THE WRITING LAB

NEWSLETTER

...FROM THE EDITOR...

On page 15 of this month's newsletter you'll see a momentous first: the announcement of the first European Writing Center Association conference. This is yet another affirmation of the presence of writing centers as integral to educational institutions around the globe. Though begun primarily present in American and Canadian schools, writing centers are now available to students in Asian, Middle Eastern, and European institutions as well.

As the addition of the European group indicates new geographical horizons for writing centers, the authors of this month's articles also remind us that we are still working on solutions to problems that continue to need our attention. Beth Hewett describes a program to bring closer integration with learning disabilities specialists on her campus, Cherie Murray offers a vivid account of how she recognized more fully the needs of students whose first language is not English, and Sara Sobota shares with us her use of a homegrown video to combat student misperceptions about what a writing center is.

And as always, we welcome your contributions to the newsletter as well.
• Muriel Harris, editor

...INSIDE...

Helping students with learning disabilities: Collaboration between writing centers and special services

As teachers and writing consultants, we are challenged by students with special needs, which range from sight, hearing, and mobility impairment to cognitive disabilities such as dyslexia and auditory or visual processing difficulties. Through the special services offices of our various institutions, we may receive letters about students with identified needs and generally learn how to offer them fair and equal classroom treatment. However, our experiences with these students often are frustrating and unsatisfying because we do not know enough about how to help them. Recognizing our limited knowledge and skills in helping students with disabilities to read and write well, we often flounder and leave teaching situations feeling that we have missed a key opportunity to help a student address a particular challenge. Many of us would welcome rescue through more practical knowledge of the problems, better training to recog-

nize and deal with them, and access to technological tools that address special needs. We sense that our students would be equally grateful if we were better prepared.

The Community College of Baltimore County at Essex (CCBC Essex) serves about 300 students with documented disabilities, of which 170 are learning disabilities. However, we cannot begin to estimate the number of students with similar learning disabilities who either have not disclosed their

situations or who do not even know that their learning problems are disability-related. Further, even for students who have self-disclosed their disability, at CCBC Essex, there has been no official mechanism for them to disclose their needs in the Writing Center, suggesting that a substantial number of students who use the Writing Center have undisclosed disability- based writing challenges.

Our consultants, all professional college instructors, indicated that they needed and wanted much more guidance about these issues. Eager to learn how we could train consultants better to help students with disabilities, I met with the Director of the Office of Special Services. Together, we developed a three-pronged program for linking the Writing Program, especially the Writing Center, and the Office of Special Services: (1) laying the foundation by increasing communication between the Writing Center and Office of Special Services; (2) supporting the framework by developing cooperative training for Writing Center consultants and Special Services counselors; and (3) furnishing the structure with shared access to essential technology. This program-level initiative considers not only how to train Writing Center consultants to address special needs students, but it also addresses what Special Services counselors should know about the Writing Center and the Writing Program to serve their students more completely.

Laying the Foundation for Collaboration

Our initial concern was to increase communication between our offices while preserving counselor-student confidentiality. Already, the Office of Special Services specified a procedure for notifying teachers about a student's disability. This procedure ensured confidentiality by requiring permission from disabled students before sending generalized letters to teachers about individual students' special classroom and study needs. Upon notification,

teachers legally could talk with counselors and the students about these specific needs. Our joint program initiative developed a similar protocol. We wrote a disclosure statement and included it on the *Student Data Form* that is filled out once a semester and kept in the student's Writing Center file. The statement encourages students with learning and/or other disabilities to disclose their special needs. Although the law forbids consultants to ask students directly about undisclosed disabilities, they can point to this written statement when new students read the *Student Data Form*. This document, somewhat public in that any Writing Center assistant or consultant can view it, does not record the student's response. In private consultation with the Writing Center secretary or Director, students fill out a *Release of Information* form giving the Office of Special Services permission to share appropriate information with Writing Center consultants for the current academic year. Students may, of course, withdraw permission at any time.

The Writing Center sends a copy to the Office of Special Services; then, the student's counselor sends to the Writing Center a detailed letter that specifies writing and reading issues that affect that student's learning processes. The Writing Center keeps this letter in a color-coded file; a similar color-coded circle on the student's file indicates that a letter is available for consultants to read and that they may talk directly with the student about his/ her disabilities.

The system for increased communication and confidentiality works from the Office of Special Services to the Writing Center, as well. Special Services counselors, who have the first contact with self-identified students with disabilities, are especially important to the process. At their meeting, they give students a copy of the Writing Center brochure, explain how the Writing Center might help them, encourage self-disclosure, and offer the

Release of Information. Thus, working together, we have increased our ability to give particular and informed help to students with learning disabilities.

Supporting the Framework with Collaborative Training

The second stage in our program initiative, collaborative training for both Writing Center consultants and Special Services counselors, involves both staff development and on-going dialogue between the two programs.

First, we prepare a joint staff development session. The Writing Center provides to the Office of Special Services documents regarding a student with a self-disclosed learning disability: a writing assignment; available drafts and final text; the student profile derived from the *Student Data Form*; pertinent daily case notes; and an analysis of the final text for the higher order concerns of idea development, attention to the assignment, content, and organization and for the lower order concerns of sentence error patterns, style, and mechanics. At the Office of Special Services, a counselor uses the student's case file to provide detailed information about the particular learning disability involved. Then, she analyzes the student text for recognizable learning disability markers. She also addresses the student's assignment sheet to isolate instructions that might prove particularly confusing for that student; often the writing itself reveals such confusion. Finally, the Special Services counselor determines the student's unique needs and the implications for tutoring. During the actual training session, to protect confidentiality, the case study is presented anonymously. The consultants gain a fuller picture of the particular student and learn how to extrapolate from one student's learning disability-related challenges to a wider population.

The detailed case study considered in the training session opens a dialogue that enables us to outline specific methods for helping particular stu-

dents. Just as useful, however, is the opportunity for Writing Center consultants to express their concerns, frustrations, and occasional disbeliefs about students with learning disabilities. Misconceptions are aired about students with disabilities: *They don't put out the effort. They lack ability and should not be in college. Their entire problem is due to poor past good instruction. They are no different from our other developmental and under-prepared students.* The Special Services counselor uses this opportunity to handle skepticism by discussing the existence and wide variety of learning disabilities. She explains that for students with learning disabilities, some cognitive and language challenges will never be resolved, but always will require specific compensatory techniques. Thus, the training shifts the focus of tutoring away from the frustrated consultant and onto the students, whose intellectual and scholarly development requires that they take responsibility for learning and using compensatory techniques appropriate to their particular challenges. To assist such development, consultants learn some tutoring strategies for helping students with learning disabilities, as well as how to access useful textual and website resources.

