The UVM Writing Centers Annual Report, 2015-16

Table of Contents

Part One
prepared by Sue Dinitz, Undergraduate Writing Center and WID Mentor Program Director
Highlights of 2015-16 ................................................................. 2
Overview of UVM Writing Centers Services ............................. 3
Undergraduate Writing Center
Providing a Service Learning Experience for Undergraduate Tutors .... 4
Individual Writing Support ............................................................. 4
Class Workshops ........................................................................... 4
Our Approach to Supporting Diversity ........................................ 5
Demographics of Students Who Used the Undergraduate Writing Center
Class Standing, Home Language, Gender, College/School Affiliation .... 6
Focus on Target Audience #1: Foundational Writing and Information Literacy
Collaborating with FWIL; Supporting TAP, English 001, HCOL 085/86 .......... 9
Focus on Target Audience #2: International Students and other Multilingual Writers
Individual Tutorials at the Writing Center ..................................... 11
Group Workshops for the International Student Sections of English 001 .... 11
Conversation Circles ................................................................... 12
Connecting with the Global Gateway .......................................... 12
Benchmarking Writing Center Support for Multilingual Writers ....... 13
Evaluating Sessions in the Undergraduate Writing Center ............ 14
The WID Mentor Program (offered in collaboration with the Writing in the Disciplines Program)
WID Mentor Placements and Contacts ........................................ 16
Evaluating the WID Mentor Program ......................................... 17
Goals, 2014-16 ............................................................................ 19

Part Two
prepared by Nancy Welch, Professor of English, and Graduate Writing Center Coordinator
Graduate Writing Center End-of-Semester Report, as submitted to the Graduate College .... 20

Appendices
Appendix A Undergraduate Writing Center Evaluations ..................... 24
Appendix B WID Mentor Program Evaluations ................................ 28
Appendix C Benchmarking Writing Center Support for Multilingual Writers (attached)
Part One
Highlights of 2015-16

Record number of contacts: The number of UVM Writing Center contacts topped 8000 for the first time. Tutors had 3304 contacts with students through individual sessions, 1011 through group tutoring sessions, and 3688 through class workshops or writing retreats.

A new Graduate Writing Center, coordinated by Nancy Welch and funded by the Graduate College, opened in Spring 2016! The four graduate tutors held 76 individual sessions, met with Physical Therapy students working on group papers (25 contacts), and hosted 4 writing retreats (49 contacts).

A new UVM Writing Centers space: We have been promised a new space on the ground floor of Bailey Howe Library, to open Fall 2017! This will allow the Undergraduate and Graduate Writing Centers to offer services out of the same space, enable us to have more tutors working at busy times, greatly enhance both Writing Centers’ identity as a place, and facilitate the building of a tutor community.

Tutor accomplishments: All 56 undergraduate tutors and 2 graduate tutors earned one of 3 levels of tutor certification through the College Reading and Learning Association. Five tutors participated in a panel presentation at the Northeast Writing Centers Association Conference at Keene State College, exploring the Writing Center’s role in supporting first-year students as they work through a variety of issues relating to identity.

Collaborations with FWIL: The new Foundational and information Literacy Requirement resulted in a series of collaborations that increased Writing Center programming for and contacts with students in English 001, TAP classes, and HCOL 085. Sue Dinitz, Libby Miles (the FWIL Director), and Daisy Benson (Library Instruction Coordinator) gave panel presentations at two conferences exploring how their collaboration to transform the English 001 curriculum in turn transformed the Writing Center, FWIL, and library instruction at UVM.

Support for Multilingual Writers: The Global Gateway Program is having a dramatic impact on use of the Writing Center by post-GGP multilingual writers: the number of students identifying their home language as other than English increased by 36%, from 154 to 210 (following a similar increase last year), and 1051 of the 2554 contacts through individual or group tutoring sessions (41% of the total number of contacts) were with multilingual writers. For the first time, UVM offered sections of English 001 for international students. We developed class presentations targeted to this group and offered evening workshops to provide additional scaffolding for research-based writing.

Connections with the Global Gateway Program (GGP): We experimented with ways of connecting with students while in the GGP (so pre-matriculation), as it was decided that these students should not use the Undergraduate Writing Center. In collaboration with GGP instructors and staff, we adapted the WID Mentor model of classroom-based tutoring support for 5 sections of Academic Writing II, with promising results. The number of writing center contacts with GGP students jumped from 145 to 665.

Classroom-based tutoring: The WID Mentor Program placed writing center tutors in 24 classes, representing a variety of disciplines, a variety of levels (from introductory to graduate), and a variety of sizes (from 8 to 162). Mentors had 372 contacts through individual tutoring sessions, 493 through group tutoring sessions, and 2547 through class workshops, for a total of 3417 contacts.
Overview of UVM Writing Centers Services, 2015-2016

Overview of Services Provided to Students

The mission of the UVM Writing Centers is to support writers in all phases of the writing process, helping ensure the success of students in their UVM classes and in their post-UVM lives. The Undergraduate and Graduate Writing Centers, open to all UVM students, offer individual and group sessions where students can talk about their writing with trained and experienced peer tutors; workshops for classes on a variety of writing-related topics; and writing retreats. The WID Mentor Program, offered in collaboration with the Writing in the Disciplines Program, attaches tutors to classes and is available to faculty who have participated in WID programming.

This year, the number of UVM Writing Centers contacts reached another all-time high, topping 8000. Though the overall increase was modest (6%), this resulted from a range of both increases and decreases in use of existing programs and the addition of some new programming, as detailed in Chart 1.

Chart 1: Number of Student Contacts through UVM Writing Centers, 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of session</th>
<th>Undergraduate Writing Center</th>
<th>Graduate Writing Center</th>
<th>WID Mentor Program</th>
<th>Global Gateway Program</th>
<th>Total Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual sessions</td>
<td>2551 (+5%)</td>
<td>76 (new)</td>
<td>417 (+12%)</td>
<td>260 (+79%)</td>
<td>3304 (+12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tutoring</td>
<td>682 (+49%)</td>
<td>25 (new)</td>
<td>304 (-39%)</td>
<td>1011 (+6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Retreats</td>
<td>1335 (+26%)</td>
<td>49 (new)</td>
<td>1899 (-25%)</td>
<td>405 (new)</td>
<td>3688 (+1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contacts</td>
<td>4568 (+16%)</td>
<td>150 (new)</td>
<td>2620 (-23%)</td>
<td>665 (+359%)</td>
<td>8003 (+6.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The total number of contacts through the Undergraduate Writing Center increased 16% (651 contacts). The number of individual tutoring sessions increased by a modest 5%, while the number of group tutoring sessions increased by 49% as a result of new programming: (1) 11 evening workshops designed for students in the international student sections of English 001 and (2) the formation of a “writing collective” in the honors college, where students came together for peer review of their papers for HCOL 085, facilitated by a tutor. Contacts through workshops in classes increased by 26% due to increased demand from English 001, reflecting the increased number of English 001 sections offered this year.
- A new Graduate Writing Center, coordinated by Nancy Welch and funded by the Graduate College, opened in Spring 2016. The four graduate tutors held 76 individual sessions, met with Physical Therapy students working on group papers (25 contacts), and hosted 4 writing retreats (49 contacts).
- The number of contacts through our WID Mentor Program decreased 23% (797 fewer contacts), largely due to vagaries in the mentor placements. We placed mentors in 24 sections this year enrolling 862 students, as compared with last year’s record high of 28 sections, enrolling 1300 students (so 34% fewer students and hence fewer contacts).
- We experimented with ways of connecting with students in the Global Gateway Program, resulting in a dramatic increase in contacts there. We adapted the WID Mentor model in 4 sections of Academic Writing II, resulting in 520 additional contacts with GGP students.
The Undergraduate Writing Center

Providing A Service Learning Experience for Tutors

The approach to tutor education

The services for undergraduate students were provided by a record number of tutors (55), 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 10/105) 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 32 recommendations for tutors this year, and gave many phone references. In addition, Susanmarie Harrington offered the tutors a resume writing workshop and Kristen Cameron presented on job search skills.

Tutor Highlights

In addition to providing over 7800 contacts with students, tutors collaborated in improving the Undergraduate Writing Center and engaged in writing center scholarship.

