

ENGL 1100 Contextualized: Designing a FYW Course for Guided Pathways

Nancy Pine

The course I describe here is a contextualized version of ENGL 1100 Composition I, a first year writing (FYW) course, designed specifically for students who declare majors in business and hospitality services programs to study composition in the context of their majors and future professions. This version of ENGL 1100 counts for FYW credit and adheres to the same learning outcomes as any other section at my institution, but it includes subject matter and the study of rhetorical situations and texts of interest and relevance to students with majors in the pathway. Developing pedagogies of contextualization for FYW through courses like this may help motivate community college students in particular to succeed in the course and facilitate transfer of their learning. The overall goal of this course is for students to recognize and value literacy learning during and beyond college, preparing them for a lifetime of reading and writing in their professional and personal lives.

Institutional Context

Columbus State Community College is an open-enrollment, two-year college in Central Ohio with two campuses, five regional learning centers in four counties, and dual enrollment partnerships with nearly two hundred high schools and career centers. The college web site reports enrollment of more than 45,000 full- and part-time students (“Fast Facts”). Columbus State considers itself the “front door” to higher education in the region (“Mission”), offering associate degrees for both degree-to-degree transfer and career programs, as well as certificate programs, and reporting “200 transfer opportunities and guaranteed admission to many institutions,” including transfer agreements with more than thirty-five colleges (“Fast Facts”). Recently, Columbus State began engaging in the Guided Pathways reform movement when it was chosen as one of thirty colleges by the American Association of Community Colleges “to develop next-generation academic and career pathways designed to ensure gains in completion of both two- and four-year degrees as well as great marketability for graduates” (“Academic Chairpersons”).

Business and hospitality services is one of the college’s eight career and academic pathways, or metamajors, from which all incoming students choose. Students who declare this pathway may select one of the following majors: accounting; baking and pastry arts; business; business office administration; culinary; entrepreneurship; finance; hotel, tourism and event management; human resources; marketing; nutrition and dietetics; real estate; or restaurant

and food service management (“Business and Hospitality Services”). Within each major are multiple programs that offer various degrees, including specialized associate’s degrees as well as certificates. All of the associate’s degrees, as well as some of the certificates, require ENGL 1100 in their programs of study.

A specific cohort program in the pathway called Exact Track is a partnership with nearby Franklin University. Designed for working adults, accepted students are placed in cohorts and complete a fixed sequence of courses from both institutions one or two evenings a week in person and online, to earn an Associate of Applied Science in Business Management from Columbus State and a Bachelor of Science with a double major in Business Administration and Management and Leadership from Franklin University (“Exact Track”). This program began at Columbus State’s second, Delaware Campus, location, where I am stationed, but it is expanding and has been adapted for particular business partners. This contextualized version of ENGL 1100 was selected for a new Exact Track business partner cohort for inclusion in its lock-step schedule. Courses are offered on site at the business at no cost to the students, reimbursed by their employer.

ENGL 1100 is considered a gateway course at Columbus State, with the highest number of sections taught in the autumn semester. For example, in autumn 2020, just over three hundred English sections were offered, including dual enrollment. The majority of ENGL 1100 sections are taught by adjunct instructors and high school teachers. The curriculum for ENGL 1100 follows the Ohio Department of Higher Education and Ohio Transfer Module requirements, revised in 2021, to include a total of “5,000 words of text that has been thoughtfully revised and copyedited to meet the expectations of particular rhetorical situations” (“Ohio Transfer”). Within that requirement, the Columbus State English department established a standard textbook, four types of major writing project assignments with minimum word counts and grade weight ranges, a grade weight range for other work, and a standard holistic grading rubric consistent with the WPA outcomes statement for first year composition. Beyond these requirements, composition faculty are fairly autonomous in assignment creation and course design.

To date, this contextualized version of ENGL 1100 has been taught on two Columbus State campuses and one business partner site.

Creation of the Course

I was invited to develop the course starting in the Summer of 2018 as part of a Department of Education Title III grant for the College’s Completion Plan specific to Guided Pathways, and I taught the first sections in autumn 2019. I received reassigned time compensation equivalent to a course release each term of course development.

