

# Rebooting ALP

Tara Coleman and Jacqueline Jones

*ABSTRACT: The COVID-19 pandemic placed particular strains on course models such as the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP), which emphasize small group learning and individualized support for students. While many of the resulting challenges, particularly those related to student engagement, have been shared by program leaders and faculty around the country, this reflective essay discusses how our writing program responded to these challenges by drawing on an existing culture of professional development along with emerging assessment practices. In a period of rapid change brought about by not only COVID-19, but also a host of other institutional, demographic and socio-political factors, we emphasize the need to guide ALP faculty in deepening their understanding of how the work we do with students is influenced by a broader context. In the essay, we show how our experience coleading a year of professional development sessions focused on next steps for our ALP course, combined with new approaches to programmatic assessment, have led to a shift in how we approach curricular and pedagogical interventions. As we attempt to move from the pandemic era of reactive problem-solving to a more proactive focus on long-term structural changes, we argue that the sustainability of ALP in the long term requires faculty to be prepared to adjust to changing circumstances while remaining grounded in the core tenets of the model.*

*KEYWORDS: Accelerated Learning Program (ALP); COVID-19; critical reading; inquiry-based learning; professional development; writing program assessment*

## Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic arrived at a particularly pivotal moment of transition for the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) writing course at our institution, LaGuardia Community College, part of the City University of New York (CUNY). We began offering ALP courses in 2011, and quickly scaled up from four sections to over 20 in 2014 (see Johnsen). In 2018, our program conducted a full-scale revision of the course in response to the (most welcome) elimination of a CUNY-mandated exit exam for developmental students, a change which allowed us to spend all our additional time with students on authentic composition skills. Along with many of the other colleges nationwide who adopted this model, we found that the course had a positive impact on student success. Prior to the pandemic, students enrolled in our ALP course routinely passed at a similar rate to students enrolled in our first-semester writing course, and at a much higher rate than students who took our standalone developmental writing course. Furthermore, ALP students passed the next composition course in our sequence at a higher rate

than students who passed our first-semester writing course (see tables 1 and 2). By 2019, due to the success of programs like ours within the system, as well as the national push to end traditional remediation, CUNY announced a phase-out of all non-credit-bearing remedial courses in math, reading, and writing (“Technical Guidance Memorandum OAA 20-01”). This change meant that our ALP course needed to make two major adjustments: 1) expand support for reading skills, now that remedial reading courses would no longer be offered, and 2) prepare to serve not only upper-level developmental students but all entering students (except those placed into our English as a Second Language program courses).<sup>1</sup> Just before the COVID-19 pandemic hit in the winter of 2020, we were approaching a decade of work on this course and looking for ways to ensure its sustainability long-term while considering what impact these major shifts in its function at the university should have on our approach to teaching and administering it.

As we will describe in this reflection, during the turbulent semesters in which our courses were conducted in distance learning, Spring 2020 through most of Fall 2021, we were able to draw on our existing culture of professional development, as well as emerging assessment practices, to guide our response. The pandemic caused us to rethink several aspects of our ALP curriculum and pedagogy, emerging most cogently in a series of professional development “reboot” seminars we coled in the 2021-2022 academic year to prepare for the so-called “post-pandemic” version of this course. The “reboot” seminar and other initiatives in our writing program have further clarified the reality that the pandemic’s impacts on our students intersect with structural changes that directly preceded it. Rather than returning to a period of stability, ALP teaching appears likely to require frequent adapta-

---

**Tara Coleman** is a Professor of English at LaGuardia Community College, part of the City University of New York where she currently serves as codirector of the writing program. She regularly leads professional development for first-year writing and ALP faculty. Her research interests include language justice and critical reading in the composition classroom, with a particular focus on the interrelation between institutional structures and individual pedagogies.

