CHAPTER 11.

SOMETHING GAINED: THE ROLE OF ONLINE STUDIOS IN A HYBRID FIRST-YEAR WRITING COURSE

Mary Gray

University of Houston

In a 2013 policy brief titled "First-Year Writing: What Good Does It Do?," the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) argues for the relevance of first-year writing courses in light of the contemporary push to accelerate the student college experience through more online instruction, dual credit courses, MOOCs, and other non-traditional alternatives. Research cited in the NCTE brief supports conclusions that first-year writing (FYW) contributes to outcomes of retention, rhetorical knowledge, metacognition, and responsibility, all important for institutions and student development, and as the brief suggests, all at risk if current trends continue. The authors argue that the traditional first-year writing experience is uniquely suited to producing these outcomes and that "none of the alternatives can provide the sustained attention to developing the habits of mind and strategies fostered in FYW" (2013, p. 14).

Despite NCTE's strong evidence for the value of traditional first-year writing courses, institutions continue to move rapidly toward new modes of online course delivery. Recent data suggest that approximately one-third of college students are now enrolled in at least one online course, and administrators believe that number will grow over the next five years to include a majority of students (Allen & Seaman, 2013, p. 20). Reasons for this institutional wave, or what David Brooks (2012) has called "the campus tsunami," range from budget-driven cost and efficiency concerns to student needs for more flexible learning environments. The field of composition, long engaged in the theory and praxis of online writing environments within a traditional class, has acknowledged this wider adoption of online course delivery with its own recent statement of best practices for online writing instruction (Conference on College Composition and Communication, 2013).

The hybrid writing class, which blends face-to-face and online instruction, now holds growing acceptance as an effective alternative to the traditional classroom. In an overview of the current state of online writing instruction published

in the field's flagship publication, *College Composition and Communication,* June Griffin and Deborah Minter (2013) report the field seems "poised to pivot, along with the rest of higher education" (p. 140) to broader adoption of online and hybrid, or blended, classes. Writing studio methodology, shown to be effective in face-to-face settings, may also have a role to play in transposing writing classes to fully online or hybrid spaces. With its pedagogical emphasis on sustained interactive support, writing studio methodology should hold promise for online adaptation, as a vehicle for both retaining essential outcomes of first-year writing and responding to institutional pressures for alternative course deliveries. In this chapter, I introduce a model for integrating online Writing Studios into a hybrid first-year writing course and point to ways the model supports those outcomes NCTE warns might be compromised or lost entirely in the online landscape.

OVERVIEW OF THE UH HYBRID/ STUDIO-SUPPORTED MODEL

As the result of a successful pilot project in 2010/2011, first-year writing students at the University of Houston (UH) have the option to enroll in a hybrid first-year writing class supported by a fully online Writing Studio. The University of Houston, a public institution of approximately 40,000 students, serves a student body whose demographics reflect the city's broad diversity. Over three-quarters of the student body live off campus, and a majority of those students report being employed during the academic year, therefore making the hybrid format an attractive option to help balance the complicated demands of work and commuting (*U.S. News & World Report*, 2014). To fulfill core communication requirements, students currently enroll in a two-semester sequence of first-year writing taught largely by English Department teaching assistants enrolled in graduate programs of literature, creative writing, or rhetoric/composition/pedagogy. Both first-year courses feature a rhetorical approach, emphasizing expository writing in the first semester and argument in the second, culminating with a substantial research-supported argument at the conclusion of the second semester.

In fall 2010, the Department of English, in partnership with the UH Writing Center, initiated first-year writing classes in the hybrid format with online Writing Studios as an integral part of the class. Offered in addition to traditional face-to-face classes, the hybrid/studio-supported classes addressed needs of students, graduate student instructors, and administrators by 1) creating flexible scheduling for the large commuter student population, 2) training graduate instructors in hybrid pedagogy and delivery, and 3) relieving scheduling pressure for overcrowded classroom space. Students meet once a week in the traditional

face-to-face classroom setting, led by either faculty or experienced TAs, with the remainder of the class conducted in the university's course management system, Blackboard. The online portion of the class consists of two components: 1) online instructor-directed activities such as blogs, journals, quizzes, or discussions; and 2) regular participation by all students in an online Writing Studio space conducted through the discussion board function in Blackboard. Depending on individual course plans for the week, students might engage in one or both of these online spaces.

GUIDING THEORY AND SCHOLARSHIP

The UH model draws from theory and research of online writing instruction (OWI) as well as studio theory and practice. As writing programs continue adopt and evaluate hybrid classes, researchers are increasingly finding learning in a hybrid class equivalent to that of a traditional class. Researchers at Brigham Young University found that student writing in a hybrid first-year writing course compared favorably with student writing in the face-to-face courses and concluded "the hybrid format did not damage student learning; if anything, it made their writing more consistent" (Waddoups, Hatch, & Butterworth, 2003, p. 278). In terms of student perception and writing outcomes, the hybrid can represent a successful balance between fully online and face-to-face formats (Sapp & Simon, 2005; Young, 2002).

To provide ongoing support for the writing process, instructors and Writing Center partners envisioned transposing Grego and Thompson's theoretical and practical model of the studio thirdspace (2008) into the online portion of the hybrid class. In the Studio model, drawn from theories of place and space (Reynolds, 2004; Soja, 1996) as well as Burke's (1960) conception of "scene," small groups of students, with guidance from a trained facilitator, mutually engage with their developing ideas and texts. As Grego and Thompson outline, Studios do not entail end-stage editing or even the traditional peer review sessions writing instructors commonly practice, but constitute a more organic "safe house" (2008, p. 74) where alternative power relationships and student-centered conversations resist institutional scripts and make possible unexpected, generative student counterscripts (p. 23). Because Studios meet students at all stages of the writing process and transpire over time, they also offer a place for thinking about ideas, and more importantly, for thinking about how to think about writing, and as such, might be a site to further support emerging metacognition outlined in the NCTE brief.

Unlike Studio's theoretical constructs, theoretical perspectives guiding OWI are best understood as a range of relevant possibilities. Hewett and Ehmann

(2004), in their guide for OWI instructors, convincingly advocate a position where instructors and writing program administrators may call upon varied approaches and "ground their practices *fluidly* and eclectically in more than one theory" (p. 54, emphasis in the original). Depending on instructional goals, theories underpinning any effective pedagogical approach—social constructivism, expressivism, post-process, critical pedagogy—can inform a successful online writing class (Hewett, 2014, p. 197). Most relevant to the hybrid/studio-supported class, however, are the perspectives of social constructivism and expressivism.

