DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 261 HE 027 103

AUTHOR Carson, Joan G.; And Others
TITLE A Model for Faculty Collaboration: Focus on Academic Literacy.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 37p.; For related documents, see HE 027 101-102.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Ability; College Faculty; *College Preparation; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning; *Educational Improvement; Higher Education; High Risk Students; High Schools; Literacy; Public Colleges; Public Schools; Secondary School Teachers; Staff Development; Study Skills; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This study, part of a 3-year project designed to determine specifically and in-depth the reading, writing, and verbal demands made of students in university-level academic courses, college students by examining academic literacy requirements and involving the cooperative efforts of high school and university faculty members. This paper discusses the rationale behind collaboration of faculty concerned with academic literacy, examines the cultural differences that exist between high schools and colleges, describes the collaborative process and its participants, and presents the academic literacy data collected. The study found that use of the faculty collaboration model led to a renewed sense of professionalism, increased commitment to teaching, and heightened expectations for their students. In addition, college faculty were able to develop a clearer understanding of high school academic preparation teaching practices. The paper argues that collaborations of this type--those focusing on academic literacy--widen the perspective that school/college partnerships have begun, to not only include a larger pool of academic program faculty, but also to focus collaborative discussions on questions and issues that are critical for student success. Appendices include student surveys and checklists of course materials and information. (Contains 19 references.) (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 261

A Model for Faculty Collaboration: Focus on Academic Literacy

Joan G. Carson, Nancy D. Chase, Sandra U. Gibson

Center for the Study of Adult Literacy
Georgia State University

1993

CE 027 103

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This project has been sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Also available at cost:

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1993). Academic demands of the undergraduate curriculum: What students need. Final report. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

This volume is the final report of the academic literacy research study from which this model for faculty collaboration was developed.

Carson, J. G., Chase, N. D., & Gibson, S. U. (1993). Literacy analysis of high school and university courses: Summary descriptions of selected courses. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED *tba*)

This volume presents the academic literacy data collected in a study of four secondary and four postsecondary classes.

Write to: The Center for the Study of Adult Literacy
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, GA 30303-3083

Table of Contents

Introduction

Universities and colleges nationwide are concerned about retention of students identified as academically marginal, as well as non-marginal students for whom the freshman year is especially difficult. For underprepared students the rigorous courses of the college core curriculum are among the primary causes of academic failure and attrition, and research has shown that these students benefit most from instruction in academic tasks resembling the reading and writing demands which will be expected of them in actual college and university coursework (Feathers & Smith, 1983; Nist & Kirby, 1986). If college preparation programs are to best serve the needs of both students and the academic community, these programs must be tied directly to the practices of the college curriculum. In other words, faculty need to understand the reading, writing, and verbal demands made of students in college-level academic courses and of students in acaden ic preparation programs so that articulation efforts can result in "smooth unimpeded progress between successive institutional levels" (Greenberg, 1991, p. 13).

One way that college and college preparatory program faculty can begin to collaborate on developing students' academic literacy skills is by forming academic alliances. These alliances have become in the last decade one response to educators' perception of the need to break down boundaries between school and college faculty. Originally intended to "make a fragmented academic community whole again" (Carriuolo, 1992, p. 71), academic alliances of high school and college faculty have formed throughout the United States to discuss common interests, share research ideas, review texts and professional journals, and work on common professional concerns. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), a 15-state compact for education, funds academic alliances with annual grants to support alliance activities. According to Research Associate Jill Triplett of the SREB, academic alliances not only demystify higher education for high school teachers, but they also promote communication between schools and

colleges so that academic preparation programs can be more responsive to college-bound students' needs.

Fife (1991) points out that the "quality of collegiate education is influenced by the quality of high school education and vice versa. The future of each is dependent on the performance of the other" (p. xv). Given this interdependence, Fife notes the logic of having college faculty working directly with programs responsible for preparing students for college-level work. School/college partnerships redefine the boundaries between schools and college, "to the point where the faculty and administrators who work on behalf of these programs see themselves as part of a single 'K through graduate school' system of education" (Edgerton, Dyer, & Parnell, 1991, p. v). These relationships are characterized by "collegiality and respect, and by the awareness that the partners are acting out of mutual, enlightened self-interest" (Albert, 1991, p. 1).

The current interest in school/college partnerships began in the mid-1980's and, as Greenberg (1991) explains, exemplifies several trends related to issues of articulation. One theme has been a concern for minority student access and retention in secondary and postsecondary education (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990; Yount and Magrun, 1989). A second dominant theme has been the need for school reform, particularly insofar as reform is related to budget and funding issues, dropout rates, changing demographics of the public school student body, and redundancy between college and high school instruction. "What begins to emerge...is a common perception that high school-college partnerships, combined with other strategies, can play significant and varied roles in solving these problems" (Greenberg, 1991, p. 6).