- All undergraduate 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 9 tutors at the “Certified” level, 21 at the “Advanced” level; and 16 at the “Master” level. Nine tutors went a level beyond those recognized by CRLA.
- Tutor Rebecca Potter served as Presentation Coordinator. Tutors offered 78 class presentations about the Writing Center, 56 of which included workshops that involved students in broader discussions and activities related to writing.
- Nineteen 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 3, five tutors participated in a panel presentation at the Northeast Writing Centers Association Conference at Keene State College. Wes Dunn, Audrey Kreiser, Cristina MacKinnon, Rebecca Potter, and Steven Ushakov gave a panel presentation entitled “First-year Students, Shifting Identities, and the Role of the Writing Tutor.” They explored the Writing Center’s role in supporting first-year students as they work through a variety of issues relating to identity, including their relationship to the topics of diversity and social justice, their encounters with different cultural expectations and communication styles, and their challenges in shifting from high-school to college-level writers.
- Tutors Rebecca Potter and Wes Dunn presented at the WID Institute, discussing how to design effective peer review of student work-in-progress.
- Many tutors contributed to the Tutor Tips webpages on writing in the disciplines and created materials for the Writing Center.

“Tutoring has been a huge part of my college experience, and probably my favorite academic activity.” --Lydia Horne

“Tutoring has made me a more thoughtful writer, thinker, and communicator.” --Rebecca Potter

“I have gained so many professional and academic skills that I will be able to apply to many different things in the future.” --Jessica Mailhot
Individual writing support (open to all students 52 hours a week in Bailey Howe)

Our Undergraduate Writing Center is operating at close to capacity. The amount of tutoring we can offer is limited by our space: we only have room for three tutors to work at a time. This year, we continued to build usage of the Writing Center when we had more capacity—in the spring semester. Nationally, writing centers report decreased usage in the spring, and this pattern was true at UVM until last year, when use in the Spring Semester actually surpassed use in the Fall Semester (see Chart 2). This year, we again held slightly more sessions in the spring than in the fall, with a modest increase in the number of sessions both semesters.

Chart 2: Number of Individual Tutoring Sessions Undergraduate Writing Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Summer # of sessions</th>
<th>Fall Semester # of sessions</th>
<th>Spring Semester # of sessions</th>
<th>Total # of sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1249 (+3%)</td>
<td>1284 (+5%)</td>
<td>2588 (+6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>1209 (-10%)</td>
<td>1226 (+23%)</td>
<td>2435 (+4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>1344 (-4%)</td>
<td>994 (+6%)</td>
<td>2338 (-1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>1401 (+8%)</td>
<td>941 (-14%)</td>
<td>2342 (-2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>1292 (+21%)</td>
<td>1095 (+28%)</td>
<td>2387 (+24%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>1071 (+11%)</td>
<td>858 (+9.7%)</td>
<td>1929 (+10.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>964 (+2%)</td>
<td>782 (+4%)</td>
<td>1746 (+6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 also to publicize the Undergraduate Writing Center. Because we don’t have the staffing to create one-off workshops for individual classes, instead we offer faculty the ability to choose from a range of workshops on general topics, including composing styles, the expectations for college-level writing, effective peer review, creating an effective thesis, what is a literature review, when and how to cite sources, and how to write an effective personal statement for graduate or professional school. This year, we offered more workshops than ever: 64, as compared with 56 last year. Forty-two of the workshops were for English 001 classes, 7 were for TAP classes, and the remaining 15 were for a variety of classes across the disciplines, from the introductory to graduate levels. We also offered 11 workshops in the evenings targeted to students in the sections of English 001 for international students (counted under “group tutoring” rather than “class workshops,” because they were offered at the Undergraduate Writing Center rather than in a particular class).

Our Approach to Supporting Diversity

In working with students making the transition to college-level writing, including students with diverse literacy backgrounds and language processing styles, the Undergraduate Writing Center helps support retention and diversity. To accomplish this, we carefully recruit a diverse group of tutors and then provide 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. The goal is to have all students feel comfortable and have their needs met without having to ask for “special” services or having to awkwardly reveal information about their identities. In end-of-session evaluations, 99% of students reported that the tutoring environment was welcoming, comfortable, and respectful.
Supporting Diversity through the Writing Partners Program

The Writing Partners Program was created in 2010 when we noticed that many multilingual writers and students with disabilities 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, 64 students requested a writing partner (compared with 61 last year), coming for 456 sessions, or about 7 sessions per student. Of the 64 partners, 33 were multilingual writers and 20 were ACCESS students (almost identical to last year’s proportions). Many of these students scheduled additional appointments in the Undergraduate Writing Center as needed.

Demographics of Students Who Used the Undergraduate Writing Center

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 Undergraduate Writing Center to work with a tutor in individual or group sessions; it does not include students who used the WID Mentor Program, who participated in class workshops, or who were in Conversation Circle groups.

Class Standing

As one might expect, the Undergraduate Writing Center is used extensively by first- and second-year students, who account for 68% of the sessions. Many students continue to use the Undergraduate Writing Center during their junior and senior years, accounting for 25% of the sessions (see Chart 3).

Chart 3: Writing Center Contacts, by Students’ Class Standing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th>Total Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>884, 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>893, 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>375, 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>266, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>122, 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>62, 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Contacts</td>
<td>2602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Home Language**
Our registration profile asks students to identify their home/first language, and so we have this information for many contacts. For the sessions in the Undergraduate Writing Center (individual or group tutoring), 2554 of the students identified their home language (96%). The languages included Albanian, ASL, Arabic, Bengali, Bosnian, Portuguese, Chinese, Creole, Dinka, English, French, German, Hindi, Ijaw, Indonesian, Japanese, Kirundi, Korean, Mai-Mai, Nepali, Portuguese, Persian, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Tamil, Thai, Turkish, Urdu, and Vietnamese. For the 2554 sessions,

- 1503 (59%) of the students identified their home language as English
- 665 (26%) of the students identified their home language as a dialect of Chinese
- 386 (15%) of the students identified a language other than English or Chinese

**Gender**
Many writing centers report that more students identifying as female use their services. This continues to be true at UVM, with very similar proportions every year. Of the sessions with students who provided information about gender (1652 out of 2615), about 1/3 of the sessions (475) were with students who identify as male, and about 2/3 (1177) were with students who identify as female.

**College/School Affiliation**
As in the past, undergraduate students from all of the colleges and schools used the Undergraduate Writing Center, in numbers roughly proportional to college/school enrollments but influenced by the disproportionate number of international students enrolled in the School of Business Administration and also the large numbers of students from outside CAS enrolled in ENGS 001 and other introductory level courses in CAS, courses for which students often visit the Undergraduate Writing Center (see Chart 4).

![Chart 4: Number of Writing Center Contacts, by College/School of Students](image-url)
Indeed, when one looks at the college/school of the course that brought the student to the Undergraduate Writing Center, these proportions change dramatically (see Chart 5). While only 39% of the contacts were with students enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences, 65% of the sessions were over papers begin written for courses in the College of Arts and Sciences. Of those, 73% were for courses in the humanities, 24% were for courses in the Social Sciences, and 3% were for courses in the sciences. Students brought papers from other colleges at about the same rate—4 to 5% of the contacts were with students coming from CEMS, CESS, SBA, CNHS, and HCOL. The proportion from CALS was a bit higher (7%) and from RSENR a bit lower (2%).

**Chart 5: Number of Writing Center Sessions, by College/School of the Course That Brought the Student to the Writing Center**

- CAS, 1576, 65%
- CALS, 177, 7%
- CEMS, 108, 4%
- CESS, 97, 4%
- ENVS, 102, 4%
- SBA, 110, 5%
- CNHS, 84, 4%
- HCOL, 125, 5%
- RSENR, 58, 2%

Total # Contacts = 2483
Focus on Target Audience #1:  
Foundational Writing and Information Literacy (FWIL)

Collaborating with FWIL

The creation of a general education requirement in Foundational Writing and Information Literacy has provided a structure and new opportunities for the Undergraduate Writing Center to support first-year students as they grapple with college level writing. This year, Sue Dinitz served on both the FWIL and the English 001 committees, supporting the FWIL Director (Libby Miles) as she developed an assessment plan for FWIL and a revised curriculum and set of readings for English 001.

The collaborations between the Undergraduate Writing Center, FWIL, and Library Instruction became the focus of Sue Donitz’s scholarship this year. Libby Miles, Daisy Benson, and Sue reported on this collaborative work at two conferences: in October at the International Writing Centers Association (“Revolving Revolutions: A Writing Center, a Library, and a Foundational Writing Program Meet a New General Education Requirement”) and in April at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (“Information Literacy and Foundational Writing: Transforming Curricula and Programs through Collaborative Outcomes”).

Supporting TAP

The number of contacts with TAP classes increased dramatically this year, by 81% (see Chart 7). This was largely due to the placement of an increased number of WID Mentors in TAP classes—five this year, as compared with two last year. WID mentors offered 95 individual tutoring sessions, 8 group tutoring sessions, and 20 in-class workshops for their TAP classes. The number of sessions in the Undergraduate Writing Center with TAP students also increased—from 130 to 165, and 6 TAP faculty requested in-class workshops. Altogether, Undergraduate Writing Center tutors had 744 contacts with students from TAP.

<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>2015-16</td>
<td>165 (writing center) 95 (WID Mentor)</td>
<td>120 (6 –writing center 321 (20-WID mentor)</td>
<td>43 (8 groups) (WID mentor)</td>
<td>744 contacts (+ 81%)</td>
</tr>
<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>

Supporting HCOL 085/085

The Writing Center supported students in HCOL 085/086 through three venues:

- At the Honors College: The writing tutor assigned to work with the Honors College developed a new model for supporting students in HCOL 085. Rather than holding open tutoring hours where students could come work on their papers and consult with the tutor and/or other students, she invited students to join a “writing collaborative,” where they could talk about the assignments and
offer each other feedback on drafts. Nine students joined the collaborative, which met four times for a total of 36 contacts.

- The Undergraduate Writing Program: We provided a list to the Honors College of tutors who had taken English 085/086, and students from these courses came to the Undergraduate Writing Center for 60 sessions.

- The WID Mentor Program: A WID Mentor was placed in Professor Jeanne Shea’s HCOL 086 section. He met with each student for an individual tutoring session (18 contacts), held two sessions for students working on group projects (13 contacts), and participated in 2 classes (36 contacts), for a total of 67 contacts.

**Supporting English 001**

After dramatic increases in the number of students from English 001 over the past two years (due to the new assignment sequence, which created more demand, and the new FWIL requirement, which created more sections), use of the Undergraduate Writing Center by students in English 001 increased more gradually this year, by 4% (see Chart 8). Tutors met with close to 500 students for individual sessions and offered workshops on composing styles, peer review, and writing literature reviews in 42 classes.

This year provided exciting new opportunities to support multilingual writers in English 001. Thanks to Libby Miles, the new FWIL director, eight sections of English 001 were designated for international students. After meeting with these instructors to discuss ways of supporting students in these sections, we decided to create some evening workshops for these students to provide additional scaffolding for research-based writing. We offered 11 workshops on two topics: (1) When and How to Cite Sources, and (2) Strategies for Integrating Material from Sources. Only a few students attended the first workshops, but after three instructors offered small incentives, 7-10 students attended each of the remaining workshops, for a total of 79 contacts.

Many multilingual writers in English 001 came to the Undergraduate Writing Center for individual tutoring support. Of the 486 individual sessions with English 001 students, 249 (49%) were with multilingual writers. Of those 249, 108 were with students from the sections for international students (if these sections had been available in the fall, the proportion would have been much higher). Of the fifteen English 001 students who requested writing partners, thirteen were multilingual writers, and 9 of the 13 were from the sections for international students.

**Chart 8: Writing Center Contacts with English 1 Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Individual Sessions # of contacts</th>
<th>Group Sessions # of contacts</th>
<th>Class Workshops # of contacts</th>
<th>Total # of contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>487 (-3%)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>848 (-1%)</td>
<td>1414 (+ 4%)</td>
</tr>
<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>
Focus on Target Audience #2: International Students and other Multilingual Writers

Individual Tutorials at the Undergraduate Writing Center (1051 contacts—41% of all contacts)

Although current Global Gateway students are not supposed to use the Undergraduate Writing Center, the program has resulted in an increase in the number of matriculated international students, which in turn has resulted in an increase in the number of multilingual writers using the Undergraduate Writing Center. The number of students using the Undergraduate Writing Center who identified their home language as other than English increased from 154 to 210 (+36%) this year, and the previous year saw a similar increase, from 112 to 154 students. Of those 210 students, 83 came for four or more sessions, some for over 20.

- 1051 of the 2554 individual/group tutoring contacts were with students who identified their home language as other than English (41% of the total number of contacts).
- The students’ home languages included Albanian, American Sign Language, Arabic, Bengali, Bosnian, Portuguese, Chinese, Creole, Dinka, English, French, German, Hindi, Ijaw, Indonesian, Japanese, Kirundi, Korean, Mai-Mai, Nepali, Portuguese, Persian, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Tamil, Thai, Turkish, Urdu, Vietnamese

New Writing Center Handouts for multilingual writers

With the help of the WID research assistants, we created a new handout listing the support for multilingual learners at UVM and in the community. Now tutors and English 001 instructors can more easily refer students to additional resources.

Group Workshops: for the sections of English 001 for International Students

Thanks to Libby Miles, the new FWIL director, eight sections of English I were designated for international students. After meeting with these instructors to discuss ways of supporting students in these sections, we decided to create some evening workshops to provide additional scaffolding for research-based writing. We offered 11 workshops on two topics: (1) When and How to Cite Sources, and (2) Strategies for Integrating Material from Sources. Only a few students attended the first workshops, but after three instructors offered small incentives, 7-10 students attended each of the remaining workshops, for a total of 79 contacts.

Group Workshops: Conversation Circles (599 contacts)

Because the Conversation Circles course is now offered through CESS rather than Continuing Education, we no longer have a mechanism for funding the program by charging students a fee. Also, some of the new faculty teaching the class use a model that does not rely on peer tutors facilitating small group discussion. However, both Thomas Dunn and Dana Sehovic wished to continue with the original model. Because this has been such a rich academic experience for both tutors and students, we continued to provide the tutors for their three sections, resulting in 559 contacts.

Summer Support for English 001 (125 contacts)

Deb Noel’s summer section of English 001 enrolled 14 students, 13 of whom were multilingual writers. As she had no training in working with multilingual writers, the Provosts’ office agreed to pay for a writing tutor to work with the class. The tutor followed our WID Mentor model, participating in class
workshops each week (70 contacts) and then meeting with students for optional individual tutoring sessions (55 contacts).

**Connecting with the Global Gateway (665 contacts)**

**Writing tutor support for Academic Writing II: (242 individual sessions; 405 class contacts)**
This year we experimented with methods of connecting with students in the Global Gateway Program, developing a model that seems to work well and that we could implement if the GGP decides to include more peer tutoring support.

- **Last year (Spring 2015):** The GGP Program asked if we could provide a tutor to hold open tutoring hours one evening a week. The open hours were popular, but tutors reported that it was challenging to work with students from so many different classes with different assignments and expectations, with no schedule, and often with students hoping to have their papers edited by the tutors.
- **Summer 2015:** (17 drop-in tutoring workshops; 155 sessions) We decided to try a model of connecting the open tutoring hours to a specific class. During both summer sessions, tutors held open tutoring hours a few evenings each week for students enrolled in Academic Writing II (both sessions).
- **Fall 2015:** (8 drop-in tutoring evenings, 24 sessions) In the fall semester, with a less compressed class schedule for Academic Writing II than in the summer, tutors offered open tutoring hours in the evenings during the weeks when papers were due. These sessions were not well-attended.
- **Spring 2016:** 405 class contacts; 63 individual sessions
In consultation with Sharon Ultsch, we decided to apply the WID Mentor model to the GGP, as it provides ways of connecting tutors with both the students and the faculty member, so that roles and expectations are clearer to everyone.
  - In Sharon Ultsch’s 3 sections, tutors came to class once a week to work with students in writing workshops (circulating along with her), and then held 1/2-hour optional tutoring sessions in the evenings before papers were due (3 times over the course of the semester). (380 class contacts; 44 individual sessions)
  - In Eleanor Stephenson's 2 sections, we experimented with the “Basic” WID Mentor model: the tutor didn’t attend the class but went once to meet the students and then held optional tutoring sessions before papers were due. (25 class and 19 individual contacts).
  - In both models, tutors met with the instructor to review the assignments and faculty expectations.
  - For these classes, faculty, students who worked with a tutor, and tutors filled out an evaluation form. Overall, everyone in both models was very enthusiastic about this way of connecting tutors to classes. While both models were successful, more students came to the optional sessions when the tutor had worked with them in the classroom setting. Students rated the experience as follows:
    - **Having a writing tutor attached to the class was useful:**
      Ultsch: 36/36 agreed, with 24 strongly agreeing
      Stephenson: 8/9 agreed (6 strongly agreed; 2 agreed; 1 neutral)
    - **It was helpful to have the writing tutor come to our class each week:**
      Ultsch: 35/35 agreed, with 21 strongly agreeing
      Stephenson: 9/9 agreed, with 6 strongly agreeing
    - **It was helpful to have the tutor available for individual help before papers were due.**
      Ultsch: 36/36 agreed, with 29 strongly agreeing
      Stephenson: 6/6 agreed, with 5 strongly agreeing
• When I take classes next year, I am likely to consult with a tutor at the Writing Center for help with my writing. (Note: a few students thought the question asked whether they wanted to become a tutor.)
Ultsch: 31/37 agreed, (23 strongly agreed; 8 agreed; 6 were neutral)
Stephenson: 9/9 agreed, with 8 strongly agreeing

Writing partners for struggling GGP students: 18 sessions
In March, the GGP asked if we could provide peer tutoring to some students who were struggling in the less advanced classes. Matching them with a writing partner seemed the best approach, and since both available tutors and funding were limited, it was decided to have faculty members recommend the tutoring to the students in most need, and to let the students opt into the program and then have their accounts charged for the tutoring. Five students requested tutors, and 4 of the 5 ended up meeting with their tutors. By the time the matches were made, there were only about 6 weeks left in the semester. Tutors held 18 sessions with the four students.

