

**Sample Reading Grid**

Article	Goals	Methods	Results	Gaps
Jennifer Corroy "Institutional Change and the University of Wisconsin-Madison Writing Fellows Program"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To show Writing Fellows/embedded instructors make institutional change.</li> <li>● This change is at the whole-college level, but more importantly affects the body of teaching writing within it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Two Writing Fellows embedded in two courses (Scandinavian Studies &amp; English Comp.)</li> <li>● Professors were interviewed after the process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● WF acted as translator between Prof. of Scan. Studies and students.</li> <li>● Prof. of Scan. Studies began to comment more on style.</li> <li>● WF helped destabilize classroom hierarchy in Scan. Studies and made environment more collaborate.</li> <li>● English Comp. Prof. had already adapted class to include drafting, providing extensive feedback and conferencing.</li> <li>● Eng. Comp Prof. found WF saved him time, and "served" his pedagogical approach nicely.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No student data was examined or quantified.</li> <li>● Students were not interviewed or assessed in any way re: their feelings on their writing.</li> <li>● Only two classes/professors used.</li> <li>● Emphasis of study was on institutional change rather than direct writing improvement.</li> </ul>

<p>Jill Gladstein  “Conducting Research in Gray Space: How Writing Associates Negotiate between WAC and WID in an introductory Biology Course.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To show bio students how to construct an argument inside their discipline’s genre: lab reports</li> <li>● To demonstrate that WF can lead students to be more rhetorically aware/flexible inside their field’s generic conventions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Two-year case study of intro biology courses where WFs helped students write lab reports.</li> <li>● These courses devoted little time in class to teaching the writing of lab reports.</li> <li>● Developed a coded rubric to measure how lab reports developed/improved between drafts.</li> <li>● Utilized grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin) to see what patterns around the writing process emerged from the data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Interviews with students suggest that before the WFs were involved, they saw the composition of their texts primarily governed by format (hitting all the bullet points).</li> <li>● After WFs, students felt more comfortable and confident with their writing.</li> <li>● Profs. were happy, as quality of lab reports improved.</li> <li>● Study opened a dialogue between Writing Program Director, biology instructors and other university staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For all the prep, study does not have conclusive quantitative results: no baseline bio course w/o WF</li> <li>● Study used to launch more studies→writer seems hesitant to report “all findings” yet.</li> <li>● Writer seems more concerned with defending her job than quantifying results.</li> </ul>
<p>Dave Healy “A Defense of Dualism: The Writing Center and the Classroom”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To show the ways in which Writing Centers are superior to course assistances/TAs</li> <li>● To validate that Writing Centers provide a collaborative learning space that can successfully supplement the classroom.</li> <li>● To show that tutors inside the classroom do not serve the students, because: (1) students see their meeting with the tutor as beneficial to their grade; (2) students see meeting with the tutor as meeting with the teacher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Analyzed student and tutor feedback via surveys after sessions.</li> <li>● Built upon a healthy dose of his own personal pedagogical theory.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Since tutors are already conflated with teachers, tutors need to actively work to break down that association.</li> <li>● Tutors can act as “fellow travelers”.</li> <li>● Writing Centers represent spaces free from the stigma of grades and the atmosphere of obligation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Author cannot seem to conceive of an embedded tutor who is not grading work (aka a WF).</li> <li>● Author does not discuss how Writing Centers remain grade/obligation free when professors require their students to meet with tutors.</li> <li>● Author does not conceive of how an embedded instructor might act as grade free/obligation free dissolver of hierarchies right in the classroom, and how that might be a more potent method.</li> </ul>

<p>Jim Henry, Holly Bruland, Ryan Omizo  “Mentoring First-Year Students in Composition: Tapping Role Construction to Teach”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To show the various beneficial roles that mentors adopt.</li> <li>● To explore how these roles might be tapped for future teachers in multiple disciplines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Four MA students were embedded in four sections of first-year comp.</li> <li>● Embedded MA students conferenced with students throughout the year (about 6-8 hrs per week) and were not to grade anything, or do anything “to undermine the instructor’s authority.”</li> <li>● Students/profs. were interviewed. Mentors kept logs of their sessions with students on a standardized log form.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The most common result was that students found the rapport that developed between the mentor and class was significant.</li> <li>● Mentors built student’s self-confidence.</li> <li>● Students found they were able to digest feedback more readily from the Mentor, and left feeling more in control of the “next step(s)” of the essay.</li> <li>● Students began to adapt to Mentor’s practices, effectively showing that Mentors can show students how to be effective students at the college level.</li> <li>● After the pilot, each professor changed their syllabus to more prominently feature the Mentor as a part of the class.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This institutions first-year writing courses are capped at 20.</li> <li>● Mentor logs: the standardized log form lacked a lot of specific detail, and relied mostly on the grad student’s perspective on the session (unlike the form I used as a WF).</li> <li>● Scope: only 4 grad students.</li> </ul>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>Judith Levine  “Using a Peer Tutor to Improve Writing in a Psychology Class: One Instructor’s Experience”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To improve writing outside of comp/English courses.</li> <li>● To show that peer tutors embedded in classrooms can improve student writing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A tutor is embedded in one class, and paid to meet with students for one hour (Daily? Weekly?)</li> <li>● One tutor was embedded in this professor’s Intro Psychology Course (33 students).</li> <li>● Professor compared grades, number of missing assignments, late assignments and overall performance with another section of Intro to Psych. In which she had no peer tutor.</li> <li>● Students were given normal course evaluations, but the professor also asked them via survey about their experience with the tutor and class.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The class with the tutor only had one student miss a deadline, whereas the other class had twelve.</li> <li>● Grades were comparable, but professor noted improved writing quality and focus in the class with the peer tutor.</li> <li>● The class with the peer tutor had generally better grades, more on-time assignments and less missed assignments.</li> <li>● Based on their feedback, students indicated that the peer tutor was helpful, that their grasp on the material was stronger and that they’d like the program to continue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The two classes could not be statistically compared because the class without the tutor were on a different curriculum (huge oversight on Prof’s part).</li> <li>● The professor admits to grading the assignments more leniently in the study.</li> <li>● Single prof/class study.</li> <li>● Study was unclear on the overall time commitment of the tutor.</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--	---