# THE WRITING LAB NEWSLETTER

Volume 30, Number 6 Promoting the exchange of voices and ideas in one-to-one teaching of writing February, 2006


## ...FROM THE EDITOR...

This month's *Writing Lab Newsletter* reflects the preparations going on for many upcoming conferences and for International Writing Centers Week (Feb. 12-18). You can read about the Indaba at Stellenbosch University in South Africa and the video on the Kansas State Writing Center's Web site. And our growing internationalism is also evident in the announcement of the European Writing Centers Association Conference.

In addition, we have Judy Gills' research report on her study of tutor training courses, how they are named, what texts and activities are included in courses, and how they reflect our approaches to tutor training. James Elmborg's discussion of the common ground in libraries and writing centers offers numerous insights into how they can work together for the benefit of students. Heather Honsaker examines the importance of putting students at ease and reports on strategies she uses, while Kiersten Honaker concludes that there is no single "tutoring style" because of the very nature of one-to-one tutoring.

We welcome responses to any of the content in this month's issue. Send as "Letters to then Editor" (preferably not over 200 words or so) to me at harrism@purdue.edu.

• *Muriel Harris, Editor*

## ...INSIDE...



## The professionalization of tutor training

In most of the scholarship on tutor training, introducing prospective tutors to the professional conversation about teaching and tutoring writing and encouraging them to participate in that conversation is applauded and encouraged. Carol Singley and Holly Boucher (1998), for example, argue that tutor training courses need to include "challenging readings to inform and shape [tutoring] experience….presented in the spirit in which they were written, as dialogues in a continuing debate over teaching and learning" (19). Not all writing center scholars are so sanguine about this approach. Terrance Riley fears that a tutor training course that "covers major theoretical figures" and encourages students to "contemplate our professional principles" is part of a "move closer to the mainstream" and undermines the vitality and variety characterizing early writing center work (30). In a similar vein, Peter Vandenberg characterizes the "professionalizing approach" to tutor training as one "that establishes awareness of the specialized discourse of writing center scholarship as a standard for tutor competence" (60). In his 1999 article "Lessons of Inscription: Tutor

The ***Writing Lab Newsletter***, published in ten monthly issues from September to June by the Department of English, Purdue University, is a publication of the International Writing Centers Association, an NCTE Assembly, and is a member of the NCTE Information Exchange Agreement. ISSN 1040-3779. 

**Editor:** Muriel Harris
**Managing Editor**: Charlotte Hartlep, English Dept., Purdue University, 500 Oval Drive, West Lafayette, IN 47907-2038; 765-494-7268.
e-mail: harrism@purdue.edu (or) wln@purdue.edu
web site:http://owl.english.purdue.edu/wln

**Subscriptions:** The newsletter has no billing procedures. Yearly payments of $15 (U.S. $20 in Canada) are requested, and checks must be received four weeks prior to the month of expiration to ensure that subscribers do not miss an issue. Please make checks payable to Purdue University and send to the Managing Editor. Prepayment is requested for all subscriptions.

You may also subscribe to the *Writing Lab Newsletter* and the *Writing Center Journal,* plus become a member of the International Writing Centers Association by visiting <http://www. iwcamembers. org>. Please pay by check or online by credit card.

**Manuscripts:** Submission guidelines are available on the *WLN* Web site. Recommended length for articles is approximately 2500-3000 words, 1500 words for reviews and Tutors' Column essays, in MLA format. If possible, please send as attached files in an e-mail to wln@purdue.edu. Otherwise, send hard copy and a computer disk or CD-ROM, and please enclose a self-addressed envelope with return postage not pasted to the envelope. The deadline for announcements is 30 days prior to the month of issue (e.g. Sept. 1 for an October issue).

Training and the 'Professional Conversation'," Vandenberg worries that the professionalizing approach to tutor training makes peer tutors "extensions of values and desires written deeply into the institution, into us" (60) and "replicate[s] our worst self-image" (79).

Riley's and Vandenberg's articles raised a number of questions in my mind about what is actually happening in the credit-bearing tutor training courses that are the standard method of preparing students to become writing center tutors, especially at schools with established writing centers. How do these courses prepare students for the actual work of tutoring in a writing center setting (the practical component) while they introduce them to the written discourse of the writing center field and invite them to participate in its scholarly discourse (the theoretical component)? What is the balance between tutorial-based, practical training and "professionalized" training described by Vandenberg?

To begin to answer these questions, I looked at the syllabi of seventy-five tutor training courses currently offered at colleges and universities across the country. Forty-three percent of the courses are offered at large, public universities, both main and branch campuses; thirty-five percent are from four-year liberal arts colleges, 20% are from private universities, and 2% are from community colleges. The great majority of these courses train undergraduate peer tutors; a half dozen include both undergraduate and graduate students, while three train graduate students only. In analyzing these syllabi, I considered the common components of syllabi: course titles, required texts, course requirements, stated aims and objectives, and activities. My intention is not to respond to the views expressed by Riley and Vandenberg about the professionalization of writing center work, but to see if their claims about professionalization of tutor training are supported by evidence provided in course syllabi.

Before I began collecting syllabi, I expected that local differences in institutional setting, tutoring philosophy, and tutoring practices would be reflected in considerable diversity among tutor training courses. What I found were remarkable similarities in the all aspects of the courses. One of the most salient commonalities is the use of the words "theory" and "practice" to characterize the courses, from their titles to their goals and objectives. I don't think that tutor training is everywhere the same, for as Lisa Ede reminds us, it is crucial to keep in mind both the "situational diversity" and "the philosophical diversity that exist among writing centers" (116). But I do think that professionalization accounts in large part for the similarities among tutor training programs, a situation augmented by technological advances that enable tutor training teachers to share experiences and ideas on a national and international level and enable tutors-in-training to engage in behaviors in a manner similar to professionals in the field.

### Course titles

As D'Ann George wrote in *The Writing Lab Newsletter,* picking a course title is critical in getting a new tutor training course proposal accepted. Because the biggest obstacle to acceptance "may be your colleagues' doubts about the academic merit of the course" (3), George recommends not focusing on "the usefulness of the course in training staff for the writing center" (4). It's best, she writes, to avoid certain words in course titles that emphasize the practical aspect of the course, words like "practice," "tutor," "tutoring," and "training" (4-5). I found that the titles of many current courses are explicit about their function in preparing students to tutor in a writing center and, in fact, use words that denote that function. Among seventy-five tutor training courses, I found that 33% of the titles include the word "tutoring" and 8% use the word "tutor," both of which are usually modified by the word "peer." Ten percent

of the titles include the word "training," while 20% include the word "practice." It is important to note, however, that every time the word "practice" appears in a title, it is combined with the word "theory," as in "Theory and Practice of Teaching Writing." This linguistic construction supports George's findings about the importance of the politics of institutional standards. The tutor training course at my school used to be called "Rhetoric and Pedagogy," which sounded academically rigorous and masked its tutor training function. In 1996, I proposed that the title be changed to "Teaching Writing: Theory and Practice," a more accessible and descriptive title. The English Department and the college's academic program committee approved the change without question. We could announce publicly that the course had practical component, but the new title still privileged the theoretical and, by using the word "teaching" rather than "tutoring," located the course within the academically respectable field of composition studies.

