THE WRITING LAB
NEWSLETTER

– FROM THE EDITOR –

This issue of *WLN* starts with two articles that offer rationales for moving from less useful and less productive approaches to more positive perspectives that look forward instead of backward. Kurt Schick invokes the half-full/half empty glass metaphor to show us how to build on students' writing strengths instead of focusing on weaknesses. Emily Isaacs continues this approach by offering her experience after the closing of her old writing center to build a broader-based proposal that resulted in campus-wide support for a greatly enlarged Center for Writing Excellence. Anthony Edgington then asks his tutors to help him explore what they do when reading students' papers at the beginning of tutorials. Danielle Sahm poses an interesting discussion topic for other tutors by contemplating the question of how tutors should work with students whose writing may be as unconventional as William Faulkner's.

And there is a very long list of regional conferences in the United State on our calendar (page 16) for the rest of this year. Some are multi-state groups, two are smaller groups within the large state of California, and one is a more localized group of Chicagoland high school writing center directors. And on a larger geographic scale, as a demonstration of how international writing centers have become, the Middle East-North Africa writing centers group will be meeting in February. If there are other local, state, regional, or multi-national groups planning meetings that are not yet on the calendar, please e-mail me (harrism@purdue.edu) with the information.

✦ *Muriel Harris, editor*

INSIDE

THROUGH GLASSES HALF FULL

✦ *Kurt Schick*
James Madison University
Harrisonburg, VA

The liveliest writing center listserv discussion in recent memory began with a somewhat innocent posting of a student's "grammar goof" for the amusement of list readers. Astonishingly, the e-mail elicited more than seventy responses. Most contributors added bloopers they'd seen or committed themselves; a few debated whether or not we should mock student writing. Though the comments were mostly lighthearted and sometimes comical, what struck me most about the conversation, labeled by the listserv thread's title as "best bad grammar mistakes," was its sheer volume. Why devote so much attention to stylistic or mechanical deficits? Why gaze at student writing through half-empty glasses?

Later that same week, students in our tutor education course displayed similar behavior during a simulated, in-class writing consultation. Acting together, nine students tutored an instructor who'd brought everyone copies of a sample draft. True to "best practices," our neophyte tutors asked their "student" to read her draft aloud as they followed along. Yet despite several weeks spent discussing higher-order rhetorical concerns and producing-better-writers-not-(so-much)-better-writing, the tutors-in-training couldn't set down their pens to just listen and read. They couldn't resist the corrective habits passed down to them from their teachers and their teachers' teachers. Happily, the session ended well—students provided plenty of wonderful help

regarding substantive issues such as focus and coherence. But I kept wondering: How much better could they have listened without first nitpicking? What unintended messages might their busy pens send to a student-writer while she nervously reads aloud?

Neither my students nor my colleagues on the listserv were just plain wrong. Writers can obviously learn from having good readers identify weaknesses in their work. Certainly, most of us have done so. But that's only part of how we learned, and perhaps not the best approach for most of the folks who visit our writing centers: developing, often anxious, often struggling student-writers. Instead of deficit-based evaluation that devalues student writing, I propose that we consider alternative means of *ascribing* value through a practice of *valuation* that builds on strengths instead of trying to fix every little deficiency.[1] Old-fashioned classroom *evaluation* enabled teachers to quickly process stacks of student writing by focusing mostly on easily marked defects. Good performance equaled compliance to pre-established rules: correct grammar, spelling and punctuation; clearly stated thesis and topic sentences; proper citations; and so forth. Copious red ink taught many of us, even if subconsciously or against our will, to equate good writing with a checklist of "do nots" that teachers scrupulously enforced and students sheepishly obeyed.

Of course, we're not those old-fashioned teachers. As enlightened modern writing consultants, we've broken this cycle of abuse because folks like Donald Murray, Peter Elbow, and Steven North helped reprogram our brains to embrace the writing process and the glorious, necessary, inevitable messiness of drafts-in-progress. Still, grammar gaffe discussions linger on, and my tutors still cannot locate the safeties on their error-seeking ink-missiles. We've even developed clever coping mechanisms to hide (or hide from) our affliction. *Don't touch student papers. Don't write on them. Don't hijack them. Lock away your marking missiles. Protect the children!* It's as if we need to save our students from ourselves. (Notice, too, that these negative imperatives fail to teach us what we're supposed to do instead.) Before we begin to enact more positive practices of valuation, we probably each need to admit that we have a problem: *Hello, my name is Kurt, and I habitually wince at unintended sentence fragments, rogue commas, and essays that begin, "Since the dawn of human civilization. . . ." Some such blunders I really hate, even though I realize how irrational it is to care so much about issues that really don't significantly impede communication. I'm Kurt, and I'm a recovering STYLIST. I sometimes see student writing through half-empty glasses.*

Compulsive deficit-driven evaluation results from *stylism*: ossified bias against violations of written decorum that mostly don't hamper meaning but still bother most folks whose formative writing processes were permanently stained by red ink. (The term "stylism" derives from "style" in its broadest sense, as the sum effect of how a writer conforms to or deviates from conventional rules and expectations. Style, in this sense, can be seen at the level of a sentence or an essay.) Stylism is conservative, even reactionary—slow to change, based in rules already "written," though often not explicitly disclosed. As habituated dogma, stylism can be as irrational and potentially damaging, metaphorically speaking, to budding writers as other discriminatory *-isms* can be to their victims. Stylism jades how we see developing writers and diminishes our expectations for what we might achieve together. Worst of all, like any recalcitrant orientation, stylism is especially insidious because we often don't admit or even realize when we do it.

Just as stylism afflicts us, it infects those students we tutor. A student who recently visited our writing center provides a typical case study. Ashley brought a draft essay for her composition class that had already been through in-class peer review. She asked for help interpreting and implementing her peers' comments, most of which were surface-level quibbles that affected meaning only in minor ways. Ashley said she needed to "fix" those problems first, implying that if she could only mend those deficits, then and only then would her paper be acceptable. *Hello, my name is Ashley, and now they've got ME addicted to correction fluid.*

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

Like many student writers, Ashley equated "grammar mistakes" with everything from actual grammar errors to problems with syntax, spelling, punctuation, citation, and stylistic *faux pas*. What she wanted from me, then, was a stylism fix—the rush of a quick and easy high (grade), whether or not the effect lasted past her current assignment. Had I given her the quick fix she wanted, I would only have strung her out and reinforced her diminished view of how good a writer she might become.

Since this was Ashley's first visit to the center, I tried to enlarge her idea of what good writing and a good writing process might look like by advocating the kinds of help we could provide, from support with mechanics such as grammar and punctuation to larger issues of structure and coherence, along with assorted revision strategies that we might try, from reading aloud to reverse outlining. By doing this, I hoped to entice her to consider the choices available to her in fuller, more creative terms than a quick fix. Then I asked her how she'd like to proceed, how she thought we ought to spend our time together. Though reluctant to give up on repairing what was wrong (or what her stylist colleagues had found wrong), Ashley agreed to try a more valuative approach: re-building her essay from strengths by first working to improve the structure and coherence of what she already thought was working well.

After she explained the main points of her paper, we read through the essay together. Immediately, I noticed that her introduction—really, her entire first page—seemed weak in content and style in contrast to the rest of her essay. But I bit my stylist tongue (remember, I'm still recovering) and continued into her body paragraphs, which were more substantive, more cogent, and even more eloquent. Together, we read and built upon those ideas, paragraphs, and sentences, refining and reorganizing, adapting them more deliberately for her intended audience. By the end, she had created—in the remnants of her draft, in her notes, and in her mind—a stronger version that, she began to notice, no longer needed that mediocre first page anymore. What was weak simply melted away in the process of building on strengths. Of course, I admit that Ashley seems like a terrific student—maybe not *yet* a terrific writer, but someone who's willing, with encouragement, to take risks to learn, not just for the grade. Others who come to our center leave frustrated when we defer their quick fix, or when they leave with a "messier" draft than what they brought. But, oh, what progress Ashley made in a single session, drinking from, and looking through, glasses half-full! What time and effort might we have wasted by dwelling only on what was "wrong"?

The key to Ashley's successful experience was how we began. We deliberately and explicitly decided to free ourselves from stylism's grasp. We resisted our urge to give in to error, to react to our preexisting biases. As recovering correction addicts, Ashley and I needed to negotiate and commit to a plan to keep us both on track, to avoid backsliding so we could concentrate on the larger, more productive issues that really mattered. Correcting errors, we realized, would only have been an easy way out. Writers who worry only about what's going wrong will likely never become good writers, or at least their growth will likely be much slower, less efficient, and more painful. Building on strengths can be at least as productive, and typically more efficient, than mending weaknesses. Of course, I'm not the first person to come up with a valuative approach to teaching writing. Among others, Peter Elbow proposed a similar method as the "believing game" in *Writing without Teachers*. Admittedly, his ideas first sounded to me as idealistic as my explanation above may sound to you ("What was weak simply melted away. . . ."). But instead of hedging my claims, I'll inflate them. I advocate that we use valuation to reframe our perceptions of, and interactions across, an even broader range of learning activities.

> **❝** *Writers who only worry about what's going wrong will likely never become good writers. . . . Building on strengths can be at least as productive, and typically more efficient, than mending weaknesses.* **❞**

In a faculty writing group this semester, a reticent colleague waited until the end of our first peer review session before saying, "Well, now that I know that you're nice, that everyone here wants to value each other's work rather than tear it down, I'm ready to offer my draft to the group." She's not alone. Since I began working with faculty writers, I've been amazed at the ugly scars colleagues across campus bear from

Notes

[1]John Dewey defined valuation as a type of imaginative or "creative" judgment that is "concerned with estimating values not in existence and with bringing them into existence" (332). I first applied his theories to teaching in a longer, denser article titled "Valuating Academic Writing."

[2.] I'm indebted to many colleagues for their contributions, including Janet Auten, Beth Browning, Amy Drewes, John Erdos, Ginny Ficker, Dolores Flamiano, Karen McDonnell, Margie Mika, Patti Ro, Cheryl Talley, Mark Thomas, Alicia Wendt, Ashley Wilson, Jim Zimmerman, and Gary Tate.

✦

Works Cited

Corder, Jim W. "Argument as Emergence, Rhetoric as Love." *Rhetoric Review* 4.1 (Sep. 1985): 16-32.

Dewey, John. "Valuation and Experimental Knowledge." *Philosophical Review* 31.4 (Jul. 1922): 325-51.

Elbow, Peter. *Writing without Teachers*. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.

Schick, Kurt. "Valuating Academic Writing." *Teaching Writing: Landmarks and Horizons*. Ed. Rob & Christina McDonald. S. Illinois UP, 2002. 228-49.

✦

brutal editorial lashings received from dissertation readers or journal editors. I'm pleased that our faculty groups can sooth some of those wounds and help scholars re-engage in collaborative writing. But our kinder, gentler writers' groups do more than build confidence. The results are not only affective but also practical; building on the strengths of each other's work has been amazingly productive. One writer, who offered a draft that at first (evaluative) glance seemed to go in a few directions at once, discovered with our valuative help that she actually had two potentially terrific publications already half-done, rather than a single, less coherent manuscript. Another writer, hearing horror stories of his colleagues' editorial rejections responded, "Those aren't failures. Lots of rejections mean you're being productive. You're writing and submitting manuscripts. Many of us can't even get anything together to send out."

Valuation transforms problems into opportunities. Instead of hindering students by slapping their wrists, we might instead reframe our biases in a positive light. For example, we might say: *It's not so much that passive verbs harm readers, really, but punchier active verbs can propel them along through your prose. It's not so much that clichés taste like cardboard; rather, original metaphors and analogies can enable writers to make complex arguments very efficiently, and sometimes even allow us to create new understandings. And complicated citation systems really weren't invented just to frustrate students, but instead to enable scholarly collaboration across time and space.* When we try harder to explain and convince student-writers of the value of these sometimes strange, socially constructed preferences, we increase their chances to integrate these conventions more successfully into their own writing.

We must also remember not to write rules in stone. Absolutes and universals should make us nervous—as when we hear teachers (or fellow tutors) say things like "*Never* use" first person, or contractions, or clichés, or split infinitives (all of which I've used plenty in this essay)—especially if they fail to provide justification or alternatives as I have tried to do above. As socially contingent preferences, standards for good writing necessarily vary according to the rhetorical particulars of audience, occasion, and purpose. This variation is especially important in writing centers where, on a daily basis, we must value whatever apples, oranges, or kumquats diverse students bring to us from diverse courses, assignments, and disciplines. We need valuation most, perhaps, when dealing with genres and styles from disciplines we know least. Isn't our job to help students discover the distinctive criteria of their disciplinary discourse, or the particulars of each class assignment? Further, we must remember the potentially lasting effects of transforming rules into harmful biases. It's unfair and irrational to equate a few mechanical errors or stylistic *faux pas* with laziness, ignorance, or stupidity. Shouldn't we judge more by content and character?

In practice, valuation works through all stages of the composing process. During invention, we might help students see possibilities in latent questions or lingering experiences they might otherwise discount. In arrangement, we can help writers see fresh order and coherence in a chaotic outline or draft by challenging them to re-sequence their ideas or tease out connections to strengthen transitions. And with sentence-level style, we can encourage students to play with diction, syntax, and figurative expression in ways that provide them with glimpses of their own eloquence. In the final edit, valuation doesn't ignore what's "wrong" but instead asks, *What's an even better way to say that?*

Whereas traditional evaluation makes readers overly comfortable critics, valuation prompts us to imagine possibilities, to allow student-writers to surprise us, and even to enable them to revise what we tutors think good writing ought to be. When we help students see writing as a tool for independent thinking, we invite them to question whatever beliefs they inherited and, alternatively, to suspend disbelief in new alternatives. Similarly, valuation provides a reconstructive path beyond our own worldview, beyond what Jim Corder calls our own "arrogance, ignorance, and dogma" (29). Only by creative estimation and experimentation can we discover and measure alternatives together. In our struggle to resist the corrective habits of our teachers and our teachers' teachers, we must remember that in the writing center we serve as tutors, as writing consultants. Arguably, classroom teachers need evaluation, mainly because they must assign grades to student essays. Happily enough, we are obliged not to evaluate writing but rather to educate writers.[2] ✦

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

AFTER THE FALL: REBUILDING A WRITING CENTER

✦ *Emily Isaacs*
Montclair State University
Montclair, NJ

September 2006 began with the news from Muriel Harris that Purdue University had withdrawn support for *WLN*. Response on the WCenter listserv was unanimous: how could this happen? List members wrote in about their strong attachment to the publication, citing it as crucial to their work with tutors. Some of us were particularly shocked that this could happen at Purdue, home of a strong composition and rhetoric community. Those of us outside Purdue are unaware of the particulars, but the lesson is clear: there was insufficient political support from the major stakeholders responsible for funding this writing center enterprise, even though users—in this case, readers—were highly satisfied. Saving *WLN* required flexibility and creativity by Harris and others who engaged with new stakeholders, finding a more hospitable home for *WLN* outside of Purdue.

This anecdote is a lesson: we must demonstrate that our work is central to the mission of the administrative units in which we are housed, for writing centers are always in danger of being under-funded, or even erased. How many times have readers of the WCenter listserv received a panicked e-mail asking for advice for how to cope with a disastrous 50 percent budget cut, a "re-organization"? For most of us, these disasters are not unforeseen, yet we feel powerless to prevent or undo them. I'd like to argue that we may be able to prevent or undo these cutbacks by engaging with our critics and recasting ourselves in ways that enable critics and important stakeholders to feel stake and commitment to our writing centers. While most of us are unable to pick up roots and move institutions as *WLN* has done, we may be able to remake ourselves dramatically to better reflect the priorities of the powerful stakeholders in our institutions. I will note that this argument comes from a kind of forced reflection that occurred for me over the last several years when, after my writing center was suddenly cut, I was able to work with colleagues to develop an entirely new "Center for Writing Excellence," supported more broadly and deeply than the previous one had been. From this experience I have come to a number of realizations that, I hope, may be helpful to others.

As a first step, we need to see major cutbacks not as chance, unpredictable "acts of God," but rather, as likely and predictable consequences. Writing centers are easy to marginalize and de-fund. That's a fact that cries of injustice do little to change. But this does not mean all is hopeless. Rather, we need to think creatively, periodically reinventing ourselves. Further, we will be in best stead if we are able to engage the powerful stakeholders in our institutions by reinventing ourselves in the language and formations that reflect popular trends in higher education.

We would be wise to recognize that as political administrators we need to work collaboratively across campus to identify primary initiatives within our institutions, and to develop programs that support those initiatives. Notably, these initiatives aren't kept secret in university vaults; they are often found right on university Web sites, within President reports, and underlined at public addresses. Further, as Douglas Hesse notes ("Understanding"), just like us, our administrators are going to conferences, participating in national conversations about higher education, and also responding to national trends and pressures from outside higher education; Hesse advises: "Discern which higher education movements and agendas are most important on [your] own campuses" ("Understanding" 310). We can also simply ask directly; people are always happy to tell you what they want from the writing center.

In addition, we need to get out of the habit of thinking small. Rather than requesting modest support so as not to be too costly, we need to propose our centrality to our university's missions, offering broad services and requesting substantial support. Perhaps the best examples of this approach can be seen at

JON OLSON RECEIVES 2008 NCPTW MAXWELL AWARD

Dr. Jon Olson, Director of Penn State University's Center for Excellence in Writing (CEW), won the 2008 Ron Maxwell Award for Distinguished Leadership in Promoting the Collaborative Learning Practices of Peer Tutors in Writing. The award plaque and a $200 check were presented to Olson on October 31 at the 2008 International Writing Centers Association (IWCA) joint conference with the National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing (NCPTW) in Las Vegas.

The award recognizes a professional within the NCPTW organization for dedication to and leadership in collaborative learning in writing centers, for aiding students in together taking on more responsibility for their learning, and, thus, for promoting the work of peer tutors. Its presentation also denotes extraordinary service to the evolution of the conference organization.

✦ ✦ ✦

BETH GODBEE WINS THE BEN RAFOTH RESEARCH AWARD

Beth Godbee has been chosen as the recipient of the first Ben Rafoth Graduate Research Award, which supported her travel to the IWCA 2008 Conference in Las Vegas. In her announcement, Elisabeth H. Piedmont-Marton, Chair of the IWCA Research Awards Committee, stated that the committee was "very impressed by the quality of your application and your detailed letters of support, not to mention by the quality and scope of your project itself. We also want to recognize the contributions you have already made to IWCA and to the scholarly literature of our field."

Miami University's Roger and Joyce Howe Center for Writing Excellence, recently funded by a 10.5 million dollar bequest, where the mission is anything but modest. We need to be at the center of learning, serving a range of students, and therefore, a range of faculty. Whereas most writing centers aim to serve 5 or 10 percent of the student body, at Miami the intention is to "measurably improve the writing skills of virtually every Miami student" ("Giving Tribute"). To achieve this goal the Center goes well beyond one-to-one tutoring, striving to "foster a culture of writing" all over campus (Miami University Writing Center Home Page).

While the writing center mission adopted at my university has particular features that are likely to work well at other schools, I echo Peter Carino (10-11) in speaking strongly to the point that this model is not necessarily the model for every institution. At any one point in history there are several national trends afoot, and our institutional leaders pick and choose among them; thus, for example, at one school appealing to arguments about the center's role in retention is persuasive, whereas at another where retention negatively signals remediation, an argument pitched for supporting the strongest students—honors students, law school candidates—will be better received. We need to keep one eye on ideas from the field (for example, the current movement for Centers for Writing Excellence), and one eye on all that is local. Ultimately we need to be savvy, doing more than assuming that following best practice in tutoring, even helping hundreds of students improve their writing every semester, will ensure our survival.

My argument is born from an experience that began with an unexpected and certainly disastrous withdrawal of support, and which ended with a writing center with scope, budget, and prominence that is several times greater than what we originally had. We accomplished this goal by engaging diverse and powerful stakeholders in our planning process, by designing a writing center that spoke to these stakeholders' interests, and by positioning the writing center as important to *all* students' learning. The result: an ambitious "Center for Writing Excellence" moved largely out of the English Department, with a broad cross-disciplinary mandate and WAC potential.

THE FALL

In the spring of 2005, changes in Montclair State University's graduate assistant (GA) allocation system, designed to enhance and reward research over teaching and service on campus, led the English Department's GA allocation to shrink from 11 to 5 individuals. As the Writing Center was entirely staffed by GAs, this policy change not only cut our operation in half, but it also sent a demoralizing spirit through the Center and department. Appeals were essentially ineffective. Talking among ourselves we were stunned: why would the administration cut such an effective, low-cost support service for students?

THE REMAKING

Strategy 1: Turn Critics into Stakeholders

Months later the director of the Writing Center, Bob Whitney, and I, the director of first-year writing, went to the dean with a new approach. We buttoned up our outrage and defensiveness and instead focused on what we hoped might be a point of agreement. The Writing Center, we argued, wasn't good enough; it wasn't serving the university in ways that it should, and that as we had recently reformed many aspects of the first-year writing program, we would like to research and reform our entire approach to providing support for writing. We reviewed a rough outline of new services and asked for her input. Surely expecting complaint from us, our dean was instead handed an opportunity, and asked what *she* thought to boot, or that was how we hoped she would see it. As it turned out, the dean was receptive, had many ideas, and announced the formation of an interdisciplinary task force that I would chair.

The "Writing Center Task Force," a committee consisting of writing faculty, faculty in the disciplines, and an associate dean, met for most of the year to produce "Developing a Culture of Writing at Montclair State University: The Center for Writing Excellence." We soon learned what had been, in part, the old

Writing Center's undoing. From a survey we found that fully 67 percent of students on campus did not even know where the writing center was located, and that only 9 percent had visited the Center. However, a well-responded-to university-wide faculty survey indicated two primary things: one, that faculty perceived the Writing Center to be almost exclusively for support of English students, and two, that faculty felt frustrated that there was little support for *their* students' writing development. They wanted much more. What had we been thinking? We had never had trouble filling up our tutoring hours in our modest writing center, and therefore had done little to promote the Writing Center. When the university cut the Writing Center, we in the English department were the only ones who were able to realize a loss—others in our community had little investment in it.

Strategy 2: Gather Data and Garner Support
I realized that the task force had two jobs—to design the ideal writing center for our university and to use the task force itself to garner support as we were designing it. Having read much in WPA literature about the importance of gaining stakeholder support (Hesse, "Politics" and "Understanding"; White), I asked committee members to work with me to interview twelve university stakeholders—the academic deans, several central administrators, and key department chairs. These meetings yielded some good ideas (for example, the value of a graduate student services component), while also allowing us the opportunity to quietly make the case for the new center. Meanwhile, task force faculty unfamiliar with the existing writing center and good tutoring practices surveyed users of the writing center and conducted focus groups with tutors. These faculty became impressed with both the complexity of our work, and also the considerable expertise that it required. The next major component of our collective research was to study twenty-five writing centers from across the country. On this list were award-winning writing centers at universities with lots of money, centers in the immediate geographical area, centers at comparable universities, and also centers with specialized foci or particular areas of excellence. Finally, we had Eli Goldblatt from Temple University and Brad Hughes from the University of Wisconsin/Madison visit. Bringing Eli and Brad to campus both helped us develop our plan and also to market it. Their presence on campus, their meetings with important stakeholders as well as the task force, all worked to develop support for the new center. By working together, task force members became experts, advocates for particular kinds of approaches. By the end of the year we had managed not only to gather broad data on what was possible but also to better understand the specific needs and desires of our faculty and central administrators.

Strategy 3: Serve Multiple Constituencies
My primary challenge as writer was to figure out how to reflect many of the goals that the task force and other stakeholders identified as crucial and exciting. I needed to think about a broad audience—central administrators, faculty with diverse needs and interests, my home department, and our students. The mission for the new writing center is both broad and comprehensive—to transform the intellectual culture on campus toward writing and to serve all students: doctoral students, honors students, graduating seniors, general education students, majors, and basic writing students. We developed a delivery system that is similarly broad, utilizing individual consulting for faculty and students, and group "delivery" through peer fellow support for writing-intensive classes and mini-courses and workshops on specific topics such as graduate school applications and poster presentations. Drawing on the models offered at many other schools, we proposed different types of tutors and consultants, paid at various rates, according to responsibility and rank. We suggested using teacher education students, lecturers, and part-time faculty from the Writing Program, graduate students, and undergraduates who had completed appropriate coursework. With a faculty director, a non-faculty associate director, and administrative assistant on site to support supervision and training, we were comfortable with a model that includes staff with a range of experience.

Strategy 4: Address the Funding Problem
At a state institution that has recently undergone budget cuts, many were skeptical that our grand plan would be adopted. From our research we found that writing centers are raising money through various fees.

Works Cited

Carino, Peter. "Writing Centers and Writing Programs: Local and Communal Politics." *The Politics of Writing Centers*. Ed. Jane Nelson and Kathy Evertz. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2001. 1-14.

Eodice, Michele. "Breathing Lessons, Or Collaboration Is…" *The Center Will Hold: Critical Perspectives on Writing Center Scholarship*. Ed. Michael A. Pemberton and Joyce Kinkead. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2003. 114-129.

"Giving Tribute." *For Love and Honor. The Miami University Campaign*. 2006. 8 Jan 2008. <http://www.forloveandhonor.org/pages/GivingTributeFall2006-4.htm>.

Hesse, Douglas. "Politics and the WPA: Traveling Through and Past Realms of Expertise." *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource*. Ed. Stuart C. Bowen and Theresa Enos. Mahwah, NJ: LEA, 2002. 41-58.

- - - . "Understanding Larger Discourses in Higher Education." *The Allyn and Bacon Soucebook for Writing Program Administrators*. Ed. Irene Ward and William J. Carpenter. New York: Longman, 2002. 299-314.

McQueeney, Pat. "What's in a Name?" *The Politics of Writing Centers*. Ed. Jane Nelson and Kathy Evertz. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2001. 15-22.

Roger and Joyce Howe Center for Writing Excellence. "About the Center: Mission." 8 Feb 2008. <http://www.units.muohio.edu/cwe/>.

White, Edward. "Use it or Lose It: Power and the WPA." Ward and Carpenter. 106-13. Reprinted from *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 15.1-2 (1991): 2-12.

✦

Reviewing my own university's fee structure, I found rationale for this last approach—by assessing a $10 per semester fee to all students, we could raise money to pay for a large staff. Raising yet another fee on students never feels great; however, the advantage of this fee is that it also holds the new writing center accountable to one of its most important goals, which is to impact every student on campus.

Strategy 5: Locate Centrally
Not surprisingly our center has been located in an inconvenient location, in two windowless rooms. We argued for a central location, off a main hall in an academic building or in the library, with room for one-to-one tutoring, workshops, and even a public speaking event. From our contacts in Development, I got the idea to ask for a new building—something that a donor might like his or her name on.

More difficult was figuring out the administrative location of the new writing center. Although faculty in English were clearly the most informed about writing, as our colleagues from other departments quickly assured us, those of us in writing had learned much in our research and in our conversations with faculty, convincing us that locating the writing center in the English Department would keep it marginal, and prevent it from being supported by the university at large. Our proposed solution was to ask for a writing center director who would be faculty in English, but who would be released from English to direct the writing center with a reporting line and budget that came directly from central administration. Further, we proposed an interdisciplinary Advisory Board comprised similarly to the Task Force.

Strategy 6: Name the Center Strategically
At first I was dismissive of the importance of names—I liked "the writing center," for its modesty, history, and clarity. But learning from veteran writing center directors (e.g. McQueeney), I became intrigued by the use of "excellence" at Penn State, Miami University and West Virginia University (and no doubt others), and found that it had great appeal to outsiders, primarily in its obvious move away from remediation, and secondarily for its appeal to development staff who are on the hunt for donors. I still find "excellence" a little off-putting, but if it's a hit with faculty and other stakeholders, and if it encourages participation by a broader range of students, it is a small concession to make.

RESULTS

When I delivered the report, I told myself that it might well be shelved. To my surprise, the central administration approved the report. The Center for Writing Excellence at Montclair State University is still in the concept phase, but we are in the process of hiring an associate or full professor faculty director, and the administration has developed a fee structure that will generate more money than what we had requested. Ultimately it will be up to our new director to work out the many particulars of the Center, but this proposal, developed collaboratively and with a close eye for administrative interests and approval, has been crucial to winning institutional support for a writing center that promises to be central to the university's mission. The point here is to advocate for a principle and a process. The principle is to accept our ever-possible marginalization and to seek to always redress it, reject it, and re-articulate our centrality not by reasserting old claims or even necessarily by presenting our past effectiveness. Rather, we might accept that in higher education the shiny new penny is the favored penny, and so it is best to figure out how to recast ourselves to appear new.

This figuring out needs to be collaborative, not only looking at best practice, but also reaching out to our colleagues and community members, near and far from our administrative units. As Michele Eodice explains, we need to reach out beyond our comfortable community, and in doing so we might find allies across campus: "what we do with collaboration every day in our writing centers can empower us to dismantle its borders and perform a kind of collaboration that will benefit both us and our institutions" (118). Rather than turning our backs to the outside community, to protect small, marginalized writing centers, we must turn around and engage with our communities so that we can become writing centers in which the entire university—or at least the major stakeholders—is invested. ✦

BECOMING VISIBLE: TUTORS DISCUSS READING AND LISTENING TO STUDENT PAPERS

✦ *Anthony Edgington*
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

Over the past two decades, several peer tutoring guides have emerged, including *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Peer Tutoring*, *The St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors*, *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors*, *Teaching One-to-One: The Writing Conference,* and *The Practical Tutor*. All have proven valuable for the preparation of writing center tutors and administrators, as they have focused on such topics as the mission of writing centers, tutor responsibilities, writing processes, tutoring in online environments, and working with non-traditional and/or English as Second Language students. Yet, while one can easily find information on how to facilitate conversation, become an active listener, and thought-fully respond to student writers through non-directive comments, there is far less discussion on how tutors read student papers. In this article, I discuss how tutors in my writing center approach reading and listening to student papers. I base my argument on an informal study using surveys, interviews, and tutor session observations. I then discuss four strategies tutors use during the reading process: conversation, note-taking, negotiation, and rereading. I conclude by offering suggestions on how writing center administrators can better prepare tutors to understand how they read student texts.

The lack of attention directed towards reading/listening is most noticeable when looking at how tutoring guides address the various steps or stages of the tutoring session. For example, in the second edition of the *St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors*, Christina Murphy and Steve Sherwood divide the tutorial into three stages: the pre-textual (when tutor and writer begin a relationship and set an atmo-sphere of trust and openness), textual (when tutor and writer discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the writer's text), and post-textual (when tutor and writer reflect on the session and formulate a plan for revision). Muriel Harris, in her book *Teaching One-to-One: The Writing Conference*, addresses sev-eral conference tasks, including taking time for tutor and writer to get acquainted, assessing the writer's needs, taking time to instruct students about the writing process, and offering evaluation and feedback. Finally, Emily Meyer and Louise Z. Smith focus on several aspects of the tutoring conference in their text *The Practical Tutor*, including the initial stage when the tutor and writer meet to get acquainted and discuss the assignment, the dialogue between tutor and writer that helps to encourage critical thinking and shaping of ideas, and the methods for offering comments for revision and correctness.

What should be noted about these guidebooks is the de-emphasized or omitted stage of reading and/or listening to the writer's paper. While a few guides acknowledge this stage, the emphasis is usually on having the writer read the text aloud or having the tutor practice active listening, which is mainly an ap-proach where the tutor makes sure the writer can see and hear the tutor's interest through nonverbal and verbal cues. It is rare to find tutors being advised to reflect upon how they are reading or listening to the student's paper, consider what is influencing them as they read or listen, or identify and consider how this influences the comments and suggestions offered to the writer.[1] In other words, reading or listening to student papers is often treated as a passive activity, and tutors are often seen as individuals who already possess the critical reading skills necessary to offer productive feedback, which, based on my experience in a writing center, is not always the case.

In order to better understand how tutors read and listen to student texts, including the influences and problems they encounter, I conducted an informal study that investigated this issue within my own writ-ing center. First, I distributed a survey to twenty-two tutors (professional, graduate, undergraduate, and ESL) that focused on their past tutoring experiences, training they received regarding writing tutorials, and what they consciously understood about how they read or listened to student texts, including what influences they noticed during this process (see Appendix for survey questions). I also conducted in-

ŦAKE NOTE

CHICAGOLAND ORGANIZATION OF WRITING CENTERS

November 7, 2008
Arlington Heights, IL
"Maximizing the Potential of Student Tutor Programs"

Contact person: Jenny Jordan: jljordan@glenbrook.k12.il.us or 847-509-2695.

EAST CENTRAL WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

CALL FOR PROPOSALS
April 3-4, 2009
West Lafayette, IN
"Writing Center Ecologies: Developing and Sustaining our Resources"
Keynote speaker: Jon Olson

Information and CFP can be found at <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/ecwca>.
For more information, please contact Linda Bergmann (chair) at lbergmann@purdue.edu or Tammy Conard-Salvo at tcsalvo@purdue.edu. Proposal deadline: December 15, 2008.

SOUTHEASTERN WRITING CENTER ASSOCIATION

February 26th-28th, 2009
Greensboro, North Carolina
"The Writing Center's Role in Student Success: 21st Century Strategies for Empowerment Rooted in Culture and Diversity"
Keynote speaker: Victor Villanueva

SWCA Chairperson: Hope Jackson, 336-334-7764; jacksonw@ncat.edu. Conference Web site: <http://cas.ncat.edu/~swca/>.

depth interviews and observations with a group of six tutors, focusing on various issues and concerns that emerged from the surveys. My hope was that a better understanding of how tutors in my writing center read and listen to student texts would emerge.

Among the problems cited in the surveys, the three most prominent were the difficulty of maintaining interest, dealing with grammatical mistakes, and deciding when to offer advice. Difficulty maintaining interest and attention could occur at any time while reading or listening to papers as tutors spoke of having to bring themselves out of daydreams while listening to papers on topics for which they had little background knowledge or that bored them. A second problem concerned grammatical mistakes and how to discuss these with writers, including when and whether or not to be directive during these moments. The third problem was when and how to offer advice to the student writer, as some tutors spoke of offering advice while the paper was being read while others spoke of the need to wait until after reading the entire paper before offering feedback.

In the surveys and interviews, tutors also spoke about specific factors that influenced how they read or listened to papers. Among these influences, past tutoring experiences, tutors' knowledge of the topic, and noise in the Writing Center were seen as the most influential. Past tutoring experiences were important when working with the same writer or with writers on similar assignments; as one tutor wrote, "If the writers are returning students I've worked with before, that tends to increase my knowledge of them and interest in the next writing experience they bring in. . . . I feel curious about the material and the writer's progress." Another tutor mentioned, "I can use the previous tutorials to inform how I approach the following ones. I can use the experiences and choices of other students as a resource when I see the next student with the same assignment." These tutors highlight the importance of knowing who the writer is or having a previous context from which to begin their discussion. However, tutors also reported more negative experiences that could also influence future tutoring sessions; one tutor mentioned, "If I see a certain name in the appointment book and remember a bad tutorial with that person, it will influence how I approach working with the student and her paper. Second, the tutor's knowledge of the topic appeared to be a mostly helpful influence, as tutors mentioned that they found themselves more involved if the topic was one in which they were interested. The interest could be further heightened "if [the writer] shows interest and willingness to work . . . we have more fun, both with reading and revising." Finally, other activity occurring in the Center (for example, background noise or a nearby tutoring session) was seen as an influence. On a busy day, it is possible to be conducting a tutoring session side by side with other tutors, while students work on computers in the background and construction work occurs on the side (our library was going through a significant reorganization at the time of the study). This level of activity can change how a tutor approaches the reading stage; said one tutor, "If I know that sound is going to be a problem, I will request to be the reader rather than letting them [the writers] read their paper aloud." Some tutors wrote of having to move outside the center to a quieter location. Another tutor wrote, "It's hard to concentrate when other people are talking nearby. Noise, I think, is the biggest setback." For these tutors, the level of distraction presented by additional noise in the Writing Center affected how they structured and ran their tutorials, possibly even forcing the student and tutor to move to another, quieter location or forcing the tutor to assume a more directive role in the session.

Tutors acknowledged a range of strategies they felt comfortable using when they encountered these problems. One common strategy was conversation; when tutors felt they may have misread something in the text or felt that the writer needed to rethink his or her perspective, they felt confident asking questions or encouraging the student to talk more about that particular section in order to gain more information and understanding. The conversation usually took place after the text had been read, but it could also occur during the reading, at a time when the tutor and writer could discuss the specific section in question. Tim, a professional tutor, used this strategy with an engi-

neering student working on a paper for a junior-level course. Pointing to specific places in the text, Tim asked repeatedly, "tell me more about . . . ," using the ensuing discussion to help him better understand the paper. Conversation could also occur while reading over an assignment sheet. Sally, an undergraduate tutor, worked with a freshman writer who had to write a rhetorical analysis of an advertisement. The student clearly had difficulties understanding the assignment, so Sally used the opportunity to discuss the first time she was asked to write an analytic paper and some of the questions and problems she encountered:

> I remember that I was once asked to analyze a television show; I think I chose *Friends*. We had to talk about what we liked and didn't like, and the teacher asked us to look at specific things related to social issues, like the way females and males talked and if any minorities were on the show and how they were depicted. . . .

As she spoke, the student writer connected his experience with Sally's, and, together, they began to develop a plan for how to approach writing the paper. In all the observations, conversation was a recurring and significant strategy used while reading student papers.

Note-taking was another important strategy; in their survey responses, some tutors spoke about taking notes regarding main ideas, organizational issues, or questions they had while they read or listened to student papers. The importance of note-taking was further strengthened during the observations, as tutors kept track of comments and questions on a sheet of paper during six of the eight tutoring sessions observed. The notes taken included comments to bring up to the writer ("introduction seems flat. The writer needs to strengthen it"), questions for clarification ("no sources cited. Is this required for paper?"), and suggestions for further help ("Should watch 911 documentary. It can help argument"). Not surprisingly, tutors took more notes when listening to a paper read by the writer than when they read the paper themselves (although a few tutors did write comments on the student's paper while they silently read it). Finally, notes were important after the session as well, as the tutors used this information when completing their tutor reports and narratives about the sessions. Overall, note-taking was a widely-used tool by a majority of the tutors observed.

In addition, tutors discussed the need to be patient listeners and to negotiate with writers while those writers were reading their own papers. During the observations, I noted that the need to be patient listeners most often occurred when writers were reading their text out loud, but felt the need to stop and point out problems or questions about the text during the act of reading. While the tutors prefer that the writer read through the whole text once before discussing it, these in-text questions forced tutors to be constantly aware of what was occurring in the text and to be ready to answer questions during the reading. At these times, tutors would often have to incorporate some negotiation skills, as they attempted to move the writer back to reading the text before entering into a conversation. Negotiation also appeared to become an important factor when writers displayed some anger or frustration while reading the paper. This could be a small as a writer being unable to pronounce an author's last name or book title or as significant as the writer displaying frustration about a teacher's comment or initial grade the paper received. Judy, an undergraduate tutor, worked with a freshman writer who asked several times while reading for her evaluation of the paper (remarking that he "just had to have an A" for this assignment). Judy had to negotiate with the writer and consistently directed him back to reading the paper, reaffirming that tutors did not offer evaluations. Each of the tutors I observed acknowledged that being patient listeners willing to negotiate with writers was important and mentioned that the hour-long tutoring sessions we schedule with writers gives them adequate time to diffuse some of these situations.

The third strategy mentioned was rereading. This strategy was useful when working with writers whose first language was not English. During these sessions, the tutor would refer back to a sentence or paragraph and re-read it for the writer, asking her to listen and note any problems. This strategy

---

TAKE NOTE

became useful when working with grammar problems in papers, but could also be used when attempting to point out a problem in the overall argument or logic of the text. Other tutors asked the writer to repeat a phrase or sentence from the paper, hoping that in rereading the text, the writer would hear problems of grammar or mechanics and be able to correct these errors on his own. Finally, rereading was used by the tutors to help in clarifying what the writer was saying in a text (i.e. "It seems that what you are saying here is _____. Is that correct? Is that what you want to say?"); this gave the tutor a chance to read a part of the paper a second time and check her interpretation of the author's message against the author's intention.

Tutors, much like teachers, read within a context, and this context can be a significant influence on how they approach the text and offer suggestions to the writer. While this study focused on only a small group of tutors in one specific center, the results assisted in understanding how to better prepare current and future tutors for writing tutorials. One area where improvement can be made is during tutor orientation and preparation, as significant time needs to be spent discussing what influences our reading and listening processes and how these influences can affect the tutorial. But, these conversations should not end after the orientation period; continuous reading sessions, where tutors look at sample texts and discuss their reactions to what they are reading can be incorporated into staff meetings. Tutors can also participate in think-aloud sessions, where they are tape-recorded during a mock or real tutoring session and then later listen and reflect on how they read/listened to the paper and how this affected the comments they offered. As writing center directors and tutors, we must strive to make visible this hidden stage of the writing tutorial. Reading and/or listening to a student's paper is an important step in the tutoring process; it's time we begin to understand and talk about it that way. ✦

End Note
[1] One noteworthy discussion occurs in the *Allyn and Bacon* guide. Gillespie and Lerner observe that tutoring sessions are often influenced by outside factors, such as social and cultural beliefs, mismatched goals between tutor and writer, and past writing experiences. Yet, the focus of the chapter is on how these outside factors influence tutor-writer relationships or the comments we offer to students. There is little discussion about how these factors influence our reading and listening strategies, and little assistance on how to combat these influences while reading or listening (beyond the need to reflect upon them). ✦

Works Cited
Gillespie, Paula and Neal Lerner. *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Peer Tutoring.* 2nd ed. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004.

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

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

Murphy, Christina and Steve Sherwood. *The St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors.* 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003.

Ryan, Leigh. *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors* 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford, 1998.

✦

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

Appendix
Peer Tutors Survey: Reading Practices

The following survey offers questions focusing on how tutors read and/or listen to student texts and the potential influences and problems that may be experienced. This information will be used as part of a presentation to be made at a regional writing center conference and may be used in future publications. All responses will be confidential; do not place your name anywhere unless you agree to the information listed at the end of this survey. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

What is your current age?_____

What is your highest level of education?_____

How long have you been a writing center tutor?_____

Have you had any tutoring experience outside of a writing center? If yes, please list below these outside experiences:

What preparation (formal and informal) did you receive prior to working as a tutor (consider texts you have read, classroom preparation, training, non-university preparation, etc.)? Which of these do you still rely upon today?

Do you experience any problems when reading and/or listening to student papers? If yes, what problems do you encounter? How often to you experience these problems?

When you encounter a problem while reading and/or listening to student papers, what strategies do you use to work through these problems? Where did you learn these strategies?

When reading and/or listening to student papers, which of the following positively or negatively influence you? Please use the following scale when answering:

- •   4: Very Influential
- •   3: Influential
- •   2:   Somewhat Influential
- •   1:   Not Influential

	4	3	2	1
Your relationship with the writer:	4	3	2	1
The writer's gender:	4	3	2	1
The writer's race or cultural background:	4	3	2	1
Your knowledge of the topic:	4	3	2	1
Your personal views on the topic:	4	3	2	
Past tutoring experiences:	4	3	2	1
Your knowledge of the writer's instructor:	4	3	2	1
Your emotional mood (i.e. anger, boredom, etc):	4	3	2	1
The time of day:	4	3	2	1
Activity (i.e. noise) in the Center:	4	3	2	1

Other (please explain below):

In the space below, feel free to further explain any of your answers above:

TUTOR'S COLUMN

TO CONFORM OR NOT TO CONFORM:
ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT UNCONVENTIONAL WRITING

✦ *Danielle Sahm*
Messiah College
Grantham, PA

I read the paper over, sit back, and come to the conclusion that, for this client, half an hour will not be enough. As I read, I am amazed to discover there is not a single period until the eighth page. Additionally, the client seems to have composed the entire piece in stream of consciousness, and the progression of his argument (if, indeed, an argument exists) is impossible to identify. I am suddenly faced with a question that many writing center tutors face at least once during their career: how does a tutor explain the rudiments of scholarly discourse to a client who doesn't even seem to have firmly grasped the English language? I do my best, but at the end of the half-hour we both come away discouraged. As I return his folder to the filing cabinet, I glance briefly at his name and shake my head. Whatever his major or vocation, this William Faulkner could use a lot of improvement in his writing.

Go ahead and laugh. But honestly, what would you do if a young, undiscovered William Faulkner came to your writing center? Or, to state the question another way, what would you do if you met a client with a writing style like Faulkner's? The tutor in such a position faces many concerns: how to help the client achieve intelligibility while at the same time retaining his or her unique voice, how to guide the client into producing his or her best work while avoiding inserting the tutor's particular privileges and writing preferences into the piece, and how to tell the difference between effective use of unconventional writing techniques and ineffective uses. Faulkner's writing style is, perhaps, a bit of an extreme example, but it serves as a useful way to initiate the discussion on individuality of voice, style, and technique that tutors at all writing centers face on a regular basis.

The anecdote of Faulkner's visit to the Messiah writing center is fictional, but in reality I have found myself in similar positions, albeit less extreme. I once had a client who attempted to save the thesis as a last, glorious flourish at the very end of her paper. In vain I looked for it in the first, second, even third paragraph, and had all but given up on it when it suddenly manifested itself in the middle of the conclusion. This affliction—I privately call it the 'thesis deferred'—is common enough, and can usually be pointed out to the client and corrected by moving the thesis to the introduction. But when I pointed out the fault to this particular client, instead of the docile acceptance with which I usually meet, she agreed that the thesis was clearly in the conclusion and then went on to inform me that she had intentionally placed it there. For a moment, I was stumped. On the one hand, as a sophomore English major she was aware of the conventions she broke by moving the thesis and had put thought and intention into her paper, which is always to be commended and encouraged. But on the other hand, the disapproving voice of the professor, always looming in the back of my mind, berated me for even considering allowing this transgression against all that is holy in the five-paragraph essay to go uncorrected. I felt conflicted between the desire to help the client meet the professor's expectations by conforming to conventions, and the wish to avoid ruining her style or replacing it with my own. How could I mediate between these two desires?

First of all, I considered the question of intentionality. I have often thought that the difference between writing badly and writing unconventionally lies in intentionality; the weakness in one person's writing may be the strength of another's simply because it serves a definite and deliberate purpose. One of my primary concerns as a tutor should be how the work will be read in an academic setting. "Think of your audience!" we tell our clients. Since professors decide the grade the paper will receive, and since they are most familiar with what they hope to achieve through the assignment, professors' reactions should be taken into account more than the feelings of a writing center tutor. However, as a writer, I can't help but gauge the client's status in the great evolution of writerly maturity. In high school we are all taught that

it is absolutely wrong to begin a sentence with 'but.' But, as we begin to dip our toes a little further into the vast sea of literature, many writers realize that starting a sentence with 'but' can't be completely wrong if most of the Pulitzer-prize-winning, million-copy-selling authors are beginning sentences with 'but' and getting away with it. This realization is, for many writers, the first step along the path of rule-breaking. The end of the path—the rule-breaker's Nirvana—comes with the recognition that it is often precisely by breaking the rules that anything new, interesting, or ground-breaking is achieved in the field of writing. The difficult part for the tutor, of course, is measuring how far along clients have traveled on the path and whether they have a strong enough grasp of the rules to go about bending and shattering them. William Faulkner, for instance, stands as an example of a writer who grasped the concepts and then purposefully broke them. There are few who would argue that Faulkner did not know exactly what he was doing and why he was doing it. So, as I ponder my advice for my client, one aspect that I must consider is whether or not she realizes that she has broken a rule.

As I have already mentioned, she did realize that fact; she understood where the thesis should be and decided to put it somewhere else instead. My next question, then, would not be whether her decision is right or wrong, but whether it is effective or ineffective. Though few could argue about Faulkner's awareness and intentionality, many can and have argued over whether his techniques are effective. Similarly, as a tutor, I must ask myself whether the argument of the paper would be more effective if the thesis were in the introduction or the conclusion. My job as a writing center tutor is not to create client-machines capable of harvesting an A on every paper, but rather to produce good writers who understand the basics of writing and are able to explore its boundaries according to their own abilities and development. Often the two go together, but if it is a question between pleasing the professor and serving the client's writing, the decision seems clear. All of this plays into the suggestions I will give to the client.

There are a lot of things to keep in mind when faced with a writer like William Faulkner who defies conventions. In the situation I described, and in many similar situations in which I have found myself at the writing center, the question has arisen: is there anything I, as a writing center tutor, can do to avoid violating the individual voice of my clients? Two concepts to consider are whether the client intentionally made decisions about his or her writing, and even if those decisions were made consciously, whether or not they are effective. But even having kept these things in mind, the tutor may not always make the right decision about whether the client should correct and conform or continue to defy conventions. And in such cases, whether the tutor gives sound advice or not, clients are at all times completely free to ignore the advice given them. Most importantly, the tutor should try to help clients take a step forward on their path of writing development. If the client is at a point where he or she wishes to experiment—to bend or even break accepted conventions—then it is the tutor's job to guide the writer in that experimentation to the best of his or her ability. When faced with unconventional writing, perhaps it is time for tutors to adjust their approaches accordingly. ✦

CALENDAR FOR WRITING CENTER ASSOCIATIONS

November 7, 2008: Chicagoland Organization of Writing Centers, in Arlington Heights, IL
Contact: Jenny Jordan, jjordan@glenbrook.k12.il.us; 847-509-2695.

February 19-20, 2009: Middle East—North Africa Writing Centers Alliance, in Al Ain, United Arab Emirates
Contact: MENWCA newsletter link on the Web site: <http://tcc.qatar.tamu.edu/symposium.aspx>.

February 21, 2009: Southern California Writing Centers Conference, in Moorpark, CA
Contact: Kathryn Adams: kadams@vcccd.edu; 805-378-1400, x 1696.

February 26-28, 2009: Southeastern Writing Center Association, in Greensboro, NC
Contact: Hope Jackson, SWCA Chairperson: 336-334-7764; jacksonw@ncat.edu: Conference Web site: <cas.ncat.edu/~swca>.

February 28, 2009: Northern California Writing Centers Association, in Gilroy, CA
Contact: Natasha Oehlman: natasha_oehlman@csumb.edu; 831-582-4614, or Kimberly Smith: ksmith@gavilan.edu.

March 27-28, 2009: Mid-Atlantic Writing Centers Association, in York, PA
Contact: Cynthia Crimmins (crimmin@ycp.edu) or Dominic Delli Carpini (dcarpini@ycp.edu). Conference Web site: <www.ycp.edu/lrc/mawca2009>.

April 2-4, 2009: South Central Writing Centers Association, in Georgetown, TX
Contact: Elisabeth Piedmont-Marton (piedmone@southwestern.edu) and Cole Bennett (bcb00b@acu.edu).

April 3-4, 2009: East Central Writing Centers Association, in West Lafayette, IN
Contact: Linda Bergmann (lbergmann@purdue.edu) or Tammy Conard-Salvo (tcsalvo@purdue.edu). Conference Web site: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/ecwca>.

April 4-5, 2009: Northeast Writing Centers Association, in Hartford, CT
Contact: Katherine Tirabassi; 603-358-2924; e-mail: ktirabassi@keene.edu

April 17-18, 2009: Pacific Northwest Writing Centers Association, in Ellensburg, WA
Contact: Teresa Joy Kramer; kramert@cwu.edu. Conference Web site:<http://www.pnwca.org/>.

THE WRITING LAB
NEWSLETTER

Muriel Harris, editor
The RiCH Company
260 E. Highland Ave. MH700
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Address Service Requested