

Lydia Meredith

Professor Ashley J. Holmes

English 8180

3 May 2020

A Teaching for Transfer Program (T4T):
What Students Need to Transfer Successfully

Principle 4: University programs (first-year writing programs, writing across the curriculum programs, majors, etc.) can “teach for transfer.” (Moore and Bass)

INTRODUCTION

An organic, robust Teaching for Transfer Program (T4T), answers the question, “What students need to transfer successfully?” Elon University’s research seminar (ERS) convened forty (40) plus writing studies professionals to address *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer* from 2011 to 2013 (Anson and Moore 3). Principle 4, the foundational theory upon which my argument rests, emerged from this seminar. *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Jessie L. Moore and Randall Bass -- a scholarly treatise on this subject, presents, explains, and applies the Five Essential Principles of Transfer (Principle 4) and implications to higher education milieus. The Moore and Bass scholarship is cutting-edge knowledge, theory, and practice toward the end of transfer. Transfer is a macro and micro phenomenon. However, both macro and micro perspectives, definitions, concepts, theories, and practice of transfer converge to inform and inspire academia: The heart of the education enterprise, from grade school to graduate school, is charged with the awesome responsibility of equipping young minds to become informed, engaged, and productive citizens -- in personal, professional, and civic life domains. Randall Bass puts it this way, “The idea of transfer is at the heart of the problem of

learning; and the problem of learning is at the heart of the future of higher education ... [therefore, higher education stakeholders have a vested interest in] preparing students to succeed in their future writing tasks in academia, the workplace, and their civic lives” (144).

The core of this enterprise is communication (language, rhetoric, voice).

“Language/rhetoric/voice has the capacity to bring clarity, vision, and power to any subject and any situation (Blair); ergo, the effective use of language/rhetoric/voice is the greatest asset (toward life achievement) we can give our students, in both their academic and non-academic lives” (Meredith). Herein lies the significance of this project to the field of writing studies -- inventing a pedagogical model (using researched-based theory and practice) -- that teaches students to transfer successfully during and post academia. ERS started to formalize and synthesize the conversation of transfer. This argument continues the conversation (offering a T4T sketch given my nascent writing studies experience) to fuse theory, practice, and research from scholarly works studied this semester. The goal/point of inquiry is to propose a mix of writing knowledge and practice -- cognitive theory, rhetorical theory, genre-activity theory, etc. - - that is proven successful. Some scholars may disagree with the premise of this project; however, I will strive to address counterarguments, (such as thoughts posed by Doug Smit, “Is transfer possible?”), by presenting evidence-based responses to such concerns.

The Logic Model Genre

To accomplish T4T development, I employ the use of an analytical instrument known as the logic model. When I think of problems, the way my brain is wired, I think of ways, means, and methods to solve the problem. Being a nonprofit (Beacon of Hope’s Early Childhood and Out-of-School Time Care and Learning Program) founder, CEO, and grant writer in my previous life, I attended a professional development workshop sponsored by United Way of Greater

Atlanta. United Way introduced its partners and grantees to a “mandated” new practice of using the logic model (for program design and evaluation) to explain programmatic solutions that respond to a myriad of social dilemmas in Greater Atlanta. Using the logic model, responding to United Way’s Children and Youth Living in Poverty focus area, Beacon of Hope received an \$80,000 grant award. Because of this success, I ventured to use the logic model to submit and win various government, corporate, and foundation grants exceeding a million dollars a year. Appropriately, and because of its unique-analytic genre affordances, I chose the logic model to address the problem of writing transfer, re-purposing writing, contextual-contingent writing, situated-perspective writing (Rule 21). Different names for the same issue: how do we most effectively teach students to write in an Aristotelian/Rhetorical manner -- so that students, “In regard to any situation, [become capable to] observe, [examine and apply], the available means of persuasion” – across academia, professional, entrepreneurial/business, or personal domains. By choosing the logic model to analyze the T4T problem, I model transfer, because I am now an academic learner, re-purposing my “prior knowledge and skills” to respond to this academic assignment via The Logic Model. The logic model offers a holistic approach to this inquiry by providing a framework to:

1. Identify and examine T4T Process elements (*inputs* that include representation from all stakeholders, contributors, and actors; *activities*, including but not limited to curricula (theory and practice); and *outputs* (records and documentation from associated *activities*); and
2. Identify and examine T4T Outcome elements (analysis of measurable criteria to assess and evaluate success for *initial, immediate, and long-term* periods).

The logic model genre is my preferred analytical tool for this project because it is a visual and organic instrument that effectively demonstrates connectivity, integration, interdependence; and synthesizing diverse program elements and data.

Finally, after concluding the T4T Logic Model analysis, I will present a rudimentary research study, conducted with a small population of Georgia State University (GSU) students. Findings will be presented and examined that support the T4T Logic Model premises and claims.

THE T4T LOGIC MODEL: THEORY

““Transfer Talk” in Talk about Writing in Progress: Two Propositions about Transfer of Learning,” an article featured in *Composition Forum*, records dissention by a respected writing studies scholar: “Over a decade ago, David Smit declared that “overwhelmingly the evidence suggests that learners do not necessarily transfer the kinds of knowledge and skills they have learned previously to new tasks” (119) and challenged the field of writing studies to trace out “the implications of what we know about transfer ...” Yancey et al., in *Writing across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing*, details Smit’s assertions, “[1] given what we know about writing and its social and cognitive character, [2] given what we know about writing teachers’ familiarity with the diversity of writing practices even inside the academy, and [3] given what we know about the role of the individual composer in any writing situation, the likelihood of transfer is low, and the degree to which any kind of knowledge or any given skill in writing is generalizable – that is transferable from one context to another – will always be problematic” (Yancey et al. 44; Smit 133). Smit continues, “We get what we teach for ... if we want to help students to transfer what they have learned, we must teach them how to do so – and do so in multiple contexts” (134). Scholarship by Yancey et al. in *Writing across Contexts:*

Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing; Moore and Bass in *Understanding Writing Transfer*; Anson and Moore in *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer*; and other transfer scholarship in works cited attack Smit's skepticism, claim, and problems head on. Yancey et al. asserts that Smit's problems are outlined and addressed in *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School (HPL)* published in 2000 by the National Research Council (Yancey et al. 38). Knowing and employing (*HPL*) theory and practice is cornerstone to this project, so that curricula is designed to mediate transfer challenges. Incorporated in the T4T Logic Model are tenets from *HPL's "Teaching for Transfer: General Recommendations, Specific Observations* [tenets are stated as follows]:

- (1) Be explicit: Provide very explicit lessons on writing theory and practice, being mindful that writing is a social practice, and convention, contexts, etc. -- appropriately, lessons should be reflective of such;
- (2) Build in expert practices: describe and demonstrate expected practice so that students know such is achievable;
- (3) Tap prior knowledge and concurrent knowledge: Prior knowledge is the base from which we all learn. Explaining what we think we know—moving from the tacit to the explicit—is a first step toward the remixing of prior knowledge engaged in by successful students. Student learning is not static, it is important to include learning that is occurring at the same time a student is in a given class;
- (4) Employ key terms/concepts: Include processes and link them to key terms and a framework. Processes need to be connected to a framework located in key terms, in our case, rhetorical situation, genre, discourse community, and so on;
- (5) Encourage student agency: Consistently ask students to create their own frameworks using prior knowledge. Learning is not always linear; we tack, and reiterative assignments support such tacking by inviting students to revisit what they have learned in light of new information and experience; and
- (6) Build in metacognition, verbal and visual, balancing big picture and small practices. The field has recognized the value of reflection for some time, though often it is focused exclusively on process. Given the success we see in supporting the transfer of process, there is every reason to expand our use of reflection, especially if it is integrated into conceptual and assignment design" (Yancey et al. 138-139).

Secondly, the Moore and Bass scholarship, pens the Five (5) Essential Principles of Transfer that are responsive to the crux of Smit's argument; and respond to Smit's challenge, that

is, be “intentional” about teaching for transfer. Jessie L. Moore’s “Five (5) Essential Principles of Writing Transfer are:

- (1) Writing transfer requires transforming and repurposing prior knowledge;
- (2) Writing transfer is a complex phenomenon;
- (3) Student’s dispositions and identities inform their writing transfer experiences;
- (4) University programs can teach for transfer; and
- (5) Recognizing and assessing writing transfer require multiple methods”
(Moore and Bass 10).

Bass reiterates, “One of the key factors in the success of the TFT model is that transfer is an explicit goal of the course” (100). Hence, toward the goal of constructing an organic, robust model, the T4T Logic Model incorporates theory and practice guided by Moore’s transfer principles, *HPL*’s recommendations, and other cited scholarship below.

THE T4T LOGIC MODEL: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The T4T Logic Model program elements and data embody excellence in scholarship; evidence-based, research-proven recommendations; best practices; and cutting-edge thought and theory; consequently, implementation (with fidelity) of this model will result in successful transfer. As previously mentioned, the affordances of the logic model genre provides agency to solve the T4T problem by visibly demonstrating connectivity, integration, interdependence; and *synthesizing diverse program elements and data*. (See Appendix I: Program Logic Model.) Linkages displayed are: *Inputs* required to conduct *Activities*; functional Activities that generate *Outputs*’ (data/records) used to test, measure, and evaluate programming; *Outputs*’ (data/records) needed to examine against desired *Outcomes* (program success criteria: goals and objectives); and Outcomes necessary to measure program success through *initial, immediate, and long-term* periods.

The T4T Logic Model explains, what students need to transfer successfully is an incubator, from grade school to graduate school, that adheres to *HPL*’s recommendations,

Moore's principles of transfer, and other transfer scholarship presented in this argument. Skeptics would say, this project is too vast in scope to achieve. However, every massive undertaking begins with an ideal. The T4T Logic Model is a vision of an ideal, transfer ecosystem. My claim is that it can be achieved, first by engaging leadership. The T4T Logic Model's first input is leadership, the acronyms EL and WPA, represent university **E**xecutive **L**eadership and **W**riting **P**rogram **A**dministrators, respectively. All actors in this model are equally important and valued; however, responsibility for leading the project is selected from EL and WPA, a professional project director (**PD**), who works closely and continuously with program evaluators (**PE**) to provide project management and oversight. A primary role of the PD is to form functional relationships with the global and local community (**Community: Vested Representatives** – T4T Logic Model Input #6) – – A bridge is established and cultivated between Academia (Grade School, High School, and Higher Learning: University/Colleges), Workplace, and Civic sectors. Moore and Bass introduces the notion of a “rebundled” university system that is characterized by *networks* -- connected to the local and global community; *integrative* -- offers multiple sites for transfer learning; *adaptive* -- continuously learning and responsive to change/need; and most importantly *learner-centered* – establish and maintain policy and practice that transform and empower student learners (144-154). The second input is Faculty, like its parent EL and WPA, faculty should also embrace and possess abovementioned attributes. The third input is an organic, Robust T4T Curriculum that is founded and driven by cutting-edge transfer theory and practice. The fourth input is Student Learners that come to our university setting with diverse ability, experience, interests, and contextual milieus. The fifth input is Program Evaluators (working arm-in-arm with PD) to (1) formally set a project start date; (2) plan and facilitate stakeholder/leadership meetings for kick-off, strategic planning, and

formalizing a T4T strategic plan; (3) design data collection media for all T4T project outputs: (including university policy and procedures, pre-surveys, post-surveys, curricular materials, student portfolios, evaluative records and report, participation records, etc.); and (4) gather, analyze, and synthesize data into reports that are reviewed regularly at stakeholder/leadership meetings. Finally, the sixth input is community stakeholders, including but not limited to, school districts, high school administrators and teachers, and representatives from the business, government and nonprofit sectors of our community. Engagement of abovementioned actors and activities are foundational to program success.

Let's commence with more detailed introductions of the T4T process and outcome elements and how these elements function. Please follow this discussion using “**Appendix I. Program Logic Model.**”

T4T Logic Model Inputs

University: Executive Leadership (EL) & Writing Program Administrators (WPA)

What drives this model is intention and the centrality of the student learner; however, this core must be cultivated and nurtured by universities that aim to teach for transfer. Therefore, the first input is “University: Executive Leadership (EL) & Writing Program Administrators (WPA)” engagement and commitment. Such EL and WPA are Global-Community minded, Collaborative, and Broadminded not only committed to T4T; but also committed to consistent professional development. Moore and Bass reiterates, “Implementing policies that support effective transfer across the critical transition of high school to college will positively affect student engagement and satisfaction, student achievement of learning outcomes, and student retention and ultimately be a transformative experience for the individual and the institution as a learning organization. To achieve these goals, universities must reinforce the centrality of the learner in the educational experience” (Moore and Bass 91)

Faculty

Likewise “Faculty” who are Global-Community minded, Collaborative, and Broadminded committed to T4T; and committed to consistent professional development. In his

article, “Teach Writing as a Process Not Product.” *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory*, Murray encourages Faculty to teach writing as a process and make student learners the center of instructional practice: listen; encourage students to discover truth and to explore (including genres, activities, modes, audiences, etc.); offer experimental opportunities; give adequate time; implement mechanics/conventions last; allow student learners to select subjects/content, examine writing to learn from it, and use their language (Murray 3-6).

Robust T4T Curriculum

An organic, robust T4T curriculum theory and practice is built on Jessie Moore’s Five Essential Principles of Transfer and *HPL*. The following scholarship, theory, research, and practice inform these principles: “Salomon and Perkins writing transfer studies that introduce theory associated with “near and far transfer” (carrying prior knowledge or skill across familiar contexts), and “high-road and low-road transfer” (carrying knowledge across different contexts); and associated mental/psychological implications and consideration. King Beach theory of “consequential transition” – a notion of generalizing knowledge across context. Terttu Tuomi-Grohn and Yrjo Engestrom thought that situates “consequential transition” within “activity systems” that shape and are shaped by student learners and other actors – suggesting transfer requires implementation of new models based on examination of prior knowledge and consolidating new and prior practices. Urie Bronfenbrenner and colleagues, and Etienne Wenger theory of “Communities of Practice” that help educators understand learners’ interactions within social contexts. Such studies speak to disposition of student learners and how such disposition affect transfer. Etienne Wenger thoughts about how student learners function in novice and expert milieu to understand strategies effective that apply across context and communities. Jan Meyer and Ray Land challenge to educators to identify and teach threshold concepts to student learners that are transformative and serve to facilitate transfer. And, Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle’s scholarship concerning threshold concepts and the important role these concepts play toward teaching student learners about writing, integral to effectively practice transfer” (Moore and Bass 2-4). A curriculum packed with such theory and practice is more likely to deliver transfer goals and objectives. As research continues, (ongoing offerings of evidence to the transfer challenge), such developed and tested theory and practice should be employed herein.

Student Learners

Diverse Students (with diverse: ability, experience, interests, and contextual milieus) are the central input of the T4T. Student learners bring a breadth of data to our classrooms and the instructional program. To successfully teach for transfer, a careful study of students’ prior

knowledge, dispositions, interests, contexts, is needed; and such data, must continually inform the design and delivery of instructional theory and practice. Moore and Bass reiterates that the T4T be guided by this data and make the student learner central to this process: “Institutions should be fundamentally learner centered, providing learning environments that support engagement in the context of empowerment and the ownership of learning” (147). Empowered student learners love to learn and easily recollect what’s needed to adapt/advance prior knowledge to new contexts. Smit’s challenge is on point: students learn what we teach them. If we teach student learners using intentional T4T theory and practice; the T4T outcomes are achievable. As fore-stated, students who are valued and made partners in the enterprise of learning, are motivated, engaged, and vested in the process of learning and transfer. (91)

Program Evaluators (PE):

Experienced and knowledgeable program evaluation experts, are consistently providing both quantitative and qualitative assessment and evaluation: facilitating the development of measurable outcome criteria that establish a logical link between activities, what the T4T is expected to accomplish, and the result it actually achieves for student learners, faculty, university EL and WPA, and other stakeholders. Outcomes (criteria: goals and objectives) are designed to measure results on an initial, an intermediate, and long-term basis. Data Collection Methods may include: 1. Quantitative: pre-surveys (student profiles – what are students’ backgrounds, prior knowledge, etc.) and post-surveys, curriculum records (lectures, assignments, rubrics, etc.), and other data outputs from associated T4T activities; and 2. Qualitative: focus groups, one-on-one interviews, student learner observations, etc. T4T Monitoring is shared with PD. Regular collection and analysis of data before, after, and during critical transitions are performed to gauge T4T effectiveness and make program adjustments as necessary, to ensure expected outcomes are achieved. Evaluative Reviews are ongoing: selected large and small groups of stakeholders review T4T data and programmatic reports to Analyze Outcomes: 1. Are outcome criteria met? 2. Are student learners functioning across transitions? 3. Based on data collected, what will we stop, start, or continue? The organic, robust T4T curriculum drives the instructional program. The assessment process begins the first day of critical transitions and is ongoing across boundaries/contexts. Student Learner Portfolios are important evaluative data along with other outputs shown on the T4T Logic Model. Ongoing Assessment and Evaluation must be done to ensure that the T4T Logic Model continually responds effectively to student learner and community expectations. (Moore and Bass 8-9)

Community: Vested Representatives:

School District, Grade and High School Admin & Teachers, Business sector, Government sector, Non-profit sector, etc. Community stakeholders are critical components to T4T. The PD’s primary role is to establish, cultivate, and maintain a bridge between Academia (Grade School, High School, and Higher Learning: University/Colleges), Workplace, and Civic sectors. Fundamental to the problem of transfer is that student learners are not provided a

nurturing incubator (milieu), themed for transfer, to thrive. As a community, we disregard and/or diminish prior learning and forward learning, experiences, environments, and institutions. As we are all vested in the effectiveness of higher learning, advancing a civil society, inhabited with informed, brilliant, and engaged student learners, we create and sustain a T4T incubator for student learners to thrive into perpetuity. (149)

T4T Logic Model Activities

University EL & WPA:

- Create and Sustain, a purpose-driven, learner centered, T4T Policy, Theory, & Practice.
- Convene regularly with Evaluators and other Stakeholders to Assess T4T Success and Add, Extract, or Enhance policy, theory and practice as needed.
- Build a bridge from grade/high school to college; Be T4T friendly: “understand and survey what students bring and value what they bring, fostering transfer by instructional designs and institutional supports! – identity, dispositions, contextual supports” (Moore and Bass 91)

Faculty:

- Implement (with fidelity) T4T Curriculum: (Evidenced-Based, Research Proven, cutting-edge T4T Teaching Strategies based upon Five (5) Essential Principles of Transfer, and *HPL's recommendations*, that include diverse, stimulating, experiential learning opportunities (on campus and off campus: surrounding communities: government, businesses, non-profits, schools, etc.) across multiple contexts, genres, activities, and media. “Explicit attention to transfer in the implementation of high impact practices has the potential to substantially enhance student learning ... high impact practices prompts students to critically analyze their prior knowledge in new contexts. Careful attention to teaching for writing transfer ... can make many educational activities, in and out of the classroom, into high-impact experiences for students” (50). Studies show that employing high impact practices lead to transformative student learning in higher education.
- Provide immediate, consistent, and substantive feedback

Students Learners:

- Learning, practicing, experiencing, exploring, engaging, exercising the full content of T4T Curriculum: Includes a Writing/Composing Process using appropriate convention; Reading; Reflecting; Problem-solving; Forming Arguments/Claims; Synthesizing Research; Rhetorically and Critically Analyzing (situations: audience, purpose, genre, media); Collaborating, etc. (72)

Program Evaluators:

Working collaboratively PD:

- Examine and Study T4T Inputs and Outputs: Host & plan program and stakeholder meetings: large group, small group, focus groups, etc.
- Monitor all T4T Activities.
- Collect all T4T programmatic outputs for assessment and evaluation.
- Analyze T4T Outcomes and Summarize for Evaluative Reports (8-9)

Community Stakeholders:

- Provide opportunities and feedback for off-campus, experiential learning. (91)
- Convene regularly with Evaluators and other Stakeholders to Assess T4T Success and Add, Extract, or Enhance policy, theory and practice as needed. (91)

T4T Logic Model Outputs

Program outputs (source documents for project evaluation) are used to test, measure, and evaluate program success. Project modifications are made upon review of reports generated from these outputs; so that the model is organic, always responding to what is working and what is not, to achieve goals and objectives (criteria) toward the goal of creating a model that works.

Expert Program Evaluators (PE) use records below for T4T assessment and evaluation:

- University Policy, Theory & Practice, meeting minutes

- Curriculum Materials: Lectures, Assignment Sheets, Rubrics, etc.
- Student Work Portfolios – useful data for self-evaluation and program evaluation. Yancey in *Understanding Writing Transfer* suggests that *portfolios are sites* where “students collect, select, and reflect on their work” – such engages students in reflection on the writing process to advance transfer practice and experience. An example of this practice is use of “ePortfolios.” Portfolio sites are among many supports needed from the EL and WPA level of T4T implementation. According to Yancey, the practice of reflection at these sites facilitate writing in discipline and writing across contexts. (Moore and Bass 40)
- Evaluative/Assessment Records and Reports Verification/Proof that activities deliver outcomes
 - Pre-Survey (student learner profiles) Records; Post-Survey Records
- Participation Logs and Stakeholder/Program/Other Meeting Minutes

T4T Logic Model Outcomes

Outcomes show to what extent activities result in met criteria (goals and objectives).

Initial

- EL, WPA, and Faculty are motivated to utilize T4T
- Faculty are motivated, engaged, and learn knowledge, skill and behaviors to support T4T
- Students learn: the importance of learning to write; writing to learn; curriculum theory & practice (terms, concepts, etc.)
- Students are motivated (positive behavioral dispositions) to discover truth, explore, & improve writing skills (Murray 3)
- Students have higher cognitive and rhetorical function: become more analytical & critical thinkers

Intermediate

- 100% of EL, WPA, & Faculty foster milieu and fund resources to advance university T4T and regularly participate in program evaluative efforts (Moore and Bass 91)
- 100% of Faculty implement effectively T4T & participate in program evaluative efforts
- 100% of Students demonstrate an increased understanding of contextual writing strategies and skills for recursive writing
- 100% of Students are more skilled finding & explaining the rhetorical situation for diverse contexts: demonstrate rhetorical & critical analysis proficiency

Long-Term

- EL, WPA, and Faculty foster milieu and fund resources to sustain university T4T and regularly participate in program evaluative efforts (90).
- Faculty consistently participate in professional development, implement T4T curriculum with fidelity, and participate in program evaluative efforts (91).
- Students become confident, competent and practice improvisational & situated-contextual writing successfully (Rule 21).
- Students use writing to learn about our world, evaluate what they learn, and communicate (be a voice for Truth) for the public good (Murray 4).
- Students transfer successfully: effectively write in discipline; write across contexts; write using different genres, different media, different audiences, and different purposes; and write successfully in post-graduation situations (72).

As we strive to implement the T4T with fidelity, outcomes (initial, intermediate, and long-term) are achievable (Moore and Bass 91). The following study provides preliminary evidence that T4T is possible.

WHO CARES [ABOUT ENGLISH] STUDY

In my humble opinion Georgia State University (GSU), Department of English (Rhetoric and Composition), is a stellar program and a perfect prototype to perform a study to test the success of instructional practices aimed to teach for transfer. GSU simply lacks a formalized

version of the T4T Logic Model -- not having an appointed Project Director (PD) or Program Evaluators (PE) on staff. Ergo, I decided to perform a rudimentary study to test my argument at this site. Please follow this discussion using **Appendix II**.

Methodology (Appendix II.A)

During the spring semester, a regularly scheduled class period, 1.25 hours, my students were asked to download the Who Cares [About English] Activity from the GSU Online Platform (icollege). Both sections, a total of 43 students, participated. Students successfully completed English 1101, and most likely, 100% will successfully complete 1102. The GSU Rhetoric and Composition curricula is implemented with fidelity.

Students were grouped by academic discourse communities. Groups were then asked to use the poster entitled “What can you do with an English major?” (Appendix II.A) to brainstorm application/transfer of English 1101-1102: Rhetoric and Composition for WAC (Writing Across Curriculum), WID (Writing In Discipline/Field), and Post-GSU Graduation. To inspire participation in this activity, students were informed that the group with the **best rationales** for application/transfer could earn 1 extra credit point toward a missed daily attendance grade. This study elicited reflective, retrospective, imaginative, and meta-cognitive thought from student learners -- a Moore and Bass recommended teaching strategy.

Data Analysis (Appendix II.A)

Application/Transfer data responses were counted and categorized as follows: Problem-Solving (27), Writing/Communication (55), and Career (25). (See Data Analysis Charts - **Appendix II.A and B**) Forty-three (43) freshman students participated across diverse career

objectives, including Computer Science-Information Technology, Science (Biology, Pre-Med, Nursing, etc.), Business (Marketing, Accounting, etc.), and Policy and Law fields of study. No students were English majors (students with undeclared majors joined a group of their interest). Majors/Interest group participants' counts were: Science major participants (25); Business major participants (13); and Policy/Law major participants (5).

Findings

Out of 107 data responses, 25.2% were problem solving; 23.4% were career; and 51.4% were writing/communication. The data suggest student learners see utility/application/transfer in English 1101 and 1102 for (WID) writing in discipline, (WAC) writing across discipline, and post-graduation. Given the fact that none of the respondents were English majors, amplifies the utility designations. (See **Appendix II.C** for Samples of Group Work) Because the participation incentive was so minute, responses are not skewed by external pressures. GSU boasts of being a research university campus located in the heart of the business and government center of Atlanta, Georgia. The majority of these students intentionally chose the GSU community of learners for higher education for this reason (according to student profile activity data conducted the first day of class). Still, with 100% respondents being non-communication majors, the utility and application of English is underscored. Application/Transfer of English is a belief held and expected by The GSU Rhetoric and Composition community of student learners.

CONCLUSION

My argument, (Principle 4), that universities can teach for transfer, begins with my teaching philosophy and its alignment with writing studies scholars' belief. Fundamentally, the

enterprise of education is inextricably linked to the advancement of our society, as we are commissioned to equip and prepare our students to be informed, engaged, productive, and contributing citizens. To attack the higher learning problem of transfer, I introduce and use the T4T Logic Model genre, as a testimonial indicator that transfer of prior knowledge does occur. The logic model genre was frequently used during my career as a nonprofit executive, to enhance educational and economic development programming for impoverished children and their families, and to fund such endeavors with millions of dollars over two decades. Re-purposing the logic model for the T4T challenge provides opportunity to tackle a pressing issue in higher learning; and begin the daunting task of solution-based response. The T4T Logic Model is an ideal – a vision – a holistic approach to solve the problem of transfer. This assigned project space does not allow me to fully put flesh on the skeletal model presented in this paper. However, I believe enough scholarship is presented herein to grasp the possibility of such an enterprise. The T4T Logic Model can deliver what students need to transfer successfully; because, its construction is built upon the foundation of excellence in scholarship, research, theory and practice. The GSU Department of English, Rhetoric and Composition, is on the right track toward achieving this ideal – as demonstrated by the rudimentary study, “Who Cares [About English] Study.” The findings from this study are promising and support the foundational premise of this argument.

Writing studies scholars agree, that new knowledge cannot be formed without prior knowledge – such is fundamental to the accepted and proven theory of learning – we learn in stages. As we briefly entertained Doug Smit and other scholars’ skepticism, transfer is only problematic when pedagogical practice is not aimed, intentional, and purpose-driven to teach for transfer. More research is needed on this ever-changing subject; and, more research is needed to

advance and continue to enhance the content of the T4T Logic Model. This project visits many uncontrolled/un-managed internal and external variables, including but not limited to socio-economic factors, cultural factors, dispositions, etcetera. Still, as previously mentioned, it plants a seed (vision), for what is possible if academic communities collaborate toward this challenge of higher learning. When we function as a “disintegrated” institution and not a holistic integrated community our efforts to strengthen student learners are thwarted (145).

We can prepare student learners to transfer successfully across academic and non-academic settings, on macro and micro levels, when writing studies professionals and executive university leadership convene forums to do more than have a conversation. Instead, we must convene forums to make transfer in higher education a consistent reality for all student learners.

Works Cited

- Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Elizabeth Wardle. *Naming What We Know, Classroom Edition: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*. UP of Colorado, 2016.
- Anson, Chris M., and Jessie L. Moore. *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer*. CSU Open P, 2017.
- Bass, Randall, and Jessie L. Moore. *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning in Higher Education*. Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2017.
- Berthoff, Ann E. "Is Teaching Still Possible? Writing, Meaning, and Higher Order Reasoning." *College English*, vol. 46, no. 8, Dec. 1984, p. 743, *National Council of Teachers of English*. www.jstor.org/stable/377206.
- Blair, Carole. "Foundational and Anti-Foundationalism." *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh UP, 1992.
- Carter, Michael. "The Idea of Expertise: An Exploration of Cognitive and Social Dimensions of Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 41, no. 3, 1990, pp. 265-286.
- Coxwell-Teague, Deborah, and Ronald F. Lunsford. *First-Year Composition: From Theory to Practice*. 2014.
- Emig, Janet. "Writing as a Mode of Learning." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 28, no. 2, May 1977, pp. 122-128.
- Driscoll, Driscoll L., and Jennifer Wells. "CF 26: Beyond Knowledge and Skills by Dana Lynn Driscoll and Jennifer Wells." *Composition Forum*, 2012, compositionforum.com/issue/26/beyond-knowledge-skills.php.
- Meredith, Lydia M. "Teaching Philosophy." *Georgia State University*. 2019, <http://sites.gsu.edu/lmeredith2/>

- Meyer, Jan, and Ray Land. "Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge: An Introduction." *Overcoming Barriers to Student Understanding: Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge*, New York, Routledge, 2006, pp. 3-18.
- Murphy, J. J., Katula, R. A., & Hoppmann, M. (2014). *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Murray, Donald M. "Teach Writing as a Process Not Product." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory*, edited by Victor Villanueva and Kristin L. Arola, 2nd ed., Southern Illinois University Press, 2003, pp. 3-6.
- Norton Anthology. "What can you do with an English Major?" W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., Poster Design by Leah Clark, (2019)
- Perkins, D. N., and Gavriel Salomon. "Are Cognitive Skills Context-Bound?" *Educational Researcher*, vol. 18, no. 1, 1989, pp. 16-25.
- Rose, Mike. "Narrowing the Mind and Page: Remedial Writers and Cognitive Reductionism." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 39, no. 3, Oct. 1988, pp. 267-302, www.jstor.org/stable/357468. Accessed 1 Sept. 2020.
- Rounsaville, Angela. "CF 26: Selecting Genres for Transfer by Angela Rounsaville." *Composition Forum*, 2012, compositionforum.com/issue/26/selecting-genres-uptake.php.
- Rule, Hannah J. "Introduction: Seeing Writing Processes." *Situating Writing Processes. Perspectives on Writing*, The WAC Clearinghouse, University Press of Colorado, 2019, pp. 3-23.
- Smit, David W. "Transfer." *The End of Composition Studies*, SIU P, 2004, pp. 119-137.
- Taczak, Kara and Liane Robertson. "The Question of Transfer." *Composition Forum*, Elon Research Seminar, 2012, compositionforum.com/issue/26/question-of-transfer.php.

Tate, Gary, et al. *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*. OUP USA, 2014.

Tuomi-Gröhn, Terttu, and Yrjö Engeström. "Conceptualizing Transfer: From Standard Notions to Developmental Transfer." *Between School and Work: New Perspectives on Transfer and Boundary-Crossing*, Ed. Terttu Tuomi-Gröhn and Yrjö Engeström. Bingley, UK, 2003, pp. 19-38.

Yancey, Kathleen, et al. *Writing across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing*. UP of Colorado, 2014.

APPENDICES

I. The T4T Logic Model

II. Who Cares [About English] Study

A. Activity and Norton Chart

B. Data Analysis Charts

C. Two Sample Responses – Two Groups of Student Learners