This essay and the teaching externship it describes grew out of our attempt to respond to gaps in two-year college English instructor preparation, particularly in basic writing, at Metropolitan Community College in Omaha, Nebraska.

The authors are English faculty members at Metropolitan Community College (MCC) in Omaha, Nebraska. We were hired as full-time English faculty members in 2009. We were told that at least half of our teaching load was to be in developmental or basic writing. Neither of us had any graduate coursework in teaching developmental writing or in teaching at the two-year college. In 2012, Darin Jensen decided to pursue a PhD at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln with hopes to investigate the history of basic writing and teaching in the two-year college primarily because of the gaps he discovered in his own preparation to be a teacher. At the same time, Susan Ely became the coordinator of basic writing at our institution and had many of the same questions. Like many teachers, she had taken an introductory course for teaching assistants that provided graduate students a light overview of composition theory and pedagogy; however, none of the readings had anything to do with basic writing or teaching in the two-year college.

When we were hired, neither of us was aware that basic writing was its own field of study with a body of knowledge and best practices. Eventually, we took on administrative roles where part of our duties were to hire part-time professionals; soon we found that our lack of knowledge about basic writing and teaching in two-year college contexts was present in the pool of teachers from which we were hiring, too. This problem led us to design and implement an externship partnership with the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO) in basic writing so could address these gaps in our local context.

Over the last four years we designed and implemented a teacher development program with graduate students that encompasses theory and practice of basic writing in a co-teaching model. Currently, the graduate students receive credit in the form of an independent study. As part of the course, the students receive classroom experience similar to a K–12 student teaching model. The externship includes co-teaching, lesson planning, grading, and working through a developmental writing
course side-by-side with an experienced instructor. We offer this model as one that demonstrates a way to build a program that meets the need of community colleges in hiring qualified instructors, that prepares graduate students for careers beyond graduate school, and that helps universities make important reforms in graduate programs to move beyond merely replicating scholars for research institutions. The conception of this model was to guide students in acquiring knowledge and experience that the authors had gained as practitioners but had not gained in preparation for this profession.

We designed the program around basic writing because there was an exigent need for qualified instructors who simply did not exist. At our institution, we are able to find many instructors experienced with first-year writing, even though those instructors almost always lack knowledge of the institutional, instructional, and student contexts of the community college. We hasten to add that we know all too well that two-year college faculty are expected to teach other developmental courses such as reading courses and learning skills courses without adequate graduate preparation or professionalization. We lament that fact and know that it is an important area of study. However, that work, while important and worthwhile, is beyond the scope of this essay.

We believe that our problem is a common one. For example, Holly Hassel and Joanne Baird Giordano tell readers in “Occupy Writing Studies” of the difficulties faced by new instructors at the community college. They note the “adjustment to teach this student population” as well as the areas in which the instructors were trained presented significant challenges (134). Hassel and Baird Giordano argue that more scholarship is needed from “open-enrollment institutions” to provide the knowledge base these teachers need (134). This call is not new. In 2001, Jo Ann Buck and MacGregor Frank wrote that “graduate level preparation for community college teaching was deficient in the early 1970s” (241). They located the problem in the disconnect between the mission of the community college and the graduate students’ preparation, lamenting that it was no surprise that teachers were underprepared, giving this disconnection (241).

When we began, we saw the externship as merely meeting our local need, but we believe the model also enters into and draws attention toward a national need. Further, we designed this program to be activist in nature. We strongly believe that the lack of teacher preparation for the profession of two-year college English instructor, and for the discipline of basic writing in particular, is a disadvantage to the two-year college students who are often underrepresented and underprepared students. It is also disadvantageous to graduate students who are left without adequate professional preparation. Here we draw on Patrick Sullivan for inspiration. In “The Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar-Activist” he eloquently argues that teachers in
the two-year college engage in the noble work of democratizing American higher education (327). We believe that training teachers for the important context of open admissions institutions makes that work possible.

