CSU The California State University

ERWC
Integrating Reading, Writing, & Rhetoric

Expository Reading and Writing Curriculum (ERWC)
Theoretical Foundations for Reading and Writing Rhetorically

Developed by Mira-Lisa Katz, Nelson Graff, Norm Unrau, Ginny Crisco, and Jennifer Fletcher

Overview

Welcome to the third edition of Theoretical Foundations for Reading and Writing Rhetorically! Whether you are a veteran ERWC teacher or wholly new to the curriculum and professional learning, this document will inform your understanding of some of the most relevant *educational theories* from the fields of composition, rhetoric, literacy studies, and sociocultural theories of learning. It will also orient you to key *teacherly dispositions and attitudes toward students* (assets-based, socially just, agency- and inquiry-oriented) that ERWC developers deem crucial to promoting students' academic as well as post-secondary success.

The CSU Expository Reading and Writing Curriculum (ERWC) is evidence-based. This document grounds ERWC's curriculum and teaching methodologies in the research[i] and supports ERWC professional learning (PL) in three ways: 1) the sections guide teachers' inquiry-based learning and reflection in PL professional learning experiences; 2) the document as a whole serves as an ongoing resource for individual and collective inquiry into why ERWC recommends that teachers do what they do in particular ways, and 3) the references offer reading resources for diving more deeply into the scholarship that informs ERWC's pedagogy and design.

The developers hope this document will support your professional learning, your teaching practices, and, ultimately, your students' success in college, career, and beyond.

As you read this document, keep in mind the defining features and overarching goals of the curriculum. The ERWC is a student-centered, text-rich English Language Arts program that balances learner engagement with substantive preparation in rhetorical reading and writing. Infused with opportunities for rich metacognitive conversations, collaborative peer-led discussions and rhetorical inquiry, the ERWC expands students' literate repertoires by introducing them to a broad variety of text types and genres. With consistent and strategic support from certified ERWC teachers, students in ERWC classrooms have the potential to become more agile, independent, and critical readers, writers, and thinkers able to engage in increasingly sophisticated explorations of their literate identities and take an active role in shaping their post-secondary futures.

Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies

An assets-based instructional approach is integral to ERWC's design, which is intended to support students' engagement with one another, with their teachers, and with the curriculum. While ERWC was initially developed in the early 2000s as an intervention to address a widespread "remediation" problem in the California State University system, ERWC developers have consistently rejected deficit attitudes toward students and teachers; ERWC is not about fixing or repairing individuals, groups of students, or teachers, nor is it about the kind of prescription or over-scaffolding that characterize deficit-oriented remedial programs. Instead, the ERWC reflects the CSU's ongoing efforts to become a student-ready university system in which instruction is designed to nurture and leverage students' many social,

linguistic, and cultural assets and values in support of their development as civically engaged and educated citizens.[2]

The scholarship on culturally responsive and sustaining teaching significantly informed the development of ERWC 3.0. In *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*, Django Paris and H. Samy Alim explain that "CSP [culturally sustaining pedagogy] seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of schooling for positive transformation" (1). It does this, as Alim and Paris write, by positioning "dynamic cultural dexterity as a necessary good" and by seeing "the outcome of learning as additive rather than subtractive" (1). In this pedagogical approach, students' strengths and assets--including "their languages, literacies, cultures, and histories" (Alim and Paris 1)—are valued and enriched, not treated as deficits to be denied or remediated. Instruction draws on students' own sociocultural experiences to make connections across diverse subjects and settings, including those outside of school. The goal of a culturally sustaining pedagogy is liberation rather than assimilation.

Our assets-based stance extends to teachers as well, seeking to build on *all* community members' respective social, linguistic, and cultural resources to support rich literacy experiences. We offer ERWC teachers professional learning that can expand opportunities for involving students in discipline-specific literacy practices and we encourage teachers to continually build connections between their students' valuable out-of-school knowledge, language, and literacies and the in-school knowledge, language, and literacies that will support students as they move beyond high school. Because students learn and teachers teach within unique school contexts, the curriculum is flexibly designed so that teachers can adapt it to their particular students' learning goals, needs, and interests.

