

Addendum to Final Report: UDL Peer Tutor Project  
January 6, 2017

Brian:

Thank you for your careful read of our final report and your question regarding the data presented. We were using Table Two as a trend comparison to the subset data for 2015-2016 since it is very difficult for us to create a true control group. For instance, students in PHYS 31 were not required to attend the peer-led sessions, but they chose whether or not they would attend. We also faced timing issues since we had to get all of this data from Institutional Research, which is a very busy department as you know. Once we received the data, we did not have the time to ask for it to be broken out by year. There is a tremendous amount of data available within this project. The Tutoring Center does not have the ability to synthesize the data due to other requirements they face in providing tutoring to our undergraduate students. However, if you thought working on this data further might gather us more faculty support to continue this effort, we would do everything possible to provide the information. Even though we had some exciting outcomes from this project, only Prof. Larry Shelton is continuing to work with us. The Tutoring Center needs some support from the colleges and schools to encourage faculty who teach large classes to engage with us in this initiative.

I have attached a piece of the back-up data that we received from Institutional Research for your review. We do have the complete data set of student names for the 2015-2016 school year if you so require it. However, we did not have the complete data set of names for the 7,656 students so we could not determine unduplicated numbers to calculate an accurate average retention rate for the trend comparison.

You are raising a point that we should have explained in our narrative. You are right that we did experiment with this model for one year prior to the EPI grant in HDFS 005 and EC 11 during the 2014-2015 school year, which impacted about 220 students. Since our trend comparison data included sections of courses where we offered peer-led, small group interventions, we were competing with ourselves in this trend analysis. If we took out the sections of these courses where we intervened, our retention rate comparisons would even be higher than they are in our report. If you think, we could get more interest in continuing this program by asking Institutional Research to work with us on the data, we are willing to keep analyzing the information. In all honesty, this project is a cost-effective way to deliver tutoring services to our students where we build capacity for students to work in study groups. The more we offer these types of interventions, the more we can move away from the more expensive one-on-one tutoring model that we are slowly changing to a group model.

It seems that our presentation of the data in two tables was confusing. We have created one table below instead of the two tables in our report to present the data more effectively.

UDL Peer Program Retention Data Analysis						
	2015-2016 UDL Peer Program Intervention				Trend Comparison: 2011-2012 to 2015-2016	
Course	Term	Students	Contacts	% Returned Fall 2016	Students	% Returned Next Fall
HDFS 005	Fall 2015	182	456	85.6	1489	80.3
HDFS 060	Spring 2016	92	294	93.4	502	86.3
EC 011	Spring 2016	138	1449	86.2	4386	78.6
PHYS 031	Spring 2016	90	1070	94.4	1279	88.0
Total		484*	3,269	88.6**	7,656	NA***

\*Unduplicated number of students.

\*\*Total percentage of 484 students who returned in fall 2016.

\*\*\* Not Available

If you would like us to resubmit the report, we could delete Tables One and Two and insert this chart while we clarify the few points listed above by Monday.

Hoping this solves some of the confusion,  
Ellen

**From:** Brian Reed <[Brian.Reed@uvm.edu](mailto:Brian.Reed@uvm.edu)>

**Date:** Thursday, January 5, 2017 at 12:19 PM

**To:** Ellen Patricia McShane <[emcshane@uvm.edu](mailto:emcshane@uvm.edu)>

**Cc:** Keith Williams <[kmwillia@uvm.edu](mailto:kmwillia@uvm.edu)>, Dani Comey <[Dani.Comey@uvm.edu](mailto:Dani.Comey@uvm.edu)>, annie stevens <[Annie.Stevens@uvm.edu](mailto:Annie.Stevens@uvm.edu)>, David Nestor <[David.Nestor@uvm.edu](mailto:David.Nestor@uvm.edu)>, Dennis DePaul <[Dennis.DePaul@uvm.edu](mailto:Dennis.DePaul@uvm.edu)>, Jennifer Dickinson <[Jennifer.Dickinson@uvm.edu](mailto:Jennifer.Dickinson@uvm.edu)>, Wendy Verrei-

Berenback <[wverreib@uvm.edu](mailto:wverreib@uvm.edu)>, Holly Buckland Parker <[Holly.Parker@uvm.edu](mailto:Holly.Parker@uvm.edu)>, Brian Reed <[Brian.Reed@uvm.edu](mailto:Brian.Reed@uvm.edu)>, "Catherine E. Symans" <[Catherine.Symans@uvm.edu](mailto:Catherine.Symans@uvm.edu)>, Jason Maulucci <[Jason.Maulucci@uvm.edu](mailto:Jason.Maulucci@uvm.edu)>, Jennifer Fath <[Jennifer.Fath@uvm.edu](mailto:Jennifer.Fath@uvm.edu)>, Jim Vigoreaux <[jvigorea@uvm.edu](mailto:jvigorea@uvm.edu)>, Laura Almstead <[Laura.Almstead@uvm.edu](mailto:Laura.Almstead@uvm.edu)>, Patience Whitworth <[pwhitwor@uvm.edu](mailto:pwhitwor@uvm.edu)>, Pat Brown <[Patrick.Brown@uvm.edu](mailto:Patrick.Brown@uvm.edu)>, Salvatore Chiarelli <[Salvatore.Chiarelli@uvm.edu](mailto:Salvatore.Chiarelli@uvm.edu)>

**Subject:** EPI Grant Final Report - UDL Peer Tutor Program

Ellen and Colleagues,

Thank you for the final progress report on your EPI Grant project. I am copying to the EPI Grant Review Committee for their information.

It is clear the UDL Peer Tutor model was successful and I am very pleased for the positive outcome. I noted that your report included data from not only the term of the EPI grant, but also your previous trials so the data spans a 5-year period. I hope you will disseminate your findings through appropriate sources, and I agree that more research is warranted. In addition, the findings will inform strategic planning for the Center for Academic Success.

I found myself hungry for some additional information. The report states that on average, there was a 6.6% increase (32 students) in the retention of students enrolled in courses/course sections involved the program. Can you provide the retention data for the "control" cohort for purposes of comparison in the tables?

Thanks again to all, and I look forward to discussing further the outcomes of your project – and I am sure that others will too.

Brian

---

Brian V. Reed, Ph.D.  
Associate Provost for Teaching and Learning  
352 Waterman Building  
The University of Vermont  
Burlington, VT 05405  
(802) 656-2232