Background

When we began our externship program in 2012, we did not look to the literature for other models. We created our model wholly out of what we could get our institution and UNO to agree to do. However, as we began to revise the program, we looked for models of professional preparation to inform our work. Unfortunately, such models are rare. Holly Hassel’s review of 239 issues of TETYC from 2001 to 2012 bears this out. Her project took as a starting point a 1999 article that outlined future research areas at the two-year college. Using that frame, she found that authors in the journal had “directly addressed [. . .] identity and technology” and had produced “notable essays [. . .] for research, advocacy, or professional service” (346–47). Hassel goes on to identify areas in need of serious representation—noting that in more than a decade of articles in the flagship journal of two-year scholarship “just 8 of 239 (3 percent) of articles address preparing future faculty to teach in the two-year college, including a group of five professional documents,” and that none of those articles were formal studies (355). This finding affirmed both our and our colleagues’ lack of preparation to teach in the two-year college as being widespread. TETYC is not the only site for such scholarship, but even sources such as the National Association for Developmental Education (NADE) or the Journal of Basic Writing have paid scant attention to this issue. This fact emphasizes what we take to be Hassel’s point: there is a serious gap in the research and scholarship of teacher preparation in our profession.

Moreover, as we examined the literature, we found that this gap was systemic and historic. Ellen Andrews Knodt, in “Graduate Programs for the Two-Year College Faculty: History and Future Direction,” locates the cause of this problem in universities’ orientation toward graduate education, noting difference of status with the mission of teaching giving them “almost by definition” an “inferior status” in higher education (125).

A decade later, a Two-Year College English Association committee authored the “TYCA White Paper on Developmental Education Reforms” wherein they also take up this gap in training and preparation. The committee offers “recommendations for national disciplinary organizations,” which include a call to encouraging graduate programs to provide preparation for “two-year college teacher scholars” (Hassel et al. 228). The Modern Language Association recognizes this gap as well in its 2014 Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature. In it the writers argue against the “narrow replication” of scholars and for more substantive training in teaching. The document mentions community colleges as a career option more than once. From reading these documents, we can see there is an awareness across English studies that the community college is an important site of work and that training for that profession is lacking.
To this point we believe it is imperative to add attention to basic writing preparation as well. In her 2006 article “Reasoning the Need: Graduate Education and Basic Writing,” Barbara Gleason found fewer than twenty graduate courses in teaching basic writing across the country. To put this into some context, the American Association of Community Colleges’ 2015 Fact Sheet reports that more than 12 million students attended community college in 2014 and that this number represented 46 percent of all undergraduates (AACC). The National Conference of State Legislatures in its report on remediation found multiple studies showing more than 50 percent of community college students are placed in a remedial or developmental class (Bautsch 1). At Metropolitan Community College, 48 percent of our incoming students placed into developmental writing (see Appendix B on the TETYC website). If we take these figures, we might guess that half of students entering community colleges took a developmental writing course. If that is true, then millions of students begin in developmental writing courses at community colleges every year, and very few courses or programs exist to prepare faculty to serve these students successfully. Gleason highlights these high stakes, noting that “basic writing’s central mission merits the attention of every professional in composition and rhetoric” because basic writing advocates for “student access to higher education” (49).