This dialogue between the Office of Special Services and Writing Center is instructive for both parties, of course. Once back in their offices, armed with a better understanding of the Writing Center's mission, procedures, and student/consultant challenges, the Special Services counselors can assist students who regularly meet with them to discuss their classes.

Furnishing the Structure with Shared Access to Essential Technology

The third part of our joint program involves sharing knowledge about, and access to, instructional and adaptive software. Many of the latest developments in both the writing and the special services fields are technology-

based. This phase of building links between the Writing Center and Office of Special Services involves training and accessing useful technology.

The Writing Program at CCBC Essex uses several kinds of software to support student learning, including the CD-ROM version of our current college handbook. Together, Special Services counselors and I examine the handbook for its useful features and, with a copy on their computers, counselors can reinforce the value of this common writer's tool when students visit to discuss their college course work.

Other software that we use currently is the Daedalus Integrated Writing Environment (DIWE), developed for computer-mediated communication (CMC). The software, like *Connect*, *CommonSpace*, and *Aspects*, internally networks a computer classroom and allows students to share files and to conduct on-line discussions about both their writing and abstract ideas. Currently, we teach about one quarter of our first-year English composition classes and developmental courses in the networked classroom. By cross-training on this software, we help the Special Services counselors to steer students to appropriate classes by highlighting some of the skills students will learn in a CMC writing course.

Additionally, this training takes our discussion of learning disabilities and writing classes into other practical concerns. For example, my own research into the characteristics and effects of oral and CMC peer talk reveals that success for learning-disabled students may differ in the oral and CMC environments, depending on their individual learning challenges (Hewett, 1998). In two peer group case studies, I found that a student with a documented auditory functioning disorder and an inability to generalize from abstractions had visible and quantifiable problems both contributing and attending to her oral peer response group discus-

sions. She believed her peer group work was relatively worthless in terms of improving her writing, and a textual examination of her writing against her group's chats supported her belief (95-6, 174-6). In a similarly configured CMC peer group, a student with a documented profound reading disability struggled in the networked classroom because he had to write and present his papers on-line, read his peer's papers and comments, and respond (talk) online. He derived his most helpful feedback from the teacher and private tutors (117-9, 188-9). Neither student was well-served in the classroom environment that s/he had chosen (232-3). Such real examples have helped our Special Services counselors to understand that their knowledge of students' particular disabilities can be instrumental in helping them decide which classroom environment might yield more success.

In our cross-training process, the Office of Special Services also shares adaptive software with Writing Center consultants. The consultants learn about software designed to address various learning challenges and learn how to use it.. Perhaps most important, they learn that such technology is not a crutch. Since students still need to be able to edit their writing and to recognize correct word choices and usage, we learn that their work merely is enhanced, and not replaced, by adaptive software. Indeed, some of this software is used by commercial businesses to improve their employees' written products.

One type of adaptive technology is mapping/outlining software. For example, *Inspiration* provides heuristics to help students visualize and organize their thinking with templates and formats for developing concept maps, webs, and other graphical plans. A second type of adaptive technology is word processing software such as *textHelp!*, used with existing programs such as *Word* and *WordPerfect* to eliminate some word processing errors.

textHelp! includes such aids as screen reading, verbal spell checking for dyslexic errors, word prediction, homophone distinction, abbreviation expansion, a speaking thesaurus, and a custom dictionary. Many students with spelling disabilities especially benefit from word prediction software such as *Co-Writer*, *Handi-WORD*, and *Key REP*, all of which anticipate word completion based on what students have begun to type, thus reducing the number of keystrokes needed, aiding spelling accuracy, and decreasing fatigue. Finally, there is voice-activated software, such as *Dragon Dictate*, which is good for students who have better verbalization skills than written expression and which assists physically disabled students in completing written work.

We have placed copies of *Inspiration* and *textHelp!* on two of our Writing Center computers, providing challenged students one more place where they can access this helpful software. Indeed, with trained Writing Center consultants, such students have the added advantage of receiving professional writing assistance while they access useful adaptive software.

Future Challenges

The collaborative training I have just described continues with an on-going attempt to resolve problems. We have no certain answers–just challenges that we (and schools in similar situations) must overcome for the entire initiative to succeed in the long term. The first of these concerns is the time factor. Not only do we need to find the time to have the training where as many counselors and consultants as possible can participate, but we have discovered that one training session per year simply is inadequate, especially given a Writing Center consultant-base that shifts each semester. The issue is further complicated by the mixed consultant-base of full- and part-time faculty; many adjunct faculty find themselves driving from college to college and, as a result, have little time to attend nec-

essary, let alone supplementary, training. Funding these training sessions also is a consideration. As at many schools, the money for necessary staff development is not available, even when paying staff for their valuable time may well increase attendance and, thus, raise the level of service to students. A third issue for us also may affect others. We are in the process of developing an On-line Writing Lab (OWL) to supplement our traditional Writing Center. While we have developed basic procedures for addressing confidentiality for students with learning disabilities in our face-to-face tutorials, an OWL lends anonymity to the tutorial scenario. Such anonymity certainly has its benefits for shy students or for those who believe that using a Writing Center is stigmatizing in and of itself; however, we will need to develop some confidential and legal mechanism for voluntary self-disclosure that will enable our offices to collaborate for these students' benefits. Finally, although we do not use peer consultants and do not foresee doing so in the near future, we recognize that other schools make excellent use of the peer-tutoring model. Such schools with interest in instituting a system like ours will need to consider both confidentiality issues and the problem of whether and how to prepare their students consultants to help self-identified students with learning disabilities.

Because ours is a new program initiative, we do not yet know how many students it will benefit in the next few academic years. But, the positive learning environment facilitated by the increased interaction between the Writing Center and the Office of Special Services has led us to believe that we need to expand the program beyond the Writing Center alone and into the Writing Program as a whole, thus touching the heart of the English Department itself.

Beth L. Hewett
The Community College of
Baltimore County at Essex
Baltimore, MD

Works Cited

Hewett, Beth L. *The Characteristics and Effects of Oral and Computer-Mediated Peer Group Talk on the Argumentative Writing Process*. Diss. The Catholic University of America, 1998. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1998. 9906570.

Resources

Aspects. Software. Group Logic, Inc. Arlington, VA, 1998.

CommonSpace. Software. Sixth Floor Media. Boston: Houghton, 1995.

Connect. Software. Ann Arbor Software and Myron C. Tuman. NY: Norton, 1999.

