The Writing in the Disciplines Program expanded in 2009 when the Writing Center was integrated into the program to create a new department. The WID Program is now a center for support of writing at UVM, with the Writing Center providing direct support to student writers, and WID programming offering direct support to faculty as teachers of writing. The Writing Center and Writing in the Disciplines exist as equal partners within the program. This report highlights the accomplishments of the Writing Center and Writing in the Disciplines, summarizing the ways we have worked independently and together to provide support for both students and faculty. (Appendices mentioned throughout this report are available by request.)

Mission and History

The Writing in the Disciplines Program and the Writing Center share missions dedicated to promoting writing across campus with a focus on undergraduate education.

The Writing in the Disciplines Program’s mission is to make writing a significant part of undergraduate students’ education beyond the foundation of the first-year experience. In order to nurture a vibrant writing culture on campus, we work with departments as well as individuals. We partner with departments and programs in identifying how writing can be central to achieving learning outcomes for their majors. In addition, we offer open programming for faculty and graduate students who are interested in thinking about the ways writing works in their teaching. Started in 2008, the WID Program has been establishing itself on campus, building ties with individuals and units, becoming part of the campus’ central infrastructure for faculty development.

The Writing Center’s mission is to help UVM 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. While all students can benefit from talking with other writers, a target audience of the Writing Center is students making the transition to college-level writing. Many first-year students are surprised to discover that expectations for college writing are different from those they encountered in high school. Students coming to campus from diverse literacy backgrounds and/or with diverse ways of processing language may feel especially challenged. Created in 1983 as a Living/Learning faculty-designed program, the Writing Center joined with the TRIO/SSS Program in 1984 to form the Learning Cooperative, where it was located for 25 years. In July 2009, the Writing Center became part of the WID Program.

Highlights of Moving the Writing Center into the WID Program

The most significant achievement for both WID and the Writing Center this year was the bringing together of both programs under the umbrella of the Writing in the Disciplines Program. While in many respects this seamless change is invisible to outsiders, the pairing of faculty and student programs under the WID umbrella has resulted in closer collaboration and will facilitate the long-term growth of support for faculty and students across campus. This year, the merging of WID and the Writing Center has made possible the following:

- **The new WID Mentor Program**, which assigns peer mentors to a limited number of courses for majors to provide increased support for student writing in the disciplines. (The WID Mentor Program is discussed in more detail on p. 14 and in Appendix D.)
• **The reconceptualization of the WID assistant position to provide Writing Center support.** Rachel Sauerwein, WID Program Assistant, expanded her duties as the Writing Center became part of the WID Program. In extending her responsibilities for communications, Rachel used her many talents to redesign publicity materials including brochures, bookmarks, and a new website, and to develop a template for putting our tutor-created tip sheets online. She provided technical support for the Writing Center and created ways for WID mentors to schedule and use WID space effectively. Her responsibilities for budget and human resources work for the Writing Center and WID also expanded.

• **A joint research project.** WID and the Writing Center developed a project investigating how students learn to write in a discipline and how knowledge of the discipline shapes tutoring sessions. We got IRB approval of this project in early March, collected data for the remainder of the semester, and have faculty from Political Science and History participating in the research during June. We have submitted proposals to present our findings at the International Writing Centers Association Conference in November 2010 and at the Conference on College Composition and Communication in April 2011.

• **Including a student perspective in faculty development efforts.** Bringing in examples from her work with students, Sue Dinitz facilitated WID workshops on peer review and on responding to ELL writers, and a writing tutor participated in the unit on peer review at the WID Institute in May.

• **Regular interaction between faculty and tutors.** While there are limitations to the use of open space for a range of functions, the daily and often informal interactions among students, tutors, faculty, graduate assistants, and staff have brought a richness to our working routines that makes all our work mutually reinforcing.

Moving the Writing Center from the Learning Co-op to the WID Program also brought substantial challenges. It required integrating locations for Writing Center activities into the WID suite, which turned out to be workable but not ideal: the space is difficult for students to find, plus partial walls create some noise and confidentiality problems. The move also required the Writing Center to find new methods for scheduling and record keeping. As the learning Co-op was making a similar transition, we decided to jointly purchase TutorTrac, software which is widely used in our fields. Unfortunately, we didn’t realize we were purchasing a system upgrade (implemented in January 2010) that had not been widely tested. The resulting software bugs, along with poor technical support, plagued our efforts to implement online scheduling, easy recordkeeping, and nuanced reporting. Solving problems connected to TutorTrac took an inordinate amount of Sue Dinitz’s time and contributed to no-shows and scheduling mix-ups.

Despite these challenges, the Writing Center’s move to WID has been an overwhelmingly positive experience, and we expect that the close working relationship between the faculty and student sides of our program will only become more creative and more effective over time.
The WID Program: Establishing an Institutional Framework

At many institutions, the model for WID programming is dictated by a curricular or philosophical commitment at the campus level (if a campus requires courses to be certified as writing intensive, then a WID program might be involved in the certification process and would also have a set of courses and instructors as a target audience; if a campus requires writing outcomes to be described and assessed within programs, then a WID program might play a role in working with departments). At UVM, the diverse nature of general education and the lack of a fixed structure for writing requirements across the curriculum means that the WID Program has had to create its own model for integrating itself on campus. In June 2009, we invited Chris Anson, University Distinguished Professor and Director of the Campus Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, to consult with us on strategic planning, and following his recommendations (see Appendix E), much WID work this year has focused on developing a model for good work in the absence of what Professor Anson called “an institutional driver” for attention to writing across the curriculum. By creating quality workshops for faculty, seeking departmental partnerships, and participating to the fullest extent possible in the campus conversations about reshaping general education, we seek to prepare WID for expanding once the campus reaches clarity about how to institutionalize students' writing experiences. Without such clarity, there is no external motivation for faculty or departments to work with WID, and our programs attract those who are already motivated to attend to writing.

