

Introduction

Alice S. Horning

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

In 2013, after I (Alice) had published two pieces in *Across the Disciplines*, Michael Pemberton invited me to serve as guest editor for an issue of the journal focused on reading and writing across the curriculum. The result was the special issue of the journal that appeared in December of that year. It included eight articles exploring reading issues in a variety of disciplines. Subsequently, Michael asked me to edit this book, a task I readily agreed to take on with the help of two colleagues I respect: Cynthia Haller of York College/City University of New York and Deborah Gollnitz, a curriculum coordinator for a public school district in Michigan. It includes an expanded and/or updated version of some of the articles from the special issue and some additional new material. Following the publication of the two volumes of *What Is College Writing?* edited by Patrick Sullivan and Howard Tinberg, I came up with the title *What Is College Reading?* thinking that it would be a good companion volume. What I did not know at the time was that Sullivan and Tinberg had a similar idea. Their volume, *Deep Reading: Teaching Reading in the Writing Classroom*, which they co-edited with Sheridan Blau, was published this year by NCTE. They kindly agreed to provide the Afterword to this collection.

Despite these happy collaborative developments, my general sense about the status of reading at the college level is that we have taken two steps forward and one step back. A brief review of recent research makes clear the sources of my sense about the inconsistent nature of our progress. The steps forward are comprised of two kinds of increased attention for reading: first, a focus on “informational text” in the Common Core State Standards to better prepare high school students for college work. A second step forward lies in more attention devoted to work on reading in first-year writing to help students develop the skills they will need in both the reading and writing aspects of academic critical literacy for their work in college and beyond. This increased attention arises from two recent books about reading and first-year writing: Ellen Carillo’s *Securing a Place for Reading in Composition* and Daniel Keller’s *Chasing Literacy*. Both report helpful research findings on reading. These developments are significant positive steps toward addressing students’ reading problems and toward improving their abilities. The step back is that studies continue to show that students lack the critical reading skills needed in college and beyond (Stanford History Education Group, 2016).

As a forward step, the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts (hereafter CCSS) are designed to place the responsibility of developing strong

reading and writing skills on all K-12 educators. The standards include performance and demonstration of these skills in Social Studies, Science and Technology courses. Educators in K-12 environments across the US are being asked by the CCSS to do more than just raise awareness of the need for literacy skills students should develop before graduating from high school. Their work requires shifting the paradigm about who is responsible for literacy development, because it shifts responsibility to all teachers in all disciplines. That is, this work is now the responsibility not only of English teachers who push students to think deeply about literature and other texts, even those that students do not find engaging, but also of all teachers of all subject areas and courses, even if they feel unprepared to teach literacy.

However, this expectation from the CCSS is not easily realized because not all K-12 teachers feel that they are prepared to teach reading and writing. Even high school English teachers will readily admit that they are not reading teachers. Their training is in teaching the themes of literature, approaches to effective writing, and overall communication skills. With a new responsibility to meet the Standards presented in Common Core, teachers are now asked to develop readers who can comprehend multiple texts on one topic and synthesize that information into new ideas that might be expressed in writing, oral presentations or in some digital format. Comprehension and synthesis are intended to lead to problem-solving and creativity. This demand places students and teachers in new territory, with new challenges that require new methods of instruction and increased interdisciplinary collaboration. So, much work remains, but there is good reason to think K-12 teachers are rising to this challenge. While there is much discussion of the assessment of the Common Core and related issues, the new requirements concerning students' reading and understanding of informational text is definitely a positive first step forward.

In the best of all worlds, the reading and writing capabilities developed in K-12 should seamlessly transition into those fostered in first-year writing courses. Fortunately, a recent revival of interest in connecting reading and writing pedagogy in first-year composition courses may help to facilitate this smooth transition, offering a second step forward. While discussions of reading pedagogy have always, to some extent, been a part of composition studies, there has been a relative dearth of attention to the topic since the early 1990s. The strong scholarly and pedagogical interest in reading seen in the 1980s and early 1990s, Carillo (2015) suggests, dwindled within the discipline in part because it became complicated by debates on the relationship between composition and the literature curriculum within English studies. However, she argues that common threads from the 1980s and 90s research, as well as newer, though less plentiful, scholarship on reading and learning transfer, can lay a good foundation for new ways of reconnecting reading and writing pedagogy in first-year composition courses. These are an important second step forward in helping students be better readers. Past work in reading scholarship outlines a variety of pedagogical approaches to draw on. Helmers' *Intertexts: Reading*

