his remedial class, but had failed four previous attempts to pass (1). Rose's discussion of this student along with others at UCLA nicely presents the problems that have existed with remediation, problems that Rose claims have been around for quite some time. It's important to note though, that in Rose's discussion of these students he illustrates the emotional effects that these kinds of classes can have on students. While having a conversation with two of them about their experiences a male student Bobby believes, "we don't belong at UCLA, do we?" (4). And while history would tell them they're wrong, many students like Bobby have felt this very same way.

As a student Rose struggled quite often and to a large extent reminds me a lot of myself. He had difficulties with grammar and math, would day-dream to avoid acknowledging any academic struggles, and as the child of working-class Italian American immigrants he was able to skim through school (18-19). He did however find a love for reading which helped open up the world to him and this budding desire for knowledge led his parents to enroll him at Our Lady of Mercy Catholic School. It is during his time at Our Lady of Mercy that Rose is placed into a vocational track; a track that would psychologically impact him throughout the rest of his academic career. While the goal of vocational approaches were to help increase opportunities for students who typically struggle, Rose now believes that the vocational track is a "dumping ground for the disaffected" (26). These approaches to education tell students that they are slow and the curriculum "isn't designed to liberate you but to occupy you, or if you're lucky, train

you, though the training is for work the society does not esteem" (28). As a result, teachers and peers pick up on these cues, the result being a negative labeling of the student.

The transition from high school to college wasn't an easy one. When Loyola College accepted Rose as a probationary student he didn't realize that his lack of positive student behaviors might get in the way of his academic success (35). Rose felt out of his league and wouldn't attend faculty office hours out of the fear of being told he was stupid (43). Because of these experiences he found a deeper love for writing and rhetoric; however, he found the transition to graduate school isolating and challenging, but it also "led toward a secure engagement with language and ideas, an engagement I wanted to shape into a career" (67). While literature was one of Rose's first loves he would soon learn that graduate school was not what he thought it would be. His mind began to wander towards psychology and so Rose signed up for courses in order to pursue a direction in humanistic psychology, but even this wasn't satisfying something within him (83). Rose opted to exit UCLA and move towards the field of teaching.

Rose started working with Teacher Corps in order to explore a different avenue that would feed his thirst to help others. In Los Angeles at that time, Teacher Corps sent volunteers to school districts in depressed areas of the country and required teachers to familiarize themselves with the neighborhoods (86). The goal was that teachers would get to know the community members in and outside of the school setting. Through these direct teaching experiences Rose began to identify curriculum issues that did not benefit students who were at-risk. He states, "these children would fail at the kind of literacy activities the school system had woven throughout its curriculum and [would be] turn[ed]

off to writing and reading in general. But that did not mean that they were illiterate"

(110). Rose's time with Teacher Corps was valuable in that it showed him how curricula

did not match or help students who come from diverse backgrounds. While Rose hoped

he had impacted his students lives positively there was no way to know for sure. Instead,

Rose's involvement with the Teacher Corps and his students would encourage him to

continue to work with at-risk community members.

After working with Teacher Corps, Rose would go on to tutor student veterans

and students who used the UCLA Tutorial center. What he found was that the

psychological effects of remediation deeply impacted struggling writers; Rose claims that

for these students "composing was a source of embarrassment, a halting, self-conscious

duty that resulted in stunted, error-ridden prose" (140). Typically, students who are

labeled as "remedial" struggle with confidence, but in many ways it is not their fault.

Rose's continued work at UCLA hints that the American educational system is not

considering the pluralistic identities of our students and it is having dramatic effects.

Some academics become extremely invested in their students' lives, but then we send

them off. "And you wonder. You know some won't make it. There's too much working

against their success. They'll drift in and out of academic probation, their transcripts a

listing of C's, C-minuses, a D or two, and then the fatal F that exits them" (204). I have

seen this happen to many students and it doesn't necessarily have to do with their ability;

it has to do with their mental stability that has in some way been impacted by negative

educational experiences. When we blame the victim, in this case students, who are at risk

because of the system we have shaped, we only perpetuate institutional constraints that

claim students are "underprepared", "deficient", or "remedial" (Rose 202). This is

contrary to what many academics hope an education can be for those students coming from diverse and unique backgrounds; we want students to engage in an educational enterprise that uplifts them from their social positions, but one that acknowledges their individual or multiple identities that they have drawn from in order to survive. I agree with Rose when he claims that, "we are in the middle of an extraordinary social experiment: the attempt to provide education for all members of a vast pluralistic democracy" (238). As a teacher at the two-year college I feel as though I am still struggling through this social experiment, but believe that by examining the past perhaps I may be able to alter the future for students who struggle.

Each of the previously mentioned literacy narratives illustrate the struggles that many working-class academics faced throughout their attempt to assimilate into traditional American society. While Thompkins was a bit more affluent and thus an exception to the rule, she still endured some emotionally traumatic events that impacted her academic pursuits. Fleisher and hooks' narratives draw specifically from social class position to show how difficult it is for students to maintain an even keel in the midst of transcending their working-class communities all the while attempting to fit into preexisting academic hierarchies that tend to be male dominated. hooks, like Gilyard and Rodriguez, is also concerned with race and discourse communities that are seen as inferior because they do not fit the monolithic American standard. These expectations that have been set seem unrealistic for anyone who has not been part of the club their entire life. And Mike Rose plows through his own contested situation in order to examine an educational system that is continuing to fail students who want to reshape their lives through the empowerment of education. Each writer speaks of fear, isolation,

discrimination and racism as a major mechanism that got in the way of their ability to feel comfortable during their acquisition of knowledge. While the period of de-segregation in schools has come and gone, discrimination, sexism, racism, and psychological dysphoria in education still exists. These literacy narratives are clear evidence of the difficulties that students, writers, and teachers face when they come up against standard American expectations.

Lessons Still Being Learned

When I was working on my graduate coursework I came across these narratives and after reading them I thought a lot about my own experiences and those of my students. But it wasn't until I was first awarded my tenure track position in fall 2010 that I wanted to learn more about how students were placed into their writing courses. I had already recovered from my experience with the EOP program and students, but still couldn't remember what the placement exam consisted of. Was the exam multiple choice or a writing sample? I would soon find out. Within the first couple of weeks of the semester I contacted the admissions office and requested to take the exam. The Accuplacer exam tested my abilities on sentence-level writing skills through the use of sample questions which the respondent selected via multiple choice answers. I would later find out that depending on the answer chosen the computer would then generate the next question. The test was confusing and in many ways, didn't resemble the approaches I used to teach writing in my classroom. Several semesters after first taking this test I convinced a handful of colleagues to take the exam again as a group. Many of us were becoming increasingly concerned with the validity and reliability of the exam and its

approach towards assessing student writing. The goal was to investigate the placement procedures at our institution in order to determine how students were categorized as "college ready" or "remedial".

There were approximately six full time English faculty who attended the group placement testing session and the experience was quite interesting. As the test began we all discussed what knowledge we had of the test and testing experience. As the only faculty member who attended a two-year college, and the only faculty member who had been placed into a developmental class, and further the only faculty member who had recently experienced the testing procedures, it became clear that many of my colleagues were stepping into an experience that they had intellectual and psychological distance from. As we navigated collaboratively each question I observed a natural divide in our verbal responses to the questions. My colleagues who had knowledge and experience in the field of Composition and Rhetoric began to examine and analyze (out loud) the sentence skill level questions whereas my colleagues who were scholars in the literary world focused on grammar and correctness. After completing the exam and while waiting for our score, we all discussed the concerns we had with the exam and agreed that it did not represent our pedagogical or theoretical approaches to writing in the classroom. I think many of my colleagues were really taken back that there even was a sentence skills placement exam and we hemmed and hawed over whether the test took into account students' individual experiences as well as the identity politics that more than likely impacted their reading of the questions. What would we do? Nothing had been done in years and I felt powerless to enact change since it was an administrative decision as to whether they would continue to invest in this placement process.

Due to administrative control over testing and the overabundance of work required of teaching faculty, to date, the Accuplacer test is still the mode in which students' writing skills are initially assessed at Suffolk Community College, but there have been recent uses of multiple measurements to place students. Over the summer of 2015 and 2016 I began to work with our advising and counseling center to incorporate the use of multiple measurements in order to place students into the appropriate writing class. Several colleagues and I would spend hours sifting through student transcripts, regents, SAT, or ACT scores along with their placement scores to figure out where we thought the appropriate placement would work. This approach is one that CCRC has examined in a recent study and they "found high school GPA to be more predictive of student success than current placement tests in one large community college system. Now some colleges from several states are using a hierarchy of measures to place students into the most appropriate-level courses (Rodriguez et al 2-3). As more institutions move towards placement activities that champion multiple measurements we may begin to see a shift in how English departments frame the teaching of writing and developmental education. While the incorporation of multiple measurements is a functional shift, it is not a solution to a larger problem; because of this I began to investigate alternatives that would help us surpass issues surrounding the placement exam. Because remedial, non-credit courses are spread out over a student's education, they create a longer time to completion. Students' lives sometimes get in the way and their ability to complete their education in a reasonable amount of time becomes clogged up with non-credit courses. This becomes emotionally and financially exhausting. Our roles as teachers of the two-year college are to help prepare students for critical and creative thinking, not to act as

gatekeepers of knowledge; but I have felt for some time our placement process is not mirroring those good educational intentions.

At institutions across the nation many teachers of writing struggle with the same concerns that I had. Year in and year out I observed students struggle and most times fail at passing through our writing sequence and I became frustrated with them and myself. I knew that something was holding them back and soon became determined to discover a way to fix the problems that plagued developmental writing at our college. In 2012 when I was first introduced to the Accelerated Learning Program I was a non-tenured junior faculty member who knew that starting this kind of intense initiative would be no easy task; however, having been a student and part time instructor at Suffolk Community College I felt I knew the composition climate which would help me navigate the ins and outs of the political red tape that permeates many two-year community colleges.

All of the classes I had taught either as an adjunct or tenured instructor have been composition courses. While I typically teach developmental writing and freshman composition, depending on the semester I also teach advanced expository writing, autobiographical, and technical writing. Having taught for ten years in total at Suffolk County Community College and at all three of their main campuses, I thought I had a firm grasp on the perception and temperature most teaching faculty have in regard to developmental writing. After attending a Developmental Studies committee meeting one afternoon I heard about an Accelerated Learning Program that was gaining momentum nationwide. No one on the committee seemed to know much about the program so I began to investigate its origins and approach towards remedial education. What I found was that the Accelerated Learning Program developed out of the Community College of

Baltimore County when faculty realized there was a need to rethink their developmental writing practices. An ALP consists of two writing courses: a credit bearing and a non-credit bearing course that are taken by a student simultaneously in one semester. Students enroll for both classes which are taught back-to -back by the same instructor. There are several features that practitioners believe ALPs are good for: mainstreaming, cohort learning, small class size, contextual learning, acceleration, heterogeneous grouping, attention to behavioral issues, and attention to life problems (Adams et al). In my third year at the college after having been exposed to the basic concept of ALP and based on my personal desire to extinguish the label of "developmental", I felt that if I could convince the college to adopt this program as a pilot that it would be a valuable research project.

While literacy narratives have become an important part of many writing programs, I am still worried about the impact that labeling and traditional developmental writing courses have on students especially at the two-year college. In addition, because of the continued threats to basic writing programs and also because some academics believed basic writing had become outdated and inappropriate, institutions nationwide began to explore alternative writing approaches that would benefit their student writers. Some of these emerging writing programs were voluntary curriculum changes while others were mandated due to state legislation. Just as Shaughnessy's work and that of others with basic writers seemed to be a necessity of the time, so were other unconventional writing models in the mid to late 1990s.

Chapter 3: Examples of Emerging Writing Programs and Courses

During the 1990s a wave of attacks against remediation nationwide began to force institutions to rethink their approaches to teaching emerging writers (see Adler and Harrington, Mutnick, Soliday, Lu, Trimmer, Rose, Troyka, Sommers). These attacks were directed towards students, high school teachers, and teachers of higher education. Why were so many students placing into non-credit developmental courses? Should developmental courses still be an option? There are a variety of answers to these complex questions and the ultimate outcome of the contentious environment towards developmental education forced many teachers of writing to rethink their approaches (see Mutnick, Soliday, Sullivan). For some states there wasn't an option. Legislation was being pushed forward to annihilate funding for developmental courses and in other cases those outside of the field of academia attempted to dictate what kinds of approaches should be implemented (see Grego and Thompson, Rigolino, Soliday and Gleason, Glau, Sullivan). In addition, the concerns related to developmental education became the responsibility of the two-year college. It became very clear, very quickly, that if teachers at the two-year college didn't take ownership of the direction of their developmental education programs, someone else would. Throughout the 90s new and improved developmental writing programs popped up nationwide and were a response to the drastic calls for change.

In the last twenty-five years, many writing programs have impacted the landscape of traditional developmental writing. I will focus on six specific programs that have offered alternative approaches to the teaching of writing. The Writing Studio at the University of South Carolina offered students the opportunity to work on their writing in

a formal classroom setting and in a workshop writing center style approach. The formal classroom setting provided students with a mix of lecture-based discussions and collaborative group work while the workshop writing center style approach took place outside of the classroom. Students were split up into small groups or pairs and worked closely with a writing center tutor. During these exchanges students could focus on their individual writing projects and gain assistance from tutors and in some cases their instructor. This gave students more one-on-one time with a faculty member and a writing center tutor. The Enrichment Pilot Project at the City College of New York (CUNY) was a course pilot that used the concept of a learning community to create a two-semester writing course sequence. Students signed up for both classes and would work in an intensive writing environment with peers, their professor, and tutors. At SUNY New Paltz compositionists implemented the Supplemental Writing Workshop which also provided extra time in an intensive environment with multiple writing experts. In 1992 the influential Stretch program at Arizona State University became an alternative approach to teaching emerging writers in non-credit writing courses. Students would take a composition course over the course of two semesters. This would give them time to work through the revision process while developing an extended relationship with their peers and professor. These four initial programs were thoughtful in their approach but almost all, except for Stretch, were unable to sustain themselves. Some programs lost administrative support due to financial or political reasons while others had a difficult time maintaining faculty and student support. However, each of these programs sought to include more time for students to think about their writing while working on building relationships with faculty and their peers. Some of the programs extended class time or

the sequence of time for courses while others facilitated writing center time and more one-on-one engagements with more experienced writers.

All four of these programs led to the creation of the last two: the renowned Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) which was developed at the Community College of Baltimore County and the California Accelerated Program (CAP) instituted at Chabot College. These programs cherry picked from earlier developmental programs in order to emphasize the value of community, mainstreaming, and acceleration. Additionally, Accelerated programs have been able to significantly lower-class size which none of the other programs were able to accomplish. All these approaches led to significant innovations to developmental education and provide a rich history to understand how writing courses specifically at the two-year college have evolved over time. While the Stretch program has been able to sustain itself, there have been challenges along the way including continuity between faculty and students who do not persist in the two- semester sequence. However, the intensive writing environment is one that worked well and is a feature that ALP and CAP have incorporated into their programs. When writing evolves so do the approaches to developmental education; while Stretch supported at-risk students at ASU and later in the California State University system, the Writing Studio took shape at the University of South Carolina.

The Writing Studio at the University of South Carolina

Because political attacks against remediation rapidly increased over time, several different models developed in response (see Mutnick, Soliday, Sullivan). In the latter part of the 1980s at The University of South Carolina Rhonda Grego and Nancy Thompson found themselves in a position where changes to the state requirements would make it

necessary for them to re-think traditional developmental writing courses. The state's Commission on Higher Education decided that developmental writing courses would not continue to receive college credit of any kind. Students might continue to take the class, but would not receive credit in any form. Ultimately this spelled out the death of developmental writing courses at the University of South Carolina. This decision was made without consulting any teachers of developmental writing and left many at the university scrambling to figure out new assessment, placement and instructional approaches (Grego and Thompson 63). Grego and Thompson were deeply invested in the practice of developmental education, particularly with how developmental writing courses function within the academic framework. They believed that this administrative decision illustrated how developmental writing students and teachers were viewed as second class citizens in academia and furthermore that the efforts they put into their courses were not valuable institutional experiences. Grego and Thompson felt "a growing sense that our everyday work was actually driven by institutional hierarchies and history, politics and public relations-not by the student needs which fundamentally engaged us in our everyday work as teachers-[this] led us to take action" (63). Thus, they explored and created a different model now known as the Writing Studio Program; however, before the Writing Studio framework existed, faculty at the University had experimented with what their new approaches would look like.

Grego and Thompson wanted to reposition developmental writing so that they could grow and learn about student writing through assessment and teaching while using the Writing Studio program as the vessel to rethink freshman composition along with academic cultures of writing (67). Because faculty were so invested in students and

potential outcomes, they had to exert a lot of energy to gain student trust in order to overcome resistance. Furthermore, they had to answer a vital question as they worked through these new changes at their institution: "how could we get around the debilitating institutional problem of no credit for the course and still meet the needs of students who needed extra help entering the academic mainstream?" (67). To answer this question along with others, Grego and Thompson believed that communication between faculty was vital in understanding pedagogical approaches and how they would impact students' reactions to them. In the studio's initial stages, a small group of teaching faculty taught their *Basic Writing Practicum* course and then discussed their observations with the group during weekly intensive 90-minute discussions. These small group interactions helped encourage the group to determine what kinds of perceptions their students in developmental writing and freshman composition level courses had about themselves as writers. Moreover, the small group interaction helped the faculty think about what the model class size should look like. They state, "the sense of progress and support created in our practicum made us think about how to create that same fluid and dynamic work environment for our students" (Grego and Thompson 68). Based on the observations and experiences the group had with one another they developed a proposal that would support the discontinuation of the traditional basic writing course (English 100); faculty who took part in the practicum supported the decision that all students would be placed into English 101. As with any drastic change this was risky, but Grego and Thompson felt that "some students could volunteer and others whom teachers identified could be placed in the Writing Studio. Small groups of 4-5 students (from different sections of English 101) would meet one hour once a week with an experienced small group leader for intensive

help on the writing they would currently be doing" (68). Students would engage with writing inside a formal classroom setting, but also outside the classroom in small groups. The weekly communication between the Writing Studio leaders/staff, instructors, and students enabled instructors to forgo giving a letter grade related to writing. Instead assessment was in the form of a final summary report on each student. The summary report reviewed student grades on other course requirements along with student attendance and whether they actively participated in class (Grego and Thompson 68). The Writing Studio Program at the University of South Carolina was piloted in the fall of 1992 and geared towards first year developmental writers while providing additional supplementary assistance for student writers at all levels. Grego and Thompson describe this approach in their article "The Writing Studio Program: Reconfiguring Basic Writing/Freshman Composition":

> all students enroll in regular freshman composition (English 101) classes, but some receive additional peer and expert help in weekly small-group writing workshops. These meetings are held in a place separate from the English 101 classroom, with students from other 101 classes, and are led by an experienced writing group leader. For students, the Writing Studio program thus works on writing development "outside" the classroom, but "inside" writing groups. (66)

The goal in approaching writing and writers in this way was to mainstream developmental writers while helping them see themselves as valuable voices within the academic community. As the Writing Studio program unfolded practitioners needed to

continue to consider how assessment practices invited or discouraged students to feel as though they were becoming a part of this academic community.

With any course or program development there are many technical details that must be worked through in order to try and create a system that works. Throughout the pilot period (1993-1995) logistical details were continually revised and placement and assessment practices were put into place which would ask incoming students to bring portfolios that would exemplify "students' writing histories" (Grego and Thompson 69). But not all students brought a portfolio, forcing Studio facilitators to create a "Writing History Diagnostic" system that would ask students to complete one in-class essay and one take home essay where students "introduced themselves as writers to their classmates and 101 instructor" (Grego and Thompson 69). By using this kind of placement system instructors were able to examine a writer's growth while the student was able to consciously explore her/his own process via a reflective/meta-cognitive apparatus. Further, Grego and Thomspon believed this writing history approach allowed time and space for students to make "sense of their writing pasts, the ideologies of writing and learning that their words perhaps unconsciously serve within academia" (69). Exploring a writing past can offer students the opportunity to attach emotion to language and writing which they may not have been able to explore. These connections were important for students to acknowledge in order to break down the stereotypes associated with "remediation". Another important goal was to re-engage students in intellectual rhetorical acts that encouraged a new culture of writing. The belief was that by mainstreaming and creating a community, students might begin to view writing as an act of research or something practitioners at the University of South Carolina called "research learning"

(Grego and Thompson 67). This kind of research learning would ask students and teachers not just to write about their rhetorical histories, but to learn from one another's processes. Instructors in the Writing Studio Program were concerned with how students grow and learn and how that is presented within their writing. They believe that, "embedded in students' emotions [there] is much the institution needs to learn about how student writing processes, products, and attitudes are predicated on institutionalized ideologies in English departments" (Grego and Thompson 70). By encouraging students to explore the emotions they have attached to their writing experiences we undermine the labels that have impacted them and forcefully attempt to teach students to examine their past in order to reestablish a new intellectual identity for themselves.

Many emerging writing programs focus on making better writers, but the question is how does a program, or institution define "better" writing? How does a practitioner encourage "better" writing? What steps must one take? What pedagogical or assessment activities help show that students improve, learn, and grow? The creators of the Writing Studio program consciously considered these issues and were strong proponents of small group pedagogical practices: "we began to suspect that if students themselves could be brought together in small groups similar to our own, they too might be able to see correlations and thereby be better motivated to take action on behalf of their own writing" (Grego and Thompson 68). In order to build consistency and collaboration among the writers and the courses, expectations among faculty had to be communicated so that a student-centered approach to literacy was effectively practiced. Grego and Thompson acknowledge that,

the Writing Studio is student-centered, particularly in the way it addresses the

politics of the position of the student and of student writing. Therapy? Perhaps.

But if so then it is, as much as anything, a kind of therapy designed to get both

therapists and patients aware of the past and present influence of the institution

within which both work. (75)

This literacy examination and reflective approach helped provide moments for students to

contemplate their individual writing experiences.

Throughout the three years the program was supported, Grego and Thompson

would argue that the Writing Studio Program was not a fad or trend and in fact shed light

on the lack of awareness that some in higher education have about the vast field of

research in composition and rhetoric.

The Studio is a site which has opened up our eyes to the ways in which higher

education's institutional culture uses the abstracted and universal modes of

academic discourse/Literature to organize (in the past and in the present) the

silences which still in most places permeate the work of composition within the

academy. As long as the "basic writing slot" exists, compositionists thus privilege

narrow institutional languages for describing and understanding student writing

and we disengage our colleagues (and at times ourselves) from understanding

composition as an area of intellectual/academic work (not just as a service

organized by academic institutions). (Grego and Thompson 82)

In other words, because traditional developmental writing courses continue to exist they will continue to act as gatekeepers for students who are believed to be unprepared. This is a valid argument to mainstream developmental writing students at least in this specific location, but as other programs can attest to that is not the most functional way for all institutions to approach the teaching of developmental writing. However, the Writing Studio was impactful in that certain elements of it have morphed with other approaches to remain somewhat relevant in a new form. When the Studio program discontinued at the University of South Carolina, other institutions worked to develop studios, but incurred the same issues with sustainability (Warnick at al 74). According to Warnick the difficulty with sustaining the Writing Studio model stems from financial support, a sustainable administrative structure, and continued buy-in from faculty, students, and other supporters of the composition field (95); overall these issues seem to plague other emerging writing programs as well.

The Enrichment Pilot Project at CCNY

Mina Shaughnessy's legendary work at the City College of New York encouraged continual writing and research that explored the realm of open admissions. In Shaughnessy's Introduction to *Errors and Expectations* she states that,

> this book is concerned with the orientation and perceptions of teachers in relation to a specific population of student writers. It assumes that programs are not the answers to the learning problems of students but that teachers are and that, indeed, good teachers create good programs, that the best programs are developed *in situ*, in response to the needs of individual student populations and as reflections of the particular histories and resources of individual colleges. (6)

There are many colleges that fall under the umbrella of the CUNY system and while each have had to adhere to uniform standards it is important to highlight more recent changes that some CUNY schools have worked through in order to better support developmental students. These courses and programs are led by teachers who are working in response to the needs of a specific student population that has continued to remain at risk.

In 1993 the Enrichment Pilot Project was supported for three years from the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE); the goal was to create a new writing course at the City College of New York (CCNY) (Soliday and Gleason 64). The Enrichment Pilot Project at the City College of New York posed a different way to approach and or substitute two traditional developmental courses and one college-level course format. Like many two-year schools, depending on a student's placement, this sequence extends the time it takes for students to enroll in credit bearing courses, but the goal of the Enrichment Pilot Project was to mainstream students and build a strong community bond between teachers and students. Furthermore, instructors believed that even without external funding, this project could exist beyond the three years so long as there was continued institutional support (Soliday and Gleason 64). Regardless of the eventual future, Soliday and Gleason set off with a new vision to rework an existing framework that included replacing the placement testing procedures which assigned students into one of three courses. Students who placed into developmental writing courses were restricted from taking credit-level courses and had to perform well on an exit test. Ultimately this traditional approach to remediation did not prove successful and denied students access to an equitable educational experience. Soliday and Gleason had a

different objective in mind: "in contrast to this sequence, the writing course we piloted carries full college credit (three credits per semester), no distinctions are made between those placed into college level writing and developmental writing, and teachers decide whether students should pass their courses. Moreover, all students are allowed to enroll in the college's core courses if they have passed the CUNY Reading Assessment TEST (RAT)" (Soliday and Gleason 65). The structure of the Enrichment Pilot Project was an intensive writing environment where teachers would have two consecutive semesters to get to know their students. Students would work with their peers, class tutors, and teachers to develop skills through individualized instruction (Soliday and Gleason 65). By creating a learning community, students have time to get to know one another and can act as mentors and facilitators of knowledge. Learning communities have been highly effective ways of breaking down communication barriers and work well in developmental writing programs. The widely held definition of the function of a learning community according to Gabelnick et al is that:

> learning communities, as we define them, purposefully restructure the curriculum to link together courses or course work so that students find greater coherence in what they are learning as well as increased intellectual interaction with faculty and fellow students. Advocates contend that learning communities can address some of the structural features of the modern university that undermine effective teaching and learning. Built on what is known about effective educational practice, learning communities are also usually associated with collaborative and active approaches to learning, some form of team teaching, and interdisciplinary themes. (qtd. in Mlynarczyk and Babbitt 73)

While the Enrichment Pilot Project allowed for instructors to develop their own curriculum based on the individual and group needs over the course of the two semesters, instructors worked with one another to develop common assignments. These assignments asked students to write literacy narratives, a kind of linguistic community narrative which would then be compared to their use of written English, and lastly students would compose an original ethnographic research essay (Soliday and Gleason 67). Each of the common assignments asked students to pay close attention to language consistencies and inconsistencies in the communities they practiced within. As with the Writing Studio model, instructors in the Enrichment Pilot Project met frequently in order to discuss their findings and writing center tutors were assigned to work with the classes. In order to evaluate the pilot's success, they did not make placement or exit decisions; instructors did not have to reach a consensus about student writing, but they reviewed student portfolios alongside a checklist that reflected the primary pilot course goals (Soliday and Gleason 69). The outcome of the pilot and assessment proved to be beneficial, but Soliday and Gleason continued to consider revision to the program. They argue that,

> though several forms of evaluation suggest that remedial-placed students performed well in our pilot course, we do not recommend that CCNY (or any other college) simply abandon remedial writing courses. In our final report on the project, we recommend that CCNY provide students the option of a two-semester college writing course that bears full college credit and that is supported by faculty development, tutoring, and formative evaluation. We argue that the college should provide the same support for students who placed into college-

level writing a course in which remedial students will eventually enroll. (Soliday and Gleason 76)

Similar to the creators of the Writing Studio it is clear that changes to remediation need to take place at the local level and that administration should work collaboratively with faculty to design appropriate courses of action to modify writing programs if that is necessary.

It is valuable to note that while the City College of New York ran a pilot in order to explore the concept of mainstreaming, as of 2017 three different colleges LaGuardia Community College, Queensborough Community College, and Kingsborough Community College have all integrated the Accelerated Learning Program models on their campuses (ALP Schools). It would seem that City College's Enrichment Pilot Project was the catalyst for changes that have taken place much more recently. The main aims of the Enrichment Pilot Project that became the nucleus of the Accelerated Learning Program are built upon community building and bonding through collaborative written and verbal exchanges. Moreover, Soliday and Gleason "conceptualized a writing course curriculum that capitalize[d] on students' existing linguistic knowledge and literacies" (66). In this way, the first-year writing experience became a transitionary year for students to learn about college life, themselves, and their existing literacy practices while attempting to negotiate and acquire a new academic discourse. The Enrichment Pilot Project like other writing programs nationwide focused on giving students the ability to examine their literacy practices while acquiring a new language through process centered

and experiential use. It also placed a call to action for other institutions to examine the coherency of their own curriculums in relationship to individual local college needs.

