

Reasoning the Need: Graduate Education and Basic Writing

Barbara Gleason

*ABSTRACT: While college composition theory/pedagogy courses are standard offerings in composition and rhetoric graduate programs, specialized basic writing graduate courses lag behind. At the same time, there is a pressing need for highly qualified teachers of nontraditional adult students, especially in community college and adult literacy education programs. This need has recently been articulated in two official statements from the Two-Year College Association of NCTE. It is also being realized by the efforts of individual professors who have collectively offered at least nineteen such courses in recent years. A second argument for offering more BW graduate courses is the extensive BW scholarship revealed by such publications as *The Bedford Guide for Teachers of Basic Writing*, 2nd ed. (Adler-Kassner and Glau) and *Teaching Developmental Writing: Background Readings*, 3rd ed. (Bernstein). This essay argues that graduate programs should augment current commitments to preparing graduate students to teach, research, and administer programs for nontraditional adult students by regularly offering courses on basic writing theory, research, and pedagogy.*

KEYWORDS: basic writing, adult literacy, adult basic education, adult learner, community college, adult education, nontraditional student, graduate education

At the 2005 4Cs, I addressed basic writing's future by arguing that BW scholarship merits increased prominence in graduate education:

There are two important reasons for us to focus on graduate education: First, basic writing's central mission merits the attention of every professional in composition and rhetoric, not just those who specialize in basic writing. Our mission is not exclusively tied to remedial instruction. It is advocating for student access to higher education, particularly for nontraditional or under-prepared students. A second good reason for our turning to graduate education now is the substantial scholarship that we've produced. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the recently published second edition of *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Basic Writing*. Edited by Linda Adler-Kassner and Gregory Glau for the Conference on Basic Writing, this annotated list of BW scholarship provides a useful resource and a testament to a growing profession, which, as

Barbara Gleason is Director of the MA in Language and Literacy at the City College of New York, CUNY.

© *Journal of Basic Writing*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 2006

the editors suggest, may be emerging as a distinct discipline.

Taken together, our mission of promoting access and our scholarship imply that we should be offering more BW graduate courses of various kinds as well as entire master's programs that prepare future BW professionals. Moreover, since adult literacy education shares so much common ground with basic writing, these two professional orientations can easily be linked in one distinctive master's program. ("Promise" 1)¹

Though they operate in different contexts, basic writing and adult literacy programs share a similar goal: to enhance adults' educational, vocational, and economic opportunities. Because their goals and also their challenges offer so much common ground, adult literacy education and basic writing professionals have much to learn from and with one another.

While BW usually focuses on post-secondary institutions, basic reading and writing classes also exist in pre-college adult basic education (ABE) and General Educational Diploma (GED) programs located in colleges, secondary schools, unions, settlement houses, community-based organizations, workplaces, and correctional systems. These courses and programs share common curricular and pedagogical aims, with one another and with basic writing and reading college courses. Yet, opportunities to learn about pre-college ABE and GED writing and reading programs are relatively rare within Composition and Rhetoric graduate programs. Given their common educational goals and recent efforts to create links between adult education programs and community colleges (Alamprese, *To Ensure America's Future*) graduate programs can easily justify integrating ABE and GED issues into graduate courses.

In this essay I will discuss the value of BW graduate courses and the possibility of entire master's programs that prepare students to teach, research, and advocate for nontraditional adult literacy learners in diverse educational contexts.

Striving for Heightened Visibility in Graduate Education

When Adler-Kassner and Glau propose that basic writing is both a sub-field of composition and an emerging discipline (7), they suggest that BW has a broader base and more far-reaching aspirations than in earlier years. Even a cursory reading of *The Bedford Bibliography* reveals an increasingly wide range of subjects being addressed by BW scholars, especially regarding diversity of

students and teaching environments. In “The Conference on Basic Writing: 1980-2005,” Karen Uehling describes students enrolled in basic writing classes as “first generation college students, people of color or speakers of more than one language or dialect, refugees or immigrants, reentry students . . . people who experienced erratic or interrupted high school educations and later earned General Equivalency Diplomas, people with learning or other disabilities, very young parents, and people who work long hours” (9). With this description, Uehling reminds us to pay attention to the diversity among students enrolled in remedial college writing classes.

A second recent publication further illustrates the diversity of topics in BW scholarship. In *Teaching Developmental Writing: Background Readings*, Susan Naomi Bernstein presents essays on teaching college writing alongside essays focusing on teaching immigrants, ESL readers, reentry adult undergraduates, and incarcerated women; one striking example of the diverse student populations represented by Bernstein is Jane Maher’s “You Probably Don’t Even Know I Exist” – an essay on teaching reading and writing to women in prison. More broadly, by including such a wide range of student populations and educational programs in this volume, Bernstein demonstrates very concretely the scope of current BW professionals’ teaching and research interests.

The cumulative weight of many fine publications makes a strong case for specialized BW graduate courses and entire graduate programs that prepare students for careers centered on teaching and researching basic literacy education for adults. In fact, there is an ongoing interest in texts recommended for BW graduate courses. In April 2006, Lori Rios queried the CBW listserv about possible texts for BW graduate courses, and soon after posted a list of recommended books and journal articles on *CompFAQS*.² The book-length essays, research studies, and edited collections that currently appear on the list are these:

**Texts for Teaching Basic Writing in the MA Program
(Compiled by Lori Rios and posted on CompFAQS in May 2006)**

Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Gregory R. Glau, *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Basic Writing*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2005.

Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Susanmarie Harrington. *Basic Writing as a Political Act: Public Conversations about Writing and Literacies*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2002.

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1986.