**Jacqueline Jones** is a Professor of English at LaGuardia Community College, which is a part of the City University of New York. She currently serves as Deputy Chair of the English Department, and previously served as codirector of the writing program. Dr. Jones has led professional development for first-year writing and ALP faculty. Her research interests include composition studies, and 20th and 21st century African American literature and media studies. Her work has been published in WPA: Writing Program Administration, Modern Language Studies, College English, and the College Language Association Journal.

tion and flexibility for the foreseeable future. In response, we argue that as researchers and teachers, we should develop models for sustainability in ALP programs, guided by scholars of programs like WAC, which can be similarly subject to changing institutional tides (e.g. Cox, Galin, and Meltzer). In 2021, when we began conceptualizing “rebooting” our ALP course, we thought the structural changes and challenges we were experiencing required us to make significant changes to our pedagogy and potentially overall curriculum for the course. Ultimately, the “reboot” seminar and the initiatives we have engaged in thereafter have led to a more measured, slow-burn response, in which we have reaffirmed core features of the course while initiating assessment in areas of particular concern. For us, sustainable ALP involves a combination of targeted, ongoing professional development and flexible assessment practices that enable us to respond to changes in students’ needs and institutional policies over time.

### **Shifting Professional Development During the Pandemic**

In the years leading up to the pandemic, professional development in our ALP course focused primarily on orienting faculty to the accelerated model and to our department’s pedagogical framework for ALP. The course, ENA101: Accelerated Composition I, is directly modeled on the Community College of Baltimore County program (Adams et al.).<sup>2</sup> ENA 101 meets for seven hours per week, consisting of four hours in which ten students placed in developmental writing take ENG101: Composition I with twelve students directly placed into the course. The developmental writing student cohort also receives three additional hours of support per week. Instructors teach all seven hours of the course and use the additional hours to deepen students’ integration of reading and writing, improve critical thinking skills, and respond to affective issues. Instructors are also highly encouraged to use this time to decelerate learning by reviewing material already covered in ENG 101 or previewing upcoming lessons or materials. In 2018, our then-ALP coordinator, J. Elizabeth Clark, took advantage of the opening created by the elimination of the exit exam to lead a professional development seminar that created a pedagogical framework of eight core features which define our program’s ENA101 pedagogy (“Teaching with the ENA101 Framework”). The yearlong effort culminated in a formal curriculum revision that included three course objectives specific to ENA101 in addition to the Composition I course objectives:

1. Provide students with individualized support and practice throughout all phases of the writing process to ensure the development of college-level writing skills to be successful in English 101.
2. Reinforce the reading and writing opportunities provided in English 101.
3. Provide students with additional time to develop a deeper understanding of the recursive writing process necessary for college composition.

To integrate these revisions into classroom practice, the program offered several rounds of paid professional development including, for the first time, paid seminars for adjunct faculty.<sup>3</sup> In addition to training faculty in both the practical aspects of teaching this course and the principles of our ENA Framework, these pre-pandemic professional development sessions heavily emphasized the importance of using the additional time provided by the ALP model to address the affective domain of writing instruction.<sup>4</sup> Such activities included developing lessons or low-stakes assignments to help students navigate writing anxiety, sharing strategies from the emerging CUNY-wide work on learning mindsets, guiding students through the transition to college, and cultivating a sense of community in the small group.

These professional development seminars continued through the beginning of the pandemic and offered a space for faculty to support each other and our students as we all navigated life at the “epicenter of the epicenter” of the COVID-19 outbreak in Queens, New York (see e.g. McVane). During these first semesters of distance learning in 2020, our extensive pre-pandemic conversations about the affective dimension of learning served us well. Faculty were able to apply their techniques for addressing the student as a whole person to all their courses, not just ALP. And even though our ALP faculty had only met their ENA101 students once or twice before moving online in Spring 2020 (due to our unusual academic calendar), many faculty reported that their ENA101 students navigated the transition to distance learning more successfully than their English 101 peers, perhaps because they had already established a sense of connection with their professor in those initial small group meetings.