We believe that this lack of teacher preparation is systemic. In fact, just one issue of TETYC, March 2001, is devoted to future faculty training. In that issue there are four articles “discussing teacher training for future faculty members” (Reynolds). Further, in her research, Gleason found just two issues of the Journal of Basic Writing “focused entirely on professional preparation for teachers (Spring/Summer 1981) and (Spring/Summer 1984)” (50). At the time we designed our program, resources like the 2001 issue of TETYC were unknown to us. Even if we had these resources, the fact is that they are between fifteen and thirty-five years old. Clearly, the lack of preparation and historical context for two-year writing teachers is emblematic of the invisibility of two-year college teachers’ work. Works like W. Norton Grubb’s Honored but Invisible and Barbara K. Townsend and Susan B. Twombly’s Community College Faculty: Overlooked and Undervalued attest to this at both the level of graduate preparation and two-year institutional attention to teaching. In particular, Grubb points out in his study that we have very little idea of what a teacher really looks like in the community college. He tells his readers that “there’s almost no information about what teaching looks like in the ‘teaching college’” and that the teaching has “never been the subject of sustained analysis of what happens or why it looks as it does” (11). Townsend and Twombly put the invisibility Grubb describes into context, noting that “there is little discussion of preparation programs and even less discussion of skills,” and that what there is seems to be “ad hoc and uncoordinated” (42). To this we would add what community college professionals already know: two-year colleges serve the largest portion of first-generation students, the largest
number of minority students, and the largest number of students who come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. This fact speaks to our mission as a profession. To that point, Mark Reynolds and Sylvia Holladay-Hicks wrote in their preface to *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*: “the two-year college is uniquely American: No other institution of higher education is dedicated to fulfilling the educational needs and goals of all the people in the community” (vii). With that mission in mind, and with the notion that the access for millions of unprepared students to engage in democratic education, civic involvement, and greater economic agency being at stake, we began to attempt to meet this need by designing a program that fit our local exigencies.

**Externship Program**

We choose the word *externship* here because the word is defined as experiential learning opportunities, similar to an internship, provided by educational institutions to give students short practical experiences in their field of study. We choose the term, too, because Gregory Cowan, a scholar who spearheaded some of the earliest thinking and writing about training programs for community college faculty, suggested the term in a 1971 *College Composition and Communication* article. We rejected the term *apprentice* because of its problematic hierarchical nature. When we decided on the externship model, we turned to our contacts at UNO to gauge their interest. UNO has an MA in English with about fifty graduate students in the department at any one time (Christensen). Many of these graduates go on to teach at MCC, and more than half of our full-time faculty have graduate degrees from the university. We felt because of this existing connection that they would be interested in a partnership. We were also aware of an earlier failed apprenticeship model. In speaking with their English faculty, Dr. Tammie Kennedy noted that UNO’s graduate students “often don’t have a deeper understanding of the needs and challenges of community college students, as well as the pedagogical issues, especially basic writing and ESL” (interview). After we met with the faculty at the university, we were all amenable to the program and saw its worth.

Our difficulty arose from the fact that there was no system in place to facilitate the partnership. What we settled on for our first year was a scheme wherein the interested graduate students would take an internship course at the university where we served as the site of the internship. This proved to be a problematic model because the graduate students were not really interns, but were student-teachers. Further, the model was problematic because the graduate students did not produce a paper or academic project. In the subsequent years, Dr. Kennedy at the university took the students on in an independent study. In this version, the graduate students created a portfolio of the teaching materials they had co-created and used while in the externship, as well as a teaching philosophy aimed at a community college audience and a new CV. We found this model more useful for students. Dr. Kennedy works with us at the end of the semester to determine a grade for their externship.

Dr. Kennedy receives no financial remuneration for this work. She found that the work is difficult to categorize in terms of quantifying it as part of her work-
load and “affects compensation and/or how the work counts in terms of teaching/scholarship/service,” which is a significant and enduring issue (interview). An early reviewer of this manuscript suggested that we have a memorandum of understanding with the university, but such an agreement would not provide a solution for how this work should be counted. The truth is that community college teaching, because of its low value in the university, is a hard sell. We also found little support from our college. Even though the authors were essentially mentoring, co-teaching, and facilitating discussion on the theory and practice of teaching writing, no release time was made available for this work. We were able to negotiate a $500 stipend as compensation. We make this point not to elicit sympathy, but to demonstrate the difficult realities of inter-institutional work and of making institutional and systemic change. Ironically, while we were attempting to facilitate this experience for the graduate students, we were also learning how difficult it was to actually create such a partnership and have the work valued.