- Bernstein, Susan Naomi. *Teaching Developmental Reading: Background Readings*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. (free professional resource; soon to appear in 3rd edition)
- DiPardo, Anne. *A Kind of Passport: A Basic Writing Adjunct Program and the Challenge of Student Diversity*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1993.
- Enos, Theresa, ed. *A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers*. New York: Random House, 1987.
- Fox, Tom. *Defending Access: A Critique of Standards in Higher Education*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1999.
- Gadsden, Vivian L., and Daniel Wagner, eds. *Literacy Among African-American Youth: Issues in Learning, Teaching, and Schooling*. 2nd ed. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 1995.
- Gray-Rosendale, Laura. *Rethinking Basic Writing: Exploring Identity, Politics, and Community in Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000.
- Halasek, Kay, and Nels P. Highberg, eds. *Landmark Essays on Basic Writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.
- Hill, Carolyn Ericksen. *Writing from the Margins: Power and Pedagogy for Teachers of Composition*. New York: Oxford UP, 1990.
- Horner, Bruce, and Min-Zhan Lu. *Representing the "Other": Basic Writers and the Teaching of Writing*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1999.
- Kells, Michelle Hall, and Valerie Balester, eds. *Attending to the Margins: Writing, Researching, and Teaching on the Front Lines*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1999.
- McNenny, Gerri, ed. *Mainstreaming Basic Writers: Politics and Pedagogies of Access*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.
- Moran, Michael G., and Martin J. Jacobi. *Research in Basic Writing: A Bibliographic Sourcebook*. New York: Greenwood, 1991.
- Mutnick, Deborah. *Writing in an Alien World: Basic Writing and the Struggle for Equality in Higher Education*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1996.
- Nathan, Rebekah. *My Freshman Year: What a Professor Learned by Becoming a Student*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2005.
- Rose, Mike. *Lives on the Boundary: The Struggles and Achievements of America's Underprepared*. New York: Penguin, 1990.
- _____. *Possible Lives*. New York: Penguin, 1995.
- Shaughnessy, Mina P. *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*. New York: Oxford UP, 1977.
- Soliday, Mary. *The Politics of Remediation: Institutional and Student Needs in Higher Education*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2002.

Sternglass, Marilyn. *Time to Know Them: A Longitudinal Study of Writing and Learning at the College Level*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997.

To this list, I would add these books:

Balester, Valerie M. *Cultural Divide: A Study of African-American College-Level Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1993.

Haswell, Richard H. *Gaining Ground in College Writing: Tales of Development and Interpretation*. Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1991.

Kutz, Eleanor, Suzy Q. Groden, and Vivian Zamel. *The Discovery of Competence: Teaching and Learning with Diverse Student Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1993.

Maher, Jane. *Mina P. Shaughnessy: Her Life and Work*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1997.

Nelson, Marie Wilson. *At the Point of Need: Teaching Basic and ESL Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, 1991.

Richardson, Elaine. *African American Literacies*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

As I write, more publications come to mind that would be useful for current and future basic writing professionals. However, even this partial list of publications suggests the breadth of topics in a rapidly growing field. And because its scholarship is both expansive and substantial, BW is well positioned to strive for heightened visibility in graduate education.

BW Graduate Courses of the 1980s

The idea of using existing and new graduate courses in preparing future teachers of basic writing is not new, not in our profession and not in the *Journal of Basic Writing*. Two earlier issues of the journal focused entirely on professional preparation for teachers (Spring/Summer 1981 and Spring/Summer 1984). Both *JBW* issues include essays on the role of graduate education in forming BW instructors. For example, Harvey Wiener, writing in 1981, argued that a stronger emphasis on “skills in literary analysis” in existing literature graduate courses offers the greatest potential for preparing “teachers of writing.” Special graduate courses for preparing teachers of basic writing are not warranted, Wiener concluded, due to the “dearth of hard data that would suggest the prototype of a full course of study” (8).

Wiener did, however, view continual writing in diverse genres to be essential professional preparation for aspiring teachers.

A more fully developed approach to the subject is offered by Lou Kelly's "Writing as Learning for Basic Writing Teachers and Their Students." Kelly describes a University of Iowa "seminar-practicum" that involves graduate students in writing about their own composing experiences, observing students' tutorials in a writing lab, discussing these writing lab observations with the writing lab director, and studying basic linguistic theories and research. While reflecting on their own experiences and observing tutorials, graduate students also practice reading student writing in highly participatory graduate seminars. Though developed more than twenty-five years ago, this curriculum is still a useful model for preparing teachers of basic writing and college composition.

Even more ambitious is an effort to revamp an entire doctoral program described by Joseph Comprone, who reports on doctoral curriculum revisions initiated at the University of Louisville to prepare future teachers of basic writing. These changes included a shift from a "remedial" pedagogical stance to a "developmental" perspective, which offered two advantages. First, instructors would be more inclined to acknowledge students' existing language competencies and literacy strengths when viewing students developmentally (rather than within a language deficiency frame). Secondly, the required emphasis on psychological theory would position the BW enterprise more solidly within scholarly goals of a doctoral program. This newly instituted focus on preparing basic writing teachers is summarized in three questions posed by Comprone:

- "What should basic writing teachers be able to do?"
- "What do basic writing teachers need to know?"
- "What kinds of practical experience should teachers of basic writers have?"

These questions would form the core of any program of study aiming to prepare future teachers of basic writing.

Contemporary BW Graduate Courses

Today, however, teacher preparation must share curricular space with other instructional goals and make way for new kinds of courses. No longer can *all* BW graduate courses afford to be focused exclusively on preparing

teachers. Contemporary graduate education must form future BW scholars, researchers, program administrators, *and* teachers. In addition to preparing students for specific professional roles, BW graduate courses should offer opportunities to study widely discussed issues surrounding such topics as students' rights to their own languages, teaching and learning standardized English, ideologies of language deficits and literacy skills instruction, mainstreaming first year college writing classes, writing assessment practices, writing and reading curricula for nontraditional adult learners, on-line instruction, and the implications of representing students as "remedial" or "basic" writers. BW graduate courses should also provide occasions for learning about adult education-community college transitional programs.

In order to learn about contemporary BW graduate courses, I posted a request for information on the CBW Listserv in Summer 2005. Responses were immediate and generous: colleagues from many different states wrote online and offline about studying BW as graduate students or teaching BW graduate courses. Some respondents reported that their graduate programs offered no specific BW courses, so they developed credit-bearing independent studies. Others wrote about graduate courses they had experienced as students or teachers. Karen Uehling sent a list of BW graduate courses she had previously shared on the CBW Listserv in 2004. Lori Rios compiled a new list of BW graduate courses, which she has recently uploaded on the *CompFAQS* web page alongside Uehling's original list.