The Wilbur and Lambert (1991) survey found 1,286 school/college partnerships involving 882 public colleges and universities and 404 private colleges and universities. The partnership activities were of four main types: (1) programs and services for students; (2) programs and

services for educators; (3) coordination, development, and assessment of curriculum and instruction; and (4) programs to mobilize, direct, and promote sharing of educational resources. The second category, programs and services for educators, is arguably the most important. As Wilbur and Lambert note, "If the ultimate intent of nearly all school-college partnerships is to build structures that will improve student learning, then partnerships that provide programs and services for educators are the foundation" (p. 69).

Partnerships that focus on educators include as a subcategory various kinds of teacher-to-teacher partnerships. Greenberg (1991) lists their common characteristics as follows:

1) They involve in-service rather than pre-service secondary teachers (Gross, 1988, pp. 10-15);

2) They join high school teachers with college faculty from academic disciplines rather than from schools of education (Bagasao, 1991, p. 6);

3) They are typically ongoing collaborations as opposed to one-shot expert consultations (Gray, 1985, p. 61), or college faculty guest lectures (Gaudiani, 1985, pp. 71, 77; Vivian, 1985, p. 88);

4) Their goal is professional development.

Academic alliances are a specific form of teacher-to-teacher partnership: they "bring together high school teachers and college faculty who have a common curricular focus to discuss common interests and concerns" (Greenberg, 1991, p. 61). Bagasao (1990) identifies more than 350 academic alliances in which the common denominator is either a focus on a particular discipline or a focus on teaching writing. Disciplines which are represented well in academic alliances include foreign languages, history, mathematics, and the sciences.

Current models of academic alliances, however, are somewhat limited in two ways. First, they assume that articulation is concerned principally or exclusively with high school and college discipline-specific courses. Second, they assume that writing is the primary focus for collaborative efforts that are aimed at improving students' academic literacy skills. However,

academic alliances that focus on a specific discipline do not consider the need for discussions of articulation issues between college faculty and faculty who teach non-discipline based academic preparation courses such as developmental studies (DS) and English-as-a-second-language (ESL) courses. Articulation discussions must include DS and ESL faculty, since their courses are, for many minority and marginal students, the primary interface with college courses. While DS and ESL faculty are more likely to be included in academic alliances that focus on teaching writing, these alliances still would not include DS/ESL faculty who teach academic preparation courses other than writing. Not only do the interests and concerns of DS and ESL faculty go beyond those of a single discipline, but they are also more broadly directed toward issues of helping students develop academic literacy--the reading, writing, and verbal demands made of students in college courses--as opposed to a single focus on teaching writing. Furthermore, faculty representing specific disciplines often share this concern for broadening the discussion to include all aspects of academic literacy. Kintzer (1973) sums up the need for this wider perspective when he says that "...articulation refers to interrelationships among the various levels and segments of an educational system.... Segments of an educational system may be considered well articulated if these interrelationships operate as a unified process" (p. 1).

One needed type of academic alliance, then, would focus on helping students develop academic literacy skills. If faculty can be made aware of the academic literacy skills that students develop in various types of academic preparation programs (high school, developmental studies, and ESL programs) as well as of the types of academic literacy skills that students need to be successful in entry-level college courses, then faculty can meet to discuss ways in which student preparation, performance, and--ultimately--retention might be improved.

In an effort to address retention issues for high-risk students, a project focusing on academic literacy requirements was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for

the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and Georgia State University. In the course of this project, high school and university faculty members in selected courses met to discuss ways to help students make the transition from high school to university coursework. The specific focus of these faculty discussions was on the improvement and development of academic literacy skills in four targeted disciplines in both high school and university settings.

The initial phase of the three-year project was a close examination of the academic literacy requirements of selected classes representing four disciplines in an urban high school and in an urban university. The targeted entry-level university courses--biology, English, history, and political science--were selected because they were all high demand courses needed to fulfill B.A. and B.S. degree requirements, and because student performance indicated that these courses tended to cause problems for beginning students. The high school courses targeted for the study were those courses that would be the last secondary course students would take in the matching discipline--senior year English, for example, or junior year American history. In this way, a comparison of academic literacy skills could be seen from the perspective of the interface of paired courses at the secondary and postsecondary levels.

The academic literacy data were collected through (1) observation of selected courses, (2) surveys of students' perceptions of their experiences in these courses, (3) analysis of relevant artifacts, including course texts, assignments, and exams, and (4) interviews with instructors and selected students in each of the observed courses. Following the data collection, the three project researchers developed descriptions of the academic literacy requirements for each of the four disciplines in both settings.

Faculty whose courses had been targeted in the data collection phase were then invited to participate in a series of faculty dialogues which focused on the description of the academic literacy requirements that had been generated in the first phase of the project. The purpose of

these dialogues was to provide opportunities for the faculty to not only learn about academic literacy from the perspectives of high school preparation, university expectations, and students' experiences, but also to collaborate on ways in which both high school and university faculty might best promote the development of academic literacy for students in ways that would contribute to students' success in university coursework. After discussing the differences between and similarities among academic literacy requirements across institutions and across disciplines, faculty were invited to propose and carry out projects addressing students' needs as identified by the faculty in the course of their discussions.

Faculty were subsequently surveyed about their experiences with the project in order to identify the aspects of the collaboration that had been essential to its success. Because replicating the entire externally-funded project would not be financially feasible, it was important to sift out the crucial aspects of the collaboration in order to develop a model for faculty collaboration that could be easily replicated in a variety of settings. The following proposed model is the result of the project researchers' observations of the collaboration as well as of the facultys' perceptions of their experiences with the project.

Rationale

Academic literacy skills, broadly defined, are language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) that are developed in, and required by, the academy. Academic literacy, then, is a specific kind of school-related literacy that, on the one hand, is one of the goals of education, and on the other hand, is a tool by which other educational goals are accomplished (knowledge acquisition, for example, or higher order cognitive skills such as analysis). Early academic literacy tends to be what Flowers (1990) calls "receptive," in that it emphasizes reception and understanding. However, postsecondary education requires the development of "critical

literacy," which goes beyond the information-gathering of receptive literacy. A critically literate person is one who:

> not only understands information but transforms it for a new purpose. He or she is able to turn facts into concepts, to turn concepts into a policy or a plan, and to see the issue and define the problem within a problematic situation (Flower, 1990, p. 5).

Critical literacy is a tool by which students develop the critical thinking skills that are needed in higher education, but it is, as well, a function of those skills.

The focus of faculty collaboration is on academic literacy for several reasons.

- First, a focus on academic literacy invites collaboration that includes faculty of transition or bridge programs, such as developmental studies or English as a Second Language programs, faculty who are typically excluded from collaborative activities that require disciplinary knowledge. A collaboration focused on academic literacy naturally includes transition program faculty who have much to contribute in terms of experience and expertise, as well as much to gain from contact with secondary and postsecondary faculty.

- Second, the development of academic literacy is a central concern of faculty in both academic preparation and university settings. As such, it provides a natural mutually agreed upon starting point for discussion.

- Third, the focus on developing skills that underlie academic success, as opposed to a focus on specific disciplinary content, allows instructors of all levels to participate in the collaborative process. Understanding academic literacy skills from a developmental perspective means that even teachers of high school freshman courses can participate in faculty dialogues.

- Fourth, the focus of the collaboration is concrete. As one faculty member put it, "programs for *abstract improvement* of education usually deflect time and energy away from teaching" [emphasis added]. Knowing what students have experienced in specific academic preparation classes and what they will experience in specific university classes allows faculty a clear picture of the interface between the two, a clear focus for discussion, and a coherent basis for instituting changes.

- Finally, the fact that the focus is on developing students' abilities provides a certain balance of power between university and high school teachers. In this collaboration faculty from both settings develop a sense of joint responsibility for helping students make the transition from high school to university work. Together they constitute a kind of "meta-institution" in which they recognize that their shared work has implications that are broader than those that extend only to their individual classrooms.

Concerns

Shaffer and Bryant (1983) define collaboration as:

> shared decision making in governance, planning, delivery, and evaluation of programs. It is a pluralistic form of education where people of dissimilar backgrounds work together with equal status. It may be seen as working with rather than working on a person (p. 3).

In this sense, collaboration between college and ESL or DS faculty who are typically housed in the same institution is likely to be easier in some respects than collaboration between high school and college faculty. Greenberg (1991) warns that because of a historical legacy of distrust, school/college collaborations do not occur naturally across institutional lines, and unanticipated obstacles can disrupt these partnerships.

> The power of these hidden impediments needs to be understood and appreciated fully by both high school and college faculty, staff, and administrative leaders if collaborations are to be formed in more than name only. The road to failed partnerships too often has been paved merely with good intentions. Would-be collaborators and cooperators would be wise not to underestimate the potential--but not insurmountable--disruptive power of the discontinuity between high school and college cultures (Greenberg, 1991, p. 15).

Greenberg (1991) provides an excellent and thorough analysis of the factors that characterize the cultural discontinuity between high schools and colleges. Because these cultural manifestations can impede school/college collaboration, prospective alliance participants need to be aware of cultural differences between these institutions.

Greenberg notes six areas of cultural difference between high schools and colleges. First, because of the different bases for **institutional funding and resources,** colleges typically enjoy greater fiscal autonomy and flexibility than do high schools which have more stringent public accountability. Second, because of the differences in **student bodies** (e.g., age, ethnicity, amount of choice over school and curricula), colleges can be more open and flexible than high schools in most operational aspects. Third, the differences between **teachers and teaching** are particularly relevant. College teachers have lighter teaching loads, better prepared students

requiring less faculty intervention with respect to classroom behavior, greater latitude in selecting teaching materials, higher salaries, more vacation time, and better amenities (e.g., office space, access to phones) than do high school teachers. Furthermore, college teachers work in an environment where academic freedom is a deeply ingrained tradition; high school teachers, however, must defer to their principal or the school board in cases of conflict of judgment. These differences, Greenberg claims, "often can be the wellspring of feelings of envy, jealousy, insecurity, superiority, mistrust, and misunderstanding" (p. 21) in high school and college faculty collaborations.

A fourth area of difference has to do with **valuing performance**. In addition to the fact that colleges place greater value on scholarly activity than on teaching, the methods for evaluating teaching differ by institutions with college faculty utilizing peer observation and student evaluations and high school faculty being evaluated by supervisor observations. Additionally, **faculty roles in decision making** are quite different depending on the type of institution. College faculty typically play a greater role in institutional governance than do high school faculty.

Finally, **institutional leadership style** differences have profound consequences for school/college collaborations. High school principals tend to be intimately involved in short-term planning and day-to-day administrative decisions, while college presidents are more concerned with long-range planning, and the broader institutional ramifications of policy implementation. These characteristics, according to Greenberg, "lead toward a more reflective, process-oriented leadership style in colleges and a more reactive, take-charge attitude on the part of principals" (p. 23). Furthermore, boards of trustees usually serve in an advisory capacity to college presidents, which means that presidents enjoy more latitude and autonomy than do high

school principals who are more limited by the direct involvement of school boards. Greenberg emphasizes that

> principals and presidents must play absolutely essential roles if cross-institutional collaboratives are ever to take hold. The degree to which these pivotal players regard and embrace each other signals to other institutional players the extent to which they are expected to value, respect, and collaborate with their opposite members (Parnell 1985, p. 119). Inevitably, without such exercises of leadership, petty jealousies, mistrust, turf battles, and feelings of inferiority or superiority could arise to taint and ultimately doom the process (p. 24).

Participants

There is some advantage to interdisciplinary discussions of academic literacy, to the extent that a) educators see their role as developing the whole person, and b) academic literacy consists of abilities that are displayed in a variety of academic settings. Nevertheless, the pragmatic nature of the faculty collaboration means that discussions are most efficient and effective when content area faculty are from the **same discipline**. Discussions among faculty from a single discipline assume the basic knowledge and aims of the discipline and allow the participants to focus quickly on mutual goals. In addition, the faculty's natural interest in their own discipline as it is constituted in both settings provides significant motivation for faculty involvement in the collaborative work. Non-content area faculty (e.g., ESL, Developmental Studies), of course, are not constrained in this way and can work well with faculty from any discipline.

Faculty from either academic setting (pre-academic or postsecondary) can initiate discussions, taking care to limit the size of the group. Small groups (8-10) are best because they are big enough to represent more than the limited perspective of one class, but small enough to allow for each teacher to explore his/her questions with faculty participants.

The Collaborative Process

The faculty collaboration consists of three distinct but interrelated phases: (1) the gathering and dissemination of information on academic literacy requirements from both settings (university and academic preparation program); (2) a series of faculty visits to classes in both settings; and (3) a series of faculty discussions focusing on the academic literacy descriptions in both settings and their implications for teaching and curricular change. Each of these phases is discussed in detail below. Ideally, these collaborative efforts will result in continued cross-institutional collaboration and/or ongoing collaborative projects in both settings, although the benefit to individual teachers from having participated in the process should not be underestimated, regardless of whether or not the collaboration continues. (See Figure 1 for an outline of this model of collaboration.)

Phase One: Description of Academic Literacy Requirements

Gathering descriptions of academic literacy requirements in specific courses by faculty in both settings is time-consuming but crucial, since these descriptions provide the primary basis for understanding and discussion in subsequent faculty collaboration. Faculty in each setting are responsible for gathering these descriptions and, in fact, this process alone can be enlightening for faculty interested in taking a closer look at their own teaching.

The descriptions of academic literacy requirements have **three principal components**.

1) The faculty need to provide general information about the course. This information includes information normally conveyed on a course syllabus:

   - name(s) of text(s) to be read;
   - topics to be covered in the course (a photocopy of the text's table of contents might be sufficient);
   - types and numbers of assignments given (including the average number of pages to be read and/or written weekly);
   - types and numbers of exams and quizzes given (including the types of questions asked: essay, multiple choice, etc.);
   - cognitive requirements of exams and quizzes (e.g., retrieval of information, analysis, evaluation, etc.);
   - criteria used in assigning grades.

Figure 1
A Model for Faculty Collaboration

	PHASE ONE	PHASE TWO	PHASE THREE
Academic Preparation Program	Description of Academic Literacy Requirements 1. Collect information a. Course information materials b. Class description c. Student post-course surveys 2. Summarize information from 1a-c 3. Deliver information to college/university faculty	Cross Visits *(To college/university classes)*	Faculty Discussions 1. Discussions with academic preparation faculty *only* 2. Discussions together with college/university faculty
College/ University	Description of Academic Literacy Requirements 1. Collect information a. Course information materials b. Class description c. Student surveys 1) Pre-course 2) Post-course 2. Summarize information from 1a-c 3. Deliver information to academic preparation program faculty	Cross Visits *(To academic preparation program classes)*	Faculty Discussions 1. Discussions with college/ university faculty *only* 2. Discussions together with academic preparation program faculty

Where relevant, this description should also include the types of standardized tests given to students that may affect course content or pedagogy. [See Appendix A for a checklist of general course information.]

2) The faculty need to generate a brief description of the general parameters of a typical class in their course in terms of the following:

   - content covered (typically how much content is covered in a class period, and whether this content replicates text content or is supplemental information);
   - the structure of the class (lecture, question and answer, student participation, activities, etc.);
   - faculty expectations of classroom student behavior (responding to questions, taking notes, making presentations, participating in discussions, etc.).

   The purpose of this general description is to give instructors in both settings an idea of how the faculty member carries out the goals of the course: i.e., the information that faculty consider important, the pedagogical techniques that are used to convey that information, and the expectations faculty have of students in their classes. [See Appendix B for a checklist of classroom descriptions.]

3) The faculty need to collect information about student perceptions of the class. This is an essential piece of the description, since it is a report on what students have found to be difficult or problematic. These student perceptions direct faculty discussions to problems that have actually been reported by students and become a real-world test of the need for the types of changes that faculty will propose. The concrete starting point for discussion, then, is the point of student need. Ideally, the surveys should be constructed so that they can be administered with op-scan sheets. In this way, the results can be collated quickly and easily.

Surveys of high school or pre-academic program students should be done at the *end* of an academic term, since the purpose is to develop a picture of students at the interface of pre-academic and university work. So, for example, American history that is taken in the junior year in high school will interface with the university-level American history course that is taken in the freshman year. (Advanced Placement classes tend to be somewhat constrained in the type of student data that can be obtained, and it is better to survey students in regular college-bound courses.)

The survey should generate the following information:

- (students' perceptions of) subject knowledge on course completion;
- problems with course;
- writing assignment difficulties and reason for difficulties;
- amount read for course;
- timing of reading (before/after class);
- reading assignment difficulty and reasons for reading difficulty;
- need to learn vocabulary for course. [See Appendix C for sample survey.]

Student surveys of university courses should be done both at the *beginning* and at the *end* of an academic term. The pre-course surveys provide a picture of student expectations for the course, based on what and how they have learned in their high school or pre-academic program course. As such, it allows faculty to see how students have constructed their sense of what it means to, for example, learn history and what they expect that experience to look like in an actual university classroom. The post-course survey provides a picture of how students have coped (or not coped) with university requirements.

The pre-course survey should generate the following information:

- (students' perceptions of) concerns about the course;
- expected types of reading and writing assignments;
- expected quantity of reading;
- expected time needed to do reading;
- expectations of exam question types;
- grade expectations.

The post-course survey should generate the following information:

- (students' perceptions of) subject knowledge of course;
- problems with the course;
- quantity of reading;
- need to read;
- time required to read;
- timing of reading (before/after class);
- rating of reading assignment difficulty;
- reasons for reading difficulty;
- rating of writing assignment difficulty;
- reasons for writing difficulty;
- amount of new vocabulary required;
- difficulty of exam questions;
- reasons for exam difficulty.

[See Appendix D for sample pre-course survey, and Appendix E for sample post-course survey.]

Since the post-course survey provides the best picture of where students have the most difficulty, this survey is the most extensive of the three. Subsequent faculty discussions will focus on comparison of student perceptions and experiences across the developmental continuum represented by these three surveys: the post high-school/pre-academic program course, the pre-university course, and the post-university course.

The three parts of the academic literacy descriptions should be collated and a written compilation and/or summary made available to the faculty at the alternate institutions. The descriptions can be sent before the faculty even meet and, in any case should be provided to faculty *before* Phases Two and Three of the collaboration.

Phase Two: Faculty Cross-Visits

Faculty will have read the academic literacy descriptions provided by faculty at the alternate institution. These descriptions provide the context for faculty cross-visits. The purpose of these visits is to allow faculty to visit one another's classes in order to observe the way in which classes are conducted and ways in which students respond--in other words, to concretize the descriptions generated in Phase One of the collaboration. Faculty will be present only as observers and will not participate in the class in any way, unless invited to do so by the class instructor.

This aspect of the collaboration has the potential of being intimidating to high school faculty, and the visit(s) by the university faculty might be postponed until actual discussions are underway and a degree of trust has been established between faculty of both institutions. In any case, negotiating a mutually convenient time is the key to successful observations, and faculty in both settings should be given the option of postponing visits until a later time, perhaps following the faculty discussions when they are acquainted with one another.

Phase Three: Faculty Discussions

The series of faculty discussions has two primary goals: (1) to develop an understanding of the academic literacy requirements in the participant's own course and in the course of faculty at the alternate institution as seen in the context of a developmental continuum, and (2) to explore issues of developing academic literacy across programs/institutions so that students might more easily make the transition between high school/academic preparation programs and university coursework. Thus, the first of a series of faculty discussions will consist of faculty talking with other faculty from their institution or program only. It is important to stress that the information be presented as descriptive, rather than evaluative in nature, so as to set a positive tone for the faculty discussions. The preliminary discussion (which may take place over a series of meetings) will focus on the written academic literacy descriptions that have been generated and provided by the faculty from both settings, and will give the faculty an opportunity to discuss various aspects of each course, noting similarities and differences across institutions/settings. What will emerge from this discussion is a clearer picture of the developmental continuum as seen from the perspective of the two courses, as well as a clearer understanding of how the course goals in question are realized in both settings. Not having to discuss the descriptions with faculty from the alternate institution/program allows the discussion participants to sort through various aspects of the courses in a non-threatening atmosphere.

After faculty in both institutions/settings have discussed the academic literacy descriptions with other faculty at their institution or program, they will come together to begin collaborative discussions of the implications of what they have learned. The function of these collaborative discussions can be negotiated by the group and can include clarifying the descriptions, developing curriculum changes within institutions, and generating collaborative projects across institutions. At this point in the project, faculty will have learned a significant amount about students' developing academic literacy, and the purpose of the discussions will

be to implement faculty findings in ways that enhance both teachers' and students' successes in the classroom.

Conclusions

The benefits of faculty collaborations are many, as Greenberg (1991) notes. High school and academic preparation program faculty can experience a renewed sense of professionalism, increased commitment to teaching, and heightened expectations for their students. College faculty can develop a clearer understanding of high school and academic preparation program teaching practices, contribute to college programs, and experience a renewed commitment to teaching. In the process of working collaboratively, these educators are redefining the teaching profession, envisioning themselves as part of a single academic community responsible for educating students from kindergarten through graduate school (Albert, 1991).

But partnerships, as Albert reminds us, are not an end in themselves. Rather, they are an important means for both improving educational opportunities for students and enhancing student performance. Faculty collaborations that focus on academic literacy thus widen the perspective that school/college partnerships have begun, to not only include a larger pool of academic program faculty but to also focus collaborative discussions on questions and issues that are foundational for student success.

References

Albert, L. S. (1991). Introduction and overview of the partnership movement. In F. P. Wilbur & L. M. Lambert (Eds.), Linking America's schools and colleges: Guide to partnerships & national directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1-4.

Bagasao, P. Y. (March 1990). An update from AAHE's national project in support of academic alliances. AAHE Bulletin: 6.

Carriuolo, N. (November-December 1992). School and college alliances. Academe, p. 71.

Edgerton, R., Dyer, T. J., & Parnell, D. (1991). Foreword. In F. P. Wilbur & L. M. Lambert (Eds.), Linking America's schools and colleges: Guide to partnerships & national directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, v.

Feathers, K. M., & Smith, F. R. (1983.) The evaluation of a research design: A case study in content reading. Reading Psychology, 4, 179-187.

Fife, J. D. (1991). Foreword. In A. R. Greenberg (Ed.), High school-college partnerships: Conceptual models, programs, and issues. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development, xv-xvi.

Flower, L. (1990). Introduction: Studying cognition in context. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M. J. Kantz, R. McCormick, & W. Peck. (Eds.), Reading-to-write: Exploring a cognitive and social process. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-32.

Gaudiani, C. (1985). Local communities of inquiry: Penn's academic alliances program. In W.T. Daly (Ed.), College-school collaboration: Appraising the major approaches. New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 69-78.

Gray, J. (1985). Joining a national network: The national writing project. In W. T. Daly (Ed.), College-school collaboration: Appraising the major approaches. New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 61-68.

Greenberg, A. R. (1991). High school-college partnerships: Conceptual models, programs, and issues. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No., 5. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Gross, T. L. (1988). Partners in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kintzer, F. C. (1973). Middleman in higher education: Improving articulation among high school, community college, and senior institutions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nist, S. L., & Kirby, K. (1986). Teaching comprehension and study strategies through modeling and thinking aloud. Reading Research and Instruction, 25, 254-264.

Parnell, D. (1985). The neglected majority. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.

Quality Education for Minorities Project. (1990). Education that works: An action plan for the education of minorities. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Shaffer, E. C., & Bryant, W. C. (1983). Structures and processes for effective collaboration among local schools, colleges, and universities: A collective project of Annapolis City Schools. Charlotte, N.C.: Livingstone College, University of North Carolina-Charlotte.

Vivian, J. R. (1985). Empowering teachers as colleagues: The Yale-New Haven teachers institute. In W. T. Daly (Ed.), College-school collaboration: Appraising the major approaches. New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 79-89.

Wilbur, F. P., & Lambert, L. M. (1991). Linking America's schools and colleges: Guide to partnerships & national directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Yount, R., & Magrun. N. (1989). School/college collaboration: Teaching at-risk youth. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Checklist of Materials for Course Information

____ 1. Name(s) of required text(s) *(attach photocopy of title page with publication date)*

____ 2. Topics to be covered in course *(attach photocopy of table of contents as appropriate)*

____ 3. Assignments *(attach examples)*

____ a. Types

____ b. Numbers

____ c. Weekly average of pages to be read

____ d. Weekly average of pages to be written

____ 4. Exams and quizzes *(attach examples)*

____ a. Types of questions asked (multiple choice, essay, etc.)

____ b. Number of exams and quizzes given

____ c. Cognitive requirements (retrieval, analysis, evaluation, etc.)

____ 5. Criteria used to assign grades

____ a. For different assignments, quizzes, exams

____ b. For final grade

Appendix B

Checklist of Information for Class Description

____ 1. Content covered

____ a. Amount per class *(in terms of major topics, &/or number of pages in assigned text)*

____ b. Source *(e.g., replication of text, supplemental)*

____ 2. Structure of class *(e.g., lecture, activities, discussion)*

____ 3. Expectations of student behavior *(e.g., notetaking, presentations, discussions)*

Appendix C
Sample Student Survey
American History — City High School

Directions: *Please record your answers on the computer sheet. Where there are blanks requiring additional information, please fill in your answers on this sheet.*

1. Choose the statement that best describes you:

   A. I know a lot about American history.
   B. I know something about American history.
   C. I don't know much about American history.
   D. I know nothing about American history.

The next 9 items relate to factors that may have caused problems for you in this course. Please rate each one as causing:

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
no problems	*some problems*	*great problems*	*overwhelming problems*

2. amount of time needed to do reading and homework
3. difficulty of reading text
4. taking notes during class
5. writing assignments
6. amount of time to finish quizzes and tests
7. difficulty of quizzes and tests
8. being called on in class
9. not enough direction from the teacher about how or what to study.
10. Other. Please specify here (and rate as above on answer sheet): _____

11. How much reading did you do for this course?

    A. 1-10 pages per week
    B. 11-20 pages per week
    C. 21-30 pages per week
    D. 31-40 pages per week
    E. More than 40 pages per week (indicate number:___)

12. Did you read assignments

    A. before the class in which the topic was discussed?
    B. after the class in which the topic was discussed?
    C. both before and after the class in which the topic was discussed?
    D. I didn't usually read the assignments.

13. How much of your American history book did you read in the course of the term?

A. everything assigned
B. most of what was assigned
C. some of what was assigned
D. a little of what was assigned
E. none

[**Note:** *Questions about writing would reflect the actual writing requirements for the course.]*

14. Did you take notes in class?

A. yes
B. no

15. Did you write a book report?

A. yes
B. no

16. Did you write a research paper?

A. yes
B. no

17. Did you do any other kind of writing assignments for the course?

A. yes (please specify: _____)
B. no

18. Indicate how much new vocabulary (words that you did not know or understand) was introduced in this course:

A. a lot of new vocabulary
B. some new vocabulary
C. not much new vocabulary
D. no new vocabulary

19. Of the vocabulary words that were new to you, did you have to understand/learn them in order to understand the readings and class discussions?

A. yes
B. no

Please indicate the degree of difficulty of various types of reading and writing assignments by darkening on your answer sheet the appropriate letter. A indicates all those that you found easy; B indicates all those that were moderately easy; C, those that were moderately difficult and D, all those that you found difficult. E indicates an item that is not applicable.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Easy	*Moderately Easy*	*Moderately Difficult*	*Difficult*	*Not Applicable*

[**Note:** *The items here would reflect actual course requirements.*]

20. the textbook
21. study guide
22. book from book list
23. maps
24. readings handed out in class
25. papers/writing exercises
26. book report
27. taking class notes

28. When you found the reading difficult, it was because: (choose the <u>most</u> important reason)

    A. The ideas were hard to understand.
    B. I couldn't connect the information in the book to what the teacher said in class.
    C. There was too much material to read and remember easily.
    D. American history was not interesting to me.
    E. Other (Please specify: _____)

29. Of the writing that you found difficult, what accounts <u>most</u> for the difficulty?
    [*Please answer this question below.*]

Appendix D

Sample Student Survey (Pre Course)
American History — Urban University

Directions: *Please record your answers on the computer sheet. Where there are blanks requiring additional information, please fill in your answers on this sheet.*

The first 11 items relate to possible sources of concern about this course. Please rate each one as causing:

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
no concern	*some concern*	*great concern*	*overwhelming concern*

1. lack of background knowledge in American history
2. amount of time required for reading
3. difficulty of reading assignments
4. difficulty taking lecture notes
5. amount of time required for writing assignments
6. difficulty of writing assignments
7. not having enough time to finish quizzes and exams
8. difficulty of quizzes and exams
9. being called on in class
10. not having enough direction from the instructor about how or what to study.
11. other. Please specify here (and rate as above on answer sheet)_____

12. How much reading do you expect will be assigned in this course?

    A. 1-20 pages per week
    B. 21-40 pages per week
    C. 41-60 pages per week
    D. 61-80 pages per week
    E. More than 80 pages per week

13. On average, how much time do you expect the reading to take?

    A. less than 1 hour per day
    B. 1-2 hours per day
    C. 2-3 hours per day
    D. 3-4 hours per day
    E. more than 4 hours per day

14. Do you expect to take notes?

    A. yes
    B. no

15. Do you expect to write book reports?

A. yes
B. no

16. Do you expect to write a research paper?

A. yes
B. no

17. Do you expect other kinds of writing?

A. yes Please specify here: _____
B. no

18. Do you expect multiple choice questions?

A. yes
B. no

19. Do you expect fill in the blank questions?

A. yes
B. no

20. Do you expect definition questions?

A. yes
B. no

21. Do you expect identification questions?

A. yes
B. no

22. Do you expect true/false questions?

A. yes
B. no

23. Do you expect essay questions?

A. yes
B. no

24. Are there other types of questions you expect?

A. yes Please specify here:_____
B. no

25. What grade do you expect to make in this course?

A. A C. C
B. B D. D

Appendix E

Sample Student Survey (Post-Course)
American History — Urban University

Directions: *Please record your answers on the computer sheet. Where there are blanks requiring additional information, please fill in your answers on this sheet.*

1. Choose the statement that best describes you:

   A. I know a lot about American history
   B. I know something about American history
   C. I don't know much about American history
   D. I know nothing about American history

The next 11 items relate to factors that may have caused problems for you in this course. Please rate each one as causing:

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
no problems	*some problems*	*great problems*	*overwhelming problems*

2. lack of background knowledge in American history
3. amount of time need to complete reading assignments
4. difficulty of reading assignments
5. taking lecture notes
6. amount of time needed to complete writing assignments
7. difficulty of writing assignments
8. amount of time needed to finish quizzes and exams
9. difficulty of quizzes and exams
10. being called on in class
11. insufficient direction from the instructor about how or what to study.
12. other. Please specify here (and rate as above on answer sheet)_____

13. How much reading did you do for this course?

   A. 1-20 pages per week
   B. 21-40 pages per week
   C. 41-60 pages per week
   D. 61-80 pages per week
   E. More than 80 pages per week (indicate number:___)

14. On average, how much time did you spend reading for this course?

   A. less than 1 hour per day
   B. 1-2 hours per day
   C. 2-3 hours per day
   D. 3-4 hours per day
   E. more than 4 hours per day

15. Did you read assignments

A. before the lecture on the topic?
B. after the lecture on the topic?
C. both before and after the lecture on the topic?
D. I didn't usually read the assignments.

16. Was it necessary to read the text in order to pass the course?

A. yes
B. no

17. How much of the text did you read in the course of the term?

A. everything assigned
B. most of what was assigned
C. some of what was assigned
D. a little of what was assigned
E. none

18. Did you take notes in class?

A. yes
B. no

[**Note:** *Items about writing assignments would indicate the type of writing done for the course in question.*]

19. Did you write a book report?

A. yes
B. no

20. Did you write a research paper?

A. yes
B. no

21. Did you do any other kind of writing assignments for the course?

A. yes (please specify: _____)
B. no

22. Indicate how much new vocabulary (words that you did not know or understand) was introduced in this course:

    A. a lot of new vocabulary
    B. some new vocabulary
    C. not much new vocabulary
    D. no new vocabulary

Please indicate the degree of difficulty of various types of assignments and exam questions by darkening on your answer sheet the appropriate letter. A indicates all those that you found easy; B indicates all those that were moderately easy; C, those that were moderately difficult and D, all those that you found difficult. E indicates an item that is not applicable.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Easy	*Moderately Easy*	*Moderately Difficult*	*Difficult*	*Not Applicable*

[**Note:** *The items here would reflect actual course requirements.*]

Assignments and Activities

23. the textbook
24. book from book list
25. maps
26. papers/writing exercises
27. book report, critical analysis
28. notetaking in class

Exam Questions

29. multiple choice
30. fill in the blank
31. identification
32. true/false
33. essay

34. When you found the reading difficult, it was because: (choose the <u>most</u> important reason)

    A. The ideas were hard to understand.
    B. I couldn't easily relate the ideas in the text to the lecture material.
    C. There was too much material to remember easily.
    D. The ideas were not interesting to me.
    E. Other (Please specify: _____)

35. If you experienced difficulty taking exams, what was the major source of the problem?

A. I didn't know the answer.
B. I had learned the answer, but I couldn't remember it for the exam.
C. I didn't understand what the questions were asking for.
D. I knew the answer but I didn't have enough time to write it all down.
E. I was too anxious.

37. If you experienced any writing difficulties, what was the major problem? *[Please answer this question below.]*