Co-Writer. Macintosh format. Don Johnston, Inc.; 800-999-4660; http://www.donjohnston.com

Daedalus Instructional System. Software. The Daedalus Group, Inc. Austin, TX. 1999.

Dragon Dictate. Dragon Systems, Inc. 320 Nevada Street; Newton, MA 12160; 800-TALK-TYP; http://www.dragonsys.com

Handi-WORD. PC format. Microsystems Software, Inc.; 600 Worcester Rd.; Framingham, MA 01701-5342; 508-879-9000; http://www.microsys.com

Inspiration. Inspiration Software, Inc. 800-877-4292; http://www.inspiration.com

Key REP. PC format. Prentke Romich Co.; Wooster, OH 44691; 800-262-1984; http://www.prentrom.com

textHelp! Lorien Systems. Available from Envision Technology; Bethesda, MD 28814; 301-654-3568; http://www.texthelp.com

Book Review

Working With Student Writers: Essays on Tutoring and Teaching, Eds. Leonard A. Podis and
JoAnne M. Podis. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.

*Reviewed by Lori Baker (Southwest State University, Marshall, MN), Sarah Dangelantonio (Franklin Pierce
College, Rindge, NH), D'Ann George (Bridgewater State College, Bridgewater, MA), and Neal Lerner
(Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA)*

*(Rather than write four separate reviews, we decided to engage in a threaded, on-line discussion of the book, or-
ganizing our exchange around the topics and questions repeated below. D'Ann edited our original conversation,
and all had the chance to modify or add to their comments.)*

Quick Descriptions of the Book

D'Ann: When I first saw the title of this text, I thought we were blessed with yet another rival for the recent assortment of books that help many of us to structure our tutor-training courses. But while the first section offers practical tutoring advice, and peer tutors at Oberlin wrote many of the often highly personal chapters, this book does not work (nor was it probably intended to work) as a complete guide for beginning tutors or as a central text for tutoring courses. That's not say, however, that novice tutors won't benefit from reading this theoretically-rich book early in their training: those who do will deepen their understanding of why identity and voice should matter to those of us who teach writing in either a lab or classroom setting.

Sarah: I think it might be important to emphasize what I'll call the" no-single voice" nature of this book: the title certainly suggests that it will be wide-ranging, and indeed it is. I would want to be clear that if a person is looking for a book that's just theoretical, or just anecdotal, then that person wouldn't find all that she is looking for here. It is a collection of very diverse pieces, from a diverse group of writers; it is both academic and personal, with both pre-professional and professional voices. But this combination is what I find most useful to me about the book.

Given Your Position on Campus, How Might This Book Prove Handy?

Sarah: As a person who wears many hats (FYC coordinator, writing center director, English faculty, Freshman Seminar coordinator, Gen Ed coordinator), the book appeals to me most because of the various audiences who might find a piece of the text useful . . . For instance, where there is discussion about college discourse communities, I noted that this would be useful to pass along to the instructors of our Freshman Seminar course as these issues are pertinent to working with incoming students.

While the advice in section I is pegged at writing tutors, I also found the segments useful for my faculty who teach FYC and who engage in significant amount of conferencing with students. As a person who is frequently called upon to "suggest a good reading on X," I was pleased with the inclusion of the bibliographies for additional readings.

Neal: My position is varied in similar ways to what Sarah describes. I don't teach a peer-tutoring course, though my writing center staff and I do meet periodically, and often at those meetings we discuss readings. That's probably the place where I'd be most likely to use this book. It's interesting that the chapters that have stayed with me since my initial reading are those

about students' experiences with making sense of the discourse demands of specific teachers and of higher ed generally. It's not the chapters about tutoring per se, but that might say more about my interests and needs than the book itself.

D'Ann: I direct our writing center, teach a tutor-training course, and will eventually teach a course called "Writing and the Teaching of Writing," designed to improve students' writing and prepare them to teach at the secondary school level. Because I want to encourage students to position themselves in a personal, autobiographical way within their academy study, tutoring, and future teaching, I'll end up using the many chapters in this book where authors openly discuss their perspectives as queer, and/or white and middle class, and/or male, etc.

I also think the book provides a valuable critique of the notion that there is only one standard for good academic writing: faced with constant pressure from legislators to guarantee students' performance on standardized tests, future teachers need to hear a counterargument for a greater variety of form and self-expression in student writing.

Lori: I direct our Writing Center and teach a practicum course that is required for English Education students. Often other students take the course as

an elective. All students in the course are required to tutor in the Writing Center for part of their practicum credit.

I see this text as valuable for the students in the class who are going to be teachers; the chapters are rich in first-person stories, often presenting the student view of the writing/tutoring/learning situation under discussion. The readings are accessible and, as Sarah already noted, very diverse, providing a variety of viewpoints and topics.

Another reason I think this text is valuable to share with my peer tutors is that in the class, I have the students do a final project that must include composition theory and research. Many of the chapters written by the students are prime examples of what I would expect from my students, and I love that I can show them published student work and tell them that yes, their voices do count, and they are capable of adding to the discussion in this field.

Along these lines, I have begun an archive of student work from the practicum class in our writing center, and this book inspired me to encourage my students to research not only journals and books but our archives as well.

Shortcomings of the Book

Neal: Okay, just a couple of things to get out of my (limited) hair. The chapters of the book that did specifically deal with tutoring I felt to be awfully prescriptive and not terribly useful. Since they were essentially written for future generations of Oberlin tutors, they had to be quite contextually specific.

Another gripe: I wasn't crazy to see initially how many chapters were written by the editors, and I didn't see those chapters as adding a lot of usefulness to the book. Almost all are reprinted publications, and to be frank, I

thought they gave the text too much of a "vanity press" kind of feel. I also felt that the editors' introductions to each section added very little—except for the bibliographies. They just slowed things down too much and were written in awfully distant-sounding ways.

While I'm at it, let me also complain about the organization of the sections—could you all figure out the rhyme and reason for why some chapters were in some sections?

Okay, my last gripe: I felt that the contributions had a certain "doctrinaire" feeling, particularly with their use of specific terms such as "essentialize" and "New Paradigm." Perhaps it's an inevitable part of the growth process for these students; I can remember doing the same thing after being exposed to liberatory theory. But I would have liked some acknowledgement on the editors' parts that what we were reading in this book came from a particular critical point of view, one that might have had more to do with their tutor-training class than with their emerging "voices."

Okay, enough with the (somewhat) cheap shots.

D'Ann: Like Neal, I wish that the introductions to sections had done more. Perhaps instead of merely summarizing what's to come, they could have suggested how different readers might use each section. For example, how might the section on classroom pedagogy prove useful to a tutor in a writing center?

