Adapting Writing Studio Pedagogy for Flexible and Equitable Acceleration

Joanne Baird Giordano and Cassandra Phillips

ABSTRACT: This article describes the writing studio model as a corequisite option for writing course acceleration in a post-pandemic era. The authors provide an overview of writing studio pedagogy and strategies for using the writing studio model to develop a corequisite support course. They provide results of a research study on a multi-campus initiative to accelerate students to credit-bearing writing with studio support. The article concludes with suggestions for applying writing studio pedagogy to other types of college literacy courses beyond corequisite support.

KEYWORDS: acceleration; adaptability; corequisite; studio

In our experiences as instructors and literacy program coordinators in two-year, open-access environments, we've worked for decades to identify and address ways to provide literacy support for students whose needs are not met in traditional writing classes. We have spent our careers working on strategies for reducing basic skills coursework through placement processes and corequisite support and also by working on the complex challenge of providing equitable literacy support for students who need it. In our community college teaching experiences, we have worked with thousands of students whose linguistic, educational, social, and cultural backgrounds have required us to engage in critically reflective teaching and to constantly re-envision what it means to be a college writing teacher.

Joanne Baird Giordano *is an Associate Professor of English, Linguistics, and Writing Studies at Salt Lake Community College. She has many years of experience with writing course placement and literacy program coordination. Her research focuses on students' transitions to college reading and writing, along with teaching experiences of two-year college literacy educators. She chairs the Two-Year College English Association.*

Cassandra Phillips *is a Professor of English at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee where she also serves as the First-Year Writing and Developmental English Coordinator for the College of General Studies. Her research focuses on literacy studies, writing program development, reading and writing pedagogy, and developmental education.*

DOI: 10.37514/JBW-J.2024.43.2.03

Initiatives that accelerate students into first-year writing while reducing or eliminating students' time in basic literacy skills programs have permanently altered reading and writing instruction at public two-year colleges and other open-access institutions. Reform movements are also reshaping curricula and program structures at community colleges and other public institutions, and they are changing or sometimes even controlling the access that students do or do not have to postsecondary literacy coursework and learning support for reading and writing. Some developmental education reform efforts--including Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) initiatives--stem from disciplinary research about student learning that questions assumptions about college readiness behind the methods used for placement, curriculum, and instruction in basic English skills classes (Adams et al.; Klausman et al.; Phillips and Giordano, "Developing"; Saxon et al.). But often developmental education reforms are imposed on writing and literacy programs by administrative decisions or legislative mandates (Whinnery and Pomeplia), including the required integration of the highest level of developmental reading and writing in Texas (Paulson, Overschelde, Wiggins) and massive statewide placement and developmental reform requirements in California through AB 705 (California Community Colleges).

These mandates can be austerity measures masquerading as social justice work, especially when they are imposed on literacy programs and English Departments without input from faculty or an understanding of the locally situated needs of a program and the students it serves. For example, reforms can come from an institutional or state push to reduce the cost of college or time to degree completion (Dana Center; Bailey et al.) without providing resources to implement change in ways that support students' postsecondary literacy development or maintain sustainable workloads for instructors. Reforms can create inequitable learning environments in which students are expected to complete first-year writing coursework regardless of their prior educational experiences or individual literacy needs.

Although the writing studio is one of the earliest versions of a developmental education reform model, it's a promising approach to corequisite support for an age of acceleration (Keller) in which students are expected to speed up the rate at which they develop postsecondary literacy skills at the same time that their literacy practices outside of school are rapidly evolving. The writing studio provides a pathway for faculty to center their teaching on responding to locally situated student needs even when administrative mandates require them to reduce or eliminate the time that students spend in basic or developmental reading and writing courses. The writing studio

is a corequisite model that college writing and literacy programs might consider in a post-pandemic age in which many students have experienced disruptions to their K through 12 and postsecondary education. Because studio courses are structured in flexible ways that can be adapted to meet the needs of a wider range of students than those who are accelerated to first-year writing, they can embed an opportunity for equitable support across an entire writing program. Although some ALP classes build on studio pedagogy, writing studios are distinct from other types of writing support courses because they focus on students' choices about the writing that they bring to the corequisite classroom or online learning space. We encourage writing programs to expand their definitions of developmental education as contributing to students' overall development in all of their courses across their time in college, re-examine the possibilities of corequisite support, and also re-imagine how to teach writing beyond a traditional classroom.

In this article, we show how studio pedagogy offers a promising foundation for acceleration in a post-pandemic era with focused attention on equity and students' literacy development. We provide an overview of key strategies for using the writing studio model to develop a corequisite writing support course. We also describe a program development and research project at a multi-campus two-year institution that piloted writing studio as a strategy for accelerating students to credit-bearing writing courses. We conclude with suggestions for applying writing studio pedagogy to other types of college literacy courses beyond corequisite support to address literacy challenges that arose and continue with the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Place of the Writing Studio in Reform Models

Acceleration efforts--both those coming from literacy educators and those imposed on programs--take on various forms (Schak et al.; Hassel et al.; Rutschow and Schneide). Strategies include lowering placement cut scores, reforming placement processes (Klausman et al.), eliminating multiple levels of developmental and/or language coursework, integrating reading and writing (Stahl and Armstrong; Saxon et al.), moving students who would otherwise be placed into developmental reading or writing courses into credit-bearing composition with corequisite support, and eliminating developmental education entirely without any support. What all of these approaches have in common is the idea that some or all students can and should be moved through a writing, reading, or math program sequence

more quickly than indicated by standardized test scores or other placement measures.