We designed the program so that we could engage with the externs in a series of readings beginning in January and then co-create the syllabi for the class. Following that, the graduate student would co-teach with the instructor during the spring quarter at the community college. Since the university is on a semester system and the college is on a quarter system, we employed the two-month difference to have four meetings to discuss a series of readings. We designed the teaching program so that the graduate students would have the theory first and then engage in teaching. The time commitment for the externs is quite extensive. Each graduate student had to be in class with the instructor for all forty-four contact hours during the quarter, the discussion meetings were more than two hours each, there were twenty-two preparation hours (one before each class), and attendance was required at a minimum of one grading session, which accounted for approximately four hours. The total time commitment for the program approached approximately eighty hours. Like a student-teacher/practicum teacher relationship in K–12 preservice teacher preparation, this externship provided guided practice and side-by-side mentoring for the novice teacher. What follows is an in-depth look at facets of the program.

**Readings**

As we said, the graduate students read four sets of readings to provide them with background and theories about teaching in a basic writing classroom. We attempted to divide the readings thematically. Our choices were based on privileging background information for the graduate students on the different issues they would encounter in their classrooms. For the first meeting in each of the years, we have had the students read Mike Rose’s *Lives on the Boundary*. From the second year on, we added Burton R. Clark’s “The ‘Cooling-Out’ Function in Higher Education” to the first meeting. We feel that Rose’s work provides one of the best and most accessible narrative introductions to the students and issues in developmental education, while Clark’s essay, even though it’s dated, provides an important counterpoint to the promise of developmental education in Rose’s book. When these works are in
conversation, it allows the students and the facilitators to have a discussion about the nature of developmental education. In some years, we have also added a portion of Mary Soliday’s *The Politics of Remediation*. This work demonstrates the artificial and cyclical nature of remedial education and who is classified as remedial. Putting her introduction and first chapter into conversation with Rose’s discussion of historical levels of literacy early in his book is a revelation for the graduate students, as it was, frankly, for us when we first encountered it.

In the first year, we relied almost totally on Susan Naomi Bernstein’s *Teaching Developmental Writing*, which is a comprehensive resource we’ve found useful in introducing teachers to developmental education because it provides a broad background that gives an important historical context. We also used other texts such as Rose’s. One of our reviewers noted that many of the readings we used were out-of-date. Part of the “datedness” of the readings came from our ignorance of up-to-date sources as we began the work on this program; however, a significant reason for keeping readings that are out-of-date is that they provide a historical contextualization of the work that we do—thus, we believe, grounding teachers in the discipline.

In each of the years we have given attention to ESL students and the special concerns that they bring to our courses because they make up a significant part of our student population. At our institution, nonnative speakers and generation 1.5 students are often tracked into developmental coursework for a variety of reasons. Authors such as Ilona Leki, Dana Ferris, and Ann Johns offer essential contexts for framing and responding to the teaching and writing of these students. Another important theme for us in the readings was the working-class or first-generation student. We found Adrienne Rich’s essay, “Teaching Language in Open Admissions” to be an excellent way to begin talking about teaching our students. This year we are using an even larger section of Patrick Finn’s book *Literacy with an Attitude* because we want to talk more about the notion of educating students in their own best interests. The graduate students responded positively to these kinds of essays because the readings were new to them—in a sense the essays revealed a new perspective. The reading lists for two of the four years of the externship are included in Appendix A (found on the TETYC website). We have included the lists because we believe they offer a genesis of a reading list for graduate students and new professionals in the two-year college. We believe, too, that it is worth comment to say that the reading list is a demonstration of the interdisciplinary nature of being an instructor in the community college.

Teaching in a two-year college requires familiarity with composition, reading, ESL, andragogy—the method and practice of teaching adults—class studies, and more. We wanted to be sure to have some history of higher education so that the externs could understand how public thinking about higher education influences their work and realize that the history of community college students, and of basic writers in particular, has been tumultuous at times. These lists represented just the barest framing for our graduate student partners. The graduate students themselves responded very positively about the breadth of the readings. For example, Bobby
felt the readings “reinforced the need to consider the whole student,” while Emily told us in her interview that the readings “enabled me to have a deeper understanding of diverse student populations and the practice of teaching itself.” Jean related that the “readings and the following discussions often caused me to reflect on my previous teaching experiences as well as my present classroom approach.” From their responses, we are hopeful that we’ve helped them begin to think about this work in ways that enhance their teaching practices and the learning of their future students.

**Course Planning and Teaching**

Another facet of our externship was our attention to course and lesson planning. Both of us met with our graduate student partners to design a syllabus and a general assignment sheet. Nearly all of the graduate externs had been TAs, but they had had little preparation in syllabus and course design beyond the ubiquitous TA practicum. Sitting down, discussing the objectives of the course, scaffolding assignments, discussing a reasonable workload were novel experiences for them. Interestingly, engaging in the reading and discussion caused us to engage in reflection about our syllabi as well. In this way, we’ve added essays to our syllabi which we were unaware of until these discussions with externs. In addition to planning the syllabus together, the externs met with us for an hour before each class to go over the lesson. Afterward we spent another hour reflecting on the class that we had just taught. The graduate students found this experience to be immensely valuable. We hasten to add that we have become more reflective teachers as a result. We say this because the process of sitting down and articulating each curricular choice caused us to question and look at those choices anew.

For our part, we teach the first section of MCC’s developmental English class as a dialectical classroom. We are focused on developing literacy in an integrated reading and writing model. Therefore, we privilege vocabulary acquisition, close reading, summary, explicit instruction, and discussion as we negotiated meaning with the students. These exercises scaffold into response assignments that roughly follow the process model of composition. Further, to increase the knowledge base of students, we use themed readings for the entire term. We use different themes in our classroom, with one of us using narratives such as Sherman Alexie’s *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* and Sandra Cisneros’s *The House on Mango Street* and the other using Immaculée Ilibagiza’s *Left to Tell Discovering God amidst the Rwandan Holocaust* and other readings. We built our classes around themes—the theme in my class is schooling and identity, for example—because our college is divided into several campuses, and each campus has a distinctly different student population. We read, write, and discuss in every class. Importantly, we write with our students and had our externs do the same. Writing with the students allows us to experience the work and show ourselves doing the work, which is something that we’ve discovered is often unfamiliar to our students. Essentially, while we are co-teaching with the graduate student externs, we are modeling such behaviors as writing with the students, lesson planning, and reflection that we have come to believe are the hallmarks of effective teaching in a developmental classroom.
A note about our curriculum: we are aware that there is a current trend to use more nonfiction and expository texts, perhaps largely growing out of the Common Core. One of the reviewers of this manuscript wanted us to address our choice of narrative texts here. What we can say is that we pick texts that are engaging for our students. Further, *The House on Mango Street* and *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* have allowed Darin to explicitly discuss the process of literacy, schooling, and identity. Susan’s use of the memoir, while narrative, allows students to build knowledge of a subject, in this case the Rwandan genocide. We’ve allowed our experience and our students’ engagement to drive our text selection.

**Grading Writing**

Another facet of the program that was novel to us was the co-assessing of student work with the graduate student extern. For at least one major assignment, and a small number of lower-stakes assignments, the graduate student and the authors read, commented on, and assessed work together. Darin had attended an MA program that used a portfolio system while he was a teaching assistant, so he was accustomed to reading student writing and coming to a consensus. Susan didn’t come from a portfolio system and had only done a small bit of norming. This experience allowed us to come to terms with Bernstein’s assessment that “students in basic writing need to practice writing full-length essays and can learn to understand rules of grammar, syntax, and style in rhetorical terms” (ix, quoting Micchiche). In our classes, since we eschew skill and drill pedagogy, we choose to concentrate on grammar in the context of writing increasingly complex summaries and responses.

Neither we nor the graduate students had any experience with co-assessing assignments. This experience allowed us to establish and discuss our hierarchy of concerns in assessing writing, how we triage issues, how and why we write the comments that we do, both marginal and terminal, and why we make our determinations. For example, with a set of responses, Darin and one of the externs each wrote a terminal comment on the essay. After the writing, they discussed why they emphasized what they did in the comment and then discussed how it might be heard by the student. It is an experience that both of us wished we had had when learning to teach, and one that all of the externs responded to positively in the program. And just as with the co-teaching, the act of drawing attention to our own assessment and commenting strategies helped us better rationalize and understand many of the choices we make in evaluating student work. We found that we all relished the intense relational experience of grading together. And while...
far too time-intensive to ever do on a regular basis, it is a practice we would like to research further.

Reflection and Outcomes

Finally, we want to hear the voices of our externs. We interviewed them for this project with an IRB-approved set of questions. We are using pseudonyms. In their interviews, all of the respondent graduate students felt the experience has positively affected their teaching. Bobby wrote that he learned “how to teach and talk with diverse classrooms,” which has “in turn allowed me to give more students freedom through language.” Emily emphasized another aspect of practice, noting that she has “dedicated more time to reflections” and feels “more confident in my teaching and in addressing issues that come up in class with students.” Powerfully and gratifyingly, Jean asserted that her very definition of teaching had changed as a result of the program:

I have learned through experience that for a student to be successful in attaining any writing goal, I have to meet them where they are in their writing experience. I have learned that students often have different definitions of success than I do, and I have come to accept this and help them accomplish whatever goal they have in the time they are in my class. I now understand teaching is not just teaching; it also means being a confidant sometimes, a counselor on other days, a coach or a cheerleader on others. I would define a writing teacher as one who provides guidance, instruction, and coaching throughout the stages of the writing process to help students become better thinkers, better writers, and better citizens. A teacher is someone who helps students discover their own agency and voice and helps them understand how to harness the power of that voice to be an effective agent of change.

Jean describes eloquently both the level of confidence and understanding that we desire in the preparation of future two-year college teachers. Bobby touched on this in his interview, too, noting that his previous “pedagogical practices were a sort of cobbled together mess of means I had picked up from watching successful teachers over the years,” and that the work of the externships provided “direction, theory, development, and implementation.” From these comments, it is clear that the program of coordinated reading, discussion, and co-teaching felt successful and satisfying to the participants. Bobby reported that his teaching evaluations after the program in his TA-ship as the university were markedly higher, too. At the very least, we believe our model provides direction and confidence for the novice teacher, which is a welcome change when compared to the overwhelming feelings other instructors describe in the literature (Fisher; Hassel and Giordano).

Importantly, too, in an age where adjunct employment has become the norm and full-time instructorships are a rare commodity, we want to say that three of the four externs in the first two years have found full-time employment, with the other going on to further study. Emily was an interview finalist twice before getting a full-time instructorship at a community college. She had a full-time position
within two years of graduating and reported that she felt much better prepared for her interviews, especially with her ability to talk about the mission and purpose of community colleges. Jean is a non-tenure-track writing instructor at her university and has been a finalist for full-time community college positions as well. Nancy has a job teaching ESL in the community, and this is exactly the job for which she hoped the externship would prepare her. Obviously, these cases are so small in number that it would be unwarranted to draw large generalizations from them; however, most of the adjuncts at our community college spend years being adjuncts, and these few teachers who had the externship experience seemed to do markedly better in getting to later stages of the interview process.

**Conclusion**

The externship program is continuing this year with one student. We hope to grow the program in the future. However, given that the work is a serious time commitment, and that the systems of the university and the college require finding tactics that allow for minimal compensation for the instructors, and that we haven’t found a way to pay the externs for their work yet, it would be overly generous and optimistic to call this program sustainable and replicable at this time. We see our program as a serious and needed reform for the gross lack of training that universities provide to graduate students, many of whom will go on to be community college instructors. We know that we join the TYCA authors in the challenge of being college faculty who are often called on to make changes in persistence and completion “with little time for study and without training and compensation” (227). We know that we share the conclusions of the MLA report calling for better and more attention to teaching preparation, too. The task force calls on graduate programs, specifically doctoral programs, to “Strengthen teaching preparation,” noting that “as a central component of doctoral education, preparation for teaching should include course work, practical experience, and mentoring. Pedagogic training should introduce students to the diverse missions, histories, and demographics of a wide range of institutions” (2). In our externship, we see ourselves providing that mentoring and also pedagogical and, frankly, andragogical training. However, the systems of the university, and we imagine most graduate programs, are not designed in a way that invites highly skilled two-year college practitioners to teach and be recognized in the university system. Ideally, one of the facilitators of a program like ours would be employed and compensated by the university, able to assign the grade for the independent study or course that the student is taking. Only then will sustainable bridges be built that will help graduate students move into professional teaching lives in community colleges in more substantive ways.

---

We see our program as a serious and needed reform for the gross lack of training that universities provide to graduate students, many of whom will go on to be community college instructors.
We believe, to draw on Sullivan again, that programs such as ours help to “deliberately frame our professional identity, in part as activists—accepting and embracing the revolutionary and inescapably political nature of our work,” and that, in Sullivan’s words, “this activism might, in fact, require some front-line, in-your-face political work as we seek to create positive change in our communities and on our campuses” (327–28). Our program, while local and small, is an example of activism that challenges how we prepare our graduate students and demonstrates how we might accomplish this work one institution at a time.

**APPENDIX A—SAMPLE GRADUATE STUDENT READING LISTS FROM THE EXTERNSHIP PROJECT**

### 2013 Reading List for Teaching Developmental Writing
#### Author 1 and Author 2 Facilitators

**Texts:**

#### January 29—Introduction
- Mike Rose. *Lives on the Boundary*.

#### February 14—Who Is the Basic Writer?
- Jane Maher. “‘You Probably Don’t Even Know I Exist’: Notes from a Prison College Program”
  - Pages 56–71 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*
  - Pages 73–82 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*
- Valerie Kinlock. From “Revisiting the Promise of Students’ Right to Their Own Language: Pedagogical Strategies”
  - Pages 40–55 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

#### February 25—Thinking about Assessment
- Dana Ferris. “One Size Does Not Fit All: Response and Revision Issues for Immigrant Students”
  - Pages 83–100 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*
- Patrick L. Bruch. “Interpreting and Implementing Universal Instructional Design in Basic Writing”
  - Pages 164–174 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*
- CCCC. CCCC Position Statement on Assessment.
  - Pages 391–400 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*
March 15—Literacy
Glynda Hull and Mike Rose. “‘This Wooden Shack Place’: The Logic of an Unconventional Reading.”
Pages 246–259 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Barbara Gleason. “Returning Adults to the Mainstream: Toward a Curriculum for Diverse Student Writers.”
Pages 214–238 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Pages 191–205 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

April 5—ESL and Generation 1.5
Ilona Leki. “Reciprocal Themes in ESL Reading and Writing.”
Pages 121–143 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Yu Ren Dong. “The Need to Understand ESL Students’ Native Language Writing Experiences.”
Pages 370–380 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Beth Hartman and Elaine Tarone. From “Preparation for College Writing.”
Pages 381–389 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

May 10—Program Structures
William B. Lalicker. “A Basic Introduction to Basic Writing Program Structures: A Baseline and Five Alternatives.”
Pages 15–25 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Karen Uehling. Creating a Statement of Guidelines and Goals for Boise State University’s Basic Writing Course: Content and Development.”
Pages 27–38 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

2016 Reading List for Basic Writing Apprenticeship
January 15, 1:30–3:30 PM—community colleges, the work, and the profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rose</td>
<td><em>Lives on the Boundary</em></td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYCA</td>
<td>Guidelines for Preparing…</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton R. Clark</td>
<td>“Cooling-Out” Function…</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 29, 1:30–3:30 PM—developmental writing and remediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Bernstein</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Purple book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Rich</td>
<td>Teaching Language…</td>
<td>Purple Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rose</td>
<td>Remediation…</td>
<td>Purple book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 12, 1:30–3:30 PM—ESL writing and writers
Dana Ferris and Michael Hedgecock Ch. 1 and 2 PDFs
Ann Johns Socioliterate Approaches PDF
CCCCC Statement of Second Language Writing and Writers Web

February 26, 1:30–3:30 PM—class and education
Patrick Finn Chapters 1–12 Book

Spring classes begin on March 10th, so you will have to arrange a time to develop a syllabus with your partner instructor.