I used the college web site to identify all the departments and programs in the business and hospitality services pathway and reviewed the plans of study to see which ones require ENGL 1100 and, if so, what other classes students take in each plan of study. I began communicating with pathway faculty in person and via email to learn about their subjects and fields, as well as collect their insights and feedback for the course. I first assured them that the ENGL 1100 contextualized would not replace any of the courses in their curriculum, that content would not overlap (for example, “business communication”), and that the course would “count” and transfer for FYW credit. I also shared draft course materials for feedback. In general, I requested the following information from pathway faculty to inform course development:

- What topics and texts would be useful for your students to read and write about in the course?
- What kinds of writing do students do in your classes? Would you please share sample writing assignment prompts?
- What kinds of research information do students in your program need to know? What style and format will students use to cite sources in your program? What library research databases will they use?
- What can you tell me about the norms for “good writing” in what the students will study as “discourse communities” in your field and profession (for example, goals and values, typical genres, etc.)? Would you please share sample texts students could study to understand the genres in your field?

In spring 2019, I began to develop an Open Educational Resource (OER) ebook called *Writing in Context* to support a contextualized approach to composition. For this, I received additional reassigned time as part of a college-wide OER initiative.

I taught the first ENGL 1100 contextualized sections in autumn 2019, and my colleague Deborah Bertsch and I taught sections in spring 2020. I had planned to begin assessing the course formally when offered full-scale the following academic year; however, this has been delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Theoretical Rationale

While there are a number of terms and models for course contextualization in general, when designing this course I adhered to the foundational concept that all “applications center on the practice of systematically connecting basic skills instruction to a specific content that is meaningful and useful to students” (Perin 270). For community colleges in particular, “[o]ne important ‘context’ for adult learning is the world of work itself and the specific tools,

practices and social relations embedded in the work setting” (Mazzeo et al. 4). Therefore, I developed this version of ENGL 1100 to contextualize it for academic and work settings in the business and hospitality services pathway. Reasons offered why “key proficiencies for academic learning,” such as writing, should be taught in the context of a student’s academic pathway or major include (1) transferability of skills, (2) student motivation, and (3) academic skills not being taught in pathways/majors (Perin 268).

Decades of theory and research in composition studies conclude that writing knowledge and practice is situated and best understood in context. For example, Yancey et al. and other’s recent research explores “the ways activity systems and contexts interact in writing transfer” (“The Teaching for Transfer Curriculum” 269). To develop this course, I combined pedagogies and curricula of Teaching for Transfer (TFT) and Writing about Writing (WAW), while emphasizing the pathway context in comparison to other disciplinary contexts across the curriculum. Composition research and scholarship demonstrate that knowledge and practices for writing are not basic, but rather a complex set of threshold concepts (Adler-Kassner and Wardle), key terms (Yancey et al.), and knowledge domains (Beaufort). When designing the course I assumed it essential that students not simply learn about isolated parts or skills in composing without the overarching, big picture: what it all means and how the parts connect in various contexts for composing, emphasizing their pathway context. If students know their “why” for composing in their pathway context, then they can work through the “how” to succeed in the course and beyond. The pathway context also facilitates students’ decision-making, guiding their rhetorical choices to include discourse community and genre, while composing their writing project assignments.

Teaching to Motivate

One of the reasons to offer contextualized composition courses is that students may be motivated to engage in the work of the course due to their interest in the topics of study, seeing the relevancy of course content to their pathway majors and future careers. Therefore, designing this course, I knew that the content—what students read and write about, as well as any sites they study—could not be arbitrary; it needed to be relevant to business and hospitality services. However, “[c]ognitive theory on transfer has a long history of unresolved debates,” including a question of “dosage”: “how much contextualization is required to facilitate transfer of learning” (Perin 288). I had to consider the right “dosage” of pathway content with TFT and WAW pedagogies and curricula. I wanted to be sure the focus of the course wouldn’t simply be reading and writing about business and hospitality services top-

ics—studying that content—but rather studying and practicing composition concepts in the context of that pathway.

To strike the right “dosage” of pathway content, I combined the approaches of Beaufort, Wardle, and Yancey et al. and others. I applied Beaufort’s approach in which “the course is structured around sustained inquiry into a subject that has both breadth and relevance” to the students (“*College Writing and Beyond: Five Years Later*”). I thought a nonfiction book would offer “breadth and relevance” and serve as a common book for the pathway students, similar to institutions where I have taught in which all incoming first year students, for example, read and discuss the same book in courses across campus. When I discussed course reading ideas with pathway faculty they indicated the value of nonfiction books in their professions, which was later confirmed by the first cohort of Exact Track students who shared examples of nonfiction books that managers or mentors had recommended they read for personal and professional development.

