CHAPTER 3.

STUDIO BRICOLAGE: INVENTING WRITING STUDIO PEDAGOGY FOR LOCAL CONTEXTS

Aurora Matzke and Bre Garrett
Contributors: Kelsey Huizing and Justin McCoy
Biola University and University of West Florida

In this chapter, two new Writing Program Administrators (WPAs), from very different universities, collaborate with studio facilitators to describe surprisingly similar experiences starting up studio programs. We argue that studio designers must perform as bricoleurs: interacting with community stakeholders, accumulating resources from different locations, and situating claims and appeals within local discourses. We use bricolage concepts of "uptake" and "not talk" to investigate our institutional studio narratives. While the two experiences contain moments of overlap, we also point out the nuances and different moves we made in order to "sell" studio curricula at our institutions.

Aurora and Bre are both newly hired WPAs at universities on opposite U.S. coasts. Aurora serves as co-director of the English Writing Program at Biola University, a small, private university in southern California; Bre directs the Composition Program at the University of West Florida (UWF), a mid-size, public university in Florida. Both Aurora and Bre accepted positions as WPAs right out of their Ph.D. programs, and both launched studio curricula in the first years of their jobs. Neither of their studio experiences easily aligned with studio best practices, and both required considerable negotiation, re-purposing, re-identifying, and transformation of locally available first-year writing models.

As we write, contributors Kelsey Huizing and Justin McCoy serve, respectively, as a Teaching Assistant at Biola and as an Instructor at UWF. Kelsey and Justin write as facilitators of Writing Studio classes. Narratives from all three perspectives (WPA, Teaching Assistant, and Instructor) allow us to uniquely highlight moments of bricolage from multiple perspectives. The multiplicity of viewpoints provides a view of Studio that is fairly unique to *The Writing Studio Sampler.* Ultimately, we hope our contribution highlights an array of possible moves for the plethora of stakeholders involved in most studio ventures.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2018.0179.2.03

Throughout this chapter, we document both administrative and pedagogical practices that illustrate how we continue to work within situated constraints to invent studio models particular to our respective local contexts.

STUDIO AND BRICOLAGE IN THEORY

An allocated writing environment, such as Studio, can provide a place that enables students to identify themselves as writers and to work with differences among home, school, and civic communities. In this volume, Alison Cardinal and Kelvin Keown provide a succinct overview of the liberatory potential of studio spaces, while acknowledging through Grego and Thompson "that this counter-hegemonic studio narrative comes into conflict with the narratives of institutions concerned with 'buildings and budgets.'" Consequently, how might teachers and administrators imagine sustainable physical realities for these studio spaces? As called for in the work of Cardinal and Keown, we hope our use of bricolage, as a practical theoretical frame to apply to Studio and the ways teachers and administrators engage in facilitator training, course design, marketing, classroom pedagogy, and program assessment, might begin the work of "strategically tell[ing] the story of studio work to administrators and students" (this volume).

At both institutions, studio development emerged at moments of kairos and exigence—key components of administrative uptake. By kairotic moments, we mean opportunities that arise that may be beyond the scope of one's originally identified goals and objectives. By exigence, we mean an articulated need or demand for change, system-wide—many of the chapters within this collection make note of such opportunities often being connected to Studio (Cardinal & Keown; Gray; Leach & Kuhne; Ritola et al.; and Santana, Rose, & LaBarge;). At UWF, for example, opportunities arose for faculty and programs to receive retention funding. At Biola, writing faculty were abandoning a potential studio site, while campus conversations focused on accreditation concerns related to writing, critical thinking, and information literacy abounded. Consequently, these curricular openings, combined with administrative focus, allowed for positive redirections in campus writing practice.

As a theoretical grounding for invention, bricolage was first defined and related to knowledge acquisition by Claude Levi-Strauss (1972) in *The Savage Mind*, and further investigated by Jacques Derrida (1978), and Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1984). Christopher Wibberley (2012), Cynthia Selfe and Dickie Selfe (1994), and Rebecca Nowacek (2013) offer some of the more recent work on bricolage in institutional landscapes. Wibberley agrees with Levi-

Strauss, Derrida, and others when he states bricolage "starts with what is at hand/what is available" (2012, p. 3). He further argues that, "[w]ith academic bricolage . . . the consideration of the process by which the bricolage is built—however emergent—is an important aspect of the overall work. This process must be articulated, both in terms of the 'mechanisms' of production and also in terms of any philosophical approach underpinning its production" (2012, p. 6). Wibberley's focus on "the consideration of the process" allows us, as authors, to more objectively view the work we've undertaken at our respective institutions. What might be viewed as a piecemeal approach to institutional intervention is, on further reflection, seen as a negotiation of local opportunities. Bricolage, then, becomes a useful frame for the sometimes baffling and complicated web of educational affordances present at many institutions. In other words, before change can take place, one must note what is available.