However, in the ensuing semesters of distance learning, we began to grapple with the twin challenges of steeply declining enrollment and higher withdrawal and failure rates. The removal of tests such as the SAT or ACT from the placement process, and at the time an incomplete transition to a new ESL placement model at CUNY, created uncertainty around the paths

students took into our courses. During this period, we and our fellow Writing Program Administrators<sup>5</sup> implemented a range of professional development opportunities for instructors teaching courses across the program, from faculty support pods and distance learning workshops to one-on-one troubleshooting and brainstorming support. Faculty members developed many creative ways of engaging students in both synchronous and asynchronous online writing courses. But as we looked ahead to the return to campus in Fall 2021, it was clear that we needed to not only address the deep emotional scars that the COVID-19 pandemic had left on all of us, especially the more vulnerable among our students, but also think more comprehensively about the many ways – not limited to those caused by the pandemic – in which our ALP course was no longer operating in the same institutional framework as it had been just two years before.

One major structural change, the elimination of remedial reading courses and the shift to a single placement score rather than separate measures for reading and writing, had, along with the pandemic, created a strong need for greater attention to critical reading skills. Faculty were reporting anecdotally that students were struggling to complete assigned readings, even though many had cut back on the amount of assigned reading during the pandemic, and that some students were struggling to understand texts that had never presented such a challenge prior to the pandemic; as such, we made critical reading skills one of the major goals of the next round of professional development. The other area of greatest need we identified came out of our assessment of student artifacts. LaGuardia's general education assessment evaluates students' work through three core competencies: Inquiry and Problem Solving (IPS), Global Learning, and Integrative Learning. In 2019, we changed the targeted competency for our Composition I course to IPS, which measures students' ability to frame issues, gather evidence, analyze, and then draw conclusions. This competency strongly aligns with one of our two program-specific learning outcomes, related to students' ability to integrate and synthesize sources in their writing. We had just begun to assess this programmatic learning outcome during the winter of 2020, and were somewhat surprised to see that students were coming quite close to meeting our benchmark expectations during distance learning. Additionally, the collegewide general education assessment showed that after a dip in the spring and fall of 2020, students were bouncing back in their work around IPS in 2021.

However, both rounds of assessment revealed that more work could be done with assignment design. We were aware that not all faculty had

adjusted their Composition I assignments to target the goals of IPS, as distance learning had disrupted our ability to implement that recent curricular change. Additionally, our programmatic assessment, which looks at faculty assignment instructions alongside student work, gave us insight into ways our faculty could better guide students in understanding the goals of research-based writing and in navigating the different stages of the research process. More broadly, we suspected that challenges with assigned readings and with the staged research-based assignment at the end of the semester could be playing a significant role in the elevated withdrawal rate for ENA101 students since the COVID-19 pandemic (see table 3). We hoped that supporting students in these two key areas would encourage them to at least pursue the class until the end, rather than get frustrated and drop out. We decided to use this new phase of professional development to integrate more mindfully what we were learning through these various forms of assessment into our ENA101 curriculum.

Without realizing it at the time, this represented a meaningful shift in how we approach professional development for ENA101. In the early days of ALP at LaGuardia, the course represented an experimental alternative to our traditional composition sequence, so it was administered and assessed separately from our other courses. We emerged from the pandemic in a very different set of circumstances: most of our faculty had now been trained to teach ENA101 and CUNY's remediation reforms had entrenched our ALP course as the primary placement for incoming students with developmental needs. The result was that ENA101 now functioned as the foundation of our writing program, the place from which many of our key pedagogical principles and strategies emerged. What we decided to call the ENA101 "reboot" seminar reflected this important solidification of the course's role in the program, and served as an opportunity to help faculty reflect on what this new phase of ALP meant—for us as teachers, for our students, and for our entire program.