I received about a dozen book suggestions from pathway faculty. After piloting some of them, I have settled for now on *When: The Scientific Secrets of Perfect Timing* by Daniel Pink. It’s engaging and applicable to all pathway majors—in all business and hospitality services programs—and the paperback is inexpensive. Additionally, as the book synthesizes an abundance of various kinds of primary- and secondary-source research on the topic, the students and I can find and study Pink’s sources to see how various fields and disciplines approach topics (for example, business, psychology, biology, etc.).

Students use the book as a source for their first writing project assignment “Applying Theory to Experience: Personal Response to a Text” and may use it in subsequent assignments if helpful for their project. Inspired by Berthoff’s double-entry notebook, encouraging students to “think, and then think again,” a writer’s notebook assignment requires students to think and write as they read, dividing each page in their notebook into two columns: record and respond. Drawing on field working methods from Sunstein and Chiseri-Strater, the assignment prepares students for later assignments to read not only texts but also conduct observations. For their writer’s notebooks, students are also guided by prompts in the course calendar with the chapter deadlines; as a class we focus on those topics, rhetorical strategies, etc. from the book. I incorporate the book as much as possible in class discussions and activities both for introductory pathway content and as a text for studying rhetoric and composition concepts. My goal is to establish a classroom culture/community in which we actively discuss and use the book as a significant part of the class, developing a collective expertise, especially as it pertains to programs and professions in the pathway.

We finish the book halfway through the course, and after the first assignment the course content includes additional texts that the students and I bring to the course from contexts in their majors to include primary and secondary library and field research. In WAW composition courses, “the research is about language, the discussions are about language, and the goal of the course is to teach students the content of our discipline” (Wardle 784). In this course, students study and write about rhetoric and composition concepts as applied in pathway contexts. The first assignment uses the book and students’ personal responses and self-studies as a motivating, pathway warm-up to the remaining WAW assignments they will complete, studying that pathway context for the majority and rest of the course. For the second and third major writing project assignment units—“Reading as a Writer: Studying How a Text Works” and “Researching Writing in Action: Case Study of a Discourse Community”—students choose a text and a discourse community to study that are related to their pathway. Students may be motivated and find relevance in studying, for example, genres used in a particular business, and students can apply composition concepts to that particular context. Within these units, group presentations, which pathway faculty reported frequently assigned in their classes, help students learn about additional texts and sites of study in their shared pathway as well.

Teaching and Learning for Transfer

Another reason to offer contextualized composition courses is to facilitate transfer of learning because “learners, even the most proficient, often do not readily transfer newly learned skills to novel settings” (Perin 268). Yancey et al. offer an overview to TFT curricula in composition studies and discuss “the complexity of transfer of writing knowledge and practice” (“The Teaching for Transfer Curriculum” 269). In designing this course, I sought to instill in students what Yancey et al. call a writing-transfer mindset with writing transfer as an outcome of the course (273-74). This course “look[s] at transfer as a process in which we want students to engage” (Skeffington 34), which includes “being much more transparent about the contextual nature of writing assignments and requirements than we are used to doing” (30) and providing opportunities for students to engage in the process of transfer in the composition course (29). The assignments in this composition course are not designed to teach students to compose in the specialized genres of their pathway majors and professions, which Wardle demonstrates is problematic (768). The assignments are WAW in the pathway context, rather than writing for the pathway. Specifically this course seeks to teach students what Perkins and Salomon call *learning for transfer*, with the instruction in composition

in the pathway context “closer to the transfer performance” (30), and it is designed to foster low and high road transfer.

Low road transfer “reflects the automatic triggering of well-practiced routines in circumstances where there is considerable perceptual similarity” (“Teaching for Transfer” 25). Employing the technique Perkins and Salomon call “hugging,” which means “teaching so as to better meet the resemblance conditions for low road transfer,” this course teaches composition concepts in the context of pathway academic and workplace discourse communities—“hugging” them closer to the students’ pathway—making connections “particularly plain” for students (28). Thus, contextualizing the course for the pathway facilitates low road transfer for students. For example, pathway faculty expressed to me that their courses require APA format, so in this course the third and fourth writing projects require APA format to support low road transfer to writing assignments in pathway courses.