Collective brainstorming on curricula for BW graduate courses caught fire and questions such as the following were posted by CBW Listserv colleagues:

- How does basic writing instruction at community colleges differ from basic writing instruction in senior colleges and universities?
- Are more basic writing courses offered in two-year colleges than in four-year colleges?
- How often are basic writing courses offered as part of composition programs with composition directors versus being offered in distinct basic writing programs with basic writing program directors?
- What sorts of textbooks, nonfiction books, and novels are currently being assigned for students to read in basic writing classes?
- What texts are available and potentially useful for BW graduate courses?
- What profiles or models of basic writing students have been invented?
- What sorts of expertise and knowledge do basic writing instructors need?

- What forms of graduate education should be provided for basic writing teachers?
- How well prepared are MA and PhD graduates for the political dimension of their work as teachers of basic writers? Are graduate programs educating students about the political nature of BW?

These questions suggest topics that could usefully be addressed in BW graduate courses. We can discover even more topics by reading the actual syllabi of professors who have offered such courses in master’s and doctoral programs.

After receiving syllabi from professors on the CBW Listserv and downloading all available syllabi posted on the *CompFAQS-Basic Writing Resources* web site, I had collected syllabi from ten BW graduate courses. Bruce Horner offered two different BW graduate course syllabi, so the work of nine professors is actually represented in this essay. The professors, their universities, and course titles are listed in the following table:

Ten BW Graduate Courses Offered in U.S. Universities from 2000 to 2005

Professor	College/University	Course Title
Linda Adler-Kassner	Eastern Michigan University	Teaching Basic Writing at the College Level
Shannon Carter	Texas A&M University-Commerce	Basic Writing Theory and Practice
Carolyn Handa	Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville	Basic and Developmental Writing
Bruce Horner	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	Basic Writing in History, Theory, and Practice
Bruce Horner	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	Rethinking Basic Writing: Critiques and Alternatives
Donna Nelson-Beene	Texas A&M University-Commerce	The Teaching of Basic and Developmental Writing
Thomas Reynolds	University of Minnesota	Developmental Writing and the College Student: Theory and Practice
Lynn Quitman Troyka	City College of New York	Basic Writing Theory, Research, and Pedagogy
Karen Uehling	Boise State University	The Theory and Teaching of Basic Writing
Mindy Wright	Ohio State University	Teaching Basic Writing

In addition to the courses listed here, nine additional courses are being offered in nine different universities, according to data presented on the *CompFAQS: Basic Writing* web site, a 1999 survey of Composition and Rhetoric doctoral programs (Brown *et al.*, “The Arrival”), and a 2004 survey on Composition and Rhetoric master’s programs (Brown *et al.*, “Mapping the Landscape”).³ All of the institutions where I have found *graduate courses explicitly focused on BW* being offered are public universities—which calls attention to the importance of institutional contexts for graduate programs. These contexts include not just the colleges themselves but the wider geographical regions and socio-cultural environments in which universities are located. BW graduate courses may well be more compelling in universities that have or once had open admissions policies—more often found in public, not private, institutions. They may also be found in universities that engage in dialogues/partnerships with community colleges, as in the case at Texas A & M University-Kingsville, where Lori Rios currently teaches an online graduate course called “Teaching Basic/Developmental Writing.” This new course is being offered in response to a community college department chair’s request for a course that can “certify” teachers of BW at his college (Rios, email). Similarly, Sugie Goen-Salter and Helen Gillotte-Tropp offer a two-semester course sequence (“Seminar in Teaching Integrated Reading and Writing”) at San Francisco State University, for graduate students who are currently employed or may soon find employment at one of the nine nearby community colleges (Goen-Salter, email).

The Need to Situate BW Graduate Courses Inside Local Contexts

In a discussion of institutional contexts and graduate programs, Richard Young and Erwin Steinberg argue that “a strategy of comparative advantage” is preferable to a one-size-fits-all approach in planning graduate curricula:

Every institution offers an environment in which some kinds of programs will do well and others will not; not all plants grow equally well in the same soil. Every institution has distinctive strengths and resources; a program that exploits them is likely to be stronger than one that does not. The effect of the assumption nationally is to diversify program design; not ‘one size fits all,’ but no one size fits all. We are arguing programs are not intrinsically desirable; they are more or less desirable, depending on their relation to their context.

What works well at Harvard may not work well at Carnegie Mellon or North Carolina State or Michigan Tech or City College of New York. And vice versa. *The assumption opens up the possibility that a school not considered among the elite might do some things better than Harvard* [emphasis mine]. (398)

In view of the “strategy of comparative advantage” approach to program planning, universities with basic writing programs, BW alternatives (e.g., mainstreamed first year writing programs), or community college alliances are likely sites for graduate programs featuring the study of basic writing.

A good example of a professor capitalizing on his own university context as a site for graduate instruction is Bruce Horner, who used the documents of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee basic writing program as primary sources for a course he has offered called “Basic Writing in History, Theory, and Practice.” In his syllabus, Horner explains,

The purpose of this seminar will be to investigate the strategic value and limitations of compositionists’ various attempts to define writing, students, courses, pedagogies and writing programs called ‘basic.’ Our aim will be to better understand and discriminate among these attempts, UWM’s own programs in basic writing, and composition generally. We will examine formative texts in basic writing scholarship, explore their relationship to our experiences as students of writing and writing teachers, and pursue projects in scholarship and teaching in light of these considerations. . . . To ground our exploration of the readings in the immediate context of UWM, I will . . . be introducing samples of UWM student writing, course materials, and institutional documents into class discussions for your consideration.

By combining institutional documents with published scholarship, Horner encourages students to locate their university’s courses in the environment of other first-year writing programs and related scholarship.