Supplemental Writing Workshop Program

From the 1970s to the 1990s while CUNY implemented the work of Mina Shaughnessy and other developmental programs, the State University of New York system also began exploring different approaches to remediation. Because of the ongoing "CUNY wars" in the 90s a trickle-down effect to SUNY became inevitable. The combative environment at CUNY was an outcome of legislators Mayor Giuliani and Governer Pataki's insistence to "eliminate remedial programs from all eleven senior colleges, thus ending the era of open admissions as defined in 1970" (Mutnik "Strategic Value" 73). Academics at all CUNY colleges were in an uproar as some agreed to eliminate open admissions while others felt the elimination of access to remediation was a war against marginalized minority groups. In defense of the decision many academics openly discussed the exponential impacts a change like this would have. The aftermath of the entrenched issues surrounding the decision caused a tumultuous environment not just for CUNY, but SUNY schools as well. Rigolino and Freel became concerned that if developmental writing courses were altogether discontinued it might impact "the diversity of their student body by excluding students from a wide range of socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds, students who had historically succeeded and even excelled at SUNY New Paltz" (54). In 1995 SUNY New Paltz began to feel the pressure mounting for calls to dismantle remediation programs at their four-year institution; a year later faculty at New Paltz began exploring the incorporation of a

Supplemental Writing Workshop Program for its developmental writing students. The Supplemental Writing Workshop Program was similar to the Writing Studio model in that it provided students with an additional hour of workshop time. This model prided itself on offering more time and support in an intensive writing environment over a shorter period of time. The Supplemental Writing Workshop Program integrated one additional hour of workshop time and one additional hour of one-on-one time with a tutor outside of standard classroom time, but did not include credit for the extra time (Rigolino and Freel 52). While this model takes into account the same conditions that other institutions faced, the creators wanted to focus on the concept of "Seamless Support" as a way to think of a writing course that could "weave together specific resources into a cohesive course design" (Rigolino and Freel 51). Unlike Grego and Thompson's original studio design in which students from various sections of composition come together once a week to work with an outside instructor, the Seamless Support Program keeps students, instructors, and tutors in class together. While there was overlap between the instructor and tutor, the intense amount of time spent together created a community of practice (Rigolino and Freel 51-52). This multi-angled approach to working with students was a modification to the pre-existing models during the time, and illustrated how if a community of writers is formed, intellectual bonds can develop.

In Etienne Wenger's "Communities of Practice" she argues that learning involves being a part of a community and that learning from others involves social participation which can be personally transformative (6). The Supplemental Writing Workshop Program was an intensive community centered model; there was a concentrated amount of time that student writers, instructors, and tutors invested in order to work through the

writing process to transform the way they thought, wrote, read, or spoke. A community of

practice, closely related to the concept of a learning community, helps reassure students

that they belong in academia. Rigolino and Freel state that "the classroom, workshop, and

Writing Center are designed to be places where students can experiment with language,

grow as writers, and establish relationships with faculty and peers" (57). This intense

Seamless Support model completely revamped traditional approaches to developmental

writing and was different from Stretch, the Writing Studio, and the Enrichment Pilot

Writing Program in a variety of ways. In "Re-Modeling Basic Writing", Rigolino and

Freel describe the differences between the models:

> it is important to note that the SWW Seamless Support model is not "remedial" in
>
> its design. In other words, students enrolled in the program are expected to
>
> complete the same assignments and readings as their cohorts in non-SWW
>
> composition courses. All of our composition courses share the same objectives
>
> and aims; have the same course numbers: ENG 160 (Composition I) and ENG
>
> 180 (Composition II); and award the same amount of academic credit. (52)

This prototype however developed out of a pre-existing model at SUNY New Paltz

which included the practices that the Educational Opportunity Program had been

requiring of students. The Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) had been offering its

students writing workshops for nearly a decade so the SWW model suggested adding to

that by providing workshops that were held twice a week in designated spaces and were

taught by composition instructors who also assumed the role of writing tutor; they gave

students oral feedback on writing and SWW students could have additional tutoring if

requested (Rigolino and Freel 54). The weekly meetings, the in-class tutor, the additional one-on-one time with an instructor all stemmed from EOP and helped give rise to the vision of a learning community and seamless support.

This vision of a learning community and the student-centered approach assisted students in decoding rhetorical situations while engaging in a shared writing experience with their peers. While the SWW relied on this exchange it made it difficult when gathering assessment data. Similar to other programs, the Supplemental Writing Workshop Program's assessment procedures centered more on the experience, but "those outside of our programs who evaluate us often use quantitative data to form opinions about the 'success' of a particular program and use such data to argue for curricular changes" (Rigolino and Freel 66). In 2002 the Program Coordinator, Rachel Rigolino, requested that the Office of Institutional Research compare the graduation rates and GPAs of student who had been in the SWW Program with those of their cohorts. The results illustrated that SWW students achieved comparable rates of success to their peers (Rigolino and Freel 66). As with other models when the Supplemental Writing Workshop Program existed it included intensive writing exposure along with features such as mainstreaming, additional support, student centered learning, collaborative work which led to bonding, and smaller class size when instructors and tutors worked one-on-one with student writers. In certain models these substructures worked to encourage those academics who were rethinking traditional developmental models. While this model encompassed numerous layers of support, like the CUNY schools who migrated to the Accelerated Learning Program model, SUNY New Paltz along with SUNY Adirondack and seven SUNY community colleges all currently offer ALPs at their institutions (ALP

Schools). As with the Enrichment Pilot Program, the Supplemental Writing Workshop

Program continued to work out all the wrinkles pertaining to budgetary and institutional

support which helped lead the way for the sustainability of an Accelerated Learning

Program.

The Stretch Program

While academic institutions on the east coast were grappling with the war against

remediation, states on the west coast such as Arizona were equally as engaged in

conversations about changes to developmental education. Similar to other traditional

developmental formats, the Arizona State University system had a two-tiered approach

for offering writing courses. One developmental writing course was being outsourced to a

local community college and one standard composition course was being offered at ASU.

However, in the fall of 1992 ASU ceased this outsourcing of classes and conversations

about whether developmental writers fit in at the university began. After some time, it

became obvious to ASU faculty that the developmental writing class had been centered

on grammar which would not give student writers the experience they needed to compose

rhetorically sound college-level essays (Glau 79). Additionally, faculty at ASU believed

it unethical to charge "university level course fees for a non-university class they did not

receive credit for" (Glau 79). And furthermore, just as many academics feared, the

elimination of developmental offerings could impact the diversity of the student body and

discourage those students from completing courses or being prepared enough for college-

level writing (Glau 30). Upon review of the problems with the traditional developmental

design, in 1994 ASU's English department implemented a "Stretch Program" pilot; the

framework for this pilot was a two-semester sequence that extended a college-level standard composition course over one academic year (Glau 79).

Students were placed into the Stretch model based on their ACT or SAT scores and throughout the two-semester Stretch course students would have more time to work through ideas and reshape essays through the revision process. Students would work on writing three essays in each of the courses over the two-semester period in order to develop a portfolio analysis which acted as their final examination (Glau 81). Assessment procedures are separate but connected for each class. The WAC 101 Stretch class is a pass/fail course however the grades they earn in the class count towards 50 % of their ENG 101 class. Since instructors stay with the same cohort of students for both semesters, the work from the WAC101 and the ENG101 each count as half of the students' final course grade (Glau 82). Presumably this gives students a chance to work through the revision process and complete multiple drafts of their writing which can enhance their grade over the two semesters. Measuring success in any developmental writing program helps determine whether students are benefiting from the approach. In Glau's article "Stretch at 10: A Progress Report on Arizona State University's Stretch Program", he compares the WAC101 cohort to their ENG 101 counterparts and finds that throughout the academic years of 1994-1995 and 2004-2005: "the pass rate for Stretch ENG101 students averages 92.65% [while] the pass rate for traditional ENG 101 students averages 88.88%. Clearly, the WAC 101 semester, which gives these at-risk students more guided writing experience, helps them" (38). Like others, Glau argues the Stretch model isn't for every institution but that the model implemented at ASU helped reshape developmental writing by not relegating it as a two-year college problem. By working

together and gathering information from other models at two and four-year schools, the Stretch model may be modified in the future to help other four-year institutions work with writers who need more time and experience.

The Stretch program has similar approaches as other programs previously mentioned. In particular, one of the goals of the Stretch program was that it would work to give writers more time to move into the university community (Glau 79). At-risk student writers, were to an extent novices who needed more time and support to build on the literacy practices they already had. It is believed that the shift to this lengthier intensive writing time helps acclimate developmental writers into an academic setting and is based on the argument presented by David Bartholomae in his 1986 article "Inventing the University". As previously discussed, while Bartholomae is genuinely concerned with emerging writers and the gatekeeping courses that have been problematic, he also seems to claim that when students have more time to engage with the "language of academia" they no longer need to invent a language of the university. While many who work in academia have become fluent in academic discourse or in some way feel they have a grip on the specialized discourse expected of them in their field, as instructors we need to acknowledge that some students are unfamiliar with the discourse communities we expect them to compose within. Bartholomae highlights this issue by stating,

> students have to appropriate (or be appropriated by) a specialized discourse, and
> they have to do this as though they were easily and comfortably one with their
> audience, as though they were members of the academy, or historians or
> anthropologists or economists; they have to invent the university by assembling
> and mimicking its language, finding some compromise between idiosyncrasy, a

personal history, and the requirements of convention, the history of a discipline.

They must learn to speak our language. (Bartholomae 4-5)

Learning to navigate a range of academic discourses and conventions takes time and practice, and while traditional developmental courses attempt to prepare students for the discourses of the academy, they also become gatekeeping courses. Traditional developmental writing courses tell emerging writers that they're not a part of the academic community, so how could they compose within its language communities? Bartholomae's arguments shed light on the problem. I do not think Bartholomae is attempting to fix the binary positions of insider versus outsider, but instead intends to create a space to discuss what makes one an insider and another an outsider, which is why one goal of the Stretch Program was to rid the stigma that emerging writers latched onto and instead give them time to try on the discourse and knowledge that makes writing more than a routine. Becoming a part of various discourses is no easy endeavor and the creators of the Stretch Program considered what objectives would benefit their student writers.

The Stretch Program's aim was to bring students into the curriculum by asking them to practice multiple discourse strategies in a variety of rhetorical contexts, which Stretch designers hoped would rid the stigma of beginning writers and instead transition these emerging students into first year composition writers. According to Glau four concepts were developed in order to underline the framework of the Stretch Program. The first was based on the view that basic writing students were capable and intelligent, but lacked time and experience when negotiating academic discourse; the second was a belief

that in order for a student to learn to write, a writer must write and share that writing in order to receive feedback that would assist them when revising their essays. This feedback and revision process could happen repeatedly; and lastly students should receive credit for their college work (Glau 80). These tenets were the core belief systems that governed and led the creation of Stretch. The designers of Stretch thoughtfully considered what their emerging student writers would need in order to not only become a community of writers, but to shift away from the label of developmental coursework. Initially the Stretch program had positive results and thus has maintained a presence, but there were some complications that needed to be ironed out. Some problems with the Stretch model were that because the course stretched over two semesters students were spending "more time working towards a degree, a residual problem of all baseline models" (Rigolino and Freel 51). As Peter Adams argues, the longer the pipeline, the more likely there will be "leakage"; in other words, the more time students spend completing coursework the more likely they are to drop out of college altogether (53). In addition, to the amount of time students spent stretching these classes over their academic career, ASU also had issues with instructor consistency. If an adjunct instructor taught in the first semester class, but decided not to return the following semester, "students lost the sense of continuity and community that comes from keeping the same instructor with the same group of students over two semesters" (Glau 82-83). Relying heavily on contingent faculty who are in some cases overworked and underpaid was one cause that led to difficulties. There were also issues with student continuity in that some students "who started in the program did not subsequently register for ENG 101 in the spring; they failed or withdrew or passed, but did not return for ENG 101" (Glau 83). While every

approach to developmental education has its bumps in the road, Stretch has adapted to the changing environment; "this particular model of basic writing instruction, at least so far, indicates that the approach makes good pedagogical sense for the majority of students who place into the Stretch Program." (Glau 88). As Stretch developed and modified throughout the 1990s it led to the emergence of the Accelerated Learning Project which was another response to public pressure and the politics of remediation, but ALP incorporated elements of each of the preceding developmental writing programs in order to create a model that many institutions had been working to implement over the last ten years.

Accelerated Learning Programs

A range of different writing programs such as The Writing Studio, The Enrichment Pilot Program, The Supplemental Writing Workshop, and the Stretch Program have all worked to overcome the stigma associated with remediation while creating an environment for students to succeed past the traditional developmental writing course model. For a variety of reasons each of these writing programs (for at least a time) seemed to have functioned well within the confines of their academic institutions and furthermore attempted to fulfill the local needs of the student body and demographic. While some of these programs have been able to remain a stable and sustainable outlet for students, others have not been able to hold on for financial, administrative, or political reasons.

From the 1970s to the 1990s the literature surrounding remediation reveals a heated debate that at some points seemed as if it would implode on faculty, administration and ultimately two and four-year institutions (see Soliday, Mutnick,

Stanley). It seemed as though everyone was unsatisfied with the current state of developmental education, but finding a solution became a grueling process especially when faculty who specialized in the teaching of composition were completely cut out of the conversation. As the 90s gave way to the early 2000s, there was little evidence that issues surrounding developmental writing courses had calmed down. For the two-year college when enrollment goes up so do developmental course offerings, but the increase of developmental course offerings did not equal success. The emerging writing programs of the 90s ushered in creative and thoughtful ways to approach emerging writers which steered the way for more recent methods of approaching at-risk students. My goal in the ensuing discussion of the California Accelerated Program and the Accelerated Learning Program is to illustrate how the features highlighted within the approaches appropriately match the need for change at my own two-year college. I must reiterate though, that I believe strongly if it weren't for the previous programs mentioned and the experimentation which led to these approaches in the field, it would be difficult to imagine getting to CAP and ALP.

Chapter 4: Accelerated Learning

Writing courses and programs at the two-year college have constantly had to reimagine approaches to the teaching of writing. The alternative approaches such as the Writing Studio, the Enrichment Pilot Project, Supplemental Writing Workshop Program, and the Stretch Program were all designed to help students develop their writing while dealing with the conflicts that remediation posed. While these inventive programs explored various approaches to the teaching of writing for at-risk populations, some of them had a difficult time sustaining themselves; meanwhile, conversations about the benefits and challenges of remediation continued. Those conversations led to newer approaches to the teaching of writing which are now commonly referred to as acceleration.

The Accelerated Learning Program at CCBC

The Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) is the brainchild of Dr. Peter Adams who was part of the conversations surrounding developmental writing in the early 1990s. Teaching at the Community College of Baltimore County in the state of Maryland, Adams paid close attention to whether the need for developmental education continued to exist. It is in his 1993 article, "Basic Writing Reconsidered" where he begins to explore whether there remains a need for the emerging writing framework. Adams states, "and if what we are doing in the basic writing classroom is no longer significantly different from what we do in college level writing classrooms, then the justification we once had for segregating basic writers may have evaporated" (24). While Adams seems to advocate for an end to remediation altogether, on the contrary, he believes that basic writing

students should not be mainstreamed directly alongside freshman composition students without appropriate support. He argues that there is plenty of evidence to support the usefulness of basic writing courses, but "it is time we begin to question seriously whether segregated basic writing classrooms are the best environment for helping basic writers develop into proficient college-level writers" (24). Based on his observations and the shifts in remediation that had been taking place, it seemed logical to discontinue the pedagogical approaches of something that wasn't functioning. Adams not only argues that individual institutions should research what is happening to emerging writing students, he sets up a platform to launch a disciplinary heuristic that would ask teachers of writing to re-examine their epistemological approaches alongside those of their students. The Accelerated Learning Program is the outcome of his own inner reflective interrogation.

While ALP was officially created in 2007, Peter Adams had spent years collecting data and examining whether emerging writing courses and the students who took them were becoming successful. An initial review of the data didn't seem too worrisome but after a longitudinal, closer and more detailed inspection of individual classes, "he discovered an alarming situation" (Adams et al 52). While the emerging writing course was designed in a sequence which encouraged students to continue to the next level writing class, Adams found that

> two-thirds of the students who attempted ENGL 052 [basic writing] never passed
> ENGL 101 [standard composition class]. The problem was not that basic writers
> were attempting first-year composition and failing; the problem was that they
> were giving up before they ever reached that course, a fact hidden when he had

simply looked at the pass rates for the small number of students who did make it into regular composition. (Adam et al 52)

This data is alarming. And at first glance these data discrepancies could easily be missed, leading to continual traditional non-credit writing programs at some colleges. Not for Adams though; with this knowledge in hand, he and several other CCBC faculty members suggested they develop a pilot that would mainstream developmental writing students in order to investigate any improvement on success rates (Adams et al 56). In 2007 the Accelerated Learning Program developed and intended to improve student achievement gaps. As with any new program there needs to be full administrative buy-in and support, so during the pilot Adams met with the Dean of Developmental Education and the Vice President for Instruction. With the support of administration and faculty, ALP thrived for reasons to be discussed below. Ultimately the goal was to assist emerging writers in completing their course work so that they could move onto credit bearing courses.

An Accelerated Learning Program model works so that students who place into non-credit writing classes, but whose cut-off scores (placement cut-off scores have a numbered range which is determined by individual schools) reach a specific level, can simultaneously take developmental writing and college-level writing (freshman composition) in the same semester. Courses are taught back-to-back by the same instructor, so that the freshman composition course is taught before the developmental course and the ALP cohorts are kept together. While different institutions have various enrollment caps for each course, the class sizes for both the ALP and college level

writing course are significantly reduced in an effort to focus more attention on each individual student's needs (Adams et al). CCBC's current ALP model has a class size of ten students for the ALP section with those same ten students alongside another ten students in the freshman composition course, which makes the course size for the credit bearing class a total of twenty students (Accelerated Learning Program). With significantly smaller class sizes, students are able to receive more individual one-on-one attention and develop a relationship with their peers which helps them gain a sense of belonging and purpose. Adams and other CCBC faculty found that there were some specific features that led to the success of the program.

Overall the Accelerated Learning Program created an intensive environment for students to complete coursework in half of the time while improving motivation rates and instilling a sense of community amongst first year writers. While ALP is different than previous approaches to traditional remediation, it "has borrowed the best features of existing mainstreaming approaches, [and] added some features from studios and learning communities [while] develop[ing] several new features of our own" (Adams et al 56). They believe that other effects of ALP courses that benefited students were: mainstreaming, acceleration, contextual learning, heterogeneous grouping, cohort learning, small class size, attention to behavioral issues, and attention to life problems (Adams et al 60).

Mainstreaming and Acceleration

Mainstreaming and acceleration are components of other emerging writing programs that produced successful results. Adams et al. reference the work of mainstreaming used by the Stretch model, the Enrichment Pilot Project, and the

Supplemental Writing Workshop and indicate that "mainstreaming students has a powerful psychological effect for basic writers" (60). Because the ALP cohort works alongside students with different abilities, it attempts to remove the direct labeling effect that can create an emotional scar. Gerry McNenny examines the outcomes that mainstreaming has on students and argues that mainstreaming is an effective configuration in the "post-remedial university" (xii). She believes that because calls to eliminate remediation have been somewhat successful teachers of writing have had to incorporate alternative models that will help at-risk students. Furthermore, she claims that mainstreaming can be appropriate when institutions assess the needs of their schools and students in light of the drastic changes being made to developmental education (xiii). The use of mainstreaming basic writers sheds light on the institutional role that developmental education has had. According to Soliday and Gleason they believe that,

> the array of positions that scholars have expressed on the subject of
> mainstreaming remedial students into freshman writing courses…does not settle
> the issue of whether we ought to abolish remedial courses. Instead, this debate
> highlights the fact that "basic" writing courses play distinct historical, curricular,
> and political roles within their institutions. Rather than continuing to debate
> whether mainstreaming is effective generally, we need to analyze the roles that
> these courses play within their institutional contexts and follow that analysis with
> a careful consideration of alternatives. (75)

Individual institutions should rely on their composition scholars and practitioners in order to make the final call as to whether mainstreaming is appropriate. While some already do,

others depend on administrative opinions which can be governed by fiscal profits. The benefits according to Adams et al. are that by mainstreaming "basic writing students" they will feel less "excluded from the real college" (60). By welcoming developmental writers into first-year composition they can sidestep the stigma that traditional developmental writing courses sometimes create. But mainstreaming alone is not the answer; along with the use of acceleration or a compressed learning model, writers need to have the ability to complete writing courses in a reasonable amount of time without extending their time in non-credit courses.

I equate the concept of acceleration to an intensive writing environment; acceleration refers to the amount of time students spend in the developmental pipeline, the longer the course sequence the more likely students are apt to fail or withdraw from the course (Adams et al 62). By creating a writing sequence within one semester, with classes back-to-back and taught by the same instructor, students are engaged in an intensive writing experience which helps them learn and bond with their peers. Sheldon and Durdella claim that "while the notion of offering accelerated or compressed courses to developmental education students may seem counterintuitive, there is evidence indicating the viability of the concept" (42). Students that place into non-credit courses can sometimes become frustrated with the fact that they are not in a college credit course and, as Adams states they get lost in the "pipeline". Acceleration works to shorten the pipeline so as to help at-risk students from falling through the cracks. According to Nikki Edgecombe's research, "advocates of acceleration believe that the rate at which academically underprepared students complete "remedial" instruction and succeed in college-level courses can be increased by helping students proceed through requirements

more quickly or by encouraging them to enroll in higher-level courses while providing effective academic support" (3). Mainstreaming and acceleration allow and encourage students to complete writing courses in a reasonable amount of time in order to continue with their education while giving at-risk students appropriate academic support without labeling them.

Contextual Learning

Another feature that has benefited Accelerated Learning Programs is "Contextual Learning". Contextual Learning helps students to see writing instruction as meaningful because the content is applicable between the two courses. Adams argues that this feature is common in both learning communities and Writing Studios in that students can identify the value of the writing task and apply it to their work. In learning communities and studio programs, students have the opportunity to discuss and explore writing and a teacher's comments, which helps the writing instruction become "more meaningful to the students because it is immediately applicable in the content course" (Adams et al 61). On the other hand, traditional developmental courses act as stand-alone courses and because they are non-credit they appear to be divorced from credit-bearing writing courses. In other words, the writing that occurs in non-credit courses can at times be vastly different than the expectations of a first-year writing course; but by linking two courses together, students have time to make meaning of information and discuss further what they learned and how to apply it to their own understanding of rhetoric and their literacy practices. Many times, students in stand-alone, non-credit writing courses have a difficult time understanding how the assignment, discussion, reading, etc. applies to something they will learn in a credit-bearing freshman composition class in the next semester. An ALP

offers the possibility of providing content and knowledge that a student can apply to a concept or piece of writing that they are working on in that moment.

Heterogeneous Grouping and Cohort Learning

"Heterogeneous Grouping" is one of the features that faculty at the Community College of Baltimore County developed. They state that earlier mainstreaming models took traditional developmental writers and placed them into credit-bearing writing courses without writers who had directly placed into first year composition. They believe that by integrating both sets of writers together into one cohort in a first-year writing course, students learn from one another while removing the stigma that can have demoralizing effects on traditional developmental writers. Furthermore Adams et al. believe that the students who place directly into the first-year writing course "can serve as role models both for writing and for successful student behavior" (62). The relationship that can build between these writers is one that can be described as a social bonding effect which is a characteristic of cohort learning.

"Cohort Learning" draws from the concept of learning communities which has its own large breadth of research; however, Adams et al. cite the work of Gabelnick, Tinto, Mlynarczyk and Babbitt in order to define the value of learning communities as they apply them to ALPs. This research focuses on the benefits of learning communities which seek to involve students by giving them a feeling and sense of belonging so they can become part of the college community in order to ensure continued success and persistence (qtd. in Adams et al 60). Learning communities or what Adams et al. call "cohort learning", allows for students to bond with one another because they have two classes back-to-back which provide an elongated period of time for everyone to develop

meaningful relationships. Adams et al. claim that the peer-to-peer relationships help to maintain student involvement: "students begin to look out for each other in a variety of ways calling to check on students who miss class, offering each other rides to campus, and, most importantly, helping each other to understand difficult concepts they encounter in their academic work" (60). Furthermore, this extended period of time encourages students to bond to the college. Because ALP cohorts are two classes taught by the same instructor they also have extended time with faculty. The features of heterogeneous grouping and cohort learning help to create an inclusive environment while establishing a sense of community among writers of varying levels. These features along with smaller class sizes, create a less intimidating atmosphere for students and faculty to get to know one another.

Small Class Size

One of the most important factors that help ALPs remain successful is smaller class size. Many of the programs previously mentioned did not significantly lower-class size with the courses they created, but accelerated courses require a smaller class size in order to mainstream stronger writing students alongside basic writers (Adams et al 57). Smaller class sizes afford instructors the ability to work one-on-one with students either in small groups or during in-class conferences. According to Alice Horning's article "The Definitive Article on Class Size", "extensive writing cannot reasonably be assigned, read and responded to in large sections. To raise students' level of engagement and learning, small classes with extensive writing are essential" (12). Students in a smaller cohort benefit from communal-social bonding and because of the smaller size students are better able to cultivate relationships with their peers and their instructors (Finn et al 352). They

feel more comfortable sharing their ideas and their struggles when it comes to writing. A smaller class size affords these emerging writers the time it takes to create relationships, which can in turn impact the psychological effects that placement has on them. By having a smaller class size, students can develop meaningful relationships and work through non-cognitive behavioral issues that can impact their ability to succeed. In addition, smaller class sizes can offer more individualized instruction, in-depth collaborative learning, and a greater focus on cognitive academic issues that sometimes impede on student success. Horning argues that "in general smaller class sizes and lower student-faculty ratios are helpful to students' engagement and success" (12). When students have the ability to work in depth with material and discuss their ideas it can also "lead to a more positive attitude toward the subject matter of the course" (Schiming). Adams believed that because these smaller class sizes worked well as a component of the Writing Studio model they would benefit ALP courses; students have the time to bond with one another and conversations can focus on individual questions and concerns (Adams 61). Having smaller classes is key to involving students in the college community while developing relationships with their peers and instructor. While class size continues to be an issue for college administrators nation-wide (Jaschik), ALP students, and all students tend to thrive in smaller settings where they can focus on specific tasks without feeling like they are lost in the crowd. Additionally, smaller class sizes are linked to social bonding which can also influence behavioral issues that traditional developmental students sometimes have.

Attention to Behavioral Issues and Life Problems

Smaller class sizes, cohort learning, and heterogeneous grouping can deter inappropriate behavior that sometimes occurs in developmental classes that are not part of the ALP model. In my experiences as a teacher of developmental writing I have observed and experienced inappropriate behavior that can create a toxic environment for students. Some of the most egregious behaviors I have experienced are students who become belligerent towards me and begin to scream and yell in class. I have also had students who attempt to berate me with comments or questions unrelated to the coursework and there have been times where I have had to call campus security in order to remove these out of control students. I have also had students pass out in class because they overdosed on drugs. ALPs create a higher stakes environment that call for students to be on good behavior because they are alongside students in the credit-bearing course that typically exude appropriate behavior. ALPs work to combat behavioral issues by addressing and discussing with students what kind of steps they should take to acclimate themselves to higher education. At the college where I teach we call these *studentship skills*. We talk about time management, appropriate study and reading techniques, when or when not cell phone usage is warranted, and organizational skills to name some. By deliberately drawing attention to behavioral issues, students learn the difference between effective tools they learned in high school versus college. Like Adams et al, at Suffolk County Community College, "we work hard to help our students understand the type of behavior that will maximize their chances for success in college" (62). Creators of ALP took great concern in considering not just behavioral issues, but other life issues or non-cognitive issues that sometimes get in the way of students' success.

CCBC faculty identified and created another feature that they believe helps ALPs remain successful: by drawing "Attention to Life Problems" and encouraging faculty to consider the lives that students have outside of school, we may understand why students struggle to accomplish the tasks we ask of them. I have often wondered why students disappeared from my classes; Adams et al. ask faculty to consider what happens to students who face difficult challenges that impede on their focus and motivation. They state, "many students who give up on our courses do so, not because of any difficulties with the material in the course but, primarily, because of circumstances in their lives outside of college" (Adams et al 63). They challenge faculty to become involved in their students' lives in order to not only identify issues they are having, but help students learn to mitigate these life issues so that they do not fall out of the "pipeline". At Suffolk County Community College, I am working directly with our faculty advising and counseling department to assign one specific counselor for each ALP cohort. I plan to have them visit the class in order to develop a rapport with students so that they feel they have a go-to person to talk to if they need it. These small details help students feel wanted, give them access to an education they deserve, and include them in their academic process. ALPs offer additional safety nets because students are also less likely to engage in behavioral problems when in the smaller class (Adams et al 61). Behavioral issues and life problems distract students and faculty away from what needs to be accomplished in the writing class, so avoiding them altogether can create a productive environment for all.