OWI scholarship has its strongest ties to social constructivism (Hewett, 2010; Hewett & Ehmann, 2004), which posits that language, knowledge, and even identity are constructed through a dialogic interchange between the individual and her social context (Bruffee, 1984, 1986; Fulkerson, 2005; Halasek, 1999; LeFevre, 1987). Composition theory continues to emphasize contextual meaning-making in collaborative settings where students become co-creators of knowledge, whether through small group activities, peer reviews, or publishing their texts online. The collaborative small-group exchanges online are a natural embodiment of social constructivist tenets and offer opportunities for conversations and community building unique to the studio experience. Research further suggests, and the NCTE brief argues, connections made in the writing class can keep students engaged and enrolled (Braxton, 2000; Tinto, 1997, 2000).

For both OWI and online studio methodology, important elements of expressivism—assigning primacy to the writer's individual thoughts, expressions, and development—also inform pedagogy, particularly the foundational work of Peter Elbow in *Writing without Teachers* (1970) and Donald Murray's (1982) practices for reaching and teaching the student writer's "other self." As Grego and Thompson (2008) point out, Elbow's work has a natural affinity with Studio's emphasis on small groups of writers engaged with their texts and each other through ideas, drafting strategies, and reflections (p. 51). In their epilogue to *Teaching/Writing in Thirdspaces*, Grego and Thompson (2008) mention Elbow's own support for the role of studio interactions in diffusing frustrations student writers face when encountering new settings and unfamiliar academic expectations (p. 206).

Christopher Burnham, in his bibliographic work on expressivism, further cites student interactions as a central strategy of expressivist pedagogy which "employs freewriting, journal keeping, reflective writing, and small group dialogic collaborative response to foster a writer's aesthetic, cognitive, and moral development" (2003, p. 19). In the online instructional setting and in online studios, where these dialogs take place textually, Hewett and Ehmann (2004) explain expressivism's relevance to OWI: "Both traditional instruction and OWI engage in the expressivist approach through a focus on higher level concerns

(HLC) over lower-level concerns. OWI teaching interactions question and prod writers to dig deeper into an idea and to consider the implications of what they think" (p. 57). Studio methodology encourages facilitators and group members alike to model this practice.

The UH pilot project further drew on scholarship of teaching online in a hybrid setting. First, the planners looked to the work of Scott Warnock (2009) to conceptualize how the online portion of a hybrid class might be designed and to determine what resources and tools could be employed for class-related online activities and online Writing Studios. Warnock's reliance on asynchronous message boards for much of the online portion of his class also rests on the social constructivist theory expressed by Bruffee (1984; 1986) as well as theorist M. M. Bakhtin who found the "dialogic response" key to "active and engaged understanding" (Bakhtin, cited in Warnock, 2009, p. 68). The message board schema Warnock describes—giving students a two-part obligation for primary and secondary posts, with an accompanying two-part deadline (2009, p. 82)— also meshed with plans to require hybrid studio group members to post their ideas or drafts-in-progress and then solicit responses from peers. Through studio participation and other class online activities, multiple online writing opportunities might offer students a "complexity of audiences" (Warnock, 2009, p. 70) and a deepening sense of rhetorical situations. In their discussion of the current state of OWI, Griffin and Minter (2013) also stress the importance of "structuring occasions through which a group of students learns to work productively together on writing and responding to writing across the span of the course" (p. 150). Warnock further cites studio methodology as contributing to a "continuous writing environment [that] makes it ever possible for students to learn through their own work" (2009, xii).

Second, as a guide to developing online studios in a hybrid setting, research on a local model was already in place. In 2009, the UH College of Technology, in partnership with the Writing Center, adapted the principles of face-to-face writing studios for online delivery in an upper division hybrid quality improvement methods course. With guidance from undergraduate Writing Center facilitators, students in the methods course followed the post/response framework outlined in Warnock (2009), posting ideas or work-in-progress by a certain date/time, then responding and continuing the online conversation until the studio's end date/time. Students received regular online studio support throughout the semester on multiple writing assignments. Michelle Miley (this volume) details this model's development using Paul Butler's concept of "countermonument" as a metaphor for studio's capacity to disrupt institutional norms and open generative spaces. Her reflections, encompassing instructor, facilitator, and Writing Center partner perspectives, trace the trajectory of UH online Studios.

At the end of the semester, researchers assessed the technology methods class by 1) measuring student attitudes toward writing and the online Studios and 2) evaluating student writing samples with a holistic rubric. Results were compared across semesters to a previous class conducted without writing studio support. Comparative results showed significant improvement in student attitudes toward confidence and competence in writing as well as a willingness to revise their work (Kovach, Miley & Ramos, 2012, p. 376). In terms of writing performance, students in the studio-supported class scored one rubric level higher on the final assignment than students without studio support (Kovach, Miley & Ramos, 2012, p. 376), prompting the researchers to conclude online studios "[were] associated with improved student performance and enhanced perceptions about the writing process" (p. 380).

SHAPING THE UH HYBRID/STUDIO-SUPPORTED CLASS

The UH hybrid/studio-supported class was therefore created through a marriage of theory and scholarship surrounding both hybrid writing instruction and Writing Studio. Aurora Matzke and Bre Garrett (this volume) draw on the notion of bricolage to describe how new studio programs spring from raw materials tied to local contexts. To define new programs, partners engage in a recursive process of adapting existing concepts and practices through "uptake," while clarifying through "not talk" what the program should not include. In Matzke and Garrett's terms, the UH partners approached the project as bricoleurs, fortunate to have positive materials for "uptake" while identifying elements to avoid through "not talk." As instructors began the pilot semester, they began by transposing or, in Warnock's terms, "migrating" (2009, p. xiii) familiar course plans to the new format with an important revision arising from "not talk" surrounding the course arc. Students had been asked to write three major argumentative essays, with the third being a "substantial research essay" normally unconnected to the first two essays. Instructors agreed that focusing on a semester-long research process, rather than the traditional end-of-semester researched argument, would better suit the hybrid format and thus adopted a theme-based syllabus that made research the primary motive for the course. To enact a more recursive process of writing and research, the assignment sequence led from topic development to exploration to annotated bibliography to final research-supported argument. This plan allowed students time for false starts, revisions, and reflection, enabling the reiterative research and writing process to develop over time, particularly within the online studio groups. Within the context of a theme-based class, students might share sources, or point struggling researchers to appropriate databases, or question other writers at the level of ideas or conclusions.

