# Writing in the Disciplines and the Writing Center

### Table of Contents

**Part 1: Highlights of Support for Institutional Priorities** ......... 2
- Enhancing Student Engagement and Student Success ......................................... 2
- Supporting General Education ........................................................................... 4
- Diversity and Internationalization ................................................................. 5

**Part 2: Goals and Challenges** ................................................................. 6
- Meeting Our Specific Goals for 2014-2015 .................................................... 6
- Specific Goals for 2015-2016 ..................................................................... 8
- Ongoing Challenges ....................................................................................... 9

**Part 3: Detailed Program Reports** ....................................................... 10
- WID: Support for the Teaching of Writing in the Disciplines ...................... 10
- The Writing Center: Support for Student Writers ....................................... 14
- The WID Mentor Program .......................................................................... 22

**List of Appendices** ................................................................................ 25
Annual Report for WID and the Writing Center

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.¹ 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).

Part 1: Highlights of Support for Institutional Priorities

WID and the Writing Center collaborate to contribute to UVM’s core institutional priorities. Part 1 features the highlights of WID and Writing Center activities this year, organized around the institutional priorities they support.

Enhancing Student Engagement and Student Success

Writing intensive courses are among the high-impact practices identified in George Kuh and colleagues’ meta-analysis of NSSE data over time. By supporting faculty attention to assignment design and the role of writing in courses, and by supporting students’ attention to the evolution of their writing projects, WID and the Writing Center support student engagement and success. WID supports faculty in creating writing-intensive experiences, focusing the role of writing in courses. The Writing Center provides additional opportunities for engagement, as students engage in conversations about their writing projects with peer tutors. Together, WID and the Writing Center enhance student engagement and student success:

Through open programming offered by WID and the Writing Center

- WID offered 24 open workshops in varied time formats, providing multiple opportunities for faculty to connect with us, and reached 154 individuals.

- Evaluations from the 7th annual WID Institute were among the most positive ever, with 100% of respondents strongly agreeing or agreeing that the Institute was valuable and they would recommend it to others and that it met their expectations.

- In the Writing Center, peer tutors engaged more students in conversations about writing than ever before, through individual tutorials and classroom workshops. Through our open programming, tutors held 2580 individual tutoring sessions (11% more than last year) and 56 workshops for classes, reaching 1060 students (4% more than last year).

- In evaluating their individual tutoring sessions, 98% of the students who filled out a survey reported finding the session useful (with 87% strongly agreeing), and 99% of the students said they would recommend the Writing Center to other students (with 91% strongly agreeing).

- We expanded access by offering on-line tutoring for students who would find coming to Bailey Howe Library a hardship.

- We began offering workshops open to all interested students (to supplement our in-class workshops). In November and February, Sue Dinitz offered workshops on writing personal statements in coordination with the Career Center.

¹ Since the Writing Center joined the Writing in the Disciplines (WID) Program in 2009, the name “WID Program” has referred to both the combined student support and faculty development programs and to just the original faculty development program. In this report, we use “Writing in the Disciplines Program” to refer to the combined units and “WID” to refer to the faculty development program only.
Through the WID Mentor Program

- The WID Mentor Program (which attaches tutors to writing-intensive classes) grew dramatically this year. Twenty-eight mentors were attached to classes, as compared with 15 last year (an 87% increase).
- One would expect a corresponding increase in the number of mentor contacts, but mentor contacts increased even more dramatically, by 264%. Mentors held 372 individual tutorials, worked with 127 writing groups (498 contacts), and offered 76 workshops in classes that reached 2,547 students, for a total of 3,417 student contacts.
- Faculty and students continue to be enthusiastic about this program. 100% of the faculty and 90% of the students who filled out an evaluation form recommended that we continue to develop the WID Mentor Program.

Through Laying the Groundwork for Supporting Graduate Student Writers

- Susanmarie helped prepare for Professor Lisa Emerson (Massey University) to return to UVM later in 2015 for a “train the trainer” set of programs that will promote more effective advising of graduate science writers.
- In the past few years, graduate directors and Graduate College Dean Cindy Forehand have raised concerns about the relative lack of support for graduate writers at UVM. Currently, the only direct support we provide is in the Writing Center, which is staffed by undergraduate peer tutors. This year, we benchmarked the services that our comparator institutions provide to graduate student writers. 70% of UVM’s peers and 100% of peer aspirants provide graduate tutors in their writing centers; in addition, a sampling of disciplinary peers suggests that other institutions are far ahead of UVM in providing services for graduate student writers (for example, 4 disciplinary peers have a freestanding graduate writing center and most provide substantial web resources for graduate writers). For a more detailed report, see Appendix B.
- In the fall, Dean Forehand asked us to create a proposal for supporting graduate student writers, as she had gained access to some additional funding and wanted to devote it to this purpose. She liked our ideas, we were able to work out a general plan, and now a Graduate Student Writing Center will be piloted in January 2015. It will be funded by the Graduate College, coordinated by Nancy Welch, and administered through WID/the Writing Center. Finally graduate students will be able to get writing support from trained graduate peer writing tutors.

Through Creating a Service-Learning Experience for 50 Peer Tutors/Mentors

- All tutors/mentors earned certification through the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) at one of three levels: “Certified” (6 tutors), "Advanced" (24 tutors), or "Master" (11 tutors); 10 tutors got an additional year of training and experience beyond the “Master” level.
- On April 18, three tutors gave presentations at the Northeast Writing Centers Association Conference at Centenary College, as part of a panel entitled “Becoming Attuned to Gender and Sexuality as Part of the Fabric of Writing Center Sessions.”
- Tutor Allie Brimlow wrote an Honors Thesis based on research in the Writing Center, entitled “Affinity Seeking in the Writing Center.”
Supporting General Education

Supporting foundational writing and information literacy (FWIL)

Collaborating with Libby Miles, the new FWIL Director

- Libby began working in January 2015. In preparation, we redesigned Bailey Howe 302 to include an office for Libby and her half-time program assistant. Work was completed in December 2014.
- We have begun establishing connections for the mutually reinforcing work of FWIL, the Writing Center, and WID (identifying points of connection between the FWIL and WID Institutes, for example, and identifying points of connection between FWIL faculty development efforts and the Writing Center). Susanmarie and Libby worked together on the first round of transfer credit evaluations.