All of the features highlighted by CCBC and their Accelerated Learning Program illustrate the effects that productive changes to remediation can have. These eight

features of ALPs that were pulled from other writing programs or developed by CCBC faculty have helped redefine how traditional basic writing courses have evolved. Additionally, Adams et al. believe that each of these features work to create a sense of community while students bond with their peers and learn to negotiate issues that develop outside of the academic sphere that prohibit them from being successful. Due to the extended period of time students see each other and their instructor, they develop these bonds and learn to work through issues that arise. Because of the success of ALP at CCBC, faculty in California began to implement their own accelerated model which is known as the California Acceleration Project.

California Accelerated Program

While individual institutions nationwide have slowly begun to offer ALP, since 2010 the entire state of California has been working to implement a program that mirrors the goals of the Accelerated Learning Program. According to the 2017 Student Success Scorecard, "California Community Colleges are the largest system of higher education in the nation, with more than 2.3 million students attending 114 colleges" ("California Community Colleges"). Due to the large population that the California Community Colleges cater to, changes to remediation became necessary. The California Accelerated Program (CAP) was co-founded in 2010 by Katie Hern and Myra Snell who taught at two-year colleges in California. On their website CAP is described as:

> a faculty-led professional development network that supports the state's 114
> community colleges to transform remediation to increase student completion and
> equity. CAP is focused on one primary outcome: increasing the number of
> students who go on to complete transferable gateway courses in English and

math, a critical early momentum point toward longer term degree and transfer outcomes. Between 2010 and 2016, all 114 California community colleges participated in CAP outreach workshops, and 84 colleges began implementing acceleration strategies with support from our extended professional development programs. ("The California Acceleration Project (CAP)")

CAP has the same framework as the ALP at CCBC. Hern and Snell believe that underprepared students need practice with college-level skills, content, and ways of thinking. They need to reason their way through open-ended questions on topics that matter. They need to think. And if, along the way, we see that they are weak in some of the basics, we need to build in targeted support. (5)

Additionally, they see the value of acceleration as that helps students move through the pipeline in a reasonable amount of time. Hern and Snell support the co-requisite model as that gives students the ability to work with writers at all levels while developing their own skills and providing contextual learning opportunities. While CAP integrates similar features that ALP developed into their model, they approach acceleration through principles related to curriculum reform. These are similar to the features that Adams et al identified as successful components to the Accelerated Learning Program model.

Increasing Completion

In order for the California Acceleration Project to effectively shift away from traditional approaches to the remedial sequence, Hern and Snell argue that approaches

should work to increase completion of college-level English and Math while requiring shorter developmental sequences in order to broaden access to college-level courses. In other words, "the length of developmental sequences must be significantly reduced to eliminate the many points at which students are lost by not passing or not enrolling in courses in the sequence. Colleges should also experiment with lowering the barriers blocking student access to college-level courses" (Hern "Acceleration Across California" 64). Acceleration works to help students move through the developmental sequence while gaining appropriate support that can help them in both the accelerated and co-requisite college level writing course. Ultimately, they believe that if remedial sequences are left unchanged there will never be "meaningful progress in student completion" (Hern 7). In addition, the idea of "lowering barriers" relates to approaches to placement. Hern and Snell believe that if colleges implement alternatives to placing students, it may eliminate the exclusionary process that high stakes standardized exams have promoted.

Reducing Reliance on Placement Tests

While placement exams have a long history of sifting students based on ability, Hern and Snell believe that if colleges in California reduce reliance on high stakes placement tests, students will have opportunities to proceed through the writing sequence while demonstrating their abilities to succeed. The CAP model champions significant changes to placement. Hern and Snell, who implemented the CAP model at Chabot College in California, argue that colleges should broaden access to transfer-level courses, thereby making access more equitable by adjusting cut scores on placement exams. They also argue that the use of multiple measures provides a clearer story of what a student may be capable of (Hern and Snell "The California Acceleration Project"). While other writing

programs such as ALP and Stretch also reviewed placement processes and their reliability, Hern believes that utilizing multiple measures in order to assess or determine where a student should be placed is a more accurate approach to placing students. She states that, "standardized placement tests are notoriously poor predictors of student performance. We need to stop using these tests to separate students into rigid "levels" and instead allow them to demonstrate their capacity in challenging, supportive, streamlined pathways" (Hern 64). At my own institution we have begun to shift to a multiple measures placement approach. We have found that by examining a student's high school record alongside their placement score we have more information about a student's abilities. The more information we have about a student and their experiences, the better they can be placed but acceleration models can combat issues of placement altogether. By offering students alternatives to the traditional developmental track, which is based on a placement score alone, students have the opportunity to determine their own placement and make decisions about what they think or believe they are capable of. Along with changes to remediation the California Accelerated Project also encourages curricular changes that can help support the needs of student writers.

Streamlining Developmental Curricula

Because the traditional approaches to remediation were called into question and because the field of composition and rhetoric has grown over time, many writing programs (Stretch, Enrichment, Supplemental, etc.) have had to reconsider the pedagogical and curricular approaches that governed the teaching of traditional developmental writing. Hern argues that CAP approaches should redesign curricula so that it reflects three key principles: "Backwards Design", "Just-in-Time Remediation",

and "Intentional Support for Affective Issues". Each of these approaches while similar to features in the Accelerated Learning Program, focus on how to help at-risk students succeed.

A "Backward Design Approach" in the writing classroom would mean that "the developmental course should look and feel like a good, standard college English course, only with more support and guidance" (Hern and Snell 7). This would require instructors to re-evaluate the writing they are asking students to do in order to reflect the expectations of a first-year writing course. Additionally, instructors would have to reimagine their assessment practices; because non-credit courses sometimes do not assign grades, instructors would have to contemplate whether offering grades in addition to feedback would better emulate what occurs in a first-year writing course. Furthermore, Hern and Snell argue that pedagogical approaches would need to move towards a "thinking orientated curriculum" (7). Instead of focusing on correctness instructors would encourage students to examine their own unique literacy practices alongside the writing process. Assignments would be based on student interests and experiences which can heighten student motivation levels (Hern and Snell 13). The backwards design is student-centered in orientation and takes into account the heterogeneous identities that students bring to the writing classroom. In addition, to approaching the classroom through backwards design, Hern and Snell believe that by implementing a "Just-in Time" approach to remediation that students may begin to "grapple with challenging college-level tasks" (8). Instead of teaching rote grammatical drills and skills, writing instruction includes individualized grammar guidance where students focus on the specific errors they make. While this is nothing new to composition practitioners, some non-

composition trained faculty at the two-year college have limited experiences teaching writing and at times fall back on grammatical drills and skills. Hern and Snell wanted CAP to emphasize a different approach to teaching writing which drew from the work of Shaughnessy.

The "Just in Time" approach seems to draw its design from Shaughnessy's work in *Errors and Expectations* which argues that errors matter, but as an instructor guides an emerging writer in order to understand the logic of their mistakes, they may "determine at what point or points along the developmental path error should, or can become a subject for instruction" (Shaughnessy 13). It is a focus on how meaning evolves through a recursive writing process that encourages students to identify error patterns they need to address. This kind of involved critical thinking encourages students to consider their literacy practices in a deeper and more meaningful way. Horner and Snell believe that, "when teachers ask underprepared students to do challenging, college-level work, they need to build in a lot of opportunities for practice. These students need space to work through their thinking, try out new vocabulary, see how other students approach tasks, and receive targeted guidance from the teacher" (19). The just-in-time curriculum approach shifts away from traditional grammar drills and skills and involves the students in a collaborative learning process. This exchange between instructors and students leads to the last feature that the CAP model promotes which is "Intentional Support for Affective Issues". Similar to ALPs which identify "Attention to Behavioral Issues" and "Life Problems", intentional support considers and recognizes the emotional side of learning and the feelings that students sometimes have. Traditional developmental students sometimes struggle with being labeled and can be fearful of the expectations

imposed on them. By addressing or discussing the uncertainties and or academic insecurities students face it can help them push through the emotional challenges they come into contact with. Hern and Snell believe that when, "pedagogical practices are employed to reduce students' fear, [it can] increase their willingness to engage with challenging tasks, and make them less likely to sabotage their own classroom success" (8). The CAP program focuses on these issues through student reading and writing assignments, but also considers flexible class policies that take into account the difficult and challenging lives that at-risk students sometimes face. The three main features of CAP, which focus on increasing completion, reducing reliance on placement tests, and streamlining developmental curricula are all believed to have led to its popularity in California. While CAP has encouraged colleges to reshape remediation in ways that work best for their individual institutions some have found that by offering both traditional developmental courses alongside accelerated models students have the control to decide which academic direction to pursue.

　　While CAP focuses on alterations to traditional developmental courses some colleges in California have kept their traditional track. At Chabot College, where Hern implemented CAP they also decided to keep their traditional developmental writing track; for some colleges this may make sense. Students can self-place and decide where they want to begin their academic studies, but Hern wants to emphasize that students are capable of more than low-level courses if they are given the opportunity to engage in college-level courses (64). In bringing the Accelerated model to California and in particular Chabot College students have had the opportunity to explore their abilities without the weight of being labeled a "developmental" writer. While acceleration is still

ongoing in California, Chabot College has success rates that are similar to CCBC. According to Hern "despite the absence of a minimum placement score, students from Chabot's accelerated course complete college level English at substantially higher rates than students who start in the longer sequence" (62). To avoid the risk of sounding repetitive, both the CAP and ALP models have incorporated successful features that illustrate alternative approaches to remediation. Furthermore, they are both grounded in a student-centered approach while taking into account the fact that when students have additional time, support, and an intensive writing environment they can be successful. Both ALP and CAP provide sound models that other institutions may decide to mirror and implement.

Conflicts Continue to Playout Nation-Wide

While the complexities associated with supporting emerging writers have continued to play out in colleges across the nation, there are continual issues concerning their ability to produce college-level writers in an expedient fashion. While these conversations became more contentious in the 90s, in the 2000s they have yet to reconcile some key problems they pose in relationship to placement, assessment, and rate of college completion. In the "Politics of Basic Writing*"* Karen Greenberg argues, "given the priorities of most universities, underprepared writers will not benefit from any of the tens of thousands of dollars that schools would save by ending placement testing and basic skills instruction" (66). In the wake of political conversations about emerging writing classes and whether or not they successfully help students, states around the country have opted to alter the availability that students have to take emerging writing

courses. In more recent years, numerous states have made major cuts to developmental

education in order to slim the financial fat that many feel is unnecessary.

For the most part in New York State or at least at Suffolk Community College we

have been able to negotiate our own local standards for emerging writing courses, but

that doesn't mean that in the short-term future legislation may not be handed down that

would be similar to those in other states. As Adler-Kassner states, "political debates over

funding and curriculum have led many basic writing programs to adopt flexible strategies

regarding basic writing" (95). These changes are something that have come out of

necessity and have also come out of the kind of evolutionary process that needs to happen

at this point in time, but as Soliday describes these changes come at a complicated cost.

In "The Politics of Remediation" she states that,

> composition teaching is a complex enterprise because writing programs often
>
> mediate the institutional and social class needs that tiering is designed to address:
>
> the need to offer democratic access to growing numbers of students while also
>
> protecting selectivity; and the need to generate enrollments while also promoting
>
> the research and development that attract corporate, state, and federal funding. (2)

Her discussion of tiering refers to a hierarchal system where top tiered institutions focus

their energy on research while lower tiered schools are dedicated to teaching. This tiering

system has not only created budgetary complexities, but also impacts the mission of the

two-year college. The history of developmental writing illustrates that at some point in

the late 1960's developmental writing became the responsibility of the two-year college

(Soliday 7). This created not only a crisis back then, but has continued to determine who

has access to what kind of education. Based on research and anecdotal evidence it has become clear that current-traditional developmental writing classes have become outdated and ineffective.

Because a significant amount of research has shown that traditional developmental programs do not work, many institutions have created alternative approaches. CCRC's researchers have found that "in some cases, colleges combine developmental courses at different levels, thus reducing the number of courses students have to take. In other cases, students needing "remediation are "mainstreamed" directly into college-level coursework that incorporates supplemental instruction, tutoring, or other supports" (Jenkins et al 1). And so, the amalgamation of a variety of programs including the Accelerated Learning Program have been able to create a sustainable approach to the teaching of writing for students on differing levels. Accelerated Learning Programs while somewhat new, offer some promising hope for emerging writers who desire to gain equal access to higher education and improve upon the writing abilities they already have. To a certain extent, institutions have had to learn how negative and inefficient noncredit writing classes have been by watching students fail, repeat, or drop out of college altogether. The continued lack of success influenced states to make drastic changes to college remediation; in 2012 Connecticut was one of the first states that was dealt a harsh blow when landmark legislation reshaped developmental education at community colleges and regional state universities (Sullivan 118). This bold legislation created tension and concerns for academics who were not necessarily prepared for the abrupt changes. According to Connecticut's PA 12-40 law, students would be exposed to "an accelerated approach to developmental education, requiring all colleges in the

system—twelve community colleges and four state universities—to offer a maximum of one semester of developmental work for any student requiring additional preparation for college" ("Substitute Senate Bill No. 40"). Furthermore, colleges were required to offer developmental students who were deemed "likely to succeed in college level work with supplemental support the opportunity to enroll in a first-year composition class that provided embedded support" (Sullivan 119). What was so controversial about this legislation was that "it appeared to establish a 'floor' for matriculation into open admissions institutions in Connecticut—thereby effectively abandoning students who scored below cut-off scores which were at or below the 8th grade level on our standardized placement test" (Sullivan 119). Further it offered a "maximum one semester of remedial work" and there may be students who need more time and more intervention in order to be able to succeed in college level writing courses (Sullivan 119). In essence, this law and its policies contradicted the concept of open admissions institutions and it wouldn't end in Connecticut.

　　After Connecticut's changes to remediation, Florida was the next to follow suit, but the outcome of their dramatic changes would not be so successful and equally as controversial. Inside Higher Ed's Ashley Smith described the changes that took place in 2013,

> Florida legislators sought a way to help students save money and encourage them
> to stay in college. Developmental education courses, which are not credit
> bearing and don't count toward a degree, would no longer be mandated for
> traditional high school graduates who don't score well on the state's standard
> placement tests. And the placement test that would determine whether a student

should enter a developmental education course was no longer mandatory, either. Adult or nontraditional students, however, weren't exempt from placement tests. ("When You're Not Ready")

Students that needed extra support but chose not to receive it were unsuccessful under this model and the state of Florida found that their "55.3 percent success rate fell to 51.9 percent for those not taking two recommended courses. It dropped to 45 percent for three courses" (Smith). While Connecticut and Florida were the first two states to enact changes, they were not the last; however, other states collaborated with faculty and were able to make significant positive changes to their remediation programs.

During the 2014-2015 academic year Tennessee began to initiate pilot programs to explore different options for their non-credit writing programs. Their model included co-requisite classes which placed students into a credit-bearing course with additional support through supplementary coursework, tutoring, or labs. The goal was to help students gain college credit in an effective and swift time period (Denley). This model, a combination of an ALP and the Writing Studio saw success and positive outcomes. According to Denley, "at seven community colleges, 957 students who would otherwise have been placed into learning support writing were instead enrolled in a credit-bearing freshman writing class with required co-requisite support. Of the students enrolled in the writing pilot, 66.9 percent received a passing grade in the class. Once again the gains were strong across the full preparation range" (Reimagining Remediation in Tennessee). Overall it seems as though this new approach in Tennessee is beginning to have significant changes in helping students succeed and gain access to an equitable higher

education (Denley). Just as Tennessee made strides with their approaches to writing courses, during 2015 California once again refined and incorporated changes for their students.

For some time, California struggled with changes to developmental education and because of recent legislation they have had to add additional alternative options. The California Acceleration Project began in 2010 and offered features such as mainstreaming, smaller class size, and co-requisite courses, to name some, but was geared towards the two-year community college. According to their website "between 2010 and 2016, all 114 California community colleges participated in CAP outreach workshops, and 84 colleges began implementing acceleration strategies with support from our extended professional development programs" (About Us: The California Acceleration Project (CAP)). While the CAP reaches out to community colleges, according to a new bill proposed by Assemblyman Irwin Seymour-Campbell, all students who attend two or four-year institutions will need to have a high school GPA of 2.5 or higher to enroll in college-level writing courses. Students can forgo the placement test even if they cannot pass it (Deruy). While Connecticut and Florida saw issues with opting out of remediation it appears that in California "under the old model, only 35 percent of students qualified for the class. Now, it's 78 percent, and the students are just as likely to do well as their peers who are good test-takers" (Deruy). Arguably Karin Spirn from Las Positas College in California claims that by allowing students to direct place and mainstream themselves they rise to the challenge and are successful (Deruy). In addition to the California Acceleration Program model and perhaps as a readied response to these significant changes to remediation, approximately seventeen other institutions in the

California State University system have either adopted or are developing Stretch programs (Flachmann). By incorporating Stretch composition along with CAP regardless of whether students attend a two or four-year school they will have another option to enhance their writing with extra time and support.

It would seem that California has had success with CAP and Stretch because they are not new to these educational innovations. By incorporating the CAP and Stretch programs California has been able to negotiate this legislation and work towards a viable solution for their students. It would appear that administrators and practitioners collaborated with one another to work through the kinks of a variety of programs and have found that writing pedagogy is not something that takes shape in a vacuum, but instead has to be recalibrated every so often in order to mirror the changes in academia and society. The goal in the California State University system is to turn "all non-credit remedial classes into college-level credit bearing ones by 2018, with the co-requisite classes as the likely model" (Gordon). By exploring different writing programs, and creating models that work at the local level, we help students gain access to an education which can support their professional goals. Colleges in some states have been forced into legislative mandates without the opportunity to work collaboratively with their peers and our most fragile students who are in need of support unfortunately suffer the consequences of these mandates.

While some states have been forced to alter their practices, other practitioners have been inspired to take matters into their own hands. By exerting a sense of autonomy many writing specialists, compositionists, and developmental education sympathizers have become conscious for the need of different writing programs that will help

struggling writers progress through their academic experience. In examining the history of approaches to emerging writing, teachers at the two-year college can sift through the appropriate models that would work best for them. While the models previously discussed were well intentioned it was difficult for some to remain permanent structures, but those models opened the door for other approaches. By reviewing the positive outcomes of those models, one can assert that there is room for improvement in order to move forward with newer approaches to developmental education. Thus far research has shown some of the features that worked in The Writing Studio, The Enrichment Project, the Supplemental Writing Workshop, and the Stretch program had helped writers enhance their successfulness in the writing classroom. From these programs ALP and CAP have pulled positive features such as collaboration, bonding, smaller class size, mainstreaming, and issues with non-cognitive behavior concerns in order to continue working with students who need extra support. I believe that these earlier writing models have led the way for Accelerated Learning Program models and I am suggesting that this model is exemplary and useful in approaching emerging writing courses.

Ultimately multiple practitioners such as McNenny, Glau, Adams, Soliday, Gleason, and Fox to name some, agree that acceleration is the newest approach to working through issues of developmental writing while attempting to engage with legislation that tries to control remediation at colleges and universities nationwide. Sullivan argues that "most of the recent scholarship on acceleration suggests that basic writing classes should engage students with authentic college-level work" (128). By examining what successful models have incorporated (such as mainstreaming and accelerating along with smaller class size) we will be able to revise the conventions of our discipline. Sullivan pointedly states, "we

are being called upon to reassess foundational assumptions and guiding principles concerning what we teach, why we teach what we do, and what students might be capable of given the right circumstances" (129). The Accelerated Learning Program is a good model for how institutions such as Suffolk County Community College could proceed to redefine non-credit bearing courses.

Moving Forward

The eight features that "Throwing Open the Gates" discusses: mainstreaming, cohort learning, small class size, contextual learning, acceleration, heterogeneous grouping, attention to behavioral issues, and attention to life problems have led to successful developmental writing options (Adams et al). ALPs have a stronger possibility for a longer shelf life than other programs; with administrative and faculty support along with the features discussed, they address the long-standing issues that have plagued emerging writing programs and students. Thus far the results of ALPs have been encouraging and colleges have found that the sequencing and class cap decrease directly impacts successful completion of ENG 010 and ENG 101 and potentially impacts retention levels (Cho et al). According to numerous studies conducted by CCRC it appears that two-year colleges that have incorporated programs such as Accelerated Learning Programs are producing successful student writers who persist and are retained throughout college writing course sequences; this includes retention and "better outcomes in terms of English 101 completion and English 102 completion, the two primary outcomes ALP was designed to improve" (Jenkins et al). These implications could have a positive benefit for many two- year colleges and while many colleges have already begun to implement this program, it is important to keep in mind that individual institutions

need to create writing programs that suit their needs. While ALPs are fast becoming the

new approach for emerging courses there should be collaboration between faculty and

administrators in order to determine if an ALP would be beneficial.

Chapter 5: The Birth of an Accelerated Learning Program at Suffolk County Community College

I believe that an Accelerated Learning Program would benefit the college where I teach. And it is because of this strong belief that in 2011 I began the journey to explore how to implement an Accelerated Learning Program at Suffolk County Community College. The Accelerated Learning Program model has several programmatic features that are beneficial to students enrolled in the program. As I highlighted in chapter four, there are eight specific features that ALP and CAP utilize which make them functional approaches but beyond those previously mentioned there are additional benefits that Acceleration has mined off of previous programs. Assessment procedures in accelerated programs move away from the idea of a grade and closer to the act of learning language through acquisition. I believe that when students focus on their ideas and the process in which they invent and compose those ideas, they are less likely to attach a letter grade to that process. I am a strong proponent of Peter Elbow's approach to grading in that "conventional grades give students a sense of seeing themselves as better and worse in relation to more of their peers" ("Writing with Power" 410). This has become a common practice in the field, but some of my colleagues who are outside of the field of rhetoric and composition do not utilize this assessment practice. While I would encourage them to consider this kind of approach, regardless, I would much rather that my classroom act as a place where practice meets process and I find that the accelerated model lends itself to this opportunity. By letting go of grades and focusing on process I find that students' writing and thinking become reflexive. Ira Shor calls this participatory learning which leads to reflection; "when we participate in critical classes, we can go beyond merely

repeating what we know or what we have been taught. We can reflect on reality and on our received values, words, and interpretations in ways that illuminate meanings we hadn't perceived before" (Shor 22). Acceleration and intensive writing environments provide a moment in time for students to make meaning of their own narrative histories, identities, or culturally diverse lives, which may have played a part in how they make sense of who they are as writers or readers. ALP and CAP courses may help students acclimate to the discourse of a university they may not have felt a part of if they were placed in a traditional "developmental" writing track.

The Local Scene

Suffolk County Community College strategically locates itself in three different areas on Long Island in Suffolk County New York. The westerly Grant campus is located in Brentwood and is home to a large Latino-American community and accommodates 9,000 students. The Eastern campus caters to 4,000 students and is located in the town of Riverhead making it the smallest, but quaintest campus. The largest and what is considered to be the main academic site, the Ammerman campus is situated in Selden, where there the population is mostly a mix of white, African American, and Latino-American students. The Ammerman campus, which was the first to open its doors, enrolls approximately 14,000 students in a given year (Suffolk County Community College). Because of the diverse demographics on each of these campuses, we act somewhat independently, but are constantly reminded that we are one campus. Further for many years due to our different enrollment sizes we approached our courses, specifically ENG 010 (developmental writing), in very different ways. While the Eastern and Ammerman campuses use an exit portfolio to evaluate an ENG 010 student's

readiness for ENG 101 freshman composition, the Grant campus does not have an exit assessment system put into place. Also, because the Eastern campus has lower enrollment they offer fewer sections of developmental writing and therefore have more time to discuss the students' end of semester portfolios. At times during the fall semester the Ammerman campus may employ 60 or more sections of developmental writing which makes end of semester portfolio readings a bit more structured and systematic.

Like many other institutions, over the years at Suffolk County Community College we noticed a consistent percentage of students placing into ENG 010 developmental writing. According to our Institutional Effectiveness team, in the fall 2015 semester the enrollment at the college was 23,670 and the percentage of students who placed into ENG 010 developmental writing was 33.4%. This is a significant number especially since many of those students do not pass ENG 010 the first and sometimes second time around. And based on our investigative inquires, typically when students do not pass the first or second time around we lose them. I am qualifying this statement based on work that my colleague and I did after we examined a sample size of ENG 010 students in 2012. When we tracked students we found that out of a total of 263 students in this population who started in the fall of 2012, roughly 47 (18%) were still enrolled. We had lost approximately 216 of those students. And it should also be noted that of those 16 students whose transcripts I read through, almost all dropped to part-time status or took one or more semesters off between fall of 2012 and spring of 2014. It became clear we had a problem retaining our students which would directly impact their ability to persist through our writing sequence.

The writing sequence at Suffolk County Community College was initially designed to help students continuously develop their writing throughout several semesters. Depending on students' CPT (Accuplacer placement scores) students may place into one of two remedial writing (ENG 09 basic writing or ENG 010 developmental writing) courses or they may go directly into ENG 101 freshman composition, a credited writing course. After fulfilling a remedial course and or freshman composition, a majority of students must also take ENG 102 introduction to literature. While the courses content requires them to read, learn, and analyze four genres (short story, poem, novel, drama), the goal of ENG 102 is to assess this knowledge via written essays. Faculty who teach these courses are strongly encouraged to continue to work on student writing through the writing process and collaborative peer revision, but at times ENG 102 looks less like a writing course and more like a literature one. Because the ENG 102 class requires students to examine literary texts and summarize, analyze, and critique them it functions more so as a literature course than a writing one. In ENG 010 and ENG 101 I rely heavily on student writing to act as models that are examined and developed upon through the use of the writing process. Additionally, I constantly ask students to reflect on their process, not the process of an outside text. Regardless, because many of our students place into developmental writing and sometimes fail to continue through the sequence we have noticed an impact on enrollment. Having observed these student retention issues, I began to mentally catalogue the many conversations I overheard during committee and department meetings and informal hallway and office conversations. It sounded like a call to action was necessary.

Investigative Inquiry

As an instructor of emerging writers, when I first learned about the concept of Accelerated Learning Programs I realized that there was a possibility that all of the issues we were facing at Suffolk County Community College might be re-imagined. Throughout several years of investigative data collection and anecdotal experience, it became clear that the developmental writing courses we are requiring of our community college students are not working and in many cases, might even be playing a role in students withdrawing from the college and ceasing to pursue their professional and academic goals. Accelerated Learning Programs, seem to offer a different approach to our writing sequence worth considering. Because of the promise of ALPs, I set off to create an Accelerated Learning Program that our administration, faculty, and students might benefit from.

Suffolk County Community College began implementation of a portfolio program in the fall of 1994. While I was not employed at the college during this time it is common knowledge among seasoned faculty that this program began in order to maintain control of writing standards in the midst of potential SUNY mandates. Faculty became worried when CUNY was required to administer The CUNY Proficiency Examination which determined whether a student was proficient enough to enroll in credit-bearing courses (Testing FAQs). In order to avoid any directives SCCC faculty began to investigate their own approaches to remediation:

> faculty within the Ammerman campus English department began discussing the
> idea of a more formal portfolio system for students in ENG 010. Later, at a
> luncheon that semester the SCCC Ammerman Campus English department met

with a group of high school administrators and teachers to discuss the growing concern of new SCCC students being placed into non-college-credit developmental writing courses. Everyone involved in this discussion hoped to initiate change to develop more unified expectations in ENG 010 for our SCCC students and to also help new students step directly into college-credit writing courses at SCCC. Through subsequent meetings involving SCCC English faculty and local high school teachers a version of the current portfolio system was developed and implemented in the spring of 1996. (SCCC ENG 010 Faculty Handbook)

The incorporation of the portfolio system was so influential it had not been altered until this past academic year of 2015/2016. Furthermore, the portfolio reading process and exchange along with the rubric had not been revised until several compositionists in the English department (myself included) lobbied to have significant changes made.

From the spring of 1996 to fall 2015 the portfolio process at the Ammerman campus existed to assess a students' ability to produce two revised essays that had been worked on throughout the semester, one reflective letter directed to an anonymous portfolio reader, and one in-class essay. All pieces were placed in a folder and void of any identifying marks. Students who failed to revise essays or complete any of the components for the portfolio could not pass the class. While this criteria has undergone some minor changes I felt that the inclusion of the in-class essay and the vagueness of the rubric did not properly align with best practices in the field of composition studies. And I concluded that our assessment of student writing was not accurate or reliable. Further I

felt the reading process, which was spread out among several different days and included part time faculty whose expectations of student writing did not meet core standards, was unfair to students. The rubric which was used to evaluate student portfolios during the reading was based on four criteria that were not defined and the numerical judgements associated with the criteria did not offer specific language to help a reader evaluate the work. Overall the process seemed archaic, too vague, and punitive. The portfolio began to act as another gatekeeping layer that did not promote student reflection or growth. Little did we know at the time how much it might be impacting our student retention and persistence rates.