### Course readings

The readings—articles and books—used in tutor training courses, like the course titles, reflect their theoretical and practical aspects. The two kinds of books most commonly used in tutoring training programs are "tutorial-centered 'practical' manuals" (Vandenberg 60) and edited collections of scholarly articles. All of the seventy-five tutor training course syllabi I looked at contain at least one required book among the readings. The most widely used are the manuals, which offer tutors-in-training practical strategies and techniques that can be employed in tutorials. Slightly over two thirds of the courses use a training manual. The most frequently assigned manuals have been published in the last six years, but two older manuals—Emily Meyer and Louise Smith's *The Practical Tutor* (1987) and Muriel Harris's *Teaching One-to-One* (1986)—also appear frequently in current tutor training course syllabi. While the focus of the newer manuals remains on the tutorial, they contextualize tutoring within theoretical developments in composition studies and introduce students to the professional conversation among writing center scholars.

Of the books that are collections of articles, the most frequently used is the only one published so far that is explicitly geared toward writing tutors: Christina Murphy and Steve Sherwood's *The St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors,* which appears as a required text in 23% of the syllabi I examined. The next most frequently used collection (8%) is Robert Barnett and Jacob Blumner's *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice*. Sixty-three percent of courses supplement required books with handouts or reading packets (the teacher's own "collection" of articles). That so many tutor training courses do use both manuals and collections of essays suggests that while what Vandenberg calls the "'newly practical'" approach to tutor training embodied in the manuals is still a dominant approach, it is no longer considered sufficient in preparing today's tutors. Those of us who teach these courses appear to want our students to understand the larger institutional, theoretical, and historical context in which tutoring takes place and to expose them to the issues and debates within the field, and so we supplement the manuals with collections of articles.

I suspect that, just as new training manuals continue to be published and older ones come out in new editions, new collections of articles on tutoring writing will also proliferate. One such collection appeared in August 2004, a collection of essays on tutoring ESL writers: Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth's *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors.* The appearance of this book may signal a new direction in tutor training texts and in writing center scholarship—books addressing a particular issue or aspect of tutoring writing. And such specialization is another symptom of professionalization.

### Course requirements

In the "Requirements" section of tutor training course syllabi, almost all instructors stress the importance of active participation in all aspects of the course, because it is preparing students to be "doers" and "practitioners" as well as learners. The requirements in most tutor training courses can be categorized as reading, writing, and tutoring activities. Twenty years ago, when tutor training was still in its early stages of development, Linda Bannister-Wills' examination of several prominent tutor training programs revealed "a number of usable techniques: peer criticism, the use of handouts, a discussion of current literature on composing and tutoring, self-evaluation, study of the composing process, role-playing, investigation of interpersonal skills and learning styles, the use of handbooks, and staff meetings" (136-7). The practicum course Bannister-Wills describes, a "'theory in practice'" course in which students tutor in the writing center, "encourages students to investigate and discuss composition theory [while] in the center their discoveries are put into practice" (139).

My examination of current tutor training course syllabi reveals that the techniques most frequently used twenty years ago are still the most frequently employed today. Fifty-two percent of the courses require students to tutor in the writing center. Having students observe tutorial sessions conducted by experienced tutors in the writing center is listed as a requirement in 36% of the syllabi. In-class presentations are required in 47% of the courses, while 16% require students to engage in peer critique of one another's writing. The writing component of tutor training courses includes short, formal papers (59%), final research paper or project (53%), and informal writing (47%). Informal writ-

ing assignments are often ungraded and include reading journals, tutoring logs, and response papers in which students are asked to make connections between their readings and their experiences as tutors-in-training. While most of what students "do" in tutor training courses—read, discuss, write, observe, tutor—does not seem to have changed much in twenty years, the relationship between tutors-in-training and professionals in the field is differently presented.

New technologies—class listservs, bulletin boards, e-mail exchanges, electronic discussion groups—are widely employed to give tutors-in-training an opportunity "to produce and interpret texts in a way similar to that of professionals" (Vandenberg 70). Twenty percent of courses take advantage of technology to enable students to "talk to each other," mimicking the way in which members of the writing center community engage in scholarly conversation and encouraging students to develop their own tutoring philosophy through reflection on the readings and response to their peers' ideas. Other ways instructors encourage their students to see themselves as part of the professional community include having them subscribe to a professional listserv such as WCenter or WACL, prepare materials for use in the writing center, write reviews of recent publications in the field, write a proposal for a conference presentation, or write an article for a publication like *The Writing Lab Newsletter, Praxis,* or *The Dangling Modifier*. So we have the curious situation of required training pedagogies in some ways remaining virtually unchanged in twenty years and in other ways having become almost unrecognizably altered. The major shift in course activities, enabled by technology, is, I believe, the result of the professionalization of tutor training and tutors-in-training.

While teachers of tutor training courses frequently employ new technologies in their classes, one of the most significant innovations in tutoring in recent years, online tutoring, is rarely mentioned in tutor training course syllabi. Several syllabi include technology in the writing center or computers in the writing center among the topics to be covered, but technology training is not a requirement in the great majority of tutor training course syllabi. Only one syllabus devotes a class meeting specifically to online tutoring, and only one syllabus lists among its required texts a book about online tutoring, James Inman and Donna Sewell's *Taking Flight with Owls.*

**Course aims and objectives**

Although in writing center circles we talk about the importance of local context, it does not appear to have much influence in tutor training. Variables such as the institutional roles of writing centers; the composition of the writing center staff; whether the school is public or private; the composition of the writing center clientele; and whether the school is a university or college appear to have little impact on course aims and goals. Riley predicted that as writing centers move into the mainstream of institutional culture, acquire academic respectability, and attain professional success, we would "renew the promise that we all do the same thing and will continue to deliver the same goods—that writing center people can be trusted to do pretty much the same things in one place as another"(31), a prediction that seems to be born out in the aims and goals outlined in the syllabi.