The underlying goal of acceleration is educational equity. Our thinking about equity draws from interdisciplinary scholarship on student success (e.g., McNair et al.; Suh et al.). For our writing studies work, we use this definition: "equity in higher education refers to institutional and pedagogical strategies that create equal educational opportunities for all students regardless of their cultural and social backgrounds. This includes fair treatment, equitable access to resources, fair assessments of student learning, and support with learning processes for all students in a classroom, program, or institution" (Giordano et al. 24). Equity in a writing program doesn't automatically happen through students' presence in a credit-bearing writing course because of placement reforms or acceleration. In postsecondary literacy programs, educational equity comes from creating conditions for learning and literacy development that allow students from diverse educational, social, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds to thrive in higher education (Suh et al.).

On the surface, acceleration appears to be an equitable approach to reducing students' time to degree completion. However, acceleration initiatives can become inequitable when they make it more challenging for students to complete credit-bearing coursework or maintain the academic standing required for access to financial aid or staying in college. Further, data from multiple studies before the COVID-19 pandemic suggest that developmental education reform initiatives have minimal impact on degree completion rates (Edgecombe and Bickerstaff). Therefore, at the institutional level, effective acceleration programs need to account for students' literacy development and learning experiences across multiple years and not just their initial college semester.

The writing studio is one of the earliest program-level strategies for supporting educational equity by reimagining how students learn to develop as college writers. In the 1990s, Rhonda C. Grego and Nancy S. Thompson ("Repositioning"; "Writing Studio"; *Thirdspaces*) developed the writing studio, which became a model for supporting postsecondary writers who weren't (and still often aren't) served by traditional approaches to teaching basic writing and first-year composition. Unlike some other corequisite support models that use a more formal structure, a writing studio provides students with in-the-moment teaching structured around the needs of each student in a small group workshop setting (e.g. Ritola et al.; Leach et al.). The studio was a forerunner to other models of corequisite writing support, including the Accelerated Learning Program (Adams, et al.). The first issue

of the *Basic Writing e-Journal* (1999) highlighted the writing studio model as one of five key approaches to structuring developmental writing courses (Lalicker). However, the studio model isn't limited to corequisite support for acceleration or developmental coursework because it can be used at every level of a writing program (from non-degree through graduate school) and also has applications in professional development for postsecondary and K-12 teachers (Brooke, Coyle, and Walden; Bostock).

The studio model has perhaps received less attention than ALP but warrants consideration for institutions that are seeking to enhance student learning through corequisite support while decreasing students' time to writing requirement completion. The studio remains a faculty-driven model that provides intensive individualized literacy instruction and, therefore, should be considered as part of disciplinary and local responses to policies that attempt to reshape how writing is delivered and taught, especially at community colleges and other access-oriented institutions. Compared to other models for reducing developmental education coursework, writing studios provide institutions with more flexibility because they focus directly on each writer's unique needs across an entire writing program and sometimes in general education courses. Support for writers' literacy needs is of particular importance in open-admissions institutions where students' needs are widely varied and in post-pandemic programs where many students have had disrupted educational experiences.

The writing studio can also be an effective alternative at smaller campuses and institutions that lack the funding or institutional support to implement a fully developed ALP program. A carefully structured studio program can potentially be more cost effective compared to ALP because classes can be offered for fewer credits and require less staffing compared to the Community College of Baltimore County three-credit ALP model. A studio can also reduce students' number of non-degree credits from three to one. An underlying assumption behind the ALP model is that students need more classroom time when they are accelerated to a credit-bearing course (Adams et al.). In contrast, the writing studio often operates under the idea that students can receive individual and collaborative support with their writing projects with fewer credits but more focused time in class. Depending on how they are structured, studio courses can be offered for college credit. Studio courses also offer students, faculty, and programs more flexibility in scheduling because learners can be enrolled in any section of a writing course or in different courses.

Studio courses can potentially help faculty push back against imposed legislative and administrative mandates for developmental education reforms by offering both faculty and students more control over how writing is taught and how students learn (e.g., Ritola et al.). Although faculty usually don't have the power to eliminate mandates, the writing studio can help them ensure that their teaching practices reflect student learning needs within a local context and in a particular course section. The studio model questions and reimagines the spaces in which postsecondary literacy learning takes place. As Chandler and Sutton note in the introduction to *The Writing Studio Sampler: Stories About Change*, "[Studio] was designed to create a means to study relationships between learning and institutional contexts; to challenge the discourses, structures, and material circumstances which create and maintain those contexts; and to support all stakeholders in learning to navigate those contexts and discourses'' (5). Writing studio pedagogy offers program coordinators, instructors, and students' agency over the content and structure of a writing course. When faced with mandates to eliminate developmental education courses or accelerate students, programs can use the writing studio as a flexible strategy for supporting students' postsecondary literacy development.