## **ENA Reboot**

Two cohorts of faculty participated in the ENA101 "reboot" seminar during the 2021-2022 academic year—one in the fall, and one in the spring. The seminar gave faculty the opportunity to brainstorm ways of responding to pandemic-related challenges in the course, such as student disengagement, while also taking a close look at policy and curricular changes that had preceded the pandemic and had not been fully addressed due to the

disruption caused by distance learning. To do this, the first session of both the fall and spring seminars included a comprehensive overview of all the changes our ALP course has experienced over the last decade (as discussed in the previous section). Changes discussed included: removal of remedial reading courses and reading placement measures, introduction of the Placement Index, course curricular revisions, the impact of the pandemic on student attendance and engagement, and how the university's focus on increasing graduation rates while decreasing time to degree influences students' willingness or availability to engage in the type of intensive learning that an ALP course requires. One topic that sparked the most interest among participants was the need to integrate critical reading and writing pedagogies, which continues to be of interest to our faculty since the "reboot" seminars. Our goal in structuring the "reboot" seminar was to first encourage participants to share observations about what they were seeing and then guide them toward a more comprehensive response by designing a curricular project targeted to one of the challenges the group identified. These projects were later shared with colleagues in the program on our writing program website. As we are a fairly large department (over 100 members, made up of roughly two-thirds full-time, and one-third part-time faculty), with fluctuating resources to fund professional development and varying abilities to commit to a semester-long seminar, sharing outcomes of our professional development initiatives in department meetings, workshops, and on our writing program website are important methods we use to engage as many members of our department as possible in program conversations about pedagogy and changes to our curriculum. In addition to discussing new teaching strategies and creating a curricular project to address the "post"-pandemic needs of our students, the seminar asked faculty to specifically re-consider the design of one of their staged, inquiry-based writing assignments, to address the needs identified through assessment.

The "reboot" seminar re-affirmed the core components of our ALP pedagogy, namely: 1) providing students with extensive individualized guidance; 2) developing peer relationships between students in the cohort model to support their sense of belonging and engagement; and 3) paying attention to affective concerns around reading and writing, as well as the development of habits of mind that will enable students to succeed in future college courses more broadly. Given the changes that have taken place since we first designed and then re-designed the class, it is important for us, collectively, to continue to reinforce these core values to ensure they are protected within our turbulent instructional environment. Yet unsurpris-

ingly, the “post”-pandemic challenges loomed large in conversations among both the fall and spring cohorts of our “reboot” seminar. While many faculty members envisioned that the return to campus would precipitate a reversal of the learning loss and challenging student behavior that emerged during distance learning, the reality turned out to be much harder and more complicated than imagined. Some faculty perceived that the gap in skill sets between students placed in Composition I and ENA101 had widened; while other faculty perceived that there were students in their ENG 101 courses that would be better served through ENA 101, and a few students in their ENA 101 courses that should have been directly placed into ENG 101. Awareness of these circumstances were leading some faculty to not only change the material covered during small group sessions, but also rethink what activities they could conduct in combined Composition I class sessions. Faculty were noting that compared to pre-pandemic attendance patterns, more ENA101 students were not attending small group sessions regularly or were coming significantly late and/or leaving early. There were also more ENA101 students who were attending class but not turning in assignments. Overall, even though our ENA101 course is designed to help support students in working through any affective issues that might be impacting their success in Composition I (and certainly many students were telling us about serious mental health concerns and challenges in their personal lives that made studying after the pandemic difficult), it seemed that we were facing a unique challenge with ENA101 students precisely because of the intensive nature of the course. The expectations held by many of the students who had graduated high school during the pandemic about what is required to successfully engage in a college writing course, let alone an accelerated one, were a formidable barrier.

