

2017

Breaking the Binary: Negotiating Space and Power in Course-Embedded Consulting

Courtne Jude Morin
Eastern Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://encompass.eku.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Morin, Courtne Jude, "Breaking the Binary: Negotiating Space and Power in Course-Embedded Consulting" (2017). *Online Theses and Dissertations*. 459.
<https://encompass.eku.edu/etd/459>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at Encompass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Online Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Encompass. For more information, please contact Linda.Sizemore@eku.edu.

Breaking the Binary: Negotiating Space and Power in Course-Embedded Consulting


By


Courtne J. Morin

Thesis Approved:

 4/11/17
Chair, Advisory Committee

 4/11/17
Member, Advisory Committee

 4/11/17
Member, Advisory Committee


Dean, Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of Arts degree at Eastern Kentucky University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made. Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Courtney J. Moun

Date 4/11/17

Breaking the Binary: Negotiating Space and Power in Course-Embedded Consulting

By

Courtnie J. Morin

Bachelor of Arts
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, KY
2015

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
Eastern Kentucky University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
May 2017

Copyright © Courtne J. Morin, 2017
All rights reserved

DEDICATION

To the Noel Studio for Academic Creativity

Student and Administrative Staff —

This one's for you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my mentor, Dr. Russell Carpenter, for guidance in all my scholarly and career pursuits. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Jill Parrott and Dr. Dominic Ashby, for their instruction and support over the last two years. In addition, I would like to thank my boyfriend, Mitch Smith, for all the dishwashing, unending words of encouragement, and late night snacks. You were my light when I could not find one. I would like to thank my mother for every hug, my father for more confidence than I deserved, my sisters for making me laugh, and all the other family members whose support saw me through this degree. Finally, I would like to thank all my wonderful Noel Studio colleagues, past and present. You all have made the last four years of my life unimaginably wonderful.

ABSTRACT

Course-Embedded (writing) Consultants (CECs) disrupt the common classroom power binary between the teacher and the student. Therefore, CECs must constantly negotiate authority and power in relation to their workspaces. Based on a Foucaultian analysis of power ideologies and spatial rhetoric, I propose a training series for instructors, CECs, and their students. This series allows participants on all three sides (teacher, CEC, and student) to recognize, analyze, and work within these dynamics of institutional structures of authority, pedagogy, and space.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. CONNECTING SPACE AND POWER	9
3. THE CEC’S (WORK)SPACE	15
4. THE CEC’S PLACE	23
5. PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING PLAN	27
6. CONCLUSION	32
Works Cited	34
Appendices	39
A. Collaborative Faculty Member Training	40
B. CEC Training	44
C. Student Information Session	49
D. Supporting Materials	51

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. The Greenhouse: A Flexible Space	16
2. The Invention Space: A Discovery Space	16
3. The Classroom: An Instructing Space	18
4. The Classroom CEC Triad	19
5. New Authoritative Identities	20
6. The Writing Center Binary	21
7. Various Classroom Dynamics with a CEC	41
8. DECK Power and Space Module	47
9. Noel Studio ThingLink	47

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Educators recognize several high-impact practices (HIPs) that allow students to achieve deeper levels of thinking and learning. HIPs are educational strategies that increase student engagement and overall success through deeper levels of thinking and learning for students from a variety of backgrounds (Kuh 9). One such high-impact practice is emphasizing writing intensive classes. It is not enough, though, for universities to simply enroll students in writing intensive classes. In addition, there must be programs that support students in the composition process. Writing centers, specifically course-embedded consultant (CEC) programs, provide support for students outside of the writing classroom. Course-Embedded Consultant programs, also known as Writing Fellows programs on many campuses, offer intensive writing-related support for students.

Writing centers often act as a hub of student learning on campus (Carpenter, Valley, Napier, and Apostel). Though Writing Center researchers attempt to stay abreast of best learning practices for the students they serve, they often do not take these practices into account when training their writing consultants or tutors. HIPs are a higher education strategy that can easily be transmitted into writing center programming and pedagogy. But instead of evolving along with educational practices, some writing centers have become stagnant in their professional development. Writing centers should draw on theories or pedagogies across the disciplines, as in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, to construct more meaningful instruction and materials.

Course-embedded writing support programs are a relatively new initiative in writing center services. Therefore, many of the publications on course-embedded programs do cover more practical, logistical concerns rather than approaching the CEC's role from a theoretical standpoint. Writing studies, including writing center scholarship, should work to integrate theory and practice. If practice is considered the "what happened," theory often provides the answer of "why." Approaching writing center studies in this way is beneficial for two reasons. First, theory provides backing and a deeper understanding to the practical struggles and successes that writing centers have on a daily basis. Second, theory is often considered to be the foundational justification for the various disciplines; therefore, writing center researchers should integrate theory into their research and writing for this type of scholarship is rigorous, important academic work.

I have worked with Eastern Kentucky University's CEC program since its genesis in 2013 and have had the opportunity to experience the Noel Studio's CEC program at a variety of levels. I began as a CEC in a traditional first-year writing classroom. As a CEC, I have worked with a variety of developmental and first-year writing classes, including ENG 090, 095R, 101R, and 101. ENG 090 is the school's lowest remedial English class. The R-courses (095R and 101R) are designated as reading-intensive courses. Students in these classes just missed the benchmark for either ENG 101 or 102, the introductory English class is that all students must take at Eastern (unless the student acquired credit previously).

During my third semester of working as a CEC, I took an interest in writing center studies and began working closely with the Noel Studio's writing coordinator. At this

time, I mostly acted as a source of tactile knowledge, or ground-level, day-to-day CEC knowledge, and as a liaison between the writing coordinator and the CECs. Once I entered graduate school, my then sixth consecutive semester of consulting, I earned the title CEC Student Coordinator. In this role, I continued collaborating with the Writing Coordinator on Professional Development for the CECs, assessment, and scheduling. In addition, I organized professional development seminars for CECs and faculty. I also acted as a peer mentor for CECs. Ultimately, researching the connection between authority frameworks and CEC workspace helped build administrative understanding of the program and aided in developing training plans for future fellows and consultants. What began as wanting some strategies for feeling more comfortable in the classroom evolved into a single research question: What is the CEC's role in the classroom?

A CEC's relationship to space changes the power dynamic because they disrupt the common power binary in educational settings: the teacher and the student. Therefore, CECs must constantly negotiate power in relation to the political spaces within which they work. Based on a Foucaultian analysis of power ideologies and spatial rhetoric, I propose a training series for instructors, CECs, and their students. This series allows all participants to recognize, analyze, and work within the dynamics of the institutional power structures of authority, pedagogy, and space.

High-Impact Practices

The Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) instruction of HIPs have been widely tested and have produced high levels of student engagement. These HIPs help students engage in “deep approaches” to learning where “students who use these approaches tend to earn higher grades and retain, integrate, and transfer

information at higher rates” (Kuh 24). Aaron Thompson, a scholar of student success and organizational design, describes high-impact practices as “anything that someone has been able to do, and replicate it in such a way that engages students to the point of having the kind of outcomes they need to have; not just quantitative outcomes... but engaging them enough to feel like they are getting a quality education” (Morin and Stanley 13). This quality education comes from programs and initiatives, like a CEC program, that work to disrupt traditional academic learning models to help students achieve a deeper level of learning.

There are many ways to challenge traditional learning paradigms. At its most rudimentary level, instructors must believe that the mission of education “is not instruction but rather that of producing *learning* with every student by *whatever* means work best” (Barr and Tagg 13, their emphasis). Simply, it is not enough for instructors to provide instruction to students. Rather, instructors should integrate various HIPs into their own classrooms to produce meaningful learning for students. Instructors must have “a commitment to more shared responsibility for learning among students and teachers, a more democratic intellectual community, and more authentic co-inquiry” (Hutchings and Huber in Werder and Otis xii). In a CEC setting, the responsibility for learning is complicated by embedding a third person in the classroom for the sole purpose of helping students achieve a higher level of success and learning. Further, establishing a “democratic intellectual community” is imperative in a course-embedded classroom. Cooperating faculty members, CECs, and students all must work together to achieve deeper learning.

CECs themselves and their work in a writing support program work to break down traditional learning or classroom models. CECs often act as peer mentors, not just in the classroom but also to help students navigate college in general. Peer mentorships are one of the most valuable high-impact practices because they work to “make seamless what happens in the traditional student affairs area” (Morin and Stanley 16). The CEC acts both as a peer mentor and a writing expert; the dual nature of their role allows CECs to have the unique opportunity of teaching students academic discourse, both in their written work and in their identities as academics.

Course-Embedded Consultant Programs

Course-Embedded Consultant programs offer communication-related support for students. These programs are often housed in writing centers and vary heavily based on the context of the university (Carpenter, Whiddon, and Dvorak). Following different configurations to meet campus needs further complicates important and necessary professional development for embedded tutors. Table 1 offers a summary of three different CEC programs at representative university writing centers that engage in professional development beyond the introduction of a handbook. The table contrasts each program’s description, values, and approach to professional development.

Table 1 exemplifies the variety in professional development in modern writing centers. Two of the writing centers (Hobart and William Smith Colleges & Brigham Young University) require CECs to take a credit-bearing course on both practical and theoretical aspects of writing and/or tutoring. The third (Drew University) offers less formal seminars that center on more practical matters and discussions among CECs. These varied professional development configurations prompt several questions:

- How are CECs entering the classroom?
- How are writing support programs training CECs to intervene in student learning?
- How do classroom interactions translate into writing center interactions?

Table 1: Comparison of CEC programs across universities.

	Hobart and William Smith Colleges (Ristow and Dickerson)	Brigham Young University (Stock)	Drew University (Holly-Wells, Jamieson, and Sanyal)
Program Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate Writing Colleagues (WCs) • Embedded in required first-year seminars (interdisciplinary, writing intensive) and introductory classes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate fellows • Embedded in specific courses in the disciplines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate • Assisted students in mandatory small groups
Program Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WC selected based upon: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • course preparedness • relationship with peers • professionalism • growth mindset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration • assuming expanded roles in classrooms • act as writing center ambassadors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • triadic structure: learner-mentor-instructor • Work with everyone in the class, not just the “weaker” writers • Strong academic role models
Training Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full-semester course credit class. Covers both practical and theoretical • embedded after course completion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credit-bearing course. Covers praxis, theory, and common assignments • Begin tutoring after four weeks in the course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative • Weekly seminars discussion based, praxis and CEC concerns

Defining CECs

CECs are writing center consultants or tutors that work within the context of the classroom and the writing center to support students with their communication skills. CECs see students in multiple composing spaces. CECs are purposely embedded in the classroom to intervene in various types of student writing activities to support the student writer instead of the written product. CECs often are not discipline specific but are instead considered peer writing experts within the classroom. Beyond working on building communication skills, CECs work to “[enfranchise] students *as* students— as readers, writers, thinkers, time managers, capable doers” (Ottery et al. 64, their emphasis). CECs act as academic role models to the first-year students they serve.

The Noel Studio for Academic Creativity, Eastern Kentucky University’s writing center, piloted its version of the course-embedded consultant program in 2013. Noel Studio administrators and ECU’s Department of English & Theatre, specifically instructors working with basic writing and first-year writers, collaborated to develop the model used in the Noel Studio today. This model includes the co-requisite initiative supporting the reading-intensive ENG 095R and ENG 101R courses. Currently, Noel Studio CECs are embedded in basic reading intensive classes, exclusively consulting and working alongside students within their assigned course (Noel Studio for Academic Creativity 5).

Purposefully placed, CECs are embedded in classrooms as a retention initiative. CECs work with students who need more support and benefit from the mentorship style of CECs. This mentorship role is one of several HIPs achieved through the CEC program. Beyond working with student reading and writing, CECs work with students on

metacognitive, critical, and creative thinking. Practicing these skills with a non-evaluative peer allows students to begin mastering these skills early in their college career. Together, instructors and CECs can integrate HIPs to help students be successful in the first-year writing classroom and beyond.

Instructors of these developmental writing classes collaborate and negotiate with Noel Studio staff—responding with their concerns and understanding of student needs toward successfully integrating a CEC into the classroom. English Department instructors bring both institutional and ground-level viewpoints to working with CECs in and out of the classroom. Cooperating faculty members should work alongside CECs and writing center administration to consider best pedagogical practices when integrating CECs. With the integration of CECs, the process of thinking and communicating in and out of the classroom must be analyzed through a pedagogical lens. Communication cannot be taught nor discussed without first allowing for thinking to happen and be discussed; CECs open up the process of communication.

CHAPTER 2

CONNECTING SPACE AND POWER

Because a CEC's relationship to space changes the power dynamics, this project aims to analyze both the *space* and *place* that CECs occupy when working with students. Space and place, then, must be distinguishable. Space is the physical location or geography. Conversely, "place" is the humanistic aspect of space. Douglas Reichert Powell defines place as "discourse, the story itself, and rhetoric, what the story does. Place is performance, the act of telling the story and the reception, the act of hearing the story. Place, as it is, is past and present, and it is dependent on human intervention to have a future" (183). An area, then, moves from being a space to a place when humans enter and make meaning from the space. In other words, "[space] only becomes a place when human action... inscribes it with meaning and purpose" (Powell 132). Space is the physical landscape while places are created from space when humans put meaning to the geographical features (Tuan 18).

CECs work with students in two different spaces, effectively working to transform these spaces into places. CECs, along with their students and cooperating faculty member, create places by adding meaning to the abstract spaces of the writing center and the classroom. Further, these places are not fully abstract but rather a reality of the CEC's daily work. The culture, politics, and environment of the university play a vital role in how CECs turn their spaces into places. The policies and institutional infrastructure of the university establish how the various spaces on campus are operated. Moreover, the people that exist within the spaces impact the interactions—charging the

space with meaning and purpose. It is the CEC along with the students and cooperating faculty member or who construct places from the spaces in which they work.

When moving between spaces, CECs lose their innate authority from the writing center. Power relations are always implicated in spatial practices. This movement from the writing center to the classroom is difficult for CECs because the instructional setting “demands that they move beyond the role of the emissary to closer communicative contact and negotiation with teachers and students” (Corbett 88). Unlike general writing center consultation, work with the CECs can have an evaluative connotation, as meeting with CECs is often a part of the student’s grade. This sense of evaluation changes the classroom space because CECs are seen as having some authority over students’ grades; that is, students contact and negotiate with the CEC to set up and complete consultations, a responsibility that non-embedded consultants do not experience. The classroom setting demands structure, as opposed to freedom, in setting, keeping, and recording consultations.

According to Yi-Fu Tuan, “Freedom implies space; it means having the power and enough room in which to act” (52). People who have power or agency within a space are insiders, dwellers, belonging to the space while the space belongs to them. So, it is not enough to simply exist, or even work, within a space. Instead, for a person to dwell in a space, they must possess some sense of agency. The classroom inherently provides space to those who traditionally occupy its space—students and teachers. CECs, however, are not granted agency in a classroom without effort. Therefore, CECs must

work to make space for themselves in the classroom in order to gain insider access and possess some agency.

To gain freedom, and the agency that comes with freedom, David Harvey offers two options: “either submit to authority... or carve out particular spaces of resistance and freedom— ‘heterotopias’— from an otherwise repressive world” (Harvey 213). The Noel Studio, like other writing centers, is a heterotopia or third space. Offering a space that allows the work of a classroom, writing center, or independent learning space, the Noel Studio allows students to break free of the traditional classroom role. In these third spaces, students gain agency to take control of their own learning. Unlike the classroom, the Noel Studio does not carry as many political or power ideologies within the space itself. Where the classroom has a clear distinction of where students exist and where the instructor exists, the Noel Studio offers a fluid space with few rules: “students shape the space to fit their composing processes, they are also shaping the contexts in which they create” (Carpenter and Apostel). In this way, students feel as though they can take control of their own learning; students can move furniture, write on the whiteboard, and spread themselves across several spaces whatever they need to achieve a deep level of learning.

Discussion of power relationships in and out of the classroom cannot be fully addressed without the discussion of space, as “the organization of space can indeed define relationships between people, activities, things, and concepts” (Harvey 216). Discussing classroom dynamics through such a lens is simpler when the teacher and students are the only players. However, when CECs enter the space, the organization must adapt to become more complex. Consequently, CECs must negotiate spatial elements

to assert authority in the classroom. Something as seemingly simple as where the CEC sits in the classroom communicates much about the dynamic of the classroom.

In fact Michel de Certeau claims, “[spatial] practices in fact secretly structure the determining conditions of social life” (96). Specifically, de Certeau differentiates between “strategies” and “tactics” when considering power structures and struggles. Strategies, or the overarching frameworks set by the ruling institutions, offer the rules, objectives, or a God’s eye view of power structures. Tactics, on the other hand, include everyday or individual activities that contribute or work within the strategic framework. Importantly, the framework that strategy provides often limits tactics and the freedom those on a tactile level possess. The university’s infrastructure provides the classroom power binary (strategy) and the CECs break that binary, allowing for negotiating to happen at the tactical level.

While the Noel Studio is less constrained than a classroom, the space is still purposefully organized in a way that defines relationships between CECs and their students. In the Noel Studio, students gain control over their own learning and the “safe environment encourages play as a way of thinking about the composing process through a variety of modes and media” (Carpenter and Apostel). There are several spaces within the Noel Studio (like the Greenhouse and Invention Space, pictured in Figures 1 and 2) that serve different purposes for any step of the composing process. Regardless of space, the entire Noel Studio is designed to promote collaboration and creativity. CECs use the collaboratively charged spaces to set their own authority identity. CECs are viewed as peers in the Noel Studio because the space allows CECs to be on the same level as the

students, both figuratively and literally. In other words, the CECs gain their peer mentor authority from the Noel Studio's spaces themselves.

If, as Foucault maintains, space is a container of social power, then space must be organized to reflect social power (Harvey 255). Furthermore, "[social] space is a social product... the space thus produced also serves as a tool of thought and action... it is also a means of control, and hence of domination/power" (Lefebvre 26). Therefore, power structures surrounding and within the classroom and writing center should be questioned when discussing space.

CEC programs ask students and faculty to intentionally and productively fracture these channels of power. In his well-known text *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault argues that humanity is inscribed with power dynamics. Much like other the HIPs, actively questioning institutional structures advances student learning and critical thinking. Foucault's assessment of power ideologies provides a methodology of examining implicit, engrained power structures in a university setting.

Discipline produces docile bodies (Foucault 138). In this production of docile bodies, "[each] individual has his own place; and each place its individual" (Foucault 143). CECs do not have a set place in the classroom; they have to identify one for themselves while still trying to fulfill the expectations of those who work with them, both teachers and students. CECs' existence in the classroom innately challenges this discipline. People are trained to behave within certain structures, like the teacher/student binary. Foucault discusses the classroom within these power structures, describing the classroom as an example of control and efficiency. The classroom acts like an assembly line of sorts by "assigning individual places... made possible the supervision of each

individual and the simultaneous work of all” (147). CECs defy this power dynamic, as they do not fit clearly into one of the two individual places in the classroom. The CEC’s presence can make the efficient machine that is the classroom to run differently, forcing uncomfortability with the power structure that previously went unnoticed. The ambiguity of the CEC’s authority furthers this uncomfortable questioning of power structures. The CEC possesses more authority than a student in the classroom but less authority than the teacher.

Often, the classroom is divided into a strict power binary of teacher vs. student because “space tends to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed” (Foucault 143). Traditional classrooms contain two bodies: teacher and student. The course-embedded classroom, however, gains the third body of the CEC. These complicated spatial considerations force CECs to create their own section in the classroom, which traditionally contains two polar roles. Instructors and students are reluctant to make a new space because the power ideologies have been engrained as a part of the education system. CECs must make space for themselves in the classroom; therefore, it is important to inform students in the classroom about these ideologies and negotiations that occur when a CEC becomes a part of the classroom dynamic. Informing students about these ideologies and inviting them to take part in the negotiations of working with a CEC in a classroom setting is vital if the CEC is to be fully integrated in the classroom.

CHAPTER 3

THE CEC'S (WORK)SPACE

Eastern Kentucky University's CECs work in two different places, or regions: the basic writing classroom and the Noel Studio. CECs must constantly negotiate between these two spaces when working with their first-year writing students. Combining theories on space/place (specifically social spaces and space construction) and Foucault's theories on power structures provides a unique framework for analyzing a CEC's interactions within the writing center and the classroom.

The Noel Studio

The Noel Studio is an "integrated support service for writing, communication, and research" for students and faculty at ECU ("About the Noel Studio"). Carpenter, Valley, Napier, and Apostel define a studio space as an "interactive space that encourages effective communication design through creative thinking, integrative collaboration, and visual thinking" (329). The Noel Studio's interpretation of studio space is featured in Figure 1. Large, bright, colorful open spaces greet students, encouraging them to collaborate, play, and learn. The Noel Studio is a studio space that is "an optimal learning environment where students (at times *side-by-side* with faculty) experiment with composition concepts and strategies in mind" (Carpenter and Apostel, my emphasis). The Noel Studio, then, does not adhere to ideas and spatial structures of traditional academic spaces. Instead, academics (including students, CECs, and faculty alike) work side-by-side to create and compose.



Figure 1. The Greenhouse: A Flexible Space

Figure 2 exemplifies this side-by-side mentality of a Studio space, picturing a student and consultant working together in the Noel Studio.. Instead, academics (including students, CECs, and faculty alike) work side-by-side to create and compose.



Figure 2. The Invention Space: A Discovery Space

CECs consult with students from their embedded classes on class assignments within this space. The Noel Studio is designed to promote creativity and innovation and

includes movable furniture, whiteboards, high-tech spaces that allow digital collaboration, breakout spaces, etc. The diversity and amount of space that the Noel Studio offers allows for more flexibility when working with students.

This flexibility is advantageous to the CEC. Unlike the static, structured classroom, the Noel Studio's space encourages movement and autonomy, allowing both the CEC and the student to have the chance to decide which space best fits the assignment or needs at that point of the composing process. Often, CECs will ask students where they would like to hold the consultation. The Noel Studio promotes student ownership in consultations, but students often default to CECs because they see them as authority figures in the Noel Studio. The authority that the CEC holds in the Noel Studio is deferred to the teacher in the classroom.

The Classroom

Most writing classrooms at ECU, as well as other universities, are more structured than the Noel Studio. Figure 3 exemplifies a traditional writing classroom. The desks are arranged in rows and, while they are technically portable, they are difficult to arrange and students often do not feel enough ownership of the space to freely arrange furniture. The classroom includes one chalkboard that the instructor usually has sole control over. In addition, there is a clear distinction between the student space (back of the room) and the instructor's space (front of the room). These clear divisions and lack of open ownership of the space make it difficult for CECs to make their own place in the classroom. In this model, the space follows the binary of teacher and students.

Traditionally, the classroom has existed within the binary of teacher and student; CECs work in the space between student and teacher. While there have been initiatives to

shift some of the authority in the classroom from teacher to student, CECs still struggle to find their authoritative identity within this stark classroom binary. The classroom is, then, a structured, rigid space.



Figure 3. The Classroom: An Instructing Space

Integrating CECs into the classroom attempts to break down this rigid binary. Since a CEC does not have a clear role in the classroom, he or she often becomes a meddler-in-the-middle who work alongside students to (dis)assemble knowledge in and out of the classroom (McWilliams 287). Although this term is often used to describe the teacher, CECs work alongside students in “sense-making and joint problem-solving” (Mumford et al. 404). CECs “provide support and direction through structure-rich activity in which they themselves are highly involved. They do not take over the work of thinking and doing” (McWilliams 289). The CEC’s role as a meddler-in-the-middle allows the CEC to break down the teacher/student binary without completely fracturing the class. Instead, the CEC embraces the fluidity of his or her position by taking on some aspects of both the student and the teacher.

The CEC's role innately defies power structures because CECs exist in the gray area between teacher and student. Figure 4 depicts the course-embedded classroom triad. Teachers are situated at the top of the triangle because they maintain the highest level of authority in the classroom. Teachers gain their authority through their expertise and credibility but also through controlling the learning that occurs in the classroom. Teachers create the course and lesson plans as well as assesses student work. CECs, on the other hand, hold a non-evaluative role as a peer consultant. CECs can take on some authority in the classroom, as they are also communication experts. Still, CECs are students, just not a student of the classroom. CECs exist in both roles but do not fit clearly or completely into either role, so they remain outliers in the classroom because there is no set role outside of the rigid teacher/student binary.




Figure 4: The Classroom CEC Triad

The CEC entering the classroom is an opportunity to question and challenge prescribed institutional power structures and binaries. Instructors, students, and CECs benefit from acknowledging and adapting authority positioning in the classroom. Figure 5 exemplifies the types of authority shifts that can occur within the course-embedded classroom. In each graphic, an unlikely player is at the top of the pyramid—signifying a higher authoritative position. Importantly, though, CECs and students cannot attain this higher position of power without support from the other two groups. The arrows in Figure 5 represent participation of the two groups contributing to the higher authoritative position; if both parties do not contribute, the dynamic can become unbalanced or fail.




Figure 5: New Authoritative Identities

Conversely the CECs' authoritative position often is not questioned within the confines of the writing center. Because consultants are under the overarching authority of writing center administration and the university infrastructure, the authority within an individual consultation often defaults to the writing consultant. While both the CEC and the students are knowledgeable, the knowledge is “unbalanced” because the CEC acts as a

writing expert or authority (Smulyan and Bolton 46). However, this authority shifts between spaces. CECs often act as writing experts while students are content experts. This collaboration in expertise allows for more balance in the power dynamic. As featured in Figure 6, the relationship between the CEC and the student is much more balanced. The writing center acts as the primary context. CECs have more authority in the Noel Studio because they are in “control of the learning that happens in their [students’] tutoring sessions” (46). However, the classroom encompasses the writing center as a framework. Once CECs enter the classroom, they are relieved of being the main facilitator of learning.




Figure 6: The Writing Center Binary

Because CECs are not disciplinary experts (as teachers are), they are often learning content alongside their students. CECs learn and teach writing simultaneously (Corbett 95). Still, CECs are experts in communication and often take the educator role—facilitating mini-lessons, workshops, or peer reviews for their students. Though many course-embedded writing support programs promote peer learning the notion of

peer tutors is somewhat of an oxymoron. According to John Trimbur, once a person has some authority he or she is no longer considered a peer. CECs specifically are torn between their role as a student and their role as a communication expert that equates them (almost) to teachers (Trimbur 25).

CECs need some sort of authority or their placement in the classroom would be unnecessary. Furthermore, a CEC finds an authoritative identity more attainable when he or she “has [his/her] own place” in the classroom (Foucault 143). The CEC acts as an expert academic communicator while still maintaining the role of a student. Authority must come from a strategic and tactical level. According to Emily Hall and Bradley Hughes, CECs must “gain authority from an institutional standpoint (they need insider knowledge, need to complete scholarship, etc.) to really be able to help students develop their academic discourse” (32). This strategic level of authority creates space in the classroom for CECs to create their own space. Therefore, “tutors should be taught to recognize where the power and authority lie in any given tutorial, when and to what degree they have them, when and to what degree the student has them, and when and to what degree they are absent in any given tutorial” (Carino 109).

Professional development should prepare CECs for these dynamic spaces inscribed power structures. Simple acknowledgment and discussion of these spatial and authoritative concerns is a good start, but it is not enough. In addition, professional development should offer tactics for dealing with the power structures that come with the two CEC workspaces. Finally, professional development should include conversations between CECs and cooperating faculty members and give suggestions on how to further these discussions in the classroom with the students.

CHAPTER 4

THE CEC'S PLACE

Understanding spatial implications is vital in adapting and negotiating authoritative identity. CECs work in a space that is familiar and comfortable (the writing center) and a space in which they do not naturally fit (the classroom). Discussing spatial concerns gives concrete reasoning for certain power structures. In addition, understanding a CEC's relationship not only to the physical spaces but also the places in which he or she works helps CECs, instructors, and students work together to create these places together.

Since space takes on human interaction and becomes place, space is a social construction. Social construction of space begins with social invention. According to Douglas Reichert Powell, social invention is “a deliberate act of organizing the contingent constructions that one can discern into formations that serve some purpose, into representations that create a deliberate and assertive meaning rather than one defined purely by cultural and political contingencies” (Powell 58; 60). To perceive space as a social construct, Powell contends that humans construct the space around them to serve a purpose, to create *deliberate meaning*; therefore, space is constructed through culture and politics, to be sure, but the construction is done on an individual level to fulfill some higher purpose.

CECs break the previous constructions of classroom space by breaking down the power structure. The CEC's purpose is to produce better communicators by working one-

on-one with the student. Therefore, students, faculty members, and CECs must work together to reconstruct the classroom with the CEC's presence in mind.

Space, then, is a social product. In his book *The Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre describes spaces as social, that is, space is a product and it has societal implications: "(Social) space is a (social) product" (26). Lefebvre further defines social space as "a space [that] is not a thing but rather a set of relations between things (objects and products)" (83). Social space, then, ties the ideas of space and place together to consider how humans interact with space. Nedra Reynolds further explains Lefebvre's definition of social space, noting, "Metaphor and material are often divided to make it easier to discuss or distinguish them, but their combination and interaction creates social space" (14). Therefore, the material and metaphor, the seen and unseen, are needed to analyze space. Lefebvre's spatial triad considers both material and metaphor in an attempt to explain the science of space.

Lefebvre's spatial theory, a theorization of space as a social product, is broken down into three different categories. The first, Spatial Practice, is the perceived space. Spatial Practice is the material expression of space, meaning it simultaneously produces and appropriates both societal and daily routine spaces (Lefebvre 38). Second, Representation of Space is the conceived space that provides the metaphors of space, the verbal signs or codes within a space to create rules for the space (41). Finally, the third category is Representational, or lived, Space. This is the space in which humans actually exist; a lived space may or may not abide by the rules set by the conceived space (42). Lefebvre's conceptual triad is useful in analyzing various social spaces, but space functions in such a way that the three concepts are often indivisible. A CEC's work is

inherently spatial. Table 2 analyzes the two spaces that CECs work within (the classroom and Noel Studio) using Lefebvre's triad. The table includes examples of how CECs navigate or negotiate each space.

Table 2: Spatial Navigation of a CEC

Lefebvre's Space Triad	Classroom	Studio
Spatial Practice Perceived space Space that is sensually experienced	Ex. Wallace 428 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructors and CECs often do not get to choose the classroom they work in. 	Ex. Invention Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CECs and students have agency in choosing and using their work space meaningfully
Representation of Space Conceived space Metaphors, verbal signs, codes that create rules for the space	Ex. Teacher's desk at the front of the classroom. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes the instructor authority. Further perpetuates student/teacher power binary. 	Ex. Noel Studio pedagogy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants are peers Use space to promote learning
Representational Space Lived space May or may not abide by the rules set by the conceived space	Ex. CEC leads class in a group activity where students rearrange desks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working together to share authority in the classroom. Space can be manipulated to better share power in the classroom. 	Ex. Student writing on the whiteboard instead of the CEC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage students to take control of their learning Approaching learning as a peer Emphasizes student ownership of their work

Spatial Practice, Representation of Space, and Representational Space all work together to create the space and place in which students, CECs, and instructors operate. Students and CECs have more inherent authority in the writing center while traditional classroom spaces hold the teacher as the highest authority. In the writing center, CECs can encourage students to take on more authority in the classroom. In the classroom, however, both students and CECs gain authority through others' participation. The

physical space of both the classroom and the Noel Studio reflect the inherent power ideologies of the conceived space. CECs should recognize these inscribed spaces and understand how they affect student learning. However, these negotiations should not be done autonomously. Instead, CECs should approach these questions of space and power alongside students and instructors. Lived space is where CECs actively negotiate within and consider inscribed space. Since most navigation between perceived and conceived space occurs in the lived space, CECs must internally decide when to abide by or defy the rules established in the conceived space.

CECs are trained how to use studio pedagogy, which emphasizes not only the teaching practices used within the Studio, but also how spaces affect learning. Studio pedagogy emphasizes “openness and adaptability” to create a politically neutral place that “[invites] cross-disciplinary discussions that prompt divergent and convergent thinking” (Carpenter, Valley, Napier, and Apostel 329). CECs have been trained under this model of learning, or studio pedagogy, and conduct consultations in a studio environment. Furthermore, given the tools in professional development, CECs can gain confidence in their workspaces by discussing the power relations that are innate in the writing center and the classroom.

CHAPTER 5

PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING PLAN

CECs, then, must grapple with these questions of space, power, and authority. Professional development sessions offer a safe space for CECs to develop their knowledge about composition and consulting. These sessions provide an evaluation-free space in which all consultants share power and authority; consultants are encouraged to take control of their own learning. CECs gain much of their authority by simply acting as peer writing experts in and out of the classroom. In other words, their knowledge grants their authority. However, spatial considerations make professional development for CECs more challenging. Professional development often only occurs in the writing center, a space in which CECs are often more comfortable and feel confident asserting their authority. Although discussions and activities that cover the classroom experience help CECs and cooperating faculty prepare for their work in a course-embedded class, hands-on training for the classroom is nearly impossible in the writing center setting. Therefore, professional development that encourages a democratic approach to the classroom is imperative for successful CEC programs.

Professional development is one way to navigate these complicated issues of space and power. In the following sections, I propose a training plan for each of the three players in the course-embedded classroom: the cooperating faculty member, CEC, and student. Each of the proposed training plans is in a seminar setting. In the Noel Studio, the semester seminar series is complemented by an online professional development system, DECK (Developing Excellence in Consultant Knowledge). DECK is a scalable,

multimodal learning platform for consultants that is based on Bloom's Taxonomy. DECK includes resources for consultants, modules, outside reading materials, and consultant pages that can be used for activities and reflection. All Noel Studio academic consultants interact with DECK throughout the year, giving them the opportunity to take control of their own learning.

The sections below offer a brief description of training sessions for each individual group as well as a session that allows collaboration between the CEC and cooperating faculty member. Each session emphasizes the relationship between space and power and offers pragmatic tactics for working within spaces. In addition, sample seminar outlines and supplemental materials for each training sessions are included in the Appendices.

Collaborative Faculty Member Training

Cooperating faculty members should receive both theoretical and practical training. It is important for the faculty to understand the theory (strategy) as they are a part of the university's infrastructure and need a theoretical background to begin fracturing the power binaries. Faculty are also working on the ground level (tactic) and should therefore know how to recognize and work within questions of authority, space, and institutional power structures. So, I suggest a training model that encompasses the faculty member's need for practical, yet meaningful, professional development.

In the first of two workshops, faculty will discuss some of the theory behind the practice of working with CECs. Facilitators of this workshop guide the faculty in unpacking the question "Why does it feel awkward having a CEC in the classroom?" while also offering practical suggestions such as example policies, syllabus wording, and

ways of communicating with the CEC. In the second workshop, the faculty members and the CECs meet. The pairs discuss the syllabus, trade emails, decide on meeting times, and set expectations for the semester.

CEC Training

General writing center training does not necessarily prepare students for embedded tutoring (Nicolas). Therefore, professional development for CECs must be tailored to their work in and out of the classroom. CECs are originally trained under studio pedagogy and must learn to develop strategies for shifting their studio pedagogy to working within the classroom.

Overall, CEC training should take a practical approach. Dedicating one training seminar and some ongoing conversation is a realistic goal when considering CEC training. There are more options for deeper discussion with CECs if they are required to participate in course credit training. Appendix B includes a sample facilitator guide for discussing space, power, and authority shift with CECs.

The training is organized by space and asks CECs to consider how their authority shifts when they move between each space. Furthermore, CECs should discuss their role in the classroom and how that role establishes their authority in and out of the classroom setting. If possible, CECs should complete some preliminary reading about power, space, and/or authorities. Such selections may include many of the works cited within this text: Foucault, Lefebvre, and de Certeau, among others.

Faculty Member and CEC Collaborative Training

CEC professional development should offer at least one session in which faculty and CECs work together. If the process of negotiating authority is supposed to be made

clear to all the players in a CEC classroom, then this session is of the utmost importance. Instructors should be learning alongside the CEC. A one-shot professional development session that includes both CECs and faculty members would allow for acknowledgment, discussions, and planning that consider power and space in the classroom.

Student Training/Informational Session

Training cannot end with the instructors and the CECs. Students are a vital factor when considering space and power because they are a major player in the classroom binary (or triad when considering the CEC). Students must be informed and prepared to work alongside the CEC in the classroom and in the writing center. Students in course-embedded courses should be prepared to work with a CEC throughout the semester since “learners need strategies for entering unfamiliar areas or ways to recognize the politics of space enacted in various places” (Reynolds 4). One strategy is informing students about the institutional power structures and binaries that occur in and out of the classroom (specifically when concerning CECs). Such preparation includes introducing the CEC on the first day of classes, going over the CEC’s role and expectations, and the purpose behind having a CEC in the classroom. It is crucial that the preparation work happen in the first class period that the CEC attends to establish quickly and clearly the purpose of the CEC.

The student information session does not need to be as intensive as those sessions for the CEC and cooperating faculty members; however, the session should acknowledge the classical classroom power binary (teacher vs. student) and how the CEC works to break down that binary. Furthermore, the student information session should discuss the two spaces that students will work in with their CECs. The information

session's goal is to make the process of working with the CEC as transparent as possible—effectively reducing the barrier between students and CECs. Appendix C includes an informational sheet along with a Prezi to help facilitate informing students about working with a CEC.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The CEC's role innately questions traditional values of power and space. The ambiguity of the CEC's role, especially in the classroom, is often left unacknowledged. There is no readily available, simple fix for the questions of space or power; however, the answer sought may not be so much a fix as much as a constant negotiation. Because each classroom is a temporary space, CECs and cooperating faculty members must collaborate on power and space in the classroom with each new set of students in new semesters. Until the existing institutional power binary ideologies begin to break down, CEC negotiations will be ongoing.

Negotiating is a positive and reasonable solution, if the only solution. Negotiating forces all the players in a CEC program (from administration to the student) to think about the power structures and why they are assumed in a university setting. Negotiating power and space may not reach a definitive resolution; in fact, a resolution may not be possible within a single semester of work. However, acknowledging that negotiations must be discussed is a start. Conversation among students, CECs, cooperating faculty, and writing center administration will begin working towards a resolution, if one can be reached. Professional development seminars and workshops are the perfect environment to facilitate these negotiations.

Furthermore, course-embedded writing programs change the way academia views peer learning. High-impact practices like peer mentorship and allowing students to take control of their own learning are evident in such interventional writing programs.

The current university infrastructure is ready to be fractured and broken down. Educating CECs, instructors, and students about these powerfully charged spaces through professional development will encourage democratic, shared responsibility of student learning. Continued growth of such programs and their attendant breaking down of power structures will only work to benefit undergraduate student scholarship.

Works Cited

- “About the Noel Studio.” *The Noel Studio for Academic Creativity*. Eastern Kentucky University, <http://studio.eku.edu/>. Accessed 5 Dec. 2016.
- Association of American Colleges & Universities. “High-impact educational practices.” *Aacu.org*. <https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips>. Accessed 5 May 2016.
- Barr, Robert. B., and John Tagg. “From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education.” *Change*, vol. 27, no. 6, 1995, pp. 12-25.
<http://www.smith.edu/deanoffaculty/Barr%20and%20Tagg%201995.pdf>.
Accessed 5 May 2016.
- Carpenter, Russell, and Shawn Apostel. “A Space to Play, A Space to Compose: A Model for Creative Collaborations and Composition Practices.” *Making Space: Writing Instruction, Infrastructure, and Multiliteracies*, edited by James P. Purdy and Danielle Nicole DeVoss, University of Michigan Press/Sweetland Digital Rhetoric Collaborative,
<http://www.digitalrhetoriccollaborative.org/makingspace/ch6.html>. Accessed on 5 Dec. 2016.
- Carpenter, Russell, Leslie Valley, Trenia Napier, and Shawn Apostel. “Studio Pedagogy: A Model for Collaboration, Innovation, and Space Design.” *Cases on Higher Education Spaces: Innovation, Collaboration, and Technology*, edited by Russell Carpenter, Information Science Reference, 2013, pp. 313-329.
- Carpenter, Russell, Scott Whiddon, and Kevin Dvorak. “Guest Editor Introduction: Revisiting and Revising Course-Embedded Tutoring Facilitated by Writing Centers.” *Course-Embedded Writing Support Programs in Writing Centers*, a

- special issue of *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2014, <http://www.praxisuwc.com/from-the-guest-editors>. Accessed 5 Dec. 2016.
- Corbett, Steven J. "Negotiating Pedagogical Authority: The Rhetoric of Writing Center Tutoring Models and Methods." *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2013, pp. 81-98.
- De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall, University of California Press, 1984.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books, 1995.
- Hall, Emily, and Bradley Hughes. "Preparing Faculty, Professionalizing Fellows: Keys to Success With Undergraduate Writing Fellows in WAC." *WAC Journal*, vol. 22, 2011, pp. 21-40. *MLA International Bibliography*. Accessed 26 May 2016.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Blackwell, 1989.
- Holly-Wells, Jennifer, Sandra Jamieson, and Maya Sanyal. "From Silos to Synergies: Institutional Contexts for Writing Fellows." *Course-Embedded Writing Support Programs in Writing Centers*, a special issue of *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2014, <http://www.praxisuwc.com/holly-wells-et-al-121>. Accessed 5 Dec. 2016.
- Kuh, George. *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*. Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2008, https://keycenter.unca.edu/sites/default/files/aacu_high_impact_2008_final.pdf
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Wiley-Blackwell, 1992.

- Liu, Barbara Little, and Holly Mandes. "The Idea of a Writing Center Meets the Reality of Classroom-Based Tutoring." *On Location*, pp. 87-101.
- McWilliams, Erica L. "Teaching for Creativity: From Sage to Guide to Meddler." *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 281-293.
- Morin, Courtnie and Candace Stanley. "Connecting High-Impact Practices, Scholarly and Creative Teaching, and Faculty Development: An Interview with Dr. Aaron Thompson." *Journal of Faculty Development*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2017, pp. 13-18.
- Mumford, Michael, Samuel Hunter, Dawn Eubanks, Katrina Bedell, & Stephen Murphy. "Developing Leaders for Creative Efforts: A Domain-Based Approach to Leadership Development." *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 17, 2007, pp. 402-417.
- Nicolas, Melissa. "A Cautionary Tale about Tutoring Peer Response Groups." *On Location: Theory and Practice in Classroom-Based Writing Tutoring*, edited by Candace Spigelman and Laurie Grobman, Utah State UP, 2005, pp. 112-125.
- Noel Studio for Academic Creativity. *Course-Embedded Consultant Handbook 2016-2017*. 2016.
- Ottery, Jim, Jean Peterolle, Derek John Boczkowski, and Steve Mogge. "Writing and Reading Community Learning: Collaborative Learning among Writing Center Consultants, Students, and Teachers." *On Location: Theory and Practice in Classroom-Based Writing Tutoring*, edited by Candace Spigelman and Laurie Grobman, Utah State UP, 2005, pp. 60-71.

- Powell, Douglas Reichert. *Critical Regionalism: Connecting Politics and Culture in the American Landscape*. The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Reynolds, Nedra. *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.
- Ristow, Ben and Hannah Dickerson. "(Re)Shaping a Curriculum-Based Tutor Preparation Seminar: A Course Design Proposal." *Course-Embedded Writing Support Programs in Writing Centers*, a special issue of *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2014, <http://www.praxisuwc.com/ristow-dickinson>. Accessed 5 Dec. 2016.
- Smulyan, Lisa and Bolton, Kristin. "Classroom and Writing Center Collaborations: Peers as Authorities." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, spring/summer 1989, pp. 43-49. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43444125>, JSTOR. Accessed 5 Dec. 2016.
- Stock, David. "Curricular Collaboration, Programmatic Collision: Challenges to Integrating Tutor Training for Writing Centers and Writing Fellows Programs." *Course-Embedded Writing Support Programs in Writing Centers*, a special issue of *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2014, <http://www.praxisuwc.com/stock-121>. Accessed 5 Dec. 2016.
- Trimbur, John. "Peer Tutoring: A Contradiction in Terms?" *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 7, no. 2, spring/summer 1987, pp.21-28. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43441837>. Accessed 5 Dec. 2016.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Werder, Carmen and Megan M. Otis, editors. *Engaging Student Voices in the Study of Teaching and Learning*, Stylus Publishing, 2009.

Appendices

APPENDIX A:
Collaborating Faculty Member Training

Faculty Training #1: Working with a CEC (1 hr)

- Introductions, description of program, purpose of training
- Look over CEC syllabus¹ together and discuss the CEC's role both in and out of the classroom
- Interacting with a CEC in the classroom




Figure 7: Various Classroom Dynamics with a CEC

- What situations allows for the classroom dynamic to shift? (Student presentations, peer reviews, workshops, CEC mini-lessons, etc.)
 - Theory: Why does it feel awkward to have a CEC in the classroom?
- Foucault: power dynamic & DeCereau/Powell/Tuan: place/space
 - Practice: How to overcome the awkward and make CEC presence in the class meaningful

¹ See Appendix D: Supporting Materials

1. Negotiate with CECs: What role do they want vs. what role you want them to have in the classroom—think observer vs. facilitator
2. Open discussion to students: Use the CEC syllabus and Prezi²
3. Introduce CEC and his/her role on the first day of class
4. Integrate the CEC in the classroom: mention the CEC frequently in class and use the CEC in activities and discussion
5. Continue negotiation and conversation throughout the semester

² See Appendix C: Student Training/Informational Session for more information

Faculty Training #2: Norming Session and Meeting CEC (2 hrs)

- Welcome: Intro, agenda
- Norming Session
 - Purpose: Setting expectations of work that the CEC will complete with students outside of class. Making sure everyone is on the same page.
 - Discuss how CECs are trained to consult (Socratic method, HoCs/LoCs)
 - Read a prompt and a sample student essay. Mark comments as you go,
 - When finished, make a list of the top 3 strengths and 3 areas that need improvement.
 - Discuss lists and compare faculty list to CEC's list.
- BREAK
- CEC and Cooperating Faculty Members Meet and Greet
 - Time to go through logistics and classroom dynamic such as meeting times, classroom roles, expectations, assignments, communication methods, CEC being added to digital learning platforms, etc.

APPENDIX B:
CEC Training

CEC Training #1: Working in a Course-Embedded Class (1 hr)

- Needs to be done before meeting the faculty members
- Welcome: Intros, program overview
 - Course: Which courses will tutors be embedded in?
 - Embedded: A part of the course structure
 - Consultant: Noel Studio academic consultant
 - Purpose of this program: retention program; supporting student communication skills
- Working in the First-Year Writing Classroom
 - C.U.F exercise. Ask CECs what they are most confident about, unsure of, and filled with dread about when thinking about working in a First-Year Writing classroom.
- A brief theory overview to provide the “why” for the “what” of course-embedded classroom dynamics.
 - Power dynamics & Space have inscribed meaning
- Practical Suggestions: Best Practices
 1. Discuss these issues and negotiate not only with cooperating faculty member, but also with students.
 2. Use CEC syllabus to set expectations early.
 3. Keep conversations going with the instructor and students.
 4. Embrace uncertainty: stepping outside of your comfort zone can be an opportunity for growth.
 5. Ask a seasoned CEC and/or staff member for advice.

CEC Training #2: Norming Session and Meeting Faculty (2 hrs)

- Welcome: Intro, agenda
- Norming Session
 - Purpose: Setting expectations of work that the CEC will complete with students outside of class. Making sure everyone is on the same page.
 - Discuss how CECs are trained to consult (Socratic method, HoCs/LoCs).
 - Read a prompt and a sample student essay. Mark comments as you go.
 - When finished, make a list of the top 3 strengths and 3 areas that need improvement
 - Discuss lists and compare faculty list to CEC's list.
- BREAK
- CEC and Cooperating Faculty Members Meet and Greet

Time to go through logistics and classroom dynamic such as meeting times, classroom roles, expectations, assignments, communication methods, CEC being added to digital learning platforms, etc.

CEC Training #3: Troubleshooting (1 hr)

- This seminar should be conducted about 4-5 weeks into the semester
- DECK content (to be reviewed before seminar)




Figure 8: DECK Power and Space Module




Figure 9: Noel Studio ThingLink

- Welcome and discussion of week/work
- Because CECs are often isolated in their work, it is important to give them time to discuss any successes or issues with their class at the beginning of each training session.

- Mostly discussion based training where CECs control the bulk of the conversation. This helps the facilitator to know 1) what is actually occurring in the classroom and 2) what the CECs need guidance on.
- A few key points to go over:
 - Reminder to keep conversations going about classroom dynamic, power structures, and space (especially with instructor).
 - Space is inscribed with meaning—try to use space purposefully in and out of the classroom.
 - Provide programmatic tips for struggling CECs. Offer to meet with the CEC and faculty member for mediating sessions, if necessary.

APPENDIX C:
Student Training/Information Session

Student Training/Informational Session

- Introduce CEC and explain purpose of having CEC in class.
- CEC explains role in and out of the classroom using syllabus .
- Discuss classroom dynamic and CEC process by guiding students through the informational Prezi.
- Prezi: goo.gl/p8y41Q

APPENDIX D:
Supporting Materials

CEC Syllabus

CEC: Courtnie Morin

Email: courtnie_morin@mymail.eku.edu

What is a CEC?

A CEC (Course-Embedded Consultant) is embedded in sections of ENG 101R, and ENG 095R and work exclusively with students in the assigned section.

What does a CEC do?

- * Attends the class
- * Joins group discussions
- * Consults with students in the Noel Studio to help: find strategies for learning, discuss readings, work on any step of the writing process for assignments, project/presentation help, etc.
- * Facilitates group work
- * Conducts workshops in and out of the classroom
- * Assists with other academic problems related to reading and writing

What will a CEC not do?

- * Grade papers, make suggestions about grading, or make any grade-affecting decisions
- * Evaluate specialized course content in student papers
- * Work with any other course work other than that of the ENG class, unless preapproved by the instructor
- * Serve solely as copy editors or edit papers for students
- * Teach the class in place of the instructor

Making Consultations

- * To the right are my office hours. I will be in the Noel Studio during these times every week. If none of these times work for you, let me know and we will figure out a time for you.
- * Office hours are completely open to students. You are more than welcome to come to my office hours without an appointment. However, if you do not make an appointment before coming in, I cannot guarantee I will be able to meet with you.
- * To Make a Consultation, you may:
 - Email me
 - Talk to me in person, before or after class.

OFFICE HOURS

Sunday: 2-5

Tuesday: 12-5

Wednesday: 4-7

Thursday: 12-5

Communication

- * Please let me know if you need to cancel, reschedule, or will be late to a consultation.
- * I will respond to emails within 24 hours on weekdays, 48 hours on weekends, as a general rule.
- * Remember that you must have 8 appointments with me throughout the semester and at least one appointment per major essay.