Pedagogy in the College Writing Classroom (2003) collects a number of ideas from contributors who have deliberately sought to enhance student reading in their writing classes. Hermeneutic and reader-response theory, which situate meaning-making not in the writer or reader but in their interaction, remind us to foreground students' interpretive practices and encourage them to be more self-aware as readers. Salvatori's "difficulty paper" assignment asks students to identify difficult places in readings as opportunities to delve more deeply into meaning-making (Salvatori & Donahue, 2005). Carillo's (2015, pp. 132–135) problem-based passage paper assignment explicitly asks students to make connections between selected portions of a text and its overall meaning, which helps them enact the hermeneutic circle.

In addition to works on reading that target college faculty, student-directed resources are available to guide students toward better college reading. Bartholomae, Petrosky, and Waite's textbook *Ways of Reading* (2014) pays special attention to helping students read well for college. In Wendy Bishop's *The Subject is Reading* (2000), both student and faculty contributors offer advice about college reading, based on their own experiences. Padgett (1997) presents creative techniques with which students can approach texts.

No matter which ideas are adopted for reading pedagogy in college classrooms, it is clear that, for successful college reading, students need to become self-aware and reflexive regarding their own processes. In her chapter on mindful reading, Carillo (2015) argues that students need to be taught a variety of reading practices, but also be taught to reflect on those practices so they can engage them appropriately as needed in diverse contexts. As Carillo points out, instructors of first-year composition must also attend to the reading/writing needs that students will encounter throughout their academic programs. Drawing upon the scholarship of learning transfer, Carillo suggests that compositionists deliberately foster "mindful" reading, foregrounding students' ability to think metacognitively about their own reading and to adjust their reading approaches as needed within different contexts.

Getting students to read mindfully is not easy, but it can be facilitated by making the invisible processes of meaning-making more visible to students, so they can "see" and reflect on those processes. In his Read Like a Writer (RLA) approach, Bunn (2011) advocates that students think deliberately about the choices writers have made as they read texts, thinking about which of those choices might be useful for their own writing. Double-entry journals (Berthoff, 1981) encourage students to become conscious of and differentiate between the processes they use to comprehend a text's meaning and the processes they use to respond to that meaning. Salvatori's (Salvatori & Donahue, 2005) triple-entry variation of this reading journal practice further helps students become more aware of their reading. These authors ask students to first respond to the text, then comment on the moves they made as readers, and finally, assess the particular meaning of the text their recursive reading produced. These types of activities and assignments, which ask students to bring a

multiplicity of cognitive processes to bear on their reading and to reflect on those processes, can help student readers move toward the three awarenesses engaged in by Horning's (2012) expert readers: metacontextual, metalinguistic, and metatextual. In addition, assignments should be designed so that students use a variety of cognitive skills (analysis, synthesis, application, and evaluation) to interpret texts.

Certainly, asking students to engage in “mindful” reading in first-year composition can enhance their approaches to reading in other academic and nonacademic contexts. However, just as K-12 reading instruction must permeate the entire K-12 school curriculum to be effective, so, too should reading instruction be part of every course in the college curriculum to reinforce and develop students' abilities in both reading and writing. While the research discussed here moves in these directions, much of this attention is within English Language Arts and Rhetoric and Composition, where we could politely be described as “preaching to the choir.” English teachers, writing instructors and others in the literacy profession don't need much of a sales pitch to get on board with reading, though some do resist as they feel they have more than enough to do in teaching writing alone. As I argued in my Introduction to my guest-edited issue of *Across the Disciplines*, however, reading needs attention across the disciplines, in every course, every term. The challenge is that academic reading is difficult and sometimes unappealing, and it is competing against the speed and superficial reading common in students' reading of many types of text, both print and online.

To explore the need for more consistent attention to reading instruction across the curriculum, we have assembled this volume to define and address the nature of college reading and ways to work on it with students across the curriculum. All of the pieces provide a definition of college reading from the authors' perspective from their individual contexts, offering strategies and approaches that can be used in a wide range of courses. Before the chapters begin, we want to provide some key background discussion to set a broader context for the work presented here. We will begin by providing, first, a basic and collaboratively developed definition of *college* reading created from contributions of all the authors. Then, we review research indicating just how difficult such reading is for our students. We will also make clear why we think the book will be useful to our likely audiences, and which chapters in the book might best support the goals and address the needs of those various audiences.