Horner continued using UWM to contextualize BW studies in a second graduate course, “Rethinking Basic Writing: Critiques and Alternatives.” As described in the syllabus, this course includes a particular focus on the criticisms of basic writing courses and alternate structures:

Reasoning the Need

In this seminar we will examine recent critiques of the formative institutional and theoretical work that has come to define ‘basic writing’ students, courses and programs, and we will consider recent alternative formulations of courses, programs, and pedagogies in light of these critiques, other scholarship, and our own experiences as writers and teachers of college-level writing. While the immediate, local impetus for offering this seminar is the place of basic writing in the current first-year composition program at UWM, the seminar itself will focus on the range of work critiquing and exploring alternatives to curricular and programmatic arrangements for basic writing nationwide.

The writing assigned in this course included both weekly response writing and a term project, which Horner describes as follows:

Your term projects should aim at making or evaluating a specific proposal about basic writing, loosely defined, in light of our examination of critiques of basic writing and proposed alternatives to it, and should ultimately take the form of a 20-25 page seminar paper in MLA format that builds on but extends your inquiry beyond the common readings and discussions.

In response to this assignment, Horner’s students worked collaboratively to develop a mainstreamed first year writing class, which UWM piloted in the academic year of 2004-2005. Horner describes the pilot and subsequent outcomes:

The mainstreaming project itself grew out of the work of the seminar as a whole, with virtually all members of the seminar, as well as the Assistant Director Vicki Bott (a lecturer), participating actively in making the proposal for the project to the dean (who had to approve the break from the curriculum, the money for staffing the new course, and the support for the 105 coordinator), developing the 105 curriculum, and rethinking that curriculum and the project as it progressed. . . . The seminar provided a cohort of us with a common vocabulary and sense of what similarly committed folks were doing elsewhere on which we could base our drafting of the proposal, development of the curriculum, and so on. (Horner, email)

Two of the students participating in this project offered a poster presentation of the class project at the 2006 4Cs in Chicago. When talking with these students (Dylan Dryer and Lisa Riecks), I was positively impressed by the clarity of their presentation and the success of the class project—already approved for continuation the following year at UWM. These two students “were very active in conducting the mainstreaming project at UWM, in part a result of having subsequently been appointed to be ‘105 Pilot Course Coordinators’” (Horner, email).

Local testing programs offer another context for BW graduate courses. To analyze political aspects of writing assessment, Shannon Carter references three standardized tests in her syllabus for a course offered at Texas A&M:

Political questions driving this course . . . include the following: What’s the history of, justification for, and function of state-mandated, high-stakes testing like the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS), the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP), and the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)? What are some of the political, economic, ideological, and social consequences of high-stakes testing, especially as those consequences define basic writing and basic writers? (Carter, English 776)

Since writing assessment programs of various kinds are often used to place students in or out of basic writing classes, thereby defining students as “basic writers” or “college-level writers,” their inclusion in graduate curricula seems desirable if not essential to the concerns of many BW graduate instructors and students. In fact, writing assessment has become such a specialized subject that a concentrated study of the subject would be particularly appropriate in a BW graduate course. Equally important are the consequences of using particular forms of assessment to screen students for remedial versus college-level courses. For instance, how does placement in a non-credit remedial course affect a student’s financial aid or that student’s overall economic investment in college—both by having to stay in college a semester longer, which may become necessary, and by a resulting loss of wages? These questions and many more related subjects should be addressed in graduate seminars that are preparing future composition/rhetoric professionals.

A third approach to grounding graduate student learning in local contexts is illustrated by Mindy Wright at Ohio State University. One of

several stated course goals is preparing students to teach introductory OSU writing workshops. Students enrolled in Wright's course were required to observe one writing workshop class four times, interview the instructor, and write an observation report. This ethnographic approach allows students to produce knowledge, not just absorb it from other people's scholarship, thereby bringing students closer to the research writing community.

The BW graduate courses designed by Horner, Carter, and Wright all require students to become researchers while studying BW scholarship. Taking this idea to another level, Linda Adler-Kassner has encouraged her students to publish their collaborative inquiry projects on the *CompFAQS Basic Writing* web site (Adler-Kassner: *CompFAQS/ Best Practices*). This idea of emphasizing student research suggests a potential need for two different kinds of BW graduate courses—one that focuses on teacher preparation and a second that emphasizes reading and writing research. Although not mutually exclusive, these *different* instructional emphases indicate that *two* BW graduate courses might usefully be offered within one master's or doctoral program.

For graduate students aiming to teach in two-year colleges, there should exist opportunities to specialize in issues centrally important to BW and TESL. Various forms of scholarship two-year college faculty can study and prepare to write are described in *Research and Scholarship in the Two-Year College*, a 2004 statement disseminated by the Two-Year College English Association (TYCA) of the National Council of Teachers of English. TYCA argues for expanding recognized definitions of research to include teacher research and applications of theory to teaching and learning practices.

Shaughnessy's Contributions to Graduate Education at CUNY

A little known aspect of Mina Shaughnessy's legacy is the graduate program that she initiated in the CCNY English Department. The MA in Teaching College English prepared instructors for newly created full-time lecturer lines at the City University of New York (CUNY) in the earliest years of open admissions at CUNY. Edward Quinn, CCNY English Department Chair from 1973 through 1976, describes the rationale for a pedagogy master's program as being closely tied to the newly hired BW instructors at CCNY and in all the CUNY colleges:

It was a pragmatic decision, determined by what was in operation at the time and by what we thought would be the case in the future.

We thought there was a place in the university for instructors who would specialize in and teach basic writing exclusively. There were at least thirty-five full-time basic writing lecturers in the City College English Department of the mid-1970s, eligible after their fifth year for a modified form of tenure, the certificate of continuous employment. (Quinn)

The proposed “pedagogy MA” sparked debate in the CCNY English Department. *Where would this degree be housed? What use was such a degree? Who would want it? What sorts of jobs were available?* (Laurence). These and other questions were discussed among faculty as they considered the proposed program. Perhaps the abundant full-time BW lecturer lines within CUNY helped persuade faculty and administrators that a full-fledged graduate study of subjects such as language, dialect, literacy, and pedagogy merited college sanction and resources. The newly approved program first appeared in the 1975-76 CCNY college bulletin. Ironically, just as this master’s program was getting off the ground, New York City experienced a profound economic crisis (highlighted by the *New York Daily News* headline “FORD TO CITY: DROP DEAD”) in which full-time BW faculty at City College as well as other CUNY colleges lost their jobs. They were a luxury no longer affordable by colleges that were closing entire programs and firing non-tenured (and some tenured) professors.

