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Campus Locations for Conference Activity

1343 Ellsworth Hall, Writing Center
Æbleskiver Cooking Lessons & Writing Center Pedagogy:
Collaboration across Generations, Cultures and Food (Thursday—5:00 until 7:00 p.m.)
Registration (Thursday—5:00 until 7:00 p.m.)
Silent Auction (Thursday—5:00 until 7:00 p.m.)
Idea Exchange Turn-In (Thursday—5:00 until 7:00 p.m.)

Schneider Hall
Breakfast Snacks (Friday and Saturday—8:00 a.m. until noon)
Registration (Friday—8:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. and Saturday—8:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.)
Concurrent Sessions (Friday—9:00 a.m. until 6:15 p.m. and Saturday 8:30 a.m. until 12:45 p.m.)
Silent Auction (Friday—9:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m.)
Idea Exchange Turn-in (Friday—8:00 a.m. until 6:30 p.m.)
Idea Exchange Pick-up (Saturday—8:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.)
Voting for New Board of Director Members (Friday—8:30 a.m. until 6:30 p.m.)
Board of Directors Meeting (Saturday—1:00 until 2:00 p.m.)

Bernhard Student Center
Buffet Lunch (Friday 12:00 noon until 1:45 p.m.)
Welcome
Luncheon Keynote Address
Conference News and Announcements
Buffet Dinner (Friday—6:45 until 9:00ish p.m.)
Tutor Award Presentation
Dinner Keynote Address
Board of Directors Election Results
Friday Night Silent Auction Pick-up
# Conference Schedule Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Day and Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening Session:</strong> Æbleskiver Cooking Lessons &amp; Writing Center Pedagogy: Collaboration across Generations, Cultures and Food</td>
<td>Thursday 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1343 Ellsworth Hall, Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Thursday 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1343 Ellsworth Hall, Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Auction (Schedule accommodations will be made for those who wish to participate but who have conflicts with these times. Talk to the staff at the registration desk.)</td>
<td>Thursday 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1343 Ellsworth Hall, Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Exchange Turn-In</td>
<td>Thursday 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1343 Ellsworth Hall, Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Exchange Pick-Up (Schedule accommodations will be made for those who wish to participate but who have conflicts with these times. Talk to the staff at the registration desk.)</td>
<td>Saturday 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Snacks (mini-bagels, pastries, coffee, tea)</td>
<td>Friday 8:00 a.m. to noon</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday 8:00 a.m. to noon</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Sessions 1 and 2</td>
<td>Friday 9:00 to 11:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffet Luncheon, Welcome, and Keynote Address</td>
<td>Friday 12:00 noon to 1:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Bernhard Center 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Sessions 3 through 5</td>
<td>Friday 2:00 to 6:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffet Dinner, Tutor Award Presentation, Keynote Workshop, Election Results, Silent Auction Pick-Up</td>
<td>Friday 6:45 to 9:00ish p.m.</td>
<td>Bernhard Center 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Sessions 6 through 8</td>
<td>Saturday 8:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors Meeting</td>
<td>Saturday 1:00 to 2:00ish p.m.</td>
<td>Schneider Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The East Central Writing Centers Association wishes to thank the following companies who donated money and products to ensure the success of our 33rd annual conference.

**The RiCH Company**

support@therichco.com  
888.348.6182

Please stop by the RichCo booth in the registration area to learn more about their writing center scheduling software, WCOnline 5.0, and the writing center journal they publish, *The Writing Lab Newsletter*.

**Utah State University Press**

http://www.usu.edu/usupress/

Conference discount order forms from Utah State University Press are available in the registration area along with sample copies of many of their books.

**Bedford/St. Martins**

http://www.bedfordstmartins.com/

Samples copies of Bedford/St. Martins books are available for review in the registration area. In addition, this company provided a number of copies of *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors* for distribution to tutors at the conference.

**Western Michigan University Bookstore**

Bernhard Center  
Kalamazoo, MI

The Western Michigan University Bookstore generously contributed 300 biodegradable bags for the conference.
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| Session 1. A | **Assessment of How to Begin Sessions Through Inquiry: The Practical Application of VARK**  
Amanda M. May and Beth Koenigsknecht, Writing Consultants, Writing Center  
Central Michigan University – Mt. Pleasant, MI |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1140</td>
<td>Niel Fleming developed the VARK Learning Styles Inventory based on four sensory modes of information in-take and output: Visual, Aural, Read/Write, and Kinesthetic. Designed to help students find efficient learning methods, VARK can also help consultants apply learning styles paradigms in consultations. In our interactive session, we will provide brief background about VARK, survey participants about their consultation initiation practices, and explore how consultants can begin sessions with questions that serve as icebreakers and reveal aspects of students’ learning styles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 1. B | **Self-Assessment: The Dangers and the Challenges**  
Nicole Trobaugh, Intern, Melanie Smith, Consultant, and Leigh Ann Meyer, Director, The Writing Center  
Indiana University Southeast – New Albany, IN |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1160</td>
<td>University writing centers are concerned with the efficacy of their services. In this presentation, we will share our attempts to measure the improvement in writing skills demonstrated by students who attend consultations in our writing center, as opposed to students who revise without writing center consultations. The goal of our presentation is to reveal how self-assessment is always a danger and a challenge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 1. C | **Using the Principles of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) to Tutor Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders at the Collegiate Level**  
Ellen Geib, Consultant, Writing Center  
Cedarville University – Cedarville, OH |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1220</td>
<td>As the number of students who have Autism Spectrum Disorders increases, writing tutors need insights into these disorders and strategies for best working with individuals who exhibit them. Therefore, this presentation will address how tutors can use Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA), specifically the ABA principles of routine, directness, and individualization, while working with writers who have Autism Spectrum Disorders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 1. C | **Mandatory Visits to the Writing Center: Bane or Blessing?**  
Emilie Lavallee, Writing Center Consultant, Writing Center  
Cedarville University – Cedarville, OH |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1220</td>
<td>Some professors encourage students to visit writing centers, while others require visits. In our presentation, I will unpack the professors’ choices, will explore popular views on this debate in the writing center community, and will present original research about mandatory writing center visits (interviews with professors and student reaction papers written after students’ required visits) as I argue that, while required visits can have negative effects, the benefits of such visits outweigh the negatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session 1. D
**Room 1320**

**Blank Stares and Plans for Revision: Why Students Don’t “Get” It**

Maureen Di Virgilio and Sean Duffie, Writing Consultants  
Fred Meijer Center for Writing and Michigan Authors  
Grand Valley State University – Allendale, MI

We will apply language learning theory to students’ revision processes by sharing research that follows student writing from conception to consultations to the final piece of writing. We will explore examples of meaning negotiations that have and haven’t worked in consultations and will share self-evaluation checks consultants can use to gauge whether or not students understand revision plans developed during consultations. Our session will ultimately suggest ways consultants can translate the academic writing process into a functional second language for writers.

### Session 1. E
**Room 1330**

**Shame on You; Maybe Not: Customizing Critical Feedback**

Matthew R. Willits, Colleen Reimer  
and Shane Swoverland, Writing Consultants, Writing Center  
Indiana University Purdue University at Fort Wayne  
Fort Wayne, IN

How can writing consultants shift communication strategies when expectations about “being polite” are not shared? In this session the presenters will lead activities that demonstrate the complexities of using mitigation strategies—techniques for offering suggestions that don’t sound too “directive” or judgmental, especially in terms of politeness and humor—as a means of helping participants develop greater understanding and flexibility with diverse writers.

### Session 1. F
**Room 1340**

**More Than a Story: Helping Students Improve Historical Understanding in Writing Center Consultations**

Samantha Steele, Consultant,  
Writing Center and Research Assistant, Department of History  
William Watson, Graduate Assistant, Department of History  
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

This workshop will help writing center staff members from all disciplines better understand many of the common problems students struggle with while writing history papers and will provide insights about how to help students improve their writing of history papers along with their overall understanding of the craft of history.
| Session 1. G | The High School Writing Center Goes to College: Gaining Academic Acceptance for High School Writing Centers  
Kyle Krol, Director  
Kody Buchino, Alex Reinke, Alyssa Doorlag, Tutors  
Writing Center, Mattawan High School – Mattawan, MI  
In this session, consultants will discuss how issues of rigor and academic integrity have come up as writing center students have applied to universities. The panel will discuss the issues they have faced during the admission process, the negative perceptions about high school writing centers, and how this affects the image and effectiveness of the high school writing center. |
| --- | --- |
| Room 1280 | One Consultant or Two? How Tag-teaming Can Be Successful in the High-School Writing Center  
Kyle Misak, John vanShaik, Jason Barber, and Coleman Wilson, Tutors  
Writing Center, Mattawan High School – Mattawan, MI  
In this session, consultants will discuss their research findings regarding how pairing two consultants with one client is more effective than one consultant alone. They will discuss the setup for their research, their findings, and the most ideal approach for various situations. Take part in these high school students’ first experience with an original research project geared at improving their high school writing center. |
| Session 1. H | Two Centers, One Goal: Advising in the Written and Spoken Word  
Tyler Hall, Writing Advisor, Writing Center  
Wittenberg University – Springfield, OH  
Drawing in part from recent work of Sheridan and Inman (2010), this session will analyze the work and roles of a writing center advisor and an oral communication consultant—two roles the presenter transfers between. The presentation will focus on similarities between the two roles and the differences. |
| Room 2345 | Ready? Using Our First Sessions for Self-Assessment  
Rebecca Price, Writing Advisor, Writing Center  
Wittenberg University – Springfield, OH  
Advisors’ first session with a client can be a means of assessing how well the advisors will do for the rest of their time in a writing center. This presentation will narrate one first session and consider how it continues to affect the advisor; in addition, session participants will be asked to consider ways their own first sessions continue to impact them and how those insights may influence advisor (or tutor or consultant) training. |
Open-Source Alternatives to Commercial Scheduling Programs:  
Part One of a Featured Two-Part Workshop

Doug Dangler, Associate Director, Tom A’Hearn, Writing Center
Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

Julie L. Moore, Director, Writing Center
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

Dianna Baldwin, Associate Director, Writing Center
Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

This presentation will explore how different writing centers have used PHPScheduleit, a free, open-source program. We will cover how PHPScheduleit can enable clients to schedule and manage their own appointments, can be housed securely on university servers, and can be modified to fit the needs of individual writing centers. We will detail how we modified PHPScheduleit for writing center use and used resulting data for administrative reports; will explore the cost-saving benefits of this scheduler as well as the daily interactions, positive and negative, of tutors and clients to PHPScheduleit; and will outline the logistics of and need for a writing center consortium to allow sharing of modified code. Participants will work in a computer lab to gain hands-on experience and insights about PHPScheduleit and the need for writing centers to collaborate on solutions to our computerized scheduling and data collection problems and needs.
| Session 2. A | Room 1140 | *Communicating Across Borders: Consulting ESL Students Online*  
Alexander F. Grabski, Tamanna Mostafa and Bo Ram Lee, Consultants, Writing Center  
Central Michigan University – Mt. Pleasant, MI  
Asynchronous online sessions can be tricky, but working with ESL students in such sessions becomes even trickier because verbal and physical cues cannot help clarify the communication. In our session, we will investigate ways to communicate clearly with ESL students online, focusing on comment types, use of language, and best practices. We will engage participants in focused discussion of working with ESL students online by exploring different experiences consultants have had with ESL students in general. |
| Session 2. B | Room 1160 | *The SOAP Note: A Cleaner Approach to the Assessment of Writing*  
Jeffrey Russ, Faculty Tutor, Richard Marshall, Director, Writing Lab  
University of Indianapolis – Indianapolis, IN  
How can medical assessment techniques be applied to student writing and help guide tutors in writing centers? In this presentation, we will discuss and show examples of how the medical documentation system, the SOAP Note (Subjective, Objective, Assessment, and Plan), can be utilized in writing centers as a way to give tutors a formalized approach to assessment and can offer writers a more complete and thoughtful take home message. |
| Session 2. C | Room 1220 | *Collaboration, Focus, and Momentum: a Study in Fruitful Assessment*  
Kellie Roblin, Coordinator, and Sarah Slachter, Professional Tutor  
Language Arts Tutorial Lab  
Grand Rapids Community College – Grand Rapids, MI  
To improve services that optimize opportunities for students to become successful writers, writing support program assessment must be carried out at multiple levels and the assessment results must be integrated into a complete, candid picture of services. In this workshop, we will outline multiple levels and areas for comprehensive assessment, will discuss the difficulties in carrying out such a comprehensive assessment, and will make suggestions for designing a step-wise, multi-year assessment process. |
| Session 2. D | Room 1280 | *Notes of a Writing Center Consultant: What My Learning Disabled Students Have Taught Me about the Writing Process*  
Caroline Le, Writing Center Consultant, Writing Center  
Beacon College – Leesburg, FL  
In the Writing Center at Beacon College, the only accredited four-year college in the country exclusively for students with learning disabilities, we approach college-level writing in a manner similar to writing centers in other higher education institutions. In addition, our consultants also practice unique strategies to engage our unique student population with individualized dialogue and a dissection of the communication process. In this session I will demonstrate how writing centers everywhere can benefit student and consultant experiences by using assistive technology and other strategies we employ. |
| Session 2. E | **A Fall for Fellows: Creating and Assessing a Writing Fellows Program**  
**Mike Mattison**, Director, and **Tyler Hall**,  
**Elizabeth Keri** and **Laura McLaughlin**, Writing Advisors  
**Writing Center**  
Wittenberg University – Springfield, OH  
Writing fellows programs are becoming popular in writing centers, and this session will analyze the creation of a writing fellows program, detailing the early goals of the Wittenberg Writing Center and then assessing how well we met those goals. Our presentation will draw on responses from faculty members, student writers, and fellows involved in the program and, thus, its assessment. |
| --- | --- |
| Session 2. F | **Read before You Write: The Intersections of Reading and Writing in Appointment Tutoring**  
**Caitie O’Neill and Jason Harrod**, Tutors, **Writing Center**  
University of Michigan at Flint – Flint, MI  
How can tutors help students who do not understand what they have read but must write papers based on their reading? In this session we will explore strategies for helping writers build reading skills, and we will do so by focusing on the same skills tutors use to read students writing. |
| Session 2. G | **Looking at LOCs with ESL Writers**  
**Marian Woyciehowicz Gonsior**, Writing Center Specialist  
Writing Center, Madonna University – Livonia, MI  
Confused about how to help English as a Second Language (ESL) learners with lower order concerns without abandoning the traditional writing center focus on more global issues? In this presentation we will provide solid strategies for tutors wanting to offer better assistance to ESL students who say, “Just check my grammar.” |
| Session 2. H | **Considering the Tensions of Assessing Writer Collaborations in the Writing Center**  
**Marilee Brooks-Gillies**, Elena Adkins Garcia, **Katie Marie Gunter**,  
and **Shari J. Wolke**, Graduate Writing Consultants, **Writing Center**  
Michigan State University – East Lansing, MI  
Writing center work often extends beyond one-on-one consulting, and the farther away our work is from this focus, the more difficult assessment becomes. Our roundtable will start with a discussion of how to assess graduate writing groups when there is the potential for tension and even conflict of interest. The goal for the presentation is to enlighten those who strive to deplete tension found in the writing center |
| Session 2. I | Using Assessment for Sustainability: Strategies for Staying Effective in a Volatile Economic Environment  
Maureen McBride, Interim Director, and Thomas Wade Brown  
University Writing Center  
University of Nevada, Reno – Reno, NV  
Writing centers must attend to short-term, practical assessments that produce measurable results for such audiences as consultants, writers, center leadership, and institutional decision makers. We’ve found a balance of assessment measures that produce tangible data for our various constituencies. We will share how we identified areas that provide us immediate data and allow for a feedback loop and possible behavioral change and will discuss our use of consultant observations, immediate consultant feedback, follow-up consultant observations, consumer satisfaction surveys, consultation summaries, and demographic data based on usage. |
|---|---|
| Session 2. J | Words to Tell the Story: Assessment Reporting of Writing Center Learning as (Imperfect) Narrative  
Scott Hendrix, Director of Writing, Steve Dudas and Chelsea Marsh, Writing Center Consultants  
Writing Center, Albion College – Albion, MI  
How can we capture the impact of writing center work on student learning? We will share one way to do so. In our session we will review data from a pilot assessment project that compares session reports written by student consultants with follow-up interviews about the sessions while focusing on the following assessment goals: testing the validity of brief session reports, checking for learning outcomes that may be overlooked, and enriching our understanding of the complex writing and learning work that occurs in writing center consulting sessions. |

Generalist Tutoring in Practice: Using Heuristics to Promote Reflectiveness about the Writing Process in Our Clients  
Jessica Winck, Graduate Assistant  
Eastern Michigan University – Ypsilanti, MI  
During this presentation, I will review how tutor training materials address the promotion of metacognition about composing in our clients. I will share how I used the sources to generate heuristics and to document the results of using the heuristics with clients. I will also call for scholars in our field to rethink some of the field’s assumptions about training new tutors to help clients think reflectively and will discuss concrete strategies and heuristics that can assist in helping students’ increased metacognition about writing. |
## Session 2. K

**Room 2325**

**Open-Source Alternatives to Commercial Scheduling Programs: Part Two of a Featured Two-Part Workshop**

**Doug Dangler, Associate Director, Tom A’Hearn, Writing Center**
Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

**Julie L. Moore, Director, Writing Center**
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

**Dianna Baldwin, Associate Director, Writing Center**
Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

This presentation will explore how different writing centers have used PHPScheduleit, a free, open-source program. We will cover how PHPScheduleit can enable clients to schedule and manage their own appointments, can be housed securely on university servers, and can be modified to fit the needs of individual writing centers. We will detail how we modified Phpscheduleit for writing center use and used resulting data for administrative reports; will explore the cost-saving benefits of this scheduler as well as the daily interactions, positive and negative, of tutors and clients to PHPScheduleit; and will outline the logistics of and need for a writing center consortium to allow sharing of modified code. Participants will work in a computer lab to gain hands-on experience and insights about PHPScheduleit and the need for writing centers to collaborate on solutions to our computerized scheduling and data collection problems and needs.

## Session 2. L

**Room 2335**

**Increasing Rhetorical Awareness and Self-Esteem Through Resumes: A Writing Center and TRiO Student Success Program (SSP) Collaboration**

**Amber Gill, Academic Mentor, Heidi Jimenez, TRiO SSP Student**

**Charlotte Giscombe, TRiO SSP Director**

**Randy Ott, Director, Center for Academic Success Program**

**Marcus Johnson, Writing Center Assistant Director, Writing Center**

**Rachel Neubauer, Writing Consultant, Writing Center**
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

In 1964 when Lyndon Johnson established the TRiO programs to help first-generation college students successfully negotiate the higher education landscape, tutoring and peer mentoring were part of the TRiO recipe for success. Fourteen years later, in 1978, when the East Central Writing Centers Association held its first conference, many writing center staff at that event were also concerned about mentoring first-generation writers. Drawing on common ground in these two strong tutoring traditions, our TRiO Student Success Program and Writing Center currently collaborate to help first-generation freshmen learn about resume writing. Far more than a template-based activity, this collaboration focuses on building student self-esteem, increasing students’ rhetorical abilities, and planting seeds of awareness about potential futures. Presenters in this session will discuss why Writing Center and TRiO Student Success Program staff decided to collaborate on resumes rather than academic writing, will review how the program fought accusations of “duplicating services,” will showcase the assignment that drives the collaboration, will focus on the impact the collaboration is having on a current TRiO freshman and a senior, and will facilitate activities to help participants learn the resume writing strategies that make writing center sessions such a key part of efforts to help TRiO students, and others, increase rhetorical awareness and self-esteem while engaged in resume/vita writing.
| Session 2. M Room 2345 | **Save the Drama for Your Mama: Interpersonal Relationships in the Writing Center**  
Alyssa McBride, Sera Mazahem, Maya Mazahem, Kelsie Mead, Jake Brininger and Alyssa Doorlag, Tutors, Writing Center  
Mattawan High School – Mattawan, MI  
We will delve into the murky waters of interpersonal relationships within the writing center, focusing on sibling rivalry, working with exes, and working with consultants who were once clients. Such issues may function in any center, so we welcome participants from all levels to hear our relationship stories, insights, and strategies. We will discuss how the high school structure can amplify relationship issues and will ask participants to share their relationship dramas and to brainstorm strategies for dealing with such issues. |

|  | **Working Well with Writing: The Importance of Having a Writing Center Staff that Works Well Together**  
Stephanie Wiley, Drew Sanford, Sarah McLaughlin, Bri Tullis and Kiana Elami, Tutors, Writing Center  
Mattawan High School – Mattawan, MI  
Our writing center’s success is closely connected to how well our large staff works together. In this session we will focus on how we have achieved and maintain our close bond and how our differences, as tutors and people, complement one another. We will talk about how our bonds help us accomplish such staff collaborations as workshops, whole class tutoring sessions, and presentations and will help participants share snapshots of their writing center work as a way to consider how well their staff works together. |
FRIDAY LUNCHEON BUFFET
12:00 noon to 1:45 p.m.

BERNHARD CENTER BANQUET HALL (3RD FLOOR)

Welcome to the 33rd East Central Writing Centers Association Conference, Western Michigan University, and Kalamazoo
Tim Greene, Provost
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

Lessons Learned: Reflections on the Future
Eileen Evans, Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
Former Western Michigan University Writing Center Director
Former ECWCA Conference Host
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

Taking Care of Business: What’s New for ECWCA?
Kim Ballard, Director, Writing Center
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

ECWCA’s Newsletter
Anthony Garrison, Assistant Director, Writing Center
Kent State University – Kent, OH
## Session 3. A

**Room 1140**

### What Writing Centers Really Value: Applying Dynamic Criteria Mapping to Writing Center Work

**Scott Sands, Graduate Assistant Coordinator of Writing Assistance**  
**Julia N. Visor Academic Center**  
Illinois State University – Normal, IL

Although Dynamic Criteria Mapping (DCM) has been used with various kinds of writing programs, no DCM research has been published about writing centers or even discussed on the *WCenter* listserv many writing center staff members read. Because DCM has tremendous potential to help writing center staff members explicate a particular center’s values and to inform the way its tutors and administrators shape their work, I will explore DCM implementation in writing centers during this workshop and presentation. Participants should leave with a clear understanding of DCM and with ideas about how DCM may become part of their assessment plans.

## Session 3. B

**Room 1160**

### Assessing our Connections: Bringing Writing Tutors and Teachers Together Regarding Assessment Strategies

**Megan Schoen, Graduate Student Tutor, Writing Lab**  
Purdue University – West Lafayette, IN

As a writing lab tutor serving as a liaison between our lab and our university’s first-year composition program, I hear instructors’ and tutors’ views about assessment. Drawing on that experience and research, I will share strategies that can generate productive dialogue between writing center tutors and introductory composition instructors about assessment strategies.

## Session 3. C

**Room 1220**

### When Words Fail: Creating New Ways to Engage Writers

**Tammy McCoy, Writing Consultant, Writing Center**  
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne – Fort Wayne, IN

For six years of college, I never once used the writing center; it didn’t fit my full-time work and school schedule. What could have motivated me to use any writing center resource? Possibly the interactive, web-based learning resource I will discuss in this session as a potential tool for reaching students like me.

### Writing Consultants: Are We Counselors, Midwives, or Models?

**Amber Arnold, Writing Consultant, Writing Center**  
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne – Fort Wayne, IN

Writing center scholars, such as Ryan and Zimmerelli, Harris, and Pistone, have proposed metaphors that best represent the diverse roles consultants take on during the consultation process. In this session, I will present six metaphors—editor, writing expert, coach, commentator, midwife, and model—and will discuss when each metaphoric role may be more appropriate than others, the benefits of each, and possible conflicts inherent with each. By being aware of the different metaphors consultants take on and incorporate into their consultation practices, consultants can become more responsive to student writers and can get at “what works” with more flexibility. Participants in the session will be able to practice different metaphors in mock consultations and to discuss that experience.
### Session 3. D
**Room 1280**

*The Theatrics of the Writing Center*
Laura Kay, Writing Advisor, Writing Center  
Wittenberg University – Springfield, OH

Writing centers are very theatrical places. As advisors and writers, we are all performers, and we can benefit from rehearsal of our roles. Though this workshop, participants will engage in improvisation exercises in order to examine how they might play into writing center work.

### Session 3. E
**Room 1320**

*Creative Assessment: Tutoring Creative Writers in the Center*
Kirsten McIlvenna and Rachel Schienke, Tutors, Writing Center  
Saginaw Valley State University – Saginaw, MI

In our session, we will draw on surveys of introductory and upper-level creative writers, along with case studies, to explore some of the key issues involved with working with creative writers in the writing center. We will also provide strategies for tutoring writers as they work with poetry, prose, and nonfiction.

### Session 3. F
**Room 1330**

*I like your paper a lot*: How Specific Feedback Strengthens Papers and Writers Alike
Allie Oosta and Carly Crookston, Lead Writing Consultants  
Katie Phelan and Rori Hoatlin, Writing Consultants  
Fred Meijer Center for Writing and Michigan Authors  
Grand Valley State University – Grand Rapids, MI

Because writers in non-academic contexts generally develop some sort of signature style and repeatedly re-use structures, we believe students should learn how to give specific, positive feedback toward the goal of defining a personalized style. We also believe writing consultants should learn to give specific, positive feedback and should learn to teach writers to do the same. As students and tutors alike learn to identify successful aspects of writing, they can focus on more than fixing negative issues and can move toward the goal of making better writers, not just improving individual papers. In this workshop, we will introduce our research that supports the above ideas and will facilitate a discussion about ways to integrate our findings into writing center pedagogy and practice by encouraging participants to apply specific techniques to student examples.

### Session 3. G
**Room 1340**

*Designing Spaces, Mapping Disciplines: Toward Better Collaboration between Writing Centers and Libraries*
Jennifer Torreano, Writing Consultant  
Fred Meijer Center for Writing and Michigan Authors  
Grand Valley State University – Allendale, MI

During this session, we will engage in a discussion about the logistics of writing center and library collaboration, including the design and use of physical spaces. We will also spend a portion of the session devising low-cost ways to implement writing center and library collaboration into existing spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3. H</th>
<th>A Research Team in the Writing Center: Self-Discovery through Self-Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1350</td>
<td>Matthew Fledderjohann, Research Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenny Abercrombie, Martina Mihelcova, Jennifer Finstrom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessica Block, Laura Brady, and Lisa Lenoir, Writing Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Center for Writing-based Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DePaul University – Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By establishing a research team, DePaul’s University Center for Writing-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based Learning has expanded the role of tutors while advancing pedago-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gical self-assessment and developing a deeper, more critical understand-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ing of a writing center’s effectiveness. The presenters will share how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this writing center has been an effective tool for students, and will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explore the possibility of new voices within the peer writing tutor dis-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3. I</th>
<th>Christina Davidson, Intern, and Katelyn Wilkinson, Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1360</td>
<td>Writing Center, Indiana University Southeast – New Albany, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This presentation explores how writing centers are using consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guides to expand their services to incorporate the ability in consul-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tation across the disciplines. It includes a discussion of how The In-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dian University Southeast Writing Center is currently implementing a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consultant guide for writing across the disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“To Everything Turn, Turn, Turn”:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitioning Between Semesters in the High School Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austin Sabin, Yasmeen Farran, Joe Eddington, and Joe Sonnevil, Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Center, Mattawan High School - Mattawan, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this session, veteran high school writing center consultants will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>team up with new consultants to discuss the changing dynamics that are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associated with transitioning semesters. The panel will focus on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>differences in training and how structures change between semesters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 3. J
Room 2335

Should Writing Tutors Play the Part of Psychologist?

Curtis Scheck and Rachel Nordhoff, Tutors, Writing Center
Kent State University – Kent, OH

Many student writers come to the writing center with a great deal of stress and frustration, some even on the verge of tears. In this session, the presenters will focus on how tutors can approach and assess sessions with highly emotional students. We will begin by sharing the problems of dealing with stressed, frustrated, angry, and/or crying student writers, will share a role-playing demonstration, and will facilitate discussion covering the difficulty of predicting which students are likely to lose control and how important it is to establish a rapport early on to ease students and make them feel comfortable. Finally, we’ll invite session participants to discuss experiences, challenges and best practices related to our topic of helping distraught students in the writing center.

SAILS: Information Literacy Assessment and the Writing Center?

Dianna Sachs, Instructional Services Librarian
Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI

The Internet and e-information explosion have greatly impacted the researching and writing that function at the heart of writing centers and academic libraries. Both of these literacy education units have also been drawn toward large-scale program assessment as a means of contextualizing decisions and improving services, and, in many institutions of higher learning, both units have been required by administrative leadership to provide assessment data. The presenter in this session will discuss such an assessment project recently begun at Western Michigan University. The SAILS (Standard Assessment of Information Literacy) assessment tool offers many attractions to academic libraries, but the tool is not flawless. The presenter in this session will offer an overview of SAILS, covering why she and her colleagues selected it and what flaws they noticed. In addition, she will engage session participants in brainstorming activities about how SAILS and/or insights drawn from SAILS data can be used by writing centers and librarians to help their operations and, ultimately, to help the researchers and writers the units serve.

Session 3. K
Room 2345

Ethics in the Writing Center: Shades of Gray?

Laura Citino, Assistant Director, Ashley Hartfik, Owen Horton and Jason Elkins, Writing Consultants, Writing Center
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

Presenters in this workshop will help participants consider the many ethical choices writing center consultants and directors face on a daily basis and will offer ways to appropriately and consistently view ethical decision-making. After a brief introduction, we will share frequently raised ethical considerations that occur in writing centers, including some dilemmas that may seem cut-and-dry on the surface, and will workshop our way to determining the consistency of ethical decision-making tempered by flexibility. Participants will leave the workshop with copies of our scenarios, multiple perspectives on and approaches for each scenario, a heightened awareness of ethical considerations and liabilities that can occur in writing centers, and a greater appreciation of consistent and appropriate ethical reactions in our work.
**The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Tutor Evaluation of Students in the Writing Center**  
Stephanie Monsanty, Lead Tutor, and Alecia Bencze, Tutor, Writing Center  
University of Mount Union – Alliance, OH

Our presentation is based on research, or assessment, of the language tutors in our center use in their session reports, and we believe our results can be of use to others. We believe writing center tutors deal with the evaluation of students and their writing—a form of assessment—on a daily basis. Some student writers openly ask for evaluative comments from their tutors; for others, such comments can be harmful to the point of discouraging them from returning. Tutors in our writing center learn to never evaluate students or their writing during a session, regardless of whether that evaluation would be positive or negative. However, as session report forms reveal, tutors do use evaluative language to talk about students and their work. In order to explore the nature of tutor evaluation of student writers in our center, we conducted a study of the language used in session report forms throughout the fall semester and researched how the issue of tutor evaluation has been dealt with at other writing centers. From our findings, we gained a better understanding of how peer tutors relate to other students during tutoring sessions. In addition to exploring that insight, we will also share the methodology of our study and will offer recommendations about the use of evaluative language.

**Teacher Versus Employer: When the Tutor Trainer is not the Writing Center Director**  
Jaclyn M. Wells, Assistant Professor, Department of English  
University of Southern Indiana – Evansville, IN

In this presentation I will discuss benefits and pitfalls that arise when the tutor trainer is not the writing center director. I will draw on my experience as a tutor trainer and will offer advice for how tutor trainers and writing center directors can collaborate effectively.

**How Do You Think You Did?: Involving Tutors in Self-Assessment and Peer-Assessment During OWL Training**  
Diana Awad Scrocco, Assistant Director, Writing Center  
Kent State University – Kent, OH

In this presentation, I report the results of a survey of peer tutors’ perceptions of an assessment activity during their email OWL training process. The survey attempts to answer the following research question: What do tutors believe they learned from an OWL certification activity that required them to assess their own and another tutor’s simulated OWL response? I conclude that these tutors are better prepared for OWL work than previously trained tutors who only received assessment from a writing center administrator because this assessment activity involved these tutors in active, reflective evaluation of what produces a successful OWL response.
Our writing center has been hesitant to introduce online tutoring for fear of disrupting the best practices we have developed through the years - focusing on writers rather than texts and ideas rather than errors. We set up an online writing center, affectionately known as UWC Zonline, designed to keep the emphasis on one-on-one interaction and conversation between tutor and writer while using technology as a medium but not an integral part of the synchronous tutorial. In the ideal Zonline tutorial, the student and tutor would meet in an online meeting room using Adobe Acrobat Connect Pro and webcams for a real-time conversation about the student’s draft. The technology would require minimum effort and know-how from the student. Both tutor and writer would be able to see and hear each other clearly with little to no lag, and the student would be in control of the draft at all times with the tutor being able to watch via desktop-sharing, as the student made revisions to the draft. Six months into the pilot, the online sessions have all seemed successful to varying degrees although almost none of the sessions have conformed to the ideal. In this presentation, I will examine the differences between expectation and reality to grapple with questions of how to define success in a tutoring session, a pilot, or a writing center. I’ll share preliminary data from the Zonline pilot in order to assess what aspects of the pilot are and are not working, as well as the benefits and limitations of conducting online tutoring sessions in real time. As an added bonus, participants will enjoy the online experience of a distance presentation, as my recently broken leg and a helpful Western Michigan University assistant will allow this presentation to occur while I am in Indianapolis and you’re all in Kalamazoo.
| Session 4. A | Room 1140 | As Time Goes on: Working with Writers Again and Again  
Catherine Stipe, Leigh Hastings and Devoni Murphy, Writing Advisors  
Writing Center  
Wittenberg University – Springfield, OH |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When our writing center began scheduling more recurring sessions, we realized that such a change might complicate the peer relationship, as described by Bruffee (1984). For example, what are the levels of responsibility for the writer and the advisor in a recurring relationship? Who decides what to work on for each session? And, what role does the professor (or her comments) play in such sessions, given the extended time frame? Auten and Pasterkiewicz (2007) discuss the teacher as “the third voice” in writing center sessions, and in this presentation we will consider whether that voice becomes more pronounced over time. In addition, we consider whether recurring session should be assessed differently than one-time sessions, and whether we should look at each session individually or as part of a larger collection? Finally, since advisors often learn of a paper’s grade during their time with the recurring writer, how should that grade reflect on the work done in the sessions? We will draw upon our individual experiences working with writers over the 2010 fall semester to address these and other questions and to ask session participants to consider their own work with writers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 4. B | Room 1160 | Using Objectives as an Internal Assessment  
Jane Brandstatter, Coordinator, Louis Noakes, Tia Wilson, Donna Courtney,  
Christine Ajayi, and Chuck Allen, Consultants, Writing Center  
Southwestern Michigan College – Dowagiac, MI |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New writing centers often face common challenges, including needing to prove the value of our work to faculty. To address this concern at our college, we decided that specialized training would be the most beneficial way to demonstrate our credibility and to assess the skills of new and professional tutors. Therefore, we used the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) benchmarks to develop a standard of training. Among many benefits, the CRLA certification process allows our coordinator to exhibit to faculty, staff, and administration that consultants are specifically trained in a variety of writing abilities, processes, and genres. Consultants are also able to assess their own growth from the specific trainings and during consultations. In this presentation, we will facilitate a panel discussion on the importance of developing and assessing a consultant training program. We will also discuss how to use CRLA trainings to expand consultants' skills (which may carry over into the consultant’s own academic or professional activities), while also developing relationships with faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 4. C | Room 1350 | Assessing Cognitive Overload: Avoiding Shutdown  
Mark A. Thomas, Christopher Griffin, Sara Beining and Tanikwa McGhee, Writing Consultants, Writing Center  
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne – Fort Wayne, IN |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We’ve all seen the glazed-over eyes of a writer who was unprepared for the amount of information that we provided them. Overwhelming our clients’ mental limits can lead to the state known as “cognitive overload.” In this presentation, we will consider how an understanding of cognitive overload can enable us to be better writing consultants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Session 4. D
### Room 1280

**Assessing High School Writing Centers: What We Can Do and How We Can Do It**  
**Kim Samuels, Tutor, Writing Center**  
Saginaw Valley State University – Saginaw, MI

During this presentation we will discuss the necessity of writing centers on high school campuses and the ongoing progress of the SVSU Writing Center and Saginaw Bay Writing Project in support of these centers. The session will include one example of a model for setting up a high school writing center and conclude with a group discussion of how to get such a center designed, supported, and sustained over the long term.

## Session 4. E
### Room 1320

**Contributions Unseen: Undergraduate Tutors and RAD Research in the Writing Center**  
**Dana L. Driscoll, Assistant Professor in Writing and Rhetoric**  
**Sherry Perdue, Director, Writing Center**  
**Jacob Matthews, Consultant, Writing Center**  
Oakland University – Rochester, MI

Research demonstrates the professionalization opportunities for tutors in the writing center (Barr, 1999; Kail, Gillespie, and Hughes, 2009), but few discussions talk about the place of undergraduates in engaging in research that Haswell (2005) would call “RAD,” or “replicable, aggregable, and data supported.” Our three panelists argue that undergraduate tutors should be actively contributing to our understanding of research-supported tutoring practices. Presenter one will discuss issues of assignment design, mentoring, IRB work, and avenues for students to make their work visible as well as the role tutor training courses can play in encouraging undergraduates to engage in writing center research. Presenter two will share how she encourages student research that responds to problems tutors identify and how tutor perspectives shape her own research agenda. Presenter three will share his original, ongoing research, which uses a mixed method, quasi-experimental design to examine the ability of the writing center to assist students with strong writing anxiety. He will also discuss the experience of designing an experiment, gaining IRB approval, and executing the study as an undergraduate student.

## Session 4. F
### Room 1330

**Voices of ESL Writers**  
**Sara Vander Bie, Instructor**  
Center for English Language and Culture for International Students  
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

In this session I will review the insights of non-native speaking student writers in response to a 2009 study I conducted in my role as an instructor in a multi-level English literacy program, which prepares international students for academic success in U.S. universities. I will cover such topics as student motivations and goals when writing, student preferred feedback style, and student attitudes about revision. Finally, I will facilitate a discussion of how the insights I offer can help writing center personnel work with non-native speaking writers, especially those who are international students.
| Session 4. G | **Queer Consulting: Assessing the Degree to Which Differences Affect a Writing Consultation**  
Jon Rylander, Graduate Student, Lucy Manley, International Programs Specialist  
Curtis Dickerson and Chelsea Milligan, Undergraduate Consultants  
**Howe Writing Center**  
Miami University – Miami, OH |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1340</td>
<td>To what degree should a tutor “out” his or herself during a consulting session? In <em>Facing the Center: Toward an Identity Politics of One-To-One Mentoring</em>, Harry C. Denny discusses the unique situations LGBTQ-identifying tutors face when presented with papers that deal with issues of queer politics, such as topics of same sex marriage and the workplace rights of transgendered individuals. Often, “other-identifying” tutors are faced with either helping students with an argument the tutor is fundamentally opposed to or outing his or herself to the student and facing possible hostility. When we examine the word “queer,” we do not merely mean sexuality, although that is a component. Other outing factors, such as politics, religion, and class also play a role. Our aim is to engage in a discussion to which there may be no answer. The presenters have all been challenged in some way with the notion of the appropriateness of revealing who we are and what we believe, and we will share our experiences with an instance of either sexual, political, religious, socio-economic, or cultural differences between a student and a consultant, followed by a dialogue with the audience to explore these issues in more depth. Feedback from session attendees will be vital to the success of our panel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Session 4. H | **Slaying the Unicorn with a Double-Edged Sword**  
OR Exploring Myths of Text and of Interaction in the Writing Center: Part One of a Two-Part Workshop |
| Room 1220 | **Trixie Smith, Director, Writing Center**  
Lamiyah Bahrainwala, Dianna Baldwin, Barbra Elenbaas, Elena Adkins Garcia, Ben Goodwin, Marilee Brooks-Gillies, James Jackson, Beth Keller, John Lauckner, Cari Ross, and Michelle Trumble, Graduate Consultants, Writing Center  
**Michigan State University** – East Lansing, MI |
| | In our two-part roundtable session, we will explore myths about the work of writing centers that are centered around both texts and interactions with people. We will first explore these myths in facilitated small groups; then each group will have the chance to present their main discussion points. Finally, we will ask participants to look for connections and intersections across groups and myths. The text-based myths we will examine (and maybe slay) in the first half of this two-part workshop include the following: |
| | - We don’t do grammar.  
- We must know a technology to help clients compose with it.  
- We must know a discipline to help clients compose in it.  
- We guarantee clients will receive better grades after a WC session.  
- There is a perfect text for each assignment.  
- We don’t theorize our work. |
Teri Horton, Director of College Writing  
Baker College of Port Huron – Port Huron, MI |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1360</td>
<td>How can writing centers encourage students to assess their own writing if tutors do all the evaluating? The role of writing centers is to produce students who are autonomous, and capable of self-assessment. Writing center tutors must help students develop the critical thinking skills necessary to evaluate their own writing, and become independent and effective writers. This workshop will help writing center directors and supervisors design role-playing activities that will help tutors become more intentional about teaching self-assessment skills to students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 4. J | **Help Me Help You: Representing Writing Center Work in Numerically Significant Ways to Administrative Decision-Makers**  
Adrien Lowery, Director, Writing Center  
Azusa Pacific University – Azusa, CA |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 2145</td>
<td>This highly pragmatic workshop acknowledges that many budgetary decisions about academic support services like writing centers are based on assessment data. From the first day I founded my university’s writing center, our tutors have gathered consultation session data in targeted ways. We’ve used this data to support the founding (and funding) of an international language and writing support service, to gain more funding for staff wages, to make a case for our ongoing existence when programs were being considered for elimination, and to secure funding from graduate programs as well as our degree completion programs so that we could develop dedicated support for their writers. We also used the results of a Spring 2009 student satisfaction survey and a faculty satisfaction survey to argue for our ongoing funding and for additional funding to develop an OWL and online tutoring. In this presentation, I’ll share our assessment tools, including our session logs and surveys. In our activities, session attendees will be given an opportunity to work on some of their own information-gathering tools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 4. K | **Incoming Freshmen: Breaking through the Resistance**  
Caitie O’Neil and Jason Harrod, Tutors  
Writing Center, University of Michigan at Flint – Flint, MI |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 2335</td>
<td>As tutors of college, high school and middle school students, we found many practices that engage advanced university students do not work well with younger students. Perhaps these strategies fail younger students because they do not understand that writing is a conversation – one in which their voice counts. Many younger students understand writing as little more than a formula into which they should plug words, preferably the “right” words. Such views are understandable; students who have found their voices are often not what teachers seek when they gauge student writing by a rubric. We decided we should bring thinking into younger writers’ formulas and to help them realize that their voices and thoughts drive their writing. We adopted methods used to create discussions with high school students to our work with incoming freshmen in the writing center, which helped the freshmen adapt to university writing. As we explore our efforts, we will provide examples of strategies that failed for us with younger students and will discuss how we eventually engaged with freshmen students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session 4. L  Room 2345  Evaluation Capacity Building in Writing Center Assessment

Carl D. Westine and Maran Subramain  
**Doctoral Student Staff Assistants, The Evaluation Center**  
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

In this session, we will discuss how a logic model can be created and used to guide the evaluation of writing centers. Based largely on a proposal to evaluate the Western Michigan University Writing Center, our presentation is intended to build evaluation capacity among participants and to help directors and consultants engage in evaluation activities at their own writing centers. We will share information on how to improve the evaluability of writing centers and will prepare center staff to work with an evaluator, if necessary, to achieve a productive evaluation. We believe writing center directors and consultants should be informed about evaluation theory and practices so they can better recognize what constitutes a good evaluation and can participate in the effort to maximize the value evaluation efforts. In our session, we will break down the logic model into pieces—inputs, activities, and outcomes—and will present strategies and methods that can be used when conducting an evaluation of a writing center.

### Session 4. M  Room 2355  Our Lived Experiences as Outcomes: Writing Center Success Tales from an Elementary English Teacher in Korea and a Presidential Library and Museum Archive Intern

**Scott G. Williams**  
**English Teacher and EPIK (English Program in Korea) Coordinator for Gyeongsangbuk Province**  
Andong Dongbu Elementary School – Andong, Korea  
**April Bryan, Archive Intern**  
Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum – Springfield, IL

For years writing center directors have included in annual reports lists of the jobs their alumni accept after leaving writing center positions. As directors offer evidence of their centers’ value-added impact on students, such lists can impress administrators. But what’s behind such lists? Does writing center work really help those who have “left us” function better in future positions? Two alumni of the Western Michigan University Writing Center explore that question, in this presentation, as they discuss how their writing center positions prepared them for their roles as an elementary English teacher and program director in Korea and as an archive intern in a presidential library. Participants will hear about the work of these two alumni as well as how they think their writing center work echoes throughout their times in their current positions.

**A Bridge in Between: The Writing Center Intern at the College of Wooster**

**Daniel Kenzie, Graduate Student**  
Purdue University – West Lafayette, IN  
**Paula Miller – Intern, The Writing Center**  
The College of Wooster – Wooster, OH

The Writing Center Intern at The College of Wooster functions as a bridge between part-time professional consultants and peer tutors, between staff and faculty, and between staff and the director. One current and one former Wooster intern will discuss their work to open up conversation with session participants about professionalization and mentorship in writing centers and about their own growth within the unique intern position.
### Session 5. A

**Room 1140**

**Writing Center Data: What Do We Need and How Should We Use It?**

**Diane Boehm,** Director, University Writing Program  
**Helen Racic-Klotz,** Coordinator, Writing Center  
Saginaw Valley State University – Saginaw, MI  
**Mary Ann Crawford,** Director, Writing Center  
Central Michigan University – Mt. Pleasant, MI  
**Sherry Wynn Perdue,** Director, Writing Center  
Oakland University – Rochester, MI  
**Jake Blumer,** Director, Writing Center  
University of Michigan at Flint – Flint, MI

The five writing program administrators presenting in this session have collected data from four different Michigan writing centers (Central Michigan University, Oakland University, University of Michigan-Flint, and Saginaw Valley State University). In this presentation we will explore the data we have collected, the tools we used to collect the data, and the way we use the data. Each of us has our own view on our data collection efforts and the need for such collection. Our perspectives range from those who see data collection as essential to those who believe data collection can detract from student-centeredness, which is more essential to writing center missions.

### Session 5. B

**Room 1160**

**Talk the Talk: An Exploration of Conversational Strategies**

**Thom Foy** and **PF Potvin,** Faculty Consultants  
**Loran Ball, Jenna Tully,** and **Megan Torti,** Consultants, Writing Center  
University of Michigan-Dearborn – Dearborn, MI

The large Middle-Eastern population at the University of Michigan-Dearborn has allowed consultants in our writing center a unique perspective on working with a particular group of non-native speakers. Drawing on that perspective in this presentation, we will share strategies for consulting with ESL student writers and for functioning as cultural ambassadors, in particular as it relates to the Muslim student. We will share strategies writing center supervisors developed to facilitate consultant learning and will consider how dialogue and reflection can foster understanding of another cultural community and their student writers.

### Session 5. C

**Room 1340**

**Creative Writing: Assessing and Assisting beyond the Creative Writing Class Workshop**

**Dustin M. Hoffman,** **Amy Newday,** **Rachel Neubauer**  
and **Tim Buchanan,** Consultants, Writing Center  
Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI

Most writing center consultants are not trained in creative writing, and many struggle when helping students with pieces from creative writing classes. Specific problems that can surface in these sessions relate to the supposed subjectivity of material, consultants’ discomfort when talking about issues in creative writing processes and pieces, and the tendency—because higher order issues seem so slippery—to focus on mechanics. In this interactive workshop, we will explore these concerns and others as a way to help all consultants improve their understanding of clients who have creative writing needs. We encourage consultants who are creative writers to attend and contribute to this workshop.
### Engaging Writers Intimately (with Texts)

Melissa Richeson, Monica Shively, Layli Magers and Natalie Bowie, Writing Consultants, Writing Center  
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne – Fort Wayne, IN

Many first-year writers do not know how to connect to their assignments or how to connect to the ideas presented in their classes. For some students, their significantly low literacy skills complicate their uncertainty about writing and academics in general. In this presentation, we will share reading-writing connections that can be used to help such students. In particular we will discuss the following:

- Engaging the Writer as Audience
- Using a Sociocognitive Approach to Reading
- Reading for “Flow”

### Challenges and Compromises: Assessing Students’ Needs During a Session

Josie Rush and Alyssa Sanow, Writing Consultants, Writing Center  
Seton Hill University – Greensburg, PA

What is the consultant’s goal in assessment during a session? Presenters in this session will help participants consider possible, realistic goals consultants can keep in mind while working with student writers. We will discuss strategies for assessing the goals of the student writer during a session and will expand upon ways to help student writers without compromising the roles of the writing center. In addition to sharing our ideas, we will engage participants in activities so they can experience the strategies we recommend.

### Assessing the Needs of International and ENL Students

Felicia Mabuza, Intern, and Leigh Ann Meyer, Director, Writing Center  
Indiana University Southeast – New Albany, IN

International and English New Language (ENL) students add richness and diversity to every university, but they have specific needs. Consultants need to understand who the ENL students are and what they go through in their academic and other daily experiences in the U.S. In this presentation, we will share how we are recognizing and accommodating the needs of ENL students and what we are doing to encourage these students to feel comfortable with, understand, and use our assistance.

"Bad at Writing”: How Consultants and Professors Support Student Writing

Dale Johnson and Kiera Wilson, Writing Consultants  
Grand Valley State University – Allendale, MI

When students view their writing ability negatively, peer consultants can struggle to help these students develop into stronger, more self-sufficient writers. Considering our work through the lens of self-efficacy—one’s perception of his or her achievement based on various factors—presenters in this session will discuss how self-efficacy enhancement techniques can contribute to consultations. We will share handouts of strategies used to promote writers self-efficacy in our writing center and will exchange ideas on the role of student self-efficacy and confidence in the writing and consulting processes.
**Session 5. G**
Room 1220

*Slaying the Unicorn with a Double-Edged Sword*
**OR Exploring Myths of Text and of Interaction in the Writing Center: Part Two of a Two-Part Workshop**

Trixie Smith, Director, Writing Center
Lamiyah Bahrainwala, Dianna Baldwin, Barbra Elenbaas, Elena Adkins Garcia, Ben Goodwin, Marilee Brooks-Gillies, James Jackson, Beth Keller, John Lauckner, Cari Ross, and Michelle Trumble, Graduate Consultants, Writing Center
Michigan State University – East Lansing, MI

In our two-part roundtable session, we will explore myths about the work of writing centers that are centered around both texts and interactions with people. We will first explore these myths in facilitated small groups; then each group will have the chance to present their main discussion points. Finally, we will ask participants to look for connections and intersections across groups and myths. The text-based myths we will examine (and maybe slay) in the second half of this two-part workshop include the following:

- Consultants don’t bring their own identities into WC sessions.
- Minimalist tutoring is the only way to tutor.
- Collaborative sessions are always comfortable.
- The center and its consultants have a unified approach and identity.
- The consultations must happen in English.
- We don’t theorize our work.

---

**Session 5. H**

Room 1350

*Considerations on Reading Aloud*

Emily Standridge, Graduate Assistant Director
Jim Chambers, Sarah Burns, and David Peters, Consultants
Writing Center, Ball State University – Muncie, IN

While student writers often come to the writing center with questions or problems, they often have no language to discuss their core concerns. Reading their paper aloud at the beginning of a session is one solution to this problem, and this activity can provide both tutor and student writer better insights into what writing issues to consider. Also, students can experience the valuable revision technique of reading aloud, which they can apply outside the tutorial. However, as we’ve practiced this strategy at our center, many questions have developed about the technique and its value: Does reading aloud keep student writers engaged during the tutorial? Does it create a focus on lower-order language-use concerns? What happens if the tutor is not an aural learner? Should the paper be read from beginning to end? Does reading small selections aloud help as much as reading large chunks of text? When should discussion of bigger picture issues occur—after reading the entire text? After each paragraph? How often should discussion interrupt the reading aloud? We’ll cover these questions and more in our presentation as we present several views on the topic and facilitate a conversation about best practices in assessing student concerns and problems during the consultation.
| Session 5. I | Practicing What We Preach: Writing Center Mission and Identity in the Age of Assessment  
Kim Cummins, Senior Undergraduate Tutor, and Michael Meinhardt, Juan Favela, Claire Gaddis, Jen Seo, Adam Michael, Justyna Obrzut, Gianna Canevari  
Loyola University – Chicago, IL  
This two-part roundtable panel explores areas and depth of assessment impact on the pedagogy and purpose of the writing center from the perspectives of people doing the bulk of the tutoring: undergraduate students. We will facilitate audience participation from brief presentations and invested discussion prompts. |
|---|---|
| Session 5. J | Assessing Our First Draft: Negotiating Roles in a High School-University Writing Center Collaboration  
Jeanne Smith, Director, and Will Mcsuley, Heather Kaley, Erin Maxwell, and Doug Sheldon, Tutors, Writing Center  
Kent State University – Kent, OH  
Margana Fahey, Chair, Department of English  
Theodore Roosevelt High School – Kent, OH  
Our presentation reveals the transformation of a high school writing center as an outreach project and a service-learning curricular innovation into a context specific, highly successful, community-engaged service that required much more than transplanting writing center methodology into the community. Our presenters will explain how the project developed and evolved based on our assessments, will focus on high school writing center development and sustainability issues, will suggest some difference and similarities between high school and college writing tutoring, will share a handbook for university tutors who venture into the high school setting, and will assess the potential of our project as we also respond to questions from the audience. |
33rd EAST CENTRAL WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE
FRIDAY DINNER BUFFET
6:45 until 9:00ish p.m.
BERNHARD CENTER BANQUET HALL (3RD FLOOR)

East Central Writing Centers Association Tutor Awards
Jeanne Smith, Kent State University, Awards Committee Chair
Allie Oosta, 2011 Tutor Leadership Award
Grand Valley State University
Jen Torreano, 2011 Outstanding Tutor of the Year
Grand Valley State University

It's Like A Consultation: Writing Center Assessment as a Means of Reflection and Revision
Brian Huot, Writing Program Coordinator
Kent State University – Kent, OH
William Macauley, Director of Writing
College of Wooster – Wooster, OH
Ellen Schendel, Director, Writing Center
Grand Valley State University – Grand Rapids, MI
Michael M. Williamson, Professor of English, English Department
Indiana University of Pennsylvania – Indiana, PA

Board of Directors Election Results
Jackie Grutsch McKinney, Ball State University, Election Committee Chair
| Session 6. A | **Breaking the Silence: Encouraging Student-led Writing Groups**  
Ellen Schendel, Director, Julie White, Allie Oosta, Kiera Wilson, Alex Jablonski, Writing Consultants, Writing Center  
Grand Valley State University – Allendale, MI  
In more and more writing centers, tutors are facilitating more and more small-group sessions in classrooms and in writing centers. In this session, we will report on an experiment within a classroom context during which tutors waited in silence for students to take control of their own groups. The professor will share her goals for the class and how she worked with the consultants to make this experiment work; consultants will share their experiences and reflect on how this experiment challenged their roles as consultants. We believe our presentation will offer new insights into strategies for facilitating small-group sessions, and we invite conference participants to help us consider even more ideas during our open discussion. |
| --- | --- |
| Session 6. B | **Assessing Student and Professor Attitudes toward the Writing Center**  
Stephanie Gallagher and Kristen Kolar, Consultants  
Kent State University—Stark Campus – North Canton, OH  
Student and professor involvement and attitudes are important in the maintenance of the high impact that the writing center has on campus. Assessing attitudes students and professors have toward the campus writing center can help consultants and administrators understand campus perceptions of the center, ways to strengthen relationships with faculty and students, and ways to improve our Center’s practices. In this presentation, we will discuss various surveys we have used—and redesigned—as ways to assess our center.  

**Assessing Our (Pre) Teaching: What Education Majors Learn as Writing Center Tutors**  
Justin Brouckaert, Stephanie Baker, and Lisa Coffell, Tutors, Writing Center  
Saginaw Valley State University – Saginaw, MI  
Writing center tutoring introduces education majors to a broad range of abilities and insight they can apply in their future roles as teachers. In this presentation, based on case studies and interviews with current teachers who served as writing center tutors, we will discuss skills teachers (and tutors in general) can acquire from writing center work. Because the line between tutor and teacher can sometimes be blurred, we will consider the duality of these two separate entities and use this framework to discuss the many different insight we learn as tutors and pre-service teachers, including the ability to assess our own teaching styles, students’ learning styles (particularly those of student writers who speak English as a Second Language and African American Vernacular English), and faculty assignments. |
| Session 6. C | **One Appointment Too Many: Assessing Tutor Stress During High Volume Times**  
Megan Breidenstein, Patrick Ranville, Tracie Lemon, and Lauren Martyn, Tutors  
Writing Center, University of Michigan-Flint – Flint, MI  

It’s the end of the semester, and students are filtering in and out of the writing center, seeking help from tutors who are booked with back to back appointments. Because tutors know students are feeling the stress of their semester-end assignments, our focus tends to be on them, not on how we tutors are handling strain. In this presentation, we will discuss how to know when tutors need to decompress before stress impedes our ability to function as efficient writing tutors and how to address tutor stress before it becomes a problem. |
| Session 6. D | **The International Writing Centers Association Assessment SIG Survey: Musing About Results**  
Kim Ballard, Director, and Hassan Al-Momani, Consultant  
Writing Center, Western Michigan University – Kalamazoo, MI  
Mary McCall, Graduate Instructor  
Purdue University – West Lafayette, IN  

The International Writing Centers Association Writing Centers Assessment Special Interest Group (IWCA Assessment SIG) formed in June 2010 under the leadership of Francis Crawford of San Antonio College, Jill Reglin of Lansing Community College, and Kim Ballard of Western Michigan University. A major goal of our SIG was to sponsor a survey that could determine prevalent views about writing center assessment held by survey participants. SIG leaders believed the survey would help determine how the SIG could serve assessment needs of IWCA community members. In this session, we will share the IWCA WC Assessment SIG survey logistics, questions and responses. We will encourage participants to review raw data from the survey so they may reach their own conclusions, consider how much our ECWCA conference may have addressed some of the needs demonstrated in the survey data, and generate additional questions or question areas for the 2011 IWCA WC Assessment SIG Survey. Finally, we will share our conclusions from our own review of the data and will ask session participants to think of future ways the IWCA WC Assessment SIG may serve our community. |
| Session 6. E | **Stereotyping Non-traditional Students in the Writing Center**  
Michelle Campbell, Consultant, Writing Center  
Central Michigan University – Mount Pleasant, MI  

In this presentation, I will share my research about positive and negative stereotypes that consultants association with non-traditional students, focusing on survey assessment of consultants’ views of non-traditional students. While discussing the survey and its results, I will argue that stereotypes are useful “jumping off” points with student writers because they make consultants aware of issues that may occur in a consultation. Stereotypes are useful, however, only to a certain point; they should never define the whole consultation, given that each writer—whether she or he is a traditional or non-traditional student—has different issues and goals. Still, by understanding stereotypes and assumptions consultants can better communicate with clients as they foster the development of better student writers. In this session, participants and I will explore such nuances of stereotypes. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 6. F</th>
<th>Creating Videos for the Training and Assessment of Writing Center Tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1330</td>
<td>Kathleen Reaume, Mackenzie Calhoun, Ron Zallocco and Yifei Xin, Consultants, Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isabelle Von Sturm-Day, Composition Instructor, Department of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Toledo – Toledo, OH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Videos for training and assessing ESL writing center tutors are rarely used within writing center settings. However, in response to a needs analysis conducted by the director of the ESL Composition and the Assistant Director of the Writing Center, staff in our center decided to use videos to bridge the void we noticed in the training and assessing of new ESL tutors. In our presentation, writing center staff will discuss why we created the videos, the use of assessment in them, how they can be used to train both ESL and other tutors, what we could have done differently in our video-creation process, and how we will change future video creations. In addition, a composition instructor who has been part of our training efforts will discuss the videos from the perspective of an experienced instructor in the native speaking composition classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 6. G</th>
<th>Bridging the Transition from High School to College: Assessing Our Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1340</td>
<td>Melissa Hirsch, Writing Consultant, Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne - Fort Wayne, IN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feeling overwhelmed, many first-year student writers visit writing centers in hopes of having their papers “fixed,” and consultants are often frustrated when these students seem to not hear or understand the terms the consultants use to discuss college-level writing. The students’ and consultants’ frustrations highlight a challenge: How do writing center consultants communicate the demands of college-level writing without blaming the student, the high school, or the college professor? In this workshop, I will review and discuss differences between high school and college writing while considering the roles and relationships consultants have with new students. I will present differences between terminology related to the writing task and process that appear in the Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio State Writing Standards for grade 12 and the standards articulated by the Writing Program Administrator’s Outcome Statement. Before our workshop ends, participants and I will consider options writing centers may consider to help first-year students bridge the transition from high school to college.
| Session 6. H | **Web 2.0 Technologies and the Writing Center: Re-thinking and Extending Sites of Collaborative Research**  
Esther Milu, Barbra Elenbaas, James Jackson, and Minh-Tam Nguyen  
Michigan State University – East Lansing, MI |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this panel presentation, we will consider how and why writing center staff should seek to participate in Web 2.0 social networks. In particular, we will discuss how we envision Zotero and Mendeley, reference management applications, can help writing centers develop and build a research community. We focus on these two tools because they both offer users an opportunity to form online research groups, based on the users’ areas of interest. In these online groups, members can share work or sources and can collaborate with colleagues—publicly or privately—on ongoing research. We will invite session participants to share their views and insights about such online collaboration and will explore how such collaborative research forums can enhance the way writing centers produce and share knowledge and the ways such collaboration may impact writing center pedagogy and practice. We will also explore what challenges and forms of resistance we might anticipate and how we can overcome them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 6. I | **When Assessment Attacks (or, What Happens When Assessment Isn’t Enough)**  
Anthony Edgington, Director, Writing Center  
University of Toledo – Toledo, OH |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward White, a leading writing assessment researcher, first signaled a rallying cry that continues to influence writing program and writing center administrators: assess oneself, or others will conduct assessment for you. Because of White’s work—along with the work of Brian Huot, Peggy O’Neill, and Irv Peckman in composition and Muriel Harris and Jeanne Simpson in writing center research—more writing centers have implemented assessment practices that help explain what we do, who we serve, and how we serve them. Today, writing centers commonly accumulate quantitative data on the number of tutorials and student visits, solicit feedback from students via comment cards or interviews, and conduct exit interviews with graduating tutors to gain insight into potential successes that need to continue and into problems that need to be addressed. But what happens when such assessment research is not enough? What does the administration of a center do when, even after offering such data as noted above, university administrators demand more assessment and more data? In this presentation, I will discuss such an experience. After reviewing the recent history of our writing center (including changes in directorship and funding lines), I will discuss the assessment practices that have been in place at the center for the past three years, practices that did not prove enough when university administrators began to challenge the future existence of the center and, in essence, called on the two directors to provide additional assessment measures. I will discuss how the directors reacted to the new challenges, who they contacted for assistance, and what we discovered during the process. I will end the session by discussing what this experience taught the directors about assessment in today’s university climate and how it has changed the way we currently conduct assessment in our center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Room 1140** | **Creative Writing Boot Camp: The Unrecognized Solution to Stress** | Kiley Miller, Melissa Hirsch, Mark Thomas, and Amy Jo Arehart, Writing Consultants  
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne - Fort Wayne, IN |
|  | Often, consultants neglect creative writing when stress builds during the semester—or during consultations. But creative writing gets cognitive juices flowing, making problem solving and alleviating stress easier for all writers. Using National Writing Project ideas, we will help participants in this session learn and use warm-up exercises, engaging discussions, and creative tools, which they can tap to encourage writers through any stage of the writing process, for both academic and creative projects. After our creative writing boot camp, which builds on Hirsch and Miller’s 2010 ECWCA Conference presentation, “Don’t Let the Moment Pass by: We Are Writers First,” participants will understand the potential and the importance of “five short minutes” during a consultation in which they use creative writing activities to spur creativity, break down writing barriers, focus problem solving, and/or alleviate the pressures of a demanding academic schedule. The exercises we will share can fuel creativity and help consultants and student writers gain energy and excitement for any form of writing, so we invite consultants who consider themselves creative writers and those who do not to join our boot camp. |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 7. B</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Room 1220** | **Breaking Through to Bartleby: Narrative Reflections of a Writing Center Tutor** | Krista Stonerock, Writing Center Director, Christine Zimmerman, Emily Stacy, Jenni Lloyd, and Tamara Holder, Tutors  
Writing Center, Ohio Christian University – Circleville, OH |
|  | Incorporating drama and real excerpts from reflective tutor logs, we will use the narrator of Melville’s Bartleby the Scrivener as a backdrop for discussing the messy yet mandatory process of honest self-reflection in assessing tutor roles and relationships. We will encourage participants to engage in their own reflective process as a way to help them connect to various tools for reflective practice. We will also discuss how reflective practice and diligent assessment can result in opportunities for expanded employment and tutoring opportunities in the university. |  |

**Re-imagining the Writing Center’s Role for Writing and Publishing on the Web**

John Lauckner, Consultant, and Dianna Baldwin, Associate Director  
Writing Center, Michigan State University – East Lansing, MI

The thought of creating websites or content for the web often conjures up the idea of XHTML tags or CSS code, skills that can take years to master. Yet, with the recent push for non-traditional assignments and remix assignments, students are often asked to create writing for the web, which means writing center staff must ask what it means to write for the web, how we may help student writers with their web-writing efforts, and, possibly, how we may support faculty with such assignments. In this presentation, we will address these questions by (1) examining the pitfalls of focusing on coding languages and programs and (2) offering alternative solutions, such as the free web application Weebly, for creating online content so that consultants may focus more on utilizing web writing strategies rather than on technology instruction. |
SESSION SEVEN                                          SATURDAY                       10:00 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.

Session 7. C                                        Room 1280

Becoming Dangerous through Writing Center Assessment:
Part One of a Two-Part Workshop

Michael M. Williamson, Professor of English, English Department
Indiana University of Pennsylvania – Indiana, PA

Ellen Schendel, Director, Writing Center
Grand Valley State University – Grand Rapids, MI

William Macauley, Director of Writing
College of Wooster – Wooster, OH

Ashlee Brand, Honors Program Coordinator
Cuyahoga Community College – Cleveland, OH

Nikki Caswell, Assistant Writing Program Coordinator
Elliot Knowles, Assistant Writing Program Coordinator

Writing centers and writing center administrators are rarely seen as high-impact forces for postsecondary reform and progress. Nonetheless, writing center administrators know how important writing center work can be for students across the curriculum who struggle to read and write in new and challenging ways for the academy and their subsequent careers as professionals. Documenting (through assessment) the impact of a successful writing center on a college campus not only raises faculty, student and administrator awareness of how important writing centers are, but assessment actually provides evidence for continued support and growth of writing center activity. Becoming dangerous with assessment can take various forms, depending upon a range of contextual and institutional variables. These variables can include increased writing center status, higher funding and a voice for writing center administrators on committees, task forces and other institutional bodies who make important decisions affecting writing center operations. Understanding data collection and analysis for evaluating writing centers and the needs of writing centers as a basis for demonstrating their value to the academy strengthens our ability to be dangerous with writing assessment. When our assessments engage us in these ways, we have the ability to upset the status quo, making real and significant changes. This workshop begins by providing participants with some basic information about writing center assessment, including principles from educational measurement and models of successful writing center assessment. The majority of the workshop is devoted to group and individual consultation in which participants can receive guidance and advice on ongoing or future assessment projects, creating the possibility that workshop participants can become dangerous on their own campuses.

Face-to-Face Sessions

Karen Saupe, Rhetoric Center Director, and Hannah Brenton, Anna Casto, Tony Ditta, Geneva Langeland, Drew Reichard, Daniel Syn, Jon Tilton, and Arianna Tolsma, Rhetoric Center Staff Members
Calvin College – Grand Rapids, MI

Viewing texts on a laptop can enhance many tutoring sessions, but optimizing the experience requires thoughtful preparation. In this session we will offer tips for using laptops effectively and deciding when hard copy is better. We will also explore logistical considerations (e.g., furniture and lighting), brain-activity research on composition processes, and judicious use of software features.
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In “Why Assessment” (2009), Gerald Graff argues that the critical conversations arising from regular program assessment are often as important as the actual findings themselves: outcomes assessment, as Graff argues, can be transformative in terms of creating a recognizable dialogue about—and a more lively institutional culture of—good teaching. Agreeing with Graff’s claim, I argue that writing centers can and should take an active, if not central, role in writing program outcomes assessment by positioning themselves at the center of emerging conversations rather than on the periphery by solely offering student support. While writing centers have and continue to be instrumental in helping students better meet writing program outcomes, they can acquire even more institutional legitimacy through a strategic central involvement in the outcomes assessment process. Perhaps most importantly, they can better sustain such legitimacy by establishing ongoing faculty outreach projects designed to both generate critical conversations about writing and increase writing center visibility. Drawing from my experiences co-leading an interdisciplinary faculty writing program assessment at my university, I will discuss the ways in which our writing center has and continues to gain a foothold in generating and sustaining an interdisciplinary, campus-wide dialogue on teaching writing.

**Tutors’ Assessment of Tutees Based on MBTI**

Christine Ewing, Breanne Schafer, Lauren Quick, and Libby Pfotenhauer, Tutors
Writing Center, Indiana Wesleyan University – Marion, IN

Because tutors decide the direction sessions will take based on their assessment of tutees and tutees’ writing, it is important to look at the tutor’s personality type and to consider how personality type may affect the tutor’s assessment. Considering the different personality types of each tutor, as determined by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator, it is possible to determine whether a correlation between personality types and assessment exists and what that correlation may tell us about improving tutoring. Those issues served as impetus for the research we will present in this session. Using videos and written tutor reports, we analyzed each tutor’s session and report, paying special attention to his or her personality type, which was determined by the MBTI prior to our research. In addition to discussing our findings, we will engage participants by inviting them to assess videotaped sessions as a way for us to best show the assessment process.
| Session 7. F  | **Communicating Across Cultures: The Role Of Culture In The Tutoring Session**  
| Room 2335    | Ashley Ellison, Assistant Director, and Elmar Hashimov, Tutor, Writing Center  
|             | Ball State University – Muncie, IN  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As more international students enter American universities, writing centers are challenged to meet the needs of students from diverse cultures. However, students who come to the writing center and tutors are sometimes not aware that people from different cultural backgrounds can hold very different worldviews than they do, and these worldviews can greatly impact individuals’ conceptualization of the tutoring session. Misunderstandings, miscommunications, and sometimes conflict arise when the tutor and tutee hold different beliefs about the nature of education and the role of the tutor. Beliefs about gender roles, the nature of learning, equality, and independence are not always acknowledged as having an effect on the tutoring session, yet failure to acknowledge and respond to different cultural beliefs is a major cause of communication breakdown. In this workshop, I will define culture and explain how international students’ expectations about tutoring sessions can differ from expectations of American students and tutors. Participants and I will consider and answer such questions as the following: How can tutors assess and respond to different cultural beliefs during the session? Should tutors respond to international students in the same way they respond to American students? Although the majority of writing center tutors believe the tutoring session “belongs” to the tutee, what do international students believe? What role does culture play in the tutoring session? What exactly is culture, anyway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Session 7. G| **Helping Students Assess the Demands of a New Discipline: Teaching APA to Newcomers**  
| Room 2345   | Shem Hinkle and Emmanouil Marneros, Writing Consultants, Writing Center  
|             | Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne – Fort Wayne, IN  
|             | To determine how to write well in a new discipline, student writers and consultants need to be able to identify and interpret the rhetorical strategies of the new discipline. Although writing center consultants do not have to know those rhetorical strategies before working with a student who is writing in a discipline new to the consultants, they do need to know how or to be taught how to analyze a text systematically in order to discover the rhetorical strategies valued by the discipline. As part of our staff education, we lead consultants through activities that teach them to read an article for its rhetorical strategies. We go beyond focusing on the recognition of such rhetorical moves as use of tone and choice of audience in a particular, usually non-scholarly article. Instead, we focus on discovering the epistemological thinking within a discipline from the process of reading its scholarly articles. We begin by focusing on how to identify the structure of the article and then move to a “says/does” analysis in which consultants distinguish between each paragraph’s content and the function that content serves in advancing the authors’ argument. During this presentation, we will demonstrate our center’s process for teaching how to read the structure and epistemology of articles written in the APA style. We will lead participants in sample analysis activities and will discuss how our approach may fit within their centers’ strategies for dealing with how to teach disciplinary writing. |
Session 7. H
Room 1160

Gamifying A Writing Center Website: A "Pointed" Discussion

John Lauckner, Consultant, and Dianna Baldwin, Associate Director
Writing Center, Michigan State University – East Lansing, MI

Websites and blogs are often established to inform readers and to create knowledge resources for the public. Similarly, staff in the Writing Center at Michigan State University created writing.msu.edu, a user driven website, to inform users about the activities at the center. But users were not creating content, so we responded by using gamification strategies. Gamification, at its core, is a system created to influence user behavior. For example, the website S2H.com (Switch2Health) rewards those who exercise with points. Online venues, such as Wikipedia, Foursquare, and IGN.com, transform perfunctory tasks like fact-checking, going to a store or restaurant, and creating blogs into games that offer users rewards. In this presentation, we will look at examples such as the ones we’ve listed, and at gamification theory, to start a conversation on the role of gamification in writing center websites and user driven content. We will explicate the model that writing.msu.edu uses to gamify content creation and will encourage session participants to help us consider ways to assess writing center gamification efforts.

Session 7. I
Room 2355

Not Just Teaching to the Test: Assessing Our Role with Pre-Med Students

Allyssa Cook and Amber Arnold, Writing Consultants
Mary Arnold Schwartz, Coordinator, Writing Center
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne – Fort Wayne, IN

In April 2010, the director of the Northeast Indiana Area Health Education Center contacted our writing center asking that we help pilot a summer enrichment program for college students. By June 1, our consultants were meeting with a small group of pre-medical students. Although the students had strong GPAs, they historically struggled to score sufficient points on the Verbal Reasoning and Writing Sample portions of the MCAT (Medical College Admissions Test). Thus, we had to determine how we could help the students improve their abilities to test well in two targeted areas, but we also wanted to help the students fare better with writing once they were admitted to medical school. Rather than teach only to the test, we decided to prepare the students to think about medical problems from multiple angles, to learn to find articles through the library more quickly, to read complex, data-dense texts with greater understanding and speed, and to improve their ability to complete complex writing projects quickly. In other words, we writing consultants and a librarian immersed the students in the language and thought patterns of medical scholars. The consultants involved in the enrichment project—a pre-med admitted to the Indiana University School of Medicine, a graduate student in communication interested in how scientific concepts can be shared more effectively with the general adult population, and a philosophy major with a strong background in writing in psychology—brought various strengths and interests to our collaboration, and we have added a new pre-med student to our team for this presentation. During our session time, we will share our experiences with the program we created and implemented, provide an assessment of our approach to preparing pre-medical students for the MCAT and other high stakes health field exams, will discuss the shortcomings of our first attempt, and will share how we plan to revise this summer’s program. We are eager to have participants attend this session to provide us feedback and questions.
**Session 7. J**

**Room 1330**

**Can Positive Psychology Influence Writing Centers?**  
Morgan Rae Glazier and Gracielle Pereira Rocha  
Central Michigan University – Mount Pleasant, MI

Positive psychology, the scientific study of human strengths and virtues, seem a natural counterpart to the optimistic view of writing development that functions in most writing centers. Potential results of applying positive psychology within a center or consultation may include consultants identifying their students’ and their own strengths, students developing better self-esteem about writing, consultants and students lowering anxiety levels, and students enhancing writing processes. In addition, during sessions, consultants may be able to identify and enhance some of the 24 different character strengths noted by positive psychology scholars. In our presentation, we will offer an overview of positive psychology and will help participants understand the “Brief Strengths Test,” which call allow help them to identify their own character strengths. We will also explore how positive language and strategies can aid students’ writing development and will encourage participants to share questions and responses to the insights and suggestions we provide.

“**Without Thinking**: Revision and Feedback in Published Writers”  
Kiera Wilson, Writing Consultant, Writing Center  
Grand Valley State University - Allendale, MI

Many published writers streamlined their writing process and revise “without thinking.” For them, feedback is an internalized process, a process that mimics the feedback between student writers and writing center consultants. In this presentation, I will discuss my research on how published writers seek and process feedback and how writing consultants can help students make connections between incorporating feedback and stronger pieces after revision. In this presentation, I will share the results of my research from interviews with five writers in different fields—journalism, academia, advertising, editorial, and publishing. I will cover such points as the type of concerns (higher order or lower order) those writers sought help with, whether or not the incorporation of feedback is intricately tied with a professional hierarchy, and how technology shapes the feedback the published writers receive and their use of it. I will also help session participants consider how insights about published writers’ use of feedback can inform writing center practices.

**Session 7. K**

**Room 1340**

**The American Revolution Revisited: Encountering British English in ESL Writing**  
Corinne Cozzaglio, Shari Wolke and Esther Milu, Graduate Writing Consultants  
Writing Center, Michigan State University – East Lansing, MI

Although spoken British and American English are often mutually intelligible, in writing, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, and idiomatic expressions differences may generate misunderstanding, especially if consultants label British forms as incorrect. What British English speakers—especially students from former British colonies—write may be correct in terms of conventions they know. While consultants should explain conventions students will be expected to use in U.S. academia, consultants should show respect for the English system students know. In our session, we will share examples of British and American English conflicts. By considering student examples of British English writing, we will show how failure to understand conventions can lead to meaning changes. We will also note how these students may expect different assessments of their writing from their professors and will encourage session participants to share experiences with their own or their clients’ use of British English and/or other types of Englishes.
| Session 8. A | **Students and Space: Athletes and Others Inside and Outside of a Writing Center**  
**Colin Payton and Eric Werner, Writing Advisors**  
Writing Center, Wittenberg University – Springfield, OH  
Anna DeZarn, Moody Bible Institute – Chicago, IL  
Most writing center sessions take place within the writing center itself. However, consultants in our program are not limited to holding sessions purely within the center and often branch into different areas. A writing center is about people, not necessarily space. Will moving our work outside of the writing center’s physical location to meet students in “their space” cause more students to utilize our services? This session will evaluate the relationship between students and the “space” of a writing center consultation, the implications of confining writing center work to a single space, and the opportunities to expand such work beyond the physical center. |
| --- | --- |
**Dawn Marie Hershberger, Associate Director, Writing Lab**  
University of Indianapolis – Indianapolis, IN  
Lagniappe is a term meaning a small gift given to a customer as a bonus. Our lagniappe approach provided “something extra” beyond our expected in-lab services and presented service and leadership opportunities that directly impacted the academic success of our peer tutors allowing us to assess ourselves within the traditional institutional model. This session will discuss the lagniappe approach to assessment and help participants develop ideas of how to use this concept to aid in their own assessment challenges.  
*Writing Our Way into the Community’s Story: Do Service Projects Enhance Writing Centers?*  
**Sarah Huck, Student Assistant and Tutor, Lindsey Sewell, Tutor**  
Writing Lab, University of Indianapolis - Indianapolis, IN  
Writing centers are reactive by nature, but what if a writing center became more proactive through community service? We had that goal in mind when our writing lab staff teamed with other student organizations to begin a “Life Review” service project at an assisted living center. In this project, tutors talked with residents of the living center about their lives, digitally recorded the residents’ memories, wrote a “profile” sheet for each resident, and shared the materials with residents and their family. In this presentation, we will discuss our “Life Review” service project to encourage an active discussion with session participants about incorporating service into writing centers, evaluating service projects once they have begun, and determining barriers to writing center service projects. We plan our talk as a catalyst for writing centers to assess themselves in the context of their core functions and institutional goals, assess their staff, and assess the needs of their local community to determine the appropriateness of a service project undertaking. |
Writing centers and writing center administrators are rarely seen as high-impact forces for postsecondary reform and progress. Nonetheless, writing center administrators know how important writing center work can be for students across the curriculum who struggle to read and write in new and challenging ways for the academy and their subsequent careers as professionals. Documenting (through assessment) the impact of a successful writing center on a college campus not only raises faculty, student and administrator awareness of how important writing centers are, but assessment actually provides evidence for continued support and growth of writing center activity. Becoming dangerous with assessment can take various forms, depending upon a range of contextual and institutional variables. These variables can include increased writing center status, higher funding and a voice for writing center administrators on committees, task forces and other institutional bodies who make important decisions affecting writing center operations. Understanding data collection and analysis for evaluating writing centers and the needs of writing centers as a basis for demonstrating their value to the academy strengthens our ability to be dangerous with writing assessment. When our assessments engage us in these ways, we have the ability to upset the status quo, making real and significant changes. This workshop begins by providing participants with some basic information about writing center assessment, including principles from educational measurement and models of successful writing center assessment. The majority of the workshop is devoted to group and individual consultation in which participants can receive guidance and advice on ongoing or future assessment projects, creating the possibility that workshop participants can become dangerous on their own campuses.
Assessment gives us multiple ways to understand and improve our effectiveness holistically. Assessment need not be scary, solitary, or unidirectional. Through assessment, we have changed by looking inward to assess the type of education we can and should have for writing consultants as a function of the writers we serve and the writers we are. During this presentation we will share our various assessment activities, discuss what they teach us and how they help us to plan, and will invite participants to share and brainstorm with us other exciting forms of assessment.