Writing Studio Pedagogy

Like other types of studios in higher education, writing studios are spaces for collective learning, individual practice, application, and creation under the guidance of an expert. Studio writing courses take place in sites of in-person or online learning spaces outside traditional classrooms. Students meet in a small writing community of peers with an instructor who facilitates discussions, workshop activities, and instruction based on the writing projects that individual students bring to the studio session. Grego and Thompson explain that the "Writing Studio attaches to an existing course or academic pursuit, a one-hour-per-week workshop, where students bring their work, sometimes to 'work on it' but more often to present the work and obtain feedback so that they can go away and work on it further" (*Thirdspaces* 8). Drawing from Bill Macaulay, Grego and Thompson describe the interactive setting for studio writing courses and programs: "a studio learning environment is one where activities of production are undertaken individually but in a place where others are working and discussing their work simultaneously, where teachers provide, along with other students, guidance, suggestions, input" (*Thirdspaces* 7).

Writing studio courses normally don't have a set curriculum or planned class periods. Rather, instructors do in-the-moment teaching by adapting their instruction and workshop activities according to the unique needs of each writer at a particular point in the semester based on the self-selected writing process work and completed drafts that students bring to a studio session. The studio approach emphasizes a student's own literacy goals as they emerge and develop throughout a course and sometimes over more than one semester. In a studio setting, students learn about how to identify and develop their own goals as college writers and readers, which is crucial for students who are inexperienced with self-assessing their literacy and learning needs. *The CCCC and CWPA Joint Statement in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic* identifies reflection as a crucial component of pandemic era writing instruction: "Invite reflection through which writers identify and articulate a relationship between class-related activities, their development of a particular composition, and their development as writers, generally." With support from an instructor who facilitates studio activities, students reflect on what they want and need at a particular point in the semester in one or more courses taken concurrently with the studio, which helps them work toward making independent decisions about their learning and development as college readers and writers.

The writing studio can be a flexible learning space for students who need support with learning how to collaborate with others, along with students who need facilitated help with making their own literacy choices. In *Teaching Across Cultural Strengths*, Chávez and Federline make a case for college classrooms that support students from both individuated and integrated (or collective) learning cultures. They argue that "To learn most completely, it is critical to study, reflect, and process both individually and collectively" (16). An effective writing studio can guide students through the process of both individual and collective learning with time to work on literacy processes that draw from both types of learning, including individual and shared process work, private and collective revision, and self-reflection and peer review. Meeting a student's individual learning needs does not automatically mean individualized work because most students need time and practice to develop collaborative (or integrated) learning skills. At the same time, studio pedagogy can help students learn how to become more self-directed and do the types of process work for a literacy project that instructors expect them to do on their own.

The following chart outlines differences between a writing studio and a traditional writing classroom or a corequisite course in which the instructor

Table 1. Comparison of Lecture/Discussion and Writing Studio

Lecture/Discussion Writing Course	**Writing Studio**
The instructor plans for each class period ahead of time.	As a group (and sometimes individually), students decide what to work on during a class period through instructor facilitation.
The instructor selects discussion topics.	Students choose discussion topics in consultation with the instructor.
All students typically study the same topics.	Students choose and focus on literacy topics and strategies based on their own needs with guidance from the instructor.
All students complete the same homework assignments.	Each student selects and completes homework assignments based on an individual learning plan and their needs as college writers at a particular moment in time.
Process work usually focuses on a single assignment that all students work on.	Process work emerges from students' varied college writing projects based on their individual choices.
Students usually receive a schedule at the beginning of the semester.	Students help create the schedule for most activities. The instructor might schedule due dates for a few major assignments (for example, midterm and final reflections).
Grades are often based on an evaluation of a student's writing.	Grades are usually based on self-assessment and completion of course activities.

preplans lessons and assignments. We both use versions of this chart in our programs to help instructors understand how studio teaching differs from other types of literacy learning coursework.

The structure for a writing studio can vary across programs and instructors, depending on the purpose of the course, the relationship between the course and a writing or literacy program, and the needs of the students that it serves. It's important to note that some ALP classrooms and programs draw from studio pedagogy, but studio teaching isn't inherently a part of ALP, especially in programs in which instructors prepare lectures, predetermined classroom activities, and assignments.

We have taught in and coordinated studio programs at different college campuses. All have had small studio class sizes ranging from four to eleven students, depending on funding and placement practices. For example, Giordano taught a writing studio course at the University of Wisconsin Marathon County with a format that followed the faculty development training that we provided to instructors across our state (Phillips and Giordano, "Developing"). She worked with students who were accelerated from a developmental course to first-year writing through multiple measures placement. The classes met at a designated table in the campus writing center. Students started the class by reporting on their work from the previous week and previewing their upcoming writing assignments from other courses (for example, first-year writing research proposals or a political science article analysis). The class worked together to determine activities that they would individually and collectively work on during the studio workshop time.

Students then spent about 35 minutes of active work time with activities varying across the semester, depending on their writing projects and processes. Activities for a typical class period included one-on-one work with the instructor; small group collaborative activities and peer review; individual planning, drafting, or research time; whole class peer review; and reflective writing or self-assessments. Writing center tutors sometimes provided additional support or helped students identify work that they could do in the writing center after class. Students typically worked on first-year writing course assignments but had the freedom to select any work from their college courses. At the end of the class period, the entire group met together as a group. Students recorded their learning in a digital studio journal and created a plan for the upcoming week, which provided students with accountability and gave them a to-do list of literacy tasks to complete for their studio homework.