In addition to starting a new master’s degree, Shaughnessy offered to teach a course on basic writing at the CUNY Graduate Center. When a CUNY professor objected on the grounds that Shaughnessy lacked a PhD, Bob Lyons negotiated a yearlong team-taught “Colloquium on the Teaching of Writing,” which Lyons and Shaughnessy offered together. Among the invited guests were Sarah D’Eloia and Tom Farrell of City College, Marie Ponsot of Queens College, Carol Reed of Brooklyn College, Harvey Wiener of LaGuardia Community College, and from outside CUNY there were John Wright from Oxford University Press and Janet Emig, who discussed her ongoing composing process research (Maher 176).

The graduate courses that Shaughnessy designed and taught challenged accepted wisdom about appropriate subjects of research for English professors and topics for graduate-level instruction in the CCNY English Department as well as in most 1970s English departments. Rather than studying literature, literary criticism, or creative writing exclusively, graduate students could now supplement the existing English curriculum with courses on language, literacy, and pedagogy. In conjunction with these new areas

of graduate instruction, faculty and administrators had to be persuaded that teaching and learning were valid objects of inquiry for faculty employed in a department of English. This issue arose in English Department discussions of Shaughnessy's promotion to full professor, which was nonetheless approved by a vote of that body and at higher administrative levels in 1977 (Maher 224; Quinn).

The CCNY MA in Language and Literacy: 1985-2007

The MA that Mina Shaughnessy began in 1975-76 continued to offer courses despite her untimely death in 1978. Seven years later in September 1985, eleven students were registered in the MA in Teaching College English, considerably fewer than the 53 graduate students in creative writing and the 30 in literature.⁴ New leadership was needed for the pedagogy MA to reach its full potential, an assignment for which Marilyn Sternglass was hired in Fall 1985. Sternglass collaborated closely with newly hired English Education professor Cynthia O'Nore to create one master's program with branches in two divisions—the Humanities Division and the School of Education. With strong support from Humanities and Education administrators, Sternglass and O'Nore named this program "Master of Arts in Language and Literacy" and expanded its scope to include a secondary English teaching certificate in the School of Education and an optional emphasis in teaching English as a second language.⁵ The proposal for this new program, distributed to English faculty by Marilyn Sternglass in November 1985, offered a description of its professional orientation and potential student body:

The proposed MA in Language and Literacy is designed to familiarize present and prospective teachers with the major conceptual and pedagogical issues related to the teaching of literacy skills (i.e. reading and writing) to adult learners in secondary, college, or adult literacy programs. The MA takes as its underlying theoretical orientation the belief that literacy skills can be best understood as deriving from current understandings of language theory, cognitive theory, reading theory, and writing theory. Accordingly, the program begins with four core courses, one in each of the above listed areas (12 credits), as the central requirement for all participants. (Sternglass, *Proposal*)

The most unusual feature of this proposal was the notion that a single

master's program could offer language and literacy theory courses that would serve as a common foundation for multiple professional pathways. Unlike master's programs that prepare students for one primary career path, this MA would provide professional graduate education for students aiming to teach adults in secondary, college, or adult literacy programs (Sternglass, *Proposal*; O'Nore). The proposal was approved by a unanimous vote of the English faculty in December 1986.⁶

During Sternglass's administration (1985 through 1995), adult literacy instructors increasingly enrolled in the L&L MA, and in the 1990s Brooklyn College employed L&L graduate Anita Caref as Director of its Adult Literacy Program. With a full-time position and leadership role in the New York City adult literacy community, Caref called attention to the growing need for graduate level professional education for New York City's ABE and GED teachers, program administrators, and researchers. Her career showcased a specialization that might usefully be expanded within the MA program.

In recent years, however, lack of institutional support posed a real threat to this program. This should have come as no surprise: a program that prepares BW instructors would predictably come into question in a college that had just abolished all BW classes and students. It's no secret that in the year 2000, the City University of New York eliminated all remedial writing, reading, and math courses from its eleven senior colleges, of which City College is one (Gleason, "Remediation Phase-out"), and so benign neglect of a graduate program that prepares BW teachers might appear self-evident, even necessary. Equally problematic was the perception that the English Department MA in Language and Literacy program competed for scarce resources with a long-standing MA in Literature and a prestigious MA in Creative Writing.

Without question, there are challenges for any graduate program that features the study of basic writing and reading, teaching English as a second language, and adult literacy education. However, it is possible and well worth the effort to mount and sustain such a program. The CCNY MA in Language and Literacy has recently made a comeback in large part due to an alliance with an agency outside the college: the union-based Consortium for Worker Education (CWE), one of the largest providers of adult education in New York City. The Consortium's Executive Director, Joseph McDermott, saw a direct link between offering affordable professional education for adult literacy instructors in New York City and improving the quality of instruction at the Consortium for Worker Education. Responding to my appeal for support, he provided off-campus instructional space, tuition reimbursements, and

assistance from a CWE consultant, Irwin Polishook, who had just stepped down from a long tenure as President of the CUNY-wide faculty and staff union, the Professional Staff Congress (PSC-CUNY). With his political expertise and a particularly strong commitment to this project, Irwin Polishook participated in jump-starting the MA in Language and Literacy, which was admitting no students between Fall 2000 and Spring 2003.