Defining “College Reading”

A phrase like “college reading” is not one easily found in the dictionary. In lieu of looking to the dictionary, we called on our assembled group of authors to give us their individual definitions of college reading. Some of them came from the texts of the chapters presented here, but some of them came in response to our specific request for each author's personal definition. With an eye toward creating a shared definition

that would capture the common elements among these writers, we asked all the authors to submit their personal definitions separately from their texts, either quoting from their chapters or writing a separate statement, drawing on their individual experience as well as their work with students. When all the definitions were fed to a word cloud tool, which functions by looking at word frequencies in a text, a few key concepts show up quite clearly in our collective thinking about the definition. The purpose of this exercise was to find a definition that captures commonalities.

The words that appear prominently in the word cloud are these: reading, readers, college-level, complex, process, actively, critically, academic, meaning, recursive, understanding, definition, texts and connections. With a bit of syntactic super glue, here's the resulting definition:

College-level academic reading can be defined as a complex, recursive process in which readers actively and critically understand and create meaning through connections to texts.

There are five key terms in the collaborative definition that frame the contributions to this collection: complexity, recursion, active, critical, and connection. These elements reveal how college reading differs from the reading students may do in other contexts and clarify why the approaches presented here are relevant to every discipline. Because college reading is complex, it needs to be taught in every discipline and every course. Because it is a recursive activity, students need to be reminded that they need to work on reading as they work on subject learning and mastery. Because it is an active process, reading assignments need to be set up so that students must do the reading and engage with the material in some overt way. Because reading should always be critical, students must learn the elements of critical evaluation of everything they read (authority, accuracy, currency, relevancy, appropriateness, bias) and be able to apply them online and on paper. And finally, because of the need for connection, faculty must help students read in context, not only within their courses, but also within their disciplines, to make connections to materials and ideas beyond the classroom. The chapters presented here offer an array of strategies for achieving these goals so that students develop their “college reading” abilities for every course in college and beyond. Faculty and administrators across the disciplines can all contribute to this work in every course, every term.

College Students and Reading—the Don't, Won't, Can't Problem

It's not your imagination and it's not your fault: students' ability to read extended nonfiction prose has been declining for quite some time. The trend is not improving overall. The evidence is quite clear from a large number of sources, both quantita-

tive and qualitative: students generally don't read much extended nonfiction prose of the kind used in college courses (textbooks, research reports, journal articles and the like) and they won't unless teachers assign reading in a specific and intentional way and make what students do count in their grades. Assigning reading in this way is necessary because the evidence suggests that students really can't read in the ways most faculty intend. There are a number of reasons to be concerned about students' reading abilities: reading has an impact on their success in college as well as on their success beyond college in their personal and professional lives, and as members of a democratic society. Moreover, reading is necessary to success in every course across the disciplines, so everyone needs to pay attention to it. For all these reasons, it is important to understand what studies reveal about where students are before we can address the situation; the evidence of students' difficulties with reading comes from both quantitative and qualitative sources.

Quantitative Studies

Quantitative studies provide one kind of evidence for students' reading abilities, or lack of them. One major quantitative study was released by the ACT organization in 2006. ACT tracked 563,000 students in three cohorts, looking at performance on the Reading section of the ACT and students' success in college. The Reading section of the ACT is a multiple-choice timed test in which students read four passages on different topics, one or more of which might be drawn from a literary work. At least one of the passages is on a Social Studies topic and one on a Science topic; these are factored into students' scores in those areas. There are 40 questions all together, ten on each passage. ACT claims it is testing for factors essential to critical reading, summarized in the mnemonic RSVP: relationships, richness, structure, style, vocabulary and purpose (ACT, 2006, p. 17). These factors are certainly key elements in critical reading, though of course not a comprehensive list.

In the 2006 report, ACT defined success using these criteria: a score of 21 or better on the Reading portion of the test, a 2.0 GPA in the first year, and returning for a second year of college. Given that definition, 51% of students were "successful." The trend shows a decline in the number of students who meet this definition: in 2015, 46% hit the slightly higher cut-off score of 22 nationally (ACT, 2015, p. 4), among those members of a graduating class of 1,924,436 students. More than half of the students you see Monday morning, then, don't hit this minimal criterion for "success."