The peer tutors who work in Bridgewater's center, who each read a section of the book, felt that the book did a better job describing how to position oneself within a text than in a tutorial situation. For example, the piece on Black English contains a wonderful dialogue between three African American students about who speaks Black

English and why, but it fails to explain what a tutor should do when she confronts Black English, or other nonmainstream dialects, in a client's paper.

Even more confusing to my students, the student editor of the conversation erases any trace of dialect from her transcript, implying that tutors should help clients to erase Black English from their writing since, as she claims, "what was being said was a bit more important than how it was said." So much for the elsewhere-emphasized connection between identity and voice!

Lori: I had a difficult time reading the text, in part because I felt like I was reading the student papers from my practicum class, and it's just not time for those yet in the semester! But I don't think I'm the audience for this book. It wasn't written to me as someone who has already studied this field and wants new information; it seemed to be written more for the newcomer, someone who's either a new peer tutor or new to teaching comp or new to directing a writing center.

The last part of the book was more interesting to me, perhaps in part because the reprints there were a little newer and also because I found the first-person accounts by students who had been labeled "other" most interesting.

I too found, like Neal, that there seemed to be too many reprints—some stuff quite dated—and that those led the rest of the chapters. But someone fill me in here: Are the Podises well-known in writing center work? Were these reprinted articles pretty important in their day? I don't want to be dismissive or insulting—I'm just trying to figure out my own positioning in relation to the text and the authors.

One of those "positioning" issues has to do, I think, with my coming through

grad school specifically in Rhet/Comp. I can tell that the assumptions underlying theory here seem to originate more in literary theory. (Maybe that accounts in part for the D'Ann's peer tutors' excellent insight about how the book helps position oneself to a text and not so much a tutorial situation.)

In the intro to the last section, the very first sentence refers to issues facing English and comp studies and cites the "reforming of the literary canon" first. I found that a little odd for a book on tutoring, but then, I need to acknowledge that the book is on tutoring of all types and not so narrowly restricted to tutoring *composition.* That's actually a strength of the book, as is the fact that they want to pay attention to the marginalization of teaching composition.

About the doctrinaire qualities that Neal mentions: I noticed them too, but I thought the recurrence of those terms had more to do with the composition theory and history that the students read for their peer tutoring class and then responded to in their final papers (which became the chapters of this book).

Sarah: For me, one of the biggest pluses was also in some ways a minus: while I like that I could deploy various pieces to different audiences, I didn't like the piecemeal nature of the text (all those voices; some of them weren't at all engaging). It seemed to only loosely hang together, so much so that I don't think I'd use the text in a class because I don't think there's enough that would be useful.

I can't offer any insight about the Podises and their positioning within Writing Center studies, but I'd agree with the "vanity press" feel commentary. Though it may just be the nature of a collection of essays (many of which had been written years before), the "look at us" factor seemed pretty high. "Limited usefulness" would be one way I'd sum it up.

Lori: I agree with you: while I don't think that I would make students buy the book for a class, I'd like to show it to them, and they might want to reference it in their own research. I might use a couple of chapters for readings, but not the whole thing.

What was Your Favorite Chapter and How Might You Use It?

D'Ann: Since many of us commented positively on the book's engagement with issues of voice, identity, and the personal, I thought I might squeeze a few more comments out of you guys. I'll begin.

Emily Fawcett, a peer tutor, does a great job explaining why the language of college professors often seems so detached and dehumanized: in short, they (or should I say we?) fear loss of authority in the classroom. I only wish Fawcett had explored writing centers as important sites for helping students (both tutors and tutees) to critically examine—and perhaps compose alternatives to—a traditional academic voice. Still, I imagine using this chapter to open a discussion with tutors about their own experiences writing for college professors.

Lori: I think Jennifer Wewer's chapter on working with dyslexic tutees would be useful. Wewer, a peer tutor, seems to be writing to other peer tutors who need some background information on dyslexia. Most helpful in this chapter are the quotations and summaries Wewer shares from her interviews with five dyslexic students; hearing what the students say they need and prefer from peer tutoring is valuable. While some of her phrasing seems a little imprecise (for example, she refers to the "New Paradigm," which might be confusing to someone reading only her chapter), her essay provides a perspective that, coupled with other readings on working with learning-disabled students, could spark some good discussion in a practicum class or tutor staff meeting.

I also found Virginia Pryor's chapter, "Writing in Academia: The Politics of 'Style,'" thought-provoking. Pryor writes in three different styles: the extremes between a stridently academic voice and what she refers to as a "Southern rural" style, and a style she considers to be in between the two. While this essay is not directed particularly to writing-center work, Pryor's purposeful manipulation of the style would help peer tutors to consider how the students may be struggling to reconcile or work with different voices. I found the piece to be creative in its structure, and while the deliberate manipulation of style and terminology may turn some readers off, the content could provide the basis for a discussion about how writers, and the students we tutor in particular, learn to navigate (and critique) academic discourse.

Neal: As I said previously, the chapters that deal with students' struggles to write in college were my favorite, but the one that represents that struggle best, I think, was Elizabeth Schambelan's "Defining a Persona Within the Boundaries of Academic Discourse, or God, I Sound Like a Pretentious Ass." The title alone makes it a favorite for me, but Schambelan also manages to critique dominant academic writing conventions without a heavy-handed attack but instead by relating her personal struggle and reflecting on that struggle. For example, she writes "academic writing is problematic to me because it asks me to construct a persona that I dislike." It's the struggle between the personal "I" and the detached and abstract, between Schambelan's vision of herself as "a future grad school student" and as an artist. Sad, of course, that she and others in this book see such polarized, either/or choices. And if so-called "academic writing" is so lousy, why have her teachers placed such value on it? But I take heart in Schambelan's acknowledgment of her need to find "balance" or of "integrating personas" rather than choosing one end of the continuum. That's a powerful message for all student writers and teachers.

*T*UTORS' COLUMN

Lessons from writing words in "Guatemalan"

Sometimes our greatest lessons are learned by accident. We simply stumble upon them without thought beyond the instantaneous dawning which draws us into a moment of wonderful epiphany. That's what happened for me as I tutored a young woman in her second year of college. Maria was a student from Guatemala who spent several half-hour sessions in our university's writing lab, trying to establish an "English as a Second Language" (ESL) confidence which would allow her to respond in writing to a text in a literature class. No matter how hard she tried, no matter what tutoring techniques I used to help her generate even a small bit of pre-writing, Maria could not put words on paper. The assignment we were discussing dealt with Colette's short story titled "The Hand." Our discussion was thorough, and Maria's ideas were sound, so I made several attempts to help her write a single sentence which expressed her feelings about the reading, as the writing assignment directed—something concrete enough to form a thesis.