We have adapted this basic writing studio structure to different contexts based on students' literacy needs at institutions. For example, Phillips now coordinates a bridge program at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee where the writing studio sections include up to 11 students who are all enrolled in the same first-year writing course (although not in the same sections). Most students are from communities that have traditionally been underrepresented in or excluded from higher education, and this program gives them an opportunity to enroll directly into degree credit courses. At a different Wisconsin campus, Giordano taught studio sections for second language writers after campus funding was eliminated for ESL courses. Each class period included mini lessons on language learning topics identified by the students through discussions about their own writing, linguistic experiences, and challenges adapting to the culture of higher education in the United States. The individualized approach of the writing studio created a learning space in which students from varying levels of proficiency in English could participate and learn. During the pandemic, Phillips has coordinated asynchronous sections in Wisconsin built around online discussion boards. Finally, at Salt Lake Community College, Giordano teaches synchronous online writing studio sections for returning adult learners who can't attend in person classes on campus. Students submit work ahead of time through an online discussion board, which allows the class to view and interact with each other's work. Students engage in activities through Zoom to discuss and work on their writing.

The characteristics of the writing studio that we describe distinguish it from other types of writing and corequisite courses in three important ways: 1) teaching strategies emphasize students' agency as writers; 2) the instructor creates flexible in-the-moment learning opportunities; and 3) the instructor provides formative assessment and feedback for the purpose of supporting students' goals as writers rather than assessment for grading. In a corequisite writing studio, an instructor can move entirely away from grading the quality of students' work and instead simply assess and provide feedback on their postsecondary literacy development for a project and across a course. The instructor also moves away from a lecture-discussion format or pre-planned workshops to facilitating learning based on issues that arise from students' questions and literacy choices. As Maske and Garret note in "Studio Bricolage," a writing studio teacher must embody a "collaborative learner, guide, or facilitator" (58). However, taking on these roles as a studio instructor often requires instructors to make significant adjustments to not

only their teaching but their thinking about the varied ways in which college writers learn.

Using a Studio for Flexible Writing Support

Studio courses can potentially provide a flexible way for faculty to develop a corequisite support course for either faculty-driven reforms or administrative mandates. For example, a writing studio can be used outside of an acceleration initiative and developmental education reforms to provide support to students' whose literacy needs aren't met in a traditional classroom, especially those whose educational pathways have been and continue to be altered by pandemic disruptions.

The flexibility to change program structures and teaching practices based on local student needs has become increasingly important in the pandemic era. *The CCCC and CWPA Joint Statement in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic* emphasizes that flexibility is a crucial component of pandemic pedagogy:

> Writers, teachers, and students all use flexibility in their roles. We draw here from the definition of flexibility found in the Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: 'the ability to adapt to situations, expectations, or demand.' In periods of crisis, flexibility is even more important in order to adapt to rapidly changing circumstances. We encourage habits of mind on the part of both students and instructors (and program decision-makers) that will make it possible for everyone learning in a virtual classroom to do their best work.

The flexibility to "adapt to rapidly changing circumstances" is the foundation of the in-the-moment teaching of studio courses. The studio model questions and reimagines the spaces in which postsecondary learning takes place. As Chandler and Sutton note, "[Studio] was designed to create a means to study relationships between learning and institutional contexts; to challenge the discourses, structures, and material circumstances which create and maintain those contexts; and to support all stakeholders in learning to navigate those contexts and discourses" (5). In other words, the writing studio model provides postsecondary literacy programs with a framework for writing instruction that they can adapt to their local contexts and to immediate, constantly evolving student needs at a particular moment in time.

The flexibility of studio teaching allows instructors to shift away from a gatekeeping function that often accompanies assessment in traditional writing courses toward formative assessment for the purpose of supporting students' literacy development. The studio's emphasis on a writing teacher as facilitator or guide normally requires instructors to rethink the purpose of college writing assessment (Grego and Thompson, "Writing Studio"). In a responsive, student-centered studio learning space, assessment becomes a tool for providing feedback, learning about students' needs, responding to students requests for feedback and support, and engaging in critically reflective self-assessment of teaching practices.

The pandemic has also revealed disparities in students' access to and experiences with technology. Individualized instruction in a writing studio supports literacy in a digital age for students who have experienced inequities in their access to technology. The global pandemic has further accelerated the rate at which college students are required to use technology as a tool for learning and a delivery mechanism for their educational experiences, while also creating potential barriers to college preparation in K-12 schools. For example, the 2022 National Assessment of Educational Progress recorded the largest decline in fourth and eighth grade reading scores in three decades (NCES). We teach students who have never used computers or email, and they are enrolled in writing courses with students who had iPads or Chromebooks provided by their high schools to use throughout their secondary education. Some community college students come from rural or urban communities with internet deserts. For example, we have taught students who live in neighborhoods with neither broadband internet access nor reliable cell phone service. We also teach students with disabilities who are still learning to use assistive technology for writing. Studios provide students with opportunities for guided practice using technologies for college learning while also helping students with advanced digital literacy skills work on other ways to develop their writing.