It is possible to argue that there are plenty of things wrong with the ACT Reading test. It uses short passages; it's a timed test; it does not look at students' prior knowledge of the topics or their interest or motivation. On the other hand, a very large number of students have taken the test, and the passages and questions do tap some key aspects of "college reading." Moreover, other studies, as discussed below,

show that students do really have a hard time with reading; it seems reasonable to think their reading problems are a factor in college attainment when the US Department of Education reports that half of the students who start some kind of post-secondary education never finish a degree (2015). While the fact that drop-out rates and “success” rates according to ACT are similar does not mean they are necessarily connected or related in any way, it seems reasonable to think that students’ reading difficulties play some role in college success or the lack of it. It’s important to note and keep in mind that these are students in every field, likely to choose from the full array of majors offered by colleges and universities. Reading is everyone’s problem.

The ACT can be criticized for other reasons besides the fact that it is a multiple-choice test on short passages. While a very large number of students take the ACT, they are, on the whole, self-selected because the exam is taken by students hoping to go to college. However, a similar picture of students’ reading performance arises from a more truly representative quantitative measure of students’ ability at the point of high school graduation, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). NAEP is run by the federal government; it is an instrument that draws a truly representative national sample of K-12 students, tracking performance in reading, mathematics and other areas at several grade levels. Thirty-seven percent of twelfth-grade students performed at or above the *Proficient* level in 2015 in reading; the sample was 18,700 students from across the country (National, 2015). Performance was lower for African-American and Latino students and also lower for males than for females. In the classroom, this result means that more than half of your students do not read as well as they should, both for success in college and for full participation in our society.

Students’ reading difficulties are not just a US problem either. Another quantitative measure is the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which is administered to 15-year-olds in 72 first-world countries. It is run by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The 2015 results are based on the administration of the 2-hour test to about half a million students worldwide. Parts of the test are multiple choice, computer adaptive, and machine scored, and parts call for open-ended answers scored by people. The results show that US students are just average in this group on reading; “about 20% of all students in OECD countries, on average, do not attain the baseline level of proficiency in reading. This proportion has remained stable since 2009” (OECD, 2016).

It is worth taking a moment to look at the PISA outcome a bit more closely, given the size and international character of the students being tested. The definition offered by PISA that is the basis of the 2015 test is very close to our generically-derived definition: “Reading literacy is understanding, using, reflecting on and engaging with written texts, in order to achieve one’s goals, to develop one’s knowledge and potential, and to participate in society” (PISA 2015, p. 9). Comprehension and engagement are key elements here. Because reading was not the focal area in the

2015 exam, full results have not been reported; however, the 2012 results provide more information and overall there is little change according to the 2015 results (OECD, 2016). According to those 2012 results, only 25% of students score at the top levels, achieving scores above 625 on a 1000 point scale (PISA 2015, p. 43). Moreover, as noted, 75% of students are not at that top level of proficiency, as measured by PISA. So, it's not just American students who aren't as good in reading as they need to be; students in other countries also have difficulty with reading.

As noted, all the quantitative studies have a number of flaws, even if the sample of students taking a particular instrument is a fair and representative one or a very large one. Such studies do not examine students' ability to read longer texts to follow a full argument, for example. They also do not examine students' ability to find, read, evaluate and use materials they find on the Internet, whether conventional articles or multimedia materials of various kinds. To get a better and closer look at these kinds of abilities, qualitative research and other kinds of studies are needed. The results of these more detailed studies confirm students' reading difficulties based on an assortment of instruments, measures and analyses.

Qualitative Studies

Highly respected reading researcher David Jolliffe and his graduate student (at the time) Alison Harl (2008) did do a qualitative study in which they paid 21 first-year composition students at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville (a research-intensive public university) to complete course reading and assignments and to keep records of their reading and responses. The writing was in response to specific prompts from Jolliffe and Harl, requiring the students to analyze, synthesize, evaluate and make use of the material they read. This study shows clearly that students have difficulty with this kind of higher-level work with assigned reading material (2008, pp. 611–613). They point to the need for all college faculty (not just English or writing instructors) to work on reading of the kind needed for college and beyond (pp. 613–615); this work should include both traditional texts and those found or accessed online that encourage students to engage more fully with the material. This study points to the need for connections to texts and to active, critical reading as specified in our generic definition.