Portfolio Pedagogy

I was aware of this outdated portfolio process and realized that portfolio pedagogy was the newest trend in assessment that we needed to examine through a critical and opportunistic lens. While I deeply value portfolio pedagogy as it pertains to assessment, I believe there are problems with the existing portfolio assessment model at Suffolk County Community College. The portfolio model at Suffolk was mirrored after Peter Elbow and Pat Belanoff's usage of portfolios at SUNY Stony Brook University which is just a couple miles from the Ammerman campus on Long Island. In 1984 at SUNY Stony Brook portfolios became the official procedure for all writing courses. The new requirement mandated that students must get a C or higher in 101 (freshman composition/comp I) or they would have to retake it ("Everyone Can Write" 424). Students were required to develop a semester long portfolio that would satisfy the University writing requirement and would encourage students to think and revise their writing. Elbow and Belanoff believed "portfolios permit us to avoid putting grades on

individual papers, and thereby help us make the evaluations we do during the semester formative, not summative" ("Situating Portfolios" 30). At the end of the semester students would submit the portfolio which contained three revised pieces and one in-class piece. These were evaluated by outside readers who also taught first year composition at the university. During mid-semester instructors had portfolio trial dry-runs so that students could see where their writing was meeting or not meeting the requirements. SUNY Stony Brook's portfolio differed from Suffolk Community College's in two respects; first, Stony Brook's faculty asked students to compose specific genres including a narrative, academic essay of any sort, and an academic essay which analyzed another essay and while faculty could put together their own small reading groups they were also required to attend a large faculty reading at the end of the semester (426). Suffolk's portfolio acted as an exit assessment process for ENG 010 a non-credit developmental writing course while SUNY Stony Brook's evaluated a credited freshman composition course. Furthermore, while Suffolk allowed students to choose the pieces they wanted to include in the portfolio regardless of the genre, Suffolk's model did not allow faculty to create their own reading groups or have large group discussions about portfolios at the end of the semester. Initially Suffolk's portfolio exchange was organized by the director who assigned anonymous portfolios to instructors to read and then return during a specified deadline, but more recently the director organizes large portfolio readings at the end of the semester where instructors anonymously exchange portfolios in small batches. These differences may seem insignificant, but they have led to a portfolio process that has become more summative than formative.

Summative assessment procedures are the typical practice amongst many of my colleagues at the two-year college. This kind of assessment offers a grade and "the comments that accompany it serve to summarize the student's performance on a discrete task" (Weiser 94). Our portfolio program may have initially begun as a formative assessment process which values all comments that "function as advice and guides to the student for future performance" (Weiser 94), but it slowly began to mirror assessment procedures that made a judgement with commentary to support it instead of allowing for collaborative community based discussion to assess student readiness. The outdated rubric lacked specific explanations for why students received the score they did and it became an individual reader's choice to pass or fail the student based on the inarticulate criteria laid out. Additionally, end of semester portfolio readings began to feel robotic, like we were all well-developed mechanical reading machines. There was no discussion, reflection, or collaborative feedback between faculty and their assessment of each other's students. We had in fact engaged in a portfolio pedagogy that was "reduced to a set of easily described steps so that it [could] be taught to and required of whole faculties of teachers in one or two in-service sessions, applied top-down as a panacea, rather than growing organically out of the needs and curiosities and abilities of teachers who are ready to stretch themselves in a new way" (Lucas 4). I found this to be problematic because as Elbow and Belanoff write in "Portfolios as a Substitute for Proficiency Examinations", the portfolio process should encourage collaboration among teachers (98) and group discussion of student work in order to attempt to "build consensus and at times resist such consensus in order to challenge authority" (Durst et al 228). When I began to envision a new portfolio model that would benefit our students at Suffolk County

Community College and involve a new assessment approach, I drew from the work of Huot and Williamson who say

> portfolios contain not only a collection of student work but also the process of how the writing got to be included in the portfolio. Ideally, students learn to make decisions about their writing in terms of what to include and how to improve what they choose to work on. Portfolios can also contain the reflective work students do as they prepare a body of their work not only to be evaluated but to represent them as writers. In this sense each portfolio can be an individual record of a student's journey to understand herself as a writer. Efforts to standardize such a record cut into its ability to help the individual student make sense of herself as a literate person struggling not only to make meaning but to create a context within which she learns to read and write. (54)

I would also include Yancey's vision of a portfolio that are linked directly to three principal activities which are collection, selection, and reflection (16). Because the student has a sense of autonomy over the collection and selection of the pieces they include, the portfolio can be "created in different contexts and may serve various purposes and speak to multiple audiences" (Yancey 16). Each definition of the usage of portfolios asks the student to be an engaged partner in their own assessment process while allowing faculty to act as a facilitator throughout the process. Huot, Williamson, and Yancey define portfolios as a collaborative, reflective, student-centered process which offers students and faculty the opportunity to learn and develop writing by engaging in rhetorical exchanges that work to reflect on one's literacy practices. While

the inclusion of portfolios is the medium with which to collect, select, and reflect there are a variety of portfolio models that may be incorporated into the writing classroom.

Portfolios that use a reflective, inquiry, exemplary, or process approach rely on collaboration, analysis, and a critical examination of one's literacy and artistic styles. Reflective writing may take many forms, but the goal is that students and faculty may use writing moments throughout the semester to consider how their literacy practices have changed in some way. Classrooms that move to foster an active construction of knowledge through student reflection and self-evaluation build communities of practice that engage teachers and students to work together as readers, writers, thinkers, and learners (Yancey and Weiser 4). Reflective portfolios raise questions that may or may not be answered, and create moments to think back about how a writer approached a specific writing moment in order to accomplish the task required. Yancey believes that by exploring reflective questioning we may unearth information about how or why students and faculty make writing and curriculum based choices ("Portfolios in the Writing Classroom" 114). Like reflective portfolios, inquiry based portfolios are concerned with a collaborative exploration that includes both teacher and students. According to Yancey, "a commitment to inquiry means that no one party to the exploration knows the answers definitively or ideally, that all parties work together to negotiate meaning, and that making meaning is the enterprise shared by all. Process in itself, then, and the processes of reflection and inquiry in particular are crucial components in a portfolio classroom" ("Teachers' Stories" 16). This rhetorical exchange is vital in order to identify students' successes and challenges as they continue to work through their writing process. Reflective and inquiry portfolio approaches tend to work hand-in-hand to create moments

where writers can be honest with their critiques and feedback in order to re-think and re-consider the writing choices they made so that they may improve upon those decisions in the future. In addition to this kind of reflexive engagement some practitioners also incorporate the exemplary portfolio approach. This approach deals specifically with the collection and selection process and the ways the student writer should go about choosing the pieces to include in their portfolio. D'Aoust believes that writers should view themselves as artists and collect work over time that thoughtfully illustrates the artist's talents and achievements. A portfolio such as this "might be a collection of writing samples garnered over time, illustrating exemplary student writing" (40). While some students may have the ability to save and collect pieces over time, others may not, which complicates this kind of approach; therefore, many practitioners champion a similar portfolio method that uses a process portfolio approach. A portfolio such as this could include "completed works, unfinished work, successful texts, texts that were abandoned, ideas for writing- whatever seemed relevant to the purposes of writing" (D'Aoust 42). Whichever approach a practitioner chooses to include in their course the pedagogical values of reflection, collaboration, analysis of literacy practices and engagement with the writing process all help to empower and motivate students to have a sense of ownership and autonomy over the choices they need to make in writing moments.

As technological advances increase, instructors seem to be expected to incorporate technology of some kind into their curriculum. The advent of e-portfolios enabled practitioners to take the culture of paper information and writing, and transform that to digital spaces so that students could engage in digital literacy. According to J. Elizabeth Clark, "e-Portfolios serve as an ideal bridge between traditional, essayistic

literacy pedagogies and emerging digital rhetoric pedagogies because they embody both

the old and the new" (29). E-portfolios offer students the opportunity to engage in

multiple kinds of content while considering the diverse audiences that may view their

content. This kind of digital environment allows students to engage in a reflective/

inquiry/process based approach that exceeds the time, social, and space limitations of a

traditional classroom setting. Students may revisit their live portfolios (if the digital

platform allows) throughout a semester in order to consider their writing process. Further

this kind of portfolio approach

> bring[s] together visibility, process, and reflection as students chart and interpret
>
> their own learning. Students are responsible for telling their own stories of
>
> learning: for explaining what they did and did not learn, for assessing their own
>
> strengths and weaknesses as learners, for evaluating their products and
>
> performances, for showing how learning connects with other kinds of
>
> learning (in the classroom and without), and for using the review of the past to
>
> think about paths for future learning. (19)

The use of e-portfolios creates a space for students to explore the impact that digital

environments have on a reader or viewer. Students could create their own digital

rhetorical environments all they while learning how to negotiate and analyze their voices

in private and public discourse communities. Additionally, e-portfolios create moments

for students to explore digital diversity where both identity and individuality could be

experimented with critically through varying cultural, racial, sexual, or linguistic forms.

Students live portfolios could acts as artifacts that have the potential to become actual

published texts (Clark 29). While this experience is still available to many students some practitioners have noted that "because millennial students have not been exposed to digital texts as a part of their education, they are resistant to digital texts as part of the curriculum; in short, they do not know how to approach these texts critically or analytically in an academic context" (Clark 32). Clark further explains that many students tend to reject digital rhetoric in favor of essayistic literacy. For many current students digital rhetoric is a social engagement which invites both private and public audiences into every moment of their lives and in some ways makes it difficult for students to become critical observers of the digital environment they engage in on a daily basis. While e-portfolios began as the newest portfolio model that many institutions implemented, it has been a difficult to sustain the kind of pedagogical and technological support needed.

    As I consider the multiple directions we could go in I realize that while electronic or digital portfolios are the most common, the technology at Suffolk Community College would be unable to support it. As Barbara Cambridge contends "technology is only one component of decision making about the use of electronic portfolios …The availability of resources to provide the necessary technology must be part of the consideration…A careful decision-making process will examine more than technological constraints and possibilities" (11). The technology at Suffolk County Community College is not updated and in many ways, would not be able to support the incorporation of an e-portfolio. Most if not all of our computers and software are slow and incompatible to the quick technological advances being made every day. In addition, while many of our students have their own cellphones many do not own a computer or i-pad that might be necessary

to create an electronic portfolio. Unfortunately, technological access and advances seem to be reserved for faculty and students who have a focus or interest in Science Technology Engineering and or Math programs (STEM). While e-portfolios are one approach to formative portfolio assessment the reflective, inquiry, or exemplary approach also offer positive benefits for incoming student writers.

These models of portfolio pedagogy and assessment are not what the portfolio at Suffolk County Community College has become. The issues surrounding the portfolio process at Suffolk County Community College and developmental writing became clearer to me in the fall 2010 semester when I was appointed a tenure track position in English at Suffolk County Community College. Initially I felt lost. While I had taught emerging writing for several years, I felt even more unprepared as a tenure track instructor. I had a lot to prove. I was hired because of my composition background and there were expectations that I would produce some monumental changes in the department. During my climb up the ladder to assistant professor I taught a variety of courses, but each semester requested at least one emerging writing and freshman composition course. I found these courses to be challenging and exciting and I soon learned how interconnected they were.

After three years teaching emerging writing I became frustrated with my retention and pass rates. It seemed that each semester I would lose fifty percent of the students who enrolled, and of the remaining students, only two thirds would pass our assessment of their final portfolio. What was it that prevented students from passing a non-credit writing course? Why were my retention rates so poor? What could I do to help students move through their writing sequence in a reasonable amount of time while successfully

developing as writers? I started by examining our developmental courses, portfolio process, and my own curriculum. After looking closely at these variables, I felt that developmental writing at the college had become stale, too comfortable with failure, and ultimately had not evolved along with the field of composition studies and our demographic. I began to speak openly with my colleagues about the concerns I had. Many agreed that we needed to make significant changes, but were unsure what kind of changes would be appropriate. Then by chance during a college-wide developmental education meeting, I heard about Accelerated Learning Programs. For the next year I began investigating the possibilities of implementing an ALP at Suffolk County Community College.

I became interested in helping emerging writers because I myself was labeled as a "developmental" writer. I started my college career as a returning student and found myself in a developmental writing class at Suffolk County Community College. My memories of the class are surrounded by rote grammar drills, silent and solitary in-class writing time, and note taking…lots of note taking. I didn't exit that writing class prepared for the rhetorical situations expected of me in freshman composition or any other college level courses that required writing. Having these first-hand experiences in writing courses at the institution where I now teach, has pushed me to re-envision an educational experience that would be more beneficial than the one I had. I am concerned where my students end up in their careers and more so want them to see the value that writing will have in their daily lives.

Getting Educated and Making Moves

In June of 2013 I attended the 5th annual Conference on Acceleration in Developmental Education in Baltimore where I gained in-depth knowledge and information about ALPs. I was convinced that the program would benefit the college where I teach, so-much-so that I scheduled a meeting that August with the Director of the Developmental Portfolio program at SCCC and the Assistant Chair of the English department. We spent one hot afternoon on the back patio of my home brainstorming ways to initiate the program. By the day's end it was clear that we needed to start by focusing on immediate administrative support which in early September led us to the Chair of the English department and the other English Assistant Chair; both immediately supported the idea and suggested we meet with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs at the Ammerman campus. I don't know why, but I was a bit shocked when after our meeting she sounded extremely excited and supportive. Then in October of 2013 I hit my first wall when I met with the Campus Executive Dean. While he seemed somewhat interested he requested significant data to back up our claims that would convince him that an Accelerated Learning Program would be beneficial.

In order to convince the upper echelon of the administration at the college about implementation of an ALP we would need more than anecdotal or qualitative theories. I requested that the college's Institutional Effectiveness office send us data that would help me unearth quantitative information that would support the need for a two semester ALP pilot. After eight months of reviewing the data, it began to tell us a story of what was happening to not only our developmental writers, but our freshman composition students as well.

After reviewing a college wide sample student population of 3,042 who placed in ENG 010 (developmental writing), in total we had not retained 1,042 students or 34%. Furthermore, when we looked specifically at students on the Ammerman campus (Selden), in the fall 2013 semester we found that out of 22.6% of students who placed into ENG 010, 31.2% did not complete or pass the course. Lastly, when we reviewed this sample we found that 23.6% of students in this cohort failed or did not take ENG 101 (freshman composition). While we knew something wasn't working, when we saw the numbers we realized we needed a new approach and we were not the only institution making significant changes to our writing sequence and curriculum. As we simultaneously reviewed data to support the need for an ALP we also worked to revise our developmental portfolio program. It seemed that the time had finally come for us to align ourselves with some of the more common practices happening in the field. I was thrilled by the potential for change.

In addition to the data we sifted through, I also wanted to identify the current and local trends at other institutions, so I queried numerous two-and four-year institutions in the tri-state area. I found that each institution that incorporated an ALP had positive results. Some of the colleges I contacted that were having positive results were: Gateway Community College in New Haven CT, Bergen Community College in Paramus NJ, SUNY Adirondack Community College, SUNY New Paltz, and LaGuardia Community College. After gathering all of this information I started by discussing the program with my direct department chairs, then the Executive and Associate Executive Campus Dean, after which the go-ahead was concretely established following a presentation to the Vice President of the college. In the spring 2014 semester after presenting all of this

information we were given approval to organize and run a two-semester pilot, for the spring and fall 2015 semesters. While our pilot involved similar characteristics as CCBC's (Community College of Baltimore County), as a composition practitioner I realized that our ALP would need to work for our students and faculty. In June of 2014 I again attended the Conference on Acceleration in Developmental Education in Baltimore.

After the conference and throughout the fall 2014 semester I met with administrators and English faculty who helped me plan the logistics of the class times, location, development of promotional fliers, and of course ideas for assignments and coursework. I also met several times with faculty from Institutional Effectiveness to develop pre-and post-surveys to be distributed to the ALP cohorts. In the same week I scheduled meetings with the head of Academic Advising in order to present and promote the pilot and met more than once with the former Director of Admissions and Placement who advised us on appropriate cut scores for the pilot. There was some negotiation on the initial requirements for a potential candidate. We all agreed that students should have placed into the upper level reading course RDG 099 or did not place into a reading course at all. We teetered back and forth with placement scores and started by looking at students who placed between the ranges 70-80 on the sentence skills portion of the exam. I also tried to speak with candidates (although it wasn't always possible) in order to vet their abilities as a college student. In large part I believe that successfully completing both ENG 010 and ENG 101 simultaneously requires good studentship or at least the desire to acquire studentship skills. Once we had our standards in place I spoke with every single academic counselor, disability service and ESL advisor and pretty much anyone who would be responsible to help us fill the classes with appropriate candidates.

With all the consistent preparation and promotion of the program I was sure we would have no problem gaining enrollment, but boy was I wrong.

The Strip

In November of 2014, as priority registration was underway at Suffolk County Community College, I kept a close eye on the spring enrollment of the ALP sections. At times it was difficult because I didn't have direct access to rosters or *banner* which was the colleges operating system. This system allows faculty to deliver a full range of functions in relationship to strategic management and records processing while also acting as a central repository for all student information. Even though I would consistently check in with the other two full-time instructors to see how much their numbers were fluctuating, having access to banner would've made my life much easier. I would typically find out pertinent information second hand; in early November I was alerted to the fact that our numbers were low. There were only two students who signed up for two out of the three sections. While spring enrollment at the college is typically low I was still extremely concerned. My concerns were not just my own; mid-November I received an email from the Campus Associate Dean of Academic Affairs about our low numbers and she was also wary about our ability to fill the sections. However, I was able to convince her that perhaps after our fall ENG 010 portfolio reading we might have some failing students who would be good candidates for the program. At the request of myself and the Director of the Portfolio Program we were able to hold off any cancelation of courses. We also asked that registrar and academic counselors be more diligent in offering students the opportunity to take part in the pilot.

Towards the end of the fall 2014 semester we were able to fill three Accelerated Learning Program course sections. Unfortunately, one was cancelled, but it had only one student that I was able to place into another section. What I didn't realize at the moment was when winter break started I would face the dreaded strip which would cut the enrollment in each of the remaining sections by half. "The Strip" is in-house terminology that refers to the time period when students are stripped from their courses if they have not paid their academic bills. Because I was focused on filling the classes, dealing with technical enrollment issues, and curriculum planning I was completely unaware of this process. One winter morning as I strolled into my office to do some planning for the upcoming spring semester, I serendipitously glanced at the rosters and noticed there were only five students in each of them. When our ALP registrar liaison informed me of this process, which takes place every semester, I immediately contacted the chair and assistant chairs of my departments to find out how I could reach the students we lost or how I might be able to locate other students who would be willing to alter their schedules to be a part of the program. I spent most of the winter break cold calling students and convincing them to come into my office so I could advise them of the program. My efforts paid off for the spring 2015 semester, but I would find that while filling the fall courses was a piece of cake, in the future I would need to continue to work tirelessly to fill the spring course sections.

Spring 2015 ALP pilot commences

In the third week of January the spring 2015 ALP pilot began and hit some bumps. When the courses were created via our registrar liaison they needed to develop mirror courses for the ALP cohorts that had separate Course Reference Numbers (CRNs)

for the ENG 101 course. In other words, instructors had one CRN for the ENG 010 course, but technically had two different CRNs for their ENG 101 course. One CRN was for the ENG 101 students who placed directly into the course and yet another imaginary CRN was made for this same ENG 010 cohort which would be deleted three weeks into the semester. This caused problems when ordering books through the bookstore because the "real" CRN was hidden and the imaginary CRN didn't really exist so it meant the class didn't exist. It was difficult for the bookstore to fulfill an order for a CRN that wasn't really there. Also, these issues meant that there would be two different course rosters in different places so when faculty needed to take attendance for ENG 101 and in general know where their students were they would need to refer to several different rosters, which can be confusing in the chaotic first couple of weeks of the semester. Additionally, since there were two different existing courses for the ENG 010 cohorts, this meant that our online web-based learning platform, blackboard, created two different courses too. Faculty needed to make sure that they uploaded course work to three different course shells. Overall while these seem like minor issues they were all things we didn't expect and didn't realize until half way through the first week.

Some practitioners may question why this logistical information is important while starting a program from the ground up, but since I had no experience using banner and lacked an awareness of the ins and outs of registrar and placement, it caused initial difficulties. I now see this as valuable information one would need to navigate in order to create an ALP. Since in essence by default (as of now) I am considered the Coordinator of the program, I believe knowing this information or having it communicated to me would've helped us streamline our approach. Having attended several Conferences on

Acceleration in Developmental Education (CADE) conferences, read, and researched the literature on ALPs, I have yet to see anyone discuss the nitty gritty details that go into developing an ALP. Furthermore, these technical issues impacted some of my ability to focus on the initial task at hand, which was to help emerging students acclimate to the idea of taking two writing classes in one semester. It was evident on the first day of classes that I would be pedagogically, theoretically, and even emotionally tested by the pilot.

I opted to teach two different sections for the ALP pilot that semester so that I had one course on Tuesday and Thursday and another course Monday and Wednesday. Both sections had different personalities, but both cohorts were determined to pass the classes. In part I believe this internal motivation was because several students in each section were re-takers (students who failed ENG 010 in the fall and were retaking it in the pilot program). I was extremely aware of the emotional and pedagogical attachment that I formed with all of the students. If I noticed someone slacking off in either class I would speak to them about it or I would challenge them to work harder. While I utilize this approach in all of my classes I tended to the ALP students much more frequently. I noticed that I would consistently challenge them or discuss my high expectations with the ALP cohort in order to ignite a fire under them. In most cases it worked.

That first semester I required a lot of work from the students. They had four major writing projects that they needed to accomplish for the ENG 101 freshman composition class. These four writing projects were worked on throughout the semester and then placed in a portfolio which I assessed at the end of the semester. I do not give out grades throughout the semester, but instead encourage students to continually revise, reconsider,

and rethink their writing and ideas all semester long. But I do tell my students that if at any time during the semester they would like to know where they stand they should feel free to come and speak with me. I also gave them the rubric I utilize to assess their final portfolio and I employ the use of Peter Elbow's concept of contract grading in order to set benchmarks for my expectations. In addition to the four writing projects I also required some homework and twelve daily writing assignments that students posted on blackboard. Of course, this is a substantial amount of work for a developmental writing course at the two-year college, but I believe the more practice students have with writing the more comfortable they become with it. During this first semester of the pilot I thought that the more writing the ALP students did the better off they would be, but my experiences during the two-year pilot would eventually alter my thinking about this approach.

During the same pilot period I spared no expense when it came to the ALP ENG 010 course. Because students needed to complete the semester long portfolio which is assessed by an outside reader I was even tougher on them. Students needed to complete three more essays which related in some way to the essays they were writing in the ENG 101 course; they had homework assignments and another set of six daily writing assignments that needed to be posted onto blackboard. Once the initial excitement of the start of semester began to wear off, so did their work ethic. I could see that some of them appeared stressed out and overwhelmed, but I pushed forward. I wanted all of them to pass both classes so badly and I now recognize that desire created a sense of bias. I wanted to know that an Accelerated Learning Program could work at Suffolk. By midterm we were all burned out. I was exhausted from over prepping and they were

getting mental blocks from the constant writing. When we left for spring break I told all of my students to literally take a break from writing. I realized that I was overwhelming them and myself and we all needed a cool down period. When we returned from spring break there were only three weeks left in the semester and all of the students submitted their final portfolios for both courses.

The outcome of the spring cohorts was productive. Since I taught two different coupled ALP cohorts I'll refer to the first one as cohort A which started with ten students, but two dropped within the first two weeks of classes. The eight students that remained all passed ENG 010 and seven passed ENG 101. Cohort B began with twelve students and three dropped leaving nine students all which passed both ENG 010 and ENG 101. I was extremely pleased with the work that they accomplished, but the entire semester left me with some lingering questions that I would need to consider as I continued teaching and coordinating the program.

Was I Pedagogically Sound

As a trained compositionist I am constantly negotiating the approaches I utilize in my writing courses. At times it depends on the make-up of the students; sometimes their gender, class, race, culture, linguistic choices, sexual orientation all impact the way I approach course material. Further I am always conscious of the role I have in the classroom and how students perceive me. I constantly reflect on the relationships in my classroom and the impact identity formation and consciousness, have on students writing, thinking, and engagement. Even though I find myself reflecting on these multiple factors that impact how bonds are created and community is formed, nothing ever really prepares an instructor of emerging writers. There are so many things that can and do happen that

are difficult to predict. As a rule of thumb while I prepare and plan in the best way I know how, I also remind myself that there must be a kind of flexible pedagogical approach when teaching developmental writers.

In anticipation for the spring 2015 courses I spent months planning the essays so that between the ENG 010 and ENG 101 courses students would see the material as relatable, but some of that scaffolding was almost too sound. What I mean is some of the assignments were too similar so students would become confused between the two courses. While I continually emphasized staying organized and separating some of the course notes, drafts, homework, and blackboard assignments, I realize now that I over-loaded the students. Furthermore, I needed to reflect on the pedagogical and theoretical influences that I was working from. I am drawn to the ideologies and approaches of the most well-known expressivist Peter Elbow. In *Everyone Can Write* he writes:

> I want to argue for one kind of nonacademic discourse that is particularly important to teach. I mean discourse that tries to render experience rather than explain it. To render experience is to convey what I see what I look out the window, what it feels like to walk down the street or fall down to tell what it's like to be me or to live my life. I'm particularly concerned that we help students learn to write language that conveys to others a sense of their experience- or indeed, that mirrors back to themselves a sense of their own experience from a little distance, once it's out there on paper. I'm thinking about autobiographical stories, moments, sketches—perhaps even a piece of fiction or poetry now and again. (237)

But there are limits to this way of thinking. There are students who need direction and who need to know how to navigate academic discourse. They need not indulge just in autobiography and ways of explaining only just their own experiences, but the experiences of others. Elbow continues by arguing that by asking students to engage in academic discourse we're requiring them to "write up to teachers who have authority over them" (240). But at times depending on a student's chosen professional they will have voices of authority that they will need to acknowledge and maneuver. While I'm influenced by Elbow's thinking, I cannot put all of my stock in the expressivist opinion because emerging writers lack experience, and need guidance. However, Elbow encourages instructors to aid students in finding their own voice through written expression and that is something I challenge students to do each semester. Therefore, I tend to work from a pragmatic expressivist position. I want students to explore themselves through writing they enjoy, but I am also preoccupied with the constraints and expectations that my students and I must negotiate in the two-year college. I have learned that teaching at the two-year college and teaching emerging writers means that one must be flexible, but also be able to manage the classroom setting in an organized way. At times an expressivist only approach does not guide emerging writers to gain autonomy over their learning and writing process in an organized guided way. I want my students to have a positive experience expressing their ideas and thoughts on paper. I don't force them to think of writing in a prescribed way that asks them to accomplish certain tasks in order to become a "better writer", but there are standards, requirements, and outcomes the institution and world will require of them. It is my job to help prepare them for that.

At the close of the first semester of the pilot my thoughts were racing about pedagogy, theory, and classroom management issues. I also realized that the organization of the pilot brought some challenges to the forefront, so I decided to develop an ALP committee which consisted of the other instructors teaching the courses, our registrar liaison, my go-to data collector in Institutional Effectiveness, the Director of the Developmental Writing Portfolio, and other compositionists interested in the program. Additionally, our sister campus on the eastern part of Long Island contacted me and wanted in too. They were convinced that an ALP would help their emerging writers and while they had a small population they believed that it would be a good fit for their campus. The committee met once a month during the semester and initially started to talk about the goals of our courses and the writing assignments we designed in order to adhere to the ENG 101 and ENG 010 course goals and objectives. We also discussed some of the glitches with registration that we were experiencing and of course voiced concerns about placement, retention, and persistence. Further there were continued issues with ENG 010 courses held in outdated computer classrooms with inadequate software, which is an issue we're still working through. These meetings were a good way for us to keep communication open and discuss the day-to-day concerns we had. I was also concerned with the general nature and relationship of developmental writing at the college for several reasons.

Developmental Division

Since I began in the English department on the Ammerman campus in 2010 there have been two separate committees; one for composition and one for developmental Writing and many of our faculty only sit on one of these. I became worried that our

writing sequence was not streamlined because of this. For years faculty have taught these classes separate and without many conversations about how they are different and or similar or what the ultimate goals should be for a student who takes developmental writing and then freshman composition. Up until 2015 we were all teaching in a stagnant, stale, vacuum. Furthermore, with my integration into the developmental writing sphere at SCCC I was asked to sit on the Developmental Studies Advisory Committee (DSAC).

Prior to the implementation of the ALP pilot, the Director of the Portfolio Program at the Ammerman campus stepped down and was replaced by another colleague who was well versed in composition studies. With this change in power, the new Director of the Portfolio Program and I were asked to attend monthly DSAC meetings. It is important to note that there is no official Developmental Education Program on our campus although in the past there had been some vivacious discussions (I was not present for, but was informed of) about whether there should be one or not. The very first DSAC meeting I attended the tension in the room was clear. Those that sat on the tri-campus committee were developmental instructors from the disciplines of Math, Reading, ESL and English. Additionally, there were supportive staff from academic learning centers, registrar, and college seminar courses. It was quite the amalgam of faculty and all had something specific to say when it came to the topic of developmental writing. It seemed that my colleague and I were to attend these meetings in order to distinguish the boundaries between the goals of the committee and the goals of the English department. At the time some reading faculty felt that there should be a "Developmental Program" at the college, but I was and am not convinced this is in the best interests of our students and department. While we were pushing forward with our ALP pilot I became worried

when the college hired a new Dean of Instruction. I did not want to re-start a pilot that was already in motion. Then during one particular DSAC committee meeting the Dean of Instruction, raised some questions and concerns about where developmental courses should be housed and who should be teaching them. My ears immediately perked up and I was curious to see where the conversation was going. It sounded as though reading faculty felt they were capable of teaching developmental writing courses, but I had serious reservations about that.