Allowing faculty the space to process these “post”-pandemic challenges was an important part of the “reboot” seminar, but our primary goal was to shift our stance as both individual instructors and as a program, from being reactive to proactive. In our conversations, we prompted participants to take a step back from the problem-solving, unceasingly adaptive mode we had all been in since the start of the pandemic to consider how a number of policy and curricular changes at the university, college, and programmatic levels were also playing a role. By doing so, we hoped that rather than throwing every creative idea we could think of at the problem to see what sticks, we could identify targeted areas where we could begin to identify structural changes that may be needed for the course long-term. From an administrative standpoint, we similarly recognized the need to shift from a stance in



which we were constantly preparing to defend an experimental intervention against potential budget-motivated elimination, using the outcomes measures which are most meaningful to administrators, to one in which we proactively identified what the course's role should be in this new educational landscape and what types of assessment would best inform that work.

### **Seminar Outcomes**

Our work in the “reboot” seminar revealed a need for ongoing support in designing inquiry-based writing assignments that aligned with institutional general education assessment goals. It was clear from our work with participants in the seminar that many faculty members were working in class with students to deconstruct, explain, and practice inquiry skills; our review of the IPS assignments faculty submitted for the seminar, however, showed that sometimes assignment instructions were less clear about the particular line of inquiry students were expected to develop and/or the steps for doing so. As seminar leaders, we provided feedback on participants' assignments, encouraging faculty to reinforce in-class guidance in their assignment prompts as well as to be more intentional in guiding students to frame a question or problem themselves (within a set of issues being discussed in class), rather than simply answering a faculty member's question. This is part of a longer-term effort across the writing program to reinforce principles of effective assignment design, with special attention being paid to how we construct and scaffold these IPS assignments.

In addition to working on IPS assignments, we asked faculty participants to target the curricular projects they designed to fill in gaps they noticed in our program's current instructional materials and to ensure that whatever they created would be useful to instructors across the program (i.e. they would not be specific to a single faculty member's course theme). In response to the broadened need for critical reading support some faculty have observed, several participants chose to develop materials related to teaching critical reading, which was one of the goals of the seminar. We used Peter Adams's article “Pedagogical Evolution” as a starting point, because it not only traces his gradual adoption of an integrated reading and writing approach for ALP, but also includes a detailed description of how reading and writing activities are sequenced in his course. The article inspired some faculty to more intentionally stage and contextualize reading assignments for students, while gradually integrating them into the writing process. Other participants chose to focus on areas such as note-taking or class engagement.

One important lesson which emerged from this professional development seminar for us as coleaders was that not all our colleagues are equally prepared for (or interested in) thinking beyond their individual classroom practice. While faculty members in our department have largely been supportive of our transition to conceptualizing and administering our sequence of composition courses as a writing program, only some of the projects which emerged from the “reboot” seminar were specifically targeted to the institutional changes and challenges that we had identified as the focal point of the seminars. We observed that faculty members who were (or had previously been) in leadership roles in various initiatives in the writing program were more comfortable framing their project as a curricular intervention to address one of the concerns that had been discussed. For example, some of those faculty members designed a staged, integrated reading and writing sequence of assignments that could be a model for colleagues interested in enhancing their reading pedagogy. Other colleagues, meanwhile, were more focused on designing activities that addressed their own individual interests for their classrooms. While valuable in themselves, these projects tended to align with our pre-pandemic pedagogical framework for the course (such as the focus on the affective domain of learning, or on preparing students exiting ENA101 for their next course in the composition sequence) rather than aiming to address new challenges. This is understandable, as faculty members often sign up for professional development opportunities either to be “trained” in a new course or pedagogical approach, or to get ideas about what other colleagues are doing. Our professional development initiatives have less often asked colleagues to do programmatic, strategic thinking or to design course materials with a broader audience in mind. This “reboot” seminar reflects our attempt to begin to engage instructors across the program—both adjuncts and full-timers—in a conversation about how the broader context (at the college, at CUNY, and in higher education more broadly) impacts our work in the classroom, because we feel that an institutionally-aware perspective will be essential for our faculty to develop the adaptability needed for teaching ALP students into the future.