A different kind of qualitative study was conducted by a school and public library librarian. Frances Harris published a book with a fine title: *I Found It on the Internet*, which has appeared in a second edition, published by the American Library Association (2011). Harris is a librarian who has worked as a school librarian, now on the faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She draws on her years of experience in both roles to discuss the present landscape of the Internet for all sorts of uses by teens and young adults. Her review suggests that

librarians need to understand the overall situation of all aspects of the Internet; students in high school and college draw on all of it in various ways. It is essential that students be taught not only to search and find, but also to evaluate and to consider the ethics of sources as well as source use. Harris notes that schools have three main strategies for helping students use the Internet effectively and appropriately: regulatory, technological and pedagogical approaches can all be called upon to help students find and use material efficiently and effectively for their own purposes, whatever they might be (pp. 122–123). While this work is not a study of reading *per se*, it does show that libraries and librarians have an essential role to play in helping students read, understand and use whatever they find online. It also points to a role for librarians and other faculty in helping students develop the critical reading abilities our generic definition suggests are part of “college reading.”

Additional qualitative data comes from focused work with students’ reading and research derived from the highly-regarded Citation Project, begun in 2011 (<http://site.citationproject.net>). This study, led by Sandra Jamieson and Rebecca Moore Howard (2012), has examined a sample of almost 2000 references in 174 first-year students’ research papers drawn from 16 schools and colleges in the US. The findings reveal the following outcomes: only 6% use real summary; 46% cite from the first page of a source; 70% of citations come from the first 2 pages of the source material, and the majority of sources are cited only once. As Jamieson (2013) points out in her analysis of the data and its relationship to students’ reading, it is clear students are reading their source materials in a minimal way, relying heavily on quotation rather than full understanding of an article that might support their own ideas. The Citation Project researchers claim that theirs is a representative sample of college-level writing from across the country and across the disciplines because the vast majority of colleges and universities require first-year writing in some form. They worked with statisticians to insure they had an appropriate sample of papers to represent college writing. The Citation Project results suggest that faculty need to help students develop skills in recursive processing of a text to understand and follow complex arguments, elements of college reading on which they need help.

Students’ writing from sources studied in the Citation Project—and their inability to read, understand and use those sources appropriately—is not the only data revealing the reading problem. Faculty might want to think that when students go online, they read more effectively, but research does not support this idea. One large-scale study, for example, directly examines students’ information literacy skills. Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) was designed by faculty and librarians at Kent State University, drawing on the work of the Association of College and Research Libraries, the part of the American Library Association for faculty librarians. SAILS is an untimed test of students’ ability to find, evaluate, understand and make appropriate use of materials found online. Findings from recent administrations of the SAILS instrument show that

only half of students have the skills needed to read online materials effectively (<https://www.projectsails.org>). A study of student performance on SAILS was led by scholars under the auspices of the Association of Research Libraries, a nonprofit organization of major research libraries in North America. A sample of more than 61,000 students from 76 institutions shows that while performance in their ability to evaluate, document and use online source materials effectively (the tasks in the SAILS instrument) does improve as students move through their undergraduate and graduate careers, and while the ability to find relevant material also improves, most students score around 50% (Radcliff, Oakleaf & Van Hoeck, 2014, p. 802).

The SAILS results point again to the need for more focus on critical reading of the kind expected at the college level.

Other reasonably current qualitative studies provide the same kinds of findings, showing students' difficulties in reading. These difficulties appear not only when students are reading traditional printed paper texts, but also with any kind of digital material. A careful study done by Alison Head at the University of Washington shows the problem clearly (2013). Head's work is part of Project Information Literacy, a large, on-going national study based at the University of Washington's School of Information (<http://projectinfolit.org/about>). This report has both quantitative and qualitative parts. First, Head and her colleagues examined library resources in high schools and colleges. They conducted interviews with a sample of 35 first-year students at six different colleges and universities and also did an online survey of almost 2000 high school and college students. So the interview data rely on self-reports, but draw on a sample of college students; these students reported having difficulty reading and understanding the material they were able to find. Their search abilities were limited as they found the use of academic library databases and other resources a challenge as well. In both the self-report data and the survey data, students report difficulty with both comprehension and evaluation of texts.

In a more current study of recent graduates from the same body of research at the University of Washington, half of the respondents reported difficulties with extracting needed information (i.e. reading and understanding material found through search), evaluating credibility, and using the information effectively for their own purposes. Again, this study relies on self-reported data, but the findings are drawn from a large sample with results reported anonymously (Head, 2015, p. 10). This study had 1,651 participants who graduated from college 2007–2012; they were from ten colleges and universities across the country representing an array of types of institutions in different parts of the US. So the students themselves perceive problems in reading and evaluating materials and making effective use of them.