Reading and Writing as Social Practices

One assumption underlying the ERWC is that reading and writing are not simple skills; rather, they are complex sociocultural practices that reflect and even shape our social worlds.[ii] Reading and writing entail long-term learning processes that are influenced by sociocultural factors such as how a teacher explains a particular literacy task, the features of the text itself, the reader or writer's familiarity with particular genres[iii] or media, and the social interactions and environments (institutional, communal, familial) in which reading and writing occur. In this digital age, texts have garnered increasing power to influence the world. (Twitter and Facebook's roles in U.S. politics serve as recent cases in point). In addition, our background knowledge and our habitual ways of interacting with text outside of school (at home, among friends) influence how we meet the task of comprehending academic literacies; therefore, and perhaps now more than ever, it is critical to support students in becoming proficient users of these new genres, media, modalities, and rhetorical moves. Part of our work, then, is to support all students in making connections between the textual worlds they currently inhabit and those of the writers we want them to know, understand, appreciate. Perhaps one day they will join the ranks of these writers themselves. Because reading and writing are communicative acts embedded in complex sociocultural contexts,[iv] in teaching reading and writing, we are facilitating an important meeting of minds and life worlds on page and screen.

As teachers of complex content area literacy practices, not only are we introducing students to the genres most valued in our discipline of English Language Arts, over time we are also involving them in increasingly sophisticated types of disciplinary thinking—the ways of communicating about and interacting with texts in our content area. Practitioners within disciplines such as English, science, or history employ a specialized discourse that is accepted by fellow members of that discourse community. Each discipline or community (medical, religious, political, athletic, artistic) has accepted conventions for speaking, writing, reading, and thinking about ideas that are valued by its members. Consider the "evidence" a literary scholar or art historian would provide to analyze a writer or painter's style or oeuvre

compared to the evidence a mathematician or scientist might offer to demonstrate a theory. So, while *what* we read and write matters a great deal (content), *how* and *why* we read and write (our approaches to stylistic choices, text structure, and interpretation) are important as well. To apprentice students to the wide-ranging practices of English Language Arts, ERWC modules offer numerous opportunities for students and teachers to engage collaboratively in ELA and ELD content, practices, and processes because to do it well takes considerable time and practice.

Broadening Notions of "Reading," "Composing," and "Literacy"

The ERWC aims to facilitate students' success through a rigorous curriculum that supports them in learning to interpret and produce the many types of complex texts they will encounter, and be expected to synthesize, critique, and use in post-secondary education and the globalizing world of work. While students continue to derive great benefit from reading fiction, creative non-fiction, poetry, and drama, they also benefit from developing fluency with visual, digital, and multimodal texts as well as with multi-genre texts that may blend exposition, diary entries, letters and other primary sources, and/or poetry in service of a story, essay, or argument.

Not only have the *types and varieties of texts* that students regularly engage with changed but the expectations for the kinds of *text-based tasks* students regularly perform have expanded.[1] Digital media—often non-linear and associative—require students to navigate and compose in new ways. Current state standards like the California Common Core emphasize expository texts and the U.S. Department of Education's College- and Career-Ready Standards emphasize "higher-order skills that students need to think critically, solve real-world problems, and be successful in the 21st century and beyond" (https://www.ed.gov/k-12reforms/standards). Young people are now routinely expected to comprehend and author multi-genre pieces, read and write multimodally, and comprehend texts composed in formats that necessitate complex cognitive work, including synthesis, hypothesis formulation, analysis, persuasion, and storytelling. It is no longer simply a matter of writing formulaic five-paragraph essays, or reading to retrieve, recall, and evaluate; the demands of literacy have multiplied exponentially to keep pace with the digital proliferation of genres and text types, not just in ELA, but across the disciplines (think of the now frequent use of data visualization in science or journalism, for example).

Researchers who have examined the reading demands in high-school and college classes in four disciplines—American History, Political Science, Biology, and English—conclude that reading differs in secondary and college contexts in terms of both the nature of the texts and the reading tasks assigned, with college students reading more and being required to synthesize and craft their own arguments based on multiple texts.[2] Authoring these varied types of texts requires students to become more versatile readers who can flexibly respond to the needs of each rhetorical situation as it arises within the context of a particular discourse community.[3] College, career and community contexts also require young people to be skilled notetakers and annotaters; writers of abstracts, bibliographies, case studies, lab reports, summaries, research papers, analyses and essays; composers of multimedia, multi-genre presentations and portfolios. Students are learning to negotiate this broadening array of genres and modalities at the same time that they are becoming conversant with the distinct characteristics of disciplinary discourse. Like all complex social practices, learning to read and write in these multifaceted ways—in English, Science, History, and Math—takes time and repeated opportunities with plentiful and strategic guidance. And for many students, particularly English learners, many of whom are learning academic English as an additional language, these skills can and should be explicitly taught.[4 The ERWC builds these complex literacy practices and rhetorical skills to prepare students to engage fully in the varied types of literacy practices they will encounter in a variety of post-secondary contexts, including, but not limited to, career technical education, trade schools, community colleges, four-year universities, career, and civil and community services.