STUDIO PROTOCOLS

Along with developing the research-based arc of the course, the online Studio structure took shape following Grego and Thompson's model. Aside from taking place online, however, the UH model departed from Grego and Thompson (2008) in two important aspects. First, logistics at the project's inception required locating the online writing studios within the discussion board function of the Blackboard course shell; therefore, the Writing Studio could not be fully "outside but alongside" (Grego & Thompson, 2008, p. 22) the writing class. Additionally, unlike students in Grego and Thompson's Studios, who were drawn from multiple sections of basic writing, all students in each hybrid section are divided into small online studio groups and interact only with classmates who are working on the same assignments.

As students begin to work on major assignments, the online studio space provides ongoing support for the drafting process over the course of two or three weeks before each major assignment due date. In the studio group, students asynchronously post messages and drafts of their work to a small group (five to six students) of their peers, developing ideas, synthesizing their ideas with others, revising their work, and responding to peers' works-in-progress. Importantly, as a means to foster continuity and community, students remain with their same studio group throughout the semester. In the pilot year, groups were facilitated by undergraduate facilitators who studied group facilitation and writing pedagogy under the supervision of Writing Center staff. Table 11.1 summarizes this model.

Table 11.1 Structure of the hybrid/studio-supported writing class

Course Component	Component Description
Face-to-Face Class (1 day per week)	Traditional face-to-face instructor-led activities, e.g., lecture, group activities, individual student presentations, in-class peer review
Online Class Activity (Blackboard)	Weekly instructor-directed online activities, e.g., online blogs, journals, discussions, quizzes, instructor-created or outside videos, research activities
Online Writing Studio (Blackboard)	Additional writing support in facilitator-guided online Writing Studios. Small groups of students (5-6) asynchronously post and respond to each other's works-in-progress during a week-long studio session (2-3 studios per major assignment; 6-8 studios per semester).

Online Writing Studios are scheduled in two- or three-week cycles; for example, Studios 1-A and 1-B, each lasting one week, might precede the due date for Major Assignment One, followed by Studios 2-A, 2-B, and 2-C supporting Major Assignment Two. Table 11.2 provides a fuller description of the week-long studio process, as presented to a hybrid class meeting face-to-face on Tuesdays.

Table 11.2. Sample online studio pattern for hybrid students in a face-to-face Tuesday class

Day(s) of Week	Studio Activity
Tuesday-1:00 p.m. *Class Day*	Studio opens. Check out your facilitator's message; see where the discussion will begin.
Wednesday-11:59 p.m.	You should be engaged in the studio discussion.
Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday	Keep reading the group's ideas, questions, drafts, frustrations, successes, and responses; answer questions, provide guidance, feel sympathy, and respond thoughtfully; follow up with any new questions, revisions, or additional comments you have. Your facilitator will be responding, too, and guiding the conversation. More talk = better studio. Studio content depends on your needs.
Monday-11:59 p.m.	Conversation for this studio ends. Your facilitator will open a new studio tomorrow at 1:00 p.m.

The weekly pattern would be the same for a class meeting on another day. Studios begin on the face-to-face class day and end at 11:59 p.m. the night before the next face-to-face class. Students receive the studio schedule, along with all assignment due dates, as part of an in-class orientation by Writing Center staff and facilitators. At this session, students also have a one-time opportunity to meet their facilitator in person. The studio pattern was inspired by a facilitator who suggested the metaphor of a vortex to describe how Studios should whirl about, always circling back as they move forward. Students have dates and times to engage with thoughts, ideas, or drafts, then a date and time for the conversations to cease, regroup, and continue. Studios pause briefly between the close of one studio and the beginning of the next; the conversation takes a small collective breath, and then whirls on.

While engaged in studio conversations, students assume dual roles of writer and responder, and must fulfill both responsibilities to receive full studio credit. In the writer role, each group member accesses the facilitator's opening

comments and general guidelines, available on the discussion board at the day/ time Studio begins, then posts ideas or work-in-progress by a deadline. Acting as responder, each writer replies online to all other members with comments, questions, or suggestions by a deadline. The facilitator also acts as a responder to each writer, encouraging further discussion with questions and comments. In a productive studio session, asynchronous conversation will continue over the course of the week with students responding, asking follow-up questions, or submitting revised work, always guided by the facilitator.

For facilitators and students alike, sustaining a dynamic online dialog comes with challenges as well as opportunities. For example, the linear arrangement of Blackboard's discussion board appears to march down the page in a vertical list of posts requiring multiple clicks to open, thus preventing the conversation from appearing spontaneous and circular. To mitigate this effect, facilitators, following the advice of Hewett and Ehmann (2004) to "respond as a reader" and "ask probing questions" (p. 79), focus on turning the conversation back to students. Illustrating this practice is the following sample response from a facilitator to a student who had found a new, more credible source: "[Student name], it's wonderful that you're considering the credibility of your sources in the context of your ethos in the paper. Excellent work there, and it sounds like you've found some much better sources with this more specific research question. Now, can you tell us how you'd answer your research question? What's your tentative thesis?"

Questions like these may spur further response from the student and lead to additional comments from other students. Such questions can also facilitate brainstorming activities or prompt students to clarify assignment prompts for the group. Because students remain in their same studio groups for the entire semester, they may become more comfortable with each other and more willing to engage in conversation. Facilitators, with their own responses to student writing, can model productive commentary and highlight possible revisions for the group.

While the asynchronous online conversation can pose challenges, for some students it can offer distinct advantages and opportunities. Although the online Studio lacks face-to-face immediacy, it affords time for students to think more carefully about posts and responses. For some students, having time to "compose" makes the process less daunting. Mark Warschauer (1997), for example, has reported increased participation in computer-mediated language classes, especially among students who might hold back from class discussions. Because computer-mediated environments allow time to compose and distance to respond, he explains, they have the capacity to be "more equal in participation than face-to-face discussion, with those who are traditionally shut out of discussions benefiting most from the increased participation" (1997, p. 473).

Also important to note are opportunities for studio groups to see each other

in the face-to-face portion of the hybrid class. In face-to-face studio models where students are drawn from different classes (e.g., Grego and Thompson's model), students might not know or interact with each other outside the studio setting. Students in the UH model, however, have chances to meet each other during class time. While studio conversations are purposely kept out of the face-to-face class to preserve studio boundaries, instructors will sometimes use studio groups to organize other in-class, small-group collaborative activities, thus giving studio groups a chance to reinforce their relationships.

THE INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR RELATIONSHIP

In this model, the instructor/facilitator relationship differs from the more familiar instructor/TA relationship in that studio facilitators are not directly responsible to the instructors. Facilitators remain under the supervision of a senior Writing Center staff member who acts as buffer and conduit between facilitator and instructor. Instructors, therefore, do not guide facilitators in the same way they might if facilitators were present in the classroom or explicitly carrying out the instructor's wishes online; however, all parties work to maintain communication without compromising the integrity of the studio's safe thirdspace. Instructors meet regularly as a group and share syllabi, prompts, and brief class plans with the Writing Center supervisor, who then distributes them to facilitators. Facilitators also participate in regular group meetings in the Writing Center to compare experiences, raise questions, and discuss pedagogical approaches. Twice during the semester, instructors join these meetings to interact one-on-one with their facilitators.

