



Re-Claiming, Re-Inventing, and Re-Reforming a Field: The Future of College Reading

Norman A. Stahl & Sonya L. Armstrong

To cite this article: Norman A. Stahl & Sonya L. Armstrong (2018) Re-Claiming, Re-Inventing, and Re-Reforming a Field: The Future of College Reading, *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 48:1, 47-66

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2017.1362969>



Published online: 29 Sep 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Re-Claiming, Re-Inventing, and Re-Reforming a Field: The Future of College Reading

NORMAN A. STAHL

Northern Illinois University

SONYA L. ARMSTRONG

Texas State University

At present, there is much discussion regarding the future of reading instruction at the postsecondary level. In order to contemplate the future of the field of college reading, however, we must first consider the field's history, and particularly the last several decades. The purpose of this manuscript is to explore both the external and internal catalysts over the most recent decades that have led to what we call "the fall of the field of college reading." After discussing "the fall," we move on to anticipate the future of college reading by providing a solutions-oriented discussion that explores possibilities to re-claim, re-invent, and re-reform a once-vital and still very much-needed field.

KEYWORDS *college reading, developmental reading, history of the college reading field*

There is great deal of conversation, presently, regarding the future of reading instruction at the postsecondary level. In order to propose a possible trajectory for the *future* of the field of college reading, we must first better understand the path taken over the past 120 years, and particularly—as will be the case in the present manuscript—the most recent several decades. To begin this discussion, though, we must first define what is meant by “the field of college reading.” College reading, just as other literacy fields associated with educational or developmental levels (early childhood reading, elementary reading, middle school reading, etc.), entails knowledge of reading and literacy scholarship, theory, and praxis as well as knowledge of the focal population. For college reading, this includes, but is

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Norman A. Stahl, Northern Illinois University, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, DeKalb, IL, 60115. E-mail: flowercjs@aol.com

not limited to, learners within postsecondary developmental reading contexts. Indeed, all aspects of academic literacy in higher education can—and do—fall under the umbrella of responsibilities of the college reading professional. In addition, we draw upon the history of the field as well as traditional hierarchies of literacy competencies to include learning and study strategy instruction within these parameters. In short, college reading might be more accurately phrased as “college literacy, reading, learning, and study strategies instruction and student support” and would encompass not only literacy within and across the college years, but also the transition to postsecondary literacies. In the past, many have opted for using the more inclusive, though still truncated, frame of “college reading and study strategies” (see, for instance, the most notable handbook in the field, Flippo & Caverly, 2000, 2009); we also often adopt such a phrasing, though for most of this manuscript, we opt for the shortened version of “college reading” with the understanding that this is simply a shortened phrasing, not a lessening of the expansive scope of responsibilities shared by those in the field.

MANZO AND THE ROOTS OF COLLEGE READING

Manzo, in a 1983 keynote to the College Reading Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association, proposed that the college reading field was both a generator of new ideas and a repository for considerable wisdom (see Manzo, 1983; see also Cheek, 1983). Indeed, a review of the general literature as well as the regularly released reviews of literature dating back to either the publication of what is generally considered the first research investigation in the field (Abell, 1894) or the birth of the field’s first dedicated program at Harvard University (Moore, 1915) suggests that Manzo’s proposal is without a doubt accurate (see Cole, 1940; N. B. Henry, 1948; Leedy, 1958; Strang, 1938; Triggs, 1943; see also early yearbooks from the College Reading Association, the North Central Reading Association, the National Reading Conference, the Western College Reading Association, and the annual reviews of literature issued by the National Reading Conference and the International Reading Association, as these associations have roots in and around college reading). In fact, one might be so bold as to assert that the very foundations of reading pedagogy across the grades, up to the date of Manzo’s speech, rested on scholarly investigations with college students/readers.

Throughout the next 20 years after Manzo made his presentation, there was a wealth of scholarship undertaken by a cadre of individuals from universities that had implemented developmental studies programs as part of the 1970s and 1980s college-access movement. In so many cases, the faculty hired to serve in these programs were doctorally prepared and expected to undertake scholarly work as well as to teach a specialization (reading, study strategies, composition, mathematics) to students identified as being ‘at-risk’ (Presley & Dodd, 2008). Such a mission produced a culture of academic mutualism. As such, one might propose that the zenith of college reading and study strategy research was achieved between the period of the 1980s and 1990s into the first few years of the twenty-first century. The University System of Georgia, with its two general

mission research universities of the University of Georgia and Georgia State University, serves as a constructive example of this proposition with faculty and their doctoral students within an institution and across the two institutions publishing articles regularly in high-impact journals (e.g., Hynd, Holschuh, & Hubbard, 2004; Simpson, Hayes, Stahl, Connor, & Weaver, 1988; Simpson, Hynd, Nist, & Burrell, 1997) and field-oriented journals (e.g., Commander & Smith, 1995; Commander, Stratton, Callahan, & Smith, 1996; Olson, Deming, & Gold, 1994; Stahl, Simpson, & Hayes, 1992) as well as chapters in texts (e.g., Simpson & Nist, 2002), research handbooks (e.g., Gold & Deming, 2000; Nist & Simpson, 2000), and yearbooks (e.g., Nist & Simpson, 1995). The chief commonality of the 100-plus publications released by the faculty at the two institutions was the confluence of the fields of cognitive science, social psychology, and reading pedagogy. Although the references noted are but examples from the Georgia partnership (Stahl, Simpson, Armstrong, & Holschuh, 2013), additional work from beyond that state can be retrieved by reviewing editions of the *Handbook of College Reading and Study Strategy Research* (Flippo & Caverly, 2000; 2009) and its predecessors (Flippo & Caverly, 1991a, 1991b).

From a programmatic perspective, since Manzo's speech, the field of college reading has found itself in rough seas. The first shot across its bow was with the policies enacted that removed "remedial" education from four-year institutions, which had the dual impacts of (a) reducing the number of specialists with doctorates when they did not hold tenure and (b) shifting the research foci for those who were protected by tenure at a four-year institution to more directly correspond with the mission of their new academic appointments (i.e., secondary literacy or adult literacy). Furthermore, as Maxwell (1969) pointed out years before, individuals from community colleges who earned the doctorate in the field rarely undertook research, as they were all too often moved into administrative or heavy teaching roles. More recently, with the restructuring of developmental education programs as part of the reform movement, it has been observed that college reading and study strategy programs (which are typically associated with developmental education programs) are being dismantled and faculty are being reduced or laid off. The limited remaining instruction in reading and study strategies is typically not being taught by individuals with advanced theoretical training in the discipline or expertise with postsecondary populations. This, what we refer to as the *fall* of the college reading and study strategy field, has ironically occurred despite and in contradiction to the prevalent narratives within the scholarly communities associated with literacy: lifelong literacy development (Alexander, 2005), adult literacy (Sticht, 1998), situated literacy (Barton & Hamilton, 1998), and even disciplinary literacy (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012).