In the past two years, our departmental partnerships and other programming have offered us the chance to create and revise a model for WID that is suited to a campus whose curricular structures are in flux. This 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.

What has emerged from this balance is a model for WID that relies on the following assumptions:

- For now, effective WID work will grow 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 CUPS and 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 whatever 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 our activities, and cannot be fully realized until an institutional framework for writing is in place:

- 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.

Finally, in order to prepare for the future implementation of an institutional driver for WID, Rachel Sauerwein has worked to create an efficient infrastructure for WID activities. She designed and created an Access database to centralize tracking of all WID contacts, events, presentations, and consultations. As WID’s work across campus increases, this database will facilitate tracking of WID’s relationships with both individual faculty members and departments across multiple years. Rachel has also established templates for many WID communications, as well as an annual schedule for cleaning and archiving both hard copy and electronic files and updating the WID and Writing Center websites. Rachel’s increased role in budgeting and accounting also increased the efficiency and transparency of financial reporting. While last fiscal year Rachel had to request budget reports through the Provost’s Office and create parallel and redundant tracking systems, she now has direct access to Peoplesoft reporting functions and was brought into the budgeting process by taking on budget building in EPM for WID. This budget now provides greater detail about how WID has allocated its general operating dollars.

**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. Last year, our workshops addressed fundamental principles of course and assignment design and responding strategies. This year, programming built on—and repeated—those fundamentals, but also explored additional emphases on ethics and culture. In addition, conversations about writing within departments were supported by our continuing department partnerships. By promoting connections across departments as well as offering units the opportunity to have focused conversations about writing in their discipline, WID offerings encourage faculty to become ever more reflective about their teaching. A total of 126 individuals (including 105 faculty members, 11 staff, and 10 graduate students) attended WID programming. In addition, WID presented to faculty at New Faculty Orientation and the CALS faculty retreat.

**Open Programming**

Open workshops offer instructors the chance to make connections across departments. This year, 58 individuals (including 37 faculty members, 11 staff, and 10 graduate students) from 29 departments took part in WID open programming which included:

- **First Fridays Series**
  In 2008-09 this series was offered for new faculty. This year we opened registration to all interested instructors. This series included Responding to Writing; Peer Review: Student
Conversations About Writing; Plagiarism, Source Use, and Writing Ethics; and Responding to and Evaluating Writing by ELL Students.

- **Writing Ethics**
  The fall First Friday plagiarism workshop proved so popular that we repeated it and expanded it into a two-part series in order to be able to address the complexities of the issue. Plagiarism I, on Source Use and Writing Ethics, explored definitions of plagiarism and ways in which faculty can think about how ethical source use can be developed; Plagiarism II, on Practical Strategies to Help Students Work with Sources addressed elements of assignment design and instructor response toward improving student performance.

- **Writing and Culture**
  Writing Across Borders: Writing and Culture at UVM was a film screening and discussion held in conjunction with Blackboard Jungle 3. A follow-up workshop, Responding to and Evaluating Writing by English Language Learners, explored frameworks for working with ESL writers.

- **GTA Programming**
  In collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning, we developed two workshops for graduate students (one on grading and one on informal writing and learning). While one workshop was cancelled due to low enrollment, these workshops were part of a larger effort to collaborate with the Graduate College and the Center for Teaching and Learning to support graduate student instructors (discussed at greater length below).

- **Writing in Large Classes**
  This August follow-up to our May 2009 workshop offered additional faculty the chance to consider ways their pedagogy could be adjusted to meet the demands of larger classes.

Given the current absence of an institutional emphasis on writing throughout the curriculum, we found it difficult to recruit as many participants to our programming as we had hoped. Although 58 individuals participated (many more than once, for a total of 75 contacts), another 33 RSVP’d but did not show and some of our workshops were attended by only a few faculty or were canceled due to low enrollment. However, those motivated to attend were happy with the programming and reported that it was of great value to their teaching.

At the conclusion of every workshop, we ask participants to fill out an evaluation to help us assess the effectiveness of the activities and to solicit suggestions for additional programming. The 56 evaluations collected this year showed that participants were overwhelmingly satisfied with the workshops. All 56 reported that the workshop was valuable and that they would recommend the workshop to others (strongly agreed or agreed), and more than 95% of participants thought the workshop balanced presentation, activities, and discussion well, thought that discussion at the workshop helped them learn, and said they would use ideas from the workshop in their teaching.

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
specific suggestions and strategies provided, the use of actual examples of student and faculty work, the opportunity to discuss teaching with colleagues and to hear perspectives from across the disciplines, and exposure to pedagogical approaches that were new to them. (More detail on workshop attendance and evaluations is given in Appendix A.)

**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, fourteen faculty from 8 different programs or departments in the Colleges of Arts and Science, Engineering and Mathematical Sciences, Education and Social Services, and the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources participated. Our efforts to recruit more senior faculty succeeded in a more diverse mix of faculty ranks in the Institute (2 professors and 5 associate professors participated.) Follow-up activities in the coming year—beginning with a fall kick-off reunion in August—will enable participants to reflect on their experiences and guide the development of additional resources or follow-up activities as appropriate for the revised approaches to teaching with writing they will be implementing.

Faculty evaluation for the 2010 WID Institute was overwhelmingly positive. Of the 11 participants who have submitted evaluation forms so far, 8 strongly agreed that the Institute was valuable (the other 3 agreeing), and the participants unanimously strongly agreed that they would recommend the Institute to others. All agreed (2) or strongly agreed (9) that the Institute met their expectations. Virtually all participants agreed or strongly agreed that the Institute balanced presentation, activities, and discussion well (1 participant was neutral on that score). Open-ended comments reinforced the key connections that the Institute made possible, as faculty praised the chance to share with and learn from other teachers, the importance of learning more about the ways faculty in other departments address similar challenges and opportunities, the validation that came from our conversations, and the opportunity to connect course design with learning goals and better strategies for communicating with students. (More detail is given in Appendix B.)

