41:5-6 | JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2017

WLN

A JOURNAL OF WRITING CENTER SCHOLARSHIP

BAKER | SCOTT | CHOSEED | VINCELETTE | BECKWITH

Table of Contents

DOI: 10.37514/WLN-J.2017.41.5.01

From the Editor

Muriel Harris

Sometimes too much of a good thing IS a good thing. In this issue you'll find two more articles that were part of Susan Mueller and Janet Auten's co-edited September/October 2016 *WLN* special issue on the work of the writing center director. Included here are articles by Lori Baker and Andrea Scott that invite your close attention.

Lori Baker explains why writing center directors should know and care about what outside accreditation teams do when reviewing an institution. Along with discussing the standards and guidelines that accreditation teams use, Baker offer a key argument: she says that being informed about outside accreditation work, engaging with the accreditation review, and learning how the writing center can profit from such knowledge is an imperative for directors. When Andrea Scott invited some German and Austrian directors to offer their views on their writing centers' identities, they emphasized their centers' work with disciplinary writing and with the writing skills of multilingual students who constitute a large population in European universities. Particularly interesting is Scott's observation that writing centers in Germany and Austria are often led by linguists involved in research on writing processes.

Also included in this issue are two of your responses on the current trend of writing centers being folded into learning centers. More of those responses will appear in the *WLN* blog (www.wlnjournal.org/blog). Malkiel Choseed's response emphasizes the value of using writing center scholarship to show that ours is a recognized field of study. And Elizabeth Vincelette offers a comprehensive review of what directors should know when relocating their writing center within a learning center. The Tutors' Column is also concerned with transitions, as Jennifer Beckwith describes her journey from client to tutor and from apprehension to a new understanding of the writing center as a "support group. . . . there to help good writers become better writers and better writers to become great writers." That definition reminds us to listen closely to the wisdom tutors offer the field.

DOI: 10.37514/WLN-J.2017.41.5.02

WLN

What Writing Center Directors Need to Know about Regional Accreditation

Lori B. Baker

Southwest Minnesota State University
Marshall, Minnesota

Writing center directors are accustomed to scrutiny and being held accountable, especially at the local level by administrators, faculty, and the students they serve. But increasingly, directors at two- and four-year colleges and universities must also deal with the demands related to institutional accreditation. Much of the writing center community's discussion of accreditation focuses on assessment and the related shift towards learning outcomes as compared to service goals, currently a high priority for accreditation. Conducting assessment has certainly become one of the most important expectations of writing center directors today; fortunately, excellent resources such as Ellen Schendel and William Macauley Jr.'s guide *Building Writing Center Assessments that Matter* help address directors' needs in understanding best practices and how they might shape assessment at their centers. Wendy Sharer et al.'s 2016 collection, *Reclaiming Accountability: Improving Writing Programs through Accreditation and Large-Scale Assessments*, fills an important gap with several examples of writing centers' involvement in pivotal assessment and accreditation projects. When it comes to a broader understanding of the stick (or perhaps it's the carrot?) that is accreditation, however, little has been directly discussed in writing center circles.

As a writing center director who recently spent three years reassigned as my institution's accreditation Self-Study Coordinator, I have developed an insider's view of accreditation, specifically the changing, growing demands and opportunities (yes, opportunities!) related to accreditation processes. Directors can benefit from aligning writing center work with these processes, because the work done with external audiences of accreditors in mind can also help increase support and visibility for writing centers at their local institutions. Moreover, if we can come to view accreditors as partners, a perspective that Shirley Rose urges (52-53), writing center directors can take advantage of accrediting agencies' own ongoing improvements and engage in and even shape regional and national understandings of writing centers and writing studies.

No longer do any accrediting agencies allow a ten-year span with no interim review; in fact, all of the regional accrediting bodies, feeling heat of their own from the federal level and from the public, have revised either their standards or processes or both in the past six years or are currently in the process of doing so. Writing center directors benefit from an awareness of these changes in accreditation. Further, viewing the work of accreditors collectively and with a national context in mind provides writing center directors with a better understanding not only of the immediate needs they will be obliged to fulfill but also a sense of what they can proactively prepare for. In this article, I will briefly situate regional accreditation and describe the regional accrediting agencies; provide examples of relevant accreditation standards and processes, drawing attention to changes that require ongoing reporting with analysis and evidence of continuous improvement (no more ten-year reprieves); and provide a checklist of points of entry for writing center directors into accreditation discussions.

WHO ARE THE ACCREDITORS, AND WHAT DO THEY DO?

Accreditation in general is a quality review process by which an institution or program engages in a self-evaluation weighed against an organization's set of standards or criteria. That self-evaluation is then reviewed and questioned by a group of external peer evaluators, who generally visit campus and determine if the self-evaluation is accurate. They make recommendations for or against accreditation and determine whether any improvements are needed. Their actions then are affirmed (or not) by the organization's review board and made public in some form. Rose describes four types of accreditors that work within higher education in the United States: "programmatic accreditors," "national career-related accreditors," "national faith-based accreditors," and "regional accreditors, which accredit both public and private, two-year and four-year, primarily degree-granting non-profit institutions" (54).

While all forms of accreditation might be encountered by writing center directors, in this article, I focus on regional accreditors. Regional accreditors are the primary accrediting agency that writing center directors will encounter, given their broad reach across institutional types, their role in determining institutional eligibility for federal aid, and the focus put on regional accreditation by administrators. However, much of the discussion in this article would likely be useful in regard to other forms of accreditation.

Regional accrediting agencies are not federal agencies; however, while they are not directly affiliated with government, they collect and provide information to the U.S. Department of Education, which the Department then uses to determine an institution's eli-

gibility for federal financial aid (Title IV programs) per the Higher Education Act. In turn, accrediting agencies themselves must be reviewed and deemed acceptable by the U.S. Department of Education through the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI) (U.S. Department of Education). There are seven regional accrediting agencies that are currently recognized by the U.S. Department of Education, each responsible for higher education in the states under their purview[1]:

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
- New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC)
- North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, The Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Senior College and University Commission (WASCSenior)
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

For the most part, the regional accrediting bodies function similarly, following the general outline of accreditation described above. They also all have sets of minimum expectations in addition to the standards for accreditation, and all have processes for substantive change approvals (such as the addition of new programs, expansion into graduate programming, and moving to competency-based rather than credit-based programs) and for the reporting required for Federal Compliance (the means through which the agencies are authorized by the U.S. Department of Education to gather mandated information related to Title IV). When looking across all seven agencies, a set of overall shared standards for accreditation emerges. These standards include having a clear mission with institutional goals that relate to that mission; having a primary goal of student learning and offering support for that learning; acting ethically; ensuring qualified personnel; maintaining rigorous academic programming, review, and assessment; and conducting institutional planning and management of resources, both fiscal and physical.

THE RANGE OF STANDARDS THAT CAN AFFECT CENTERS

Standards more specifically related to writing center work can be found across the various categories listed above, though each accrediting agency uses its own language for these standards and might have different levels of specificity and expectations. Writing center directors can use the language of these standards to validate the work of the writing center or point out where more support might be needed. Common standards that affect writing centers

include first, that student support is offered, especially as it relates to the institutional mission and student population: "The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring...which meet[s] the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers" (WASC Senior Standard 2.13). Similarly, some standards refer to distance education and the support required for those students (which might include the work of online writing centers), such as NEASC's Standard 5.9: "The institution offers an array of student services… appropriate to its mission and the needs and goals of its students. It recognizes the variations in services that are appropriate for residential students, at the main campus, at off-campus locations, and for distance education programs."

Standards related to academic assessment might help writing centers argue for resources, such as NWCCU's standard 4.B.2m, which mandates that "The institution uses the results of its assessment of student learning to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices that lead to enhancement of student learning achievements." Assessment of student support services is increasingly specified, as is the use of this assessment in decision-making regarding allotment of resources; take, for example, HLC Criterion 5.C.2, which states "The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting." Though perhaps intimidating to consider, writing centers can likely make a case for the necessity of their services based not only on their own assessments but on university-wide writing assessment results.

Another common standard across the agencies requires that the staff providing support meet professional standards (who determines what those professional standards are is generally not established by the accrediting agencies) and are provided with professional development opportunities, something writing center directors often find themselves arguing for. Other typical standards writing center directors might need to consider, depending on their institution's needs for evidence, can often be found in standards related to planning and institutional resources, ethics and integrity, transparency of services, diversity initiatives, and even contractual arrangements if any tutoring is outsourced.

OVERVIEW OF CHANGING EXPECTATIONS AND PROCESSES

Along with similar-yet-different standards for accreditation, each agency has its own set of processes and timelines of which directors also need to be aware. In addition to the usual comprehensive review with an on-site visit, most now require annual reporting that goes beyond simple submission of data, as well as mid-cycle

substantive reports. These mid-cycle reports generally require in-depth self-evaluation; for example, the NEASC mid-term report must include a 15-20 page essay on "educational effectiveness."

At least half of the accrediting agencies also now require some form of quality improvement project with additional reporting and review. For example, SACSCOC requires a "Quality Enhancement Plan" (QEP) from each institution; in addition to meeting the usual standards for accreditation, the QEP must be a focused project which "addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning." Depending on which accreditation pathway their school is placed in, HLC institutions might find themselves pursuing multiple, annual "Action Projects" or a five-year "Quality Initiative Project." These types of focused projects are key components in the reaffirmation of accreditation.

SO WHY DO DIRECTORS NEED TO KNOW THIS?

The details of accreditation can seem like a lot of bureaucratic minutia, perhaps someone else's problem. It's understandable why at first glance a director might not want to get bogged down or prefer to worry about it later. But there are a number of good reasons to raise one's level of awareness.

Knowledge about accreditation is, simply put, *practical*.
Obviously, it's an advantage for an administrator to know what is coming down the pike, especially during a time when standards and processes are evolving. No one wants to be working towards old standards only to find out they have shifted and there are suddenly new expectations, with little or no time to adjust to them.

Being aware of the accreditation standards and processes can help a director *rhetorically situate her center in alignment with institutional priorities*.
Directors likely already demonstrate how their centers are extensions of university and programmatic missions and/or are essential towards a university's strategic plan; consider accreditation criteria another strategy for gaining visibility and buy-in. Acknowledging or referring to accreditation standards in your reports can demonstrate an awareness that administrators will appreciate, and you can use these standards as part of your arguments for resources. For example, I might reference HLC's criterion 3.D.4, "The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning" as part of an argument for creating a writing center, or criterion 3.C.6 "Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring . . . are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development" in an appeal for conference travel

funds. If you haven't already made an explicit effort to tie your writing center's mission to the broader university mission, do so; ensuring that resources reflect a university's mission is often paramount in reviewers' scrutiny.

Knowing about accreditation processes and timelines can help a director *recognize opportunities* for her writing center and for writing centers overall.
Becoming involved in accreditation efforts can help directors raise their leadership profile on campuses. The interdisciplinary nature of writing centers means most directors have a good handle on the scope of what's happening across programs in a way other accreditation steering committee members might not. Given that quality improvement projects are becoming the norm for accrediting agencies' processes/timelines; writing centers can position themselves to be a part of these initiatives; for example, the Sharer et al. collection details the creation of a writing center as part of a QEP at a community college, the integral role of writing centers in several other QEP projects focused on writing and WAC, and the creation of a university mentor program (akin to a writing fellows program), brought to the table by the WPA serving on the accreditation steering committee.

This awareness can help writing center directors *effect change* in accreditors' and the public's understanding about writing.
As Rose notes, writing professionals can "influence accreditation processes through participation at the local institutional level and as peer reviewers for their regional accrediting associations. They can also work collaboratively and collectively with their peers at other institutions to develop means of demonstrating student learning outcomes and the effectiveness of areas of support" (62). Ultimately, Rose calls on writing professionals to become involved with accreditation—to partner with accreditors, in order to influence and educate accreditors and accrediting agencies.

ENGAGING WITH ACCREDITATION IN THE WRITING CENTER

Below is a list of questions and prompts that directors can use to review their current efforts and to consider how to strategically align their writing center's goals and efforts with accreditation. The list starts with local, information-gathering suggestions and moves on to broader prompts leading to more active involvement.

- Know your institution's regional accreditor, and which accreditation process if the accreditor offers more than one (such as HLC's three processes).
- Read through the standards to have a sense of where the center might fit or will need to be explicitly addressed.
- Review your standards for hiring and ensuring quality of

your employees. Who determines professional standards for writing center employees at your institution? What arguments can you make or draw from, such as position statements on graduate student administrators from the IWCA or the College Readiness and Learning Association's (CRLA) certification process?

- Consider your writing center's web presence on the institutional web site. With growth of off-site review, even though the review focuses on the reports generated by the institution, reviewers will look for corroborating information. Take a look at your writing center's description of services and mission through a reviewer's eyes. It can also be useful to trace other departments' links to the center. Other web artifacts that accreditors might visit include your institution's policy statements and organizational charts; make certain that the writing center is accurately represented in these.
- Find out what is expected for annual reporting for accreditation. Is it changing? Is there a way to anticipate this and incorporate into annual reports you already write?
- Find out when your institution is next up for comprehensive review. How does the university draw on existing documentation/evidence in preparing for it? What will the timeline and expectations be for contributing?
- Explore whether your institution is contemplating any quality improvement projects that could involve writing or student support services.
- Know if your institution is facing any focus visits or progress reports related to writing or student support services. How might you/the center contribute to these needs?
- Discuss accreditation standards and processes with your staff to help demystify these standards and make such discussions part of the ongoing work of the center.
- Serve on your institution's accreditation committee.
- Consider applying to become a peer reviewer.
- Share your assessment successes and failures and accreditation experiences with other center professionals.

Rather than seeing accreditation as an external demand that drains our resources, we in writing centers can consider these requirements strategically. Viewing accreditation broadly opens up both local and global opportunities for the writing center community to explore. The increased reporting and quality improvement projects related to accreditation provide possible pathways (and the necessary institutional support) for writing center projects or expansions. Further, these accreditation mandates help ensure that institutions, and the units within them, "move from productive internal conversations about improving learning to engaging more deeply

with other institutions and higher education organizations" (WASC Senior 3). Collectively, writing center directors can use the language and processes of accreditation to engage in efforts that contribute to writing centers' practices, values, and worth.

NOTES

1. See the U.S. Department of Education's "Database of Accredited Postsecondary Institutions and Programs" (http://ope.ed.gov/accreditation/agencies.aspx) for links to each of the regional accrediting agencies.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

WORKS CITED

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC). *Accreditation Reference Handbook.* ACCJC, July 2015. PDF.

Higher Learning Commission (HLC). *Higher Learning Commission 2016 Resource Guide. 2016*, download.hlcommission.org/ResourceGuide_2016-04_INF.pdf.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation.* 13th edition, 2015, www.msche.org/publications/RevisedStandardsFINAL.pdf.

New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC). *Procedures for Interim Reports*. August 2016, cihe.neasc.org/sites/cihe.neasc.org/files/downloads/POLICIES/Pp51_Procedures_Interim_5-Yr_Reports.pdf.

---. "Standards (Effective July 1, 2016)." *New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education*, July 1 2016, cihe.neasc.org/standards-policies/standards-accreditation/standards-effective-july-1-2016.

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). *Accreditation Handbook*. March 2015, www.nwccu.org/Pubs%20Forms%20and%20Updates/Publications/Accreditation%20Handbook,%202015%20Edition.pdf.

Rose, Shirley K. "Understanding Accreditation's History and Role in Higher Education: How It Matters to College Writing Programs." Sharer et al., pp. 52-63.

Schendel, Ellen, and William Macauley Jr. *Building Writing Center Assessments that Matter*. Utah State UP, 2012.

Sharer, Wendy, et al., editors. *Reclaiming Accountability: Improving Writing Programs through Accreditation and Large-Scale Assessments.* Utah State UP, 2016.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). "General Information on the Reaffirmation Process." *Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges*, 2016, www.sacscoc.org/genaccproc.asp.

---. *The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement.* 5th edition, 2012, www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2012PrinciplesOfAcreditation.pdf.

United States. Department of Education. "Overview of Accreditation in the United States." *Accreditation in the United States*, April 2016, www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation.html#Overview.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Senior College and University Commission (WASCSenior). *Handbook of Accreditation*. Revised edition, April 2015, wascsenior.box.com/shared/static/oxgx719tnw5bn8b4kp28.pdf.

DOI: 10.37514/WLN-J.2017.41.5.03

The Storying of Writing Centers Outside the U.S.: Director Narratives and the Making of Disciplinary Identities in Germany and Austria

Andrea Scott

Pitzer College
Claremont, California

In *Peripheral Visions for Writing Centers*, Jackie Grutsch McKinney highlights the cognitive dissonance between the work of writing center directors and the stories they tell about that work. When describing their centers to stakeholders, directors all too often rehearse what she calls the "writing center grand narrative" (WCGN), namely the story that says "*writing centers are comfortable, iconoclastic places where all students go to get one-to-one tutoring on their writing*" (3; emphasis in original). While this narrative allows directors to assert that they belong in a professional community, it also has significant costs (5-6), preventing others from "understand[ing] the complexity of our work" and perpetuating "untenable positions" within our institutions (85). Stories are not simply interpretations of the past. When internalized, they actively construct the future by informing what seems possible in the present.

Grutsch McKinney's research shows that our stories have a direct bearing on the survival and growth of writing centers, serving as tools for educating stakeholders, asserting institutional value, and defining disciplinary identities. Yet to what extent are our stories also limited by U.S.-based frameworks? Since the first writing center was founded outside North America in Bielefeld, Germany in 1993, writing centers have proliferated across the globe (Thaiss). Despite this growth, writing studies scholarship published in North American journals remains largely monolingual and U.S.-centric in its orientation (Anson and Donahue; Horner et al.). In my contribution I turn an international lens back onto this research to ask how directors are storying the work of writing centers in other countries and what those stories tell us about the distinctness of disciplinary identities, institutional cultures, and research traditions in other countries. How universal is the WCGN even in regions, like German-speaking countries, where writing centers have strong transatlantic histories?

Based on responses from 14 writing center administrators (WCAs) from 11 of Germany's roughly 60 centers and from 1 of Austria's 8, I argue that the WCGN, as we've come to understand it, may need to

be qualified as a writing center grand narrative *in the United States*. The United States-based version often *informs* these stories, authorizing directors' work by situating it within an established discipline with a transatlantic reach. Yet the stories are also shaped by a set of unique institutional and disciplinary narratives in the region. To get at these differences, I contextualize directors' stories in German-language scholarship on writing and higher education.[1]

METHODOLOGY

I began my study by reproducing two surveys in German translation: Grutsch McKinney's 2011 open-ended survey of directors, designed to elicit stories, and Rebecca Jackson and Grutsch McKinney's 2009 questionnaire about non-tutorial activities in writing centers. Reproducing these surveys and supplementing them with questions specific to Germanic contexts allowed me to test the validity of past studies and engage in comparative research—something rarely done in the field. It also allowed me to build on existing research that uses narrative inquiry as a method (Caswell et al.; Grutsch McKinney).

In Fall 2014, I distributed this comprehensive survey to the EWCA listserv and to the 14 attendees of the 2014 EWCA conference who signed their names to a recruitment list. I also posted an invitation to the website of the Society for Writing Pedagogy and Writing Research based in Germany. From the twenty-one individuals who completed the survey, I chose to include in this study only the fourteen surveys from participants who identified as WCAs (defined in the instrument as a "director, assistant director, coordinator, etc.") or whose roles aligned with this definition. Central to my analysis here were four open-ended questions from Grutsch McKinney's 2011 survey:

1. In your own words, what is a writing center?
2. How do you describe the role of your writing center to those at your own school?
3. In what ways do you think your writing center is different from other writing centers?
4. In what ways do you think your writing center is similar to other writing centers? (62).

Surveys are particularly useful instruments for researching grand narratives because, as Grutsch McKinney argues elsewhere, they offer a "big picture description of a population, particularly of the population's attitudes and beliefs" (*Strategies* 73). However, the reliability of this snapshot depends on the collection method (77). One significant limitation of my study is my use of convenience rather than random sampling, which diminishes the generalizability of my claims. Although additional research is needed to test the representativeness of my results, the conclusions drawn are

supported by the storying of writing centers in German-language scholarship. Moreover, given that narrative inquiry is one of my methods, the meaning of individual stories was as important to me as their statistical significance.

Narrative inquiry is a methodology that allows us—in the words of D. Jean Clandinin—to see "experience as narratively composed" (12). It focuses, Clandinin and Jerry Rosiek argue, "not only on individuals' experience but also on the social, cultural, and institutional narratives within which individuals' experiences are constituted, shaped, expressed, and enacted" (qtd. in Clandinin 12-13). In other words, narrative inquiry enables us to understand individual experience as always already situated within social narratives. Thus writing center stories are not simply windows onto individual centers or directors. They are situated in larger disciplinary histories both local and transnational in their orientation. To capture story themes, I first analyzed the responses, looking for patterns. I coded for concepts that appear in the WCGN and concepts that appear outside it. Next, I zoomed out to interpret how these themes are embedded in larger discourses about writing and writing centers.

LESSONS FROM CODING

In the process, I discovered something striking: participants rehearsed very few commonplaces from the WCGN. When prompted to articulate *what is a writing center*, there was wide consensus that writing centers attend to "writing," but references to the center being "comfortable," "iconoclastic," and welcoming to "all students" occurred infrequently. The plural for students ("*StudentInnen*" or "*Studierende*") was often evoked but rarely in self-conscious reference to *all* students. Only the familiar notion of centers as "places" emerged often. The only other key concept invoked frequently was writing-in-the-disciplines (WID)—a keyword absent from the WCGN. More distantly, study participants defined writing centers as places for research and faculty development. In other words, if a grand narrative exists at all for writing centers in this region, it appears to be *writing centers are a place where students learn how to write in the disciplines, where faculty may receive support in the teaching of writing in their disciplines, and where professional faculty and staff, including peer tutors, can engage in research*.

The narrative became even more capacious when WCAs were asked to describe the role of their centers to university stakeholders. They most frequently invoked a mission to advance writing or WID. In fact, writing was often referred to as "academic writing" (*wissenschaftliches Schreiben* or *akademisches Schreiben*) and mentioned in the context of students' disciplinary pathways. This reflects the WID-based approach to writing at universities in the region, where students begin specializing in their fields right away. The next most

frequent categories to appear were faculty development and one-to-one tutoring, followed more distantly by a focus on students' personal development; workshops; tutor training; support for core competencies; a sense of writing center work as iconoclastic; and career readiness and professional writing. In other words, the story that WCAs collectively tell stakeholders might go something like this: *diverse in pedagogical orientation, writing centers advance writing in the disciplines most often through faculty development and writing consultations. They are sometimes iconoclastic, but equally often they further the teaching and learning missions of their universities by supporting the development of key competencies. They do this in multiple ways: facilitating disciplinary and professional writing, supporting students' and tutors' development as writers, and offering workshops and tutor training*. WCAs seem to perceive writing center work as comprehensive and often unique within the higher education landscape. Moreover, they appear to be quite good at making this work visible to others.

Not surprisingly, there was less consensus among WCAs about how their centers differed from others. WID initiatives emerged as the most frequent response, followed more distantly by research and, more distantly still, by attention to students' personal development; networking and engagement with debates in higher education; writing pedagogies; tutor training; and an iconoclastic institutional identity. As expected, WCAs evoked what their centers are known for best, suggesting that some centers, at least at the time of the study, have specialized identities in one or more categories: writing in the disciplines, multilingual tutoring, literacy management; peer tutor autonomy and teamwork; multimodal writing; and engagement in higher education policy.

When asked how they thought their centers were similar to others, there was greatest consensus around the presence of one-to-one tutoring and the value placed on peer tutoring and collaborative learning. This isn't surprising given the tremendous growth in peer tutoring since Gerd Bräuer established the first peer-tutor writing center in Germany in Freiburg in 2003 and Katrin Girgensohn followed suit in Frankfurt (Oder) in 2007 (Bräuer and Girgensohn). Girgensohn's center has since become a hub for \center research. Her peer tutors have gone on to direct their own centers and undertake some of the country's first B.A., master's, and doctoral theses in the field. Peer tutor participation in the discipline is arguably one of the newest and most exciting developments in the region.

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF DIRECTOR STORIES

While coding renders visible conceptual patterns, it doesn't capture how these stories often feel quite different from the WCGN in the U.S. Take these three definitions of writing centers[2]:

A. We see disciplinary writing and reading as a learnable craft. We make it easier for students to learn and for faculty to teach academic writing. The point of a university [education] is to learn how to think in a discipline and apply this acquired knowledge meaningfully beyond the university. Through the use of pedagogical strategies in writing and reading, we as a writing center ensure that disciplinary information can be handled intelligibly, and disciplinary perspectives can be more easily acquired, disseminated, and used.

B. A writing center is an institution dedicated to the key competency of writing. In writing centers, writing is viewed as a process that is individual and capable of being learned. At university writing centers trained facilitators (student peer tutors and academic staff) support writers in teaching and learning activities and consultations that enable them to develop their own writing strategies and to find their own answers to challenges during writing processes. Writing also encompasses more broadly multiliteracies, including academic literacies and multimodal communication, as well as writing in other languages and engaging critically with the personal challenges inherent in the transition into new discourse communities.

C. Our writing center addresses the needs of international students, who pursue their studies in the foreign language of German and compose scholarly texts. It is a central "service provider" and a place of learning in higher education where multilingual students can complement their studies by accessing resources to further develop their knowledge of the German language at the university and in their disciplines. To this end, we take into account the language proficiency requirements for admission to a degree program as well as various discipline-specific genres and the requisite technical language of disciplines during a course of study. The writing center offers […] courses (also blended learning), workshops, [and] individual consultations that address writing as both process and product. [….] Active participation counts towards the degree […]. Staff are experts in foreign language acquisition.

These examples reflect the diverse activities and emphases of writing centers, while also signaling that these approaches are embedded in transatlantic and regional research traditions. We see the invocation of U.S. scholarly discourse on WID, multimodal writing, and self-efficacy. However, texts B and C invoke European traditions in multiliteracies (Cope and Kalantzis) and writing process research (Keseling; Knorr et al.). Text C points to the importance of research from German didactics and applied linguistics to a number of writing centers in the region, where multilingual writing is routine, given the diversity of the German population, inter-university mobility within Europe, large numbers of international students, and the prevalence of English as a lingua franca in the sciences (Brinkschulte et al.; Knorr and Neumann). Such centers are often led by

linguists active in the development of writing pedagogies. Text C also emphasizes an awareness of debates—that originate in the U.S. but have migrated across the globe—about whether writing centers have "service" missions or are sites of inquiry.

In her account of narrative analysis as a methodology, Riessman highlights the importance of attending to *what* is said and *how* and *why* it is said (11). Studying narratives requires what Riessman calls a "close study of the particular" (18), including the "nuances of language, audience, organization…, local contexts of production, and the circulating discourses that influence what can be narrated" (18). When this framework is applied to writing center narratives in Germany and Austria, we see that they often signal an understanding of regional and transnational scholarly discourses about writing centers and pedagogies in order to assert their membership in the field and educate stakeholders about what writing centers do and why. They also often link the center's mission to the university. To cite writing as a "key competency," for example, is to invoke the transnational discourse of the Bologna Accords with their focus on student outcomes and transferrable credit. At the same time, text C shows how writing center stories can resist the "general skills" discourse of generic outcomes by framing them in the context of disciplinary practices.

Yet stories alone can't ensure the sustainability of writing centers in the region. Writing centers' missions may be capacious, but institutional longevity will depend on stable funding streams and strong disciplinary standing, which most centers in the region still lack. As one respondent puts it:

> It's a difficult role that's currently under discussion. On the one hand, we are constantly relegated to administrative "service," though we are employed as academic staff in teaching and research [in Lehre und Forschung Wissenschaftlich Arbeiten]; on the other hand, many individuals and institutions at the university want to work with us, which means our personnel resources are quickly depleted, tending us toward self-exploitation. We aren't a department, though we offer elective modules; we aren't a service institution and aren't taken very seriously by the governance structure because we're a small unit, and yet at the same time our charge is very large.

In a survey question, half of the study participants reported believing their center was at risk due to a pending loss in funding. When asked how institutional operations might be made more secure, nine commented on the need for permanent university funding. "We are funded entirely by third-party grants," wrote one WCA, and "all our staff […] are on temporary contracts." Given these constraints, it's perhaps unsurprising that so many WCAs self-consciously evoke disciplinary discourses to stake out a claim to legit-

imacy in the academy. As Girgensohn and Nora Peters put it: "at [the] university nothing speaks louder than research."

Since external funding from federal grants is scheduled to expire at the end of 2016 for up to half of Germany's writing centers (Lahm), it remains to be seen whether university administrators will find this argument compelling. If WCAs are successful, directors across the globe may learn that engaging both regional and transnational discourses on writing and writing centers may be essential to argue for their permanence. As evinced by the recent "Open Letter to College and University Administrators on Retaining Highly Qualified Writing Center Directors," even the positions of established directors in North America can be eliminated when their expertise isn't understood and valued. Yet at the same time, our colleagues in Germany and Austria may serve as models of persistence and ingenuity in the face of these challenges.

NOTES

1. Thank you to the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation for funding this project.
2. All translations are my own.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

WORKS CITED

Anson, Chris M. and Christiane Donahue. "Deconstructing "Writing Program Administration" in an International Context." *Transnational Writing Program Administration*, edited by David S. Martins, Utah State UP, 2015, pp. 21-47.

Bräuer, Gerd and Katrin Girgensohn. "Literacy Development Projects Initiating Institutional Change." *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*, edited by Chris Thaiss et al., Parlor P, 2012, pp. 225-238.

Brinkschulte, Melanie et al. "Resource-Focused Research for Multilingual Competence in Scientific Writing." *Journal of Academic Writing*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 17-28.

Caswell, Nikki, et al. *The Working Lives of New Writing Center Directors*. Utah State UP, 2016.

Clandinin, D. Jean. *Engaging in Narrative Inquiry*. Left Coast P, 2013.

Cope, Bill and Mary Kalantzis. "Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures." Routledge, 2000.

Girgensohn, Katrin and Nora Peters. ""At university nothing speaks louder than research": Plädoyer für Schreibzentrumsforschung." Zeitschrift Schreiben, 2012, http://www.zeitschrift-schreiben.eu/Beitraege/girgensohn_Schreibzentrumsforschung.pdf.

Grutsch McKinney, Jackie. *Peripheral Visions for Writing Centers*. Utah State UP, 2013.

---. *Strategies for Writing Center Research*. Parlor P, 2016.

Horner, Bruce et al. "Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm." *CCC*, vol. 63, no. 2, 2011, pp. 269-300.

Jackson, Rebecca and Jackie Grutsch McKinney. "Beyond Tutoring: Mapping the Invisible Landscape of Writing Center Work." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2011.

Keseling, Gisbert. *Die Einsamkeit des Schreibers: Wie Schreibblockaden entstehen und erfolgreich bearbeitet werden können*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2004.

Knorr, Dagmar and Ursula Neumann, editors. *Mehrsprachige Lehramtsstudierende Schreiben: Schreibwerkstätten an deutschen Hochschulen*. Waxmann Verlag, 2014.

Knorr, Dagmar et al., editors. *Methods in Writing Process Research*. Peter Lang, 2014.

Lahm, Swantje. "Stories We Live By: A Review of 20 Years Writing Center Work at German Universities." European Writing Centers Association Conference, Frankfurt (Oder), 2014.

Thaiss, Chris et al., editors. *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*. Parlor P, 2012.

DOI: 10.37514/WLN-J.2017.41.5.04

WLN

How are Learning Centers Working Out: Maintaining Identity During Consolidation

Malkiel Choseed

Onondaga Community College
Syracuse, New York

The Writing Skills Center (WSC) at Onondaga Community College (OCC) was created by the English department in 1978 in response to a perceived need for supplemental tutoring for non-credit, remedial classes. For the first couple of decades, it served essentially as a lab section for those classes. Although it kept the name, the WSC slowly evolved, changing into a tutoring center open to all students in all stages of the writing process. In the 2014 Fall semester, after a protracted discussion about how to improve access to our campus tutoring centers (the WSC, Reading and Study Skills, Math, and Content), our provost informed us that all tutoring would be moving to a new Learning Center (LC), overseen by a newly hired Associate Vice President for Academic Support (AVP). While there were some obvious benefits to the move, like simplifying the process of students finding help and consolidating resources, the English department had questions. Would the structure and priorities of a tutoring session remain connected to those of contemporary writing centers? Who would set the priorities in the new space and determine what was or was not "good" tutoring? In short, would the unification damage our ability to deliver writing tutoring in the way we saw best?

The change was happening, and my job as Writing Program Coordinator, a WPA-type position in the English department, which includes responsibility for writing tutoring, was to help determine what the organizational structure might look like and the future shape of writing tutoring at OCC. I decided then that our writing center could best maintain its identity by continuing to claim a distinct disciplinary and professional identity in our new, shared space, and by grounding our training, professional development, and tutor evaluation in contemporary writing center theory and best practice.

The danger of combining writing tutoring with other services on any campus is that the emphasis might change from "writing" to "tutoring." Territoriality aside, members of the English department

were afraid that if our WSC was absorbed into the LC and was not guided by a knowledgeable English faculty member, writing tutors might not conduct sessions in ways that communicated to clients what was really important about the writing process. We feared that writing tutoring sessions would be used to simply correct student papers or tell students what to do without efforts to ensure students understood how or why they were doing it.

To work against these potential negative outcomes, I laid claim to and grounded my identity as a professional in an established discipline, that of Writing Center Studies. The physical space and administrative responsibilities, while important to a writing center, were not as important in this consolidation move to maintaining our identity as a writing center as was a continued commitment to writing center theory and practice. I reiterated this professional claim in meetings with provosts, deans, faculty, and whoever else would listen. I tried to ground this claim in the notion that writing center professionals could get results for our students that others would not, and I was lucky to find a receptive audience.

An entire world of writing center theory and practice exists that directors of writing centers being moved into a learning center can draw on, cite, and reference in our intra-campus communication. We need to make the case, using those sources, that our expertise is unique, special, and valuable. This expertise may be obvious to WLN readers, but it is not necessarily obvious to our campus administration or even to our faculty colleagues, both in and out of the English department. The lack of acceptance of Writing Center Studies expertise may be especially prevalent in a community college environment, where notions of expertise are often more fluid and grounded in practice rather than degree, formal training, or scholarly intervention. Those in other established humanities fields may not have to face this rhetorical challenge, but taking it on can be vital when a writing center is made part of an LC. A writing center director must convince stakeholders that the links to our discipline and proven expertise are worth maintaining.

While we at OCC were mindful of challenges, our English faculty and tutoring staff also acknowledged the benefits of the move. OCC's new AVP streamlined our schedule, making it more responsive to student need, while expanding our hours and making face-to-face tutoring available on weekends. The AVP also provided the resources for us to expand our online tutoring options. I argued that what those online sessions could or should look like ought to be the purview of a writing center professional. Consequently, I was able to propose and secure a structure for the online sessions that was in accordance with contemporary writing center practice,

a structure that I argued maximized student learning. To be able to engage in such work, I explained, tutors needed to understand basic principles of how writers write and students learn and the best way to communicate such insights. In short, tutors needed to be connected to scholarship in Writing Center Studies. In my experience, a writing center director is best positioned to help staff make such connections. Because I was allowed to focus on what our WSC staff needed, a partnership emerged in our new LC. The AVP used her substantial administrative and budgetary skills to make tutoring possible while I focused on what happened during a writing tutoring session.

When faced with the prospect of moving into a learning center, writing center directors need to make the argument that trained writing tutors can bring basic principles to bear on their work with students in a way that others with a different disciplinary background can not. Of course, we expect a writing tutor to have a deep understanding of essay form and structure, rhetoric, English grammar, punctuation, citation, etc. But the job of a writing tutor differs from a content tutor knowledgeable in these areas because the writing tutor must explain and teach these concepts to clients as well as help clients prioritize their approach to writing and writing issues (e.g. clarifying a thesis and paragraph development before working on punctuation or citation). Our content tutors are evaluated on how well they can answer questions about course material, i.e. how good they are at communicating biology, chemistry, or Spanish grammar, whereas our writing tutors are expected to help students understand how to write a paper and not what to write. Our reading/study skills and math tutors also focus on approach over content, and similar arguments about them privileging students understanding of the "how" of the subject over and above the "what" could be made on their behalf.

At OCC, the makeup of the writing tutors, all considered professional tutors with a minimum of an MA in English or a related field, mirrors that of typical composition programs. The bulk of our tutors are dedicated and caring, and the director's most important role is to help train these tutors. During our paid training, for example, I hold discussion groups using articles from writing center anthologies and journals and bring in speakers when the budget allows. We built a library of writing center resources for use by tutors. Those resources mark our theory and practice as different than those of the other tutors in the LC. We need to continually build on our distinct, disciplinary identity as writing center professionals. We need to remind any and all stakeholders that not just anyone can do our job, or at least do it as well, and we need to follow up with our staff

to ensure, to the best of our ability, that our tutors have the necessary knowledge and practice.

While becoming part of an LC hasn't always been easy, our strategy of claiming professionalism has worked, for the most part. Day-to-day concerns like time card processing and budget monitoring are handled by the AVP, while tutor training and evaluations are handled by me in my role as writing program coordinator. In every meeting and communication across campus, I maintain that it is in the best interests of the student served by our tutors to work with trained writing tutors. To the extent that writing tutoring at OCC has stayed connected to our English department and the Writing Center Studies field, I've succeeded, through repetition and consistency of message, in making our professional distinction a central issue. Whether the expertise comes from the tutors themselves or the writing center director helming the program, it is in our best interest to lay claim to and seek to continually build on our distinct, disciplinary identity as writing center professionals.

DOI: 10.37514/WLN-J.2017.41.5.05

WLN

From the Margin to the Middle: A Heuristic for Planning Writing Center Relocation

Elizabeth Vincelette

Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia

As a writing center director (WCD) who has overseen relocation to a learning commons (LC), I offer a heuristic for center directors who are contemplating relocation and considering the individual and institutional implications of such a move. I offer the questions in this heuristic as a generative approach for WCDs to make decisions as they confront a variety of concerns; the questions can be "mixed and matched" in order to suit individual writing center needs.

Despite the local aspect of every WC, a brief overview of my WCD experience is necessary for context. Five years ago, the WC I direct, which reports to English, moved to a learning commons in a library. The following year saw the launch of a Student Success Office charged with upholding student success initiatives and coordinating campus tutoring. The WC is one of several tutoring centers occupying separate conference rooms (approximately 1,041 square feet in size) in the LC. As the WCD, although I officially report to English, I participate on Student Success and LC committees. Every year, the number of responsibilities and opportunities for collaboration increase, but rather than focus on details of our WC's ongoing journey, I will extrapolate from my experiences and offer a heuristic to guide directors through the process of establishing and maintaining shared resources while safeguarding their existing practices, procedures, and policies.

Because relocation will likely increase opportunities to share resources and collaborate, I've devised a heuristic to help WCDs work through potential changes. Potential stakeholders should clarify reporting lines (even if it means ensuring, in writing, that a WC remain with its "parent" department) because, while partnerships are often positive, they can be fraught with new pressures and the need for regular negotiations.

The heuristic comprises suggested areas of exploration loosely organized under the headings of *policy*, *budget*, *physical space*, *collaboration*, and *labor*. Because these areas overlap and influence one another, the questions in each section are non-sequential and

can be adapted to meet local center needs.

POLICY

Are WC policies already established, or might policies change with the move? Where are policies published? Are policies authored by an individual director, a series of directors over time, or a committee? Are policies vetted by a department (such as English) or by a shared group, such as a team of tutoring center directors from across disciplines? Will the WC transfer existing policies into its new space? Could shared resources (such as space, data management systems, or scheduling software) cause policy changes? Which shared resources could impact policies?

BUDGET

What existing resources does the WC possess? What funds will be maintained and from what source? What resources will the WC gain or lose? Who is responsible for hiring, evaluating, supervising, assessing, and handling payroll? Are all tutors paid on the same scale? Who determines pay? What resources will be shared? Who has decision-making authority to authorize resource allocation? What day-to-day office items are needed, and who provides these? Who is responsible for purchasing computers, projectors, tablets, furniture, office supplies, and other items? Who pays for repairs, new software, or software updates?

PHYSICAL SPACE

How will the furniture and space be arranged? Where will students wait for consultations or go afterwards? Will private spaces, cubicles, or administrative areas be provided? How many, and what shape are, the tables? How many desks and computers? How will the administrative desk be arranged? Where are phone jacks and outlets for use during consultations? Does the WCD have a private office, or a private desk and computer separate from tutoring areas? How can the WCD's space be personalized or decorated? What "creature comforts" (microwave, refrigerator, coffee pot, etc.) will be needed or allowed in the WC? Will the WC space be available after hours for other uses? Who manages cleaning, security, and reservation of the WC space? Who has keys to the space, and when is the WC space locked? How might the allotted space for the WC impact the number of sessions? Will space expansion or constraint impact hours? How do the current number of tutors and scheduling affect the space? How does the space affect the number of tutors on staff? How many people could comfortably collaborate in the WC space? Will tutoring "spill out" of the new space?

COLLABORATION

How will the WC collaborate with nearby tutoring offices? How do the WC's pedagogical approaches, structure of sessions, and

staff compare to those in other tutoring centers? What are other tutoring centers' hours, consultation lengths, and types (drop-in, appointment, group, individual, mixed), and staff makeup (volunteers, graduate students, undergraduates,, professionals, etc.)? To what degree are services among tutoring centers expected to be similar? Must special schedules, such as exam study sessions and orientations, be coordinated? How will WC information (hours, closings, workshop schedules, special events, adjusted exam schedules, etc.) be disseminated? Will the WC maintain separate schedules from other tutoring offices? Will directors of nearby tutoring centers meet regularly? Who has access to WC tutor and director performance evaluations, and how can these personnel evaluations be used? If shared software among tutoring centers is used, who has access to data (names of clients, client numbers, usage by departments, demographic information, visit reports, etc.)? Who has permissions to record, evaluate, and use such information? Are there different levels of access to such information? If shared programs schedule appointments online and collect data, who sets permissions and rules within the software? How much input does the WC have in the above decisions?

LABOR

Do the WC administrators and staff have a current, official job descriptions? What does a day, week, month, semester, summer, or year in the life of a WC administrator or staff member look like? What types of meetings do WC administrators attend? What committee assignments do WC administrators hold? Will that change? How? How much time does the WCD spend on day-to-day center operations, in meetings, on data reporting and analysis, staff training, scholarship, or other activities? How might that expand or change? How do WC staff employment contracts (and rank) align with expectations? How might administrative duties and expectations, particularly the expansion, reduction, or combination of roles, be determined or clarified?

Within these questions one might rightfully sense a warning: WCDs should be cautious when joining a learning commons/success center as the only way to grow or change, especially when there are unclear expectations and vague—or non-existent—documents to regulate policy and define boundaries.

To establish and maintain autonomy during a transition to a LC, WC administrators may begin by taking a few steps before initiating meetings and discussions with potential partners: (a) locate existing or historical documents (formal agreements, emails, memos, or other texts) regarding your WC; (b) interview past WCDs, or deans, as applicable; and (c) gather information regarding the

learning commons/success center and its departmental structure. Once these documents are collected and reviewed by the WCD and appropriate support staff in the center, I suggest that WCDs use the heuristic to initiate conversations among potential partners and eventually to generate formal documents outlining shared responsibilities, resources, budget, and reporting lines. Formal documents should be authorized by WC administration, the chair, deans, and/or personnel of other tutoring units before relocation. If possible, a departmental committee or advisory board within the WC's reporting line should be organized to support the WCD and staff, providing both assistance and institutional backing for decisions.

Subsequently, after a WC has moved to an LC, periodic revisiting of "founding" documents may be necessary to renegotiate responsibilities for services and physical space. Founding documents may include the following: WC policies, which should be vetted and published as official procedures and recommendations; chartering or initial "set-up" agreements (such as a "memo of understanding") that outline who is responsible for staffing, purchases, and maintenance of physical amenities; and guidelines for the development and oversight of data systems before and after relocation to an LC.

It is possible that a center can move to a campus hub—from the margins to the middle—and subsequently exist centrally in physical space, yet marginally in conceptual space. Careful planning for change can help maintain control of (or at least, influence on) decisions rooted in writing center theory and practice. WCDs must then resist pressures to negotiate when "compromises" indeed do compromise WC theory and practice. Jeanne Simpson argued that WCDs need to proceed with caution when working with other tutoring services, and warned, "We don't always have the authority to make decisions all on our own, though writing center directors get left to their own devices so much, they may be beguiled into thinking they do have that authority. Be sure before you act." In the spirit of Simpson's advice to get ahead of the problem, I offer the heuristic to help directors pursue specific lines of inquiry that will help them preserve center autonomy and authority before they act.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

WORKS CITED

Simpson, Jeanne. "WCenter Digest: September 29, 2014." WCenter Listserv, WCENTER, 30 Sept. 2014, <lyris.ttu.edu/read/messages?id= 24534381>. Accessed 30 Sept. 2016.

DOI: 10.37514/WLN-J.2017.41.5.06

WLN

Tutors' Column: "My Idea of the Writing Center: Through the Eyes of a Client Turned Consultant"

Jennifer Beckwith

Worcester State University
Worcester, Massachusetts

Three years ago, I walked into the Worcester State University Writing Center with my heart feeling like it was ready to leap out of my chest. I was a timid freshman who, although confident in my choice to study English, was not at all confident in my writing. My professor required a writing center visit before English Comp assignments could be turned in, and to me the requirement only meant one thing: someone else was going to have to read my writing and they were going to tear it apart. Much to my surprise I received some really great advice and the consultant didn't scribble angry notes all over my paper like I had anticipated. In fact, my session went so well that my professor saw something in my writing I clearly did not, and I went from fearing the Writing Center—or rather, my idea of it—to working in the Writing Center. Now, it's my job to help students become better writers and to eliminate, or at least decrease, the misconceptions and fears people have about writing centers in general.

After just a few months of working in the Writing Center, I found that it wasn't uncommon to enter into a session with a peer writer who assumes I'll be the one doing all of the revisions that day. Because of such experiences, I developed a habit of telling new clients that we aren't an editing service—we are simply a place to progress. Student writers need to think for themselves and can't expect other people to tell them what to write, and although I've had some frustrated clients who just want to get the required stamp on the paper, most are open to—and even eager for—our guidance in helping them to better their own writing. Unfortunately, the commonness of the editorial service assumption stems from students' years in secondary school, when our writing mistakes were corrected based on what our instructors believed to be right, and the assumption is even perpetuated by some college professors. Yet Lil Brannon and C.H. Knoblauch suggest that "helping writers achieve their own purposes . . . while insisting on ideas, strategies, or formal constraints" (159) is what is truly important in creating

an "incentive to write" (159). Because of this, I discovered that my duty as a writing consultant is to honor the student's writing and his or her authority over it; not making decisions for them but simply making suggestions is crucial to a happy client and a successful session.

Although it's sometimes difficult not to fall into the isolated role of editor, I like to think of the Writing Center as a place for conversation, or "collaborative learning" (93) as Kenneth Bruffee calls it. I quickly found that just getting the writer talking can generate ideas and spark creativity; one of my very first sessions as a consultant began in this way. My client—we'll call him Paul—came in with just an assignment sheet and a look of complete distress on his face saying that he couldn't think of a topic and there was no way he would be able to finish by the due date the next day. Together, Paul and I looked over the assignment and after just a few minutes of talking he looked at me and said, "Oh man, what I just said right there was perfect don't you think? That could be my thesis." I couldn't have been happier at that moment, especially as a new consultant; just from talking with me, Paul managed to sort through the chaos of his ideas and craft a perfect thesis statement for his essay. He left the session that day with his entire first page written and a confidence that wasn't there when he arrived.

Even when I'm seated with a client who is not as successful as Paul was, "writing continues to be an act of conversational exchange" (Bruffee 93) through goal setting. While there are many techniques for helping a peer writer set good goals, I found that asking them outright what they are struggling with the most can best help to determine a goal that is both realistic and productive. Setting goals is so important, not only to conduct the session in a timely manner, but also to ensure that consultants focus on helping the writer with first order concerns—not falling into the editing role. I once sat with a client who confessed that she needed help with *everything*. After looking over what she had already written, I assured her that the overall structure and content of her essay was sound—she simply needed a clearer thesis and a bit more supportive evidence to really strengthen her argument. All at once, she seemed relieved, and we agreed on two goals for her to accomplish after she left that day. One week later, she came back to the Writing Center to tell me that she had earned an *A* on her paper.

Though we consultants may not realize it, there are so many students who are intimidated by the idea of showing others their work, generally due to lack of confidence or a fear of being judged—I would know, I was one of them. Students spend so many years being told what not to do when we're writing rather than having

our individual strengths reinforced that we are, consequently, used to focusing on the negatives and many of us feel as if our writing is worth nothing at all. Fortunately, there are many professors in higher education who promote the same core value as the Writing Center: " . . . that writers, and not necessarily their texts, are what get changed by instruction" (North 438). By showing writers that we value *all writing at all stages* it allows them to see that the Writing Center is not at all scary. My hope is that, in coming to the Writing Center, clients not only dispel whatever fears they might have had about the center but also pick up the tools they need to begin improving their writing on their own.

While my goal is to help eliminate any fear or discomfort that peer writers have about the Writing Center, I know it isn't easy. In order to educate students about the Writing Center—or even just to let them know it exists—our center at Worcester State University often makes brief and informative classroom visits. I think that giving students the chance to interact with our consultants outside of a session is a great way to build rapport with peer writers and show that the Writing Center is not at all intimidating. I also firmly believe that acting as an ambassador outside of the center is important as well. By showing my peers that I'm just another student working hard like them, I can help create a level of trust that allows others to see that writing consultants aren't anything more than peers seeking to help peers succeed. By educating others and creating relationships with peers, we can help to eliminate some of the stigmas that surround the Writing Center, in turn making it more comfortable for both consultants and student writers.

In my Writing Center practicum I read opinions of countless scholars who identified what they believed writing center responsibilities are, but I think the Writing Center is many things for many people: a quiet place to hide away between classes, a spot to talk to people with similar interests, but most of all, a support group. It is there to help good writers become better writers and better writers to become great writers. The Writing Center isn't just a place for writing; it's a place for conversation—a place to bounce ideas off one another to turn a decent thesis into a fantastic one. It is there to help writers set goals and build confidence that otherwise may not have been discovered. To me, the Writing Center is a safe haven away from critical professors or friends. It is a place where students can always go to help them make progress in their writing. It is important to me that I ensure student writers never feel any level of discomfort in a session, because for me the Writing Center was a saving grace that opened my eyes to my own writing skills, which I may never have discovered otherwise.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

WORKS CITED

Brannon, Lil and C.H Knoblauch. “On Students’ Rights To Their Own Texts: A Model of Teacher Response.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 33, no. 2, 1982, pp. 157-166.

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Peer Tutoring and the "Conversation of Mankind." *Landmark Essays on Writing Centers*. Edited by Christina Murphy and Joe Law. Hermagoras, 1995, pp. 87-98.

North, Stephen M. "The Idea of A Writing Center." *College English*, vol. 46, no. 5, 1984, pp. 433-446.

GET INVOLVED WITH *WLN*

Interested in serving as a reviewer? Contact Kim Ballard <kim.ballard@wmich.edu> and Lee Ann Glowzenski <laglowzenski@gmail.com>.

Interested in contributing news, announcements, or accounts of work in your writing to the Blog (photos welcomed)? Contact Josh Ambrose <jambrose@mcdaniel.edu>.

Interested in guest editing a special issue on a topic of your choice? Contact Muriel Harris <harrism@purdue.edu>.

Interested in adding to or working on our digitial resource database, WcORD? Contact Lee Ann Glowzenski <laglowzenski@gmail.com>.

Interested in writing an article or Tutors' Column to submit to *WLN*? Check the guidelines on the *WLN* website: <wlnjournal.org/submit.php>.

Announcements

CFP: MULTIMODAL WRITING IN WRITING CENTER

Susan DeRosa and Stephen Ferruci invite papers that examine how the increasingly multimodal nature of composing texts affects writing center identities and our relationships with and responsibilities to the writers, tutors, faculty, and others we work with every day.

For the full CFP and deadlines for proposals and then full articles, if invited to do that, see <www.wlnjournal.org/blog/2016/12/call-for-proposals-special-issue-of-wln/#more-2643>.

CANADIAN WRITING CENTRES ASSOCIATION

May 25-26, 2017
Toronto, Canada | OCAD University
"From Far and Wide: Imagining the Futures of Writing Centres"
Keynote: Frankie Condon

The Canadian Writing Centres Association invites writing centre practitioners—from far and wide—to consider how we respect individual differences amid pressures to serve ever greater numbers of students on limited budgets and in sometimes challenging administrative contexts. How do we continue to diversify our programs, our tutor training, and our research? And how do we extend our rhetorics of respect outside of our centres, across our institutions, and into our larger communities? For conference information, contact Heather Fitzgerald: <hfitzgerald@ecuad.ca>; conference website: <cwcaaccr.com/2017-conference>. Deadline for proposals: Jan. 13, 2017

LATIN AMERICAN NETWORK OF WRITING CENTERS AND PROGRAMS

May 24-26, 2017
Santiago, Chile | Pontifical Catholic University of Chile
"Disciplinary Writing: Contributions from Academic Literacy and Linguistics"

The focus of this conference is on the teaching and researching of Disciplinary Writing, from the disciplines of Academic Literacy, Applied Linguistics and Educational Linguistics. This focus aims to integrate the interests of different writing centers and programs with regard to the link between the linguistic approach to Academic Writing and its model for teaching in diverse institutions in our region. For information about submitting

proposals and other questions, contact <discursoacademico@uc.cl>.

MISSISSIPPI WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

March 24-25, 2017
Jackson, MS | Millsaps College
"Community and Identity: Mapping the Writing Center"
Keynote speaker: Harry Denny

The Writing Center at Millsaps College and the Board of the Mississippi Writing Centers Association invite proposals for the annual MSWCA conference and TutorCon. Information about proposal submission can be found on the conference website: <drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw0rL8SqZt8DSHBpTk1XSmxxblk/view>. Deadline for proposals: Jan. 20, 2017.

SOUTH CENTRAL WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

Feb. 16-18, 2017
Edinburg, TX | University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
"Writing (Centers/Centered) Institutional Identifications"
Keynote speaker: Rebecca Hallman Martini

For information, contact: Randall Monty: <rgvwc17@gmail.com>;
Conference website: <scwcargv17.wordpress.com>.

SOUTHEASTERN WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

Feb. 16-18, 2017
Oxford, MS | University of Mississippi
"Welcome to Today's Multimodal Writing Center"
Keynote speakers: Lisa Zimmerelli and Naomi Silver

SWCA invites conference-goers to explore how writing centers can become spaces that welcome all academic writers and to consider how writing centers can translate the increasing demand for multimodal and technological support into collaborative partnerships. Conference chairs: Brad Campbell: <mbcampbe@olemiss.edu>; < 662-915-7686>; Joanne Mitchell: <jsmitch1@olemiss.edu>; <662-915-2626>; and Alice Myatt <amyatt1@olemiss.edu>: <662-915-7678>. For information about conference registration, lodging, travel, and other information, visit the conference page on the SWCA website: <www.iwca-swca.org/2017-Conference.html>.

WRITING CENTERS OF JAPAN

March 6, 2017
Osaka, Japan | International Christian University
"Directions in Academic Writing: Issues and Solutions"

This symposium provides opportunities for scholars, teachers, students, university administrators, and other professionals to come together to exchange ideas about the role of writing centers in Asian universities as well as the teaching and learning of writing. The Program Committee invites proposals for both research- and practice-based presentations in English and Japanese. Deadline for proposals: January 20, 2017 (Japan Standard Time). Conference website: <goo.gl/2cWuKh>.

Conference Calendar

February 16-18, 2017: Southeastern WCA, in Oxford, MS
Contact: Brad Campbell: <mbcampbe@olemiss.edu>; Joanne Mitchell: <jsmitch1@olemiss.edu>; and Alice Myatt <amyatt1@olemiss.edu>: Conference website: <www.iwca-swca.org/2017-Conference.html>.

February 16-18, 2017: South Central WCA, in Edinburg, TX
Contact: Randall Monty: <rgvwc17@gmail.com>; conference website: <scwcargv17.wordpress.com>.

February 24-25, 2017: Rocky Mountain Writing Tutor Conference, in Bozeman, MT
Contact: Michelle Miley: <michelle.miley@montana.edu>; conference website: <www.montana.edu/rmwcatc/>.

March 6, 2017: Writing Centers of Japan, in Osaka, Japan
Contact: Conference website: <goo.gl/2cWuKh>.

March 23-25, 2017: East Central WCA, in Dowagiac, MI
Contact: Louis Noakes <lnoakes@swmich.edu>.

March 24-25, 2017: Mississippi WCA, in Jackson, MS
Contact: Liz Egan: <eganee@millsaps.edu>; Conference website: <drive.google.com/file/d/0Bw0rL8SqZt8DSHBpTk1XSmxxblk/view>.

March 31-April 1, 2017: Mid-Atlantic WCA, in Reading, PA
Contact: Holly Ryan: <holly.ryan@psu.edu>; Conference website: <www.mawca.org/event-2299008>.

April 1-2, 2017: Northeast WCA, in Pleasantville, NY
Conference website: <www.northeastwca.org/2017-conference>.

April 21-22, 2017: Colorado and Wyoming Writing Tutors Conference, in Greeley, CO
Contact: Crystal Brothe: <Crystal.Brothe@unco.edu>; conference website: <www.cwwtc.org>.

May 24-26, 2017: Latin American Network of Writing Centers and Programs, in Santiago, Chile.
Contact: <discursoacademico@uc.cl>.

May 25-27, 2017: Canadian Writing Centres Association, in Toronto, Canada
Contact: Heather Fitzgerald: <hfitzgerald@ecuad.ca>; conference website: <cwcaaccr.com/2017-conference>.

WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship

WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship, published bi-monthly, from September to June, is a peer-reviewed publication of the International Writing Centers Association, an NCTE Assembly, and is a member of the NCTE Information Exchange Agreement. ISSN 1040-3779.

Managed and Produced by
TWENTY SIX DESIGN LLC under agreement with
WRITING LAB NEWSLETTER LLC
52 Riley Road #380, Celebration, FL 34747
(866) 556-1743
<www.wlnjournal.org>
<support@wlnjournal.org>

Subscriptions, Archives and Manuscript Submissions:
Visit <www.wlnjournal.org> for subscription information, free archive access, and manuscript submission guidelines.

A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship
WRITING LAB NEWSLETTER LLC.
52 Riley Road #380
Celebration, FL 34747


wlnjournal


WLNjournal