I returned to the English department and during a department meeting shared the conversations that took place. While many faculty seemed indifferent to the DSAC committee and its implications, as each semester progressed it appeared they were attempting to exert some authority, power, and control over developmental education and more so developmental writing. As these changes college wide seemed to be taking shape another interesting event took place that could have impacted the approval of the ALP pilot. The Vice President was abruptly released from her duties without any warning. At the time any new pilot programs needed to be approved by the Vice President and while the Accelerated Learning Program had been, it seemed like anything that could go wrong, would. We were finishing up with the first semester of the pilot, but who knew if we would be approved to move forward with this significant administrational change. Upon becoming aware of her release from the institution I immediately reached out to the English department Chair and Assistant Chairs. They were equally as curious to see what would happen, so we waited. And then I received a phone call from the new Dean of Instruction requesting to meet with me to discuss the Accelerated Learning Program. To put it lightly, I freaked out! I called the English department Chairs and we reached out to

the Dean of Academic Affairs to explain my concerns and that I was loaded up with papers and had a lot to do for the ALP pilot. I wanted to wait until the end of the semester to discuss any changes that we might be asked to make. Towards the end of the semester I sat down with the Dean of Instruction and the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.

Our meeting was cordial and honest. While I got the sense that the Dean was curious about the pilot he didn't seem dead set on getting directly involved. He did suggest and ask that at the next DSAC meeting in the fall 2015 semester I discuss the ALP pilot with the rest of the committee. Again, I became reluctant. For two reasons: first there are some that argue that ALP's should be coupled alongside reading classes instead of two writing classes. And while that might be something to consider in the future it wasn't an idea I was interested in investing time in, at that moment. Second, in the beginning of August 2015, the college hired a new Campus Executive Dean and prior to the start of the semester I was contacted by his office because he was requesting a meeting so I could explain and discuss what and why we were running an Accelerated Learning Program. I contacted the ALP committee members to discuss this new development. We all agreed that we would continue to plan for the fall as we had been doing with the hopes that we would solidify the already approved pilot. Between discussing the pilot at a DSAC committee meeting, meeting with the new Campus Executive Dean, and trying to feel out the new Dean of Instruction while planning the next pilot, I was overwhelmed!

I met with the new Executive Campus Dean in late August. I knew nothing of this new administrator and felt a bit unprepared to go into the meeting. My focus over that summer was planning and prepping for the semester and as the co-chair of our Teaching

of Writing Festival I had been chasing down the creator of the Accelerated Learning Program Dr. Peter Adams to invite him to be our keynote speaker. In short, I wasn't thrilled with the necessity for another round of consent required. Throughout the meeting the campus dean was difficult to read. He asked no questions of me and was quite expressionless until the end. After going through the PowerPoint, I initially created and discussed some of the benefits we had anecdotally noticed thus far, he agreed to commit to not just another semester, but another year. Internally and perhaps even externally I felt a huge sigh of relief. I was ready to get going with the fall semester.

Organized Chaos in Fall 2015

Because of the uncertainty of the Accelerated Learning Program pilot I was nervous to teach for the first time in a long time. Walking into the ENG 101 class on August 27th, 2015 I felt distant from the students in part because many of them were placed directly without a need for my intervention. Like many other institutions enrollment during the fall semester is higher than in the spring. While I was on campus the month of June working on placing some students, I really didn't know many of them and this was uncomfortable for me. I like vetting the students. I like talking to them to find out about them and to be forthright with what they can expect. While I know the office of Academic Advising and Placement does their best, they sometimes fall short in explaining the details of the program and this can, and has led to misplacement.

At the start of the ENG 101 class it was difficult to tell who was part of the ALP pilot and who was a direct placement. In general, the demographic makeup of the class was interesting. The ENG 101 cohort consisted of six returning veterans, with more than half of them over the age of twenty-five. Having experience working closely with veteran

students, their needs are much different than the traditional student and this created an interesting dynamic. The remaining students in the ENG 101 only cohort I would identify as traditional students who recently graduated from high school and had attained a placement score on the upper end of the spectrum. Meanwhile the ENG 010 cohort consisted of two veterans, one repeater, and one student who openly identified as a disabled learner, leaving the remaining six students as what I distinguish as traditional students who were on the cusp of entering ENG 101 based on their placement score. Because of the age and experience in this cohort alongside the ENG 010 cohort there was a strong sense of community and comradery that I didn't have to caress or nurture as much. Throughout the semester many of the students from both classes would meet up in the library or Writing Center to work on drafts or talk about homework assignments. Based on my observations it seemed like the older veteran students liked working with the traditional students because it made them feel like they were imparting some wisdom on them. And the traditional students had a lot of respect for their veteran peers. Overall watching the interaction between the two cohorts was inspiring. While I was nervous on the first day of the fall semester my anxiety was short lived. Throughout the semester I watched all of the writers grow and learn from one another in a way that I hadn't noticed during the first semester trial of the ALP pilot. In part it was due to the sustained advancements of the writers that led me to push for a revision to the ENG 010 rubric.

Midway through the fall semester I met with the Director of the Portfolio Program and several other colleagues in order to discuss revision to the rubric. While it was discussed in passing, nothing concretely stuck and I believed that since we were attempting to make significant changes to our approaches and investing time in an ALP,

that it was time to put the wheels in motion. The rubric designed in 1996 was organized around four specific criteria: *Idea Development, Organization, Voice/Style*, and *Grammar/Mechanics*. Students' portfolios were assessed with these criteria in mind, but they did not have any language attached to them to guide the evaluator. In order to evaluate the writing, evaluators or readers would mark student writing for each criteria with a 1 equating to "Generally strong", 2- "Needs revision", and 3- "Major revision required". Some evaluators wouldn't check off a specific number, but would put a check in between numbers which became even more confusing and inaccurate. The bottom of the rubric prompted comments from the evaluator but in more cases than not, none were offered. After the evaluator checked off the criteria they would pass or fail the portfolio, but there weren't any guidelines for how one should make that decision. Two readers could give the same marks, but one portfolio might fail while the other passed. I believed if we wanted to be consistent with our ALP students and our traditional students, and furthermore move towards some kind of current composition assessment practices, we needed to alter the current assessment practice.

Towards the end of the fall semester a small group of instructors and I worked tirelessly to completely revise the rubric and portfolio reading process. We sifted through a variety of rubrics we gathered, but conceded to incorporate the following criteria that would be applicable to our ALP and traditional ENG 010 student portfolios: *Purpose/Controlling Idea*, *Development*, *Organization, Syntax/Mechanics*, and *Reflection*. Along with these changes we developed numerical indicators ranging from 0-3 and specific language for each of these ranges so that the reader had a sense of what number should appropriately reflect the students writing. Additionally, we created

guidelines that were less serendipitous in gauging whether the portfolio was a pass or fail. We asked faculty to keep in mind that a passing portfolio should score a total of 9 or higher on the rubric. However, a score of zero in any of the categories, regardless of total score, could result in a No PASS. We believed this would help create more continuity among portfolios. And during portfolio readings we asked instructors to offer some kind of feedback or comment about the portfolio so that the instructor could show the student what the evaluator was actually thinking of the writing. Since the revised rubrics inception, we have seen some good indications that faculty needed to realign themselves and their expectations of student writing. I was hopeful that this would give all our emerging writers an opportunity to progress through the writing sequence in a reasonable amount of time and keep the lines of communication among faculty open, but unfortunately it didn't turn out that way.

    After the approval of the rubric the communication between faculty teaching in the ALP pilot started to become nonexistent. I felt I had less control of what was happening. I would email faculty to try and set up meeting times, but I wouldn't receive responses. I had little to no communication with our sister eastern campus who was running their own pilot. While I wanted their campus to design an ALP that would work for their student population, I still wanted some sense of consistency. Also, due to the lack of communication I realized that some students had been misplaced into the pilot. After an instructor informed me of an issue with one of her students and a concern I had with one of my own, I reviewed CPT scores (placement) for each ALP student in each section. I found several misplacements and contacted the faculty to find out the student's status. After some time, instructors informed me that most of their misplaced students

were keeping pace, but towards the end of the semester two students took their complaints to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and after careful consideration the students were given withdraw grades for the ENG 101 course. At the very least they both passed ENG 010 so I saw that as a small victory. Furthermore, as we began planning for priority registration for the spring 2016 semester there were faculty who didn't want to teach in computer labs, but did not communicate this pedagogical change. And more unmoving was that when our ALP courses were uploaded to banner they were hidden, so that no one could see them except for a couple of people in registrar. As we moved into priority registration I became extremely conscious that the four sections we slated for the spring 2016 semester would not fill because no one new they existed. I could not seem them, nor could the academic chairs of my department, and even the academic counselors were unaware of their presence in the system. At the time I let nature take its course because the semester was rolling on and I needed to focus on the students in my students who were currently enrolled in the ALP ENG 010 and ENG 101 classes.

Crossing the Finish Line in Fall 2015

Throughout the remainder of the semester I watched the ENG 101 and ENG 010 students create friendships and bonds that were inspiring. Whenever I asked students to work in groups they would make an effort to reach out to someone and would get straight to work. I noticed that they all autonomously held each other accountable for their writing and there was a sense of pride and accomplishment that they all exemplified when they handed in their final portfolios at the end of the semester. While the ENG 010 ALP cohort handed in their writing portfolios a week early only to wait for the outcome of their semester long work, they diligently continued to work on their ENG 101

portfolios. Once I collected the ENG 101 portfolios I had already known the outcome of the ENG010 cohort, but I thought it best to give back both portfolios together. Typically, when I teach ENG 010 I conference with students one-on-one to go over the outcome of their portfolio. I like to look through their essays and go over the rubric with them (which in the past I was trying to decipher) and then talk about what they needed to improve on. But when it comes to ENG 101, I assess their portfolio using a rubric different from ENG 010, which I include in their portfolio alongside a one-page letter from me, to them, that discusses their writing in the portfolio and their work throughout the semester. It is in this letter that I house their grade and provide thoughts and suggestions for what they should work on. When I hand back my ENG 101 students their folders I tell them that they can read the letter and look everything over at that moment or they can do it on their own and contact me if they have any questions. Most students read things over and if they have any concerns we discuss them, but the process for evaluation or feedback of the portfolios for both classes is different.

Much like the outcome of the two ALP cohorts I taught for the spring 2015 semester, the fall 2015 ENG 010 cohort was equally as encouraging. I began with ten students, but two dropped leaving eight students remaining. Of those eight students six passed ENG 010 and ENG 101. One of the ALP students required a withdraw grade as they felt they were inaccurately placed and I reluctantly granted that request. Anecdotally throughout the academic year I have had students from both semesters either stop by my office and or bump into me in the hall and communicate to me that they are either taking ENG 102 (the next writing course in our sequence) or continuing to persist in their major. I had at least one student contact me to tell me she was graduating in the spring 2016

semester. Beyond these informal conversations whenever I see students from the ALP cohorts they always rush up to me excited to tell me about what they're doing in their classes. Seeing their excitement and the fire they have for their academic pursuits supports what is alluded to in "The Accelerated Learning Program: Throwing Open the Gates", and that is that there is an increase "in bonding and attachment to the college" (Adams et al 69). Students feel as though they belong and when their hard work is acknowledged and valued that is meaningful to them and it encourages them to continue to strive for academic excellence and hopefully even builds a sense of genuine confidence. Thus far based on the outcome of the two-semester pilot I was ready to push ahead to the spring 2016 semester only to be reminded that some logistical issues with syllabi language and the class sections being hidden in banner could cause some extra angst over the winter break.

Before completely checking out for the winter break I called one last Accelerated Learning Program committee meeting and forcefully requested that all attend. While I coerced everyone to a local Starbucks with the promise of coffee, tea, and pastries, my main goal was to discuss our courses and the outcomes, reflections, and concerns we had. There were several pertinent agenda items that we needed to discuss: whether to keep in the in-class essay writing component as an evaluating measure in the final portfolio, whether to include language in our syllabi that explained course and portfolio eligibility, and lastly whether the model we were using was viable.

For at least three consistent years there were conversations among the English faculty at department meetings about the use of in-class essay writing sample and specifically whether it should be a course outcome for ENG 010, ENG 101, or neither.

Many who teach developmental writing feel it is an inadequate use of classroom time, but those who do not teach the course believe it is a vital skill that writers should learn in college. A majority of faculty who teach ENG 010 devote at least three different classes to work on the in-class essay, which the instructor collects, reads over, and then either gives it back to the student to be rewritten towards the end of the semester, or the student is sometimes allowed to choose from one composed essay written on one of those days which ends up in the final portfolio. Either way many feel that this is an unproductive use of class time especially since not all of our students at Suffolk Community College place into ENG 010 and thus might be missing out on learning this skill. Some faculty argued that if they felt it was a vital skill to learn it should take place in ENG 101 freshman composition. During our ALP meeting as a collective we agreed that since we are running a pilot we may alter some of the components in the final portfolio in order to determine whether more energy should be spent on the revision process instead of this one-time product in-class writing sample. We opted to remove the in-class essay as a requirement for the semester long portfolio. This alteration initially took place in the spring 2016 portfolio reading, but it wouldn't be until the fall 2016 semester that we would approach our department colleagues to present our thoughts about the in-class essay.

While the in-class essay was on all our minds we also needed to discuss issues with student withdrawals and the possibility of students attempting to pass one course while avoiding another. These issues arise in workshops and presentations at the Conference on Acceleration in Developmental Education each year, and we had issues of our own with students who sat in our courses, but waited until the end of the semester to

say they were misplaced. We felt we needed to have language in our syllabi that would help us explain some course criteria and eligibility requirements. The committee spent at least an hour revising language that should be placed in an instructor's ENG 010 syllabi. The language was as follows:

> Students taking part in the Accelerated Learning Program courses (ENG 010 and ENG 101) must complete requirements for both courses in order to be eligible to pass both courses. Students may choose to complete course requirements for ENG 010 only and receive a passing grade for ENG 010 only. Your ENG 010 portfolio must consist of three items: one typed reflective letter and two essays both which have been revised and worked on throughout the semester. As part of the revised essays to be included in the portfolio, students in the ALP courses may select one essay they have worked on in the ENG 101 class. Whichever revised pieces the students choose, they must be worked on throughout the semester and the instructor must review them.

We hoped and believed that by including language such as this and discussing it with students we not only communicated our expectations, but thought students would give their all to both ENG 010 and ENG 101 because there are immediate benefits to doing that. In other words, we gave students the option to include an essay from the ENG 101 class in their ENG 010 portfolio and believed that that incentive and connection between the course materials would increase their interest in both courses. In my own courses I noticed a sense of contextual learning that took place because of this change. Students became more invested in essays that they knew had to go in their ENG 010 portfolio

which in the end helped them in their ENG 101 class. I made a mental note of this and believed this approach may come in handy in the future.

As the coffee wore off and the pastries disappeared we finished off the committee meeting at Starbucks on a December afternoon in 2015 discussing the CCBC model of ALP and whether we felt it was viable for our college, our student body, and our teaching philosophy. Some faculty suggested that we consider creating a cohort model with just ENG 010 students that took both ENG 010 and ENG 101. Others also asked us to consider whether the back-to-back classes were beneficial or if spreading the classes out on different days would be more feasible. While we tossed around several different scenarios I suggested we consider working from the model we have and examine some data before we make significant changes. Additionally, one faculty member voiced concerns over the ENG 101 cohort. They were concerned that we weren't paying enough attention to the students in the ENG 101 only cohort and that we might want to consider what positive or negative impacts the pilot might have on them. This was a considerable thought and in the future, I plan to work towards designing surveys geared just towards this cohort in order to unearth any influences the pilot or an ALP course/ cohort may have on them.

After our ALP committee meeting I returned to my office to review the course sections for the spring 2016 semester and as I suspected our enrollment was extremely low. I contacted the Director of the Developmental Portfolio and asked her to email all faculty teaching the ENG 010 courses to remind them that if they had any students who they thought would be a good fit, they should send them our way. I also requested the director run a report that showed us all the students currently signed up for ENG 010 for

the spring and all those who didn't pass ENG 010 in the fall. I felt having this information might be useful if I needed to cold call students to see if they were interested in the program. And that is just what happened. After the holidays I was back in my office running through contact information and calling students to try to get them to come onto campus to talk to me. While this was the same drill from last year I felt it to be a bit more challenging in that I couldn't see the classes in banner. Because of this, I formally requested that the chair of my department "unhide" the courses. He agreed to do so and for the next three weeks over winter break I worked to fill all the sections. While I spent countless hours vetting students, reorganizing schedules, and even speaking to parents I would still face the dreaded strip and have the same outcome as I had the previous year. A week before the semester started we held the courses open and hoped students would fill them. Luckily the initial low enrollment turned into fully capped-off courses. I found it a small success that each of the four ALP coupled courses would run with at least eight students in each of them.

ALP in Spring 2016

Just as in previous semesters, within the first six weeks of the spring 2016 semester I lost several students. In the spring I took some time to adjust my personal goals and objectives for the ALP cohorts. I was a bit more laid back and tried not to overwhelm them with work. I continued to be open minded to concerns they had and of course made myself available, but I lightened my motivational academic soliloquies and riot act rants. When I did so, I noticed a congenial and symbiotic relationship took place between the ENG 101 and ENG 010 cohort which in the future I plan to encourage, but not directly embolden. While the spring 2016 cohort developed some camaraderie

between themselves, it was not as strong of a bond that existed in the fall 2015 semester. I would hypothesize that this is because of two specific factors: I did not have as many non-traditional older students and the spring semester brings with it a different attitude and approach to schoolwork. I believe that having non-traditional/older students in class changes the dynamic between peer-to-peer contact. In some cases, not always, older students raise the standard of what kind of non-cognitive and cognitive behaviors are appropriate in the classroom. These students also tend to uplift traditional students and want to help them; most times they are more articulate, manage their time well, and offer good feedback and advice to their younger counterparts. Additionally, the semester a student enrolls in a specific course can make a big difference. I find that during the fall semester students are excited and ready to get back into school mode, but once the spring rolls around they lose this motivation. While these conjectures are purely observational, they are noteworthy and something to contemplate as we move forward with ALP at Suffolk County Community College.

Another thought post-spring 2016 I considered is the validity or lack thereof of the pre- and post-surveys distributed to the ENG 010 cohort. I did not feel they were providing us with valuable information that helps us with planning our courses and approaching our students. Therefore, I had meetings planned with our Institutional Effectiveness liaison in order to explore more direct data on the cohorts which would hopefully tell us more about whether an Accelerated Learning Program is more beneficial than traditional ENG 010 courses. Some questions I wanted to explore and gather data on are:

1. How many students in each section for each cohort semester did we start out with in total?

2. Of that number how many of those were retaking ENG 010? And how many times had they taken ENG 010 prior to the pilot?

3. Of the total number of students in each section or cohort how many passed both ENG 010 and ENG 101?

4. How many students in each section or cohort failed ENG 010 and thus ENG 101?

5. Of the number of failures of ENG 010 only (sections or cohorts) how many re-registered for traditional ENG 010 or the ALP pilot courses? In what semester?

6. Of the number of students (sections or cohorts) that passed both ENG 010 and ENG 101 how many continued to persist in their courses at SCCC in general?

7. Of the number of students (sections or cohorts) that passed both ENG 010 and ENG 101 how many continued to persist into ENG 102? And in what semester?

8. Of the number of students (sections or cohorts) who passed ENG 010, but did not pass ENG101 how many registered for ENG 101 and in what semester?

9. Of the number of students (sections or cohorts) how many if any have graduated or transferred?

While I had hoped to gain access to this data in order to examine the effectiveness of our pilot I am still waiting, but I was contacted by the Dean of Instruction not long after the semester concluded and agreed to meet with him to discuss the progress of the ALP pilot.

I was yet again nervous and excited to sit down with the dean to discuss our progress. While several years before I was extremely skeptical about how administration

would take to the ALP writing program, I have been thoroughly supported and encouraged by many administrators who have shown genuine concern as we worked through the kinks of the pilot. During our meeting a longtime proponent of the ALP pilot and also the Assistant Executive Academic Campus Dean attended the meeting where I learned that some data had been collected and collated. The results were showing that we were successful! I was ecstatic! The data that I was presented with showed not only that we were successful, but when we stopped hand-picking students, something that had become more of a necessity in order to fill classes, we were able to reach students whose CPT scores were in the longer range. Ultimately what it meant was we were reaching students who in most cases may not have passed the traditional ENG 010 class the first time around. While I was being patted on the back for all my hard work the only thing I could think about were my students. The ones I would see walking across campus later that day, or the ones who stopped by my office to chat with me, and still the ones who graduated or transferred to another institution to continue with their professional and academic pursuits. I felt like I was making a difference and that I was helping to fulfill the dreams of students who were a lot like myself.

After hearing the very promising news I discussed some concerns I had with the future of the pilot courses. It was in that instant that both deans supported my move to create a separate course that would act as the ALP course which would be linked as a co-requisite course to ENG 101 freshman composition. We discussed other campus faculty who could guide me through this process and we talked about a realistic timeline to work on a course proposal. With the upcoming fall 2016 semester, which was the last approved semester of the pilot, I thought it best to work on the proposal over the spring 2017

semester. There were several logistical issues I wanted to work through before starting the proposal and I thought it best to make some smaller changes to our traditional developmental ENG 010 class before introducing a brand-new course. I was again fully supported and would continue to meet with both deans in the future as I planned to work on the course proposal.

The End of the ALP Pilot

The fall 2016 semester started off without too many glitches. By that time all the faculty knew the potential pit-falls and issues that would come up as did I. Our ALP committee met monthly as we had been doing and we discussed two specific changes we wanted to enact during the fall. We had successfully implemented a brand-new rubric for the traditional ENG 010 portfolio assessment which many faculty had implemented throughout the semester in order to prepare their students for the final semester evaluation. There were also opportunities to work more with our adjunct population. I invited one adjunct to teach in our ALP pilot for the fall 2016 semester and she was working well with the students and participated in events our other full-time ALP faculty engaged in. There were brown-bag workshops where faculty could discuss the rubric and one of the writing components that was part of the assessment. For some time the reflective letter component of the portfolio had produced some uneven results at the end of the semester. While most faculty used the reflective letter as a moment for students to consider their writing process, analyze their progress throughout the semester through writing, reading, or language acquisition, other faculty encouraged students to write about their favorite movies or hobbies. Ultimately, there seemed to be a disconnect between some reflective letter assignments which was resulting in some failing portfolios. We

wanted to reduce any issues or concerns and brown bag workshops seem to be the best way to do that. And we had to return to the issue of the in-class essay component of the portfolio.

The in-class essay part of the portfolio seemed to rile faculty up. We had some energetic discussions about the essay in previous semesters and for whatever reason nothing ever came of these conversations. There was a general division between faculty in that those who taught ENG 010 developmental writing felt it had been useful, but was outdated in terms of a semester long evaluation. Meanwhile faculty who traditionally taught only ENG 101 freshman composition believed in-class writing was a valuable skill and so it should be taught in a developmental writing course. I must note that a large majority of the Ammerman English department have little to no formal composition background. I am the only faculty member who teaches writing courses and only writing courses. Based on the lack of experience with writing, I believed conversations about in-class writing could've been ongoing for semesters to come. I met with ALP committee members to discuss enacting change before we began creating our new ALP course. I argued that if we wanted to create a course that would be the equivalent of ENG 010 while acting as a co-requisite to ENG 101 then the time to make significant changes was upon us. In late fall 2016 after careful thought and consideration the English department faculty on the Ammerman campus voted to take out the in-class essay from the ENG 010 semester long portfolio. The Director of the Developmental Portfolio program made some valid arguments that were supported by myself and others who had taught developmental writing for an extended period of time. We believed strongly that like the outdated rubric, the in-class essay had outlived its time as a valuable measuring tool. As

fall 2016 came to a close so did the ALP pilot period. The two-years the pilot ran really changed some traditional practices that had become common place at Suffolk County Community College on the Ammerman campus. I was really proud of the department for choosing to make things different in order to help our students. I realized that throughout the two-year period there were some processes and approaches we would have to re-think if we were going to create a sustainable course that acted like other ALP writing programs throughout the nation.

Immediate Reflections on the Pilot

After the fall 2016 semester I took some time to think, reflect, and write about what could've been done better. Our initial thoughts about hand-picking students was well intentioned, but didn't necessarily get to the students who typically fall behind or do not progress through our writing sequence. While we picked and promoted the pilot to students whose CPT scores were in a higher range we hadn't considered that those students, if in an ENG101 freshman composition course, might succeed without intervention. We needed to work on reaching students who had a different history; this is where the use of multiple measurements played a big part. Additionally, we wanted to include students who might also have a history of struggling because perhaps with the intensive yet supportive writing environment acting as an intervention early in their career, they may change the trajectory of their continued academic success. As I thought about moving to assorted picking I also considered the amount of writing I had asked of my students in previous semesters. I asked myself: *How much work is too much work?* During each of the four semesters of the pilot in the combined courses I asked students to compose six essays and eighteen journal assignments as well as weekly reading and

homework for both classes. This was too much. More doesn't mean better. Based on my observations all the work that I gave created more anxiety for myself and my students. While the goal of an ALP is to help students overcome emotions they attach to their lack of success, I just created another kind of emotion for them to work through. For some it ignited them and created self-motivation, but for others it may have created an insecurity I hadn't intended to foster. After considering some of these issues and the impact they may have on students I wanted to move forward with the plan to propose a new course at the college.

Making ALP Stick

In the spring 2017 semester I scheduled several meetings and one in particular with the Associate Dean for Curriculum Development and Academic Affairs. This meeting proved to be one of the most important and informative meetings that would help me organize the course proposal process. At this meeting I learned about the considerable amount of paperwork that I would have to prepare and more importantly I learned that the entire English department would need to approve the course proposal by a majority. Given the difficult time in the past with curricular changes this gave me a slight pause for panic. In addition, to the Ammerman campus English department approval we would also have to have our campus Curriculum Committee's approval and the campus Senate governing body too. At the time, there really weren't many college-wide conversations about remediation and developmental writing. While the Developmental Studies Advisory Committee talked about remediation it happened in a vacuum; most departments were merely content with making claims about bad writing skills, but they never joined the conversation or made an attempt to learn about the complexities

surrounding developmental writing. All of the faculty who sat on the Curriculum Committee were non-English faculty and some weren't even teaching faculty, so I was worried about their contextual knowledge of the field of Writing and Rhetoric. While I thought about the proposal and the concerns I had from outside groups I hadn't even considered any potential dissension from within the ALP Committee. There were in fact some required sections of the course proposal that several committee members gave me a hard time about; the catalogue description, the learning outcomes, and the title of the course.

The course/catalog description language had been an area of contention even during the initial stages of the pilot. During the pilot we developed syllabi language to combat any issues with students who might stop attending the ALP course. We considered that language when creating the new class description. The catalog description is as follows:

> This course is for those students interested in fulfilling the requirements of ENG 010 and ENG 101 in one semester. Students will focus on exploring a variety of written genres while learning to engage with the writing process in order to rework or reimagine the development of ideas. The course also introduces students to writing skills that include but are not limited to prewriting, drafting, editing, proofreading, reading comprehension, reflection, and analysis in so far as these skills relate to essays written in the ENG 101 class. This class is taken in conjunction with ENG 101, and students must pass ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop in order to receive a passing grade in ENG 101. Graded on an S-U-R-

W basis. Pre-requisite ENG 009 and RDG 098, or Placement in ENG 010 and

Placement in RDG 099, Co-requisite ENG 101. (Leo)

 While most of the language in it was accepted by the committee, there was one specific

line that made one faculty member uncomfortable: "This class is taken in conjunction

with ENG 101, and students must pass ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop in order to

receive a passing grade in ENG 101" (Leo). We felt we needed to continue to include

language such as this in order to combat against students who might sign up for both

courses, but then only commit to the credit-bearing course (ENG101). The faculty

member eventually understood the value of this line for pedagogical and logistical

approaches, but there were also issues with the number of learning outcomes we decided

to include along with the language of some of them. When I thought about the learning

outcomes for the course I felt really strongly that I didn't want to reinvent the wheel. Not

long ago in order to adhere to some Middle States requirements, campus departments

formed committees where we revised and in some cases, re-wrote learning outcomes for

all of our courses. I sat on both the developmental and freshman composition committees

and I think we developed some very good outcomes that were in line with the writing and

work we value as compositionists. When I set about to draft the ALP proposal for the

new course, I borrowed outcomes from each of the current ENG 010 and ENG 101

syllabi. For the new class, in total there were five learning outcomes and one learning

outcome had nine smaller sub-outcomes. The concerns about the number of outcomes

was in part because some were worried we would be tackling a lot in a brand-new course,

but the traditional ENG 010 syllabi had more outcomes than what I included and I

believed that students were capable of accomplishing the outcomes when tasked with a challenge. While some committee members were willing to overlook the number of outcomes others were uncomfortable with the language, so I charged them to work on revising them. Upon review I made additional alterations to their revisions and ultimately, we unanimously agreed to the changes. The last conflict we needed to resolve was what the title of the course would be. As previously discussed, the phrase history for a non-credit writing course has undergone significant changes throughout time. After some discussion among the committee only one or two weren't completely sold, but agreed to support the course title.

