

# UGA Writing Center End of Year Report, 2016-2017

---

---

## Introduction

As part of its core mission to serve the UGA campuses through one-on-consultations, the Writing Center saw Filled Percent increases in five locations (out of eleven) over the 2016-2017 academic year with a total 2.16 increase in annual Filled Percent across all locations. These figures include the launch of online consultations over the summer to assist students who are taking UGA coursework abroad or are recent graduates and applying to professional schools but no longer in the Athens area. The Writing Center now staffs twelve different locations throughout the academic year. In addition to its core mission, the Writing Center also engaged two core projects dealing with science writing and graduate students.

One direction that the Writing Center anticipates need for in the future is science-based writing assignments. Currently, this segment of our clientele is limited, and the majority of students in the sciences requesting our services are international graduate students for whom English is a second language. However, with increased focus on STEM fields at UGA and in society at large, it is no longer feasible to ignore the growing demand for help with science writing. This is notably applicable to undergraduates, who have little or no experience with the science writing expected at the post-secondary level because primary and secondary education link writing instruction with the humanities.

To address anticipated future demand for science writing assistance, the Writing Center proactively began to ready its staff. Due to the Writing Center's structure as an entity whose consultants are on teaching contracts within the English Department, the vast majority of its consultants are highly skilled writers with years and years of humanities-rich writing experience but little to no exposure to science writing or science coursework. To remedy this lack, the Writing Center instituted a mandatory semester-long science writing training program in Spring 2017 for all consultants. This training consisted of weekly meetings where consultants read and evaluated introductory lab write-ups from BIOL 1107L and 1108L—a component of an IRB-approved pilot study collaboration with the Biology Department and Writing Intensive Program that was developed and led by the Writing Center. Biology was chosen as the ideal partner because it is now the most enrolled major at the UGA Athens campus.

In addition to receiving direct pedagogy and feedback from the Assistant Director of UGA Writing Centers in training meetings, a committee that included the Department Head of Biology and Biology Lab Coordinator helped assess the capabilities/growth of the Writing Center's consultants through reviews of the biology student writing assignments that the consultants had evaluated during training. From these committee meetings, we determined what science writing knowledge gaps existed and how to best train the Writing Center's staff to address said gaps. While previously hesitant to recommend our services due a lack of knowledge regarding consultants' abilities, both the Department Head and Lab Coordinator now approve of the Writing Center's abilities to comment on introductory lab reports after reviewing over the data. We anticipate that this will cause an uptick in science writing consultations in the upcoming year now that the Biology Department will be actively recommend that their students utilize our services.

In addition to better training the Writing Center's consultants, this pilot study utilized the gathered student writing assignments to develop an in-house writing handbook for the Biology Department. It is our belief that the best way to help new students write in the sciences is by providing them with instruction addressing essential genre knowledge that is often learned through trial and error and not specifically taught in introductory coursework, hence the essentialness of the handbook. This handbook

will be provided to the students free of cost. Given the current enrolled numbers in BIOL 1107L and the average cost of a science writing handbook, this move is expected to save students, collectively, \$14,500-45,000 per semester.

The Writing Center also believes that it must devote more resources to graduate student writing projects. As most graduate degrees at the university culminate with an extended piece of scholarship in the form of a thesis or dissertation, there is a need for the Writing Center to help students complete these projects. However, while the Writing Center offers services to graduate students in the form of weekly consultations lasting up to sixty minutes, the length of their projects and the varied writing components and stages make it difficult to address the myriad needs. Because most graduate students have no prior experience writing theses and dissertations and do not enroll in departmental coursework to help with writing these projects, graduate students must tackle these intricate and long projects as novices. This leaves ample space for assistance.

One way that the Writing Center has begun to address the need for enhanced graduate student writing services is by collaborating with the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Judy Milton, to develop and run the university's thesis and dissertation boot camps. While it is not possible in its current form to address every graduate student need on campus, the boot camps provide a space to assist twenty-some students a time with tailored instruction. To help launch this program, the Writing Center researched and wrote the ten-lesson handbook that the program utilizes in addition to having the Assistant Director lead all boot camp programs. This successful collaboration culminated in a week-long summer intensive program (Summer 2016) and a semester-long writing group program (Fall 2016), both of which were free for students. Currently, the Graduate School and the Writing Center are working on developing the program for the university's satellite campuses, which was piloted in Spring 2017 at the Griffon Campus (marking the first time that the Writing Center had visited a satellite campus). Visits to Griffin and Tifton campuses are planned for Fall 2017. Lastly, GRSC 8300, a class premised on the work of the boot camps, has been approved as course for the 2017-2018 academic year and will likely be offered in Fall 2017 as a pass/no pass credit course in lieu of the writing workshop.

<b>Park Hall 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.

<b>Park Hall 30-minute Sessions</b>			
	<b>Summer 2016</b>	<b>Fall 2016</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>
<b>Sessions Offered</b>	<b>9 per week</b>	<b>116 per week</b>	<b>93 (86)<sup>1</sup>/75<sup>2</sup> per week</b>
<b>Filled Sessions</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1153</b>	<b>1019/741</b>
<b>Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)</b>	<b>24 (24/0)</b>	<b>315 (315/0)</b>	<b>192 (192/0)/470<sup>3</sup></b>
<b>Unfilled Sessions</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>220</b>
<b>Absentees (NS/12)</b>	<b>11 (10/1)</b>	<b>203 (188/15)</b>	<b>133 (130/3)</b>
<b>Percent Filled</b>	<b>82.67%</b>	<b>82.47%</b>	<b>83.93%/79.84%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1956</b>	<b>1564</b>

<b>Park Hall 30-minute Sessions</b>			
	<b>Summer 2015</b>	<b>Fall 2015</b>	<b>Spring 2016</b>
<b>Sessions Offered</b>	<b>30 per week</b>	<b>73 per week</b>	<b>103 per week</b>
<b>Filled Sessions</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>930</b>	<b>1185/961</b>
<b>Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)</b>	<b>49 (49/0)</b>	<b>339 (289/50)</b>	<b>343 (306/37)/567</b>
<b>Unfilled Sessions</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>395</b>
<b>Absentees (NS/12)</b>	<b>25 (11/14)</b>	<b>158 (140/18)</b>	<b>157 (132/25)</b>
<b>Percent Filled</b>	<b>47.33%</b>	<b>91.06%</b>	<b>76.93%/73.45%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>1532</b>	<b>2080<sup>4</sup></b>

<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 Session</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>Percent Filled</b>	<b>81.7%</b>	<b>83.99%</b>	<b>68.3%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>1661</b>	<b>2098</b>

**Observations for Summer 2016, Park 66:**

<sup>1</sup> One consultant was on sick-leave for the 1.5 months. Ninety-three represents the week with her inclusion, and eight-six represents her without it.

<sup>2</sup> Training was conducted as part of the Writing Center's science writing study. All numbers after a slash indicate adjusted numbers to exclude sunk training hours.

<sup>3</sup> This number is Sunk Shifts plus the training hours.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

Summer 2016, with only one consultant working instead of Summer 2015's two, experienced a 35.34 increase in Percent Filled compared to the previous summer. Likely, this resulted from fewer appointments offered due to both reduced sessions that could be offered and that six shifts from the traditional in-person location were shifted to online hours.

**Recommendations:**

None.

**Observations for Fall 2016, Park 66:**

Fall 2016 had an increase in Sessions Offered per week by 58.9% compared to Fall 2015's. While last year's recommendations called for an increase in this location, the increase was steeper than desired, and as a result Fall 2016's Percent Filled dropped by 8.59. Its Percent Filled, however, closely matches Fall 2014, which had a similar Sessions Offered figure. This indicates that there is a threshold for this location given where Sessions Offered and Percent Filled have corresponding relationships that swings greatly (up to 90 per week Sessions Offered is hypothesized to be the upper 80s/lower 90s Percent Filled threshold; more sessions offered after that number will cause Percent Filled drop to the mid to low 80s). It is also important to note that this location, due to staffing needs with one of its consultants, had to accommodate a schedule that resulted in double coverage for long stretches of time. This location often only needs one consulting slot, and the double coverage caused long stretches of unbooked appointments.

**Recommendations:**

Shift hours and avoid double coverage. While the total staff hours for all locations were sufficient for the semester, the issue here became one of a schedule that did not maximize its potential. Ideally, hours from this location would have been shifted to a satellite location (preferably the MLC). Fall 2017 should strive to offer no more than 90-100 Sessions Offered to best meet current demand.

**Observations for Spring 2017, Park 66:**

Spring 2016 continued Spring 2015's trend of reducing staffing hours from Sessions Offered and utilizing that time for training. As a result, Spring 2016 saw our flagship location breaking 80% in Percent Filled for the first time. The trimmed schedule saw a 7% increase (6.39% when accounting for training) over Spring 2015's Percent Filled. Contributing to this increase is the fact that though Sessions Offered went down, Absentees remained stable.

**Recommendations:**

Hold staffing numbers and continue training. Training seems to be the best way to make use of consultant time while shrinking the supply of consultations offered such that student demand creates a sufficient Percent Filled without creating a scenario where there are not enough available appointments.

All-Purpose Help (SL) <sup>5</sup> 30-minute Sessions		
	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Sessions Offered	13 per week	14 per week
Filled Sessions	122	118
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	36 (36/0)	31 (31/0)
Unfilled Sessions	30	75
Absentees (NS/12)	16 (13/3)	13 (13/0)
Percent Filled	81.82%	63.59%
Totals	204	237

Science Library 30-minute Sessions		
	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
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

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

<sup>5</sup> Due to delayed funds, the WIP Director was prevented from securing a science writing specialist, who is the person that usually staffs the science writing location in the Science Library. Instead, two writing specialists with humanities backgrounds were secured. As a result, we decided to make this location an all-purpose site rather than a science writing location because we could not guarantee the needed standard for science writing.

**Observations for Fall 2016, Science Library:**

Fall 2016 reduced Sessions Offered compared to Fall 2015 due to a lack of a science writing specialist. Overall, the location only dropped 0.7 in Percent Filled compared to the prior year, which indicates this location is useful for students regardless of whether it is branded specifically for science writing.

**Recommendations:**

None. With advanced funding, the WIP Director has secured a science writing specialist. This location will return as a science writing site and increase its Sessions Offered to match Fall 2015.

**Observations for Spring 2017, Science Library:**

Reducing Sessions Offered at this location seems to have played a role in increasing Percent Filled by 1.35. Extra sessions were funneled to the Park 66 location, which utilized them appropriately.

**Recommendations:**

Hold numbers at the 2015 level. To determine the need for science writing during in spring semesters, we need another year advertised as science writing in order to make comparisons.

Miller Learning Center 30-minute Sessions	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Sessions Offered	9 per week	10 per week
Filled Sessions	71	78
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	12 (12/0)	0
Unfilled Sessions	32	12
Absentees (NS/12)	9 (8/1)	10 (10/0)
Percent Filled	71.17%	88.00%
Totals	124	100

Miller Learning Center 30-minute Sessions	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
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

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

<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.

**Observations for Fall 2016, MLC:**

Fall 2016 saw a 23.52 decrease in Percent Filled, which is steep given this location is the highest performing, historically.

**Recommendations:**

Keep staffing levels minimal and monitor Fall 2017. Whether Fall 2016's Percent Filled drop was an anomaly or the result of some other issue can only be determined by observing what happens in the upcoming year.

**Observations for Spring 2017, MLC:**

Spring 2017 saw a 24.9 increase Percent Filled compared to Spring 2016. Additionally, for the first time, the spring location out-performed the fall one (despite having comparative Sessions Offered). This suggests Fall 2016's numbers were not an ordinary occurrence.

**Recommendations:**

None.

<b>Digital Media Lab<sup>7</sup> 30-minute Sessions</b>	<b>Fall 2016</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>
<b>Sessions Offered</b>	<b>22 per week</b>	<b>24 per week</b>
<b>Filled Sessions</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Unfilled Sessions</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>Absentees (NS/12)</b>	<b>28 (26/2)</b>	<b>29 (29/0)</b>
<b>Percent Filled</b>	<b>84.75%</b>	<b>56.74%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>356</b>

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

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

---

<sup>7</sup> This space was renamed.

**Observations for Fall 2016, Digital Learning Lab:**

One of the best showings for all locations occurred here with a 16.99 increase in Percent Filled compared to Fall 2015. This space has historically struggled fill appointments, so the decision to cut Sessions Offered seems a smart one; despite an almost 50% cut in Sessions Offered, there was little difference in Filled Sessions. The reduction in Unfilled Sessions drove the Percent Filled increase.

**Recommendations:**

None.

**Observations for Spring 2017, Digital Learning Lab:**

This location saw a 4.8 decrease in Percent Filled compared to Spring 2016. Despite offering the same number of weekly appointments, Spring 2017 began consulting immediately rather than the traditional third/fourth week mark as a result of the Digital Learning Lab not needing the space. It is hypothesized that students simply had no assignments to work on so early in the semester (the first few weeks saw large numbers of Unfilled Sessions), and Spring 2017 would have more closely matched Spring 2016 without the large number of Unfilled Session accrued early in the semester.

**Recommendations:**

Reduce Sessions Offered and shift consulting hours to Park 66 if needed. Ensure the first weeks of the semester operate at minimum.

Online Consultations 30-minute Sessions			
	Summer 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Sessions Offered	6 per week	5 per week	14 (8) <sup>8</sup> per week
Filled Sessions	28	36	71
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	0	19 (19/0)	34 (34/0)
Unfilled Sessions	9	52	46
Absentees (NS/12)	11 (5/6)	22 (22/0)	19 (16/3)
Percent Filled	78.57%	52.72%	65.41%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>138</b>

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%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>138</b>

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%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>96</b>

<sup>8</sup> A consultant on sick-leave joined the center 1.5 months into the semester. This reflects the hours before her joining the staff and afterward.

**Observations for Summer 2016, Online Consultations:**

Summer 2016 marked the first time that online consultations were offered over the summer.

**Recommendations:**

Hold. Its strong debut merits continuing the service at current numbers for Summer 2017.

**Observations for Fall 2015, Online Consultations:**

Despite offering fewer Sessions Offered, Fall 2016 saw a 39.78 decrease in Percent Filled. It is believed that this resulted from online sessions beginning at 17:00 and ending at 18:30 to accommodate the consultant's newborn (typically, online sessions do not begin before 19:00). Because online sessions cater to those who work normal business hours, a lack in Filled Sessions could have resulted from this time change.

**Recommendations:**

Hold numbers but ensure consultations begin no earlier than 19:00.

**Observations for Spring 2017, Online Consultations:**

Spring 2017 saw a marginal drop of 1.26 in Percent Filled compared to Spring 2016. Part of this drop is attributed to a second consultant being added into this space to accommodate health issues that prevented the consultant from traveling to campus and conducting in-person appointments. Aside from this increasing the number of Sessions Offered past desired numbers, consultations began at 17:00, which, like Fall 2016, created issues with time demand.

**Recommendations:**

Reduce numbers to 8 sessions and begin no earlier than 19:00.

All Locations 30-minute Sessions	Summer 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Sessions Offered	15 per week	165 per week	155 (142)
Filled Sessions	80	1606	1459
Sunk Shifts (DS/PL)	24 (24/0)	382 (382/0)	257 (257/0)
Unfilled Sessions	24	444	507
Absentees (NS/12)	22 (15/7)	278 (257/21)	204 (198/6)
Percent Filled	80.95%	80.75%	76.57%
Totals	150	2710	2457

Overall Percent Filled: 78.76%

All Locations 30-minute Sessions	Summer 2015	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

Overall Percent Filled: 76.6

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

Overall Percent Filled: 70.25%

**Observations for Summer 2016:**

Summer 2016 cut its Sessions Offered in half compared to Summer 2015, and in turn it saw a 33.62 increase Percent Filled. Both in-person and online spaces performed well.

**Recommendations:**

Hold numbers and maintain online consultations.

**Observations for Fall 2016:**

Fall 2016 had a 13.01% increase in Sessions Offered, which likely played a role in its across the board 4.63 decrease in Percent Offered as a result of increasing supply. It did serve more students than Fall 2015, but many of the additional appointments resulted in Unfilled Sessions. Despite the dips in Park 66, the MLC, and online hours, the Digital Learning Lab showed remarkable growth.

**Recommendations:**

Hold numbers at the 2016. Despite underperforming, percentage-wise, Fall 2016 still maintained a strong showing by breaking 80% Percent Filled. Additionally, scheduling issues that could not be avoided (double coverage and earlier online hours) seem to have played a role in this drop. For these reasons, Fall 2016 numbers are encouraged for Fall 2017 if the recommended handling of schedules is executable.

**Observations for Spring 2017:**

Spring 2017 experienced a 9.45% reduction in Sessions offered, and produced a 4.32 increase in Sessions Filled compared to Spring 2016. Strong performances by Park 66 and MLC (historic highs for spring) coupled with equivalent numbers in the other locations compared to prior springs drove this increase through a reduction of Unfilled Sessions.

**Recommendations:**

Hold numbers at the 2017 and maintain training. Training seems to be one of the driving factors allowing for a reduction in Unfilled Sessions compared to prior years. Additionally, better scheduling practices are believed to be able to bring up Percent Filled numbers across the board.

## Class Visits

All Locations Class Visits	Summer 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
FYC Classes	0	23	6
English Classes	0	1	3
Other	5	11	12
Totals	5	35	21

All Locations Class Visits	Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
FYC Classes	5	21	11
English Classes	0	3	2
Other	2	5	4
Totals	7	29	17

### Observation:

In this table, you will find three categories of visits. The first two represent class visits in which the Assistant Director or a consultant visited a class and spoke 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 that the Writing Center gives when contacted by faculty from across the campus. These presentations are entirely dependent on the faculty person's requests, and they are generated from scratch. This past year included workshops in the A.R.O.T.C. and departments of Mathematics, Public Health, Chemistry, Horticulture, Sociology, and Genetics amongst others. The fact that Other visits more than doubled in Fall 2016 and tripled in Spring 2017 compared to the prior year's fall and spring, respectively, bodes well for the Writing Center being sought after as a campus resource for faculty in multiple disciplines.

## Exit Survey Questions

### Writing Center Efficacy

This table responds to question “If you’ve visited the Writing Center before, would you say that your prior appointment helped you earn a better grade, gain admission to your program, or any other desired outcome?”.

	Spring 15	Summer 16/Fall 16/Spring 17 Average
Yes	47 (77.05%)	305 (82.88%)
Somewhat	10 (16.39%)	39 (10.6%)
No	4 (6.56%)	24 (6.52%)
This was my first appointment/N.A. <sup>9</sup>	23	229

#### Observations:

Because the nature of consulting does not allow for immediate feedback as to the benefits of Writing Center interactions, this question is vital in returning to prior visits as to reflect on whether students achieved their desired goals. It bodes well that 93.48% of respondents indicate at that the Writing Center helped achieve their goals at least somewhat, with the vast majority indicating a strong affirmative to the question. Additionally, this questions allows us to better gauge the number of first-time visitors we encounter with an estimation of 38.36%.

---

<sup>9</sup> These numbers were removed from the percentage calculation.

## 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. The 2016-17 academic recorded the highest satisfaction rates yet.

	Summer 14/Fall 14/ Spring 15 Average	Summer 15/Fall 15/ Spring 16 Average	Summer 16/Fall 16/ Spring 17 Average
<b>Excellent</b>	407 (65.75%)	534 (66.17%)	402 (67.45%)
<b>Very Good</b>	138 (22.29%)	163 (20.20)%	125 (20.97%)
<b>Good</b>	43 (6.95%)	63 (7.81%)	40 (6.71%)
<b>Fair</b>	16 (2.58%)	28 (3.47)%	15 (2.52%)
<b>Poor</b>	9 (1.45%)	18 (2.23)%	12 (2.01%)
<b>Unacceptable</b>	6 (0.97%)	1 (0.12)%	2 (0.34%)

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	Summer 16/Fall 16/ Spring 17 Average
<b>Yes</b>	570 (92.23%)	731 (90.58%)	546 (91.46%)
<b>Maybe</b>	35 (5.66%)	65 (8.05%)	42 (7.03%)
<b>No</b>	13 (2.10%)	11 (1.36%)	9 (1.51%)

The third Client Satisfaction table shows student responses to the question “**I will recommend the center.**”

	Summer 14/Fall 14/ Spring 15 Average	Summer 15/Fall 15/ Spring 16 Average	Summer 16/Fall 16/ Spring 17 Average
<b>Yes</b>	573 (92.72%)	750 (92.94%)	545 (91.44%)
<b>Maybe</b>	33 (5.33%)	46 (5.70%)	42 (7.38%)
<b>No</b>	12 (1.94%)	11 (1.36%)	9 (0.51%)

**Observations:**

While there are slight fluctuations in individual categories (both positive and negative), none of them are statistically significant.

**Recommendations:**

None.

## Appointment Data

Two new questions were added in Spring 2017 to better determine what type of assignments the Writing Center assists students with. This first table shows student responses to the question “**I received help for a class or assignment in...**”.

	<b>Spring 2017</b>
<b>Application Materials</b>	<b>83 (17.36%)</b>
<b>FYC</b>	<b>95 (19.87%)</b>
<b>Humanities</b>	<b>56 (11.72%)</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>148 (30.96%)</b>
<b>Sciences</b>	<b>11 (2.3%)</b>
<b>Social Sciences</b>	<b>85 (17.78%)</b>

The second Appointment Data table shows student responses to the question “**I worked on a/an...**”.

	<b>Spring 2017</b>
<b>Essay</b>	<b>321 (67.15%)</b>
<b>Lab Report</b>	<b>2 (0.42%)</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>53 (11.09%)</b>
<b>Statement of Purpose</b>	<b>56 (11.72%)</b>
<b>Thesis/Dissertation</b>	<b>46 (9.62%)</b>

### Observations:

These figures confirm some beliefs that the Writing Center already held and raised questions about others. It was not surprising that FYC composed the largest share of explicit categories, but it was surprising how many students made appointments for help with Application Materials (either in the form of applications to undergraduate majors, such as Terry or Grady, or graduate schools). Additionally, Social Sciences had a stronger showing than Humanities if FYC is not added to the Humanities figure. Other resulted in the largest share of assignments, which is hard to define given that Essay composed the bulk of responses for documents worked on. It could be that students who are unfamiliar with the traditional academic division breaks selected Other and selected Essay when more appropriate choices should have been made (given the number of graduate students we assist, Thesis/Dissertation seemed low, but that could be a result of low survey responses from graduate students).

### Recommendations:

Modify training to focus more on application materials. While the Writing Center does train its consultants for how to read and respond to statements of purpose, these figures indicate that more time should be invested to ensure more types of statements are covered so as to know the differences between various programs, such as statements of purpose for professional degrees vs. doctoral

programs. Additionally, the questionnaire has been altered to add more categories (including Education, Fine Arts, Mathematics, and Engineering) in an effort to better qualify responses as Other.