In "Politics of the Interface," Cynthia L. Selfe and Richard J. Selfe (1994) identify bricolage as a means by which computer designers "can support alternative approaches to constructing meaning" (p. 493). Drawing on Turkle and Papert, Selfe and Selfe specify that the construction of meaning happens through "the arrangement and rearrangement of concrete, well known materials, often in an intuitive rather than logical manner" and "by interacting with [a subject] physically" (1994, p. 493). Such "well known materials," in curricular design, constitute project discourse; course and institutional histories; policies; location in the form of buildings and spaces; pedagogies; and a range of students, teachers, administrators, and staff. Studio opportunities may thus not proceed from a strongly articulated plan outlined by major university stakeholders. Instead, arrangement schemes may arise from the "physical" interactions of the stakeholders in the available institutional spaces.

In her 2013 Conference on College Composition and Communication address, "Transfer as Bricolage: Assembling Genre Knowledge Across Contexts," Nowacek defined bricolage much as Wibberley. She also argued bricolage occurs through a negotiation of "uptake" and "not talk." Uptake happens when bricoleurs first examine "what is at hand" before deciding what will be useful, or "taking up" the available means. For example, when Bre arrived at UWF, retention discussions were already underway; she was able to "uptake" retention concerns in her studio initiative. During this time of "uptake," bricoleurs spend a significant amount of time theoretically and practically engaged in "not talk": defining what is *not* useful, needed, or wanted. For Aurora, "not talk" occurred when instructors discussed their frustrations with the lack of structure in the potential studio space. "Not talk" allows organizers to locate clarity and exigence that rest separately from pre-established norms. We found ourselves defining what Studio

is not while reaching out to make connections with established programs at our universities. As practitioners, we are not willing to be stymied by arguments that overly simplify studio practices, purposes, and the individuals making use of the courses; thus, we must engage in "not talk" in order to clarify our goals.

When participating in "on the ground" course design, curricular designers must look, as Wibberley (2013) and Selfe and Selfe (1994) argue, to the available means and physical affordances of production. Before action takes place, steady uptake enables bricoleurs to survey "what is at hand" (a neglected course in Aurora's case, a retention initiative in Bre's) prior to assessing usefulness or outcome. During "uptake," one must reflexively practice "not talk" (solid learning was not occurring in Aurora's case; students were not getting enough support in Bre's), identifying what is *not* useful, needed, or wanted (Nowacek, 2013). Uptake is a collaborative, hands-on process that requires one to, quite literally, traverse the physical landscape and become intimately familiar with campus resources (Selfe & Selfe, 1994). In our work, we use Nowacek's concepts of "uptake" and "not talk" to help us define "the mechanisms of production" operating in both institutional contexts. Through "not talk," bricoleur administrators are able to find openings for "uptake" that acknowledge joint purposes with other programs, misidentified or misused resources already in place, and/or new practices in line with university goals or missions. Another place to view the type of studio emergence that may be connected with bricolage is that described by Dan Fraizer within "Navigating Outside the Mainstream" (this volume). Fraizer outlines similar moments that could be labeled as "not talk" and uptake at his own institution—Studio is not remedial nor basic (the "not talk"); Springfield needed someone to assist struggling writers (the uptake).

Bricolage also functions as a theoretical frame to define studio pedagogical approaches. Organizers can shapeshift studio curricula depending upon the model that most suits local contexts, learning outcomes, and student needs; Studio "is not limited to a course per se but is a configuration of relationships that can emerge from different contexts" (Grego & Thompson, 2008, p. 7). The main purpose of studio curricula is a central and extensive one-on-one focus on writing instruction, but what this looks like and how it fits within a university curriculum may significantly differ.

STARTING THE YEAR AT A NEW LOCATION: OPENINGS FOR NEW INITIATIVES, NEW COMMUNITIES

Joining new university communities may open opportunities for designing and reshaping writing pedagogy and writing culture, something both Aurora and Bre

experienced. In addition, our initial work to make a case for Studio transpired quite smoothly, because we framed our purposes within university initiatives and discourses. For Bre, university-wide attention toward retention efforts created prime opportunities for administrators to listen to and try out new programs centered on student learning. Bre's experiences resonate with Christina Santana, Shirley K. Rose and Robert LaBarge's (this volume).