In addition to pedagogical adaptability, the writing studio model also offers programs promising options for post-pandemic flexibility in how they structure corequisite support. When programs have limited resources, the writing studio model can be a flexible way to develop a corequisite program in combination with acceleration through changes to placement. Before the University of Wisconsin System restructured its two-year institution and merged campuses with four-year universities (Phillips and Giordano, "Messy Processes"; Sullivan), we coordinated the writing and developmental English programs for 13 open-admissions campuses, which included both very

small rural campuses and larger urban campuses plus an online program. Each campus adapted the studio model to reflect local student populations and workplace realities. Our studio program had a level of flexibility that benefited our open-admissions campuses with limited funding, locally situated constraints, and widely diverse student communities. For example, our smaller rural campuses had different student populations, budget problems, and staffing concerns in comparison to our larger urban campuses. Implementing a variable credit course that was not tied to a particular class or instructor was less logistically difficult to implement and less expensive in comparison to enrolling all students for three corequisite credits that matched accompanying designated sections of first-year writing. Campuses that served refugee communities and/or international students were able to offer second language writing studio sections and/or increase the number of studio credit hours for some students. Because we had students who sometimes took two years to complete first-year writing, we eventually offered an intermediate writing studio course on some campuses, which provided a second year of support for students as they worked toward completing general education writing requirements for an associate degree. Campuses were able to adapt their studio programs over time based on locally situated student community needs.

Writing Studio as Corequisite Support for Acceleration: A Case Study

To demonstrate how the writing studio model can be a flexible approach to student success through corequisite support, we share results from a University of Wisconsin System initiative to accelerate students to credit-bearing courses with corequisite support. Our efforts focused on using multiple measures placement to move students into first-year writing with studio support (Hassel and Giordano; Phillips and Giordano, "Developing"). One key difference for our program in comparison to some corequisite models was that we offered writing studio courses through advising for students who would benefit from supplemental support in first-year writing for reasons other than acceleration (e.g., Garret). Additional students who weren't required to take a corequisite were able to self-select the studio.

Our research indicates that individualized support through the writing studio was an essential part of success for the students we accelerated. In 2016, we collected data from five pilot campuses within our institution, which included a mix of small rural and larger urban locations. On those

campuses, 450 students placed into developmental writing based on their state system placement test scores. One student was successfully accelerated to English 102 (the core research course) and received an A grade. One-third (or 150) were accelerated to credit-bearing composition (English 101) through multiple measures placement. The following chart describes the courses that accelerated students chose to take:

Table 2. Students' Placement Choices

Enrollment Choice	Number of Students
First-Year Writing	109
Developmental or L2 Writing	17
No writing course	23

The results for students who were accelerated to credit-bearing writing were somewhat better than our typical annual course completion rates for students with direct English 101 placements (about 70% or sometimes slightly higher):

Table 3. Completion Outcomes for Accelerated Students

First-Year Writing Outcome	Number of Students
Completion with required grade of C or higher	84 (77%)
Completion with a C- or D grade	6 (6%)
Withdrawal from the course	23 (21%)
Failing grade	0

The following year, our institutional research office helped us collect data from all campuses with a studio program. This research included writing course outcomes for students who were accelerated to first-year writing, plus students who took a studio with another writing course in their first college semester. Students who took a studio course concurrently with developmental education usually had significantly low standardized test scores (for example, single digit ACT scores), low high school grades (D and

Table 4. Outcomes for Writing Studio Students

First Composition Course Taken	Writing Studio Coenroll-ment	# of Students	Successful Completion of Writing Course
ENG 098 (Developmental Writing)	No	583	62%
	Yes	191	85%
	Total	774	68%
ENG 101 (First-Degree Credit Course)	No	1793	70%
	Yes	360	89%
	Total	2153	73%
ENG 102 (Core Writing Requirement)	No	1300	74%
	Yes	122	94%
	Total	1422	76%

F grades in English), or significant gaps in their education. Students who enrolled in the studio with a second semester writing course (English 102) typically had significant learning needs, or they were returning adults with high test scores who had been away from school for many years. The results indicated that students who completed a studio course had a significantly higher course completion rate compared to their peers.

For us, the most compelling part of these findings is that students with multiple placement measures indicating that they might struggle to complete a degree-credit writing course and who had thus enrolled in a studio course had higher success rates in those credit-bearing courses than students who placed directly into those courses without the added studio course. Despite our successes in increasing writing program completion rates for most students in our studio program, we encountered a few challenges in implementing corequisite courses across our institution. Disaggregated institutional data showed that part-time students had lower writing program

completion rates even after we implemented placement changes and writing studio support. We weren't able to develop an effective way to provide part-time students with the same level of corequisite support as students who were on campus full-time although the studio course was effective for part-time students enrolled in it.

Although we both moved on to different positions after we conducted this research, we continue to work on developing placement processes and writing studio courses that support the changing needs of college students and new higher education realities. During the pandemic, Giordano worked with colleagues to develop a writing studio program as part of an institutional acceleration initiative centered on guided self-placement. Participating faculty had to rethink how to structure corequisite support within the context of changed conditions for teaching and learning, which led to the creation of online instructor training, a course development shell to reduce faculty workload, and livestream videoconference course options. Program faculty are still working toward developing a sustainable program within the constraints of our institutional advising and placement practices. During the pandemic, Phillips also developed online instructor training and online writing studio shells for students who needed corequisite support but required more flexibility. Our experiences have taught us that developing an effective corequisite program that addresses barriers to writing course completion and degree attainment is a process that requires ongoing professional engagement, assessment, critical reflection, and revision. Ways for developing writing studio programs need to evolve with changing local circumstances. In both of our programs, instructors are still very much learning how to teach students and support their literacy development in the aftermath of the pandemic.

The Potential of Applying Writing Studio Principles for Post-Pandemic Realities

Several years later, our experiences co-coordinating our program in Wisconsin have continued to be extremely helpful as we adapt pedagogical practices and cocurricular support to new professional environments that have evolved because of the pandemic. One valuable part of our work has been learning how to translate writing studio pedagogy into different contexts. Doing so, we think, has the potential to reach all students, including those who need additional support developing college-level literacies.