All of these reports give some additional perspective on the problems students have with reading extended nonfiction prose in the ways faculty expect. Finally, two other recent qualitative studies point indirectly to students' reading problems: Keller (2014) and Carillo (2015) both make the case for more attention to reading

in writing classes and beyond at the college level. Using case studies with nine high school students, and following four of them to college, Keller reports on their reading activities online and off. He proposes that faculty need to pay more attention to reading trends in the online environment to discourage what he calls “digital literacies tourism” (2014, p. 160), i.e. superficial reading. Carillo did a different kind of study under the auspices of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, a part of the National Council of Teachers of English, the major professional organization for English teachers including composition instructors. Reporting on a national survey of college writing faculty, Carillo argues for what she calls “mindful reading” (2015, p. 117f.), the kind of thoughtful, thoroughly engaged reading students do not do now according to all the studies cited previously. Keller’s findings are particularly useful because of his focus on online reading as well as reading traditional texts, while Carillo’s work reveals how instructors see what is happening with students’ reading in the classroom. All of these qualitative studies and all the quantitative research discussed here show the problems students have with college reading as we have defined it in this book, a complex, recursive, active, critical process of connecting to texts.. This collection offers an array of new strategies and approaches to expand this discussion along with assorted ideas for addressing students’ problems.

Overview of the Chapters

Literacy instruction is the work of all teachers, K-12 and beyond. It does not and should not end in elementary or secondary school. The goal of this collection is to provide replicable strategies to help educators think about how and when students learn the skill of reading, synthesizing information, and drawing inferences across multiple texts. This type of reading is stressed in the Common Core State Standards and teachers of secondary students are finding challenges in leading readers to mastery of these standards. It is not only the act of helping students read that creates challenge. The need for data to show progress and to determine the next phases of reading instruction has added another layer of complexity to the work of teaching literacy. Composition instructors and scholars should also find this collection of interest as well as faculty and administrators across the disciplines. The presented definitions of college reading can be helpful as high school faculty work to prepare students for the real work of learning in college, and as faculty in college work with students once they get there. And it must continue to include literature but now must also include extended nonfiction prose. This body of work should be of interest and practical use to those who are facing the need to offer more for students as they exit their high school career and begin the journey of post-secondary education. While the chapters not only address those elements in the generic definition, they fall into two broad cat-

egories that we have used to organize them. First, there are six chapters that describe work in cross-institutional settings of various kinds. In the second part, the seven chapters take up assorted disciplinary settings for work on reading.

To begin, Anson presents work connecting writing with rhetorical analysis to improve reading comprehension. Anson shows that connecting writing and reading leads to improved teaching and learning when assignments call for students to engage actively with texts. Gogan's chapter presents a fresh way of understanding college reading. Drawing from research on threshold concepts, he reports on interviews with eight students who had deep, transformative experiences with reading. Gogan writes:

When practiced as a dynamic mode of reception, reading transforms the agency of the reader, allowing the passive receptor to become an active co-creator of meaning. When practiced as a relational arrangement, reading transforms the identity of the reader and of the text, as it stitches together texts, contexts, selves, and others in novel configurations. And when practiced as a recursive journey, reading transforms the approach or orientation of the reader to the text, affording the reader the opportunity to chart his or her course inside of the text. (p. 53)

These experiences, it should be clear, occur with a variety of different kinds of reading across disciplines, illustrating the recursive and complex nature of active reading.

Hollander, Shamgochian, Dawson, and Bouchard offer suggestions for scaffolding the reading task to help students understand content in a manner that deepens comprehension. To achieve this goal, their work suggests the importance of changing the reading "climate" on campus across disciplines to facilitate students' abilities to connect to texts. Using a different kind of cross-campus project, Maloy and her colleagues explore the ways that the use of a common book can be adapted on any campus to build students' reading abilities. This approach builds a sense of community on a campus, contributing as well to students' sense of themselves as *college* students. When Maloy et al. write that "What makes Queensborough's Common Read uncommon is that it is a yearlong collaborative experience for faculty participants and a curricular immersive experience for student participants. It provides much-needed community for our faculty and students . . ." the program focuses attention on this sense of connection through reading.

Townsend's study of high-profile football players' reading reveals that it is important to challenge stereotypes about how different student populations engage in reading. Her research with college athletes shows that they are much more fully involved with reading and learning than either their ACT scores or the common negative stereotypes might suggest. The complexity of student athletes' reading

practices and their active use of reading to learn offer surprising insights into this group of students. Young and Potter also offer this kind of wider view of reading from a P-16 perspective, drawing on the Common Core State Standards; they argue that the contemporary focus on testing distracts from students' need for critical reading skills essential to college and careers. As Young and Potter say: "Although not at the complete exclusion of approaches that are more direct, we argue that whole language and constructivist approaches offer a level of contextualization and engagement that best prepares students for the work they will do in the college environment" (p. 124). For high school teachers, particularly those working with grade 11 and 12 students, this chapter may be most pertinent. Young and Potter describe the current emphasis on data-driven decisions about teaching strategies and highlight the danger of losing authentic means of measuring student progress because of a political climate that requires specific types of reading assessment.