With external support from the Consortium, internal support from many CCNY faculty and administrators, and a group of newly admitted graduate students⁷ the L&L MA came back to life on an experimental basis in Fall 2003 and was ultimately reinstated in June 2005.⁸ The newly reinstated program's curriculum reflects its present alliance with the Consortium for Worker Education by requiring all students to enroll in a course that addresses basic writing and reading instruction in pre-college and college environments. The remaining three core courses are Second Language Acquisition, Introduction to Language, and Theories and Models of Literacy. Students may develop individualized programs of study by enrolling in elective courses in areas such as TESL, adult education, sociolinguistics, autobiography, literature, or fiction/non-fiction writing. Most recently, a new elective, "Basic Writing Theory, Research, and Pedagogy," has been designed and taught by Lynn Quitman Troyka, former *JBW* editor and widely respected BW teacher-scholar. Troyka's detailed syllabus illustrates a curriculum that balances teacher preparation with learning to read and write BW scholarship. (See appendix.) This course was offered for the first time in Summer 2006 and will be described by Troyka in a talk at the 2007 4Cs in New York City. This is the first time that a 4Cs panel of speakers will address designing and teaching BW graduate courses.⁹

Online Resources for Developing BW Graduate Courses

For professors and program directors considering BW graduate courses for their own master's or doctoral programs, many online resources offer valuable information. The best primary source documents are sample syllabi that have been compiled and recently posted on *CompFAQS* by Karen Uehling and Lori Rios. A second online resource for learning about graduate curricula is the *Doctoral Consortium in Composition and Rhetoric* web site, which provides a survey of existing doctoral programs. Of special value is a third online resource, the *Conference on Basic Writing (CBW)* web site, which offers well-organized, up to date information on BW as well as directions for subscribing to the CBW Listserv. Equally important are the Listserv and

its subscribers—graduate students, faculty teaching undergraduate and graduate students, administrators, and scholars. Uehling’s richly textured historical narrative describes how CBW founder Charles Guilford “posted a sheet on a message board of the Washington Hilton” at the 1980 Conference on College Composition and Communication to solicit members for a fledgling organization that received initial advice and support from Lynn Troyka and eventually came to be known as the Conference on Basic Writing (Uehling 10). Today CBW is a highly participatory organization with many members who respond to queries and engage in online discussions.

BW professionals’ interest in Adult Literacy research is evident in the contents of the CBW web page, which hosts links to the National Institute for Literacy and the National Center for Adult Literacy. Also accessible on the CBW web site is a link to the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy report, *A First Look at the Literacy of America’s Adults in the 21st Century*. This research uses one common approach to study the English language prose literacy, document literacy, and quantitative literacy of adults (age 16 through 65 and older) whose literacy scores are analyzed by level of educational attainment, age, gender, and culture and classified by a system of four levels: “below basic,” “basic,” “intermediate,” and “proficient.” Not only is the survey comprehensive demographically but it also offers a historical comparison between a group of people studied in 2003 and a similar group studied by the same approach in 1993. This report illustrates the overlapping interests of ABE and BW professionals by assessing the literacy of people who have attained some high school education, a high school diploma, a GED, an associate’s degree, a bachelor’s degree, and a graduate degree.

Making a Place for Basic Writing in Graduate Programs

The Two-Year College English Association offers explicit advice on graduate education for future community college faculty in its *Guidelines for the Academic Preparation of Two-Year College English Faculty*. Among the suggested offerings are courses on theories of learning, including basic writers and literacy for adult learners (*Guidelines*). Despite TYCA’s call for specialized community college professional preparation, some university professors and doctoral students may view community college employment options as intellectually and professionally limiting. Others argue that graduate education for adult education professionals cannot be justified given that field’s over-reliance on volunteers and part-time teachers. However, these lines of reasoning beg the question of why *at least* nineteen BW graduate

courses are already being offered in universities all across the U.S. and why so much creative, carefully researched, often provocative BW scholarship continues to be published despite or perhaps because of reductions in funding and political support for basic writing programs in senior colleges and universities.

Resistance to including BW scholarship and entire BW courses in graduate programs might be interpreted as a common sense decision related to employment options or it might be seen as a new generation of “they don’t belong in college” gatekeepers who now offer a more subtle slogan: *the teachers of basic writers don’t belong in graduate school*. While literature and composition pedagogy courses are standard fare in English and English education graduate programs, courses on Basic Writing and Adult Literacy remain relatively obscure. The resulting exclusion of BW scholarship from graduate curricula perpetuates a tradition of employing poorly informed graduate students and adjunct instructors from other disciplines to teach classes that, ironically enough, require the most finely tuned pedagogical skill.

Basic writing also merits strong representation in composition and rhetoric graduate programs because BW has made important contributions to the field of composition/rhetoric as a whole. Writing assessment research gained prominence initially for the purpose of BW placement testing; innovative writing curricula were developed for BW courses that could also be used in college composition and advanced composition courses (Bartholomae and Petrosky); and one of the earliest longitudinal research studies (Sternglass) focused on the long-term experiences of students who initially placed into basic writing classes and whose future academic success was being called into question by critics of CUNY’s open admissions policy.

Neither the professional prestige nor the direct market value of a career can be the only factor in decisions about graduate curricula. Another approach to making decisions about graduate curricula is to consider the value a knowledge base may have for improving the opportunities and lives of individuals, families, and entire communities. The fact is that full-time employment opportunities *do* exist in community colleges, and adult education is a field much in need of more professionally qualified instructors, administrators, and leaders. Activist teacher-scholars such as those cited in this essay have opened up the BW field and pointed to a broad horizon of possibility. Graduate education can play a vital role in enabling us to apply reason to that need.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Edward Quinn for responding to multiple drafts of this essay and suggesting the title; the CBW as a whole and the Listserv participants who responded to my queries in Summer 2005; all the professors who made available copies of their syllabi; Bruce Horner, Karen Uehling, Lori Rios, and Lynn Quitman Troyka; Sydney Van Nort of the CCNY Cohen Library for assistance with institutional archives; and *JBW* editors Bonne August and Rebecca Mlynarczyk.

Notes

1. The Conference on Basic Writing Executive Committee sponsored a panel (“CBW at 25”) honoring CBW’s twenty-fifth anniversary at the 2005 College Composition and Communication Conference in San Francisco. Co-chaired by William Lalicker and Thomas Reynolds, panel speakers included Karen Uehling, Gerri McNenny, Greg Glau, Linda Adler-Kassner, and Barbara Gleason.

2. *CompFAQS* is a Wiki site that offers information on composition questions and research. A special site for basic writing includes two lists of BW graduate course titles and syllabi. The URL is <<http://compile.tamucc.edu/wiki/CompFAQs/Home>>.

