11

NEW DESIGNS FOR COMMUNICATION ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

Andrew Billings

Morgan Gresham

Michael Neal

Summer Smith Taylor

Donna Winchell

Art Young

Teddi Fishman

Angie Justice

Barbara Ramirez

Melissa Tidwell Powell

Kathleen Blake Yancey

Clemson University conducted its first Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Workshop in 1989. It was an entirely voluntary grassroots affair: there was no mandate, no administrative support, and no extrinsic reward for participating. Sixty of Clemson's approximately nine hundred faculty signed up for a one-day workshop and journeyed to a retreat center eight miles from campus where they met, talked, and shared strategies for incorporating writing activities into their classes. During the next few years, Clemson faculty as well as visiting scholars conducted several more well-attended workshops on a variety of WAC topics that included responding to student writing, writing to learn, and collaborative learning. The common themes for all of the activities were the use of WAC strategies to encourage students as active learners and to support instructors as interactive teachers. This faculty workshop approach to WAC, which in a modernist sense is the program's primary mode of delivery, is a familiar one for beginning WAC programs.

In 1990, the R. Roy and Marnie Pearce Center for Professional Communication was established at Clemson University with a generous gift from the Pearce family. As a result, the WAC initiative expanded to focus more broadly on Communication Across the Curriculum (CAC), thus strengthening its interdisciplinary emphasis by explicitly embracing oral, visual, and digital—in addition to written—communication. The Pearce Center was founded for three interrelated missions: CAC on the Clemson campus, collaboration with South Carolina schools, and partnerships with industry and the community. This three-part charge serves to connect our Clemson-specific mission of enhancing the developing language and thinking abilities of our students with community

activism, school-to-work partnerships, and civic responsibility. These changes in our mission marked the beginning of a postmodern turn in our endeavors. Instead of writing workshops functioning as a stable, recognizable site for CAC, the program became more multidimensional and more about multiple functions than a location (Derrida 1978, 280). We no longer focused on writing as the only medium; we no longer separated written and oral language from visual and digital learning; we no longer viewed the Clemson campus as our only space; and we broadened our audience beyond faculty to include community and corporate partnerships. During the first half of the 1990s, however, faculty workshops continued to be the primary engine that drove the CAC initiative, the topics broadening to include speaking across the curriculum, service learning, visual communication, and teaching with technology. Our endeavors were recognized in 2001 when *Time* magazine and Princeton Review honored Clemson as the "Public College of the Year" on the strength of our CAC program and its impact on campus culture and teaching throughout the disciplines. Despite these successes, however, attendance at our faculty workshops had steadily declined since the mid-1990s. Whereas early workshop enrollments ranged from thirty to forty, they dropped to twenty and thirty, and then dipped into single digits.

So what was our problem? Clearly faculty were still interested in communication as evidenced by their continued participation in CAC alumni events and the use of WAC/CAC techniques in their classrooms. Our successful model of interactive faculty workshops had even sparked significant competition for faculty participation in interdisciplinary workshops. During the past six or seven years, new campus entities were developed to help faculty improve their teaching effectiveness. Examples include the new Office of Teaching Excellence and Innovation; the newly endowed Rutland Center's Ethics Across the Curriculum; the campus-wide Service Learning Cooperative; the Office of Distance and Continuing Education; and the Collaborative Learning Environment, a course management system from our new division of Educational Technology Services with workshops for faculty on how to use this new e-environment in pedagogically sound ways. Other interdisciplinary workshops were sponsored by women's studies, African American studies, and the Office of Assessment. While we welcomed the increased attention to teaching innovation and effectiveness, we recognized that we were now having to compete for participants. Particularly at a school that is placing increased emphasis on research, grant funding, and graduate education, finding faculty members with the desire, the time,

and the resources to participate in CAC workshops became increasingly challenging.

This decline in faculty participation in workshops is not unusual in mature, or "second-stage," WAC and CAC programs. In "The Future of WAC," Barbara Walvoord addresses directly the sustainability of WAC programs initiated and nurtured by faculty workshops:

> I think WAC also must fundamentally reexamine its old micro-level concerns, particularly its traditional workshop-plus-follow-up model, its leadership, and its theories of faculty development, and the delivery of services to faculty. . . .
>
> The word "follow-up" reveals an underlying assumption that the centrally located workshop led by a writing specialist is the key transforming event, which needs only "follow up" to maintain conversion. That thought pattern spells demise or stagnation once the recruitable faculty have been through a workshop. WAC must see itself not as a transforming workshop plus "follow-up" but as part of a sustaining set of services, a network, a culture, within the university, that supports ongoing, career-long, self-directed growth for faculty. (1996, 72–73)

Walvoord has described one aspect of the situation we were facing at Clemson, and her postmodern prescription for the future of WAC coincided in many respects with our own planning for the further development of our CAC initiative. In our effort to remain a catalyst for faculty-centered educational and cultural change, we have become more open to chance opportunities to network and partner with a variety of organizations both on and off the Clemson campus.

Even as we realized that traditional faculty workshops could no longer be the singular focus of our CAC program, we continued to value the interdisciplinary faculty workshops that have changed and continue to change Clemson's culture. The problem, as we saw it, was that workshops had become routine. Clemson's Strategic Plan and Roadmap both call for substantially more interdisciplinary faculty collaboration in teaching, research, and service. The good news is that faculty frequently participate in workshops, symposia, and other interdisciplinary teaching and learning exchanges. Even Clemson's president, James Barker, routinely convenes interdisciplinary colloquia on topics such as science and society and academic integrity. The bad news, however, is that faculty no longer attend our CAC workshops in the numbers they once did.

As one solution to the decline in workshop participation, many WAC/CAC programs viewed the establishment of required writing-intensive courses as central to institutionalizing and, thus, sustaining themselves.

However, Clemson's CAC program never pursued this strategy, believing that curricular requirements that are reluctantly embraced would need to be monitored, further reducing writing- and speaking-rich courses to an identified handful. Independent of the Pearce Center, the university in the mid-1990s did institute the curricular option of writing-intensive and oral-communication-intensive courses; however, with a few exceptions, academic departments never embraced this opportunity, preferring instead to have their majors fulfill general education requirements with courses such as technical writing and public speaking taught by faculty in English and communication studies. In the fall of 2003, as part of a proposal to revise general education, the University Curriculum Committee voted to end the writing-intensive and oral-communication-intensive requirements.

The dubious nature of writing-intensive courses as represented on the Clemson campus as well as our own decentered vision for CAC within broad local, national, and international arenas means that we have not pursued aggressively "writing in the disciplines" (WID), which many scholars have suggested as the next step for WAC. For example, Jones and Comprone write, "Finally, and most importantly, WAC pedagogy needs to use research into discipline conventions to create more effective rhetorical approaches to WAC courses" (1993, 65). They continue, noting that David Russell calls for discipline-specific research on writing and discourse communities that may enable disciplines to "eventually . . . design the pedagogical 'scaffoldings' . . . , curricular structures built of meaningful experiences with language, which will lead students through progressively more sophisticated engagement with each discipline through its discourse" (65).[1]

Such scholars argue for a greater emphasis on WID because knowledge is socially constructed and academic language is constituted by the written conversation of particular discourse communities (for example, history or physics). They often see studying each discipline's rhetoric as essential to the growth of WAC theory and practice as well as a force for change locally and nationally. And such research, curricular changes, and pedagogical scaffolding are important theoretical and applied work for WAC as well as rhetoric and composition and technical communication programs. However, for our work at Clemson—which encourages participation and collaboration with schools, industry, and civic groups—we promote pedagogies and scaffolds that are interdisciplinary rather than discipline specific and that promote personal reflection and social action as ways that students can write, speak, design, and digitize

to make a difference in their own lives and the lives of others. We want CAC at Clemson to work across as well as within communities, both on and off campus. This commitment to civic values implies that CAC will never be a quick fix for educational or political issues. CAC here is fundamentally about systematically changing our campus and, since our campus does not exist in a vacuum, about changing the larger cultures in which schools, colleges, industries, and communities exist. Thus a solution will not be found in a workshop, a curricular change, a focus on technology, assessment, or any other grand narrative for educational change—but it may be found in all these and more in paratactic combinations.

Consequently, the highly visible problems of lack of attendance at faculty workshops and the continued challenge to institutionalize curricular revisions have become an exigency to rethink our primary goals. We plan to work for educational change on our campus and nationally through the interconnectedness of our commitments to work collegially with every discipline, department, and program on our campus in support of common goals; to develop mutually beneficial partnerships with South Carolina and the nation's secondary schools; and to develop mutually beneficial partnerships with corporate and nonprofit organizations, especially as they relate school to work expectations, performance, and critique. In this process, we developed and continue to plan, implement, and assess a variety of new and always provisional partnerships, projects, workshops, resources, clients, and delivery systems that allow us to join with others on and off campus in continually learning and changing as we together educate students and wider communities in using writing and communication to make a difference in our lives. To quote Barbara Walvoord again, "WAC . . . must dive in or die" (1996, 70).

In what follows, we provide brief descriptions of some of the CAC initiatives with which we are currently involved and suggest how each plays an important role in fulfilling our mission. We combine new approaches with familiar ones, establish a diminished role for faculty workshops without abandoning them, and reimagine a future for CAC at Clemson based on an active partnership with our students as well as with other people and organizations at Clemson and in the community. First, we introduce three new models and modes of delivery for interdisciplinary collaboration: the South Carolina Institute for Ethics and Reflection (SCISE), the Poetry Across the Curriculum initiative (PAC), and the Summer Reading Program and Presidential Colloquium. Next, we describe three reinventions of the traditional workshop model, some

involving new workshop structures and new clients: the thematic series, the focused two-hour workshop, and the graduate school partnership. Last, we describe the Class of 1941 Studio for Student Communication, in both its physical and virtual spaces, a facility and a facilitation that suggests Ihab Hassan's "open in time as well as in structure or space" (1987, 93). This new kind of studio, designed by the Pearce Center faculty to enable students and faculty to collaborate on communication projects in a variety of new and old media, will establish a presence for CAC on campus that cultivates new opportunities to ensure that CAC at Clemson will never again be only faculty workshops led by a writing specialist and a few writing-intensive courses.

SCISE

Having determined to dive in, we began looking for ways to better address the changing needs of the university while still meeting the three-part mission of the Pearce Center. One particularly attractive opportunity was a three-way partnership with Clemson's Rutland Center for Ethics and the university's Darla T. Moore School of Education. Together, we developed SCISE, a summer institute that targets teachers and teacher educators throughout the state (although we have had attendees from other states and even other countries). These workshops, which are conducted during the summer to allow practicing teachers to attend, focus on current trends and issues of concern to education professionals. Faculty facilitators act as instructors, discussion leaders, and role-playing participants in order to help bring about experiential as well as reflective learning on a range of related topics including pedagogy (both for K-12 teachers and university teacher educators), ethics, and the uses of communicative and reflective practices in the classroom.

SCISE combines small group discussions, scenario-based problem solving, reflective writing, and collaborative presentation. Participants begin with discussions of the core concepts which, for the past two years, have centered on incorporating ethical awareness into class discussions and activities. Then they are presented with various scenarios and are asked to identify and justify ethical decisions. During the initial discussions, participants are introduced to some major schools of philosophical thought. Because many K-12 (and other) educators have little familiarity with teaching ethics, it is first necessary to define key terms, review central concepts, and "practice" the methods and approaches that workshop participants will later use with their students. Once key terms and vocabulary are in place, facilitators lead increasingly complex

scenario-based inquiries in which new topics are introduced and often argued. Facilitators demonstrate how the various philosophical "tools" can be used as strategies for making more reasoned decisions. The next step is to show participants how these strategies can be taught as a mechanism for resolving ethical dilemmas, again with the goal that participants will later follow similar procedures with their own students. Workshop sessions typically end with reflective writing exercises that are collected and responded to by facilitators.

A single day's discussion topics might include a brief introduction to Kantian deontology, virtue ethics, and utilitarianism, all of which might be applied to questions about colonialist paternalism. Rather than addressing the topic in the abstract, however, participants might be asked about when intervention in the cultural customs of another country might be warranted. Is it morally justifiable to intervene, for instance, in situations where women's dress is proscribed? Does it matter if, along with other mandated codes of conduct, women are not given access to higher education? Are we justified in trying to change another culture to prevent the practice referred to as "female circumcision"? When does it become our moral duty to interfere, and when are we ethically obligated not to get involved or not to impose our own standards on members of another culture?

Although discussion topics range from abstract instructional scenarios like the classic, "if four people arrived at the emergency room and you had to choose between saving the one most critically injured or saving the other three," to highly topical real-life political questions such as the ones outlined in the last paragraph, they share a common thread of civic responsibility—particularly with respect to elementary and secondary education. Additionally, the methods of the institute itself—small group discussion, free writing, reflective writing, dialogic problem solving, cross-disciplinary collaborations—all are in keeping with the mission of the Pearce Center even though the look and feel of this institute is very much different from our traditional communications workshops. In the process of building ethical knowledge and pedagogical strategies among participants, there is a blurring of the traditional hierarchical relationship between ethics and rhetoric—relocating them in language and as interdependent. As Faigley, interpreting Lyotard's approach to ethics, writes: "Lyotard relocates ethics in the material practices of reading and writing. In a traditional view of the relationship between rhetoric and ethics, ethical values pre-exist rhetoric. Rhetoric in the traditional view becomes the means to persuade people to be ethical. In a postmodern

theory of rhetoric, there is no legitimate preexisting discourse of values for rhetoric to convey" (1992, 237).

There are several features of SCISE that make it unusual not just for us but for WAC/CAC activities in general. The partnerships with ethics and education faculty as well as the emphasis on content area (in this case, ethics) rather than communicative strategies may seem, at first glance, to make this less about communication and more about pedagogy and ethics. In fact, however, SCISE provides a very focused, very communication-intensive series of activities which have WAC/CAC principles at their core. Institute participants, too, are somewhat nontraditional for WAC/CAC activities. Rather than being the interdisciplinary mix that WAC/CAC coordinators hope to attract, the SCISE participants come from a variety of disciplines, all of which are related to education. While there have been no engineering or math faculty present, the range of ranks and responsibilities of the participants provides a variety of perspectives and concerns which serve to enrich the discussions as participants negotiate the topics under consideration. What finally, however, makes the SCISE and the Pearce Center a useful symbiotic relationship is the emphasis on "communication to learn," which functions as the central pedagogy for the workshops and is complemented by exploratory reflective writing. The SCISE workshops afford a unique opportunity for the Pearce Center team to work directly with not only teacher-educators but also the teachers who will be utilizing WAC in their K-12 classrooms in fulfilling the three-part mission of the Pearce Center.

POETRY ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

Poetry Across the Curriculum (PAC) is in its fifth year, and forty faculty from more than twenty disciplines and over two thousand students have participated. Such a project is one way to address the CAC issue of "follow up" in faculty development and at the same time embark on a new area of emphasis with a delivery mode not based on workshops led by a "writing specialist." While many college catalogs announce curricula based on critical thinking and *creativity*, this project (in collaboration with other people and organizations) seeks to integrate creative thinking and expression into courses throughout both the curriculum and the campus culture. To participate in this project, rather than attend an isolated workshop on why and how to incorporate PAC into the classroom, faculty participants meet regularly to contribute their knowledge and experience with this innovative teaching strategy, to generate

collaborative scholarship on teaching and learning, and to value and promote opportunities for imaginative representation and expression in disciplinary contexts. As part of this PAC project, teachers ask students to write poems in courses across the curriculum in order to gain new perspectives about the content they are studying and to develop their creativity through imaginative language play. Poems suggest an accessible cross-disciplinary discourse for probing, imagining, and resisting specialized disciplinary knowledge and discourse. Elsewhere, Art Young has described this impetus for resistance as "writing against the curriculum":

> The purpose of Poetry Across the Curriculum, as we conceive it, is to provide opportunities for students to use written language to engage course content in meaningful ways, not to teach them to be better poets. For many students, creating a poem provides a way into disciplinary discussions in which the writers' own poetic language engages, recasts, and critiques disciplinary knowledge without having to conform to the discourse conventions of an alien discourse. (2003b, 475)

Poetic writing activities give students opportunities to make personal connections to the material they study and to reflect on new academic knowledge and experiences. Most teachers describe a poem "as anything you want it to be," thus creating an open space for play with language, media, ideas, and experience and for performing, exploring, identifying, or blurring the tensions within and among them. And when such playful language activities are made social by sharing in groups or at public readings, they enable students and teachers to build classroom communities based on a respect for language and on a connection to texts and to each other in which further learning and growth occur, sometimes in surprising ways.[2]

Our ongoing PAC project (2000–04) involves occasional academic and social get-togethers coordinated by professors of biology, English, and psychology who are codirectors of the project. PAC participants attend regular lunch meetings to discuss issues and experiences that arise in their classes. Each year, we publish an anthology of selected student poems from each participating class; print editions of whole sets of poems from particular classes such as biology, horticulture, music, and psychology; award "certificates of achievement" and bookstore gift certificates to selected authors for merit; and publish selected poems on the Web (people.clemson.edu/~apyoung/focus_on_creativity.html). We print student poems from every participating teacher's class on special

PAC stationery for posting on office and departmental bulletin boards. Each spring, poets and their faculty mentors read students' poetry in the university library as part of Clemson's "Arts in April" festival. And an interdisciplinary group of faculty holds an evening meeting each spring to discuss the future of the project and to analyze and evaluate over a hundred student poems.

Many of us are excited about what the PAC project has yielded for our teaching and learning, and we plan not only to continue the project for another year but we are also expanding its goals. An interdisciplinary team of PAC participants is developing a 2004 pilot project for our classes tentatively called Creative Response for Learning (CRL). Our goal is to open and expand possibilities for students' imaginative responses to academic subject matter beyond poetry to all forms of creativity: graphics, music, stories, performance, parables, video, hypertext, quilts, e-poetry, photography, poster design, sculpture, mixed and fused modes and media, publication, and other fascinating genres and media that we know our students will generate. The opening of the Class of 1941 Studio for Student Communication (discussed later in this chapter) promises to be an enabling space for the collaborating, planning, designing, composing, presenting, and performing that we imagine for ourselves and our students participating in the CRL pilot project. We know there will be new challenges as well as new possibilities, and we know that if and when we decide to open the project to all Clemson faculty, we will be greeted with questions like "How can I make and assess assignments that encourage students to use photography or multimedia, when I don't know anything myself about using and judging art forms in my classroom?" Although we may not arrive at a satisfactory answer during our pilot project, we are familiar from other contexts with such questions about oral presentations, written documents, digital portfolios, and the writing of poetry. In many instances, we trust answers will emerge through our collaboration with our students and colleagues and through our partnering with other organizations and projects, such as the state's schools and Clemson's "Arts in April" festival.

PRESIDENTIAL COLLOQUIUM

Clemson instituted its Presidential Colloquium four years ago when our president selected as the theme for the year "The Idea of a University." Throughout the year students in first-year composition read works that covered every aspect of the topic from Cardinal Newman's early thoughts on the purpose of a university to the will of Thomas Green

Clemson, which created Clemson as a land-grant university, to visions of how computer technology will increasingly shape university life. Richard Lanham came to speak to the students about what discourse has come to look like and where it may take us in the future. A series of additional outside speakers, plus lecturers and panels representing a range of Clemson faculty and administrators, kept the topic before the first-year students as well as other students and faculty throughout the year, and the theme became a topic for PAC and for an essay competition sponsored by our Rutland Center for Ethics. The theme gave the campus a year-long focus for communication across the curriculum.

In each subsequent year, the president has worked with faculty to come up with a topic that will interest faculty and students across the curriculum. One year the focus was "Science and Values: New Frontiers, Perennial Questions"—until the events of September 11 forced us to reconsider what we wanted our students thinking, reading, and writing about, and we shifted in midyear to focus on ethics in time of war. We moved from asking about how the "Brave New World" of cloning and other areas of medical research forces us to rethink our values to the topic "Values Revisited: The Brave New World in Time of War." Again, hundreds of our students were thinking, hearing, reading, and writing about images of the enemy (How do we handle our relations with international students who now look like the enemy?); America's history in time of war (What was the campus like during World War I, World War II, and Vietnam? How does Bush's statement after the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks compare with Roosevelt's on the day after Pearl Harbor?); and women in the military ("What Did You Do in the War, Grandma?"). We have gone on to focus last year on academic integrity and this year on the human and social costs of admission to the American educational system.

Broader involvement campus-wide, if for a shorter period of time, came this year when we joined numbers of universities across the country in instituting a Summer Reading Program. One of the most gratifying results was that we were able to involve both faculty and staff from all over campus, 165 of them, from administrative assistants to the provost and president. These volunteers met over lunch in the spring to get their copies of Richard Rodriguez's *Hunger of Memory* and some general guidelines for leading a discussion of it. Then on the day before classes began they watched as three thousand or more students streamed into the coliseum from all over campus to hear the author speak about his life and the writing of the book. After the presentation, faculty met with

students in small groups to discuss the book and Rodriguez's remarks. Before they arrived the students each wrote a brief response to the book, a piece of writing that in future years will be the first piece in each student's digital portfolio.

Getting faculty from all disciplines involved has been an important step toward breaking down disciplinary boundaries. We plan to continue to draw in faculty from across the campus by selecting works for the Summer Reading Program that are not viewed as fitting only into the domain of literary studies, as has been the model for a number of summer reading programs elsewhere.

VARIATIONS ON AN OLD THEME: THE EVOLUTION OF CAC WORKSHOPS

As we programmatically expand the purview of the Pearce Center to include new initiatives such as SCISE, PAC, and the Summer Reading Program and Presidential Colloquium, we would be shortsighted to abandon features of our program that have been foundational to the long-term success of the CAC initiative at Clemson. Rather than rigidly clinging to past successes in the area of faculty development workshops, we have begun to experiment with variations of the tried-and-true workshop model that has garnered such positive responses throughout the history of the program. As we enter this new phase at Clemson, we want that which has worked well for us in the past to evolve into something that will continue to meet our ever-changing audience, environment, and purposes. Recently, we began to rethink the traditional workshop model that has been a staple of the program since its inception. In response to the current environment at Clemson, we are exploring variations in both delivery and audience.

Workshop Series: Plagiarism and PowerPoint

Desiring a longer time frame for depth and coverage but understanding the reality of busy faculty schedules, we have begun to offer communications workshops in a series over the course of a semester or an academic year. Multidimensional topics like plagiarism and PowerPoint effectiveness—two issues we have covered at Clemson in such a series— would be a challenge to "cover" in a full-day workshop format. For this reason, we began offering workshops in two different types of series. In the first we offer a number of separate workshops centered on a specific theme. These are identified as a series in the promotional materials, and attendees commit to any number of individual sessions. Our first

foray into this model of delivery focused on the vexing problems associated with plagiarism, an initiative that arose from several intersecting goals of the university and the Pearce Center. We were looking for ways to continue to provide useful, topical offerings while at the same time coordinating our efforts with those of the university colloquium series, which for that academic year was organized around "Academic Integrity and the Integrity of the Academy." Our goals shifted from attempting to provide a "survey" that addressed the most critical elements of the topic to a series of semi-self-directed inquiries from which workshop participants could build a set of "best practices" or, in some cases, simply a more sophisticated understanding of key issues. In our first meeting on academic integrity, we began by attempting to define plagiarism in the context of our home disciplines. While the participants were initially skeptical of the usefulness of this discussion, it became painfully clear within the first ten minutes that the entire two-hour period could be devoted to this task. Workshop participants not only had differing ideas regarding what constituted plagiarism, they also wanted to contest the ways in which other disciplines defined the problem. Based on discrepancies between the disciplinary understanding of plagiarism, we spent a large portion of the first workshop examining problems students might have negotiating several disciplines within a semester and committing to define plagiarism clearly within our classroom settings. The absence of a universal understanding of plagiarism across disciplinary, cultural, and other contexts then became a foundation for the remaining workshops in the series. By shifting from a coverage model or workshop delivery to one in which depth and focus were the primary goals, we hoped to provide maximum benefit to participants who were unable to attend the entire series.

The second type of workshop series enlists a group of participants to commit to a number of shorter workshops on a designated topic for a period of time, usually a semester or two. At Clemson we have twice offered this type of series on PowerPoint as a pedagogical delivery method. As an area, PowerPoint provides the entire range of CAC content—written, oral, visual, and digital communication—and targets pedagogical issues upon which the Pearce Center has built its reputation. It's also a CAC topic not without controversy: some sign up for the workshop because they are heavily invested in the technology and think it has revolutionized teaching for the better while other participants find that PowerPoint necessarily leads to student passivity and the reduction of subject content to bulleted lists. In fact, many of the PowerPoint tip

sheets one finds online suggest no more than six bullets per slide and six words per bullet (the six-by-six rule). Those of us who have battled with students over a predetermined format cringe at the thought of content becoming subservient to the formatting limitations of the medium.

But dismissing PowerPoint as a pedagogical delivery system is not an option for some in the academy. In our first meeting this year, we began the workshop with personal introductions that included an opening statement of interest in PowerPoint in which one participant discussed a difficult predicament. The personnel committee in her science-related field critiqued her first year of teaching because she did not use PowerPoint; however, after she adopted PowerPoint the second year she found her students disengaged from the content of her lectures and more critical of her teaching methods on the student evaluations. Others felt a similar departmental pressure to use PowerPoint in their teaching, especially with the increasing population of students in their respective classes, though some were more confident than others in its effectiveness.

Because the group remains consistent over time, content can build upon itself in this model to achieve greater depth and breadth of coverage. The sustained effort does not significantly infringe on the workload of the participants because meetings are held at reasonable intervals—in our case once a month for the two-semester series—and the framework allows for reading, exploration, and activities to be completed in between meeting times that enhance the discussion and application of the topic. In response to the concerns articulated in the first session, we have since followed up with a number of conversations and mini-presentations centering on uses of PowerPoint that engage students in active listening and learning, thus in effect discussing differences and tensions in the modernist and postmodernist perspectives on teaching and technology. All participants brought in sample slides demonstrating good teaching within their respective disciplines that in turn fostered lively discussion regarding students, teaching, and engaging pedagogy: the type of discussions that interweave communications, technology, and teaching and that reflect the values of the Pearce Center.

Stand-Alone Two-Hour Workshops: CAC Topics

In an evolving program, the stand-alone workshop, however, is not without merit. One alternative we have explored is cutting the length of the workshops from a full day to two hours, offering each workshop at least twice on different days and at different times to allow for scheduling conflicts. While the two-hour workshops contain significantly less

content than the full-day ones, they are reasonable to prepare, and faculty around campus seem willing to commit that amount of time. In addition to issues of delivery, another change we have incorporated in our workshop is an expansion of content beyond the traditional WAC subjects to include a larger CAC purview that includes oral, written, visual, and digital communications—especially looking for subjects with overlap between them. The two-hour workshops in the past several years have expanded to include topics ranging from illuminating gender communication in the classroom to understanding communication assessment competencies to writing cohesive and articulate theses and proposals. The majority of the workshops contain some component of media and often pertain to the myriad ways in which communication technology can be incorporated into the classroom. In doing so, faculty can hone communication skills regardless of the discipline in which they teach.

The crux of the new communication workshop model is based on several key elements. The topic of the workshop must be interdisciplinary and new. One good way to examine whether the topic appeals to multiple disciplines is to outline what someone from each college within a university could gain from attending. While appeals to each department at a university may appear impossible, appealing to at least some people within each college has appeared quite plausible at Clemson University. The two-hour workshops must provide innovative content, additional sources for information if an attendee would wish to seek it, and an applied end result that can be implemented in the classroom. Additionally, workshops must be interactive, often utilizing discussion from participants. The new workshop model requires the pooling of shared information, which comes not just from the facilitator but from participants—who often sign up because a given topic fits their interest and who, consequently, have information and tips to share.

The ultimate goal is to fashion workshops that pertain to interdisciplinary communication issues in order to ensure that a large portion of the university community can be served. When implemented correctly, the two-hour workshop can be integral to the success of a CAC program, rather than being viewed as an outdated relic of previous CAC designs.

Professional Development for Graduate Students

In addition to the evolution of CAC workshop content and delivery, we have also begun to expand the base of participants to include graduate students, an underserved population within the university community despite Clemson's administrative push toward a higher

priority on graduate programs. In 2002–03, the campus engaged in a year-long discussion of eight research "emphasis areas" that would guide the flow of funds and attention within the university. All faculty were under increasing pressure to win external grant funding, new graduate degrees were being proposed in most colleges, and departments were encouraged to increase graduate enrollment. In the past, the Pearce Center and CAC at Clemson had focused almost exclusively on issues surrounding the teaching of communication to undergraduates. But the new emphasis on graduate research provided a strong exigency for establishing a new partnership with the graduate school.

Meanwhile, from the graduate students' perspective, the exigency for assistance with communication had always been present, but had simply been overlooked by entities like Pearce and CAC. Graduate students, particularly those in technical and scientific fields, often receive little guidance from faculty on their writing or speaking. Yet they are expected to publish their research, create research posters, attend conferences, and—not the least of their worries—complete a thesis or dissertation. As their faculty advisors felt more pressure to write grants and work with additional students, the graduate students could expect less attention and higher expectations.

Recognizing the graduate students' current needs and anticipating that many of these students will become faculty members in the near future around the country, the Pearce Center began offering a set of professional development experiences for the students. This effort engaged CAC with a new clientele and exemplified our new approach of reaching out directly to students rather than confining our work to faculty professional development. The effort also incorporated the "sustaining set of services" (Walvoord 1996, 72) model that had been successfully tested on campus with initiatives like our plagiarism and PowerPoint series.

While the graduate student initiative goes beyond workshops, this form of delivery, however, is the entry point for participants. Graduate students from across the university are invited by the graduate school to attend workshops presented by the Pearce Center which address such topics as writing for scholarly journals, presenting at conferences, and writing thesis and dissertation proposals. They feature presentations by the workshop leader, small-group discussions on topics suggested by the leader, and whole-group discussions based on the results of the small-group discussions. These workshops are designed not only to provide an overview of strategies but also to help the students develop a few specific goals and plans to act on after the workshop.

The workshops are consistently overbooked, confirming the graduate students' desire for communications-focused professional development. They bring together students from a variety of majors in the sciences, engineering, agriculture, social sciences, and the humanities. More than half of the students are typically second-language English speakers. The students quickly recognize the opportunity for gleaning new ideas and strategies from others who, though differing greatly, are still experiencing many of the same stresses and pressures as researchers and communicators. For example, in a recent workshop several students at one table learned from others about the database-searching help offered by librarians at the university library. At another table, students engaged in a lively discussion of how to accomplish their goals despite the politics and intellectual conflict among their dissertation committee members.

The professional development initiative begins with these workshops, but does not stop there. Moving toward the "sustaining services" advocated by Walvoord, we offered interested students from the workshops the opportunity to join a Graduate Student Writing Group facilitated by faculty of the Pearce Center. Meeting every three weeks for about two hours, the writing group allows more individualized, thorough, and extended assistance for graduate students who are writing seminar papers, theses, dissertations, proposals, or articles. The meetings are facilitated by faculty but are student-directed; we attempt to balance teaching with facilitation. The participating students are asked to bring questions, concerns, and drafts to the meetings, which flow from round-table discussion of common issues to reading and commenting and back again. At the end of the meeting, each student announces a specific writing goal that he or she promises to achieve by the next meeting.

The writing group meetings feature the sharing of ideas and strategies across disciplines, cultures, and stages of progress on writing. At a recent meeting, faculty from English who have conducted research on collaboration from a communication perspective exchanged ideas with a student from mechanical engineering who was writing a thesis proposal about a computer system designed to facilitate collaboration. On this topic and others, student and faculty participants found that they could help each other clarify their ideas because of (rather than in spite of) their disciplinary differences. Sharing also occurred across cultures, with a French student offering suggestions based on French practices of promoting organic foods to an American student studying organic food production and sales in the United States. Students who were further along in the thesis process offered suggestions to those who were

just beginning. The faculty facilitators also learned from the graduate students—not only about the content of their research but also about the conventions of writing in their disciplines. All in all, the Graduate Student Writing Group provides an opportunity to reach out to a new and eager clientele, while also enriching our own understanding of communication across the disciplines.

CAC Alumni Events

One of the most successful workshops offered by the Pearce Center continues to be the CAC Alumni Event, a two-hour workshop that highlights some of the progressive and interesting communication work across the campus. Despite being offered each semester during exam week, the workshop attracts between forty and fifty attendees on a regular basis. The workshop typically highlights three examples, each typically representing a different college, of the "best CAC practices" of faculty and students in a setting that provides the presenters a chance to showcase their pedagogical work—something that continues to be valued at Clemson—to an interested audience. Recent CAC alumni events have included such communication projects as one from an abnormal psychology class where students placed painted green shoes around campus and the local community with factual information educating readers about mental disorders and promoting a local benefit walk to raise funds and awareness for mental health care. While the professor discussed the objectives of the assignment and her role, several of the students from the class shared what they had learned through the process as well. Other presentations have included service-learning projects with a strong communications emphasis, faculty members who participated in the PowerPoint workshops, PAC participants, an entomology professor's approach to integrating communication and creativity in her class, and many others. This regular workshop both creates a space for community to develop and provides continuing ideas and resources for those who are interested in integrating communication assignments and activities into their curriculum. It also provides an opportunity for those not involved with the Pearce Center to get a sense of the work and values of the CAC program at Clemson in an enjoyable, nonthreatening setting.

THE STUDIO AND THE ONLINE STUDIO

As we have seen in the preceding pages, the Pearce Center has reinvented itself to fit the changing environment at Clemson. Jay Bolter (2000) describes the ways in which our postmodern culture encourages us to

revisit and rethink our artifacts in different media as remediation—not in its usual sense of being remedial, but rather in the sense of something old made new again. And our spaces, like so much of our teaching and learning, are being *remediated* to meet new demands—of undergraduate students, of overworked faculty, and of our increasingly digital culture. Recognizing, as did Louise Phelps in her 2003 WPA Conference address, the import of continual redesign and reconceptualization, we are changing spaces as we struggle to support new delivery methods, new clients, and new connections that accompany our new exigencies. The term "space" plays on multiple layers here—ambient, physical, virtual, and curricular—because it is the interplay of these multiple spaces that cultivates the context for change. Crucial to this remediation of space is seamlessness. In arguing against Kaufer and Butler's notion of design as "a seamless integration of the knowledge and goals of the designer" (1996, 33) as too complete, too neat, and too constricting of larger human functions of human activities, Phelps made a key point about reconceptualization and its role in composition and curriculum. What we have been (re)designing is a space for multiple interactions with new clients, new partners, and new technologies that foregrounds the seams of knowledge, goals and learning—the cobbling together rather than the ultimate creation. If we do not continually rebuild, we lose function over time—new media become old media, and new clients become old partners—and if design (and the structures that embody it) do not change over time, they will be abandoned or demolished. Continual redesign is a key element of technoprovocateurs[3] but is obvious only if we take note of the seams. The seams are the flexible spaces, the spaces of change.

In May 2003, Clemson University began construction on the Class of 1941 Studio for Student Communication, a 4,000-square-foot facility for students to work on communication projects in speech, writing, visual, and digital technologies. While we have been blessed with a new physical space, what has been more important for us are the ways in which the *idea* of the space and its remediation have offered us space to reconsider and remediate our existing mission. We now have two new spaces—the new physical studio and its online counterpart—that provide us the potential to fulfill and enhance the mission of the Pearce Center as it was first conceived. Now besides working with faculty, the studio provides a work environment for students as well. And when the online studio matures, we will have a space that simplifies both outreach

services to K-12 schools and working with the corporate world by limiting the physical space that now separates us.

The Class of 1941 Studio for Student Communication

A reflective, collaborative approach to studio design was a key element in helping us rethink the space; we engaged over seventy-five "stakeholders" throughout the planning process, including members of the Pearce Corporate Advisory Board, faculty, administrators, IT and other staff, custodial staff, and students. In these conversations, we discovered not only the significant contributions that each had to offer but also the importance of (re)imagining our mission in light of how the space will connect us to each of these groups and how they will connect to one another once the space is in place. What follows, then, is a series of extended examples for the studio and its online counterpart, illustrating how the studio might be used; through these, we can imagine space, activity, staffing needs, scheduling issues, and curriculum.

At nine o'clock in the morning, six students appear to work on a PowerPoint presentation, due the following week, for a business class: they have to persuade a board of directors to become a silent partner in their start-up firm. They also have to complete a one-page document explaining the logic of their appeal. They seem primarily to want space, but you'd like to work with them. A first-year student is also at the door, wanting help with a classroom writing assignment; she seems to need work in invention. At quarter past nine a student comes in to talk about the Tiger Cup public-speaking competition, which has just been announced—he definitely wants to talk about what he can say. The topic focuses on Clemson, as it does every year, and you also wonder what could be said. At half past nine a portfolio mentor group shows up—they are to review their digital portfolios, adding something that they have completed this term. A Pearce faculty workshop leader appears and needs to know how to make the projection equipment work. At ten of ten faculty start streaming through the studio to get to the conference area, and the students are distracted.

Welcome to the new Class of 1941 Studio.

The Online Studio

Connected to, but not quite mirroring, the physical space is the Online Studio. We have begun planning and implementing it using a three-stage model, which we believe offers an example of how we

can remediate a more traditional Online Writing Lab (OWL) into an increasingly dynamic space. Accompanying the description of each stage below are examples of how we expect the space to be used; in fact, it was these kinds of scenarios that helped us plan the space. In the first stage, we offer an electronic warehouse of communications information.

> A Clemson student needs help composing a PowerPoint presentation and looks online for pointers. The search results in two or three digitized hand-outs from Clemson instructors on giving PowerPoint presentations in the disciplines. Another student, working on her electronic portfolio, needs advice on how to reflect on her growth as a writer in looking at three projects: a first-year writing assignment, a poem that she wrote for a PAC project in a psychology class, and a biology lab report. The results from the search of the electronic file cabinet reveal a short handout on writing reflective memos, an article on reflection, and a PowerPoint presentation from a Pearce workshop on how to repurpose documents for the portfolio.

Second, we will construct an asynchronous network of conversations about writing and communications in and across disciplines.

> Another student, Jamal, has been placed on a team with three other Pearce clients who are also working on digital portfolios. They have a group computer space to deposit video and textual documents for review. They use the online center's listserv and discussion board spaces as well as the project management space to maintain a six-week project management calendar. The team schedules meetings with Pearce specialists to talk about reflection, choosing documents that represent a well-balanced college experience, and discussing the strengths and weaknesses of each.

Third, we invite participants to discuss issues in real time with other communicators and with specially trained consultants who can receive, view, and comment on multimedia and other projects in real time.

> Seeking immediate help with a presentation, Bill, a student based in Texas, wanders into the Pearce Center Multi-user domain Object Oriented (MOO). There he encounters scenarios that allow him to brainstorm topics, create PowerPoint slides, and share text and video with a Pearce consultant. That consultant leads Bill to a MOO room where others are working on similar projects. Students take turns sharing information and providing feedback. During the presentations, a high school English class comes online to see how high school writing differs from college writing.

Our hope, then, is to help students—and faculty—to design a facility with multimodal language that can be presented and represented visually, verbally, and virtually across time.

Lessons Learned

We have learned numerous things in the planning, the building, and the foreseeable opening of these studios. One category of learning might be titled "the politics of location, physical and curricular." If the best learning is not in the course container but rather in spaces like this studio, we will have to find new ways of defining this curricular work, of identifying spaces where it can occur, and of funding it—particularly in schools dominated by Full Time Equivalencies (FTEs) as the way of distributing resources. It may be, as Barbara Walvoord has argued, that such work in particular requires us to make alliances with other units on campus (and off), and it may also be that cross-curricular projects like studios, CAC portfolios, service learning, and ethics across the curriculum will provide focal points for such alliances. We count on the intersection of physical and curricular spaces, on our new activities, on our students, and on our colleagues to help us understand the patterns of remediation here.

THE FUTURE OF CAC AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

In her 1989 *College Composition and Communication* article, Susan McLeod anticipates a third stage of WAC in the academy, especially citing the modernist need for WAC to stabilize in light of a number of supposed WAC programs around the country that were neither cognitively or rhetorically based in the way that we traditionally understand WAC programs (342). She argues for WAC "as a permanent fixture in higher education" so that administrators in our institutions do not think of a WAC program as "merely additive—more term papers, more courses, more proficiency tests—but one that is closely tied with thinking and learning, one that will bring about changes in teaching as well as in student writing" (342–43). And McLeod is right about programs that effect positive change on a number of levels: administration, faculty, and students. What is perhaps ironic is that as the Pearce Center moves into the next phase of WAC, we have found strength in a postmodern malleability rather than in permanency: the evolution of WAC into CAC; partnering with other programs and people on as well as off campus, thus decentralizing the administration of pieces within the program, pieces

that are distinct, paratactic, and interrelated; seeing old things in a new way; using spaces both virtual and physical in new ways to reach larger and different populations within our mission; and being fluid enough to suit the current climate of the university without losing its distinct history and identity within the institution. If anything, the CAC program is less stable and identifiable now than it might have been over the past two decades; however, it is this same fluidity and unpredictability that best positions it for continued growth and success at Clemson University for years to come.