### **Rebooting ALP Assessment**

In the face of persistent pandemic-era challenges, particularly around student attendance and engagement, and stemming in part from our “reboot” conversation, we have begun to think differently about how we identify areas of need for curriculum and professional development. The

overall pass rate of our ENA101 course has been improving over the three semesters since we returned to primary in-person instruction, though it has not yet reached its pre-COVID rate (see table 3).<sup>6</sup> One key issue appears to be unofficial withdrawals, or students who essentially disappear long before the end of the semester. Unofficial withdrawal grades rose during the pandemic and remain persistently high, while the percentage of students who fail despite making it to the end of the semester has been fairly consistent. This leaves us with a question: to what extent is the course itself failing to meet the needs of our current students, and to what extent are factors external to the course the primary cause of this change? In other words, should we focus our attention on curricular and pedagogical reforms, or on working with students and the institution to help students navigate those challenges which may be preventing them from engaging with the course as designed?

To help us begin to explore this question, in the spring of 2023 our program piloted a new approach to assessing our ALP course, focused on gathering more information on the interconnected set of issues impacting our students' success. Rather than assessing student work in the course in isolation, this assessment looked at student outcomes alongside indicators of student engagement (e.g. turning in work, attending class, participating in classwork or discussions), as well as a set of habits of mind that we know are crucial to long-term student success. The assessment also combined faculty reporting on these factors for each student with pre- and post-surveys taken by students in which they describe their expectations for the class, experiences with reading and writing tasks, sense of their own commitment to it, etc. This approach aimed to identify the primary factors pushing down course completion rates, information which can be used to target our interventions more effectively.

Although the data from the first round of this assessment is currently being analyzed by project leads Neil Meyer and J. Elizabeth Clark, the preliminary results show a range of different experiences in the course, without a clear shared challenge. Overall, faculty reported participation in class discussions and writing assignments at higher rates than we expected based on what we had heard through professional development conversations in previous semesters. Many students reported gaining a lot from the course, and even some students who struggled to understand or meet the expectations at the beginning of the semester were able to adjust and succeed. For those who struggled, inconsistent attendance was a leading factor, but even that was not the case across the board. Some students attend regularly but do not submit work, others submit work but do not revise when given the op-

portunity or seek out help from resources on campus like the Writing Center. Even among the students who do struggle to attend class regularly, a range of factors come into play, from things that instructors can help address (e.g. lack of interest or sense of connection to the course material) to those which are more challenging (e.g. parental obligations). Notably, there was almost no distinction, in terms of the prevalence of these challenges, between the ALP students and those in first-year composition. Recent institutional data likewise shows that the placement index score has had little correlation to actual student outcomes in first-year composition.

Going forward, as we search for support to continue this work, our preliminary findings suggest that even though our ALP course has always emphasized individualized guidance, instructors will need ongoing professional development as they continue to find new ways to address the increasing heterogeneity of student needs and levels of preparation within each class section. Some adjustments may need to be made to the way we use time in our ALP sessions as well, such as by focusing more on habits of mind and connecting to college in the early weeks, and only diving deeply into writing skills later in the course. Finally, during the 2023-2024 academic year, grant funding allowed the program to pilot an intervention offering “mainstream” first-year writing students supplemental lab hours with a faculty member focused on reading, writing and/or study skills. The intervention was a recognition of the fact that our incoming students face similar challenges across the board.<sup>7</sup> While this temporary intervention did not garner as much student participation as we had hoped, it provided further evidence of the need for rethinking how we support students moving forward. The goal of this intervention was to provide some of the benefits of the ALP model—small group instruction, community building, and supplemental skill development with a faculty member—to students who were not placed into ENA101 but could have used the extra support. However, much like our assessment of the course in the spring of 2023, this effort revealed that our students face a greater number and range of challenges than this type of instructional support model could address.