3. The additional eight BW graduate courses are being offered at Ball State University, California State University-Los Angeles, California State University-Fresno, Miami University, California State University-San Bernardino, San Francisco State University, Montclair State University, and University of Louisiana at Lafayette. In addition, a few special topics courses on “teaching nontraditional students,” “teaching ESL writing,” and “teaching in community colleges” are listed in the *Rhetoric Review* surveys of master’s programs (Brown, Torres, Enos, and Juergensmeyer) and doctoral programs (Brown, Stuart, Jackson, and Enos). Steve Lamos, for example, offered a graduate course entitled “Teaching Composition in the Community College” at Illinois State University in Spring 2005.

4. Graduate student enrollments are recorded in the September 1985 CCNY English Department faculty meeting minutes.

5. CCNY Humanities Dean Paul Sherwin leant particularly strong support to the MA in Language and Literacy and to Marilyn Sternglass's administration of the program.
6. The vote is recorded in the December 1986 CCNY English Department Faculty Meeting Minutes.
7. Twelve students who began as non-matriculated graduate students requested and received permission to matriculate in the Spring 2004 term. All twelve of these students completed the program.
8. English Department Chairs Fred Reynolds and Joshua Wilner provided essential leadership for reopening the program in 2003 and securing official reinstatement status in 2005.
9. The other speakers on this panel include Lori Rios, Sugie Goen-Salter, and Helen P. Gillotte-Tropp.

Works Cited

- Adler-Kassner, Linda. *Best Practices. CompFAQS: Basic Writing*. <<http://compile.tamucc.edu/wiki/BasicWriting/BestPractices>>.
- _____, and Gregory R. Glau for the Conference on Basic Writing. *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Basic Writing*, 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005.
- A First Look at the Literacy of America's Adults in the 21st Century*. 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy, <<http://nces.ed.gov/naal/>>.
- Alamprese, Judy. Abt Associates, Inc. *Helping Adult Learners Make the Transition to Postsecondary Education*. November 2005. <<http://www.c-pal.net/papers/transition/transition6.html>>.
- Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 1986.
- Bernstein, Susan Naomi. *Teaching Developmental Writing: Background Readings*, 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007.
- Brown, Stuart C., Monica F. Torres, Theresa Enos, and Erik Juergensmeyer. "Mapping a Landscape: The 2004 Survey of MA Programs in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." *Rhetoric Review* 24 (2005): 5-127.
- _____, Rebecca Jackson, and Theresa Enos. "The Arrival of Rhetoric in the

- Twenty-First Century: The 1999 Survey of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 18 (2000): 233-73.
- Carter, Shannon. English 776: Basic Writing Theory and Practice. Course Description. University of Texas-Commerce. Summer 2004.
- Comprone, Joseph. "Graduate Programs for Teachers of Basic Writing: The University of Louisville's Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Composition." *Journal of Basic Writing* 3 (1981): 23-45.
- Conference on Basic Writing* Website Home Page. <<http://www.asu.edu/clas/english/composition/cbw/>>.
- Doctoral Consortium in Composition and Rhetoric*. Home page. 25 July 2006. <http://www.rhetoric.msu.edu/rc_consortium/>.
- Gleason, Barbara. "Remediation Phase-Out at CUNY: The 'Equity versus Excellence' Controversy." *College Composition and Communication* 51 (2000): 488-91.
- _____. "The Promise of Basic Writing." *College Composition and Communication Conference*, San Francisco. March 2005.
- Goen-Salter, Sugie. Email communication. 3 October 2006.
- Guidelines for the Academic Preparation of Two Year College Faculty*. The Two-Year College English Association of the National Council of Teachers of English. 4 November 2004. <<http://www.ncte.org/groups/tyca/featuredinfo/119956.htm>>.
- Horner, Bruce. Email communication. 28 July 2006.
- _____. English 754. Basic Writing in History, Theory and Practice. Course Description. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- _____. English 854: Rethinking Basic Writing: Critiques and Alternatives. Course Description. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Spring 2004.
- Kelly, Lou. "Writing as Learning for Basic Writing Teachers and Their Students." *Journal of Basic Writing* 3 (1984): 38-54.
- Laurence, Patricia. Telephone interview. 12 March 2005.
- Maher, Jane. "'You Probably Don't Even Know I Exist': Notes from A College Prison Program." *Teaching Developmental Writing: Background Readings*, 3rd ed. Ed. Susan Naomi Bernstein. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007. Reprinted from *Journal of Basic Writing* 23 (2004): 82-100.
- O'Nore, Cynthia. Telephone interview. 15 May 2006.
- Quinn, Edward. Personal interview. 20 June 2006.
- Research and Scholarship in the Two-Year College*. Two-Year College Association of the National Council of Teachers of English. November 2004.
- Rios, Lori. Email communication. 26 August 2006.

- Schell, Eileen E. *Gypsy Academics and Mother-Teachers: Gender, Contingent Labor, and Writing Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook: Heinemann, 1998.
- Sternglass, Marilyn. "Proposal for M.A. in English with Specialization in Language and Literacy." November 1985.
- _____. *Time to Know Them: A Longitudinal Study of Writing and Learning at the College Level*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997.
- To Ensure America's Future: Building a National Opportunity System for Adults: Strengthening Links Between Adult Education and Community Colleges*. Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy. New York. 9 February 2005. <<http://www.caalusa.org>>.
- Uehling, Karen. "The Conference on Basic Writing: 1980-2005." *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Basic Writing*, 2nd ed. Ed. Linda Adler-Kassner and Gregory Glau. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 8-23.
- Wiener, Harvey. "Preparing the Teacher of Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 3 (1981): 5-13.
- Wright, Mindy. English 811.02: Teaching Basic Writing. Course Description. Ohio State University. Winter 2000.
- Young, Richard E., and Erwin R. Steinberg. "Planning Graduate Programs in Rhetoric in Departments of English." *Rhetoric Review* 18 (2000): 390-402.