Throughout the spring 2017 semester I tirelessly worked on the course proposal. There were numerous meetings with curriculum committee members who agreed to review a draft of the proposal to give us some feedback on areas that should be highlighted or addressed vigorously. Then at the second to last Ammerman campus English department meeting we discussed and voted on the proposal. I was shocked when it unanimously passed, but it still had to go through the curriculum committee and the Senate. The curriculum committee waited until their last meeting of the spring 2017 semester to review it, which meant that if it didn't pass we would be at least a semester behind in implementing the course. Thankfully after a couple of hours of questions and clarification, the entire committee voted in favor of the new course. A representative from the committee would present it to the Senate for further review and they would let us know the outcome. With the end of the semester looming and our timeline to get things organized waning, I was relieved to find out that the proposal was fully supported by the Senate. We could begin to plan for the implementation of eight sections of ENG

012 emerging writers workshop for the spring 2018 semester. That left the fall 2017 as a buffer to gather additional teaching faculty and to combat any issues with the master schedule on banner. Thus far things have gone smooth and I already made a *to do* list for additional ideas to implement. I am looking at working with the academic counseling center and hoping to pair an academic counselor with each ENG 012 emerging writers workshop section. I would also like to create a faculty and student handbook; I think this would be beneficial for new/incoming faculty who would like to teach the courses and I also think that students should have some information to refer to if they have questions about the course(s). And I would also like to create an online webpage about our ALP emerging writers workshop classes that could be accessed via the Ammerman English department website. These are all projects I will begin to work on during the fall 2018 semester.

From the beginning of the ALP pilot to the inception of a new course based on the ALP co-requisite, mainstreaming, accelerated model I have learned a lot and took thorough notes that have helped me reflect on numerous issues surrounding emerging writing at the two-year college. These notes are based on my observations, experiences, and opinions about emerging writers and the benefits of an Accelerated Learning Program. Teachers at the two-year college constantly face challenges and the ever-evolving sentiments about writing and rhetoric require us to rethink or reconceive how we can help our students successfully navigate writing courses. For now, I believe an Accelerated Learning Program model can help students and faculty overcome the detrimental past and impact of remediation. The work that I started in 2013 until now has

produced a plethora of reflective conclusions about this project and the potential it has for the future of traditional developmental writing courses.

The Takeaway

Implementing an ALP is difficult work, but can be successful with student, faculty, and administrative support. Because of the help from multiple deans on campus I was able to start the ALP pilot which offered insightful information about how beneficial alternative approaches to the traditional developmental courses can be. Teaching faculty who have been involved in the planning and teaching of the courses have been instrumental in offering refreshing ideas that are organically changing the culture of writing at the college. Additionally, academic advisors helped and continue to help us promote the course so that students can complete their coursework without getting lost in the pipeline. Without the support and collaboration of colleagues the path to integrating an ALP can be a difficult one.

The ALP classroom environment also sets up positive outcomes for students and teachers alike. Smaller class size helps students have more in-depth time with their instructor and peers which can lead to social bonding. Horning argues that smaller class sizes are a "crucial element for student success [because there] is one-to-one teacher student interaction on written work" (17). Further she contends that having smaller classes allows for learning "through doing and getting feedback; these activities can only be accomplished in small classes where students actually do a lot of writing" (14). Because ALPs have smaller class sizes students are able to have more access to their instructor in order to learn how to self-assess and gain autonomy over their writing

process and literacy practices. Small class size allows for extended collaboration during peer response and involves each student in the learning process. ALPs create and sustain social activities through a small writing environment. Due to these small class sizes, ALPs encourage more writing time in intensive writing environments. When writing courses are compressed into one semester, instead of stretched over the course of at least two-semesters, students have the opportunity to contextualize the work they are doing. Along with these intensive writing moments ALP instruction often provides relevant writing tasks that help students examine their own unique processes. When students are engaged with their peers and instructor they have more of a chance to explore writing tasks that can help them develop as students and writers.

Another positive outcome of ALPs is the impact it has on instructor approaches to the teaching of writing. I have learned to be flexible, to reflect on my own assessment and evaluation approaches. Here I consider Peter Elbow's examination of assessment procedures in his article "Ranking, Evaluating, Liking: Sorting Out Three Forms of Judgment" where he writes, "evaluation means looking hard and thoughtfully at a piece of writing in order to make distinctions as to the quality of different features or dimensions" (191). Because I do not give grades, students do not rely on them; they have more time to grow and learn through studying their own writing and that of their peers. The ALP environment affords students the chance to work through their specific writing challenges throughout the course of the semester so that they can begin to intellectualize the errors they are making without a grade attached to it. I have found that when I do not provide students with grades they focus more on the writing moment. Beyond assessment practices I have reflected on my pedagogical approaches, my classroom management,

and my own experiences as a developmental writer. I have become much more conscious of the complexities that surround students' lives which has required me to consider the psychological effects that labeling can have on students.

Lastly, I believe strongly that Accelerated Learning Programs attempt to diminish the shame, fear, and stigma attached to labeling. Because students are working alongside peers who were institutionally sorted into credit-bearing classes, they appear to feel different about their abilities. Students exude more confidence, they gain self-motivation, and overall work harder because of the high stakes involved in their completing two writing classes in one semester. Students develop relationships in both the ALP and freshman composition course that evolve over time and help them work through the shame and fear that they feel. This kind of social interaction can create a healthy environment not just in the classroom, but sites campus wide where commuter students engage with one another. Integrating an ALP at Suffolk County Community College and teaching emerging writers in a post-remedial college has been a challenging, but rewarding experience.

Conclusion

Voices to Consider

This dissertation project has helped me think a lot about how we define writers at all levels. My hope is that by significantly changing the ways Suffolk County Community College has approached writing, we will work to become more in-line with approaches that other community colleges have taken that have been successful. In this way, I believe that we can alter the narratives that students have developed about themselves and the relationships they have with writing. By encouraging students to explore the emotions they have attached to their writing experiences we undermine the labels that have impacted them and forcefully attempt to teach students to overthrow the past in order to reestablish a new intellectual identity for themselves. My goals in creating ENG 012/ the emerging writers workshop and thus this dissertation, have led me to think a lot about how the work we do with students affects us as teachers and people. I have often believed that in order to be a successful instructor I have to get in there and become intimately involved with my students in order for them to understand how important their writing is to me and other audiences, but I have also realized that this impacts me on an emotional level. Shaughnessy acknowledges this need for instructors to consider how we "change in response to students, [and] that there may in fact be important connections between the changes teachers undergo and the progress of their students" (312). In "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing" Shaughnessy argues that there are four stages instructors go through that may directly impact their view of emerging writing students; she names the four stages as "Guarding the Tower", "Converting the Natives", "Sounding the Depths", and "Diving In". In each of these stages she focuses on the teacher as subject

and Shaughnessy argues that if we are to understand students we need to unearth our own biases and stereotypes that impact student writers.

I believe Shaughnessy's examination of what an instructor goes through as a teacher of emerging writing is relevant when we consider how we reshape our praxis in the classroom. In the first stage "Guarding the Tower" the instructor acts as a proprietor who is determined to protect academia and keep out those who do not belong to the community which influences students to believe that something is wrong with their writing. The instructor can only transcend this stage when they engage in an intimate rhetorical exchange with their students wherein the instructor begins to question their initial perceptions of the student writer. This leads to the next stage where an instructor attempts to "Convert the Native"; that is, that the instructor's purpose is "to carry the technology of advanced literacy to the inhabitants of an underdeveloped country" (Shaughnessy 313). The instructor focuses on teaching grammar, the structure of the paragraph and the essay in order to improve on students' skills; yet the instructor sees the students struggling with what they would think are "simple things" and that is when the instructor realizes that writing isn't simple because students haven't had enough experience with the standards that academia has set (Shaughnessy 314). The third stage "Sounding the Depths" is when the instructor finally recognizes that there are behaviors that govern how students approach writing and for which audiences. The instructor starts to look for patterns and develops a hypothesis as to why students may be struggling with writing. Further the instructor uses the patterns and hypothesis to develop a "pedagogical path for teacher and student to follow" (Shaughnessy 314). It is in this stage that the instructor begins to reflect more deeply on their pedagogical choices and the tasks they

are asking students to perform; the instructor alters the way in which they communicate with students in order to focus on specific writing tasks that are more realistic and essential to students (Shaughnessy 317). It is at this point when an instructor engages in the final stage which Shaughnessy calls "Diving In". This challenging stage requires an instructor to remediate him or herself and "to become a student of new disciplines and of his students themselves in order to perceive both their difficulties and their incipient excellence" (Shaughnessy 317). The instructor needs to look past the label of "remedial" in order to get to know their students better and it is in these moments that the intimate exchange of ideas can have a more meaningful advantage for students and teachers alike. Shaughnessy's thorough examination requires an instructor to care about the process and linguistic exchange that happens between instructor and students. And it requires a sense of awareness and an ability to reflect, be open-minded, and ultimately entails flexibility.

At some point throughout the ALP pilot and the course creation process I have undergone each of these stages, and more than once. At times I find myself wanting students to adhere to the discourse academics favor because it will only help them in future courses and in their chosen professions or careers, but that may not be true. And so, I focus on the "problems" with their writing by attempting to indoctrinate typical academic standards or expectations, but then I get fed up with myself and I start to focus on the patterns or behaviors that individual students employ. I ask myself what I can do as a writing teacher to reflect on better pedagogical practices that will in turn help my students reflect on the behaviors and patterns they draw from when they approach a writing task. Then I dive in. I question the expectations I am asking of students and reconsider the writing performance I'm requiring of them. I remind myself that the label

and course they have been provided with, while initially intended to help them, may have psychologically hurt them. I weave in and out of these stages all the while questioning whether I am emotionally too far in. There are many times when I sit in my office and worry about my students and their progress and further I constantly question whether my course schedule and strategies effectively help students. Royster and Taylor argue that "by focusing on teacher identity, we re-shuffle these relationships and re-make the balances in order to make recognizable the notion that the negotiation of classroom identity involves an interaction of all parties, sometimes with competing agendas" (28). Teaching writing at the two-year college has been a challenge for me. I have spent a lot of time reflecting on who I am as a teacher, emerging writer, and working-class first generation college student. This contemplation led to an ALP pilot and a concrete course option because I genuinely care about my students and sometimes allow that to emotionally impact how I approach the engagements I have with them. I want them to succeed and I want them to have access to an equitable educational system that can improve their lives. Writing and the teaching of it is emotional for me; the connection is an inevitable byproduct of engaging with writers and exploring their thoughts and use of language. For me, this is an idiosyncratic approach that I have when I approach the teaching of writing and is one that I will consistently maintain and develop as our ALP/ENG 012 matures.

Emerging Writers in the Post-Remedial College

As a teacher of writing at the two-year college I have experienced a lot alongside our emerging writers. Prior to our implementation of ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop I observed many students struggling with their writing and sometimes failing

at successfully completing courses in our writing sequence. After watching students semester after semester attempting to gain access to college-level courses, I realized that there was something at our two-year college that wasn't working. Coupled with my own college experiences and being labeled a "developmental writer" I wanted to enact significant change that might help our students, but also alter how we had been viewing and teaching writing at Suffolk County Community College.

Throughout the process of working to create ENG 012 the emerging writers workshop I found that there were moments of success and moments where I had been challenged. Some of the most successful moments I had was when I worked with my students in the classroom. There is one student in particular that I remember and the struggles she had early on. Initially she was uninterested in the writing classes and it seemed college in general; after one of our one-on-one conferences I asked her why she was in college and she told me she wasn't sure. I was very honest with her and told her if she didn't commit her time to the work there was no point in her staying in the classes. I also told her I thought she was more than capable, but she had to find a way into the work we were doing. In other words, I encouraged her to find her voice in the topics and paper projects in a unique way that would help her audience see her perspective and understand her reasons for telling us what she was. I don't know if it was the conference or some external stimuli, but after a week of conferences she came back to the class with a whole new outlook. She worked so hard and was so focused that she influenced many of the other students in the ALP cohort to work just as hard. I was so proud of her and in some ways it just seemed like there was a moment where things clicked for her. These were the moments where I felt ALP/ENG 012 could be exponentially impactful. It was the

moments where students became excited about their work and about the progress they were making. While I'm sure my positive and reassuring feedback was somewhat helpful, I think more so when they found a sense of autonomy and felt they were in control of their education they thrived.

While I found success working with students I was also taken back by the support I received from administration. Throughout the pilot and the implementation of our ENG 012 course, multiple deans and faculty were in full support of our pilot program. While I was initially skeptical about the kind of support I would get, I was pleasantly surprised to find that the administration at the college wanted to see change that would positively help our struggling students. I found that there was a genuine interest to investigate the problems that were holding so many of our students back. While some of these issues are external and thus out of our control, administration's thinking seemed to be in-line with trying to fix the problems on our end. I found a sincere appreciation for the work that I was doing and felt that I was fully supported with trying to change the atmosphere of writing at Suffolk County Community College.

Valuable Outcomes

As I simultaneously worked on the ALP pilot and course creation I was also reading for and writing this dissertation, which allowed me to reflect in detail about the positive outcomes acceleration and mainstreaming has had on two-year college students. Some noteworthy characteristics of ALPs are that it works to eliminate labels, emphasizes the importance of small class size, values collaborative work, focuses on contextual knowledge and learning in an intensive writing environment, requires instructors and students to be flexible while self-reflective. Because ALPs mainstream

writers who placed into non-credit courses alongside those who directly place into credit writing courses, the lines between intellectual categorization become blurred. Students are all focused on working towards the same goals because they are on the same playing field, in the same class, accomplishing the same writing tasks. Students have the opportunity to work towards the same goals because of the small class size; there is social bonding that occurs and the cohorts have the time and opportunity to get to know one another through writing and reading. Horning writes that "it is clear that in general smaller class sizes and lower student-faculty ratios are helpful to students' engagement and success" (12). The entire class has the time to collaborate with one another on writing and reading assignments while contextualizing meaningful work and writing tasks. The intensive writing environment creates a space for students to become comfortable with sharing their writing in small groups with their peers or instructor. This intimate rhetorical engagement asks faculty and students to not only share their writing, but reflect on their processes. In order to negotiate a variety of approaches and or error patterns that each students has, the entire community of writers must be flexible with their thinking, feedback, and approaches to the writing process. These exchanges are able to take place in the ALP classroom because of smaller class sizes and the mainstream environment. I have found that these kind of outcomes are difficult to reproduce in the traditional developmental classroom or in an ENG 101 class with a larger class size. While my goal as a practitioner has always been to assist students in reestablishing a new intellectual identity for themselves, I have come to realize that that can't happen if a teacher and institution aren't consistently engaging in the same process. ALPs have successful

features and some of the outcomes I've observed, for the time being, have changed the intellectual writing identity at Suffolk County Community College.

The Future of ENG 012/ALP at Suffolk County Community College

Incorporating a two-year pilot based on the ALP model at Suffolk Community College was not easy. While navigating the politics of writing and curriculum at a college where not much has changed in fifteen years I learned a lot about the state of writing and rhetoric at the two-year college and it is scary. While the larger issues surrounding writing are some of my initial concerns for the future of acceleration at Suffolk County Community College, I am, at present, focused on some of the technical aspects which hindered our pilot program and ENG 012 course creation. As of the spring 2017 semester the course creation of ENG 012 the emerging writers workshop has led to an alteration in the ways we view writing. In the past our ENG 101 freshman composition course and our traditional developmental writing courses were separate and not much conversation about their relationship existed. In other words, those faculty who taught ENG 101 and didn't (in most cases) teach ENG 010 developmental writing never discussed the differences or similarities between the courses. But with our new class, I have heard from many full-time faculty who are interested in teaching both of these courses. Some have previously taught ENG 010 while others have not; I find this to be a small win. Additionally, we have included part-time faculty who during our pilot program offered some insightful feedback. While many of our contingent part-time faculty have taught writing for long periods of time at our college, we believe it would be valuable to offer them re-training opportunities so that if they desire to teach our ENG 012 course they will be prepared to do so. In general, I think that if our part-time and full-time faculty who traditionally do

not teach writing courses or who need to be re-trained in the field of writing are now interested in teaching our writing courses then perhaps there will be moments for those faculty to learn about the history and nuances in the field of writing and rhetoric. Therefore, in the summer of 2018 the Director of our Developmental Portfolio Program and I will be running training sessions to help better equip and prepare those faculty.

With the incorporation of faculty from different areas of English studies I hope that within the next several years we will be able to "scale up" (Adams at al 64) or build our program. During the first spring semester our pilot was offered we struggled to fill the four sections and so we only ran three; while I was disappointed I pushed to run four sections in the following fall and they easily filled. The last two semesters we also filled each of the four sections and I had a lot of additional students who were interested afterwards. This was a clear indication to me that if I marketed and publicized the program among faculty and our academic advising center, we could reach our seat capacity and offer more sections. While I was and remain concerned about filling spring sections, I think college-wide our enrollment tends to be down during the spring semester, so we will just have to work harder at filling the sections. Whether that is through direct engagement with current students in our traditional developmental writing course who are at risk of failure or if I have to go back to cold calling incoming students, then I will. What I have found through our two-semester pilot is that filling fall sections should not be as difficult. When I worked to propose our new ENG 012 course I recommended we increase the number of sections in order to accommodate students who were previously interested in the courses, but because the sections had already been capped off they were unable to be a part of the pilot. For the spring 2018 semester we are

running eight sections and for the fall 2018 semester I'm going to suggest we move to ten sections. Each year at the Conference on Acceleration in Developmental Educational I have heard the myriad of approaches institutions across the nation take when expanding their ALP courses and traditionally many ALPs increase or double the number of sections each semester. While I am open to increasing the number of sections we offer, I want us to be careful about over extending ourselves and our faculty. Furthermore, depending on our enrollment numbers this may impact the number of ALP sections we can provide; as of now, and after discussions with several colleagues we do not intend to completely eliminate traditional ENG 010 developmental writing.

There are several reasons why, for now, it might not be beneficial to move one hundred percent to ALP/ENG 012 courses. First, we don't yet have an established framework to support this kind of move. We need time to train faculty, we need time to transition from our pilot to a concrete class, and we need to gain more specific assessment information from our institutional effectiveness department. As previously noted, over the summer my colleague and I will plan faculty training and I would like to continue to offer brown bag workshops during the semester. I think that it will be important to have conversations and open forums to discuss concerns or successes we are having in both of our writing courses. In addition to training opportunities, while I hope that the creation of a concrete ALP course will benefit our students we need time to transition it from a pilot. We need to work through minor issues and we need access to data that will help us truly understand if acceleration is benefiting our students. An additional reason why it may be difficult to eliminate traditional ENG 010 altogether is that over the past two years many of my English department colleagues and I have

noticed a rise in students who have emotional or anxiety driven disorders. During the pilot period I spoke with many students and encouraged them to volunteer to participate in the program, but many of them told me they thought it would be too much for them to handle. I remember one student came to talk to me several times, once with his mother and both of them were equally concerned with whether his anxiety would impact his ability to accomplish two writing classes at once with the other courses he already planned to take. The student opted for the traditional developmental course so as not to feel overwhelmed. This is not something I've come up against just in the ALP pilot courses during the recruitment stage. I had started to notice this kind of emotional anxiety in my traditional ENG 010 courses too. I discussed it with several other writing faculty and with our department chair on numerous occasions and while I don't think we have discovered a clear way to address these emotional issues students are having, it would seem we would need to keep the traditional track available for those students who want it.

I believe that for now, if Suffolk County Community College is to keep the traditional developmental writing option available alongside the accelerated model we should monitor both pathways in order to assess whether one or both are valuable for our students. Perhaps over time we will see that we may need to adjust the traditional CCBC/CAP model in order to effectively mirror what our students need. In addition, we need to consider that our demographic is constantly evolving as is what we value as college-level writing and in some ways the ALP/ENG 012 course could impact our ENG 101 freshman composition students.

While I am concerned greatly with the well-being of our at-risk population who have placed into our traditional developmental track, I am equally concerned with how

ALP/ENG 012 will impact the ENG 101 cohort. While most of the research conducted by CCRC has shown to have a positive impact on both cohorts, I think that there is room for a more thorough investigation (Adams et al 62 and Jenkins et al 17). In the future I'd like us to investigate some of the following research questions that would help us in-house: Does an ALP impact the ENG 101 direct placement students in a negative or positive way? If so, in what ways? I would also like us to research what kind of students makeup the direct placing ENG 101 cohorts. Are they students who took a traditional developmental track and then signed up for freshman composition? Did they take part in the ALP/ENG 012 but somehow fail to pass ENG 101? Did the past experiences they had in either traditional ENG 010 or ENG 012 influence their perception of or motivation in ENG 101? Furthermore, I am going to suggest that the English department rename our traditional developmental and freshman composition course in order to streamline it with our ENG 012 emerging writers workshop. Elsewhere I have argued that I believe all writers are emerging from one stage to another so maybe we will need to alter course titles so that they work to extinguish a hierarchy between ENG 010, ENG 012 and ENG 101; I could see our freshman composition course entitled emerging writers workshop II. Whichever direction we continue in, I am hopeful that we will consider what is consistent in the field of writing and rhetoric and work to maintain writing courses that will benefit our students. I would eventually encourage the college to make both the emerging writers courses credit bearing, but I believe that will take some time to alter. While it has taken fifteen years to make some significant changes at Suffolk County Community College voices from the classroom, student and teacher alike are coming to the forefront to advocate for changes to traditional developmental writing classes. The concerns that have

surrounded non-credit bearing courses are being openly discussed and more frequently, which I think will help us move in a healthy and successful direction. Additionally, some larger questions that would not only benefit Suffolk County Community College, but the field of writing are: What emotional impact does the teaching of writing, especially emerging writers at a two-year college have on faculty? Should non-credit "remedial" writing courses continue to exist? Should writing remain the sole responsibility of writing programs or English departments in academia? While some of these questions are not new, I believe they need to be revisited in order to mirror our ever-evolving perspectives on writing and the approaches we have continued that do not positively champion student success or access to the American dream.

I would like to conclude this dissertation project with another very thoughtful opinion about how we should approach emerging writers that is bit more current. Patrick Sullivan charged through some very difficult legislation in Connecticut and gently explored options that would help students at his institution and he claims that we should consider basic writing classes not:

> as fixed and monolithic entities, perhaps we would be better served to theorize them, instead, as places that are more fluid and designed to be responsive to many different kinds of students and many different kinds of needs-as sites founded on principles of differentiated instruction. As we know, the basic writing classroom is a site where all kinds of powerful social and cultural variables converge, including class and race, as well as complex economic conditions related to the global marketplace. It is a site where many immigrants and underprivileged

Americans begin to build careers and sustainable futures for themselves and their families. (Sullivan 128)

This country is a place where my ancestors came because they believed in the concept of the American dream. Even though they had no money, no education, did not speak the language and were undocumented immigrants in a time when that was perhaps less controversial, they came here to make something not of themselves, but of their children and their children's children. That would be me. I am the daughter of non-college educated parents and undocumented Italian American immigrant grandparents and I am an emerging writer who has had to work hard to overcome a lot of barriers; similar but different barriers than my students have had to endure and so it is my privilege, honor, and life's work that I devote to helping others traverse a difficult academic journey that may help them gain access to the career and life they have dreamed of and that their ancestors dreamed for them. I believe that if we are to succeed at the college where I teach then we need to consider the unique and diverse identities that comprise the writing classroom and encourage students to continually re-write their own narratives. That work can be done if we discontinue traditional modes of teaching writing, which can deter students from accomplishing the academic goals they strive for. For now, I believe that ALP/ENG 012 can help assist students in tackling those goals.

Works Cited

Accelerated Learning Program. Community College of Baltimore County, 2017, alp-

    deved.org/. Accessed 7 July 2014.

Adams, Peter, et al. "The Accelerated Learning Program: Throwing Open the Gates."

    Journal of Basic Writing (CUNY), vol. 28, no. 2, 01 Sept. 2009, pp. 50-69.

    EBSCO*host*,

    lib1.lib.sunysuffolk.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=tr

    ue&db=eric&AN=EJ877255&site=ehost-live. Accessed13 Jan. 2014.

Adams, Peter Dow. "Basic Writing Reconsidered." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 12, no.

    1, 01 Mar. 1993, pp. 22-36. EBSCO*host*,

    lib1.lib.sunysuffolk.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=tr

    ue&db=eric&AN=EJ463749&site=ehost-live. Accessed 13 Apr. 2015.

Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Susanmarie Harrington. "Responsibility and Composition's

    Future in the Twenty-First Century: Reframing 'Accountability.'" *College*

    Composition and Communication, vol. 62, no. 1, 2010, pp. 73–99. *JSTOR*,

    www.jstor.org/stable/27917885. Accessed 2 Dec. 2013.

--- *Basic Writing as a Political Act Public Conversations about Writing and Literacies*.

    Hampton Press, 2002.

---"'The Dilemma That Still Counts': Basic Writing at a Political Crossroads." *Journal of*

    Basic Writing, vol. 17, no. 2, 1998, pp 3-24.

    https://wac.colostate.edu/jbw/v17n2/harrington.pdf. Accessed 18 Nov. 2017.

Adler-Kassner, Linda. "Just Writing Basically: Basic Writers on Basic Writing". *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1999, pp 69-90.

https://wac.colostate.edu/jbw/v18n2/adler-kassner.pdf. Accessed 18 Nov. 2017.

"ALP – Accelerated Learning Program." *ALP Accelerated Learning Program*, Community College of Baltimore County, 2014, alp-deved.org/2015/03/alp-sourcebook/. Accessed 1 Mar. 2013.

"ALP – Accelerated Learning Program." *ALP Accelerated Learning Program*, Community College of Baltimore County, 2013, alp-deved.org/features-of-alp-success/.

Anyon, Jean. "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work." *The Journal of Education*, vol. 162, no. 1, 1980, pp. 67–92. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/42741976. Accessed 1 Dec. 2017.

Bailey, Thomas, et al. "Referral, Enrollment, and Completion in Developmental Education Sequences in Community Colleges." *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 29, no. 2, Apr. 2010, pp. 255–270., doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.09.002. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 5, no. 1, 1986, pp. 4–23. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43443456. Accessed 10 Jun. 2013.

--- "Released into Language: Errors, Expectations, and the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy." *Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching*, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005, pp. 36–59.

---"The Tidy House: Basic Writing in the American Curriculum." *Journal of Basic*

    Writing, vol. 12, no. 1, 1993, pp. 4–21. *JSTOR*,

    www.jstor.org/stable/43443598. Accessed 12 Jun. 2014.

Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-*

    1985.   Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1987.

"Beyond Graduation." *Http://Www.nyc.gov/Html/Records/Rwg/Cuny/*, NYC Task Force,

    7 June 1999, www.nyc.gov/html/records/rwg/cuny/pdf/history. Accessed 21 Oct.

    2017.

Bizzell, Patricia. "What Happens When Basic Writers Come to College?" *College*

    Composition and Communication, vol. 37, no. 3, 1986, pp. 294–301. *JSTOR*,

    www.jstor.org/stable/358046. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

Bradford, Annette N. "Cognitive Immaturity and Remedial College Writers." *The*

    Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking, NCTE, 1983, pp. 15–24. *ERIC*

    PlusText [ProQuest], files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED233366.pdf. Accessed 13 Apr.

    2014.

"California Acceleration Project." *Acceleration Project,* California Acceleration Project,

    2017, http://accelerationproject.org/. Accessed 6 Oct. 2017.

Cambridge, Barbara L. "Electronic Portfolios as Knowledge Builders." *Electronic*

    Portfolios: Emerging Practices in Student, Faculty, and Institutional Learning,

    American Association for Higher Education, 2001, pp. 1–11.

"Campus Information." *SUNY Suffolk County Community College*, Suffolk County

    Community College: SUNY, 9 Dec. 2017, sunysuffolk.edu/about-suffolk/campus-

    information/index.jsp.

Chase, Susan. "Narrative Inquiry: Multiple Lenses, Approaches, Voices." *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln, Sage, 2005, pp. 651–679.

Cho, Sung-Woo, et al. "New Evidence of Success for Community College Remedial English Students: Tracking the Outcomes of Students in the Accelerated Learning Program." Community College Resource Center, Dec. 2012. Accessed 15 Apr. 2014.

Clark. J. Elizabeth. "The Digital Imperative: Making the Case for a 21st-Century Pedagogy." *Computers and Composition*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2010, pp. 27-35. Science Direct, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2009.12.004. Accessed 4 Dec. 2018.