FALL OF A FIELD

There are numerous historical sources that cover the growth, maturity, and rise of the field of college reading (Stahl & King, 2000; see also, Stahl, 2009, in press). Such a comprehensive overview is beyond the scope of the present manuscript. The purpose of this manuscript, rather, is to explore the more recent decades that

have led to what we call “the fall of the field of college reading.” We begin our discussion just after its peak (as illustrated earlier via Manzo and the Georgia partnership) and delineate its decline. This decline did not occur quickly or in a vacuum, and so there were catalysts, both external and internal, that require some attention. Although we position external influences and internal influences separately, we should note, too, that there is considerable overlap and interplay, as Newton’s Law applies just as well to higher education policy and politics as it does to physics. In other words, if a field is impacted by factors created and enabled externally, it should be accepted that such actions and outcomes may be equally influenced by factors that come from the reactions of members of that academic community. These two forces may converge to promote the field or to have deleterious effects. The latter, as demonstrated across the past decade, has been the case with the field of college reading.

External Influences

To fully understand the external forces facing college reading, one must first consider the place of developmental education in the current higher education milieu (again, even though college reading is not limited only to developmental reading, the affiliation between college reading and developmental education is undeniable). Although developmental education was introduced as an innovative intervention based on a philosophy formed from developmental psychology with its stage theory of learner development integrated with the concept of andragogy as espoused by the adult education community, it was actualized as a structural design as well as an administrative entity. It does not, however, have its original roots as a recognized academic field. Within this design, there are, generally, three acknowledged fields of instruction: English composition, mathematics, and reading pedagogy. Each of these is part of a much larger and tradition-based academic discipline, and so each field has a role in and relationship to developmental education, but equally or more so to a respected academic discipline. As fields within academic disciplines, each rests on a historical and ongoing foundation of theory, research, and practice.

Developmental education has been under the microscope for over a decade now as research centers and policy outlets have suggested in numerous articles, technical reports, and policy papers that as a structural model developmental education has been less than successful (e.g., Boatman & Long, 2010; Complete College America, 2011, 2012). In borrowing the leaky pipeline metaphor, proponents of reform presented a largely economic case, suggesting that developmental education was a model that had not met its promised objective of being an important mechanism for providing access and opportunity for the nontraditional student. These reformers postulate that for all too many students, the intervention never got beyond being a “revolving door” (to borrow a term from Cross, 1971) due to a stair step system based on a K-12 remedial skills model.

Although there are those who question the research and motives of the reform-oriented forces, it can be argued that meaningful reforms, although not fully validated to a gold standard yet, have been readily adopted particularly by

community college boards and systems as policy mandates. For instance, the Basic Reading/Basic Writing movement has been reborn as the current Integrated Reading and Writing reform; the adjunct course model has been reborn as the co-requisite reform (see A. A. Smith, 2017, for an example of a legislative mandate in one state); and the contextualized learning course model(s) has been reborn in interventions such as I-BEST (i.e., Wachen, Jenkins, Belfield, & Van Noy, 2012). All three of the original models have historical roots, at least partially, in the field of college reading. On first glance, such reform efforts seem entirely positive, particularly when arguments in favor include saving students time and money. However, reforms, particularly when generated by individuals from outside of a field, often promote unanticipated consequences (Merton, 1936).

Perhaps the most prevalent examples of external forces come in the form of research groups and nonprofit organizations that have been developed in recent years, purportedly, to, for example, “work with states to significantly increase the number of Americans with quality career certificates or college degrees and to close attainment gaps for traditionally underrepresented populations” (Complete College America, 2017). This and other organizations such as the Community College Research Center have claimed their place as experts on issues related to college-preparedness and completion, which, of course, includes developmental education. Such organizations have put forward much research, informed by disciplinary affiliations and traditions outside the scope of developmental education (i.e., economics, labor, etc.). And, much of this research has questioned the efficacy and utility of developmental education writ large (e.g., Bailey & Cho, 2010; Jaggars & Stacey, 2014; Pretlow & Wathington, 2011; Vandal, 2014). Unfortunately, much of this research has been adopted to inform policy and legislation that aims to eradicate or seriously diminish developmental education (Boylan, Calderwood, & Bonham, 2017; Goudas & Boylan, 2012). Legislative actions in Florida, Connecticut, and Tennessee make this point (Mangan, 2017). The basic argument for many of these actions is not necessarily driven by the actual findings of such research, but is, instead, focused on interaction of accountability and fiscal issues. For instance, a long-standing argument by many politicians is that taxpayers should not pay for content that was or should have been mastered in K–12 contexts (see Breneman & Haarlow, 1998; Cohen, 1987; Pretlow & Wathington, 2011; Saxon & Boylan, 2001).

To be clear, we are critical as well of the current and traditional models of curriculum and instruction adopted in developmental reading, and we advocate for continued efforts—by those within the field who have relevant expertise—to improve such. We do share a belief in tandem with reform-minded researchers from the Community College Research Center (CCRC), whose work has, however unintentionally, been adopted as the argument in favor of diminishing developmental education, including reading: “We do not advocate—nor do we believe that the results of our research support—the elimination or reduction of developmental education, the placing of all students into college courses, or the wholesale conversion of developmental education into a co-requisite model” (Bailey, Jaggars, & Scott-Clayton, 2013, p. 2). Unfortunately, legislators and staff personnel from higher education authorities across the states have, in too

many cases, failed to consider this point, as research can be interpreted in various ways (Huff, 1954) to fit the political currents.