In the "aims and goals" sections of the syllabi, just as in the course titles and the readings, the emphasis in most courses is on balancing theory and practice in preparing students to become writing center tutors. The goals and objectives stated in the syllabi include a "practical" and a "theoretical" component, usually positioning the practical within a theoretical framework. One variation in the aims and objectives section of the syllabi is the order in which the practical and theoretical goals are presented. Some descriptions of course objectives place the practical or training aspect of the course first while others place the training aspect in a secondary position. The theoretical framework of most tutor training courses is composition theory, but as the writing center field comes more and more to resemble composition studies as an academic subdiscipline, with its own history and pedagogy, some courses focus more narrowly on writing center history, philosophy, and administration; these courses are usually offered at the graduate or upper-level undergraduate level.

I predict that as more scholarly articles and books on writing centers are published, more tutor training courses will focus on writing center theory and practice. This semester, for example, my tutor training course will reflect the ongoing professionalization of the writing center field in that *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice w*ill be our primary text. Rather than reading and writing about composition history and theory, the students are reading and responding to scholarship on writing center history, theory, and practice. At the same time, I am devoting more time to what might be considered "practical" training—getting out of the classroom and into the center where the actual work of peer tutoring happens. My sense so far is that the students are more engaged with the reading because they see that it has direct implications for the work they are undertaking as peer writing tutors. The professionalization of writing center work can present then an opportunity to bridge a gap between theory and practice in tutor training.

*Judy Gill*
*Dickinson College*
*Carlisle, PA*

Works Cited


Bannister-Wills, Linda. "Developing a Peer Tutoring Program." *Writing Centers: Theory and Administration.* Ed. Gary A. Olson. Urbana: NCTE, 1984. 132-143.

Barnett, Robert W., and Jacob S. Blumner, eds. *Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001.

Bruce, Shanti, and Ben Rafoth, eds. *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2004.

Ede, Lisa. "Writing Centers and the Politics of Location: A Response to Terrance Riley and Stephen M. North." *Writing Center Journal* 16 (1996): 111-130.

George, D'Ann. "Lobbying for New Courses in Writing Center Theory/ Pedagogy." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 27 (2002): 1-5.

Harris, Muriel. *Teaching One-to-One: The Writing Conference.* Urbana: NCTE, 1986.

Inman, James and Donna Sewell, eds. *Taking Flight with OWLs: Examining ElectronicWriting Center Work.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000.

Meyer, Emily, and Louise Z. Smith. *The Practical Tutor.* New York: Oxford UP, 1987.

Murphy, Christina, and Steve Sherwood. *The St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors.* New York: St. Martin's, 1995.

Riley, Terrance. "The Unpromising Future of Writing Centers."*Writing Center Journal* 15 (1994): 20-34.

Singley, Carol J., and Holly W. Boucher. "Dialogue in Tutor Training: Creating the Essential Space for Learning." *Writing Center Journal* 8 (1998): 11-22.

Vandenberg, Peter. "Lessons of Inscription: Tutor Training and the 'Professional Conversation'." *Writing Center Journal* 19 (1999): 59-83.


# A writing center video celebrates its birthday

A recent discussion on the WCenter listserv invited ideas for celebrating the upcoming International Writing Centers Week (February 12-18, 2006) and for celebrating writing center birthdays.

At the University of Kansas we made a film to mark our fifth birthday (2003) and it is available for viewing on our Web site as a quasi-promotional tool. Scroll down our picture page and view a short or long version (Real Player needed): <http://www.writing.ku.edu/gallery/>.

This group project involved several tutors who ran the camera, edited the film, and mixed a soundtrack. We used a handheld digital camera we borrowed from our instructional development office and filmed for one week.

The best thing about this inexpensive and fun project was the way the film lives on, on our Web site, as a kind of view into our work, to what might happen in the writing center during any given week. I watched the long version (17 minutes) again the other day just because I miss some of the students who were in the film. You can watch the short version (seven minutes) and get sense of our excitement over turning five years old.

Thanks for letting me share this with you!


*Michele Eodice*
*University of Kansas*
*Lawrence, KS*
*meodice@ku.edu*


## European Writing Centers Association

Call for Proposals
June 24-26,2006
'Connecting the Dots"
Istanbul, Turkey

Proposals due Feb. 13, 2006. Contact: Dilek Tokay, email: dilekt@sabanciuniv.edu. Conference Web site: <http://ewca.sabanciuniv.edu/ewca2006>.

## Writing Centre Indaba at Stellenbosch University, South Africa

*"Indaba" is an African word that means "a deliberation of leaders in an African community"(Translated from the HAT*). Within everyday South African language usage the word has come to take on the meaning of a deliberation and/or discussion among groups of people.*

**"A call to celebrate international writing centres"**

For the first time, in 2006, International Writing Centers Week, an initiative of the International Writing Centers Association, will be celebrated in various ways in writing centres around the world. A specific week is designated for the event.

The Western Cape Writing Centre Forum has responded to this call from the IWCA and has decided to use the week as an opportunity to:

- increase awareness about the importance of academic writing development on our individual campuses.
- market the services of the writing centres on their campuses at the beginning of the academic year (the week coincides with the beginning of the academic year)
- simultaneously raise the profile of our writing centres on our individual campuses
- network with important and strategic role-players on campus to strengthen our institutional positions (where necessary)

**The 2006 Writing Centre Indaba**

*Purpose*: Apart from the campaigns on the individual campuses there will also be a collaborative event where writing centre practitioners will have the opportunity to engage in writing centred topics. The staging of this event is exploratory, and its success will determine the continuation in the future.

*2006 Hosts:* Stellenbosch University Writing Lab
*Arrangement Committee:* Sharifa Daniels and Rose Richards
*Date:* 16 February, 2006
*Venue:* Seminar Room, Language Centre, Crozier Street, Stellenbosch
*Number of possible attendees:* 22

*Format*:

- A one-day seminar/symposium with various presentations/contributions by Writing Centre experts/practitioners
- The guest speaker/presenter: Prof Carel Jansen, University of Nijmegen, Netherlands

*Costs*: The Stellenbosch University Language Centre will cover all costs for the seminar/symposium. This means that in future the host of the Indaba will also be liable for funding the event. The host will not be liable for the transport and boarding arrangements of delegates who may travel from distant destinations. We could, however, make suggestions about possible places to stay.

Sharifa Daniels
sdaniels@sun.ac.za
021- 808 2902

* HAT: *Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* (Afrikaans explanatory dictionary)

## Kellogg Institute for the Training and Certification of Developmental Educators

Boone, NC
June 24-July 21, 2006

The Institute will be on the campus of Appalachian State University. The 2006 summer program will focus on assessment and placement of developmental students, use of learning styles, and other topics. For further description of the program, see the Web site: <www.ncde.appstate.edu>.

Institute fees are $995, plus $920 for room and board. A graduate credit fee for the three-hour practicum will also be charged. Up to six hours of additional graduate credit may also be obtained for participation in the summer program. For applications and further information, contact Sandy Drewes, Director of the Kellogg Institute, or Kate Hoffman, Administrative Asst., National Center for Developmental Education, ASU Box 32098, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608-2098; phone: 828-262-3057.