While new, young, feminist WPAs might wish to pause, watch, and gather intel during their first years, we jumped to take advantage of institutional momentum for communal, positive change. Yet even in the face of opportunity, we worked to remember two pieces of advice and one overwhelming truth. The advice: 1) New program development always requires "cost-analysis," and 2) Opportunities are most successfully crafted from local sites of flux best known by those with on-the-ground experience. The overwhelming truth: As a new WPA, it's impossible to perform a strong cost-analysis, and you have little to no local experience.

While building relationships constitutes a survival skill for how WPAs become part of institutional communities, it does not always happen without tension and the acknowledgement of differences, which is where uptake and not-talk come into play. We strove to channel new relationships into mutual partnerships and alliances, a rhetorical task that involves a combination of spontaneous decision making and goal shifting, deliberate cross-campus conversations, professional development, and WPA work boldly and loudly cast as "intellectual and scholastic activity." For Aurora, this relationship building needed to occur at a grassroots level: The time and money were there, but no one understood how to use them. These actions required a quickly established ethos predicated on relational uptake. Credibility intricately links to and evolves from relationship building and a keen awareness of time and moment. This situational preparedness is most aptly demonstrated in this volume by Santana, Rose, and LaBarge. Somewhat differently for Aurora and Bre, they were new to their home institutions. Yes, starting/rejuvenating programs at our new institutions could have been risky, if we attempted to assert dominance in these spaces, instead of promoting a model of shared responsibility. Sure, we could have lost funding. However, as students with need were already underserved at our new homes, there was much more to gain—even in fits and starts—than there was to lose.

For us, seizing these opportunities was the first step toward actively embracing bricolage. In the following section, we provide detailed narrative accounts of our positionalities in order to show "not talk" and "uptake" overlaps and differences among positionalities and between institutions, providing a Venn-like opening with which others might situate differing university contexts.

SITUATED NARRATIVES AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXTS

Small, Private, Liberal-Arts University—Aurora's Story

When I arrived at Biola's roughly 4,000-student campus, tucked up against the hills of La Mirada, California, I understood my job was to work as a Co-Director of the English Writing Program (EWP). The EWP included two courses taught to all incoming students in their first and second semesters. These courses were called "Critical Thinking and Writing I" and "Critical Thinking and Writing II." Yet, I noticed something curious during my first semester. There was another course with "Critical Thinking and Writing" in the title—ENGL 100.

At Biola, the accelerated-stretch composition (ASC) course, ENGL 100, arose over a decade ago out of a perceived need related to student preparedness. The ASC courses carried the same units toward graduation as the non-stretch, but with twice as much course time set aside. A non-stretch course meets twice a week for two-and-a-half hours of instruction; the stretch meets for five hours spread out over a four-day period. Different than most "intensive English courses" designed almost exclusively for English language learners, students are placed in ENGL 100 if they have SAT/ACT scores lower than Biola's cutoff for reading and writing, are in the completion stages of the university's intensive English program, are returning to the institution after a long absence from school, are ear-marked by administrators as needing "extra assistance," or self-select as wanting additional time with an instructor. In other words, the population is highly mixed for reasons that aren't entirely clear or in line with best practices in writing instruction. My impression upon entering the university? The course worked as a "catch-all."

The other interesting wrinkle: ASC courses were taught exclusively by part-time faculty and undergraduate teaching assistants (TAs). The part-timers would teach two of the four meeting times, and a TA would teach the other two. In addition, the same semester I began to investigate ENGL 100, or "Basic Studies in Critical Thinking and Writing," the veteran adjuncts teaching the course moved to graduate programs and/or different work. Consequently, only brand new teachers—all without formal post-secondary training in the teaching of writing, let alone work with students deemed "at risk" by the university—were assigned to ENGL 100. If the part-time faculty were not prepared, the level of preparedness for the TAs assigned to ENGL 100 was even sparser. I immediately thought, "Could this be studio space?"