However, to facilitate high road transfer, composition concepts also need to be decontextualized in the course through what Perkins and Salomon describe as the technique of “bridging” (28). In contrast to low road, high road transfer “always involves reflective thought in abstracting from one context and seeking connections with others” (26). High road transfer “require[s] explicit mindful abstraction” of “patterns and applications in other settings” to “decontextualize such patterns” and use them in other contexts (28). Therefore, in this course, while the final two writing projects require APA format, the first two writing projects require MLA format to support both low and high road transfer for each style. Students have sustained practice in two formal assignments for each style to experience transfer in the course, as well as abstracting principles about the logic of citation, transitioning from MLA format to APA. The two styles and citing sources, like all other concepts in the course, are not framed as sets of rules, but studied and found to be reflective of goals and values in particular discourse communities.

To design this course for such high road transfer, I drew on Beaufort’s curriculum because I thought it was the clearest for students who would take this course.. The course content is organized around what Beaufort calls the five knowledge domains of writing—subject matter, rhetorical situation, genre, writing process, and discourse community—which she represents in a graphic as overlapping circles with discourse community subsuming the other four. For Beaufort, “mental schemata” of the five knowledge domains of writing can be used by students as “mid-level abstractions” or “mental grippers” for problem-solving in new situations to bridge from prior knowledge (17). For each assignment, the students study and apply the knowledge domains of writing, making decisions about their own chosen discourse communities,

rhetorical situations, and genres that inform how and why they might compose the project the way they do.

Designing this course, I also sought to minimize negative transfer, “where knowledge or skill from one context interferes with another” (Perkins and Salomon “Teaching for Transfer” 22). Although our current composition curriculum begins with the assignment category “Writing from Personal Experience”—and most instructors assign a personal narrative or memoir for that unit—this course does not have a formal personal narrative assignment. Skeffington claims such assignments may foster negative transfer and cause issues with student perception, such as a view that class writing assignments are expressive (37). In a meeting with a group of pathway faculty from various majors, I had asked them about the role of personal writing in their courses, and they reported it is used for reflection or in assignments where students needed to demonstrate the value their skills or performances add to their team or profession (for example, performance appraisals, reports on group projects, etc). The first assignment in this course, therefore, invites students to apply a theory from a text to their personal experience—from the past, or in the present—as a form of self-study. As Beaufort writes, “transfer of learning goals need to merge with, interweave with any skills-development or knowledge acquisition goals of a given curriculum” (“*College Writing and Beyond: Five Years Later*”).

I also designed this course to emphasize consistent learning goals with the pathway to facilitate positive—and minimize negative—transfer of learning from this course to pathway contexts. General writing skills are enacted in local pathway contexts because “general and local knowledge interact in human cognition” (Perkins and Salomon “Are Cognitive Skills Context-Bound?” 24). Therefore, in designing the course I took care to go “beyond educating memories to educating minds” (24), emphasizing higher order skills applicable to pathway contexts rather than only factual knowledge. For example, I noticed the concept of analysis emerged as an academic strategy that if practiced in this composition course may support student success in pathway majors, as well as across the curriculum. Writing analytically is often challenging for many students, and, as Danielewicz and others point out, terms like *analysis*, used generally, “do not help students understand how research in one field may be analyzed differently from research in another.” In the assignments I reviewed from participating pathway faculty, students were frequently asked for a specific kind of case-study analysis, to apply a concept to a case, for example, and write about what the concept means or how it works. Therefore, each writing project assignment in this course invites students to make a similar analytical move, applying a theory or concept to a text or situation. Furthermore, an emphasis on analytical writing supports students’ continual analysis of the five

knowledge domains of writing as applied to their writing project assignments, for example, by analyzing sample texts from a particular genre in which they are considering composing their project. This strategy of analysis becomes a habit of mind in this composition course that is valued in pathway courses, as well as across the curriculum.

