

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM SUMMARY FORM

Program Name: MA Program in English. Fall 2022 Report. October 15, 2022

Dept: English

College: CLAS

Submitted by: Angela Vietto (Dept. Chair), Marjorie Worthington (Graduate Coordinator)

Colleen Abel, Suzie Park, Jad Smith, Tim Taylor (Graduate Studies Committee)

Part 1:

<p>CGS Learning Goal #1 A depth of content knowledge</p>	<p>Program Learning Goal(s): Develop advanced content knowledge in selected concentration.</p>
<p>How are learners assessed?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial Portfolio (all students complete an initial portfolio through ENG 5000) 2. Final Portfolio (completed in last semester of study) 3. Thesis & Oral defense 4. Thesis & Independent Study Proposals 5. Exit Survey (see Appendix 4 for full survey).
<p>What are the expectations for the students?</p>	<p>Students will generate informed interpretations or analysis of texts and questions for scholarly or creative inquiry or as a means for inquiry into advanced pedagogy (theory and practice).</p>
<p>What are the expectations for the program?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% of students achieve expectation in initial portfolio 2. 90% of students exceed expectation; 10% meet expectations in final portfolio. 3. 80% students meet expectations; 20% exceed expectations in thesis and oral defense. 4. 100% of thesis proposals meet or exceed expectations; 75% of independent study proposals meet expectations in thesis and independent study proposals. 5. 85% of respondents indicate “Excellent” or “Very Good” when asked to rate “How your coursework has helped you to achieve or to enhance the knowledge and skills required in your current or targeted profession.”

<p>What were the results?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 45 initial portfolios reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22% Achieved expectation with Distinction; 78% Achieved expectation; 2. 15 final portfolios reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 73% exceeded expectation; 27% Achieved expectation 3. 4 Theses completed: 2 Passed with Distinction (50% exceed expectations); 2 Passed (50% met expectations); 1 student altered course of study from thesis path 4. 2 (40%) thesis proposals exceeded expectations; 3 (60%) thesis proposals met expectations; of 8 independent study proposals, 100% met expectations 5. When asked to rate “How your coursework has helped you to achieve or to enhance the knowledge and skills required in your current or targeted profession,” 100% of respondents said “Excellent”
<p>How are the results shared? How will these results be used?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are discussed in most Graduate Studies Committee meetings throughout the year, specific issues related to assessment processes and individual students are addressed by the committee. Results, concerns and plans for the future are shared with all faculty in 1-2 department meetings in fall semester. • These results will be particularly useful this year, as our Department discusses whether and how to expand recruitment and increase enrollment. These results indicate our students are currently are well supported and able to be successful; continued attention to these assessment protocols will ensure that we maintain this for the future.
<p>CGS Learning Goal #2: Critical thinking and problem-solving skills</p>	<p>Program Learning Goal(s): Develop advanced critical thinking and problem-solving skills.</p>
<p>How are learners assessed?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial Portfolio (all students complete an initial portfolio through ENG 5000) 2. Final Portfolio (completed in last semester of study) 3. Thesis & Oral defense 4. Thesis & Independent Study Proposals 5. Application material 6. Exit Survey

What are the expectations for the students?	Students will demonstrate advanced skills in critical thinking, reading, and writing, including the ability to analyze texts, to synthesize ideas, and to reflect on these activities.
What are the expectations for the program?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% of students achieve expectation in initial portfolio 2. 90% of students exceed expectation; 10% meet expectations in final portfolio. 3. 80% students meet expectations; 20% exceed expectations in thesis and oral defense. 4. 100% of thesis proposals meet expectations; 75% of independent study proposals meet expectations 5. Of admitted students, 75% admitted with no reservation; 25% admitted with some reservation 6. 100% of surveys show excellent or good results when asked to rate “The effectiveness of courses in challenging your critical, analytic, and/or creative thinking.”
What were the results?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 45 initial portfolios reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22% Achieved expectation with Distinction; 78% Achieved expectation; 2. 15 final portfolios reviewed: 73% exceeded expectation; 27% Achieved expectation 3. 4 Theses completed: 2 Passed with Distinction (50% exceed expectations); 2 Passed (50% met expectations); 1 student altered course of study from thesis path. 4. 2 (40%) thesis proposals exceeded expectations; 3 (60%) thesis proposals met expectations; of 8 independent study proposals, 100% met expectations. 5. 39 students admitted with no reservation (78%); 11 students with some reservation (22%) 6. Results of 7 Exit Surveys when asked to rate: “The effectiveness of courses in challenging your critical, analytic, and/or creative thinking”: 100% Excellent.
How are the results shared? How will these results be used?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are discussed in most Graduate Studies Committee meetings throughout the year, specific issues related to assessment processes and individual students are addressed by the committee. Results, concerns and

	<p>plans for the future are shared with all faculty in 1-2 department meetings in fall semester.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These results will be particularly useful this year, as our Department discusses whether and how to expand recruitment and increase enrollment. These results indicate our students are currently are well supported and able to be successful; continued attention to these assessment protocols will ensure that we maintain this for the future.
--	--

<p>CGS Learning Goal #3: Effective oral and written communication skills</p>	<p>Program Learning Goal(s): Develop effective oral and written communication skills.</p>
<p>How are learners assessed?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial Portfolio (all students complete an initial portfolio through ENG 5000) 2. Final Portfolio or Thesis (completed in last semester of study) 3. Thesis & Oral defense 4. Thesis & Independent Study Proposals
<p>What are the expectations for the students?</p>	<p>Students will conduct and produce original research, creative, or pedagogical work that aligns with selected concentration and/or professional goals.</p>
<p>What are the expectations for the program?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% of students achieve expectation in initial portfolio 2. 90% of students exceed expectation; 10% meet expectations. 3. 80% students meet expectations; 20% exceed expectations in thesis and oral defense. 4. 80% achieve expectation; 20% exceed expectation
<p>What were the results?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 45 initial portfolios reviewed: 22% Achieved expectation with Distinction; 78% Achieved expectation; 2. 15 final portfolios reviewed: 73% exceeded expectation; 27% Achieved expectation 3. 4 Theses completed: 2 Passed with Distinction (50% exceed expectations); 2 Passed (50% met expectations); 1 student altered course of study from thesis path. 4. 2 (40%) thesis proposals exceeded expectations; 3 (60%) thesis proposals met expectations; of 8 independent study proposals, 100% met expectations
<p>How are the results shared? How will these results be used?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are discussed in most Graduate Studies Committee meetings throughout the year, specific issues related to assessment processes and individual students are addressed by the committee. Results, concerns and

	<p>plans for the future are shared with all faculty in 1-2 department meetings in fall semester.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These results will be particularly useful this year, as our Department discusses whether and how to expand recruitment and increase enrollment. These results indicate our students are currently are well supported and able to be successful; continued attention to these assessment protocols will ensure that we maintain this for the future.
CGS Learning Goal #4: Evidence of advanced scholarship through research and/or creative activity.	Program Learning Goal(s): Develop advanced scholarship, skills, or preparation for professional career through research and/or creative activity
How are learners assessed?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial Portfolio (all students complete an initial portfolio through ENG 5000) 2. Final Portfolio or Thesis (completed in last semester of study) 3. Thesis & Oral defense 4. Thesis & Independent Study Proposals 5. Application Material 6. Exit Survey
What are the expectations for the students?	Students will engage in professional activities by producing concentration-specific documents intended for a professional audience and/or through public reading of scholarly/creative work or through publication.
What are the expectations for the program?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% of students achieve expectation in initial portfolio 2. 90% of students exceed expectation; 10% meet expectation in final portfolio. 3. 80% students meet expectations; 20% exceed expectations in thesis and oral defense. 4. 80% achieve expectation; 20% exceed expectation 5. Of admitted students, 75% admitted with no reservation; 25% admitted with some reservation 6. 100% of surveys reveal excellent or good results when asked to rate "How your coursework has helped you to achieve or to enhance the knowledge and skills required in your current or targeted profession."
What were the results?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 45 initial portfolios reviewed: 22% Achieved expectation with Distinction; 78% Achieved expectation;

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. 15 final portfolios reviewed: 73% exceeded expectation; 27% Achieved expectation 3. 4 theses completed: 2 Passed with Distinction; 2 Passed; 1 student altered course of study from thesis path 4. 2 (40%) thesis proposals exceeded expectations; 3 (60%) thesis proposals met expectations; of 8 independent study proposals, 100% met expectations 5. 39 students admitted with no reservation (78%); 11 students with some reservation (22%) 6. When asked to rate “How your coursework has helped you to achieve or to enhance the knowledge and skills required in your current or targeted profession,” 100% of respondents said “Excellent.”
<p>How are the results shared? How will these results be used?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are discussed in most Graduate Studies Committee meetings throughout the year, specific issues related to assessment processes and individual students are addressed by the committee. Results, concerns and plans for the future are shared with all faculty in 1-2 department meetings in fall semester. • These results will be particularly useful this year, as our Department discusses whether and how to expand recruitment and increase enrollment. These results indicate our students are currently are well supported and able to be successful; continued attention to these assessment protocols will ensure that we maintain this for the future.
<p>CGS Learning Goal #5: Ethics and Professional Responsibility</p>	<p>Program Learning Goal(s): Understand and abide by ethical and professional responsibility in the field of English Studies.</p>
<p>How are learners assessed?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students in ENG 5000 (required) complete an ethics and professional responsibility project (to be implemented in Spring 2022). 2. Students in ENG 5025 (required for Creative Writing concentration) will, as part of their literary citizenship proposal assignment, include a component on ethics and professional responsibility (to be implemented in Fall 2021). 3. Graduate assistants assigned to the Writing Center will (1) develop a teaching/mentor philosophy through the Writing Center Practicum (ENG

	<p>5500); This will address ethics, professional responsibility, and attentiveness to diversity and inclusion of various student populations.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Graduate assistants assigned to the Writing Center will be directly assessed in Writing Center consultation. This will address ethics, professional responsibility, and attentiveness to diversity and inclusion of various student populations. 5. Graduate assistants in Mentored Teaching Program (ENG 5502) are evaluated in regard to their work ethic and professional potential.
<p>What are the expectations for the students?</p>	<p>Students in all concentrations will learn and abide by professional codes of ethics as defined by EIU and the Modern Language Association, which includes a responsibility to protect free inquiry; to promote integrity in teaching, mentoring, and research practices; and to promote respect and value for diversity and inclusion.</p>
<p>What are the expectations for the program?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% of students should meet expectations 2. At this stage, we reviewed qualitatively rather than quantitatively in order to develop assessment protocols. See Appendix 1 for further details and pull quotations. 3. 15% of GAs will exceed expectations; 85% will meet expectations 4. 85% of GAS will be evaluated as “Very Good” or “Excellent”; 15% will be evaluated as “Good.” 5. 100% of students should meet expectations
<p>What were the results?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% of students assessed met expectations. 2. Students provided thoughtful statements that we are still determining how to assess. See Appendix 1 for pull quotations 3. 14% of students exceeded expectations, 86% of students assessed met expectations. See Appendix 2 for examples. 4. For the 3 questions that focus on professional ethics and professional responsibility, 84.7 % were assessed as “Excellent” or “Very Good” and 8.3% were assessed as “Good.” See Appendix 3 for the assessment questions related to ethics and professional responsibility and specific evaluation of those questions.

	5. In terms of work ethic, ability to adapt to student needs and challenges and over all professional potential, 66% of students were deemed “Excellent”; 34% deemed “Strong.”
How are the results shared? How will these results be used?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are discussed in most Graduate Studies Committee meetings throughout the year, specific issues related to assessment processes and individual students are addressed by the committee. Results, concerns and plans for the future are shared with all faculty in 1-2 department meetings in fall semester. • These results will be particularly useful this year, as our Department discusses whether and how to expand recruitment and increase enrollment. These results indicate our students are currently are well supported and able to be successful; continued attention to these assessment protocols will ensure that we maintain this for the future.

Part 2

Describe what your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Graduate Assessment Summary Response from last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

Last year we said indicated that students required more guidance in putting together their preliminary and final portfolios. This year we have systematized this process: the introductory course, ENG 5000, now contains a unit that focuses on preparing and uploading the required documents. This unit is part of any section of the course, regardless of who teaches it. Discussion of and instructions for the requirements for the final portfolio also takes place in ENG 5000 so that, upon application for graduation, student simply need a reminder to complete the portfolio.

Last year we implemented a faculty survey that required all graduate faculty to assess all students’ performance. This proved unwieldy and redundant (students were already receiving grades and copious feedback from faculty), so we and chose instead to rely on graduate GPAs, which demonstrate individualized faculty assessment of each and every student and is data that is far more easily gathered from already overburdened graduate faculty. In other words, looking at student grades provides the same data that the surveys did, without requiring an additional assessment task from faculty. For these reasons, we discontinued this survey.

Ethics and Professional Responsibility: As is clear above, this year we were able to assess the data collected for LG #5. The data we collected were multi-faceted, coming from a variety of different program elements: the ENG 5000 ethics quiz, the initial and final portfolios and exit surveys (all students); the Writing Center and Mentored Teaching (all Gas). We have also collected data from students in the Creative Writing concentration (see Appendix 3) and are discussing how we might gather and assess such data from our other two concentrations.

Overall Assessment Plan

As in previous years, the central component of this assessment plan--the student portfolio--is a highly flexible tool for gauging student achievement across all three concentrations (Literary Studies, Creative Writing, and Rhetoric and Composition) for students who are both online and on campus. As our program continues to grow, we anticipate this model to be an effective assessment measure; however, as we are implementing these assessment measures for the first time, we continue to refine our process and tools for gathering assessment data accurately and efficiently.

Our updated assessment plan spans six stages and provides for a rigorous and ongoing assessment of our students during their time in the MA Program.

Stage 1: Orientation

Stage 1 provides an orientation to incoming students at the beginning of their degree. Students are introduced to the MA program's learning goals and expectations through EMAP—the MA Program's D2L site. Students are provided with an overview of the Assessment Portfolio, a description of its components, important steps in the completion timeline, and tips and best practices for completion.

Stage 2: Core Course & Initial Portfolio

Stage 2 occurs in English 5000—the single required course for all concentrations and typically taken in the first year of study. In English 5000, students will complete an initial portfolio with the close guidance of the faculty member teaching the course. This initial portfolio includes a résumé, statement of professional goals, and two self-selected documents from coursework. Students will be asked to provide a rationale for their portfolio selections and indicate how their selections meet the learning expectations.

Stage 3: Thesis and/or Independent Studies

For students who participate in these aspects of the degree, the thesis and independent proposals and thesis oral defenses are assessed.

Stage 4: Graduate Assistant Evaluation

Graduate Assistants are evaluated in the Writing Center and in the Mentored Teaching course (ENG5502).

Stage 5: Final Portfolio

In order to gain a holistic perspective on student achievement during their time in the MA program, we require all students to submit a final portfolio. Students may choose the coursework option or the thesis option:

Portfolio Coursework Option	Or	Portfolio Thesis Option
<p>Contents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Résumé ● Professional Statement ● Statement on how documents meet learning expectations ● 2 coursework documents (formal papers or creative works) ● 1 public document (paper or creative work designed for presentation) 		<p>Contents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Résumé ● Professional Statement ● Statement on how thesis/capstone experience has met learning expectations ● Thesis + documents from initial portfolio

Stage 6: Exit Interviews

Issued to all graduating students. Results in report.

Part 3

Summarize changes and improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

We made substantial changes to ENG 5000 (our introductory course) to 1) improve understanding and submission of the beginning and final portfolios; 2) implement instruction in and assessment of ethics and professional responsibility. ENG 5025 also now includes an ethics assignment; ENG5502 also includes teaching observations by the Director of Composition during the semester, which enable various kinds of assessment. It is not part of the curriculum, per se, but the Writing Center now performs a variety of assessment as well.

Our students' consistently high performance across a variety of assessment vehicles demonstrated to us that we are doing a good job on the whole of accepting good candidates, guiding and supporting them through our program, and helping them meet their professional goals. This is gratifying to recognize, since we serve a rather wide variety of student: online and face-to-face; students who are already working professionals, teachers returning for their Masters degrees, students who wish to continue graduate study at the Ph.D. level, those who want to be community-college instructors and those who want to be writers.

One area we wanted to focus on is to encourage continued professional development. We already have several courses that do this (ENG 5025 for creative writers and ENG5502 for GAs who wish to teach), but we realize there is more we could do. This coming year, we plan to hold symposia designed to help students apply to and prepare to present at professional conferences. It is our hope to have these symposia serve as a sort of pipeline into helping students apply for the travel grants the Graduate School awards. Right now, few of our students take advantage of this opportunity and we hope to find ways to facilitate that kind of professional development.

Lastly, we plan to discuss how best to assess the data we have begun collecting from Creative Writing students in their professional statements (see Appendix 2). These are informative but qualitative data and this year we will determine how best to glean some quantitative data from them as well.

Appendix Index

Appendix 1: Assessment instrument for Ethics and Professional Responsibility Learning Goal for English 5025: Creative Writing Professional Development

Appendix 2: Sample of Writing Center Graduate Assistants' Statements of Professional Philosophy

Appendix 3: Writing Center Consultations with Graduate Assistants

Appendix 4: Rubric and Results for Mentored Teaching Program

Appendix 1:

Assessment instrument for Ethics and Professional Responsibility Learning Goal for English 5025: Creative Writing Professional Development

Prompt Given to Students:

Creative Writing Professionalization

Literary Citizen Proposal, Final Assignment

Assignment Instructions: I would like you to write a proposal for how you plan to maintain your literary citizenship after this class is over, after your degree is done, and beyond. Go back to Shannon Cain's list: (<https://literarycitizenship.com/tag/definition/>) for what makes a good literary citizen. Which of these do you plan to focus on, and how, being as specific as possible? I'd also like you to read the mission statement of AWP, the governing body of creative writing programs in the US: <https://www.awpwriter.org/about/mission>, as well as the professional ethics statement from the MLA: [Statement-of-Professional-Ethics/Read-the-Statement-Online](#).

In your proposal, I'd also like you to consider how you'll uphold the ethical and professional responsibilities of our community. In other words, in your quest to be a good literary citizen, how will you promote inclusiveness and diversity? How will you work toward fairness and positivity in the writerly community? These questions should be considered in addition to the other elements in your proposal. Remember that the beginning of the class focused on you and your goals and ambitions. Literary citizenship is about uplifting and promoting others, in all the ways listed in Cain's short piece, and many more.

Selected Student Responses to the Prompt:

1. *No matter what I do, I want to help promote and support aspiring writers and writers of different backgrounds, whether that's through a free community workshop or by reviewing and promoting books by diverse authors. There are so many stories out there that deserve so much more recognition but don't always get it because they're from smaller publishers or lesser-known (or international) authors. I want to give diverse stories more exposure and, hopefully, others will do the same for my books and collections one day.*
2. *In each of these possible aspects of my literary citizenship, my focus would be on mentoring, making connections with, or promoting writers who are part of marginalized groups in an effort to diversify whichever writer communities I would be a part of. I also tend to be discerning about the people I befriend and support, so I would keep the ethics of inclusion and fairness in mind when interacting with different communities or people.*
3. *Perhaps most importantly, I plan to focus on upholding the values I stand for as a human as well as a writer by supporting diversity and inclusion, and uplifting marginalized voices in the literary community and in the publishing space. I will do this by doing my part to stay connected to and active in positive social movements, using my voice to advocate for change, and publicly supporting those who are doing the same.*
4. *I think it is important for us writers to promote diversity, inclusivity, and fairness. By writing works that contain diverse casts of characters and promoting and celebrating other writers who come from diverse backgrounds and those who don't see fit to write about the typical, we writers accomplish this. Someday soon, I hope to publish works of this sort, but right now, I'm going to settle for shouting out cool and interesting books and writers who do these things whenever I can (be it online or in plain conversation).*
5. *By reading widely and deeply, I think that in reviewing books, I could "judge the work of others fully, fairly, and in an informed way," as the MLA Statement of Professional Ethics says, and this would also inform my*

support for inclusiveness and fairness. By honing my awareness of literature through committed and regular reading of diverse texts, I think I could uplift texts and provide inroads for readers and teachers looking to expand the canon.

Appendix 2: Sample of Writing Center Graduate Assistants' Statements of Professional Philosophy

The following is a sample of Statements from 7 different Writing Center GAs

Student 1

Writing Center Philosophy

In the microcosm of thirty-minute sessions that are inherently focused on a specific assignment that the student wishes to make better, it is often easier to fall into an assignment-centered session. After all, this is where the student sitting at my table wants me to go. In fact, in the first five minutes after some pleasantries have been exchanged, most of the conversation goes straight to the assignment: What are we working on today? Do you have the assignment sheet? When is it due? How long does it need to be? Are there any specific requirements you have to meet? These are questions focused on the assignment, and once we start reading the assignment sheet or the assignment itself, our focus is given over to the task at hand, not the student sitting next to me. However, focusing on the assignment will rarely help produce a better writer over time if they do not see the potential for transfer, and my goal as a Writing Center tutor is to help the student in front of me become a better, more confident writer through a student-centered approach.

Over the last few months, it has become evident though that if I want my sessions to be student-centered, I have to continually ask questions beyond those first five minutes and their focus often differs than the ones first asked. For example, when students want help with a specific citation style, my role often becomes very focused on providing information to the student. But to keep the session truly focused on the student and to open the door for students to transfer the knowledge later down the road, student-centered questions need to be asked: Is this a citation style you normally work with? What resources did you use to do the citations you already have? What about your citations are you most worried about? Answering these questions helps a tutor understand the student and their actual needs more than simply dumping correct citation information at them. A first-year student, who was only ever taught MLA and needs help with APA, may just need to understand the different function APA citation serves to help their brains make the shift. An experienced writer, who is confident in their citations, may just be looking for a second set of eyes for citation typos because of the importance of the paper. On the other hand, an international student, or anyone who has not been thoroughly exposed to citation expectations in Western academic culture, may first need an explanation of *why* citations are even needed before an explanation of citation format can be helpful. Each session needs a curated approach, and asking questions without making assumptions is the best way to provide each individual student the help they need.

Asking these questions, avoiding assumptions, and building rapport is what makes tutoring in the Writing Center unique. Although the best questions to ask are not always evident, they are important. It allows me to come alongside a student and meet them where they are at. By defaulting to questions, I am constantly giving the session over to the student and giving them the space to explain their writing experience, decisions, and concerns. Asking questions of students also positions me to ask a continuous question to myself. In her essay "What Line? I Didn't See a Line," Molly Wingate asks, "Did the writer learn anything about being a better writer?" (11). Although the answer to this question can rarely be answered in any concrete way, I strive to push this idea that what we do in a session together does not have to exist only in this one session, for this one assignment.

Thankfully, I was able to answer this question for myself after two specific sessions where students returned to the Writing Center for another appointment. One student found great benefits from the outline we worked on for an essay that had to be completely reorganized to fit their professor's expectations, so they came in for another assignment before even starting specifically to work on an outline. Another student had written more of an informative essay instead of the argumentative one she was asked to write. She was practically done with the essay and going to turn it in the next day after one last proof-reading appointment. Instead of redoing her whole essay, we worked on peppering in her argument to fit within the information she

was already using. She came back the next day and wanted help from another tutor to make sure she had “peppered in” enough argumentative language.

These students learned something from our sessions and took it with them into other sessions and even other assignments. Although I don’t always have the chance see first-hand students take that knowledge with them, my goal in each session is to be able to pinpoint one thing the student could take with them in the future. I am not always successful, but the goal is there. In every session there is always a way to help with the student’s immediate concerns while pushing them to consider how they can take the knowledge and tips and structures into their next assignment. Whether this is by expressing to students how useful an outline can be before starting an essay as well as after completing one to check organization or by adding phrases like “in your next assignment” or “in the future,” it is important to remind students that what we’re talking about today can be useful tomorrow.

With the goal of helping students become better writers and to retain and transfer the skills talked about in our sessions, there isn’t a session that goes by where I don’t encourage the idea of returning to the Writing Center at a later stage in the assignment process or for the next writing assignment. Thirty minutes rarely allows tutors and students to talk through everything that could be talked through, and certainly one thirty-minute session won’t magically make the student a better writer. If my goal is to help the students to become better writers, then the best thing I can do for them is encourage them to keep coming back. The more they come back, the more questions we can ask them, and the more we get to know them, so each session becomes more and more individualized and more this-specific-student centered.

Work Cited

Wingate, Molly. “What Line? I Didn’t See Any Line.” *A Tutor’s Guide: Helping Writer One to One*. Edited by Ben Rafoth, 3rd ed., Boynton/Cook, 2005, pp. 9-16.

Student 2:

ENG 5500

14 Dec 2021

Tutoring Philosophy Final

As a writing consultant, my main goal is to help students improve as writers. Whether that means helping them with the brainstorming process or helping them with citations, when students leave our session, I want them to feel like they’ve learned something that they can implement themselves later. Sometimes that means a short grammar lesson. Sometimes it means showing students a new way to outline a paper. Either way, it’s important to me to help students work through issues that they’re having with their assignments so that they can better help themselves in the future.

Something I try to do is give my students strategies to organize their own ideas, as this can be a struggle for many students. In her article “Reading: Securing Its Place in the Writing Center,” Alice Horning gives strategies for consultants to help their students focus and organize their ideas. She introduces graphic organizers “to help [students] grapple with and understand a text’s arguments,” an evaluation heuristic “to help writing center clients learn how to judge the quality of sources,” and a 25-word summary that “requires that readers try to grasp and share the essence of a text by capturing it in only 25 words” (Horning 5-6). I especially like the 25-word summary. There have been many instances where a student that I am working with can’t figure out the focus of either a source or their own paper, so I’ve used the 25-word strategy to help them get to the point by asking them to summarize the work in a few sentences. This usually helps find the main idea they need to work with. I’ve also used the evaluation heuristic to help one of my students find reliable sources after I realized about half of their sources were unreliable. They seemed to understand how to find better sources after that.

Another way I try to help my students is by showing them different kinds of writing and brainstorming strategies that they might not have tried in the past. Writing “is not about crafting a sentence or perfecting a text but about mulling over a problem, thinking with others, and exploring new ideas or bringing disparate ideas together” (Alder-Kessner 19). Exploratory writing can help people working in all fields—or just doing it for

fun—come up with new ideas and solve problems. I’ve never been much of a freewriter myself, but I have told a few students to free write during a session when they got stuck. It usually seems to get their thoughts out of their head and gives them something concrete to work with. In the sessions where I have used this strategy, the students seemed to like the exercise, and they usually left with a good idea of what they wanted to do next.

Lastly, I want to make the most of the time that I have with my students. Sometimes that means working on things that they don’t necessarily want to work on. Other times, that means guiding them to a new topic if what they’re doing isn’t working. Sometimes it can even mean not working at all and referring the student somewhere else where they can get the help they really need. In other words, “tutors decide when to be direct, when to be indirect, when to ask a question, when to move to another part of the paper, when to address mechanical or citation issues, and when and how to conclude a session” (Taylor 1). This essentially means that, while the writer has control over the session, the tutor still has the power to guide them in the right direction. I am there to help my students, especially when they don’t know exactly what it is that they need help with. I’ve had a few moments like this before, but my best example is when a student came in very adamant that they wanted to work on a specific part of their paper, but I realized that they didn’t even have a very good start on prewriting. I gently nudged them in the direction of creating a solid outline, and from there the session went smoothly, and we got a lot accomplished.

In the end, my job is to be a guiding force for students, a light in the dark when they don’t know where they’re going. I want to be able to give my students the help they want while still giving them the help they need. By teaching students strategies to help themselves, writing center consultants can foster better writers who will be able to grow and evolve throughout their college careers.

Works Cited

- Alice S. Horning. “Reading: Securing Its Place in the Writing Center.” *WLN: A Journal for Writing Center Scholarship*, vol. 41, no. 7-8, 2017, pp. 2-7.
- Adler-Kassner, Linda, et al. “Writing Is a Knowledge Making Activity.” *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, Utah State University Press, Logan, 2015, pp. 19–20.
- Taylor, Tim, et al. “Kairotic Moments in the Writing Center.” *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 7, no.1, 2009, <http://www.praxisuwc.com/taylor-et-al-71>.

Student 3

In my mind, the key purpose of the writing center is to provide helpful, thoughtful, and flexible ways of assisting students in the completion of their goals. The first part of this, naturally, is acknowledging that every session is a new and unique situation-- even students coming in from the same class with the same project will require different kinds of help, as each student has their own process and goals for the project. Muriel Harris states, for instance, that we must “account for this diversity of revision behaviors as we construct a more detailed picture of revision” (188). Essentially, mindfulness and flexibility are both key to tutoring writing *because* every student has their own processes and goals and tutors need to be considerate of how we approach those items. Forcing a student to work in a completely different way may do more harm than good, even if we believe that our method is better; though, that said, if a student’s process does have a substantial flaw or oversight (e.g. pulling all-nighters at the last second), then our job as tutors leans more toward negotiating adjustments that may be of more help to the student. Of course, the issue is whether or not what we recommend to a student will actually help them-- we can all agree that a student staying up all night to finish a paper isn’t engaging in a healthy habit, but are we overstepping ourselves by recommending adjustments to their processes? Are we actually helping, or just pushing a practice onto a student who may not benefit from it? In my own experiences, I’ve found that there is no real answer. I’ve recommended strategies that have worked very well for students and I’ve recommended strategies that turned out to be less-than-ideal fits. A common metaphor for writing center work is gambling, trying to guess whether something is the right choice with limited time and information; and, while there is some truth in that, I think a more productive way of thinking, one that gives agency to both tutor and tutee, is a focus on negotiation, on talking with our students. While we

are positioned as “experts” in the writing center, our place is at the student’s side rather than above them. I personally try to show this by using shared language, starting sessions by asking things like “what are *we* working on today?” or saying “we’ll see what *we* can do,” or similar, making it clear to students that I want to work *with them* rather than dictate toward them. I see this form of collaboration as a critical part of our work.

That said, I consider another important aspect of the writing center to be giving students the power to accomplish their goals. This could take the form of assisting them in acquiring skills (e.g. proofreading, grammar, etc.), negotiating with them on how they want to organize a project, helping them put their thoughts into words on the page, or any number of similar actions. The key in any of these practices would be that, while we aid the student in their endeavors, we give *the student* the most agency in the session. Even when we need to intervene and do more substantial tutoring, the student should not feel helpless, or like we’re forcing them into following certain patterns. We must similarly encourage students to embrace their agency even in failure, as students’ fear of failure-- no matter how reasonable based on academic or personal pressures-- often “works against the learning process,” leading them to only write for their instructor and avoid taking risks, exploring topic or genre possibilities, and in general growing as writers and as people (Shirley et al 63). While students’ concerns regarding failure are, again, incredibly valid, we nonetheless cannot allow those fears to overwhelm them and leave them feeling helpless. In working together with students, encouraging them and negotiating goals with them, we are able to keep agency with the student and allow them to continue to develop that sense of agency even in situations of failure.

The elephant in the room, so to speak, in all of this discussion of collaboration, student agency, failure, etc. is the question of what we in the writing center must do in regards to the greater academic environment we find ourselves in. The debate surrounding Standard Written English (SWE) and its implementations, for example, is one of the key instances of controversy that tutors become embroiled in. With the knowledge that the continued pushing of SWE in favor of other dialects is part of a corrupted system that academia continues to, by and large, foster, where do the responsibilities of a writing center tutor fall? If we are to focus on our students having agency and being able to accomplish their goals, then are we hypocrites encouraging them toward the system for the sake of their grades? I cannot claim to have answers for this, nor is the solution that I have come to one that I would press onto others. But, I consider it important as, again, my own philosophy regarding the writing center is based heavily on collaboration and agency. In my mind, the best thing we can do for students is to focus on that idea of negotiation, on talking with them about their goals, helping them to understand the greater context of the work they’re doing, while at the same time focusing on the job in front of us. It’s important to be aware of greater societal issues surrounding writing, but in the center we are not in control of students’ grades. I would consider this a different solution from the likes of Peter Elbow or similar, as while the former is a professor, we are tutors-- we do not make the assignments, we work on them, and there is very little we can do to change them. But, this is no reason to despair, because tutors ought to be “boots on the ground” types who understand both theory and practice of writing and can in turn extend that understanding to our collaborators, our students. That is what I try to be for the students in my sessions.

To reiterate, my philosophy on the writing center practice is that we need to be helpful, thoughtful, and overall flexible in how we approach our sessions and our students, helping them do what they need to do in order to achieve their goals. While this does make us complicit in the system, we do not have to be completely bound to it. Through understanding of theory and practice and discussing these concepts with our students as we work alongside them, we can minimize the issues that arise from the troubled system we are currently embroiled in. Students will be able to keep their personal agency, better utilize their own unique processes, do the job in front of them, and take the skills they learn into whatever goals they may have in their lives. We, as tutors, are the people on a more equal ground of power who can help support that personal agency and all that comes with it.

Works Cited

Elbow, Peter. "Inviting the Mother Tongue: Beyond 'Mistakes,' 'Bad English,' and 'Wrong Language.'" *The Journal of Advanced Composition*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1999, pp. 359–388.

Harris, Muriel. "Composing Behaviors of One- and Multi-Draft Writers." *College English*, vol. 51, no. 2, 1989, pp.174-191.

Rose, Shirley et al. "Concept 4: All Writers Have More to Learn," *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle. University Press of Colorado, 2015, pp.59-61.

Student 4

Philosophy of Writing Center Consulting

Writing Center Consultants occupy a liminal space in the minds of their classmates somewhere between fellow student and a kind of teacher. While most consultants probably would not claim any actual authority, students who come to the writing center for help do seem to bestow some authority on us. Our knowledge and judgment, such as it is, is given a degree of trust by virtue of our position. At the very least, our fellow students look to us for answers to questions that they themselves feel they do not have. To complicate matters, we may not be entirely sure where to position ourselves within this matrix of relationships to our peers, classmates, and professors. This is not merely a rhetorical question. How we define our own role directly informs how we view our purpose. Leigh Ryan and Lisa Zimmerelli address this very idea in *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors*, writing that tutors "function variously as an ally, a coach, a commentator, a collaborator, a writing 'expert,' a learner, and a counselor" (5). While this view does reflect reality, it does little for those seeking a straightforward answer. And that, perhaps, is the salient point: there is no single role, function, or purpose that can be attributed to the Writing Center or the people who work in one. We must try to fill the role that our classmates and peers need of us from session to session and be prepared to fulfill a different role for the next student who comes in to see us. In this way, tutoring reveals itself to be situational and the most effective tutors display a considerable degree of flexibility and patience.

Navigating the myriad roles and responsibilities that we may be asked to play in the course of any given day is, likewise, not a straightforward process. There are a few seemingly universal tenants that we may cling to as core values: let the student set the agenda, avoid taking control of the session, and focus on rhetorical concerns before turning to surface-level errors and grammar. Stephen North, in his landmark essay "The Idea of a Writing Center," sums these tenants up nicely when he writes that "our job is to produce better writers, not better writing" (69). How exactly we produce these "better writers" will depend largely on the particular student sitting across from us. Fortunately, these tenants apply no matter the consultant, student, or project involved. In letting the student set the agenda, the consultant must learn to ask questions at the beginning of a session rather than answer them. "What would you like to work on today?" followed by "Do you have an assignment sheet we can go over?" or "Is there a particular part of your paper you're having trouble with?" immediately position the student to set and meet their own expectations. Once the agenda is set, the consultant must allow the student to keep control of their own work. Rather than provide specific instructions or recommendations (or, most harmful, actually put their own hands on the keyboard), consultants are most helpful when they coax the student's own answers out, ensuring that the work remains their own. If surface-level issues require attention, the consultant can—at most—point out an instance or error, explain the solution, and allow the student to fix the next on their own. The cumulative effect of this student-centered, hands-off approach is, ideally, a writer who has been given the tools they need to improve *all* their future writing, rather than a single, isolated piece.

As with all ideal situations, however, reality often prevents us from conducting a “perfect” session according to these guidelines. It is in those less-than-optimal sessions that flexibility and patience make their value apparent. Writing center experts like Molly Wingate, Nicole Kramer Munday, and especially Muriel Harris have all written about not only the conversational, hands-off approaches mentioned above, but also about how to help manage sessions that, for one reason or another, have gone off the rails. Even the most gifted and qualified writing center consultant will eventually find themselves trying to help a student who is frustrated, non-communicative, or unwilling to employ critical thinking. We may find ourselves making no progress by asking questions, deflecting attempts to shift control to us, or gently resisting a student not-so-subtly looking for an editor and nothing more. In such sessions, we find ourselves actively resisting the role in which the student might be trying to cast us. Some days, we may even fail to meet our own standards due to fatigue, distraction, or a sincere desire to help a struggling student as much as possible. It is worth remembering in those moments that we can always take a breath and reset, refer the student to resources for issues beyond our purview, or encourage them to make another appointment and get further help. At the end of the (literal) day, however, any experienced writing center consultant should remember that they cannot hold themselves responsible for another student’s success or failure. No matter what role or function in which we may find ourselves cast, be it coach, guide, “expert,” editor, etc., all we can really try to be is as helpful as possible.

Works Cited

- Harris, Muriel. “Talk To Me.” *A Tutor’s Guide: Helping Writers One to One*, edited by Ben Rafoth, 2nd ed., Boynton/Cook, 2005, pp. 23-33.
- Munday, Nicole Kramer. “(Non)Meeting of the Minds.” *A Tutor’s Guide: Helping Writers One to One*, edited by Ben Rafoth, 2nd ed., Boynton/Cook, 2005, pp. 17-22.
- North, Stephen M. “The Idea of A Writing Center.” *The Longman Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice*, edited by Robert W. Barnett and Jacob S. Blumner, Pearson Longman, 2008, pp. 63-78.
- Ryan, Leigh, and Lisa Zimmerlli. *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors*. 6th ed., Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2016.
- Wingate, Molly. “What Line? I Didn’t See Any Line.” *A Tutor’s Guide: Helping Writers One to One*, edited by Ben Rafoth, 2nd ed., Boynton/Cook, 2005, pp. 9-15.

Student 5

Philosophy of Writing Center Consulting

One of the most important issues that arises in the Writing Center involves the balance between encouraging student creativity and aiding students in following assignment requirements and standards of formal English. While we as tutors do need to keep the standards of professors and general academia in mind during sessions, it is also important for the student to be allowed to show creativity in their writing. While curriculum has shifted in recent years to encourage some level of creativity on the part of the students, there is often still conflict between what a student wants to write about or create and what is expected within the classroom. Our job in the writing center is to help prepare students for their future writing or career fields. To this effect, I believe that students must be given the space for personal growth and creativity, be taught to understand writing as a field, and learn the importance or lack thereof of smaller errors in writing over actual content.

The Writing Center should be a place that encourages personal growth and learning for the students we meet with. My personal belief system about the history and emphasis of writing curriculum aligns with the philosophies presented in Don Zancanella et al.’s text “Dartmouth Revisited: Three English Educators from Different Generations Reflect on the Dartmouth Conference,” which describes how “‘student-centered’ instruction and a ‘personal growth’ curriculum” have been set aside in favor of “externally developed rubrics, lessons, and frameworks” as well as “high-stakes testing and tightly regulated curricula” (15, 18). The Writing

Center presents a difficult liminal space for this issue, with tutors needing to help students reach the expectations of professors and standardized grading while also helping them to become better writers and granting them tools for future writing assignments that may involve more creativity. Finding this balance is an important part of each Writing Center session and is often heavily dictated by assignment descriptions and the beliefs of the students themselves.

One foundation element of writing knowledge that can aid students in writing more creatively is learning the definitions and restraints of writing genres. My personal philosophy on this issue was formed partially through the reading of Irene L. Clark's article "Addressing Genre in the Writing Center," which discusses how the teaching of genre conventions to students can aid them in writing more creatively and in strengthening their understanding of the purpose of different writing types. Clark posits that "simply teaching a set of arbitrary rules will not enable students to apply what they have learned to new situations that involved writing," which I strongly agree with (7). In the Writing Center, we help to explain certain types of papers and the attached standards of genre to students, like explaining what constitutes "formal" writing versus more informal reflective writing, or explaining exactly what is expected from a literary analysis or rhetorical analysis paper when the student has no background with these genres; however, we also teach students to be creative in their assignments, focusing more on the content of a paper than on the standards of its genre. In a few sessions I have had, students have wanted to construct a paper in a way that does not strictly fit its genre, and often they have already asked their professor if that is a change they can make. At the point when I was able to work with these students, our sessions were based in balancing a student's creative ideas about a paper and the requirements of their professor. By explaining what specific assignments require, students can have more of an opportunity to take this approach in their writing, having learned the standards of genres so they can push those boundaries creatively.

One of the most important elements of tutoring in the Writer Center that I have encountered is the concept of focusing on student growth and a paper's actual content instead of small errors in a paper. Students in sessions will often be so focused on using correct grammar or formatting a paper exactly as they were told to and give little attention to their subject matter or the development of their thesis. This leads to papers that may appear organized and successful but have no internal cohesion or strong development of ideas. This concept is addressed in Alice L. Trupe's "Organizing Ideas: Focus Is the Key" chapter from *A Tutor's Guide*, where it is noted that, "[I]n many cases, a reader has difficulty following a paper because it reflects what the writer thinks he is supposed to do rather than reflecting a rhetorical purpose of his own" (102). Trupe suggests setting specific goals for seemingly disorganized papers when they are encountered in a tutoring session, which can help students recognize the more important aspects of their writing (101). If the student has a strong understanding of their subject when writing and understands the genre format of the paper they are writing, it becomes easier for them to organize their ideas from source material. This ease of writing is also strengthened when students are taught not to focus solely on grammatical or structuring errors in their papers and instead focus on writing a paper that contains well-informed points and supports its thesis. If the student does not have these concepts in mind, their writing will be formatted strictly to fit the assignment instructions instead of being an additive piece of knowledge to their chosen subject.

Horner et al.'s "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach" references this concept as it related to ESL students, discussing how focusing on small writing errors can be detrimental to student learning, especially when the course contains ESL students. In Writing Center sessions with ESL or multilingual students, I have always tried to impart the value of a paper's content over the importance of a paper being written "perfectly" in formal English. I have had sessions where students had genuinely interesting topics that they were passionate about, but they were too focused on grammatical errors or were unable to understand the specifics of the assignment and were not developing their thesis enough. Explaining the importance of content over grammatical correctness can be difficult, especially with students who have professors who grade more strictly but making accommodations in one's teaching style for ESL students are imperative to their growth as writers.

This teaching of genre conventions in writing and stronger focus on student growth over small writing mistakes is imperative for imparting useful writing knowledge to students. Students should be taught the rules of different genres and should be allowed to be creative and make mistakes without being seen as failing in some aspect of their writing. By introducing the methods discussed in this essay at a classroom level, students would be able to more directly engage with writing and would have a stronger understanding of writing concepts that they could carry with them into the future. This is what we hope to impart to students in the Writing Center, making them better writers while also balancing creativity with professor expectations.

Works Cited

- Clark, Irene L. "Addressing Genre in the Writing Center." *The Writing Center Journal*. 1999. Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 7-32, <http://www.jstor.com/stable/43442082>.
- Horner, Bruce, et al. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English*, Vol 73, No. 3, Jan 2011. Faculty Scholarship. <http://ir.library.louisville.edu/faculty/67>.
- Trupe, Alice L. "Organizing Ideas: Focus Is the Key." *A Tutor's Guide*, edited by Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook Publishers, 2005, pp. 98-106.
- Zancanella, Don, et al. "Dartmouth Revisited: Three English Educators from Different Generations Reflect on the Dartmouth Conference." *English Education*. Oct 2016. Vol. 49, No. 1, pp. 13-27. National Council of Teachers of English. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26492607>.

Student 6

English 5500

7 December 2021

Writing Centre Philosophy

Working in the writing centre is being a cheerleader, a therapist, a tutor, but most importantly, knowing which role to adopt. My overarching goal in the writing centre is to ensure that the students are able to leave my sessions on a path to becoming a better writer. To ensure I meet my overarching goal, I have realized that making sure I create a safe space for the students in the writing centre is crucial. My philosophy is to make sure I make the students feel comfortable, show them the tools to use to improve their writing, and help them gain confidence in their own writing skills so they can be a better writer on their own.

My first step of my goal is to ensure that I create a safe and comfortable environment for my tutees. As was mentioned in the RISE conference, learning only takes place when students' affective filters are not activated. I found this to be relevant beyond ESL students, for young students who are nervous as well. I have found that the formal experience of having to set up an appointment to meet someone in an official setting can be a scary experience for many young students. My primary job in a tutoring session is to ensure my students feel comfortable. My sessions therefore start with small talk. This establishes connection, makes my tutees realize I am not someone they need to be wary of or be intimidated by. Beyond the initial establishment of connection, I would seek to provide assurance to the student that they are being respected throughout the session. Students coming to the writing centre for help with the writing often feel almost embarrassed that they are needing to seek out writing interventions. This is further fuelled when students are sent off to the writing centre to "fix" their writing. In order to make these students feel that they are respected, and their thoughts are heard, I make sure to provide the space for them to speak, and I respond to them with verbal and physical backchannel. As explained by Tracy Santa in their article "Listening in/to the Writing Center: Backchannel and Gaze", backchanneling leads to convey of attention, understanding, empathy or even displeasure/ struggle—all crucial for communication for tutoring session (3).

My philosophy of ensuring my students feel respected also include me respecting their writing. Writing is an intimate act. Critiquing someone harshly on their writing can not only make them feel personally disrespected, furthermore, it would can also demotivate them from improving their writing skills in a longer run. If we feel we are not ‘good enough’, we may internalize that feeling and stop attempting to improve. My semester of working in the writing centre has entailed me encountering a lot of ESL students and students with regional dialects. For these students, the process of adapting to standard written English can be strenuous. Ensuring we respect their progress and the writing is crucial. When I encounter a writing that is far from the conventions of standard written English, I ask them questions regarding their choices. Instead of looking for mistakes, and I inquire and make attempts to understand their reasoning before showing them options how they can make their written piece more aligned with the expected genre and conventions. Instead of treating their writing as “lesser”, my philosophy is to ensure I meet them on their stand point and show them paths that they may choose to opt for. Listening to them and allowing them to show why they wrote what they wrote is crucial in ensuring we are able to understand them and then show them that there are other ways they may achieve the goal they seek which are more aligned with the academic conventions. “When we listen- truly listen- we treat ESL writers with the respect they deserve, regarding them as peep rather than as uninformed learners of the English language and the U.S culture” (Matsuda & Cox 49). My philosophy is to ensure that my students are comfortable and that they feel respected.

When we ensure that the writing centre is a comfortable space for the students and that they are respected, we help increase the confidence of the students. A lot of students who come to me are not only nervous about the appointment, but also about their writing. Their lack of confidence leads them prefer the tutors lead the session. However, in order to ensure that they are able to apply the told we show them in the tutoring sessions, we need to help them gain confidence in their writing. When the students are more confident in their writing skills, they would be able to metacognitively utilize the tools which we show them in the writing centre. The end goal of my tutoring session is to ensure I create better writers. I aim to make the students feel comfortable in the writing centre so they set up appointments regularly, learning new tools in each session, gaining confidence in their own writing and thus progressing to become a better writer.

Works Cited

- Matsuda, Paul K., & Cox, Michelle. “Reading an ESL Writer’s Text”. *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, edited by Shanti Bruce & Ben Rafoth Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook, 2009, pp. 39-47
- Santa, Tracy. “Listening in/to the Writing Center: Backchannel and Gaze.” *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*, vol. 40, no. 9-10, 2016, pp. 2-9

Student 7

Writing Center Philosophy

In my experience working in multiple writing centers, and through studying composition and writing center theory, I have developed my own philosophy centered around the student in each session. This individualized philosophy works towards bettering students’ writing as a whole, rather than just the writing assignment they bring in, by helping students understand and explore their writing process and the conventions

of written language expected in college composition, all while allowing students to develop a relationship with the writing center as an ongoing resource.

Students who attend sessions with me should develop some level of understanding or awareness of their own writing process, and the challenges that face them within that writing process. This aspect of my philosophy is derived from Shirley Rose's article, "All Writers Have More to Learn," which argues that writing, in all forms, is a process. Rose refers to the challenges and struggles of writing, some of which students who seek the writing center's help might be dealing with, and argues that there is some power in that struggle. Rose writes that "writers must struggle to write in new contexts and genres, a matter of transferring what they know but also learning new things about what works in the present situation" (60). When students come to the writing center, they are often struggling with new genres or contexts for essays and assignments, or are simply looking to improve the academic quality of their work. As a tutor, I feel I am responsible for not only reminding *myself* that the struggle means that they are trying and that it will be good for them, but informing the student of this as well. As a tutor, I consider it my responsibility to frame struggle as a way to grow and as an opportunity to praise effort. This article informs the ways I approach writing processes, in that, for students, the process is often a struggle and thus should be studied. The writing center is a great place to do so.

When students enter a writing center session, they are coming in from a variety of backgrounds and academic contexts, and as a result, have their own unique writing style. Because there are generally expected conventions of written language for college composition, I work toward an awareness of those conventions with students who work with me. This aspect of my philosophy is derived from Peter Elbow's Article, "Inviting the Mother Tongue: Beyond 'Mistakes,' 'Bad English,' and 'Wrong Language,'" which highlights an important and long debated topic among composition educators and scholars, the struggle between Standard English, the language that is perceived as being grammatically and structurally correct and preferred for academic contexts, and other nonstandard dialects that do not meet the "criteria" for Standard English, but have developed language in their own way. Elbow argues that what is important is a "shift in what we require: not the impossible demand that all our students know enough about English grammar and conventions of usage to do it all without help, but rather the pragmatic and feasible demand that they know how to take charge of their writing process and do what is needed" (367). While writing center tutors are not in the position to utilize this approach as a pedagogical practice, I do utilize this approach as a way of thinking when working with all students in the writing center. Ultimately, the student is responsible for the languages and dialects in which they wish to write in. What I can do as a tutor is educate students in what I know best, Standard English. I explain the ways in which the conventions of Standard English might be beneficial to students in an academic setting, and allow each student to decide how they move forward. It is important that within my sessions, students see me as taking on an educational role as an "expert" of the genre, rather than assert Standard English's dominance by arguing against a student's writing style.

While working with a student, and developing an understanding of process and language, I attempt to do so through careful listening. This, in turn, helps to develop a relationship between the student and the writing center as a useful resource throughout their academic career. My thoughts on careful listening are derived from Tracy Santa's article, "Listening in/to the Writing Center: Backchannel and Gaze," which highlights the importance of nonverbal communication and listening skills for a writing center tutor. Santa references studies that demonstrate this importance, such as "experimental studies" in which "Kendon found that a listener's gaze upon a speaker is viewed by the speaker as a signal of undivided attention" (6). The simple act of looking at a student when speaking to them, or when the student is speaking, communicates attention, and thus deepens the relationship between tutor and student. Throughout a session, I remind myself to lift my head to look at the student as they are speaking, which demonstrates that I care about their answer. Santa references Kendon again, who found that "a speaker's upraised gaze served two functions: 1) to ascertain 'that he is being 'received'' and 2) to indicate that he is willing or interested in sharing the floor with the listener (77)" (6). When I speak with students about their work, and especially when I am asking questions about the student's particular choices in their writing, I look at them as they listen. This simple act is not only a gesture of respect and equality, but a true sign of listening. This, as a result, shows that I care about what they have to say, and this, I find, keeps students coming back.

It is my wish that students from all walks of life, with varying academic backgrounds and writing skill sets, make their way to the writing center to improve their writing. Students may stumble as they step inside, they may fail, but given the agency to speak and write in the language that they feel is best, I believe they will step into an easy stride, which becomes more and more familiar each time they return. And then, after their time in academia is over, they will have learned to run.

Works Cited

- Elbow, Peter. "Inviting the Mother Tongue: Beyond 'Mistakes,' 'Bad English,' and 'Wrong Language'." *The Journal of Advanced Composition*, 1999.
- Rose, Shirley. "All Writers Have More to Learn." *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner & Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, 59-62.
- Santa, Tracy. "Listening in/to the Writing Center: Backchannel and Gaze." *WLN*, 2016.

Appendix 3:
Writing Center Consultations with Graduate Assistants

These are the consulting questions related to Ethics and Professional Responsibility:

Consultant communicates respectfully and ethically with the student and others in the Center.

Poor: 4.2%

Good: 8.3%

Very Good: 20.8%

Excellent: 66.7%

Throughout the time when the student is in the Center, consultant demonstrates a professional disposition appropriate to their role and to the session.

Poor: 4.2%

Fair: 8.3%

Good: 8.3%

Very Good: 16.7%

Excellent: 62.5%

Consultant's practice shows that they value the diversity of student writers they work with (e.g., international students, non-neurotypical students, students who don't use standard edited American English, and so on).

Fair: 4.2%

Good: 8.3%

Very Good: 29.2%

Excellent: 58.3%

Appendix 4: Rubric and Results for Mentored Teaching Program (ENG 5502)

Evaluation Rubric

Using the rubric below, please rate the student as a candidate to teach ENG 1001 next fall. If the student did not participate in certain activities, please mark NA for “not applicable.” If you want to leave comments for each individual item, there are spaces for that.

Work Ethic

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Poor	Needs Improvement			Strong	Excellent

Comments:

Ability to Construct an Effective Lesson Plan

NA	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Poor	Needs Improvement			Strong	Excellent

Comments:

Ability to Facilitate Discussion and/or Direct Discussion-Based Activities

NA	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Poor	Needs Improvement			Strong	Excellent

Comments:

Ability to Craft Strong Writing Assignments

NA	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Poor	Needs Improvement			Strong	Excellent

Comments:

Ability to Respond to and Effectively Evaluate Student Writing

NA	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Poor	Needs Improvement			Strong	Excellent

Comments:

Ability to Adapt to Students' Needs and Challenges

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Poor	Needs Improvement			Strong	Excellent

Comments:

Overall Potential to be a Strong Teacher of ENG 1001

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Poor	Needs Improvement			Strong	Excellent

Comments:

Ratings of Mentored GAs from ENG5502, Spring 2022

Work Ethic

6, 6, 4 Mean: 5.3

Ability to Construct an Effective Lesson Plan

6, 6, 4 Mean: 5.3

Ability to Facilitate Discussion and/or Direct Discussion-Based Activities

6, 6, 4 Mean: 5.3

Ability to Craft Strong Writing Assignments

6, 6, NA Mean: 6

Ability to Respond to and Effectively Evaluate Student Writing

6, 6, NA Mean: 6

Ability to Adapt to Students' Needs and Challenges

5, 6, 4 Mean: 5

Overall Potential to be a Strong Teacher of ENG 1001

6, 6, 4 Mean: 5.3