This is certainly not an exhaustive listing of external influences, as we have not covered factors such as the ongoing problem of textbook publishers pushing skill-driven approaches that contradict more sophisticated approaches to postsecondary reading pedagogy and that implicitly endorse an understanding of the field's primary mission (and identity) as "remediation" (Armstrong, Lampi, & Stahl, 2016; Lampi, Stahl, & Armstrong, 2017). Additionally, we have not addressed the same problem that occurs when test publishers maintain a monopoly on how college-ready reading is defined via reading placement tests. And, the list goes on and on. However, these external influences represent only a partial explanation of the fall of the field of college reading. Indeed, we would be acting in a disingenuous manner if we did not propose that forces within college reading (the teaching force, program administrators, and the professional associations) share some of the responsibility for the fall.

Internal Influences

Here, as in the last section, we do not aim to provide an exhaustive listing of all internal influences on the fall of the field of college reading; instead, we provide three specific focal areas of interest: professional organizations; training, credentialing, scholarship, and professional development; and theoretical and philosophical disconnects.

Professional Organizations

As we live in an uncertain age where the future of higher education and our various fields is at best tenuous as driven by ever-changing economic, political, and societal trends and values, the one safe haven for members of any field would be their professional association. As a home for sharing theory, research, and praxis, as well as an environment that fosters camaraderie and professional development, one's professional association is in a sense a welcome port in the storm. Yet, we maintain that such a safe harbor does not exist for the field of college reading at the time this text is being written. In the following sections, we identify two groups of organizations, based on their foci, that are specifically relevant to professionals in the field of college reading.

Reading/literacy-focused organizations. Ironically, if one reviews the organizational histories of most of the reading/literacy associations, including the International Literacy Association (ILA), the Literacy Research Association (LRA), the Association for Literacy Educators and Researchers (ALER), or the American Reading Forum (ARF), one observes that each was founded with major contributions by college reading professionals. Yet, college reading as a field is at best marginalized within the current K-12 orientations of these associations. For instance, as ILA has retrenched due to economic and membership factors facing large omnibus professional associations, it is unlikely to find any sessions at its conference pertaining to college reading, and, in fact, its College Literacy and

Learning Special Interest Group, long a staple of IRA/ILA conventions, now meets at another conference venue (<http://j-cll.org/conference-information>). Although this marginalization of one field within the larger discipline is unfortunate, it is understood that associations can only maintain relevance to so many constituency groups.

The logical question would be as follows: Does not an association exist that serves the college reading professionals at this time? In years past the answer would have been a resounding “Yes” as the Literacy Research Association, the North Central Reading Association, the Association for Literacy Educators and Researchers, and the College Reading and Learning Association were initially focused solely on the college reading and study strategy field. Yet, missions evolve for all associations, and all member-driven associations move to greener pastures if only to promote solvency. At best, there currently exist within these associations small and not particularly field-unifying special interest groups pertaining to both college reading and learning strategies.

Developmental education and learning assistance-focused organizations. One logically now asks: Do not the associations in the developmental education and learning assistance field focus on the college reading and study strategy field? The answer is a tentative “Yes” in that the associations provide opportunities for members of the field to meet and share ideas through presentation and publication. Yet, there are multiple associations (National Association for Developmental Education, Association for the Tutoring Profession, Association of Colleges for Tutoring and Learning Assistance, National College Learning Center Association [NCLCA], College Reading and Learning Association, and Teaching Academic Survival Skills) and various aligned state/regional chapters. Hence, members of the field may have too many options, which actually has a splintering effect on the field. Furthermore, the field of college reading and learning is not the sole focus of the missions of these associations.

Clearly then, there is no unifying body for college reading and learning professionals benefitting from an economy of scale as one would find for the composition field through the College Composition and Communication or mathematics through American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges.

Training, Credentialing, Scholarship, and Professional Development

A second issue—one created from within the field—that has led to the de-professionalization of the field has to do with the acceptance, over the years, of far fewer opportunities and expectations for training, credentialing, and professional development for those in the field. On one level, this is not a new problem. In fact, Martha Maxwell (1969) almost 50 years ago lamented the lack of population-specific training that most college reading instructors held. And, others have discussed the lack of formalized, focused training and credentialing required of college reading professionals (e.g., Simpson, 1983; Stahl, 1990; Stahl, Brozo, & Gordon, 1984). However, this problem has persisted (and perhaps even worsened). Just as Maxwell and others have noted, there is an over-reliance in the field on professionals who are trained for the K–12 (actually, more often than not,

K–3) arena, and they tend to transfer those instructional approaches and pedagogical principles to the college level where all too often they equate to a remedial and discrete-skills approach (which might have had relevance when the primary model of evaluation was the Nelson–Denny Reading Test and its clones, but in a natural-text oriented era, such an approach is wanting).

Part of this problem connects back to the professional organizations and their lack of involvement in the academic preparation of field professionals for postsecondary reading and learning specialists. For instance, IRA/ILA standards for credentialing college reading professionals have not covered such since the 1986 edition of the *Guidelines for the Specialized Preparation of Reading Professionals* (IRA, 1986). The third edition of the IRA standards document (IRA, 1992) lumped adult and college together, but since then there has been no mention of college reading in the standards documents.

In addition to a dearth of training for the professional realm of college reading, there has also been a decline in the amount and visibility of the scholarship within the field, largely as a result of the movement of college reading programs from the research universities to the community college. As evidenced by professional organizations' and graduate programs' tendencies to focus on K–12 literacy, the field is not situated neatly within the larger discipline of reading/literacy in the traditional sense. At the same time, it does not necessarily fit under the umbrella of higher education studies. Therefore, in terms of alignment with a scholarly/disciplinary tradition, there is not a clear fit. Indeed, the needs for college reading professionals are so great and varied and far-ranging that developing any training, credentialing, or certification program is difficult. It is true that doctoral programs in developmental education (at Grambling State University, Sam Houston State University, and Texas State University) as well as those with broader missions (at Appalachian State University) prepare developmental educators and researchers. However, because these programs aim to provide expertise for working with a population, not specifically a content area, depth or breath of knowledge specific to reading (as in traditional doctorates in reading like Michigan State University, University of Georgia, etc.) is not the focus (Texas State University comes closest, with a focused specialization area of “developmental literacy” within the graduate programming).

Intricately related to this issue of advanced graduate training is the issue of field-initiated research. Traditionally, research within the field was aimed at learner foci such as cognitive and affective issues. Unfortunately, such research was not heeded or utilized in the development of reforms (Stahl & Armstrong, 2015), and instead the current foci on success/completion, structural design of programming, or economic implications—generally undertaken by those outside the field—have been taken to represent what is known in the field.

Furthermore, if formal academic programs do not exist specific to college reading, the need for in-depth professional development must become an option. For decades, the field of developmental education and its kindred field of learning assistance have both drawn upon a model of professional development that has roots in the 1800s: the summer institute. As an example, the Kellogg Institute and the Advanced Kellogg Institute sponsored by the National Center for Developmental Education have provided developmental educators with an

opportunity to meet across an extended period of time in the summer to learn of the most pressing issues and current trends impacting developmental education. A similar, but not quite so intensive, institute for learning assistance personnel has been delivered by the NCLCA for a number of years, and for over a decade the Curriculum and Instruction Department at Texas State University offered the Technology Institute for Developmental Educators (TIDE). All three of these initiatives have delivered effective professional development for developmental educators and/or learning assistance personnel. However, the essence of the training has been of a generalist nature, and even when topics may have touched upon college reading, the coverage could not provide the depth necessary to fully delve into theory, research, and praxis as necessary for a well-trained, well-rounded college reading specialist.

Theoretical and Philosophical Disconnects

Throughout the last three decades of the twentieth century and then into the current century, the literature pertaining to developmental education has regularly covered the definitions of, the differences between, and the philosophical/pedagogical foundations of developmental education and remedial education and to a lesser extent compensatory or basic skills education (e.g., Arendale, 2005; Clowes, 1980, 1984; Cross, 1976; Grubb, 2013; Maxwell, 1979, 1997; Nist, 1985; Roueche & Wheeler, 1973). From its earliest days, developmental education as a movement was philosophically linked to the constructs of adult education and developmental psychology (particularly stage theory) and as such was designed to be a pedagogy or more likely called at the time an andragogy that was quite unlike the historical practice of remediation (see Stahl, Theriault, & Armstrong, 2016, for a listing of interviews that cover this movement). Unfortunately, the curriculum and instruction of developmental education and more specifically college reading as actualized did not draw from the “new” philosophy. Rather, it doubled down on the remedial model by misinterpreting stage theory so as to structurally adopt the step ladder system of skills courses ala K–12 remediation that has in recent years given rise to concept of the leaky pipeline effect.

Ironically, the construct of developmental reading predates by several decades the field of developmental education as it emerged in the era of the “new” student. What appears to be an initial use of the term ‘developmental reading’ as it pertains to the college level is found in William S. Gray’s (1936) seminal article on the reading difficulties in postsecondary education. Nila Banton Smith, in her landmark text *American Reading Instruction* (1934/2002), accurately details the evolution of the concept of developmental reading versus remedial reading with particular reference to *Reading in the High School and College as Part II of the 47th Yearbook of the NSSE* (N. B. Henry, 1948). Within the field of reading there are three levels of instruction (developmental, corrective, and remedial). Developmental reading can be defined as reading instruction, except remedial, for students at all levels (Harris & Hodges, 1995). In part, this draws upon Gray’s (1948) belief and Alexander’s (2005) more recent admonition that growth in reading is a lifespan activity.

Should then college reading adopt a remedial model rather than a developmental model? Perhaps not if we take the definition of the field provided by Nist and Simpson (2002):

Developmental/College reading is broad term (sic) that refers to the academic literacy skills necessary to be successful in post-secondary settings. Because the reading tasks in which college students engage differ from those required in either elementary- or secondary-school settings, approaches to text reading also differ. That is, college students have learned how to read; now they must read to learn. As such, they must use generative and additive reading strategies that embody cognitive, metacognitive, and self-regulatory processes, selecting such strategies based on the task, the text, and students' own characteristics as learners. (p. 127)

If so, why has the curriculum and instruction of college reading emphasized a hierarchical step system with the remedial, skills-based orientation when a true developmental approach was far more appropriate? In addition to a teaching force with expertise in K–3 reading, which may naturally gravitate toward a more skills-based approach, unfortunately, publishing companies have clearly pushed the use of disposable workbook materials that favored a skills orientation as integrated with a culture of decontextualized standardized testing for multiple decades. Nonetheless, the field has generally stayed with the skill-drill-kill model over evidence and theory-based approaches so as to actualize the stair step system with its structural failure.

Another aspect of philosophical or theoretical disconnects has to do with how reading is assessed at the college level. Flippo and Schumm (2000; 2009; also Flippo, Armstrong, & Schumm, *in press*) have outlined the underlying theory of reading behind the most often used reading comprehension assessment instruments used at the college level (i.e., Nelson-Denny Reading Test, the Degrees of Reading Power, ACCUPLACER, etc.). What is notable is that many of these assessments don't align philosophically with a more holistic perspective of literacy, even in programs that advocate such a perspective. Here again, the mismatch becomes clear: well-accepted theoretical perspectives such as disciplinary literacies, social literacies, and lifespan literacy development are ignored at the college level.

The answer may not be clear, but such a remedial approach that did not focus on teaching a content literacy or a disciplinary literacy philosophy could only have led the field to be, at best, marginalized and just as likely—as we have discovered in this reform era—to be expendable.

UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

The confluence of these various external and internal influences has had some unanticipated, and perhaps unintended, consequences to the field of college reading, particularly at the level of curriculum and instruction. Let us offer as an example the current reiteration of the integrated reading and writing (IRW) model. Few literacy specialists would argue against a sound program integrating components of the language arts in that the model stands on a time-valued

foundation of theory, research, and praxis (e.g., Emig, 1982; Nelson & Calfee, 1998; Shanahan & Tierney, 1990). Yet, an unintended consequence of the second-generation IRW courses in colleges has been that composition programs have been given the charge of teaching such coursework and the ownership over the curriculum as well. This practice has led to a situation where instructors are highly trained in the theory, research, and practice of teaching *writing*, but have limited expertise in the theory, research, and practice of teaching *reading*. Furthermore, most in either camp currently have little or no in-depth training in the integration of the language arts. It is a rare program, indeed, that has teamed instructors from both fields to deliver the coursework as was done through the original Basic Reading and Writing program at the University of Pittsburgh (Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1986). More often than not, then, reading faculty are lost to the winds of change.

An additional consequence, which we would suggest was unintended, has been that the curricular and instructional materials for many IRW courses across the country include textbooks that are composition-centric (Armstrong et al., 2016; Lampi et al., 2017). Furthermore, even though the original models of Basic Reading and Basic Writing strived to be other than primarily a skill-drill model in the teaching of reading and writing (Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1986), IRW textbooks have propagated such a model in part due to the aforementioned disciplinary “ownership” issue.

If there have been unintended consequences associated with higher education trends, there are also deliberate actions that are of an economic nature that have led to reading specialists losing position in higher education. For decades across the twentieth century individuals trained in reading, whether housed in reading departments or units, educational psychology departments, or psychology departments offered learning strategy courses on campus. Instructors tended to be either tenured/tenure-track faculty or doctoral students within the field. With the coming of the gradual lessening of financial support to higher education from various governmental entities, we would propose that there has been a lessening of institutions offering contextualized or authentic simulation models of learning strategy coursework in favor of ubiquitous student success courses that embed generic study skills instruction delivered in more cases than not via a “blind training model” (Brown, Campione, & Day, 1981) that offers a minimal chance of transfer as delivered by individuals who do not possess graduate training in field.

An important, but extremely difficult question that must be asked about the current state of college reading is as follows: What is the value of reading instruction at the postsecondary level? There is widespread acceptance of the belief that developing a student’s advanced knowledge and competency in writing or speech (including listening) is perfectly acceptable, and thus such courses at the outset of a college career are perfectly appropriate; however, oddly enough, reading instruction at the postsecondary level is viewed in a negative light.

THE FUTURE OF COLLEGE READING

In the sections that follow, we put aside thoughts of the *fall* of college reading, and begin to daydream about the future of college reading, and what we believe needs to involve a rebirth of sorts. Specifically, we aim to provide a solutions-oriented discussion that explores possibilities to re-claim, re-invent, and re-reform a once-vital and still very much-needed field.

Solutions for the Field: Re-claim

An important starting point is to re-claim the field of college reading by providing a new definition of reading/literacy for the postsecondary level. The foundation of a new definition comes from asking a difficult question: What is the role of reading in the community college and or the university? Or perhaps equally so we must ask: What is the culture of reading in institutions of higher education?

One would be hard pressed to find an individual associated with postsecondary education who would not point to the centrality of reading in the broadest sense to the mission, goals, and objectives of the academy (see, for example, Nist & Simpson, 2000, for their claim that approximately 85% of learning in college involves reading). Yet, across the years, studies have demonstrated (Armstrong & Stahl, 2017; Armstrong, Stahl, & Kantner, 2015, 2016; National Center on Education and the Economy, 2013; Richardson, Fisk, & Okun, 1983) that reading is not necessarily expected of nor practiced by many students in the community colleges to the degree of established beliefs and historical myths might suggest. Research suggests that as a response, faculty members have adopted a culture of work-arounds that deliver content while avoiding their responsibility to promote, integrate, and instruct either content reading techniques or disciplinary literacy practices in their respective classes. If reading is no longer the heart and soul of the postsecondary curriculum and instruction, and faculty believe that aliteracy if not illiteracy is the standard for the day, then the faculty in reading programs must lead the endeavor to evaluate the role and culture of reading on each campus. Curriculum audit practices or “reality checks” are called for in approaching such queries (Armstrong et al., 2015; Simpson, 1996).

This calls for a new mission for college reading experts that takes them away from the silo focused on traditional skills-oriented courses to a role of chief professional development specialists supporting the contextualization of reading and learning competencies in classes, the integration of the disciplinary literacy theories and practices in all classes across the institution, and the delivery of professional development (for both faculty and graduate teaching assistants) and literacy-oriented services across the academic community. To some this recommendation may seem like a new venture, but in reality, college reading and study specialists regularly crossed such boundaries at earlier times in our history. It is time to re-claim these roles on every campus in the country.

Let us suggest another opportunity to re-claim an important aspect of our field. One of the internal issues mentioned in this commentary was the loss of

having a strong professional association or at least an equally strong special interest group that speaks for the field of college reading and study strategy experts. Certainly, we acknowledge that the process of forming a national association such as the Conference on College Composition and Communication for composition is at best a daunting task taking decades as opposed to even years, yet it is possible for college reading and study strategy specialists to unite under a single special interest group in an existing association. We would, of course, suggest that such be done through the College Reading and Learning Association given its historical support of the field.

Solutions for the Field: Re-invent

We would be the first to say that there is a very thin line between re-claiming and re-inventing the field as our history is like a fast-flowing river at flood stage, and college reading is deep in theory and research and wide in praxis and service. Still, it is time to stand on our past achievements, whether widely known or not, and face a future where we must re-invent the field progressing well beyond the current reform movement.

Let us begin with an example drawn from how reading experts for the postsecondary level are trained, particularly in an age of reinvented reform models such as IRW and co-requisite courses. We would suggest that there is a need for graduate degree programs that focus on the integration of reading and writing. At the master's level and at this time in our history, one might advocate for the program at San Francisco State University where graduate students may train in the theory, research, and practice of both reading and writing. Additionally, we believe there is a pressing need for doctoral programs that adopt an "multidisciplinary" approach that brings together faculty and courses in cognitive science, reading research, composition, educational psychology, educational research, and higher education to fully train literacy theorists and researchers who can cross borders and tear down artificial siloes so as to promote postsecondary literacy practice through their research and scholarship.

Directly related to our call for the creation of focused graduate programs that produce college reading experts is our call, too, for all in the field to push accreditation agencies and program administrators to require and expect those teaching or developing curriculum to have the appropriate training and credentials (and to demonstrate sincere support for students by not only requiring such, but also by supporting those who endeavor to pursue such advanced education). Furthermore, we are strong supporters of the work that was initiated by California AB 1725 that requires all individuals assigned to teach a college reading class to have 12 credits in the instruction of reading. However, one must question if this policy is indeed being honored with the growth of the IRW movement in the state as it appears that the majority of instructors of IRW courses have been primarily trained in the field of composition. Hence, we call on the regional higher education accreditation agencies to stand by their policies that individuals must have formal training in reading to teach courses focused on the topic, which would include IRW courses.

A second aspect of re-invention calls for a careful examination and understanding of the students coming to the halls of ivy from high school through the lens of Alliance programs (see L. A. Henry & Stahl, 2017). A fundamental component of the secondary literacy field is the acknowledgement that future and also current college students are firmly entrenched in a world focused on the new literacies. Any pedagogy delivered to this adolescent population must focus on their interests, attitudes and literacy practices if instruction is to be fully accepted and successful. On the other hand, we acknowledge that a “Catch 22” situation may exist as postsecondary faculty hold firmly to a traditional view of the role of reading, if not writing, all the while bemoaning the students’ unwillingness to engage in literacy practices in the same manner as they personally utilized while part of the undergraduate experience so many years ago. Through the opportunities provided by Alliance programs college reading experts can learn of the reforms in secondary literacy instruction that focus on the new literacies and from such interactions with our secondary-level colleagues we can develop programming that provides for a more seamless transition from the secondary school.

Let us consider a third perspective. It is well known by those of us in the field that college reading crosses many borders in higher education. Yet, for too long we have been put into a small box of basic skills teaching and generic, simulated learning skills instruction. We need to reassume the breadth that was college reading from before the coming of the developmental education model. We need to own our expertise areas, and develop the courses that we know will help support students’ learning in college. Let us re-invent through the perspectives provided through the disciplinary literacy movement. Let us move beyond the generic reading and study strategies course to offer one-credit adjunct courses building upon disciplinary literacy and CTE practices that contextualize strategic learning where students might take up to three one credit adjunct courses each tied to a specific discipline. Let us move beyond an IRW model to develop a team-taught approach that integrates and contextualizes all of the language arts as related to introduction courses in a pathways design (which becomes a *de facto* theme). Finally, let us accept that critical reading is critical thinking, and such is foundational to being college ready. Should an institution desire to offer a precollege level course focused on reading, it should build on the advanced levels of the Common Core State Standards as they promote higher-level, cross-disciplinary reading competencies.

Solutions for the Field: Re-reform

Reform is a natural occurrence in the field of education. In fact, the fundamental philosophies and designs of developmental education were impactful reforms within the higher education arena in the 1970s. By the very nature of reform as a process each reform will eventually face the prospect of reform itself. The question is often whether reform brings with it something that is actually new, or, as we have learned from the “reading wars,” there is simply a directional change in the pendulum’s swing. While the reforms in developmental education

as they have impacted college reading clearly have influenced program structure, there has, at best, been a minimal amount in the way of new pedagogy and minimal impactful research focused on pedagogy. In fact, for college reading and we might add writing, we simply see a version of the reading wars being waged at the postsecondary level.

This proposition does not suggest that the reforms impacting and perhaps improving college reading should be abandoned as they actually take existing constructs to new levels. However, it is imperative that the college reading community leads the way in conducting impactful research (Duke & Mallette, 2011) on the recent reforms as they impact college teaching and student learning. We believe that the recent interest in formative and design experiments (Bradley & Reinking, 2011; Reinking & Bradley, 2008) holds particular promise for the practitioner-researcher in the field. Simply looking at movement through the pipeline does not insure that students have become critical readers and strategic learners able to transfer knowledge, competencies, and dispositions to college content delivered in various disciplines and career-oriented fields.

This proposition can be taken one step further. College reading specialists, as well as all developmental educators and learning assistance professionals, must become fully qualified in undertaking both the methods and materials of formative and summative evaluation (Boylan & Bonham, 2009; Simpson, 2002) to implement structural and pedagogical reforms, as well as to evaluate these reforms once in practice and then re-reform these reforms as appropriate. Indeed, one might suggest that the current reform movement would not have come to light if members of the field had undertaken regular and sophisticated evaluation processes across the past decades. Reform and re-reform through impactful research and solid evaluation practices must be a cyclical and hence a never-ending process.

FINAL THOUGHTS

In closing, we want to acknowledge that we raised a number of points in this work, and indeed some will be troubling to members of the field. Still, all of these points should have been self-evident after a degree of self-reflection. Even though much of this manuscript dealt with negative issues and negative impacts on the field, we believe that in every problem there does exist a silver lining if those impacted are able to embrace change, develop strategic allies, and build anew based on theory, research, and evidence-based practice.

As a field we have our shortcomings. Indeed, most fields do. As a field we have a rich history of contributions to our profession. Indeed, we have much about which to feel very proud. Yet, any future requires a close and honest evaluation of both as we face the future. After writing this analysis, we believe that Benjamin Franklin's statement at the cessation of the nation's Constitutional Convention in 1787 catches the potentials for the field of college reading in 2017: "I have often in the course of the session ... looked at that sun behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now at length I have the happiness to know it is a rising and not a setting sun" (Independence Hall Association, 2017).

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Norman A. Stahl is Professor Emeritus of Literacy Education at Northern Illinois University with earlier service at Georgia State University, the University of Pittsburgh, and San Francisco State University. His PhD in Language Communications was awarded by the University of Pittsburgh. He has been the President of the Literacy Research Association, the Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers, and the College Reading and Learning Association. He is a CLADEA National Fellow and a member of the Reading Hall of Fame.

Sonya L. Armstrong is an Associate Professor in the Graduate Program in Developmental Education at Texas State University, where she also serves as the director of the Doctoral Program. She earned her doctorate in literacy education from the University of Cincinnati.

REFERENCES

- Abell, A. M. (1894). Rapid reading: Advantage and methods. *Educational Review*, 8, 283–286.
- Alexander, P. A. (2005). *The path to competence: A lifespan developmental perspective on reading*. Paper commissioned by the Literacy Research Association. Retrieved from <http://www.literacyresearchassociation.org/assets/docs/Websitedocs/thepaththocompetence.pdf>
- Arendale, D. R. (2005). Terms of endearment: Words that help define and guide developmental education. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 35(2), 66–82. doi:10.1080/10790195.2005.10850174
- Armstrong, S. L., Lampi, J. P., & Stahl, N. A. (2016, December). *When the textbook is the curriculum: A content analysis of integrated reading and writing textbooks*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Literacy Research Association, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Armstrong, S. L., & Stahl, N. A. (2017). Communication across the silos and borders: The culture of reading in a community college. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 47(2), 99–122. doi:10.1080/10668926.2015.1132644
- Armstrong, S. L., Stahl, N. A., & Kantner, M. J. (2015). Investigating academic literacy expectations: A curriculum audit model. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 38(2), 2-4, 6, 8-9, 12-13, 23.
- Armstrong, S. L., Stahl, N. A., & Kantner, M. J. (2016). Building better bridges: Understanding academic text readiness at one community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 40(11), 1–24. doi:10.1080/10668926.2015.1132644
- Bailey, T., & Cho, S.-W. (2010). *Issue brief: Developmental education in community colleges*. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- Bailey, T., Jagars, S. S., & Scott-Clayton, J. (2013). *Characterizing the effectiveness of developmental education: A response to recent criticism*. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- Bartholomae, D., & Petrosky, A. (Eds.). (1986). *Facts, artifacts and counterfacts: Theory and method for a reading and writing course*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boatman, A., & Long, B. T. (2010). *Does remediation work for all students? How the effects of postsecondary remedial and developmental courses vary by level of academic preparation* (National center for postsecondary research working paper). New York, NY: National Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Boylan, H. R., & Bonham, B. S. (2009). Program evaluation. In R. F. Flippo, & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study research* (2nd ed., pp. 379–407). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Boylan, H. R., Calderwood, B. J., & Bonham, B. S. (2017). *College completion: Focus on the finish line*. Boone, NC: National Center for Developmental Education. Retrieved from <https://ncde.appstate.edu/news/college-completion-focus-finish-line-boylan-calderwood-and-bonham-march-1>
- Bradley, B. A., & Reinking, D. (2011). Revisiting the connection between research and practice using formative and design experiments. In N. K. Duke, & M. H. Mallette (Eds.), *Literacy research methodologies* (2nd ed., pp. 188–212). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Breneman, D. W., & Haarlow, W. N. (1998). Remediation in higher education: A symposium featuring developmental education: Costs and consequences. *Fordham Report*, 2(9). Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Brown, A. L., Campione, J. C., & Day, J. D. (1981). Learning to learn: On training students to learn from texts. *Educational Researcher*, 10(2), 14–21. doi:10.3102/0013189X010002014
- Cheek, D. H. (1983). The evolving definition of college reading. *Journal of Reading*, 26(6), 556–558.
- Clowes, D. A. (1980). More than a definitional problem: Remedial, compensatory, and developmental education. *Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education*, 4(1), 8–10.
- Clowes, D. A. (1984). The evaluation of remedial/developmental programs: A stage model of program evaluation. *Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education*, 8(1), 14–15, 27–30.
- Cohen, A. M. (1987). Responding to criticisms of developmental education. In K. M. Ahrendt (Ed.), *Teaching the developmental education student (New directions for community colleges no. 57)* (pp. 3–10). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cole, L. (1940). *The background for college teaching*. New York, NY: Farrar & Rinehart.
- Commander, N., & Smith, B. (1995). Developing adjunct reading and learning courses that work. *Journal of Reading*, 38(5), 352–360.
- Commander, N., Stratton, C., Callahan, C., & Smith, B. (1996). A learning assistance model for expanding academic support. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 20(2), 8–16.
- Complete College America. (2011). *Time is the enemy*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Complete College America. (2012). *Remediation: Higher education's bridge to nowhere*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Complete College America (2017). <http://www.completecollege.org/about.html>.
- Cross, K. P. (1971). *Beyond the open door: New students to higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, K. P. (1976). *Accent on learning: Improving instruction and reshaping the curriculum*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Duke, N. K., & Mallette, M. H. (Eds.). (2011). *Literacy research methodologies*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Emig, J. (1982). Writing, composition, and rhetoric. In H. E. Mitzell (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (5th ed., pp. 2021–2036). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Flippo, R. F., Armstrong, S. L., & Schumm, J. (In Press). Reading tests. In R. F. Flippo, & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Flippo, R. F., & Caverly, D. C. (Eds.). (1991a). *Teaching reading & study strategies at the college level*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Flippo, R. F., & Caverly, D. C. (Eds.). (1991b). *College reading and study strategy programs*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Flippo, R. F., & Caverly, D. C. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Flippo, R. F., & Caverly, D. C. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Flippo, R. F., & Schumm, J. S. (2000). Reading tests. In R. F. Flippo, & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (pp. 403–472). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Flippo, R. F., & Schumm, J. S. (2009). Reading tests. In R. F. Flippo, & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategies* (2nd ed., pp. 408–464). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gold, M. V., & Deming, M. P. (2000). The reading and writing connection. In R. Flippo, & D. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (pp. 149–173). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Goudas, A. M., & Boylan, H. R. (2012). Addressing flawed research in developmental education. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 36(1), 2–13.
- Gray, W. S. (1936). Reading difficulties in college: The nature and extent of reading deficiencies among college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 7(7), 356–362. doi:10.2307/1974217
- Gray, W. S. (1948). Increasing the basic reading competencies of students. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *Reading in high school and college. Yearbook of the national society for the study of education*, 47(2) (pp. 91–115). (1948). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Grubb, W. N. (2013). *Basic skills education in community college: Inside and outside of classrooms*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harris, T. L., & Hodges, R. E. (Eds.). (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Henry, L. A., & Stahl, N. A. (2017). Dismantling the developmental education pipeline: Potent pedagogies and promising practices that address the college readiness gap. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 60(6), 611–616. doi:10.1002/jaal.640
- Henry, N. B. (Ed.). (1948). Reading in high school and college. In *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 47 (2). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Huff, D. (1954). *How to lie with statistics*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Hynd, C., Holschuh, J., & Hubbard, B. (2004). Thinking like a historian: College students' reading of multiple historical documents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 36(2), 141–176. doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3602_2
- Independence Hall Association (2017). *The Rising Sun Armchair (George Washington's Chair)*. Retrieved from U.S. History <http://www.ushistory.org/more/sun.htm>
- International Reading Association (IRA). (1986). *Guidelines for the specialized preparation of reading professionals*. Newark, DE: Author.
- International Reading Association (IRA). (1992). *Standards for reading professionals*. Newark, DE: Author.
- Jaggars, S., & Stacey, G. (2014). *What we know about developmental education outcomes*. (CCRC Research Overview). Retrieved from the Columbia University Academic Commons website: <http://academiccommons.columbia.edu/catalog/ac:170486>
- Lampi, J. P., Stahl, N. A., & Armstrong, S. L. (2017, May). *Convergences and divergences of theory and curricula embodied in textbooks: A content analysis study*. Paper session presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Antonio, Texas.
- Leedy, P. D. (1958). *A history of the origin and development of instruction in reading improvement at the college level*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York, NY: New York University.
- Mangan, K. (2017, May 26). Florida moves to slash funds for remedial education, and college leaders protest. In *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (p. A24).
- Manzo, A. V. (1983). College reading: Past and present. *Forum for Reading*, 14, 5–16.
- Maxwell, M. (1969). *What the college reading teacher needs to know about reading*. Berkeley, CA: University of California. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED046646).
- Maxwell, M. (1979). *Improving student learning skills*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maxwell, M. (1997). *Improving student learning skills: A new edition*. Clearwater, FL: H & H Publications.
- Merton, R. K. (1936). The unanticipated consequences of purposive social action. *American Sociological Review*, 1(6), 894–904. doi:10.2307/2084615

- Moore, E. C. (1915). An experiment in teaching college students how to study. *School and Society*, 2, 100–107.
- National Center on Education and the Economy. (2013). *What does it really mean to be college and work ready? A study of the English literacy and mathematics required for success in the first year of community college*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nelson, N., & Calfee, R. C. (Eds.). (1998). The reading-writing connection. In *Ninety-seventh yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Nist, S. L. (1985). Developmental versus remedial: Are the terms confused in higher education reading programs? *Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education*, 8(3), 8–11.
- Nist, S. L., & Simpson, M. L. (1995). Why strategies fail: Students' and researchers' perceptions. In D. J. Leu, & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Forty-Fourth yearbook of the National Reading Conference*. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.
- Nist, S. L., & Simpson, M. L. (2000). College studying. In M. Kamil, R. Barr, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (3rd ed., pp. 645–666). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nist, S. L., & Simpson, M. L. (2002). Developmental and college reading. In B. J. Guzzetti (Ed.), *Literacy in America: An encyclopedia of history, theory, and practice: Volume 1* (pp. 127–131). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Olson, J. R., Deming, M. P., & Gold, M. V. (1994). Dialogue journals: Barometers for assessing growth in developmental learners. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 18(1), 26–32.
- Presley, J. W., & Dodd, W. M. (2008). The political history of developmental studies in the University System of Georgia. *The Community College Enterprise*, 14(2), 37–55.
- Pretlow, J., & Wathington, H. D. (2011). Cost of developmental education: An update of Breneman and Haarlow. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 35(1), 2–10.
- Reinking, D., & Bradley, B. A. (2008). *Formative and design experiments: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Richardson, R. C., Fisk, E. C., & Okun, M. O. (1983). *Literacy in the open-access college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Roueche, J. E., & Wheeler, C. L. (1973). Instructional procedures for the disadvantaged. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 21(3), 222–225. doi:10.1080/00193089.1973.10533431
- Saxon, D. P., & Boylan, H. R. (2001). The cost of developmental education in higher education. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(2), 2–8.
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2012). What is disciplinary literacy and why does it matter? *Topics in Language Disorders*, 32(1), 7–18. doi:10.1097/TLD.0b013e318244557a
- Shanahan, T., & Tierney, R. J. (1990). Reading-writing connections: The relations among three perspectives. In J. Zutell, & S. McCormick (Eds.), *Literacy theory and research: Analyses from multiple paradigms. Thirty-ninth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 13–34). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.
- Simpson, M. L. (1983). The preparation of a college reading specialist: Some philosophical perspectives. *Reading World*, 22(3), 213–223. doi:10.1080/19388078309557705
- Simpson, M. L. (1996). Conducting reality checks to improve students' strategic learning. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 41(2), 102–109.
- Simpson, M. L. (2002). Program evaluation studies: Strategic learning delivery model suggestions. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 26, 2–10.
- Simpson, M. L., Hayes, C. G., Stahl, N. A., Connor, R. T., & Weaver, D. (1988). An initial validation of a study strategy system. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 20(2), 149–180. doi:10.1080/10862968809547632
- Simpson, M. L., Hynd, C., Nist, S. L., & Burrell, K. (1997). College reading and learning assistance programs. *Educational Psychology Review*, 9(1), 39–87. doi:10.1023/A:1024733706115

- Simpson, M. L., & Nist, S. L. (2002). Encouraging active reading at the college level. In M. Pressley, & C. Collins-Block (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research based best practices*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Smith, A. A. (2017, July). Texas legislature requires colleges to use popular reform approach to remedial education. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/07/12/texas-legislature-requires-colleges-use-popular-reform-approach-remedial-education>
- Smith, N. B. (1934/2002). *American reading instruction: Special edition*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Stahl, N. A. (1990). *The development of graduate level emphases for adult reading-literacy instruction and postsecondary reading - learning instruction*. ERIC database (ED314729). DeKalb, IL: Faculty in Reading, College of Education, Northern Illinois University. Retrieved from https://archive.org/stream/ERIC_ED314729/ERIC_ED314729_djvu.txt
- Stahl, N. A., & Armstrong, S. L. (2015, November). *Did that research make a difference?* Paper session presented at the meeting of the College Reading and Learning Association, Portland, Oregon.
- Stahl, N. A., Brozo, W. G., & Gordon, B. (1984). The professional preparation of college reading and study-skills specialists. In G. McNinch (Ed.), *Reading teacher education: Yearbook of the 4th Annual Conference of the American Reading Forum*. Carrollton, GA: West Georgia College.
- Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2000). A history of college reading. In R. F. Flippo, & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study research* (pp. 1–24). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2009). History. In R. F. Flippo, & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study research* (2nd ed., pp. 3–25). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (In Press). History. In R. F. Flippo, & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Stahl, N. A., Simpson, M. L., Armstrong, S. L., & Holschuh, J. (2013, November). *The Georgia connection: Its impact on college reading and study strategy theory, research, and practice*. Session presented at the College Reading and Learning Association Conference, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Stahl, N. A., Simpson, M. L., & Hayes, C. G. (1992). If only we had known: Ten recommendations from research for teaching high-risk college students. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 16(1), 2–11.
- Stahl, N. A., Theriault, J. C., & Armstrong, S. L. (2016). Four decades of *JDE* interviews: A historical content analysis. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 40(1), 4–8, 10–12, 14, 16.
- Sticht, T. G. (1998). *Beyond 2000: Future directions for adult education*. El Cajon, CA: Applied Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED427188).
- Strang, R. (1938). *Problems in the improvement of reading in high school and college*. Lancaster, PA: Science Press.
- Triggs, F. O. (1943). *Remedial reading: The diagnosis and correction of reading difficulties at the college level*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Vandal, B. (2014). *Assessment and placement: Supporting student success in college gateway courses*. Complete College America. Retrieved from <http://completecollege.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Assessmentand-Placement-Final-PDF.pdf>
- Wachen, J., Jenkins, D., Belfield, C., & Van Noy, M. (2012). *Contextualized college transition strategies for adult basic skills students: Learning from Washington state's I-BEST program model*. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.