## **Conclusion**

The changes affecting our ALP course at LaGuardia in recent years have been just as sweeping as they are rapid. The simultaneous arrival of the pandemic and major structural changes to the course at the institutional and programmatic level have made it nearly impossible to determine

which causes are tied to which effects on our students and their learning. Analyzing quantitative data provides an opportunity to contextualize the individualized perspectives of faculty members within broader trends in the program and over time. At the same time, the insights which we have gathered through deep conversations about pedagogy in professional development seminars, as well as other initiatives within the program to address the needs of this student population, has been invaluable in informing our sense of the range of factors that influence outcomes data.

Now that our university system, like many across the country, has fully committed to the corequisite model for developmental education (“CUNY Ends Traditional Remedial Courses”), our task as administrators shifts from developing and expanding these courses to sustaining them. This is far from a simple task in such a period of flux. As program leaders, we need to take the time to think strategically about what sustainability for Accelerated Learning Programs looks like within the complex networks that make up each institutional setting, and to create structures that provide feedback from a range of perspectives. Our experience in the “reboot” seminar revealed the importance of engaging all ALP faculty in this work, which will require targeted, ongoing professional development opportunities informed, at least in part, by assessment results and awareness of institutional priorities. The ability to quickly adapt to changing circumstances, honed during the emergency days of the pandemic, now threatens to become the permanent mode of operation for ALP instructors for the foreseeable future. The long-term success of the ALP model requires flexible and creative practices that are sustainable over time.

## Notes

1. At the same time as the decision to eliminate standalone remedial courses was made, CUNY replaced separate reading and writing placement exams with a single English proficiency placement index (PI) that considers students’ high school GPA, NY State English Regents exam scores, and SAT scores. Though this policy change introduced multiple measures in an attempt to more accurately predict a student’s likelihood of success in first-year writing, the way a student’s PI score is calculated is notably less transparent. During the pandemic, the fact that many students opted out of taking the SAT and ACT, scores which were significant to determining the PI, only muddled the waters further. In addition, CUNY removed the ability of programs to re-level students

on their own, so overall the impact has been that programs have less clarity and control over placement than previously.

2. The program began when Peter Adams gave a presentation on the model at LaGuardia in 2010. In 2017, a visit from CCBC's Susan Gabriel helped us re-establish best practices in acceleration prior to launching our curriculum revision process in 2018-2019.
3. Though the first two rounds of this work were supported by Strong Start to Finish grant funding, the rest were the result of CUNY funding devoted to assisting colleges in scaling up corequisite course offerings, as part of the mandate to eliminate standalone remedial courses. As a result of this funding, and particularly due to the opportunity to provide paid training for adjunct faculty, we were able to expand the number of sections and begin to offer the course during the evenings and short sessions.
4. For example, a presentation by Rebecca Kaminsky, Melissa Knoll and Kurt Meyer, and another by Kelsey Pepper-Ford, were influential in our thinking about this topic at that time.
5. Our writing program functions with a team of three Writing Program Administrators who are elected by the department to a three-year term. See Abdullah-Matta et al. for more on the program structure and philosophy.
6. We are not including data here from the semesters which were conducted in distance learning. At CUNY distance learning extended through much of the fall 2021 semester, when the "return to campus" was set to begin, but confusion over meeting vaccination requirements meant that most courses designated to meet partially in person did not actually do so until November.
7. We called this intervention the "English 101 Success Studios." Students signed up for weekly, hour-long sessions with a faculty member to work on either reading, writing, or studying. The sessions took place in a conference room in the department with snacks and coffee and aimed to foster a sense of connection to the writing program and to other English 101 students, which "mainstream" students do not always have the opportunity to develop in the same way that our ALP students often do.