## Web site for NCPTW

For those seeking information or sending proposals to the National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing, please note the correct Web address: <http://www.lsa.umich.edu/swc/ncptw/>. If you have questions, contact George Cooper at geob@umich.edu.

# Locating the center: Libraries, writing centers, and information literacy

In a recent *New York Times* article, Geoffrey Nunberg declares information literacy "a phrase whose time has come." A significant theme in librarians' discourse since the late 1980s, information literacy as conceived by Nunberg has become a bigger issue than can be addressed in the library. In language that will seem familiar to writing scholars, Nunberg declares that "instruction in information literacy will have to pervade every level of education and every course in the curriculum." Like writing across the curriculum before it, information literacy across the curriculum is poised to become a major educational initiative, and as with WAC, a debate within libraries has been brewing for some time about whether information literacy can "belong" to the library or whether it will evolve, like WAC, as an issue for all faculty in content areas. Up until the present time, writing programs in general and writing centers in particular have been relatively unconcerned with information literacy. The time for composition studies to engage information literacy might well be at hand. A number of pressing questions for writing scholarship and pedagogic practice are entangled with the fate of information literacy. All these questions lead to the conclusion that information literacy and writing are fundamentally interconnected in the work of college students.

Writing for an audience of librarians, Barbara Fister has noted the curious intellectual disconnection between librarians and writing teachers. Pursuing parallel paths in the academy, these two groups have much in common, yet they rarely engage each other in questions of mutual academic concern. In fact, we seem to have erected an invisible intellectual wall between those who teach students to write and those who teach students to research. Writing instruction involves the writing—which focuses on language usage, disciplinary discourse, and questions of academic genre—while information literacy involves the research—which focuses on the construction of good search statements, the evaluating of sources, and the assembling of bibliographies. Even the most cursory of perusals will testify to the artificiality of this bifurcated approach. By treating these two domains as separate, we create a disconnection that serves neither students nor our respective professional identities well. In fact, by recognizing that writing and research are one single activity, we might reinvigorate the discussion about writing process and how the search for information is shaped by that process.

Student writing is heavily dependant on academic sources. Especially when they begin to write in academic specialties, students must learn to choose sources that their disciplines deem credible and persuasive. Such judgment about sources is part of the tacit knowledge professors develop over time about their disciplines, and this tacit knowledge must be developed among apprentice writers who want to join the conversation. This "conversation of mankind," as Bruffee called it, is an assemblage of the "best" sources, and prior to this generation, that conversation was archived in the academic library. Each previous generation of writers has come to the academy and engaged this conversation through the library, and then, through explicit writing instruction, has been coaxed and disciplined into writing similar discourse. Today's technologies allow a much different engagement as students cut and paste a pastiche of credible and noncredible sources together based on Web searches, library resources, listserv archives, and blogs. In doing so, students are in danger of losing their connection to the "conversation of mankind" and the associated engagement with intellectual history and practice.

At heart, information literacy involves preserving this conversation as we move into new information environments. Indeed, much of the push for information literacy can be related to the growing volume of disintermediated information online. In the emerging networked learning environment, many of the traditional expectations of faculty and students about where and how learning occurs have become unstable, and traditional measures of quality are no longer relevant. Peer reviewed journals and university presses have long guided students to valid and authoritative academic sources, but such standards have become increasingly slippery as faculty and students move into the discursive terrain of blogs, Web sites, and e-mail discussion lists, all of which have become forums for high level academic inquiry and discourse. Under what circumstances can students cite sources like blogs and Web sites? How much weight will faculty accord a blog citation as opposed to a peer reviewed journal? These and many other questions are central to both information literacy and composition.

The nature of knowledge production has changed drastically in the past ten years as scholarly literature has migrated from print to pixels. The ease of personal publication has meant that the high barrier once attached to publication is now almost ridiculously low. Nearly every freshman on campus has the ability to "publish" a Web site. On the positive side, alternative voices that might once have been silenced are now

accessible through your search engine of choice. But this ease of access places the burden of judging credibility and authority squarely on the shoulders of the student (and by extension, the faculty member who must evaluate the student's work). In the past, faculty could assume that anything that came from the academic library had passed a credibility test, but today's academic library is increasingly virtual, and the line is increasingly blurry between online collections, grey literature, and the "free Web."

Indeed, the complex tools that organize the library collection—indexes, bibliographies, dictionaries, and catalogs—tools developed over the past centuries by patient scholars working in timeless solitude—have become transformed (some would argue made irrelevant) almost overnight. Full-text searching enables anyone with even a modest vocabulary to reach deep into textual corpora and retrieve "relevant" results. Students do such searching at an early age, and they often come to college feeling quite confident about their ability as searchers. Research suggests, however, that even experienced library users fail to take advantage of sophisticated searching techniques, ignoring subject classifications and search statement construction in favor of freestyle text searching. Novotny noted in one study that, "many users . . . expected the library catalog to function as an Internet search engine. They typed in broad keyword searches and expected that the 'computer' would interpret their search and process the results" (531-32). In actuality, Web search engines use complex algorithms to interpret searches, but library catalogs simply do not work that way. They depend, instead, on skillful searching implemented by conscious strategy.

Complicating the situation is the fact that libraries now license aggregated collections they used to own in physical format, and these collections are comprised of articles from periodicals that may bear little resemblance to each other. In some online library databases, newspapers, magazines, trade publications, and academic journals are all jumbled together, leaving it to students and faculty to sort out the relative academic weight of any given title. Academic Search Elite, a common general index, boasts full-text searching of 1,850 journals. Six-hundred of these titles are not peer reviewed. Lexis-Nexis allows students to search daily newspapers from any city of any size in the United States and retrieve contents full-text. Contents are current to within the past week. In visual terms, the library catalog, the subscription index, and search engines like Google look nearly identical (a small box to type in search terms that then display in a numbered list). Conceptually, however, these tools are worlds apart.

What part does this complex information environment play in the lives of student writers? On the most basic level, as students write, they read and think. They accumulate sources, and they write about them. They actively return to sources to fill what information researcher Brenda Dervin calls "knowledge gaps" (38). Dervin argues that we should treat knowledge as a verb rather than a noun. As students write, they are "knowledging," engaging actively with new sources and also with prior knowledge drawn from sources. They use those sources to build bridges to cross gaps in their existing knowledge. It has become common to argue in the context of "writing to learn" that writing makes thinking visible, which justifies its use across the curriculum in teaching. If writing makes thinking visible, it also makes gaps in thinking visible. Writers who have knowledge gaps have those gaps exposed in the course of writing. Indeed, many student writing problems might just as easily be seen as problems with knowledge gaps.

In his often quoted essay, "Inventing the University," David Bartholomae makes a crucial point:

> "There is, to be sure, an important distinction to be made between learning history, say, and learning to write as a historian. A student can learn to command and reproduce a set of names, dates, places, and canonical interpretations . . . ; but this is not the same as learning to 'think' (by learning to write) like a historian. The former requires efforts of memory; the latter requires a student to compose a text out of the texts that represent the primary materials of history" (633).

My goal here is, to some extent, to question and explore the bifurcation Bartholomae establishes here. Can we really separate the ability to "command and reproduce" pre-existing knowledge from the writer's efforts to participate in the creation of similar discourse? Are the knowledge gaps identified by Dervin in the "names, dates, places, and canonical interpretations" or in the ability to "think" like a historian? Can the two be separated?

In practice, information literacy librarians and writing tutors enact this bifurcation. Writing tutors handle problems with discourse and librarians handle problems with information retrieval and evaluation. Beyond this distinction, however, writing centers and libraries occupy remarkably similar academic niches. Writing centers and libraries are each positioned as mediators between students and faculty. From this vantage point, they see the best and worst of both students and faculty. From faculty, they see instructors who work tirelessly to create dynamic, engaged learning environments for students, and they see faculty who seem determined to work against the best efforts of students and those who support them, creating assignments that almost encourage cheating and lazy shortcuts. From students, they see hard work and commitment that faculty sometimes doubt exists, but they also see students

who want their work done for them through proofreading or bibliography services. Positioned at the crossroads between faculty and students, librarians and writing center personnel handle the daily transactions of academic commerce, a form of work that is often undervalued or even unvalued by other academics.

A conversation needs to take place between writing center personnel and librarians. This conversation could easily frame a series of shared academic concerns. Many librarians are on the tenure track, and those who are face concerns similar to tenure track center faculty. In the academic hierarchy of research, teaching, and service, librarians and writing center faculty spend most of their time in the final two, less valued, categories. Their status in relation to "real" faculty is always open to question. Positioned as they are between faculty and students, librarians and writing center personnel must translate the concerns and priorities of each to the other. Unlike disciplinary scholars whose work can be defined by subject and method, librarians and writing center staff must be conversant in multiple flavors of academic discourse, and they must do their teaching in the most labor intensive manner possible—the "one to one" fashion of the tutorial.

It is nice to have friends in the academy, and nearly all those who teach writing profess affection for librarians, and the feeling tends to be mutual. At the heart of the foregoing analysis has been the tacit observation that we can and should be more than friends. In fact, librarians and writing centers have the potential to develop important partnerships that build on their mutual interests and the interests of the students they serve. These partnerships might be both enriching and politically valuable as we move into a new academic era marked by interdisciplinary conversation and increasingly networked knowledges. Having worked at the boundaries of this partnership for almost ten years, and having spent the past year co-editing a collection of case studies about partnerships between writing centers and libraries, I see clear paths to collaboration that are emerging in practice. Clearly, something is going on in these collaborations that merits examination. I would like to summarize some of what we found here.

Perhaps the most important thing for librarians and writing center personnel to do is begin a working conversation. This conversation should involve professional talk focused on sharing observations and insights to find the intersections between librarianship and writing instruction. At The University of Kansas, Michele Eodice and Lea Currie began to work together to create a writing center in the main library. In doing so, they realized they were enacting the kind of interdisciplinary collaboration being championed by campus administration. They invited stakeholders from around campus to a round-table discussion to talk about collaboration and the conditions that foster it. They concluded that with proper commitment from administration, writing centers and libraries can become leaders in progressive initiatives on campus, modeling new kinds of collaborative programs. Eodice and Currie find their partnership held up to the campus as an example of resource sharing and creative problem solving, and they find themselves on the forefront of defining what collaboration and interdisciplinarity look like. On most campuses, issues of undergraduate teaching and learning are receiving increasing emphasis. Either librarians or writing center personnel can initiative a conversation about how the two units can find common ground.

Co-referencing—Libraries and writing centers share a common place in the academy, but their areas of expertise are quite different. If each has an understanding of the other's philosophies and practices, they should find it easy and valuable to refer students to each other. In the course of a tutoring session it might become clear that a student has an inadequate understanding of what kinds of sources are required for a research paper. These students can be easily referred to the library where a librarian on duty can help them with their work. In return, librarians should be aware of the availability of writing center tutors who can provide help with issues of writing and rhetoric. Many experiments are underway that explore these co-referencing models. In one such experiment at Bowling Green State University, writing tutors have been offering "Research and Writing Project Clinics" in the library. Inhabiting office spaces near the reference area in the library, tutors can work with students and send them for quick (or lengthy) consultations with librarians.

In early stages of collaboration, co-referencing can be useful for working out the problematics of the relationship between writing and information literacy. Occupying marginal status in the instructional culture of academia, both librarians and writing center tutors tend to want to expand the scope of their instruction rather than defer to the expertise of others. The question of research falls in a gray area between writing and library skills. Co-referencing tends to activate anxieties about who owns that territory and can thus provide the occasion for discussions about which activities belong to an individual unit and which are shared.

Libraries and writing centers have unique needs in the academy in relation to the creation of academic space. Writing centers often contend with bad space, assigned as they are to isolated, hard-to-find offices with insufficient technology. Libraries, meanwhile, are undergoing a crisis of space. As collections become increasingly virtual, the nature of library space is changing, and libraries are actively exploring

ways to create space for collaboration and education. Benefits to locating a writing center in a library can be significant. At Wesley College, housing the writing center in the library was at first a way of consolidating services to save money. What emerged was a collaboration between the library and writing center that involves team-teaching and sharing of computer classrooms and lab space. Consolidation of services in one location is attractive to administration, and both writing centers and libraries can be expected to pick up foot traffic through space sharing. Computing services are more likely to be consolidated in shared space, and co-referencing of services is facilitated by the easy access between writing centers and reference librarians housed in the same building.

Both libraries and writing centers have been increasingly involved in faculty development workshops. Rather than compete for faculty time by offering separate workshops when the issues addressed by such workshops are so related, the two units might benefit from offering shared workshops. Plagiarism, designing effective assignments, active learning, service learning—virtually any topic related to general education—can be framed as a central concern for both libraries and writing centers. At the University of Washington-Bothel, the library and the writing center have been engaged in a ten-year faculty development project built around an innovative class that encourages interdisciplinary research in the undergraduate curriculum. Becky Reid-Rosenberg and Sarah Leadley describe their work as a constant process of challenging conventional ideas (including their own) about research and interdisciplinarity. Faculty from across campus have been involved in the development of this course, taking the lead at times. Through their collaboration with each other and with departmental faculty, they have fostered important investigations into the potentials and problems of interdisciplinary work.

Both the writing scholarship and information literacy scholarship have been engaged with creating new kinds of research based in pragmatic approaches to real-world problems. Indeed, this kind of research is at the leading edge of the scholarship of teaching and learning as advocated by the Boyer Report. Nowhere is the unnecessary bifurcation of these two fields more problematic than in the relative ignorance each field has of the other's research. The education of writing tutors should include some framing of information literacy topics, and the education of librarians should of necessity include the scholarship in writing instruction. Writing tutor Casey Reid describes her growing awareness of the ways writing scholarship can inform the work of librarians while working as Assistant Director of the Writing Center at Southwest Missouri State University and simultaneously working as a reference assistant at the library. Reid notes that writing theory has provided theoretical models for the "reference interview" through analysis of tutorial sessions. She also notes the ways that writing centers have turned their marginalized academic position into a position of intellectual strength—a move Reid right suggests would benefit librarians.

In one of the most intriguing collaborations we encountered, the Connors Writing Center at the University of New Hampshire Durham had engaged the university archives in the creation of a research archive chronicling the history of writing at New Hampshire. The university archives had never considered collecting student work as part of its chronicling of the university's history, but the writing center staff encouraged librarians to see that student writing (by making thinking visible) might be the best evidence of the intellectual evolution of a campus. The archive at the University of New Hampshire might serve as a research repository for librarians as well as writing scholars. Like writing scholars, librarians need to understand how student work reflects the instruction they have received. Without some comprehensive understanding of what students produce (and have produced over time) no clear picture of information literacy or writing can be achieved.

Finally librarians and writing staff need to explore possibilities for co-publishing. In recruiting case studies for this project, we required that (with few exceptions) cases studies be written collaboratively. This intentional choice was prompted by our desire to encourage the conversation that co-authorship necessitates. We believe the case studies in our work provide starting points for experiments in collaboration. They also provide abundant models for further collaborative publication. The lines should become fuzzier between information literacy as we experiment at the boundaries. Our own work is intended to test that hypothesis and to provide incentive and opportunities for others to test it, as well.

In an age when literacy itself is being redefined in so many ways, emerging, flexible conceptions of literacy can be used to build bridges—to find ways to close our own thinking gaps. The gap between information literacy and writing instruction can be bridged to the benefit of everyone, especially students, who will be the ultimate beneficiaries of a more coherent conception of what they do and the demands of the work they are assigned. Collaboration is no panacea for either libraries or writing centers, and problems abound. Writing tutors need to find their comfort zone in this new model, either by expanding their expertise or clearly demarcating their jobs. Reference librarians, trained on the expert model of academic service and ever conscious of their institutional image, may

well see collaboration with writing tutors as threatening to their academic status. These very real problems will need to be addressed in the course of evolving relationships. The vitality and energy created by successful collaborations suggests that however difficult the work, the results are well worth the effort.

*James K. Elmborg*
*The University of Iowa*
*Iowa City, Iowa*
*james-elmborg@uiowa.edu*

Notes

[1]Geoffrey Nunberg. *New York Times*. 13 Feb. 2005. 4: 4.

[2] Barbara Fister. "Common Ground: The Composition/Bibliographic Instruction Connection." *Academic Libraries: Achieving Excellence in Higher Education* (Chicago: ACRL, 1992) 154.

[3] Kenneth Bruffee. *Collaborative Learning: Higher Education, Interdependence, and the Authority of Knowledge*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1983) 113.

[4] Eric Novotny. "I Don't Think I Click: A Protocol Analysis Study of Use of a Library Online Catalog in the Internet Age." *College and Research Libraries* 65:6 (2004): 531-2.

[5] Brenda Dervin. "Sense-Making Theory and Practice: An Overview of User Interests in Knowledge Seeking and Use." *Journal of Knowledge Management* 2:2 (1998) 38.

[6] David Bartholomae. "Inventing the University" in *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader,* ed. Victor Villanueva (Urbana: NCTE, 2002) 633.

[7] James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook, eds. *Centers for Learning: Libraries and Writing Centers in Collaboration.* ACRL: Publications in Librarianship, 2005.

*(Ed. note: A review of James Elmborg and Sheril Hook's edited collection, Centers for Learning: Libraries and Writing Centers in Collaboration, will be appearing in WLN in the near future.)*

## Southern California Writing Centers Association

February 25, 2006
Claremont, CA

For information, contact: Wendy Menefee-Libey, e-mail: menefee@hmc.edu. Conference Web site: <http://writing.mckenna.edu/socalw> .

## Writing Center Director
## University of Toledo

Nine-month faculty administrative appointment to manage an established University writing center and direct an Arts and Sciences WAC program. Applicants should demonstrate an understanding of current theories that underpin tutoring and tutor training and possess a sound pedagogical vision that integrates WAC and faculty development. The ideal candidate will have a Ph.D. in an appropriate area, preferably in rhetoric/composition, have writing center administrative experience, and have published in recognized journals that focus on theory and practice in writing, writing centers, and/or writing across the curriculum. Hiring is anticipated at the rank of tenure-track assistant or tenure-track/tenured associate professor within the Department of English Language and Literature; the position reports to the dean. The negotiable teaching load will include general composition, upper-division, and graduate-level courses.

Send letter of application, c.v., statement of writing center/WAC philosophy, transcripts, three letters of recommendation, and a writing sample to Chair, Writing Center Search Committee, College of Arts and Sciences, MS 906, University of Toledo, Toledo, OH 43606. Review of applications will begin on February 15. The position will be filled pending final budgetary approval. Information about The University of Toledo is available at <www.utoledo.edu>. The University of Toledo is an EOE/AA employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

## Midwest Writing Centers Association

Call for Proposals
October 25-29, 2006
St. Louis, MO
*"Expand the Frontier: Look Up, Look Out"*

Proposals should include a presentation title, the names, titles, and contact information of all presenters, the presentation format, a 350-word description of the presentation, and a 50-word abstract for the program. Please note that LCD projectors will not be available for use.

We encourage you to submit proposals electronically at the conference Web site: Proposals may also be mailed to Greg Dyer, greg.dyer@usiouxfalls.edu. *Proposals must be submitted on-line or postmarked by February 17, 2006 for consideration.* Questions about the call for proposals may be directed to co-chairs Dawn Fels (d.m.fels@iup.edu) or Susan Mueller (smueller1@stlcop.edu).

For up-to-date information about the conference, go to <http://www.ku.edu/~mwca/conference/>. To join the MWCA, go to <http://www.ku.edu/~mwca/membership/>.