Learning about studio pedagogy from John Tassoni while earning my doctorate taught me the importance of investigating university purposes with first-year students outside and alongside first-year writing. At the same time, I knew that the small, one-unit courses with links to a unified first-year writing cur-

riculum, courses like I taught while at Miami University, were not necessarily going to be the norm. And, I might have to undertake a long, hard climb before reaching a place where Studio could exist at my new home. It wasn't as if money was falling out of the sky for new program development. That's why, when I discovered space might indeed be available in our first-year curricula for Studio to start, I got creative.

Being a new WPA with the only composition and rhetoric degree on my campus has allowed me curious constraints and freedoms. In the case of Studio, the freedom came to the fore. Championing a failing course by shifting it to an approach my colleagues not only did not know how to do, but had never even heard of, could have been disastrous. Yet, thanks to everyone's good spirits, a firm focus on student development, a solid co-director, and willingness to compromise and adapt to current availabilities, Studio was able to emerge as a new, theoretically sound, life-affirming option for a population of students and faculty slowly being forgotten by the university. The change happened quietly, without fanfare, within the confines of a pre-existing budget. We just *shifted* the discourse.

Kairotic Intervention

I started by sitting in the part-time faculty meeting area and the English Department office, catching instructors on their way to their mailboxes and when they were in their office hours. I made sure to identify and engage the current TAs in "water-cooler" talk about their teaching experiences. I had these conversations in informal spaces—where my own power position was less, if at all, established. I never called anyone to my office, nor formally requested any meetings. I found that, overall, no one was happy with the current system, and many weren't interested in continuing to support or participate in the teaching of the course.

In my conversations with the new part-time faculty teaching ENGL 100, instructors and TAs stated they were not sure what to do with the extra time. Instructors felt their TAs, due to a lack of training and closeness in age with the students, could work as quiet-time monitors at worst, or grill-and-drill instructors at best. The TAs expressed feelings of anxiety and frustration during talks. Common themes of disinterested students, lack of attendance, and confusion regarding class rolls often emerged. In all, the teachers and TAs were looking for a way to make better use of the extended classroom time for sections; they knew they were losing their audience, and they didn't know what to do about it.

Not Talk

The main contention was a call for structure: to make the time and effort students put into the course as useful to them as possible. In fact, even though teaching ENGL 100 came with an extra unit of pay, two of the new instructors chose not

to continue teaching the course. Here was what Nowacek (2013) identified as the "not talk" of bricolage. The instructors knew that what they were doing in ENGL 100 was *not* what they wanted for student engagement and interaction, was *not* serving the students well, and was *not* helping them develop into better teachers. The TAs also frequently engaged in "not talk" as they shared their experiences. The students were *not* interacting with them in ways they thought were positive, nor were the students respectful or open with the TAs, nor did the TAs feel like they understood how exactly to fix this situation. The "not talk" established that a pattern of behaviors was occurring that no one wanted and provided an opening for change. After the conversations, I asked the scheduling administrator to sign me up to teach the one, off-cycle course of ENGL 100 offered in the spring, and I asked the TA who seemed most interested in additional training, Kelsey, if she would like to try out studio pedagogy with me.

Resituating Available Materials for Uptake

In order to pilot the first Studio in spring 2013, Kelsey and I had to move quickly. Our initial conversations about curriculum plans began in October of 2012 with a projected class implementation of January 2013. In our conversations, Kelsey shared her experiences with me, and I shared my studio dreams with her. We took time to read studio texts together over winter break and crafted lesson plans to allow TA sessions to be governed by a mix of studio and workshop pedagogies. We took our knowledge of what was and wasn't working and shifted to a pattern of "uptake," asking, "What do we know about previous experiences that did work (assignments and activities the TA could remember were used to good effect)? What were we reading in studio texts that created positive results for others (hosting discussions about the purposes of the course in relation to larger university goals about whole-self education)? And, what were our local constraints that we could turn to our advantage (such as the highly diverse student body)?" Kelsey and I took time to talk and dream together before getting down to the brass tacks of course implementation, because I wanted to make sure ownership of Studio was happening from the ground up.

Once the course began, we debriefed after every class session, and we both kept teaching journals of our progress and understanding of the students. To plumb student understanding and experience, we held small group instructional diagnostics, or SGIDs, and we asked students to participate in anonymous surveys. The course—from the perspectives of Kelsey, the students, and me—was a success. Kelsey told others what a turnaround had occurred with the new curriculum, and other instructors saw students as they walked to and from my office and interacted with one another in the halls, noticing they had generally happy, upbeat expressions on their faces. These new watercooler moments resulted in

one long-term adjunct offering to help teach ENGL 100, and a new adjunct excitedly volunteering to join in the project.