### **Works Cited**

Abdullah-Matta, Allia, Jaqueline M. Jones, Neil Meyer, and Dominique Zino. "Departmental Democracy and Invention in Two-Year College

- Writing Programs.” *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2020, pp. 38-53.
- Adams, Peter, Sarah Gearhart, Robert Miller, and Anne Roberts. “The Accelerated Learning Program: Throwing Open the Gates.” *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2009, pp. 50-69. doi.org/10.37514/JBW-J.2009.28.2.04.
- Adams, Peter. “Pedagogical Evolution: How My Teaching Has Changed in Ten Years of the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP).” *Sixteen Teachers Teaching: Two-Year College Perspectives*, edited by Patrick Sullivan. Utah State University Press, 2020, pp. 247-78.
- Cox, Michelle, Jeffrey Galin, and Dan Melzer. *Sustainable WAC: A Whole Systems Approach to Launching and Developing WAC Programs*, NCTE, 2018.
- “CUNY Ends Traditional Remedial Courses.” The City University of New York, 12 Jan. 2023. [www.cuny.edu/news/cuny-ends-traditional-remedial-courses](http://www.cuny.edu/news/cuny-ends-traditional-remedial-courses).
- Johnsen, Heidi. “Response to ‘Faculty Orientations Toward Instructional Reform.’” *Scaling Innovation: Advancing Productive Practices in Developmental Education*, Community College Research Center, April 2014. [ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/johnsen-response-to-inside-out-5.pdf](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/johnsen-response-to-inside-out-5.pdf).
- Kaminsky, Rebecca, Melissa Knoll, and Kurt Meyer. “Listening, Observing and Intervening to Identify and Address Affective Issues in the Pre-Collegiate Classroom.” Strengthening Student Success Conference, October 2015, Oakland CA.
- McVane, Ben. “I’m a Doctor at the ‘Epicenter of the Epicenter.’” *The New York Times*, 5 Apr. 2020. [www.nytimes.com/2020/04/05/opinion/coronavirus-elmhurst-queens.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/05/opinion/coronavirus-elmhurst-queens.html).
- Pepper-Ford, Kelsey. “Affective Learning in the Accelerated Learning Program for Developmental Writing Students.” 4th Annual Conference on Acceleration in Developmental Education, June 2012, Baltimore, MD. <https://alp-deved.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Affective-Learning-in-ALP.pdf>.
- “Teaching with the ENA101 Framework.” *Teaching Writing at LaGuardia*. <https://lagccwriting.commons.gc.cuny.edu/ena-101/ena-101-framework-2>.
- “Technical Guidance Memorandum OAA 20-01.” The City University of New York, 2020, [www.cuny.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/page-assets/academics/academic-policy/Technical-Guidance-OAA-20-01-without-tables.pdf](http://www.cuny.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/page-assets/academics/academic-policy/Technical-Guidance-OAA-20-01-without-tables.pdf).

**APPENDIX****Table 1.** Comparative Pass Rate for ALP Students (Enrolled from Fall 2016-Spring 2018)

<b>Course</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>
<b>ENG101 (first-semester composition)</b>	79%
<b>ENA101 (ALP)</b>	73.2%
<b>ENG099 (Basic Writing)</b>	54.6%

**Table 2.** Comparative Pass Rate for ALP Students in Second-Semester Composition Course (Students enrolled in source course from Fall 2015 – Fall 2017 and enrolled in ENG102 from Spring 2016 – Spring 2018)

<b>Source Course</b>	<b>ENG102 Pass Rate</b>	<b>Average Grade</b>
<b>ENG101 (first-semester comp)</b>	87.9%	2.67
<b>ENA101 (ALP)</b>	91.2%	2.72
<b>ENG099 (Basic Writing)</b>	90.8%	2.6

**Table 3.** Overall Pass, Unofficial Withdrawal (WU) and Failure Rates for ALP Students

<b>Semester</b>	<b>C minus or better</b>	<b>WU</b>	<b>Fail</b>
<b>Fall 2019</b>	73%	7%	11%
<b>Spring 2022</b>	57%	15%	12%
<b>Fall 2022</b>	60%	19%	11%