## Pacific Northwest Writing Center Association

Call for Proposals
April 29, 2006
Corvallis, OR
*"Engaging Communities"*
Keynote speaker: Andrea Lunsford

Proposals are encouraged which address the ways that writing centers engage multiple communities in our colleges and universities. How do we adapt ourselves and respond to the needs of these various communities (administration, faculty, students) while maintaining allegiance to our core principles? How do we benefit from the diversity that our tutors bring to writing center work while also ensuring some commonality of purpose, philosophy, and practice? And how do the communities of students we serve (second language speakers, graduate students, basic writers) influence and shape our notions of writing center pedagogy? Proposals on community and technology, service learning, or other topics of interest to writing center faculty are also welcome.

More information, including the online proposal submission form, can be found at <http://www.acadweb.wwu.edu/writepro/PNWCA.htm>.

## Southeastern Writing Center Association

February 16-18
Chapel Hill, NC
*"Let's Research: Gathering Evidence to Support Writing Center Work."*
Keynote Speaker: Neal Lerner

For further information, visit the conference Web site: <http://uwp.aas.duke.edu/wstudio/swca/>.

# TUTORS' COLUMN

## Slouching and digressing

The other day I was with one of my good friends discussing a large research paper that was coming up in our Survey of Western Theatre class. She sounded quite frightened about the upcoming due date. I naturally suggested to her that she might want to take her paper into the Writing Center to get some help on it. Her reply shocked me as she said, "That won't help, the last time that I went in they just checked my grammar and that was it." I was stunned! As a tutor at the Writing Center, I know that grammar is on the bottom of our priority list. This conversation spurred my thought process forward as I analyzed what I do in a session to send my students away feeling like my friend. Through this analysis I found that the number one thing that I try to control in my sessions is the atmosphere. There are certain tactics which I find helpful in creating a more comfortable atmosphere which, in turn, helps me guide my student to a better developed paper.

I concentrate heavily on atmosphere because I feel that no student can concentrate when they are nervous, so the best thing to do for a session is to relieve the tension in the room. I know that we have all had students who come in and their tension is palpable. They are clinging to their book like it is the last life-preserver on a sinking ship. When I can see the whites of their eyes, first thing I do is shoot them a smile. Enthusiastically introducing myself and asking them what they are working on helps to break the ice.

I like to sit back in my chair at the beginning of the session. I just slouch back in my chair with my legs sprawled in front of me and nod as they tell me about what they are worried about with their paper. When they see how relaxed I am by my tone and posture, they loosen up and really open up as to what their concerns are.

Once I get this introduction out of the way I step into the next gear. After they have told me what their paper is about and what they want to really focus on, I lean forward to read the paper. It seems silly that this kind of posturing is so important, but it is. When the student reads me their paper, they are not looking at my face. They are looking at the paper on the table. If they can see in my body positioning that I am leaning forward, they get the sense that I am engaged in their paper. I like to make pencil marks during this time as to what I want to go back and talk about later, but I try not to disrupt the flow of their reading while I do this.

Once the paper has been read I take a breather. The student is out of breath, so they do not mind. I just take a second and collect my thoughts on the overall impression of the paper. At this moment the student has just put their work all out in front of me. They are rather vulnerable. Students often feel that a tutor is judging them somehow. Once again, I find that relaxed posture can help them not to feel so anxious about this exposure. While in this relaxed, laid-back atmosphere I feel free to digress for a few minutes.

Since we only have a short amount of time with the students and their papers, tutors often feel like they have to stay 100% on task. However, I often feel like digressions are the best part of the session. When I let myself explore a stream-of-consciousness that the student's paper has lead me down, the student and I can banter back and forth about the big ideas of their paper. The student may find in this "big picture analysis" that the real thought of their paper did not come through. This automatically exposes any problems with the thesis statement, which is the next step in the process.

Once the digression has exhausted itself, then—and I make sure to wait until then, I get back to the actual paper. The digressing breather gives us both a short while to relax before jumping into the specifics of the paper.

When I jump back into the paper, I like to lean forward again. I go though the paper paragraph by paragraph with them and see if each paragraph fits into the big picture that we talked about or if it needs to be modified. Even though I am leaning forward and posturing that I am attentive, I make sure to not seem rigid. When I get excited I'll pull my feet up under me and shift around in my chair or jump up and pace if the mood strikes me. I hate feeling like the chair I sit in is a ball-and-chain, or worse, that the student feels like it is the Judgment Seat and I'm Chief Justice. This bohemian-type atmosphere is free from pressure and liberating for both the tutor and the student. They can tell that I am just a peer, totally on their level.

It is only after we get through these periods of digressions and idea discussions that I will move on, if we have time, to the minutiae of English such as punctuation and syntax.

I have found these planned breathers

to be the best part of my sessions. They give me a chance to tell the student what their paper made me think about and really discuss their ideas. It allows us both to step back and look at the ideas in a lower pressure environment. Tutors need to feel free to slouch during the digression section. Slouching helps the students to see that we are non-judgmental peers. The persona of "I'm the tutor on this side of the table and you are the student on that side" gets broken down. This level of comfort can help the student to open up to their tutor and really discuss and defend their paper, rather than just wanting the tutor to "proof-read" it so they can go. When students, like my friend, feel more comfortable with the tutors to really talk about the big ideas of their paper, they will feel that their time at the writing center was relaxed, enjoyable, and productive. This increased satisfaction will in turn make students want to come back to the writing center more often.

*Heather Hunsaker*
*Utah State University*
*Logan, UT*

## Searching for a style

I have a confession to make. In all my years as an undergraduate English major, I never once set foot into the Writing Center at my university, even though I knew it was there and had been told of its virtues many times. I also never signed up to tutor, even though I had the opportunity more than once. Because of my lack of experience, I was, needless to say, terrified as I began my first semester of Writing Center tutoring. As I reach the end of the semester and realize I have emerged relatively unscathed, I can look back and see what it was that I learned that helped me get this far. Pushing through all the talk about grammar, dealing with difficult students, helping second language learners, relating to students, and maintaining a positive attitude has taught me one valuable lesson: I have no tutoring style.

Toward the beginning of our Writing Center training course, we were asked to define our tutoring style. Many different ideas came up: I'm cheerful, I'm helpful, I'm interested. On my paper, I wrote that I had no tutoring style. I thought I would probably develop one after I had some experience, but if I was asked to repeat that activity now, I would write the same thing. Looking back over the tutoring sessions I have had, there is not one way to describe the way I have tutored. Every session has drawn on different aspects of my personality because every student is different and needs a different kind of attention. From aspiring English majors to economics majors who could care less about writing to second language learners, each student and session demands a different tutoring style.

One early session I had was with a student who came in specifically to get help with comma placement. I know how to use commas, but I have never taken a grammar class teaching me the whys of the rules. In this session, my style was to become a fellow student, one who was on the exact same level as the tutee. We waded through unfamiliar grammatical terms together, puzzling over confusing explanations of rules. Anyone observing the session would have been confused as to which one of us was the tutor, but I felt this was a very effective style for the session. In another session, the student felt that he wrote poorly. He lacked confidence and, as a result, was very closed off and did not want to discuss his paper. I told him that as a reader, I liked the introduction and thought that the paper as a whole flowed well. These positive comments helped build up his confidence and we were able to move deeper into his paper. This time, my style was more like that of a counselor. In a more recent session, I became a teacher. The student came in asking for help with MLA, and I took him step by step through a book that describes the correct format. Much of what we do in the Writing Center is give suggestions and opinions on how to improve, but MLA is clear cut—either right or wrong, no opinions. I felt pressure to teach the student correctly because we both knew what he learned would directly affect his grade. This is a completely different style from the first, where I got to be an equal peer, but it was just as effective of a session because it was what the student needed.

At the Writing Center, each student gets the individual attention that would be ideal but is impossible in a classroom situation. Students can meet one-on-one with people who can help them, making the Writing Center a very valuable resource. Since all students learn differently, some are inevitably not fully engaged in the learning process in the classroom. Tutors at the Writing Center must be able to adjust to the different learning styles of each

student that comes through the door. Not only will the students have different questions, but they will react to writing and tutoring, and adjust accordingly.

I have tutored many different students throughout the last semester, and no two sessions were the same. In fact, the sessions that I consciously tried to conduct in the same way as previously successful sessions became my most unsuccessful sessions. I learned that I had to approach each session as if it were my first, with no preconceived notions about the best way to work with the student, because each student, paper, and problem was unique. I guess I do have a tutoring style after all: adaptable.

*Kiersten Honaker*
*Utah State University*
*Logan, UT*

## Mary Nell Kivikko Excellence in Scholarship Award

The North Texas Writing Center Association is now accepting entries for the 2006 Mary Nell Kivikko Excellence in Scholarship Award. The award is open to all writing center professional staff, graduate tutors, and undergraduate peer tutors in the South Central Writing Center Association region (Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana). Those eligible must have a paper in the subject area of writing center theory and practice accepted for presentation to a professional conference during the 2005-2006 academic year.

The paper based on the winning proposal will be presented at the NTWCA Spring Conference to be held April 7, 2006, at the Langdon Center in Granbury, Texas. The winner will receive a $150 honorarium upon presentation of the paper.

The 250-word abstract of the entry should include a title and the name and contact information of the presenter. Please submit entries to Dave Kuhne (d.kuhne@tcu.edu), Contest Coordinator, by February 24, 2006. Electronic submissions only please.

## Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC)

May 18-20, 2006
Clemson, SC
Keynote Speakers: Anne Herrington and Charles Moran

The WAC Conference Program highlights include presentations from participants in writing centers, fellows programs, and WAC programs, as well as presentations on writing across and in disciplines (sciences, engineering, nursing, first-year composition).. Early Registration with reduced fees ends February 22. To register and for more information please visit our Web site: <http://www.clemson.edu/caah/Pearce/wac2006/>.

## Colorado Community College Conference on Composition

April 14, 2006
Greeley, CO
*"Real-World Writing: Ennobling Composition"*
Keynote Speaker: John Calderazzo

This is an annual conference of primarily two-year college English faculty; however, four-year English composition faculty as well as writing center staff and tutors are encouraged to attend. The Web site for the 5C's conference is at <http://www.aimsced.com/5C.htm.>. It will be updated soon to reflect this year's conference theme and registration procedures. For further information contact Chuck Fisher at chuck.fisher@AIMS.EDU.

# *Calendar for Writing Centers Associations*

February 16-18, 2006: Southeastern Writing Centers Association, in Chapel Hill, NC
**Contact:** Kim Abels, e-mail: kabels@email.unc.edu and Vicki Russell vgr@duke.edu. Conference Web site: <http://uwp.aas.duke.edu/wstudio/swca/>.

February 23-25, 2006: South Central Writing Centers Association, in Little Rock, AR
**Contact**: Allison Denman Holland, e-mail: adholland@ualr.edu; phone: 501-569-8311. Conference Web site: < http://www.scwca.net/>.

February 25, 2006: Southern California, in Claremont, CA
Contact: Wendy Menefee-Libey, email: menefee@hmc.edu Conference Web site: <http://writing.mckenna.edu/socalw> .

March 3-4, 2006: Rocky Mountain Writing Centers Association, in Provo, UT
**Contact**: Penny Bird, e-mail: penny_bird@byu.edu; phone: 801-422-5471. Conference Web site: <http://english.byu.edu/writingcenter/peertutoring.htm>.

March 4, 2006: Northern California Writing Centers Association, in Sacramento, CA
**Contact**: Susan McCall, e-mail: mccalls@arc.losrios.edu. Conference Web site: <http://ncwca.stanford.edu>.

March 9-11, 2006: East Central Writing Centers Association, in Alliance, OH
**Contact**: Bill Macauley, e-mail: WMacauley@wooster.edu; phone: 330-263-2372; Rodney Dick, e-mail: dickrf@muc.edu; phone: 330- 823-4792. Conference Web site: <www.ecwca.org>.

April 7-8, 2006: NorthEast Writing Centers Association, in Nashua and Amherst, NH
**Contact**: Leslie Van Wagner, e-mail: lvanwagner@rivier.edu.

April 8, 2006: Mid-Atlantic Writing Centers Association, in Annapolis, MD
**Contact:** Chip Crane, e-mail: cecrane@usna.edu; Leigh Ryan, e-mail: lr@umd.edu: and Lisa Zimmerellli, e-mail: lzimmerelli@umuc.edu. Conference Web site: <http://www2.mcdaniel.edu/mawca/conf_2006.htm>.

April 29, 2006: Pacific Northwest Writing Center Association, in Corvallis, OR
**Contact:** Conference Web site: <http://www.acadweb.wwu.edu/writepro/PNWCA.htm>.

June 24-26, 2006. European Writing Centers Association, in Istanbul, Turkey
**Contact**: Dilek Tokay, email: dilekt@sabanciuniv.edu. Conference website: <http://ewca.sabanciuniv.edu/ewca2006>.

October 25-29, 2006: Midwest Writing Centers Association, in St. Louis, MO
**Contact**: Susan Mueller at smueller@stlcop.edu or Dawn Fels at dfels@earthlink.net. Conference Web site: <http://www.ku.edu/~mwca/>.

THE WRITING LAB
NEWSLETTER

Non-profit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Purdue University

Muriel Harris, editor
Department of English
Purdue University
500 Oval Drive
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2038

Address Service Requested