Teaching in this model requires a good deal of surrender, since the instructional team works in partnership to create a positive learning environment. Expectations and practices are laid bare, and because much of the teaching and learning process occurs within Blackboard, they are permanently archived. The transparency of processes and pedagogies, however, can create a productive opening for student learning and the opportunity for "interactional inquiry," described by Grego and Thompson (2008) as the intersection of inquiry and action made possible by the collaborative studio environment (p. 22). However, as Miley (this volume) explains, a studio partnership with an English department reveals an inherent tension surrounding authority over writing instruction, that is, whether instructors can cede the writing ground to facilitators. She correctly asserts that the Freudian "rage to cure" is strong among writing teachers, who must allow themselves to let go and trust students' studio experience creates a different but equally valuable opportunity to develop their thinking and writing.

STUDENT VOICES FROM THE PILOT YEAR

At the conclusion of the pilot year's fall and spring semesters, students were invited to participate in a voluntary, anonymous survey designed to assess student attitudes and beliefs concerning items related to course goals. The survey contained both closed-ended items on a five-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree; 5=Strongly Agree) and open-ended short-answer questions that allowed students to more fully describe their feelings toward the class. Closed-ended items on the survey targeted three important concepts: 1) student attitudes toward confidence in writing; 2) student attitudes toward the hybrid format; and 3) student attitudes toward the role of the online Writing Studio. Because online studios comprised a significant portion of the class and students participated in multiple studios for each major assignment, the studio experience necessarily shaped student perceptions of writing, the hybrid format, and the Studios themselves.

Closed-ended Likert Scale Items

An analysis of the survey suggests students left the course with a positive assessment of all three targeted concepts. Table 11.3 shows the mean responses for the three targeted concepts along with the average reliability co-efficient (Cronbach's alpha).

Table 11.3. Descriptive statistics for individual targeted concepts fall 2010/ spring 2011 end-of-semester surveys

	End of Semester Fall 2010 (N=122)		End of Semester Spring 2011 (N=106)		Average Reliability Co-efficient*
Targeted Concepts	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**α**
Confidence in Writing (4 items)	3.89	.860	3.83	.861	.87
Attitudes toward the Hybrid Format (4 items)	3.92	1.030	3.82	1.094	.83
Attitudes toward the Writing Studio Method (6 items)	3.88	.890	3.89	1.003	.90

Note: * Cronbach's alpha

Table 11.4 reports the items associated with the target concepts for each semester, as well as the percentage of students who indicated agreement. In the actual survey, items were shuffled to appear in random order.

Table 11.4. Summary of individual items arranged by targeted concept showing percentage of students responding "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"

Targeted Concept/Survey Item	Fall 2011 (N=122)	Spring 2011 (N=106)
Confidence in Writing (4 items)		
I am confident in my writing ability.	72.1%	71.6%
I can easily find meaningful things to say in my writing.	70.5%	68.9%
I can easily express what I want to say in my writing.	64.8%	59.4%
I am confident writing for my university courses.	77.9%	76.4%
Attitudes toward the Hybrid Format (4 items)		
The hybrid class makes managing my schedule easier.	82.8%	74.5%
I prefer hybrid classes to traditional face-to-face classes.	57.4%	57.5%
The hybrid course format is as effective as a traditional face-to-face format.	66.4%	62.3%
Students can learn the same amount in a hybrid class as in a face-to-face class.	76.2%	65.1%
Attitudes toward the Writing Studio Method (6 items)		
The writing studio discussions keep me connected to the class.	79.5%	77.4%
The writing studio group helps me become a better writer.	61.5%	63.2%
The writing studio provides valuable feedback throughout the writing process.	78.7%	72.6%
The writing studio gives me an audience to develop my ideas.	79.5%	77.4%
I am more likely to revise my writing after feedback from the studio group.	75.4%	74.5%
Responding to my studio group helps me improve my own writing.	67.2%	67.9%

The results illustrate a consistency between the two semesters, with the greatest area of agreement on items associated with the online Writing Studios. Responses also indicate students feel confident in their writing, a belief shown to make "an independent contribution to the prediction of writing outcomes" (Pajares, 2003, p. 145) and view the Writing Studio as a place to interact with an authentic audience and receive constructive feedback. Students further reported they are likely to revise after studio feedback, a finding in line with results in Kovach, Miley, and Ramos (2012). Karen Gabrielle Johnson's data (this volume), based on a studio-supported writing/service learning class, also demonstrate Studio's role in building confidence and a willingness to revise. Her findings, which

also show facilitators' influence on student learning, suggest the Studio method can yield positive results across different contexts.

Responses linking online Studios with a connection to the class are especially relevant considering the NCTE brief and research into the relationship between the freshman classroom and student persistence. The NCTE policy brief stresses the role of first-year writing courses in "fostering engagement (a sense of investment and involvement in learning) along with persistence" (2013, p. 13). The first-year classroom has further been singled out by researchers as the site where student engagement begins and institutional ties are formed (Tinto, 2000, 1997). Moreover, connections made in those classroom communities have been shown to be "reliable predictors of student persistence" (Braxton et al., 2000, p. 569).

OPEN-ENDED SHORT ANSWER ITEMS

While a majority of responses indicated agreement on the survey's targeted concepts, it was not possible on the scaled items to gauge why students might have agreed or disagreed. The following open-ended short answer items allowed students to more fully express their attitudes toward their writing processes, the hybrid format, and the online Studio method. Analyzing responses in light of the NCTE brief suggests the online Studios reinforced important elements of the first-year writing class. Responses, however, also point to places where the online space created barriers and sites of dissatisfaction.

How Did Your Writing Practices in this Class Differ from Other Composition Classes You Have Taken?

When prompted to discuss how their writing practices in the hybrid class differed from other composition classes they had taken in either college or high school, 75% of respondents in fall and 69% of respondents in spring pointed to elements of the online Studios as making a positive difference in their experiences. Most frequently mentioned were creating multiple drafts, staying on task through the online writing obligations, and increased confidence in writing. Another emerging theme highlighted the communal nature of writing, as expressed by the following student:

> In other composition classes, you only focus on your own
> writing and follow the teacher's prompt in your own thought,
> so sometimes in the writing process, you don't know that if
> you are on the right track toward the goal of the assignment.
> But in this class, I get to view other's writing and others give

> me feedback on my writing during the writing producing stage. This helps me to know if I am on the right track in the writing, and I get to receive others' ideas, not just my ideas.

The student emphasizes the difference between composing as a solitary writer and being part of a collaborative process, signaling the value of shared texts with the phrase, "I *get* to view other's writing" (emphasis mine). Yet another student expressed difference in terms of the solitary vs. the communal: "My writing has become something I don't dread doing. I can feel confident in my essays because I have constant feedback from the board post. I am not alone and have constant help at the touch of a computer." This student implies a causal connection between online group support, the pedagogical embodiment of social constructivism, and a shift from dread to confidence.

Other students saw the difference in terms of a safe space to work through the writing process, echoing Grego and Thompson's definition of the studio setting as "a 'safe house' for risk taking on the part of both students and teachers" (2008, p. 74). One student described the studio space as such a safe environment, saying, "I like how everyone shares their opinion with no fear. It gave people the courage to be completely honest, which in turn is very helpful." Another seemed to reinforce Warschauer's (1997) conclusions that computer-mediated learning environments may hold benefits for the student hesitant to participate in class discussions: "It allowed me to be critiqued without being embarrassed or shy to say what I wanted or for people to respond as they wanted." For some students, the difference in the hybrid class and other writing classes lay in producing more writing. The hybrid format alone demands a greater reliance on writing, and text-based online studio conversations—posting, responding, questioning, revising, and reflecting—only multiply occasions for writing. "I was always writing," explained one student; "the more writing, the better I got."

How would You Describe the Role of the Studio Group in Your Writing Process?

When asked to describe the role of the online studio group in their writing process, 69% of respondents in fall and 84% of respondents in spring described the studio group as beneficial to the writing process. While some students focused on the Studio's role in keeping them "on track" and preventing procrastination, many other students expressed the importance of having an immediate audience for their ideas and drafts. One student, for example, characterized the Studio as a place that "gave me more insight into my writing and also allowed me to consider my audience more." The NCTE brief stresses the importance of audience awareness in developing rhetorical knowledge transferable to other disciplinary

settings (2013, p. 14). Students sharing different ideas, styles, and methods in the studio setting can foster that deepening sense of audience.

Not all students, however, were satisfied with their online studio group. Most often mentioned in negative responses were complaints about meeting deadlines, poor group attendance, and the quality of peer responses. Peer responses, one student mentioned, were completed only to "fulfill a participation grade," so group members often did not treat the studio conversations seriously. Instructors and Writing Center staff acknowledge the tension inherent between maintaining a safe, non-judgmental studio space and eventually ascribing a value to student participation. In decisions about grading policies, instructors tried to strike a balance for rewarding responsible participation and providing penalties for irresponsible participation by assigning holistic grades based on facilitator notes for full, partial, or no studio participation.

In addition to complaints about studio participation, another student felt that feedback offered online was not as effective as feedback offered face-to-face: "[F]eedback about someone's work, in my opinion, is best given face-to-face on a personal level. Emotions do not read well through text, so I do not think that feedback through the studio was terribly effective." Although this perceptive response reflects a personal preference, it exposes the persistent challenge of making the online, text-based environment as accommodating as possible for students with diverse learning styles.

How Would You Describe the Role of Your Studio Facilitator in Your Writing Process?

Students registered the strongest positive responses when prompted to describe the role of the studio facilitator, with 85% of respondents in fall and 90% of respondents in spring describing the facilitator in terms of helpfulness and support. Students often mentioned the role of facilitators in giving constructive feedback, as illustrated by the following: "She explained and answered questions in a way that was easy to comprehend. Best of all, sometimes she understood where my paper was heading better than I did, which in turn gave me more ideas for what to write about and how to write it." One respondent characterized the facilitator as an "excellent mediator," while still another cited the facilitator's influence in a successful first-year transition, responding, "[He] helped me bridge the gap between university and high school level writing."

Responses to the facilitator's role in the online Studio also indicate evidence of two important elements of the NCTE's defense of first-year writing: 1) emerging metacognition and 2) responsibility. The NCTE brief notes that metacognition, or "the ability to reflect on one's own thinking" (2013, p. 14), enables students to adapt their writing for different contexts and genres. Students, the

authors point out, "often become 'locked' in the genre constraints of what they learned in high school" and assume "that a five-paragraph theme is the best response to any writing context" (p. 14). One student expressed how his thinking about writing had changed over the course of the semester by saying, "In high school, I was taught a certain structure of writing, which confused me for years. So, I had to learn how to be more open when writing." This step in cognitive development indicates the student might be open to adjusting rhetorically to a new writing context, in essence to think about how to think about the assignment and thus less likely to fall back on old, established patterns.

The NCTE brief concludes with the claim that first-year writing increases responsibility, a trait that goes "hand-in-hand" (2013, p. 14) with metacognition and enables students to "become empowered as agents responsible for their own learning when they are given the *time and space* to develop their meta-awareness as writers" (p. 14, emphasis in the original). Studio methodology requires facilitators to act as guides, not instructors, and, as an outgrowth of expressivist epistemology, facilitators are trained to turn the conversation back towards students to encourage them to take ownership of their own writing processes and the productivity of the group. Student descriptions of the role of facilitators and the studio group often reflected this process in action:

- "She really helps me to see flaws in my writing and pushes me to find ways to make it better on my own."
- "Gave good advice, and listened attentively to questions we had regarding the papers. Led us in the right direction (or back on track), and provided questions to further our thought processes."
- "The studio group allowed me to question myself and my writing in order to make necessary changes for improvement."
- "I like how this class taught me to be more confident in my writing and not to lean so much on a teacher or peer for help."

The above responses represent a range of perceptions regarding the facilitator/student relationship, but all point to developing agency, self-awareness, and personal responsibility toward writing. Interesting also is the suggestion by one student that the Studio constitutes a conversation, with the facilitator "listen[ing] attentively" to questions.

What Was Your Greatest Obstacle (Academically, Technologically, or Otherwise) to Completing Your Assignments? Please Explain.

Responses to this question, as a whole, reflected the range of challenges faced by first-year students, from struggling with more rigorous academic demands, to overcoming work/study obstacles, to becoming more proficient writers. Also,

and unsurprising in a university with a large contingent of international students and multilingual learners, gaining writing proficiency in English posed the greatest challenge for one student: "My greatest obstacle was to express my ideas in right words, in correct grammar, and in a smooth way in English. And it took a lot of time to produce the correct expression of my thoughts in writing." For students grappling with English language acquisition, online Studios may hold special potential through ongoing informal, low-stakes writing to an authentic audience of peers and facilitator guides.

Other responses, however, addressed technological difficulties particular to the online environment, such as temporarily losing internet service. Several students cited the regular online writing obligations as obstacles, but often faulted their own tendencies toward procrastination and forgetfulness for missing assignments or deadlines. More troubling, however, were the few students who expressed issues of proficiency and access in comments such as, "I am not around a computer at that time," or "I am a slow typer and had a hard time finishing the assignment in time sometimes," or "I don't have the internet at home and live 25 miles from campus," or "The studio group was well thought out if you can handle computers all the time. I found it to be a little frustrating because I'm not computer savvy. I like to write everything down that flows from my mind." While these students may not have fully understood the implications of a hybrid class, their frustrations suggest our assumptions about students' technology proficiency should still be questioned and concerns regarding access remain valid (see, e.g., Kirtley, 2004; Moran, 1999, 2003).

REVISION, REFIGURATION, AND A PATH TO SUSTAINABILITY

As the tale of the studio program at the University of South Carolina (Grego & Thompson, 2008) makes clear, even well-planned and effective studio programs may face elimination for institutional reasons beyond instructors' or facilitators' control. It was unclear after the pilot year whether this model would survive as well. Threatening its continuation was the unavoidable fact that its structure required more resources than a traditional face-to-face class, and in the face of shrinking budgets, its future was uncertain. Saving the project in its second year, however, was the award of a university grant supporting courses aligned with the university's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which emphasizes a commitment to undergraduate research. Because the hybrid/studio-supported classes focused on a semester-long research process, the project already shared many QEP goals. The research-based arc of the course, along with Writing Center and research-based library partnerships, therefore led to a successful grant proposal.

The project's third year saw several important developments that created a more secure future. First, the English Department, with support from the university's administration, substantially revised the first-year program for incoming graduate teaching assistants. In their first year as teaching assistants, new graduate students had been expected to be fully responsible for teaching one course in the fall and two in the spring, and then assume a full teaching load of two classes per semester thereafter. In the third year of the hybrid project, however, the incoming class of GTAs moved out of the classroom entirely and into the Writing Center as studio facilitators for both hybrid first-year writing classes and Writing Center studio projects in other disciplines like art history. This change represented strong administrative support for the hybrid project and for GTAs, who now spend their first year working closely with students across the academic spectrum, facilitating online and face-to-face Writing Studios in classes ranging from first-year writing to senior-level disciplinary courses. Kylie Korsnack (this volume) shares a similar evolution at the University of Alabama-Huntsville, where GTAs now serve as studio facilitators for a year before assuming full instructional duties. Much like the graduate students Korsnack (this volume) describes, first-year GTAs at UH faced all the pressures and insecurities of full classroom management, including grading, after a single week of orientation coupled with a pedagogy seminar. They now receive ongoing support for their year-long studio experience, take the pedagogy seminar before they enter the classroom, and view teaching writing from the unique facilitator perspective.

Second, the project expanded to include the first semester writing course, which allowed students to take the two-semester sequence in the hybrid/studio-supported format and facilitators to view the processes and products of the entire first-year writing program. Shifting the facilitator role from undergraduate writing consultants to graduate teaching assistants also marked an evolution toward a more autonomous facilitator, one more able to provide "an openness to student concerns and determination of the group's agenda on the basis of student concerns and needs" (Grego & Thompson, 2008, p. 74). Teaching assistants have the latitude to frame studio conversations in ways that respond more directly to specific contexts and the group's immediate needs.

Along with a change in the facilitator role in the third year, a change in the configuration of the Blackboard space allowed Studios to be situated outside the class Blackboard shell. With help from the university's Blackboard support staff, the online Studios moved from the discussion board function within the instructor's course shell into a separate Blackboard space. Now, when students log into Blackboard, they see a separate Writing Studio link in their course listings and enter a separate studio space, thus replicating online the way they might

leave a face-to-face classroom and go to the Writing Center for a face-to-face studio. Instructors had always exercised care to reassure students that the studio space was an instructor-free zone where ideas and writing processes were not subject to instructor observation or judgment; however, as long as studios were situated within the course shell, it was possible for instructors to peer into the studio space. As Miley (this volume) explains in her discussion of the origins of UH online Studios, this arrangement can be challenging for facilitators to navigate and tempting for instructors to innocently or actively trespass. That option, however, no longer exists as the space now belongs exclusively to students, facilitators, and Writing Center staff.

In a final logical progression implemented in the project's fourth year, graduate student facilitators now have the option, with departmental approval, to become hybrid instructors after completing their year as Writing Center facilitators. As former facilitators, they come to the instructional cohort with a history of reflective practice gained through a year's experience in the facilitator community, and they transfer that practice to the instructional community. Viewing student writing processes from the inside out now shapes their pedagogy, whether in practical matters like assignment design or commenting on student work, or in more global considerations like creating a teaching persona or understanding student motivations. Also informing their pedagogy is an understanding of the different audiences and expectations students encounter in other disciplinary settings. From a programmatic perspective, the creation of a predictable pipeline for qualified and capable hybrid instructors has further stabilized the project. Hybrid/studio-supported offerings have expanded each year and grown from enrolling 372 students in the 2010/2011 pilot year to over 1,100 in 2016/2017.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

As with any methodology, the hybrid/studio-supported model may not be suited for all students; however, the online studios allow students to communicate through writing to multiple audiences and to think, draft, and reflect on class assignments in ways that wouldn't happen otherwise. Survey responses also indicate online Studios promote the outcomes of engagement and retention, rhetorical knowledge, metacognition, and responsibility outlined in the NCTE brief. Moreover, as more writing classes move online, the need for online writing support will only increase. The Conference on College Composition and Communication position statement on OWI best practices (2013) argues that online instruction (either hybrid or fully online) should be accompanied by online writing support through an online writing lab. Based on UH results, the online

Writing Studio deserves consideration as an effective alternative to the online writing lab. Online studios might be attached to either hybrid or fully online classes, either as stand-alone credit-bearing courses or integrated into individual classes as in our model.

For those considering adapting an online writing studio component in their own contexts, the UH experience further illustrates successes and challenges of online Studios. As a whole, students reacted positively to the online space and expressed satisfaction with the Studio's community and role in their writing. Online asynchronous interactions were shown to be advantageous for some students, such as shy or withdrawn students who may be reluctant to join face-to-face conversations but become thoughtful and "talkative" responders online. On the other hand, some students find the online space uncomfortable, for example, in responding or accepting feedback when they cannot gauge expression or body language. Students may also resist the recurring deadlines inherent in online studio participation. Since online Studios require an initial post, then responses to other group members, students must keep two deadlines in mind and check in and out of their Studio over the course of a week. Making studio obligations clear, consistent, and predictable, however, can assist students in adapting to the asynchronous rhythms of online studios. Adopters of any online writing model must also remain alert to the persistent possibility that students may struggle with technology's dependability and access or may lack the proficiency we too often assume.

Perhaps the biggest challenge for adopting online studios lies in their added layer of complexity. Online studios, whether inside or outside the class structure, require not only knowledge of facilitating first-year writing, but knowledge of facilitating first-year writing in an online setting. The complexity of online studios therefore poses additional challenges in terms of training instructors, facilitators, and staff, as well as in creating course structures and partnerships that will support studio success. Each of these elements requires an investment of time and effort for both individuals and departments. The classes discussed here, for example, could not have been sustained without the Writing Center's role as the site for studio development and implementation.

Although the UH hybrid/studio project seems stabilized for now, its future cannot be guaranteed. Administrations change, and priorities shift. Sustaining the complex system of the hybrid model further requires constant internal reassessment of its practices and results. Regardless of its future, however, it may offer a model for retaining important elements of traditional first-year writing courses that might be diminished or lost in the rush to new delivery methods and credit alternatives. The hybrid course supported by online Writing Studios may hold the potential to mitigate those losses and realize unexpected gains.

REFERENCES

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2013). *Grade change: Tracking changes in online education.* Babson Survey Research Group. Retrieved from https://onlinelearningconsortium. org/survey_report/2013-survey-online-learning-report/

Braxton, J. M., Milern, J. F., & Sullivan, A. S. (2000). The influence of active learning on the college student departure process: Toward a revision of Tinto's theory. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(5), 560-590.

Brooks, D. (2012, May 3). The campus tsunami. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/04/opinion/brooks-the-campus-tsunami.html?_r=0

Bruffee, K. (1984). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." *College English, 46*(7), 635-653.

Bruffee, K. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. *College English, 48*(8), 635-653.

Burke, K. (1960). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burnham, C. (2003). Expressive pedagogy: Practice/theory, theory/practice. In G.Tate, A. Rupiper, & K. Schick (Eds). *A guide to composition pedagogies* (pp. 19-35). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2013). Position statement of principles and best practices for online writing instruction. Retrieved from http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples

Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing without teachers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Fulkerson, R. (2005). Composition at the turn of the twenty-first century. *College Composition and Communication, 56*(4), 654-687.

Grego, R. C., & Thompson, N. S. (2008). *Teaching/writing in thirdspaces: The studio approach.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Griffin, J., & Minter, D. (2013). The rise of the online writing classroom: Reflecting on the material conditions of college composition teaching. *College Composition and Communication, 65*(1), 140-161.

Halasek, K. (1999). *A pedagogy of possibility: Bakhtinian perspectives on composition studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hewett, B. L. (2010). *The online writing conference: A guide for teachers and tutors.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Hewett, B. L. (2014). Fully online and hybrid writing instruction. In G. Tate, A. R. Taggart, K. Schick, & H.B. Hessler, (Eds). *A guide to composition pedagogies* (2nd ed., pp. 194-211). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hewett, B. L., & Ehmann, C. (2004). *Preparing educators for online writing instruction.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Kirtley, S. (2005). Students' views on technology and writing: The power of personal history. *Computers and Composition, 22*(2), 209-229.

Kovach, J.V., Miley, M., & Ramos, M. A. (2012). Using online studio groups to improve writing competency: A pilot study in a quality improvement methods course. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 10*(3), 363-387. https://dx.doi. org/10.1111/j.1540-4609.2012.00349.x

LeFevre, K. (1987). *Invention as a social act.* Carbondale, IL: SIU Press.

Moran, C. (1999). Access-the "a" word in technology studies. In G. E. Hawisher & C. Selfe (Eds.), *Passions, pedagogies and 21st century technologies* (pp. 205-220). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Moran, C. (2003). Technology and the teaching of writing. In G. Tate, A. Rupiper, & K. Schick, (Eds), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (pp. 203-223). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Murray, D. (1982). Teaching the other self. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(2), 140-147.

National Council of Teachers of English. (2013). First-year writing: What good does it do? *Council Chronicle, 23*(2), 13-15. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.og/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CC/0232-nov2013/CC0232Policy.pdf

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 19*, 139-158.

Reynolds, N. (1998). *Geographies of writing: Inhabiting places and encountering difference*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Sapp, D. A., & Simon, J. (2005). Comparing grades in online and face-to-face writing courses: Interpersonal accountability and institutional commitment. *Computers and Composition, 22*(4), 471-489.

Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sutton, M. (2010). Messages to and from the third space: Communication between writing studio and classroom teachers. *Open Words: Access and English Studies, 4*(1), 31-45. Retrieved from https://www.pearsoned.com/wp-content/uploads/Sutton-Open_Words-Spring_2010-5.pdf

Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(6), 599-623.

Tinto, V. (2000). Linking learning and leaving: Exploring the role of college classroom in student departure. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *Reworking the student departure puzzle* (pp. 81-94). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

U.S. News & World Report. (2014). Education: Rankings and reviews—University of Houston. Retrieved from http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/university-of-houston-3652

Waddoups, G. L., Hatch, G. L., & Butterworth, S. (2003). Blended teaching and learning in a first-year composition course. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 4*(3), 271-278.

Warnock, S. (2009). *Teaching writing online: How and why*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Warschauer, M. (1997). Computer-mediated collaborative learning: Theory and practice. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 470-481.

Young, J. R. (2002). "Hybrid" teaching seeks to end the divide between traditional and online instruction. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 48*(28), 33-34.

CONTRIBUTORS

Suzanne Biedenbach is Associate Professor of English and chair of the English Composition Committee at Georgia Gwinnett College, where she teaches developmental writing, first-year composition, advanced composition, rhetoric courses, and professional writing courses. In her approach to teaching writing, she strives to employ a variety of teaching strategies aimed at assisting her students in becoming self-regulated independent learners who understand the connections between and are able to maneuver back and forth through the various discourse communities in which they find themselves.

Alison Cardinal is a doctoral candidate at the University of Washington and a Senior Lecturer at the University of Washington Tacoma. She is also an Affiliate Researcher at the University of El Paso's Sites of Translation: A User Experience Research Center. Her community-engaged work uses participatory approaches to generate collaborative research and user-centered design. Her work has appeared in *Composition Forum* and *Communication Design Quarterly*.