Appendix

**City College of the City University of New York
MA Program in Language and Literacy
Basic Writing Theory, Research, and Pedagogy
ENGL B8108, Section 2YY
Professor Lynn Quitman Troyka (LQT)**

Thursday, 6 July through Thursday, 27 July 2006
Lynn Quitman Troyka (LQT) e-mail: troykalq@nyc.rr.com
LQT's Administrative Assistant: Ida Morea

Official Course Description

How does “basic writing” (BW) differ, if at all, from garden-variety “writing”? How are basic writers (BWs) different, if at all, from other first-year writing students? To explore these and related questions, we will use a practical approach to debate the conceptual frameworks underlying theories of BW, including those of cognitive development (Vygotsky), critical literacy (Shor), psycholinguistics (Smith), and experiential models (Hillocks). We will critique the relative merits of qualitative and quantitative research designs, including those for assessing writing and drawing conclusions about effective BW pedagogy. We will craft cases and simulations for BW classroom use; analyze and share productive responses to provided samples of the writing of BWs; define our visions for potential research, conference presentations, and journal articles about BW; and write reflections on our readings and discussions. Each student will craft a pre-approved final project to explore or apply ideas related to the course.

Books: Selected Readings DON'T PURCHASE THESE TWO BOOKS. They're yours at no charge, courtesy of their publisher Bedford/St. Martins. I'll hand them out at our first class session.

Bernstein, Susan Naomi, ed. *Teaching Developmental Writing: Background Readings*, second edition. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004. [selected readings only]

Stahl, Norman A., and Hunter Boylan, eds. *Teaching Developmental Reading: Historical, Theoretical, and Practical Background Readings*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. [selected readings only]

Supplementary Readings

- A. from Dunn, Patricia A. *Talking Sketching Moving*.
- B. from Fox, Tom. *Defending Access: A Critique of Standards in Higher Education*.
- C. From Hillocks George. *Research in the Teaching of Composition*.
- D. from Smith, Frank. *Understanding Reading*, sixth edition.
- E. various by LQT re BW (NOTE: Please, please feel free to respond to these openly and honestly even though I wrote them.)

Weighted Elements for Course Grade

Participation 25%; in-class writings 30%; three special projects 45% total (see last paragraphs in section that follows)

The Spirit of Our Enterprise

This course consists of two concurrent strands. One supports our study of theories and research concerning BW. The second supports our concrete, often creative applications of those theories and that research to the BW classroom. My intention is to model, as much as is practical in our three-hour format, good teaching strategies for BW (and other writing) courses.

Never will I talk “at you” for the entire time. When I do, my goal is to pass along background information and set contexts. You’ll need to take notes because you’ll be drawing on them for in-class writings, group work, and your final course project.

Your robust participation in class and in groups will count for 25% of your final grade. I plan to engage you in organized, lively discussions and activities/projects that [I hope] are engaging. During these times, you’ll want to jot down notes so that you can draw on them for your in-class writings. (I’m rather a pro at getting everyone involved, so I promise that no one will dominate—on the flip side, this means that I’ll be inviting quieter folks into the conversation.)

In-class writings will count for 30% of your final grade. To start

each class session except the first, I'll hand out a 15-to-20-minute in-class writing prompt at 6:00 PM sharp. Anyone arriving after 6:00 PM sharp will not receive a prompt sheet—see “Attendance” below. The prompts ask you to demonstrate that you've read the assigned readings and are able to think reflectively about them and how they relate to the prior class session(s). I'll talk more about “reflective thinking” in our first session.

To end each class session, I'll hand out a 5-to-10 minute prompt for an in-class writing. They ask for you to react specifically and honestly to the class session or other issues related to our work together. One function of these writings is to help me plan productively for the next session. At the end of each writing session, I'll collect your work. Between classes, I'll respond to, but not grade, your writings.

Combined, three special projects to hand in will count for 45% of your grade, as follows:

A. DUE START OF FIFTH [LATER EXTENDED TO SIXTH] CLASS, JULY 20, 2006. A written simulation/role-playing scenario, composed according to guidelines explained and demonstrated during the third class session. We'll start these in class. Double space required. 10%

B. DUE START OF SIXTH CLASS, JULY 25, 2006. Annotated bibliography of 10 articles not read for class work: 20%

You can take five articles from the two required books, as long as they're ones I've not assigned and are related to our topics. Please take the five others from the *Journal of Basic Writing*, the *e-Journal of Basic Writing*, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, and others that I approve in advance as long as the articles relate specifically to BW.

NOTE: Each annotation must consist of four elements.

Double space required.

1. Complete bibliographic entry for the article (MLA style preferred; APA okay).
2. Summary, with no commentary, of the article.
3. Synthesis—this means blend it in with topics from our class work and our assigned readings. This is a crucial part of each annotation. We'll discuss “synthesis” in class.

4. Your response to the article.

C. DUE START OF SEVENTH CLASS, JULY 27, 2006. A three-page (750-words or so) final reflection paper. Be prepared to read aloud yours and discuss. (I estimate 750 words to be about three double-spaced pages of 250 words, if in 12 point Times New Roman.) Double space required. 15%

Details of class sessions

1. Thursday, July 6 Topics: Introductions and distribution of materials. Topics: Defining Basic Writing (BW); identifying Basic Writers (BWs); structures of BW programs in post-secondary institutions; applied psycholinguistics and its relation to theories of reading and reader response for BWs

2. Tuesday, July 11 Topics: Conceptual frameworks: theories of cognitive development in relation to BWs; alternative theories of reading/approaches to text, critical thinking, and related metacognitive applications for BWs

3. Thursday, July 13 Topics: Experiential models (Hillocks) for teaching/learning; participation in a demonstration simulation/role-playing scenario; start of writing project due fifth session

4. Tuesday, July 18 Topics: Theories of Multiple Intelligences (Dunn)

5. Thursday, July 20 Topics: Reading and responding to BW's writing; evaluating research (especially about grammar teaching); role of grammar(s) in BW

6. Tuesday, July 25 Topics: The politics of BW (Fox)

7. Thursday, July 27 Topics: Sharing of Reflective papers (see assignments) and survey of books about BW