The second set of chapters pay closer attention to specific disciplinary settings in which reading can and should play a key role. As in the cross-disciplinary chapters of the first part, these chapters address the nature of "college reading" and ways to help students with its complex, recursive quality—the importance of active engagement that leads to critical connection with texts in various subject areas.

Leading off the second section, Nantz and Abbott, coming from outside the English Language Arts arena, describe an interdisciplinary team-taught honors course that challenged students to read texts across historical and economic perspectives on the concept of "empire." They focus on the development of both skill in and motivation for reading. Even though Nantz and Abbott experienced mixed results in their attempt to provide students with the tools they need for deep reading, they were working on critical reading within their respective disciplines, suggesting how this goal might be achieved. Davies provides another disciplinary perspective. Her chapter presents ways that biology and other science professors can model assignments on a sequential series to encourage students' recursive reading. Davies explicitly advocates modeling as a strategy. Moreover, she forthrightly states that "Conversations about student writing issues and/or students' lack of content knowledge at an institutional level need to be reframed and focused on students' reading practices" (p. 179). These chapters show that faculty in disciplines other than English can achieve their own teaching goals when they work on students' active critical reading.

Along with disciplinary variety, faculty in both high school and college settings deal with groups of students with particular needs in addition to their disciplinary learning. Freedman described a collaborative project where principles of ELL language learning were used to promote better reading in East Asian Studies courses. This chapter's focus on preparing TAs to work with students who are learning the language as well as disciplinary content is particularly valuable. Developing reading ability is, after all, part of learning a language. Similarly, Huffman describes her

curricular transformation of a developmental reading class, a unique focus in this collection, to enable better comprehension, critical thinking, and pass rates. Course assessment results suggest that students using the rhetorical analysis and writing model may be more engaged and motivated in the course, and the reading they learn to do may make them more engaged writers; however, the approach may not help students better identify main ideas, key points, or bias, which points to the need to define what comprehension means explicitly. Readers of these chapters will find ideas for adding rigor and student engagement in any curricular area.

A different student group with particular needs is discussed by Melis, who is writing from a tribal community college. Composition instructors can learn from Melis' advocacy for a culturally responsive approach to college reading, one that both recognizes differences in student populations and also takes into account students' experiences with high school reading instruction. Melis addresses the importance of culturally responsive teaching, a more prevalent challenge than many educators recognize. It is a challenge that both secondary teachers and college professors face; the authors published in this text have aptly presented practices and research that can directly inform classroom practice in ways that acknowledge the complexity of reading for all kinds of students.

Odom suggests three ways disciplinary faculty can further support their students' reading: considering the types of assignments they give, explaining their goals when assigning reading, and providing guidance as students read challenging texts and/or texts in unfamiliar genres. A key idea in her chapter as well as in the book as a whole is, as she says: "Determining what does bring meaning to our students' textual experiences is a crucial first step in developing pedagogies that make successful reading, writing, and learning connections for students" (p. 256). Connecting to texts is a key aspect of college reading. Similarly, Sturtz, Hucks, and Tirabassi explore an initiative that links first-year writing with disciplinary studies at Keene State College, where education professors have joined forces with composition professors for a two-semester sequence on reading, writing and professional development for beginning students in their program. According to Sturtz et al., "[t]he structures of full-year linked courses, learning communities, and clustered learning programs connecting two or more courses that typically involve the same faculty and students offer researchers interested in transfer further opportunities to study how a whole cohort of first-year students apply, transform, integrate and reconstruct their learning about reading and writing processes across contexts . . ." (p. 288). These ways of creating connections to texts and among the students are essential to students' developing the elements of college reading.

College reading, however, is an issue that affects faculty in all disciplines, wherever students are expected to engage in academic reading and writing. Much of this book, therefore, moves beyond reading pedagogy in college composition courses (discussed in the Afterword and addressed by many chapters in *Deep Reading*:

Teaching Reading in the Writing Classroom) to consider how such pedagogy can be successfully implemented across disciplines and within discipline-specific courses. It should be clear that we have assembled these chapters to provide an array of options for instructors across these various settings. College reading must be part of the work of every member of the faculty. Using the variety of tools, strategies and approaches offered here, building on and collaborating with colleagues in first-year writing and in the library, faculty can help students become faster, more effective readers, writers and critical thinkers in every course, every term.