"It's no use," she said in broken, halted English, "I just can't do it." Maria's lined paper held only a few disconnected words.

I asked, "Why do you think you can't write what you tell me you know and have experienced, what you seem to understand, and about which you have something to say?"

"I don't know," Maria answered, "I can *think* what I want to say in my *head* (and she tapped her forehead with her fist)—if I could only *write* what I want to say in my own language . . .," and her voice trailed to silence as she cradled her head in her hands and leaned on the round table in front of her. For me, a fairly new tutor, this was, however, an insightful moment. My response was immediate: "Then *write* it in your *own* language—we'll translate what we can, and work out the rest." But, perhaps of even more significance, it was at that moment that I realized I had just blurted out a strategy which seemed to give Maria a degree of authority for her own thinking and writing process. Her lights went on, too.

"Can I really do that?" she asked. "Why not?" I responded. And then I watched her relax and begin to write word after word after word. It was an amazing experience for both of us. That afternoon, for the first time in the term, Maria completed a short paper and turned it in to her literature professor. From this experience came my understanding that tutors need to be open and flexible because each new student brings their own ways of knowing, of learning, of expressing themselves; and, our goal, after all, is to help students learn to express themselves, their knowledge and experiences, through successful writing.

First attempts at articulation of an idea or subject often demonstrates "a [basic] writer's "inner, preverbalized thought, not yet shaped for communication" (232) according to Mina P. Shaughnessy, whose work, *Errors & Expectations*, became my tutoring bible some years ago. In that moment with Maria, I had discovered a new perspective in, and technique for tutoring writing. I knew that this is what the "discovery" process is all about—getting everything out of our head on to paper, using whatever tools we have at that moment. As writers, we each discover in our own "language," no matter what language that may be. We write it in shorthand; in hastily sketched ideas, key words, and phrases; in idioms and vernacular; and, we list, cluster, brainstorm, web, cube, network, bubble, and dialogue until our notes are sufficient to recover what we know, what we feel, what we think. Maria wrote what she was thinking in Spanish, and we translated her words, her ideas, and her feelings until she was satisfied with the results. But, this discovery went beyond the common, ESL-type, sentence-level errors which usually get between the brain and the paper. Maria was now free to use her best tool—her *first* language—where her personal authority also exists (along with her "preverbalized," unshaped thoughts), but which had sadly been dormant in the traditional American university classroom.

While ideally there already existed a personal "authority" which should have told Maria it was all right to use her own "voice" in an American college class, the sometimes *overt* (or more often *implied*) intimidation of college classrooms tended to negate that voice for whatever reasons. In the Writing Center, a tutor gave Maria "permission" to write her ideas in the language with which she was the most comfortable, helping her to overcome the classroom fear of responding to a prompt. Early in the process of learning to use an academic language, the tutorial triangle of instructor, student, and tutor needs to work together to encourage all basic writing students to take personal authority for their own written product, but the dilemma

comes in the question, "How do basic writers bridge the gap to academic language before they understand it and have learned how to use it—how to build it?"

One answer seems to be this method of encouraging a student to use his or her own "first language." And it certainly does not stand as a technique for working only with ESL students. It can also be used for all basic writers who come to universities "under-prepared" (as Shaughnessy calls it) to demonstrate in writing, their knowledge and understanding of any particular discipline. Recognizing that all students bring with them, at the very least, dialectic differences, then all students have a first language which separates them from the "King's English." This language should not be labeled "remedial," as if it is something which must be "re-taught," but it should be *expanded* upon. It is the first language which is the students' foundation upon which to build their new-found world in higher education.

Shaughnessy tells us that it is mainly vocabulary which separates the basic writer from the advanced or academic writer, so we can only imagine how difficult it becomes for the ESL student who has to continually translate words as well as build a completely new, very complicated set of academic words and phrases in English—a much more lengthy bridge than for American students, for sure. But, the goal of writing lab tutorials should be each student's personal writing success as he or she acquires this new, very different language which is used across the disciplines, so the starting point is found in what they already know and use. In her seventh chapter titled, "Beyond the Sentence," Shaughnessy reminds her readers that basic writers have the same ideas and points to make as advanced writers; they just don't have the skills and vocabulary to form their thoughts into complex expression (226-227). What better way to help students begin this journey into the land of academia, than to say to them, "Write it in your own words"?

Over the years, I have used this "write-it-in-your-own-language" tool with students of several languages, including two Japanese students who brought their pocket electronic translators to our sessions. But, I have used the technique more often with students who speak Americanized English full of its idioms, jargon, and slang. When the students' papers sound verbose or like inflated prose, I now ask them to look up from their essay and tell me in their own words what it is they are trying to say. It works every time. Then, I tell them to return to their paper and write it like they just said it; the problem that gets in the way of sincere, responsive prose generally goes away. Although it's just a starting point, it's such a simple solution—Maria wrote what she was thinking using her own "Guatemalan" words, and we translated and negotiated her words, her feelings, her ideas, until she was satisfied with the result. This young, very bright ESL student had been freed to use her best tool—the language that she brought from home. A language which gave her a sense of place, where her personal power exists, the place where critical thinking exists, waiting to be expressed. Language, specifically our personal lexicon, is where the personal voice of *all* students is found, no matter what their first language; but, more often than not, that voice remains dormant while it waits for someone to acknowledge it and give it power.

Something still gets in the way, though. Even while I re-read, re-thought, and revised this text, a professor edited for me and gave me new insight into what might be the basic problem: "It's not E*S*L," he pointed out, "it's E*F*L—not English as a *Second* Language; but, English as a *Foreign* Language. Think about it." And he left it at that.

Cherie L. Murray
Eastern Oregon University
LaGrande, OR

Work Cited
Shaughnessy, Mina P. *Errors & Expectations*. New York: Oxford UP. 1977.

Quotable Tutor Quote

"Being able to draw a writer out of his shell, to get him to speak, to write down new ideas, to support his point, to finally make a point—that is the essence of the center. To change the writer."

Caryn Lazzuri
Washington College
Writing Center
Chestertown, MD 21620

Disentangling the writing center grapevine: Creating a video to confront student misconceptions

As a writing center administrator who has never taken a marketing course, I felt a bit unprepared when faced with the task of promoting our center. My sense of inadequacy increased exponentially when I realized that the task is twofold: not only must a Writing Center advertise in order to inform students of its existence, but it must also address and disprove the erroneous and often damaging information about the Writing Center's purpose that seems to weave itself into the collective student (un)consciousness. I knew I had to find the origin of the Writing Center grapevine as I listened to students in the center breathe sighs of relief and amazement when they realized that they would not be ridiculed in the Writing Center, that the consultants are neither published authors nor out-of-touch nerds, and that through a consultation the student might actually learn something more than how to fix a comma splice.

