

## **Corequisite Implementation Considerations: Plan, Develop, Implement, Assess, and Revise**

### **Data collection: Student demographics and needs**

Collect data about student outcomes for existing basic writing/developmental education courses and first-year composition/writing courses (ideally, disaggregated):

- Who are your students? What are their demographics, and what curricular and support needs may they have?
- How many students are placing into each class?
- How many students are passing and how many are earning Ds, Fs, and Ws? What is the placement scatterplot for students who earned different grades? (In other words, how did students place who earned As, Bs, Cs, Ds, Fs, and Ws?)
- How many students are enrolling into the next level of composition/writing class? How many students are enrolling into classes at your institution the semester after completing their first composition/writing class? How many are persisting, being retained, and

### **Placement considerations**

- Does your institution have resources to consider a directed self-placement (DSP) or guided self-placement (GSP) system to provide a more nuanced approach to placing students that gives more choice while still accounting for KBOR English Placement requirements?
  - What data do you already have to help with making placement decisions?
  - How might changes in placement scores impact course enrollments and student needs?

### **Corequisite model decisions**

- What are your goals for the corequisite? How will you and your department define and measure “success” for the corequisite?
- What model of corequisite instruction best fits your goals?
- What facets of each model may work best for different student populations, specific program needs, institutional context, etc.?

### **Course design (for an ALP-style course)**

- Will you repurpose an existing course or create a new one for the corequisite?
- Will you require a 1-, 2-, or 3-credit hour corequisite?
- Will/how will students pay for the corequisite? (Some institutions charge for fewer credit hours than what is required or charge a lower tuition rate.)
- What will be the course caps/enrollment caps for the corequisite?
- Who will develop the course and make sure it aligns with current scholarship and research? How will potential instructors/faculty be involved in course development?
- What will the course outcomes and outline prioritize?
- What kinds of activities, assignments, and assessments will the class prioritize?
- Will an online or hybrid version be offered, and how will course activities be translated into this learning modality to maximize student success?
- What textbook or other resources will be used?

- OERs do exist, including the English Composition I Corequisite and NROC: Integrated Reading and Writing Course, including the NROC Open English Textbook.
- Identify texts that are high-interest and varying reading levels.
- Integrate the common read (if you have one).
- Incorporate readings about reading, such as Ellen Carillo's A Writer's Guide to Mindful Reading.
- How will the class be graded (pass/fail, regular grades, etc.)?
- Will the grade in the corequisite be tied in some way with the grade in the first-year writing class?
- What happens if a student passes the corequisite but does not pass the first-year writing course? What happens if a student passes the first-year writing course but not the corequisite?
- How will you involve students into course development and assessment processes?

### **Other course-related issues and needs**

- Who will create the new course if you are building one?
- Who will take the course through the curriculum process?
- What are your institution's curriculum and course catalog change deadlines?
- Who will create buy-in for the course among campus and other stakeholder groups?
- Who will collaborate with academic and student support services, including writing centers, about embedded support, guest speakers, and activities that will support students' affective, basic, and/or non-cognitive needs?
  - Embedded tutoring is more effective than drop-in tutoring (Kurzer et al. 2023).
  - Embedded tutoring can assist in improving students' "self-regulation" and "habits of mind" (MacArthur et al. 2022).

### **Faculty selection and professional development**

- Will the institution have the same instructor for the corequisite as for the first-year writing course?
- Who will teach corequisites? What will be your criteria for selecting instructors/faculty?
- What training and on-going professional development will instructors/faculty receive? Who will develop and run professional development if it is managed in-house? Faculty need substantial PD and support, including about
  - Integrating reading and writing
  - Providing active learning and culturally-responsive pedagogy
  - Addressing non-cognitive/affective issues
  - Coordinating paired classes

### **Assessment**

- What are your goals for the corequisite? How will you and your department define and measure "success" for the corequisite?
- What outcomes and measures will be tracked and used to assess the corequisite and make changes?
- How will you involve students into course development and assessment processes?

### **Course spaces, scheduling, systems issues, and other logistics**

- With whom do you need to work to arrange for course spaces and to determine scheduling?
- How will the corequisite be set up in your student information system to make sure the correct students are enrolled in both the corequisite and the first-year writing class?

### **Institutional education and support**

- Who will educate [advisors](#), high school counselors, and others about placement and corequisites?
- Who will reach out to campus programs with degree plans that may be impacted by the corequisite?
- Who will collaborate with academic and student support services, including writing centers, about embedded support, guest speakers, and activities that will support students' affective, basic, and/or non-cognitive needs?

### **Implementation support resources**

- [A Practitioner Model for Scaling Corequisite Support Models](#)
- [McGraw Hill Corequisite Course Planning Tools and Peer Support](#)
- [Corequisite Support from Complete College America](#)

### **Major English corequisite resource hubs**

- [Accelerated Learning Program \(ALP\)](#)
- [California Acceleration Project](#)
- [Community College Research Center](#)
- National Organization for Student Success (NOSS) [“Resources on Corequisites”](#) List
- [NSHE Corequisite English Professional Development Series](#) (videos)

### References and Sources to Consider

- Adams, P. (1993). Basic writing reconsidered. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 12(1), 22-36.  
<https://wac.colostate.edu/jbw/v12n1/adams.pdf>
- Adams, P., Gearhart, S., Miller, R., & Roberts, A. (2009). The accelerated learning program: Throwing open the gates. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 28(2), 50-69.
- Anderst, L., Maloy, J., & Shahar, J. (2016). Assessing the accelerated learning program model for linguistically diverse developmental writing students. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 44(1), 11-31.
- Carter, S. (2008). *The way literacy lives: Rhetorical dexterity and basic writing instruction*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Cerna, O., Plancarte, V., Raufman, J., Machecha, J. & Wasserman, E.. (2023). *Lessons from the Dana Center's Corequisite Research Design Collaborative Study*. Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/lessons-dana-center-corequisite-research-design.html>
- Charles A. Dana Center. (2022). *Corequisite English Design Principles*. Charles A. Dana Center. [https://www.utdanacenter.org/sites/default/files/2022-04/crdc\\_english\\_corequisite\\_design\\_principles\\_jan2022.pdf](https://www.utdanacenter.org/sites/default/files/2022-04/crdc_english_corequisite_design_principles_jan2022.pdf)
- Christie, A., & Gaillet, L. L. (2020). Swimming in the deep end: Data-driven retention and success with corequisites English 1101 (Success Academy Section) and GSU 1010. *Composition Studies*, 48(2), 93-104. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1269648>
- Denley, T. (2015a). *Co-requisite Remediation Pilot Study*. Tennessee Board of Regents Technical Brief No.1.
- Denley, T. (2015b). *Co-requisite Full Implementation*. Tennessee Board of Regents Technical

Brief No.3.

Denley, T., (2021) *Scaling Co-requisite Developmental Education*, University System of Georgia

Academic Affairs Technical Brief No.1. [https://completega.org/sites/default/files/resources/CoRequisite%20Strategies\\_0.pdf](https://completega.org/sites/default/files/resources/CoRequisite%20Strategies_0.pdf)

Edgecombe, N., Jaggars, S. S., Xu, D., & Barragan, M. (2014). *Accelerating the*

*integrated instruction of developmental reading and writing at Chabot College: CCRC working paper no. 71*. New York, NY: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Glau, G. (1996). The stretch program: Arizona State University's new model of

university-level basic writing instruction. *Writing Program Administration*, 20(1), 79-91. Retrieved from <http://wpacouncil.org/archives/20n1-2/20n1-2glau.pdf>

Glau, G. (2007). Stretch at 10: A progress report on Arizona State University's Stretch Program.

*Journal of Basic Writing*, 26(2), 30-48.

Goen, S., & Gillotte-Tropp, H. (2003). Integrating reading and writing: A response to the

basic writing 'crisis.' *Journal of Basic Writing*, 22(2), 90-113.

Grego, R., & Thompson, N. (1995). The writing studio program: Reconfiguring

basic writing/freshman composition. *Writing Program Administration*, 19(1).

Grego, R., & Thompson, N. (2008). *Teaching/writing in thirdspaces: The studio approach*.

Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hebel, S. (2009, May 1). Lumina's leader sets loft goals for fund's role in policy debates. *The*

*Chronicle of Higher Education*.

<https://www.chronicle.com/article/luminas-leader-sets-lofty-goals-for-funds-role-in-policy-debates/>

- Hern, K. (2011). *Accelerated English at Chabot College: A synthesis of key findings*. Hayward, CA: California Acceleration Project. <http://cap.3csn.org/files/2012/02/Chabot-Accelerated-English-Synthesis1.pdf>
- Hern, K. (2011). *Window into an accelerated classroom, reading and major assignments from English 102: Reading, reasoning, and writing (accelerated)*. Hayward, CA: California Acceleration Project. <https://app.box.com/s/6ymjrxvggdkqm0epeu4q>
- Hern, K. (2017). Unleashing students' capacity through acceleration. In P. Sullivan, H. Tinberg, and S. Blau (Eds.), *Deep reading: Teaching reading in the writing classroom* (pp. 210-226). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Hern, K. (2022, May). *Press release: AB1705 gains momentum*. California Acceleration Project. <https://accelerationproject.org/Publications/ctl/ArticleView/mid/654/articleId/142/Press-Release-AB1705-Gains-Momentum>
- Hern, K., Snell, M., & Henson, L. (2020, December). *Still getting there: How California's AB 705 is (and is not) transforming remediation and what needs to come next*. California Acceleration Project. [https://accelerationproject.org/Portals/0/Documents/Still\\_Getting\\_There\\_Final.pdf](https://accelerationproject.org/Portals/0/Documents/Still_Getting_There_Final.pdf)
- Kelderman, E. (2020, January 7). Happy new year, higher ed: You've missed your completion goal. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. [https://www.chronicle.com/article/happy-new-year-higher-ed-youve-missed-your-completion-goal/?cid=gen\\_sign\\_in](https://www.chronicle.com/article/happy-new-year-higher-ed-youve-missed-your-completion-goal/?cid=gen_sign_in)
- Lamos, S. (2000). Basic writing, CUNY, and 'mainstreaming': (De)Racialization reconsidered. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 19(2), 22-43.
- McNenny, G., ed. (2001). *Mainstreaming basic writers: Politics and pedagogies of access*.

- Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Melzer, D. (2015). Remedial, basic, advanced: Evolving frameworks for first-year Composition at the California State University. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 34(1), 81-106.
- Miller, T., Daugherty, L., Martorell, P., & Gerber, R. (2022). Assessing the effect of corequisite English instruction using a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 15(1), 78–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2021.1932000>
- Otte, G, and Mlynarczyk, R. W. (2010). *Reference guides to rhetoric and composition: Basic writing*. Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse.
- Peele, T. (2010). Working together: Student-faculty interaction and the Boise State Stretch Program. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 29(2), 50-73.
- Peele, T. (2014). Speaking for themselves: Basic writing students in a stretch program. *The Basic Writing e-Journal*, 12(1). [https://bwe.ccny.cuny.edu/Peele\\_Speaking\\_for\\_Themselves2.html](https://bwe.ccny.cuny.edu/Peele_Speaking_for_Themselves2.html)
- Perin, D., Bork, R. H., Peverly, S. T., & Mason, L. H. (2013). A contextualized curricular supplement for developmental reading and writing. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 43(2), 8-38.
- Ran., F. X., & Lin, Y. (2022). *The Effects of Corequisite Remediation: Evidence from a Statewide Reform in Tennessee*. Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/effects-corequisite-remediation-tennessee.html>
- Ran., F. X., & Lin, Y. (2024). Does corequisite remediation work for everyone?: An exploration of heterogeneous effects and mechanisms. *Annenburg EdExchange Ed Working Papers*. <https://edworkingpapers.com/ai24-928>

Shear, M. D. & de Vise, D. (2009). Obama announces \$12 billion community college initiative.

*Washington Post*. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/07/14/AR2009071400819.html?sid=ST2009071502758)

[2009/07/14/AR2009071400819.html?sid=ST2009071502758](https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/07/14/AR2009071400819.html?sid=ST2009071502758)

Sullivan, P. (2015). “Ideas about human possibilities”: Connecticut’s PA 12-40 and basic writing in the era of neoliberalism. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 34(1), 44-80.

Sullivan, P. (2013). “Just-in-time” curriculum for the basic writing classroom. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, December, 118-134.

Sullivan, P., & Nielsen, D. (2013). “Ability to benefit”: Making forward-looking decisions about our most underprepared students. *College English*, 75(3), 319-343.

TYCA Research Committee. (2015). TYCA white paper on developmental education reforms. *TETYC*, 42(3), 227-243.

Whinnery, E. & Odeker, V. (2021). *50-state comparison: Developmental education policies*.

Education Commission of the States. <https://www.ecs.org/50-state-comparison-developmental-education-policies/>

The White House. (2011, June). (rep.). *The White House Summit on Community Colleges*. The White House. [https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/community\\_college\\_summit\\_report.pdf](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/community_college_summit_report.pdf)