

Pausing in the Whirlwind: A Campus Place-Based Curriculum in a Multimodal Foundation Communication Course

Barbara J. Blakely and Susan B. Pagnac

[P]lace is pause; each pause in movement makes it possible for location to be transformed into place.

—Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place*

ABSTRACT

A campus place-based first-year curriculum operationalizes campus place, not as a neutral backdrop that students pass through on their way to a vocation, but as a purposeful assemblage of physical, verbal, and natural artifacts that play an important role in students' adjustment process and in their higher education journey. The curriculum described here is based on David Gruenewald's observation that "place is profoundly pedagogical" (621); it activates the campus itself pedagogically, providing students opportunities for pausing, exploring, researching, and sharing place-based discoveries in multiple modes in our Communication Across the Curriculum program. Now the standard curriculum in our first-level course, it successfully addresses two issues of interest to WPAs: establishing a stable-but-generative curriculum that provides consistency across many sections while allowing innovation and choice for students and instructors. This curriculum promotes and enhances students' understanding of their new campus-as-place—its mission, history, art, architecture—through multimodal communication assignments. A place-based curriculum both assists students in their transition to the university and helps them to identify their goals in the context of the university's—and their own—past, present, and future by allowing meaningful communication projects.

INTRODUCTION

In summer 2010—just before the fall semester in which we piloted the campus place-based curriculum we describe in this article—a new sculpture appeared on our campus. *Whirlwind*, by artists Andrea Myklebust and Stanton Sears, is a wholly fitting visual metaphor for the writing program curriculum we describe in this article. Iowa State University’s extensive Art on Campus program captures the meaning of the sculpture—the impact of the university experience on students:

Whirlwind is an elongated cyclone swirling with imagery and activities prevalent at the Memorial Union. Students may picture themselves at the base of the columnar sculpture where a tiny Iowa landscape, a specific reference to Grant Wood, is shown on a bubble-shaped patch of land. The students can imagine the history, energy, and enthusiasm of campus life sweeping them into a towering tornado. (Art on Campus, “*Whirlwind*”)

For campus pedestrians without ready access to the online fact sheet, the artists themselves state the work’s meaning on the sculpture’s base: “Going to college should pick a person up and set him or her down in a new place with new ideas and a deeper understanding of the world” (“Traditions”).

Place was the topic of a recent thread on the WPA listserv as one writer asked for assistance in locating a “theory of place” for an Honors first-year writing course he was planning. Amidst the suggestions of readings—many from literature and environmentalism—one comment seemed to sum up our field’s interest in place: “I wish I were teaching this course”! (Brueggemann “Theories”). Certainly, “place” can mean everything from a patch of land in our backyards, to the neighborhood or rural acres from which we come, to the vanishing tall-grass prairie, to an urban environment, to online cyber-communities—and that flexibility alone makes place a fascinating and productive curricular concept for WPAs. In this article, we focus on a particular place—the university campus—and its curricular benefit for its particular students and their instructors. In our work with new first-year students and (not incidentally) the new TAs who teach ISU-Comm Foundation courses at Iowa State University, a land grant university (enrolling nearly 29,000 in 2010, the year we piloted this curriculum), our objective was two-fold as we embarked on this project:

1. to develop a consistent, coherent, relevant curriculum for the first in a two-course sequence of foundation communication courses

(approximately 80 sections of which are offered each year), one with no lack of rich material readily accessible for students; and

2. to accomplish the objectives of this course with a stable-yet-generative curricular framework that allows room for both instructor and student innovation and choice as new students grapple with the successive approximations of academic discourse David Bartholomae calls “inventing the university” (134).

Important to our thinking about this curriculum is Larry Beason’s assertion that “a sense of place” is important for its ability to engender “[p]lace attachment, or a feeling of rootedness . . . a powerful human need that helps people connect and ‘be themselves’” (150). Beason cites sociologists Lee Cuba and David Hummon who reiterate that a sense of place “involve[s] a sense of shared interests and values . . . bringing a sense of belonging and order to one’s sociospatial world” (qtd. in Beason 150). While Beason notes that such a feeling of rootedness is important for its affective value in an instructor’s pedagogy, this study links curricular place-conscious work in the foundation communication class to the same feelings of attachment, belonging, and order to positive results for first-year students as well. Synthesizing scholarship from several disciplines—that of campus planners, architects, landscape designers, environmental educators, specialists in student development and in higher education, environmental psychologists, compositionists, and social psychologists—we develop a “theory of place” (as sought in the WPA listserv) that supports a stable and consistent, yet generative, first-year curriculum that is exciting and beneficial for new students and permits a successful inaugural teaching experience for new TAs in communication programs.

Specifically, a campus place-based foundational communication curriculum operationalizes campus place not as a generic, neutral backdrop that students pass through on their way to a vocation, but as a purposeful and rich assemblage of physical, verbal, and natural artifacts that play an important role in students’ adjustment process and in their higher education journey. The writing program curriculum described here takes as its primary principle place-based educator Thomas Gruenewald’s observation that “place is profoundly pedagogical” (“Foundations” 621); it activates the campus itself pedagogically, providing students opportunities for pausing, exploring, researching, and sharing place-based discoveries and insights in multiple twenty-first-century communication modes. Now the standard curriculum in the first of our two-level foundation communication series at Iowa State University, it contextualizes the whirlwind of changes and chal-

lenges new university students experience—characterized by one scholar as the ongoing balance of tranquility and activity (Griffith 645). This equipoise, this trope of stability balanced with transformation, is described by campus architect Richard Dober in the last decade of the twentieth century, and the notion is remarkably consonant with the function and characteristics of the curriculum itself: “Intellectually, higher education depends on balancing the forces of continuity and change, a fundamental in defining . . . a campus architecture rooted in reality and imagination (34). This echoes the sentiment, expressed sixty years earlier, of landscape architect Ernest E. Walker: “Gathered here are the forces that . . . fit new thoughts to new conditions” (qtd. in Dober 35). The campus place-based curriculum is also stable yet generative, in ways that we believe make it useful and exciting for WPAs.

The stability we sought in creating this curriculum is a response to practical realities faced by many WPAs of large (and not-so-large) writing programs. One is the benefit of consistency and coherence among many sections of the same course. While this doesn’t require a lockstep approach to curricula, it does mean that Iowa State University’s Communication Across the Curriculum (CAC) program (called ISUComm) at the foundation courses level has stated objectives and standard assignments/projects for achieving those objectives (some of which are listed below). While there are multiple ways of achieving the goals, with a significant staff of TA and non-tenure-track faculty instructing these two courses, it is important to create a curriculum that works with a standard, rhetorical, genre-based text and which can be adopted (and adapted) relatively easily by instructors. *Stability* in this context also means that course content—what Johnathon Mauk calls the “material-discursive where” (379)—is readily accessible, from the physical campus with signage and beckoning places for pausing and noticing; to an Art on Campus program that provides plentiful artifacts to visit, online material to read for further information, and guided educational tours; to library archives that provide both online and physically accessible information about campus history, people, and architecture; to many programs and organizations that embody the university’s land grant mission.

Balanced with these components that provide curricular stability, the campus place-based curriculum is also generative because it offers countless opportunities for students and instructors both to augment and tailor it in various ways. For example, with this curriculum, students are able to investigate the heritage behind the buildings at Iowa State University. Two alumni—Carrie Chapman Catt, an instrumental player in the fight for women’s suffrage, and George Washington Carver, a groundbreaking African American scientist, have buildings named for them on our campus.

In the course of investigating these buildings, students could expand their learning beyond the physical places to the people behind them and the vital contributions these alumni made to society. The campus place-based curriculum's generative possibilities are also demonstrated in its having been adapted for two learning communities on our campus. Learning community sections of the first-level course are themed around specific majors. For the BEST/Genetics (biology, engineering, science, and technology) and Animal Science/Pre-Veterinary Medicine learning communities, the instructors modified this curriculum to focus on aspects of campus most interesting and useful to those students, with input from professors in the other academic areas. In both cases, the generative nature of our curriculum allows for a more specialized focus on particular majors and areas of study—and their attendant resources—on our campus.

The campus place-based curriculum we designed for the foundation courses at our land-grant university capitalizes on the progressive multimodal pedagogy (written, oral, visual, and electronic modes) of our CAC program, ISUComm. Developed in the 1990s and adopted by the university faculty senate ten years ago, ISUComm is unique in its application of five rhetorical concepts—context, substance, organization, style, and delivery—to written, oral, visual, and electronic communication modes, in ways that allow instructors and students to readily call upon the affordances of one mode while working primarily in another and to repurpose a project from one mode to another. For instance, a written project can become a visual project (brochure, poster, video) with an oral (presentation) component supported by the electronic mode (e.g., presentation slides). Our university is a residential campus, we have a significant international enrollment, and we offer our two foundation courses only in face-to-face formats, including conducting classes in a computer lab one day a week.

The synergy of the two initiatives, ISUComm and the campus place-based curriculum for the foundation courses described here, turns on students' understanding of their new campus-as-place—its mission, history, appearance, emphases, and initiatives—through meaningful multimodal communication assignments. The curriculum is designed to assist students in their critically important transition to post-secondary education; help them to identify their goals in the context of the university's and their own past, present, and future; and allow them both the valuable “learning to communicate” and “communicating to learn” practice that ISUComm promotes. Nancy Sommers and Laura Saltz use the metaphor of the threshold to describe the challenging transition new university students experience. They note, “[s]tudents are asked as freshmen to leave something behind and to locate themselves in the realms of uncertainty and ambiguity” (like the

action of a whirlwind), and they further note the “central role writing plays in helping students make the transition *to college*” (125; 127).

WHAT IS CAMPUS PLACE?

With competition for student enrollment, the term “campus place” easily brings to mind visions of glossy marketing materials full of stunning campus vistas laid out with historically and architecturally impressive buildings. Rhetorically, these images have tremendous iconic power in our culture to attract students to a place that visually so clearly says “higher education.” It can also conjure less positive but no less culturally resonant images of wildly partying students seemingly focused more on next weekend’s party than on their classes. Therefore, we differentiate from the outset our approach to the campus-as-place from these other readily recognizable concepts of campus: the “campus-as-brand” and the “campus-as-holding-pen.”

Campus-as-brand focuses on making a favorable if somewhat hazy impression on prospective students and their parents: “Families tend to come away from a campus tour with a strong instinct about the school, colored in large part by whether it matches the look and feel of the campus of their dreams . . . whether it truly has that storybook look and feel” (Geller and Corning). The homepages of all our campuses reveal that effort is necessarily devoted to developing an attractive, unified, and recognizable campus look—a “brand”—for recruitment purposes. In his study, Ernest Boyer found that “it was the buildings, the trees, the walkways, the well-kept lawns—that overwhelmingly won out. The appearance of the campus is, by far, the most influential characteristic during campus visits . . .” (17).

On the other end of the visually iconic continuum from “that storybook look and feel” is what we might call a holding-pen view of the campus. Made graphically unforgettable in the 1978 movie *Animal House*, this image is articulated a bit more genteelly by Sir John Daniels, vice chancellor of Britain’s Open University, when he described the campus as a place where students are sequestered while they work through a messy maturation process: “a protected environment where young people can come to terms with life, love, liquor and learning—while sparing the rest of the community the sight of these often unsightly processes” (qtd. in Burgan 2).

The conceptualization of campus place on which our foundation course curriculum is based is neither campus-as-brand nor campus-as-holding-pen. Rather, it is one informed by the work of campus planners, architects, landscape designers, environmental educators, and specialists in student development and in higher education, environmental psychologists, and social psychologists. Dober’s description of a campus as a physical and

organizational embodiment of an institution's mission—its approach, in other words, to the ongoing balance of tradition with change—describes the thematic core of our curriculum: stability and transformation. Campuses are “large groups of buildings and landscapes constructed over time and intended to be mutable environments responding to social and cultural needs” (Dober 166–67). Campuses are planned and designed to embody educational purpose and institutional mission and values in various ways (e.g., organizationally, in bricks and mortar); they are both a visible and symbolic link between the past, present, and future—of the institution, of knowledge, and of the students. A campus place-based curriculum spotlights and takes advantage of this link and of the central role of students' communication work within it.

William F. Sturmer, in one of the earliest articles delineating the connection between campus place and educational process, argues that the campus-as-place, the totality of its physical environment

simultaneously reflects and shapes, is both a response to and a cause of, the values and practices of an educational institution . . . The design and construction of the physical aspects of the university should complement and strengthen the mission of the university to stimulate students in the effective use of learning opportunities. (98 – 99)

Thus, while the stirring first impressions of a breathtaking, history-steeped campus may be the basis for a visiting first-year student's initial reaction, “it is through a deeper level of reaction to the qualities of the surroundings that campuses become places of substance, meaning, and beauty” (Reeve and Kassabaum 1). It is this deeper level that a campus place-based curriculum plumbs.

WHY CAMPUS PLACE? TRANSITION AND IDENTITY

An attractive campus today is too often thought of simply as a strategy for student admissions and retention, not as something central to the educational mission.

—David Schuyler, “Frederick Law Olmsted and the Origins of
Modern Campus Design”

The transition to being a successful university student is seen as a movement toward more generative and adaptive ways of understanding and being in the world, a process that happens on many levels and through many means beyond time spent in classrooms. The transition to and subsequent experience at the university is not just a time of limbo or a four-year layover on the road to the “real world.” Students are not just marking time while on

the way to someplace else; to view it in these reductionist terms overlooks the significant person-place relationship—what Irish poet Seamus Heaney aptly described as “the marriage between the geography of the mind and geographical places” (qtd. in Gruenewald, “Foundations” 626). Place is a central influence in our experiences and developing sense of self. However, rich, place-conscious opportunities—particularly as an instantiated part of the curriculum—can be overlooked. David Orr, a professor of environmental studies, asserts that “other than as a collection of buildings where learning is supposed to occur, place has no particular standing in contemporary education” (126). Place, says educational theorist Paul Temple, “is the largely unacknowledged independent variable in understanding how higher education institutions work” (“From Space to Place” 209). And educational theorist Michael Peters agrees: “modern educational theory has all but ignored questions of space, of geography, of architecture” (qtd. in Usher 53).

Discussions about campus place tend to be dominated by focus on recruitment and student engagement, leaving out the role that the first-year/foundational curriculum can play in making meaningful the link among the university mission statement, the physical campus, the institution’s history and trajectory, and how the student belongs. Yet scholars in student development, environmental and social psychology, architecture and design, and higher education tell us that campus arrangement, landscape, and architecture contribute significantly to the articulation and achievement of educational purposes. A campus “convey[s] visually a sense of purpose, place, order and quality” (Griffith 645). Moreover, a campus is a particular kind of place—as Thomas Gaines says in his book about campus designs: “the college campus has an ambience all its own . . . there is a there there” (x). Frederick Law Olmsted, the preeminent landscape architect and city planner of the second half of the nineteenth century, designer of several campus landscapes, believed passionately that place is an educational force (Schuyler 8). Olmsted was emphatic that attention paid to the campus-as-place was integral to students’ experience, that physical surroundings were fundamentally important to students’ education and to the kind of people they could become (Schuyler 2).

However, defining this ambience—the ineffable “there-ness” of campus visits—what C. Carney Strange, professor of higher education and student affairs, calls “the distinctive values and impressions we intuit from the very air we breathe in the setting” (299)—is both an exciting and a challenging endeavor, one that necessarily extends beyond the campus visit and the first week of orientation activities. Sam J. Fugazzotto, a specialist in educational leadership and policy, is perhaps more concrete (pun intended) when he notes that the effectiveness of an institution depends on its “structures

and cultures,” and that through mission statements and use of space, those structures and cultures become tangible (285). In our curriculum, this view of “effectiveness” and “tangibility” is useful in students’ perceptions of their work in the foundation communication class—the very beginning of their work at the university. Basing student work in campus place (art, architecture, landscape, history, and programs) we “ground[ed] learning in local phenomena and students’ lived experience” (Smith 586) in an effort to make their learning both tangible and effective: contributing to the adjustment process, creating interest and excitement about Iowa State University’s mission and its potential in their lives, and building knowledge of and skills in the rhetorical bases of written, oral, visual, and electronic communication.

As environmental scholars point out, we are often unaware of the significance of our places, both natural and built, and thus, our students’ new geographies, both external and mental, might go unremarked. Although literature professor Lawrence Buell notes our tendency not to see and articulate the value of “all that is to be noticed and expressed” in our environments, significantly, he also sees this stunted awareness as possibility—an “enabling ground condition as it becomes activated in the work of composition and critical reading” (22). Curriculum theorist Gillian Judson notes that neglect of place in education is “due in part to its ‘invisibility’: ‘the everyday,’ by its very nature, is difficult to grasp. Its very ‘normality,’ its very taken-for-grantedness,’ ‘all-around-us-ness,’ makes it elusive to pin down, to take stock of” (234). Yet Judson reiterates that research shows that “school spaces matter to students as they contribute to identity formation and sense of belonging in schools” (242).

An important component in this identity formation and sense of belonging, we find, is providing students an effective and tangible curricular context from which to grapple with questions most new college students are implicitly asking. Bioregionalist Robert Thayer lists these as “Who am I?” “Where am I?” and “What do I do?” (qtd. in Brooke and McIntosh 136). A fourth, related question students can productively explore in their first-year communication work is posed by Strange: “What is it like to be here?” (299). Strange argues that all aspects of the campus environment—constructed and organizational—are important to student adjustment, success, and literally and figuratively, finding their place in the institution and in their futures. Inasmuch as a campus is consciously designed to both reflect and influence student learning, and since, as social psychologists tell us, identity (one’s subjective sense of self) is clearly shaped by our “relationships to the various physical settings that define and structure day-to-day life” (Proshansky, Fabian, and Kaminoff 58), we are particularly encour-

aged by the potential of a campus place-based curriculum to counteract some of what Johnathon Mauk refers to as the “apparent placelessness” of many new college students (370). These students, who increasingly see college in entirely instrumental terms—a way to a job and a paycheck—can benefit from curricular work that “accounts for and engages the spatial and material conditions that constitute the everyday lives of students” (370).

Our campus-as-place curriculum creates a meaningful “material-discursive where” (Mauk 379) from which work in foundation communication classes connects students in deliberate ways to their university experience as a series of opportunities to pause in and notice their present, and to contemplate and begin preparing for their futures. This material-discursive where is especially important as it relates to relocation—the life-event new students are experiencing as they begin their time at the university. The going-to-college relocation is a voluntary one, a “conscious discontinuity” in environmental psychology terms (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell 218). The campus has been chosen as part of a new stage in life, but it is a relocation nonetheless. This singular fact offers an opportunity for work in foundation communication courses: while this conscious discontinuity is daunting and alienating, it also represents the development of new place attachment and new identity development.

In their work, environmental psychologists Kenny Chow and Mick Healey found that this particular relocation represented a significant moment: “Not only did the decision to move from home represent self-concept change but it also fostered the opportunity to develop new identities. Through seeing new places and different people and experiencing new situations a new perspective on life was acquired . . .” (366). In part, this relocation is negotiated through processes that environmental psychologists refer to as adjustment and familiarization, through which students “read” the campus in ways that connect it to their desires and needs (368). Similarly, Louis Attinasi, a professor of educational leadership and cultural studies, has studied student adjustment to this relocation and identifies common responses to the new campus place. Students overwhelmingly describe a perception of “bigness” in the physical, social, and academic “geographies” they are navigating (262). Resolving the new campus place into meaningful, logical spaces means everything from daily way-finding to connecting oneself to the larger trajectory the university represents in a marriage of physical and mental geographies referred to above.

HOW: PAUSING, MAPPING, RESEARCHING, SHARING THE CAMPUS PLACE

To be at all—to exist in any way—is to be somewhere, and to be somewhere is to be in some kind of place. Place is as requisite as the air we breathe, the ground on which we stand, the bodies we have. We are surrounded by places. We walk over and through them. We live in places, relate to others in them, die in them. Nothing we do is unplaced. How could it be otherwise? How could we fail to recognize this primal fact?

—Edward Casey, *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*

Students need time and opportunity in the form of meaningful communication work to assist their sense-making (familiarization and adjustment) processes. This academic space now contextualizes their writing, thinking, and living. Their new campus place is both literally and figuratively Buell's "enabling ground" (22) upon which students can begin to build their understanding about their connection to the stream of academic and local campus tradition and values which are ripe for activation in the first year or two of a student's transition to college. Architect Frances Halsband is eloquent about a campus place as enabling ground for this understanding. University campuses, she says,

have been carefully designed over decades, even centuries. They are places that speak to us of continuing care, thoughtful decision-making, reverence for tradition and ritual, and a harmony of nature, landscape, and architectural design. . . . Walking through the gates, we walk into the world of our future. (4)

To assist in adjustment to the university as well as to their entry into the educational trajectory the university represents, we asked our students to be cognizant of not only instantiations of care, decision-making, tradition, landscape, and architectural design, but of how these depict the nature and purpose of the institution, in this case, of Iowa State University and how this was meaningful to them as students at this particular institution.

Our study consisted of eight pilot sections of the first in the two-course sequence in the ISUComm Foundation Courses. Six graduate teaching assistants (TAs) were the instructors: two PhD TAs, experienced both with teaching and with the principles and pedagogy of ISUComm, taught four of the classes; the other four TAs were MA students, new to the English Department and were mentored closely by (and team-taught one day a week with) the experienced instructors. Since the goal was for the campus place-based curriculum to become the standard first-course fare in our

foundation courses, we were eager to know if it was readily useable by new TAs, who also are unlikely to be familiar with the ISU campus. A human subjects application submitted to the Institutional Review Board at Iowa State University's Office for Responsible Research was approved and nearly 100 students participated in the study, consenting to have their work in the course used as data and responding to some short follow-up questions at the end of the semester. The primary investigator and first author did not teach any of the classes or reveal to the six instructors who in their classes were participants in the study. In addition, the primary investigator was never aware of how a participant's paper/project was graded or responded to; she examined each submission only as an artifact of how the student engaged with the assignment and the campus place-based curriculum overall. The secondary investigator and second author (one of the two PhD TAs) taught two of the classes, mentored two new TAs, but learned who the student participants were only after the semester was over and final grades for all eight sections had been submitted, in accordance with our IRB form. The other PhD TA was centrally involved in planning the semester, creating materials, and mentoring two of the four new TAs. He did not examine data.

Envisioning the campus place-based curriculum metaphorically as a pebble tossed into a pond by a whirlwind of change, rippling outward from the center, we began the semester where our students were (and where they had just come from), with who they were and what they were experiencing at that particular time in their lives. They were, as Sommers and Saltz describe, on a threshold of leaving some things behind and adopting new ways of being and learning. Gradually, as the semester progressed, students explored more about their new campus place. Because the Iowa State University campus is very large, and adjustment to a relocation (moving from home to the university) typically presents challenges to students, we deliberately began the semester acknowledging the conscious discontinuity students experience when they move to the university by asking them to write about where they were from, allowing them to make that place attachment a starting point as they began navigating their new campus place.

As the descriptions of the communication projects below show, the assignments reflect common first-level course genres: letters, profiles, public documents, analysis and interpretation, and research. Several texts could complement this campus place-based curriculum inasmuch as the assignments are strongly rhetorically- and genre-based. Consonant with the Council of Writing Program Administrators' Outcomes Statement, ISU-Comm's mission is, in part, to "cultivate a full range of communication competencies: from critical reading practices to comprehensive research

methods; from clear prose to effective oral presentation; from the systematic analysis of textual, verbal, and visual media to the development, design, and delivery of well-reasoned arguments” (“Vision, Mission, and Means”).

To realize this principle, ISUComm articulates several goals for our first-level Foundation Course, goals that are common in writing programs and consistent with the WPA Outcomes. Among them are that students learn to

- adapt their writing to specific purposes and audiences, and situational contexts
- integrate and document a range of informational sources, from personal interviews to print and electronic publications
- practice varied organizational strategies and transitional devices
- match expression to situation and audience, avoiding errors that distract or confuse
- develop strategies to revise their own writing
- develop basic oral presentation skills, focusing on meaningful information, clear organization, and engaging delivery
- analyze visual communication, such as art on campus
- use visuals effectively (e.g., imported, scanned, or digital pictures) and integrating them with written texts
- use word processing skills, including making headings, attachments, tables, etc.
- choose one or more suitable media for delivering a piece of communication to its intended audience. (“English 150/250 Course Descriptions, 2011–2012”)

Students submitted their work to their instructors online, as is increasingly common in our foundation courses. Our department uses Moodle, an open source course management system, and instructors have separate Moodle course sites for their students. It is a secure, password-protected site that students register for and access with their own chosen ID and password. Moodle sites are used in our program mostly as online syllabus and announcement sites as well as handout and assignment repositories. Students were free to upload several kinds of files, including Word, PowerPoint, Keynote, and Pages files, and they could choose to receive an email back from the system confirming their uploads. Students could also access their papers online after they were graded; students received marginal, terminal, and rubric feedback on their papers as well as an overall grade on each paper.

Where I'm From: Conscious Discontinuity and Home

In the first assignment, “Where I’m From,” students wrote a short essay describing their home or where they were from. Combining physical and emotional descriptions, students considered what “home” and “being from somewhere” meant to them at the beginning of the semester. Many students chose to write about their hometowns while others focused on the actual family dwelling. Some international students wrote about their home country in contrast to the U.S. However they chose to define “home,” we wanted students to have the opportunity to connect, deliberately, the ideas and feelings they had about the place with the physical place itself; in other words, to work for the first time with the notion of place as not just a neutral backdrop for their life events, but as an influence on those events, providing meaning itself. Examination of these “Where I’m From” essays revealed that students focused heavily on themes of safety, security, comfort, memories, and community when describing their physical home places.

One student wrote, “Home is where I feel comforted, loved, and needed. Home is not just four walls and a roof, but it is the surrounding community or the ‘support beams.’” Another student explained that “Home is a place where you can feel safe and welcome . . . and a sense of community.” Finally, another student indicated how deeply s/he felt about his/her home: “In my heart, home is a place which is full of memories of the years behind me.” The opportunity to look back and consider how they felt about their homes allowed students to explore their feelings of “conscious discontinuity”: each of these students had chosen to leave home and come to Iowa State University for college, yet they struggled with feelings of homesickness and longing for a familiar environment. In a time in their lives when they were just beginning to build new communities on the Iowa State University campus, it was clear that our students were simultaneously looking back to the familiar communities and connections of home.

Deep Mapping and Letter Writing

“Sharing Experiences,” a two-part assignment, asked students first to visually represent campus as they experienced it via a deep mapping exercise. As a follow-up, students complemented their deep map with a letter to a friend or family member, in which they described the experience of the new campus place. “Deep maps” (a term first used by William Least Heat-Moon in the title of his book *PrairieErth (A Deep Map): An Epic History of the Tallgrass Prairie Country*) depict the emotional and daily relationships people form with place. Of the many portions of campus that students

experienced daily—dorm rooms, dining halls, classroom buildings, sections of campus landscape, a piece of art, the student union, the library, a campus bench—we asked them to render those they found the most salient at that early point in the semester in the form of a deep map. By imagining that they were creating this map for their family and friends back home, students needed to consider how to visually represent campus in a way that showed what aspects of the place created an impression on them early in their first semester.

Significantly, landscape architect James Corner declares that mapping is an act of agency; maps are not “transparent, neutral or passive devices of spatial measurement and depiction . . . but imaginative, operational instruments” (250). Thus, we were able to use mapping both as metaphor and strategy: students had to pause and see their new campus place, not just hurry through it. And mapping began the resolution of students’ conscious discontinuity by assisting in a visual and personal way with students’ adjustment to and familiarization with their chosen parts of campus. These maps were necessarily highly personalized for each student and his/her experience with campus to that point (two weeks or so into the semester). Indeed, as Attinasi notes, such maps function precisely because of “the identification of significant objects in the environment, the establishment of the connectedness of the objects to one another and to the observer, and the assignment of meaning, whether emotional or practical, to the objects and their relationships” (268).

Our students’ deep maps reveal these functions—more than mere way-finding, but the establishment of emotional and practical attachments. Students depicted the main landmarks on campus to them at the time—from dorm rooms, to the building a major is housed in, to the closest US Bank ATM. Although our campanile is often thought of as the iconic center of the campus, several of our students didn’t include it on their deep maps at all but instead drew their dorm rooms and recreation and dining facilities because these represented more “central” locations in these new students’ campus experiences. Indeed, a few students’ deep mapping represented their daily campus place as a circular route: from their dorm, past Lake LaVerne, to a classroom building, to a dining hall, and so on. On the other hand, some students deep mapped their campus place as extensions of the buildings that house their major. In one case, the building that houses agronomy and agricultural majors was the literal center of the map (apparently this student’s dominating campus place at this early point). Other places on campus—his dorm, other classroom buildings, the student union, other important landmarks—are depicted as clearly peripheral to the agronomy and agriculture hall and his major. These deep maps reveal the marrying of

external and internal geographies in visual form. The newly forming connections between familiar places on campus are rendered in personal ways that show each student's own developing place attachment.

Accompanying the deep map, students identified one of these special places on campus and wrote a letter to a younger friend or relative describing that place in ways that connected it to their current experiences and more distant futures—to, as student development specialist C. Carney Strange says, “understand and communicate to others what it’s like to be here” (299). In these letters, students began to write from the position of a campus “material-discursive where” (Mauk 379) and began to transfer some of the comfortable feelings about home to their new campus place.

In these letters, many students wrote about the security, comfort, and community of particular locations on campus—finding a smaller piece of the bigger whole to connect to as part of the familiarization and adjustment process. Of an attractive and secluded courtyard on campus, one student wrote, “This courtyard is much more than a courtyard to me. It is a place I can come to on campus that gives me a sense of belonging, clarity, and tranquility. I adore the landscape and the history behind this courtyard . . . the closeness, the security, the sense of belonging.” Another student explains,

When I first arrived at Iowa State I thought it was so big and really didn't know how I would find everything . . . A place on campus that I love is the Campanile. It is located in the center of campus and is surrounded by large fields of grass The Campanile is a comfortable place I can go study. I like to lay down my comfy blanket in the damp grass, sprawl out, and study.

These two students connect feelings of home—security, belonging, comfort—to specific places on campus to help them ameliorate the “conscious discontinuity” (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell 218) of coming to college.

Campus Program or Organization

Building on students' growing comfort with campus, in the third project, “Exploring a Campus Program or Organization,” students extended their exploration beyond the personal and physical to learn about some of the campus programs and organizations. Expanding the notion of campus place beyond the physical to a community and organizational level, this assignment emphasized the specific context of Iowa State University by exploring how its mission statement and land-grant status obligations are made tangible in programs and organizations. Students chose from among several organizations or programs, including ISU's Art on Campus Program; ISU's Lectures Program; Live Green!, the campus recycling and

environmental initiative; the Aldo Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture; the university botanical gardens; the university archives; multicultural student organizations; the Iowa Water Center, part of ISU's Agronomy Department; intramural sports; and the Virtual Reality Application Center, part of ISU's Human Computer Interaction Program. Central to this assignment was the requirement that students become familiar with an organization or program within the context of the university's land-grant heritage and resulting mission, that they examine the online public documents available on these organizations or programs to learn how each represents itself in relation to the larger university's work, and that they experience, in one way or another, the organization or program they wrote about.

Students were able to continue the process of resolving complex campus geographies into smaller, more meaningful territories by linking an otherwise abstract mission statement to everyday programs, practices, and sites. Fugazzoto notes, the tangibility of connecting "structures and cultures" to mission statements (285), and this can be a valuable meaning-making process for students. In particular, our students were able to see the land-grant heritage of ISU, which emphasizes making knowledge available for all in practical ways, instantiated in campus programs and organizations.

A key ideal in the land-grant mission is public accessibility. Through ISU's Art on Campus program, students began to notice, and then to really look at and think about, some of the many pieces of art on this public university campus. One student wrote, "[o]ne of the first things you notice when you step on to Iowa State campus is the art, lots of art . . . The goal of all this over the years is, and has been, to reflect the mission of Iowa State University through public art available to all." Another student wrote about the connections between the university's "green" program and how it makes tangible the school's land-grant mission:

From the mission statement of Iowa State University, I have learned that the two missions—"create knowledge through world-class scholarship in teaching, research, and creative endeavors" and "apply knowledge to improve the quality of life for current and future generations"—are trying to make Iowa and the world a better place. Live Green! is absolutely supporting this statement.

These comments reveal students doing more than simply passing through their campus place in quotidian routines of attending class and returning to dorms; they are developing substantive appreciations of and attendant connections with their campus place in a way that helps them answer some of those probing, identity-formation questions: Where am I, and how do my surroundings suggest values and goals worth attaining and tell stories

of how others have attained them? Instead of functioning as a neutral backdrop against which four years of classes simply transpire, students have an opportunity to understand the campus as itself part of the curriculum, part of the educational experience, and in this case, of land-grant ideals. By learning more, sharing what they learned, and taking part in some of the events on campus, students began to see themselves as part of the campus community.

Understanding Campus Art or Architecture

In “Understanding Campus Art or Architecture,” students took another scaffolded step in familiarizing themselves with their campus-as-place by analyzing a building or piece of art on campus. In particular, students worked with the ideas that a campus “express[es] the mission of [the] university in built form” (Edwards 3) and “communicate[s] an institution’s purpose, presence and domain” (Dober 3). Students chose one of several buildings or any piece of art on campus, all of which are relatively easy for students to gather information about because of the rich historical/archival, architectural, and visual art materials available online via Iowa State’s University’s website. Students were also encouraged to visit the university archives to view documents and other physical artifacts in addition to spending considerable time with their chosen building or piece of art.

Student projects revealed their tangible discovery that campus places carry within their history and physical design an ongoing link between past, present, and future—one dependent on advancement of knowledge while at the same time preserving what is valuable in the past. Once they began investigating the history of campus through its buildings and its selection and placement of art, students became more aware of how an individual campus place visually and organizationally expresses its approach to stability and change—the sought-after balance that says so much about an educational institution. Student work by this point in the semester was no longer limited to description and personal reaction (although these remained significant parts of the communication in this first-level course); it now added analytical elements addressing why a building or a piece of art is appropriate and meaningful for Iowa State University, how it fits into this place’s history and contributes to the institution’s educational mission, and how it signifies, however subtly and aesthetically, the educational opportunities the campus place offers for students.

For instance, Beardshear Hall, the main administration building, is one of the oldest and most storied buildings on the campus, standing in the place of the first administration building, Old Main, that was destroyed

by fire at the turn of the nineteenth century. It has a beautiful oculus in the dome, marble columns, and a suspended staircase and is clearly “one of Iowa State University’s cultural spaces where architecture, art, and architectural ornament have created a significant and beautiful sense of place” (Art on Campus, “Beardshear Hall”). One of our students, while taking in all of the gold-leaf and stained-glass grandeur, was drawn to art embedded in the floor and walked over every day: “To me the compass [in the floor of Beardshear Hall] feels almost like it is directing students where to go in their lives while providing them the tools to get there.” Of a newer piece of art now at the entrance to one of the oldest buildings on campus, named for the Morrill Act out of which the land-grant institutions were formed, another student wrote, “The work of art was placed in the entrance of Morrill Hall in order to represent a connection between the old and the new, not only of Morrill Hall, but of Iowa State in general.” This art piece is aptly called *Transformations*.

Another student forged a stronger connection to his chosen major as a result of feeling more acclimated both to his main classroom building and the library’s nooks and crannies:

[P]robably the most important [environment] that influenced me in an educational way is the electrical engineering building, Coover Hall. This building is where my major is mainly focused at and is the building that I will be spending most of my time during my Iowa State University career. Just by the technology and how the building’s [interior] architecture is set up influences me to work harder in my studies. Another physical environment is the university’s library, Parks Library. When I am in this building I like to go all the way in the back where the single cubbyholes are and just buckle down and focus on my work with no distractions.

Several times throughout the campus place-based semester, students commented that they had walked by a particular building or piece of art daily but had not really looked at it and probably would not have taken time to find out more about it. They also commented that this act of pausing and of looking below the surface of glossy campus photos to Iowa State University’s history and ideals was a valuable communication project because each student was able to find something that was meaningful or interesting to him/her. The following student expresses the thrill of actually holding some of the university’s history in his hands, leaving no doubt it made an important impression on him:

What was cool in this course was learning the history of the campus and its original buildings. The most interesting thing I did for this course was go to the archives and read about Old Main in books written in it. I like history so I found this really cool, especially when I got to look at the original Accessions book from 1879.

For these students, the curriculum's "pause in movement ma[de] it possible for location to be transformed into place" (Tuan 6). The realization that the university expresses its mission through the "continuing care, thoughtful decision-making, reverence for tradition and ritual, and a harmony of nature, landscape, and architectural design" that Halsband describes was an important one to these students. It elevated campus place—and their time in it—from generic backdrop or "placelessness" (Mauk 370) to the "enabling ground" that Buell says offers stronger learning opportunities (22).

Visual Communication

The earlier description of our CAC program, ISUComm, shows how it permits rhetorically informed movement across the four communication modes. With their third and fourth assignments completed (both primarily written, with at least one image integrated in each), students next produced visual communication by repurposing information from their Profile of a Campus Program or Organization or Understanding Campus Art or Architecture essays. Students' communication exigency thus became to visually represent "what it's like to be here" (Strange 299). Although analysis of visual communication is not uncommon in first-year programs, ISUComm asks students also to produce visual communication as part of the development of their twenty-first century literacies ("The NCTE Definition"). The experience of producing visual communication sharpens students' ability to read visual texts intelligently and with attention to why certain design decisions were made over others. Students repurposed again when they turned their visual communication into a slide show presentation in which they explained to their classmates not only what they had learned about the particular feature of campus place on which they had focused but also their rhetorical choices (context, substance, organization, style, and delivery) in creating their visual and oral communication projects.

Semester Portfolio: Final Reflections

ISUComm Foundation Courses students begin a communication portfolio (print or electronic) in their first foundation communication class, and they are encouraged to add to it over their four years at the university. In assembling these portfolios, students include such artifacts as examples of

their work in each of the four modes as well as how they have advanced in synthesizing the modes. They also both reflect on and project their progress in the present course and explain what they will continue to attend to in upcoming communication work at the university. In some of the reflection questions, we asked if or how the campus place-based work had worked for these one hundred students, and students wrote about how their adjustment and familiarization processes were aided by the place-based curriculum, helping them to feel both more comfortable in and more meaningfully connected to their campus place. Students wrote about how the campus became a part of their experiences as they developed new place attachment, and they expressed surprise that there was so much to learn that was interesting but would never have been discovered by them without a curricular pause in the whirlwind of their transition to the university. Examining the Iowa State University mission statement, understanding the land-grant mission, as well as accessing the information online about campus art, architecture, landscape, and history of their university, were profoundly important to the positive reactions of the students. For example, a first-year student wrote:

I never thought before starting school that my English Composition course would not only expand my communication skills but familiarize me with the campus. Before coming to Iowa State University I knew little about the school and what it stands for. Now I have new insight through this course and have learned about many different buildings, arts, organizations, and even the ISU mission. Because of this course I feel more connected with ISU. I'm able to appreciate the history and the environment.

Another first-year student's reflection on the semester's work was similar: "Because of doing these assignments, I know more about ISU's arts, buildings' history, and organizations' and programs' functions. It helps me know more places in ISU other than my dorm." For these two first-year students, a campus place-based curriculum helped them develop a sense of place on a large campus.

Moreover, the campus place-based curriculum helps not just first-year students; we also saw reflective comments from sophomores indicating the pedagogical and personal efficacy of the curriculum:

Even though this was not my first semester at ISU . . . I still feel more "located" in the ISU place than I did before participating in the class. The place-based focus of our section was just the twist I needed to inspire me to succeed in this class. . . .

Another sophomore student explained,

[. . .] I have to say although it's the second year for me at ISU, I didn't find my "place" here until I did the assignments for this course. . . . After finishing those assignments, I know much better about our campus and feel that I belong to the ISU community now.

Both of these students—neither new to Iowa State University—felt more positively about their campus after we moved place to the center of the curriculum in their foundation communication class. Comments like these remind us of those students, on all our campuses, who do not stay after the first year—who, for one reason or another, do not succeed in marrying their internal geography to the external geography of the campus and negotiate its cognitive, social, and physical terrains. This is the focus of the following student's reflection:

This class has forced me to learn about the campus. You see, I'm somewhat of a loner when it comes to new places. I'm a transfer student from two other colleges, and this class as a "place based" class has definitely made me get out of my comfort zone to get to know my college a little. When I was at the University of [X], I didn't have a class like this. I really only went to (and even then didn't learn about) the buildings that I had classes in. I ended up coming back to my home state and going for a completely different major. Had I taken a class like this at the University of [X], I think I would be in a different place right now. This class has made me feel more a part of the campus (something that the University of [X] never did), and will do a lot for other students. Not only did it force me to get to know the history of some important buildings on campus, but it also made me broaden my view from a narrow "these are where my classes are at" focus. I recommend keeping the place-based class!

As the cross-disciplinary literature suggests, a curriculum that assists students form place attachment can also assist them in recognizing something about their identities and aspirations, as the following student comment reveals:

I always noticed all of the unique paintings and art décor throughout campus, but I never took the time to really examine them and dig deeper. Through studying this program I have learned that all of these different beautiful places are there for a purpose and were put there by specific people that love and appreciate art as much as I do. I hope to visit all of the museums here on campus eventually, and maybe possibly one day have a piece of my own on display.

Finally, to return to Beason's point about the value of instructors also developing their sense of place and to track the extent to which the campus place-based curriculum was workable for new TAs (one of our objectives as WPAs), we invited informal reactions from two of the four MA TA instructors a year after their pilot experience. The two MA TAs were new to ISU and to the Midwest (one from the western United States and the other an international TA from China). Both felt that the campus place-based curriculum was an asset in their own transition to and ability to form place attachment with their new campus place. Working through the assignments with their students had the salutary effect, in many cases, of permitting students from the Midwest to be the authority in their communication work—a turn of events that Bartholomae and others see as important for building confidence in student writers and in writing to an authentic audience. The TA new to the Midwest from a western state observed:

the seemingly huge challenge [of learning about ISU's campus as a reflection of its mission] was a gift to us all. Not only did we, my students and I, learn together, but exploring Iowa State University's campus, traditions, history, and culture together fostered a close class community. Through assignments dealing with the campus mission, values, culture, landscape, programs, and architecture, we moved beyond observing this place called Iowa State University that we inhabited—we began analyzing, understanding, appreciating, and living more fully, more presently, on this campus and its surrounding spaces and places.

The reflections of the international TA from China are especially poignant and are even more promising in what they suggest for the potential of place-conscious curricula like this one to be satisfying and successful for international TAs. Furthermore, her own feelings of conscious discontinuity became something she realized she shared with her first-year students:

The place-based work pulled me closer to our campus, and it also strengthened my sense of Iowa State University identity. The internal overwhelming-ness I experienced at the beginning of last fall is still fresh in my memory. It was the 13th day after I came to this country for the first time that I found myself standing in front of a class. I knew I was in the right place, but somehow I felt a bit strange because the blond hair and blue eyes constantly reminded me of my unfamiliarity of the campus, the city and the country. It was the truth, though silly, that for the first month when I was here, I tried to avoid walking on campus without a companion because otherwise I would feel like I was on someone else's territory. But as I realized

that my students shared exactly the same feelings as mine, based on their assignment #1, I became more comfortable considering myself as one of the Iowa State University people. Perhaps, this was the main reason why I found their papers for the first assignment (about their home) emotionally appealing.

CONCLUSION

In an interesting way, our students face something of the same task as successful campus places: when they walk through Frances Halsband's gates to their future, they, like campuses, are balanced between stability and change—they are themselves a link between past, present, and future. They are embarking on what feels like a whirlwind ride of transition to college, but the time taken to pause and understand their place in a more substantive way, after the campus orientation tours are over, can mean making personal educational sense out of the experience and beginning to see how to project themselves into the trajectory represented by the university. Along the way, and not incidentally, the campus place-based educator is rewarded, as students are rewarded, with the pleasure of discovering the beautiful, the awe-inspiring, the surprising, and the intriguing about their campus—what Thomas Gaines surely meant by discovering that “there is a there there” (x).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Thomas Lindsley, PhD student in Rhetoric and Professional Communication, for invaluable assistance with materials, mentoring, and instruction of ISUComm Foundation Courses campus place-based sections; Breanna Kreimeyer, PhD student in Rhetoric and Professional Communication, for adapting this curriculum for science learning communities; Lindsay Kurtz, Rebecca Lee, Sarah Pike, and Manman Qian—MA students in the Department of English—for instruction of ISUComm Foundation Courses campus place-based sections; Tanya Zanish-Belcher, Head of Special Collections and University Archives at ISU's Parks Library; the Art on Campus program at Iowa State University, directed by Lynette Pohlman, Director and Chief Curator, University Museums; and of course, the students who participated in the eight sections of the course and shared their work with us. We acknowledge Don Payne, former Director of ISUComm, whose interest in the history and beauty of our campus was inspirational. Finally, we are deeply indebted to Michael Mendelson, University Professor of English at ISU and the first Director of ISUComm, for

his vision of this unique CAC program and tireless efforts to bring it into existence.

WORKS CITED

- Art on Campus. "Beardshear Hall." Iowa State University. Web. June 2011. <http://www.museums.iastate.edu/AOCFactSheetsPDF/BeardshearHall.pdf>.
- . "Whirlwind." Iowa State University, 2011. Web. June 2011. www.museums.iastate.edu/AOCFactSheetsPDF/2011/Whirlwind.pdf.
- Attinasi, Louis C. "Getting In: Mexican Americans' Perceptions of University Attendance and the Implications for Freshman Year Persistence." *Journal of Higher Education* 60.3 (1989): 247–77. Print.
- Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing-Related Problems*. Ed. Mike Rose. New York: Guilford, 1985. 134–65. Print.
- Beason, Larry. "Fostering Quality through Sense of Place." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 34.1 (2010): 149–52. Print.
- Boyer, Ernest. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997. Print.
- Brooke, Robert, and Jason McIntosh. "Deep Maps: Teaching Rhetorical Engagement through Place-Conscious Education." *The Locations of Composition*. Ed. Christopher J. Keller and Christian R. Weisser. Albany: State U of New York P, 2007. 131–49. Print.
- Buell, Lawrence. *Writing for an Endangered World: Literature, Culture, and Environment in the U.S. and Beyond*. Harvard UP, 2001. Print.
- Burgan, Mary. *What Ever Happened to the Faculty? Drift and Decision in Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. Print.
- Casey, Edward. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997. Print.
- Chow, Kenny, and Mick Healey. "Place Attachment and Place Identity: First-Year Undergraduates Making the Transition from Home to University." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 28 (2008): 362–72. Print.
- Corner, James. "The Agency of Mapping: Speculation, Critique and Invention." *Mappings*. Ed. Denis Cosgrove. London: Reaktion Books, 1999. Print.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition." Web. October 2011.
- Dober, Richard P. *Campus Architecture: Building in the Groves of Academe*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996. Print.
- Edwards, Brian. *University Architecture*. London: Spon, 2000. Print.
- "English 150/250 Course Descriptions (2009-2011)." *ISUComm*. Iowa State University, 1996–2011. Web. December 2011.
- Fugazzotto, Sam J. "Mission Statements, Physical Space, and Strategy in Higher Education." *Innovative Higher Education* 34 (2009): 285–98. Print.
- Gaines, Thomas. *The Campus as a Work of Art*. New York: Praeger, 1981. Print.

- Geller, Joseph T. and Robert M. Corning. "Designing a Unified Campus: When Landscape and Other Site Designers Get Creative, a Campus's Character Can Shine." *University Business* (May 2007). Web. August 2010.
- Griffith, Janice C. "Open Space Preservation: An Imperative for Quality Campus Environments." *The Journal of Higher Education* 65.6 6 (1994): 645–69. Print.
- Gruenewald, David. "Foundations of Place: A Multidisciplinary Framework for Place-Conscious Education." *American Educational Research Journal* 40.3 (2003): 619–54. Web. July 26, 2009.
- . "Accountability and Collaboration: Institutional Barriers and Strategic Pathways for Place-Based Education." *Ethics, Place and Environment* 8.3 (2005): 261–83. Web. July 30, 2009.
- Halsband, Frances. "Campuses in Place." *Places* 17.1 (2005): 1–8. Print.
- Judson, Gillian. "Curriculum Spaces: Situating Educational Research, Theory, and Practice." *The Journal of Educational Thought* 40.3 (2006): 229–45. Print.
- Least Heat-Moon, William. *PrairieErth (A Deep Map): An Epic History of the Tall-grass Prairie Country*. New York: Mariner Books, 1999.
- Mauk, Jonathan. "Location, Location, Location: The 'Real' (E)states of Being, Writing, and Thinking in Composition." *College English* 65.4 (March 2003): 368–88. Print.
- "The NCTE Definition of 21st Century Literacies." NCTE, 2008. Web. June 2010.
- Orr, David. *Ecological Literacy: Education and the Transition to a Postmodern World*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1992. Print.
- Proshansky, Harold M., Abbe K. Fabian, and Robert Kaminoff. "Place-Identity: Physical World Socialization of the Self." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 3 (1983): 57–83. Print.
- Reeve, John R., and Douglas G. Kassabaum. "A Sense of Place Masterplan: Linking Mission and Place." *APPA Proceedings*. 1997. Web. June 15, 2011.
- Schuyler, David. "Frederick Law Olmsted and the Origins of Modern Campus Design." *Planning for Higher Education* 25 (1996–97): 1–10. Print.
- Smith, Gregory. "Place-Based Education: Learning to Be Where We Are." *Phi Delta Kappan* 83.8 (2002): 584–94. Print.
- Sommers, Nancy, and Laura Saltz. "The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshman Year." *College Composition and Communication* 56.1 (2004): 124–49. Print.
- Strange, C. Carney. "Dynamics of Campus Environments." *Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession*. Ed. Susan R. Komives, Dudley B. Woodard, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003. 297–316. Print.
- Sturner, William F. "Environmental Code: Creating a Sense of Place." *Journal of Higher Education* 43.2 (1972): 97–109. Print.
- Temple, Paul. "From Space to Place: University Performance and its Built Environment." *Higher Education Policy* 22.2 (2009): 209–23. Print.
- . "Learning Spaces for the 21st Century: A Review of the Literature." *Higher Education Academy* (July 2007): 1–84. Web. June 2010.
- Thayer, Robert. *Gray World, Green Heart: Technology, Nature, and the Sustainable Landscape*. New York: Wiley, 1996. Print.

- “Theories of Place.” Writing Program Administration List. Arizona State University, Sept. 30, 2011. Web. Oct. 3, 2011.
- “Traditions, Myths, and Stories.” Iowa State Memorial Union. Iowa State University. 2011. Web. June 2011.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1977. Print.
- Twigger-Ross, Clare L., and David L Uzzell. “Place and Identity Processes.” *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 16 (1996): 205–20. Print.
- Usher, Robin. “Putting Space Back on the Map: Globalisation, Place and Identity.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 34.1 (2002): 41–55. Print.
- “Vision, Mission, and Means.” *ISUComm*. Iowa State University, 1999–2011. Web. June 2011.