The idea of creating a video to depict and disprove widespread misconceptions about the Writing Center originally came about as I leafed through monthly issues of the *Writing Lab Newsletter*. I had already implemented marketing and motivational procedures suggested by contributors such as Todd McCann and Jim Bell. In addition, James Inman's article on "The Writing Center and Student Expectations" confirmed that the situations I was witnessing in our Writing Center were by no means limited to the students on the Coastal Carolina University campus. The practice of visiting classrooms at the beginning of each semester was already established in our standard marketing repertoire, but somehow it didn't seem to effectively get across to students the crucial tenets of our service. One day as I scanned the glazed-over expressions of a room full of passive and sedate freshmen, I reasoned that perhaps part of the challenge was engaging students' attention during these presentations. Later in the semester, as I watched many of those same students enter the Writing Center expecting to drop off their papers to get them "fixed," I brought forth the issue at a staff meeting.

"If you could get one idea across to every student who enters the room, what would it be?" I asked the consultants.

"Don't be so afraid," said Anita, a junior whose cheerful demeanor is as consistent as her Southern drawl. "Students come in here and they're so nervous that sometimes they can't concentrate on their papers. So I spend the first ten minutes just talking to them, asking about themselves and avoiding the topic of writing altogether," she explained. "Gradually, when they feel more comfortable, we get around to discussing their paper. Then, by the time they leave, they'll say, 'This wasn't so bad.' It makes me wonder, who do they think we are? Some kind of monsters? Do they think we'll laugh at them or yell at them or something?"

Jeanette added, "I wish somebody would tell these students that we DON'T PROOFREAD FOR THEM! I sometimes get tired of students coming in here and acting like we OWE them something, like we're doing them a favor by helping them," she confessed. Sometimes they just sit there while we try to make suggestions, and they don't even listen, and yet when they leave they expect to get an A on their paper! And it's just because they graced our doorway!"

As the conversation progressed, we talked about the kinds of student beliefs and behaviors we commonly encounter and what truths we would have the students understand when they enter the center; between complaining, giggling, and recognizing shared experiences, we created a list of the most common situations that occur as a result of that vast yet elusive verbal network that seems to reach our students long before we do. What began for the consultants as a brainstorming session for common myths about the Writing Center turned into an audience-based informational video. We drafted scripts, selected roles, and memorized lines. As the project evolved and we began incorporating the video into our classroom orientation sessions, I realized that the scope of the project was multi-faceted; not only did it help us directly address the misinformation that seems to proliferate on campus, but it served as a valuable training experience for the consultants, a helpful reminder for faculty members, and a boost for our campus-wide profile.

I allotted an entire semester for creating the video. Rather than focusing on the finished product and working intensely to complete it in a few weeks, I wanted the concept and the project to evolve gradually. The video became a regular topic of discussion among consultants during the first two months of the spring 1997 semester. We wrote the script over a period of two weeks and held a staff meeting in March to conduct a group revision. Coastal's television studio staff lent their assis-

tance and equipment for the filming of the video in early April, which was completed in a few hours, and they also provided the editing, graphics, music, and credits. I suggested a few minor revisions to the product after viewing it a few weeks later, and the video was ready for presentation by the end of the semester.

The Writing Center staff was enthusiastic about the idea of creating a video because it gave them a chance to directly address some issues that affect their jobs on a day-to-day basis. Although a few members were camera-shy at the outset, they were able to overcome their fears with the help of their more extroverted colleagues. Because of the consultants' familiarity with the subject matter, they wrote with genuine voices, and thus the scripts they generated were accurate and realistic. In fact, in the early stages of planning the video, the consultants came up with so many topics for scenes that I had a difficult time envisioning how they could be organized into a coherent piece. In our impromptu chats, we discussed the structure of the video and the variables that would be crucial to its effectiveness. Since it was designed as an element of classroom orientation, it would be directed at first-time freshmen in English classes. Brevity was essential since we wanted to honor both the professor's schedule constraints and the attention span of the typical freshman. Humor was equally important in order to highlight the informal and student-oriented atmosphere of the center.

As we tossed around ideas and rehearsed potential scenes, former Writing Center administrator Susan Meyers expressed a valid concern: all the skits seemed to ridicule the student, while the consultant was consistently portrayed as a bastion of knowledge and polite restraint. She reasoned that all the consultants are quick to recognize student misinformation that leads to difficulties in consultations, but if the video sends a message that focuses

solely on *students'* unproductive behavior and erroneous beliefs, the viewer could reasonably construe that humor as mockery and take offense at the Writing Center's perceived attitude toward its clients. An early draft of one scene, for example, depicted a student who arrives at the center completely unprepared for a consultation, asks senseless questions, and becomes angry when the consultant calmly resists his request for proofreading. Susan suggested that our skits also address various roles the *consultant* may play in contributing to an unproductive consultation, either in response to a misinformed student or in simply failing to uphold the Writing Center's stated objectives. As the consultants began considering how their roles could impel an unproductive consultation into a downward spiral, their reflection on their work in the center became more relevant. In this way, the creation of the script for the video became an important training tool in that it allowed each consultant to consider the ways a student's preconceived notions can negatively impact a consultation as well as the numerous ways his/her role in that consultation can affect its outcome.

As the script for the video went through numerous revisions, the overall structure of the piece took shape. We determined that the first half of the video would consist of a series of skits portraying unproductive sessions in the Writing Center, while the second half would depict a productive session. Thus, students would be left with an accurate example of a typical consultation. I would serve as video narrator, intermittently commenting on the scenes and pointing out how and why misconceptions originate. We filmed the video in the Writing Center so students would both be familiar with the setting when they visited for the first time and so they would take note of its inviting and open atmosphere.

The actual shooting of the film provided another valuable training experi-

ence for all. Some consultants had memorized their lines and rehearsed their scenes repeatedly, while others had merely familiarized themselves with the general concepts to be communicated in their scenes and improvised their lines as the scenes progressed. In each scene, the actors were obligated to revisit the purpose of the video as they literally placed themselves in the position of a first-time client, requiring them to consider that person's viewpoint in intricate detail. On a few of the first takes, the skits degenerated into a scene of giggles and red faces, but by the second or third attempts, the consultants had internalized their roles and accurately portrayed the perspective of those self-conscious and misguided students. As a result, they produced some believable and effective scenes. Such an experience allowed the consultants to reflect upon and empathize with the viewpoint of their characters in a practical and authentic manner.