Institute participants requested follow-up during the 2010-11 academic year with reunion check-ins to keep the conversations flowing, WID availability for consulting, and the WID Mentor Program (Institute participants are not guaranteed mentors, but their participation in the Institute does enhance their applications).

**Special Workshops and Programs**

*Library Faculty*

In addition to open programming, we offered a specially designed workshop for library faculty. It addressed issues of brain science (presented by Professor Charles Rathbone) and intentional activity design in the context of faculty/librarian collaboration, and grew out of collaboration with WID Board member Daisy Benson about library and information literacy work in the 2009 WID Institute.
**New Faculty**

Another significant presentation was developed for new faculty orientation, in partnership with the Fleming Museum, the Center for Teaching and Learning, Community-University Partnerships and Service Learning, and the Center for Cultural Pluralism. Working with George Kuh’s *High Impact Educational Practices* (conclusions drawn from analysis of decades of National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data), we introduced faculty to the high impact practices that can be controlled in the classroom—such as the provision of a writing-intensive environment—and illustrated the ways our offices can support work on those areas. CUPS, CTL, and WID used portions of this presentation at the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences retreat. This presentation was substantively revised from previous year’s purely informational presentations about the services offered by professional development units. This new presentation brings current research to the attention of new faculty and offered the opportunity for interaction with the material and with colleagues.

**Graduate Students**

WID collaborated with the Center for Teaching and Learning to develop ways to support graduate students who are beginning their college teaching careers. In summer 2009, Susanmarie Harrington worked with CTL colleagues Holly Buckland Parker and Wendy Verrei-Berenback to analyze data gathered through a series of interviews about teaching support for graduate students that Holly and Susanmarie had completed with graduate program directors. The resulting needs analysis led to the creation of workshops in WID and CTL, as well as continued conversations with Associate Dean Ralph Swenson about a certificate program for graduate students. CTL and WID co-designed this certificate program, which would offer a structured instructor development program and teaching portfolio program for interested graduate students. This proposal currently awaits formal approval in the Graduate College. (See Appendix H.)

**The National Day on Writing**

The National Day on Writing, sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English and other professional associations from across the disciplines, drew attention to the central role of writing in the personal, public, and civic sphere, and highlighted the importance of writing instruction at every level of schooling. In support of this national initiative, WID held an open house in October to formally introduce the program to faculty. The open house featured a dedication to Toby Fulwiler, Professor Emeritus of English and leader of foundational work on writing across the curriculum at UVM, as well as displays on tutoring writing across the disciplines and Institute alumni work with writing in their courses that were created by Writing Center tutors and WID’s GRAs. This event fit into a series of events held at UVM that day, organized and publicized through the Literacy Lunch Bunch (see p. 17).

**Departmental Partnerships**

For the past two years we have sought opportunities to work with faculty in departments, looking at the ways WID can collaborate with groups of faculty to explore the relationships among teaching practices, writing, and disciplinary and professional expectations. These collaborations encourage faculty to identify the ways writing already functions as a natural process in the discipline, and seek to build on those disciplinary experiences to strengthen attention to writing across courses in the unit. This year, we pursued two new departmental partnerships and explored new ways those partnerships might function. Beginning with local goals, connected to work that is already underway in the department, is a promising strategy for forming new relationships with units.
Department of History

The History partnership began with discussion of the department’s goals for its Methods course, History 101, and has opened up into a project that will help faculty broadly support student writing in the major. In July and August, Susanmarie Harrington worked with History chair Steve Zdatny and Prof. Abigail McGowan to determine the key issues for a planned August retreat. Susanmarie facilitated the retreat, which brought together twelve faculty members with an interest in teaching methods and resulted in the identification of a small set of shared goals and two general models for approaching the course. In May, the department and Susanmarie met again to review the ways in which the Methods course had been taught this year. These conversations have enabled faculty to share ideas and resources, think through the challenges of the course, and identify areas where additional WID support can be helpful.

In addition, WID prepared a survey about writing experiences which was distributed to students in the departments’ senior seminars. The student survey suggests differences in majors and non-majors’ experience of history courses, with non-majors reporting less confidence and less clarity about their writing experiences. Generally, the history students, both graduate and undergraduate, reported experiences with a wide range of genres and were quite articulate about their development as writers. The department is eager to continue the survey, adding in some questions about students’ experiences with Methods, and to explore the student data more closely.

The final part of the History partnership was an analysis of department writing assignments as presented in course syllabi during 2009. Our analysis of the syllabi—which of course captures only one part of the ways writing assignments are presented to students—confirms the breadth of writing assignments in use at all levels of the department. It also suggests a range of terminology for writing that could be usefully refined to provide students with what might be a more clear path to understanding departmental and disciplinary expectations. During the 2010-2011 academic year, the partnership will continue with an exploration of this department profile and will also focus on facilitating the production of writing resources for students. (The department profile is in Appendix I, available on request.)

The Department of Medical Laboratory and Radiation Sciences (MLRS)

The MLRS partnership grew out of general faculty concern about the nature of the writing experiences provided to students and the changing nature of writing instruction at UVM (the faculty are concerned that their students will be less likely to take English 1 if additional sections are not made available). After a preliminary department-wide discussion of these issues, we formed a partnership aimed at the following goals:

- Greater awareness of what writing expectations already exist in MLRS
- Development of resources to support teaching writing in MLRS
- Refinement/development of assignments, pedagogies, and expectations for writing in MLRS

The first step in this collaboration was the development of a writing curriculum map and writing profile for the department. WID research assistants Maggie Spencer and Elizabeth Barnes interviewed the MLRS faculty regarding approaches to writing and collected syllabi. The interview process and syllabi analysis revealed strengths in the MLRS department’s current attention to writing (variety of writing assignments and clarity of expectations within the department and the profession), identified challenges facing faculty (coordinating writing across courses and managing the time-intensive process of
supporting students’ writing), and identified future resources or activities that the partnership could provide (attention to assignment development, faculty development around grading and responding, continuing to develop a relationship with the Writing Center). (See Appendix J for the full profile.)

Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources

Our first pilot partnership, Writing Rubenstein, was an ambitious project to engage the entire school in focusing on writing. As we reported last year, in spring 2009 a small faculty committee formed to draft school-wide writing outcomes. Although the partnership was less active this year, Susanmarie Harrington served on the Steering Committee for Rubenstein’s Engaged Department initiative. As that project evolved, the writing outcomes developed in the previous year became part of the working materials for the faculty group considering curricular issues in Rubenstein, and it is our hope that the work of the Writing Rubenstein faculty group will be revived as the Engaged Department initiative work moves ahead.

Consultations

Tailored consulting workshops were offered with the Departments of Psychology, Religious Studies, and English, and what began as a single consultation with the Department of Sociology became the foundation for a 2010-11 partnership to further explore the possibility for writing activities in larger classes as well as faculty expectations for writing development throughout the major. The Department of Psychology invited Susanmarie to facilitate a workshop on responding to student writing, designing assignments, and handling increased class size and a mix of majors and non-majors. This workshop fit into a running department conversation about the evolution of teaching, and it is our hope that as the department further considers these issues, WID can be a continuing resource. The Department of Religious Studies approached WID for support as it considered its capstone course. Susanmarie met with department chair Kevin Trainor, and then facilitated a department-wide conversation about different models for a revised capstone. We anticipate continued contact as the department moves ahead with course development, and the Religious Studies capstone course was one of the placements for a WID Mentor. Finally, an English Department consulting workshop illustrated another way in which WID can be of service to departments: Susanmarie was asked to consult with the department’s curriculum committee as it considered revising the major. Her presentation focused on the literature about writing in the discipline in English Studies.

Susanmarie offered 15 personal consultations to faculty seeking advice about writing assignments. In addition, Susanmarie and Sue Dinitz twice consulted with Dana Kaplan of the Center for Student Ethics and Standards: once to review possible responses to individual cases of plagiarism and once to meet with a faculty member about ways to develop teaching materials on intellectual property and citation.

The Writing Center: Student Support

Talking with other writers is an integral part of the process of most successful writers. The Writing Center offers a place where any UVM student can get feedback and support at any point in the writing process. At the Writing Center, students engage in a wide range of activities, such as clarifying assignments and expectations, developing ideas, exploring ways to focus and shape an argument, sharing feedback on a draft, interpreting teacher comments, learning how to find and incorporate sources appropriately, creating more effective and powerful sentences, and finding an effective composing style.
Because of the move to the WID Program, the services of the Writing Center considerably expanded this year. The Writing Center’s programming now includes two distinct components: services open to all students and faculty seeking direct support for student writing, and services available through the WID Mentor Program, which attaches an experienced tutor to a limited number of writing-intensive courses for majors. In both components, support to students is provided through three formats: individual tutoring sessions, group sessions facilitated by a tutor, and class workshops. In addition, the Writing Center also launched the Writing Partners Program, designed to support English Language Learners and students with disabilities but open to any student who requests it.

Summary of Services

2009-2010 saw an enormous rise in demand for Writing Center services:

- The Writing Center’s open services for the campus as a whole served more students than ever before, with a 6% increase in the number of individual tutoring sessions (1,746) and a 30% increase in class workshop contacts (1,042), for a total of 2,788 student contacts (a 14% increase).

- The WID Mentor Program provided support to 14 classes from a variety of disciplines, with 233 individual sessions, 66 group sessions serving 555 students, and 3 class workshops serving 145 students, for a total of 933 contacts. (For a detailed report and evaluation of the WID Mentor Program, see p. 14 and Appendix D.)

- In sum, Writing Center tutors worked with 1,883 students this year for a total of 3,721 contacts, a 49% increase over last year.

Demographics

- **Class Standing**
  Students consulted with writing tutors throughout their UVM experience: 35% of the tutoring sessions were with first-year students, 18% with sophomores, 14% with juniors, 20% with seniors, 7% with graduate students, and 6% with CE students.

- **College/School Affiliation**
  Students came for individual tutoring from all of the colleges and schools, roughly in proportion to the schools’ enrollments (CAS 45%, CALS 6%, BSAD 10%, CESS 9%, CEMS 2.5%; CNHS 8%; RSEN 6%; GRAD 7%; CE 6.5%). Analyzed according to the courses for which students were writing papers, these proportions shift towards CAS, indicating that students enrolled in other schools were actually writing papers for their courses in CAS: (CAS 67%; CALS 3%; BSAD 7%; CESS 10%; CEMS 2%; CNHS 4%; RSEN 1.5%; ENVS 3%, HON College 3.5%).

- **Gender**
  Of the students who came for individual tutoring, 34% were male and 66% female (according to classifications in the Banner system).
Assessment of Individual Tutoring

At the end of each session, tutors ask students if they would like to fill out an anonymous evaluation. Questions 1-5 rate the scheduling process, the tutoring environment, the tutor, the session, and the Writing Center on a scale of 5-1 (strongly agree - strongly disagree). For all five questions, 96% or more of the students gave a 4 or 5 rating (agree or strongly agree). The survey also assesses our outcomes for tutorials: 91% agreed or strongly agreed that the session increased their confidence, and 96% agreed or strongly agreed that the session helped them move forward with their papers. Over 99% of the students said the session met or exceeded their expectations. In explaining how meeting with a tutor increased their confidence and helped them move forward, many commented on the value of the collaborative nature of the process. They saw the session as providing them with a direction for moving forward, describing themselves as “lost,” “unsettled,” “stuck” before and as “having a target,” “being on the right track,” “seeing where to go” after the session. Some students came for a new perspective, primarily to get feedback on their ideas or draft. Most ended up feeling they were helped with a specific aspect of the writing process: understanding assignments and expectations, coming up with a topic or focus, developing ideas, organizing/developing a structure for the paper, editing. Many mentioned receiving helpful advice or suggestions, and some extended this beyond their current writing project, feeling they received generally useful advice and strategies for writing. For detailed information and comments from students describing how meeting with a tutor helped them move forward with their papers, see Appendix C.