Ethical and effective tutor assessment procedures should ideally empower individual tutors, increase peer mentoring within the writing center, and enhance the writing center’s sense of community. A writing center’s physical space can greatly impact the peer tutor mentoring and peer tutor training processes. Change in space and size can necessitate a shift from an organic and informal process to a more formal process that involves the use of experienced tutors in the assessment of novices. This presentation explores the concepts of space and community as they pertain to the ideas of peer tutor training, tutor preparedness, and ethical and effective assessment practices.

Peer writing tutor programs excel at helping traditional undergraduate students, but such programs often underserve adult students. In this presentation, I will discuss the principles of andragogy, of how adults learn, as a way to help writing center staff tailor tutoring processes for adult student writers and to more effectively target that group. Speaking through the lens of andragogy, I will note how adult students can differ from their younger counterparts in key ways. For example, adult students often need to have their work and family obligations respected. Usually extremely motivated, because they know what being without a degree in the workplace means, many retain negative memories of school and have a wealth of work experience that must be considered in the tutoring process. These students might struggle to let go of writing habits they have acquired over the years, or they might not value being tutored by a writer younger than themselves. Drawing on our institution’s efforts to expand our peer tutoring program to more adult students, I will discuss how we have implemented such efforts and why, will note benefits of and barriers to our efforts, and will work with session participants to ensure they generate ideas about how their centers can better serve this important population.
### Session 8. G

**Room 1360**

**Live Online Writing Consultations: Great Techniques For Efficient Results**

**Kelsey Book and Sean Duffie, Writing Consultants, Writing Center**

Grand Valley State University – Allendale, MI

As live online consultations become more relevant and possible for writing centers important considerations and positive outcomes surface. For example, we need to consider how student writers’ experiences can be maximized within a different technological medium. Positive outcomes include that students can search for help online from the convenience of their own residence, which may mean they will ask for help more readily. If we can provide online consultations outside of our regular writing center hours, help is more available to students who may not be able to visit the center during the set hours. This presentation will examine important techniques consultants may use in live online consultations (excluding email) and will pose questions to help us consider what makes these consultations the most efficient learning sessions. In addition, we will use *Wimba Pronto* to demonstrate online consultations and will encourage questions and responses from our session participants.

### Session 8. H

**Room 2345**

**The ESL Writer and the Workshop Class**

**Sue Montross and Rachel Hoffman, Writing Center Tutor, Writing Center**

University of Michigan-Flint – Flint, MI

Because many placement tests or other testing mechanisms do not distinguish between English as a Second Language (ESL) and basic writers, these two different groups of writers, who have vastly different, even conflicting needs, often end up in the same classrooms. In this presentation, we will offer a workshop class for ESL writers focusing on instruction in writing in English with an emphasis on extending English language proficiency as well as continued writing instruction. This presentation will discuss tutoring strategies as well as present the overall goals of the course. Participants will also be invited to share tutoring strategies they use in their centers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Session(s)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Session(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Jill</td>
<td>8.F</td>
<td>Crawford, Mary Ann</td>
<td>5.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arehart, Amy Jo</td>
<td>7.A</td>
<td>Crookston, Carly</td>
<td>3.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Stephanie</td>
<td>6.B</td>
<td>DeZarn, Anna</td>
<td>8.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball, Loran</td>
<td>5.B</td>
<td>Dickerson, Curtis</td>
<td>4.G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beining, Sara</td>
<td>4.C</td>
<td>Driscoll, Dana L.</td>
<td>4.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bencze, Alecia</td>
<td>3.L</td>
<td>Dudas, Steve</td>
<td>2.J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block, Jessica</td>
<td>3.H</td>
<td>Duffie, Sean</td>
<td>1.D, 8.G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumer, Jake</td>
<td>5.A</td>
<td>Eddington, Joe</td>
<td>3.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boehm, Diane</td>
<td>5.A</td>
<td>Edgington, Anthony</td>
<td>6.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie, Natalie</td>
<td>5.D</td>
<td>Elami, Kiana</td>
<td>2.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandstatter, Jane</td>
<td>4.B</td>
<td>Ellison, Ashley</td>
<td>7.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breidenstein, Megan</td>
<td>6.C</td>
<td>Evans, Eileen</td>
<td>Fri. Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenton, Hannah</td>
<td>7.D</td>
<td>Ewing, Christine</td>
<td>7.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brininger, Jake</td>
<td>2.M</td>
<td>Fahey, Margana</td>
<td>5.J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brouckaert, Justin</td>
<td>6.B</td>
<td>Favela, Juan</td>
<td>5.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Thomas Wade</td>
<td>2.I</td>
<td>Finstrom, Jennifer</td>
<td>3.H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan, April</td>
<td>4.M</td>
<td>Fledderjohann, Matthew</td>
<td>3.H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, Tim</td>
<td>5.C</td>
<td>Foy, Thom</td>
<td>5.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchino, Kody</td>
<td>1.G</td>
<td>Gaddis, Claire</td>
<td>5.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, Sarah</td>
<td>5.H</td>
<td>Gallagher, Stephanie</td>
<td>6.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busby, Bruce</td>
<td>8.D</td>
<td>Garrison, Anthony</td>
<td>Fri. Lunch, 8.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Michelle</td>
<td>6.E</td>
<td>Gill, Amber</td>
<td>2.L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canevari, Gianna</td>
<td>5.I</td>
<td>Giscombe, Charlotte</td>
<td>2.L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casto, Anna</td>
<td>7.D</td>
<td>Glazier, Morgan Rae</td>
<td>7.J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Session(s)</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Session(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin, Ben</td>
<td>4.H, 5.G</td>
<td>Lee, Bo Ram</td>
<td>2.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Tim</td>
<td>Fri. Lunch</td>
<td>Lenoir, Lisa</td>
<td>3.H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunter, Katie Marie</td>
<td>2.H</td>
<td>Mabuza, Felicia</td>
<td>5.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashimov, Elmar</td>
<td>7.F</td>
<td>Marneros, Emmanuel</td>
<td>7.G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoatlin, Rori</td>
<td>3.F</td>
<td>Maxwell, Erin</td>
<td>5.J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Dustin M.</td>
<td>5.C</td>
<td>May, Amanda M.</td>
<td>1.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Rachel</td>
<td>8.H</td>
<td>Mazahem, Maya</td>
<td>2.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder, Tamara</td>
<td>7.B</td>
<td>Mazahem, Sera</td>
<td>2.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton, Teri</td>
<td>4.I</td>
<td>McBride, Maureen</td>
<td>2.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huck, Sarah</td>
<td>8.B</td>
<td>McCall, Mary</td>
<td>6.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jablonski, Alex</td>
<td>6.A</td>
<td>McGhee, Tanikwa</td>
<td>4.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jettpace, Lynn A.</td>
<td>3.M</td>
<td>McLaughlin, Laura</td>
<td>2.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez, Heidi</td>
<td>2.L</td>
<td>McLaughlin, Sarah</td>
<td>2.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Dale</td>
<td>5.F</td>
<td>McSuley, Will</td>
<td>5.J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaley, Heather</td>
<td>5.J</td>
<td>Meinhardt, Michael</td>
<td>5.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keri, Elizabeth</td>
<td>2.E</td>
<td>Miller, Kiley</td>
<td>7.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koenigsknecht, Beth</td>
<td>1.A</td>
<td>Milligan, Chelsea</td>
<td>4.G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeland, Geneva</td>
<td>7.D</td>
<td>Monsanty, Stephanie</td>
<td>3.L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavallee, Emilie</td>
<td>1.C</td>
<td>Moore, Julie L.</td>
<td>1.I, 2.K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le, Caroline</td>
<td>2.D</td>
<td>Mostafa, Tamanna</td>
<td>2.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Session(s)</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Session(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, Devoni</td>
<td>4.A</td>
<td>Schienke, Rachel</td>
<td>3.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen, Minh-Tam</td>
<td>6.H</td>
<td>Seo, Jen</td>
<td>5.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obrutz, Justyna</td>
<td>5.I</td>
<td>Shively, Monica</td>
<td>5.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ott, Randy</td>
<td>2.L</td>
<td>Smith, Melanie</td>
<td>1.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdue, Sherry</td>
<td>4.E</td>
<td>Sonnevil, Joe</td>
<td>3.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, David</td>
<td>5.H</td>
<td>Standridge, Emily</td>
<td>5.H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfotenhauer, Libby</td>
<td>7.E</td>
<td>Steele, Samantha</td>
<td>1.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelan, Katie</td>
<td>3.F</td>
<td>Stipe, Catherine</td>
<td>4.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Rebecca</td>
<td>1.H</td>
<td>Subramain, Maran</td>
<td>4.L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick, Lauren</td>
<td>7.E</td>
<td>Swihart Jewell, Megan</td>
<td>7.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racie-Klotz, Helen</td>
<td>5.A</td>
<td>Swoverland, Shane</td>
<td>1.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranville, Patrick</td>
<td>6.C</td>
<td>Syn, Daniel</td>
<td>7.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaume, Kathleen</td>
<td>6.F</td>
<td>Thomas, Mark A.</td>
<td>4.C, 7.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimer, Colleen</td>
<td>1.E</td>
<td>Tolsma, Arianna</td>
<td>7.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richeson, Melissa</td>
<td>5.D</td>
<td>Torti, Megan</td>
<td>5.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roblin, Kellie</td>
<td>2.C</td>
<td>Trobaugh, Nicole</td>
<td>1.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush, Josie</td>
<td>5.E</td>
<td>Tullis, Bri</td>
<td>2.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ, Jeffrey</td>
<td>2.B</td>
<td>Tully, Jenna</td>
<td>5.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rylander, Jon</td>
<td>4.G</td>
<td>Vander Bie, Sara</td>
<td>4.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabin, Austin</td>
<td>3.I</td>
<td>VanShaik, John</td>
<td>1.G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachs, Dianna</td>
<td>3.J</td>
<td>Visor, Julia N.</td>
<td>3.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands, Scott</td>
<td>3.A</td>
<td>Watson, William</td>
<td>1.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, Drew</td>
<td>2.M</td>
<td>Wells, Jaclyn</td>
<td>3.L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanow, Alyssa</td>
<td>5.E</td>
<td>Werner, Eric</td>
<td>8.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saupe, Karen</td>
<td>7.D</td>
<td>Westine, Carl D.</td>
<td>4.L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schafer, Breanne</td>
<td>7.E</td>
<td>White, Julie</td>
<td>6.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Session(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Scott, G.</td>
<td>4.M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson, Michael M.</td>
<td>Fri. Dinner, 7.C, 8.C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willits, Matthew R.</td>
<td>1.E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Coleman</td>
<td>1.G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Tia</td>
<td>4.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winck, Jessica</td>
<td>2.J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woyciehowicz Gonsior, Marian</td>
<td>2.G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynn Perdue, Sherry</td>
<td>5.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xin, Yifei</td>
<td>6.F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zallocco, Ron</td>
<td>6.F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman, Christine</td>
<td>7.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>