

Chapter Three: The History of the Oregon State University Writing Center as Part of the Center for Writing and Learning

Context, in terms of writing centers, is not a simple concept. In addition to the institutions in which they are situated, writing centers often have smaller contexts—specific programs or departments of which they are a part. These smaller contexts, like the larger ones, vary widely. [. . .]. Thus many, perhaps most, writing centers exist within multiple contexts, all of which help to define the resulting programs. Often, these different contexts exert opposing forces on a writing center program. As a result, programs must frequently compromise between the various forces that surround them, treading a sometimes torturous path among conflicting needs and demands in order to serve each constituency fairly and effectively.

—*Joyce A. Kinkead and Jeanette G. Harris,*
xv-xvi

The Oregon State University Writing Center is within the larger Center for Writing and Learning (CWL). It's both difficult and unhelpful to separate it from that context and, too, from the bureaucratic powers that control most of the money. In order to understand the history of the Writing Center, then, one must first look at its place in the CWL.

This chapter will explore the beginnings of the Writing Center (then known as the Writing Lab*) as part of the Center for Writing and Learning (then known as the Communication Skills Center [CSC*]). (In general, when talking about the years prior to the name changes, I will use the titles CSC and Writing Lab, and after the name changes, I will use the titles CWL and Writing Center.) It will also examine the various reporting lines of the CWL over the years—that is, the bureaucratic bodies to whom the director reported—as well as its budget. Interactions with other departments and ways of advertising services will also be examined. Finally, this chapter will explore the more recent changes with OSU's current strategic plan and how it impacts the CWL and its Writing Center.

Supplemental Writing Services at Oregon State University: The Beginning of the Writing Lab and the Communication Skills Center

The Oregon State University Writing Lab arose from need. According to Tim Perkins, who later developed the CSC and ran the Writing Lab, several English instructors in the early- to mid-1970s offered extra office hours to help students with the mechanics of writing. Margaret Lawrence was an English instructor at OSU and a “classical grammarian” who performed “emergency grammar and mechanical surgery on students” (Perkins). It is unclear whether other English composition instructors did this as well. What we do know, thanks to a report by James Sweeney, an Education graduate student in the 1970s, is that this assistance was a formal program in the English Department called the OSU Writing Clinic (Sweeney 13). Indeed, a 1976 brochure for the new CSC states, “The OSU Writing Clinic is now the Writing Skills portion of the Communication Skills Center” (*The OSU Communication Skills Center*).

According to Perkins, the timing for opening the CSC was not unusual. The CSC was instituted just before and during open admissions, at the time of the “first real TV generations” (who seemed to read less), and around the time *Newsweek* magazine ran the article “Why Johnny Can’t Write” (which seemed to precipitate a crisis in schools and colleges [Ede *Situating Composition*]). Further, an OSU report on the results of a Communication Skills Testing Program based on testing done in 1971-72 recommended that “[a]ll students at the University should have access to a reading/study skills center” which should be run by a “qualified director” (Ahrendt and Orzech 38). Finally, Margaret Lawrence retired in 1974 after directing the Writing Clinic for four years (and teaching for twenty-five) (Castano). Thus, the confluence of the national writing crisis, Lawrence’s retirement, and the results of the 1972 study at OSU made

it the right time to combine the recommended study and reading skills with writing skills into a single resource center.

At the time, Perkins was an instructor in the English Department at Oregon State University. He was well known at the school, as he had been a prominent athlete as an undergraduate there (Hogg personal interview) and had returned to teach after earning a master's degree in English from Western Washington University. During the summer of 1975, Perkins attended a summer teaching institute at OSU run by Stewart Knapp, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Perkins suggested the idea of combining a writing lab with the existing Study Skills* and Reading programs to Knapp, who had been involved in implementing the Math Center, and together they wrote a proposal (Perkins). That proposal included all aspects of what would become the Communication Skills Center, including location, purpose, and organization. They were awarded a grant to develop this new unit (Perkins).

In fall, 1976, the CSC opened on the second floor of one end of the McAlexander Fieldhouse, near the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC). (Please see Appendix A for a map.) Although space might have been available in Moreland Hall, where the English Department was located, or where the Reading Program ran, or even in the Counseling Center, where Study Skills originated, Perkins states that he wanted a neutral site “by instinct,” only later realizing that it was smarter and more appealing to students to reduce department ties and, perhaps, control.

So, with the ROTC students practicing on the first floor of one end of the armory, according to Perkins, they “set up carrels [and opened the CSC . . .], making it all up as we [went].” A number of services were offered; along with reading improvement and study skills,

“Writing Skills” provided self-help materials (with a charge for workbooks) and assistance from tutors for, as a flyer for the new CSC states,

Spelling, Punctuation, Grammar and usage, Sentence content and variety, Paragraph unity, Thesis development, Introductions and Conclusions, Logic and evidence, Tone, Individual writing programs [and] Technical report writing, Research paper writing, English as a second language, [and] Dialect complications.
(*The OSU Communication Skills Center*).

Also at the time, several schools at OSU (the Colleges of Agriculture, Business, Education, Forestry, and Home Economics) had all of their students take an English Diagnostic Test (EDT*), which was administered by the Writing Lab. The students’ scores determined whether they needed to take a writing class or to work on skills (grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation) in the Lab using taped programs and workbooks (Lundeberg). In general, these students worked individually, but tutors, as indicated above, were available to answer questions. Although the numbers of colleges that required students to take the EDT (for which the colleges were charged money) decreased over the years, the EDT remained until 1990, when the Writing Intensive Curriculum (WIC*) was introduced (Ede personal interview).

Because it had combined with existing programs, the CSC also offered reading classes: Basic Reading, Rapid Reading (which led to the development of a Technical Reading class focused on how to read scientific texts, textbooks, and how to take notes) and Vocabulary (Lundeberg). Study Skills, too, were incorporated into the CSC, a program that had begun in the Counseling Center and often involved the coordinator, Michele Sakurai, visiting various groups and dormitories (Sakurai). Perkins was in charge of the Writing Skills portion of the Communication Skills Center, and he was the CSC Coordinator (*The OSU Communication Skills Center*).

The early tasks in the Writing Lab included hiring tutors to work with students on their papers and to assist with the independent EDT study, scheduling appointments, and developing the weekly tutor meeting and tutor training (Lundeberg). In addition, the staff created materials for Writing 90, which covered basic skills. Perkins was involved in all aspects of the CSC, including budgeting, public relations (making sure that information about the CSC was included in the school bulletin for 1976, advertising via bookmarks in the bookstore, speaking at orientation meetings), and even making coffee (Perkins).

Students were hired as tutors through the federal work-study program* (Lundeberg). As part of the selection process, students took a test developed to ensure they were qualified to work in the Writing Lab and provided a writing sample. In addition, Perkins says that one or two instructors worked in the Writing Lab each term; it is unclear whether these instructors volunteered their time or were paid.

Perkins reports that OSU was supportive of this endeavor, stating that Stewart Knapp and Richard Astro, then the chair of the English Department, were especially encouraging. He attributes some of the support to his being known at OSU and posits that it would have been “harder for an outside person to come in—at least to get [the Center] started.” Perkins states that the CSC put “tentacles throughout the institution” by advertising itself, getting involved with assisting incoming freshman athletes in the summers prior to their matriculation, and in his having a split appointment with the English Department. Further, various television stations and newspapers ran stories on the CSC in the fall of 1976 (Sweeney 15).

Perkins reported to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies Stewart Knapp. (He had a split appointment with the English Department, where he taught half-time during the first year the

CSC was open.) After that, the CSC position was increased to full time, and Perkins no longer taught in the English Department (Sweeney 16).

The budget for the CSC came from various sources: the grant that initiated the program, Michele Sakurai's salary from Student Services, the Rapid Reading Course (through Continuing Education), running Writing 90, and the EDT required by the various departments (Perkins). In addition, they applied for and received research money (Perkins). Perkins reports that they carefully documented what they did; unfortunately, these reports do not appear to have survived.

Initially, the purpose of the CSC was to help students with writing and with basic skills and to "provide the tools to make success available to all students," as Sakurai says. But it was more complicated, and Perkins states, "[it took] two to three years to understand the dynamics/ issues [of the CSC]," leading to change over the three years that he was there. Thus, it makes sense that Lundeborg, who began shortly after Perkins left, reports the philosophy was two-part: to help students improve their writing and "to provide an opportunity for other students to do the teaching" (she suggests that working in the Writing Lab "helped tutors as much as [it helped the] students coming in").

Perkins further states that there was a clear need for pedagogical change during his tenure, with increased freewriting and revision and changes in the ways people taught writing. Because writing center research was so new and so little was published on it at that point, Perkins and his staff were able to receive grants to measure and evaluate the teaching of writing as part of the national movement, as well as to build their own resources at the center (Perkins). Unfortunately, the results of their measurements and evaluation no longer exist. Still, the CSC at OSU had been born.

The Communication Skills Center as a Work-in-Progress

Director and Location Changes in 1979

In 1979, Perkins left OSU for Northeastern University in Boston, where he developed the “East Coast equivalent” of the Bay Area Writing Project: teaching teachers how to teach writing. Barb Hogg (who had joined the CSC in 1978 as a part-time clerical worker and who eventually became the assistant director) and Michele Sakurai remained in their respective positions of clerical assistant and Study Skills coordinator. Roberta Lundeberg likely became the Writing Lab Coordinator at that time, although the exact date is unknown and she says her title was not formalized (Lundeberg). Lisa Pederson, who had been a research assistant unclassified in the CSC in spring, 1979 (while obtaining a masters degree at the University of Oregon) became the director of the Communications Skills Center in September, 1979 (Castano). During her tenure, several changes occurred, as documented in an annual report written by Pederson. First, the CSC developed a procedures manual, which, she states in the report, “will be a great help to the entire staff, especially new members” (6). Second, staff developed a training program for tutors, drawing on the skills and experience of various programs to address issues such as Non-Native English Speakers (NNES*), ways of tutoring, policies and procedures, and grammar concerns. Third, they developed a procedure for faculty to refer students to the CSC. The CSC staff also began to gather statistics of use and increased the Center’s promotional efforts (6). Finally, the CSC moved to Waldo Hall, a great improvement in atmosphere and space, which also enabled them to organize their materials better. (Please refer to the map in Appendix A to see the rooms of the CSC/CWL in Waldo Hall. Further discussion of the space used by the CSC will be explored more in Chapter 3.) In June, 1979, Pederson left OSU.

While these shifts were occurring with the CSC, various changes were also being considered in the English Department.

Development of Composition and Rhetoric in the English Department

In 1979, the English Department, under Chair Robert Frank, underwent some changes. It was in the process of developing a composition and rhetoric program, but there were not yet enough courses for a full schedule in the field. Thus, reports Frank, they were looking to hire a professor who could introduce some courses on composition and rhetoric into the curriculum; ideally, this person would have experience in teaching in other areas as well (Frank). In addition, the professor who had directed the first year writing program, Ed Smith, was retiring, and a replacement was needed. According to Lisa Ede, who eventually was offered and accepted the position, the coordinator of composition position had typically been held by a junior professor or a tenured professor who didn't publish much. The faculty felt at that time that it should instead be run by someone with expertise and training in rhetoric and composition (personal interview). Since the English Department did not yet offer a masters program, composition (Writing 121*) was taught by non-tenure-line instructors and several other faculty members; the coordinator of composition, therefore, worked with the faculty on how to teach this course effectively and with consistency within the department. Because this coincided with Lisa Pederson's departure from the CSC and thus the need for someone to direct the CSC, the English Department cobbled together the positions of coordinator of composition and director of the CSC into a tenure-line position (Ede personal interview).

Frank also recognized that the CSC would benefit from a director who had a PhD—preferably in composition and rhetoric, although that was fairly rare then—and who at least had experience in composition and rhetoric. This would not only “professionalize” the position (and

the composition and rhetoric program, as well as the CSC), but also provide continuity to both programs. He states he was also looking for someone with “a history as a scholar, [. . . who] had a track record or promise as an outstanding teacher, and an effective colleague,” which was what he looked for, really, in all of his applicants.

Although Frank doesn't recall the exact number of applicants, he believes it was likely between 80 and 150 people (a tenure-track position in literature would have netted between 300 and 500 applicants). Ede filled the requirements: she was a scholar with teaching experience who had run a first-year composition program, and, although her PhD was in Victorian Literature, she had significant training in composition and rhetoric, thanks to her participation in a year-long National Endowment for the Humanities seminar in rhetoric and composition.

During her visit to OSU to apply for the job, Ede was not formally interviewed by anyone from the CSC; she would not, she says, have even seen the CSC had she not asked. Although Ede expresses some amazement at her naiveté when taking the job, it appears that the English Department, too, did not truly understand the level of work and involvement the CSC would require when they combined these positions (of director of the CSC and the coordinator of composition). Indeed, during her interview with the English Department faculty, Ede was only asked questions focused on her responsibilities in English, “and it was clear they knew little, if anything, about the CWL part of my job” (Ede personal interview).

Thus, after Pederson's departure in June, 1979, Lisa Ede took over as director of the CSC part-time. In addition to coordinating first year writing and directing the CSC, Ede was contracted to teach eight classes during the school year. The normal teaching load for tenure-track faculty then was three courses per term; Ede's contract called for one course release time to direct the CSC (Ede personal interview). Ede was the first director of the CSC to hold a tenure-

line position in the English Department. (Perkins had only been an instructor, and Pederson was not involved with the English Department.) Although Ede had no direct experience in writing centers, she had a great interest in the developing field of rhetoric (Ede personal interview), and, as stated above, had already participated in an intensive seminar in that field.

Although Pederson had left quite detailed notes, Ede was not trained by Pederson at all. In fact, when Ede arrived, she was at first unable to locate anyone with direct experience working at the CSC. Eventually, she connected with the people who had worked there the previous year and rehired them (Hogg, Lundeberg, and Sakurai). (They were in nine-month, year-to-year positions.) After beginning the job, Ede realized the magnitude of what she had taken on, admitting that she had been “shockingly inattentive to the dual nature of the position I was being asked to fill.” Due to the amount of time the CSC required, she taught, it turns out, only one course during 1980-81, thanks to the intervention of Robert Frank, who was very supportive (Ede personal interview).

At the CSC, while Lundeberg coordinated the Writing Lab and Sakurai ran Study Skills, most other duties fell to Ede, including chores as mundane as ordering supplies, because there was inadequate administrative and secretarial support. Barb Hogg worked with Ede from the time Ede started the job, but because Hogg was then a graduate student, her hours were limited. Mostly, Hogg helped with accounting and ordering, although she did not entirely take over these tasks for a number of years (Ede personal interview). In the first few years, Ede also had to manage the finances of the CWL, in addition to administrating the CSC at the start. She felt, she reports, “quite hopeless and overwhelmed, and I cried a lot in my [Waldo Hall] office” during the first months after beginning the job (Ede personal interview).

The Evolution of the Communication Skills Center Under Lisa Ede

Ede began to make changes in the CSC, some of which were based on theory and some on circumstance. For instance, Ede was concerned that some of the CSC's budget depended on money from the Rapid Reading course and the EDT. Although she had pedagogical concerns about both of these services and their value, she also worried that they were not a dependable source of income (Ede personal interview). (See the budget section in this chapter for more details). Ede felt that a "recurring budget would provide stability and allow decisions on programs [to be made based] on sound pedagogical understanding and not just on the budget" (Ede personal interview). It is interesting to note that Pederson, in her memos to Ede about the programs, emphasized which services (both existing and suggested) made money; for instance, Pederson wrote that the Reading Technical Material classes "should be a real \$\$-getter" (Pederson "CSS" 2) and that "the possibility of a vocabulary class for [foreign] students [. . .] should be pursued—they're [the English Language Institute] even willing to pay!" (Pederson "Program Development" 1).

The EDT contributed to the CSC's budget (generally between \$2,500 to \$4,000 a year), but it reinforced the image of the Writing Lab as a place for remediation, and students who failed the EDT were required to do decontextualized exercises in grammar, punctuation, and usage. Writing centers already struggle with this perception by others, and Ede disliked its being reinforced. Further, she felt it departed from the primary mission of the Writing Lab, which was not and is not to remediate, but rather to teach students to think and act like writers (Ede personal interview). The EDT was phased out by various departments over the years and was eliminated eventually when the Writing Intensive Curriculum (WIC) program was instituted in 1990 (Ede personal interview).

The Rapid Reading course, too, states Ede, was not in line with the CSC's philosophy; she felt the traditional reading comprehension course fit better. Further, she was skeptical about the benefits of the Rapid Reading course; while students might indeed learn to read faster and thus complete their assigned reading, how much were they truly understanding and remembering? Thus, that class was eliminated in 1992.

Although Ede says she had no formal writing center philosophy when she arrived, she was familiar with current research on rhetoric and on the writing process, and she consciously tried to adapt this research to the Writing Lab. Over the years, her philosophy (explored more fully in the next chapter) has become increasingly "explicit, conscious, and theorized"—and specific to writing centers (Ede personal interview). In general, it's based on collaborative and peer learning. To reflect the Writing Lab's emphasis on collaboration and peer learning, Ede expanded the training for the writing assistants using this philosophy.

The level of growth and learning that writing assistants gain as a result of their experience working with student writers was a surprise to Ede when she started. She was also surprised at the different type of relationship she had with them as compared with students in her classes. She states that,

it became clear quickly what an amazing experience it was to work with all [the] undergraduate writing assistants, [. . .] to be part of their lives and education in a non-traditional way and to form a genuine community in the Writing Center that is different than in the classroom. (personal interview)

In fact, similar to what Lundeberg said, Ede believes that the work done in the Writing Center is worthwhile just for what it gives the writing assistants, as long as no harm is done to the students who seek services (and it appears no harm is done given the feedback from students) (Ede personal interview). The smaller number of writing assistants through the 1980s made the

intimate community Ede speaks of stronger. At that time, she says, she knew the names, faces, and work of all the writing assistants. Because the number of writing assistants has increased to between thirty-five to forty in the 1990s and on, it's harder, she says, for her to keep track of each. While she celebrates the numbers, the diffusion of this intimacy appears to be a loss (Ede personal interview).

Shifts in Names and the Impact of the Writing Intensive Curriculum Program

In 1990, several changes occurred: the names of CSC and Writing Lab were changed and the WIC program began. The names were changed in 1990 due to concern about the remedial connotations of the titles, in particular, the words *skills* and *lab*. Further, Writing Lab sounded medical, says Ede, adding that *lab* sounds “like a place you go to get something done to you” (personal interview). Many writing centers were shifting away from the term *lab* around that time (Ede personal interview). These name changes coincided with the shift from *tutor* to *writing assistant* at the CWL (explained in Chapter 4). For pragmatic reasons, it was easier to change all these names at the same time.

The birth of the WIC program allowed Ede to strongly encourage the colleges still requiring the EDT to eliminate it, arguing that WIC was more productive than the EDT. The WIC program assists those faculty across OSU who teach writing intensive courses, and thus includes faculty in every department that offers a major; all students are required, as part of their baccalaureate core curriculum* requirement, to take a WIC class in their major (Tolar Burton). The program assists faculty by training them to respond effectively to student writing and by providing ongoing education, helping them to determine if a class meets the WIC guidelines, and by providing both beginning and advanced seminars (“About WIC”). The WIC director has

assisted specific departments to publish (online or on paper) writing guides for students in their discipline (fifteen different guides by spring, 2006); these guidelines were an OSU WIC innovation (“About WIC”).

The WIC program began as a result of changes in OSU’s general education requirement, voted on by the faculty (“About WIC”), and various faculty, including Ede, were involved in the discussions about and development of it. Ede was the interim director the first year WIC was open, prior to a permanent director being hired. Thus, there was already a close connection between the CWL and the WIC program, which benefitted both programs. For instance, because the WIC program had a solid budget, being associated with it provided more stability for the CWL and allowed the hiring of the long-asked for classified position (administrative assistant). In fact, until the recent move to central administration, WIC covered the full cost of the administrative assistant (it is now shared equally). Further, until the move, the WIC program gave \$5,000 to CWL annually to assist with the CWL’s expenses. The CWL and WIC continue to share office space, some supplies, and an administrative assistant. In addition, both directors are tenure-line professors in the English Department, each of whom has a half-time appointment as professional faculty in Academic Affairs, allowing them to administrate the CWL and the WIC program. This further enables them to consult with each other and explore options that could benefit the OSU writing community. The connection between the CWL and WIC is vital because, when instituted, the WIC program and the Writing Center were expected to impact each other synergistically (Ede personal interview).

In sum, 1990 brought a number of positive changes into being (the processes had begun in the late-1980s) for the CWL. The title changes more accurately reflected the purposes of the Center for Writing and Learning, the Writing Center, and writing assistants and removed the

negative connotations in the old titles. And the WIC program not only gave Ede an excellent argument for eliminating the EDT, it enhanced writing throughout OSU and provided practical support for the CWL.

The Reporting Lines for the Center for Writing and Learning

The CWL has been under several different larger bureaucratic bodies, as can be seen in the following chart, which shows the different bodies and the people to whom the directors reported:

Table 3.1: Programs and their Representatives Reported to by the Communication Skills Center/Center for Writing and Learning Director

• Academic Affairs 1976-1986		
• 1976-79	Dean of Undergraduate Studies	Stewart Knapp
• 1979-85	Dean of Undergraduate Studies	Judi Kuipers
• 1985-86	Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs	Mimi Orzech
• College of Liberal Arts 1986-2001		
• 1986-94	Dean of the College of Liberal Arts	Bill Wilkins
• 1994-2001	Dean of the College of Liberal Arts	Kay Schaffer
• Academic Affairs and International Programs 2001-present		
• 2001-04	Assistant Provost for Academic Programs	Bob Burton
• 2004-present	Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs & International Programs	Becky Johnson

Sources: Ede's Annual Reports, Ekland (e-mail).

Each change has, of course, impacted the CWL. Some of the effects were positive and some negative depending, basically, on how committed the person to whom Ede reported was to the

CWL, and the financial resources that he or she had (Ede personal interview). In general, the more central the unit reported to, the more resources available; thus, when the CWL moved to Academic Affairs in 2001, there were fewer channels through which the money and resources had to travel, and more were available (though the budget was quite low when the CSC was in Undergraduate Studies from 1976 to 1987).

From its inception until 1986, the directors of the CSC reported to the dean of Undergraduate Studies in Academic Affairs; as stated previously, Stewart Knapp, who was dean in 1976, was in part responsible for birth of the CSC and was very supportive of the enterprise. A number of programs with little in common apart from being support for students and/or for faculty, such as the CSC, the Women's Center, and the College Assistant Migrant Program (CAMP), were under the auspices of the dean of Undergraduate Studies. Because the Women's Center and the CAMP are not crucial to—and in many cases not used or even known about by—many of the students, the CSC was marginalized by being associated with these programs. Added to the inherent marginalization that writing centers tend to experience, Ede states the CSC was “doubly marginalized” (personal interview).

In 1985, the dean of Undergraduate Studies position was eliminated. During 1985-86, Mimi Orzech, assistant vice president for Academic Affairs, was the person to whom Ede reported. Orzech was likely familiar with and supportive of the CSC; as mentioned earlier, in 1972, she had evaluated the results of a communication skills testing program and found that OSU first year students were weak in study skills, textbook-reading, and library research. She and her co-author, Ken Ahrendt, recommended the establishment of “a center to provide corrective and developmental reading improvement and study skills assistance” (Ahrendt & Orzech 36).

Because Orzech was only temporarily in this position, though, she couldn't provide much material support.

In 1986, the CSC was moved to the auspices of the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) by Graham Spanier, then vice president of Academic Affairs, who wanted to reduce the number of programs and people reporting to him (Ede personal interview). As Ede writes in the annual report for that year, “[t]he staff of the CSC viewed this as a positive change. Since the CSC is basically an instructional unit rather than a support service, our interests and goals are more consistent with those of CLA rather than those of Academic Affairs” (3). There may have been an element of wishful thinking in this statement, Ede adds ruefully (personal interview).

Ede initially reported to Bill Wilkins; later, Kay Schaffer became the dean of the CLA and oversaw the CSC. While Wilkins and Schaffer were supportive, the main concern of the CLA is the needs of the academic departments in the college. Because the CSC did not provide credit-bearing programs for students, it was not a priority. And not being a priority made the CSC susceptible to having its budget cut because most of the money was allocated to the academic departments. In addition, the CLA was experiencing a series of budget crises and reductions and faced extreme difficulties even meeting its basic obligations. Ede states this was a “brute reality” (personal interview). During these years, the CSC was frequently at risk of being closed; the dean sometimes spoke of it as an option to manage the limited funds.

In 2001, the CWL returned to the reporting auspices of Academic Affairs, specifically into Academic Programs. Leslie Davis Burns, then the interim vice-provost for Academic Affairs, was responsible for this move (Ede personal interview). Ede had appealed to Burns for the CWL to be moved to Undergraduate Academic Programs in an extensive memo in January, 2000, citing the severe budget problems the CWL faced—problems that threatened the delivery of its

programs. A follow-up meeting permitted discussion of these issues, and Ede writes in a summarizing memo that Burns and “Andy [Hashimoto . . .] continue to believe that as university services focused either directly [. . .] or indirectly [. . .] on increasing student learning it makes the most sense for the CWL and WIC to be located in Undergraduate Academic Programs” (Ede “Memo” 1).

This move was beneficial in a number of ways. First, the budget was more stable, allowing for growth, and the CWL did not have to compete with academic departments for funding. Second, a more accurate job description, that of Professional Faculty (not Instructor), was established for Wayne Robertson, the current Assistant Director of the CWL, and for Moira Dempsey (the coordinator of the Academic Success Center [ASC*], which was part of the CWL until 2004). Further, both were given raises, and their positions increased from nine to twelve months (Ede personal interview). Robertson states that being under central administration “is a huge advantage. It’s where we fit. We don’t fit in CLA; only twenty percent of the students [are] from there.”

At present, there is a significant emphasis on assessment* in Academic Affairs—on measuring what programs are doing and whether they are accomplishing the goals they set out. According to the website of the Office of Academic Affairs,

The assessment process must demonstrate that the outcomes important to the objectives of the program and to the performance of its students and graduates are being systematically measured and used to enhance the educational programs. (“Goals & Metrics”)

To assist in this, the CWL staff met weekly during 2004-05 (in addition to weekly staff meetings). They began by revising the Writing Center’s Mission Statement (discussed in Chapter 4), by setting up learning outcomes and ways of measuring them, and by developing ongoing

evaluation plans (Ede “Assessment Report”). Ede reports that she agrees with ongoing assessment and finds it helpful (personal interview).

Currently, Ede reports to Becky Johnson, the vice-provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs, who is supportive. Johnson also oversees the WIC program and the ASC, as well as the library, CAMP, International Programs, institutional research, ROTC, and the OSU Press. She was also instrumental in expanding Academic Success into an independent program, directed by Moira Dempsey, who had been running the smaller but related program under the CWL since 1994-95.

Although the reporting lines only changed three times, shifts occurred more frequently due to changes in the staff as various people retired or their job descriptions changed. Budget crises, too, kept the staff of the CWL from ever relaxing in regard to funding, until more recently. Thus, the changes in reporting lines—and the monies they controlled—had an impact on the CWL.

The Budget of the Center for Writing and Learning

It is difficult to summarize the particulars of the CWL’s budget, as most year’s budgets were cobbled together from diverse sources. The annual reports list only “items of budgetary note” and not the complete budget (Ede personal interview). For instance, until the CWL returned to Academic Affairs, the .50 full-time employee (FTE) of Ede’s salary connected with her position as Director of the CWL was funded by the English Department. The English Department, in other words, paid all of Ede’s salary, so none of this money appeared as part of the CWL’s budget. However, in 2001, when the CWL returned to Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs began to fund half of Ede’s salary. Only then did the true cost of Ede’s position as

director appear in the CWL's budget (Ede personal interview). It is only in the last few years that the budget has become "transparent" or visible. Too, it is only in the last few years, since the move back to central administration, that most of the the CWL's budget problems have eased.

As a program in a public university, the CWL's budget is linked to the university's—and the state's—budget. Since Ede arrived in 1980, budget cuts have been a reality of life. There were a series of budget crises in the 1980s, and the passage of the 1990 Ballot Measure 5, which limited property taxes, only exacerbated these difficulties. The expectation at the time was that Oregon would institute a sales tax to help compensate schools for the financial losses ("Oregon Measure Ballot 5"); however, as of summer, 2006, a sales tax has yet to be instituted. Patty Wentz, a staff writer on environment, minority issues, and religion for *Willamette Week*, writes, "Far from building support for a sales tax, however, Measure 5 seems to have sparked a kind of recurring anti-tax fever." In regard to OSU itself, "As a result of Ballot Measure 5, [. . .] state general fund assistance was reduced by \$12.5 million" ("OSU Libraries"). Thus, nearly all public schools and universities in Oregon are under continual financial pressure. In addition, the state budget cuts in regard to PERS (the Public Employees Retirement System) and, with more impact on employees, increases to PEBB (the Public Employees Benefit Board) make each employee at OSU cost more to the University, since benefits cost about half of each salary (Ede personal interview). Thus, money that would be slated for programs and departments goes instead to salary and benefit costs.

As is the case with many writing centers, the budget for the CWL has always been a problem. Although this problem eased four years ago with the move to central administration, concerns about finances remain, as explained above. But for many years, particularly while in the CLA, the only recurring budget was minimal and had to be put together each year. When the

CWL left the CLA, its recurring budget was only \$3,768. Ede states that the budget has been the biggest problem for her in all of her years as CWL director, and that she has written many emergency budget reports (personal interview).

The Center for Writing and Learning's Recurring Budget: An Overview

As noted earlier, it has been difficult finding complete material on the CWL budget through the years. This is because, in part, no specific information exists about the CSC budget between 1976 and 1979, although it is known that the start-up money for the CSC came from a grant. Thus, while some of this information came from the annual reports, much of it was obtained from interviews. It isn't possible, therefore, to trace a detailed budget history, and the one presented here is less chronological than focused on recurring problems and their solutions.

Since 1980, a partial budget has been available in the annual reports and/or in the CWL office. In the 1980s, a consistent income of \$1,900 per year was received from the English Learning Institute, which rented space from the CSC. Student fees, which were earned from non-credit classes such as Rapid Reading, brought in between \$5,610 and \$7,363. The money earned from the classes made it a source of income, but not always a reliable one because the amount of money varied greatly. (Though the CWL was budgeted to earn a certain amount of money per year, it didn't always do that; in some cases this became apparent early on, so Ede compensated by spending less.) Ede points out in numerous annual reports that the EDT, which brought in money from the departments, cost less when administered by the CWL than it would have elsewhere. When the EDT was phased out, that caused a reduction in income, which was in part compensated by the CLA. Consequently, the only actual consistent recurrent money was the \$3,768.

Obviously, the CWL could not and did not function on only the recurring \$3,768 and the money earned from classes. State funds supplied various monies, although these, too, fluctuated. Further, the CWL sometimes provided special programs for different divisions on campus, such as the athletics department, for which they received money—up to \$10,000. As mentioned previously, until the recent move to Academic Affairs, the WIC program gave \$5,000 to the CWL annually and paid for their shared administrative assistant. In 1980-81, the state-funded support was \$32,555; when the other income was added, the starting budget for that year was \$42,205. In general, state funding increased (with some variation) during the 1980s, and in 1989-90, the CSC received \$58,776 from the state and, with the additional funding sources, had an actual budget of \$71,538. This was higher than the following year, when it decreased to \$58,411. So, despite the overall increases, there were continual budget problems. More recently, the budget has increased: Ede proposed a budget of \$230,000 for 2005-06 and received about \$220,000 (Ede personal interview).

The largest expenditure in the CWL is salaries, which are fixed (that is, they do not change radically each year) (Ede personal interview). Salaries for the Writing Center coordinators, until recently, were low, starting at about \$23,000 in 2000 (Robertson). Further, all of the positions were nine-months, including Ede's (although she has been paid most summers for a couple of weeks or a month.) (When the Writing Center began staying open in the summer, the coordinator was paid additional money). In the early years, Ede says that she didn't know if money would be available for the CWL staff from year to year (personal interview).

The budget covered salaries and basic supplies, such as “office supplie[s], general operating [expenses], lab [Writing Center] supplies, books and periodicals, equipment maintenance, and the computer center” (Ede “Annual Report 1983-84” 14). It did not, however,

finance larger, one-time purchases, such as typewriters and computers, and special monies had to be obtained for these. In some cases, the object itself was given to the CSC. Ede tells of a meeting with Bob Frank in which she mentioned that the CSC did not have an electric typewriter like the one in his office; at that point, Frank rose, picked up his typewriter, and carried it to the CSC.

Supplemental Money

The CWL has received additional money over the years from various sources, including grants, emergency funds, special funding for expensive supplies. Table 3.2 lists some of these one-time funds, along with their years, amounts, sources, and reasons. Due to inconsistent budget reporting, this is an incomplete list.

Table 3.2: Non-recurrent Funds for the Center for Writing and Learning by Year, Source, and Reason ^a

Year	Amount (\$)	From	For
• 1984-85	13,413	Undergraduate Studies	Projected deficit
• ---	7,951	English Department	Clerical specialist
• ---	4,000	Undergraduate Studies	Computer purchase
• 1985-86	2,500	Undergraduate Studies	Equipment
• ---	100	English Department	Printing support
• 1986-87	3,400	Academic Affairs	Temp. clerical spec.
• ---	565	English Department	Temp. clerical spec.
• ---	807	Academic Affairs	Admin. stipend
• ---	1,259	English Department	Computer equipment
• 1988-89	1,000	CLA	Computer
• 1989-90	1,300	WIC	Services & supplies
• 1991-92	1,207	CLA	Summer pay (1 wk) for Ede
• ---	1,500	Academic Affairs	Furniture needs
• 1992-93	2,363	CLA	Equipment
• ---	2,415	Academic Affairs	Portable computer equipment
• 1996-98?	34,114	Info. Serv. Tech. Res. Grant	Equipment, training, Web

• 1998-99	25,000	E-Board	Work-study pay, satellite desk (library), <i>Craft of Writing</i> series implementation, credit-bearing ASP course
• 2002-03	?	Academic Affairs	.49 GTA* position for ASC

Source: Ede's Annual Reports.

^a Not all information was available.

Grants awarded are listed in Table 3.3 below:

Table 3.3: Grants Received by the Center for Writing and Learning ^a

Year	Amount (\$)	From	For
• 1990-91	?	Provost's Office	Faculty Development Grant (for travel to CCCC)
• 1992-93	3,865	WIC Development	Writing Center Summer Session
• 1994-95	34,000	Technology Resources	Purchase of 3 Power Mac computers
• 1997-98	?	State of OR E-Board	OWL Development, purchase of 4 new computers
• 2001-02	8,000	Access Grant	Writing assistant pay

Source: Ede's Annual Reports.

^a Not all information was available, indicated by question mark (?).

The Budget's Impact

The budget has affected staff significantly. The small salary allocated for the Writing Center coordinator limited the selection to regional candidates, says Ede (personal interview). For instance, Jon Olson applied because his partner had been hired in the English Department. Ede

reports that the position also drew limited numbers of applicants because of the low salary (only two viable applicants in 2000). Nonetheless, for a variety of reasons, the CWL has been able to hire excellent coordinators, and only one left due to the salary.

Until 2001, the only writing assistants paid were work-study students with the \$3000 earned from the non-credit classes. This amount of money increased some when the CWL was under the Assistant Provost for Academic Programs, Bob Burton (Ede personal interview). It was not until 2004-05, however, that the CWL got a budget specifically to pay writing assistants regular student wages. Although the \$20,000 included in the budget was reduced by several thousand dollars the following year, it is still a significant increase.

While the budget and its fluctuations affect the coordinators and impact general staffing, Ede, perhaps, is most affected. It is she who needs to balance the budget and who has written numerous memos asking for emergency money to keep the CWL open. She has also participated in various meetings in which the CWL's budget was an issue. She recalls one memorable meeting in the 1980s with then-President Robert MacVicar in which she went to the meeting, armed with statistics, to persuade him to keep the CSC open. She knew that MacVicar would probably decide whether or not to keep it open during the actual meeting (Ede personal interview). He kept it open.

Concerns About the Continuation of Funding and Support

While it is true that the budget increase in 2001 was due in part to the move to central administration, this increase might not have happened if the university had not developed a new strategic plan* (discussed in more depth later in this chapter). Because the plan focuses on retention, money has been made available to support the CWL. Further, Academic Success,

which had begun as Study Skills in the CSC, expanded into its own program with an annual budget of \$450,000 (Dempsey “RE: Question”). Concern exists, however, about whether the University will maintain this level of support or shift it with the next strategic plan, as units like the CWL that do not offer credit-bearing courses are often more vulnerable than traditional academic departments, such as English Departments (Ede personal interview).

It is clear that the budget is the most unstable and unpredictable component of the CWL. Its precariousness means that Ede can not rely on receiving adequate funding each year, or on maintaining it through the year. Even the recent positive changes do not guarantee secure future budgets.

The Center for Writing and Learning’s Interactions with Academic Departments at Oregon State University

Interactions with the English Department

The CWL and the Writing Center interact with numerous departments across the university, although they are more well-known and work more closely with some than with others. As may be expected, the association with the English Department is the closest—although it is not always smooth or ideal.

From its inception, the Writing Center has been associated with the English Department, as Tim Perkins was an instructor in that department when he began directing the CSC and had a split-appointment between the two for the first two terms (Perkins). However, he says that there was mixed support from the faculty. While some faculty members felt the Writing Lab was necessary and were relieved to not have to spend a lot of time teaching and/or correcting mechanics themselves, others were “dismayed” when they realized that the CSC could not fix

students' writing difficulties "in three days" (Perkins). Indeed, Perkins says that some faculty members became angry and blamed him when students continued to turn in papers with errors.

Nancy Leman, an instructor in the English Department from 1971 to 1987, states that when the Writing Lab became available, some faculty took advantage of it, even making visits there mandatory for English Composition. This course, taught by all English Department faculty, varied greatly in content and strictness in regard to errors, which led to a mixed usage of the Writing Lab by different classes. Some faculty mentioned it in their syllabi; others did not (Leman). After 1979, faculty could easily refer students by using the form provided to them. Leman also reports that there were developmental courses (such as Writing 230, Effective Writing) available, as well as classes designed for students whose first or home language was not English (Leman).

Leman appears to have had mixed feelings about the Writing Lab. While, she states, Writing Lab support was necessary because faculty only had two office hours a week to meet with their twenty-five English Composition students and with students in other classes, she feels that office hours focused more on the "philosophical [aspects and the] structural development of the idea [in the essay]" (Leman). Further, she states, though a second opinion on essays was beneficial, she wasn't sure the writing assistants knew enough about writing to be truly helpful.

Michele Sakurai, who ran the Study Skills program from 1974 to 1981, reports that there was a strong relationship between the English Department and the CSC. Because the writing classes were so large, much of the critique on papers occurred as written feedback from professors, which may have been less effective for students, and not in individual discussions. And she felt that some students "fell through the cracks because they didn't know the theory behind

[these] critique[s].” Still, she states that the CSC was “a tool of survival for English and writing professors.”

Roberta Lundeberg, coordinator of the Writing Lab between 1979 and 1985, states that the English Department as a whole was very supportive, in that the department paid half of Ede’s salary and that the faculty seemed to see the Writing Lab as a “valuable tool.” Lundeberg expressed disappointment that more professors did not encourage students to use the Lab, stating that some faculty worked closely with the Lab, while “others didn’t seem to know it existed.”

Wayne Robertson, the Writing Center coordinator from 2001-05 (and currently the half-time CWL assistant director) states that he has always felt a good relationship between the Writing Center and the English Department. He is known in the department, as he did his masters work and was a graduate teaching assistant (GTA*) there. Further, he states, many of the writing assistants have been recommended by English faculty (although not all writing assistants are English majors), and this leads to a certain level of trust about the quality of the Center because the faculty know who is working there.

A close connection exists between Writing 121 and the Writing Center. Prior to 2005-06, the Writing 121 coordinator (who manages that part of the writing program and trains the GTAs who teach it) had been Chris Anderson, a tenure-line professor in writing and rhetoric, who understood the purpose of the Writing Center and its importance in writing classes (Ede personal interview). In fall, 2005, Sara Jameson, a 2004 graduate of the writing and rhetoric masters program at OSU, was hired as the interim coordinator for composition. Jameson’s understanding about being a GTA and a writing assistant—and her strong encouragement of use of the Writing Center—may be in part due to her having been a GTA, a writing assistant, and a writing instructor at schools with writing centers (Jameson). She writes,

The “standard” WR 121 syllabus for new TA’s for fall 2005 did require the students to go to the writing center for either the first or second essay (we split it up so as not to overwhelm the WC with so many students at once). Now, in winter term, the TA’s can write their own syllabi, and they might not all require the writing center. I think some will continue to require it, and I think all will give extra credit for students who go.

Jameson indicates that when she was a GTA, she required her students to use the Writing Center, but not all of the other GTAs did; thus, requiring GTAs to send their fall term students to the Writing Center is a recent change.

While it is positive that the Writing Center is informally linked to Writing 121, Dennis Bennett, the current Writing Center coordinator, states that he has mixed feelings about a closer relationship with the English Department: he would like a tighter connection with the department as a whole, but he would not want to report to it or to be under its budget. Still, he believes increased “collaboration” would be useful, such as a “for-credit companion course for [those students struggling with] Writing 121” (Bennett).

Interactions with Other Departments

As stated previously, the CWL and its Writing Center were known to various departments because of the English Diagnostic Test. It is unclear, though, whether these departments were fully aware of the other services offered by the CWL. Sakurai says that the Writing Lab was, perhaps, a tool for faculty in other departments, who, she states, “assumed [students] knew how to write,” leaving the students to figure out the mechanics. And Lundeberg states that many professors—especially those in departments other than English—misunderstood the difference between editing and/or proofreading and the Writing Lab’s goal of making students better

writers. According to Robertson, this misunderstanding continues. Some faculty, even those in the English Department, seem to view the Writing Center as a place where students can bring their papers to be fixed (Robertson). The visits to classes, now made by Wayne Roberston and by Dennis Bennett, help alleviate misunderstandings. Lundeberg adds that if someone who worked in the Lab had a relationship with a professor, that professor was more likely to know about the Lab. Similar to what Lundeberg expressed, Roberston states that there are few true “partnerships” with entire departments; instead, he has developed relationships with some faculty members in nearly every department over the years, usually because of the WIC program (Roberston).

The WIC course is an additional requirement in the baccalaureate core curriculum. Because the WIC program requires writing in one’s major, more faculty are having to read and grade students’ writing. They are trained in the program by the WIC director, Vicki Tolar Burton, and some of the training includes a talk about the Writing Center (Robertson). Thus, some faculty in every department are familiar with the Writing Center.

An additional source of knowledge dispersal to other departments about the CWL is the CWL staff. For instance, Lisa Ede sits on various committees and interacts with numerous people. Despite the staff’s active promotion of the CWL, many faculty don’t seem to remember to tell students about the CWL’s services, and thus they must be advertised directly to students, as well.

Advertising the Center for Writing and Learning in the University

An ongoing issue for most writing centers is the need to get out the word about its services to faculty and students. Students often feel shy about going to a writing center, because it means they need help, that they can’t do it on their own, that they are somehow “less than”—or so they

believe. Some faculty set up incentives for students to visit the Writing Center: extra credit, a requirement, and more (Weintraub; Jameson). All of this relates, too, to other supportive services, such as the Academic Success Center.

Thus, it's important to remind students and faculty of the CWL's existence. When he opened the CSC, Tim Perkins made bookmarks available in the OSU Bookstore. He states that he was unable to run ads in *the Daily Barometer*, OSU's student-run newspaper, because of the cost. Indeed, running ads in *the Daily Barometer* has been an intermittent activity. First, it currently costs \$23 per day for a fifteen-word, two-inch ad ("The OSU Daily" 3). Second, while many people on campus look at the daily newspaper, it's unknown how many read or even notice the ads. Lisa Pederson, interim Director of the CSC, did place ads in the *Barometer*, spending about "\$400/term in advertising costs" (Pederson "CSC Programs"). However, it appears this was not as simple as just submitting an ad to run; in her memo to Lisa Ede, Pederson explained how the costs were figured for ads and warned Ede to make sure that the charges were accurate (Pederson). It is impossible to truly gauge the effectiveness of the ads.

In addition to sporadic ads in *the Daily Barometer*, the CWL has advertised through the use of flyers and table tents in the Memorial Union, which is frequented by most students (Ede personal interview). Further, staff from the CWL have gone to orientation and open house events both on- and off-campus, events designed to inform or remind students of all the opportunities available to them (Ede personal interview). And classes are always advertised. Examples of some of the ads used through the years are available in Appendix B.

Another way that the CWL and the Writing Center have been publicized is through articles in *the Daily Barometer*, *the Oregon Stater* (OSU's alumni magazine), *the Gazette-Times* (Corvallis' local newspaper), and *the Mid-Valley Sunday* (combined Corvallis and Albany Sunday newspaper).

The articles seem to come in spurts, with several in different publications around the same time. When Ede arrived in 1980, *the Daily Barometer* wrote a profile on her. Little newspaper coverage is recorded until 1984-85, when *The Barometer* published four articles providing information about the CSC (and about the Math Science Learning Center), one of which was titled, “Students ‘unaware’ of Communication Center’s Resources.” In 1989-90, Lex Runciman, then Coordinator of the Writing Center was interviewed in an article titled “Writing 121 to thesis material: Lab open to all levels of writers.” In December, 1998, *the Oregon Stater* published “Former Writing Assistants Write Back...,” which featured excerpts from recollections by sixteen writing assistants who had worked in the Writing Center in the late 1980s and the 1990s, sharing how the experiences there impacted their lives. In 1997 or 1998, *the Gazette-Times* featured a story on writers in Corvallis and their programs and resources; Moira Dempsey, the coordinator for Academic Success and for outreach, was interviewed. And *the Mid-Valley Sunday* published “Programs help OSU students discover the ‘write stuff’” in October, 1998. In June, 1999, *the Daily Barometer* ran an article relating the ASC and student retention at OSU. More recent *Daily Barometer* articles have profiled the Writing Center, interviewing the coordinator and several students; the new Academic Success Center under Moira Dempsey; and Wayne Robertson’s film, *Writing Across Borders*. This free publicity, reports Ede, is always welcome.

But the most effective method of getting the word out about the CWL and the Writing Center appears to be classroom visits. Thus, all of the coordinators have visited classrooms, explaining the purpose and procedure of the Writing Center and giving a variety of presentations (Ede personal interview). Wayne Robertson, as Writing Center coordinator, presented one-hour workshops on “Introduction to College Writing” and on writing resumes and cover letters, as well as shorter talks (Robertson). Dennis Bennett, current Writing Center

coordinator, continues in this path. In addition, as noted earlier, the Writing Center coordinators have been involved in training WIC faculty since that program began (Robertson).

The current CWL director, assistant director, and Writing Center coordinator all agree that “word of mouth” appears to be the best advertising—although this depends on the fact that “the service needs to work” (Robertson). Because she represents the CWL at OSU, Ede attends various meetings and “tries to be a good working member of the community and to advertise the Center.” Her presence and indeed the long-term presence of the CWL at OSU seem to increase the CWL’s stability; the longer “the Writing Center exists, the more it becomes part of the institutional landscape and memory” (Ede personal interview).

The Present and the Future

As noted earlier, the Writing Center has been affected by the most recent university strategic plan. Goal 2 of the plan is to “[p]rovide an excellent teaching and learning environment and achieve student access, persistence and success through graduation and beyond [. . .]” which involves,

creat[ing] a dynamic and vibrant learning environment inside and outside the classroom that deeply engages students in the life of the university by connecting them to our primary activities of teaching/learning, scholarship, and outreach. (Oregon State University 8).

One of the ways OSU intends to measure progress is to increase student retention, especially between the first and second years (8). Two of the initiatives are to “[p]romote teaching as an academic discipline and provide training, resources and support through two new Centers on campus to enhance teaching, learning, and advising [the Academic Success Center and the Center for Writing and Teaching]” (8) and to,

[a]lign curricular and co-curricular programs and support services to respond to the shared and unique needs of our students, promote student development, encourage a broad and diverse educational experience, and support student success. (9)

A way of increasing student retention is to make students more able to succeed in college, as Michele Sakurai stated about her work in the 1970s. Thus, the CWL has become both central to and supportive of this effort. First, more money has been budgeted to it, allowing for decent salaries and raises for the Writing Center coordinators (Ede personal interview). Second, the ASC has broke off from the CWL (where it was called the Academic Success Program) into an independent program. Its budget is substantial, and a space in Waldo Hall (near the CWL) was renovated for its use. Robertson was hired there half-time, and the CWL and ASC still share a number of undertakings, including the Supplemental Instruction Study Tables* (SISTs) (Ede personal interview).

While the strategic plans are always taken into consideration by Ede when planning changes or events for the CWL, apart from the increased income to pay writing assistants and increased professional staff (one-and-a-half full time employees), the actual Writing Center has not been particularly affected by any of the strategic plans. Ede, however, has both realistic and idealistic hopes for the Writing Center, which has always been the largest and most well-developed of the CWL's programs (and for several years its only program). First, she would like better facilities—to design a space herself, which would be “central, bright, and inviting”; there has, in fact, been discussion about building a center for all student and faculty support services. Ede would also like to see more community literacy outreach and to have the Writing Center host events such as poetry slams, parental readings, and opportunities for faculty to talk with

students about their own composing processes. The present facility does not have adequate space for this, so a new building would be beneficial (Ede personal interview).

Ideally, Ede would also like to implement the Brown University Writing and Rhetoric Fellows Program, in which students are chosen to sit in on a class, working with both the professor and students. Because Fellows are familiar with the course, expectations, and assignments, they are able to assist students with course content as well as writing skills (Ede personal interview). Although it is unlikely that either the new building or the Fellows Program will come to fruition, consideration of the benefits they would bring is useful in evaluating the best use of the current space and in designing the best possible training for writing assistants.

Conclusion

Several characteristics discussed in Chapter Two are illustrated in this chapter. The shift in name from Writing Lab to Writing Center and from Communication Skills Center to Center for Writing and Learning occurred when these sorts of changes were being made in writing centers nationwide. Similarly, the OSU Writing Center's pedagogy is similar to that practiced elsewhere, with a focus on individual meetings with peer tutors (writing assistants) who strive to help students think like writers. While writing assistants may not follow Grimm's suggestion to learn many specifics about each student they work with, they do respect individuality (in particular with NNES, as we'll see more in Chapter Four). Further, the difficulties with the budget and the CWL's place at OSU are ongoing, as is the case at so many schools. The OSU Writing Center differs somewhat from the norm in that its director is a tenure-line professor who was hired specifically for her expertise in rhetoric. Although both the tenure-line position and the

degree in rhetoric are more usual in the present decade than they were in the 1980s, most writing center directors are not in tenure-line positions (Griffin et al.).

It's clear, as well, that the Writing Center is an integral part of the CWL and must be considered as part of this larger whole, as Carino's cultural model suggests. Although the Writing Center is in some ways insulated from the outside world, in that everything that affects the CWL does not necessarily affect the Writing Center, it still rides the waves of the CWL's changes and budget shifts. The CWL is, thus, one of the Writing Center's larger cultures, and the Writing Center can not be understood apart from it.