Rachel E. H. Edwards
Temple University

Alignments and Alliances: Smoothing Students' Transitions from High School English to First-Year College Writing
(WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies, No. 20)*

August 2012

The studies and articles annotated in this bibliography respond to the issues students and teachers face when working at the crossroads between high school and "college-level" writing. Although college faculty routinely attribute first-year students' lack of readiness for first-year composition to deficits in high school English instructional practices, assessment approaches, and/or curricular goals, it is clear from this collection that at least some of these perceptions of underpreparedness arise from a lack of communication and collaboration. The critiques are not wholly without validity, however, since many students' college-writing preparation has also been undermined by state-mandated standardized testing that emphasizes simplified, formulaic definitions of writing success that force high school pedagogical foci away from preparing students for the complexity of "college-level" writing.

How, then, can both first-year college and high school English faculty and administrators work together to align curriculum, instructional and assessment practices in order to prepare students effectively for the critical reading, research and synthesis skills that go into forming an original argument? Would this alignment allow instructors to focus on supporting student recognition and enactment of the disciplinary and genre expectations of college writing?

With these questions in mind, the texts included in this bibliography primarily investigate how alliances will facilitate the sharing and shaping of assessment tools, instructional practices and curricula focused on spanning the high school-college writing expectational gap. The issues addressed here are different from those researched by Rhodes for "Dual Enrollment Issues," WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies, No. 5, in that these articles are concerned with the problems engendered by teaching and evaluating writing separately at the secondary and post-secondary levels. Overall, most authors advocate, explicitly or implicitly, for the following:

- alignment of secondary and collegiate writing curriculum (Addison & McGee (2010); Alsup & Bernard-Donals (2002); Appleman & Green (1993); Blau (2010); Donahue (2007); Goldblatt (2007); Griffin, Falberg & Krygier (2010); Jolliffe & Harl (2008); McCrimmon (2005); and Yancey (2010));
- development of alternate and more cohesive writing assessment tools at both educational levels that will influence writing program formation and administration at the state and national levels (Appleman & Green (1993); Brockman, Taylor, Crawford & Kreth (2010); Donahue (2007); Griffin, Falberg & Krygier (2010); McCrimmon (2005); Sullivan (2006); Thompson & Gallagher (2010)); and

- communication of specific instructional practices that address disciplinary and genre conventions and concerns at the high school and college levels (Appleman & Green (1993); Blau (2010); Alsup & Bernard-Donals (2002); Goldblatt (2007); Jones (2007); Knudson (1998); McCormick (2006); Weinstein (2001)).

Despite well-intentioned efforts of many secondary and college-level educators and administrators, pedagogy, curricula, and assessment tools, as well as disciplinary and genre expectations, continue to divide writing practices at the high school and college levels. At best, this divide frustrates students; at worst, it leads to finger pointing, blame, and student attrition. While the changes outlined above are ideal long-term goals, what is most crucial in the short term is maintaining a dialogue and avenues for sharing strategies--such as those outlined in this bibliography--so that a better understanding of the writing challenges faced at each level can guide efficacious and responsive instructional and administrative solutions.

KEYWORDS: school-college, articulation, student-preparation, skill-level, bibliography, annotated

Addison, Joanne; Sharon James McGee

Writing in high school/writing in college: Research trends and future directions

College Composition and Communication 62.1 (2010), 147-179

Outlines major large-scale writing research projects done within the ten years preceding article publication. Using student responses to the National Survey of Student Engagement's (NSSE) "writing-specific" questions, Addison and McGee identified five scales that "describe the quality of undergraduate writing and establish that certain types of writing are 'substantially related to NSSE's deep learning subscales, especially higher-order thinking and integrative learning," through investigating: pre-writing activities, instructor articulation of clear expectations, the assignment of higher-order writing tasks, good instructor practices such as student collaboration, sample review and opportunities for writing practice, and evidence of student use of integrated media like the inclusion of visual content in their writing. Upon comparison of the aggregate data from the studies referenced above using these five scales, Addison and McGee found that college and high school faculty across the curriculum only diverged in their practices in terms of assigning higher-order writing tasks and using integrated media . Yet, college faculty tended to provide fewer opportunities for peer review and "informal, exploratory" writing. Alternately, student and teacher as well as instructor-workplace perceptions and expectations about writing were far less congruent. In response, calls for the following future actions: the creation of "WAC-centered vertical curriculum" between high schools and colleges that concretely emphasizes the transfer of skills related to not only essay but also narrative and critical research-based writing , including interdisciplinary rhetorical analysis and workplace genres; the establishment of future research partnerships between large organizations like NSSE and WPA jointly guided by the Committee on Research and Committee on Professional Visibility and Databases within CCCC; and the formation

of an online repository by NCTE/CCCC to archive the raw data and tools used in writing studies as a resource for upcoming research and advocacy efforts.

KEYWORDS: writing-studies, school-college, articulation, literacy, WAC, scale, deep learning, curriculum, workplace, genre, best-practices, academic, research-method, future, trend, National Survey of Student Engagement's (NSSE), WPA Committee on Research and Committee on Professional Visibility and Databases, CCCC, data repository, digital, rhetorical-analysis, interdisciplinary

Alsup, Janet; Michael Bernard-Donals

The fantasy of the "seamless transition"

In Thompson, Thomas C. *Teaching writing in high school and college*; Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, (2002), 115-136

This article takes the form of a dialogue between the authors about the possibility of devising curricula that will help high school students "seamlessly transition" from producing high school to college level writing. Alsup, a university teacher educator and Bernard-Donals, a rhetorical theorist, each draw on various theorists and on their personal experience in their disagreement over whether inquiry in high school versus argument in college can help develop students' ethical, political, or socially responsive textual stances. They agree, however, that high school and college curricula cannot be "operationalized" in the same way due to differences between high school and colleges at the institutional level and the in "intellectual and developmental levels" of their student bodies. The authors recommend the formation of alliances and professional collaborations between high school and college teachers so that similar "cross-disciplinary" and "cross-contextual" dialogues can be enacted that influence instructional practices or address community literacy problems. As examples, the authors point to projects like the Milwaukee Area Academic Alliance in English, Temple University's Institute for the Study of Literature, Literacy and Culture, and to organizations like NCTE, CCCC, and the NWP.

KEYWORDS: school-college, articulation, needs-analysis, myth, curriculum, operationalization, social, personal, political, teacher-cooperation, Milwaukee Area Academic Alliance in English, The Institute for the Study of Literature, Literacy and Culture at Temple University, NCTE, CCCC, NWP

Appleman, Deborah; Douglass E. Green

Mapping the elusive boundary between high school and college writing

College Composition and Communication 44.2 (1993), 191-199

Appleman and Green's study sets out to define the "differences between high school and college writing" and to rectify inconsistencies between their own instructional practices

and evaluative methods as instructors within Carleton College's Summer Writing Program. This program is a three-week intensive course on reading and writing for high school students, which is designed to prepare them for the demands of writing at Carleton. Acting on the premise that "these difficulties [are shared] by all instructors of composition," they use their own observations and experiences, instructor questionnaires and student case-studies as the basis for this study. They start by listing their own six "theoretical assumptions" about writing that, most importantly, include: that the teaching of writing should concentrate on the process not the product and that revision is essential in the writing process. Yet, after administration of an attitude and belief inventory and an objective questionnaire about teaching processes to their colleagues, they find that their evaluative practices privilege product over process, resulting in a reduction of revision and a "search for control – like coherent argumentation, thesis and linguistic maturity." The authors compare staff evaluations of two students, one who earned credit for the Carleton College Writing Requirement and one who did not, in terms of the three criteria that guided instructor's assessment of these student's writing and guided their credit award decisions, "control, revision and self-assessment." Appleman and Green conclude that "linguistic maturity" in final writing "products" as evinced by sentence clarity, grammatical and punctuational correctness, organization and "sophisticated argumentation" is valued more than originality and growth within student writing processes. The authors acknowledge that their failure to define the exact nature of "boundary between high school and college writing" negatively impacted their ability to develop programmatic curriculum and instructional practices. As a result, the authors encourage not only discussion between high school and college educators about student writing "expectations and assumptions," but also that educators accept differences between instruction methods in hopes that this will advance more approaches to rhetorical problems. Moreover, the authors suggest the enlargement of writing instructional programs beyond one course and clear programmatic articulation of the importance of grammar and syntax while being careful not to make them the only measures of "good writing."

KEYWORDS: school-college, high-school, articulation, preparation-course, summer-seminar, orientation-program, accelerated, case-study, ethnographic, data, student-opinion, quality, teacher-cooperation, process-product, revising, self-evaluation, grammar, syntax, augmentation, Carleton College, requirement

Blau, Sheridan

Academic writing as participation: Writing your way in

In Sullivan, Patrick; Tinberg, Howard; Blau, Sheridan (Eds.), *What is "college-level" writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings and Student Writing Samples*; Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English (2010), 29-56

Blau describes and models his methodology and classroom practice of a genre-specific approach that purports to enable the transition of high school, community college and first-year college students into the university academic discourse community. Blau bases

his claims of efficacy on anecdotal reports, observations done in New York City community colleges and high school classrooms as well as the application of research and theory. Blau suggests that students ought to write share and discuss literary commentary so they can concretely enact the formation of genuine academic discursive practices. These student commentaries are used for longer papers where students read, respond to and cite each other's work. Blau contends that this "genre-creating program" promotes the "critical thinking" that is essential to the reading and writing involved in "college-level discourse" because it lends students academic authority, in that they are originators and evaluators of a shared classroom disciplinary textual knowledge that mirrors the practice of academic disciplinary communities at large.

KEYWORDS: school-college, two-year, research-method, New York City, discourse-community, genre-specific, disciplinary, convention, WAC, critical-thinking, research-practice, theory-practice, discursive, praxis

Brockman, Elizabeth; Marcy Taylor; MaryAnn K. Crawford; Melinda Kreth

Helping students cross the threshold: Implications from a university writing assessment

English Journal 99.3 (2010), 42-49

In response to complaints that "students can't write," English department faculty at a mid-size Midwestern college surveyed and conducted focus groups with faculty. Brockman *et al.* came up with three main faculty perceptions about writing as a result of this assessment: "good" writing criteria are complex and variable according to discipline; writing/reading connections are vital; and instructors understand writing proficiency takes time. The authors further explicate each assessment conclusion and offer responsive instructional strategies for high school teachers such as assigning "dialogic papers", specific texts, original research and encouraging ongoing reflection about "writerly growth and development." Ultimately, Brockman, Taylor, Crawford and Kreth suggest students need to be inculcated into a developmental model of writing mindset where they come to understand that "writing competency develops over time."   They encourage internal assessment projects like this because they can lead to funding for WAC programs, curricular changes and credibility boosts for English writing programs, both locally and nationally.

KEYWORDS: school-college, survey, data, focus group, faculty-opinion, value, discipline-specific, proficiency, teacher-strategy, needs-analysis, development, theory, self-validation

Donahue, Christiane

Notes of a humbled WPA: Dialogue with high school colleagues

Writing Instructor (2007), 1-20

Donahue sets up the framework for this study by supplying an account of published scholarship on high-school-college writing connections. She cites lack of: existing collaboration, high school faculty articulation, actual high school-to-college transitional period research and connections between cognitive-developmental and social theory. In response to the needs identified above and in order to develop the college readiness of Maine high school students, Donahue crafts a set of research questions gleaned from three exploratory focus groups and "key informants" from Maine high schools and colleges. A sampling of the questions surrounding the "eight areas of concern" that both sets of instructors share are included below:

- How are the writing process, peer review and collaborative writing enacted in each arena?
- With what criteria is writing evaluated?
- What is the function of research and citation work?
- What forms and structures of writing are made dominant unintentionally? Why?

KEYWORDS: WPA, high-school, teacher-opinion, school-college, articulation, student-preparation, needs-analysis, interview, administrator-opinion, teacher-opinion, data, process, form, assignment, evaluation, criteria, citation, plagiarism, WAC, rules, change, focus-group, Maine, Calderwood Conversation project

Goldblatt, Eli

Continuity and control

In Goldblatt, Eli, *Because we live here: Sponsoring literacy beyond the college curriculum*; Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc. (2007), 35-81

Goldblatt explores the reasons behind pervasive and persistent inequities in college writing preparation between Philadelphia area public urban, suburban and Catholic schools. Using data garnered at Temple University between 1995-2000, Goldblatt examines three measures of college-writing preparedness by high school: from first semester GPA, retention rate percentage, and basic writing placement. As expected, these measures suggest that students from suburban schools are generally better prepared to meet college writing expectations. Goldblatt then investigates the origins of this difference by specifically comparing the English curriculum and classroom practices of one urban and one suburban school. Goldblatt observes that students from more privileged schools can see themselves within the literary and cultural voices that they are exposed to in high school, and can, therefore, see themselves as entitled to a college education and its attendant advantages. By contrast, underprivileged students view their chances to attend college as diminished because they lack exposure to textual and collective voices that mirror their own experiences and that might guide them toward the expanded opportunities afforded through higher education. Goldblatt advances the exigency for dialogue between English instructors and writing collaboration between students at the college and high school levels so that writing curriculum is responsive to the needs of inner-city high school students.

KEYWORDS: school-college, Philadelphia, urban, suburban, Catholic, data, preparation, school curriculum, underprivileged, articulation, teacher-cooperation

Griffin, Merilee; Amy Falberg; Gigi Krygier

Bridging the gap between college and high school teachers of writing in an online assessment community

Teaching English in the Two-Year College 37.3 (2010), 295-304

> Griffin, Falberg and Krygier address differences in assessment standards between college and high school writing instructors. The authors created an on-line community consisting of high school and college/university faculty, called Learning in Networked Communities (LINC), to comparatively evaluate pieces of writing from first-year composition courses and establish discourse about how abstract evaluation standards are applied. Griffin et al. find that a shared discourse increased interrater reliability between high school and college instructors. They advocate that this particular methodology can be translated for use in other institutional projects and could possibly establish curricular coherence between high school and college programs.
>
> KEYWORDS: school-college, evaluation, standards, LINC [learning in networked communities], teacher-opinion, shared discourse, interrater-reliability, data, teacher-cooperation

Jolliffe, David A; Allison Harl

Studying the "reading transition" from high school to college: What are our students reading and why?

College English 70.6 (2008), 599-615

> This investigation poses and answers question about "what, how, and why students read" in high school and college, so that first-year writing courses can "foster close, critical reading." Jolliffe and Harl studied the "reading habits and practices" of twenty-one randomly selected first-year composition students at University of Arkansas through: a questionnaire that investigated student views about their reading aptitudes and routines; student journals that recorded what they read, how much time they spent reading, and responses to questions regarding a specific text read that day; and an exit interview that centered on a "think-aloud" procedure on a 250 word passage from a student-selected class text. Generally, the time these students spent reading and preparing for class matched what was found by the 2004 High School Survey of Student Engagement, the 2005 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the 2006 Sanoff study measuring high school and college teacher perceptions of student reading preparedness. The questionnaires in particular revealed that these students did not notice a striking change between the time they spend reading and their reading ability when transitioning

between high school and college classes. The journal entries, however, led to Jolliffe and Harl's discovery that students were clarifying their own values, expanding their knowledge in areas of personal interest and preparing for careers when selecting their own texts. Moreover, the authors found that students made text-to-self connections more easily than connections between class texts and that students were more engaged by "technologically based texts" for "personal communication and social networking." By contrast, students rushed through required reading tasks because they were "uninspiring and dull." Jolliffe and Harl recommend that college administrators join faculty throughout the university in creating "curriculums, co-curriculums and extra-curriculums" that inspire students to make connections to "their lives, world and other texts" by focusing on a common theme[s]. Furthermore, faculty need to implement explicit instruction on how to make "text-to-text" and "text-to-world" connections using a "think aloud protocol" and to incorporate more technology into their reading assignments through Web blogs or discussion forum posting.

KEYWORDS: critical reading, pedagogy, University of Arkansas, school-college, articulation, first-year, reading habit, technology-based, extracurricular

Jones, Joseph

Muted voices: High school teachers, composition, and the college imperative

Writing Instructor (2007)

Jones surveyed students before and after one semester of college attendance at Catalina Foothills High School in Tucson, AZ, an affluent district with a 90% postsecondary college attendance rate. Four years later, he administered a similar questionnaire to English teachers at Catalina Foot Hills. From the responses, Jones posits that disjunctions between student expectations and the reality of first-year writing courses are due to scant articulation between high school and college.   This lack of articulation leads teachers to rely on their own outdated experiences, which tend to privilege the study of literature and imagined imperatives. While Jones contends that the historic division he traces between high school and college teaching and curricula will remain, he encourages clarification of the skills and assignments that will be encountered in first-year writing courses within English education programs and through visits to first-year writing classrooms.

KEYWORDS: high-school, student-preparation, teacher-opinion, school-college, history, questionnaire, data, Arizona, articulation, needs-analysis

Knudson, Ruth E.

