

THE WRITING LAB

N E W S L E T T E R

Volume 25, Number 5

Promoting the exchange of voices and ideas in one-to-one teaching of writing

January, 2001

...FROM THE EDITOR...

This month's newsletter includes some "firsts:" a "Reader Comment" and an author "Response" and three pages of job announcements. While most of us may not be seeking new positions at this time, please take a few minutes to read through these job descriptions. We should be heartened not only by the new centers being structured and in need of directors but also by the descriptions of the qualifications. Note the complexity and diversity of skills needed—impressive lists that should reinforce awareness of the many talents needed to direct a writing lab and should also help those of us seeking help in describing our positions to administrators, particularly in terms of our varied responsibilities.

And a more personal note from me. In our writing, our electronic listserv chatting, and our face-to-face interactions at conferences, we often talk about our writing center community as a group of supportive, helpful friends. Having recently gone through some scary emergency surgery, I can personally attest to how we support and help each other. I'm not yet able to acknowledge individually all your good wishes, but I do know that I've gotten a powerful reminder of what an incredible community of good friends we are. With deep appreciation and many thanks,

• Muriel Harris, editor

...INSIDE...

Computers and the Perception of the Writing Center

- **Barbara Kossman** 1

Reader Comment and Response. . . .

- **Beth L. Hewett and Christa Ehmann** 7
- **Holly K. Moe** 7

Tutors' Columns: "Personal Revelations in the Tutoring Session"

- **Jane Honigs** 9

"Head 'Em Off at the Pass: Strategies for Handling Emotionalism in the Writing Center"

- **Tracy Hudson** 10

Conference Calendar 12

Job Announcements 13

Quotable Tutor Quote

- **Teresa Goodlett** 15

Computers and the perception of the writing center

If I were to write a recipe for how computers contribute to the present-day functioning writing center, it would read something like this: Take one small room, too large to be a closet, too small to be anything else, fill with a minimum of two tables seating four comfortably, five not so comfortably. Add at least one three-drawer filing cabinet for consultant handouts, schedules, timesheets, and session reports. Squeeze in one bookshelf housing several handbooks for quick reference on how to improve writing skills; include the *MLA Handbook* and the *Heath Handbook*. Decorate with a pegboard for messages and news, cartoons, pictures, etc. Toss one telephone in an easily accessible corner. Add a dash of pencils and sprinkle with pads or piles of paper. If funding is available, top with a computer or two for increased efficiency.

For most universities, writing centers are becoming increasingly common enhancements of campus life. For some of these centers, computers are becoming increasingly incorporated into their practices. Because funding is often marginal, the addition of computers in

these writing centers is sometimes as topical as the last sprinkle of powdered sugar in a recipe; computers are seen as mechanisms to increase production and extend reach rather than a means to develop writing proficiency. Often, either the computers are too outdated and lack the capacity to adequately perform and meet the needs of the students, or the use of the computer is stymied by inadequate application of the technolo-

gies it can offer. If the writing center is to continue to grow, to influence, to succeed as more than a contemporary phenomenon, then it must, at the very least, make optimal use of the computer technology available to it.

It is my intention here to demonstrate how present computer technology affects peer tutoring and collaboration within the writing center. In particular, I examine the emergence of on-line writing labs and how they change the role and perception of the writing center. Given the significance of computers now and forevermore, it is important for us as teachers, administrators, and consultants not only to understand and effectively use the technology within the context of the writing center, but also to apply it for the improved perception of the writing center at large.

To understand the impact of on-line technology (and by on-line technology, I'm referring specifically to on-line writing labs) on collaboration in the writing center, we should first look at collaboration within the center without such technology.

In her essay, "Collaboration and Ethics in Writing Center Pedagogy," Irene Clark illustrates the importance of collaborative learning in the writing center; this is learning that involves an active role for both the consultant and the student, learning that becomes a true partnership in the exchange of knowledge, where students make discoveries for themselves as well as benefit from the knowledge imparted by the consultants (88-96). Collaboration, then, includes a mutual effort between students and consultants to communicate and engage in social interaction.

With this in mind, it is easy to understand how the exchange between students and consultants is rooted in conversation. "If thought is internalized public and social talk, then writing is internalized talk made public and social again," Ken Bruffee writes (90-1).

In talking with consultants about their writing, students can clear their thinking, ask questions, organize their thoughts and most importantly discuss ideas with an interested, informed second party. Talking creates a dynamic exchange between the student and consultant because it requires immediate response and mutual dependence. As Andrea Lunsford's research indicates, "collaboration engages the whole student and encourages active learning; it combines reading, talking, writing, thinking; it provides practice in both synthetic and analytic skills" (111). Following Bruffee and Lunsford, then, talking in the writing center makes the relationship of student to consultant a truly symbiotic one.

The second party, in turn, becomes the group from which the student can gain a sense of comfort and with which the student can share a feeling of belonging, because when students enter the writing center seeking help, they are also seeking a community that acknowledges and welcomes them. They want to know that not only are there people they can come to, with whom they can discuss their writing issues, but also that these people will be interested in discussing intellectual issues with them while helping them become better writers.

When consultants work face-to-face with students, they are affirming student's decisions to improve their writing by giving students the personal attention they seek and deserve. The physicality and conversation that takes place in face-to-face sessions foster a link between consultants and tutors that emulates the intimacy of a writing community, a community of individuals dedicated to thinking, talking, sharing their discoveries and developments in, about, and through writing and the writing process. This intimacy is nurtured by students sitting down with consultants for a block of time deliberately set aside for concentrating on the issues at hand, issues of writing and development as writers.

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 National Writing Centers Association, an NCTE Assembly, and is a member of the NCTE Information Exchange Agreement. ISSN 1040-3779. All Rights and Title reserved unless permission is granted by Purdue University. Material will not be reproduced in any form without express written permission.

Editor: Muriel Harris

Managing Editor: Mary Jo Turley
English Dept., Purdue University, 1356
Heavilon, West Lafayette, IN 47907-1356
(765)494-7268.

e-mail: harrism@cc.purdue.edu
mjturley@purdue.edu

web site:<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/lab/newsletter/index.html>

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.

Manuscripts: Recommended length for articles is 10-15 double-spaced typed pages, 3-5 pages for reviews, and 4 pages for the Tutors' Column, though longer and shorter manuscripts are invited. If possible, please send as attached files or as cut-and-paste in an e-mail to mjturley@purdue.edu. Otherwise, send a 3 and 1/2 in. disk with the file, along with the paper copy. Please enclose a self-addressed envelope with return postage not pasted to the envelope. The deadline for announcements is 45 days prior to the month of issue (e.g. August 15 for October issue).

Face-to-face sessions can also diminish the detachment students sometimes fear because they view writing as a solitary, isolated task that requires more talent than knowledge. Having a partner to work with makes the task less daunting, more fun, more reasonably accomplishable for some. Together, these elements of the face-to-face sessions (conversation/dialogue, proximity, and partnership) create an atmosphere of encouragement and student-evolvement, where students take the most responsibility for their own personal growth as writers, turning to the consultants for guidance.

In managing sessions this way, we are assuming a predominantly minimalist approach to consultation. Our definition of collaboration as a two-way street, however, enables us also to lend a stronger helping hand when necessary. As Clark suggests, in "the early phases of the learning process, it might be beneficial for the tutor to assume a more active role" (92). This active role may include anything from setting examples for the student to demonstrating ways to organize a paper before it is written or ways to go through a paper after it is written.

In either case, sitting down to work with someone directly encourages dialogue, which is crucial to the progress of becoming a better writer. The face-to-face interaction gives students an active role, empowering them to think independently as writers, to voice ideas and concerns as writers, to question writers as writers, and to make decisions as writers with the support and aid of individuals as interested in their writing as they are themselves. The dynamics of dialogue and the active exchange of both verbal and non-verbal language (eye contact, facial expressions, posture, etc.) between the student and consultant are what make visits to the writing center effective.

Incorporating on-line technology in writing center practice risks diminishing this intimacy and shifts the col-

laborative focus to a consultant-dominated environment by altering the possibilities of conversation and intimacy. Although the consultants are no less interested in the student's growth as writers, the nature of the technology inhibits an interactive partnership. A look at the on-line writing labs that currently exist demonstrates this shift.

In studying on-line writing labs, or OWLs, I first discovered that they differ significantly in function from on-line writing centers. I studied a total of twenty-five on-line writing labs and on-line writing centers, and have chosen to focus primarily on OWLs. The on-line writing centers tend to be just that, centers transposed on-line consisting of information on staff hours, staff biographies and telephone numbers. They are what they simply claim to be, that is centers for information as opposed to labs of interaction. It is the importance of this interaction that I wish to look at here.

My research revealed that there are two general categories of on-line writing labs, which, for the purposes of this paper, I've defined as basic and basic+.

The basic OWL is a site on the Internet accessible by an html address to anyone with access to the Internet. Much like the on-line writing centers, the OWLs are linked to their respective college or university writing centers and typically carry a menu of citation and documentation information, guides to writing essays, grammar tips and guidelines, dictionaries, thesauruses and links to other writing related sites, including other OWLs.

North Carolina State University's OWL is a typical basic model. It provides writing-help handouts, which consist of style documentation, bibliographic citation, grammar guides, and dictionaries. It hosts links to other resources available on the Internet, including "Bartlett's Familiar Quotations," "The Editorial Eye" which

consists of newsletter articles for language professionals, and "The Voice of the Shuttle," available through The University of California at Santa Barbara to supply information for research in the humanities. The site also provides information on the staff director, staff hours, and staff consultants, as well as what the philosophy of the center is and how to contact the center via telephone. The distinguishing feature of the basic on-line writing lab is that it provides an e-mail question-and-answer grammar hotline, which, to quote the NCSU Lab "answers questions about specific writing problems and provides help with the structure of individual sentences" (<http://www2.ncsu.edu/ncsu/grammar/>). Students submit specific grammar or syntax-related questions via e-mail to the writing center tutors. The tutors provide answers to the questions and offer other suggestions within a specified turn-around time, usually 24 hours.

While this on-line question-and-answer hotline serves to bridge the gap between students and the writing center by providing a convenient means for them to access the information and help they need, it also inhibits the growth of each student as a writer. Of course, using computers in the writing center expands our reach by opening the discourse to everyone, regardless of race, gender, creed, character (Handa 160-194) and "develops a sense of community that extends beyond the classroom" (Schroeder & Boe 28-46). But if collaboration is a give-and-take relationship between the student and consultant, the question and answer hotline becomes a less productive option. It creates a situation in which the student can hide behind the technology, submitting general proof-reading inquiries and receiving ready responses within a 24-hour period. For example, an ESL student can submit a paper that he or she had not written, but we would not be able to discern this without speaking directly to the student. The hotline also encourages a kind of instant gratification by its con-

venience. Students are likely to grow accustomed to having others access and adjust their difficulties while they attend to other, perhaps more “important” issues in their academic lives.

The limited question-and-answer structure suppresses the need for conversation while perpetuating a consultant-dominated session. The consultant answering the question becomes the container of knowledge pouring into the spaces the student needs filled without the student ever having to leave the comforts of home, or more importantly, without ever having to really think about the consultant’s response. The writing center becomes a place that provides answers instead of guidance, and the consultants become experts in a hierarchy that develops only writing ability and not abled writers. From the outside looking in, the on-line writing lab becomes an avenue for a quick fix like the quick reference of the *MLA* or *Heath Handbook*.

The basic+ OWLs take the submission of grammar and syntax questions a step further, incorporating on-line tutoring via e-mail into their repertoire of writing assistance. I chose one such OWL to examine here. It not only demonstrates the general functions and capacity of the typical basic+ OWL, but also enhances these functions and capacity to create a more dialogue oriented tutoring session.

The University of Michigan OWL offers all the features of the basic, or NCSU, version of the OWL plus the opportunity to forward an entire paper to a “cybertutor” for review and response. To do this, students simply enter their names, e-mail addresses, year in school, the class the paper is written for/purpose for writing the paper, the paper topic, and its due date into the spaces provided by the OWL. The OWL also requires students submitting papers via e-mail to state exactly what kind of help they hope to receive, and promises a response within a 48-hour period.

To see what kinds of responses are generally received, I sent a paper I had written to the University of Michigan OWL. The paper was an explication of a passage in Shakespeare’s *King Lear*. After describing the assignment, I requested the cybertutor(s) to review the paper for logic, clarity and conciseness and within 24 hours I received a response. The cybertutor introduced herself, made some general comments about my paper, and then proceeded to more specific critiques. She enclosed her comments in asterisks as a separation device, and interjected them into the body of my paper which she e-mailed back to me. The comments ranged from suggestions regarding diction to particular direction in thesis development and idea support. While receiving this feedback from the cybertutor did encourage me to review my paper once more, the fact that I had no way to directly respond to the tutor’s comments or ask further questions that my second reading provoked, turned the exercise into one reminiscent of a typical red-pen grading by a teacher; I turned the paper in to the cyber“teacher” and the “teacher” made corrections for me to address.

Granted, I could have jumped back on e-mail to initiate a dialogue regarding her comments. However, due to the nature of the e-mail exchange, technical difficulties, or a lack of immediate responsiveness by the tutor, the dialogue could last hours, even days or weeks with lapses in between. And this was in fact the case. Even though I tried to initiate a dialogue, the dialogue was frustrated and inevitably suffocated by the strains of technology and distance. To the credit of the tutor, she did make suggestions in her initial critique beyond the structural range of grammar and syntax by raising content-related questions. But she also answered these questions herself. For instance, the tutor made the point that a portion of my thesis was not sufficiently addressed. “So, speak more of this aspect or get rid of this part of your thesis,” she wrote (Ancharki 2/22/98). She went on to indicate exactly

where in the paper I can expand on this second half of my thesis and just how to do it: “you can suggest that [Lear] learns to look beyond the superficial, and, then, explain briefly why you feel that this is so” (Ancharki 2/22/98).

Without speaking directly to her, I can only assume that the space between us prompted her to fill the gaps in conversation herself; that this was a reaction to the fact that I was not there with her trying to answer the questions she raised before she could answer them herself. It could also be that she is an impatient consultant whose approach to tutoring is not minimalist. In any case, I was left with a paper sliced by comments and directions, some of which I wasn’t quite sure how to take and all of which left no room for me to work through in my own writing. I didn’t get the chance to discover for myself where my paper and my development as a writer needed help and what I could do to improve. Instead, I was fed with options that I could simply choose to accept or decline.

The ideal student would of course think through and evaluate the cybertutor’s comments and suggestions to reach a decision and follow through for him-/herself. But we all know and, at one point or another, have fallen to the temptation of passivity. The absence of dialogue promotes exactly this sense of passive receiving instead of active deliberation. As Jay David Bolter states in his research on *Writing Space: The Computer, Hypertext and the History of Writing*, “computer-assisted instruction, although meant to encourage the participation of the student, can often reduce the student reader to a state of televised passivity” (229). Again, the student becomes the vessel into which the knowledge is poured, sometimes all too eagerly.

To test the consistency of the cybertutor’s evaluation and the nature of the University of Michigan’s OWL, I sent this same paper to several other OWLs receiving much the same response in terms of the following:

- **Timing**—all cybertutors responded to me within 48 hours save one; sometimes I received responses from two or three cybertutors.
- **Method**—comments tended to be interspersed within the body of my paper and separated by asterisks or brackets; there were also some tutors who wrote summaries of well-developed points and points that needed improvement either at the beginning or end of my paper.
- **Attitude**—every response I received included both positive and negative aspects of my writing; every response raised questions and provided answers; every response ended with an invitation to send more papers, but only one response invited questions regarding the critique at hand.

The lack of extended dialogue facilitated by the current structure of on-line writing labs is cause for concern, not only because it discourages active participation in one's own writing, but more importantly because the passivity that the deficiency encourages brings the function and perception of the writing center itself closer to a fix-it shop. The convenience of sending a paper via e-mail is much like the convenience of dropping a paper off and picking it up later after it has been reviewed. Sarah Sypniewski, a writing consultant at DePaul University, makes this disconcerting comparison:

Until orientation for the Writing Center, I had no qualms about proofreading or editing someone else's paper. I allowed many people to slip a paper under my door and I would return it an hour later. While it was accompanied by explanations of my markings and [comments] about the paper, my service was still just a quick fix (Online posting 6 Oct. 1997).

How is this practice of sliding papers under a door or dropping papers off to be picked up later any different from the current practice of on-line writing labs? To be sure, some universities acknowledge the limitations of the technology as it exists on-line. The Purdue

University OWL and many others, for example, state directly that they are not proofreading services. Acknowledging these limitations is only a first step.

Aside from accounting for the usual fallibility of computer technology, such as malfunctions, breakdowns, and inaccuracies of formatting, what can we do to move the use of on-line writing labs in the writing center away from what seems to be a quick-fix? Some colleges and universities are already making adjustments. The University of Iowa offers face-to-face consultations as a follow-up to cybertutoring. Washington State University offers an "OWL Writers' Exchange" through which writers can read and respond to the writings of others and these responses are posted for all to see as well as respond to, much like a listserv. The Exchange is organized into a table according to the title and author of the paper. The date and time of each paper entry is also listed, and each entry has an icon onto which the visitor can click for viewing responses as well as responding to the writing. The author of a paper that has been responded to is notified of the response via e-mail and must visit the site to view the response. This encourages an ongoing, although somewhat stilted, on-line discourse. The University of Missouri-Columbia offers links to MOOs, which are a kind of elaborate chat room, on writing and writing related issues. Even requiring a follow-up telephone conversation regarding comments made to a paper would prove more beneficial to a student's development as a writer and illustrate that the function of the writing center and technology within the writing center go beyond proofreading and providing answers.

If, as consultants, instructors, and administrators, we believe as Roy Pallido, another DePaul University consultant says, "Collaboration . . . necessitates a give-and-take relationship between the consultant and student. I provide answers when necessary, but I expect a student to help me find an-

swers when we both hit a problem" (On-line posting 5 Oct. 1997), then our desire for efficiency, productivity, and convenience must be backed by a stronger concern for and attention to the quality of interaction in writing.

The ability to access information via computers is convenient and unlimited in scope. Students and non-students alike, all across the world can get assistance with writing any time of day or night. This extended reach pushes the writing center beyond its circle of academia, expanding its exposure and influence to the world at large. But the common concerns addressed in on-line writing labs currently, as we can see, focus mainly on mechanical aspects of writing and supply quick fix remedies. While these aspects are essential elements of writing, by offering only them to the community, we risk the perception of the writing center as a station for mechanical recourse, an encyclopedia of writing tidbits.

"The beauty of the Internet," Muriel Harris says, "[is] it's free and accessible. It's a worldwide sharing of ideas." But she also admits that "there seems to be something about two people talking, talking out problems and asking questions that you can't seem to duplicate" (<http://www.jconline.com/boiler/punews/1105p02.html>).

DePaul is experimenting with an on-line annotations environment which promotes internal dialogue within the text of a body of writing. Anyone can submit a text at any stage of development—first draft, revision, etc. The annotations environment separates the paper into its component paragraphs and establishes comment windows in which the consultant can post comments to the paragraph either next to or above the particular paragraph being addressed. After receiving the tutor's comments, the student submits a response to the tutor within the same comment windows, creating a pseudo-discussion. Comments can be highlighted, edited, deleted to suit the

needs of the “discussion.” Music and pictures can also be submitted to the annotations environment for “discussion.” Still in an embryonic stage, it is not entirely clear how effective the environment will be. If we remember to incorporate dialogue into our on-line environments, however, we are that much closer to encouraging better writers and not just fixing weak writing.

Before we can even begin to address issues that this on-line technology raises, issues of confidentiality, language development and ethics, we must first consider how the incorporation of this technology will affect the mission and perception of the writing center. We can work with the technology to overcome the barriers it creates. When we do this, the addition of computer technology to the writing center will be more substantial in sustaining the positive impact we have upon both writing and writers.

Barbara Kossman
DePaul University
Chicago, IL

Works Cited

- Ancharski, Karen. “Re: Explication of passage in Lear.” ancharsk@umich.edu (22 Feb. 1998).
- Bolter, Jay David. *Writing Space: The Computer, Hypertext, and the History of Writing*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, Inc., 1991.
- Bruffee, Kenneth. “Peer Tutoring and the ‘Conversation of Mankind.’” *Landmark Essays on Writing Centers*. Ed. Christina Murphy and Joe Law. CA: Hermagoras Press, 1995. 87-98.
- Clark, Irene Lurkis. “Collaboration and Ethics in Writing Center Pedagogy.” *The St. Martin’s Sourcebook for Writing Tutors*. Ed. Christina Murphy and Steve Sherwood. NY: St. Martin’s Press, 1995. 88-96.
- Handa, Carolyn. “Politics, Ideology, and the Strange, Slow Death of the Isolated Composer or Why We Need Community in the Writing Classroom.” *Computers & Community: Teaching Composition in the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. Carolyn Handa. NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1990. 160-84.
- Lunsford, Andrea. “Collaboration, Control and the Idea of a Writing Center.” *Landmark Essays on Writing Centers*. Ed. Christina Murphy and Joe Law. CA: Hermagoras Press, 1995. 109-16. North Carolina State University’s Online Writing Lab. NCSU. 3 March 1998 <<http://www.ncsu.edu/ncsu/grammar/>>.
- Pallido, Roy. “prompt #3.” Online posting. 5 Oct. 1997. Writing Center Theory and Pedagogy by thread. 3 March 1998 <<http://www.depaul.edu/archives/lists/wcweb/>>.
- Purdue University Writing Lab. Purdue University. 6 Nov. 1997 <<http://www.jconline.com/boiler/punews/1105p02.html>>.
- Schroeder, Eric James and John Boe. “Minimalism, Populism, and Attitude Transformation: Approaches to Teaching Writing in Computer Classrooms.” *Computers & Community: Teaching Composition in the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. Carolyn Handa. NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1990. 28-46.
- Sypniewski, Sarah. “ethics in writing.” Online posting. 6 Oct. 1997. Writing Center Theory and Pedagogy by thread. 3 March 1998 <<http://www.depaul.edu/archives/lists/wcweb/>>.
- The University of Michigan OWL. U of M. 3 March <<http://www.lsa.umich.edu/ecb/OWL/owl.html>>.

MIDWEST WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

Call for Proposals
September 14th—15th
Iowa City, Iowa
“Looking Back, Leaping Forward: Writing Centers in the 21st Century”
Keynote Speaker: Lou Kelly

MWCA solicits proposals from writing center administrators, tutors, and peer tutors that demonstrate effective individual and/or group presentations of ongoing research projects, practical experiences both unique to a particular center and important to all centers, and reflections about the variety of theory and practice in our writing centers. We also solicit proposals for small-group workshops in which participants collaboratively explore questions that writing center professionals return to regularly. Local Conference Chairs: Carol Severino & Mary Trachsel; Conference contacts: SuEllen Shaw [shaws@mstate.edu] or Cinda Coggins [CCoggins66@aol.com]. For more information and a guideline for submitting proposals, visit <www.ku.edu/~mwca>, click on “conference”! We also encourage you to submit your proposal online. Deadline April 2, 2001.

Reader Comment and Response . . .

Letter to the Editor

We appeal to our colleagues in writing center work to engage in a fruitful exchange of ideas that will enhance student learning support services at all educational institutions that support a common mission—to help students develop into better writers. To that end, we would like to address some of the issues raised in Holly Moe's research paper, published in *The Writing Lab Newsletter* (25.2, October 2000). The following points will be considered: the relationship between Ms. Moe's data and her reported findings as well as the reasoning she employs in her consideration of SMARTHINKING's writing program.

As presented, there seems to be a disconnect between Ms. Moe's reported data and the conclusions that she draws. For example, regarding student satisfaction (question 1), Ms. Moe states that 44 of 65 students found the service to be highly beneficial and that 18 of 65 found it to be moderately beneficial. Regarding the helpfulness of the tutor, she presents similar findings: 48 of 65 students rated the tutors in the 8-10 satisfaction range while 16 rated them as moderately beneficial. Regarding convenience, 49 of 65 students rated the service highly, while 14 rated it as moderately beneficial (13). For any writing center, traditional or online, these are positive ratings. However, Ms. Moe interprets these data from the negative, explaining that, "students are pleased with the SMARTHINKING program," but invalidating their satisfaction on the grounds that students "are not always aware of what is best for them"; one wonders whether she would have had the same response if the students *didn't* like the service. She reduces the three statistical questions to one of convenience, assumes that convenience is the major issue for students (despite

her evidence to the contrary), and deduces that "I doubt whether SMARTHINKING is really helping students become better writers" (14). Additionally, her claims about how writers learn, how tutors achieve their goals, and how issues of authority are manifested in tutorial relationships are not supported by an analysis of writing samples or tutorial responses.

Such odd reasoning follows Ms. Moe throughout the research paper and leads her to numerous unsupported claims. Perhaps the weakest claim regards the use of the college dictionary to parse terms and "define" SMARTHINKING's mission. Somehow, she concludes that the "online environment of SMARTHINKING is not a laboratory," evidently disliking our use of a common metaphor. Further, she suggests that the company's promise to return a student's writing within 24 hours implies a "jiffy" service and, despite other students' and her own claims that they have received assistance on higher order concerns, or "FOD" in her lingo, that SMARTHINKING's OWL is exclusively an "editing service" (15).

Moreover, Ms. Moe cites responses from the WCenter list participants, who were asked a question without proper consideration of context; she did not reveal to them that the writing center where students might "drop off" papers was an online writing lab (15). Because the respondents had not been told that the writing center in question was an OWL, it seems natural that they responded strongly to this question; best practice in traditional writing centers eschews dropping off papers and requires student-tutor interactions. Adding to the misperceptions that this survey presents, a review of the WCenter archives from that period re-

veals more than one respondent, not quoted in her paper, who mentioned not only asynchronous OWLs but also lengthy papers as exceptions to the "drop off" rule.

In light of these issues, the validity of Ms. Moe's methodological approach must also be considered. Although a comprehensive review of the principles and procedures of her data collection and analysis would indeed be inappropriate for *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, questions about her methodology do arise. In the absence of a critical examination of this information, the validity of Ms. Moe's study needs to be taken with the proverbial grain of salt.

We appreciate this opportunity to address Ms. Moe's article and would welcome further discussion.

Beth L. Hewett, *Online Writing Lab Coordinator, SMARTHINKING, Inc.;*
bhewett@smarthinking.com
Christa Ehmann, *Vice President of Education, SMARTHINKING, Inc.;*
cehmann@smarthinking.com
SMARTHINKING, Inc.
1819 H St. NW Suite 500
Washington D.C. 20006

Holly Moe responds . . .

Dear Editor,

I was disappointed to see the way in which Beth Hewett and Christa Ehmann interpreted my review of Smarthinking. My goal in writing the review was not to attack or demean the Smarthinking service; my goal was to review a service that interested me, observe what does and does not work in online tutoring, and offer suggestions

for improvement. Unfortunately, after reading a letter written by Hewett and Ehmann to *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, I fear they have misunderstood my intent and made insubstantial and inaccurate claims against my reasoning.

Their first claim is that a disconnect exists between my reported data and the conclusions I draw. While the students surveyed were indeed pleased with the service, I did not invalidate “their satisfaction on the grounds that students ‘are not always aware of what is best for them.’” In fact, I offer quite sound reasoning for reducing three statistical questions to one of convenience. I did so because convenience was, according to the surveyed students, the major attribute with which they were pleased. I maintain my original observation: “If convenience is the major aspect students are pleased with (in other words, they are more pleased with the convenience of the program than the help they are receiving), I doubt whether Smarthinking is really helping students become better writers” (14). Hewett and Ehmann’s criticism of my reasoning may have occurred from an inaccurate or even biased reading/interpretation of my findings.

In an additional allegation in the same paragraph of the letter, Hewett and Ehmann state that my claims “are not supported by an analysis of writing samples or tutorial responses.” It is important for me to remind Hewett, Ehmann, and other readers that a note appeared at the end of my article informing all readers that the printed article was a condensed version of a much larger research paper. The original paper, which includes tutorial responses, etc, is thirty-eight pages long.

Clearly, the entire paper could not be published. For that reason, in the same note appearing at the end of the article, I offered to send the paper in its entirety to anyone who requested it via e-mail. This offer still stands. I feel certain that a reading of the paper in its entirety would invalidate Hewett and Ehmann’s assertion.

Hewett and Ehmann then attack my use of a college dictionary, calling it my weakest claim. Although the use of a dictionary as support is generally avoided, I used dictionary definitions in my paper as a means of clarification. While calling a writing center a laboratory may be a common metaphor, it is not, as in this case, always accurate. In fact, in the next sentence of their letter, Hewett and Ehmann refer to Smarthinking as a “company” and not a laboratory. Since they too refer to Smarthinking as something other than a laboratory, my reasoning for calling Smarthinking a “service” instead of a laboratory doesn’t seem too weak. Furthermore, they do not offer evidence that the company’s twenty-four hour promise does not constitute “jiffy.” Finally, as stated in my original article, “the word ‘edit’ is defined as ‘to prepare for publication or presentation, as by adapting or correcting.’” Contrary to their implication, I never claimed that assistance with higher order concerns (focus, organization, and development) is exclusive of an editing service; the students’ responses indicated that the dictionary definition of the word “edit” accurately portrayed the Smarthinking service as it functioned when we piloted it.

Hewett and Ehmann’s next claim against my reasoning targets my ques-

tion to WCenter list participants regarding dropping off papers and student-tutor interaction. Hewett and Ehmann’s statement about the manner in which I posed my question does not appear to consider that I desired an unbiased response regarding student-tutor interaction. Furthermore, while asynchronous OWLs and lengthy papers may be exceptions to the “drop off” rule, there is no exception to the student-tutor interaction “rule.” A review of the WCenter archives to which Hewett and Ehmann refer reveals that even those respondents who mentioned OWLs as an exception to the “drop off” rule noted the importance of interaction. Curiously, Hewett and Ehmann’s citing of the WCenter archive does not even address the importance of student-tutor interaction.

Finally, if Hewett and Ehmann genuinely want “to engage in a fruitful exchange of ideas that will enhance student learning support services,” I cannot understand their recommendation that my “study needs to be taken with the proverbial grain of salt.” Shouldn’t they, instead, view it as a method for productive growth and change? Their questioning of my methodology is understandable because of their apparent misunderstanding of my intent, but their assertions remain insubstantial and inaccurate.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to address Hewett and Ehmann’s disapproval of my study. I hope they will take a few minutes and re-view my study more objectively, this time aware of my altruistic intent, and I believe they will find use for my constructive criticisms, if they have not done so already.

*Sincerely,
Holly K. Moe*

TUTORS' COLUMN

Personal revelations in the tutoring session

As my practicum in Shepherd College's Writing Center came to a close, the director of the center wanted to observe my work—my very first tutoring session without an experienced tutor by my side. When the director saw the student I would be tutoring, she warned me not to be drawn into a personal conversation. The director had this person in a class she was teaching that semester, and she knew from holding writing conferences that the student liked to talk at length about her most intimate problems. Sure enough, as the session began, the student read her paper to me, but she also began to grumble, slipping in comments such as, "With the way my life is, I'm lucky I'm even here." I nodded and responded with a sympathetic "hmmmm." Repeatedly, the student tried to pull my attention away from her paper. Each time, I pulled her back into our discussion. At the end of our 30-minute meeting, the student had made quite a bit of progress on her assignment, and I could see that our director had been absolutely right: The tutoring session has no room for personal conversations. I left the session resolved that as long as I was a tutor, I would never let students draw me into discussing their personal problems.

Well, my resolution would have been a wise one if every tutoring session were exactly the same as that first one. During my six semesters as a tutor, however, I learned to modify my policy because some students must have their emotional needs met before they can focus on their writing.

Soon after I started working as a full-fledged tutor, I met with a freshman

who wanted some help with her Honors English Composition class. "Sue" was very bright, but she seemed extremely young and vulnerable for a college student. I soon learned she was a mere sixteen years old, and eventually, she used her writing to let me know just how rough her life had been. At first, her papers were about Plato, Thomas Jefferson, and other assignments typical to Shepherd's English 101 course. She wrote well, and her grades were fine. She seemed to enjoy receiving some feedback from me as she worked. Finally, though, she had a chance to write about herself, to express her ideas and feelings on a subject that concerned her, a subject with which she had intimate and painful knowledge, and she really took advantage of the opportunity to write a poignant essay that let her readers know what she had experienced. The problem was that her first readers—her peers—didn't seem to care.

Sue hurried to the Writing Center after a "workshopping" session in her Honors 101 class. "What's your thesis?" I inquired, beginning the usual routine, but Sue couldn't think about her thesis—yet. "I revealed so much about myself," she told me, "and they acted as if it were just another essay. They said it was O.K. and fine and all that, but nobody really seemed to notice what I was *saying*."

I asked if it would be all right for me to follow our usual procedure of reading the paper aloud, but she declined. She wanted me to read silently, and as I read, I understood her dismay. The assignment was to write a research paper that included personal experiences,

and Sue had chosen child abuse as her subject. Reading about her painful past horrified me. She had been subjected to nightmarish ordeals, yet she had written about her torment in a restrained and dignified manner while making good use of her research about abuse victims and their needs. Her writing—and the pain she had experienced—moved me, and I told her so. It was exactly what she needed to hear. I also explained that her revelations had probably surprised her peers. They didn't know how to react, so they acted as if nothing had happened. I could see the relief on her face as I spoke. Sue needed to know that what she had suffered was of consequence to the rest of the world, that *she* was of consequence to the rest of the world. Ignore her personal life? Impossible, but before the session ended, Sue improved her thesis statement, and she developed a weak paragraph. As we finished for the day, Sue told me she was in therapy and "doing just fine."

Since that day, I've encountered students who were writing about such personal topics as alcoholism, drug use, unwanted pregnancy, and surviving on welfare. I came to realize that many students approach the Writing Center looking for more than help with their writing. But was our director wrong when she told me not to be drawn into a personal conversation during my first session? Absolutely not! She knew that particular student needed my help with her writing, not with her personal life. I had to learn on my own how to deal with future situations involving personal issues—to work out the difference between public and private, what to discuss and what

not to discuss. Dealing with personal revelations can be extremely difficult, but I've developed the following list of guidelines for tutors:

1. *Tutors aren't psychologists or counselors.* Writing centers aren't counseling centers. I offer sympathy, understanding, and attention—not advice.
2. *Alter your usual approach to the session if necessary.* Sue didn't want me to read her paper aloud, so I didn't. Be flexible, and be sensitive.
- 3 *If necessary, refer the situation to your supervisor.* If a student seems to have a serious emotional or behavioral problem, ask your supervisor for help, but

never tell someone to see a psychiatrist. Such a comment could be offensive, and dangerously so.

4. *In general, restrict your comments regarding personal problems to subjects students write about, and even then, don't comment unless the students bring it up.* Some students don't want your sympathy; they just want help with their writing. They'll let you know if they need some personal attention, but don't fall into the trap of being overly supportive. After I was able to help Sue, I strayed too far from my director's initial instructions and reacted to every little need students mentioned.

Some chronic grumblers didn't get much writing done when they were with me, and I couldn't do a thing to help them.

5. *Guidelines are nothing more than guidelines.* Treat each student as an individual.

How can you know for sure that you should respond to students' personal problems? You can't. Go with your instincts, and if you're wrong, do the best you can to clean up the session and get some good out of it for the student before it ends.

Jane Honigs
Shepherd College
Shepherdstown, WV

Head 'em off at the pass: Strategies for handling emotionalism in the writing center

Writing is stressful business. Frustration can plague even the most accomplished writer sometimes. It may be that becoming a successful writer *requires* a certain amount of angst. However, student writers may not have developed strategies for constructively handling the frustration that accompanies writing. Sometimes the stress of the composing process coupled with the other pressures of college life lead to anger or tears. While emotionalism is understandable, it makes tutoring almost impossible. Tutors should prepare for the possibility of emotionalism from students by mastering techniques that encourage professional behavior. Productivity is enhanced when tutorials lack overt emotionalism. The key to handling emotional situations lies in recognizing the signals that indicate a potential problem, understanding its source and attempting to prevent simmering emotions from erupting and creating an unproductive tutorial.

First, an example of a tutorial with a student who is required to attend the writing center shows how anger can impact the productivity of a session. Ralph, an upperclassman who has never attended the writing center, brings a draft of an annotated bibliography to a session. All members of his class are required to attend the Writing Center for this assignment. This is how the session progresses:

Ralph: I don't know why I have to do this. I've always gotten good grades on my writing. This is a waste of time. (crosses his arms over his chest)

Tutor: Well, maybe we can see some ways to improve your writing even further.

Ralph: My brother reads all my papers. I don't need an editor.

Tutor: The Writing Center's purpose is not to edit your paper but rather to collaborate with you on your writing. Sometimes talking with someone else can help you see your writing in a different light.

Ralph: I still think this is a waste of time. Can't you just sign the paperwork and let me out of here?

Tutor: I'll make a deal with you. If we look at your annotated bibliography together and can't think of one thing that would make it better, I'll sign your paperwork and you can leave.

Ralph: Ok, it's a deal. I bet I'm out of here in five minutes!

This example shows how the tutor's actions disarm the student. The tutor does not respond to the client's resistance defensively. By clarifying the

purpose for the writing center, the tutor helps foster the idea of collaboration rather than authority. Making a deal that the tutor can be reasonably sure will yield a productive session cements the partnership with the tutee. In this situation, the participants may be able to proceed with the tutorial in a productive manner because the tutor knew how to deal with a hostile client. Of course, if the client appears violent, don't attempt to continue the session and call security immediately.

Next, another sample tutorial with Suzie, a freshman writing student, shows how progress diminishes as shame, frustration and fear escalate in the tutorial. She arrives at the Writing Center for the first time with a draft of an argumentative essay on legalized gambling. Her professor reviewed the draft, made written comments and suggested that Suzie seek help in the Writing Center before turning in the completed essay. The session proceeds as follows:

Suzie: My professor said I should come and get help with this paper.

Tutor: What areas of the paper would you like to work on?

Suzie: I don't know. I think it's a good paper, but the teacher hates it. (her lip trembles)

Tutor: I'm sure the teacher doesn't hate the paper. Why do you think that?

Suzie: Look at all these marks on it! I worked so hard on it and now I have to start all over. I have too much other work to do. I'll never get it done! (starts to cry)

Tutor: Don't cry, Suzie. It'll be okay.

Suzie: I did my best and it wasn't good enough. I know I'm gonna fail this class! (cries harder)

In this example, the tutee's emotionalism accelerates as the session

progresses because her tutor has enabled her to release her frustration by asking her why she feels as she does. Writing issues are never discussed and, because of the direction the session has already taken, it will be difficult for the tutor to make progress at this point. So how might situations such as this be handled effectively?

First, a tutor must be aware of a tutee's body language during a session. When Suzie's lip began trembling, the tutor should have acted to diffuse any repercussions associated with the tutee's shame at being sent to the Writing Center. The tutor should set a professional tone at the beginning of a session, focusing on the writing issues and away from any potential personal problems between the student and teacher. Asking questions about whether the tutee likes the class or the teacher encourages a relationship that may be counterproductive to the main goal of tutoring. Although some tutoring guides suggest establishing a rapport with the tutee, many experienced tutors discourage this type of interaction, as students may perceive a closer relationship than is intended. Writing tutors should be friendly toward students, but they don't need to foster a close intimacy with them. By remaining professional and detached, the tutor has a better chance of avoiding unwanted emotionalism in the session.

The best way to establish professionalism often begins with a statement of goals and objectives for the session, as illustrated in the tutorial with Ralph. A first time student, such as Suzie, may not understand the purpose of a tutoring session. In the example with Suzie, the session may have been more productive if the tutor had explained the purpose of the writing center: to help her improve her writing skills by working with her on the current project, and also subsequent essays, to achieve long-term goals. By encouraging her to vocalize her feelings about the teacher, the tutor opened the door for the display of emotion. Instead the tutor should have exhibited an interest in the

essay *only*. By playing the role of the counselor, the tutor defeats the purpose of the session and essentially sets the tone for the present, and possibly future, tutor/tutee relationship. As a result, the focus of Suzie's example session is on the individual, not the writing.

In Suzie's example session, her emotionalism appears to stem from a problem with her teacher, but she may be suffering from performance anxiety. Suzie assumes that the teacher's comments on her paper mean that she needs to start over at the beginning. Caught in this endless loop of negative thoughts, Suzie may be inhibiting her ability to write by setting unrealistic goals. In this case, a tutor may counteract this behavior by establishing more realistic goals. Although the tutee may not be able to write a Pulitzer Prize winning essay after the first session, focusing on a steady plan for improvement will reassure the student. The tutor may want to assure the student that everyone, even experienced writers, needs to revise an essay many times before it is completed. Planting this thought in the student's mind will reinforce the gradual improvement techniques writing centers employ. In addition, this type of positive and encouraging feedback may help alleviate anxiety and promote the common sense approach that discourages emotionalism.

Another possible reason for Suzie's emotionalism may arise from the anxiety associated with asking for assistance. Many first-time tutees may be rather nervous about what the tutor may find wrong with their paper. Since coming to the writing center means admitting to a problem in the first place, the anxiety stems from not knowing where the ax may fall. In both Suzie and Ralph's cases, being sent to the writing center exacerbates their emotionalism. If the tutor is able to make the first session successful, perhaps both of the clients will return of their own volition. The fear will dissipate as clients come to understand what to ex-

pect from a visit to the writing center. Of course, quality and consistency of tutoring will ensure this result.

Even students who have been to the writing center often might appear to be upset at the beginning of a tutorial. Writing problems may not be the cause. Tutees plagued with family, money or psychological problems may be unable to focus on academic work. After determining that the problem is of a personal nature, the tutor may offer to contact the university's counseling center for the student. The tutor should also call the counseling center

or campus security if the tutee exhibits inappropriate anger or verbal abuse, and the session should be terminated immediately. Under these circumstances, tutors may find that rescheduling the appointment is the best course of action.

Since the act of writing often involves delving into passionate feelings of some kind, it isn't surprising that tutors may observe all sorts of emotions in students during a session. Keep in mind that many tutees are adjusting to college life, which includes both per-

sonal adjustments and seemingly overwhelming academic requirements. Remember your primary goal: writing improvement. Watch for emotional signals and keep a professional tone at all times. Head off any attempts to engage in personal counseling or relationships. Avoid emotionalism by paying attention to the signs and altering your tutoring techniques before the situation gets out of control.

*Tracy Hudson
Winthrop University
Rock Hill, SC*

Calendar for Writing Centers Associations

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 Centers 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 Johaneck, English Dept, Denison University, Granville, OH 43023. Ph: 740-587-5793; e-mail johaneck@denison.edu. Conference website:<<http://www.denison.edu/ecwca2001>>

March 29-31, 2001: South Central Writing Centers Association, in Lafayette, LA

Contact: James McDonald, Department of English, P. O. Drawer 44691, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, LA 70504-4691. Phone: (337) 482-6907; e-mail: jcm5337@louisiana.edu

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/>>

June 18-20, 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/>>

Sept. 14-15, 2001: Midwest Writing Center Association, in Iowa City, IA
Contact: SuEllen Shaw, shaws@mnstate.edu, or Cinda Coggins, CCoggins66@aol.com. Conference website: <www.ku.edu/~MWCA>.

Alexander P. and Adelaide F. Hixon Writing Center— Director California Institute of Technology

The California Institute of Technology invites applications for a full-time director to develop and maintain a new Institute writing center. Applicants for this administrative position should have an advanced degree in rhetoric, composition, or a related field, and/or experience in administering a writing program. We are particularly interested in candidates who have experience working with ESL students. Responsibilities will include teaching composition, program development, and supervision of composition staff.

This is not a tenure-track position. Send letter of application, vita, and dossier to Director of Writing Center Search Committee, Caltech, Humanities and Social Sciences 101-40, Pasadena CA 91125. We will be interviewing candidates at the MLA conference in late December. Caltech is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer. Women, minorities, veterans, and disabled persons are encouraged to apply.

Writing Center—Director Salem State College

We are looking for a Writing Center Director who can also teach upper level lit courses. Qualifications: Ph.D. in English preferred, Ph.D. (or ABD with scheduled defense) in a closely related field considered; two years accumulated experience teaching literature and composition and experience directing a college writing center required. We prefer a writing specialist with ability and interest in teaching literature sections, with literature fields in British or Non-U.S. language literature. Experience in computer-assisted writing courses and/or on-line teaching a plus. Please direct all replies to
Office of Equal Opportunity and Human Rights,
Salem State College
352 Lafayette St.
Salem, MA 01970.
Refer to 01-AA-F ENG-WRITC1.

University Writing Center— Director California State University, Los Angeles

The Dean of Undergraduate Studies at California State University, Los Angeles invites applications for the position of Faculty Director of the University Writing Center. The position is a full-time, twelve-month academic appointment. The University seeks to fill this position by July 2, 2001.

The University Writing Center: The Writing Center operates as part of the University Learning Services (ULS) which includes the Academic Advisement Center, the G.E. Honors Program, the freshman peer mentoring program (PALS), the Student Support Program, the University Testing Center and the University Tutorial Center.

Requirements: Earned doctorate in Rhetoric/Composition, Linguistics, English or a related field; experience in the administration or operation of a university writing center, including supervising personnel, developing strategic plans, and managing budgets and resources. A record of successful teaching and scholarship; experience with innovations in instruction, learner-based approaches, use of new technologies and teaching culturally and linguistically diverse populations, non-native speakers and developmental writers is highly desirable. Demonstrated ability and/or interest in working in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural environment.

Closing Date: The position is open until filled; however, to ensure full consideration, apply by January 26, 2001. To apply, please submit a current vitae, a statement describing your qualifications and reasons for interest in this position and three letters of reference. Please address all inquiries, nominations and application materials to:

Alfredo Gonzalez, Dean
Undergraduate Studies
California State University Drive
5151 State University Drive
Undergraduate Studies, ADM 725
Los Angeles, CA 90032

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY /TITLE IX EMPLOYER

Student Center for Academic Achievement—Director California State University, Hayward

(Job # 00-072) California State University, Hayward (CSUH) invites applications for the position of Director of a new Student Center for Academic Achievement. The Center will offer a comprehensive array of academic assistance programs and resources to promote student academic success.

The University: CSUH, a comprehensive urban public institution located in the San Francisco Bay Area, is noted for its excellence in education serving a highly diverse student population of over 13,000 undergraduates and graduates at the main campus and the Contra Costa Campus.

The Position: This position requires a strong educator who has the vision to lead in creating the highest quality Center for writing, math, and other learning assistance programs. The Director will provide leadership, manage daily operation, design a wide array of assessments, tutorial services, and learning assistance, and maintain a strong network of contacts with academic departments and student services. Additional responsibilities may include program assessment, data base management, applied research and fund-seeking.

Qualifications: Academic credentials and experience to support a tenure-track faculty appointment. Experience in teaching, training, supervision and/or management. Demonstrated knowledge of issues in writing and/or mathematics education, learning theory, and the principles, practices and current issues that affect student academic success. Experience with a diverse university student population.

Compensation: Salary is competitive and commensurate with qualifications and experience. The appointment to the CSU Management Personnel Plan with faculty status includes a broad and attractive benefits package.

Nominations and Application: Review of applications will begin January 2, 2001 and will continue until position is filled. Starting date negotiable but no later than July 1, 2001. Individuals are invited to submit a letter of interest/nomination, a curriculum vita, a statement of the applicant's vision for a student academic achievement center, and the names of five references to:

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
Office of Academic Affairs —Warren Hall, Rm 945
25800 Carlos Bee Blvd.
Hayward, CA 94542-3007
Phone: (510) 885-3711 Web site: <<http://www.csuhayward.edu>> (click on "visitor")

Academic Resource Center— Director Lakeland College

Our Academic Resource Center will house our Writing Center, beginning next fall. Lakeland College is a small, liberal arts college in east central Wisconsin. In addition to a large number of traditional students, we also serve a distinctive population that includes a high number of non-traditional students, international students, and under-prepared students. Thus, the Academic Resource Center is a central and important part of our campus.

We're seeking someone to do a number of things:

- 1) Develop pre-enrollment assessment measures so that we can adequately situate our students in the proper math, reading, and writing courses.
- 2) Continue development of tutorial programs for students in various disciplines (math, science, writing, etc.) at both the basic and

advanced levels.

- 3) Teach in the General Studies program to integrate the ARC with the rest of the college.

At this point, we're really seeking someone who can help us get our Center up and running more productively. Although the duties are not specifically in the Writing Center, the director would be expected to work cooperatively with the director of the Writing Center to ensure the successful development of both programs.

Applicants should send a letter describing their interest in this position, a current CV, and names and phone numbers of at least 3 references to the following: Dr. Arthur E. Linkins, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Lakeland College; P. O. Box 359; Sheboygan, WI 53082-0359.

Composition Program and Writing Center— Director California University of Pennsylvania

Responsibilities: This Assistant Professor position entails coordinating California's three composition courses (basic writing, introductory college composition, intermediate college composition) and supervising a writing center, staffed by undergraduate and graduate student tutors, that serves the University community. Tenure-track members of the English Department ordinarily teach 4 courses per semester, with a half-time load in the teaching of composition. The Director of Composition/Writing Center Director position thus requires half-time administrative work plus half-time teaching of composition.

Qualifications: Applicants must have a Ph.D. in English, graduate-level coursework in Rhetoric and Composition, and experience in the teaching of college composition.

Requirements: Experience in writing program administration and professional publications in Composition are desirable.

Application Deadline: January 15, 2001
Review of applications begins (January 15, 2001) and continues until position is filled. For more information on the University and the position visit <www.cup.edu>.

Complete application materials should be sent to:

Dr. William Hendricks, Search Committee Chair
Department of English
California University of Pennsylvania
250 University Ave. Box 36
California, PA 15419-1394
Phone: (724) 938-4070; e-mail:
hendricks@cup.edu

Writing Center Director Mercersburg Academy

Mercersburg Academy, a coeducational boarding school of 425 students grades 9 – 12, located in south central Pennsylvania, seeks a professional to create and direct a writing center that will become the focal point of a writing-across-the-curriculum program.

Experience. A strong candidate will possess an advanced degree with work in composition and/or writing center theory. Previous experience creating and/or managing a successful writing center at the high school or undergraduate levels will be a major consideration. Demonstrated experience as a collegial and diplomatic member of an academic community and as the creator and proponent of an innovative and supportive writing center climate will be important considerations.

Management Skills. A strong candidate will have experience/training in one or more of the following management skills: decision making, records management, curriculum design, personnel development and direction, and faculty development and support.

Send resume, references, and transcripts by January 15, 2001 to Dr. Eugenio Sancho, Academic Dean, Mercersburg Academy, 300 East Seminary Street, Mercersburg, PA 17236.

Quotable Tutor Quote:

One way to think about handling global before local concerns in a client's paper is to "Focus on the head wounds instead of the knee scrapes."

*Teresa Goodlett
College of Charleston
Charleston, SC*

Rocky Mountain Peer Tutoring Conference

Call for Proposals
March 23-24
Provo, Utah
"Tutoring for Lifelong Learning"
Keynote speaker: Louise Plummer

Proposals are invited for individual or group presentations that discuss the conference theme, "Tutoring for Lifelong Learning." Deadline for submissions is January 29, 2001. For a form to use for proposals and for further information, contact Beth Hedengren (801-378-7844; beth_hedengren@byu.edu) or Penny Bird (801-378-5471; penny_bird@byu.edu).

Texas Tech University Graduate English Society

February 23-24, 2001
Lubbock, TX
*"Stepping Through the Looking Glass: Reflections on,
Revisions of, and Premonitions about English Studies in
the 21st Century"*

The conference will include sessions on writing centers. For conference information, contact Tim Hadley, Dept. of English, Box 43091, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409-3091. E-mail: Tim.Hadley@ttu.edu; conference website: <<http://english.ttu.edu/GESConference>>.

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

Muriel Harris, editor
Department of English
Purdue University
1356 Heavilon Hall
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1356

Address Service Requested

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