The topic of the first scene in the video is directed at the student misconception that the Writing Center is staffed by arrogant student writers who are both disinterested in helping others and eager to ridicule their clients' lack of writing ability. The scene opens with a group of Writing Center consultants lounging around the front desk; a few are loudly discussing a party they recently attended while another distractedly draws pictures on the dry-erase board. A timid student, Anita, appears in the doorway. After surveying the scene and slowly entering the room, Anita realizes she is being ignored and coughs softly to gain the consultants' attention. They all turn to face her, and one consultant, Joanne, scoffs, "Quiet, guys. We got one." Anita apologetically explains that she needs some help with her paper while the consultant waves her over to a table, grabs the paper, and begins to read. After a few moments Joanne begins giggling and calls her colleagues over to the table to witness the hopelessly flawed specimen. When another

consultant approaches and, after reading the essay, asks the student how she got into college, Anita snatches her paper out of the consultant's hands and runs from the room in tears.

The second scene is aimed at the student misconception that a Writing Center consultant may make changes to a paper without the consent of the student. The scene opens with a student, Will, and a consultant, Becky, seated at a table. Will asks Becky specifically about the thesis of his paper and whether he develops it fully throughout his essay. Becky responds that, while Will's thesis is "ok," she herself once wrote a "really good" paper on the same topic. She then seizes Will's paper and begins crossing out large portions, replacing his ideas with hers and rephrasing his main points. When Will protests, first politely and then loudly, Becky argues with him, demanding "why are you getting all weird on me? It's still your paper – you see that? Your name's still on the top! Now just be quiet and let me think." Will uneasily acquiesces, muttering, "Well, all right . . . if you say so."

The third scene depicts a situation that occurs when students erroneously believe that the Writing Center consultants will write papers for students. A student, Angelia, plops down into a seat in the Writing Center and despondently begins explaining her predicament. She tells the consultant, Sarah, that she has to write a paper on a short story, but she "[hasn't] even bought the book yet." Angelia explains that her teacher told her to come to the Writing Center for help and that she would like "some ideas – maybe an outline or a rough draft or something" to help her in writing her essay. When Sarah suggests that Angelia read the story first, and then come in to work on a brainstorm together, Angelia takes offense. Implying that Sarah is not fulfilling her duties, Angelia informs her that "my teacher told me to come here. She said you would help me She said you would write my paper for me, actually." The

scene degenerates into an exhibition of insults and name-calling from both parties as Sarah laughs at the preposterous notion and Angelia threatens to have Sarah fired. At the last moment, Angelia angrily pushes back her chair and warns, "I'm going to see your supervisor right now!" "Have a nice day," Sarah responds sarcastically.

The three scenes described occur in succession and comprise the first half of the video. In the next portion, I serve as narrator and conduct an analysis of the three scenes, identifying the misconception involved in each scene and indicating the points at which the consultant and/or the student causes the situation to become negative. Then I explain what should have happened in each scene, why the misconception was erroneous, and how the Writing Center operates in reality. The final portion of the video depicts an accurate scene in the Writing Center, dramatizing the cooperative nature of the consultation and emphasizing that the student retains control of his/her paper at all times.

In the first scene, the consultant, Becky, cheerfully greets the student, Will, and he explains the assignment he has been given as well as the problems he is having with his paper. Becky asks Will to read his paper aloud; afterward, she points out specific parts of the paper she finds effective and asks him if he has particular goals for the session. Will feels that his thesis needs work, and admits that he is unsure whether he develops it fully. Becky agrees that the thesis could be stronger, and they discuss options for revising it. Next, Becky points to an area of the paper in which Will has made a good point but has failed to support it with evidence from the text. The scene fades out as Will is referring to his textbook in search of quotations to add to his essay for support. Both consultant and student are respectful and are focused upon a common goal in this scene as the student's expectations for the session are fulfilled.

Over the last few years, we have presented the video as an element of Writing Center orientation for numerous English classes and freshman seminars. Students' immediate reactions have been largely positive; of course, the scenarios involved in the video have been exaggerated to highlight the absurdity of the actors' assumptions, yet the student viewers understand the problem of miscommunication lurking beneath the humor. Consultants also use the video as a foundation for discussion of the Writing Center's benefits and limitations. The film's comic element communicates informality, which serves as an effective ice breaker to get students to ask questions and take part in a conversation about how the center can become a component of their writing process. Since the person making the presentation is frequently seen in the video, the presenter is thus granted a degree of familiarity with students, which facilitates interaction afterward. I've found that after showing the video, I'm encountering fewer glazed-over expressions from students, and I've even heard a few chuckles at appropriate points; in addition, students seem more willing to ask questions after they've seen a model consultation. The film provides a setting and a context to accompany the service we're promoting, so the Writing Center seems more realistic and practical to our audience after they've "seen it on TV."

While we haven't yet attempted to measure or analyze student response to the video on a broad scale, we have conducted an exercise with two classes. When we showed the video to a group of students as a component of their English 101 class, they were encouraged to visit the Writing Center at some point during the semester. Then, later, we showed the video to those students again and asked them to respond to it, keeping in mind their initial reaction, their actual visit or visits to the Writing Center, and their reaction to the video the second time around. The students were asked what

they did and didn't like about the video, and what they would change about it.

The majority of student responses indicated that they did in fact identify with the fears and anxiety that the student writers in the video displayed. For example, Amy writes, "I find it very useful that the video shows what does *not* happen in the Writing Center. I find it very hard and intimidating to go and share my work with a stranger. I think the first three scenes really address the concerns of most students." Continuing, she notes, "Until I came to Coastal I had never experienced a writing lab so I was not really sure what to exspect [sic]. I did see the video before I made my first visit and it kind of calmed my nerves. I think everyone feels they will be laughed at and told their writing is bad." Brian agrees with Amy. He writes, "The video was a good way to show students what the Writing Center is. The scenarios were extremely life-like. As I was watching I could relate to the students in the video." He adds, "When I first went to the Writing Center I felt like all three of the students. Scared, nervous, and stubborn. I think that when students who haven't been to the Writing Center see this video they may become more relaxed about getting help. Showing your work to other people and asking for help is a really hard thing to do. Most people never show their work to anyone. The video show [sic] a relaxed and friendly atmosphere that might encourage someone who might never go to the Writing Center to give it a try." Nick, meanwhile, admits the reality that students might try to take advantage of the Writing Center. He writes, "One thing that I thought was very useful was the scene with the girl that thought that she could get her paper written for her. A lot of people think that they could get a free ride and they need a reality check." One student appreciated the opportunity to watch the video in the presence of his professor; this delivery seemed to send an important message of confirmation about the Writing Center from the instructor.

In addition to the written feedback we have received, reactions to the video have emerged in numerous forums. More than one student writer has crossed the threshold of our doorway, hesitated, and exclaimed, "I feel like I'm in the video!" Consultants have reported that students stop them while walking across campus to compliment them, sometimes with good-natured sarcasm, on their acting abilities. Several faculty members have commented that their students enjoyed the video and that they learned from it as well. Overall, the video has made a memorable impression in the minds of its viewers and thus has had a substantial impact on the Writing Center's campus-wide profile.

While it may be impossible to locate the exact origin of the Writing Center grapevine, an educational video is one way to confront the confusion and misinformation it can cause. Central to the concept of disproving potential misconceptions about our service is the importance of becoming attuned to the informal student conversations that thrive around campus. If we as Writing Center administrators and staff can tap into those conversations and learn to understand and anticipate student perspectives, problems, and needs, we will be equipped to not only confront misconceptions but to use that conversation to our advantage in reaching students and helping them to become better writers.

Sara J. Sobota
Coastal Carolina University
Conway, SC

(To purchase a copy of the video, please send $10 to cover cost of the tape and shipping to Sara Sobota, Writing Center, Coastal Carolina University, PO Box 261954, Conway, SC 29528-6054. E-mail: sobota@coastal.edu.)

Works Cited

Bell, Jim. "Promotional Ideas for Writing Centers." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 21.1 (September 1996): 13-14.

Inman, James. "The Writing Center and Student Expectations: A Case Study." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 21.5 (January 1997): 1-3, 5.

McCann, Todd. "Using Skits to Get the Word Out." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 21.1 (September 1996): 5-7.

Northeast Writing Centers Association

Call for Proposals
March 31, 2001
Worcester, MA
"Literacies, Identities, and Power"
Keynote speaker: Howard Tinberg

The announcement for the conference (including information about accommodations) and the call for proposals are available at<http://www2.clarku.edu/resources/writingcenter/NEWCA/>. Deadline for proposals: December 29, 2000. For further information, contact Anne Ellen Geller, Director of the Writing Center and Writing Program, Clark University, 950 Main Street, Worcester, MA 01610; phone: 508-793-7469; e-mail: angeller@clarku.edu

European Writing Center Association

Call for Proposals
June 18-20, 2001
Groningen, the Netherlands
"Teaching Academic Writing across Europe"

The First Conference of the European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing in cooperation with the First Conference of the European Writing Center Association welcomes writing program administrators, writing center staff, teachers, researchers, and students with an interest in the teaching of academic writing. Conference language: English. Proposal guidelines are described on the website: <http://www.hum.ku.dk/formindling/eataw/>. E-mail: eataw.conference@let.rug.nl; fax: ++31.503636855/ Deadline for sending proposals (in English and by e-mail): November 30, 2000. Confirmation and provisional program will be issued in January 2001.

Northern California Writing Centers Association

Call for Proposals
March 3, 2001
Ronhert Park, California
"Learning Together: The Writing Center as Cosmo-polis"

Deadline for submissions is December 15, 2000. For further conference and submission information, visit our website at <http://www.sonoma.edu/programs/writingcenter/ncwca2001/>. Also feel free to contact the convention organizers, Scott L. Miller and Rose Gubele, at the SSU Writing Center, 1801 E. Cotati Ave., Rohnert Park, CA 94928 (e-mail: writing.center@sonoma.edu; phone 707-664-4401).

Jean Kiedaisch Wins 2000 NCPTW Maxwell Leadership Award

Congratulations to Jean Kiedaisch, Director of the Academic Support Program at the University of Vermont, for winning the 2000 National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing (NCPTW) Ron Maxwell Award for Distinguished Leadership in Promoting the Collaborative Learning Practices of Peer Tutors in Writing. The award recognizes an individual for dedication to and leadership in collaborative learning in writing centers, for aiding students in together taking on more responsibility for their learning; thus, for promoting the work of peer tutors. Its presentation also denotes extraordinary service to the evolution of this Conference.

The Maxwell Award honors leadership that is demonstrated in a variety of ways, including but not limited to the following:
- Building a record of bringing peer tutors to present at the Conference
- Giving service to the NCPTW through hosting the Conference, serving as program chair, leading in the search for future sites, etc.
- Fostering leadership skills among peer tutors
- Showing evidence of leadership in collaborative learning on the home campus
- Developing innovative peer tutoring programs in the home community
- In general, welcoming and meeting new challenges in leading a center guided by a collaborative learning philosophy

While other aspects of a candidate's professional performance, e.g., work with professional tutors, writing center research, and publication are respected by the NCPTW and are surely interrelated, this award is intended to recognize meritorious work in an area too little acknowledged.

Calendar for Writing Centers Associations

November 2-4, 2000. National Writing Centers Association in conjunction with the Mid-Atlantic Writing Centers Association, in Baltimore, MD. Conference website: <http://www.english.udel.edu/wc/mawca/nwcacon.html>

Feb. 16-18, 2001: Southeastern Writing Centers Association, in Auburn, AL
Contact: Isabelle Thompson, Auburn University (thompis@groupwise1.duc.auburn.edu) and Glenda Conway, University of Montevallo (conwayg@montevallo.edu)

March 3, 2001: Northern California Writing Centesr Association, in Rohnert Park, CA
Contact: Scott L. Miller and Rose Gubele at the Sonoma State University Writing Center, 1801 E. Cotati Ave., Rohnert Park, CA 94928. Ph: 707-664-4401; e-mail: writing.center@sonoma.edu. Conference website: <http://www.sonoma.edu/programs/writingcenter/ncwca2001>

March 23-24, 2001: East Central Writing Centers Association, in Granville, OH
Contact: Cindy Johanek, English Dept, Denison University, Granville, OH 43023. Ph: 740-788-9288; e-mail johanek@denison.edu. Conference website:<http://www.denison.edu/ecwca2001>

March 31, 2001: Northeast Writing Centers Association, in Worcester, MA
Contact: Anne Ellen Geller, Writing Center/Writing Program, Clark University, 950 Main Street, Worcester, MA 01610, (508) 793-7469, angeller@clarku.edu. Conference website: <http://www2.clarku.edu/resources/writingcenter/NEWCA/>

18-20 June 2001: European Writing Center Association, in Groningen, The Netherlands
Contact: e-mail: eataw.conference@let.rug.nl; fax: ++31.503636855. Conference website: <http://www.hum.ku.dk/formidling/eataw/>

THE WRITING LAB
N E W S L E T T E R