Seizing the Moment

We are now in the process of leading a team of three instructors and three TAs in the new studio courses. With a research study underway that includes interviews with students, portfolio evaluation and analysis of students' written reflections, we hope to demonstrate and validate the need for Writing Studio with mixed qualitative and quantitative data that should be persuasive to audiences outside of the department.

Although Kelsey and I are happy with our small successes, this is by no means a hero narrative. While student reflections and questionnaires from the pilot semester underscore how helpful and affirming students found the bricolage take on studio pedagogy, as we move forward, I worry about sustainability and assessment. Resources, teacher-mentoring, and time are all already stretched too thin on a shoestring budget. My work as a bricoleur isn't finished; I must continue to engage in "not talk" and uptake, working to repurpose and honor the contributions of others who may not share my training or perspectives.

On the Ground Preparation at Biola—Kelsey's story

I had received no training prior to walking into the classroom as a teacher's assistant for two courses. One day, on the walk to start class, my cooperating professor handed me article printouts she wanted me to go over with the students. I had no foundational understanding of the topic that I was teaching, and I did not understand how I was supposed to connect the materials to the overarching project the students were working on. Ten minutes painfully ticked by on the clock, as I tried to skim through the handout and still be social with the class. Once I officially began the session, we read through the piece together, before I asked the students to write about how they thought the article applied to their current essay assignment. When finished, the students discussed their answers in groups. It was a class of 12, and they were mostly English-Language Learner students, which led to a short discussion. By the time we completed my impromptu lesson, 30 minutes of class time remained. I had no idea what to do. We ended up talking about current football team statistics before grinding to a halt fifteen minutes early. This was not the only time a scenario like this played out.

Calling the class sessions ineffective is an understatement. I fumbled through the content because I was not confident in my own abilities, and there was no apparent structure to the class. Many days, most of the class would be wasted on conversation that had no apparent correlation with our scheduled topic. If I

made it through a session alive, I considered it a success. However, my preparedness and the lack of understanding I had about my role weren't the only issues.

There was also a disconnect with students. Students were frequently disinterested in the content that I was trying to teach them and rarely asked for any type of assistance inside or outside the class setting. I was seen as a peer with no right to any kind of authority or, sometimes, respect. This only became more apparent as the semester progressed. Once, a student tried to sneak out by crawling across the floor. These hectic, first-semester snapshots of my experience highlight many different problems that I encountered on a daily basis: disrespect, lack of communication, lack of punctuality, and unpreparedness. The difficulties I describe here were not necessarily immediately solved through Studio, but studio pedagogy has definitely changed my experiences as a TA, and the experiences of the students, for the better.

Constantly Communicate

Every interaction with Aurora embodied what Studio is about—communication. Weeks before I began the studio course, she made sure that I was properly trained and that I clearly understood what my role in the classroom would be. I always felt like my opinion and teaching experiences were heard and validated. Because Aurora modeled what proper communication looked like, I was able to carry that model into my studio work.

Studio group is a time of trial and error: a place where students engage in not-talk and uptake without the fear of embarrassment. At the start of the semester, many students would preface a question with, "this may be a dumb or stupid question, but . . ." However, as the semester progressed, students slowly stopped prefacing their questions and began to allow the class to interact with their ideas, opinions, and queries at face value. In studio space, they were able to be raw and real human beings. They did not have to be successful, completely composed students. They could be frustrated or tired; these emotions were treated as suitable and normal feelings. Studio allows students to be upfront about their struggles, and it also presents a space where they can come alongside each other—either to find or give help to work through university requirements.

The most successful moments in Studio are when students practice uptake, when they realize how what we do connects back to the class' purpose. In the words of a current student, "Oh . . . so studio groups are supposed to help us be successful in whatever projects we are doing in this class?" To us, the educators, this seems obvious. But when students have breakthroughs like this, Studio is truly successful. When students learn to make connections and conclusions on their own, they have learned a skill they can apply to any class, job, problem, or situation they face in life.

Regional, Comprehensive State University—Bre's Story

Nestled on 1,600 acres in the northwest part of the state, University of West Florida (UWF) serves just over 13,000 undergraduate and graduate students. When I joined the Composition Program at UWF, one of my first anticipated actions was to implement Writing Studio. I aimed to increase the presence and visibility of writing intensive courses—a personal objective fueled by the university's charge to "reform writing." As a new community member and a brand new WPA, I knew I must couch any proposed changes in collaboration and research.