References

- ACT. (2006, 1 March). Reading between the lines: What the ACT reading test reveals about college readiness. Retrieved from <http://www.act.org/path/policy/reports/reading.html>
- ACT. (2015). The condition of college and career readiness—Michigan. Retrieved from <http://www.act.org/newsroom/data/2015/states/pdf/Michigan.pdf>
- Bartholomae, D., Petrosky, A., & Waite, S. (2014). *Ways of reading: An anthology for writers*. (10th ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Berthoff, A. (1981). *The making of meaning: Metaphors, models, and maxims for writing teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Bishop, W. (2000). *The subject is reading: Essays by teachers and students*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bunn, M. (2011). *How to read like a writer*. In C. Lowe & P. Zemliansky (Eds.) *Writing spaces: Readings on writing, Vol. 2* (pp. 71–86). Andersen, SC: Parlor Press. Available at <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/writingspaces2/>
- Carillo, E. C. (2015). *Securing a place for reading in composition: The importance of teaching for transfer*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Harris, F. J. (2011). *I found it on the Internet: Coming of age online*. (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Head, A. J. (2013). *Learning the ropes: How freshmen conduct course research once they enter college*. (Project Information Literacy Passage Studies research report). Seattle, WA: University of Washington. Retrieved from http://projectinfolit.org/pdfs/PIL_2013_FreshmenStudy_FullReport.pdf
- Head, A. J. (2015). *Project Information Literacy's research summary: Lifelong learning study phase two: Trends from the online survey*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington School of Information.
- Helmets, M. (2003). *Intertexts: Reading pedagogy in writing classrooms*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Horning, A. S. (2012). *Reading, writing and digitizing: Understanding literacy in the electronic age*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Horning, A. S. & Kraemer, E.W. (Eds.). (2013). *Reconnecting reading and writing*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/reconnecting/>

- Jamieson, S. (2013). Reading and engaging sources: What students' use of sources reveals about advanced reading skills. *Across the Disciplines*, Special issue on Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum. Retrieved from <https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/reading/jamieson.cfm>
- Jamieson, S. & Howard, R. M. (2012). The citation project. Retrieved from <http://site.citationproject.net/>
- Jolliffe, D. J. & Harl, A. (2008). Texts of our institutional lives: Studying the reading transition: from high school to college: What are our students reading and why? *College English* 70(6), 599–617.
- Keller, D. (2014). *Chasing literacy: Reading and writing in an age of acceleration*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press/University Press of Colorado.
- Lombardo, S. (2016). Evaluating sources. Handout available at Kresge Library, Oakland University.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. (2015). Are the nation's twelfth-graders making progress in mathematics and reading? Retrieved from http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_g12_2015/#reading
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2016). PISA 2015 results in focus. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-2015-results-in-focus.pdf>
- Padgett, R. (1997). *Creative reading: What it is, how to do it, and why*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- PISA 2015 draft reading literacy framework. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/Draft%20PISA%202015%20Reading%20Framework%20.pdf>
- Radcliff, C., Oakleaf, M., & Van Hoeck, M. (2014). So what? The results and impact of a decade of IMLS-funded information literacy assessments. In S. Durso, S. Hiller, M. Kyrialliou, & A. Pappalardo (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2014 Library Assessment Conference* (pp. 801–05). Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. Retrieved from <http://libraryassessment.org/bm-doc/proceedings-lac-2014.pdf>
- Salvatori, M.R. & Donahue, P. A. (2005). *The elements (and pleasures) of difficulty*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Stanford History Education Group. (2016). *Evaluating information: The cornerstone of civic online reasoning*. Stanford, CA. Retrieved from <https://sheg.stanford.edu/upload/V3LessonPlans/Executive%20Summary%2011.21.16.pdf>
- Sullivan, P. & Tinberg, H. (Eds.). (2006). *What is "College-Level" writing?* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. Available at <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/collelevel/>
- Sullivan, P., Tinberg, H., & Blau, S. (2017). *Deep reading: Teaching reading in the writing classroom*. Urbana, IL: NCTE. United States Department of Education. (2015, July 27). Fact sheet: Focusing higher education on student success. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/fact-sheet-focusing-higher-education-student-success>