Cullen, Francis T. Sreberny Annabelle. "Labeling and the Socialization to Deviancy in Schools: Notes on Labeling Theory and the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy." *ERIC - Education Resources Information Center*, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 31 Mar. 1976, eric.ed.gov/?id=ED130956. Accessed 5 Oct. 2017.

D'Aoust, Catherine. "Portfolios: Process for Students and Teachers." *Portfolios in the Writing Classroom: An Introduction*, National Council of Teachers of English, 1992, pp. 39-48.

Denley, Tristan. "Reimagining Remediation in Tennessee." *Higher Education Today*, American Council on Education, 21 Oct. 2015, www.higheredtoday.org/2015/10/21/reimagining-remediation-in-tennessee/. Accessed 3 Oct. 2017.

Deruy, Emily. "Big Shift for California Community Colleges: Remedial Classes Fail

    Students." http://www.mercurynews.com/, 16 May 2017,

    www.mercurynews.com/2017/05/16/big-shift-for-california-community-colleges-

    remedial-classes-fail-students/. Accessed 3 Oct. 2017.

Durst, Russel K., et al. "Portfolio Negotiations: Acts of Speech." *Assessing Writing: a*

    Critical Sourcebook, Bedford/St. Martins, 2009, pp. 218–232.

Edgecombe, Nikki. "Accelerating the Academic Achievement of Students Referred to

    Developmental Education." *Community College Research Center*, Community

    College Research Center, Feb. 2011.

Elbow, Peter, and Pat Belanoff. "Reflections on an Explosion: Portfolios in the '90s and

    Beyond." *Situating Portfolios: Four Perspectives*, Utah State University Press,

    1997, pp. 21–33.

--- "Portfolios as a Substitute for Proficiency Examinations." *Assessing Writing: a*

    Critical Sourcebook, Bedford/St. Martins, 2009, pp. 97–101.

Elbow, Peter. *Writing with Power*. Oxford University Press, 1998.

--- *Everyone Can Write: Essays Toward a Hopeful Theory of Writing and Teaching*

    Writing. Oxford University Press, 2000.

--- "Ranking, Evaluating, and Liking: Sorting out Three Forms of Judgment." *College*

    English, vol. 55, no. 2, 1993, pp. 187–206. *JSTOR*,

    www.jstor.org/stable/378503. Accessed 29 Dec. 2017.

Ellis, Carolyn, and Arther Bochner. "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity:

    Researcher as Subject." *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by

Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, Sage Publications, 2000, pp. 733–768.

ENG 010 Portfolio Guide for Faculty and Staff. Suffolk County Community College, English Department Ammerman Campus, 2015.

Faigley, Lester. "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal." *College English*, vol. 48, no. 6, 01 Oct. 1986, pp. 527-42. EBSCO*host*, lib1.lib.sunysuffolk.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct= true&d b=eric&AN=EJ339970&site=ehost-live. Accessed 18 Aug. 2012.

Finn, J. D., et al. "The 'Why's' of Class Size: Student Behavior in Small Classes." *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 73, no. 3, 1 Sept. 2003, pp. 321–368. *JSTOR*, doi:10.3102/00346543073003321. Accessed 5 Nov. 2016.

Flachmann, Kim. "California State University, Bakersfield Academic Senate English Stretch Composition Program Res. 141513." *California State University, Bakersfield Academic Senate*, California State University, Bakersfield, 18 Dec. 2014.

Fleisher, Kass. *Talking out of School*. Dalkey Archive, 2009.

Fox, Tom. "Basic Writing as Cultural Conflict." *Journal of Education*, vol. 172, no. 1, 01 Jan. 1990, pp. 65-83. EBSCO*host*, lib1.lib.sunysuffolk.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct= true&d b=eric&AN=EJ429557&site=ehost-live. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

Garrison, Roger H. "Community Colleges: The Literature of the Two-Year College." *Change*, vol. 7, no. 3, 1975, pp. 58–60. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40162305. Accessed 1 Nov. 2017.

Geertz, Clifford. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive: Theory of Culture." *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1973, pp. 3–30.

Gilyard, Keith. *Voices of the Self: A Study of Language Competence*. Wayne State University Press, 1991.

Glau, Gregory. "The 'Stretch Program': Arizona State University's New Model of University-Level Basic Writing Instruction." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 20, no. 1/2, 1996, pp. 79–91. *JSTOR*, wpacouncil.org/archives/20n1-2/20n1-2glau.pdf. Accessed 7 Jul. 2015.

--- "Stretch at 10: A Progress Report on Arizona State University's Stretch Program." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2007, pp. 30–48. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43444083. Accessed 7 Jul. 2015.

Goldin, Claudia, and Lawrence F. Katz. "The Shaping of Higher Education: The Formative Years in the United States, 1890 to 1940." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 13, no. 1, 1999, pp. 37–62. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2647136. Accessed 12 Oct. 2017.

Gordon, Larry. "California Colleges Transform Remedial Courses to Raise Graduation Rates." *Daily News*, 28 Aug. 2017, www.dailynews.com/2017/06/25/california-colleges-transform-remedial-courses-to-raise-graduation-rates/. Accessed 3 Oct. 2017.

Graff, Gerald. *Professing Literature: An Institutional History*. The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Greenberg, Karen L. "The Politics of Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1993, pp. 64–71. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43443603. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

Grego, Rhonda, and Nancy Thompson. "Repositioning Remediation: Renegotiating Composition's Work in the Academy." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1996, pp. 62–84. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/358274. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

--- "The Writing Studio Program." *Council of Writing Program Administrators*, Council of Writing Program Administrators, 1995, wpacouncil.org/19n1-2. Accessed 12 Oct 2016.

Hairston, Maxine. "The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 33, no. 1, 1982, pp. 76–88. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/357846. Accessed 8 July 2014.

--- "Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 43, no. 2, 1992, pp. 179–193. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/357563. Accessed 20 July 2014.

Headden, Susan, "How the Other Half Tests." *Washington Monthly*, Washington Monthly, 5 July 2016, washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/septoct-2011/how-the-other-half-tests-2/. Accessed 20 Nov. 2014.

Hern, Katie. "The California Acceleration Project: Improving Completion and Equity Among Students Considered 'Under-Prepared.'" The California Acceleration Project, 5 Apr. 2016. Accessed 10 Oct. 2017.

--- "Acceleration Across California: Shorter Pathways in Developmental English and

      Math", *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2012, pp.

      60-68.

Hern, Katie, and Myra Snell. "Remedial Education Reform and The Classroom."

      Learning Works, Learning Works, Oct. 2013, pp.1-31,

      www.LearningWorksCA.org. Accessed 11 Nov. 2017.

Hooks, Bell. *Bone Black: Memories of Girlhood*. Henry Holt and Company, 2007.

---*Wounds of Passion: A Writing Life*. H. Holt, 1999.

---*Where We Stand: Class Matters*. Routledge, 2009.

Horner, Bruce. "Mapping Errors and Expectations for Basic Writing." *English Education*,

      vol. 26, no. 1, Feb. 1994, pp. 29–51. *JSTOR,*

      www.jstor.org.lib1.lib.sunysuffolk.edu/stable/pdf/40172822.pdf?refreqid=excelsi

      or%3A0dd7ee11bd6e0ce872792314ad267c56. Accessed 18 June 2014.

--- "Discoursing Basic Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 47, no.

      2, 1996, pp. 199–222. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/358793. Accessed 13 Apr.

      2014.

Horning, Alice. "A Definitive Article on Class Size." *Writing Program Administration*,

      vol. 31, no1/2, 2007, pp. 11-34.

Huot, Brian, and Michael M. Williamson. "Rethinking Portfolios for Evaluating Writing:

      Issues of Assessment and Power." *Situating Portfolios: Four Perspectives*, Utah

      State University Press, 1997, pp. 43-56.

"Institutional and General Education Learning Outcomes." *Welcome to Suffolk County Community College - Home of the Sharks*, The State University of New York, 15 Aug. 2013, sunysuffolk.edu/index.jsp. Accessed. 18 July 2014.

Jaschik, Scoot. "Composition Overcrowded." *Inside Higher Ed.* Inside Higher Ed., 16 March 2009, www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/03/16/comp. Accessed 20 Sept. 2017.

Jenkins, Davis, et al. "A Model for Accelerating Academic Success of Community College Remedial English Students: Is the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) Effective and Affordable?" *Community College Research Center*, Teachers College Columbia University, Sept. 2010, ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/accelerating-academic-success-remedial-english.html. Accessed 2 Nov. 2016.

Kane, Thomas J., and Cecilia Elena Rouse. "The Community College: Educating Students at the Margin between College and Work." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 13, no. 1, 1999, pp. 63–84. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2647137. Accessed 5 Aug. 2016.

Koos, Leonard V. "The Junior-College Curriculum." *The School Review*, vol. 35, no. 9, 1927, pp. 657–672. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1078685. Accessed 31 Oct. 2017.

Layton, Marilyn Smith. "Lives Worth Fighting For." *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*, edited by Mark Reynolds and Sylvia Holladay-Hicks, Boynton/Cook, 2005, pp. 27–37.

Leo, Meridith and Raymond DiSanza. "Suffolk County Community College New-
     Course Proposal For." Suffolk County Community College, Selden, 6 Mar. 2017.

Lerner, Neal. "Rejecting the Remedial Brand: The Rise and Fall of the Dartmouth
     Writing Clinic." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 59, no. 1, 2007,
     pp. 13–35. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20456979. 13 May. 2014.

Lewiecki-Wilson, Cynthia, and Jeff Sommers. "Professing at the Fault Lines:
     Composition at Open Admissions Institutions." *College Composition and
     Communication*, vol. 50, no. 3, 1999, pp. 438–462. *JSTOR*,
     www.jstor.org/stable/358860. Accessed 3 Apr. 2017.

Lucas, Catharine. "Introduction: Writing Portfolios-Changes and Challenges." *Portfolios
     in the Writing Classroom: An Introduction*, National Council of Teachers of
     English, 1992, pp. 1-11.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "Conflict and Struggle: The Enemies or Preconditions of Basic Writing?"
     College English, vol. 54, no. 8, 1992, pp. 887–913. *JSTOR*,
     www.jstor.org/stable/378444. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

Maanen, John Van. "Fieldwork, Culture, and Ethnography." *Tales of the Field: on
     Writing Ethnography*, University of Chicago Press, 2011, pp. 1–12.

Mattson, Eva Heimdahl and Lisa Roll-Pettersson. "Segregated Groups or Inclusive
     Education? An Interview Study with Students Experiencing Failure in Reading
     and Writing." *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* vol. 51, no. 3, 2007,
     pp. 239-252.
     file:///E:/Newest%20Chapters/New%20articles/studentswhoexperiencefailure.pdf.
     Accessed 17 Nov. 2017.

McCants, J. "The Early History of the Higher Education Act of 1965." *National Trio Clearinghouse*, www.pellinstitute.org/downloads/trio_clearinghouse-The_Early_History_of_the_HEA_of_1965.pdf. Accessed 27 Nov. 2017.

McNenny, Gerri, and Sallyanne Fitzgerald. *Mainstreaming Basic Writers: Politics and Pedagogies of Access.* Earlbaum, 2001.

Merton, Robert K. "The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy." *The Antioch Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1948, pp. 193–210. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4609267. Accessed 13 Dec. 2016.

Mlynarczyk, Rebecca Williams and Marcia Babbitt. "The Power of Academic Learning Communities." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2002, pp. 71-89. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43444059. Accessed 5 Oct. 2012.

Morest, Vanessa Smith. "From Access to Opportunity: The Evolving Social Roles of Community Colleges." *The American Sociologist*, vol. 44, no. 4, 2013, pp. 319–328. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/42635370. Accessed 1 Nov. 2017.

Mutnick, Deborah. *Writing in an Alien World: Basic Writing and the Struggle for Equality in Higher Education.* Boynton/Cook, 1996.

--- "The Strategic Value of Basic Writing: An analysis of the current moment." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2000, pp. 69–83. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43739265. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

Perl, Sondra. "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 13, no. 4, 1979, pp. 317–336. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40170774. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

Rigolino, Rachel, and Penny Freel. "Re-Modeling Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic*
      Writing, vol. 26, no. 2, 2007, pp. 49–72. *JSTOR*,
      www.jstor.org/stable/43444084. Accessed 13 Jan. 2014.

Ritter, Kelly. "Before Mina Shaughnessy: Basic Writing at Yale, 1920-1960." *College*
      Composition and Communication, vol. 60, no. 1, 2008, pp. 12–45. *JSTOR*,
      www.jstor.org/stable/20457043. Accessed 1 Oct. 2013.

Rodriguez, Olga, et al. "Calculating the Costs of Remedial Placement Testing."
      Community College Research Center, Teachers College Columbia University,
      May 2015, https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/cost-placement-testing-
      analytics.html. Accessed 6 Jun. 2015.

Rodriguez, Richard. *Hunger of Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez: an*
      Autobiography. Dial Press Trade Paperbacks, 2005.

Rose, Mike. "Remediation at the Crossroads." *Teaching Developmental Writing:*
      Background Readings, edited by Susan Naomi. Bernstein, Bedford/St. Martin's,
      2013, pp. 27–30.

--- *Lives on the Boundary a Moving Account of the Struggles and Achievements of*
      America's Educational Underclass. Penguin Books, 1990.

--- *Back to School: Why Everyone Deserves a Second Chance at Education*. New Press,
      2015.

Roueche, John. "Designing Programs to Work: Shifting Paradigms for Changing Times."
      Between a Rock and a Hard Place, Washington D.C. Community College Press,
      1993, pp.69-98.

Roueche John and Susanne Roueche. "Back to the Future: Getting Here from There."

  Between a Rock and a Hard Place, Washington D.C. Community College Press,

  1993, pp. 21-67.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones, and Rebecca Greenberg Taylor. "Constructing Teacher

  Identity in the Basic Writing Classroom." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 16, no. 1,

  1997, pp. 27–50. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43444023. Accessed 4 March

  2015.

Rutschow, Elizabeth et al. *Unlocking the Gate: What We Know About Improving*

  Developmental Education. Executive Summary. MDRC, MDRC, 1 June 2011.

  EBSCOhost,

  lib1.lib.sunysuffolk.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=

  true&d b=eric&AN=ED521474&site=eds-live. 28 Aug. 2014.

Schiming, Richard C. "Class Size." *Class Size – Articles – Resources – CETL –*

  Minnesota State University, Mankato, Minnesota State University Mankato, 2

  Jan. 2013, www.mnsu.edu/cetl/teachingresources/articles/classsize.html.

  Accessed 29 Sept. 2017.

Shaughnessy, Mina. *Errors and Expectations*. Oxford University Press, 1977.

--- "Diving in: An Introduction to Basic Writing." *College Composition and*

  Communication, vol. 27, no. 3, 1976, pp. 234–239. *JSTOR*,

  www.jstor.org/stable/357036. Accessed 10 Oct. 2015.

Sheldon, Caroline Q., and Nathan R. Durdella. "Success Rates for Students Taking

  Compressed and Regular Length Developmental Courses in the Community

College." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, vol. 34, no. 1-2, 2009, pp. 39–54, doi:10.1080/10668920903385806. Accessed 13 Nov. 2013.

Shor, Ira. *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change.* The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Smith, Ashley. "When You're Not Ready." *Florida's Remedial Law Leads to Decreasing Pass Rates in Math and English*, Inside Higher Education, 25 June 2015, www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/06/25/floridas-remedial-law-leads-decreasing-pass-rates-math-and-english. Accessed 4 May 2016.

Soliday, Mary. *The Politics of Remediation*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002.

Soliday, Mary, and Barbara Gleason. "From Remediation to Enrichment: Evaluating a Mainstreaming Project." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1997, pp. 64–78. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43444025. Accessed 5 Sept. 2014.

Somchanhmavong , Sivilay Steven. "Educational Opportunity Program (EOP): A Review of the Literature and Implications for the Disadvantaged." *Cornell University*, 2009.

Sowards, Amanda Kay. "Labeling: Student Self-Esteem and the Stigma of a Label." *http://Mds.marshall.edu/Etd/976/*, *Marshall University*, Marshall University, 2015, mds.marshall.edu/etd/976/. Accessed 1 Oct. 2017.

Stanley, Jane. *The Rhetoric of Remediation: Negotiating Entitlement and Access to Higher Education*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.

Steele, Claude and Joshua Aronson. "Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 69 no. 5, 1995, pp. 797-811.

http://users.nber.org/~sewp/events/2005.01.14/Bios+Links/Good-rec2-Steele_&_Aronson_95.pdf. Accessed 21 Nov. 2017.

Strickland, Donna. "Errors and Interpretations: Toward an Archaeology of Basic Writing." *Composition Studies*, vol. 26, no. 1, 1998, pp. 21–35. Accessed 6 July 2017.

"Substitute Senate Bill No. 40 Public Act No. 12-40: An Act Concerning College Readiness and Completion." *State of Connecticut*, Connecticut General Assembly, 31 May 2012, www.cga.ct.gov/2012/act/pa/pdf/2012PA-00040-R00SB-00040-PA.pdf. Accessed 2 Aug. 2017.

Suffolk County Community College. *Your Success Matters: Educational Opportunity Program. Your Success Matters: Educational Opportunity Program*, Suffolk County Community College, 2017, www.sunysuffolk.edu/about-suffolk/publications/documents/StudentSuccess.pdf.

Sullivan, Patrick. "'Just in Time' Curriculum for the Basic Writing Classroom." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2 Dec. 2013, pp. 118–134.

"Testing FAQs – The City University of New York." – *The City University of New York*, The City University of New York, 2017, www2.cuny.edu/academics/testing/testing-faqs/. Accessed 29 Dec. 2017.

Teunissen, Pim W, and Harold G J Bok. "Believing Is Seeing: How People's Beliefs Influence Goals, Emotions and Behavior." *Medical Education*, Development and Research, Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, 13 Oct. 2013, onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/medu.12228/full. Accessed 5 Oct 2017.

"Text." *Bill Text -*, California Legislative Information, 16 Sept. 2017,

      leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id. Accessed 4 Oct.

      2017.

Thompkins, Jane. *Life in School: What the Teacher Learned*. Addison-Wesley, 1999.

Trimmer, Joseph F. "Basic Skills, Basic Writing, Basic Research." *Journal of Basic*

      Writing vol. 6, no.1, 1987, pp. 3-9. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/43443468.

      Accessed 22 Nov. 2017.

Troyka, Lynn Quitman. "Perspectives on Legacies and Literacy in the 1980s." *College*

      Composition and Communication, vol. 33, no. 3, 1982, pp. 252–262. *JSTOR*,

      www.jstor.org/stable/357487. Accessed 13 Apr. 2014.

"2017 Student Success Scorecard." *California Community Colleges*, California

      Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2017,

      scorecard.cccco.edu/scorecardrates.aspx?CollegeID=000.

Warnick, Chris, et al. "Beyond the Budget: Sustainability and Writing Studios." *Journal*

      of Basic Writing, vol. 29, no. 2, 2010, pp. 74–96. *JSTOR*,

      www.jstor.org/stable/43443900. Accessed 5 May 2016.

Weiser, Irwin. "Portfolio Practice and Assessment for Collegiate Basic Writers."

      Portfolios in the Writing Classroom: An Introduction, National Council of

      Teachers of English, 1992, pp. 89–101.

Wenger, Etienne. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge

      University Press, 1998.

Williamson, Richard. "The Lesson Plan." *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*, edited by Mark Reynolds and Sylvia Holladay-Hicks, Boynton/Cook, 2005, pp. 38–51.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Portfolios in the Writing Classroom: A Final Reflection." *Portfolios in the Writing Classroom: An Introduction*, National Council of Teachers of English, 1992, pp.102-116.

---"Teachers' Stories." *Portfolios in the Writing Classroom: An Introduction*, National Council of Teachers of English, 1992, pp.12-19.

---"Introduction: Digitized Student Portfolios." *Electronic Portfolios: Emerging Practices in Student, Faculty, and Institutional Learning*, American Association for Higher Education, 2001, pp. 15-30.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake, and Irwin Weiser. "Situating Portfolios: An Introduction." *Situating Portfolios: Four Perspectives*, Utah State University Press, 1997, pp.1-17.

Appendix A

SUFFOLK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NEW-COURSE PROPOSAL FORM

STOP!!

Unless you have submitted your Letter of Intent Form to the College Associate Dean for Curriculum Development, Jennifer Browne at centralacadaffairs@sunysuffolk.edu, and received a Response Form back from her, do not continue with this proposal form.

NAME OF PROPOSAL: Emerging Writers Workshop ENG 012

Requesting Campus(es): __X___Ammerman   _____Grant   _____East

Name of Department Chair(s):

Ammerman: Douglas Howard

Grant:

East:

Name of Proposer: Meridith Leo, Doug Howard, Ray DiSanza, Leanne Warshauer_____

Proposal Checklist

*Please be sure you send ALL of the below documents and information in a single **email to the appropriate Curriculum Chair** when you are ready to have the proposal considered by the Campus or College Curriculum Committee.*

( )   Electronic Letter of Intent with **Response from College Associate   Dean for Curriculum Development**

( )   Completed New Course Proposal Form

( )   Vote(s) of Department (See voting guidelines):

   Name of Department: English Department/ Ammerman Campus

   For: _21_____ Against: _0_____   Abstentions: _0_____

   Date of Vote: ___3/6/17_____   Proposer's Initials: _ML_____

        Select One: **Approved__X___   Not approved_____**

   Name of Department: *(Name of Department/Campus)*

   For: _____   Against: _____   Abstentions: _____

   Date of Vote: _____   Proposer's Initials: _____

        Select One: **Approved_____   Not approved_____**

   Name of Department: *(Name of Department/Campus)*

   For: _____   Against: _____   Abstentions: _____

   Date of Vote: _____   Proposer's Initials: _____

        Select One: **Approved_____   Not approved_____**

( )   Completed College Course Syllabus Form

( )   Sample Course Outline with 15-week topic outline

( )   All necessary Executive Dean's Acknowledgment of Support
       Form(s)

cc: Jennifer Browne, Associate Dean for Curriculum Development

       Executive Deans of affected campuses

       Academic Chairs of affected departments at all three campuses

SUFFOLK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NEW-COURSE PROPOSAL FORM

NAME OF PROPOSAL: Emerging Writers Workshop: ENG 012

Requesting Campus(es): __X___Ammerman   _____Grant   _____East

I   GENERAL RATIONALE:

200-
(State rationale for offering this new course. Also state rationale for giving it a 100 or level designation.)

This course has run as a pilot successfully for four semesters on the Ammerman and Eastern campuses. ENG 101 Freshman Composition is a co-requisite of ENG 012 the Emerging Writers Workshop, which is a developmental course. The course is taken simultaneously with ENG101, and it serves to help students by offering extra support as they develop their writing skills. The Emerging Writers Workshop provides students with a foundational understanding of the writing process which will assist them as they will be asked to complete writing tasks throughout their lives academically, professionally, and personally. Throughout the semester, students are enrolled in ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop and ENG 101 Freshman Composition and complete writing tasks assigned by each of these courses. As students learn how to apply the writing process to each writing experience, apply reflective and analytical skills, collaborate with their peers, self-assess their own writing while evaluating their peers, and incorporate feedback and suggestions from their professor and peers, they also learn *studentship* skills that help them better navigate their academic lives. At semester's end, students illustrate their learning and writing process with a portfolio of collected pieces they have developed.

While we are naming this course Emerging Writers Workshop, it is modeled after a national movement entitled the Accelerated Learning Program. Originally developed at the Community College of Baltimore County, accelerated courses have grown to over 254 institutions nationwide and have been successful at other community colleges and universities in the state of New York. The English department invited the creator of ALP, Dr. Peter Adams, to Suffolk Community College in October 2015 to discuss the success of ALP and the process of implementation. His presentation and discussion were helpful to us as we developed our pilot courses.

The Emerging Writers Workshop was first taught here at SCCC in the spring 2015 semester under the ENG 010 class designation. The course was linked to an ENG 101 course and was subsequently offered on the Eastern campus. Throughout the pilot, we ran 10 sections (Ammerman and Eastern

campuses) beginning in the spring semester and found students were engaged and successful throughout the four-semester offering. According to a report by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Paul Beaudin, there were a total of 104 students, and 76% of the students successfully completed ENG 010 with an S (Satisfactory) grade; 68% successfully completed ENG 101. His report indicates that our pilot was successful for students who had low CPT scores and low high school GPAs. According to the report, "it is fair to say that for more than 20 of these students ALP was a highly effective and necessary intervention". This examination of the Accelerated Learning Program pilot illustrates that the smaller classroom size and the corequisite ENG 101 course were extremely effective in reaching students who are at risk and need intervention in order to accomplish their academic goals.

By offering students a smaller class size with more one-on-one time with their instructor along with early intervention, we will increase retention and students won't have to wait an extra semester to accomplish ENG 101; therefore, they would be more likely to finish their degree programs along with their peers who placed directly into ENG101. Ultimately, the Emerging Writers Workshop course offering could impact graduation rates.

II.   CATALOG DESCRIPTION

(Give the exact description you wish to see in the catalog for this course, including prerequisites, corequisites, concurrent enrollment and any other stipulations you wish to include in the catalog description. Assume the description on this form will be copied and pasted directly into the catalog, Banner, and all other places where course descriptions are referenced.)

This course is for those students interested in fulfilling the requirements of ENG 010 and ENG 101 in one semester. Students will focus on exploring a variety of written genres while learning to engage with the writing process in order to rework or reimagine the development of ideas. The course also introduces students to writing skills that include but are not limited to prewriting, drafting, editing, proofreading, reading comprehension, reflection, and analysis in so far as these skills relate to essays written in the ENG 101 class. This class is taken in conjunction with ENG 101, and students must pass ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop in order to receive a passing grade in ENG 101. Graded on an S-U-R-W basis. Pre-requisite ENG 009 and RDG 098, or Placement in ENG 010 and Placement in RDG 099, Co-requisite ENG 101.

III.   STATEMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES

(Course outcomes should be stated in the form of observable learning outcomes, e.g., "Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to . . . . ")

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

A. Write and complete a series of essays that focus on a main idea and support that main idea via clear, well-ordered paragraphs developed by specific details, examples, or reasons.
B. Apply strategies for prewriting, drafting, revising, and proofreading (both in-class and out-of-class papers).
C. Integrate and consider the feedback from peers and/or instructor when revising essays.
D. Adapt and apply appropriate academic strategies and learning tools to promote academic success.
E. Develop writing skills that focus on the following:
- Central purpose and/or argument
- Coherent organization and structure
- Support from relevant examples and evidence
- Connections between ideas and examples/evidence
- Provide specific details and facts pertaining to audience and genre
- Include effective word choice, style, and tone
- Create a smooth flow of ideas through use of transitional words, phrases, or paragraphs where necessary
- Revise sentence level grammatical and mechanical errors
- Incorporate appropriate format, document design, and preparation in accord with manuscript requirements and genre convention.

IV. RELATIONSHIP TO STUDENTS

   A. Credits and Contact Hours
       (Provide a rationale for proposed credits and contact hours. See the formula for credit   hours and contact hours on the Curriculum Website.)

          Credit Hours____3___   Contact Hours___3____

          Lecture__X____   Lab_____   Studio_____
          Internship_____

   B. Course Fees

       (Will the student be charged additional fees for this course?)

          Lab Fees_____N/A_____ Course Fees__N/A_____

          Please explain as
       necessary:_____

   C. Required/Unrestricted Elective/Restricted Elective

       (Will this be a required course? If so, for which curricula? Provide a rationale as to   why this course should be required. If this course is proposed as an elective

or   restricted elective course, state what elective category it will fulfill and why it
is   appropriate for that elective category.)

Dependent upon CPT placement into ENG 010 and RDG 099, ENG 012 is offered as an option to fulfill the ENG 010 requirement.

D.   Prerequisites/Corequisites/Concurrent Enrollment

(What prerequisites, corequisites, or concurrent enrollment courses will be required for   this course? Provide a rationale for these requirements. If there are any grade   stipulations on the prerequisites or concurrent enrollment courses, please state that   here and provide rationale.)

In order for students to be successful, this course requires that students have experience with reading comprehension and fundamental writing skills so ENG 009 and RDG 098 should be prerequisites or students must place into ENG 010 and RDG 099.

This course works in conjunction with a credit-bearing writing course so ENG 101 Freshman Composition will act as a co-requisite to ensure that students have a well-supported and concentrated writing experience.

E.   Course Replacement

(Will this course be replacing any existing course or courses? If so, list the courses it   will replace and provide a date when those courses may be deleted from the catalog.)

                N/A

F.   Transferability

        A. Will this course fulfill a SUNY Transfer Path required or recommended course.   Yes_____   No__X___

        B. If yes,

                1. List the SUNY Transfer Paths for which this course is either   required or recommended.

                2. Provide the SUNY course descriptor to which this course will   map.

        C. Would this course transfer to any other non-SUNY institutions? If   so, give examples of non-SUNY transfer institutions/departments who   would accept this course. Give the name(s) of the courses it would   transfer as. Demonstrate how transferability was determined.)

G.   Master Schedule

This course would be offered in the fall and spring semesters. In the fall and spring 2015 and 2016 semesters, we offered 4 sections. For the spring 2018 semester, we would like to offer 8 sections on the Ammerman campus. This three-credit course would meet for 150 minutes per week at suggested sessions of two 75-minute sessions to fit into the master schedule and maximize students' scheduling options. The course will be paired with an ENG 101 course, and one instructor will be assigned to both classes which will be taught back to back. Students will attend the credit-bearing course ENG 101 Freshman Composition first and then immediately following that will attend ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop.

H.   Estimate of student enrollment

(How many students are anticipated to initially enroll in this course per semester? Per year? How were these enrollment figures determined?)

During the pilot course offering in 2015 and 2016, ten sections were offered with a total of 104 students (Ammerman and Eastern campuses). We would like to offer 8 sections with 12 students in each class on the Ammerman campus in the spring 2018 semester which will enroll a maximum of 96 students. Since we have a larger influx of incoming students in the fall semester, we would like to offer 16 sections which will enroll a possible 192 students. As the Emerging Writers Workshop course grows, we project that a significant amount of students placing into developmental writing would eventually choose the ENG 012 option as it allows them to complete the requirements of a developmental placement alongside a credit-bearing (ENG 101 Freshman Composition) writing course. This will help students to move through the academic pipeline efficiently in order to fulfill other credit-bearing courses offered at Suffolk County Community College.

I.   Class Size

(What is the maximum number of students that should be allowed to enroll in one   section of this course? Provide a rationale for this class size. Should the class size be forcible?)

The maximum number of students in ENG 012 is recommended to be 12 students, non-forcible, in order to insure students have one-on-one time with the instructor in order to enhance their writing skills.

As stated in the general rationale, the Emerging Writers Workshop is modeled after the Accelerated Learning Program, which was created at the Community College of Baltimore County. CCBC and many other national institutions have set the standard for appropriate class size in

a model that accelerates intensive writing engagement such as the class we are proposing. Currently, CCBC has a class size of 10 students for the ALP course, and there are several local schools in New York State that have also determined appropriate class size based on the percentage of students placed into developmental writing. At Queensborough Community College, the class cap is 14 students for the ALP course, LaGuardia Community College has a class size of 10, SUNY Adirondack has a class maximum of 8, and SUNY Genesee Community College has an ALP class size set at 12. Based on the data collected from our two-year pilot, a class size of 12 was successful.

The faculty who taught during the pilot phase of our ALP courses (ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop) believe the class size for the Emerging Writers Workshop should be reduced from the traditional ENG 010 class size for a variety of reasons. First, developmental students need more one-on-one time with their instructors in order to develop their own specific writing skills. Developmental writers approach developmental courses from different levels and have had different experiences, so students need individualized instruction that can help them identify their specific challenges with writing. This kind of individual instruction can be done in class with one-on-one conferences or consultations, or an instructor can tailor a specific workshop or writing moment around the specific struggles a student is facing. Through this direct interaction, students have the opportunity to ask questions that will help them understand their writing process and the errors they make. Additionally, developmental students in a smaller cohort benefit from communal-social bonding. Developmental students who cultivate relationships with their peers and their instructors feel more comfortable sharing their ideas and their struggles when it comes to writing. A smaller class size affords developmental writers the time it takes to create relationships, which can in turn impact the psychological effects that developmental placement has on them. Incidentally, social bonding can influence behavioral issues that developmental students sometimes have. By having a smaller class size, students can develop meaningful relationships and work through non-cognitive behavioral issues that can impact their ability to succeed. We also believe that a smaller class size can offer more individualized instruction, in-depth collaborative learning, and a greater focus on cognitive academic issues that sometimes impede on student success.

At-risk students who place into these large classes with 22 students have a difficult time developing meaningful and intellectual relationships with their peers and instructors, which can lead to a lack of academic engagement. With a smaller class size an instructor has

the ability to spend more time with students to guide them through the challenges they have with their writing. Writing is a process, and that process takes time for students to work through. Having a smaller class allows an instructor extended time to work with each student. Writing is also collaborative in nature and having a smaller class size affords students time to work through their writing and the writing of their peers in an in-depth intensive way. Students feel less rushed because they are engaging with their peers while having access to their instructor for protracted periods of time. This collective bonding that happens in-class, creates a community of writers that is difficult to create in a large class. With a smaller class size, the Emerging Writers workshop would work to contest the issues that developmental writers sometimes face and help them pursue their academic and professional goals.

V. RELATIONSHIP TO FACULTY

  A. Number of current faculty available to teach proposed course and   number of additional faculty required.

  ▪ Four full-time faculty at the Ammerman Campus
  ▪ One adjunct instructor at the Ammerman Campus

While we have had five faculty teach the proposed course when it was in the pilot stage, we believe that with the appropriate training any full-time or part-time faculty member would be available to teach the proposed course.

  B. Number of other staff positions required.

  Due to the planning (scheduling, mentoring, training) coordinating (advertising, working with academic advising, admissions), and organizing (the portfolio readings, curriculum ideas, aligning with ENG 101) it would be crucial to have release credits to distinguish a director or coordinator of the Emerging Writers Workshop courses.

  C. Discipline(s) required and/or minimum preparation in order to teach the course.

M.A. in Composition Studies

M.A. English Literature

M.A. in Developmental Education with an emphasis in Writing or English Literature

VI. RELATIONSHIP TO SUNY GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS*

  Is this course being proposed as a SUNY General Education Course?

_____Yes   ____X_____No

If you answered no, skip to Step VII. If you answered yes, continue with Step VI,

A.   Identify which of the ten SUNY knowledge and skills areas the course would fulfill.

*The ten SUNY knowledge and skill areas are Mathematics, Natural

Sciences, Social Sciences, American History, Western Civilization,
Other

World Civilizations, Humanities, The Arts, Foreign Language, Basic

Communication.

B.   Demonstrate how the course outcomes map to the SUNY Learning Outcomes for the knowledge and skills areas you have identified. (See the Curriculum Website for further details about the required outcomes.)

C.   How does this course incorporate the SUNY infused competencies of Critical Thinking and Information Management? (See the Curriculum Website for further details about the required outcomes for Information Management and Critical Thinking.)

D.   Provide a list of sample readings.

E.   Do the faculty within the department/discipline agree to assess this course according to the SUNY General Education Learning Outcomes?

VII.   COSTS

There are no additional costs associated with the course, beyond the costs of staffing the extra sections that would be required to accommodate the smaller class sizes, and possibly trainings for adjuncts who wish to teach the course. These costs would be almost entirely offset by the increased tuition revenue generated by the additional 3-credit ENG 101 course that ENG 012 students would be taking, and further offset by a decrease in the number of sections that we are required to offer in subsequent semesters. Sixty-eight percent of students who participated in the ALP pilot passed their ENG 101 courses. If those numbers hold for a larger sample (96), then we'd be looking at either 60+ open seats in the fall that could be taken by other students or a decrease of 1-2 sections of ENG 101, which would offset the previous semester's increase.

From a strictly financial perspective, a smaller class size always looks like a loss (or at least like less of a gain). If, however, the Emerging Writers Workshop course's smaller class size helps us to retain students, as the data

suggests it will, any initial costs will be mitigated by the increased retention and by those returning students who will now enroll in other classes. This is a positive both financially and in terms of the college's academic mission.

We currently (spring 2017) have more than enough classroom space to accommodate the increased number of sections. This should be the case in the spring 2018 semester as well. We are also exploring the possibility of offering twice weekly evening sections either within the 4:20 pm time slot or in the 6:00 timeslot. Because the 012 and the 101 would both meet twice-weekly, we wouldn't actually be looking at one 3-hour block, but rather an ENG 101 that meets twice weekly from 4:20-5:35 (or 6:00-7:15) and an ENG 012 that meets twice weekly from 5:45-7:00 (or 7:30-8:45). These numbers can, of course, be adjusted slightly to meet institutional and legal requirements for contact hours.

Given the program's success to this point, it's reasonable to assume that the number of sections we are required to offer will continue to trend downward as fewer students are required to either retake 010 and 101 or to delay 101 until after they have completed the developmental course. This could help to alleviate some of the congestion in the fall schedule, or open up space to offer sections of the Emerging Writers Workshop in the fall. Looking at enrollment data gathered from the past four academic semesters (fall '15, spring '16, fall '16, and spring 17), EWW will require the addition of 3-7 sections with the numbers actually trending lower in the fall semesters.

VIII. COURSE SYLLABUS

(Complete Course Syllabus Form below.)

IX. SAMPLE COURSE OUTLINE

*(A **Be sure to include a 15-week topic outline.** Please note: The audience for the Sample Course Outline is not your students. It is the College Community, other colleges and universities, and possibly SUNY System Administration and the New York State Education Department. A modified excerpt of a Sample Course Outline is below to help you with providing the necessary information. It is NOT a form but merely a guideline for drafting an example of a course outline for the course.)*

X. EXECUTIVE DEAN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT-OF-SUPPORT FORM

(Once you have completed this proposal form, email the entire proposal to the appropriate Executive Deans and ask them to sign the Acknowledgement-of-Support Form below [one per dean]. Once you have received the forms back from the Executive Deans, email complete proposal packet to the appropriate Campus or Curriculum Committee Chair.)

SUFFOLK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

COLLEGE COURSE SYLLABUS FORM

To meet the ideals of Suffolk County Community College, new courses should, if appropriate, consider issues arising from elements of cultural diversity in areas of textbook choice, selection of library and audio-visual materials, and teaching methodology. (Please note that a course syllabus is not the same as a course outline. A course syllabus outlines the general requirements for a course. A course outline is the specific document created by the individual faculty member to distribute to a specific course section. Please see the Faculty Handbook for further details as to what to include in a course outline. A SAMPLE course outline should be attached below.)

I.   Course Number and Title:

> *(Be sure to consider whether this course is a 100- or 200-level course and give*
a   *rationale for the decision.)*

ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop

II.   Catalog Description:

This course is for those students interested in fulfilling the requirements of ENG 010 and ENG 101 in one semester. Students will focus on exploring a variety of written genres while learning to engage with the writing process in order to rework or reimagine the development of ideas. The course also introduces students to writing skills that include but are not limited to prewriting, drafting, editing, proofreading, reading comprehension, reflection, and analysis in so far as these skills relate to essays written in the ENG 101 class. This class is taken in conjunction with ENG 101, and students must pass ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop in order to receive a passing grade in ENG 101. Graded on an S-U-R-W basis. Pre-requisite ENG 009 and RDG 098, or Placement in ENG 010 and Placement in RDG 099, Co-requisite ENG 101.

III.   *Learning Outcomes:* *(Main concepts, principles, and skills*
> *you want students to learn from this course)*

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

A. Write and complete a series of essays that focus on a main idea and support that main idea via clear, well-ordered paragraphs developed by specific details, examples, or reasons.
B. Apply strategies for prewriting, drafting, revising, and proofreading (both in-class and out-of-class papers).
C. Integrate and consider the feedback from peers and/or instructor when revising essays.
D. Adapt and apply appropriate academic strategies and learning tools to promote academic success.
E. Develop writing skills that focus on the following:

- Central purpose and/or argument
- Coherent organization and structure
- Support from relevant examples and evidence
- Connections between ideas and examples/evidence
- Provide specific details and facts pertaining to audience and genre
- Include effective word choice, style, and tone
- Create a smooth flow of ideas through use of transitional words, phrases, or paragraphs where necessary
- Revise sentence level grammatical and mechanical errors
- Incorporate appropriate format, document design, and preparation in accord with manuscript requirements and genre convention.

V.   **Programs that Require this Course:** *(List or indicate none.)*

None

VI.   **Major Topics Required:**

- ➢ Stages of the Writing Process
    1. Prewriting
        a. Outline
        b. List
        c. Visual cluster/web
        d. Free write
        e. Focused free write

    2. Drafting
        a. Learning to write Introductions, Body Paragraphs and Conclusions
        b. Developing thesis statements/argument/controlling purpose
        c. Developing supporting details in body paragraphs
        d. Organizing ideas in a logical order

    3. Revising
        a. Global revision versus sentence level
        b. Learn to integrate feedback from a variety of audiences

    4. Editing
        a. Sentence level analysis skills

    5. Proof reading
        a. Actively reading over writing

- ➤ Genre awareness
    1. Explore a variety of genres and the conventions they prescribe

    2. Learn how to write some of the following genres (but not limited to):
        a. Reflection/Analysis
        b. Narrative
        c. Compare/Contrast
        d. Definition
        e. Argumentative/persuasive
        f. Review writing
        g. Critical analysis
        h. Informative

    3. Audience Awareness
        a. Understanding the audience and their expectations

- ➤ Studentship skills
    1. Time management with specific writing tasks
    2. Organizing and gathering information
    3. Study/reading/writing skills
    4. Digital literacy awareness
    5. Appropriate use of in-class/out-of-class time
    6. Writing preparation (the writing process)

- ➤ Document/Format design

VI.   **Special Instructions:**

A.   Prerequisite(s) to this Course: *(List or indicate none)*

ENG 009, Basic Writing

RDG 098, Introduction to College Reading

B.   Course(s) that Require this Course as a Prerequisite: *(List courses or indicate none)*

This course satisfies the developmental writing prerequisite for ENG 101.

C.   External Jurisdiction: *(List credentialing organization/association if   appropriate or indicate none.)*

None

VII.   **Supporting Information:** *(Examples – newspapers, journals, Internet resources, CD-ROMS, Videos, other teaching materials, textbooks, etc.)*

Purdue Owl National Online Writing Lab

Virtual Learning Commons

MLA Writer's reference book (Instructor's choice)

VIII.   **Optional Topics:** *(List or indicate none)*

Textual Analysis (Time permitting and when appropriate)

Appropriate integration of outside sources and MLA citations (Time permitting and when appropriate)

IX.   **Evaluation of Student Performance:**

Instructors may use a variety of methods to measure student achievement, but a student's final course grade will rely on their semester long portfolio. The ENG 012 portfolio assessment reading will utilize the same rubric that is used to assess the ENG 010 student semester long portfolio.

See attached rubric.

List possible methods to be used for evaluating students' achievement of the course's learning outcomes.

X.   **Sample Course Outline**

(Consider using template below. Be sure to provide a 15-week schedule of topics and activities for the course.)

See Attached

ENG 012
Emerging Writers Workshop
Suffolk County Community College

New Course Proposal

February 2017

Sample Syllabus taken from fall 2016 pilot

Instructor Contact Information

Prof. Meridith Leo
Email: leom@sunysuffolk.edu
Class Hours: Monday and Wednesday 2:00-3:15 pm
Class Room: Islip Arts 111
Office Hours: Monday: 11:30 pm-12:30 pm, Tuesday: 2:00 pm- 4:00 pm, Wednesday: 5:00pm-6:00 pm, Thursday: 2:00 pm- 4:00 pm, Friday: Virtual 1:00 pm-2:00 pm
Office location: Islip Arts 1-J
Office phone: 631-451-4594

COURSE DESCRIPTION & OBJECTIVES:

This course is for those students interested in fulfilling the requirements of ENG 010 and ENG 101 in one semester. Students will focus on exploring a variety of written genres while learning to engage with the writing process in order to rework or reimagine the development of ideas. The course also introduces students to writing skills that include but are not limited to prewriting, drafting, editing, proofreading, reading comprehension, reflection, and analysis in so far as these skills relate to essays written in the ENG 101 class. This class is taken in conjunction with ENG 101, and students must pass ENG 012 Emerging Writers Workshop in order to receive a passing grade in ENG 101. Graded on an S-U-R-W basis. Pre-requisite ENG 009 and RDG 098, or Placement in ENG 010 and Placement in RDG 099, Co-requisite ENG 101.

ENG 012 will be conducted as a writing workshop where students will have the opportunity to both discuss and write about their personal writing processes and to explore new and potentially successful methods of approaching their writing. In addition, to these readings students will offer constructive feedback to peers, respond to feedback, and critiques with an open mind. By engaging with the readings students will work through ideas and issues that are relevant to their own lives and personal interests. ENG 012 will work to help students discuss any issues that arise in the ENG 101 class and will give students the opportunity for one-on-one time with their instructor to hone in on individual writing challenges. *Not applicable toward any degree or certificate.*

<u>COURSE OUTCOMES:</u>

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

A. Write and complete a series of essays that focus on a main idea and support that main idea via clear, well-ordered paragraphs developed by specific details, examples, or reasons.
B. Apply strategies for prewriting, drafting, revising, and proofreading (both in-class and out-of-class papers).
C. Integrate and consider the feedback from peers and/or instructor when revising essays.
D. Adapt and apply appropriate academic strategies and learning tools to promote academic success.
E. Develop writing skills that focus on the following:
- Central purpose and/or argument
- Coherent organization and structure
- Support from relevant examples and evidence
- Connections between ideas and examples/evidence
- Provide specific details and facts pertaining to audience and genre
- Include effective word choice, style, and tone
- Create a smooth flow of ideas through use of transitional words, phrases, or paragraphs where necessary
- Revise sentence level grammatical and mechanical errors
- Incorporate appropriate format, document design, and preparation in accord with manuscript requirements and genre convention.

Ultimately, in a class such as this you must care about how well you write and the progress your writing will experience throughout the course. This is a writing intensive course that will challenge you constantly; therefore, you will be writing 20+ pages of writing throughout the semester. This writing will be accomplished either during class time or on your own. This course is designed to assist you in becoming more critical writers and thinkers.

<u>MATERIALS:</u>

- MLA Writer's Reference book Hacker & Sommers ISBN: 1457666766
- 2-pocket folder
- Notebook for class notes
- Dictionary
- Weekly planner

COURSE REQUIREMENTS & STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES:

ATTENDANCE: READ CAREFULLY!!

Class discussion and participation are essential in this class. You are expected to attend every class, to be on time, to be prepared, attentive, and to actively participate in class discussions. The college-wide attendance policy deems that, *"Students are responsible for all that transpires in class whether or not they are in attendance. The College defines excessive absence or lateness as more than the equivalence of one week of class meetings during the semester."* It is standard college policy that students are permitted one week's worth of absences.

For this course students are permitted **TWO ABSENCES.** That means **STUDENTS AUTOMATICALLY FAIL THE CLASS IF THEY EXCEED MORE THAN TWO ABSENCES**. Students having more than two absences, for whatever reasons, will be withdrawn or fail the class. A lateness is considered 10 minutes after the start of our class time. Being late two times constitutes one absence. If you are late by more than 20 minutes you will receive an absence for that day. There are no excused absences. If and when you choose to use your absences use them carefully. And if you miss a class it is your responsibility to contact a peer to find out what you missed or you should stop by my office hours for help. Contacting me via email to find out what you missed is not an appropriate way to make up course work.

REQUESTING A "W" GRADE: If you choose to withdraw from our class you need to know that there is a deadline. Make sure you refer to the academic calendar if you wish to withdraw from our class. I do not give "W" grades at the end of the semester. If your name is on my course roster you will receive a failing grade. I will give a W grade towards the end of the semester if there are extenuating circumstances, but you to speak with me about this in person.

STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT& CLASSROOM DISRUPTION: This term disruptive behavior is defined in the Student Code of Conduct as any behavior that could endanger life or property, behavior that interferes with the maintenance of an atmosphere that is conductive to academic pursuit, conduct that disrupts any authorized or sponsored college event, lewd or indecent conduct, behavior causes a material disruption to either academic endeavors or the administrative operation of the college. Some of the Most Common Disruptive Behaviors include students who may intimidate to harass the professor, students who may badger the professor with questions with the intent to interrupt lectures and gain attention to themselves, students who routinely enter class late or depart early or repeatedly talk in class without being called upon, students who either threaten a professor, participate in a physical display of anger, or verbally abuse faculty member. If you engage in disruptive behavior during our class I may ask you to take an absence for that class session and you will need to speak with me in order to resolve the issue.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES: If you have a learning disability, you are under no obligation to inform me, but knowing that information can help me make your learning experience better. If you have a physical, psychiatric/emotional, medical or learning disability that may impact your ability to carry out the assigned course work, please contact Student Services. Their telephone number is (631) 451-4045 and all information and documentation is confidential.

EMAIL: I will be communicating with you via email on a weekly basis. Therefore, you need to use your SCCC email address and consistently check it. You need to be responsible to check

your email **at least** once during the week and stay in contact with your peers for help. If you need my help make sure you contact me.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: The College's Student Code of Conduct expressly prohibits "any and all forms of academic or other dishonesty." Using someone else's exact words or original ideas or data acquired from their research in your writing without giving accurate credit (Parenthetical citations) in a reference is known as plagiarism. It is both unethical and illegal and may be grounds for failure. Any form of cheating, be it on a formal examination, informal quiz or other submitted material, is a violation of college conduct. Copying material from fellow students or from other sources during an examination may result in a failing grade for the course and/ or serious disciplinary sanctions as outlined in the Code of Conduct. When students work together on a project, this becomes a joint responsibility for a group so designated and should be limited to the people and resources agreed upon with the instructor. If I think you are engaging in a form of academic dishonesty we will speak about the consequences. If you are unsure about whether you are plagiarizing something in your work you should ask me for help so that you can learn the appropriate ways to integrate others' ideas

PARTICIPATION: Most people learn best by engaging in discussion rather than passively listening to a lecture. Although I will provide occasional lectures to supplement your reading, most of the class will be spent in seminar-style discussion and writing workshops. This means that you need to be committed to regular attendance and remain engaged in participation in class discussion. While I encourage diverse opinions, everyone must be allowed to have a voice in our class, but being a shy or withdrawn person in our course is also not beneficial. This course will thrive on everyone's engagement in discussion and productive use of collaborative group time, which I will facilitate.

GRADES: I do not give any grades throughout the semester, but instead encourage you to continually revise, reconsider and rethink your writing and ideas all semester long. This course works on a Satisfactory/Un-Satisfactory/Repeat grading scale which means that if your portfolio isn't passed by an outside reader you cannot pass the class.

If your final portfolio is passed by an outside reader you will receive a **Satisfactory** grade. If the outside reader determines your final portfolio does not meet the criteria for a Satisfactory grade in ENG 012, students will receive a **Repeat** grade. Students who do not hand in a portfolio or who do not accomplish the goals required of ENG 012 will receive an **Unsatisfactory** grade.

PORTFOLIO ASSIGNMENTS: There will be at least 3 major assignments you'll be working on throughout the semester; however, you will choose which of these essays to put into your final portfolio. The portfolio will need to include revised major writing projects that have been worked on throughout the semester, developed through drafts, and shared with your instructor.

WEEKLY ASSIGNMENTS FOR ENG 012 ASSIGNMENTS DUE ON THE DATE LISTED

Monday August 29th	Wednesday August 31st	Monday September 5th
• Class Introduction • Review of Syllabus	• Syllabi review • Blackboard discussion & VLC	**No formal class→ Labor Day**
Wednesday September 7th	**Monday September 12th**	**Wednesday September 14th**
• Class Discussion: The Essay and Its Parts & The Writing Process • Bring Pocket Manual to class: MLA formatting	• Discussion of how to write a critique • Prewrite Project 1 • In-class viewing of Introductions on VLC • Read from Pocket Manual pgs. 155-162.	• **1st Draft of The Social Media Machine** • In-class work on draft
Monday September 19th	**Wednesday September 21st**	**Monday September 26th**
• In class review conclusions on VLC • In-class work on revising The Social Media Machine • Collaborative group work	• **2nd Draft of The Social Media Machine (Digital access)** • In-class work on draft: make sure you have digital copies to work with	• Reading due: *Argument* • In class work on The Social Media Machine • Discuss & Brainstorm Project 2
Wednesday September 28th	**Monday October 3rd**	**Wednesday October 5th**
• In-class viewing of Body Paragraphs • In-class writing workshop on Transitions • Read from Pocket Manual pg. 55-71 & 76-82	**No formal class→ Rosh Hashanah**	• **1st Draft of Project 2 Argument/Persuasive Advocacy (Digital access)** • In-class revision on draft
Monday October 10th	**Wednesday October 12th**	**Monday October 17th**
• In class work on Annotated Bibliography for ENG 101 • In class work on Project 2 Argument/Persuasive Advocacy • One-on-one conferencing	**No formal class→ Yom Kippur**	• **2nd Draft of Project 2 Argument/Persuasive Advocacy** • In-class work on draft

Wednesday October 19th	Monday October 24th	Wednesday October 26th
• We're in the library room 112 • In-class work on revising Neighborhood History project ENG 101 • Discussion of Project 3 Movie Review	• Writing workshop bring any projects from ENG 010 or ENG 101 to work on • *How to* integrate feedback into your draft	• In-class work on revising Neighborhood History project ENG 101 • One-on-one conferencing
Monday October 31st **MID-TERM** **NO FORMAL CLASS** Individual Conferences • Writing Center assignment due, • 1pg Reflection due	**Wednesday November 2nd** **MID-TERM** **NO FORMAL CLASS** Individual Conferences • Writing Center assignment due, • 1pg Reflection due	**Monday November 7th** **MID-TERM** **NO FORMAL CLASS** Individual Conferences • Writing Center assignment due, • 1pg Reflection due
Wednesday November 9th • Reading due: *Process Analysis & Review Writing* • Discussion of Movie Review Project 3 • One-on-one conferencing	**Monday November 14th** • **1st Draft of Project 3 Movie Review (Digital access)> Hand in on Blackboard** • In-class work on draft: make sure you have digital copies to work with	**Wednesday November 16th** • Read due: *Writing a Definition* • *Research day, Catch up day* • One-on-one conferencing
Monday November 21st • **2nd Draft of Project 3 Movie Review (Digital access)** • In-class work on draft: make sure you have digital copies to work with	**Wednesday November 23rd** **No formal class→ Thanksgiving Break**	**Monday November 28th** • **Writing workshop** • One-on-one conferencing

Wednesday November 30th	Monday December 5th	Wednesday December 7th
• In class work on portfolio • One-on-one conferencing	**NO FORMAL CLASS** Conferences: Bring the essays you plan to include in portfolio. 1. Final portfolio briefing and planning 2. Discussion of Portfolio Assessment	**NO FORMAL CLASS** Conferences: Bring the essays you plan to include in portfolio. 1. Final portfolio briefing and planning 2. Discussion of Portfolio Assessment
Monday December 12th **NO FORMAL CLASS** Conferences: Bring the 2 essays you plan to include in portfolio. 1. Final portfolio briefing and planning 2. Discussion of Portfolio Assessment	Wednesday December 14th • In class writing assignment **Final Portfolio due**	**Monday December 19th** • One on One Portfolio Conferences

Appendix B

ENG012 Final Portfolio Evaluation Sheet

To the Student: Complete this section prior to submitting your portfolio. Place this sheet at the front of your portfolio.

Student ID# _____
items:

Checklist of required

CRN: _____
letter

☐ One typed reflective

☐ Two typed revised essays

Submit this writing in a folder with your ID# and your CRN displayed clearly on the cover.

Note: An overall score of "Pass" means you are eligible to pass ENG101 at Suffolk Community College. By taking into consideration your portfolio scores and overall performance this semester, your professor will assign your final grade in the class.

_____

To the Faculty Evaluator:

Please evaluate this portfolio using the criteria/space below. Please comment on "No Pass" portfolios.

☐ PASS   ☐ NO PASS

Are all the required pieces of writing present?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

(If no, the portfolio does not pass.)

	3	2	1	0
Purpose/ Controlling Idea	Strong sense of purpose. Central idea is clear, evident, and engaging.	Central idea and purpose are generally evident throughout the essay. Central idea is worth developing.	Purpose is vague or wandering; controlling idea is weak, unclear, or too broad.	Absence of controlling idea; writing lacks a sense of purpose.
Development	Uses a variety of appropriate details and relevant examples to explore ideas throughout the work.	Uses some relevant details and examples to explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses few details and examples. Some content is irrelevant.	Writing lacks details and examples or the content is irrelevant.
Organization	Paragraphs are appropriately divided; ideas are linked with effective and organic transitions.	Paragraphs are appropriately divided with sound transitions.	Paragraphs are mostly stand-alones with weak, awkward, or generic transitions.	Paragraph structure does not exist or is a single wandering paragraph or series of isolated paragraphs.

Syntax/ Mechanics	Uses language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity. Writing has few if any mechanical errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers; writing includes some mechanical errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage and mechanical errors.	Writing is filled with errors; meaning is obscured or unclear.
Reflection	Reflection moves beyond simple description to a detailed analysis of how the experience contributed to student understanding of self and course concepts. Student clearly demonstrates a foundational understanding of the writing process.	The reflection demonstrates student's attempt to analyze the experience and his/her writing process, but analysis lacks depth.	Reflection summarizes the learning experience and describes the writing process but makes little attempt to analyze.	Reflection is too brief and at times gets off topic; makes no attempt to analyze the learning experience and student's writing process.

Note: A passing portfolio should score a total of 9 or higher on the rubric. However a score of zero in any of the categories, regardless of total score, could result in a No PASS.

Comments: