

# UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

## Introduction

As the new Assistant Director of First-year Composition of the Writing Center, my goal for this past year has been to improve on the good work of past directors. Having worked in the Writing Center for two years before assuming the directorship, I knew of areas for improved efficiency, and that has been the theme for this past year's success. My goals were to better advertise our services on campus, improve outreach efforts with faculty and programs across campus, and improve the work space for consultants.

In keeping with that theme, this report has also been redesigned for efficiency and better data management. For example, here is last year's table reflecting our data for our most frequented location, Park 66:

<b>Park Hall 30-minute Sessions</b>	<b>Summer 2014</b>	<b>Fall 2014</b>	<b>Spring 2015</b>
<b>Filled Sessions*</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>1300</b>	<b>1429</b>
<b>Unfilled Sessions</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>538</b>
<b>No Show Sessions**</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Percent Filled</b>	<b>85.79%</b>	<b>86.27%</b>	<b>74.36%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>1651</b>	<b>2086</b>

What's problematic about this table from an administration perspective is that it is both not accurate (unintentionally) and not effective for use as a metric. Regarding the former point, one must understand a little bit about how the Writing Center tabulates its appointments. For every three hours of work, the Writing Center has offered a thirty-minute desk shift to consultants, which is a mixture of a break and a time for them to perform various duties (fill out client reports, man the welcome desk, etc.). In this table, filled sessions do not differentiate between appointments with students and these desk shifts. While both are paid hours, only the former represents booked time with a consultant that is variable (desk shifts are sunk operating costs). Without accounting for them, up to 1/6 of a consultant's performance would be considered filled by desk shifts, a fact that can swing performance numbers a good deal.

In terms of efficacy, what troubled me about prior reports was that they there was no baseline to compare one year to another. For instance, if one year saw an increase in appointments filled but a decrease in total sessions, was that due to a decrease in staffed consultants? Having fewer consultants but identical demand would produce that effect. Due to each location, each semester, having a variable number of appointments offered, there needed to be a yardstick by which one's years data could be compared to another. To achieve this, a new category of "Sessions Offered" calculated how many available sessions were offered on an average weekly schedule.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

This is what that same data table looks like with Desk Shift and Sessions Offered considerations:

<b>Park Hall 30-minute Sessions</b>	<b>Summer 2014</b>	<b>Fall 2014</b>	<b>Spring 2015</b>
<b>Sessions Offered</b>	<b>21 per week</b>	<b>104 per week</b>	<b>108 per week</b>
<b>Filled Sessions</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>1064</b>	<b>1031</b>
<b>Desk Shifts</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>401</b>
<b>Unfilled Sessions</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>538</b>
<b>No Show Sessions</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>Percent Filled</b>	<b>81.7% (-4.09%)</b>	<b>83.99% (-2.28%)</b>	<b>68.3% (-6.06%)</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>1661</b>	<b>2098</b>

With regard to the aforementioned unintentional inaccuracies related to desk shifts, that explanation deals with how the Writing Center's scheduling software calculates a desk shift. In past years, all desk shifts were entered by the acting director manually setting up an appointment under his/her name. The result was that these appointments went into the system as would any student's appointment. Thus, when the yearly numbers were tabulated, the system had no way to differentiate between desk shifts and actual client sessions.

To remedy this and improve efficiency on other scheduling fronts, three new features were added to the system. The first was the adding of a "student" account by the name of "Desk Shift." By creating this tag for desk shifts, a simple control-F search of a semester's appointment master list could reveal exactly how many desk shifts were scheduled; that number was then subtracted from the total number of appointments.

The reason this method was never employed in prior years is because the same method for marking desk shifts was also used to mark official Writing Center work not related to consultations (for example, visiting a class to lead a workshop). Essentially, there needed to be a way to throw out the bath water without the baby. The solution to this problem was to create another "student" by the name of "Miscellaneous Student." With this tag, the Writing Center was able to accurately tabulate all of its non-consulting duties.

Finally, the Writing Center decided to address the recurring problem of last-minute cancellations. While improvement was made last year by denying students access to manually cancelling their appointments less than twelve-hours before the start of their appointments, that did not resolve the issue. What to do when a student e-mails you to say he/she won't attend the session? If you do nothing, the appointment becomes a no-show, but you lose the chance to offer that time slot to another student. If you cancel the appointment and no student signs up, it brings down the efficiency rate. The solution to this problem was the creation of the "student" account "12-hour Cancellation." In the scenario when an appointment was canceled on short notice and that timeframe went unfilled, this tag was retroactively applied. Doing so allowed for the tabulating of these appointments at the end of the semester, and then these were considered similarly to desk shifts in that their numbers were stricken from the overall appointment record to prevent influencing statistics for better or worse.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

Taking all this information into account, our new table appears as the following:

<b>Park Hall</b>
<b>30-minute Sessions</b>
<b>Sessions Offered</b>
<b>Filled Sessions</b>
<b>Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)</b>
<b>Unfilled Sessions</b>
<b>Absentees (NS/12)</b>
<b>Percent Filled</b>
<b>Totals</b>

### Table Key:

**Sessions Offered** is the total number of appointments available for students to sign up for on an average week. This metric allows one to compare the capacity of any location in any given semester in reference to another in the face of variable staffing. Desk shifts are excluded from this calculation.

**Filled Sessions** represents the number of appointments filled by consultant work. This number excludes desk shifts but includes “Miscellaneous Student” sessions because the latter is a filled duty.

**Sunk Shifts** account for necessary markers on the schedule system— but ones that are not indicative of performance. This total number is made up of two sets of data: desk shifts and placeholders. Whenever an available appointment needs to be blocked out (for example, a consultant is sick and needs to have his/her schedule removed from available appointments), a placeholder is utilized.

**Unfilled Sessions** are sessions that were available for consultation but went unbooked.

**Absentees** are sessions in which the client did not show up. This number comprises no-shows and 12-hour Cancellations. While both numbers contribute to total appointments, only the no-show number is factored in the Percent Filled category.

**Percent Filled** represents the number of Filled Sessions plus the number of no-shows (no-shows are counted in this percentage because consultants cannot help other clients during these sessions) all over the Filled Sessions plus no-shows plus Unfilled Sessions. This metric determines how successful a location was in utilizing its offered time.

**Totals** is tabulation of all the figures.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

Park Hall 30-minute Sessions	Summer 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Sessions Offered	21 per week	104 per week	108 per week
Filled Sessions	105	1064	1031
Desk Shifts	49	231	401
Unfilled Sessions	28	228	538
No Show Session	20	132	128
Percent Filled	81.7%	83.99%	68.3%
Totals	202	1661	2098

Park Hall 30-minute Sessions	Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Sessions Offered	30 per week	73 per week	103 per week <sup>1</sup>
Filled Sessions	104	930	1185/961
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	49 (49/0)	339 (289/50)	343 (306/37)/567 <sup>2</sup>
Unfilled Sessions	128	105	395
Absentees (NS/12)	25 (11/14)	158 (140/18)	157 (132/25)
Percent Filled	47.33%	91.06%	76.93%/73.45%
Totals	306	1532	2080 <sup>3</sup>

### Observations for Summer 2015, Park 66:

Summer 2015 was the only location of the year to experience a downturn in Percent Filled; however, it's Filled Sessions number is virtually identical. Summer 2014 operated with 1.5 consultants while Summer 2015 operated with 2 consultants (this difference is seen in the Sessions Offered numbers). While it's impossible to determine any relationship based on only two years (factors, such as number of FYC summer classes offered, can greatly influence Percent Filled), Summer 2016 will have 1 consultant.

<sup>1</sup> One of my initiatives this year was to introduce training to our program (there had never been a formal training program for consultants in Writing Center pedagogy). The reason training never existed is that consultants work on a strict 9-hour a week contract; it would be impossible to compel them to attend training unless they were paid for it (or if training were optional). Because spring semesters have traditionally been slower, I devoted one hour a week to mandatory training. This way, training could be completed, consultants would be compensated, and it would make use of the traditional lag in appointment numbers. So as not to reflect any "cooked" numbers, the sessions offered per week have factored out training hours (which were marked on the schedule as Miscellaneous Student). The dual numbers in this column reflect what these criteria look like if one considers training as a filled session or second a desk shift.

<sup>2</sup> This number is Sunk Shifts plus the training hours.

<sup>3</sup> If anyone audits this number, this will be the only total that is off from the system's record. The reason is the Writing Center had an intern during this semester, and she was listed as staff for training purposes. Her thirty-two training sessions have been stricken from the Totals.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

Figures from next year should help to establish a trend and determine the right number for summer consultants.

### **Recommendations:**

None. Staff numbers are currently undergoing restructure, and those downsizing efforts are deemed appropriate.

### **Observations for Fall 2015, Park 66:**

Fall 2015 suffered a reduction in consultant hours by 29.81% when compared to Fall 2014. While it did see a drop in Filled Sessions compared to Fall 2014, Fall 2015's Filled Sessions was only reduced by 12.59%. As such, Fall 2015 generated a 7.07% increase in productivity.

### **Recommendations:**

Operating at over 90% at a location as large as Park 66 is a carrying capacity for that set of consultant hours. Attention should be devoted to increasing staffing needs at this location, whether it be from additional consultant hours or redirecting hours from other locations (most likely the emma Lab).

### **Observations for Spring 2016, Park 66:**

Spring 2016 encountered a reduction in consultant hours by 4.63% when compared to Spring 2015. While it did see a drop in Filled Sessions compared to Spring 2015, Spring 2015's Filled Sessions was reduced by 6.79% (if training hours are treated as Sunk Shifts). By offering staff training, Desk Shifts were minimized by 23.69% and helped reduce the number of Unfilled Sessions. Those factors in addition to accounting for 12-hour Cancellations allowed for an improved efficiency in Percent Filled by 8.63%/5.15% (depending on whether one counts training hours as part of Percent Filled).

### **Recommendations:**

Hold staffing numbers and make better use of consultant time. The chief difference between Spring 2015 and Spring 2016 was the maximizing of consultant time. Whether it's training or campus-related projects, spring is the time to execute those side projects.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

Science Library 30-minute Sessions		
	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Sessions Offered	28 per week	26 per week
Filled Sessions	235	214
Desk Shifts	125	39
Unfilled Sessions	98	141
No Show Sessions	24	16
Percent Filled	72.55%	61.99%
Totals	482	410

Science Library 30-minute Sessions		
	Fall 2015	Spring 2016 <sup>4</sup>
Sessions Offered	19 per week	16 per week
Filled Sessions	212	134
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	45 (45/0)	60 (60/0)
Unfilled Sessions	50	91
Absentees (NS/12)	30 (24/6)	18 (16/2)
Percent Filled	82.52%	62.24%
Totals	337	303

### Observations for Fall 2015, Science Library:

Fall 2015 had a reduction in consultant hours by 32.14% when compared to Fall 2014. While it did see a drop in Filled Sessions compared to Fall 2014, Fall 2015's Filled Sessions was only a reduction of 9.79%. As such, Fall 2015 generated a 9.97% increase in productivity.

### Recommendations:

Hold numbers at the 2015 level. Percent Filled above 80% is doing very well. The max Sessions Offered should be 20 per week but can probably safely drop to 17.

---

<sup>4</sup> The decision was made to improve location-specific services by better labeling locales. Rather than calling this location "Science Library," which often read to students as an all-purpose help spot in the Science Library, we labeled it "Science Writing Help." By doing so, we cut the number of students seeking help with non-science-related writing (as reported by the science consultant, who worked both Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 in this location). At the same time, we therefore cut the general use of students in this location. Thus, the marginal increase in performance at this location must also be viewed as a vast improvement in qualitative services (and that this quantitative increase would have likely been larger had we not attempted to refine our services in this location).

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

### **Observations for Spring 2016, Science Library:**

Despite a 38.46% drop in Sessions Offered per week, there was virtually no difference in Filled sessions between Spring 2015 and Spring 2014. Sensing last year's numbers would be difficult to overcome, I made the decision before the start of the semester to shift hours from our science consultant at only the Science Writing location to include Park 66 and MLC.

### **Recommendations:**

Hold numbers at the 2016 level and continue to disperse hours to other locations. If the Science library holds at sixty-something-percent rate regardless of staffing needs when it passes a certain threshold, the only solution is to bring down the Sessions Offered numbers closer to that threshold in the Science Library location until more outreach can be done to increase use in this location.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---



---

Miller Learning Center 30-minute Sessions		
	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Sessions Offered	20 per week	16 per week
Filled Sessions	206	116
Desk Shifts	82	41
Unfilled Sessions	28	85
No Show Sessions	28	10
Percent Filled	89.31%	59.72%
Totals	344	252

Miller Learning Center 30-minute Sessions		
	Fall 2015	Spring 2016 <sup>5</sup>
Sessions Offered	12/6 per week <sup>6</sup>	13 per week
Filled Sessions	100	106
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	26 (24/2)	33 (30/3)
Unfilled Sessions	6	69
Absentees (NS/12)	9 (7/2)	17 (12/5)
Percent Filled	94.69%	63.10%
Totals	141	225

### Observations for Fall 2015, MLC:

Fall 2015 yielded a 5.38% increase in Percent Filled.

### Recommendations:

It's not possible to determine any recommendations. Due to the loss of so many hours, this location operated at a very high Percent Filled rate out of scarcity

### Observations for Spring 2016, MLC:

While Spring 2016 had a reduction in consultant hours by 18.75% when compared to Spring 2015, Spring 2016's Filled Sessions only encountered a reduction of 8.62%. As such, Spring 2016 generated a 3.38%

<sup>5</sup> This location included a science writing consultant.

<sup>6</sup> Halfway through the semester, there was a health issue with an instructor in the English Department. The Writing Center lost consultants working in this location so that those consultants could teach the courses of the ill faculty member. These two numbers represent the offered numbers before and after the loss our consultants.



## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

increase in productivity compared to Spring 2015. Also, of the three consultants working in this location, the science writer had a steep Unfilled Sessions number compared to her non-science writing counterparts. Quite possibly more students would have utilized her services had she been an all-purpose consultant.

### **Recommendations:**

Hold numbers at the 2016 level but do not place a science-writing consultant in this location (or do not advertise the consultant's services as such).

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

emma Lab 30-minute Sessions	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Sessions Offered	40 per week	36 per week
Filled Sessions	188	89
Desk Shifts	434	462
Unfilled Sessions	224	344
No Show Sessions	28	13
Percent Filled	49.09%	22.87%
Totals	874	908

emma Lab 30-minute Sessions	Fall 2015	Spring 2016 <sup>7</sup>
Sessions Offered	42 per week	24 per week
Filled Sessions	245	157
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	41 (40/1)	8 (0/8)
Unfilled Sessions	137	110
Absentees (NS/12)	44 (43/1)	19 (17/2)
Percent Filled	67.76%	61.54%
Totals	467	294

### Observations for Fall 2015, emma Lab:

One of the few locations to receive an increase in staffing hours (by 5%), Fall 2015 welcomed an 18.67% growth in Percent Filled. This, I feel, was done through a much better effort on the part of Sara Steger in the emma Lab advertising our services to the FYC curriculum.

### Recommendations:

Drop consultant numbers. Rather than staff four consultants at this location, Fall 2016 will staff three and move the fourth into Park 66. This should both bring up efficacy in the emma Lab location while also helping to add much needed support in Park 66 (all without increasing overall staff).

---

<sup>7</sup> Similar to the Science Library location, we made a concerted effort to rebrand this location from what students perceived as an all-purpose location to one specifically geared to assist FYC students. We did so by renaming it "ENGL 1101, 1102, and 1103 Help." Thus, aside from the massive boost in Percent Filled, we also achieved a target improvement on qualitative goals (students who created appointments outside of the FYC class spectrum were instructed to rebook appointments at different locations).

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

### **Observations for Spring 2016, emma Lab:**

Anticipating a slower spring semester, I decided to reduce consulting hours in the emma Lab for Spring 2016. The decision resulted in a 33.33% reduction. That reduction (which minimized Unfilled Sessions) coupled with an increase in Filled Sessions generated a 38.67% increase in Percent Filled.

### **Recommendations:**

Hold numbers at the 2016 and practice strategic spreading of hours. This location is most popular during the last two weeks (when FYC portfolios are completed). Rather than offer full services in the middle of the semester, limited services should be offered; then, toward the end of the semester, those held hours should be applied to handle the increased demand.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

Online Consultations 30-minute Sessions		
	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Sessions Offered	10 per week	6 per week
Filled Sessions	40	46
Unfilled Sessions	26	38
No Show Sessions	12	12
Percent Filled	66.67%	54.76%
Totals	78	96

Online Consultations 30-minute Sessions		
	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Sessions Offered	6 per week	8 per week
Filled Sessions	48	70
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	10 (0/10)	0 (0/0)
Unfilled Sessions	6	46
Absentees (NS/12)	26 (26/0)	22 (22/0)
Percent Filled	92.5%	66.67%
Totals	90	138

### Observations for Fall 2015, Online Consultations:

A decrease of 40% in Fall 2015's Sessions Offered compared to Fall 2014's occurred. Additionally, Fall 2015 saw a 25.83% increase in Percent Filled.

### Recommendations:

Hold if necessary; increase if staffing needs allow. While this increase in Percent Filled might be tied to a lowering of Sessions Offered (increasing scarcity), there's a perception amongst staff that students are becoming more attached to online appointments (and this is reinforced by Millennial learning patterns). Therefore, this increase must also be regarded as a possible increase in a preferred style of appointment.

### Observations for Spring 2016, Online Consultations:

Spring 2016, based on the success of Fall 2015, earned an increase of Sessions Offered by 33.33% compared to Spring 2015. While Spring 2016 did not see the same success compared to Fall 2015, it did produce an 11.9% Percent Filled increase compared to Spring 2015.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

### **Recommendations:**

Hold numbers at the 2016 level. If the advent of online consultations does indeed pan out, these numbers will improve on their own. And, as it stands, 6 sessions per week is a very low-risk, low-resource-demand number to work with when considered in regard to overall staffing.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

All Locations 30-minute Sessions	Summer 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Sessions Offered	21 per week	200 per week	192 per week
Filled Sessions	105	1713	1473
Desk Shifts	49	872	943
Unfilled Sessions	28	597	1127
No Show Sessions	20	218	173
Percent Filled	83.66%	76.38%	59.35%
Totals	202	3400	3716 sessions

All Locations 30-minute Sessions	Summer 2015 <sup>8</sup>	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Sessions Offered	30 per week	152/146 per week	164 per week
Filled Sessions	104	1535	1652
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	49 (49/0)	461 (398/63)	444 (396/48)
Unfilled Sessions	128	304	711
Absentees (NS/12)	25 (11/14)	267 (240/27)	233 (199/34)
Percent Filled	47.33%	85.38%	72.25%
Totals	306	2567	3040

### Observations for Fall 2015:

Fall 2015 had an across-the-board reduction in consultant hours by 27% when compared to Fall 2014. However, it only saw a decrease in Filled Sessions of 8.06%. As such, Fall 2015 generated a 9% increase in productivity.

### Recommendations:

Hold numbers at the 2015 level (but growth is manageable). Fall 2015 represented a much learner Writing Center operating at high capacity at all locations. Bearing demand doesn't significantly grow, it can maintain its progress with current staffing numbers or grow to accommodate more appointments (while still being in the 80+% zone).

---

<sup>8</sup> Because summer is made up of only one location, its holistic data has already been represented in Summer 2015, Park 66.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

### **Observations for Spring 2015:**

While Spring 2016 experienced a 14.58% reduction in Sessions offered, it managed to produce an *increase* in Sessions Filled (12.15%) compared to Spring 2015. By offering fewer sessions and yet still increasing session usage, Percent Filled jumped 12.9% compared to a year before (and almost equaling Fall 2014).

### **Recommendations:**

Hold numbers at the 2016 level and incorporate even more strategic use of consultant time. For a spring semester to rival the usage of a fall semester is pretty out of the ordinary. If outreach efforts continue, there's no reason spring cannot crack into the 80+% field within a few years while also accomplishing important Writing Center side endeavors. One suggestion for immediate improvement is for the science WIP consultant to have his/her schedule reversed (this past year, the science consultant worked one unit in the fall and two in the spring. Given Fall's greater need, the two units should be front-loaded).

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

All Locations Class Visits <sup>9</sup>	Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
FYC Classes	5	21	11
English Classes	0	3	2
Other <sup>10</sup>	2	5	4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>17</b>

Class visits haven't been included in prior end of year reports, but they do represent a portion of the services we provide— a service that is not usually calculated in our session numbers. The reason for this is the managing director of the Writing Center often delivers these presentations personally (and his/her hours are not accounted for in the system because he/she works based on duties, not a 9-hour-week schedule).

In this table, you will find three categories of visits. The first two represent class visits in which the director or a consultant visit a class and speak about the Writing Center's services (typically as a way to advertise our resources and enlist potential clients). The last category, Other, represents tailored workshops the Writing Center gives when contacted by faculty from across the campus. These presentations are entirely dependent on what the faculty person requests, and they are generated from scratch. The Other visit area is the prime location to divert consultants with unused schedule time toward (typically in spring) in that the creation of individual class presentations requires not an insignificant amount of time.

---

<sup>9</sup> There is no record of prior years' visits to compare this year's numbers to.

<sup>10</sup> Department of Student Affairs, Department of Chemistry, Department of Sociology, Department of Portuguese, Department of Comparative Literature, Army ROTC, Ignite Write Festival, Writing Fellows, COE Advisors Meeting, SAUGA Writing Workshop.



# UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

## Writing Center Efficacy

The decision was made to utilize our survey capabilities for more than present (reflecting on the just-had session) and future (reflecting on future use) reflection. Added in the final weeks of the Spring 2016 was the question “**If you’ve visited the Writing Center before, would you say your prior appointment helped you earn a better grade, gain admission to your program, or any other desired outcome?**”.

The rationale behind this question is that none of the prior questions addressed the efficacy of our work from a retrospective perspective (when the student could definitively discern if desired outcomes had been achieved). While this question only surveyed a small portion of our clientele, the results are promising and are the best illustration of our clients’ perceptions that the Writing Center boosts performance.

	Spring 15
Yes	47 (77.05%)
Somewhat	10 (16.39%)
No	4 (6.56%)
This was my first appointment/N.A.	23 <sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> These numbers were removed from the percentage calculation.

# UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

## Client Satisfaction

This table shows student responses to the question “**I would rate this session...**”. Students had overwhelmingly positive responses to their consultations, with fair-to-negative responses barely registering.

	Summer 14/Fall 14/ Spring 15 Average	Summer 15/Fall 15/ Spring 16 Average
<b>Excellent</b>	<b>407 (65.75%)</b>	<b>534 (66.17%)</b>
<b>Very Good</b>	<b>138 (22.29%)</b>	<b>163 (20.20)%</b>
<b>Good</b>	<b>43 (6.95%)</b>	<b>63 (7.81%)</b>
<b>Fair</b>	<b>16 (2.58%)</b>	<b>28 (3.47)%</b>
<b>Poor</b>	<b>9 (1.45%)</b>	<b>18 (2.23)%</b>
<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>6 (0.97%)</b>	<b>1 (0.12)%</b>

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

The second Client Satisfaction table shows student responses to the question “I will return to the center.”

	Summer 14/Fall 14/ Spring 15 Average	Summer 15/Fall 15/ Spring 16 Average
Yes	570 (92.23%)	731 (90.58%)
Maybe	35 (5.66%)	65 (8.05%)
No	13 (2.10%)	11 (1.36%)

The third Client Satisfaction table shows student responses to the question “I will recommend the center.” Spring 2015 shows significant growth over Fall 2014.

	Summer 14/Fall 14/ Spring 15 Average	Summer 15/Fall 15/ Spring 16 Average
Yes	573 (92.72%)	750 (92.94%)
Maybe	33 (5.33%)	46 (5.70%)
No	12 (1.94%)	11 (1.36%)

### Observations:

While there are slight fluctuations in individual categories (both positive and negative), none of them are statistically significant. What does need to be mentioned is that the Writing Center’s efforts to improve survey completion was successful in that the survey response numbers increased by over 100 responses in every category (in spite of the number of filled sessions between the two years being equal). Thus, this past year’s survey results reflect a better survey of our clients’ experiences by capturing more responses from the same-sized pie.

### Recommendations:

None.

## UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2015-2016

---

---

Finally, missing from this report is a series of data boxes that have been included in prior reports. The data included class standing, home language, and various metrics related to Writing Center preferences. I have chosen to leave that information out from this report for a few reasons. First, the information isn't necessarily accurate. Because clients only complete a profile once, their registration information is not update yearly. That means, for example, a client who made an appointment while in ENGL 1101 and used our services for four years was always being counted as an FYC student, despite not being one for years. Second, the information related to scheduling preferences is not viable nor tailored. Because the Writing Center must accommodate a tremendous amount of time amongst its various locations, we have never had the luxury to shift overflow appointments when creating staff schedules. Similarly, asking a question of whether students prefer a particular shift time is rendered meaningless if we always staff people at all normal business hours. So while it is a great idea to ask students which days and times they prefer sessions to be held, unless we abandon our Monday-Friday, 8-5 coverage principles, these responses will never be incorporated. Additionally, in locations that have only one or two consultants, preference is given to the consultants schedule as he/she must balance other commitments. Third, it is my opinion that much of the information contained in the data was not useful for determining the efficacy of the Writing Center and need not be presented here. However, I do recognize the value of that data in particular circumstances; all of that data is still on hand and can be retrieved should it ever be requested.