Benchmarking Writing Center Support for Multilingual Writers
In the past few years, the UVM Writing Center has been involved in an increasing number of conversations about how to support multilingual learners at UVM. In order to become better informed as to ways we might leverage limited time and resources around this issue, we decided to benchmark writing support for multilingual learners at twenty-nine comparator institutions. In addition to benchmarking with UVM’s official Aspirant and Peer institutions, we selected thirteen schools based on either the stature of their programs within the field of composition and rhetoric or features that make these institutions an apt comparison for us. As we seek to specifically benchmark our writing program, we thought it was important to look beyond UVM’s institutional list of comparators in order to position ourselves in relationship to some influential writing programs at other campuses. For the full report on this benchmarking project, see Appendix C.

Benchmarking addressed the following issues:
• What types of writing support are available to multilingual learners by writing centers?
• In considering the types of support each institution made available, what was the demographic makeup of each institution?
• What sorts of programs for multilingual learners did each institution offer?

How UVM Compares
While it has fewer international students than all but one of its Peers and Aspirants, UVM is highly competitive among its comparator institutions for the types of services offered by the UVM Writing Center to multilingual learners. For example, we offer resources for multilingual learners on the website, tutors trained in working with multilingual writers, and tutoring focusing on English-language conversation. In contrast, six UVM Peers advertised no specific services for multilingual learners through their writing centers (besides standard tutoring). No single UVM Peer offered more types of services than the UVM Writing Center does. For UVM Aspirants, the UVM Writing Center offers more services for multilingual learners than Georgetown’s University Writing Program, and offers a comparable range of services to Dartmouth and Brown.

The UVM Writing Center is not behind its comparators, but benchmarking points to some services other writing centers offer which we could consider:
UVM’s Aspirants all have someone on the writing center staff with TESOL certification. UVM used to collaborate with Dana Sehovic when she held the position of ELL Coordinator, with an office located in the WID suite. When that position was eliminated, we lost this connection.

One Aspirant and some self-selected WID/Writing Center comparator institutions (though no Peers) offer special services for multilingual graduate students, such as a free editing service for graduate students.

Two self-selected WID/Writing Center comparator institutions offer PDF resources written in some students’ first languages (e.g. Chinese-language resources on writing and formatting at the University of Minnesota, Japanese resources at American University).

It should be noted, of course, that both UVM and its comparator institutions offer additional services for multilingual learners through other programs. This benchmarking only highlights where UVM’s Writing Center stands in relation to other writing centers, and does not reflect how well each university as a whole addresses the needs of multilingual students. Indeed, UVM’s relatively small international student body may help explain its Writing Center’s relative variety of services for multilingual writers, as colleges with more international students may have more independent academic support programs for multilingual learners and therefore may rely less on their writing centers for those services.

**Evaluating Sessions in the Undergraduate Writing Center**

The Undergraduate Writing Center continued to invite students to fill out an evaluation at the end of each session, asking them to identify both their goals 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: we received 1233 evaluations, so for 49% of the sessions. For a summary of the evaluations, including student comments, see Appendix A.

**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.

- 97% found the session useful, with 84% strongly agreeing.
- 98% were satisfied with what they worked on in the session, with 85% strongly agreeing.
- 99% found the tutoring environment was welcoming, comfortable, and respectful, with 93% strongly agreeing.
- 98% felt the process of making an appointment and meeting with the tutor went smoothly, with 89% strongly agreeing.
- 98% would probably use the Writing Center again, with 86% percent strongly agreeing.
- 99% would recommend the Writing Center to other students, with 89% strongly agreeing.

**What Students Worked On at the Writing Center:**

For the fourth year we have gathered data both on students’ goals for sessions and on what they actually worked on in their sessions, data which has remained remarkably consistent over four years. Most students came with several goals for the session: in 60% of sessions, students checked between 3 and 5 goals, and in 9% students checked six or more goals. And most students want to consider their writing project on multiple levels. The top reason for coming to the Writing Center was to get general feedback on a writing project (in about 70% of sessions), followed closely by work on organization (in about 60% of sessions) and on strengthening ideas/content (about 60%). Students came for help with editing in about 50% of the sessions, but that was rarely their sole agenda item (and many students came before they had written a draft). Students overwhelming reported being able to work on the aspects of writing they were hoping to address in the session—93% of the time. (See Chart 6 for details.)
Chart 6: Student Goals as Compared with Session Agendas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session goals</th>
<th>Student Goals # who checked n = 1195</th>
<th>Session Agendas # who checked n=1190</th>
<th>Percent of Times Student Goals were Addressed in the Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Feedback</td>
<td>813 (68%)</td>
<td>836 (70%)</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>678 (57%)</td>
<td>725 (61%)</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening ideas, content or thesis</td>
<td>652 (55%)</td>
<td>695 (58%)</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing at the sentence level</td>
<td>629 (53%)</td>
<td>647 (54%)</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming ideas</td>
<td>379 (32%)</td>
<td>425 (36%)</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding assignment or genre</td>
<td>234 (20%)</td>
<td>281 (24%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing and using sources</td>
<td>205 (17%)</td>
<td>222 (19%)</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing teacher’s comments</td>
<td>90 (8%)</td>
<td>100 (8%)</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling a class requirement</td>
<td>141 (12%)</td>
<td>141 (12%)</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing ESOL skills</td>
<td>51 (4%)</td>
<td>66 (6%)</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>21 (2.4%)</td>
<td>75 (6%)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentage of Set Goals Worked On</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The WID Mentor Program (in collaboration with Writing in the Disciplines)

WID Mentor Placements and Contacts, 2015-2016

This year, we placed mentors in 24 classes, representing (a) a variety of disciplines, including classes in the humanities, social sciences, health sciences, and natural resources; (b) a variety of levels, from TAP classes (in English, GSWS, history, and sociology), to core courses for first-year students and sophomores (in Education, English, GSWS, HCOL, HDFS, History, Natural Resources), to advanced courses in the major (HDFS, Psychology, Religion, Physical Therapy); and (c) a variety of sizes, from large introductory classes of 160 students to small seminars of 8 students, as detailed in Chart 9.

Mentors continued to offer a good mix of individual sessions, group tutoring sessions, and class workshops. The number of mentor contacts this year decreased by 24%, largely due to vagaries in the mentor placements. We placed mentors in 24 sections this year enrolling 862 students, as compared with last year’s record high of 28 sections, enrolling 1300 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th># indiv.</th>
<th># group</th>
<th># class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 174</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>Peek</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE 056</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Reyes</td>
<td>Kreiser</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 005</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 005</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Reinert</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 031</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 031</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 086</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chira</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGS 086</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Chira</td>
<td>Kleiner</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 095</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wemple</td>
<td>Mailhot</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 153</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rayback</td>
<td>Felone</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSWS 001</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSWS 001</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>McCrate</td>
<td>Keller</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCOL 086</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS 001</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Weinstock</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS 296</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Weinstock</td>
<td>Hurd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 012</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>Kleiner</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 095</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td>McHale</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 002</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Ivakhiv</td>
<td>Lister, Glu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 257</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Abaid</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 318</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 141</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Borchert</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 203</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Trainor</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 297</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chimumora</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 095</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>411</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>2614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating the WID Mentor Program

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

Faculty Evaluations

All of the 16 faculty who completed an evaluation felt the WID mentor (a) positively contributed to the students’ experience in the class and (b) enhanced their work with students on writing. All of them recommended continuing to develop the WID Mentor Program, with 14 strongly agreeing. And all of the instructors rated their mentors highly. One commented that she learned from the mentor that “We have smart and talented students,” and another said her mentor was “The best ‘TA’ I have worked with in my eleven years teaching at UVM. Top shelf!”

Faculty commented on how much their students’ writing improved:
- I saw distinct improvements in their work. Their structure and sophistication and organization.
- I was able to do more writing assignments - and more complex assignments- because I had assistance from the mentor in working with student drafts.
- I think that writing mentors should be attached to more classes at all levels. I was really pleased with the changes in my students’ writing and wondered why I had not incorporated a writing mentor more thoroughly into my classes before! Now, I am looking for other classes to do this with!