College students' writing: An assessment of competence

The Journal of Educational Research (1998), 13-19

This study examined the efficacy of writing instruction developed to improve student performance on an examination administered to University of California freshman in order to determine their level of "writing competence."   Knudson uses multiple-regression analysis with the holistic score acting as the dependent variable and the five components of the analytic scale as the independent variable to ascertain which variable or combination of variables most impacted a scorer's holistic rating. Knudson found that of the five components, position and giving support-evidence were most related to passing scores. The components of issue and macro- and micro-level skills were of least affect on rating. Knudson defines "position" as evidenced by: including a thesis statement; the use of pathos, logos and a philosophical stance to form an essay; "implying or stating a judgment;" and "persuasive reasoning." "Support" indicates that the essay utilizes: ethos; strategies that capably present ordered evidence; pertinent evidence and logic to argue a position; other arguments by refuting or acknowledging them; and persuasive answers through broaching questions.   Developed and administered instruction about how to synthesize and summarize readings in order to form written arguments to 100 high school English honors students. The efficacy of this instruction was measured through a comparison of student responses before and three times during the intervention to essay prompts similar to those found on the University of California exam. Knudson found instruction in summarization increased student competency in developing a position and supporting it, as well as increased their micro- and macro-skills level. Student improvement levels were not as compelling after synthesis instruction. Knudson concludes that the prevalence of the use of writing proficiency exams by public and private universities prior to student entrance as freshmen necessitates high school instruction in summary, argument writing and the purpose and structure of these exams.

KEYWORDS: assessment, competency, testing, school-college, G11, text-analysis, skills, pedagogy, improvement, pre-post, data, University of California, Subject A, multiple regression, holistic-analytic, support, thesis, summarization, synthesis, argumentation

McCormick, Kathleen

Do you believe in magic? Collaboration and the demystifica-tion of research

In Sullivan, Patrick; Tinberg, Howard; *What is "college-level" writing?*; Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English (2006), 199-230

Based on Hillocks's (2002) research in *The Testing Trap*, McCormick's pragmatic approach is grounded by the assumption that students come from high school underprepared to do college-level research. McCormick investigates research texts and finds them lacking in specificity, which causes "remystification." Using Hillocks's concept of "epistemic rhetoric" and Smith and Wilhelm's practice of "flow," McCormick establishes instructive research pedagogy that features: dialectically discovered truth; "frontloading of information;" scaffolding of assignments according to level of difficulty; promoting student sense of "control and competency;" providing "clear goals and feedback;" and helping students to "focus on [their] immediate experience." She details a

seven-stage collaborative research process where actual teaching approaches are prescribed that were enacted by McCormick and colleagues at Purchase College, SUNY in order to "demystify" authentic student and teacher practices.

KEYWORDS: school-college, George Hillocks, The Testing Trap, student-preparation, research-method, review-of-research, critique, mystification, remystification, flow, epistemic rhetoric, specificity, scaffolding, teacher-research, truth, assignment, difficulty, research-agenda

McCrimmon, Miles

High school writing practices in the age of standards: Implications for college composition

Teaching English in the Two-Year College 32.3 (2005), 248-60

During a three-year project centered on aligning high school and college writing instruction, McCrimmon examines the detrimental effects of state-mandated standardized assessment of writing on high school students. He cites multiple-choice and essay questions from Virginia's SOL Writing Test to show how these questions serve "scientism" instead of remedial or failing students. Through excerpts from student reflective essays, McCrimmon identifies patterns of behavioral and attitudinal impact based on the students' belief or denial of the idea that successful writers have a "knack" for writing. He enjoins other high school teachers to reinstitute portfolio assessment and reflective writing so as to allow for the pedagogy that is more responsive to student writing needs. Additionally, McCrimmon encourages first-year college writing teachers nationally to help students: expand narrow fields of genre expression encouraged by standardized testing; recognize institutional regulatory practices; investigate "forms of postmodern communication"; and voice support for the equal "professional autonomy" of secondary counterparts, so they too can serve the broader writing interests of students.

KEYWORDS: two-year, standardized, high-school, testing, school-college, articulation, state-mandated, ideology, student-opinion, implication, multiple-choice, scientism, portfolio, assessment, reflective, Virginia SOL Writing Test, professionalism

Sullivan, Patrick

An essential question: What is "college-level" writing?

In Sullivan, Patrick; Tinberg, Howard; *What is "college-level" writing?*; Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English (2006), 1-28

Sullivan's essay calls for the resumption of the discussion about forming a cohesive definition of "college-level" writing. The essay stemmed from a study piloted by the Connecticut Coalition of English Teachers that studied instructional practices and sought to develop common standards, expectations and outcomes. Sullivan asserts that discussion of assessment is essential if the tide of underprepared writers entering college

is to be stemmed. He cites statistics that point to the fact that many of these underprepared students wind up in community colleges such as "50% . . . of community college students . . . are advised to enroll in at least one remedial class" (Roueche and Rouche qtd. in Sullivan 7). Sullivan contends that college first-year instructors will burn out emotionally if they are forced into determining students' access to higher education through remedial writing courses. Sullivan argues that writing teachers need to be armed with information culled from research about what "differentiates precollege and college-level writing" as well as the information about the relationship between "teacher expectations and student achievement." Both sets of information gives those who teach composition the power to define "college-level" writing" so they can influence the financing and legislation of basic writing programs and policies both at the state and national level.   Sullivan puts forth his own definition of "college-level" writing, one that includes changing the "college-level" writer to "college-level reader, writer and thinker," so as to highlight the importance of students' ability to discuss and evaluate complex and abstract ideas from multiple, thematically related readings in order to form organized responses incorporating "analysis and higher-level thinking" about texts. Finally, Sullivan poses questions for future discussion about: differentiating high school from first-year college-level writing and beyond; the impact of documents like the Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement; instituting a national "college-level" writing standard; and articulating what "intellectual work" comprises "college-level" writing for students and instructor/scholars.

KEYWORDS: school-college, standards, skill-level, Connecticut Coalition of English Teachers, assessment, definition, WPA Outcomes, basic, FYC, data

Thompson, Tom; Andrea Gallagher

When a college professor and a high school teacher read the same papers

In Sullivan, Patrick; Tinberg, Howard; Blau, Sheridan (Eds.) *What is "college-level" writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings and Student Writing Samples*; Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English (2010), 3-28

Thompson provided an example research assignment and selected three papers that represented above to below average student performance. Gallagher, a high school teacher, and Thompson, a college instructor, then presented a breakdown of their individual assessments of each paper. They deduce that high school focus is on state standards, which promote a task-specific evaluative approach suited to rubrics and checklists. By contrast, professor focus is self-determined. Gallagher and Thompson cite institutional variances in terms of instructor accountability for student performance and teaching loads as the basis for difference of interest in standardization, which causes confusion about expectations for first-year college students. This confusion surrounding expectations is primarily attributed, by Thompson and Gallagher, to professors who "won't or can't" articulate "what an A paper looks like" as well as disagreement between professors about what an A paper is. The authors recommend the creation and use of skill-specific rubrics to help students successfully transition.

KEYWORDS: school-college, domain, rubrics, assessment, benchmark, motivation, institution, cohort, standards, accountability, objective

Weinstein, Larry

Writing at the threshold: Featuring 56 ways to prepare high school and college students to think and write at the college level; Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English (2001)

This book features fifty-six discretely explicated and sequenced "teaching ideas" that Weinstein has effectively employed in the writing classroom over twenty-eight years. The book is divided into four parts that investigate: developing student higher order thinking through inquiry processes that inculcate open-ended thinking; encouraging students' effective communication of complex thinking through writing; building student trust through instructor use of real life examples that encourage mutual sharing and feedback; designing a course that utilizes his "teaching ideas". In particular, Weinstein's approaches to making the process of textual synthesis transparent to students, expanding theses, and sharpening student revision and editing skills in concert with building peer feedback groups are most original. Many of the materials mentioned in the teaching ideas can be found at http://atc.bentley.edu/courses/resources/lweinstein/

KEYWORDS: school-college, preparation, pedagogy, higher-order thinking, composing, best-practices

Yancey, Kathleen Blake

Responding forward

In Sullivan, Patrick; Tinberg, Howard; Blau, Sheridan (Eds.) *What is "college-level" writing? Volume 2: Assign-ments, Readings and Student Writing Samples*; Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English (2010), 300- 311

Yancey explores three recent studies: University of Washington Study of Undergraduate Learning (UW SOUL), a joint study by the University of Washington and the University of Tennessee, and the Harvard Study of Writing. These studies find that students' conception of writing is distorted by testing; that students' disciplinary understanding is non-existent, that students' genre knowledge is limited and not applied; and that students' success in college depends on "noviceship"- the extent to which students perceive that one begins to learn to write anew when entering college. Yancey suggests "shared vocabulary of practice" is essential to the present and future connection of high school and college writing cultures. She calls for redefining the "writing process" as adaptable to the needs of genre and inclusive of out-of-school practice and technology; understanding the term "genre" as explicitly contiguous between high school and college; and introducing the phrase "rhetorical situation" to high school teachers as an "analysis tool and heuristic."

KEYWORDS: school-college, articulation, University of Washington, University of Tennessee, Harvard University, testing, knowledge, genre, disciplinary, novicehood, jargon, 'process', redefinition, rhetorical situation