Dan Fraizer is Professor of Composition and Rhetoric at Springfield College. He teaches first-year composition, writing studio, advanced composition, and writing for the professions, and he also works with faculty across the disciplines to improve writing assignments and evaluation tools in a program called Faculty Writing Fellows. His publications have added to conversations about the textbook industry, service-learning, writing about war, and most recently knowledge transfer, where his research on studios as locations of transfer appeared in *WPA: Writing Program Administration* and his research on teaching for transfer in cross-disciplinary courses appeared in *Composition Forum*. He introduced writing studio to Springfield College in the late 1990s, making it an early adopter of Studio.

Bre Garrett is Assistant Professor and Director of Composition at the University of West Florida, where she teaches a range of writing and rhetoric classes across the curriculum. Her research investigates the intersection of rhetorical theory and composition pedagogy. She has an article that links writing studio and disability studies in *Composition Forum*, and she has conducted additional research on embodied composing and curricular design, on institutional studies and writing program administration, and on multimodal composing.

Mary Gray is Visiting Assistant Professor of English at the University of Houston, where she coordinates and teaches hybrid first-year writing supported by online studios. In partnership with the UH Writing Center, her work includes training and supervising new hybrid instructors as well as conducting program assessment.

Christine Weber Heilman is currently a part-time faculty member in English composition at Miami University of Ohio, where she teaches first-year writing. She has been teaching college writing for nearly thirty years at both two-year and four-year colleges. As Assistant Professor of English at Georgia Gwinnett College from 2011 to 2013, she served as Coordinator of the Segue Initiative, which piloted ALP (Accelerated Learning Program), a learning community that blends mainstreaming, acceleration, and studio models for developmental writers and allows them to earn college credit. Her research has focused on the interconnection between two fields: working-class studies and college student intellectual development as it relates to college writing.

Karen Gabrielle Johnson is Associate Professor at Shippensburg University, where she directs the Writing Studio. Karen is Co-editor of the *Writing Lab Newsletter: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship* and a member of the Executive Board of the International Writing Centers Association. Her scholarship has focused on service-learning and writing assessment, while her editorial work includes guest-editing a special issue on tutor pedagogy in *The Writing Lab Newsletter*. Her most recent work is an open-access digital book, *What We Teach Writing Tutors: A WLN Digital Edited Collection*, which was co-edited with Ted Roggenbuck in 2018.

Kelvin Keown is the English Learner Specialist at the University of Washington Tacoma, where the focus of his work in the Teaching and Learning Center is tutoring and teaching multilingual students. His professional interests include language teaching and learning, sociolinguistics, and the history of English.

Kylie Korsnack is a doctoral candidate in English at Vanderbilt University, where she teaches undergraduate writing courses in the English department and facilitates graduate seminars as part of the Vanderbilt Center for Teaching's Certificate in College Teaching Program. Her research focuses on contemporary literature, speculative fiction, and digital pedagogy.

Michael Kuhne began his educational career as a high school English teacher in Minnesota and Colorado before earning a Ph.D. in English at the University of Minnesota (1998). Since 1995, he has taught English at Minneapolis Community and Technical College. His research interests include game-based learning and racial justice. He has published in *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, the *Minnesota English Journal*, *Communitas*, and *Antipodes*, and he has contributed chapters to numerous books.

Robert LaBarge is an English Language Arts instructor at Piñon High School on the Navajo Nation. A former linguist, his current research interests include literacy and development in rural and under-served areas and the rhetoric of Marian apparitions.

Jane Leach has taught English at Minneapolis Community and Technical College since earning her Ph.D. in English at the University of Minnesota in 1999. Her primary interests are developmental writing, first-year composition, and critical literacy. She has taught Developmental English for more than 15 years and was awarded a Minnesota State Board of Trustees Outstanding Educator Award in 2012.

Aurora Matzke is Associate Professor and Co-Director of the English Writing Program at Biola University, where she teaches first-year writing, embodied rhetorics, digital pedagogy, and writing in the disciplines courses. Her work may be found in such collections as *Bad Ideas about Writing* and *Feminist Challenges or Feminist Rhetorics?: Locations, Scholarship, and Discourse*.

Michelle Miley is Assistant Professor of English and Director of the MSU Writing Center at Montana State University. Her articles have appeared in the *Writing Center Journal* and *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*. Her current research uses institutional ethnography as a lens to map perceptions of the work of academic writing and writing centers from the standpoint of students.

Cara Minardi-Power teaches at Florida Southwestern State College in La-Belle, Florida. When she taught at Georgia Gwinnett College (GGC), she was one of the six-member team who worked on the state's project to transform remedial writing instruction through a grant from Complete College America, which developed into GGC's Segue Program. Her research areas include scholarship on teaching and learning as well as feminist rhetorics. She has published articles in *Peitho, thirdspace*, and *Pedagogy & Practice*, and has co-edited five textbooks for first-year composition.

Tonya Ritola is Teaching Professor and Chair of the Writing Program at University of California, Santa Cruz, where she teaches lower-division writing and provides pedagogical training for graduate student instructors. Her publications and research focus on teaching for transfer, equity in writing program assessment, and organizational rhetoric.

Shirley K Rose is Professor and Director of Writing Programs in the Department of English at Arizona State University. She is a Past President of the Council of Writing Program Administrators and is the Director of the WPA Consultant-Evaluator Service. She regularly teaches graduate courses in writing program administration and has published articles on writing pedagogy and on issues in archival research and practice. With Irwin Weiser, she has edited four collections on the intellectual work of writing program administration, including *The WPA as Researcher, The Writing Program Administrator as Theorist, Going Public: What Writing Programs Learn from Engagement*, and *The Internationalization of US Writing Programs*.

Christina Santana is Assistant Professor of English at Worcester State University, where she serves as Director of the University Writing Center. Her work on collaboration and community engagement has been focused on both writing and conversation and includes her dissertation project as well as articles that have appeared in the *Community Literacy Journal* and *Currents in Teaching and Learning*. She regularly teaches courses in community writing, professional/business writing, and writing consultancy.

Mandy Sepulveda is Associate Professor of English at Georgia Gwinnett College. She has been teaching college courses in various departments and disciplines for the last 13 years. Her areas of specialty are teacher training and adolescent learning. She worked as a graduate teaching assistant (GTA) in Auburn University's English and Educational Psychology Departments for 5 years, teaching courses in rhetoric and composition, basic research methods, and adolescent development, learning, assessment and motivation. She received a Master's of Liberal Arts in 2005, a Master's of English with a concentration in rhetoric/composition in 2008, and a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology in 2010. As one of the six charter members of the Segue Taskforce at Georgia Gwinnett College, she is involved with transforming remediation of first year writing courses, introducing students to yoga, and promoting a holistic approach to learning.