And several attributed that improvement to the peer relationship:
- A peer-to-peer relationship is less intimidating and more relaxed. I think students felt comfortable approaching the mentor with a rough draft and their questions.
- Having expectations conveyed by another student makes it more real and helps students see the usefulness of effective writing.
- Yes, I think the help of the mentor positively contributed to the student's experience of writing in the class. With a peer mentor, students were able to seek help in a less intimidating environment. The individual one-on-one work with the students really helped several of them move their writing to the next level.

Faculty found that the mentors helped them understand the students’ perspective and class experience:
- Meeting with my WID mentor and getting perspective on the assignment and how students were reacting was very helpful
- Great feedback for me on assignments and students' perception of assignments and expectations.
- What students do and do not understand about assignments. Uncovering ideas and gaps in prior learning of my students in relation to my expectations.
- Learned a lot more about student experiences of the class.

And this new understanding helped instructors design more effective assignments:
- It was really helpful to have the members give feedback on assignments and ask questions about my goals.
- Rethought/reworked writing assignments to clarify objectives
- Continue to refine assignments and my goals/expectations for writing assignments.

And this new understanding also helped instructors see the need to provide more scaffolding:
- I gained valuable insight into how my students interpret and react to my assignment. I also learned that announcements to students in class once isn’t enough as it pertains to writing assignments. (for example, students need lots of reminders about format, citation standards, etc.)
• Some common misunderstandings students have. Students' need for repetitive teaching about and review of writing.
• The mentor suggested providing an example of a final project and having the mentor come to class to discuss the example and the writing process. That was great!

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, but 100% supported continuing the program, with 13 of 15 strongly agreeing. In their comments, mentors highlighted how they were able to contribute to the experience of both students and instructors: for students, by serving as an additional resource and /intermediary with the instructor, by fostering communication between instructor and students, and by helping introduce students to writing in the discipline and to expectations for college writing; for faculty, by providing insights into the students’ experience in the course, by helping with assignment design and with integrating writing activities into the class, and by allowing the faculty member to provide more writing support to students. A few representative comments include
• It seemed beneficial to Beverly to have a student's perspective and insight inform her curricular decisions in the course. I also think I acted effectively as an intermediary between student and professor, providing useful feedback that typically doesn't clearly make it back to the professor.
• My perspective as a student and an educator helped to mediate conflicts of "they're not working hard enough!" vs. "they don't understand the assignment and/or don't have time!"
• I think that by offering myself in a lot of ways (reflecting the wide range of services offered by the WC) I was able to provide support to a number of students on a number of skill sets. I helped with brainstorming/solidifying the topic ideas, organizing writing, editing drafts, and reading challenging papers. Those who returned more than once for aid seemed to have benefitted from their previous visit(s). Additionally, I think I acted well as a mentor regarding helping with their transition into college and understanding the expectations and requirements.
• Shelly and I truly collaborated on this, so it was a learning experience for both of us. She was very open to suggestions on ways to improve, what wasn't working well, etc. She clearly cares deeply about her students and their success. We worked to revamp her writing workshop and to clarify assignments.

Student evaluations
Of the 356 students filling out an end-of-semester evaluation form, 93% recommended that the WID Mentor Program continue to be developed, and 64% felt having a WID mentor available was useful in completing the writing assignments for the class. Students’ comments echoed the mentors’ comments, describing how it was beneficial to have an approachable, knowledgeable peer available to help them understand expectations, help them improve their general writing skill, provide useful feedback based on knowledge about writing and about the subject, and answer questions. Some representative comments include
• I like the fact she has been in the class and can really relate to some of the troubles, and can help provide positive alternatives. Encourages us to become better writers
• Support with meeting college writing requirements, reading skills, and techniques for writing scholarly papers.
• Jess helped clarify the expectations of the professor and provided very useful feedback regarding writing assignments.
• Helped to explain professor's expectations, understanding of material and give an alternative view.
• It was SO beneficial - she was very flexible with meeting with students and helped improve my writing so much when I met with her.
Goals, 2014-16

Meeting Goals from the 2014-15 Annual Report

- **Support FWIL:** Sue Dinitz worked with Libby to connect with FWIL classes: she became part of the English 001 community by serving on the English 001 committee, and collaborated on plans for TAP by serving on the FWIL committee. She worked with Martha Lance to support the creations of a Writing Collaborative in HCOL 085/086.

- **Support for multilingual writers:** We greatly increased our support for multilingual writers this year, increasing the numbers of multilingual writers using the Undergraduate Writing Center, creating new workshops on research-based writing for students in the sections of English 001 for international students, facilitating small groups in Conversation Circles classes, and experimenting with new models for connecting with students in the Global Gateway Program.

- **Scholarship:** Sue Dinitz collaborated with Libby Miles and Daisy Benson on two conference presentations: (1) for IWCA, on how FWIL has revolutionized English 1, the teaching of information literacy, and the UVM Writing Center; and (2) for CCCC on how the new ACRL Framework and WPA Outcomes can transform work in information literacy, foundational writing, and writing centers.

- **Support for science writing:** Unfortunately, Lisa Emerson’s visit from mid-November to mid-January was funded by and targeted at support for science writing at the graduate level. Thus, she wasn’t able to consult on supporting undergraduates with science writing. The Graduate Writing Center wasn’t open yet and Nancy Welch was on sabbatical during the fall semester, but she attended many of Lisa’s workshops.

Targeted Goals for 2015-2016

- **Support Nancy Welch in developing the Graduate Writing Center**

- **Design a new space for the UVM Writing Centers:** With Nancy Welch and the support of CUWI, design our new UVM Writing Centers space and develop a plan and budget for furnishing it (to open in September 2017)

- **Continue building connections with FWIL:** Continue to serve on the FWIL and English 001 committees. Continue to work on integrating FWIL, WID, and the Writing Center into the Center for University Writing Initiatives (CUWI).

- **Develop more connections with the TAP program:** Next year, Libby Miles will be turning her attention to TAP classes, providing more opportunities to connect with TAP faculty.

- **Scholarship:** Libby Miles, Daisy Benson, and Sue Dinitz have proposed a panel for the College Research Libraries Association (CRLA) on how their collaboration has changed the model for library support of first-year writing classes. Nancy Welch and Sue Dinitz have had their proposal accepted for the International Writing Centers Association Conference, “Using the Exit Survey to Dispel Myths and Change Narratives.”
UVM’s new Graduate Writing Center opened its door at the start of the Spring 2016 semester with funding from the Graduate College and administrative support from the Writing in the Disciplines program and the undergraduate Writing Center. The GWC’s earliest weeks were devoted to training four peer consultants—from masters and doctoral programs in English, History, Pharmacology, and Psychology—and to getting out the word about how the GWC can support graduate writers.

**Who’s Coming to the GWC**

Over this pilot semester the GWC recorded 150 contact hours with graduate students in individual and small-group consultations and in four Sunday graduate writing retreats.

**Student Contacts through the Graduate Writing Center, Spring 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of session</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual sessions</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tutoring</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Retreats</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While students making individual and small-group appointments have come primarily from graduate programs in the College of Nursing and Allied Health, GWC consultants have met with students from all of the colleges with graduate programs.

The Sunday Graduate Writing Retreats (offering three to four hours of quiet writing time with healthy snacks, coffee and tea, and the option to confer with a consultant) have been especially popular with graduate students from RSNR and CESS; Jump Start camp enrollment is almost evenly distributed across students in CALS, CAS, CEMS, and CESS with one enrollee to date from RSNR.
To date, we also have thirteen graduate students enrolled for the June 20-23 Thesis and Dissertation Jump Start Camp.

**What Students Seek from the GWC**

Students’ writing projects have included applications, proposals, and blogs with the majority of students seeking help with research articles, thesis or dissertation chapters, and literature reviews.

With a very few exceptions, most students made their appointment early in the writing process, seeking brainstorming help or feedback on the purpose, clarity, and organization of an early draft.
Only eight of the graduate students making appointments listed a first language (Chinese, French, Italian, Polish, and Vietnamese) other than English, and their specific concerns—how to organize a literature discussion or sign-post a longer research article or thesis chapter—did not differ markedly from the concerns of native speakers.

What Graduate Students Say about the GWC
Graduate students who visited the GWC completed exit surveys with 100 percent rating their meeting with a consultant and their satisfaction with the session as highly satisfactory. Comments offered on the surveys include

- “[My consultant] has taught me SO much about writing—about research and in general!”
- “My tutor helped me think about the goals and purposes of my writing that will help to bring it more clarity.”
- “[The session] helped me understand the process of organizing ideas in each paragraph.”
- “Thank you for offering such a helpful service,” wrote another. “I look forward to visiting again.”

Graduate students who attended the Sunday writing retreats also completed surveys and reported appreciation for the structured time, quiet space, and accountability for writing. “I accomplished more in the past three hours than I have in the past three months,” wrote one student.

Students also reported initial difficulty with learning about the GWC’s existence. “I think people need to use this service more, but it’s not really advertised. I had to dig to find this resource,” wrote one student. “I would have loved to use the writing center much sooner if I knew about it,” reported another. Students attending the Sunday writing retreats as well as one Friday Forum we held for thesis and dissertation writers also requested specific workshops on topics such as how to write a literature review or thesis proposal and how to manage time and the writing process over a long project.

What Are the GWC’s Challenges?
Space is one impediment, of course: The subterranean Waterman room has few passersby and does not visually communicate the GWC’s presence on campus; the GWC currently has access to the large room that would be needed for special-topic workshops only on Friday afternoons and weekends.

Other challenges in communicating the GWC’s existence and purpose have included limited administrative support for developing and maintaining the GWC’s initial website; graduate students’ (self-reported) tendency not to check their UVM email for announcements; and students’ and advisors’ assumptions that a writing center only serves those students who late in the writing process need proofreading or formatting help. In addition, international students who might benefit from the GWC’s support—in grasping U.S. academic genres and approaches as well as in sentence-level editing—rarely come from undergraduate institutions that offer such a resource and so are less likely on their own to see the value of making an appointment.
Beyond the Pilot: Plans and Goals for AY2017
These challenges point to the GWC’s goals for the 2016-2017 school year:

- To find avenues for promoting the GWC beyond our (soon-to-be-revamped) website and regular emails to graduate students and faculty—including by working with faculty who would like their students, singly or in small groups, to meet with graduate writing consultants on assignments that present students with a new genre or writing situation;

- To offer regular workshops on topics of interest, including “traveling” workshops that are both tailored for and take place within specific programs and classes;

In the coming year the GWC will also expand its services to support graduate students enrolled in online and low-residency degree programs (through consultations via Skype and Google Docs) and in the Global Gateway premaster’s program (most likely by “embedding” two consultants within the program). In addition, we will work closely with the undergraduate writing center and the Bailey Howe library on planning for a new integrated—and much more visible, accessible, and useable!—writing center space on Bailey-Howe’s ground floor for the 2018 academic year.

To meet these goals, the GWC is also growing. For the Fall semester we anticipate having nine paid graduate writing consultants from Community Development and Applied Economics, Education, English, Natural Resources, Pharmacology, and Psychology plus an additional writing consultant from Plant and Soil Sciences who (although her visa prevents her joining the paid staff) is working toward her Level II College Reading and Language Association (CRLA) tutor certification.

Integral to expanding the GWC services, reaching more students, and maintaining a high level of satisfaction is the training provided to the graduate writing consultants. The training we provide—twelve hours in advance of the semester plus biweekly tutor development workshops—also makes the GWC’s consultants eligible for certification by the College Reading and Language Association International Tutor Training Program. One consultant has already achieved the CRLA’s Level II certification while another will have her Level I certificate by early fall. Next year’s nine consultants all begin with significant undergraduate or graduate writing center tutoring experience, including working with nonnative speakers of English. Such experience will allow us to focus our pre-semester training and ongoing workshops on specific topics and concerns such as effective Skype tutoring with Google Docs and working with international graduate students as English language learners and advanced academics.
Appendix A: Undergraduate Writing Center Evaluations, 2015-2016

**Total number of evaluations: 1233**

1. *Meeting with a writing tutor was useful.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1034 (84%)</td>
<td>164 (13%)</td>
<td>26 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agreed or Agreed: 97% Average Score: 4.8

2. *I am satisfied with what I worked on during the session.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1038 (85%)</td>
<td>159 (13%)</td>
<td>27 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agreed or Agreed: 98% Average Score: 4.8

3. *The tutoring environment was welcoming, comfortable, and respectful.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1140 (93%)</td>
<td>78 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agreed or Agreed: 99% Average Score: 4.9

4. *The process of making an appointment and meeting my tutor went smoothly.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1098 (89%)</td>
<td>112 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agreed or Agreed: 98% Average Score: 4.9

5. *I will probably use the Writing Center again.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1054 (86%)</td>
<td>149 (12%)</td>
<td>20 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agreed or Agreed: 98% Average Score: 4.8

6. *I would recommend the Writing Center to other students.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1098 (89%)</td>
<td>118 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agreed or Agreed: 99% Average Score: 4.9
Selected Comments: (515 total)

**General positive comments about the Writing Center experience: 25**

“This was my first time in the writing center and it went better than I could have imagined. Thank you!”
“My tutor had useful, helpful feedback. I felt better about my paper when I walked out.”
“Being able to talk through ideas and gain necessary feedback to move forward more efficiently.”
“It’s always good to get an outside perspective.”
“Straight-forward clear help, used time effectively.”
“My writing was strongly improved.”
“It was a wonderful experience. Thank you so much!”
“She gave me good advice about my grammar.”
“My experience would have been better if... there were puppies and rainbows.”

**General gratitude, “thank you,” or smiley face: 46**

**Great/really great/very nice/awesome: 39**

“Helpful” non-specific: 74

“Helpful” with specific tasks: 23

“This really helped me especially on how I should outline my entry for this specific class.”
“Really helpful for developing my ideas and their organization.”
“I understand my assignment and I did a better job on revising my essay.”
“I know now what I am supposed to do for each essay I have to do.”
“I went from being unorganized and having a draft to having a plan and an outline.”
“The session helped me figure out the next step I had to take for my assignment.”

**Thanking/complimenting a specific tutor: 51**

**Would like to return/would recommend to others: 4**

**Nice/friendly environment/service: 24**

“Loved my tutor, she was great at listening and giving feedback verbally.”
“Constructive criticism and positive attitudes; welcoming and helpful.”
“Amanda was very well informed, and was very easy to talk to. Never made me feel inferior even though my writing needed many corrections.”
“Quiet area. Tutor was nice, knowledgeable. Probably will be able to construct a better paper.”
“The atmosphere was calm and relaxed! Thanks so much!”

**Feedback/criticism regarding time/length of sessions: 11**

“My experience would have been better if... It would be better if the session can be longer”
“My experience would have been better if... I could stay for longer.”
“My experience would have been better if... Longer (being picky here)”
“My experience would have been better if... more work got done in the allotted time. It felt rushed.”

**Feedback/Criticism regarding setting up an appointment/session: 8**

“Awesome! Maybe advertise how to set up an appointment more.”
“Kind of confusing schedule online.”
“Easy to schedule, straight-forward, good feedback.”
“If you make an appointment in less than 20 hours from appointment, should have an hour when you can cancel.”

**General feedback/suggestions for improvement:**

“My experience would have been better if... tutor was harder on my writing.”
“Candy selection was welcome but lacking.”
“My experience would have been better if... More detailed feedback was given.”

Feedback regarding tutor’s background/discipline: 6
“My experience would have been better if... My tutor was more familiar with what I was doing (statistics).”
“My experience would have been better if... We had more background knowledge in common. Me: Working on a research methods section. Her: Having lots of English writing skills.”
“The tutor had experience herself with the subject matter, which aided in sharing ideas.”
“What I liked best/most about my session is... There is a variety of tutors you can meet with depending on the subjects.”

 Unsatisfied: Feedback focused on the tutee: 24 (19 concerned preparedness)
“I would probably have to write up a draft before coming in, this helps to get more done in the hour session :) cheers!”
“My experience would have been better if... I had been more prepared.”
“My experience would have been better if... I had had more of my stuff done so I could get more feedback.”
“My experience would have been better if... I had come better prepared with content and questions.”

7. What were your goals at the beginning of your session today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Checked</th>
<th>0-2 Goals</th>
<th>3-5 Goals</th>
<th>5+ Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Feedback</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing ESL</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening ideas, content or thesis</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing for grammar, punctuation or style</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing and using sources</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding assignment or writing type</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing teacher’s comments</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling a class requirement</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. What did you work on during your session today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Checked</th>
<th>0-2 Goals</th>
<th>3-5 Goals</th>
<th>5&lt; Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Percent of Set Goals from Question 1 Worked On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Feedback</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>96.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing ESL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>92.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening ideas, content or thesis</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>93.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing for grammar, punctuation or style</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>93.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing and using sources</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>91.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding assignment or writing type</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>89.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing teacher’s comments</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling a class requirement</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>89.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Percentage of Set Goals Worked On 93.02%
Appendix B: WID Mentor Program Evaluations, 2015-2016

At the end of each semester, we surveyed faculty, mentors, and students in courses with a WID Mentor, including questions that asked each participant to rate aspects of their experience as well as open-ended questions. Evaluations were collected from 16 faculty members, 21 mentors, and 356 students. Representative comments are included below.

Faculty Evaluations

Strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1).

1. Having a WID mentor positively contributed to the students’ experience in this class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 (56%)</td>
<td>6 (38%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Especially true of Rebecca - she is wonderful!
- Yes, I think the help of the mentor positively contributed to the student's experience of writing in the class. With a peer mentor, students were able to seek help in a less intimidating environment. The individual one-on-one work with the students really helped several of them move their writing to the next level.
- I would choose 5 but because not all students took advantage of drop-in or one-on-one sessions for their papers, I agree, but not strongly agree.
- Caroline was very sick for the first month of the semester (or more) then needed to take a lot of time to catch up on her own work. She wasn't able to establish a relationship with the students for much of the semester.
- Yes- as 1st semester students I believe it was helpful to have a fellow undergrad - they could talk with them and relate.

2. Having a WID mentor enhanced my work with students on their writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 (56%)</td>
<td>6 (38%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Students who went to her found her very helpful
- Meeting with my WID mentor and getting perspective on the assignment and how students were reacting was very helpful
- It was really helpful to have the members give feedback on assignments and ask questions about my goals. Also, they suggested providing an example of a final project and having the mentors come to class to discuss the example and the writing process. That was great!
• Yes. I saw distinct improvements on their work. Their structure and sophistication and organization.

• Yes, with the help of a student mentor, I was able to focus on particular aspects of the student's writing. The student's got a double-whammy of emphasis on certain skills.

• I was able to do more writing assignments - and more complex assignments- because I had assistance from the mentor in working with student draft.

• Only some students took advantage but they benefitted greatly.

3. My WID mentor fulfilled her or his responsibilities as outlined in our plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• She was great!

• Absolutely!

• Absolutely. The best "TA" I have worked with in my 11 years teaching at UVM. Top shelf!

• There were some challenges in the middle of the semesters when Shaken was sick. He did keep me apprised of the situation.

• The first real interaction my mentor had with students was an in-class presentation and it did not go particularly smoothly. That's not the end of the world (and I do think the mentor learned a lot!), but I do think it may have discouraged some students from seeking his assistance later. Attendance at his workshops was pretty low.

4. The logistics of the project went smoothly, including communications between the mentor and me and between the mentor and the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (75%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• This was my fault, not hers. I should have been better organized and had a better sense of how to utilize her.

• Having a plan and a regular meeting time worked well

• Because I worked with 3 mentors for 2 classes and none had common meeting times free, the logistics could be tricky. We did a great job staying in communication, but it wasn't always smooth!

• Some lapses, slow communication
Yes, I believe so.

5. I would recommend that the Writing Center/WID Program continue to develop a WID Mentor Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (88%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- I think Becca was great and very approachable to students. The Writing Center alone might be sufficient. I'm not sure I gave mentor enough info specific to the class to make her contribution tailored enough.
- Yes, please!
- Absolutely!
- Yes! Absolutely. Ryan helped to make this course successful for the TAP students!
- Critical for HDFS students to see what is possible and have an upper level student mentor.
- Yes! I think that writing mentors should be attached to more classes at all levels. I was really pleased with the changes in my student's writing and wondered why I had no incorporated a writing mentor more thoroughly into my classes before! Now, I am looking for other classes to do this with!

6. What benefits did having a peer mentor provide for you or your class? [Selected comments]

Benefits to students:

- The oral presentations this year were particularly good. I believe that Adam's background in debate was very useful to the students, and he was able to impart to them some key elements of a good presentation. The students will be providing oral presentations when they are on clinical affiliations next May 2016 so this experience was a bit of a warm up.
- Made me approach the class more strategically, and plan ahead (which is great - especially for a new class)
- I think students found the mentor very approachable. Students who didn't meet with me individually met with Mike.
- It helped students who were too intimidated to see me about writing.
- Overall it was really nice to have someone who understood exactly how to write a literature review (our big writing assignment). It was nice to have an external resource to corroborate what I was telling the students, especially when they were having trouble "getting it".
- Introduced first year students to benefits and services provided by Writing Center, writing partner for one or two students.
• Having expectations conveyed by another student makes it more real and helps students see the usefulness of effective writing.

• A peer-to-peer relationship is less intimidating and more relaxed. I think students felt comfortable approaching the mentor with a rough draft and their questions. Great feedback for me on assignments and students' perception of assignments and expectations.

• He also interpreted me to the students. This was helpful because tutor has worked with me and taken a class with me. This he had a better sense of the points I attended to.

• Several students in the course were not native speakers of English or had lower English proficiency for other reasons. The mentor was helpful in working with some of them one-on-one on their prose, with the added benefit that the mentor had relevant content knowledge. For other students, work with the mentor helped them write more succinctly, which was important for the specific class assignments.

7. **What did you learn from having a WID mentor?**

• That it's nice not to have to "go it solo" and that multiple perspectives are helpful - both for students and for me, because Allison was able to relay to me student perspectives on the assignments.

• Learned a lot more about student experiences of the class experience

• We have smart and talented students.

• I gained valuable insight into how my students interpret and react to my assignment. I also learned that announcing students in class once isn’t enough as it pertains to writing assignments. (for example, students need lots of reminders about format, citation standards, etc.)

• Rethought/reworked writing assignments to clarify objectives

• Continue to refine assignments and my goals/expectations for writing assignments.

• Some common misunderstandings students have. Students' need for repetitive teaching about and review of writing.

• Peer mentoring can be very effectively incorporated into a class. Does not take that much time (less than a normal TA) Great feedback on assignments.

• This time around, I'm not sure I learned all that much. (I was, perhaps, too busy learning things about working with a particularly unexperienced GTA, instead.)

• What students do and do not understand about assignments. Uncommon ideas and gaps in prior learning of my students in relation to my expectations.

### Mentor Evaluations

**Strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1).**

1. **Communications between mentor and professor went smoothly.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
• We didn't meet very often, and when we did, I felt as though prof. ______ didn't want to spent too much time coordinating (she seemed to feel more comfortable with each of us doing our own thing)

• We connected often and effectively

• Prof. ______ was always positive and friendly, but often took a long time to reply to emails, and habitually was vague about assignment details.

• Met weekly and emailed regularly

• I regret not checking in, even during lulls in the semester, to express in words my continued engagement/that "all is well, do you need anything from me?" That said, making a schedule and discussing goals at the beginning of the semester = success!

• Professor was not very good at communicating initially, but followed up an announcing all of our Drop-in sessions

• Shelly was great- always clear and prompt. It was definitely a collaboration.

• Occasionally some radio silence about meeting times and follow

• Was a few times where I wasn't in the loop about material given to students

• Not much communication (difficult to reach)

2. Communications between mentor and students went smoothly (connecting, making appointments, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• Only issue I ever had was when a mentor [mentee] dropped by during my hours at the WC, thinking that I would always be able to meet with them at that time (I think I confused them by introducing my role as a tutor and a mentor at the same time/not distinguishing those roles enough)

• I have to keep better track of my appointments!

• I missed a session and didn't always talk to students directly to set up appointments, but I thought that when I did talk to students I was able to connect and communicate with students more effectively and productively than I did last semesters.

• First years tend to be flakey, but most stuck to schedules and replied promptly.

• Overall good, but I had a class when the class met, so I could not go to introduce myself.

• Being in class a lot helped

• Once clarified that I'm a resource but that tutor/mentor role = not an "editor" and collaborative, things went smoothly. Use of Blackboard and role as "admin" = very helpful for communication.
Having to find out own space to meet sometimes caused extra difficulties

As long as we announced on blackboard and professor announced in class it was fine!

Most students were fine - there were a few that had no idea what was going on, but that may be a personal issue

No issue, use of doodle was successful

Sometimes meeting with me felt unnecessary if my student felt confident in their abilities.

3. I would recommend that the Writing Center/WID Program continue to develop a WID Mentor Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 (91%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Absolutely!
- It's awesome and I think students find it helpful.
- I found that most students claimed my assistance made assignments and concepts approachable and able to complete.
- I think the program is wonderful, but I think it would be more effective for first year classes (e.g. TAP), senior seminars, and classes with a unique or specific writing task. Because the class was made up of primarily upperclassmen in an intro class, I felt that most students didn't think they needed/wanted help.
- Absolutely. I see this as a valuable program!
- Helps mentors and mentees grow!

4. How do you think this class benefited (students and/or instructor) from having a WID mentor?

Served as an additional resource/intermediary for students and professor
I was able to provide more one-on-one work than would otherwise be available to students, I also have a good working knowledge of Jackie's expectations and attempted to convey and explain them. I helped students who needed guidance, and I think the presentations are made much better in our practice sessions. Also coming into class and talking about writing and assignments seemed to put everyone on the same page.

Fostered communication between professor and students

- I think it helped them with miscommunication between themselves and their professor and with better understanding the professor's expectations - even college expectations in general. Since I was mentoring a TAP class, I think I helped many students acclimate to what kind of writing was expected of them. Also, since I mentored freshmen, I encountered a lot of anxiety and felt as
though I was able to help with that to some degree (since I, like all students, have similarly experienced such anxiety)

**Helped introduce students to writing in the discipline/college writing**

Most of my contributions to the class were individual meetings with students. For the most part, I think a lot of the students really benefitted from these because they were in need of individual attention. As they were all first year students, they were also able to talk to me about their problems with transitioning into college. I had the unique position of having taken the class years before, so I think I was able to set a tangible example for them, as well as helping them strengthen as writers.

I think it held students accountable for preparation prior to large assignments.

I think my assistance made the material, assignments, and the students' transition to college academia more accessible.

I think that by offering myself in a lot of ways (reflecting the wide range of services offered by the WC) I was able to provide support to a number of students on a number of skill sets. I helped with brainstorming/solidifying the topic ideas, organizing writing, editing drafts, and reading challenging papers. Those who returned more than once for aid seemed to have benefitted from their previous visit(s). Additionally, I think I acted well as a mentor regarding helping with their transition into college and understanding the expectations and requirements.

Among the students I did meet with, there was some confusion on what a literature review is trying to accomplish. So I think I was most helpful in clarifying those ideas.

5. **How do you think the faculty member benefitted from having a WID mentor?**

**Helped instructor understand the students’ experience in the course**

- My perspective as a student and an educator helped to mediate conflicts of "they're not working hard enough!" vs. "they don't understand the assignment and/or don't have time!"

- It seemed beneficial to Beverly to have a student's perspective and insight inform her curricular decisions in the course. I also think I acted effectively as an intermediary between student and professor, providing useful feedback that typically doesn't clearly make it back to the professor.

- I think Prof. Abaied benefitted from the program by getting my feedback on the student perspective on her assignment. I also think it was helpful to have me as an in-between for students when they are interpreting their feedback from Prof. Abaied.

- Sarah has taught this class before, so I think she had a good sense of how students experience the class. It was helpful to her to know how students received the books though (there were some additions) and what qualities sparked their interest to write about.

**Helped with assignment design and integrating writing activities into the class**

- Professor Carr was able to have a student/mentor's perspective in creating assignments.

- Shelly and I truly collaborated on this, so it was a learning experience for both of us. She was very open to suggestions on ways to improve, what wasn't working well, etc. She clearly cares
deeply about her students and their success. We worked to revamp her writing workshop and to clarify assignments.

**Allowed the faculty member to provide more writing support to students through the mentor**

- I think I acted as a buffer between Jeanne and the students in order to help their writing process before she read the products.
- I think the faculty member benefitted by having someone to lead workshops related to writing so that she could devote more time to other aspects of the course (though the students ultimately did not end up taking full advantage of the workshops- perhaps they may have been more likely to if they mentor was also a HDFS major?) I think my helping one student who had been struggling with Jackie's assignments also helped her.
- Nicole was able to use me, her TA, and her own time, to give students a lot of opportunities to get individual and personal help on their assignments.

6. **What suggestions do you have for improving the WID mentor program?**

**None: 7**

**Foster relationship building**

- Suggestions: List of questions for mentor/professor to review and answer at beginning of semester, to solidify expectations/"make a plan"? Professor Fox and I functioned fine without this, but I see such a framework as potentially helpful for clarification of roles/needs from all parties involved in WID.

**Utilize certain or more mentors for specific classes**

- I can't think of any improvements for the program as a whole, but for this class in particular (HDFS 296), I would suggest using a mentor who is an HDFS major and has taken classes with Jackie before, as I think students might be more responsive to this.

**General support/logistics for the program**

- I don't know about better, but maybe bigger. Maybe keep the program the same but increase the scale. OR what if mentored were more involved in class and instead of getting paid, got class credit. I thought that my work with students increased my 86 related knowledge, so I definitely got some sort of academic learning as well as experiential learning.
- If we could stress 1:1 appointment scheduling throughout the semester somehow that would be great (like actually in the WC, not just open houses)
- Everyone should have to turn in a clear/defined schedule for their classes. Makes it easier to point back to when everyone has turned one in.
- More ubiquitous! Then the role would be better understood.
• Centralizing the work with the Writing Center would be nice. It definitely felt like this was more tangential than normal tutoring.

• Perhaps a digital record form for those who can't make it to meetings?

• Entering names in the computer difficult to understand. Perhaps an easier system could be installed?

• Let students take the class and mentor at the same time. Kind of a different role, but it would be interesting.

**Student Evaluations**

7. About how many times did you meet with your writing mentor? (356 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5+</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
<td>34 (10%)</td>
<td>112 (31%)</td>
<td>135 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Why did you arrange to meet with the WID mentor? (375 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I thought it would be helpful</th>
<th>Professor recommended it</th>
<th>My 1st meeting was helpful</th>
<th>My professor required it</th>
<th>A classmate recommended it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>157 (44%)</td>
<td>112 (31%)</td>
<td>44 (12%)</td>
<td>208 (58%)</td>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The logistics of meeting with my mentor went smoothly (making an appointment, finding the space, etc.). (151 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161 (45%)</td>
<td>112 (31%)</td>
<td>28 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. My WID mentor was well-qualified (knowledgeable and skilled at providing the support I needed). (133 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179 (50%)</td>
<td>99 (28%)</td>
<td>28 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Having a WID mentor was useful in completing the writing assignments for this class. (320 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133 (37%)</td>
<td>97 (27%)</td>
<td>60 (17%)</td>
<td>13 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I would recommend that the WID Mentor Program continue to be developed, so that other students can have the opportunity to work with a WID mentor in one of their writing-intensive classes. (405 responses)
13. What benefits did having a WID Mentor provide for you or your class?  
[Selected comments – common themes include help understanding professor’s/discipline’s expectations, improvement of general writing skills or increased understanding of certain genres/assignments, having feedback from someone knowledgeable about writing and about the subject, having an approachable, knowledgeable peer for questions]

**PT 318**
- Having a set of eyes review the paper who is not in PT program so doesn't know the same background knowledge which helped us state things in a simple and clear way.
- It was helpful to have someone read our paper who didn't know anything about the subject- Adam read it as it was written, whereas we were reading our paper with a lot of assumptions that we didn't really cover in the paper.
- Feedback before presenting in front of the class. We were able to fix/improve some things beforehand.
- It helped me better edit papers and know what to look for. It also improved my presentation skills.

**SOC 095**
- It helped to have one person who knew the professor and class that we were writing for.
- It was nice to have someone for just our class that could help us with our writing techniques.
- It provided a better understanding for the assignment given.
- Helped me understand that ideas I have are solid but my rushed way of writing gets in the way of it being presented well.

**PSYS 257**
- It was SO beneficial - she was very flexible with meeting with students and helped improve my writing so much when I met with her.
- Someone who is knowledgeable about lit reviews.
- She gave good tips for constructing the paper and feedback on the themes that we discussed.
- Gave suggestions and helped explain what professor is looking for.

**HDFS 001**
- I like the fact she has been in the class and can really relate to some of the trouble and help provide positive alternatives and encourages us to become better writers.
- The designated person who knows specifics about the class and teacher is helpful.
• Having WID mentor helped because it provided an extra reliable person you could go to when you needed help
• Very good/ professional @ explaining helpful tips. Her knowledge of both the class and writing skills were great assets
• A tremendous amount of insight on how and why it is important to peer review and what makes it a positive experience

**ENGS 086B**

• Since they had taken the class before they know all of the assignments and gave good advice based on it
• Having someone who can help on projects/essays who is actually involved with the assignment and knows what it’s all about
• It made me feel stronger and better about the work I did, because I knew I could get support from WID mentor
• One of the mentors actually helped me solidify my decisions in regard to my major and minor!
• Helped structure how we prepared for group projects and have someone to help with the class.

**GEOG 095**

• It provided the opportunity to learn/clarify proper writing techniques and helped to find the best topics possible.
• Support with meeting college writing requirements reading skills and techniques for scholarly papers.
• The ability to ask clarifying questions about readings and assignments.
• Jess helped clarify the expectations of the professor and provided very useful feedback regarding writing assignments.
• It helped with learning how to handle complicated scientific texts.
• Improved my reading habits with scholarly articles.

**ENGS 031**

• Helped to explain professor's expectations, understanding of material and give an alternative view.
• Knew the class and could give better advice
• It gave an opportunity to the students to meet with someone professional and who knows what going on in the class
• Open up conversation and made me think more critically about my paper

**REL 203**

• Great suggestions/his knowledge of religion theory was very helpful
• Structure, language, and ideas for my paper