Efforts to Support Retention and Diversity

By providing peer tutoring in an area which challenges many college students, the Writing Center supports retention and 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 students see how to build on their strengths and acquire new ways of thinking and writing without sacrificing old ones. The training for new tutors provided through English 104/105 focuses on this mission; tutors explore expectations for academic writing and connections between literacy and various aspects of identity. Also, this has been a focus of Sue Dinitz’s scholarship over past years. Her March presentation at the 2010 Conference on College Composition and Communication described how dialect can provide a productive opening into anti-racism work with tutors.

Our overall approach to supporting diversity in the Writing Center is Universal Design. For the past four years, we have worked to design our spaces and services according to the principles of Universal Design, with flexible environments and strategies that are appropriate for a variety of learning styles and that serve the diverse needs of each student without requiring any student to identify as "different." This year, for example, we are trying to get our resources that exist in paper format into an on-line format so that they are more accessible to all students. We also launched a new program we thought would be especially useful to English language learners and students with disabilities, the Writing Partners Program. This program, open to all students, matches experienced writing tutors with students who would like to meet regularly with a tutor. We had requests from 39 students, and 33 were successfully matched with a tutor. Of these, 15 were English language learners and 6 were ACCESS students. There...
were 325 sessions with writing partners, accounting for 19% of sessions occurring through our open services.

Below are details of our efforts in connection with various target audiences:

- **First-year Students**
  The Writing Center supports students in first-year writing intensive courses such as English 1 and TAP. Over 150 students came to the Writing Center from 30 different TAP classes, accounting for 225 sessions. We conducted writing workshops in 15 TAP classes and engaged in special projects involving required tutoring sessions with 3 TAP classes. The number of sessions with English 1 students decreased from 421 to 294, reflecting the reduced number of English 1 classes offered. We did writing workshops in 15 English 1 classes (as compared with 24 last year), and were engaged in special projects involving required sessions with 3 English 1 instructors.

- **ALANA Students**
  Use of the Writing Center by ALANA students continues to increase. This year, 158 students identifying as ALANA (in Banner) came for 541 tutoring sessions, accounting for 17% of students coming for tutoring through our open services and 27% of sessions (an increase of 29%). Tutor Ariel Commins served as our link with the ALANA Student Center and staff. As in past years, we supported the Summer Enrichment Scholarship Program (SESP) by providing some training for the person chosen to be the writing tutor for the English 1 summer class.

- **English Language Learners**
  The Writing Center has always served many English language learners, though the university doesn’t have a way to officially identify these students. We were able to count sessions with ESL students who requested a writing partner and with students who came for at least 9 sessions. We had a total of 22 such students, coming for 307 sessions. This small number of students accounted for 18% of our individual tutoring sessions. There were many additional sessions with ELL students who didn't request a partner or who came fewer than 9 times.

This year, because of the **U.S.-Sino Pathway Program**, we engaged in much future planning related to supporting English language learners. Sue Dinitz served on the International Student Success Task Force (ISSTF) and strongly advocated for combining some of the various ESL-related work on campus into one position, so we have someone on staff who can guide us in assessing the needs of and providing services for English language learners, including more extensive training for writing tutors and faculty. She worked with Continuing Education in planning the writing/ELL portion of the summer bridge program, eventually arranging for three writing tutors to provide tutoring for English 4. In support of faculty development efforts, Sue Dinitz offered a workshop on responding to ELL writers in March through the WID Program, and she will co-facilitate (with Sarah Turner) a day-long workshop for English 1 faculty in August.

"I am an English language learner and having a partner that I can meet every week really helped me with my papers and speeches this semester. Sometimes you just need that someone to talk with. It helps relieve my stress in a way when I know someone actually is listening and will help me understand/write."

"Sara Solnick told me she had someone from the Writing Center come talk to her TAP class about writing. She found it to be very useful, and her students said it was worthwhile. I was hoping it wasn't too late to schedule a similar gig for my TAP course."

—Professor Kathy Fox
• **Students With Disabilities**

The number of ACCESS students using the Writing Center remained almost exactly the same as for the past two years: 106. The number of sessions increased from 256 to 315. Twelve ACCESS students requested writing partner; 6 were successfully matched and 6 never followed through with their tutor.

**Professional Development for Tutors**

The 45 writing tutors benefited from a wide range of professional development opportunities. We carefully frame our tutor training as an academic learning experience, which begins with the two courses required of first-year tutors (English 104 and 105) and continues through regular staff development meetings both with the second- and third-year tutors and with the tutors serving as WID mentors. Tutors are encouraged to collaborate in the improvement and development of our services and to participate in broader conversations within the field by presenting at conferences and publishing articles in tutor-centered venues.

Some tutor highlights from this year include:

- 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): 17 as "Regular" tutors, 9 as "Advanced," 11 as "Master," and 8 went a level beyond CRLA (and so were dubbed "Grand Masters").

- Eleven tutors served as WID Mentors and helped us develop and evaluate that program.

- In November, tutors Matt Tyo, Rachel Conrad, Kate Fallone and Writing Center Director Sue Dinitz gave a presentation at the National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing (NCPTW) on “Leadership in a Session’s Opening Moments.”

- This spring, the Writing Center Director at the Fashion Institute of Technology (FIT) approached us about a tutor exchange over spring break. (Their tutors were impressed by our presentation at NCPTW.) In March, Sam Wakefield, Lea McClellan, and Rachel Conrad went to FIT, and in April four FIT tutors visited here. Our tutors were quite taken with the large writing studio space at FIT, which helps create a vibrant community of writers/tutors.

- The FIT and UVM tutors have proposed a joint presentation about the exchange at the next National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing this November in Baltimore.

- Tutor Marjorie Scarff served as Presentation Coordinator, organizing over 70 presentations about the Writing Center and workshops about composing styles and strategies in classes across campus.

- Tutors have helped create and improve our spaces and services this year. Mari Rufo created a poster for our tutoring spaces prompting students to think about the connections between writing and identity; Hannah Rosenberg and Takeshi Horiguchi created posters and a sequence of flyers advertising the Writing Center; four tutors designed online versions of some of our tutor-created handouts related to writing in various disciplines; Jon Roketenetz and Kalle Fjeld wrote essays and rhetorical analyses to be included in the next common reader for English 1 classes; Sam Du and Jackie Shaffer submitted articles for publication in the "Tutor's Corner" of *The Writing Lab Newsletter.*
The WID Mentor Program

This year, WID and the Writing Center collaborated to pilot the WID Mentor Program, which attaches experienced peer writing tutors to writing-intensive courses for majors. This program was developed at Brown University in the early 1980s and has spread nationally, often supporting a curricular requirement for writing-intensive courses. One advantage of WID mentors is that they provide multiple opportunities for faculty and students to converse together about writing and learning to write.

The national model assigns one mentor for every twenty students and is used in courses having at least two required papers, one of which is due in the first month of the semester. Mentors read through drafts and meet with each student in the class; additional meetings are optional. In fall 2009, we experimented with this model in four classes and soon discovered that each class integrated writing so differently—partly due to expanding class sizes—that the national model had to be adjusted. Though only two of the four mentors were well-utilized, all the faculty and mentors involved and a majority of the students recommended continuing to develop the program.

For Spring 2010 we decided to abandon the national model and experiment as widely as possible to develop effective models for our own campus context. We placed a mentor in 10 classes from across the disciplines (business, nursing, chemistry, political science, history, religion). Enrollments ranged from 9 to 106 students, class level ranged from introductory to senior seminars, and writing assignments varied from two short papers to extensive writing projects throughout the semester. We held a workshop for faculty, sharing what we had learned from the successes and struggles of the fall, including a range of possibilities for using their mentor. We also held regular staff development sessions with the WID mentors to troubleshoot problems and brainstorm possibilities. As a result, this spring 9 of the 10 mentors met with a substantial portion of the students in their assigned class. Collectively, the ten mentors held 229 individual, group, or class sessions, and had 855 contacts with students (as compared with fall 2009, when the 4 mentors held 70 sessions and had 77 contacts).
### Summary of Student Use of WID Mentors, 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Student Contacts</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>ANTH 21</td>
<td>E. Smith</td>
<td>K. Williams</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individual sessions:</strong> 21; <strong>Open review:</strong> 1, attended by 6 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>HST 177</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>S. Hausmann</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individual sessions:</strong> 4; <strong>Open workshops:</strong> 4, attended by 6 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>PSYC 231</td>
<td>L. Bond</td>
<td>Z. Chapman</td>
<td>35 individual</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>BSAD 266</td>
<td>C. Beaudoin</td>
<td>M. Scarff</td>
<td>40 individual</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 131</td>
<td>R. Waterman</td>
<td>R. Conrad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individual sessions:</strong> 7; <strong>Group sessions:</strong> 5, attended by 30 students; <strong>Class workshops:</strong> 1, attended by 60 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>CLAS 166</td>
<td>J. Bailly</td>
<td>K. Williams</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individual sessions:</strong> 8; <strong>Group sessions:</strong> 6, attended by 30 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>HST 196K</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>E. Smith</td>
<td>44 individual</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>HST 196B</td>
<td>N. Phelps</td>
<td>S. Hausmann</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individual sessions:</strong> 17; <strong>Open workshops:</strong> 11, attended by 51 students; <strong>Class workshops:</strong> 2, attended by 80 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>POLS 071</td>
<td>P. Von Doepp</td>
<td>T. Massa</td>
<td>16 group</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>POLS 129</td>
<td>A. Ewald</td>
<td>M. Roddy</td>
<td>23 individual</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>POLS 195</td>
<td>E. Andersen</td>
<td>M. Bookman</td>
<td>24 group</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>PRNU 131</td>
<td>S. Whitney</td>
<td>S. Wakefield</td>
<td>13 individual</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spr 2010</td>
<td>REL 201</td>
<td>K. Trainor</td>
<td>Z. Chapman</td>
<td>12 individual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>299 sessions</strong></td>
<td><strong>932 contacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation

At the close of each semester, we surveyed all students in sections with a WID Mentor (including students who did not work with the mentor so that we could learn about why they chose not to) and also surveyed faculty about their perceptions of the WID mentor’s actions and impact. The WID mentors themselves also completed a reflective survey. All of the faculty and mentors and a majority of the students strongly recommended that we continue to develop the program.

All of the faculty agreed that the WID mentor positively contributed to students’ experience in their class (6 of 13 giving the highest rating) and enhanced their work with students on writing (8 of 13 giving the highest rating). Faculty described how having the WID mentor resulted in better student papers and “freed me up to focus more on content.” Faculty also reported unanticipated benefits, including that having a mentor forced them “to be more deliberate, conscious, and engaged when crafting assignments” and made them aware of “possible pitfalls from a student perspective.” Mentors described what they added to the classroom, giving students “someone to work with them who understood their needs and concerns and could be an intermediary with the professor,” and providing “individual help without being remedial.” Students saw the WID Mentor Program as resulting in “better papers” and “better grades,” in part because it “bridged [the] professor-student gap” and “communicated requirements and teacher expectations.” Of students who worked with a mentor, 91% agreed that “having a WID mentor was useful in completing the writing assignments for this class,” with 43% giving the highest rating. The specific ratings, along with representative comments, are included in Appendix D.
Insights and Goals

This year’s pilots suggest that mentors can work successfully in a range of contexts, engaging in a range of roles. Some of the roles mentors filled this year include:

- Conferencing with individual students: required of the entire class, optional for students who requested them, or recommended to a subset of the class
- Facilitating group peer-review sessions over drafts or over preliminary steps, such as checking topics and sources
- Holding group workshops on special topics, such as assignment expectations, citing sources, developing a thesis
- Conducting in-class workshops (being an effective peer reviewer, untangling sentences and improving style, strategies for reading source material)
- Facilitating review sessions before essay exams
- Holding writing workshops: students worked on their papers along with other students in the class, with the tutor available for support/facilitation
- Rehearsing individual or group presentations
- Taking part in class activities as relevant, such as acting as one of the judges when groups presented proposals for project funding

We discovered some class contexts don’t lend themselves to having a peer mentor: senior seminars taken only by majors (this group seems to either feel confident as writers or to not want to find out at this late date that their writing needs work); when the WID mentor is positioned as there to help the “bad” writers in the class (then no one wants to see the mentor); in courses where short papers are assigned and/or no revision is incorporated (students write papers the night before the due date and so don’t have time to see a mentor); when students perceive writing assignments as not requiring critical thinking, when the structure and content of the paper are rigidly specified or when the assignment doesn’t seem to pose new challenges; and when students receive fairly good grades on first-draft writing.

When adapted appropriately to the context, WID mentors were successful in all of the types of classes in which we experimented, including large classes of around 100 students. Strategies for large classes included staggering the assignment so the mentor was working with (and the professor responding to) a subset of students at a time, working with groups rather than individual students, and facilitating peer review rather than providing direct feedback to papers.

Key to the success of this new open model for a WID Mentor Program are (a) figuring out a unique plan to fit the individual context of each faculty member and class, (b) an orientation for faculty, which includes refining of the plan, (c) ongoing supervision for mentors, and (d) regular communication between mentor and instructor, between mentor and students, and with the Writing Center Director. These elements make this a very labor-intensive model to create and direct. To expand it much further would require additional administrative support, not to mention the additional wages required for more WID mentors. The cost for each mentor is about $600. To continue to support our current rate of 14 sections per year, we’ve had to commit $8400 out of the $35,000 total WID budget.
Next year, we plan to continue developing and refining this flexible and contextual approach to a WID Mentor Program so that when the direction for WID at UVM becomes clearer and/or more resources for WID become available, we will be ready to quickly adapt the program to support a new context.

**WID and the Writing Center: Campus Conversations**

As WID Director and Writing Center Director, Susanmarie Harrington and Sue Dinitz participated in a number of committee assignments or campus processes addressing writing on campus. Susanmarie Harrington provided information about writing to the General Education Task Force. While WID was not represented on the Task Force, Susanmarie was invited to meet with the members in December 2009 to assist the committee in considering possible variations for the structure of writing requirements in a general education framework (she was also part of the UVM team at the June AAC&U Institute on General Education). Through that visit and a number of memos during the year, she provided the Task Force with scholarship and peer models addressing local concerns. At its February meeting, the WID Board also discussed the Task Force’s December 2009 general education report, resulting in a memo to the Task Force and Curricular Affairs Committee on behalf of the whole board that advocated for a) making use of the expertise of composition faculty in designing a general education approach to writing, b) considering the needs of faculty in implementing that approach, c) creation of a campus writing board, with the WID Director as an ex officio member, that supports curricular and faculty development, and d) retaining flexibility in a structure for writing requirements so that departments attend to writing throughout their curricula (rather than concentrating writing in one or two courses). (See Appendix F for a copy of the memo.)

Susanmarie and Sue both served on the English Department’s Composition Committee, which oversees English 1, a foundational writing course taught in the English Department. Their presence on this committee—and rotating English 1 coordinator Richard Parent’s presence on the WID Board—helps facilitate conversations about some elements of UVM’s early writing experiences and the relationship with writing in the disciplines. And as English 1 students are a core target audience for the Writing Center, participation on this committee allows the Writing Center Director to be integrated into the planning framework for the course and to maintain ties with the English 1 instructors. In addition, Sue Dinitz participated in the International Student Success Task Force (ISSTF), which helped the campus prepare for the growing number of international students, and in particular for the US-Sino Pathway Program students (see p. 12).

The Writing in the Disciplines Program is one of several units on campus with responsibility for faculty development. One of the ways in which we have increased our effectiveness is through partnerships with other faculty development units. In July 2009, WID hosted a faculty development event for faculty developers: representatives from CUPS, CTL, the Center for Cultural Pluralism and the Fleming Museum joined to explore reading related to academic leadership and to strengthen our own leadership skills. This group met formally with Associate Provost Wanda Heading-Grant in order to discuss ways units could help support the Blackboard Jungle program, and we meet on an informal basis during the year—usually at least once a semester—in order to network and share ideas.

Susanmarie and Sue also participate in the Literacy Lunch Bunch, organized by Associate Dean Janet Bossange of the College of Education and Social Services. This group meets monthly to help faculty and staff on campus who have some interest in literacy development share updates about their work. Members come from a variety of places on campus, including the Vermont National Writing Project, the College of Education, and WID. This group also collaborated on UVM’s celebration for the National Day
on Writing on October 20. As WID held an open house in honor of Professor Emeritus and former WAC director Toby Fulwiler, other events on campus celebrated the many ways writing is important at UVM and beyond. Exhibits in the College of Education showcased work by area elementary school students and UVM’s own education students, the art gallery at Allen House displayed art inspired by words, the Asian Studies program and CALS developed writing-themed galleries, and an open-mic event at Brennan’s kept participants busy well into the evening hours.

WID is happy to participate in such a rich network of conversations on campus.

Imagining Writing at UVM

The Writing in the Disciplines Program’s first year (2008-2009) culminated in a consultant review of the program’s approach to meeting its charge: to ensure writing is a significant part of undergraduate students’ education beyond the foundation of a first-year experience. Given the limitations on resources for the Writing in the Disciplines Program (and writing more generally) at the University into the foreseeable future, one of the five key recommendations offered by consultant Dr. Christopher M. Anson, Director of the Campus Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, was for WID to pursue fundraising as a way to increase the program’s capacity. Rachel Sauerwein, WID Program Assistant, led the development of a fundraising vision for WID that also extended beyond the program in order to make the case that a robust WID Program depends on a foundation created by a coherent first-year writing experience.

With the emergence of general education as a campus priority, Associate Provost Brian Reed asked us to expand that vision to describe an overarching writing program for UVM in line with general education goals. While the WID program is not represented on the General Education Task Force, and the precise nature of the curricular experience remains to be determined via faculty governance, the resulting proposal for a UVM Center for Writing Excellence was submitted, with endorsements from the Provost and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, as a priority for the next UVM Capital Campaign.

The vision for a UVM Center for Writing Excellence describes the desired learning outcomes for students, as well as the major components of a writing program, including a First-Year Seminar Program designed to give all students a foundational college writing experience; an expanded Writing Center that continues to offer tutoring to students across campus and coordinates the WID Mentor Program, but on a larger scale to reach more students; a Writing in the Disciplines Program that works to coordinate advanced writing experiences in every degree program on campus and provides an increased number of development institutes for faculty; and a new Writing Studio that would house provide space for students and faculty to meet individually and in groups to work on their writing and their courses. (See Appendix G for the complete vision.)

Goals

Our most important goal is positioning ourselves to expand services for faculty and students when UVM reaches clarity about how it wants to institutionalize student writing experiences. Our work for the past two years has established a good foundation; we are building capacity—via networking, via programming, and via planning—for extending our work across the campus.
For the WID Program as a whole (WID and the Writing Center), a key goal remains upgrading the classification of our staff position. The work of our program assistant has greatly expanded over the past year; the merging of the Writing Center and WID has created many additional tasks for the program assistant to manage, and the program assistant’s responsibility for the budget has also increased (see p. 4). In addition, the anticipated growth of WID in response to campus curricular changes will require advanced writing and reporting skills as well as ever-more-complicated database management skills.

Action steps for the coming year include:

**Writing in the Disciplines**

- **Workshops**
  Develop a range of workshops, experimenting with varying times in attempt to attract new participants. Explore new formats for workshops to see whether a study group/faculty learning community model might be attractive for some participants.

- **Departments**
  Request invitations to department meetings, especially in colleges or schools with relatively modest participation in WID offerings for the past two years. Consider model of bringing workshops to departments in order to boost participation.

- **Partners**
  Develop one or two additional partnerships with departments.

- **Campus Networking**
  Maintain a network of relationships with other faculty development units. Look for chances to participate in conversations about writing and general education.

**Writing Center**

- **WID Mentor Program**
  Continue to develop models and solidify our approach based on our pilots, and be ready to expand if this program is funded.

- **Universal Design**
  Get all of our materials and resources online. Experiment with providing online tutoring through the platform available in TutorTrac.

- **Writing Partners Program**
  Advertise this program more extensively through the Office for International Education, the ACCESS Office, the TRIO/SSS Program, and the College/School Assistant Dean's offices.

- **Support for English Language Learners**
  Assess the tutoring support provided through the USPP summer bridge program. Work closely with the Office of International Education to support the USPP students, including having a writing tutor linked directly to that office and offering writing partners to all USPP students. Provide more tutor training on ELL issues, if we have an ELL specialist on staff.

- **Publicity**
  Find new way to reach first-year students, now that fewer students take English 1.
Post flyers regularly in the dorms and across campus. Try to connect with students by creating a Student Advisory Board, with representatives from SGA, the ALANA Student Center, Athletics, ACCESS, TRIO/SSS, the Office of International Education, etc.

- **TutorTrac**
  Move the program to the UVM server to increase speed. Move to online scheduling. Train and re-train tutors to improve the accuracy of tutor data entry. Check data accuracy each week.

- **Space**
  Develop procedures for using our current spaces more efficiently and effectively.

- **Create More Tutor Community**
  Though unlike the Fashion Institute of Technology, we can’t create community through a large writing studio space where tutors congregate, the experienced tutors and I have decided to (a) meet bi-weekly rather than monthly and invite the new tutors to join our meetings, (b) make the Fulwiler Room available for tutors to use when it is unscheduled, and (c) have more social events.

**Staff**

- **Susanmarie Harrington**, Director of the Writing in the Disciplines Program, handles program development and planning.
- **Sue Dinitz**, Director of the Writing Center, works with Susanmarie to coordinate student and faculty support.
- **Rachel Sauerwein**, Program Assistant, coordinates the office, communications, archiving, and reporting.
- **Maggie Spencer** and **Elizabeth Barnes**, WID’s Graduate Research Assistants supported research and programming.

The WID Board, composed of representatives from every undergraduate school or college, provides valuable advice on our ongoing work.

**2009-2010 WID Board**

**Cathy Beaudoin**
Assistant Professor, School of Business Administration

**Daisy Benson**
Library Associate Professor, Bailey/Howe Info and Instruction

**Janet Bossange**
Associate Dean, College of Education and Social Services
Senior Lecturer, Department of Education

**Paula Deming**
Assistant Professor, Department of Medical Laboratory and Radiation Sciences
Joel Goldberg  
Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry

Richard Parent  
Assistant Professor, Department of English

Cathy Paris  
Senior Lecturer, Department of Plant Biology  
Liaison for Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

Jonathan Sands  
Professor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Wendy Verrei-Berenback  
Interim Director, Center for Teaching and Learning

Deane Wang  
Associate Professor, Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources