Channel Islands

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Materials, Services, Facilities and Technology Fee
Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget Request Form*

DUE: Friday, January 9, 2015 @ 5:00 P.M.
Please return completed requests via email to gina.matibag@csuci.edu

If you have questions about this form, please contact Gina Matibag at (805) 437-3320
For additional information please consult the MSFT web page.

Project or Activity Title: University Writing Center-peer tutoring

Name of organization requesting funds: Broome Library / University Writing and Multiliteracy Center   **Date:**   1/7/15

Requestor: Kathleen Klompien & Stephen Stratton **Contact Phone Number**: (805.437.8913)
E-mail: Stephen.stratton@csuci.edu

Amount of MSFT Funding Requested: $54,209

Date Funding Needed by: August 20, 2015

Will you receive funds from any other source(s)? Yes, some amounts will be covered however, MSFT has paid for the full amount of Instructional Student Assistant salaries
If yes, please detail amount requesting from other source(s) as well as your total request for fiscal year 2014-2015 (including request from MSFT).

Has this project or activity previously received MSFT funding? Yes
If yes, please attach copy of report

Please describe how the use of MSFT funds for this project or activity will benefit the CI student body.

Please provide the following in your application. You may attach additional pages and materials (applicants may be requested to meet with the committee to discuss proposals):

  Brief Project Description. Describe the project and its benefits to the educational or co-curricular experience of students at CI.

In 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, $24,836 was given each year to both the University Writing Center and Learning Resource Center because they were in one funding department. In 2010-2011 both

centers spent all $24,836 on Instructional Student Assistant Salaries with about $9,934.00 spent by the University Writing Center. In 2011-2012, both centers spent $21,162.42 of the $24,836 with about $9,465.00 spent by the University Writing Center (UWC). Also, in 2011-2012, money was transferred into GD901.

For AY 2012-2013, separate requests were submitted. The 2012-2013 budget allocation is attached. In 2012-2013 the UWC was awarded $37,600 ($36,000 of which is being spent on ISA salaries; $1,600 was used to purchase two laptops). Detailed records can be provided for use of funds if needed. In 2014-15, $39,000 was allocated from MSFT. All of these funds are allocated towards ISA salaries.

EXPENSE& SALARY		2014-15 Budget	Funding Requested from MSFT	2015-2016 Total Budget Request
GD901	601303 Student Assistants (SA)	10,000	5000	15,000
GD901	604001 Telephone Usage	500		500
GD901	660002 Printing	500		500
GD901	660003_Supplies and Services-Other	1,133	2,000	3,133
GD901	660831 Copier Usage	250		250
GD901	660832 OPC Chargebacks	250		250
GD901	660816_Membership Dues & Fees	50		50
	GD901 Subtotal	12,683		14683
GD925	601303 Instructional Student Assistant*	39,000	48,000	48,000
	GD925 Subtotal	39000		55,000
00171	601303 Instructional Student Assistant (ISLAS)	9,216		
	00171 Subtotal	9, 216		

*This was one-time funding.

Request A: Tutors (ISAs) provide one-to-one writing assistance and serve as in-class tutors in the CI composition program, as well as making presentations in UDIGE courses and in library orientation sessions. The activity is instructionally related as the Center's staff provides writing-related tutoring for over 1000 undergraduate courses in over 20 different majors.

Request B: Student Assistants (SAs)
At present the UWC only has Student Assistants (SA) available for approximately half the hours we are open. Student Assistants work between 20 to 25 hours a week between them all, yet the UWC is open 45 hours a week during a regular week and 65 hours a week during the four weeks of extended hours. We need full coverage for the efficient operation of the Center. In addition, minimum wage is going up to $10.00 in January of 2016. Currently, the SAs start at $9 per hour, and therefore we need to consider how to

meet this increased wage need. Student demand for UWC services constrains the Center from reducing coverage and requires additional coverage in the immediate future.

Request C: Supplies.
Currently, the colored/black printer ink for one computer costs $900 per year. Printer ink accounts for nearly our entire $1,133 supplies budget. We need to be able to purchase all of the necessary supplies for the Center to run smoothly. The printer that the Center owns is over 5 years of age, and has stopped working. Attached are an estimate of a replacement that is needed for the work of the Center.

Please provide specific information about how MSFT funds will be used and their impact on the campus. Please describe how this project benefits CI students?

These funds will be used to pay for the vast majority of Instructional Student Assistant salaries for peer tutors working in the University Writing Center (UWC). Funding for UWC tutoring benefits CI students, both those who tutor and those who receive tutoring, to become not only better writers, but also more successful students. The amount requested, $48,000, would pay for 135 hours of tutoring per week for 15 weeks of two semesters. The average tutor working 15 hours per week is likely to work individually with over 20 students in a week.

Please describe items and provide justification if your request includes the purchase of computers, equipment, furniture or other materials.

Taking into consideration that in addition to on-on-one tutoring, the 9 tutors funded through the MSFT would also be conducting workshops, making class visits, and facilitating group tutoring, it is reasonable to expect that over 2600 matriculated students will be impacted by this activity. Most of these students should gain confidence and see improvement in their writing as a result of UWC tutoring. Another significant impact is on the tutors themselves. Tutoring provides the perspective and experience for the tutors to develop their own writing abilities, as well as communication, interpersonal, teaching, and study skills, while helping others to do the same. In the fall of 2013 the UWC had 3570 contacts by 1161 students. Since 9 of those tutors were paid through MSFT, we can estimate that 2471 of those contacts were made as a direct result of MSFT funding. Tutors helped over 804 students, from freshmen to graduate students and in a variety of majors, improve their writing. The tutors themselves gained greater understanding of the writing process, as well as valuable experience and confidence.

Please provide a timeline for implementation of the proposed project.

This project requires funding by the start of classes in August as the tutors will be assisting students as soon as the classes start at the beginning of the semester.

If physical improvements are requested please describe need, scope and impact of work to be completed. If the project includes provision of services please indicate the type of service, personnel costs and level or quantity of service to be provided with project funds.

Project/Activity Budget. Please enclose a complete detailed budget of the entire project. Indicate (in bold) specific items of requested MSFT funding including (where applicable) a **schedule** and **priority** of project items to be considered if the project is funded at a **reduced level.**

Item	Cost	Breakdown
1. Peer tutor (ISA) salaries for established tutoring activities	$48,000	135 hours of writing tutoring per week, for 15 weeks, each semester. + 50 hours of tutor development/education. MSFT request.
2. Additional Student assistant salaries	$5,000	These additional funds would give the Center full SA coverage: roughly 50 hours of support per week at $9/hour. MSFT request.
3. Tables	$2000	These additional funds better reflect what the UWC actually spends on supplies and include the purchase of a new color printer/copier for the Writing Center
4.		
5.		
TOTAL REQUEST MSFT	$ 55,000	

Were other, less costly, approaches considered when preparing the budget for the project? When it comes to offering Writing Center services (request A), it is essential that we employ the most capable tutors (ISAs). We also need to assure that the ISAs are paid a competitive wage. To that end, there is really no way to spend any less on this service without sacrificing the quality of this service.

Because of the physical layout of the Center, it is essential that someone is sitting at the front desk at all times. At present, ISAs who are paid up to $2 an hour more than SAs are staffing the front desk of the Center when no SAs are available to work (due to insufficient funding for SA coverage) which is a poor use of the Center's budget. Request B will enable the Center to be more cost effective in that tutors will no longer need to take away time from tutoring for working at the front desk.

In the UWC, we are constantly working to reduce our spending on supplies. At one time when they visited classes to promote the Center they handed out Writing Center pens and folders. Due to the high cost of these supplies, they currently hand out only bookmarks we make here in the Center. Additionally, the tutors and students use scratch paper instead of notepads during their sessions and, when printing, we always use black ink and duplex printing. One cost we cannot avoid is ink for our printer, although we have experimented with buying refilled ink. Request C will help us continue to offer printing as a service for our students.

Are there elements that could be eliminated or deferred if funding is not available for the entire project? While we believe that our entire request is essential to the smooth running of the Center, we have ranked our requests with Request A being the most essential—without it there will be no writing tutoring available to undergraduate CI students—and C being the least essential.

Project Assessment. Describe how the effectiveness of the project will be assessed and measures that will be used to determine if it has attained its objectives. After each tutorial tutors are evaluated by the students with whom they work. These evaluations are compiled and reviewed by the director. At the end of the semester students and faculty working with in-class tutors also complete evaluations.

- o Center Evaluations
  - A total of 928 surveys were completed by students as they left the UWC. Our strengths in the Center were in the following areas:
    - Tutors were focused and gave their full attention to the students (98% positive response),
    - Tutors provided clear feedback about the paper and how to strengthen the students' writing (98% positive response),
    - Tutors were sensitive to individual needs (97% positive response).
  - When asked, most students learned about our services from their professors (30%) or another student (18%), while fewer students reported learning about us via advertising (9.5%). Finally, students reported hearing about the Center during orientation or from another program –DRP, STEM Center, library staff, etc. (9%).
  - When asked about their desire for tutoring in student housing this semester, 82% of students surveyed said that they would take advantage of the service if it were offered.
  - Select student comments:
    - "[The tutor] was really nice and listened to what I wanted as a writing outcome and essay goals and focused on that the whole time we went over my essay. His help made me feel confident and pleased with my essay. Thank you!!"
    - "[The tutor] was absolutely brilliant and incredibly helpful. [They] covered every base that I intended to cover before he asked if I had any particular questions for [them]."
    - "[The tutor] was incredibly professional, courteous, and I could tell [their] priority was to make sure I would leave the session feeling great and confident in myself to finish my paper! I can't thank [them] enough for all of [their] help."
    - "[The tutor] was so awesome to work with. [They] helped me with very area I was struggling in and I felt very comfortable talking to [them] about what I felt unsure of. I will definitely be asking for [them] specifically the next time I need help with a paper."
    - "Will definitely visit the writing center in the future. Great resources, great tutor."
  - There were only a handful of constructive/negative comments. They include the following:
    - ✓ "The only reason why the tutor seemed distracted was because [the tutor] was running the front desk while tutoring me. Maybe there was a short staffing situation. [The tutor] was very helpful!"
    - ✓ "We need longer sessions"

- o In-Class Evaluations This semester 27 sections of composition had in-class tutors. A total of 404 surveys were completed.
  - As a result of in-class tutoring students reported that they:

- Were comfortable sharing ideas with the tutor (87% positive response)
- Felt the tutor provided them with clear information about what they could do to improve the paper and strengthen their writing (84% positive response)
- Felt the tutor helped them feel more confident about their abilities as writers (61% positive response)
- Would like to have an in-class tutor in another writing class (83% positive response)
- Results indicate that, when given the opportunity:
- 44% saw the tutor 1-2 times
- 34% worked with her/him 3-5 times
- 5% of students worked with the in-class tutor 6 times or more.
- 18% did not work with the tutor at all
- When asked if having an in-class tutor encouraged them to visit the Center on their own, 60% reported that it did, and 25% reported it might.

If funded, how will the project acknowledge the use of student funds so that students are aware that their student fees made (or helped to make) it possible?

Tutors and students who visit the UWC played an active role in the MSFT fee vote in fall of 2013. The staff distributed voting pamphlets and posted notices in the Center to let students know that tutor salaries were directly funded through MSFT fees. Several tutors and "regular" visitors attended the Town Hall meetings. New UWC tutors are also informed that their salaries come from student fees. The well-informed tutoring staff has helped, and will continue to help, to educate the student body to ensure that they are aware that their student fees are directly responsible for tutoring. As promotional materials are revised, we mention MSFT on them and on our Facebook page.

If appropriate, indicate how the project or activity promotes sustainability at CI.

While the term "sustainable" is most commonly applied to the consumption of natural resources in our physical environment, the term can also apply to social systems. At CI we ask ourselves, "Are we making the most of our student resources?" "Do we provide opportunities for our students to enrich their educations and prepare for the future? Here at the UWC, we can answer those questions with a resounding, "yes." Many of our tutors plan to go into teaching careers—from childhood to university levels. The experience of tutoring is invaluable for these students. The one-to-one experience proves to be a good precursor to the rigors of classroom teaching. Tutors learn to communicate with students who have a variety of learning styles, backgrounds, and interests. In addition, our tutors are encouraged to participate in the annual tutoring conference, and publish within national tutoring publications such as *The Dangling Modifier* and the *Writing Lab Newsletter's* tutor column. Writing tutoring also dovetails with several courses our tutors are required to take:

- ENGL 329— Seminar in Tutoring English, taking this course is a requirement for all tutors during their first quarter of tutoring
- ENG 478- Writing as Reflective Practice
- ENG 475 Language and Social Context.

Each year the Center sees a large influx of applicants from these courses and subject areas; these students are eager to gain the experience of tutoring CI students before going out into areas they hope to teach. Furthermore, we are confident that nearly all students who receive writing tutoring will see some, and many will see dramatic, improvement in their writing.

es of Project Support. Please list the other sources of funding, and additional port for the activity. If this project or activity has been conducted previously ase indicate how it was funded. Please explain if MSFT is the only source of port for the project.

marks used to promote the Center with students and handed out in each room interaction will include the statement "funded by CI students through the rials, Supplies, Furniture, and Technology fees committee funding"

ntly state ide budget support of the University Writing and Multiliteracy r is provided for the Lecturer faculty, part time staff assistant, partial funding student assistant dget and monies for miscelaaneous operating expenses. ched is a budget for the Center for 2014-15.

Fi Management: Project sponsor's unit or department may be responsible for in over and bove what is funded through the MSFT. If support is requested for c ond initial award for use on activities or materials not included in a proposal, the sponsor must seek approval from the MSFT co h project sponsor will be responsible for managing purchases and tr of funds related to approved projects.

P view MS web page for information about the fund and its objectives before

Sehi Computer Products, Inc.
1275 Puerta Del Sol
San Clemente, CA 92673
1-800-346-6315

Quote	Q00056648
Date	3/10/2014
Page	1

Bill To:

California State University Channel Islands
One University Drive
Accounts Payable
Camarillo, CA 93012

Ship To:

California State University Channel Islands
One University Drive
Receiving Warehouse
Camarillo CA   93012

Quote Number	Customer ID	Salesperson ID	Shipping Method	Payment Terms		Master No.
Q00056648	CAL012	jpolfer	BEST	Net 30		163,453

Quantity	Item Number	Description	UOM	Unit Price	Ext. Price
1	CF082A#BGJ	HP LASERJET ENTERPRISE 500 COLOR M551DN	Each	$669.40	$669.40

This item is in stock, delivery is 3-7 business
days from the receipt of your order. If you have
any question please contact me @ X216. Thank you
for choosing Sehi, have a wonderful day! Jill

Subtotal	$669.40
Misc	$0.00
Tax	$50.21
Freight	$0.00
Trade Discount	$0.00
Total	$719.61

Sehi Computer Products, Inc.
1275 Puerta Del Sol
San Clemente, CA 92673
1-800-346-6315

Quote	Q00056652
Date	3/10/2014
Page	1

Bill To:

California State University Channel Islands
One University Drive
Accounts Payable
Camarillo CA   93012

Ship To:

California State University Channel Islands
One University Drive
Receiving Warehouse
Camarillo CA   93012

Quote Number	Customer ID	Salesperson ID	Shipping Method	Payment Terms		Master No.
Q00056652	CAL012	jpolfer	BEST	Net 30		163,461

Quantity	Item Number	Description	UOM	Unit Price	Ext. Price
1	CM752A#B1H	OFFICEJET PRO 8100 EPRINTER N811A 20/16PPM 1200X600DF	Each	$129.60	$129.60
1	13172	6FT USB AB DEVICE USBA TO USBB	Each	$7.46	$7.46

This item is i stock, delivery is 3-7 business
days from th receipt of your order. If you have
any question please contact me @ X216. Thank you
for ch   ehi, have a wonderful day! Jill

Subtotal	$137.06
Misc	$0.00
Tax	$10.28
Freight	$6.00
Trade Discount	$0.00
Total	$153.34

MEMORANDUM

TO:	AMY WALLACE
FROM:	KATHLEEN KLOMPIEN
SUBJECT:	UNIVERSITY WRITING & MULTILITERACY CENTER REPORT FOR FALL 2014
DATE:	12/22/2014

➤ Statistics

- ➤ <u>Contacts</u>: Total number of sessions[1] for the semester was 3194 by between 928 and 1248 students[2].
  - ▪ The following categories give a general idea of the type of visit students selected when logging in to TutorTrac.
  - ▪ Within the Center: Students logged in to use the Center under the following categories:
    - ◆ Appointments—974 visits were for general appointments to work with tutors.
    - ◆ Walk-ins—498 visits were for tutoring on a walk-in basis.
    - ◆ Misc.—74 visits were for study room usage, non-academic tutoring, computer usage, and "other."
- ➤ Outside the Center:
  - ▪ In-class tutoring program—1,648 contacts were made during weekly visits by writing tutors in 35 composition classes.
  - ▪ Workshops--The center greatly expanded its workshop program: up to 1,274 contacts were made via 64 one-time Writing Center class visits, some of which were as brief as 15 minutes and others as long as two hours. *(This is almost double the number of workshops over spring '14 when we conducted 31 sessions.)*
    - ◆ Most frequently requested topics included:
      - ✓ Basic pitch—15 min. (9 in classes, 15 during library orientations
      - ✓ Plagiarism—1 hr. (7 classes, of 35 approx. students)
      - ✓ Peer Review—1-2 hours (5 classes, of 35 approx. students)
      - ✓ Citation—1 hour (5 classes, of 35 approx. students)
      - ✓ Literature Review—1 hour (3 classes, of 35 approx. students)
    - ◆ Most Programs requesting workshops[3]:
      - ✓ UNIV (27 sections)
      - ✓ PSYCH (7 sections)
      - ✓ SOC (6 sections)

---

[1] In-center sessions are typically last 30 minutes; composition in-class sessions are typically 45 minutes, and center class sessions can range from 15 minutes to an hour in length.

[2] The total number of students seen is higher than 928 but lower than 1248 as we did not collect the names of students seen during writing center class visits. Some of the students we spoke to in the class visits were already center patron, but not all of them.

[3] NOTE: This list does not include the composition classes with in-class tutoring. Each section in the in-class program learns the basic pitch information on day one of in-class tutoring.

       ✓ ESRM (5 sections)

       ✓ COMM (3 sections)

➢ <u>Courses tutored</u>: While composition is the most frequently tutored area in the center (1,858 visits—including in-class tutoring), other frequently tutored courses included:

- Psychology (171 total visits)
- English, excluding composition (158 total visits)
- Sociology (138 total visits)
- University (121 total visits)
- ESRM (110 total visits)
- Communication (85 total visits)

➢ <u>Demographics for Center Usage</u>:

- 71% of Writing Center users this semester were female (890 females, 358 males).
  - ❖ Even though we have more female students on our campus and some disparity in usage is to be expected, this is a problematic figure. While I have worked to address the problem with male Center usage by hiring more male tutors, I will keep working on ways to encourage more male students to visit the Center.
- First year students used the Center most often (58%), then juniors (17.4%), then seniors (14.3%), then sophomores (8.7%). Graduate students and community members made up 1.5% of visitors. We continue to suffer what the nation research refers to as the "sophomore slump" in which see fewer sophomores than any other undergraduate class.

➢ <u>Utilization</u>: All in-Center Tutoring Sessions (Does not include composition in-classes or Writing Center Visits)

Week	Tutor Work Hours	Student Visit Hours	Student-to-tutor ratio (percentage)	Number of Visits
2	133	97.57	73.36%	37
3	130.6	63.53	48.64%	54
4	128.3	73.57	57.34%	59
5	127.6	69.71	54.63%	81
6	131.6	87.34	66.37%	90
7	127.3	351.11	275.81%	82
8	128.3	169.24	131.91%	128
9	121.8	150.81	123.82%	120
10	122.1	135.06	110.61%	84
11	123.8	164.87	133.17%	123
12	105.4	241.66	229.28%	121
13 (open 7 days)	170.6	329.11	192.91%	187
14 (open 7 days)	82.5	115.47	139.96%	112
15 (open 7 days)	163.8	262.36	160.17%	182
Finals Week	105.1	89.24	84.91%	69
Semester Total	1901.8	2400.65		1529

➢ Some of the busiest weeks of the semester came at mid-terms (weeks 7 & 8) and the final few weeks of the term when many papers were due and extended hours were in effect.

➢ The Center offered approximately 52 hours extended hours/added hours for this semester.

❖ **Evaluations (The design of all surveys that the UWMC distributes, were changed this academic year. Generally, they allow each student only three options per question, rather than the five options they were allowed in previous semesters.)**

➢ <u>Center Evaluations</u>—A total of 928 surveys were completed by students as they left the UWMC:

▪ Our strengths in the Center are in the following areas:

♦ Tutors were focused and gave their full attention to the students (98% positive response),

♦ Tutors provided clear feedback about the paper and how to strengthen the students' writing (98% positive response),

♦ Tutors were sensitive to the individual needs of the students (97% positive response).

♦ 46% of students felt confident about their writing before working with a writing tutor whereas 96% of students felt confident about their writing after the session with the tutor.

▪ Selected student comments:

♦ "[The tutor] was really nice and listened to what I wanted as a writing outcome and essay goals and focused on that the whole time we went over my essay. His help made me feel confident and pleased with my essay. Thank you!!"

♦ "[The tutor] was absolutely brilliant and incredibly helpful. [They] covered every base that I intended to cover before he asked if I had any particular questions for [them]."

♦ "[The tutor] was incredibly professional, courteous, and I could tell [their] priority was to make sure I would leave the session feeling great and confident in myself to finish my paper! I can't thank [them] enough for all of [their] help."

♦ "[The tutor] was so awesome to work with. [They] helped me with very area I was struggling in and I felt very comfortable talking to [them] about what I felt unsure of. I will definitely be asking for [them] specifically the next time I need help with a paper."

♦ "Will definitely visit the writing center in the future. Great resources, great tutor."

♦ "[The tutor] was very helpful and I feel confident on all the sections she helped me with. [They] walked me through it and it now made sense."

- There were a handful of constructive/negative comments. They include the following:
  - ◆ "The only reason why the tutor seemed distracted was because [the tutor] was running the front desk while tutoring me. Maybe there was a short staffing situation. [The tutor] was very helpful!"
  - ◆ "We need longer sessions"
- ➤ In-Class Evaluations This semester 35 sections of composition had in-class tutors. A total of 484 surveys were completed. Due to clerical issues, 4 sections (approximately 80 surveys) worth of in-class tutor feedback was not recorded.
  - As a result of in-class tutoring students reported that they:
    - ◆ Were comfortable sharing ideas with the tutor (87% positive response)
    - ◆ Felt the tutor provided them with clear information about what they could do to improve the paper and strengthen their writing (84% positive response)
    - ◆ Felt the tutor helped them feel more confident about their abilities as writers (61% positive response)
    - ◆ Would like to have an in-class tutor in another writing class (83% positive response)
  - When given the opportunity:
    - ◆ 44% saw the tutor 1-2 times
    - ◆ 34% worked with her/him 3-5 times
    - ◆ 5% of students worked with the in-class tutor 6 times or more.
    - ◆ 18% did not work with the tutor at all
  - When asked if having an in-class tutor encouraged them to visit the Center on their own, 60% reported that it did and 25% reported that it might.
  - Students felt encouraged to visit the writing center after working with a tutor:
    - ◆ "in class tutors are helpful, but also, now having the writing center open on weekends and later is more helpful"
    - ◆ "[The tutor] helped me improve my essays so much with [their] feedback and helped me feel more comfortable with writing essays. [The tutor was] very helpful in class and at the UWC when I needed help."
    - ◆ "I feel that I should visit the writing center once or twice before turning in my portfolio."
- ➤ Positive comments from in-class evaluations include:
  - ◆ "I feel like the writing center and in class tutors is such a great help! It honestly makes me feel more confident about my writing."
  - ◆ "[The tutor] gave really good feedback, and if you were stuck, helped you to get ideas and [they] definitely helped me write both of my papers."
  - ◆ "[The tutor] made me feel like I was doing a good job even when I was unsure, and my grades proved it!"
  - ◆ "Always very helpful and is not harsh about how good/bad the essay is; just willing to encourage to make it better with a few tips"

- ◆ "[The tutor] would provide good questions about my paper to make me think about what I was writing"
- ➤ The following comments are a reminder that the tutors can help assist in the clarification of the lesson:
  - ◆ "very helpful, he understood what my professor was talking about and could explain in different words if needed"
  - ◆ "Having an in class tutor who knew the material I was working with helped a lot."
  - ◆ "[The tutor] gave our group a lot of attention and help us focus our ideas. [They] made us feel like we were the number one group in our class! Lots of fun!"
- ➤ In-class tutoring can be a bit more tricky that in-Center tutoring due to time constraints:
  - ◆ "I felt we probably could have used more time with [the tutor]. Then again, there was like 20 of us and 1 of [them]..."
  - ◆ "Next time when we have a in class tutor can we have a little bit more time talking to them? Maybe let everyone spend time going over their essays."
  - ◆ "I wish they stayed for the whole class period not just a section of the class"
  - ◆ "I feel the tutors and the teachers should collaborate more on a scheduled go-around with the students in class"
  - ◆ "It was hard because when I needed [the tutor], everyone did."
  - ❖ **Tasks Accomplished**
- ➤ UWC Direction
  - ▪ Planned and co-led tutor orientation and staff meetings.
  - ▪ Maintained tutor schedules.
  - ▪ Assigned and supervised tutors to 35 sections of composition and communicated regularly with faculty regarding the program.
  - ▪ Coordinated visits from writing Center tutors to 64 classes across the disciplines (visits varied for 10-15 min.—two hours in length).
- ➤ Teaching
  - ▪ Taught Interdisciplinary Transfer Seminar: UNIV 349.
  - ▪ Participated in 4 days of holistic scoring.
  - ▪ Attended library program meetings.
  - ▪ Designed curriculum for and taught four sections of Early Start Writing (Starting the Stretch) for summer 2014 to 90 students.
- ➤ Committee/Campus-related Service
  - ▪ Served as lecturer representative on Faculty Senate, Faculty Development Advisory and Orientation committees.
  - ▪ Met with fellow faculty teaching UNIV course in conjunction with ISLAS.
  - ▪ Coordinated and participates in the faculty writing retreat On Santa Rosa Island May 30-June 1.

- ➢ Service to the fields of Writing Center Studies and Composition: Southern California Writing Centers Association representative to International Writing Centers Association (IWCA).
- ➢ Secured over $1,000 in funding from the Attended SoCal Writing Center Association conference along with 10 center tutors who all participated by presenting in one of two sessions led by CI tutors. (Irvine, CA)
- ➢ Scholarly Presentations/Publications: The article written by three tutors, Scott DeLoach and I was published in a special issue of *Praxis*, an online writing center journal.

❖ **Staff Tasks Accomplished**
- ➢ Tutors completed and presented a short introduction to the Center in 64 classes across the campus.
- ➢ Tutors updated/designed workshops on the following topics:
  - Writing Anxiety
  - Personal statements
  - Plagiarism
  - Citation