Therefore, to engage students in this kind of analysis, as well as the study and practice of the five knowledge domains of writing, the major writing project assignment units progress in the following way:

- “Applying Theory to Experience: Personal Response to a Text” - Students are introduced to concepts like prior knowledge and transfer of learning, reading and writing analytically, and the five knowledge domains of writing (discourse community, genre, rhetoric, process, and subject matter). For the assignment, students apply a theory from the book *When* (subject matter knowledge) to a personal experience or situation related to their pathway major.
- “Reading as a Writer: Studying How a Text Works” - Students conduct in-depth study and practice of the knowledge domain of rhetoric, using texts in pathway and other contexts. For the assignment, students apply a theory about rhetoric to analyze the rhetorical situation of a text of their choice (ideally from the discourse community they choose to study for the next assignment).
- “Researching Writing in Action: Case Study of a Discourse Community” - Students conduct in-depth study and practice of the knowledge domains of discourse community and genre, using texts and sites in pathway and other contexts. For the assignment, students apply theories about discourse community and genre to conduct a case study of a discourse community of their choice related to their pathway major.
- “Developing Your Theory of Writing: Self-Study of Writing Practices” - Students conduct in-depth study and practice of the knowledge domain writing process. For the assignment, students apply theories about writing process to conduct a self-study of themselves as writers—as they complete a writing project for the class and a project in another, ideally pathway, context—to support development of their own theory of writing.

Students have the opportunity to engage in the process of transfer of learning within this course, which includes frequent and sustained study and practice with particular genres and situations for writing. Students compose shorter texts in multiple genres and situations in various activities and then compose longer writing projects, each with opportunities for “extensive practice

of the performance in question” to engage in transfer processes for “remix” or “a setback or critical incident,” leading to new knowledge and writing practices for the writing situation (Yancey et al. *Writing Across Contexts* 104). Drawing on Beaufort, an informal process reflection letter assignment, which students submit with each writing project final draft submission, supports this transfer as a metacognition activity for students to reflect on their developing understanding of the knowledge domains of writing from their experience with the writing task. The last question of the process reflection also helps students brainstorm topic ideas for their final self-study writing project assignment to support their emerging theory of writing. The “Developing Your Theory of Writing: Self-Study of Writing Practices” assignment combines a WAW curriculum assignment and Yancey et al. theory of writing assignment from their TFT curriculum. Students consider what they know so far about writing concepts as applied to their pathway context by studying their practices, positioning them for transfer.

Critical Reflection

I found the most insightful and rewarding part of developing this course working with the participating pathway faculty, some of whom have continued to consult with me for issues related to teaching writing. In meetings I learned a lot about their disciplines, and I was proud to share the wealth of expertise that composition studies can offer about teaching writing to students, then applying that knowledge to develop this course supporting our shared students together. I wish they too were funded by the grant and also had received reassigned/release time to collaborate with me not only to develop the course materials, but also so we could have learned more from each other. Knowing that the participating pathway faculty volunteered, while I was compensated, I was especially sensitive to their time and labor invested as I developed the course. I didn’t want to ask them to do too much, which may have limited, for example, how much I learned about their pathway to inform the contextualization of the course. Pathway faculty engagement could be especially important in creating opportunities to use techniques of “hugging” and “bridging” in their courses to support students’ writing transfer beyond this composition course.

An immediate and practical challenge that needs to be addressed is enrolling the students who may most benefit from this ENGL 1100 contextualized course version. A number of students enrolled each term were in different pathways and said they didn’t realize it was a “special” course version of ENGL 1100; they signed up only because of the day and time offering. These students had no interest in the business and hospitality services pathway and were perhaps less motivated than students in the pathway for which the course was

contextualized. A solution the college is considering is closing registration to the contextualized ENGL 1100 versions, so that students may not register for it by themselves but only through an advisor who could share the course blurbs and other details to help students make an informed choice.

I appreciate that pathway students do have the choice of whether or not to enroll in the contextualized versions of ENGL 1100, because I have found that the students have varying interest in and commitment to business and hospitality services topics and sites of study. Because through guided pathways students are encouraged to choose a pathway when beginning their studies at Columbus State, I wonder how many students are truly “undecided” and “exploring” but end up in this or other pathways. To support their success in ENGL 1100 and beyond, I would not recommend contextualized course versions for students to test whether or not they are interested in particular pathways. With the central goals of pathway course contextualization being both student motivation and transfer of learning, I believe ENGL 1100 contextualized is best suited for students fairly committed to a major in the pathway. The Exact Track cohort with the business partner ended up not being a good fit for ENGL 1100 contextualized because of this lack of choice, with all of the students in the same program with the same major being required to take ENGL 1100 contextualized (even if they already have FYW credit). In addition, the cohort students all work for the same employer and are in this way perhaps too contextualized with security and ethical issues complicating research for the case study assignment, for example. I learned a number of the cohort students desired a regular ENGL 1100 section.

In addition, although the contextualized community college literature focuses on adult basic and developmental education, claiming such students benefit from contextualized courses, students who place near-ready for ENGL 1100 cannot currently enroll in this course because they are not paired with ENGL 0199 co-requisite (ALP) sections. If the scheduling logistics of in-person contextualized ENGL 0199/1100 pairings cannot be worked out, then perhaps online versions may be developed.

In addition to enrollment, I think this course needs more work with developing pedagogies of contextualization to support transfer of learning. Anson points out the “situational uniqueness” of writing and that “[a]daptation and success require continued situated practice and gradual enculturation,” namely “situationally determined knowledge” (541-42). Students need to experience that writing knowledge and practices are situated; therefore, they need to be engaged in and learn to value the messiness of composing—the slippages in the “textbook” understandings of the knowledge domains—and they need to learn, given the situation, how to write by being adaptable, flexible, and persistent. Rosinski and Peebles demonstrate how they use problem-based learn-

ing: “Through engagement, students learn that writing is messy, open-ended, indeterminate, and iterative; they learn how to writing within such contexts; and they learn to value the process of working through/with this messiness” (15). Public pedagogies (see Holmes) that include service-learning—or other forms of experiential learning more broadly—may also present opportunities for students in this course to develop varying kinds of knowledge for composing with authentic writing situations in the pathway that would work well in a FYW curriculum.

When more sections of this course are taught, professional development for instructors will be crucial. Mazzeo and others cite research that illustrates, “While curriculum materials can be very useful, most research suggests that curriculum itself cannot promote instructional change without a complementary investment in professional development” (17). In addition, WAW and TFT curricula necessitate that instructors have some rhetoric and composition disciplinary content knowledge; however, especially at community colleges, the majority of composition courses are taught by contingent faculty with various coursework backgrounds and specializations (see Skeffington and Tinberg). Teaching for transfer would be especially challenging for instructors who are formulaic and prescriptive in their approach to teaching composition, which is especially common at institutions that teach underserved students where “teachers sometimes grab onto ‘formulaic acts’ to fulfill the obligations attached to composition,” regulating students’ literacy (Soliday and Trainor 125). In spite of these hurdles, “it is well worth the effort” to have these conversations about transfer at all institutions, including community colleges; “[t]he chief beneficiaries will doubtless be students, who will be better prepared to adapt to the fluctuating demands of college and career” (Tinberg 29). To prepare to teach this course, instructors would benefit not only from initial training workshops, but also ongoing mentoring and support their first term teaching the course, ideally through weekly meetings and frequent communication with experienced contextualized composition faculty.

These reflections occurred before the COVID-19 pandemic, which has interrupted offering this course and its assessment, but as the pandemic continues, I am reflecting on aspects of the course that may or may not translate virtually, including the case study assignment. When the course is taught again, assessment, ideally qualitative and longitudinal, can examine student motivation and the nature of transfer of learning. Are pathway students succeeding in the contextualized course version at higher rates than those in regular ENGL1100 sections? If so, why? What do students find motivating about the course? What about transfer? How do students engage in transfer of learning in this course, pathway courses, other courses, and the workplace? Are they experiencing positive transfer or negative or both? Is the transfer low

road, high road, or both? For assessment and study, I think it would be ideal for students to be assigned in subsequent pathway courses a mini-self-study, theory-of-writing assignment to continually support writing transfer as well as provide data, from willing study participants, about the nature of transfer.

This data could show that a contextualized course like this does more harm than good by fostering negative transfer. Perhaps this course sends a message to students and faculty that more about writing can be taught in FYW than really can. Does the course reinforce an idea that students really “should have learned that already” in FYW and, therefore, be expected to perform more expertly in writing tasks in their pathway courses and others and their eventual workplace? Does this contextualized course make a promise that it cannot deliver? Or does the course better deliver promises already made in FYW? The field of composition studies continues to explore how to foster the adaptable and innovative lifelong literacy learners demanded in the twenty-first century, and this course pursues this goal for students in business and hospitality services programs and professions. Certainly, working together with faculty in pathway programs toward this shared goal leads to greater opportunities to support student writers.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank the faculty who teach majors in the business and hospitality services pathway at Columbus State for generously taking their time to share their teaching and learning worlds with me as I developed the course. I also appreciate the kind and thoughtful feedback from *Composition Studies* editors Matt Davis and Kara Taczak throughout the process of this write-up. Finally, I am so grateful to my colleague Deborah Bertsch who not only provided feedback to an early draft of this project, but also supported me during the entire journey of the course’s development.