Thinking Rhetorically

ERWC borrows in a principled way from both classical and modern descriptions of rhetoric to build learners' transferable abilities in rhetorical thinking. The curriculum retains Aristotle's focus on finding the best available means of persuasion, with its emphasis on how speakers/writers present themselves (ethos); how they develop their ideas and arguments (logos); and how they appeal to listeners' values, senses of themselves, and emotions (pathos). Yet the curriculum also ventures beyond argument and persuasion to consider rhetoric, as Phyllis Ryder writes of rhetorical analysis, "a valuable tool for understanding and preparing to engage in the world." This more expansive definition of rhetoric leads to the curriculum's emphasis on rhetorical situations (Bitzer 1968) and their components as key concepts for learners to study in order for them to flexibly adapt their communication to the many purposes and audiences they are likely to encounter in and out of school. ERWC focuses on helping learners think rhetorically, by which we mean prepare them to carefully consider what communication choices present themselves and will best serve their purposes for any given context.

Questions about rhetoric teach students to notice how authors deploy linguistic strategies designed to influence readers. Students are sometimes surprised to discover that they themselves are the people (the readers) these strategies are intentionally being employed to persuade. As they become better able to perceive the rhetorical patterns in action and recognize that they are personally part of a larger conversation (members of a discourse community), they also begin to feel that they have some power over the text, and through the text, some power to shape others' thinking and actions. This awareness of their own power "to read between the lines," as one student put it, has the capacity to increase students' engagement with reading and subsequently help them become rhetorical writers who are capable of wielding words with greater nuance, agility, and influence.

As they learn to read like writers (Bunn 2011), students come to understand how writers attempt to influence their readers. And as they work with their peers and teachers to collaboratively sort out what they think (see section below on student-centered discussion), the power dynamics in the classroom begin to shift. Valued as co-constructors of knowledge and understanding, students internalize these ways of working with text over time, becoming more independent and enabling teachers to shift or reduce scaffolding as students take on the rigorous work of disciplinary learning.

As the tables turn and students shift to writing like readers, they work to consciously apply a rhetorical writer's tools. In the writing rhetorically stage of the ERWC, students consider the importance of audience, purpose, ethos, message, and genre to affect readers in particular ways, and they make an active contribution to the conversation among voices and texts they have been interacting with through reading and discussion.

The conversational back and forth—in person as well as on paper and screen—is central to the ERWC's rhetorical approach: readers and writers orient their actions to those of others based on social rules of conduct. As readers and writers develop their understanding of these social rules, they come to understand that the knowledge base is not neutral; there is always a response—a motivated agreement or disagreement. The ERWC teaches strategies for making meaning (comprehension) within an approach that also takes into account the broader rhetorical concerns of varied academic literacies. "Skills"—conceived here in their broadest sense—are empowering; learning to use the tools of a discourse community allows young people to become active participants in disciplinary conversations, perhaps even effecting change as a result of their involvement.

Supporting Literacy through Student-Centered Discussion

ERWC's commitment to extensive opportunities for student discussions (in pairs, trios, small groups, and whole class) is rooted in two related ideas: learning is social and learning leads development.[v] That is, we

first encounter new ideas, processes, and information in real world contexts (including in texts), and we then make sense of new knowledge collaboratively through talk and social interaction with others. Over time, we internalize these new understandings, and as a result of doing so, we are eventually able to draw on and build from new knowledge independently. New learning, once internalized, thus pushes

development forward and upward—learning leading development.

ERWC leverages these socially-rooted dimensions of learning by centering students' voices, offering them frequent occasions to collaboratively make sense of (read, converse, write, and think together about) high-interest topics written in different genres for varied purposes. Such plentiful opportunities for text-centered talk among peers—about content, structure, meaning-making, and rhetorical stance—also cultivate students' sense of curiosity and boost motivation and engagement. Rich conversations also offer all members of the classroom community many models for thinking—everyone has access to others' thought processes and use of language, both in terms of comprehension strategies and rhetorical perspective taking. Importantly, ERWC's emphasis on classroom conversation gives students repeated openings to reflect metacognitively on their unique internal processes; as they consider their own thinking processes and externalize them through conversation, their internal practices become available for discussion and accessible for modification. Effective ERWC classrooms thus prepare students to participate more fully in university-level academic work, workplace collaborations, and civic activities by inviting students to share their thinking, make choices about which direction to go, and agentively advance their own learning.

Teachers and students in ERWC classrooms become co-inquirers, delving into texts and constructing knowledge together. Supported by their teachers, students work together and alone to paraphrase, synthesize, elaborate, clarify, analyze, and build mutual understanding. In ERWC classrooms, talking is thinking and listening is also learning. Over time, as teachers release responsibility to students for doing more of the hard work of learning, including releasing interpretive and facilitative roles to students, there is less emphasis on eliminating "wrong" answers and more collaborative and open-ended intellectual exploration. Because such student-centered discussions support deeper thinking, they also foster better writing.

Expanding the Inquiry Space

ERWC strategies, resources, and module activities nurture student agency by expanding the inquiry space in ELA and ELD classrooms. Instead of teaching toward a "right" answer or prescribing fixed rules and formulas for students to follow, an inquiry-based approach supports students in becoming flexible, adaptive, and reflective thinkers and communicators.

While inquiry certainly involves asking questions—teachers asking questions about form and content, students asking one another about their evidence for interpretations or claims, students asking questions as they read and annotate in the margins, and teachers and students inquiring collaboratively into a text's meaning as well as into their own thought processes—inquiry is also a stance toward learning and knowledge building.

Rooted in openness and curiosity, ERWC's inquiry stance honors a variety of possible textual interpretations and perspectives that readers and writers work together to construct through a combination of metacognitive reflection and rhetorical thinking. ERWC creates inquiry spaces (for teachers in professional learning and students in classrooms) in which individuals with varied sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds, values, and life experiences share varied ways of taking/making meaning from texts through extended dialogue.

We agree with our Reading Apprenticeship colleagues, Schoenbach, Greenleaf & Murphy (2017), that inquiry "is an active, intentional process animated by questions and observations. The inquirer actively engages in constructing new understandings by building theories, finding patterns, and making meaning. Inquiry experiences are therefore potentially transformative in their impact on knowledge and practices" (Schoenbach, Greenleaf and Murphy 51).

Inquiry-based instruction purposely avoids guiding students to particular interpretations of texts. ERWC's inquiry stance means that teachers trust students to do their own thinking and encourage them to ask their own questions. It also means allowing students to make their own mistakes and draw their own conclusions since confusion and possible misinterpretation are where learning and knowledge-building often begin. It is therefore perfectly normal in ERWC classrooms for students—and teachers—*to not know everything*. It is also very acceptable to change one's mind based on new evidence or information gleaned from reading text or conversing with peers. Not knowing is where new learning becomes possible—it is the jumping off point for discovery, learning, and development. Over time, ERWC teachers learn to trust that even if they don't tell their students the answers, or lead them toward the answers, students will "get it." This trust in students' capacities to do the very hard work of learning is absolutely central to ERWC students' success, as evidenced in the attention the curriculum gives to productive struggle.

Supporting Productive Struggle and Goal Setting

ERWC is grounded in the idea that productive struggle leads to growth and independence. One challenge for many teachers is letting go of control in order to give more to their students. It can be uncomfortable to witness students' frustration grappling with complex and perplexing new material, texts, or ideas. Because we want students to succeed, it can be tempting at times to reduce the learning load by providing students with "right answers" or correcting their "wrong" answers. Indeed, teachers sometimes feel guilty for not jumping into the fray during student discussions to offer the kinds of interpretations that disciplinary experts would deem relevant or valuable.[vi] Our challenge as teachers is to build our own confidence about our students' ability to do the work. This may mean shifting our views of both what students are capable of and what our role is in guiding learners' processes. Rather than over-scaffolding (explaining content, fostering particular interpretations, giving directives, evaluating responses), inquiry-based teaching relies on extensive modeling of the discourse patterns themselves—rhetorical questioning, for example—encouraging students to formulate their own questions—to forge their own paths to developing literacy expertise, content knowledge, and a robust sense of themselves as able learners, readers, and writers. The struggle with complexity and novelty becomes productive—i.e., produces growth—when it is supported through practices such as metacognition, goal setting, and teacher modeling.

To foster classroom communities where it is not only safe for students to ask questions and share uncertainty, but encouraged, takes time and repeated opportunities. When students can risk admitting confusion about what a text or group of texts might mean, or puzzle with a peer over how to put together a multi-genre writing assignment, their skills and disciplinary expertise expand as does their confidence in their ability. More comfort with skills combined with confidence in one's capacity leads to greater motivation to keep doing the hard work of learning. Supporting students in doing this hard work fosters intellectual growth and agency.

In addition to providing space for students to question and explore their own thinking and cultivate a sense of self-efficacy, ERWC offers students repeated opportunities to set goals for themselves and make choices about their learning that support their continued development. The curriculum also guides students and teachers in identifying criteria and evidence that will indicate the achievement of the learning goals and facilitate ongoing formative assessment for learning. By attending to the importance of

problem solving and goal setting, the ERWC thus scaffolds for independence rather than task completion.

Universal Design for Learning

ERWC integrates Universal Design for Learning (UDL)[vii] to address social justice and create equity for students with disabilities, general education students, and English learners. UDL is a curriculum-agnostic approach to pedagogy that seeks to support all students' access to general education by implementing accessible, flexible, and challenging curriculum. Its flexibility addresses more than the needs of the struggling learner, however; it cultivates practices that support all learners, including high-performers as well as students who struggle in a variety of ways. The ERWC Assignment Template and modules have been designed with UDL in mind, providing options for addressing engagement, action and expression, and representation—the core principles of the UDL Guidelines.

One myth UDL debunks is that of the "average student." Meyer, Rose, and Gordon argue that because abilities to perceive are mediated by which modalities students favor and how they take in information (visually, auditorily, through gesture, etc.), learners have different needs but none are average. Variability in learning depends on students' previous experiences with school, family history, sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds, economic status, life encounters, and the social circumstances in which teaching and learning take place. Thus, from a UDL perspective, variability can change based on the task, the environment, the instructional design and modality, and an individual's previous experiences and resources.

Planning for variability can seem overwhelming, so Meyer, Rose, and Gordon simplify by focusing on three networks: Affect, Recognition, and Strategic Networks. *Affect* is the "why;" it is the place of engagement, motivation, and purpose where students gain and sustain interest in a topic. It is also where relevance is cultivated, threats and distractions can be minimized, and teachers can encourage students' reflection and self-assessment. *Recognition* is the "what" of learning. It is where students can become resourceful and knowledgeable by accessing information through varied media and modalities. It is about how patterns are highlighted and recognized, where background knowledge is accessed, and where transfer and generalization occur. Teachers can provide students with a variety of options for accessing information, including multimedia, visual, aural or other symbolic means of expression, including language and gesture. *Strategic Networks* are the "how" of learning. Students develop goals and strategies for monitoring their own progress toward completing projects as they learn, representing what they know in a variety of ways, including visual, multimedia, and kinesthetic means (Meyer, Rose, Gordon 31; CAST).

In order to support students in making effective choices, ERWC developers have created the Cycle for Cultivating Expert Learners. UDL's end goal—through the various brain networks—is to create expert learners, who are, according to Katie Novack in *UDL Now!,* resourceful, motivated, and strategic. The Cycle for Cultivating Expert Learners

- Emphasizes an inquiry approach to learning
- Practices goal setting — for students and teachers — to support agency in learning
- Offers choices for learning, emerging from goals
- Integrates formative assessment to provide regular feedback — for both students and teachers
- Evaluates student performance (and has them evaluate it) through summative assessment
- Reviews choices, progress, and process through reflection.

This cycle structures student choices and provides them and their teachers opportunities to reflect on those choices to promote transfer of learning and more effective choice-making during the future learning

cycles. Through this recursive and emergent process, students gain agency and control over what they want to learn and continually enhance their abilities as active and strategic learners.

The Roles of Engagement and Motivation

In addition to helping students build skillful and strategic rhetorical literacy practices, the ERWC responds directly to frequent calls to improve motivation and engagement in order to enhance reading comprehension, literacy, and academic achievement. Interest and intrinsic motivation can lead to long-term and deeper levels of text-based learning (Naceur and Schiefele 2005), and, like other programs (i.e., CORI and Reading Apprenticeship), the ERWC harnesses authentic interest and inquiry to encourage students to invest personally in literacy.

The reading selections for ERWC modules encompass topics and themes of interest to adolescents (e.g., social media; climate change; the juvenile justice system; teenagers and sleep; gender and culture; bullying) and embody powerful rhetorical strategies and models of language use that students can discuss and analyze deeply. Most importantly, the issues addressed in the modules are relevant to the lives of young adults and are truly debatable—a fact that the curriculum reflects by including readings that represent multiple perspectives on topics. Rather than promoting a particular position, the modules provide instructional routines, tools, and materials that afford students a variety of entry points into ongoing conversations. Through extended conversation and writing, students explore their positions relative to each topic and interact in many different ways with texts, their peers, and their teachers to establish and develop their perspectives.

Transfer of Learning

Teaching for transfer of learning across in-school and out-of-school contexts is a critical aspect of the ERWC's culturally responsive pedagogies. Transfer of learning is the adaptation and application of prior learning in new situations (Haskell 2001; National Research Council 2012; Perkins and Salomon 2012). This involves repurposing, or "remixing" (Yancey et al 2018), knowledge, skills, and dispositions acquired in one setting so that they can be meaningfully redeployed in settings that may differ significantly from the original learning environment. For example, a student who edits videos or music in their free time can leverage those skills to make and evaluate organizational choices in written compositions. In a similar way, a student who plays a sport or works a part-time job can transfer habits of mind such as persistence, engagement, and responsibility to their academic work. Through its attention to teaching for transfer, the ERWC honors and nurtures the cultural, linguistic, and personal resources students bring with them to the classroom and helps them to connect their learning to their everyday and future lives.

Developing a sense of agency and identity as literacy learners means developing what Kathleen Blake Yancey and her colleagues call a "writing-transfer mindset" (43) or more appropriately for ERWC, a "reading/writing-transfer mindset." The ERWC curriculum is designed to support students in developing both practice in and the conceptual knowledge of reading and writing rhetorically that will help them transfer that knowledge to new reading/writing situations in their lives. Yancey and her team have found that studying key terms related to writing, supported by frequent reflection, helps college students approach writing more mindfully in classes following their composition classes, and ERWC has taken a similar approach, with concept mini-modules introducing key concepts that learners can use to engage with both reading and writing in the present and future. Other research on transfer of learning reveals that "meta-awareness about writing" remains with learners from their composition classes (Wardle 77) and that writing knowledge correlates with more success in writing in a variety of contexts (e.g. Beaufort 1999; Graham and Perin 2007; Saddler and Graham 2007). This emphasis on developing a conceptual vocabulary to describe rhetorical decision making is likely, therefore, to support learners in applying the

skills of rhetorical thinking beyond their high-school English classes.

This reading/writing-transfer mindset develops as students practice applying strategic rhetorical approaches to engage deeply in critical reflections about high-interest texts on varied topics. Applying rhetorical thinking in multiple contexts is an important part of the process (cf. Yancey et al 2018). Learners practice adapting routines of reading and writing rhetorically, deepening their understanding of and comfort with the practices of expert readers and writers. As students come to exert greater control over the reading process as well as the writing they do in response to the readings, their perceptions of themselves as autonomous learners and thinkers grow.

The reading/writing-transfer mindset begins, though, with recognizing, and helping learners recognize, that they already bring expertise with language and text to the classroom. Students already read many texts expertly (lyrics to popular music; video game instructions; social networking posts; many varieties of online multimedia; hobby-related reading). Building bridges between in-school and out-of-school worlds by inviting students to bring such texts into the classroom for collaborative analysis can provide students with a conscious understanding of their own knowledge and expertise and cultivate self-esteem and confidence with and through literacy activities. Such activities also foster the development of literate identities and promote a willingness on learners' parts to experiment with new forms of literate involvement.

Conclusion

The ERWC supports young people's development of deep literacies and literate identities—the skills, dispositions, and habits of mind that will expand their opportunities to engage fully and meaningfully in the twenty-first century. Perhaps most importantly, at the same time that the ERWC makes the option of higher education real for students who might never have considered college, it also prepares them for the literacy demands they will encounter—whether they choose to enroll in a two- or four-year college, move directly into varied careers, or pursue vocational or military training. It is our greatest hope that all ERWC students will be well prepared to navigate the diverse contexts and challenges of their future lives.

Works Cited

Barton, Hamilton, et al. *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*. Routledge, 2000.

Beaufort, Anne. *Writing in the Real World*. Teachers College Press, 1999.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1968, pp. 1-14.

Brandt, Deborah. *Literacy as Involvement: The Acts of Writers, Readers, and Texts*. Southern Illinois UP, 1990.

Bunn, Mike. "How to Read Like a Writer." *Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing*, vol. 2, edited by Charles Lowe and Pavel Zemliansky, Parlor Press, 2011, pp. 71-86.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny. *The Social Construction of Literacy*. 2nd ed., Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Fong, Anthony, et al. "Evaluation of the Expository Reading and Writing Course: Findings from the Investing in Innovation Development Grant." WestEd, 2015.

Gee, James Paul. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. 3rd ed. Routledge, 2008.

Graham, Steven, and Dolores Perin. "A Meta-Analysis of Writing Instruction for Adolescent Students." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 99, no. 3, 2007, pp. 445-76.

Greenleaf, Cynthia & Katz, Mira-Lisa. "Releasing Responsibility for What? Developing Learning Environments for Text-Based Inquiry in the Disciplines in Secondary Schools." *The Gradual Release of Responsibility in Literacy Research and Practice,* edited by Mary McVee, Evan Ortlieb, Jennifer Reichenberg, and P. David Pearson. Literacy Research, Practice and Evaluation, vol. 10, Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 37-52, 2019.

Hall, Tracey E., et al. *Universal Design for Learning in the Classroom: Practical Applications. What Works for Special-Needs Learners Series*. 2012.

Haskell, Robert E. *Transfer of Learning: Cognition, Instruction, and Reasoning*. Educational Psychology, Academic P, 2001.

Lee, Carol D. "The Multi-Dimensional Demands of Reading in the Disciplines." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,* vol. 58, no. 1, 2014, pp. 9-15.

Meyer, Anne, et al. *Universal Design for Learning*. CAST Professional Publishing, 2014.

Naceur, Abdelmajid, and Ulrich Schiefele. "Motivation and Learning — The Role of Interest in Construction of Representation of Text and Long-term Retention: Inter- and Intraindividual Analyses." *European Journal of Psychology of Education,* vol. 20, no. 2, 2005, 155-70.

National Research Council. *Education for Life and Work: Developing Transferable Knowledge and Skills in the 21st Century.* Committee on Defining Deeper Learning and 21st Century Skills, James W. Pellegrino and Margaret L. Hilton, Editors. Board on Testing and Assessment and Board on Science Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. The National Academies Press, 2012.

Novack, Katie and David H. Rose. *UDL Now! A Teacher's Guide to Applying Universal Design for Learning in Today's Classrooms*. 2nd ed., CAST Professional Publishing, 2016.

Paris, Django, and H. Samy Alim, editors. *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*. Teachers College Press, 2017.

Perkins, David N, and Gavriel Salomon. "Knowledge to Go: A Motivational and Dispositional View of Transfer." *Educational Psychologist: New Conceptualizations of Transfer of Learning* 47.3 (2012): 248-58.

Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Ca. Science Technology Policy Inst. *Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*. Distribution Services, RAND, 2002.

Ryder, Phyllis Mentzell. “Rhetorical Analysis in the Real World.” *Writing Commons*, writingcommons.org/article/rhetorical-analysis-in-the-real-world-a-useful-thinking-tool/, Accessed 13 February 2019.

Schoenbach, Ruth, et al. *Reading for Understanding: How Reading Apprenticeship Improves Disciplinary Learning in Secondary and College Classrooms. 2nd ed.*, Jossey-Bass, 2012.

Schoenbach, Ruth, et al. *Leading for Literacy: A Reading Apprenticeship Approach*. Jossey-Bass, 2017.

Scribner, Cole, and Cole, Michael. *The Psychology of Literacy*. Harvard UP, 1981.

Street, Brian V. *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge Studies in Oral and Literate Culture, vol. 9, Cambridge UP, 1985.

Vygotsky, Lev, and Cole, Michael. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard UP, 1978.

Wardle, Elizabeth. "Understanding 'Transfer' from FYC: Preliminary Results of a Longitudinal Study." Writing Program Administration, vol. 31, no. 1/2, 2007, pp. 65-85.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake, et al. "Writing Across College: Key Terms and Multiple Contexts as Factors Promoting Students' Transfer of Writing Knowledge and Practice." *The WAC Journal*, vol. 29, 2018, pp. 42-63.

Works Consulted

Applebee, Arthur N. *Curriculum as Conversation: Transforming Traditions of Teaching and Learning.* U of Chicago P,1996.

Applebee, Arthur N., Judith A. Langer, Martin Nystrand, and Adam Gamoran. "Discussion- based Approaches to Developing Understanding: Classroom Instruction and Student Performance in Middle and High School English." *American Education Research Journal,* 40, 2003, pp. 685–730.

Bawarshi, Anis S., and Mary Jo. Reiff. *Genre: An Introduction to History, Theory, Research, and Pedagogy*. Reference Guides to Rhetoric and Composition, Parlor, WAC Clearinghouse, 2010.

Brynelson, Nancy, Jennifer Fletcher, and Nelson Graff. "From High School Curriculum to Literacy Network: Transforming High School English Teaching in California." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,* vol. 62, no. 6, 2019, pp. 681-85.

CAST. "Universal Design for Learning Guidelines Version 2.2." CAST, 2018, udlguidelines.cast.org/binaries/content/assets/udlguidelines/udlg-v2-2/udlg_graphicorganizer_v2-2_numbers-yes.pdf. Accessed 11 May 2018.

Coiro, Julie. *Handbook of Research on New Literacies*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Taylor & Francis Group, 2008.

Fisher, Douglas B., and Nancy E. Frey. *Better Learning Through Structured Teaching: A Framework for the Gradual Release of Responsibility.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2008.

Fisher, Douglas B., and Nancy E. Frey. *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Content Strategies at Work.* 3rd ed., Pearson, 2012.

Frey, Nancy. *Collaborative Conversations: Speaking and Listening in Secondary Classrooms.* SchoolsMovingUp, WestEd, www. schoolsmovingup.net/cs/smu/view/e/5306, 13 Feb. 2013, Webinar.

Frey, Nancy, et al. P*roductive Group Work: How to Engage Students, Build Teamwork, and Promote Understanding.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2009.

Greenleaf, Cynthia, Mira-Lisa Katz, and Aaron Wilson. "Designing Literacy Leadership: Fractal Motifs for Teaching and Learning." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,* vol. 62, no. 1, 2018, pp. 105-09.

Hammond, Zaretta, and Yvette Jackson. *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students*. Sage Publications, 2015.

Katz, Mira-Lisa, Brynelson, Nancy, and Edlund, John. "Enacting Rhetorical Literacies: The Expository Reading and Writing Curriculum in Theory and Practice." *Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy*, 7th ed., edited by Donna Alvermann, Norman Unrau, and Misty Sailors, Routledge, 2019, pp. 533-62.

Lee, Carol D., and Anika Spratley. *Reading in the Disciplines: The Challenges of Adolescent Literacy. Final Report from Carnegie Corporation of New York's Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy*. Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2010, pp. 1-34.

McCann, Thomas M. *Transforming Talk into Text: Argument Writing, Inquiry, and Discussion, Grades 6-12*. Language and Literacy Series, Teachers College Press, 2014.

Minor, Cornelius. *We Got This.: Equity, Access, and the Quest to Be Who Our Students Need Us to Be*. Heinemann, 2019.

Novak, Katie, and David H. Rose. *UDL Now!: A Teacher's Guide to Applying Universal Design for Learning in Today's Classrooms*. Revised & Expanded ed. Cast Professional, 2016.

Nystrand, Martin. *Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom.* Teachers College P, 1997.

Rogers-Shaw, Carol, Davin J Carr-Chellman, and Jinhee Choi. "Universal Design for Learning: Guidelines for Accessible Online Instruction." *Adult Learning,* vol. 29, no. 1, 2018, pp. 20-31.

Skerrett, Allison, and Randy Bomer. "Borderzones in Adolescents' Literacy Practices: Connecting Out-of-School Literacies to the Reading Curriculum." *Urban Education* 46.6 (2011): 1256-279.

Wilkinson, Ian, and Eun Hye Son. "A dialogic turn in research on learning and teaching to comprehend." *Handbook of Reading Research,* edited by Michael Kamil, David Pearson, Elizabeth Moje, and Peter Afflerbach, *vol. 4*, pp. 359–387, Routledge, 2011.

Zwiers, Jeff. *Building Academic Language: Essential Practices for Content Classrooms.* Jossey-Bass, 2008.

Zwiers, Jeff and Marie Crawford. *Academic Conversations: Classroom Talk That Fosters Critical Thinking and Content Understandings.* Stenhouse, 2011.

---

[i] See Fong, Finkelstein, Diaz, Broek and Jaeger "Evaluation of the Expository Reading and Writing Course: Findings From the Investing in Innovation Development Grant" https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED559522.pdf

[ii] See Barton, Hamilton and Ivanič, *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context;* Brandt, 1990, *Literacy as Involvement*; Cook-Gumperz, 2006, *The Social Construction of Literacy*, Gee, 2008, *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*; Scribner and Cole, 1981, The Psychology of Literacy; Street, 1985, *Literacy in Theory and Practice*; Lee, 2014, "The Multi-Dimensional Demands of Reading in the Disciplines."

[iii] Genre has historically been a means of categorizing text types (e.g., blog postings, social media posts, digital and multimedia texts, videos, photos, images, paintings, maps, news articles, opinion editorials, poetry, drama, myth, autobiography or biography, fiction or non-fiction, speeches, essays, letters or correspondence, public service announcements, informational brochures, etc. In keeping with more current thinking in the field of genre studies, ERWC developers consider text types to be characterized by specific forms, content, and style that set readers up to have particular expectations these same elements. In other words, genres are connected with writers' and readers' social purposes. Scholars Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) suggest that, "Genres both organize and generate kinds of texts and social actions, in complex, dynamic relation to one another. …This dynamic view of genre calls for the study and teaching of how formal features are connected to social purposes, why a genre's formal features come to exist the way they do, and how and why those features make possible certain social actions/relations and not others" (pp. 212-213).

[iv] See RAND Reading for Understanding, 2002.

[v] See Vygotsky, 1978, *Mind in Society*.

[vi] See Greenleaf & Katz, 2019, "Releasing Responsibility for What?" https://doi.org/10.1108/S2048-045820190000010003

[vii] See Hall, Meyer and Rose, 2012, *Universal Design for Learning in the Classroom*, and Novak and Rose, 2016, *UDL Now!*