

THE WRITING LAB

N E W S L E T T E R

Volume 28, Number 2

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

October, 2003

...FROM THE EDITOR...

Buried in the small print on the second page of this month's newsletter, in the information about subscriptions and submissions, is some new information: the NEW (all NEW) e-mail address for the newsletter: WLN@purdue.edu. Previously, our e-mail went to Mary Jo Turley, who wears two hats, as the Purdue Writing Lab's Administrative Manager, and as the *Writing Lab Newsletter's* Managing Editor. But now, with much regret we are losing Mary Jo, who will retire in December to enjoy some well-earned leisure. But she will be greatly missed. Those of you who have interacted with her know well how much effort, kindness, and helpfulness has gone into her work with *WLN*. And so, along with saying goodbye to Mary Jo in a few months, we will have to get used to a new e-mail. (Again, that new address, starting now, will be WLN@purdue.edu).

Also in this issue are articles in which authors draw on principles of Zen (Paula Gamache) and art (Audra Chantel Fletcher), along with ways to use videos of tutorials (Tim Catalano) and reflections of previous tutors (Bonnie Devet and tutors).

And, please note that on p. 15 is an announcement about nominations for IWCA Board members.

• Muriel Harris, editor

...INSIDE...

Zen and the Art of the Writing Tutorial

• Paul Gamache 1

Tutors' Column:

"Creative Problem-Solving: Building a Bridge between Information and Art in the Writing Center at American University"

• Audra Chantel Fletcher 6

Using Digital Video for Tutor Reflection and Tutor Training

• Tim Catalano 8

Looking Back: Linking Writing Lab Consultants of the Past with the Present

• Bonnie Devet, Jimmy Butts, Alicia Hatter, LuElla Putnam, and Jill Willis 13

Conference Calendar 16

Zen and the art of the writing tutorial

You want to know how to paint a perfect painting? It's easy. Make yourself perfect and then just paint naturally. That's the way all the experts do it. The making of a painting or the fixing of a motorcycle isn't separate from the rest of your existence. . . . The real cycle you're working on is a cycle called yourself.

— Robert Pirsig, *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*

Introduction: "Right Mind"

Whenever I am asked for tutoring "tips," I think about my efforts to learn Aikido. Like most beginners, anxious to do the "right things," I focused on the technical side of the art: how to move, when to step and with which foot, where to place my hands, and so on. My sometimes-exasperated instructors told me not to worry about all of that since Aikido, they insisted, is not about "right movement" but about "right mind." "Move your mind," they told me, "and let your body follow."

In their own way, my instructors were telling me to forget about superficial technique and focus instead on the deeper philosophical issues which determine technique. The same can be

said of conducting a tutorial session: first, examine the deeper philosophical issues of tutoring; then, you can develop proper technique, or, perhaps more fittingly, *appropriate* technique once you have examined your purposes and goals. In a tutorial, as in Aikido, “right action” or “right method” comes from “right mind.”

The first step: Critical self-examination

All educational practice, including yours and mine, is rooted in some

theoretical values and assumptions (or “world-view”), if not explicitly, then implicitly. Thus, educational practice is never solely a matter of technique. A focus on technique exclusively doesn’t indicate an absence of basic philosophical views, just that the philosophical assumptions upon which the techniques are based have been accepted unconsciously. My point here is that if you adopt the techniques of another, you will also be adopting the basic philosophical “world-view” that informs these techniques, a world-view that may not be yours. For this reason, it is important that you critically examine your own motives, assumptions, purposes, and actions, for with understanding comes the possibility of self-direction (literally, “self-control”). I believe that we, as educators, should understand as much as possible about the values and assumptions that underlie our own practice so that we can work from a position of self-knowledge rather than ignorance.

The first step in becoming an effective tutor, then, is to examine your own beliefs and motivations, particularly your beliefs about the tutoring process, critically and honestly. In other words, developing “right mind” is the first step toward developing “right action.” Once you have uncovered and examined your basic assumptions about the tutoring process, your goal or purpose as a tutor, the role of the student, and the nature of knowledge and learning themselves, you can begin to develop your own techniques, methods, and procedures based on these values and beliefs. As Cleo Cherryholmes writes, “in order to exert control over practice and not simply react to it, we must be explicit not only about what we do but also about what it is that structures what we do” (6). What structures what we do, in this case with students in tutorial sessions, is our basic philosophical view of our role/purpose as a tutor and the nature of knowledge and learning.

Some practical suggestions

1. Determine your purpose

Ironically, the question “How can I conduct a good tutorial?” differs little from what students tend to ask tutors about essays (“How can I write a good essay?”). Therefore, I will begin in the same way that I begin with my students—determining the purpose of the undertaking. Complete this sentence: “*I will consider a tutorial session a success if _____.*”

Another way of determining your purpose is to identify your function as a tutor: exactly what is your role in the process? What are you trying to do?

Of course, there are many possible answers: improving the student’s paper, giving encouragement, teaching the student something, suggesting alternative methods or approaches, getting a good grade on the paper, and so on. Personally, I don’t consider any of these as my purpose; rather, I consider my purpose to be to give each individual student whatever he/she needs. If a student needs to know something, I teach it. If he/she needs encouragement, I give it. If he/she needs to be told that the work isn’t good enough, I say it. Sometimes giving a student what he/she needs means that we never get to the paper; sometimes we simply talk (intelligent conversation about ideas being a rare commodity according to many students, perhaps a reflection of class size or student shyness), especially when a student comes with nothing to say and no idea how to even begin thinking about the topic or assignment (“priming the pump”). When what a student needs is beyond my area of expertise, I try to recommend a suitable source. For me, a successful tutorial is one in which I give the student something that he/she needs (even if that is a referral).

Consequently, I spend the first part of every session trying to determine exactly what it is that this particular

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. 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, 500
Oval Drive, West Lafayette, IN 47907-
2038 (765)494-7268.

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

web site: [http://owl.english.purdue.edu/lab/
newsletter/index.html](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 approximately 2500-3000 words, 1500 words for reviews and Tutors’ Column essays. 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).

student needs. I do this in a variety of ways—asking, listening, observing, prompting. Since I believe that everyone is unique, I search for the unique approach to this particular student (not always with success, I might add). I always look for the root problems underlying the particular manifestation that the student exhibits. A poorly-written paper, for example, may be the result of any number of causes—lack of knowledge, lack of time, even lack of food or money. Often, these causes are themselves the product of other problems; lack of time, for example, may be the result of too much socializing, too little interest, family demands, health problems, too heavy a work schedule, and so on. I try to deal with the root problem (e. g., lack of knowledge) rather than the particular manifestation (e. g., incorrect comma placement). Often, I cover academic skills other than writing.

Note that I try to give students what they need, not what they *want*. I always ask, of course, but giving students what they want is not my role (nor is it making them happy, a not infrequent occurrence when what they *need* to hear is not at all what they *want* to hear). Students often want me to proofread, or give my opinion of a paper's worth (i.e., a letter grade), or intercede with a professor/marker on their behalf, all of which I refuse to do since these are not what they need. (Usually, what these students need is to do their own work, themselves.) Students get what they want only if it is also what they need.

2. Determine your definition of knowledge

Do you believe in an objective, impersonal “body of knowledge” to which we can appeal to resolve disputes? Or do you believe that knowledge is created by each of us (“personal knowledge,” to use Michael Polanyi's term)? Perhaps you prefer the radical constructivist view that knowledge is not a “body” or “thing”

at all, but an action. Think for a moment: what *is* knowledge?

What matters is not *what* you answer, but *that* you answer. Your conception of knowledge will determine your actions: if you believe that a “body of knowledge” exists “out there,” then your actions will be designed to bring students to that “body” and to “learn” it; if, however, you see knowledge as created by each individual student, then your actions will be designed to encourage students to make sense of things for themselves. Your conception of knowledge will determine your definition of and approach to learning itself, and these will, in turn, determine the specific methods you use, so think hard!

3. Determine your definition of learning

For some, learning means the passive absorption of facts and interpretations determined by others (the “sponge” metaphor), while for others, learning consists of a more active discovery of those same facts and interpretations (the “explorer” metaphor). Although these conceptions appear to be opposites, they are actually based on the same belief that knowledge exists external to and independent of the learner. Therefore, in both, students' knowledge can be classified as “right” or “wrong” depending on how it relates to this external “body of knowledge.” This is what many students believe. These students will want you, as their tutor, to be an expert, someone with a clear view of the “body of knowledge,” someone who can (and will!) give them “the truth.”

Do you think of yourself as an expert? Do you have access to “the truth”? Is the validity of the ideas of others directly proportional to their similarity to your own? If so, then you will spend much time getting students to see the “proper” way to do things and the “proper” ideas to profess. You will take great care to point out stu-

dents' “mistakes” and show them the “right” way to correct them. All of this will be done without reference to the goals or wishes of the students since “right” and “wrong” exist independent of them. You will spend a lot of time telling students what to do, and the “good” ones will do what you say. Thus, for you, “learning” means remembering and doing what one is told (the “shepherd” metaphor).

Personally, I see learning as a process engaged in by the student and knowledge as the components of that student's actions. As a result, I go to great lengths to convey to the student that ours is a collaborative undertaking in which my job is to help him/her express his/her vision as effectively as possible (the “midwife” metaphor). I begin by indicating that the student is the “expert” in this relationship (since he/she is the one who has the vision and knows the purpose of the paper) by asking a question such as “How can I help you?” (rather than taking control away by asking a question such as “What can I do for you?”). In this way, I tell the student that he/she must be an active participant in our tutorial, not just a passive “sponge” waiting to receive “the truth.” Even with something as seemingly simple as grammar and other conventions of language, I encourage each student to think them through and choose whatever will create the desired result or effect rather than simply following “rules.” At numerous points in the tutorial, I indicate that my suggestions are just that and that the student can do with them as he/she sees fit: follow all, some, or none of them. As with your definition of knowledge, what matters to me is not *what* the student thinks, but *that* the student thinks. “Above everything else,” Graham Gibbs (1981) writes,

[I]t is the encouragement of students' active reflection about their studying which is the cornerstone to their development. Simply adopting a new technique will be to little avail if it is not

accompanied by the student actively thinking about what he is trying to do with it when it is applied. . . . Awareness and reflection are not merely symptoms of developments in learners; they bring about the developments. It is through engaging students in reflecting upon the process and outcomes of their studying that progress is made. Passively following advice results in little such reflection, and so little improvement. (90-91)

For these reasons, I avoid discussions of “right” and “wrong,” concentrating instead on *effectiveness* (not that this spelling or that fact is “wrong,” but that it will annoy the reader and lessen the effectiveness of the argument). I often ask for the student’s help in an attempt to foster a collaborative atmosphere (“What do you think?” “Which do you prefer?” “Try it both places and go with your instincts.”). In such a collaborative process with students, writes Timothy Crusius:

[T]he first step is to ask for their interpretations and thereby perhaps to gain an active partner, without which no dialogue is possible. And with activity comes the potential for repossessing the world that being processed [as students] has taken away, almost beyond the thought of questioning. This is what empowering students ought to mean: nurturing authority itself, not substituting one kind of indoctrination for another, one kind of unquestioned authority for another. (81-82)

I try, as much as is practical, to get the student to forget about “giving the professor what he/she wants” (or giving me what he/she thinks *I* want) and to focus, instead, on giving the professor what the student wants. My goal, always, is to help each student discover what he/she thinks (and perhaps did

not even know) and help each express it effectively and accurately. For me, a “good” student can develop a vision and pursue it honestly, thoroughly, and relentlessly; what that vision is is immaterial. “The rhetorician’s task,” writes Crusius, “is not to grind one ax, but to help people sharpen whatever ax they are grinding, the object being an improvement in the quality of exchange generally . . .” (48). I possess as many axes as the next person, but I try to grind them elsewhere.

4. Borrow wisely

“Borrowing” the techniques of others is a useful practice (teachers are notorious for gathering and using anything they can get their hands on), but you must borrow wisely. Think about the technique or method, and uncover the philosophical view that informs it to see if it matches your own; adopt only those techniques that will help you to achieve your goal or purpose. Here is one useful question to ask yourself: “*If I do this, what message will I be giving the student?*”

Take, for example, the formality of the tutor-student relationship. Some tutors like to joke around and be friendly with students in an effort to put them at ease, while others prefer to remain aloof and maintain their distance in order to establish a “professional” relationship (I do both). Since each approach sends a different message, which you choose should depend on more than which was used with you when you were a student or which is used by someone you admire. Choose the approach (i.e., technique) that will help you to accomplish your goal. Choose wisely.

5. Treat everyone as an individual

Although your overall goal or purpose when tutoring may never change, you will find that the techniques you use will vary depending upon the particular situation and the relationship between you and each student. This is so for the simple (but often-over-

looked) reason that everyone is different. What works with one student or one assignment may not work with another; similarly, what works for other tutors will not necessarily work for you. There are no generalizable rules, methods, or techniques for conducting a successful student tutorial. As Snow pointed out over a quarter-century ago:

[W]e are increasingly aware that the definition of the best educational environment depends heavily on the kinds of learners at hand; the old question, Which method is best? must be qualified by the question, Best for whom? In other words, the educator’s responsibility today is to adapt instruction to the individual learner—to seek an optimal match between the individual’s characteristics and the characteristics of alternative possible educational environments. (269)

Conclusion: Technique follows philosophy (or “right action” follows “right mind”)

As you can probably tell, I tend to value free and critical thought rather than uncritical acceptance, and I encourage active involvement in learning rather than passive compliance; as a result, I have developed a range of methods and techniques to encourage my students to develop their ability to discover, develop, and articulate their own “right mind” (which is, I believe, what higher education should be about). The specific techniques that I use are determined by the specific situation — student and assignment — not by any routine or “typical tutorial” model. However, even though the specific techniques that I use vary widely, all are designed and used to achieve the same overall purpose—to give each student what he/she needs—and all flow from my basic philosophical beliefs.

Designing effective actions, methods, and techniques is possible when

one's basic goals and beliefs are clear, which is why I encourage all beginning tutors to spend some time engaged in critical self-reflection.

Paul Gamache
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Works cited

Cherryholmes, Cleo H. *Power and Criticism: Post-Structural Investigations in Education*. NY: Teacher's College P., 1988.

Crusius, Timothy W. *A Teacher's Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Urbana: NCTE, 1991.

Gibbs, Graham. *Teaching Students to Learn: A Student-Centered Approach*. Milton Keynes: Open University P., 1981.

Pirsig, Robert M. *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance: An Inquiry into Values*. NY: Bantam, 1974.

Polanyi, Michael. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. Chicago: U of Chicago P., 1958.

Snow, Richard. "Aptitude-Treatment Interactions and Individualized Alternatives in Higher Education." *Individuality in Learning: Implications of Cognitive Styles and Creativity for Human Development*. Ed. Samuel Messick. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976. 268-293.

SAT-Center: A listserv for writing tutors/coordinators who work with student athletes

Working as a writing tutor/consultant whose clients are college student athletes offers a unique set of challenges. Tutors often find themselves constrained and frustrated by the strict and foreign NCAA guidelines governing the tutoring of student athletes. Additionally, tutors may also become discouraged by the lack of time they may have to work with their clients, by the unwarranted sense of entitlement of one student athlete and the unwarranted lack of academic confidence of another, by the negative assumptions expressed about the student athletes who visit their satellite by members of their university community, and sometimes even by their writing center colleagues. Above all, one of the most difficult exercises may be meeting the demands of politically important composition departments and intercollegiate athletics programs, the mission statements of which are not always entirely congruent.

These circumstances force writing center tutors and coordinators to revise their ideas of best practice to fit their new tutoring situations, possibly even requiring them to develop an entirely different style to enable them to work effectively with student-athlete writers who visit their satellite. Because of the specific challenges writing tutors in this situation face, they can find it difficult to accurately represent their difficulties—and their successes—to those of their writing center colleagues not working within the athletic department.

For that reason, we've decided to start a discussion forum for writing tutors/coordinators working within athletic department contexts, and for the staff/faculty who coordinate their tutoring programs, to give them the opportunity to share their experiences with other members of a larger community of tutors and coordinators who offer student-athlete writing support.

On the SAT-Center Listserv, we will encourage discussions of logistical, practical, pedagogical, and fiduciary concerns, toward the primary goal of encouraging the development and preservation of writing programs which assist college student athletes, and the secondary goal of revising many of the negative stereotypes that are perpetuated about student athletes (i.e. that they are unmotivated, disinterested, poor students).

For information on how to sign up for this listserv, please contact William Broussard (wjb@email.arizona.edu) or Stephanie Sheffield (sheffie4@msu.edu).

Editor's note: For an article by William Broussard, describing the writing center for athletes at the University of Arizona, see the September 2003 issue of the Writing Lab Newsletter (Vol. 28, No. 1).

TUTORS' COLUMN

Creative problem-solving: Building a bridge between information and art in the writing center at American University

When students come into our writing center, they seek our understanding of how to clearly present academic information on subjects such as biology, international studies, and business. It makes sense that if the subject is systematic, then the process of writing about it will be as well. However, the process is far from being systematic. Like each of the arts, writing is a creative process, and creativity may seem to students to be in opposition with the content of an analytical paper. Sometimes, it is difficult to bridge the gap between academic information and the “magical” process of writing. The student looks to the tutor to direct the construction of this bridge. However, we tutors sometimes forget our blueprints for creating this connection.

For a long time, I never thought much about creativity during my writing center sessions with students. Although I was getting a Master’s degree in dance, I didn’t think to bring the creativity I learned in dance classes to my writing center sessions. Instead, I would try my best to box these sessions into a quick, easy, and logical format. Despite the training I had during my four years as a tutor, I was still approaching each session in the same way: figuring out what was “wrong” in a paper and working with the student to “fix” the problem. I thought that this was the key to tutoring effectively—that is, until I started reading a book for a choreography class.

One of the main ingredients in *Choreography: A Basic Approach Using Improvisation* was a process for solving creative problems (Minton 2).

When I encountered its five-step process for creating choreography, I suddenly realized that these steps to creativity in dance could apply to the writing process as well. The five steps are:

1. Decide on a problem to be solved.
2. Have the right kind of preparation.
3. Allow enough time, and work for the discovery of appropriate solutions.
4. Experiment with the use of the different solutions discovered during step three.
5. Decide whether the project needs further work or if it is complete.

The steps are simple, but they can help our understanding of how to address the need for creativity in writing when working with students.

The first step, deciding on a problem, may seem obvious, but I have found many students come to the Writing Center having missed this essential step. A solution for a problem cannot be explored unless a problem is first defined. The student and the tutor work together to analyze and assess what is needed for the paper, and what can be accomplished within the time constraints of the session. Both will need to agree on what should be worked on, and which problem should be solved first. It is the tutor’s responsibility to guide the student on the choices made, since this step will set the course for the rest of the session. The assignment sheet can play a very important part in this first step.

Once students are aware of the problem to be solved, they are ready for the second step, which is being prepared to solve it. And the students must be prepared in every way: prepared to change, prepared to explore, prepared to grow, prepared to unlearn bad habits, and prepared to build a bridge of communication with the English language. In order to be creative in writing, the student should feel at ease with the English language and the basics of how to construct a paper. Meanwhile, as tutors, we need to be prepared to answer a student’s questions or to direct them to find their own answers. We have the capability to prepare students for being creative by offering our skills and knowledge. We can teach them in a session how to construct a thesis and how to use commas, much as an art teacher shows students how to use color and how to paint with a brush. We can show them how to find their voice, their words, their style, developing their own identity in a paper. This is the time to talk about the rules of academic writing, explain what a thesis is, or give the needed knowledge of grammar to the student so that he/she can creatively use it.

After awareness and preparation, the student needs time to improvise with the provided knowledge. The student can begin using the tools of language to integrate the preparation for the paper in a creative and logical way. As tutors, we need to allow enough time in the session for creating and discovering—what in dance we call improvisation and in writing we call “brainstorming.” This could be a time when the tutor and student are actively dis-

cussing or when the student is silently thinking and writing. The tutor may know exactly what would work as a possible solution, and it would be easy to just give the students the answers. But, of course, they need to explore their own ideas. It is important to encourage the students by acting as the audience and by keeping an open mind to possible solutions. One or more of the possibilities from brainstorming could lead to the perfect solution.

Once the student has created and discovered, the difficult task becomes integrating the new information and changes. This is the step in which to explore variations of sentence structure, phrasing, organization, flow, and theme. Manipulation of the material should be encouraged. But, this step may be frustrating if the possibilities seem to fail when incorporated. To the student, the solution may seem foreign and awkward because it isn't some-

thing the student would normally write, even if the tutor may feel the student has made a great leap from where he/she started. Integrating a solution is not an easy task, and, in most cases, it cannot be done in the allotted time for one session.

After integration, the last step is to decide whether the paper needs further work or if it is complete. Sometimes the solution that is found in a session may not work for the particular assignment or for the student's satisfaction. If this happens, the problem should be redefined, back to step one. If the integration of the solution was successful, then the student and tutor can move on to smaller problems within the paper and so on until most problems have been addressed.

The five steps in the creative process are basic yet fundamental to our understanding of writing and problem solv-

ing in writing. These steps are not linear; rather, they form a cycle that can be repeated. When tutoring, we can use these five steps to guide students to a more efficient means of language and skill. As students grow in knowledge and awareness of the art of writing, they will discover an infinite number of directions and options for future bridge building. This creative problem-solving process offers tutors an effective blueprint for building the bridge between communication and art.

Audra Chantel Fletcher
American University
Washington, DC

Work Cited

Minton, Sandra Cerny. *Choreography: A Basic Approach Using Improvisation*, 2nd ed. Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1997. p. 2.

South Central Writing Center Association

February 19-21, 2004
Stillwater, OK
"Putting Research at the Center"
Keynote speaker: Carol Mattingly

Please submit one-page proposals for 20-minute papers or 90-min. panels, roundtables, or workshops to Melissa Ianetta/Kala Blankenship, English Dept., 205 Morrill Hall, Oklahoma State U., Stillwater, OK 74-78; phone: 405-744-9365; email: ianetta@okstate.edu. Deadline: Proposals must be e-mailed or postmarked by Nov. 1, 2003. Conference Web site: <<http://www.writing.okstate.edu/scwca/meetings.htm>>.

Southeastern Writing Center Association

Call for Proposals
February 19-21, 2004
Keynote speaker: Peter Elbow
"Getting Back to Writing"

Proposals are invited that examine the intersection of the tutorial with tutor training, writing center administration, faculty expectations, institutional missions, and administrative pressures. We encourage submissions from staff, administrators, and faculty affiliated with writing centers at all education levels. We particularly want to encourage proposals from peer tutors. Proposals are invited for poster sessions, 20-minute individual presentations, 3-5 person panels, and 90-minute workshops on topics related to the conference theme. Submission Deadline: October 31, 2003.

Detailed submission guidelines for proposals are available on the Web site: <<http://frink.mypwd.com/proposal/call.html>>. For proposal information, contact Marcy Trianosky, Hollins University, Roanoke, Virginia. E-mail: mtrianosky@hollins.edu. Conference chair: Bob Barrier, e-mail: bbarrier@kennesaw.edu. Web site: <<http://www.kennesaw.edu/english/swca/>>.

Using digital video for tutor reflection and tutor training

Sherry is a triple-major in English, Education, and French. Aside from the eighteen credit-hours in which she enrolls every semester, Sherry also finds time to play in the college concert band, work as a resident assistant, volunteer some time to the college's activity board, and devote five hours each week in the classroom as a student teacher. Miranda is a double-major in English and History. In addition to the eighteen credit-hours that she takes every semester, Miranda serves as the president of her sorority, chair of the student senate judicial board, treasurer of the pre-law club, a member of the forensics team, and a member or office holder of almost a half-dozen honor societies. Both of these individuals also devote around five hours each week tutoring in Marietta College's Campus Writing Center, and it's fair to say that the other eleven individuals who tutor in the writing center are equally as involved in the college experience. They occupy seats in student governance, volunteer their time in the community, and participate in Division III athletics. These students live the residential liberal arts college experience.

Perhaps my biggest ongoing challenge as director of the Campus Writing Center at Marietta College is to provide and deliver a "credit-free" tutor-training curriculum that voluntarily draws students out to constructively reflect on and refine their practice. Initially, we found time to read and discuss commonly anthologized writing center texts in small groups throughout the week. Many of the tutors displayed a strong interest in material that directly and immediately affected the way they viewed the tutorial. For example, tips and strategies for working with writers for whom English is a sec-

ond language were read and discussed in earnest. Readings on writing center "ethics" also brought about vibrant discussion. However, I sensed strong resistance when I required readings or activities that were perceived as extraneous. Readings about the importance of "wait time" and the theory behind collaborative learning, for example, were received with less enthusiasm. Unfortunately, discussions inspired by the readings were rarely carried over from one week to the next.

In a moment of opportunity and intuition, I purchased a digital video camera for the writing center. So far, it has turned out to be one of the better investments I have made towards promoting reflection, community, and professional development. When I initially purchased the camera through our college's Technology Improvement Grant, I wasn't quite sure what I wanted to do. I had some goals in mind: increase the sense of "ownership" and community that tutors exhibit in the writing center, record tutorials (either real or "mock") for instructional purposes, and encourage tutors to engage in constructive self-reflection. Beyond these general goals, I had no specific ideas.

When I conducted a literature review in the use of video in tutor-training curricula (I limited my review to the *Writing Center Journal* and the *Writing Lab Newsletter*), there was certainly a heavy emphasis toward the recording of mock-tutorials, especially in the late 1980s and very early 1990s. For example, Fran Zaniello, in a 1983 *Writing Lab Newsletter* article, "Using Video-Tapes to Train Writing Lab Tutors," describes how videos were used at Northern Kentucky University to supplement tutor-training instruction

by pointing out "some of the things tutors should and should not do in the Lab" (2). Zaniello's staff scripted and recorded their own instructional tapes, and she claims that the production of the mock tutorials allowed tutors to see themselves "acting" as tutors. The safe environment afforded by the mock tutorials made it easier for tutors to observe and discuss their own strengths and weaknesses (3).

In another 1983 *Writing Lab Newsletter* article, "Homemade Instructional Videotapes: Easy, Fun, and Effective," Michael F. O'Hear advocates the use of recorded mock tutorials as a primary way to deliver a tutor-training curriculum. O'Hear recorded mock tutorials and later handed out transcripts of the tapes to his staff so that they could view the tutorial and follow the action. Occasionally the tutors would be instructed to pause the recording and fill out exercises that corresponded with the action on the tape: "Many tapes are accompanied by handout scripts so that students may follow along with what's happening on the screen. Some are even accompanied by exercises which the student performs during a break in the tape's instructional content or after the tape has concluded" (2).

In their article "Using Videotapes to Train Tutors," Janice Neulib, Maurice Sharton, Julia Visor, and Yvette Weber-Davis emphasize the use of recorded mock tutorials for both instructional and reflective purposes. As part of a for-credit seminar at Illinois State University, tutors "work together on scripts and videotapes, basing the scripts on real tutoring situations" (2). They then ask the group to write "a set of self-evaluation questions for the tutor to follow while viewing a private session" (3).

Irene Lurkis Clarke's 1982 *Writing Lab Newsletter* article, "Hypothetical Dialogues and the Training of a Lab Staff," discusses the learning that takes place among tutors as they collaboratively produce and direct mock tutorials. In the 1982 *Writing Center Journal* incarnation of the article, "Dialogue in the Lab Conference: Script Writing and the Training of Tutors," Clarke argues that script writing among her staff forces the tutors to "choose those behaviors which best facilitate productive student-tutor interaction, determine the structure and sequence of instruction to be followed, [and] select which techniques should be learned" (23). In both articles, Clarke emphasizes the learning and dialogue among the tutors that takes place during the writing and recording of the mock tutorial, suggesting that tutors who engage in such activities feel a strong sense of community in the writing center.

Armed with a camera and a small literature review, I asked our tutors to submit mock tutorial manuscripts that covered a variety of topics. And, as I should have expected, this assignment was laden with challenges. One challenge I continued to face was the busy tutor schedule; it was difficult for the groups to find a common time to collaborate. Another challenge I continued to face was the "relevancy" issue addressed earlier: the tutors simply did not buy into the concept of writing and recording mock tutorials, and saw no real gain or advantage. The manuscripts I received were very far from self-reflective. The scripted tutorials read like a bad soap opera, where a twist in the narrative is nothing more than a formulaic cliché. All situations addressed in the mock tutorials were remedied by many of the techniques that our tutors learned over the years: keeping the paper in front

of the students, asking open-ended questions about content and structure, or helping students with an outline. Tutors scripted their response in a rather fossilized fashion, knowing ahead of time that a particular technique has already been stamped for approval (Clarke "Maintaining Chaos" 23).

Instead of throwing a \$750.00 camera into my desk drawer, I went back through the literature. I came across Shelly Samuels' 1983 *Writing Lab Newsletter* article, "Using Videotapes for Tutor Training," which discusses the results of the use of videotapes for tutor training at Northeastern Illinois University. Samuels argues that "real" tapes are more effective than scripted tapes, largely because "the tape is of a real session, not a staged one, not a perfect one, but one of a 'tutor in progress'" (7). She claims that in reviewing the real tutorial, "the new tutor cannot feel programmed in his responses" (7). Furthermore, Samuels notes that mock tutorials or scripted tapes were simply too time consuming to produce: "The time involved in such a project made it unacceptable for us" (5). Samuels suggests that any video "should really be presented in a three-step process: previewing (preparation for the viewing), viewing, and post-viewing (analysis and evaluation)" (6). In other words, it's probably not a good idea to simply record a tutorial, plopp the tape down on the tutor's desk, and expect him or her to really know how to respond. Samuels suggests that the video should also be accompanied by a questionnaire designed to "focus the viewer's attention on the discrete bits of information that make up the totality of the image of the tutoring session" (6). Although she doesn't expressly use the term, Samuels' suggestion to break down the process of watching the video into a three-step approach, complete with questionnaire, is designed to encourage better self-reflection.

Currently I require all tutors in the Campus Writing Center to participate in one "real" taping and reflection session sometime during the academic semester. Essentially, I tape a live tutoring session of each tutor, download the video onto the computer, and then ask tutors to review their recording (often during their "down" time in the writing center). To accompany this activity, I developed handouts and guidelines for previewing, watching, and reflecting on the video (as suggested by Samuels). This activity passes the "relevancy" test with the tutors, probably because it does not require any time commitment outside of a tutor's normal working hours. More importantly, this activity has energized the tutors' interest in reading and thinking about issues that affect the writing tutorial, and a sense of a discourse community is beginning to emerge. For a copy of the guidelines, see page 14.

The first session I recorded was between Josh, a new tutor in the writing center, and Alex, a new student from China. Alex filled out the consent form, and I photocopied his draft, thinking that it might be handy for Josh to look at later when he's viewing his video. I then turned on the camera, hit "record," and left the room (the camera is small enough that some tutors actually forget it's there; I leave the room to ease the additional pressure on both the tutor and the client). Later, I downloaded the video on a computer in the writing center, and subsequently Josh watched his recorded tutoring session.

I sat next to Josh as he reviewed his recorded tutorial. Josh laughed, shifted around in his chair, and analyzed some of his comments. He stopped and played certain sections of the video over, and even froze a couple of frames to capture a hand

gesture. He covered his eyes in embarrassment during one particularly tutor-centered portion of the recording, when he left the room to double-check a word on Alex's translator with a copy of the *Old English Dictionary* down the hall in the English Department office. When Josh watched the video, he realized that Alex sat alone in the center for almost three minutes with no instruction on what to do. I asked Josh some of the questions from the worksheet, but mostly I just sat back as he continued to view the video, take notes, and periodically rewind and replay the recording.

A few of the other tutors that I recorded reacted much the same way, and during this time I began to see an emerging pattern; all of the tutors were picking up on non-verbal communication cues. Josh noticed that he talked too much, and that he leaned into the client as he was doing so. Molly noticed that she sat across from, rather than next to, a client. These topics grew directly from the tutors' interests, and as a staff we collectively began to form a discourse community around the role of non-verbal communication in the writing center tutorial.

Our readings and discussions during this time period were focused and energetic. We read articles about the importance of non-verbal communication and discussed the idea that over "eighty percent of message meaning is derived from nonverbal language" (Amigone 24). Non-verbal response, which might be as simple as the placement of the text or the possession of the writing implement, or as complex as reading and responding to body language, posture, and tone, plays a significant role in the development of a successful writing tutorial.

In doing another literature review, I discovered that some of the writing center directors who conducted tutor training on non-verbal communication were Janice Neulib, Maurice Scharton, Julia Visor, and Yvette Weber Davis. They claimed that "all center tutors learn on day one that nonverbal signals dictate the tone of initial contacts and may affect all future tutoring" (2). More common from writing center directors are comments that recognize the relative importance of responding to non-verbal communication. Sharon Williams, for example, suggests, "A tutor's sensitivity to nonverbal cues *plays a part* [my emphasis] in determining the success or failure of a writing conference. If the tutor gives inappropriate verbal signals, or the tutor fails to respond to the writer's cues, the open, comfortable atmosphere needed for a successful writing conference may not develop" (6).

Of course, we're still in the initial stages of using this technology for tutor-training. For the moment, it has helped me to fulfill my goals of drawing on the tutors' interests, creating a "community" among tutors in the writing center, and encouraging more self-reflection. As our video collection builds, I can see other applications and developments of this technology. New tutors in the writing center will watch a few videos before they themselves are taped and recorded; a couple of my tutors want to use the tapes to conduct research on differences in tutoring styles with ESL and non-ESL clients; and a few of the tutors are talking about creating an instructional CD-ROM. Most importantly, though, is the fact that they're talking, writing, thinking, and reflecting on their craft—all outside the context of a required course.

Tim Catalano
Marietta College
Marietta, OH

Works Cited

- Amigone, Grace. "Writing Lab Tutors: Hidden Messages That Matter." *Writing Center Journal* 2 (1982): 24-29.
- Clark, Irene Lurkis. "Dialogue in the Lab Conference: Script Writing and the Training of Tutors." *Writing Center Journal* 2 (1982).
- "Hypothetical Dialogues and the Training of a Lab Staff." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 7.4 (1982): 7-8.
- "Maintaining Chaos in the Writing Center: A Critical Perspective on Writing Center Dogma." *Writing Center Journal* 11 (1990): 81-95.
- Neulib, Janice, Maurice Scharton, Julia Visor, and Yvette Weber Davis. "Using Videotapes to Train Tutors." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 14.5 (1990): 1-3, 8.
- O'Hear, Michael F. "Homemade Instructional Videotapes: Easy, Fun, Effective." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 7.6 (1983): 1-4.
- Samuels, Shelly. "Using Videotapes for Tutor Training." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 8.3 (1983): 5-7.
- Williams, Sharon. "Body Language: The Non-Verbal Path to Success in the Writing Center." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 16.4-5 (1992): 6-7.
- Zaniello, Fran. "Using Videotapes to Train Writing Lab Tutors." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 3.10 (1979): 2-3.

(See next page for the Video Review and Reflection Sheet)

CAMPUS WRITING CENTER—VIDEO REVIEW AND REFLECTION

TUTOR'S NAME:
DATE OF INITIAL VIEWING:
DATE OF TUTORIAL:

PRE-VIEW

Attachment: Client Data Sheet, Copy of Student Paper

- Before you watch this video, write down a sentence or two you remember about the session. What do you remember about the paper, about the client, and about your own tutoring effort?
 - If possible, describe the goals of the client. What was it she needed help with?
 - Think back to the tutorial, and evaluate its success. What are some things you did well, and what are some things you think you need to improve upon?
 - Can you recall specific obstacles that blocked the completion of a successful tutorial? For example, were you working on a few hours of sleep, or was the client particularly reluctant to make his own changes?
 - On a scale of 1-10 (with 1 being “unsuccessful” and 10 being “extremely successful”), rank the overall success of the tutorial:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----
 - On a scale of 1-10 (with 1 being “very reluctant” and 10 being “extremely active”), rank the overall level of the client’s participation in the writing tutorial:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----
-

DURING

As you watch the video, take notes on elements you believe changed or altered the course of the tutorial. Think of options you could have employed to change the direction of the tutorial. *Some* things you might want to consider include the following:

- Did you ask the student to describe his or her assignment?
 - Did you ask the student about his or her own goals for developing writing?
 - Did you manipulate the conversation, or did you promote more of a two-way discussion?
 - Did you provide opportunities for the client to make his or her own changes to the text?
 - Was the paper positioned between both you and the client?
 - Did you sit across from the client, or did you sit next to the client?
 - Did you point out and correct errors for the student, or did you explain the reason for the error?
 - Did you respond to both verbal and nonverbal cues in a manner that progresses the development of the tutorial?
 - Did you provide the client with supplemental sources to assist him or her in improving writing?
 - Did you end the session by making sure that the client had no further questions?
-

POST-VIEW

- Now that you have watched the video, how accurate were your original memories about the paper, the client, and your own tutoring effort?
- Compare your original thoughts about the client’s goals with your current thoughts. What did the writer need the most help with?
- Again, based on this tape, evaluate the success of the tutorial. What are some things you did well, and what are some things you think you need to improve upon?
- Did you notice specific obstacles that blocked the completion of a successful tutorial?
- On a scale of 1-10 (with 1 being “unsuccessful” and 10 being “extremely successful”), rank the overall success of the tutorial:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----
- On a scale of 1-10 (with 1 being “very reluctant” and 10 being “extremely active”), rank the overall level of the client’s participation in the writing tutorial:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----
- Any lasting thoughts you would like to share? What are the strengths and weaknesses of using the video for self-reflection? What have you learned from studying this tape that maybe you didn’t know before?

Northern California Writing Center Association

Call for Presentations
March 6, 2004
Stanford, CA
*“Acts of Writing: Performance in the Writing
Center”*

Deadline for Proposals: Please complete the NCWCA on-line form for conference proposals and send a description of your presentation (150-word maximum for individual presentations; 250-word maximum for panels, roundtables, and other group proposals) by December 15, 2003. If you prefer to send your proposal by surface mail, please print out the proposal form or request a form by mail, and send two copies of the proposal form and 8 copies of your proposal to Stanford Writing Center, Margaret Jacks Hall, 450 Serra Mall, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305.

For the proposal form and further information please see the NCWCA Web site: <<http://ncwca.stanford.edu>>, or phone the Stanford Writing Center at 650-723-0045. For further information, contact John Tinker: jtinker@stanford.edu.

What's new and/or interesting on your Web site?

WLN invites writing center folks who want to share some special feature or new material on their OWL to let us know. Send your URL, a title, and a sentence or two about what to look for, to the editor (harrism@cc.purdue.edu).

Yearly reports available on writing center Web sites:

- **The University of Texas at Austin Undergraduate Writing Center**
<http://uwc.fac.utexas.edu/pages/about/annual_reportannualreport.html>

We decided to publish our annual report online so that administrators and faculty at UT and writing center practitioners elsewhere would have access to it. Lester Faigley, our director, explains that “the primary benefit has been to show that students from across the university use the UWC in roughly the proportion to their majors.” We also include links from the annual report to results from our online exit survey <http://uwc.fac.utexas.edu/pages/about/annual_report_exit_poll_200_3.html>, which strongly illustrates the benefit students derive from our services. We’re currently planning an overhaul of our site that should be complete by November. The annual report will still be there, but the URL may change in the process.

*Chris LeCluyse
University of Texas at Austin
lecluyse@mail.utexas.edu*

- **Southern Arkansas University Writing Center**
<<http://www.saumag.edu/writingcenter>>

Our reports are included in newsletters sent to the faculty around campus.

*Shannin Schroeder
Southern Arkansas U.
Magnolia, AR
smschroeder@saumag.edu*

Looking back: Linking writing lab consultants of the past with the present

Continuity . . . connection . . .

These are words any writing lab director recognizes as central to managing a lab. Every director wants to establish links between the experienced consultants and the newer ones, for, without such links, labs can falter and even fail. How does a director establish this vital bridge between the veterans and the new consultants? I recently used a resource to foster this connection, a resource that was ten years in the making.

Since 1992, I have asked departing consultants to write an essay entitled "Advice to the Future." The advice, directed to all future consultants, could cover any aspect of their work, with the choices left entirely to the departing consultants. After all, they know what are the hardest parts of their jobs, what are the most demanding aspects, and what other consultants should know in order to be successful.

After collecting these pages of excellent advice, I asked this year's consultants to "look back" by reading the essays. Then, to establish a strong tie between the long-gone veterans and the current tutors, I asked the present consultants to speak to their fellow workers in a staff meeting about what "gems" of advice they had mined from the ten years of writings by graduated tutors. The dialogue among the consultants revealed essential elements on how to flourish as a consultant, what roles consultants play in a lab, and what new consultants can learn about themselves from reading the former consultants' words.

Bonnie Devet: What gems about being successful consultants did you discover in the advice essays?

LuElla Putnam: One gem I found was, "Ideally, we, as tutors, help students with their problems by helping them help themselves." This advice was so true for me. I recall a session where the student was writing for a 300-level English class; at this higher level, it was wonderful writing, so I thought, "How can I help *her*?" Although I was not an active participant in the consultation, (I only nodded my head and asked a question or two), the client felt I had helped by listening. She believed she had had a good consultation. So, I realized, as the gem had said, that we lead clients to do the work.

Jill Willis: You are right; there was no bad advice. I liked, for instance, how the pieces stressed that consultants should ask questions of *themselves*, not just of the clients: "How can I be the best consultant possible?" and "What types of questions could I have asked to make the session go smoother?" This self-questioning was something I had not thought of before.

Jimmy Butts: I, too, liked how the essays said that consultants should be reflective about their work. But we should notice that former consultants emphasized more than just the consultants' reactions. They also stressed the clients' perceptions of the Lab. Especially useful was this former consultant's words: "Imagine yourself a Freshman again. . . You should imagine this scene because that student

might well be your next client. Identify with that client as a learner." From this advice, I have understood better the client's difficulty of coming through the Lab's doors.

Alicia Hatter: All that you've said is true, but for me one of the best pieces of advice focused on the "I-hate-the-professor" clients. If students bash professors, they want the consultants to do it, too. I had this experience once. It was fifteen minutes to closing, and a girl came in to get help with a paper that had made a "D." When I told her that the paper had no thesis, she complained, "My professor did not teach the thesis. So, how am I supposed to know about it when I'm not even an honors student?" I just refused to go along with her complaints and kept pointing out the problems in the paper. If students are negative about professors, I try not agree with them. Agreeing with clients will only keep them from taking responsibility for their work; they need to see it as *their* writing.

LuElla: I have had the same trouble, though I do think we can encourage clients. Here's what one of the former consultants stressed about providing encouragement: "Constantly reinforce that the client is not alone in making the mistakes he or she has made." Although it is easy to tell clients their problems, it is also useful to point out what is unique or special about their writing.

Alicia: I've done that, also. The former consultants' advice offered even more practical suggestions, such

as “Banter is important” and “Do not feel as if you need to write the papers for the clients; instead, offer alternatives, and let clients pick one.” That is so useful. I try not to let the clients make me into a “writing machine.” When they say to me, “I bet you can turn out a five-page paper in only two hours,” I reply, “Well, I have to stop and think. . . I am only human, too.”

Jill: Yes, the essays had loads of practical suggestions like, “Have a friendly relationship with clients even outside the lab.” Now, I see that I need to make conversation, like saying “Hi!” when I meet clients on campus even if I can’t recall their names. And I have learned about another way to relate to clients. If you have had the same professor, you can let the clients know you understand what they are saying about the course.

LuElla: That’s a good way to assist clients.

Jill: Just having completed my first semester as a consultant, I have been worried about my work after I had left for the day, and I found one of the former consultants had written advice I could really relate to: “One has to leave the writing lab at the door. It does not do you any good to say, ‘I should have. . .’ or ‘I wonder if I gave good help. . .’” So, now, I know what I told the client at the time was what I thought was right then.

Bonnie Devet: How do you think the Writing Lab has changed over the ten years the essays were collected?

LuElla: I don’t think there’s been much change. We consultants today have the same issues and worries as consultants from the last ten years. “Did I do enough?” Previous consultants also share with us the same inferiority complexes and anxieties, and there is still the same way to relieve some of those fears: we can go to our fellow consultants for help. We are not alone.

Jill: Yes, doing so shows clients you are not necessarily smarter than they are in English.

Alicia: I agree, Luella. And don’t forget the clients. Their problems also seem to be the same over the years. Many clients are not well taught in high school, and college classes do not always take the time to teach fundamentals like thesis statements and basic grammar. Clients, because they are sometimes afraid to go to their professors, see us as a satellite resource.

Jill: I agree that some of the clients were not well taught in high school, so they have no idea even what MLA is. I did not learn it, either. When my high school teacher said to turn in a paper in MLA style, I thought she meant to use a cover sheet on the essay.

Jimmy: But I have to admit I think there *has* been a major change. Because grammar and usage are not being taught in our public high schools, fewer and fewer students enter the Lab with a working knowledge of our language’s structure. We consultants today have to prod a little more than former consultants did in order to help clients understand grammar.

Bonnie Devet: What do the advice essays reveal about the role of consultants in a Writing Lab?

LuElla: We consultants are helpers, standing beside the clients. In fact, I am learning like the clients because I like to look up answers to questions. Then, I remember the material for the next time.

Jimmy: You are right about learning a great deal. However, our most important service is to be not just helpers but also an audience. . . someone to bounce thoughts off of as *peers*.

Jill: Oh, definitely. We give clients someone to talk to, and the clients know that we know what we are talking about. We are not intimidating,

however. We avoid making them feel as if they know nothing.

Alicia: Well, I think this is an idealized view of the Writing Lab. In a perfect world, consultants and clients both know what the problems are so that there is a dialogue between them. In reality, however, clients look to us for answers and explanations. They nod and write it all down. Consultants, then, not clients, answer questions.

Jill: True, but we really cannot have this idealized dialogue in *every* session. After all, clients do not realize where the problems are. If they knew, for instance, that a comma was needed, they would have put it there.

LuElla: One of the best pieces of advice from the former consultants addressed this lack of dialogue: You have to “keep quiet” and “draw the clients into the piece.” If you don’t say anything, then clients will start to speak. Our role, then, is to get them to talk.

Bonnie Devet: What did you learn about yourself from looking back at the former consultants’ advice?

LuElla: Well, I could really relate to the following advice from a former consultant: “The lab has been a pinnacle part of my education at the College as well as providing a thorough supplement to my English studies.” To me, it has been helpful not just for English essays; I have learned from working with biology and history papers—I am a more well-rounded student.

Jill: I, too, realized something about myself. Usually, I try to please others by doing what they want me to do. But I must shift my personality a bit when working with clients. Although clients would prefer I just tell them what to write, I have to avoid trying to please them. I must get the clients to do the work.

Alicia: That’s true, and although some of the advice was just nuggets not pol-

ished gems, I felt I was back to the basic training of the fall when we were first hired. Reading the pieces was a refresher on the training we had already received.

Jimmy: I found it was encouraging to know that other consultants from across the sands of time have overcome the daunting task involved in helping clients write well.

"Hands Across the Ocean"

The past can always provide lessons for the present. Having current con-

sultants read and reflect on what their own peers from the last decade have said about working in the Writing Lab demonstrates to the present consultants that they are not alone in their constant, generous, sympathetic efforts to assist others with writing essays or reports or term papers. They are, indeed, connected to a long line of fellow workers who, like them, have realized the special roles they play as helpers to others. In effect, then, the advice essays are like Paul McCartney's 1971 lyric "hands across the water"; the hands (and, yes, even hearts) of former

consultants have reached out to continue helping others, the true roles of consultants at any time in a lab's history.

Bonnie Devet, Jimmy Butts, Alicia Hatter, LuElla Putnam, and Jill Willis
College of Charleston
Charleston, SC

Work Cited

McCartney, Paul. "Uncle Albert/Admiral Halsey." By Paul McCartney. *Ram*. No place. 1971.

Call for nominations:

The IWCA board is accepting nominations for board members to take office in November of 2004. The constitution established this tradition of calling for board members early, so, I imagine, that new board members can anticipate their assumption of duties, ask the questions they want to ask, attend meetings to get a sense of things, and the like. So we will take nominations until the end of the 2003 NCTE meeting, November 25. We will then send out a ballot and hold an election.

The board positions that will open a year from November are all two-year terms:

- Six at-large representatives
- One community college representative
- One graduate representative
- One secondary representative

You may nominate others, but please contact them first to be sure they are willing to be nominated. With the nomination, please include all contact information: e-mail address, telephone, and mailing address. Please send nominations to IWCA secretary Leigh Ryan, 0125 Talliaferro Hall, University of Maryland at College Park, College Park, MD 20742. (301)405-3785, Fax: (301)314-9351, LR22@umail.umd.edu before November 25. Please feel free to nominate yourself for these positions, and if you are a current member of the board, please feel free to stand for re-election. The board has important work ahead of it, and it is exciting to be part of IWCA's future.

WLN and WCJ in MLA Bibliography

I've volunteered to be a field bibliographer for the Modern Language Association (MLA). I have been assigned the *Writing Lab Newsletter* and *Writing Center Journal* for indexing. This means I will categorize each article (excluding book reviews) by subject classifications so people can search for the article by topic. I will also write brief synopses of each article. The index is available in both book and electronic forms as the *MLA Bibliography*, available in book form in the reference section of the library. The cost of the bibliography to MLA members is \$40. The hardbound edition is \$1,000. It can be ordered from MLA Customer Service, 26 Broadway, New York 10004-1789.

Each bibliographer is expected to submit 100 citations annually. Each issue of *WLN* has about 6 articles per issue (total of 60/yr.), and *WCJ* can contain between 4 and 9 articles per issue (total of 8-18/yr). So, just keeping up with the current issues should result in more than 70 citations per year. As time allows I will also work backwards issue by issue. As you can see, this is a long-term, major project. Thanks for your patience!

Bibliographers get a free copy, however, so people could consider volunteering as I am. They have many journals that still need to be covered. As for the electronic version of the Bibli-

ography, (the *MLA International Bibliography*), people should ask their respective librarians how it's accessed at their institution. Or, browse the list of databases their library carries. Also, a very good resource for people who know the journal they are looking for but don't know which database it's in is "JAKE." This is a wonderful resource. Type in the name of the journal, and JAKE will tell you which database carries it, what year it starts, and whether or not it's full-text. <<http://jake.med.yale.edu/index.jsp>>.

Rebecca S Day
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
ykbb@iup.edu
Indiana, PA

Calendar for Writing Center Associations

October 4, 2003: Michigan Writing Centers Assn. in Flint, MI
Conference Web site:
<www.flint.umich.edu/Departments/writingcenter>.

October 23-25, 2003: International Writing Centers Assn. and National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing, in Hershey, PA
Contact: Ben Rafoth, brafoth@iup.edu. Conference Web site: <www.wc.iup.edu/2003conference>.

Feb. 19-21, 2004: South Central Writing Centers Association, in Stillwater, OK
Contact: Melissa Ianetta. E-

mail: ianetta@okstate.edu; phone: 405—744-9365; Conference Web site: <http://www.writing.okstate.edu/scwca/meetings.htm>

Feb. 19-21, 2004: Southeastern Writing Centers Assn., in Atlanta, GA
Contact: Bob Barrier, e-mail: bbarrier@kennesaw.edu. Web site: <<http://frink.mypwd.com/proposal/call.html>> and <<http://www.kennesaw.edu/english/swca/>>.

March 6, 2004: Northern California Writing Center Assn., in Stanford, CA
Contact: John Tinker: jtinker@stanford.edu; Conference Web site: <<http://newca.stanford.edu>>.

WCenter listserv

In 1991, Fred Kemp established WCenter for the writing center community, and it has been my privilege to serve as listowner. Effective August 31, 2003, however, I retired from Texas Tech University. Kathleen Gillis, the new director, has agreed to serve as listowner, so the list will continue. The current address for subscribing to WCenter is <http://lyris.acs.ttu.edu/cgi-bin/lyris.pl?enter=wcenter&text_mode=0&lang=english>.

Should you have problems (particularly those concerning changes in your address), please contact Kathleen Gillis at Kathleen.Gillis@ttu.edu.

*Lady Falls Brown
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX*

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

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

Address Service Requested

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