Works Cited

- “Academic Chairpersons.” Columbus State Community College, <https://www.csc.edu/about/recruitment/chairs.shtml>.
- Adler-Kassner, and Elizabeth Wardle, editors. *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*. Utah State UP, 2015.
- Anson, Chris M. “The Pop Warner Chronicles: A Case Study in Contextual Adaptation and the Transfer of Writing Ability.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 67, no. 4, 2016, pp. 518-49.
- Beaufort, Anne. *College Writing and Beyond: A New Framework for University Writing Instruction*. Utah State UP, 2007.
- . “*College Writing and Beyond: Five Years Later*.” *Composition Forum*, vol. 26, Fall 2012, <https://compositionforum.com/issue/26/college-writing-beyond.php>.

- Berthoff, Ann E. *The Making of Meaning: Metaphors, Models, and Maxims for Writing Teachers*. Boynton/Cook, 1981.
- “Business and Hospitality Services.” Columbus State Community College, <https://www.csc.edu/academics/business-hospitality-services/>.
- Danielewicz, Jane, et al. “Assignments and Expectations.” *Composition Forum*, vol. 46, Spring 2021, <https://compositionforum.com/issue/46/expectations-transfer.php>.
- “Exact Track.” Columbus State Community College, <https://www.csc.edu/academics/departments/exact-track/index.shtml>.
- “Fast Facts.” Columbus State Community College, <https://www.csc.edu/about/fast-facts.shtml>
- Holmes, Ashley. *Public Pedagogy in Composition Studies*. National Council of Teachers of English, 2016.
- Mazzeo, Christopher, et al. *Building Bridges to College and Careers: Contextualized Basic Skills Programs at Community Colleges*. 1 Jan. 2003. EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=eric&AN=ED473875&site=ehost-live.
- “Mission.” Columbus State Community College, <https://www.csc.edu/about/mission.shtml>.
- “Ohio Transfer.” Ohio Department of Higher Education, <https://www.ohiohighered.org/transfer/transfermodule/learningoutcomes>.
- Perin, Dolores. “Facilitating Student Learning Through Contextualization: A Review of Evidence.” *Community College Review*, vol. 39, no. 3, July 2011, 268–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552111416227>.
- Perkins, David, and Gavriel Salomon. “Are Cognitive Skills Context-Bound?” *Educational Researcher*, vol. 18, no. 1, American Educational Research Association, Jan. 1989, pp. 16–25. SAGE Journals, doi:10.3102/0013189X018001016.
- . “Teaching for Transfer.” *Educational Leadership*, vol. 46, no. 1, Sept. 1988, p. 22. EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=a9h&AN=8524829&site=ehost-live.
- Rosinski, Paula and Tim Peebles. “Forging Rhetorical Subjects: Problem-Based Learning in the Writing Classroom.” *Composition Studies*. vol. 40, no. 2, 2012, pp. 9–32.
- Skeffington, Jillian K. “Enhancing Transfer from First-Year Composition: A Pedagogy of Shorter Essays.” *Journal of Teaching Writing*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2012, pp. 27–45. EBSCOhost, direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=mzh&AN=2019871479&site=ehost-live.
- Soliday, Mary and Jennifer Seibel Trainor. “Rethinking Regulation in the Age of the Literacy Machine.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 68, no. 1, 2016, pp. 125–51.
- Sunstein, Bonnie Stone and Elizabeth Chiseri-Strater. *Fieldworking: Reading and Writing Research*. 3rd ed., Bedford/St. Martin’s 2007.
- Tinberg, Howard. “Reconsidering Transfer Knowledge: Challenges and Opportunities.” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 43, No. 1, September 2015, pp. 7–31.

- Wardle, Elizabeth. "Mutt Genres and the Goal of FYC: How Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the University?" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2009, pp. 765-88.
- Wardle, Elizabeth and Doug Downs. *Writing About Writing: A College Reader*. Bedford St. Martins, 2011.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake, et al. "The Teaching for Transfer Curriculum: The Role of Concurrent Transfer and Inside- and Outside-School Contexts in Supporting Students' Writing Development." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 71, no. 2, 2019, 268-95.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake, Liane Robertson, and Kara Taczak. *Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing*. Utah State UP, 2014.