Administrative support for FWIL

- WID Program Assistant Kristen Cameron managed FWIL’s budget and stipends this year. Libby hired a half-time program assistant in May, and Kristen is helping to train her. A separate budget line for FWIL is being created for FY16.

Writing Center Support for FWIL Classes

- English 001: The new foundational writing requirement resulted in additional sections of English 001 and new opportunities to connect with English 1 instructors and students as they engage in the challenging new curriculum. We developed presentations/workshops targeted at the new assignment sequence and gave 57 presentations in English 1 classes, 39 of which included one of these new workshops. Two instructors set up special projects with the Writing Center. With these closer connections, the number of individual sessions with English 001 students increased by 140% (503), the number of workshop contacts by 77% (858), and the total number of contacts with English 001 students by 85% (1361).
- TAP: Students from 32 different TAP classes used the Writing Center, coming for 130 sessions. We offered in-class workshops in 8 TAP classes and placed WID Mentors in 2 TAP classes. In May, Sue met with TAP faculty participating in the FWIL Institute and discussed how the Writing Center can support TAP faculty and students in meeting the four FWIL outcomes.
- HCOL 085/086: Writing Center tutors held open tutoring hours in the Honors College the night before papers were due for English 085. In addition, students from HCOL 085/086 scheduled appointments at the Writing Center for 36 sessions; two HCOL students requested and worked weekly with a writing partner; and a WID Mentor was placed in Jeanne Shea’s HCOL 086 class. In May, Sue met with Martha Lance, the Honors College Academic Advisor, to discuss creating a “Writing Collaborative” in the Honors College next fall.

WILD: Supporting writing in the major

- The Writing and Information Literacy Across the Disciplines (WILD) initiative welcomed 5 new participating departments, bringing the total of participating departments to 9. Another 3 departments are slated to begin work in Fall 2016 (recruiting continues and we anticipate that number to grow).
- 5 departments completed surveys of faculty, students, and in two cases, community partners
- 4 departments identified writing and information literacy outcomes for the major
- 2 departments completed curricular mapping
- To date, 8 departments have had significant conversations about student learning and outcomes.
Diversity and Internationalization

Faculty Development: Responding to Writing by English Language Learners (ELLs)

- Susanmarie and Sue collaborated to develop a workshop for faculty on responding to writing by ELLs, which they offered as an open WID workshop in November 2014 and as an invited, unit workshop for faculty in the School of Business Administration in February 2015.
- Susanmarie and Sue presented on this topic at both the International Writing Centers Association Conference in October 2014 and the Conference on College Composition and Communication in March 2015 (“Risking Change for Multicultural Classrooms: Writing Centers and Changing Faculty Attitudes and practices around Language Diversity”).
- Susanmarie and Sue collaborated with the CTL and Gayle Nunley to create a workshop series on teaching in a globally diverse classroom. This culminated in a day-long workshop in May, co-sponsored by several units, on “Reaching and Teaching All Students in the Globally Diverse Classroom,” which included a workshop facilitated by Sue and Susanmarie.
- Sue and Susanmarie received funding through the Buckham Program in the English Department to bring Michelle Cox to campus. Michelle is the inaugural Director of the English Language Support Office of Cornell University’s Knight Institute. She offered three workshops on responding to writing by English language learners: one for the writing tutors, one for English 001 instructors, and one open to all faculty (sponsored by WID).

Support for English Language Learners through the Writing Center

Individual tutoring

- English language learners continue to seek out the Writing Center as they encounter the demands of college-level academic writing in English. Tutors worked with 154 matriculated students who self-identified as having a first language other than English (listing 30 different home languages), up 37% from last year. These students came for 730 sessions, many making regular use of the Writing Center. Fifty-seven of the students came four times or more, averaging 10+ sessions each; 32 worked weekly with a writing partner.

Connecting with the Global Gateway Program

- A goal for this year was to connect matriculating Global Gateway Program (GGP) students with the Writing Center. Each semester as a new group matriculated, Sue gave a brief presentation about the Writing Center. This spring, we experimented with introducing students to the Writing Center while they were still in the Gateway. We offered drop-in tutoring hours on Thursday evenings for students in Academic Writing II. These sessions proved very popular, with 6-20 students attending each week. Since the Gateway Program operates over the summer, we were asked to continue offering the weekly open tutoring hours during the summer.

Support for Students with Disabilities

- Although we have no way to identify the number of students with disabilities who use the Writing Center, we know that 20 students from the ACCESS Office were matched with writing partners through the Writing Partners Program. ACCESS Counselors often called Sue to discuss individual students’ needs, so that each student could be matched with an appropriate tutor.
Part 2: Goals and Challenges

Meeting Our Specific Goals for 2014-2015

Meeting WID Goals

Maximize collaborations with other professional development units.

- WID had a close working relationship with the Center for Teaching and Learning, co-sponsoring 3 series over the year (programming for new faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences; programming on teaching globally diverse students; and programming for graduate students, particularly those in the Graduate Teaching Portfolio program). (The Provost’s Office and Office for International Affairs also supported series on teaching globally diverse students.)

Survey alumni of the WID Institute to explore possibilities for targeted advanced programming.

- The survey has been developed and will be distributed in early Fall 2015.

Explore incentives for faculty participation in intensive WID programming.

- Benchmarking in the 2014 annual report addressed this matter, finding that financial incentives are a common practice for intensive programming. No further action required at this time, as no changes were mandated and the current incentive system works well.

Coordinate with the new director of Foundational Writing and Information Literacy (whom we hope will be joining us in the fall).

- The New FWIL Director began work January 2015. Susanmarie and Libby collaborated on early approaches to evaluating transfer credit for FWIL courses and general established a close working relationship.

Recruit more departments into the WILD project and continue working with the General Education Committee on Writing and Information Literacy.

- Susanmarie continued as co-chair of the General Education Committee (Writing and Information Literacy) and co-coordinated work on the WILD initiatives. 4 new departments moved into the project during the year, with 3 others committing for 2015-16.

Pursue partnership with the NBH Spire for support of science/graduate student writing.

- Susanmarie worked with Rae Nishi and Sharon Henry of the NBH spire to plan a return visit for Professor Lisa Emerson from Massey University in New Zealand. Her 3 month stay will help institute a “train the trainer” model to support better advising for graduate science writers

Meeting Writing Center Goals

Make online tutoring available to students who find coming to Bailey Howe Library a hardship.

- We developed the capacity to offer on-line tutoring, added information to our website, trained tutors, and informed interested parties such as ACCESS and Athletics.

Offer some open workshops of general interest to supplement our classroom-based workshops.

- We developed a workshop on creating personal statements and offered it through the HUB in November and February.
Increase use of the Writing Center in the spring semester.

- The number of individual tutoring sessions increased by 38% this spring, partly as the result of closer collaboration with English 1 classes and of offering open tutoring hours in the Global Gateway Program.

Pursue connections between the Writing Center and foundational writing classes.

- We focused on English 001 this year, working closely with the instructors, offering more workshops, and increasing contacts with English 1 students by 85%.

Work with the Global Gateway Program to ensure GGP students who matriculate receive writing support.

- Sue gave presentations about the Writing Center to GGP matriculating students in August, December, and May, and we offered open tutoring hours on Thursday evenings in the Gateway.

Monitor use of the Writing Center by ELLs to determine needs for additional programming and funding.

- This is an on-going process. For example, we are providing tutoring to ELLs in two venues this summer, as needs have arisen.

Meeting WID Mentor Program Goals

Integrate use of WID Mentors as an option for providing faculty development to departments and instructors who are trying to incorporate writing into their classes more effectively.

- The WILD emphasis on curricular mapping and outcomes development did not lend itself to attention to this goal. We will carry it forward to 2015-16.

Revise program tip sheets for faculty and mentors, including more information about faculty development options.

- Sue updated WID program materials to reflect the new emphasis on faculty development.

Meeting Collaborative WID & Writing Center Goals

Develop workshop(s) on responding to English language learners’ writing.

- Sue and Susanmarie developed a workshop on this topic and offered it twice: once as an open workshop and once, by invitation, to the School of Business Administration. WID and CTL co-sponsored a workshop series over the year on addressing globally diverse learners, and in May, they collaborated with other professional development units to offer a day-long workshop, “Reaching and Teaching All Students in the Globally Diverse Classroom.”

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.

- Work continues on this. The FWIL assistant was not hired until May 2015 so work will continue in 2015-16. The FWIL director and staff assistant are integrated into the space, and the process of developing shared policy will continue.

Extend 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.
- Sue and Susanmarie presented 2 conference papers on their joint work, one at the International Writing Centers Association Conference in October 2014, and one at the Conference on College Composition and Communication in March 2015.

*Investigate how our peers and aspirants provide writing support to graduate students.*

- See Appendix B, a report on our benchmarking on this topic.

**Specific Goals for 2015-2016**

**Specific Goals for WID, 2015-2016**

- FWIL: Articulate principles connecting WID, WILD, and FWIL work. Find ways to integrate that articulation into our publicity as well as our workshops
- Support for graduate students: Make connections with faculty in the sciences through Lisa Emerson’s visit; participate in preliminary work for the Alda Institute affiliate programming
- Support for faculty developing approaches to teaching multilingual student writers: Create additional programming linking universal design for learning and responding to writing
- Collaborate with library faculty to investigate how our work combining attention to information literacy and writing connects with scholarship in library science and composition studies

**Specific Goals for WILD, 2015-2016**

- Continue to develop the rolling recruiting process to engage more departments with WILD. Currently we have 3 departments committed for next year; the project has capacity to add several more.
- Advance currently participating departments to the assessment/future planning phases of WILD.

**Specific Goals for the Writing Center, 2015-2016**

- FWIL: Work with Libby to connect with FWIL classes. As she creates a community of English 1 instructors, work to become part of this community and to connect English 001 students with the Writing Center. As Libby begins to work with TAP faculty, take the opportunity to show TAP faculty how the Writing Center can help them address the four FWIL Outcomes. For HCOL 085/086, work with Martha Lance to create a Writing Collaborative in HCOL.
- Support for science writing: Take advantage of Lisa Emerson’s visit to improve how the Writing Center works with students learning to write in the sciences.
- Supporting ELLs: continue to make connections with the Gateway and look for ways to support international students/other ELLs, addressing needs as they arise.
- Scholarship: Libby Miles, Daisy Benson, and Sue Dinitz have proposed two conference presentations: for IWCA, on how FWIL has revolutionized English 1, the teaching of information literacy, and the UVM Writing Center ; and for CCCC on how the new ACRL Framework and WPA Outcomes can transform work in information literacy, foundational writing, and writing centers.

**Specific Goals for the WID Mentor Program, 2015-2016**

- As WILD pilots progress, work with departments to consider how they might use WID Mentors to support faculty developing new writing-intensive courses.
Specific Collaborative Goals for WID and the Writing Center, 2015-2016

- Graduate Writing Center: work with Nancy Welch to create a graduate writing center; provide administrative support for the graduate writing center, especially in the fall, when Nancy will be on sabbatical.
- Continue to re-organize 302 Bailey Howe staff, space, and materials to better include (and take advantage of the presence of) Libby Miles and the FWIL half-time program assistant.
- Continue to develop and offer faculty development opportunities related to responding to ELLs.

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.

Writing Center Space

As noted in last year’s report, having three small spaces on three different floors of the library is less than ideal, and limits growth and effectiveness of the Writing Center perhaps more than any other factor. Tutors are not able to form a community or learn from each other as they are tutoring, and we have had to devise an elaborate system to figure out who is tutoring in which space. No one is able to greet students as they come to the Writing Center or to answer questions about the service without interrupting a session. So this year, we decided to benchmark the nature of the Writing Center physical spaces at our peer and aspirant institutions.

The location of our Writing Center in Bailey/Howe Library, with the Director’s office on the third floor, matches the best practices of our comparator institutions. Twelve of the 18 writing centers were located in a library (with 6 of those 12 within a Commons or Learning Commons in the library); 3 were in a Center for Student Services, and 3 were in English/Humanities departments. Most writing centers hosted a director’s office either within the writing center (4) or in the same building, but in a different location (9). Three directors had offices in a different building.

While the location of our Writing Center matches best practices, the nature of that space does not. We are the only institution not to have at least one large room for tutoring, with multi-use space including individual tutoring stations, tables appropriate for groups, and lounge seating on the periphery. Instead, we have 3 small tutoring spaces, each of which can accommodate one tutor, on three different floors in the library. We could estimate square footage for these large tutoring rooms at ten of the institutions, and the combined square feet of all three of our tutoring spaces matches the size of the smallest writing center room of our comparator institutions: 300 square feet. Four had rooms somewhat larger than this (320, 320, 320, 384 square feet) and five had much larger rooms (480, 480, 540, 765, 1200 square feet). The average size was 508 square feet. A reception desk, staffed by someone who could greet students and answer questions, was found in 13 of the institutions.

If there is ever a plan to remodel or expand the library, we should attempt to create a large writing center room (300+ square feet) that could accommodate two individual tutoring spaces, some open space for group tutoring, and a desk for a receptionist. For more details, see Appendix C.

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

Currently, the Writing Center director’s faculty position is funded at 87.5%, 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 only sustainable for another year or two. Without additional funding from another source, the Writing Center director will not be able to continue to develop and coordinate this program.

**Gradual Implementation of General Education**

WID is working closely with the general education initiative. UVM’s implementation of the outcomes for writing and information literacy beyond the foundational experience relies on voluntary participation of academic units. The Davis Foundation provides a short-term, timely incentive for departments to begin (re)articulating outcomes in the major. Continuing work must be folded into ongoing department processes. As we noted last year, 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. The voluntary nature of participation in WILD is a strength; only those who wish to participate sign up; this builds good will. Depending on voluntary participation builds a certain amount of conservatism into the initiative, and requires that WID and the general education committee be ever-creative in publicizing the initiative and its opportunities.

**Part 3: Detailed Program Reports**

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

**Establishing an Institutional Framework**

WID’s seventh year was productive and exciting. In part due to the expansion of the general education WILD initiative, our contacts grew. Programming supporting faculty addressing the needs of multilingual student writers opened up excellent connections with other units, and the first phase of WILD led to increased contacts with faculty who had not yet attended any WID events.

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, as well as increasing clarity about how to support multilingual students’ writing and information literacy needs, WID stands ready to expand its services.

**WID Programming**

A variety of WID workshops and other activities for faculty, graduate students and staff with teaching responsibilities helped expand conversations about writing. In addition to a range of workshops addressing the fundamentals of teaching writing, we also offered a number of workshops addressing ways assignment design and response strategies can be developed with an eye toward welcoming a diverse range of students. Overall, these conversations encourage reflection, pedagogical experimentation, and assessment.

**Participation**

In 2014-15, the number of individuals who participated in some sort of WID programming or meeting increased sharply, largely due to activities associated with the WILD general education initiative. A total of 281 individuals (including 238 faculty members, 13 staff, 2 post-doctoral fellows, and 28 graduate students) attended WID programming (see Appendix D for details), for 491 contacts. Participants came from 47 different departments and 10 schools or college on campus. Participation from Business and Medicine was up compared to previous years because WID offered workshops in each of those units for the first time.
**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 or offered for a specific academic unit. This year, 154 individuals from 48 departments and 8 programs took part in WID open programming (these figures represent a small increase over last year). Open workshops addressing the following themes: responding to writing, assignment design, working with multilingual writers, and rubrics:

**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 and developing effective rubrics and response strategies were highlighted in several open workshops.

**Writing and Diversity**

Many of our workshops addressed these fundamentals through the lens of inclusion and diversity. Workshops on applying principles of universal design for learning to a course, on welcoming multilingual students to the classroom and strategies for effective response to multilingual students work helped faculty work with core WID principles to address students’ varied needs.

**GTA Programming**

In collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning, WID continues to support the Graduate Teaching Certificate Program. WID and CTL regularly offer a workshop on teaching in higher education specifically for graduate students; we 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.

**Participant Evaluations of Open Programming**

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 65 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 and that the discussion helped them learn. Most of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they would use ideas from the workshop in their teaching, and that they would recommend the workshop to others. Almost 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 assessment methods, leading class discussions, more opportunities for conversations with other faculty, online course design, storytelling as a pedagogical tool, teaching for wholeness, and writing for upper-level classes. (More detail on workshop attendance and evaluations is given in Appendix D.)

“The discussion piece was great and application to particular cases and experiences.”

**Extended Workshops, Programs, and Activities**

WID’s 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 to develop new approaches over time, sustained by continuing conversation and resources.
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**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. The Institute was revamped this year to promote better attention to the needs of multilingual students as well as better attention to the role of information literacy in relation to writing. This year, 15 faculty from 13 different programs or departments in the Colleges of Arts and Science, Agriculture and Life Sciences, Education and Social Services, and Engineering and Mathematical Sciences participated. Daisy Benson of Bailey/Howe Libraries was present throughout the institute and led presentations on information literacy; Dan DeSanto, the information literacy coordinator for WILD, participated for two days. 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 Emily Howe and Kathryn Warrender—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 2015 WID Institute was among our most positive ever. Faculty noted that the Institute went beyond their expectations, in that it addressed overall issues of pedagogy and course design, not simply attention to developing and responding to writing assignments. Participants were unanimous in 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 strongly agreed that they would recommend the Institute to others. Open-ended comments indicated that the Institute was time well spent and the emphasis on connecting course goals and activities, 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 to enhance student learning. (More detail is given in Appendix E.)

**Engaging Students Book Group**

When we publicized the book group for Elizabeth Barkley’s *Student Engagement Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty*, the response was overwhelming. We decided to run two parallel book groups in order to accommodate demand. The discussion of strategies and principles for increasing motivation and attention proved so popular that both groups requested an additional meeting. The 12 participants in the book group all identified specific strategies for in-class work that encouraged more student involvement with peers and material.

**Faculty Writing Workshops**

Faculty writing retreats encourage faculty to attend to their own writing needs. By providing space and time for writing, WID (and the CTL) encourage faculty to develop their scholarship and other writing projects as well as to develop their pedagogies. We offered faculty writing retreats throughout the year. We had 12 participants from 10 departments or programs attend a total of 28 times.

**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.

**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. This Faculty Senate initiative is an excellent way for WID resources and expertise to be connected to departments. Susanmarie’s role as co-chair of the General
Education Committee (Writing and Information Literacy) dovetails with her role as WID Director. WILD continues to deepen WID’s connection 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. In 2014-15, an additional 5 departments came on board (4 of them early enough in the year to accomplish significant progress; the 5th, Political Science, began work with the intention of beginning full department involvement in Fall 2015). Department participation to date is summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Liaison</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
<th>Assessment Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Emily Manetta</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDAE</td>
<td>Kelly Hamshaw</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLL</td>
<td>Ignacio Lopez Vicuna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Judy Cohen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Britt Holmen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVS</td>
<td>Amy Seidl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Laura Webb</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Science</td>
<td>Jamie Abaied</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Alison Brody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Caroline Beer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The WILD project has three broad goals:

1. To train library liaisons and faculty liaisons in participating departments to coordinate the work of developing and implementing outcomes. In the past year, we provided orientation and support for 5 sets of liaisons, and achieved efficiencies in orientation by combining the survey development and orientation meetings. In addition, the hiring of the grant-funded information literacy librarian Emily Crist freed up department liaisons for WILD work. We coordinated and met with liaisons and librarians throughout the year.

2. To enable participating departments to identify priorities/learning outcomes; map curriculum to outcomes; and assess where and how students learn and propose changes in pedagogy to promote more learning. This is the heart of the WILD project. As is evident in the table above, departments are moving through the WILD process at different rates of speed. The time each department has available for the project varies somewhat based on other departmental projects and the departments’ responses to other institutional priorities. All participating departments have, to date, had significant conversations about writing and information literacy, and the process of moving from survey results to outcome development has gotten increasingly smooth as the WILD coordinating team has more experiences.

3. **Assess impact on each department.** Because of the pace of implementation, no department has moved fully into the assessment phase of WILD yet. However, we can see the impact of the process already. In Geology, for example, the WILD conversations have led to the decision to revise major requirements in order to improve
attention to geology coverage and also make possible better scaffolding for WILD outcomes. Another example: in Nursing, conversations teased apart the difference between graduate and undergraduate outcomes and also highlighted a particular area requiring clarity (the role of students as information creators).

**Challenges and Barriers in WILD**

Participation in WILD is a voluntary process, and rates of participation have been lower than anticipated. As other institutional initiatives also required departmental attention, WILD has to attract departments’ attention. The time-limited nature of WILD funding—one course release per participating department—can be both an appeal and a disincentive. Ultimately, the fruits of WILD must be sown within a department’s usual working rhythms, and the success of the WILD pitch depends in part on how well a department can imagine carrying on the work of WILD absent the grant-funded leadership.

A previous barrier to the spread of WILD was limitations on library liaisons. The presence of a grant-funded librarian has eased this challenge considerably.

**Goals and Outlook for Next Year**

The WILD coordinating team continues to work on recruiting departments for next year. Our experience this year has shown that departments will decide to participate during the school year, and that staggered beginnings for the WILD cycle have some benefit in terms of distributing the work through the year at WID. WID RAs do a considerable amount of processing of survey data and implementation, and the rolling start dates for the surveys make that work more manageable.

The WILD Team to date has 3 departments committed for next year, and anticipates filing out the WILD roster with departments identified in the fall.

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

**Overviews of Writing Center Services, 2014-2015**

**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 a surprising 38%-- from 5,442 to 7,516 contacts.

- This increase was due largely to a 264% increase in the number of contacts through the WID Mentor Program-- from 938 to 3,417 contacts. The WID Mentor Program is growing in popularity (we had 28 mentor placements this year, as compared with 15 last year), and many of the faculty involved mentors in class workshops and activities, creating many additional contacts.
- The demand for individual tutoring and class workshops through open programming also increased, though more modestly.
- All of these increases offset the one decrease in contacts: in group tutoring through open programming. This decrease was caused by a change in the offerings of Conversation Circles (a class where small groups of English language learners meet with a tutor to practice conversation skills): while 10 sections of Conversation Circles were offered last year, only three were offered during 2014-15. We suspect this course is being phased out.
### Table 1: Student Contacts through Writing Center Programs 2013-2014

<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>2580 (+11%)</td>
<td>372 (+49%)</td>
<td>2952 (+15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tutoring</td>
<td>459 (-60%)</td>
<td>498 (+253%)</td>
<td>957 (-27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class workshops</td>
<td>1060 (+4%)</td>
<td>2547 (+366%)</td>
<td>3607 (+131%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contacts</strong></td>
<td>4099 (-9%)</td>
<td>3417 (+264%)</td>
<td>7516 (+38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of Services Provided to Tutors: A Service Learning Experience**

The approach to tutor education

The services above were provided by 51 tutors, ranging from sophomores to seniors and from a variety of majors. The 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 10/4 and 105) and continues through regular staff development meetings for second- and third-year tutors and WID mentors.

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. Sue wrote recommendations for 30 tutors this year, and gave many phone references. In addition, Susanmarie offered the tutors a resume writing workshop and Kristen presented on job search skills.

**Tutor Highlights**

In addition to providing over 7500 contacts with students through tutoring sessions and class workshops, tutors collaborated in improving the Writing Center and engaged in writing center scholarship.

- 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 6 tutors at the “Certified” level, 24 at the “Advanced” level; 11 at the "Master" level; and 10 at the “Grand Master” level.
- Twenty-three tutors served as WID Mentors, (a) helping faculty members integrate writing into their courses and (b) providing writing support to students in a specific class.
- On April 18, three tutors participated in a panel presentation at the Northeast Writing Centers Association Conference at Centenary College. Emily Howe, Allie Brimlow, and Kathryn Warrender gave a panel presentation entitled, “Becoming Attuned to Gender and Sexuality as Part of the Fabric of Writing Center Sessions.”
- Tutor Allie Brimlow wrote an Honor’s Thesis based on research in the Writing Center, entitled “Affinity Seeking in the Writing Center.”
- Many tutors contributed to the Tutor Tips webpages on writing in the disciplines and created materials and artwork for the Writing Center.
- Tutor Kathryn Warrender served as Presentation Coordinator, organizing 94 class presentations about the Writing Center (compared with 75 last year), 56 of which included workshops that involved students in broader discussions and activities related to writing.
- Tutors Emily Howe and Kathryn Warrender presented at the WID Institute, discussing how to design effective peer review of student work-in-progress.

“Being a writing tutor has been one of the most rewarding experiences that I have had at UVM.”

“The Writing Center has been a really important part of my experience at UVM thus far. I’ve really enjoyed being able to meet new students and help them feel more confident about their writing.”
Services Provided Through Open Programming

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

For the first time in its history, the Writing Center was busier in the spring semester than in the fall semester. This was due in part to the opening of a satellite tutoring service in the Global Gateway Program in January, where 4 tutors held open tutoring hours and met with 145 students, and in part to an increase in sessions with English 1 students overall, but especially in the spring, when we engaged in two special projects with English 1 classes. It’s wonderful to see the tutors so busy throughout the year!

<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>2014-15</td>
<td>1209 (-10%)</td>
<td>1371 (+38%)</td>
<td>2580 (+10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>1344 (-4%)</td>
<td>994 (+6%)</td>
<td>2338 (-0.1%)</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

For the first time, the Writing Center offered online tutoring for students who would find coming to Bailey/Howe Library a hardship (e.g. because they live outside of Chittenden County, or because they have a disability). We are using a platform offered through our scheduling database. Although no one took advantage of this service, we are now prepared!

Class 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. Last year, we designed some new workshops targeted at the English 1 curriculum (on being an effective peer reviewer for social narratives and on writing literature reviews) and at TAP classes (on creating a strong thesis). These workshops were in great demand: while last year 75 presentations were offered, 42 of which included a workshop, this year we offered 94 presentations, 56 of which included workshops.

Last year, we benchmarked writing center workshop offerings and decided to experiment with offering a workshop on a topic of general interest. In November, Sue offered a workshop on writing personal statements at the HUB, collaborating with the Career Center. Six students attended, all of whom reported finding it very useful. The Career Center then invited Sue to offer the workshop in February, targeted at students applying to medical school. Ten students attended.

Demographics of Students Who Use Open Programming

Our database system does not connect to the Banner system, so we have to rely on student registration profiles for demographic statistics. The data below is based on self-reporting by students who came to the Writing Center to work with a tutor; it does not include students who used the WID Mentor Program, who participated in Writing Workshops, or who were in Conversation Circle groups.

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, with very similar proportions every year. Of the students who provided information about gender, about 1/3 of the sessions (1190) were with students who identify as male, and about 2/3 (608) were with students who identify as female.
**Class Standing**

In April, we realized that students who completed a profile the previous year had not updated their information in our database system. As a result, we don’t have accurate information about the class standing of students who used the Writing Center this year. Next year, we will require all students to create or update their profiles when they schedule their first appointment of the year.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th># of sessions, AY15</th>
<th>% of sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAD</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESS</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNHS</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSENR</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMS</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD COL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2180</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Supporting English 1**

A continuing goal for the past few years has been 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 (see the chart below). The new foundational writing requirement has resulted in some of these sections being restored and in new opportunities to connect with English 1 instructors and students, as they engage in the challenging new curriculum. Last year, we developed some workshops directed specifically at the new assignments, and the number of workshops increased from 8 in AY13 to 22 last year to 39 this year. In addition, two of the GTAs (Mark Hengstler and Sarah Clarke) required their students to come to the Writing Center, resulting in 75 required sessions in the spring. With all of this increased activity, the number of workshop contacts with English 1 students increased by 77%, the number of individual sessions by 140%, and the total number of contacts with English 1 students by 85%.
Table 4: Writing Center Contacts with English 1 Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Individual Sessions # of contacts</th>
<th>Group # of contacts</th>
<th>Class Workshops # of contacts</th>
<th>Total # of contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>503 (+140%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>858 (+77%)</td>
<td>1361 (+85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>209 (+158%)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>484 (+128%)</td>
<td>735 (+150%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting HCOL 085/085

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, though we weren’t very successful at keeping records. Emily Howe and Becca Potter were available for open tutoring hours the night before papers were due for HCOL 085 in the fall, and reported working with 2-5 students every week, though we only received session reports for 12 sessions. Students came to the Writing Center for 24 additional sessions over HCOL 085 papers, for 12 sessions over HCOL 086 papers, and for 19 sessions over HCOL 186 papers. Two HCOL first-year students asked for writing partners, one coming for HCOL 085 and 086 (23 sessions) and 1 only for HCOL 085 (9 sessions). In total there were 140 open-programming sessions over papers for HCOL 085, 086, and 186. In addition, a WID Mentor was placed in the HCOL 086 section taught by Jeanne Shea; he held 41 tutoring sessions and participated in 4 class workshops.

Supporting TAP

The number of contacts with TAP students decreased somewhat this year, partly because we placed WID Mentors in 2 rather than 3 TAP classes. We still had a robust relationship with the TAP program: students from 32 sections of TAP used the Writing Center, coming for 130 sessions. We offered 8 in-class workshops through open programming and 6 through the WID Mentor Program, resulting in a total of 411 contacts. As Libby Miles begins working with TAP faculty, we should have increasing opportunities to connect with TAP faculty and classes.

Table 5: Writing Center Contacts with TAP Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Individual Sessions # of contacts</th>
<th>In-class Workshops # of contacts</th>
<th>Group Tutoring # of contacts</th>
<th>Total # of contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>130 contacts</td>
<td>281 contacts (14 workshops)</td>
<td></td>
<td>411 contacts (-22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>175 contacts</td>
<td>348 contacts (20 workshops)</td>
<td>5 contacts (3 groups)</td>
<td>528 contacts (+121%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>111 contacts</td>
<td>94 contacts (7)</td>
<td>34 contacts</td>
<td>239 contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>149 contacts</td>
<td>180 contacts (9)</td>
<td>31 contacts</td>
<td>363 contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>64 contacts</td>
<td>216 contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>280 contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details About Supporting Diversity (a target audience/goal)

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, 98% of students reported that the tutoring environment was welcoming, comfortable, and respectful.

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

**Faculty Development**

One of the primary goals for this year was to do more faculty development around responding to ELLs, in response to the many papers ELL students bring to the Writing Center that are marked up and responded to in unhelpful (even counterproductive) ways. Susanmarie and Sue collaborated to develop this workshop and offered it as an open WID workshop in November 2014; they then were invited to run this workshop for faculty in the School of Business Administration in February 2015. In March, they received funding through the Buckham Program to bring Michelle Cox, the inaugural Director of the English Language Support Office of Cornell University’s Knight Institute, to campus. She offered three workshops on responding to writing by English language learners: one for the writing tutors, one for English 001 instructors, and one open to all faculty (sponsored by WID).

In May, Sue and Susanmarie collaborated with other professional development units to offer a day-long workshop, “Reaching and Teaching All Students in the Globally Diverse Classroom.” They presented on this work at both the International Writing Centers Association Conference in October 2014 and the Conference on College Composition and Communication in March 2015.

**Individual Tutorials**

The Writing Center is now able to gather some information about students’ home languages, as this is an optional question included in the profile students fill out to register in WCOnline. These records reveal that the Writing Center worked with at least 154 students who identify as having a first language other than English (not including students in the GGP, who are not registered in our system as they cannot make appointments at the Writing Center), up 37% from the 112 students last year. These students listed thirty different home languages (including Armenian, Arabic, Bosnian, Chinese, French, German, Gujarati, Hindi, Korean, Polish, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish, Thai, Tri, Turkish, and Vietnamese). The 154 students came for 730 sessions, plus we held an additional 145 sessions with students in the Global Gateway, adding up to 875 sessions with English language learners, accounting for 34% of all of the individual sessions held through open programming. Fifty-seven of the students came four times or more, averaging 10+ sessions each, and 32 of these 57 students worked with a writing partner.

**Group Workshops: Conversation Circles**

This year, there were only 3 sections of Conversation Circles offered, as compared with 10 the previous year. This created a dramatic decrease in the number of group contacts through Conversation Circles: 455 this year, compared with 1,114 last year. Indeed, the Conversation Circles classes seem in danger of disappearing. When they were moved from Continuing Education to the Education Department, there was no longer a willingness to wait until a few weeks into the semester to decide whether the classes would run (international students always registered late for this class), and so several classes were canceled.

**Summer Bridge Program for USPP Students**

Last summer was the final year of this summer bridge program. As in the past, two writing center tutors provided weekly tutorials and facilitated weekly conversation and study groups for the students from China. Originally, the planners thought the students from Nigeria would not need ESOL tutoring support, but after several weeks we were asked to recruit an additional tutor to work with these students.
Connecting with the Global Gateway

A goal for this year was to consult with the GGP staff and figure out how best to connect the GGP students who will be matriculating with the Writing Center, so that they receive the writing support they need to be successful. We tried two methods. (1) In August, December and April, Sue gave a presentation about the Writing Center to the matriculating GGP students. (2) In the spring, we offered drop-in tutoring hours on Thursday evenings from 7-9 for students in Academic Writing II (the writing course students take before they matriculate). These hours proved very popular, with 6-20 students coming each week to work with the 3-4 available tutors. Since the Gateway Program operates over the summer, we were asked to continue offering the weekly open tutoring hours during the summer.

Support for Students with Disabilities

Without access to Banner, there is not an accurate way to count the number of ACCESS students using the Writing Center. All of the ACCESS counselors continue to consult with Sue, which resulted in 20 ACCESS students being matched with writing partners, about the same number as last year and the year before. This year, only 2 of the 20 students were enrolled in Think College (a program located in the Center for Diversity and Community Inclusion that provides a college experience for students with intellectual disabilities), as compared with 5 last year.

Support for ALANA Students

Tutor Sydney Camisa continued to offer tutoring at the ALANA Student Center, but failed to enter these sessions in WCOnline (so they are not included in our totals for the year). She estimated that she met with about 15 students over the course of the year, in about 30 sessions. Sydney and Sue worked with Jaydeen Santos at the ALANA Student Center to develop a plan for making this satellite service sustainable, as Sydney is graduating this year.

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 a bit, from 70 to 61 students, coming for 628 sessions (as compared with 790 partner sessions last year). However, unlike last year, there were many ELLs who came to the Writing Center frequently but who chose to schedule their own appointments rather than work with a writing partner: an additional 13 ELLs came 5 or more times (including students who came 17, 20, and 28 times!), meeting with several different tutors. Now that we are aware of this, we can alert tutors to ask ELLs who have scheduled several appointments on their own if they would like to be matched with a writing partner.

Of the 61 partners, 32 were English language learners (as compared with 40 last year) and 20 were ACCESS students (as compared with 21 last year). Twelve of the students worked with a partner both semester. The average number of contacts with each partner per semester was 8.5.

Student evaluations of the Writing Partners Program

The writing partners were emailed at the end of the semester and asked to respond to a brief questionnaire. Twenty-six of the students took the time to email a response. For a compilation of the students’ comments, see Appendix F.

All of the students said that the program either met or exceeded their expectations, often with general responses such as “great,” “very well,” or “helpful.” Several students remarked at the patience displayed by their tutor. The only suggestion was that partner meetings occur twice a week, rather than once.

“The writing center went beyond my expectations. My writing partner was honest, insightful, and was able to communicate with me in a way that enhanced my writing abilities.”

“She helped me a lot with my grammar and help me describe things better which is so helpful. And it made sense for myself later when I read the essay alone.”
When asked “What did you find useful about meeting with your writing partner,” many students commented that they liked having a second opinion on their papers. Three students said they appreciated help with brainstorming or idea development. Five made general comments about improving their writing skills or making general progress. Some of the unique responses included help with organizing class materials, preparing for future course work, and meeting deadlines. There were no negative responses.

Assessment of Open Programming

The Writing Center continued the practice of inviting students to fill out an evaluation form at the end of each session, 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, more students filled out an evaluation than ever before: 844 (35% of the open programming sessions in Bailey/Howe Library), as compared with 670 last year. For a fuller summary of the evaluations, including student comments, see Appendix G.

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.

- 98% of the students found the session useful, with 87% strongly agreeing.
- 97% were satisfied with what they worked on in the session, with 86% strongly agreeing.
- 98% of the students found the tutoring environment was welcoming, comfortable, and respectful, with 93% strongly agreeing.
- 98% of students felt the process of making an appointment and meeting with the tutor went smoothly, with 89% strongly agreeing.
- 98% of the students said they would probably use the Writing Center again, with 89% percent strongly agreeing.
- 99% of the students said they would recommend the Writing Center to other students, with 91% strongly agreeing.

What Students Worked On at the Writing Center:

This is only the second year we have gathered data on students’ goals for sessions and what they perceive that they worked on in their sessions. Most students do not come with one particular question or goal: 519 (61%) checked between 3 and 5 goals for their session, and 54 had over 5 goals. Interestingly, this year’s students worked on almost exactly the same issues as last year’s students. Nearly two-thirds (64%) reported receiving general feedback; 64% received help with organizing, and 61% received help with strengthening the content of their paper. About half reported working on editing; 40% worked with the tutor to brainstorm ideas for a piece of writing; 28% worked with the tutor on understanding assignment expectations; and 20% worked on using and citing sources in their papers.

Table 6 What Students Worked on in Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What students worked on in their session</th>
<th># students who checked N=844</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Feedback</td>
<td>537 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>540 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening ideas, content or thesis</td>
<td>517 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing for grammar, punctuation or style</td>
<td>425 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming ideas</td>
<td>334 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The WID Mentor Program

WID Mentor Placements and Contacts, 2014-2015

This year, the WID Mentor Program experienced dramatic growth! Mentors were placed in 28 sections, as compared with 17 last year (and 18 the year before). The number of contacts went up even more dramatically: from 941 to 3,417, an increase of 263%. This may have been partly the result of

- The new focus in our advertising: using WID mentors to provide not only student support for writing but also faculty development around the teaching of writing may have drawn more faculty to the program.
- A better introduction to the program for faculty may have led to better integration of mentors in the classes. Instead of inviting only faculty using the extended model to attend a training and information session, we asked all participating faculty to attend, and invited faculty who had signed up for the “basic” model to consider using their mentor in additional ways.
- More faculty than in the past involved mentors in class workshops/activities, and two of these classes had over 100 students.

The classes with mentors represented (a) a variety of disciplines, including classes in the fine arts, 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 225 students to small seminars of 14 students, as detailed in Table 7.

Table 7: WID Mentor Program 2014-2015 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>ANTH 189</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS 12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>McDevitt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE 056</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Reyes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE 056</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Reyes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 005 TAP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 023</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Goodson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 023</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Goodson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 030</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Goodson</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 031</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 031</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 086</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Boland-Chira</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 086</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Boland-Chira</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 086</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Boland-Chira</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td># / ind sessions</td>
<td># group sessions</td>
<td># group contacts</td>
<td># wrkshps</td>
<td># wkshp contacts</td>
<td>Total Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVS 002</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVS 195</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSWS 001 TAP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kornbluh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCOL 086</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS 001</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Weinstock</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS 189</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Weinstock</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 096</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Massell</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 002</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Ivakhiv</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 071</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS 195</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 3XX</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 3XX</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Escorpizo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 128</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Andrus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 298</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Borchert</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>372</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>498</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>1547</strong></td>
<td><strong>3417</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Developing the Program:

Next year, we hope to begin offering mentors to departments who are participating in WILD. In the WILD 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.

### 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 of the 19 faculty who completed an evaluation felt the WID mentor positively contributed to the students’ experience in the class (with 9 strongly agreeing), and all of them highly recommended continuing to develop the WID Mentor Program (with 17 strongly agreeing). Faculty commented on the value of having an additional resource for support for student writers, which resulted in improved student writing/thinking and helped to make their workloads more manageable. And faculty described how the program helped them learn how to incorporate writing more fully and effectively in their courses, as in the selected comments below:

- I feel I can include more writing and blogging work in my classes
- This is the 4th semester I've done it and I've learned a lot about how to see through students' eyes, how to word and use assignment guides and rubrics
- Some good writing workshop strategies. How to help students work on writing. What's possible from students.
- Audrey's presence became a constant, positive reminder to attend to writing and reading in my classroom.
Mentor evaluations
Not surprisingly, the mentors themselves were more critical of their own contributions to these classes, with some noting challenges in communicating with the instructor and/or students, but 100% strongly supported continuing the program, with 23 out of 24 strongly agreeing. In their comments, mentors highlighted how they were able to contribute to the experience of students and instructors:

- Serving as an additional resource/intermediary for students and professor
- Fostering communication between professor and students
- Helping introduce students to writing in the discipline
- Helping instructors understand the students’ experience in the course
- Helping with assignment design and integrating writing activities into the class
- Allowing the faculty member to provide more writing support to students

Student evaluations
Of the 405 students filling out an end-of-semester evaluation form, 90% recommended that the WID Mentor Program continue to be developed, and 74% felt having a WID mentor was useful in completing the writing assignments for the class (almost identical to last year’s percentages), 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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