This document reports the goals, activities, and challenges for the Writing in the Disciplines Program, representing WID’s work on professional development for individuals and departments around teaching writing in the disciplines, and the Writing Center’s work to provide direct support for student writers in individual, group, and workshop settings. This document illustrates the ways WID and the Writing Center—equal partners working on mutually supportive missions—work independently and together to provide support for both students and faculty (our mission statements and a brief history are found in Appendix A).
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Part 1: General Program Report for WID and the Writing Center

Mission and Goals for 2013-2014

WID Mission and Goals
WID’s mission is to ensure writing is a significant part of undergraduate students’ education beyond the foundation of a first-year experience. To work toward that mission, WID provides opportunities for individual faculty, departments, and schools/colleges to connect with WID resources and workshops. WID programming and activity is guided by a core set of goals, presented below and glossed with the particular ways in which WID worked toward those goals in the past year. WID’s ongoing goals are to:

Support attention to writing in varied formats that invite new contacts from individuals and departments while supporting ongoing work with previous contacts. In the past year, WID

- offered 21 open workshops (a sharp increase over last year), in varied time formats, to provide multiple opportunities for faculty and departments to connect with us, with a special emphasis on extended programming for new faculty. The program series for new College of Arts and Sciences faculty met bimonthly all fall and periodically in the spring, and offered a combination of specialized programming just for the new faculty and open workshops in which new and experienced faculty worked together on aspects of universal design for learning as applied in a new campus environment.
- continued the WID Institute. Evaluations from the 6th WID Institute were the most positive ever, with 100% of respondents strongly agreeing that the Institute was valuable, and strongly agreeing or agreeing that they would recommend it to others and that it met their expectations.
- emphasized the importance of assignment design in relationship to course goals and disciplinary priorities, via a 4-workshop series created in collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning and Bailey/Howe Libraries.
- emphasized mentoring science writing, through 3 workshops and other activities sponsored by a visiting Fulbright scholar, Lisa Emerson of Massey University (New Zealand)
- collaborated with the Center for Teaching and Learning and Bailey/Howe Library to offer coordinated workshops and consultations. Nearly half WID workshops were collaborative efforts of some sort.

Create a driver for WID, to create more predictable paths and incentives for departments and individual faculty to take advantage of WID resources. In the past year, WID supported the Faculty Senate’s General Education initiative by

- consulting with the Foundational Writing and Information Literacy interim director on matters of strategic planning and assessment. WID provided extensive budget support and logistic support for assessment and workshops.
- supporting the pilot implementation of WILD (Writing and Information Literacy in the Disciplines), overseeing the development of pilot surveys, reports, and meeting practices. WID worked with 4 departments (CDAE, Romance Languages and Linguistics, Anthropology, and Nursing). With particular effort from the graduate research assistants, WID oversaw the distribution and reporting on surveys of faculty and students in the 4 departments (with Linguistics handled separately from Romance Languages). Anthropology and Nursing have moved into the outcomes creation phase; Romance Languages is just beginning; CDAE is ready to move there next August.
Support broad notions of what writing is and how it is learned. Faculty can support student writers best when they understand writing as a complex construct, something that is learned slowly and unevenly as students move in and out of different intellectual and rhetorical territories. In the past year, WID worked toward this goal by

- offering programming in conjunction with Blackboard Jungle, focusing on faculty stories of multilingualism.
- collaborating with the Writing Center to prepare materials for faculty teaching ELLs.
- creating a series of workshops that presented multiple opportunities to work with the relationships between assignment design, course goals, and grading/responding strategies.
- offering personal consultations to 8 faculty.
- creating 8 bibliographies on writing in specific disciplines to help expand faculty connections between rhetoric/composition as a field and their own disciplines.

Writing Center Mission and Goals

The Writing Center’s mission is to provide a portion of the institutional context—the portion based on peer tutoring and collaboration—that will enable all UVM students to become effective writers.

- Through open programming, the Writing Center provides students with the opportunity to get individualized support at any point in the writing process, from understanding assignments to editing final drafts. The Writing Center aims to engage students in a dialogue about their work that not only meets their immediate needs in relation to a specific writing project but also helps them develop as writers.
- The target audiences (through open programming) are groups that may be facing new challenges with writing, including first-year students making the adjustment to college-level writing, non-native speakers of English, students with disabilities, first-generation college students, and non-traditional students.
- Through the WID Mentor Program, students receive support in learning how to write in a specific major from an experienced tutor who has been selected to work with their class.
- A secondary mission of the Writing Center is to provide a rich service learning experience for fifty peer tutors, helping them develop a range of skills and abilities that will be useful academically and professionally.

To enhance and extend the Writing Center’s ability to fulfill this mission, the following specific goals for the 2013-2014 academic year were set. Each goal is followed by a brief description of what was done to meet that goal, with references to the pages where the topic is discussed in more detail.

Goals for open programming:

- Provide better access to students through on-line scheduling: While in the past students had to call the Learning Cooperative during office hours to make a Writing Center appointment, they are now able to quickly make and cancel appointments at any time of the day or night through our new online scheduling/database system, WConline. WConline has allowed the Writing Center to customize scheduling and data collection for program and reporting purposes. Initiating and ensuring the smooth functioning of WConline has been an ongoing process this year, presenting a series of challenges that were handled very adeptly by Kristen Cameron, WID Program Assistant. Of the students who filled out evaluation forms, 99% felt the process of making an appointment went smoothly, with 91% strongly agreeing.

- WConline opened an additional opportunity: to experiment with on-line tutoring. The Writing Center is now poised to offer online tutoring to students who aren’t able to come to campus for on-site tutoring.
• **Increase use of the Writing Center in the spring semester:** While in the fall semester the Writing Center has been operating at close to capacity, during the spring semester there has been some room for growth. This spring, Sue did an additional mailing to faculty offering to do in-class presentations and workshops, and tutors posted flyers across campus. These strategies seemed to work as the number of recorded sessions in the spring increased by 6% over last year.

• **Increase the number of in-class workshops:** There were two reasons for this goal: (1) the number of presentations and workshops has dropped over the past two years, and (2) while there is not much more capacity to offer individual tutoring sessions, there is capacity to reach more students through workshops. So Sue and the tutors designed some workshops targeted at English 1 and TAP classes and advertised their availability to these instructors. The number of workshops increased from 16 to 42, and contacts with students through workshops increased from 428 to 1,017.

• **Benchmarking workshops:** With this year’s emphasis on workshops, the Writing Center benchmarked workshop offerings at 21 other writing centers, including peer and aspirant institutions. Over half of these institutions do not offer workshops, providing only one-on-one tutoring. A review of the offerings of the ten centers that do hold workshops suggests that what the Writing Center offers is fairly comparable. Two use a similar design, with tutors available to go into classes and facilitate writing workshops. Two other centers offer to have professional staff members design and offer workshops (one, for a hefty fee). Five writing centers offer on-site rather than classroom-based workshops. The Writing Center does not offer on-site workshops, so here is an opportunity for growth. For these on-site workshops, three universities’ offerings were open to anyone and were on topics of general interest; two offer targeted workshops designed for international students or graduate students. (For more details about the benchmarking, see Appendix B.)

• **Develop more tutor tips webpages** on writing in a variety of discipline, for use by tutors and students when writing papers in unfamiliar disciplines. Sue and Kristen worked with tutors to create new webpages for Human Development and Family Studies, Art and Art History, Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies, Public Communications, and Business Administration, as well as contributing new materials to several of the existing disciplines.

• **Improve tutoring spaces:** Last year’s annual report noted that having only two small tutoring spaces limited the amount of individual tutoring that could be provided. The library had allowed the tutors to use one of their carrels on the ground floor as an overflow tutoring space, and this year they gave permission to make that a permanent tutoring space. Kristen and Sue redesigned the space to make it more functional and attractive, and that has temporarily solved the space issue. However, having three small spaces on three different floors of the library is still less than ideal.

### Goals for supporting the target audience of first-year students

• **Restore a connection with English 1 and increase the number of contacts with English 1 students,** which has been declining for several years. Nancy Welch decided to require all of the graduate teaching fellows to schedule a writing center presentation for their classes. Sue and the tutors developed some workshops to address challenges in the new English 1 sequence. The number of presentations for English 1 classes increased from 8 to 34, and the number of workshops from 8 to 22. Correspondingly, the number of workshop contacts with English 1 students increased by 128% and the number of individual sessions by 158%.

• **Participate in the development of the foundational writing gen ed initiative:** Through the English Department Composition Committee, the Sue helped create next year’s sequence of assignments and readings for English 1, which includes several pieces written by tutors. She took part in the two foundational writing assessments, reviewing portfolios from English 1 and TAP classes to consider how they met the foundational writing outcomes. Two tutors and Sue offered a presentation about the Writing Center at the First-year Writing Institute, providing a student perspective on students’ experiences with writing. Daisy Benson was invited to provide training for the writing tutors that would enable them to better support foundational information literacy goals in their sessions.
Goals for supporting the target audience of English language learners

- Begin providing some faculty development on responding to the writing of English language learners: To address the concern that faculty are sending ELL students to the Writing Center with unrealistic expectations, Sue created (with input from the tutors) a description of the Writing Center’s philosophy and key approaches to working with multilingual or bi-dialectal writers, and then asked to meet with instructors to explain how the Writing Center works with English language learners. Sue found that the four faculty members she approached were quite receptive.

- Secure funding for additional tutoring support for ELLs: In preparation for the matriculation of students in the Global Gateway Program, Sue wrote a report for Associate Provost Gayle Nunley on current and estimated use of the Writing Center by ELLs, proposing that support for additional ELL tutoring slots be increased next year from $3700 to $4800, and by an additional $1100 for each of the next four years. Gayle agreed that this seemed a reasonable plan.

Goals for tutor professional development

- CRLA tutor certification renewal: The five-year program tutor certification through the College Reading and Learning Association, which allows the Writing Center to grant tutors certification at three levels, was due to expire in August 2013. Sue submitted an application for recertification, sending in a large collection of documentation related to tutor training, evaluation, and monitoring. The application was approved, with no concerns or suggestions reported, and with comments that included the praise “Beautifully structured application, very thorough, and the enthusiasm and pride you have for your program shines through.”

Collaborative WID/Writing Center Goals

Goals for the WID Mentor Program

- Improve the WID Mentor Program “Basic” Model: Last year several of these placements fell apart because (1) the mentor and faculty member didn’t communicate regularly and/or (2) one mentor was assigned to several sections and too many students wanted to meet with the mentor at the same time. This year, faculty and mentors enrolled in the “basic” model were included in the faculty and mentor training, the importance of communication was emphasized, and one mentor was assigned for each section of a course. All of the sections using the basic model were successful this year.

- Explore how mentors can contribute to faculty development around the teaching of writing: Last year’s annual report noted that faculty development around the teaching of writing has been a hidden benefit of the WID Mentor Program, and speculated that it could provide a clearer focus and purpose for the program. This year, Sue
  - included faculty development as one of the stated goals of the program, and included more examples of possible faculty development activities in the information provided to mentors and mentor faculty;
  - had mentors keep a log of any conversations they felt contributed to faculty development, and discussed this aspect of their experience in the bi-weekly mentor meetings;
  - developed a panel presentation with Susanmarie and four WID mentors for the Northeast Writing Centers Association Conference, which allowed the Writing Center to explore the range and depth of the faculty development that mentors can provide.

Mentoring graduate research assistants

The WID graduate assistants have typically been drawn from English and/or History, programs that involve a great deal of writing and research in archives and scholarly literature. An ongoing goal is to help the GRAs use their academic skills to function in the Writing in the Disciplines Program. They must learn to apply those skills to new content areas and often extend their research methodologies. In the past year, Susanmarie and Kristen worked toward this goal by
- creating and implementing a new system for tracking tasks and hours that improved planning and project completion
- creating more consulting contact with librarians to expand graduate students’ research skills in disciplines unfamiliar to them
- extending training in advanced features of Excel to facilitate report writing

Creating a space that can accommodate a larger writing program

- Last year’s annual report noted that creating an umbrella Writing Program that includes WID, First-Year Writing, and the Writing Center would allow for greater efficiency and effectiveness of collaborative work to help all UVM students become better writers, but that one of the biggest challenges to such collaboration is lack of space. With some creative thinking and support from the Provost’s office, a plan to redesign the existing space was developed. The current Writing in the Disciplines space houses offices for Susanmarie and Sue, Kristen, two graduate research assistants; a tutoring space; and a conference room/evening tutoring space. Assuming a new director for Foundational Writing and Information Literacy is hired next year, the tutoring space will become the director’s office, the current storage space will be renovated as an office for that program’s half-time administrative assistant, the graduate research assistant space will be renovated into a tutoring space, and the reception space will become an office for the graduate research assistants.

Extending the program’s scholarly activity

To deepen the understanding of the field as well as to publicize WID/Writing Center in the discipline,

- Sue and Susanmarie gave a joint presentation at the Northeast Writing Centers Association (NEWCA), where they presented with a group of tutors about faculty development and WID mentor programs
- Susanmarie and Sue gave a joint presentation at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), where they presented on their research regarding partnerships between writing centers and WID programs
- Susanmarie served on the Council of Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Task Force, where she led the subcommittee that tackled the final revising of the Outcomes Statement for First Year Composition Programs.

WID and the Writing Center: Report on Activities and Support for Institutional Priorities

WID and the Writing Center collaborate to contribute to UVM’s core institutional priorities. This section reports on the activities of WID and the Writing Center this year, organized around the institutional priorities they support.

Advancing Quality and Excellence

In providing hands-on support to faculty and students, WID and the Writing Center are directly involved in the university’s core activity: providing a high-quality academic experience for students. The University’s mission statement emphasizes the common commitment to communication skills, and President Sullivan’s vision for the campus includes a focus on enhancing the quality of the academic experience, creating access to excellence through the provision of academic support, and raising academic expectations. The NEASC 5-year accreditation report emphasized the importance of general education in the campus planning process. The activities and programming in the Writing Center and WID support these aims in myriad ways.
Supporting Faculty who are Developing and Revising Courses

WID’s open programming, as well as the intensive WID Institute in May, offered a variety of options for faculty who are seeking to refine an existing assignment or design a whole new course. With programming ranging from 15 minute Sound Bites programming to the 4-day WID Institute, WID offered programming suited to the quick pace of campus work in terms of both workshop length and topics. This academic year featured an extensive collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning. The year-long faculty group for new colleagues in the College of Arts and Sciences, emphasizing universal design for learning, covered core WID topics in the context of learning to teach at the college level more generally. A series on assignment design—in collaboration with the CTL and the Bailey/Howe Library—explored how assignments are reflections of course goals and disciplinary priorities. More than 154 individuals attended WID programming this year (with a significant increase in the number of people who participated in more than one WID activity during the year).

Benchmarking WID

Last year’s benchmarking effort indicated that while most comparator institutions have a more firm structure for their writing requirements (10 have requirements of some sort at the upper and lower levels). Most of the comparators also have more robust staffing and structure for the WID program (although this is difficult to evaluate given the diversity of curricular structures and institutional sizes). UVM stands up well, however, in terms of breadth of programming offered. UVM is among the leading institutions in this regard. This year’s benchmarking looked more closely at the breadth of programming offered. With a slightly revised set of comparator institutions, UVM is a clear leader in programming. The number of one-off open workshops and the number of extended programs WID offers is much greater (although there is reason to believe that some other institutions’ websites might under-represent their actual activities. It is very common for WAC programs at institutions with upper-level writing requirements, such as the University of Hawaii, to offer some sort of faculty development workshops. This benchmarking might be limited.). Most of the comparator institutions do not offer much in the way of extended programming, and many do not appear to offer any faculty development at all, focusing instead on students and curriculum development. (See Appendix C)

Engaging Students through the Writing Center

The Writing Center offers students a variety of opportunities to become more engaged in their writing by working with experienced peer tutors in individual sessions, group sessions, and class workshops. It offers services through two programs: open programming, which can be scheduled by any student or arranged by any faculty member, and the WID Mentor Program, which attaches tutors to classes and is available to faculty who have participated in the WID faculty development program.

The number of Writing Center contacts with students increased by 8% this year, from 5,029 to 5,442 (a record), with 2,568 tutoring sessions scheduled by over 1000 individual students, 1,310 contacts through group tutoring sessions, and 1,564 contacts through in-class writing workshops. In evaluating their individual tutoring sessions, 98% of the students who filled out a survey reported finding the session useful (with 80% strongly agreeing), and 99% of the students said they would recommend the Writing Center to other students (with 94% strongly agreeing)—the highest evaluations the tutors have ever received.

Providing a Service-Learning Experience for 50 Peer Tutors

The Writing Center created an opportunity for engaged learning for 50 of UVM’s outstanding students. Through their training and experience as peer tutors, students developed a wide range of skills: in writing, teaching, leadership, public speaking, time management, and professionalism. They also increased their understanding and appreciation of diversity. In English 105, tutors consider through multiple lenses how every writer’s abilities, processes, and choices are shaped by aspects of their background, experience, and identity, and they learn ways of supporting academic literacy development using an approach shaped by Universal Design.

In addition to providing individual and group tutoring, tutors gave 75 class presentations and conducted 42 in-class workshops; designed new materials for our Writing Center, including several new Tutor Tips webpages on writing in a variety of disciplines and an article on working with students with autism; presented at the Northeast Writing
Centers Association conference on how WID mentors can contribute to faculty development; shared a student perspective at several WID and foundational writing workshops for faculty; experimented with online tutoring; created a writing center satellite at the ALANA Student Center; and served as writing mentors in 17 classes.

Tutors find their extensive training and work experience very valuable when they seek employment or admission to graduate or professional school. All of the tutors achieved certification through the College Reading and Learning Association at the Regular, Advanced or Master level. Susanmarie offers tutors a workshop on how to highlight their tutoring experiences in their resumes and cover letters, and Kristen offers the tutors a workshop with tips for a variety of aspects of the job search process. Sue wrote recommendations for over twenty tutors this year, and gave phone references for many others.

Supporting General Education

General Education as a Driver for WID and the Writing Center

WID and the Writing Center directly support the university’s mission and goals: of preparing students who will “bring to their work . . . effective problem-solving and communication skills,” and who will be prepared “for success as accountable leaders in the 21st century.” WID’s mission, focusing on faculty development, is “to ensure writing is a significant part of undergraduate students’ education beyond the foundation of a first-year experience,” while the Writing Center’s mission, focusing on student support, is to help students “discover writing as both a fulfilling activity and a tool for effectively creating and communicating ideas—a tool that will help them excel while at UVM and after they graduate.”

In the WID and Writing Center vision for the future, UVM students will graduate with the writing skills that are key to success in every field. Students in every major will have a rich, thoughtfully designed college writing experience. They will be engaged in meaningful assignments throughout their college years, assignments that have been created and responded to by instructors who have participated in faculty development around the teaching of writing. And students will have access to peer support at every point in the writing process.

The Faculty Senate’s work on general education has created a curricular and political context that will help make this vision a reality. Beginning in Fall 2014, all entering undergraduate students will take a foundational course addressing writing and information literacy outcomes. This will lead into additional learning and practice through the major. With the support of the General Education committee, departments will develop a plan for identifying and achieving writing outcomes for their majors. This should provide the motivation for departments to work with WID, for instructors to participate in faculty development around writing, and for faculty and students to use the resources provided through the Writing Center and the WID Mentor Program. This year, WID and the Writing Center made continued progress toward turning vision into reality, as described below.

Leadership for General Education

Susanmarie served as co-chair of the Faculty Senate’s ad hoc Committee on General Education. A subcommittee (led by Nancy Welch) continued a pilot involving English 1, the HCOL seminar, and TAP seminars to work towards implementation of 4 broad foundational writing and information literacy outcomes. Simultaneously, Susanmarie’s WID expertise helped steer the pilot of a department-based process that will bring greater attention to writing and information literacy in years 2-4 of the undergraduate experience. She and committee co-chair Char Mehrtens, working closely with librarian Dan DeSanto, coordinated work in 4 pilot departments (CDAE, Romance Languages and Linguistics, Anthropology, and Nursing). The WILD process created surveys for faculty and students in each department. Some delays in survey creation meant that each department did not complete the full WILD process, but each department has received a report about faculty and student views of writing and information literacy in the field. Working within each department’s culture, the WILD team provided guidance as the departments developed outcomes and move toward curriculum mapping. The WILD project garnered major support from the Davis Foundation, who awarded the project a roughly $300,000 grant for 3 years.
Supporting foundational writing and information literacy

The work of the general education committee made great progress toward institutionalizing first-year writing and information literacy experiences. WID and the Writing Center continued their support of first-year students and faculty teaching first-year students in varied ways, some connected directly to the General Education committee and some beyond.

Writing Center Support for First-Year Students

Students making the transition to college-level writing are a target audience for the Writing Center. Through open programming, tutors held over 850 individual tutoring sessions with first-year students, comprising nearly 40% of those sessions. In addition, WID Mentors were placed in three TAP classes (ENGL 005, BIO 009, and GSWS 065) and three sections of HCOL 086, and a WID Mentor held open tutoring hours in the Honors College dorm the night before papers were due in HCOL 085. All of these placements were very successful, with faculty, mentors, and students commenting on the value of having a peer mentor to work with students on adjusting both to college writing and to college life.

In supporting foundational writing classes, tutors had 735 contacts with English 1 students (209 in individual sessions, 42 contacts in group sessions, 484 contacts in class workshops); 528 contacts with TAP students (175 individual session, 5 contacts in group sessions, and 348 contacts in workshop sessions); and 363 contacts with HCOL 085/086 students (142 in individual sessions, 38 in group sessions, and 183 in class workshops).

Participating in foundational writing program planning and assessment

As a member of the Composition Committee, Sue helped to develop a new assignment sequence and to select new core readings for English 1, enabling the course to better address the foundational writing outcomes. She also participated in the assessments for English 1 and for TAP, evaluating what selected student portfolios revealed about how the courses are meeting foundational writing outcomes. And Sue, along with tutors Eliza Novick and Rob Benner, were guests at the First-Year Writing Institute in May, sharing a student perspective on assignments and ways of responding to student writing.

Administrative support for the first year writing pilot

WID Program Assistant Kristen Cameron managed the collection of student writing for the pilot writing and information literacy assessment. She also managed the pilot’s budget and stipends, and helped prepare for workshops and events. Budget projections and management for the foundational program took additional time this year as leadership for the program transitioned.

Supporting writing in the major

The major work for supporting writing in the major was focused on WILD, described above. In addition, WID and the Writing Center had the following initiatives:

Department and College Conversations about Writing

WID completed the process of advising the Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics regarding the development of a policy on writing-intensive courses. This policy, the first in the College of Arts and Sciences, grows out of faculty attention to WID resources. Susanmarie helped draft and guided revision of the document.

WID Mentor Program

The WID Mentor Program, a program jointly sponsored by WID and the Writing Center, supports students learning ways of thinking and writing in their majors. The Program attaches experienced writing tutors to courses in their discipline, at the request of faculty who have participated in WID Programming. The WID Mentors also provide continued faculty development by sharing with instructors their insights, as students and tutors, on the assignments, methods of responding to writing, how writing is incorporated in the class, and the students’ experience in general.
In our fifth year of piloting this program, we placed mentors in 17 classes, representing (a) a variety of disciplines, including classes in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences; (b) a variety of levels, from TAP classes to core courses for sophomores to senior seminars; and (c) a variety of sizes, from large introductory classes of 106 students to small seminars of 11 students. Through individual sessions, group workshops, and in-class workshops—all targeted to address challenges students experience with writing in that discipline—mentors had 938 contacts with students. Faculty and students continue to be enthusiastic about this program. 100% of the faculty and 87% of the students who filled out an evaluation form recommended that we continue to develop the WID Mentor Program.

Tutor Tips on Writing in the Major

Sue, Kristen and tutors continued the project of creating on-line resources by students and for students on writing in a variety of majors. This year, webpages for Human Development and Family Studies, Art & Art History, Gender, Sexuality, & Women’s Studies, Public Communications, and Business Administration were created, as well as adding materials to several of the existing webpages (anthropology, psychology, political science, history, English literature, creative writing, natural resources, environmental studies, and introductory biology and chemistry. (See www.uvm.edu/writingcenter/tutortips.)

Diversity and Internationalization

In recent years, UVM’s goals have included to “build a diverse and globally aware university community sustained by an inclusive, supporting, and just campus climate” and to “Increase domestic diversity and grow international student enrollments across the University” (one of the Provost’s 8 Academic Excellence Goals). To help support these goals, WID has included programing for faculty development related to ELLs and the Writing Center has focused on providing support for English language learners.

Integration of Perspectives Regarding Diverse Student Populations

In order to prepare for the planned increase in international students, as well as to support the diversity of students already enrolled at UVM, WID open workshops have generally begun to stress a framework influenced by the universal design for learning project. Whatever the topic, workshops stressed the importance of constructing assignments and classroom experiences with an eye toward welcoming all learners, supporting students from diverse backgrounds, and supporting students with physical and cognitive disabilities.

Similarly, the Writing Center strives to provide services that are welcoming to and effective for all students by systematically applying the principles of universal design to spaces, materials, and tutoring strategies. In addition to working with many English language learners as described below, tutors worked with many students with disabilities. In end-of-session evaluations, 99% of students using the Writing Center reported that the tutoring environment was welcoming, comfortable, and respectful; 98% said they found the session useful and would use the Writing Center again, and 99% said they would recommend the Writing Center to other students.

Changing the climate toward ELLs

A continuing goal this year has been to positively affect the campus climate regarding English language learners. Because many UVM faculty have had limited experience teaching ELLs, challenges can arise when faculty turn to grading and responding to writing by English language learners. In some courses, relatively large numbers of ELLs have required support from faculty who were not prepared for or specifically supported in developing strategies for grading, responding, and advising students about developing academic English skills in the disciplines. Because UVM is a complex place, ELL students may not always know where to turn for assistance. Writing Center and WID programs this year have reached out to students and faculty, hoping to support ELLs and their instructors and prepare for increased numbers of ELLs.

Multilingual writers, Multiliterate lives

WID’s program in conjunction with Blackboard Jungle was a modified repeat of last year’s hugely successful faculty panel featuring four multilingual UVM faculty (one whose native language was English; three whose native languages were other than English; all of whom do significant scholarly work in a language other than the one they
spoke at home as a child). With a slight change in lineup, panelists shared their stories about how they developed their multilingual capabilities, what supported their language learning, and what challenges they faced. A mixed audience of tutors and faculty found much to talk about!

**Faculty Development: Responding to Writing by English Language Learners**

The Writing Center began using student experiences with tutors to help educate faculty about strategies for responding to ELL writing. With input from the tutors, Sue created a description of our Writing Center’s philosophy and approaches to working with multilingual or bi-dialectal writers. When tutors alerted her that an instructor was sending ELL students to the Writing Center with unrealistic expectations, she contacted the instructor and asked to meet to explain how the Writing Center works with English language learners. Sue also shared these concerns and approach with Gayle Nunley, who is very understanding and supportive of the need to start providing this faculty development.

**Support for ELL Writers through the Writing Center**

**Individual tutoring**

Based on students’ self-reporting, the Writing Center worked with at least 112 students who identified themselves as having a first language that was not English. These 112 students came for 757 sessions, accounting for 33% of all of our individual sessions. Half of the students—56—came five times or more, averaging 11.5 sessions each. And 40 of these 55 students asked to be matched with a writing partner for weekly sessions. Looking at the class standing of the students who came for 5 or more sessions suggests that the Writing Center is especially important in ELL students’ first year as matriculated UVM students (whether as freshmen, sophomores in the USPP Program, or graduate students).

**The Writing Partners Program**

The Writing Partners Program began in 2010 when it was clear that many ELL and ACCESS students came to the Writing Center frequently, often meeting with a different tutor each time. Matching such students with a writing partner for weekly appointments facilitates the creation of a relationship, which is key to effective tutoring and which can be complicated by language and cultural barriers. It also allows for continuity of services, with tutors able to build on what has been accomplished in previous sessions.

This year, 70 students took advantage of the Writing Partners Program, coming for 790 sessions. Of the 70 partners, 40 were English language learners, 21 were ACCESS students, and 9 came for other assorted reasons, including writing anxiety and challenges with time management.

**Group Tutoring Through Conversation Circles**

Writing Center tutors continued to work with groups of English language learners to improve their verbal English skills through weekly Conversation Circles classes. Tutors worked with small groups of 3 or 4 students under the direction of the classroom teacher in 10 classes, and were paid through fees charged by Continuing Education to students enrolled in the courses.

**Tutorial Support for the USPP Summer Bridge Program**

Last summer, Sue connected with the USPP students on several occasions: providing an introduction to Academic Support at the USPP Summer Bridge orientation, greeting students when they found the Writing Center during a scavenger hunt, and doing a workshop on writing and academic support for the group as students began the fall semester. This spring, Sue continued to work closely with Continuing Education and Đana Šehović to plan the writing tutor support for the USPP summer bridge program. Two writing center tutors were recruited to work for about 13 hours each week, holding required individual tutorials with each USPP student and facilitating weekly conversation and study groups.
Scholarly Activities
For the past four years, Susanmarie and Sue have maintained an active research agenda exploring various aspects of how to support students’ experiences learning to write in academic contexts.

Exploring the Effect of Disciplinary Expertise in Writing Tutorials
In February, Susanmarie’s and Sue’s article reporting on how disciplinary expertise, or a lack of it, shapes sessions appeared in *The Writing Center Journal*.

Writing Centers, WID Programs, and Partnerships for Change
Sue and Susanmarie built upon their 2013 NEWCA keynote for a presentation at the 2014 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) and presented a researched argument about the ways WID/Writing Center collaboration can

- affect faculty attitudes and practices around assigning and responding to writing;
- ensure student voices shape curricular initiatives such as General Education, helping to create an argument for changing the way we teach writing; and
- create momentum to improve policies (such as plagiarism policies) related to writing.

WID Mentor Programs and Faculty Development
At the Northeast Writing Centers Association Conference, Susanmarie, Sue, and four tutors offered a panel presentation arguing to expand the goals of WID Mentor Programs to include faculty development. After Susanmarie and Sue placed this approach in the context of current scholarship on writing fellows programs, the tutors analyzed how they had each contributed to faculty development through their mentor placement, demonstrating the range and depth of the development mentors can provide to faculty.

Revising National Writing Outcomes
At the 2014 CCCC, Susanmarie participated in the panel presented by the Council of Writing Program Administrators’ Task Force on the Outcomes Statement. Providing an overview of the process as chair, she steered the conversation about the revised document, encouraging participants to consider how the new document can be useful in their contexts. She chaired the subcommittee which led the final revision of this document, which will be approved by the CWPA Executive Board next July.

Goals and Challenges for 2014-2015
As this year closes, WID and the Writing Center consider goals for 2014-2015 and identify some on-going challenges the programs are expecting to face in the future.

Specific Goals for WID, 2014-2015

Regarding providing support for writing in varied formats

- Maximize collaborations with other professional development units
- Survey alumni of the WID Institute to explore possibilities for targeted advanced programming
- Explore incentives for faculty participation in intensive WID programming
Regarding creating a driver for WID

- Coordinate with the new director of Foundational Writing and Information Literacy (whom we hope will be joining us in the fall)
- Recruit more departments into the WILD project and continue working with the General Education Committee on Writing and Information Literacy

Regarding supporting broad notions of what writing is and how it is learned

- Pursue partnership with the NBH Spire for support of science/graduate student writing
- Develop workshop(s) on responding to English language learners’ writing

Specific Goals for the Writing Center, 2014-2015

For Open Programming

- Make online tutoring available to students who can’t physically come to the library
- Offer some open workshops, perhaps on creating personal statements
- Continue to build use of the Writing Center in the spring semester
- Benchmark (a) writing center support for graduate students and (b) the nature of writing center spaces

For the target audience of students in foundational writing classes

- Solidify the connection with English 1, in preparation for a new director of first-year writing
- Pursue connections between the Writing Center and foundational writing classes, as the general education requirement is implemented

For the target audience of English language learners

- Encourage tutors to alert Sue when they see opportunities for faculty development, and then pursue conversations with individual instructors
- Work with Susanmarie to develop workshops for faculty on responding to writing by ELLs
- Work with the Global Gateway Program to ensure GGP students who matriculate receive the writing support they need to be successful (especially in light of the loss of the ELL Coordinator position)
- Monitor use of the Writing Center by ELLs, to determine needs for additional programming and funding

For our target audience of ALANA students

- Create a tutoring service at the ASC that will be sustainable

Collaborative WID/Writing Center Goals, 2014-2015

For the WID Mentor Program

- Integrate use of WID Mentors with the WILD program, as an option for providing faculty development to departments and instructors who are trying to incorporate writing into their classes more effectively
- Revise program tip sheets for faculty and mentors, including more information about faculty development options
For integrating with the new first-year writing program and director

- Develop office policies and procedures as we adapt the space for an additional program and two additional colleagues (director and staff member)
- Identify productive ways to collaborate logistically and programmatically; identify what resources can be shared

For collaborating with the librarians on integrating information literacy into WID programming and tutor training

- Identify ways librarians can consult with the graduate students
- Identify questions that librarians can help with during tutor training

For extending our program’s scholarly activity

- Proposals have been submitted to two conferences, on how writing centers and writing in the discipline programs can play key roles in raising campus awareness and changing campus practices around issues of language diversity.

Ongoing Challenges

WID and the Writing Center have worked hard to design and expand programs in ways that address both present and future needs. Working collaboratively to coordinate faculty development and student support, WID and the Writing Center promote and enhance the development of students as writers throughout their UVM experience. At the same time, services are constructed in ways that can provide a framework for supporting current campus initiatives, such as those related to general education and internationalization. As this year closes, on-going challenges are identified as the programs look to the future.

Developing the WID Mentor Program: Financial Support for the Writing Center Director

Currently, the Writing Center director’s faculty position is funded at 100%, with 25% teaching and 62.5% administrative release from the Provost’s Office. This arrangement, an outgrowth of the historical role of the Writing Center director in the Learning Cooperative, permits the administration of Writing Center open programming. Since merging with the Writing in the Disciplines Program, the WID budget has been able to fund the remaining 12.5% of the Writing Center director position (because of savings accrued from the first semester of our operation as we moved into new space and searched for a program assistant) to support the creation of a WID Mentor Program, which attaches experienced Writing Center tutors to courses in the major. However, this funding model is not sustainable for much longer. Without additional funding from another source, the Writing Center director will not be able to continue to develop and coordinate this program.

Writing Center Funding

As in the past, the Writing Center relied on the generosity of WID to supplement its meager operating budget of $1020/year. Next year will present a special challenge, as the cost of WCONline ($715), our scheduling and database program will be a new expense. (That cost was subsidized this year by Academic Support Programs.) Workstudy grants tutors chose to use also allowed the program to stay within budget for tutor wages (barely).

Gradual Implementation of General Education

WID is working closely with the general education initiative. The relatively slow pace of general education development--necessary in order to build firm support in the Senate--creates uncertainty regarding WID’s future. Some departments and individual faculty are understandably cautious about beginning writing initiatives without clarity about the future of general education. The Davis Foundation grant funds the planning for writing and information literacy in the major, but does not provide funding for departmental implementation or innovation. It remains to be seen how incentives for implementing WILD will evolve, and how departments will find ways to
reallocate existing resources for their own WILD activities. If general education truly reshapes the ways that departments address writing and information literacy, additional resources will be needed for WID to be able to support and partner with departments, both in the medium term and once the program is fully implemented.

**Administrative Support for the foundational gen ed writing requirement**

As the general education initiative advances, additional demands have been brought to bear on WID. Program Assistant Kristen Cameron has been able to provide support to the pilot initiative for foundational writing and information literacy, and will provide valuable assistance next year as the pilot work extends to departments. In 2013, as the leadership plans for the foundational initiative changed, uncertainty grew about administrative support. Particularly with matters of budget, Kristen Cameron had to do extensive work to manage the funds available and their transfers from central administration. As the foundational writing and information literacy requirement is fully implemented in fall 2014 and, we hope, the department-based work expands as well, administrative demands will exceed what WID is able to provide. As general education grows, central support for its administrative implementation will be required. The hiring of a staff assistant (not to mention director) for the foundational program should ease this burden.

**Integrating with the new Foundational Writing and Information Literacy Program**

The Foundational Writing and Information Literacy program will be a major advance for the campus. Its physical location in the WID space will raise questions about the productive use of space, the delineations of responsibilities between units that have mutually supportive and occasionally overlapping missions (e.g. TAP seminars may sponsor writing in the disciplines; both WID and the Foundational program have reasons to connect with TAP faculty). There will be much to do regarding coordinating communications and priorities.

**Lack of Summer Support for the WID and Writing Center Directors**

Much of the work of the Writing in the Disciplines Program continues into the summer. With the WID Institute in mid-May, the lengthy project of writing the annual report—so crucial to analyzing the current year and planning for the future—extends into June. End-of-the-year budget planning also must happen in late May/June. Some preparation for the upcoming year has to take place in the summer, such as consulting with WID mentor faculty as they develop their courses. August is an ideal time for faculty development workshops, programming which needs to increase in connection with any general education communications outcome.

**Part 2: Detailed Program Reports**

**WID: Support for the Teaching of Writing**

**Establishing an Institutional Framework**

WID’s sixth year was productive and exciting. Much of the work focused on nurturing the general education initiative as it began to focus on cultivating attention to writing and information literacy in departments/disciplines. Programming focusing on science writing, an extension of previous conversations with graduate directors, was made possible by visiting Fulbright Scholar Lisa Emerson. In addition, open workshops were used to respond flexibly to emerging needs. By creating quality workshops for faculty, seeking departmental partnerships, offering program tailored to the needs of particular constituencies (such as new faculty members) and participating to the fullest extent possible in the campus conversations about reshaping undergraduate education and assessment, WID seeks to be a central resource for faculty interested in writing. As the campus slowly develops clarity about its vision for writing and information literacy, WID stands ready to expand its services.

WID’s model brings together expertise from WID with disciplinary expertise across campus in order to address the problems, opportunities, and challenges around writing identified by individual faculty members and/or academic units. WID’s approach grows from these assumptions:
• Effective WID work grows out of faculty-identified local needs. In the absence of an institutional driver that organizes campus attention to writing, WID must be responsive to the experiences of faculty in the disciplines. Faculty who are already exploring changes to how writing works in their courses or units are ripe for collaborating with WID.

• WID workshops and departmental partnerships can be designed in order to provide resources and assistance for faculty-led curricular development, to help address problems that have emerged in the experience of teaching particular courses or challenges that emerge in the design of new ones, and to help departments assess how to proceed as they design new experiences for their students.

• The goals and design of particular advanced writing experiences emerge from faculty leadership in the disciplines. Successful WID partnerships rely on leadership within units, as both expertise from WID and expertise from the disciplines are necessary.

• Collaboration with other faculty development units (such as CTL) is essential in order to maximize the effects of the limited resources each unit has and to assist faculty and departments with their work.

While the current campus climate means that WID must be responsive to the needs faculty and departments identify, it is important to acknowledge the core message at the heart of what WID brings to any activity. These fundamental assumptions about writing guide all WID activities, and cannot be fully realized until an institutional framework for writing is in place. They are fully consonant with the assumptions guiding the general education project:

• Serious engagement with a range of writing tasks across their experiences at UVM will position graduates to meet the personal and professional challenges of an increasingly globalized world.

• Well-designed writing experiences can help deepen students’ intellectual experiences on campus and prepare them for professional experiences in a global economy post-graduation.

• Writing is essential to achieving learning outcomes in every academic discipline. Writing is both a way to learn and a way to demonstrate learning, and is an important part of almost every profession.

**WID Programming**

A variety of WID workshops and other activities for faculty, graduate students and staff with teaching responsibilities helped expand conversations about writing. These conversations encourage reflection, pedagogical experimentation, and assessment. In 2013-2014, the number of individuals who participated in some sort of WID programming increased slightly. A total of 154 individuals (including 97 faculty members, 8 staff, 9 post doctorates, 28 graduate students, and 12 undergraduate students) attended WID programming (see Appendix D for details). Eight people from 5 different departments requested individual consultations with Susanmarie. Overall participation was up sharply, largely as a result of increased contacts per participant. This is due both to participation in extended programming as well as individuals attending multiple open workshops. WID increased the number of open workshops from last year (we offered 12 more open workshops this year than last, over half in collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning). All told, we had 342 contacts with 154 people. Relative to 2012-2013, we also saw greater representation from science departments, largely due to our science writing programming with Fulbright Scholar Lisa Emerson. Otherwise, there were no significant changes in participation by school/department.

Our programming offers a mix of introductory and advanced sessions. This year, one of the goals of collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning and Bailey/Howe Library was to emphasize to participants the deep links between course goals, assignment goals, and teaching/responding strategies. Our series on “Assignment Design” offered multiple opportunities for faculty to explore different facets of their teaching, and make connections with staff here at WID, the CTL, or the library. Our extended programming for units or small groups of faculty pursuing more narrow interests allow participants to explore some topics in greater depth. These specialized programs promote connections across department boundaries and permit faculty with shared interests (such as first-year students, or plagiarism) to develop new approaches over time, sustained by continuing conversation and resources. In addition, conversations about writing within units largely focused within the general education WILD initiative. By promoting connections across departments as well as offering units the
opportunities to have focused conversations about writing in their discipline, WID programming encourages instructors to become ever more reflective about their teaching.

**Open Programming**

Open workshops offer instructors the chance to make connections across departments; our open programs are typically one-time workshops, open to any instructor who wishes to attend. This year, 125 individuals (including 77 faculty members, 7 staff, 6 post doctorates, 19 graduate students, and 12 undergraduate students) from 40 departments and 5 programs took part in WID open programming, which included workshops addressing the following themes:

**General Principles of Teaching Writing**

Through conventional workshops, we explored key topics in the field of writing in the disciplines and writing across the curriculum: connecting all aspects of a course to well-developed goals was the key theme of the year. In addition WID also offered more attention to student peer interaction in courses. The Sound Bites series, developed in conjunction with other professional development units, offered faculty the chance to get a very short introduction to key topics (such as writing course goals, saving time while grading, or using exam wrappers to promote reflection).

**Writing and Diversity**

WID’s commitment to diversity includes mounting programs with a central focus on issues of diversity in the classroom as well as on including an emphasis on diversity within most workshops offered. Part of WID’s general message about teaching writing is that writing offers broad opportunities for students to learn and to display what they have learned; writing assignments thus offer the opportunity to create varied opportunities for students to proceed through a course. WID often incorporates principles from the Understanding Diverse Learners (UDL) perspective to the work, particularly in collaboration with the CTL on programs such as “Teaching in Higher Education.” In addition, WID continues to support Blackboard Jungle by offering a related workshop (this year on multilingual writers and emerging linguistic competence).

**GTA Programming**

In collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning, WID has supported the Graduate Teaching Certificate Program. This program provides feedback and encouragement for graduate students as they explore ways various high impact teaching practices can be useful in their teaching. WID and CTL offered a workshop on teaching in higher education specifically for graduate students and welcomed graduate student participants in other workshops connected to the program. WID extended this program to include attention to job seeking materials such as teaching philosophy statements, letters of application, and resumes or cvs.

**Science Writing**

Thanks to the presence of visiting Fulbright Scholar Lisa Emerson, WID was able to offer private consultations as well as two public workshops on the topic of writing in the sciences and mentoring science writers. In addition, WID provided consulting to Physical Therapy faculty, opening a productive line of dialogue with several groups of faculty regarding supporting science and/or graduate student writers.

**Participant Evaluations**

Faculty members motivated to attend WID workshops were happy with the programming and reported that it was of great value to their teaching. At the conclusion of each workshop, participants were asked to fill out an evaluation to help assess the effectiveness of the activities and to solicit suggestions for additional programming. The 95 evaluations collected this year showed that participants were overwhelmingly satisfied with the workshops. Virtually all respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the workshop was valuable, that discussion helped them learn, that they would use ideas from the workshop in

“It’s helpful to hear other faculty who have some of the same issues arise and then to be able to brainstorm solutions.”
their teaching, and that they would recommend the workshop to others. Over 90% of participants thought the workshop they attended met their goals and balanced presentation, activities, and discussion well.

Participants were also asked open-ended questions about what element of the workshop was particularly helpful and whether there are any other activities, materials, or programs they would like WID to offer. The most common responses to the first question were that participants appreciated the chance to learn from and connect with colleagues in other departments; the chance to see examples of others’ approaches, and exposure to new perspectives and teaching tools. Faculty requested more workshops addressing proposal writing, learning theory, and assignments for teaching effective writing. (More detail on workshop attendance and evaluations is given in Appendix D.)

**WID Institute**

The WID Institute, a four-day program in May, supports full-time faculty developing or revising an undergraduate course with a significant writing component. Participants develop a clear plan for the role of writing in the course, create assignment materials and class activities, and create assessment tools and strategies. This year, 14 faculty from 8 different programs or departments in the Colleges of Arts and Science, Education and Social Sciences, and Nursing and Health Sciences participated. Notably, a team of faculty from Physical Therapy attended with the intention of developing courses that interlock. Daisy Benson of Bailey/Howe Libraries was present throughout the institute and led presentations on information literacy. In addition, department liaison librarians visited on one day to provide all participants with the opportunity for information literacy consulting during the course development process. Two writing center tutors—seniors Bronwen Hudson and Indigo James—joined Sue Dinitz to facilitate conversation about peer review. Follow up activities will help support faculty teaching as well as writing.

Faculty evaluation for the 2014 WID Institute was among our most positive ever. Participants were unanimous in strong agreement that the Institute was valuable. All of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the Institute balanced presentation, activities, and discussion well, that the institute met their expectations, and that they would recommend the Institute to others. Open-ended comments indicated that the Institute’s emphasis on the connections between course activities and course goals, and the variety of ways to use writing assignments opened up many new insights among participants. This work led participants to consider both new kinds of assignments as well as new strategies for responding to student work and peer review. (More detail is given in Appendix E.)

**Extended Workshops, Programs, and Activities**

This section of the report includes programming that WID sponsored beyond its open programming.

**Faculty Writing Workshops**

In conjunction with the Center for Teaching and Learning, since 2011, WID has sponsored faculty writing retreats, which help faculty invigorate summer and break writing projects. This year, the faculty writing retreat continued through the academic year. Although the summer retreats are better attended, we had a small group of faculty continue to use weekly writing times to anchor their writing routines. In total we had 31 participants from 21 departments or programs.

**New Faculty Group**

With support from a generous donor, Robert Small and family, WID and the CTL co-facilitated a year-long group focusing on principles of universal design for learning with new faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences. A combination of open workshops (such as drawing for learning) and closed programming just for this new faculty group allowed us to explore themes of course design, universal design, and strategies for promoting student engagement.
Departmental Partnerships

**WILD**

The WILD process occupied most of WID’s time with departmental partnerships. Surveys of faculty and students were conducted in Romance Language and Linguistics, Community Development and Applied Economics, Anthropology, and Nursing.

**EPSCoR**

Susanmarie and Lisa ran a workshop on science writing for post-docs and graduate students at EPSCOR.

**GTAs in Rubenstein**

Susanmarie did a workshop on grading and rubrics for Walt Kunezel’s classes, and consulted on resulting materials.

**WID and General Education: WILD**

The Writing and Information Literacy in the Disciplines (WILD) initiative is the second phase of the General Education Committee’s work on writing and information literacy. While WILD is, strictly speaking, a Faculty Senate initiative, it is, in practical terms, the central work of WID. The General Education committee, co-chaired by Susanmarie, drew heavily on resources and connections Susanmarie and WID supplied in order to conceptualize and roll out the WILD program. WILD, of course, brings information literacy into play with writing in ways that WID alone could never have initiated. WILD is significant in several ways:

- It promises to be a driver for WID, an institutional mechanism to strongly encourage, if not require, departments to engage with writing and information literacy concepts
- It promises to have enormous impact on the undergraduate experience
- It usefully challenges WID to expand its attention to information literacy, building on the collaborative partnerships we have already had with librarians.

**WILD Activities**

In 2013-2014, four departments participated in the WILD pilot: Romance Languages and Linguistics (RLL), Anthropology, Community Development and Applied Economics (CDAE), and Nursing. The WILD pilot, inspired by the University of Minnesota’s Writing Enhanced Curriculum (WEC) project, started off with surveys for faculty and students about writing and information literacy in the major. The WILD initiative identifies four outcomes for participating departments:

- Identification of disciplinary priorities for writing and information literacy
- Student learning outcomes based on those priorities
- Curricular map of where those outcomes are taught
- Plan for assessing and refining the outcomes

These outcomes are achieved with the leadership of a department liaison (who receives one course release, funded this year by the Provost) working with the WILD leadership team: Char Merhtens and Susanmarie Harrington, co-chairs of the General Education Committee, and Dan DeSanto, of Bailey/Howe Libraries, supported by the WID graduate research assistants and Kristen Cameron, WID Program Assistant. WID coordinated the work of adapting the WEC surveys Minnesota has made public, with Dan leading the attention to creating analogous survey questions about information literacy.

After a slow beginning with survey development—developing and customizing the surveys for each department took some time—the departments began work. The WILD process envisions four key meetings for departments:
1. Meeting to review the survey outcomes
2. Meeting to review draft outcomes and begin curricular mapping
3. Meeting to plan assessment
4. Meeting to review work and make future plans in light of available resources

The meetings proceeded at different paces with each department, as each department had a very different culture and the process needed to be adapted to each one. The meetings to review survey outcomes (held so far for 3 of the 4 departments) typically did not reach clarity on possible writing and information literacy outcomes; in fact, these meetings usually revealed that faculty have very shallow understandings of information literacy as a concept. The second meetings usually began to create deeper understandings and more clarity about concepts, but did not get as far as curriculum mapping. No department moved into the assessment planning phase.

**Challenges and Barriers in WILD**

The funding for 2013-2014 WILD liaisons was secured very shortly before faculty went off contract in Spring 2013. Given that Susanmarie and Char do not have summer appointments, WILD planning went on hold until the contract period resumed in August 2014. Late appointments for liaisons meant that the planned orientation activities for liaisons and liaison librarians did not take place as planned; WID worked with each liaison and department one at a time, which was inefficient. In addition, progress on getting the surveys developed did not begin until Fall 2014, and recursive adaptations of the surveys took time.

Once the WILD process began with the departments, it moved along in time with each department’s culture. Some departments appear to be more quick-paced than others. The WID GRAs had their own learning curve with Lime survey, and grew more adept with downloading and reporting data as the year went on. Generally, there are problems with student participation rates; faculty participate at great rates but few students do.

The WILD process—which will be supported by a Davis Foundation grant for the next 2, possibly 3, years—provides funding for planning writing and information literacy outcomes and an initial assessment. At the moment there are no clear sources of funding for implementation (beyond WID’s modest resources which might be used to support some activities). This lack of implementation funding may make some participants skeptical about how much is actually possible with WILD. While WILD pilot departments are all eager to begin the work, it is not always clear how departmental barriers (such as class size) might be addressed in the future.

A final challenge is the small size of the library’s Information and Instruction department. Only 8 librarians support the entire campus. One librarian’s sabbatical affects our ability to partner with many departments. And the question of librarian workload in WILD is significant.

**Responding to Challenges**

The Davis Foundation funding provides more stability to WILD recruiting. Char and Susanmarie, joined by the General Education Committee and particularly with the help of Brian Reed, continue recruitment efforts. The WILD process should run more smoothly next year; with reporting processes, document creation guidelines, and much expertise with Lime to build on. Liaison orientation should be able to happen earlier and in groups. By reflecting on and learning from previous experiences, good process guidelines have been created for next year. Part of the WILD leadership team’s message to participating departments is that this process is fundamentally a department-driven initiative. It should assist departments in identifying how to use the resources at their disposal. It is the hope that in the coming years, WILD will be able to use the experiences of other departments to help guide conversation about the relationships between change, resources, assessment, and curriculum reform.
**Goals and Outlook for Next Year**

In the next year, WID seeks to complete the WILD process with the 4 pilot departments and recruit up to 8 additional departments. To meet this recruitment goal, WILD needs to find a way to manage working with the stretched-thin librarians, and find a way to communicate more effectively with chairs. This will be an ongoing effort. In addition, WILD will refine duties and support for liaisons.

The Davis Grant offers an exciting beginning for WILD. It remains to be seen how implementation will play out. When the WID Program was established in 2007, Susanmarie’s offer letter noted that the initial budget was set, and that as the program grew, additional resources would be needed. A WILD initiative that truly engages all departments in regular assessment and refinement of writing and information literacy outcomes will tax the current resources of WID and the library more than they can bear.

**The Writing Center: Support for Student Writers**

**Overviews of Writing Center Services, 2013-2014**

**Overview of Services Provided to Students**

The Writing Center offers students the opportunity to talk about their writing with a trained and experienced peer tutor at any point in the writing process. It offers services through two programs: open programming, which can be scheduled by any student or arranged by any faculty member, and the WID Mentor Program, which attaches tutors to classes and is available to faculty who have participated in the WID faculty development program.

This year, the number of writing center contacts with students again hit an all-time high, increasing by 8% from 5,029 to 5,442 contacts. Last year, Sue realized there was little room for growth in individual tutoring sessions, especially in the fall semester, and so did only minimal promoting of the Writing Center. Sue continued that policy this year, but did some additional outreach in the spring semester and also promoted in-class workshops. The usage patterns reflect this strategy, as presented in Table 1 and described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of session</th>
<th>Open Programming</th>
<th>WID Mentor</th>
<th>Total Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual tutoring</td>
<td>2318 (-1%)</td>
<td>250 (-21%)</td>
<td>2568 (-3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tutoring</td>
<td>55 ENS 1 groups + 1114-conv. circles = 1169 (-9%)</td>
<td>141 (-28%)</td>
<td>1310 (-12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class workshops</td>
<td>1017 (+138%)</td>
<td>547 (+7%)</td>
<td>1564 (+75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contacts</td>
<td>4504 (+11%)</td>
<td>938 (-4%)</td>
<td>5442 (+8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The overall 8% increase was fueled largely by a 138% increase in contacts through class workshops, thanks to increased outreach and the excellent work of our new tutor presentation coordinator, Kathryn Warrender.
- While the number of individual tutoring sessions through open programming looks as if it declined slightly, this number is almost certainly not accurate. The Writing Center switched to an on-line scheduling system that resulted in more no-shows than in past years, with no easy way for tutors to record the drop-in sessions they were consequently able to hold. So some sessions went unrecorded. In the spring, Sue and Kristen worked to address these issues, Sue did some outreach, and the number of sessions increased (as compared with last spring) by 6%. And when you add in the 20 slots that were used for the 55 group tutoring contacts (mostly for a special project with two English 1 sections), the number of recorded tutoring sessions was almost identical to last year: 2338 compared with 2342.
- The 9% decrease in the number of group contacts in the Writing Center reflects a decrease in the number of students signing up for Conversation Circles classes (where small groups of English language learners meet with a tutor to practice conversation skills).
While the number of contacts through the WID Mentor program declined slightly, the balance between individual tutoring, group tutoring, and class workshops shifts somewhat each year, depending on the nature of the placements. Also, the program focused on the mentors' role in providing faculty development, which isn’t reflected in the number of contacts with students.

Overview of Services Provided to Tutors: A Service Learning Experience

The approach to tutor education

All Writing Center services were provided by fifty peer tutors, ranging from sophomores to seniors and from a variety of majors. The writing tutors are carefully chosen through an interview and application process after being recommended by a professor. Their training is framed as an academic service learning experience, which begins with the two courses required of first-year tutors (English 104 and 105) and continues through regular staff development meetings for second- and third-year tutors and for tutors serving as WID mentors.

Through their tutor education, tutors explore how every writer’s abilities and writing processes are shaped by aspects of their background, experience, and identity, and learn ways of supporting academic literacy development at all levels, with focused units on ESL writers and writers with disabilities. The tutors develop a wide range of skills: in writing, teaching, leadership, public speaking, working in both one-on-one and group settings, time management, responsibility, and professionalism.

Tutors find their extensive training and work experience very valuable when they seek employment or admission to graduate or professional school. Susanmarie offers tutors a workshop on how to highlight their tutoring experiences in their resumes and cover letters, and Kristen offers a workshop with tips for a variety of aspects of the job search process. Sue wrote recommendations for over twenty tutors this year, and gave phone references for many others.

Goal for this year

Our five-year program certification through the College Reading and Learning Association, which allows us to grant tutor certification at the 3 levels of Regular, Advanced, and Master, was due to expire in August 2013. Sue submitted an application for another five-year recertification, which required sending in a large collection of documentation related to tutor training, evaluation, and monitoring, showing how tutor training addresses a long list of required topics, in a variety of required modes, and how tutors’ work and performance are documented. The application was approved, with no concerns or suggestions reported, and with comments that included the praise “Beautifully structured application, very thorough, and the enthusiasm and pride you have for your program shines through.”

Tutor Highlights

In addition to providing nearly 5500 contacts with students through tutoring sessions and class workshops, tutors collaborated in improving services and participated in broader conversations within the field by presenting at conferences and creating materials for use in the Writing Center.

- All tutors earned certification through the College Reading and Learning Association at one of three levels (each level requiring a minimum of 10 additional hours of training and 25 additional hours of tutoring). We had 2 tutors certified at the “Regular” level, 22 at the "Advanced" level; 15 at the "Master" level; and 9 completed an additional 25 hours of tutoring and 10 of training beyond the Master level (our “Grand Master” tutors).
Tutor Sydney Camisa proposed creating a writing center satellite at the Alana Student Center (ASC), and then worked with the ASC staff to publicize the service in the ALANA community. By the spring, she had come up with a system that worked—having interested students email her to schedule an appointment—and held 22 sessions at the ASC with 12 students.

Several tutors helped experiment with offering online tutoring, using the platform available through the new scheduling/database software, WCONline. The Writing Center is now poised to offer this service to students who can’t physically come to the Writing Center.

On March 1, four tutors participated in a panel presentation at the Northeast Writing Centers Association Conference at the University of New Hampshire. Bronwen Hudson, Kathryn Warrender, Laura Davenport, and Rob Benner, along with Sue and Susanmarie, gave a panel presentation entitled, “From Student Support to Faculty Development: Creating Change by Shifting the Focus of a Writing Fellows Program.” Sue and Susanmarie described the purpose and nature of this shift, placing it in the context of the scholarship on writing fellows programs, and then each mentor analyzed how they had contributed to faculty development through their mentor placement.

Several tutors created materials and workshops on subjects such as effective peer review, writing literature reviews, and working with writers with autism.

Many tutors contributed to the Tutor Tips webpages on writing across the disciplines, creating new webpages for Human Development and Family Studies, Art & Art History, Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies, Public Communications, and Business Administration, as well as contributing annotated sample papers and other updates to several of the existing websites.

Tutor Kathryn Warrender served as Presentation Coordinator, organizing 75 class presentations about the Writing Center (compared with 37 last year), 42 of which included workshops that involved students in broader discussions and activities related to writing.

Six tutors served as mentors for the Young Writers Project (YWP), providing feedback to student writers in grades 2-12.

Tutor Allie Brimlow completed a one-credit internship connected to English 105, as part of an Honors College requirement for sophomores. In search of a topic for her thesis, she explored how the principles of instructional communication (from her field of Public Communications) might apply to writing center tutoring.

Two groups of tutors participated in faculty development activities: tutors Bronwen Hudson and Indigo James presented at the WID Institute, discussing how to design effective peer review of student work-in-progress; tutors Eliza Novick and Rob Benner talked with the faculty at the First-Year Writing Institute about responding to and evaluating writing. And several tutors helped with the search for a Director of First-Year Writing, meeting candidates for breakfast and taking them on campus tours.

**Services Provided Through Open Programming**

*Individualized writing support (open to all students for 52 hours a week in Bailey/Howe)*

This year, access to the Writing Center improved by moving to online scheduling. In the past, students had to call the Learning Cooperative during office hours to make a Writing Center appointment. This became so burdensome and confusing, especially to international students, that the Learning Cooperative decided they could no longer provide this service and offered to help the Writing Center move to a separate scheduling/database system. WCONline was chosen because it offers easy online scheduling, though it does not allow us to connect to the Banner System and has more limited database and reporting functions than the system we shared with the Learning Cooperative. Students are now able to quickly make and cancel appointments at any time of the day or night. Of the students who filled out our evaluation form, 99% felt the process of making an appointment went smoothly, with 91% strongly agreeing.
Initiating and ensuring the smooth functioning of WCONline has been an ongoing process this year, handled very adeptly by Kristen Cameron, WID Program Assistant. The new system created several new challenges. For example, due to the ease in scheduling, we had more no-shows than usual in the fall, and no way to let students know that a tutor was available. Also, tutors had no way to easily record sessions with student who dropped in when slots became available due to no-shows. Thus, in Table 3 below, a historical snapshot of the growth in individual sessions through open programming over the past five years, it appears that the number of sessions decreased by 1% in the fall. However, we are fairly confident that the actual number of sessions was higher than the records in WCONline indicate.

In the spring, these issues were addressed by setting up the “wait list” feature on WCONline, by adding signage to make it clearer when a tutor was available for drop-in sessions, and by developing a system for tutors to more easily record any drop-in sessions. Also, Sue did some additional advertising in the spring, as the center is always less busy in the spring than in the fall semester. Sue sent an additional email to faculty, offering to do in-class presentations and workshops about the Writing Center, and tutors posted flyers across campus. These strategies seemed to work: the number of recorded sessions in the spring increased by 6%, resulting in an annual decrease in recorded sessions of only .01%. Tutors worked with over 1000 students, in 2338 sessions.

### Table 3: Number of Individual Tutoring Sessions through Open Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Fall Semester # of sessions</th>
<th>Spring Semester # of sessions</th>
<th>Total # of sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>1344 (-4%)</td>
<td>994 (+6%)</td>
<td>2338 (.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>1401 (+8%)</td>
<td>941 (-14%)</td>
<td>2342 (-2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>1292 (+21%)</td>
<td>1095 (+28%)</td>
<td>2387 (+24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>1071 (+11%)</td>
<td>858 (+9.7%)</td>
<td>1929 (+10.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>964 (+2%)</td>
<td>782 (+4%)</td>
<td>1746 (+6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expanding Access Through Offering On-line Tutoring

In response to Sue’s additional outreach efforts in the spring, a CE instructor requested tutoring support in an online class for distance education students. As the new online scheduling and database system has a platform for online tutoring, this seemed a good opportunity to experiment. Kristen and Sue activated the system on our website, trained some interested tutors, and sent information about the service to the students. Unfortunately, no one in the class took advantage of the opportunity. However, the Writing Center is now poised to offer online tutoring to students who aren’t able to come to campus for on-site tutoring.

Next year, the Writing Center plans to offer online tutoring in a method similar to that used for the Writing Partners Program. The Writing Center website will explain that students for whom coming to Bailey/Howe Library would be a hardship (e.g. because they live outside of Chittenden County, or because they have a disability) can submit a request for online tutoring. Sue will consider the requests and grant access to the schedule for online tutoring when appropriate.

### Class Workshops

A goal for this year was to increase the number of workshops, for two reasons: (1) the number of presentations and workshops has dropped over the past two years, and (2) while there is not much more capacity to offer individual tutoring sessions, there is capacity to reach more students through workshops.

Workshops are an excellent way to provide some writing support to a larger number of students than can be reached through one-on-one sessions, and to connect students with the Writing Center. Currently, the Writing Center does not offer any on-site workshops, but it does offer classroom-based workshops. When offered in classroom settings, workshops also serve to introduce faculty to the Writing Center and support faculty in their efforts to integrate writing into their classes. The main Writing Center webpage includes a link to the following information about workshops:
Writing in the Disciplines and Writing Center Annual Report, 2013-2014

Writing tutors are available to do class presentations introducing students to the Writing Center. These can last from 10-45 minutes. The longer presentations include a workshop portion that involves students in a discussion of writing, providing a fuller understanding of what happens at the Writing Center. Possible workshops topics include composing styles, the challenges of academic writing, writing literature review, and what makes peer review effective. Faculty can request a workshop engaging students in a general conversation about writing, a conversation that might involve looking at a sample paper, considering what makes peer review effective, discussing what makes writing challenging, identifying students’ styles of composing, or some combination of these topics.

To increase requests for workshops, Sue and tutors designed some workshops targeted at the English 1 curriculum (on being an effective peer reviewer and on writing literature reviews) and at TAP classes (on creating a strong thesis), and advertised the availability of these workshops with English 1 and TAP faculty. These strategies seemed to work: while last year 37 presentations were offered, 16 of which included workshops, this year 75 presentations were offered, 42 of which included workshops. Contacts with students through workshops increased from 428 to 1,017, and were responsible for the overall increase in contacts this year.

Benchmarking writing center workshop offerings

Next year, Sue would like not only to continue promoting workshops but also to consider extending our workshop offerings. So Sue decided to benchmark workshop offerings at 21 other writing centers, including those of our peer and aspirant institutions. (For the data from this project, see Appendix B.) Sue discovered that over half of these institutions do not offer workshops, providing only one-on-one tutoring: Binghamton, Boston University, Boston College, Brown, Dartmouth, George Washington, Georgetown, Stony brook, the University of Minnesota, William and Mary, Tufts, and the University of Rochester. A review of the offerings of the ten centers that do hold workshops suggests that what the Writing Center offers is fairly comparable. Two use a design similar to our own, with tutors available to go into classes and facilitate writing workshops (North Caroline State and UMass Amherst). Two other centers offer to have professional staff members design and offer workshops (UC Boulder and Syracuse, with Syracuse charging $75/hour for the service). Five writing centers offer on-site rather than classroom-based workshops. At the University of Connecticut, the U. of Hawaii, Manoa, and George Mason these are open to anyone and are on topics of general interest, such as writing personal statements, using commas, and writing from sources. Cornell and the University of Connecticut offers targeted workshops designed for international students, and American University offers workshops for graduate students. (Some additional universities offered workshops for graduate students but not through the Writing Center, such as the University of Rochester.)

Next year, Sue plans to experiment with holding a few workshops on topics of general interest that are not overly context-dependent (e.g. writing personal statements, developing a writing process that works for you) to guage if there is student interest.

Demographics of Students Who Use Open Programming

Gender

Many writing centers report that more students identifying as female take advantage of their open programming services. This continues to be true at UVM. The proportions this year were exactly the same as the proportions last year: students identifying as female accounted for 65% of individual Writing Center sessions through open programming and students identifying as male for 35%. One student identified as genderqueer.

---

2 The new database system does not connect to the Banner system, so student registration profiles are relied on for statistics. Because of difficulties adjusting to the system, 218 students never filled out a profile. The data below is based on the 2,149 sessions with students who did fill out a profile. It does not include students who used the WiD Mentor Program, who participated in Writing Workshops, or who were in Conversation Circle groups.
**College/School Affiliation**

As in the past, undergraduate students from all of the colleges and schools used the Writing Center, in numbers roughly proportional to college/school enrollments but influenced by the disproportionate number of English language learners enrolled in the School of Business Administration or taking courses through Continuing Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th># of sessions, AY14</th>
<th>% of sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAD</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESS</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNHS</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSENAR</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMS</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD COL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class Standing**

Nearly 40% of sessions scheduled through open programming were with first-year students, one of the Writing Center’s target audiences. Students continued using the Writing Center all the way through graduate school, with decreasing numbers of sessions for each advancing year-in-school.

**Chart 1: Class Standing of Students Coming to the Writing Center**
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Details About Services to First-Year Students (a target audience)

Students making the transition from high school to college-level writing have always been a target audience for the Writing Center. For the past few years, there has been a continuing decrease in the number of sessions with students enrolled in first-year classes focused on writing, and so Sue made additional efforts this year to connect with English 1 and TAP instructors, sending multiple emails to both groups and presenting at the TAP Writing Institute and GTA English 1 Orientation. Also, as reported above, Sue and tutors designed some workshops targeted at English 1 and TAP. These efforts paid off, with the number of contacts with English 1 students increasing by 150%, and the number of contacts with TAP students increasing by 121%. More detail about the nature of these contacts is included in the tables below. Overall, the proportion of sessions with first-year students increased from 29% to nearly 40%.

Supporting English 1

This year, one of Sue’s goals was to restore a connection between the Writing Center and English 1 students. Writing Center support for English 1 classes had been declining since the number of English 1 sections was cut nearly in half in 2009-10. Previous to this cut, sessions with English 1 students typically made up about 25% of all open programming sessions. Nancy Welch decided to require all of the graduate teaching fellows to schedule a writing center presentation for their classes, and we developed some options for workshops directed specifically at the new English 1 sequence (one on peer review and one on writing literature reviews). As a result, the number of presentations for English 1 classes increased from 8 to 34, and the number of workshops from 8 to 22. In addition, one of the GTAs (Ethan Wattley) arranged for his students to come in groups to the Writing Center for facilitated peer review. Correspondingly, the number of workshop contacts with English 1 students increased by 128%, the number of individual sessions by 158%, and the total number of contacts by 150%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Individual Sessions # of contacts (+158%)</th>
<th>Group sessions # of contacts</th>
<th>In-class Workshops # of contacts (+128%)</th>
<th>Total # of contacts (+150%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>209 contacts</td>
<td>42 contacts</td>
<td>484 contacts</td>
<td>735 contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>81 contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>212 contacts</td>
<td>293 contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>161 contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>234 contacts</td>
<td>395 contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>240 contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>180 contacts</td>
<td>420 contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>294 contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>300 contacts</td>
<td>594 contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>421 contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>480 contacts</td>
<td>901 contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting TAP

The number of contacts with TAP students increased by 121%, to 528 contacts. 311 of those contacts were created through our open programming, with 129 individual sessions and 10 class workshops that resulted in 182 contacts. WID Mentors were also placed in 3 TAP classes (ENGL 005, BIO 009, and GSWS 065). This was very successful, with faculty, mentors, and students all commenting on the value of having a peer mentor to work with students on their writing and also on adjusting to college. Some representative student comments include, “She was helpful when it came to reading hard texts and grammar. She also made me feel less insecure about reading and writing” and “Gave us good tips and info to help us in the future with school.” Mentors had 46 individual contacts with TAP students, 5 group contacts, and 166 class workshop contacts.
### Supporting the Honors College First-Year Seminars

The model developed several years ago (at the request of Lisa Schnell) to support students taking the HCOL first-year seminar continued to be successful. In the fall, tutors Emily Howe and Wes Dunn were available for open tutoring hours the night before papers were due in HCOL 085. They held 47 tutoring sessions, and students came to the Writing Center for an additional 23 sessions. For HCOL 086 in the spring, the sections have different assignments and due dates, so rather than holding set tutoring hours, Emily invited students to schedule their own appointments with her or with another writing center tutor as needed. HCOL 086 students scheduled 31 sessions, for an annual total of 101 sessions, almost the exact number as last year (99).

In addition, WID Mentors were placed in three HCOL 086 sections taught by Sheila Boland-Chira and Jeanne Shea. HCOL 086 mentors held 41 individual sessions; 9 group sessions, with 38 contacts; and 9 in-class workshops, with 183 contacts, for a total of 262 additional contacts with first-year students in the Honors College. Many students commented that it was helpful to having another perspective and additional insights on assignments and drafts; one student noted that “the mentor was more versed in providing writing support than most regular peers would be, while still having the comfort level of being a peer.”

### Goal for next year

The General Education initiative should provide increasing opportunities to connect students with the Writing Center during their first year. With all first-year writing classes sharing a common set of outcomes that includes revision, the Writing Center should be better able to connect with students and faculty, explaining how the Writing Center can help them achieve their goals related to writing.

### Details About Supporting Diversity (a second set of target audiences)

**The Writing Center’s approach to diversity**

In working with students making the transition to college-level writing, including students with diverse literacy backgrounds and language processing styles, the Writing Center helps support retention and diversity. To accomplish this, Sue carefully recruits a diverse group of tutors and then provides extensive preparation through which tutors explore expectations for academic writing and connections between literacy practices and various aspects of identity. Tutors learn how to help students build on their strengths and acquire new ways of thinking and writing without sacrificing old ones. To make its spaces and services welcoming to and effective for all students, the principles of universal design are systematically applied to Writing Center spaces, materials, and strategies. In end-of-session evaluations, 99% of students reported that the tutoring environment was welcoming, comfortable, and respectful.

**Support for English Language Learners, Including International Students**

**Faculty Development**

Though the Writing Center has been advocating for more faculty development related to working with second language writers since the number of international students began growing with the USPP Program, this year there were several experiences that prompted Sue to focus on this goal. Several tutors expressed concern that faculty were sending ELL students to the Writing Center hoping this would result in writing that would mirror that
produced by a native speaker. They copied and shared with Sue papers marked up in ways that showed that, though the instructors had good intentions, they had little understanding of how to help students develop their language and writing skills or of how to respond to writing by ELLs effectively.

In response, Sue experimented with a strategy for opening productive conversations with faculty. She created (with input from the tutors) a description of the Writing Center’s philosophy and key approaches to working with multilingual or bi-dialectal writers, and then asked to meet with the instructors (individually) to explain how the Writing Center works with English language learners. The 4 faculty members Sue approached were quite receptive, and ended up understanding other approaches for working with ELLs beyond marking all of their errors. Sue and Susanmarie also shared their concerns about faculty development and this approach with Associate Provost Gayle Nunley, who is very understanding and supportive of the need to start providing this faculty development. For next year, WID and the Writing Center hope to provide some workshops for faculty on responding to writing by ELLs.

*Individual Tutorials*

This year, for the first time the Writing Center was able to gather some information about students’ home languages, as this was a question included in the profile students fill out to register in WCOnline. Although many students left this question blank, some of the information was gleaned from the partner program requests and lognotes. These records reveal that the Writing Center worked with at least 112 students who identified themselves as having a first language that was not English. They listed twenty different home languages (including Amharic, Arabic, Bosnian, Chinese, Haitian Creole, Dinka, French, German, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Malayalan, Polish, Portuguese, Spanish, Tri, Twi, and Vietnamese). These 112 students came for 757 sessions, accounting for 33% of all of the individual sessions. Half of the students—56—came five times or more, averaging 11.5 sessions each. And 40 of these 55 students worked with a writing partner.

Looking at the class standing of the students who came for 5 or more sessions suggests that the Writing Center is especially important in ELL students’ first year at UVM. Of the 56, there were 13 freshmen, 19 sophomores, 10 juniors, 3 seniors, 8 graduate students, and 3 CE students. The 13 freshmen, 19 sophomores (all from the USPP Program), and 8 graduate students—or 40 of the 56 students (73%)—were in their first year at UVM.

*Group Workshops: Conversation Circles*

Writing Center tutors continued to work with groups of English language learners to improve their verbal English skills through weekly Conversation Circles classes. In Fall 2013, 17 tutors worked with groups in 6 classes, while in Spring 2014, 12 tutors worked with groups in 4 classes. This year, a new funding plan was developed: rather than paying the tutors through additional funds requested of the Provost’s Office, tutors were paid through fees charged by Continuing Education to students enrolled in the courses.

*Summer Bridge Program for USPP Students*

Last summer, Sue Dinitz connected with the USPP students on several occasions: providing an introduction to Academic Support at the USPP Summer Bridge orientation (with the Learning Co-op), greeting students when they found the Writing Center during a scavenger hunt, and doing a workshop on writing and academic support for the group as students began the fall semester.

This spring, Sue continued to work closely with Continuing Education and Đana Šehović to plan the writing tutor support for the USPP summer bridge program. Two writing center tutors were recruited to work for about 13 hours each week, holding required individual tutorials with each USPP student and facilitating weekly conversation and study groups.

*Collaborations with ELL Coordinator Đana Šehović*

In the Fall Semester, having the ELL Coordinator’s office in the WID Program facilitated a wonderful collaboration. Đana provided additional training to all of the tutors on working with ELL writers, through presentations in English
104 and at meetings for 2nd and 3rd year tutors. And in working with all of the ELL instructors and students, she was able to link ELL students with the support available through the Writing Center.

In January, the position of ELL Coordinator was eliminated; Đana Šehović began teaching full-time in the new Global Gateway Program and moved her office there. As a result, we have lost the ability to consult with Đana about individual students and to ask her to provide additional training to the Writing Center tutors. Perhaps more importantly, there is no longer such a close connection to the international students themselves.

A goal for next year is to consult with the GGP staff and figure out how best to connect the students who will be matriculating with the Writing Center, to make sure they receive the writing support they need to be successful.

**Support for Students with Disabilities**

Without access to Banner, there is no longer an accurate way to count the number of ACCESS students using the Writing Center. All of the ACCESS counselors continued to consult with Sue to connect students with a suitable writing partner. Sue connected 21 ACCESS students with partners this year, about the same number as last year. The Writing Center continued to provide support for Think College, a program located in the Center for Diversity and Community Inclusion that provides a college experience for students with intellectual disabilities. Five students enrolled in Think College worked with writing partners, and both students and tutors commented on the value of this experience. Deborah Baker-Moody sent this thank-you:

I wanted to let you know what a great job Lauren, Abbey, and Amy did with the Think College students this semester. It is not easy to know where to jump in and spend the hour with each of these students; however, all three of them held them accountable for their work and pushed them to add material, edit, and revise their work. One of the most important outcomes comes from our students knowing that there are supports in place to help them improve their work every week. Thanks for all of your help matching them with strong tutors.

**Support for ALANA Students**

Over the years, the Writing Center has experimented with holding open tutoring hours at the ALANA Student Center (ASC), but never successfully. Students want to see a tutor when they need one, and that timing usually does not correspond with the two or three hours a tutor happens to be at the Center. This year, a tutor who is active at the ASC and who is also a member of the Honors College (Sydney Camisa) was annoyed that students in the Honors College were receiving what seemed to be a special privilege, having a writing tutor available in their dorm on Wednesday nights. She asked if she could hold some tutoring hour at the ASC. Sue responded enthusiastically, explaining that this had been tried in the past but students didn’t use the service. Sydney decided to try a different strategy: to advertise heavily on the ALANA listserv that students could email her to set up a writing center appointment at the ASC, at a time that was mutually convenient. By spring the program took off, and Sydney held 22 sessions with 12 students.

Goal for next year: To create a tutoring service at the ASC that will be sustainable after Sydney Camisa graduates next May. Sue plans to find one or two new tutors to work with Sydney, so that in future the Writing Center can always have a tutor experienced with the ASC program continuing into the following year. Sydney, the ASC staff, and Sue also plan to meet throughout the year to consider how Writing Center support for ALANA students can be improved.

**Supporting Diversity through the Writing Partners Program**

The Writing Partners Program was created in 2010 when Sue noticed that many ELL and ACCESS students came to the Writing Center frequently, often meeting with a different tutor each time. Matching such students with a writing partner for weekly appointments facilitates the creation of a relationship, which is key to effective tutoring but which can be complicated by language and cultural barriers. It also allows for continuity of services, with tutors able to build on what has been accomplished in previous sessions.
This year, the number of students who took advantage of the Partners Program decreased by about 25%, from 92 to 70 students. The number of writing center sessions with students matched with writing partners decreased by about the same proportion, from 1,074 to 790. Though the reasons for this decrease are unclear, it addresses our concern last year that the partners program was making it difficult for other students to schedule appointments. While last year the students with partners accounted for 46% of all individual tutoring sessions, this year they accounted for only 34% of all sessions, leaving slots open that were filled by other students.

Of the 70 partners, 40 were English language learners, 21 were ACCESS students, and 9 came for other assorted reasons, including writing anxiety and challenges with time management.

**Student evaluations of the Writing Partners Program**

The 70 writing partners were emailed at the end of the semester and asked to respond to a brief questionnaire. Thirty-eight of the students took the time to email a response. For a compilation of all the student comments, see Appendix F.

Students loved this program! All of the students said the program fulfilled their expectations, using superlatives such as “outstanding!” “fantastic,” “amazing,” “helped me tremendously,” and “You only hire the best.”

- In describing what they hoped to gain from having a partner, twelve students said that they wanted to improve their writing in general and become better writers. Thirteen wanted help specifically with editing their papers (about half of whom were ELLs), six with learning how to write a particular type of paper or in a particular discipline, and five with organizing their papers.

- In describing what they found useful about working with a partner, only three students focused on help with editing. Fourteen students described how working with a partner was useful in and/or helped them improve their writing process. Seven students mentioned that the feedback they received on drafts was useful in helping them revise, and two students said that working with a partner helped them reduce anxiety and gain confidence as writers.

- When asked for suggestions for improving the Writing Partners Program, most students replied that their experience had been positive and didn’t offer any suggestions. Three students made suggestions for expanding the program or services: longer sessions, more time to chat, tutoring in other locations on campus. One student wished he had had a partner with expertise in his major, Finance. Indeed, one goal for this year was to recruit more tutors from Business. Sue was able to recruit one, but he is currently only a junior and had not taken a finance class yet. Sue will continue to work on this next year.

**Assessment of Open Programming**

The Writing Center continued the practice of inviting students to fill out an evaluation form, asking them to identify their goals for the session and what they worked on in the session and then to rate several aspects of their experience. This year, Sue made a special effort to get tutors in the habit of asking students to fill out the form at the end of each session, and placed the forms in a prominent place right on the tutoring tables. The number of evaluations almost doubled, from 366 to 670. For a fuller summary of the evaluations, including student comments, see Appendix G.
What was Learned about Student Satisfaction with the Writing Center

The ratings for all six evaluative questions confirmed the outstanding service provided by the talented and committed writing tutors. Though the ratings from students are always very high, this year’s were the highest ever.

- 98% of the students found the session useful, with 80% strongly agreeing.
- 98% were satisfied with what they worked on in the session, with 82% strongly agreeing.
- 99% of the students found the tutoring environment was welcoming, comfortable, and respectful, with 91% strongly agreeing.
- 99% of students felt the process of making an appointment and meeting with the tutor went smoothly, with 91% strongly agreeing.
- 98% of the students said they would probably use the Writing Center again, with 93% percent strongly agreeing.
- 99% of the students said they would recommend the Writing Center to other students, with 94% strongly agreeing.

What Students Worked On at the Writing Center:

Many faculty, students, and new tutors assume the Writing Center is primarily a place where students can have a paper “checked over,” imagining that most of the work involves changes at the sentence level to ensure that papers are as close to error-free as possible. However, as indicated in Table 5 below, only a little over half of the students (56%) reported addressing editing concerns during their sessions. Furthermore, none of these students worked just on editing; students who worked on editing also worked on global concerns involving the paper as a whole, such as organizing and/or strengthening the paper’s ideas or content. For each of three items, two-thirds of the students checked that they had addressed that issue in the session: (1) organizing, (2) strengthening ideas, content, or thesis, and (3) revising based on tutor feedback. A third of the students reported working on brainstorming ideas. 22% of the students reported leaving the session with a clearer understanding of the assignment and/or genre of writing. 20% worked on using an citing sources appropriately. A smaller number of students worked on reviewing the teacher’s comments, developing ESOL reading and/or conversation skills, and/or time management.

Table 5 What Students Worked on in Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What students worked on in their session</th>
<th># students who checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Feedback</td>
<td>449 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>447 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening ideas, content or thesis</td>
<td>446 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing for grammar, punctuation or style</td>
<td>373 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming ideas</td>
<td>217 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding assignment or writing type</td>
<td>145 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing and using sources</td>
<td>135 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing teacher’s comments</td>
<td>74 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling a class requirement</td>
<td>70 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing ESOL skills</td>
<td>30 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>17 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The WID Mentor Program

WID Mentor Placements and Contacts, 2013-2014

This year, mentors were placed in about the same number of class sections as last year: 17 as compared with 18. The number of contacts this year was also about the same as the number last year: 941 as compared with 979. Six instructors chose the “basic” model, for which the mentor plays a more defined role, holding open tutoring hours the night before papers are due and meeting with individual students upon request and as time allows. Nine instructors chose the “extended” model, developing an individualized plan for using their mentor. These classes represented (a) a variety of disciplines, including classes in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences; (b) a variety of levels, from TAP classes, to core courses for sophomores, to senior seminars; and (c) a variety of sizes, from large introductory classes of 106 students to small seminars of 11 students, as detailed in Table 6.

Table 6: WID Mentor Program 2013-2014 Placements and Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th># ind sessions</th>
<th># group sessions</th>
<th># group contacts</th>
<th># wrkshps</th>
<th># wkshp contacts</th>
<th>Total Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WGST-TAP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Andersen, E.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO –TAP</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Miller, B.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL-TAP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 031</td>
<td>30 x 2</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCOL 086</td>
<td>20 x 2</td>
<td>BolandChira</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCOL 086</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS 196</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bailly</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVS 201</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Anderson, K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 232</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Krymkowski</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS 001</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Weinstock</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 021</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mares</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 068</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCOL 086</td>
<td>Xx</td>
<td>Schnell, et al</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN 101</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Lopez-Vicuna</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 109</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Rudiger</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>576</strong></td>
<td><strong>941</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals for this Year:

Focus on Faculty Development

Last year’s report synthesized what had been learned after four years of experimenting with various ways of using WID Mentors to support the development of student writers, particularly as they take on the challenges of disciplinary writing in their majors. The report also noted that faculty development around the teaching of writing had been a hidden benefit of the program, and speculated that it could provide a clearer focus and purpose for the program. Sue proposed placing mentors in departments who are developing a writing-intensive curriculum for their majors, through the general education initiative. In this process, faculty will be rethinking the role of writing in their courses and their own role in teaching writing. And in this context, the mentor can provide not only student support for writing but also some faculty development. . . . Mentors’ contribution to faculty development is unique:
they can help faculty see writing assignments and experiences from the student perspective, which in turn helps them rethink their practices related to student writing.

Thus, the goal for this year was to explore in more depth how mentors can contribute to faculty development around the teaching of writing. Faculty development was stated as one of the goals of the program, and more examples of possible faculty development activities were included in the information provided to mentors and mentor faculty. Sue asked mentors to keep a log of any conversations they felt contributed to faculty development, and discussed this aspect of their experience in our bi-weekly mentor meetings.

NEWCA Presentation: This work on faculty development culminated in a presentation at the Northeast Writing Centers Association on March 1, entitled, “From Student Support to Faculty Development: Creating Change by Shifting the Focus of a Writing Fellows Program.” After Susanmarie and Sue placed this new approach to writing fellows programs in the context of current scholarship and practice, tutors Bronwen Hudson, Kathryn Warrender, Laura Davenport, and Rob Benner each analyzed how they had contributed to faculty development through their mentor placement. These case studies allowed us to see the range and depth of the development mentors can provide to faculty, including

- **Developing new teaching pedagogies to address new classroom contexts:** one mentor’s work focused on helping a faculty member who was used to teaching large lecture classes to design approaches and activities appropriate for a small TAP class.

- **Developing strategies to address students’ struggles with new genres:** one mentor helped a faculty member see why students taking a 100-level psychology course struggled so much to write literature reviews, a new genre for them, and then worked with the instructor to revise the assignment and create new class activities and workshops.

- **Developing more effective ways of responding to writing:** one mentor served as a bridge between students and the instructor, helping her understand students’ struggles when writing about issues of race and in adjusting to college in general. This allowed her to respond more effectively to the students, both in the classroom and on their writing projects.

Article in UVM Today: At the suggestion of English Department Chair Val Rohy, **UVM Today** decided to do a story on the WID Mentor Program, assigning it to former tutor Amanda Waite, who is now one of their staff writers. Amanda interviewed Sue and Susanmarie, attended a mentor meeting, attended the rehearsal for the NEWCA presentation, and interviewed some of the mentors and mentor faculty. The article, which appeared on May 7, first reports on “the obvious benefit . . . for the students taking the classes, who now have a trained tutor at their service with intimate knowledge of the class and the professor’s expectations,” and goes on to highlight the contribution mentors make to faculty development.

**Improving the WID Mentor “Basic” Model**

Last year Sue introduced the “basic” model for faculty who would like to provide some writing support for a class but who have minimal time to spend planning for and working with a mentor. Several of these placements fell apart because (1) the mentor and faculty member didn’t communicate regularly and/or (2) one mentor was assigned to several sections and too many students wanted to meet with the mentor at the same time. This year, these problems were addressed by including faculty and mentors enrolled in the “basic” model in all of our faculty and mentor training, by emphasizing the importance of communication, and by assigning one mentor for each section of a course. And this year, all of the sections using the basic model were successful (though the degree of success varied, as it does in the extended model also).

**Evaluating the WID Mentor Program**

Faculty, mentors, and students continue to be enthusiastic about this program. (For a summary of the program evaluations, with selected comments, see Appendix H).
Faculty Evaluations

All faculty who completed an evaluation felt the WID mentor positively contributed to the students’ experience in the class and highly recommended continuing to develop the WID Mentor Program. Faculty noted how much their students’ writing improved (“helped students to better understand the assignment and produce higher quality work”) and how much they appreciated having a peer to provide additional writing support (“Having the support of someone who could meet individually with students, in addition to my office hours, was also very valuable”; “I think some appreciated that they could turn to a peer for support”; “offered students someone to meet with who they’re less intimidated by!”).

As in the past, many faculty members commented on how much the writing mentor taught them:

(a) About understanding the student perspective

- It helps me gain more insight about students’ expectations, anxieties, abilities, concerns, strengths, weaknesses.

(b) About creating assignments

- How to be clearer in assignments.
- Need for additional clarity in assignments.
- Helped me word assignments clearly.
- Re-frame assignments to address student concerns.
- That I would like to change these assignments in the future - I plan to significantly redesign this class.
- Having a ‘second pair of eyes’ to help me review the assignments and rubric was tremendously useful.
- It helped me feel more ‘on top of the ball’ with assignments, rubrics, and due dates.

(c) About incorporating more activities related to writing

- KEY: Developing writing skills in a process and there are many activities that we can use to help students build and refine components of the process.
- Ideas for scaffolding assignments and activities in class to facilitate learning.
- I became more aware of the benefits of scheduling in-class writing and preparation activities.
- In general, the extra assistance available to students makes me more comfortable assigning writing in a large intro class. By focusing on pre-writing sessions, I think it saves time on comments later.

(d) About responding to and evaluating writing

- I learned that students use rubrics not only as a guide for grading but as a template to writing papers, which is both good and bad. It made me more aware of how I phrase things and how I present rubrics in class.

Mentor evaluations

Not surprisingly, the mentors themselves were more critical of their own contributions to these classes, but 100% strongly supported continuing the program, offered comments such as “The WID Mentor program is so important! I always hear such great feedback from students and instructors (when the placement and plan are well-arranged), and I think it’s a crucial resource”; and “This program is so important to good writing at UVM, and I have seen first-hand how dramatically it can help student and faculty!”
In describing how the class benefitted from having a WiD Mentor, mentors echoed the faculty, commenting on their ability to (a) provide a peer perspective, to both students and instructors; (b) support faculty in designing assignments and planning class activities; and (c) help students understand the expectations for writing in the discipline, as the comments in Appendix H illustrate.

**Student evaluations**

Of the students filling out an end-of-semester evaluation form, 87% recommended the WiD Mentor Program continue to be developed, and 72% felt having a WiD mentor was useful in completing the writing assignments for the class, with comments that echo the mentors’ comments, describing how mentors clarified expectations, taught them about aspects of writing in the discipline, provided a different perspective, forced them to revise, enabled them to talk through their ideas, helped them become organized, and made them more comfortable and confident.
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