The writing studio has been a model for teaching and learning that we have adapted in varied ways across different programs, course structures, and student success initiatives. Writing studio pedagogy creates flexible classroom and online learning spaces that allow instructors to quickly respond to both the broad range of literacy experiences that students bring to college and the rapidly evolving ways in which students use literacy both inside and outside of school. We have learned that we can use studio teaching even when a writing studio isn't available as an enrollment option for students. Principles from writing studio teaching offer postsecondary literacy educators strategies for providing students with equitable and inclusive learning support both within a designated corequisite program and independently in their own classrooms or online learning environments. These principles include moving away from instructor-driven pedagogy and centering teaching on students' individual literacy needs at moments in time and then adapting teaching practices as those needs evolve across a course. As instructors consider how pandemic education has changed their students' learning needs, they can shift their thinking away from predetermined ideas about what students should do and know as college readers and writers. Instead, instructors can focus teaching on where diverse students are in their postsecondary literacy development, including what students are saying about their own experiences with college writing.

Instructors and program coordinators are exploring ways to support student readers and writers in a post-pandemic era in which members of our profession are increasingly questioning traditional approaches to teaching and assessing writing. As part of the process of reimagining how to support students in an age of acceleration and pandemic disruptions, literacy educators might consider flexible ways to adapt the writing studio beyond corequisite support. Perhaps the most important takeaway that we have learned with studio teaching is that all of our community college writers benefit from sustained, individualized support for reading and writing across all of their time in a writing program and not just in a first-semester corequisite course.

In an evolving teaching and learning environment, we offer five examples of how writing instructors might draw from studio teaching to reimagine and change their work as literacy educators beyond corequisite courses:

Use a studio approach to structuring workshops for first-year and sophomore writing courses. We both draw from studio teaching to organize in-class writing workshops for our credit-bearing writing courses. Although we have used this approach for many years, we've strengthened how we use writing

studio pedagogy because students' literacy needs are widely varied in our credit-bearing courses as we emerge from the pandemic. We ask students to plan out their requests for feedback in class (or online at home) before a writing workshop. Students identify the issues that they want to discuss and the questions that they would like to ask their groups. During the workshop, students work with partners or small groups to share their process writing and/or completed drafts based on their requests for feedback. At the end of the workshop, students have time to discuss issues that came up during the workshop with the entire class. They also have time to create a post-workshop plan and to-do list of writing process activities to complete during the next stage of their projects like they would at the end of a writing studio session.

Integrate studio pedagogy into a developmental writing or integrated reading and writing course. We use studio teaching in a more intensive way in developmental courses. Because we work at institutions where students are accelerated to first-year writing through placement, the students who remain in our basic skills courses typically have intensive learning needs or are returning after years away from school. In our face-to-face courses, we incorporate elements of in-the-moment studio teaching into many class periods (Giordano). We reserve flexible time for students to receive individualized instructor help with their writing while students work in small groups to discuss their literacy experiences and share their work. Workshop activities are flexible enough that students who are at earlier stages of a project can work with peers who have fully developed drafts. This approach to writing instruction has been especially important for us as students return to our campuses after the pandemic with very different high school experiences from previous groups of students--and as they continue to miss class because of ongoing medical and employment issues linked to the pandemic. Our classrooms also become sites of writing production that are similar to a writing studio to help students work toward completing planning, researching, and drafting. We use reflective activities that help students identify their own needs as writers and then plan for the work that they will do at home after class.

Create hybrid courses with online learning and in person studio sessions. Giordano developed an emergency integrated reading and writing program during the pandemic. Students completed online learning activities and reading discussions. They then met in person for thirty minutes a week in a very small writing studio group (with limited enrollment because of pandemic restrictions). Some instructors who used this model for emergency pandemic teaching continue offering regular studio time during their in-person classes. In her current hybrid writing courses, Giordano's students

engage in regular in-class workshops that mirror her teaching practices for studio courses, and they also participate in additional asynchronous online workshops and discussions.

Incorporate studio components into a synchronous online course. Giordano uses writing studio activities in some class periods of first-year and sophomore courses that meet virtually through Zoom. Students complete online asynchronous writing process activities to prepare for in-class workshops. They also share their work online before class with the expectation that different learners will be at different stages of a project during a virtual Zoom workshop. Class members identify the issues that they would like to work on together or in small groups for a virtual workshop while students who are absent complete alternative online activities. In first-year writing, Giordano frequently reserves the last fifteen to twenty minutes of class for open-ended workshop time, and students who want help with writing projects stay online to discuss their work, receive help with project planning, and work through challenges with completing writing process activities.

Adapt elements of the writing studio to asynchronous online courses (with limitations). We both regularly teach online writing courses, which are the most challenging learning spaces to incorporate studio teaching methods even as increasing numbers of students are selecting online courses (Weissman). In-the-moment teaching is difficult to implement when students are accessing the course site at different moments across a week. However, we have retained elements of studio teaching in our asynchronous courses. For example, we ask students to make requests for feedback so that online workshops are driven by students' concerns and their needs as writers at a specific week in the course (in contrast to instructor-driven ideas about what should happen in an online workshop style discussion). We also normalize the idea that different writers will bring different work to online workshops. Some students have essay planning or emerging ideas while others have complete drafts. When students can't participate in a workshop with their peers, we offer alternative experiences for receiving feedback and interacting with other writers through a writing center or instructor conference. We give students multiple opportunities to reflect on their literacy experiences and check in with us about their needs at varying times across a course. We don't pretend that our asynchronous workshops and student support make our online courses writing studios. However, our experiences with writing studio teaching have fundamentally transformed how we think about online learning spaces and the diverse individual and collective work that students can do to develop as postsecondary learners while working on writing projects.