When I arrived, the Composition Program at UWF primarily consisted of two first-year Composition courses: ENC 1101 (Introduction to Academic Writing and Research) and ENC 1102 (Public Writing). I quickly discovered frustration and general discontent with student writing among my colleagues. This led me to wonder how I might start the process of transforming this culture of writing. How might I employ the bricolage methods of "uptake" and "not-talk" to switch the conversation from students' "lack" in writing skills to a "lack" of curricular writing support? One answer to these questions was to create a trial course, ENC 1990 (Writing Studio), a one-hour elective that functioned as an intensive, small group writing workshop.

Rather than spend time meticulously making a case for course implementation, planning course design, acquiring sustainable resources, and settling institutional logistics, I opted for learning through doing and action. In less than three months from my arrival at UWF, I offered the brand-new studio course as a three-semester pilot study. I used the pilot to accumulate the data I would use to propose an official course. Some may argue that more time was needed for advertising, securing stakeholder buy-in, and researching local needs. I do not disagree, yet I found extreme value in using a pilot study as a grassroots pedagogical exploration.

Uptake, Examining What Is at Hand

To explore possibilities for offering writing studio courses in spring 2013, I began by conducting informal, localized research that would determine *who* constituted studio audience(s) and *what* model or course design would most benefit UWF students. I spent weeks listening, observing, and socializing to identify available material, physical, and discursive resources. I attended open faculty forums and workshops sponsored by groups like The Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment; focus group discussions about the university's Quality Enhancement Plan and about university assessment demands; and "faculty happy hours" and Friday "Faculty Social Hour" sessions.

Through these communal engagements, I pieced together important facts

about my campus: high power stakeholders prefer to be in the know about significant curricular changes; university advisors must be fully informed, as they are the sounding-boards between students and course endorsements; composition faculty need to feel included in the decision-making process; scholarship and aide students at UWF cannot always find space for *elective* hours in already tight schedules; classes with "low enrollments" are at-risk of getting cut; and university initiatives often involve student retention concerns.

Uptake Translates into Not-talk

In my fall 2012 conversations, colleagues across campus expressed disparate expectations regarding "good writing." I needed to set the program apart from any sort of "remediation" space. UWF, as part of the State University System of Florida, does not offer any remediation courses. While Studio, in general, has a history of helping writers marked as "basic" (in whatever way that term is used), Studio is not a stand-alone basic writing class. Part of my administrative approach included defining and positioning Studio as an elective curricular space, a workshop space, in which students investigate writing processes and rhetorical knowledges. I next reached out to the Committee on Retention Efforts (CORE), a task force offering financial support for curriculum designed to increase student retention. Listing the course was easy, yet sustainable curricular and pedagogical development evolved at a more gradual pace and less linear trajectory.

Seizing the Uptake Opportunity

Studio emerged at a kairotic campus moment, when the university shifted attention from increased enrollment to retention. Similar to the argument Ritola et al. make in this collection, timing is very much a part of studio curricular design, the launching and implementation and the sustained support. The administrative environment was particularly financially supportive of curricular ideas framed around "high impact learning" for first-year students. I attended meetings in which speakers discussed national data that links student success to the grades they earn in first-year composition. Students who pass first-year core courses in math and writing are more likely to return to the institution their second year. Therefore, I cast the class as a curriculum that would increase "first-to-second year retention rates." The class is small and the offerings few. Here arose a tension between theory and practice that I would consistently encounter.

Building Relationships through Course Design

With retention in the spotlight, I returned to my department to identify a teacher-collaborator and secure a cross-community partnership to attain university

buy-in and, if possible, funding. A veteran adjunct faculty member, Justin McCoy, expressed interest in teaching the course. Justin and I partnered with the Director of Student Success Programs (SSP) to offer a section of Writing Studio designated for TRIO students.[1] We worked closely with SSP to organize what would become a non-traditional studio model. The SSP Dean graciously provided us a teaching space and funded our initiative by offering to pay the instructor. However, to use TRIO grant money, the course instruction had to be characterized as "supplemental," meaning the class could not run as an official course. We feared, as a result, the course would carry connotations of a tutoring space rather than a space of robust production and revision. We would have to offer the course as a true "third space."