Books to be bought:
Rose, Mike. Lives on the Boundary
Finn, Patrick. Literacy with an Attitude

APPENDIX B—INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
A. Questions for the Participants in the Program
1. Did the apprenticeship program help you become a more reflective practitioner in the classroom? Please explain.
2. Did the apprenticeship program help you become a teacher-scholar? Please explain.
3. Did the apprenticeship program help you to better understand diversity, including ethnic diversity, socioeconomic diversity, and diverse ability learners? Please explain.
4. Did the apprenticeship program help you build better pedagogy to serve students? Please explain.
5. Did the apprenticeship program help you to ground your teaching in theory and research? Please explain. I would also be interested to know here if you felt that there were gaps present after the apprenticeship or if the apprenticeship pointed you to any new areas of research inquiry?
6. Did the apprenticeship program help you to develop curriculum either on your own or collaboratively? How was/is the curriculum developed different than other curriculum you had previously developed?
7. Did the apprenticeship program help you to serve your college and community or perhaps help you see how you might serve your college and community differently? Please explain.
8. Did definitions of teaching change for you because of the apprenticeship program? If so, can you explain how?
9. Would other members of your graduate school cohort have been helped if they had taken this program? If yes, how would they have been helped?
10. Would you recommend that this kind of apprenticeship be a part of the mandatory course of study or a track in a graduate program? Will you please explain your answer?
11. After this experience, do you see the mission of higher education differently? Please explain.

12. What about the apprenticeship attracted you to it?

13. What were the best aspects of the apprenticeship?

14. Did you feel that the apprenticeship provided preparation in theory, practice, and research that you would not have otherwise gotten in your graduate program? Please explain.

15. If you are working in higher education now, did the apprenticeship give you knowledge and skills that made you better prepared for the position? Please explain.

16. What did you learn about higher education policy and the politics of education during the apprenticeship?

B. Questions for the Teacher-Facilitators of the Apprenticeship Program

1. What were your goals and outcomes for the apprenticeship? Why did you choose them?

2. After facilitating the apprenticeship, how has your own teaching changed, if at all?

3. Did you have an opportunity to engage in an apprenticeship like this when you were a student? If not, would you have if it had existed? Please explain.

4. Why did you found the apprenticeship?

5. What does the apprenticeship provide that a traditional graduate assistant teaching position cannot? Please explain.

6. What did you teach the students about the community college, institutional contexts, and other items that might fit under the notion of higher education politics?

7. What components did you include in the apprenticeship? How did you prioritize them in your work with the apprentice?

8. What were your guiding principles for your work with the apprentice? Why did you choose those principles? For example, did you think it particularly important to demonstrate a student-centered classroom, or that explicit instruction was important?

9. How did engaging in and facilitating the apprenticeship aid in your professional development as a teacher? Please explain.

10. What were the challenges of the apprenticeship? Scheduling? Institutional support? Please explain.

C. Questions for the Faculty Sponsor of the Apprenticeship Program

1. Why did you think this was an important program to bring to your institution?

2. Can you describe your experience with community colleges?

3. What do you think the typical faculty member’s experience is with community colleges in your department and institution?

4. Did the program aid in your students’ professional development? Please explain.

5. Is there a need to address preparation for teaching in the two-year college or teaching basic writing in your department?

6. How has that need been traditionally met?

7. How would this need be ideally met?

8. If you had the opportunity, would you have all graduate students engage in a teaching experience apprenticeship like this one? Please explain.

9. What were the challenges in sponsoring this apprenticeship experience? Were they academic? Institutional? Financial? Please explain.
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