A writing studio disrupts traditional conceptions of how writing is taught and learned in higher education, which is both a benefit and a challenge. Some of the challenges that we have experienced in developing writing studio programs include figuring out placement mechanisms, working with advisors in labor-intensive ways, seeking funding for program coordination and faculty development, helping students understand the purpose of the course, training faculty on new ways of teaching, and helping teachers and administrators understand differences between the studio and classroom teaching or writing center work. Barriers to creating and maintaining a corequisite studio program are often locally situated within the constraints of an institution and writing program. Developing a studio program requires cooperation from and collaboration with institutional administrators, advisors, and campus support staff. Further, a writing studio isn't automatically equitable if the instructor doesn't understand and apply the disciplinary theory and practice that create a framework for implementing an equitable studio program. An instructor needs to use inclusive teaching practices that remove barriers to college learning and help them work toward degree attainment. Developing and maintaining equitable and inclusive teaching practices takes time and consistent effort.

The future of equity in writing pedagogy requires flexibility and adaptability due to changing mandates, enrollments, and other educational shifts. Responding to students' needs at particular moments in time can be a strategy for reducing inequities that students experience when their literacy and educational backgrounds aren't aligned with traditional expectations for what happens in a college writing classroom. The writing studio model offers an inclusive approach to student-centered literacy support that can be applied to multiple contexts at institutions with students who have diverse educational experiences and learning needs. As literacy educators, we can't let controversies about developmental education get in the way of interrogating critical issues related to students' literacy. Nor can we ignore the permanent changes to writing programs and higher education that emerged from the COVID-19 pandemic. We invite literacy educators to reimagine writing courses as learning spaces centered on developing students' agency and also as opportunities to learn from students' literacy experiences.

Works Cited

Accelerated Learning Program. "About ALP." Accelerated Learning Program, no date. https://alp-deved.org/about-alp.

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.

Bailey, Thomas R., Shanna Smith Jaggers, and Davis Jenkins. *Redesigning America's Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success*. Harvard University Press, 2015.

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony R. Petrosky. *Facts and Artifacts: Theory and Method for a Reading and Writing Course*. Heinemann, 1986.

Bostock, Susi. "Thirdspace: A Perspective on Professional Development." *Language Arts*, vol. 89, no. 4, 2012, pp. 222-31. doi.org/10.58680/la201218733.

Brooke, Robert, Deborah Coyle, and Anne Walden. "Finding a Space for Professional Development: Creating Thirdspace Through After-School Writing Groups." *Language Arts*, vol. 82, no. 5, 2005, pp. 367-77. doi.org/10.58680/la20054413.

California Community Colleges Assessment and Placement. "What Is AB 705?" California Community Colleges, 2018.

Chávez, Alicia Fedelina, and Susan Diana Longerbeam. *Teaching Across Cultural Strengths: A Guide to Balancing Integrated and Individuated Cultural Frameworks in College Teaching*. Stylus, 2016.

Charles A. Dana Center, Complete College America, Education Commission of the States, and Jobs for the Future. *Core Principles for Transforming Remediation: A Joint Statement*. Charles A. Dana Center, December 2012.

Conference on College Composition and Communication and Council of Writing Program Administrators. *CCCC and CWPA Joint Statement in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic*. CCCC, 2020.

Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project. *Framework For Success in Postsecondary Writing*. CWPA, 2011.

Edgecombe, Nikki, and Susan Bickerstaff. "Addressing Academic Underpreparedness in Service of College Completion." *Texas Education Review*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2018, pp.75-83. doi.org/10.15781/T27941B74.

Garrett, Bre. "Hacking the Curriculum, Disabling Composition Pedagogy: The Affordances of Writing Studio Design." *Composition Forum*, vol. 39, Summer 2018. N.P.

Garret, Bre, and Aurora Matzke. "Studio Bricolage: Inventing Writing Studio Pedagogy for Local Contexts." *The Writing Studio Sampler: Stories About Change. Perspectives on Writing*, edited by Mark Sutton and Sally Chan-

dler, The WAC Clearinghouse, University Press of Colorado, 2018, pp. 43-59.

Giordano, Joanne Baird. "Second Chance Pedagogy: Integrating College-Level Skills and Strategies into a Developmental Writing Course." *16 Teachers Teaching: Two-Year College Perspectives*, edited by Patrick M. Sullivan. Utah State University Press, 2020, pp. 221-42.

Giordano, Joanne, Holly Hassel, Cassandra Phillips, and Jennifer Heinert. *Reaching All Writers: A Pedagogical Guide for Evolving Writing Classrooms*. Utah State UP, December 2024.

Grego, Rhonda C, and Nancy S. Thompson. "Repositioning Remediation: Renegotiating Composition's Work in the Academy." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1996, pp. 62-84. doi.org/10.2307/358274.

---. "The Writing Studio Program: Reconfiguring Basic Writing/ Freshman Composition." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol.19, no. 1–2, 1995, pp. 66-79.

---. *Teaching/Writing in Thirdspaces: The Studio Approach*. Southern Illinois UP, 2007.

Hassel, Holly, Jeffrey Klausman, Joanne Baird Giordano, Margaret O'Rourke, Leslie Roberts, Patrick Sullivan, and Christie Toth. "TYCA White Paper on Developmental Education Reforms." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 43, no 3., 2015, pp. 227-43.

Hassel, Holly, and Joanne Baird Giordano. "The Blurry Borders of College Writing: Remediation and the Assessment of Student Readiness." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 1, Sept. 2015, pp.656-80. doi.org/10.58680/ce201527437.

Keller, Daniel. *Chasing Literacy: Reading and Writing in an Age of Acceleration*. Utah State University Press, 2013.

Klausman, Jeffrey, Leslie Roberts, Joanne Giordano, Brett Griffiths, Patrick Sullivan, Christie Toth, Anthony Warnke, and Amy L. Williams. "TYCA White Paper on Placement Reform," *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 44, no. 2, Dec. 2016, pp. 135-57.

Lalicker, William B. "A Basic Introduction to Basic Writing Program Structures: A Baseline and Five Alternatives." *BWE: Basic Writing e-Journal*, vol 1., no. 2, 1999.

Leach, Jane, and Michael Kuhne. "Professional Development, Interactional Inquiry, and Writing Instruction: A Blog Called 'Accelerated English @ MCTE.'" *The Writing Studio Sampler: Stories About Change. Perspectives on*

Writing, edited by Mark Sutton and Sally Chandler, The WAC Clearinghouse, University Press of Colorado, 2018, pp. 115-30.

McNair, Tia Brown, Estela Mara Bensimon, and Lindsey Malcom-Piqueux. *From Equity Talk to Equity Walk: Expanding Practitioner Knowledge for Racial Justice in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2020.

National Center for Educational Statistics. "NAEP Report Card: 2022 NAEP Reading Assessment." NCES, 2022.

Paulson, Eric J., James P. Van Overschelde, and Afi Y. Wiggins. "Accelerated Developmental Reading and Writing Coursework and Student Preparedness for College-level Reading-intensive and Writing-intensive Courses in Texas Community Colleges." Policy Brief. Texas Education Research Center, February 2018.

Peele, Thomas. "Speaking for Themselves: Basic Writing Students in a Stretch Program." *Basic Writing e-Journal*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2014.

Phillips, Cassandra, and Joanne Baird Giordano. "Developing a Cohesive Academic Literacy Program for Underprepared Students." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2016, pp. 79-89. doi.org/10.58680/tetyc201628769.

Phillips, Cassandra, and Joanne Baird Giordano. "Messy Processes into and out of Failure: Professional Identities and Open-Access Writers." *Failure Pedagogies: Systems, Risks, and Failures*, edited by Allison D. Carr and Laura R. Micciche. Education Series. Peter Lang Publishing, 2020, pp. 153-62.

Ritola, Tonya, Cara Minardi Power, Christine W. Heilman, Suzanne Biedenbach, and Amanda F. Sepulveda. "The Politics of Basic Writing Reform: Using Collective Agency to Challenge the Power Dynamics of a Flat Administration." *The Writing Studio Sampler: Stories About Change. Perspectives on Writing*, edited by Mark Sutton and Sally Chandler, The WAC Clearinghouse, University Press of Colorado, 2018, pp. 61-77.

Rutschow, Elizabeth Zachry., and Emily Schneider, E. *Unlocking the Gate: What We Know about Improving Developmental Education*. New York, NY: MDRC, June 2011.

Saxon, D. Patrick, Nara M. Martirosyan, and Nicholas T. Vick. "NADE Members Respond: Best Practices in Integrated Reading and Writing, Part I." *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2016, pp. 32-34.

---. "NADE Members Respond: Best Practices in Integrated Reading and Writing, Part 2." *Journal of Developmental Education*, vol. 39, no. 3, 2016, pp. 32-34.

Schak, Oliver, Ivan Metzger, Jared Bass, Clare McCann, and John English. "Developmental Education Challenges and Strategies for Reform." US

Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, January 2017.

Stahl, Norman A., and Sonya L. Armstrong. "Re-Claiming, Re-Inventing, and Re-Reforming a Field: The Future of College Reading." *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2018, pp. 47-66. doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2017.1362969.

Suh, Emily K., S. Owens, Ekateryna O'Meara, and Leanna Hall. "Clarifying Terms and Reestablishing Ourselves within Justice: A Response to Critiques of Developmental Education as Anti-Equity." National Organization for Student Success, 2021.

Sullivan, Patrick. "Composition in the Age of Neoliberalism: An Interview with Holly Hassel and Joanne Baird Giordano." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 73, no. 1, 2021, pp. 126-55. doi.org/10.58680/ccc202131590.

Sutton, Mark, and Chandler, Sally. "Writing Studios and Change." *The Writing Studio Sampler: Stories About Change. Perspectives on Writing*, edited by Mark Sutton and Sally Chandler, The WAC Clearinghouse, University Press of Colorado, 2018, pp. 3-26.

Weissman, Sara. "Online Learning Still in High Demand at Community Colleges." *Inside Higher Ed*, July 7, 2023.

Whinnery, Erin, and Sarah Pompelia. "50-State Comparison: Developmental Education Policies." Education Commission of the States, 10 December 2018.