During spring 2013, we ran a pilot study of two sections of ENC 1990 Writing Studio. One section was listed on the course registration and granted students one credit hour and a letter grade; the second section was off-the-books and reserved for TRIO students. For the catalog section, students officially enrolled in the course and therefore had a personal incentive to arrive and participate. However, because we offered the TRIO section without any credit hours or grade affiliation, students lacked motivation to participate. In this volume, Santana et al. offer a compelling narrative regarding a studio that relies on Directed Self Placement. However, with an optional attendance policy, only two students attended the UWF Studio and attendance was not always consistent. Unfortunately, even though we believed as Santana et al., who contend, "optional studio classes therefore serve to allow greater scheduling flexibility for students and to demonstrate innovation and efficiency," we found, like them, that optional attendance and a lack of grades caused learning barriers for some students. In addition, because this section was not officially listed, we could not include these two students in our quantitative assessment data.

While the second section was open enrollment, advisors did not receive enough notice to properly advertise the course to students. When the semester began, only three students had registered, but within the first two weeks, two more students began to attend, making a total enrollment of five. Three of the students were first-years co-enrolled in ENC 1101 or 1102; two students were beyond their first year. In addition, two students were ELL learners from Brazil. Despite enrollment issues, the courses assisted the students. The once-a-week class session gave students repeated and consistent opportunities for deep reflection; collaborative, small group learning and sharing; and across the curriculum writing instruction.

1 TRIO is a federal outreach program often housed within Student Success Programs. Its mission centers around retention and graduation of program participants and offers financial and tutorial assistance to students identified as at-risk of leaving the university.

Uptake and Outcomes

To assess our pilot sections, we conducted mixed methods research. In the courses, each student identified a corresponding course for which he or she hoped Studio would assist with learning success. In review, no student in either Studio earned lower than a B- in that course. One student's composition instructor observed an explicit development of the student's writing, a growth both parties attributed to Studio. We also used anonymous surveys and focus groups to solicit student feedback. All students celebrated the courses, said they would take the course again, and would recommend the course to friends. One student remarked that she had never considered herself a writer, and she highly valued a collaborative space in which "peers listen and take her advice seriously." Both students in the TRIO section stressed a desire for a grade connected to participation, attendance, and arriving with required materials. We agreed and decided to only offer Studio as an officially registered course section, even if this meant losing funding from community partners. We also refused to offer required sections, much like Santana, Rose and LaBarge's work (this volume), opting for a self-placement model that would maximize student agency and ensure the open access nature of the curriculum.

In fall 2013, the semester following our pilot study, we offered two additional sections of Studio. We changed the location of the course and broadened our audience to writers across campus. And while the courses were not solely populated by first-year students, this became an unforeseen strength. For example, placing a first-year composition student working on a rhetorical analysis for ENC 1102 in conversation with a senior Environmental Science major writing a Capstone project allowed each writer to discuss genre conventions, audience, and disciplinary style in ways they would not otherwise have had.

As a bricoleur, curricular design taught me that I must arrange materials to invent new instructional spaces and constantly rearrange those materials to adapt and keep alive the language and bodies associated with such spaces. As we move forward, our main concern revolves around sustainability. Even now, as we enter the fall 2014 semester, Studio continues to evolve, adapting to fit the curricular demands and students' needs at hand.

On-the-Ground Preparation at UWF—Justin's Story

The idea for a Writing Studio Program emerged from Bre's training with Dr. John Tassoni and her dialogue with writing teachers about the region-specific needs of UWF students. In a collaborative, low-stakes workshop environment, students interpret assignment sheets and teacher feedback on assignments; generate and research ideas; invent topics; write, evaluate, revise, and edit drafts; and

present works-in-progress as well as final writing projects. Studio teaches these activities as recursive, in that writers engage and re-engage in them throughout completing assignments. Through the experience of sharing both process materials and final productions, students learn to ask critical questions about their own writing, prompting broader, more nuanced conversations about academic conventions. My studio teaching can be characterized in terms of three divergent experiences: 1) the TRIO-funded pilot study in spring 2013, 2) my open enrollment section in fall 2013, and 3) my fall 2013 English Composition I section of TRIO students that included a studio day added to the regular course curriculum.

Uptake and Outcomes

The function of UWF's Writing Studio is to "re-enable" both the student and the curriculum, to re-embody students as authorities and the classroom as a site of possibility. My role as facilitator in this uptake process is one that I am constantly considering. Unlike other courses, Studio demands that instructors facilitate the learning of rhetorical strategies through students' initial studio-session discussions. In this way, student uptake determines the foci of classes. The instructor practices uptake by making spur-of-the-moment decisions that impact daily goals. This process can be exciting and engaging, because many opportunities for learning arise. Studio pedagogy affords students a type of spontaneous learning through which each student exercises his or her own agency and practices engaging me and his or her peers in writing workshops.

CONCLUSION: FORWARD MOVEMENTS

A few years later, we understand even more fully how studio implementation necessitates bricolage. Creators must acquire disparate resources, build new relationships, practice uptake and "not talk," identify gaps in curricula, and provide opportunities for institutional growth. As we move forward, we must establish stable funding, training, and more standard curricula.

Currently, unlike the work of Tonya Ritola et al. in Chapter Four, Biola and UWF do not have funding dedicated to training studio facilitators. We are exploring our collaborations with on-campus writing centers, and we are in negotiations to create teacher-training courses. While new approaches and additional pay create an impetus to teach studio courses, the contingent nature of both groups require methods of continual teaching and development. For example, in one small focus group at UWF, a student reflected, "Studio moments don't necessarily come from group work and collaboration, but from spontaneous discussions and conversations." Her insight captures the entire essence of studio

pedagogy. Teachers of any course often gauge their success from assignment design, course organization, and content delivery. However, in Studio, the teacher must literally re-embody herself or himself as collaborative learner, guide, or facilitator—a process that requires training.

We are also applying for internal "course development" grant monies to formalize the results of our research. Through formalizing the results, we will make our case to upper administration regarding studio's value for retention, writing, critical thinking, and information literacy. The overwhelmingly positive student and teacher voices tell us we are on the right track. Yet, as also indicated by the work of Ritola, Minardi Power et al., we need "hard data" regarding increases in pass rates to back up our qualitative truths.

The other ongoing decision we face with studio design is about who will actually populate the courses. At UWF, the course was originally marketed as driving positive first-to-second year retention, and we ended up with a diverse accumulation of students from across the curriculum. At Biola, the course was already a "catch all" and requires that we work backwards to untangle whom, exactly, is in the course and for what reasons. And while these are not the best approaches from a program administrator or studio teacher standpoint, there are two benefits: 1) We fill seats, which ensure that the section(s) make, and 2) The students in the spaces find value in the experience.

Throughout our pilots, we have encountered a handful of challenges. The difficulties seem to center around misunderstandings about what exactly Writing Studio *is*: What purpose does it serve and for whom? Often, we must continue to cater to administrative audiences over student audiences, even though focusing on students and teachers at this stage helps more effectively with enrollment issues. In addition, teacher/facilitator training is an ongoing struggle. With the fast turn-around and mobility of TAs and adjunct faculty, we cannot assume we will have the same teachers for more than a few semesters at most. Teacher training and curricular revision require sustainable finances, which returns us to the continued arguments made for Studio—a circular dilemma to say the least. Last, we continue to work at increasing student motivation. Kelsey and Justin's stories point toward the need for extrinsic motivation: grades attached to the courses. Yet, we continue to seek more complex means of intrinsic motivation. How might we make the courses more personally worthwhile for students?

Despite nuances and bypasses, we value the grounded research approach that has thus far resulted in a revisionary pedagogy that truly places students and the teaching of writing first. In a bricolage fashion, our invention and delivery of different writing studio approaches has patched together a fine-tuned arrangement of disparate materials and resources. We have forged relationships in unlikely places and have recruited former studio students to help us market

the class. The result is a model of extemporaneous instruction and embodied learning for students and teachers. We hope that our work helps others, both teachers and administrators, to identify or reconceptualize studio approaches and policies that will prove successful in their context.

REFERENCES

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (1998). *Evaluating the intellectual work of writing administration*. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/positions/intellectual-work.html

Deleuze, G., & Guattari F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

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

Grego, R. C., & Thompson, N. S. (1995). The writing studio program: Reconfiguring basic writing/freshman composition. *Writing Program Administration, 19*(1/2), 66-79.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1972). *The savage mind*. London, UK: Weidenfield and Nicholson.

Nowacek, R. (2013, March). *Transfer as bricolage: Assembling genre knowledge across contexts*. Paper presented at a meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Las Vegas, Nevada.

Selfe, C. L., & Selfe, R. J. (1994). The politics of the interface: Power and its exercise in electronic contact zones. *College Composition and Communication, 45*(4), 480-504.

Wibberley, C. (2012). Getting to grips with bricolage: A personal account. *The Qualitative Report, 17*(50), 1-8.