

Consortium on Graduate Communication

2018 Summer Institute

June 10 – 12

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Emerging Identities in Graduate Communication Support



Table of Contents

Welcome to the 2018 CGC Summer Institute!	3
Program at a Glance	6
Works-in-Progress Session Grids	7
Plenary Speakers and Abstracts	10
Workshops, Roundtables, and Networking Descriptions	13
Workshop Abstracts	14
Roundtable Descriptions	22
Works-in-Progress Speakers and Abstracts (Alphabetical)	24
Information about Ann Arbor	49
University of Michigan Map	51
List of 2018 CGC Institute Participants	52
About the Consortium on Graduate Communication	55

Welcome to the 2018 CGC Summer Institute!

Welcome to Ann Arbor! On behalf of the CGC Board of Directors, the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan, and MICHIGAN ELT, we invite you to spend the next few days in this beautiful college town brainstorming the future of graduate communication support.

As with the 2017 Summer Institute in Monterey, this year's Institute will feature several thought-provoking plenary addresses and five concurrent Works-in-Progress sessions, in which participants can discuss and collect feedback on their research, pedagogy, or program design. New to this year's Summer Institute are the graduate communication **Workshops** and **Roundtable sessions**, which allow participants to engage deeper on topics of interest and to walk out with useful strategies and materials that they can implement at their home institutions. We will also provide space for those who wish to hold networking sessions on topics of interest to groups within the CGC community. As with last year, the plenary addresses and materials from workshops will be made available on the MEMBERS-ONLY portion for the CGC website.

All sessions will be held in Weiser Hall (500 Church Street), the home of the famed English Language Institute. The tenth floor of Weiser Hall is "Institute Central" and is where you will find registration, the plenary talks, book and information tables, and food and coffee. Breakout sessions can be found on floors 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9. Most rooms (with the exception of the 7th floor rooms) are easily accessible from the stairwell and elevator on the building's east side. For 7th floor rooms, just follow signs for the English Language Institute.

This Year's Theme: Emerging Identities in Graduate Communication Support

CGC members and the graduate students with whom we work represent a wide variety of identities when it comes to disciplinary affiliations, institutions, experience levels, job titles, responsibilities, nationalities, cultures, racial and ethnic identities, gender identities, language backgrounds, and so on. Graduate communication itself is emerging as an area of specialization and community of practice, with an identifiable and growing body of scholarship and new institutional structures. The graduate students we support are in the process of developing and defining their identities as emerging academics and professionals in their fields.

For the 2018 Summer Institute, we invite participants to reflect critically on how these webs of identities impact and shape graduate communication support as well as the

emerging identity of CGC as a new professional organization. In particular, we hope to explore these questions and others:

- How are graduate support mechanisms affected by the ways in which institutions, support programs, instructors, and tutors conceive of graduate student identities?
- How do graduate students' conceptions of their own identities affect their experiences in graduate communication support programs?
- How do race, class, nationality, language, culture, and gender shape the work that is being done in graduate communication support?
- Which scholars and texts have helped to shape the identity of the CGC as a community of practice?
- In what ways do our different disciplinary affiliations inform the work being done by CGC members?
- What opportunities and limitations come with the different professional identities held by graduate communication specialists, such as staff, tenured faculty, contingent faculty, administrator, graduate assistant and so on?
- What programs, courses, and workshops have been designed to help graduate students develop their identities as effective communicators in their fields?

To explore these questions, the Institute will feature works-in-progress sessions, workshops, and keynotes.

Works-in-progress (WiP) are short presentations on graduate communication pedagogical strategies, programmatic initiatives, and scholarship followed by rich discussion. The purpose of these works-in-progress sessions are for the presenters to share ongoing work, get feedback, explore open questions, and learn from other disciplinary and institutional perspectives. A table with a list of all concurrent sessions and their room numbers can be found on page 7. An alphabetical list of WiP presenters and abstracts can be found on page 24.

Workshops and roundtables — new additions to the CGC Summer Institute!—will share nuts-and-bolts approaches to written and oral communication support, perfect professional development opportunity for those who are new to the field or exploring new graduate communication initiatives or approaches. On Sunday and Monday afternoons, participants can choose from among four concurrent workshops/roundtables, or can choose to arrange a networking opportunity. Descriptions of the workshops and roundtables start on page 13 .

Keynotes by established and emerging graduate communication scholars will push forward the conversation in relation to the Institute theme. University of Michigan's John Swales and Christine Feak, two of the best known scholars on communication support for international multilingual graduate students, will close out the Institute with a special joint keynote. Other keynote speakers include Shannon Madden from the University of Rhode Island and Doreen Starke-Meyerring from McGill University.

The CGC Board of Directors would like to extend sincere gratitude to the English Language Institute at Michigan for hosting this year's summer Institute and to MICHIGAN ELT for sponsoring Sunday evening's reception.

If you have any questions about the program, session locations, or things-to-do in Ann Arbor, please ask any of the organizers, local hosts, or graduate student volunteers.

Thank you for coming to the 2018 Summer Institute!

Lindsey Ives (CGC Co-chair)
Steve Simpson (CGC Co-Chair)

Nigel Caplan (Board Member)
Michelle Cox (Board Member)
Jane Freeman (Board Member)
Talinn Phillips (Board Member)
Shyam Sharma (Board Member)
James Tierney (Board Member)

Angelo Pitillo (Local Host)
Kelly Sippell (Local Host)

Program at a Glance

Sunday June 10	8:00-9:00	Breakfast & Registration	1010
	9:00-9:30	Welcome & Opening Remarks: John Godfrey	1010
	9:30-10:30	Keynote: Shannon Madden	1010
	10:40-12:10	A Strands	See page 7
	12:15-1:15	Lunch	1010
	1:30-3:00	B Strands	See page 7
	3:00-3:25	Coffee Break	1010
	3:30-5:00	Workshops/Networking	See page 13
	5:30-7:00	Evening Reception	Arbor Brewing Company Brewpub (sponsored by MICHIGAN ELT)
Monday June 11	8:30-9:00	Breakfast	1010
	9:00-10:15	Keynote: Doreen Starke-Meyerring	1010
	10:30-12:00	C Strands	See page 8
	12:10-1:30	Lunch/CGC Business Meeting	1010
	1:40-3:10	D Strands	See page 8
	3:10-3:25	Coffee Break	1010
	3:30-5:00	Workshops/ Networking	See page 13
Tuesday June 12	8:30-9:00	Breakfast	1010
	9:00-10:30	E Strands	See page 9
	10:45-11:45	Keynote: John Swales and Christine Feak	1010
	12:00-1:30	Lunch and Discussion	1010

Works-in-Progress Session Grids

Room	355	455	555	747	855
A Sunday, 10:40-12:10	<i>Materials Development</i>	<i>Needs Analysis</i>	<i>Writing Groups</i>	<i>Curriculum</i>	<i>Grad Student Consultants</i>
	Julia Salehzadeh: Soliciting feedback for EAP listening materials development	Marilyn Gray: Graduate writing needs survey	Tetyana Bychkovska & Susan Lawrence: Writing center's first semester offering graduate writing groups	Daniel Bommarito: Graduate writers' use of live-broadcasting software to share their writing processes publicly	Kathleen Steeves: Connection between development of scholarly identity among grad students and writing
	Judy Dyer: Materials for new academic listening class for international graduate students	Kelly Cunningham: Graduate writing lab: Starting programming and conducting needs analysis	<div>Sarah Huffman and Erin Today: Devising malleable graduate peer review group models to address unique disciplinary communication</div> <div>Angela Garner: Assessing writing groups from student, faculty, and administrative perspectives</div>	Melinda Matice: Gardening in the local community course	Austin Gorman: Employing graduate students as collaborative teaching specialists
Room	355	455	555	747	855
B Sunday, 1:30-3:00	<i>Speaking and Pronunciation</i>	<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Writing Camps</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Science Communication</i>
	Pamela Bogart: Teaching students to use spoken language corpora to enhance pronunciation in graduate speaking contexts.	Ida Chavoshan: Course design for grad level research writing course using task-based goals	Sara Saylor: Dissertation boot camp course	Eunjeong Park: Use of lexical bundles in language acquisition	Ryan McCarty: Science communication writing workshops for graduate students in chemistry
	Lixia Cheng: A Mixed methods validity investigation of speaking tasks that measure graduate student instructors' pragmatic interaction	Melissa Myers: Benefitting both sides: Bringing together undergraduate anthropology students and multilingual graduate students	Lenore Latta: A Writing camp for English language learners in graduate programs	Heather Boldt: The moves for talking about your research: A corpus-analysis of the 3MT	Najma Janjua: Making the most at a Japanese graduate school of medicine

Room	755	747	955	906	855
C Monday, 10:30- 12:00	<i>Program Admin</i>	<i>Curriculum</i>	<i>Tutoring Approaches</i>	<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Research</i>
	Greer Murphy: Plagiarism (among MLW grad students) as an administrative issue	Estee Beck: Course design & campus politics of pilot skills-based course for international graduate students (STEM)	Mark Haugen: Linking interests and identity to task based goals	Jane Dunphy: speaking and listening support for grad students	Nathan Lindberg: Longitudinal study on masters students in engineering from a Summer intensive English program
	James Tierney and Anna Moldawa-Shetty: Helping graduate students negotiate issues of identity, diversity, and equal inclusion	Christina Montgomery: how disciplinary faculty might improve their writing pedagogy to promote revision among graduate students	Taylor Tolchin: Universal design and graduate writers in the neoliberal university's writing center	Tyler Carter: Designing integrated oral-writing course	Peter Grav: Research on communication needs/ goals of professional master's students
					Talar Kaloustian: Interview research with international grad students to inform teaching practices
Room	955	455	555	747	855
D Monday, 1:40-3:10	<i>Program Administration</i>	<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Curriculum</i>	<i>Pedagogy</i>
	Michelle Campbell: Grad student positions to offer WAC/WID support to graduate students	Nigel Caplan: Seeking feedback on annotated lit review in pre-matriculation course for international grad students	Thomas McCloskey: Researching graduate school writing center and ability to address speaking needs of grad students	Jovana Milosavljevic-Ardeljan & Meaghan Elliott Dittrich: Possibilities for a hybrid program connecting Writing Center, WAC, and Grad school to address written and oral support concerns	Kyung-Hee Bae: Assessing a manuscript writing course for multilingual graduate students
	Cameron Bushnell: Graduate writing teaching assistants: Moving from pilot to program	Michael Bowen: Project/ grant proposal writing assignment sequence in ESL grad writing course	Daniel Calvey: Structured peer writing consultations among L2 graduate students	Lisa Russell Pinson & Susan Barone: One professional, many roles: The complexity of supporting EAL graduate-level learners	Edwina Carreon: Helping dissertation students use textual mentors

Room	755	855	555	747	955
E Tuesday, 9:00-10:30	<i>Discipline-Specific Courses</i>	<i>Course Development</i>	<i>Write-together sessions</i>	<i>Boot camps</i>	<i>Workshops</i>
	Sukyun Weaver: Evaluation of ELL support in graduate art & design curriculum	Michelle Cox: Designing a writing course for international professional masters students	Kristina Quynn: Show up & write drop-in sessions	Katie Baillargeon: Dissertation Write-In, how and why dissertation boot camps might be effective program offerings	Olivia Tracy: Writing prompt development and revision workshop
	Stacy Sabraw: Developing a Writing in STEM Fields course	Sarah Burcon and Katie Snyder: Redesigning a technical writing course for graduate students	Louis Cicciarelli: Coordinating and implementing write-together sessions	Rachel Cayley: Reflections of boot camp participants 2 years later	Lindsey Ives: Adjusting rhetorical situations to respond to diverse experience levels in a public speaking workshop for MBA students

Plenary Speakers and Abstracts

Pathways to inclusion: Identity, difference, and institutional innovation



Shannon Madden
University of Rhode Island

As has been noted, many graduate colleges in the U.S. context are taking much-needed steps to enhance the demographic diversity of their student populations. Still, graduation and retention rates for students from historically underrepresented groups are not increasing in corresponding proportion. Although a rich tradition of scholarship in applied linguistics, composition, and TESOL has successfully promoted a more complex view of graduate communication—one that acknowledges

writers' identity shifts and variable processes of disciplinary enculturation—in many cases, reductive views of writing persist in institutional practice. These reductive views of communication contribute to structural issues that exclude some writers more than others and result in equity gaps for underserved students. What often gets elided in discussions of graduate writing programs and interventions is epistemic injustice (Fricker; Godbee)—where difference becomes a barrier in the mind of the institution and the advisor, where a student's way of knowing is discounted or dismissed, and the reasons for attrition are presumed to reside within the student's body. In this talk, I draw on survey and focus group interview data to highlight equity and justice issues that impact graduate student writers. Ultimately, I suggest that graduate writing specialists are well-positioned to become advocates (Inoue; Perryman-Clark) and ally-accomplices (Green), and I offer strategies for challenging exclusionary writing policies and practices.

“Maybe I’m just not cut out for this”: The consequences of institutional discourses about writing for doctoral researcher identities



Doreen Starke-Meyerring
McGill University

In this talk, I share data from a cross-institutional and cross-disciplinary study of doctoral writing at Canadian research-intensive universities to trace how institutional discourses about writing surface in the research writing experiences of doctoral students. Drawing on survey responses from 3000 doctoral students and interviews with 50 doctoral students, I examine how institutional discourses about writing shape assumptions about research writing in doctoral programs, how doctoral students take these discourses up, and what consequences these discourses have for doctoral researcher identities. The purpose of this talk is to invite participants to

share and explore strategies for engaging those charged with doctoral education in reflecting on the consequences of inherited institutional discourses about writing, which have traditionally escaped reflection, but have significant consequences for the scholarly identity development of doctoral researchers.

Responding to an expanded repertoire of graduate communicative tasks

John Swales
Christine Feak
University of Michigan



The traditional communicative tasks for doctoral students have changed dramatically over the years. On the speaking side, students used to be mainly involved in teaching discussion or lab sections, giving presentations in seminars, and defending proposals and dissertations. On the writing side, students once were mainly involved with course papers, exams, and proposals and dissertations, this last typically being in monograph format.

Today, we see doctoral students much more in the role of “pocket-sized professors.” They present more frequently at conferences; they attempt to publish more articles, singly or, more typically, with co-authors. They are increasingly expected to apply for competitive grants and fellowships. They are socialized earlier into disciplinary sub-

groups and yet are increasingly expected to become inter-disciplinary. They are expected to have some kind of display of their scholarly selves on the Internet. They are encouraged, particularly in science, to become involved in communications for audiences outside their disciplines, in events such as the Three Minute Thesis that are designed to enlighten the general more academic public. When they are on the job market, they face academic job applications that have become more daunting, with tricky additions such as Diversity Statements and Statements of Community Engagement. If they have decided on a career outside academia, they must find ways to communicate with those whose interests lie mainly in solving everyday problems in cost-efficient ways. These exigencies suggest the need to create many and varied opportunities for students to develop communication agility. How we might best accomplish this is the focus of our talk.

Workshops, Roundtables, and Networking Descriptions

Sunday, June 10 , 3:30-5:00

Workshop 1. Why do Advanced-High/Superior Speakers Seek Language Support and How Can We Respond? (Room 747)

Peggy Wagner, Emory University

Mackenzie Bristow, Emory University

Workshop 2. Designing a Course on Publishing for Multilingual Graduate Students (Room 555)

Joel Bloch, The Ohio State University

Workshop 3. Tell Us What You Struggle With: How to Understand and Respond to the Concerns of Graduate Students in Writing Consultations (Room 1010)

Elena Kallestinova, Yale University

Linda Macri, University of Maryland

Roundtable Discussion 1. An Open Discussion on Reviewing and Publishing Work in your Field (Room 855)

Led by Christine Feak and friends

Networking Session 1. (Rooms 755, 955, 906)

Space will be provided for participants to network with others on a shared topic.

Monday, June 11, 3:30-5:00

Workshop 4. Teaching Students How to Increase Conceptual Clarity Through Diagramming (Room 1010)

Jane Freeman, University of Toronto

Workshop 5. Using Linguistic Needs Analysis to Inform Discipline-Specific EAP Course Design (Room 747)

Natalia Dolgova, George Washington University, Washington, DC

Workshop 6. Strategies for Teaching a One-Size-Fits-All Graduate Writing Course (Room 555)

Shyam Sharma, Stony Brook University

Roundtable Discussion 2. Graduate Course Content: Where Do We Go from Here? (Room 855)

Led by Kelly Sippell and friends

Networking Session 2. (Rooms 755, 955, 906)

Space will be provided for participants to network with others on a shared topic.

Workshop Abstracts

Workshop 1. Why Do Advanced-High/Superior Speakers Seek Language Support and How Can We Respond? (Room 747)

Peggy Wagner, Emory University

Mackenzie Bristow, Emory University

Presenter Information.

Peggy Wagner has been teaching in the ELSP program of Emory University since it first began in 1990 (being one of the original creators of the program). She teaches courses in both the intermediate and advanced tracks of oral communication, as well as the courses in academic writing. In response to requests from graduate faculty in the mathematics department, Peggy was awarded a grant to develop the elective course Seminar in Professional Communication which is designed to improve the academic and professional speaking performance of the Advanced and Superior level students (OPI Levels 3.7-4.0) . She subsequently developed and teaches the companion elective course for advanced-high/superior speakers Laboratory in Professional Communication. Peggy Wagner received an MS in Applied Linguistics/TESL from Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

Mackenzie Bristow is currently the Director of the English Language Support Program (ELSP) for the Laney Graduate School at Emory University. Along with managing the daily operations of the program, she serves as a member of Laney's Senior Staff as well as facilitates courses and workshops for PhD students and Postdoctoral researchers. Since her arrival at Emory, she has advocated for ELSP to have higher visibility outside of the program through constant contact with Laney's academic programs, the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence, and the Global Strategy and Initiatives Office. In her free time, she pursues her PhD at Georgia State University in Applied Linguistics.

Session Description.

The English Language Support Program of Emory University's Laney Graduate School offers full credit, semester long elective Oral Communication courses for students scoring Advanced High/Superior on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview. Although the ELSP has been providing advanced oral communication support for over two decades, interest and enrollment in these courses has doubled in the past five years. This increase aligns with the more recent notion that living and studying in-country is not sufficient to move them to higher level speaking skills but that language instruction is indeed needed (Leaver and Campbell 2015; Bygate 2005). What compels them to come into our program? Why do they believe they need more training and practice?

When asked these questions on a precourse information gathering form, some common responses are "to feel more confident" or "to reduce my accent" or "my vocabulary is limited" or "I make mistakes" or "I want to sound like a native speaker". The question then arises: How can these perceived needs be translated into a successful and viable graduate course and curriculum? But the general goal for all, we have found, is that they want to develop a more professional identity by using the language that best expresses their intellect, their expertise, their knowledge. One challenge to developing and teaching this course is that the needs of speakers of this level become even more individualized to where approaches used at the intermediate level do not necessarily work at these higher levels (Bygate 2005; Leaver and Campbell 2015).

Secondly, these students are highly motivated, so identifying and working with that motivation is critical to the success of the student and the course; this often requires flexibility on the part of the instructor. Thirdly, considering adult learning theories, the student must perceive all activities, goals, and tasks as relevant and meaningful; the teacher-student relationship takes on a more coach-professional interaction, or facilitator-actor; students require greater autonomy and control over their learning which requires flexibility on the part of the instructor. During the workshop, the facilitator will describe profiles of advanced-high and superior speakers, and identify what they need to advance to a higher level of speaking. She will share the considerations when developing goals, a curriculum, and activities, and how these considerations informed her course development. Using sample student profiles and cases, the participants will discuss possible goals for a course, activities that might be used to reach the goals, and strategies to maintain motivation of the students. Questions to discuss include: What are the main types of 'repertoires' or oral discourse that these speakers should be able to use? What role does 'repetition' and 'rehearsal' play, if any? How can goals be prioritized or scaffolded? What should be the focus of explicit instruction? Implicit instruction? What priority should be given to pronunciation, if any? What role does formative feedback play? The workshop will enable participants develop strategies to provide oral communication support for advanced/superior speakers who are moving towards developing a more professional identity.

Workshop 2. Designing a Course on Publishing for Multilingual Graduate Students (Room 555)

Joel Bloch, The Ohio State University

Presenter Information.

Joel Bloch has taught a course on publishing for multilingual graduate students for twenty years. He has a PhD in rhetoric from Carnegie Mellon University and has published a numerous books, articles, and book chapters on technology, plagiarism, and academic writing. He is currently working on research on open access journals.

In preparation for the workshop.

Before the workshop, participants might want to view my presentation about the course at 2018 AAAL (<https://vimeo.com/261398957>) and the open access textbook at <https://issuu.com/joelbloch9/docs/6912ebook>.

Session Description.

This workshop will provide teachers an opportunity to discuss issues related to the design of a publishing course for multilingual students who are beginning to enter their academic communities of practice, share with other participants their previous work on these designs, and work with other participants on the design of various forms of support for publishing, and discuss their designs with other participants. I will lead the discussion and be available to answer questions of the participants' designs. The participants should bring their materials, syllabi, or course and workshop designs. Each participant may share with the other participants their designs as well as questions and concerns they have with the design of a course on publishing. Finally, the participants can work together to develop or modify their own course designs. I will be available for suggestions and questions. We will then reconvene and discuss the results of these groups. The goals are for a better understanding the content of support needed for publishing as it relates to their emerging identities and for teachers to share their own designs and concerns. This workshop begins with questions using Top Hat for discussing participants' backgrounds and concerns. The questions asked here will relate to issues related to publishing to be answered using a cell phone. We will then discuss the questions asked, and then discuss the identities of the students and how these identities impact course design and the role of the teacher. We will then discuss the design of a semester-long course divided into two parts: a discussion of various topics related to publishing including the motivation for the design of the class, the topics discussed, the nature of the one-on-one tutorials, and some of the reactions of the students as a basis for revising the course. In the next section, we will address the institutional and departmental constraints on course design as well as alternative approaches. Then we will discuss potential topics that can be part of a course or broken into workshops: introduction to the publishing process, the choices of journals, the peer review process, auxiliary writing forms including grants, the ethics of publishing, plagiarism and intellectual property, conference proposals and presentations, and related grammar topics. I will share the URLs to my open access textbook and curated Scoopit site containing articles related to publishing. We will discuss the role of open access materials and some of the issues students need to consider. Each participant will have the opportunity to share their designs brought to the workshop Outcomes Each participant will take an increased understanding of designing and teaching courses on publishing and ideas for implementing or improving new or existing designs. The participants will understand the relationship between the emerging identities of graduate students as they prepare to enter their academic

communities of practices and their relationship with support design as well as discuss the concerns raised, in the literature, on the GCS bulletin board, and in the field of multilingual writing and publishing.

Workshop 3. Tell Us What You Struggle With: How to Understand and Respond to the Concerns of Graduate Students in Writing Consultations (Room 1010)

Elena Kallestinova, Yale University

Linda Macri, University of Maryland

Presenter Information.

As directors of writing centers that exclusively serve graduate students at two large research institutions, Kallestinova and Macri have substantial experience coordinating and facilitating writing consultations, as well as training and mentoring peer-consultants. Yale's Graduate Writing Laboratory has been in operation for ten years and annually offers over 2000 consultations to graduate students from a wide range of disciplinary and linguistic backgrounds. The University of Maryland's Graduate School Writing Center, founded five years ago, offers over 600 appointments annually to a similarly wide range of graduate students.

In Preparation for the Workshop.

Participants should come prepared with any information about their current consultation practices, in particular what scheduling system they use and what information they collect on their appointment requests, client report forms, and evaluation forms/surveys.

Session Description.

The outcome of a writing consultation with graduate students frequently depends on how consultants match the stated needs of graduate students. If a consultant addresses the concerns that the student brings to the session, then the outcome of the session is more positive (Raymond & Quinn 2012; Winder, Kathpalia & Koo 2016). In the context of a one-on-one consultation, what distinguishes graduate students from college students is the variety of genres they work in, the length of their papers, and the scope of their concerns.

To address those concerns, the consultant needs to make a number of mindful choices in (1) eliciting information from a student, (2) interpreting those articulations, (3) prioritizing the elicited concerns, (4) addressing those concerns during the session. This workshop will offer participants ways to support graduate students in a writing center or through one-on-one consultations. Using research from our writing centers, we will consider ways to design consultation appointments, including methods for collecting information from both students and consultants and best practices for pre- and post-consultation support. The goal of the workshop is to engage the participants

in examining the writing concerns of graduate students when they come to writing sessions. Participants will leave the workshop with a number of concrete take-aways. First, they will develop a list of questions tailored to their institution that they could use to elicit information from consultees. Based on the protocol of an appointment at their institution, they will be able to use this list in the appointment form or during an in-person session. Moreover, they will create a list of effective practices (questions for client report forms and evaluation forms) that will allow them to assess what makes a writing consultation successful. Finally, they will develop a plan for incorporating research in their own center practices and designs. The design and delivery of the workshop will be equally shared by the two presenters who will organize the discussion through a series of small group and hands-on activities. Together, we can address a wide range of settings (private and public institutions; serving a wide range of disciplines; working with students from a wide range of linguistic and national backgrounds; serving students in doctoral, master's and professional programs). The activities will invite the participants to analyze consultation scenarios, share ways programs elicit writing concerns of graduate students, and evaluate examples of student requests (gathered from research at our centers). By examining a variety of terms graduate students employ when they articulate their writing needs, we will invite the participants to make choices about how they or their consultants would prioritize and address those concerns during their sessions. Participants should come prepared with any information about their current consultation practices, in particular what scheduling system they use and what information they collect on their appointment requests, client report forms, and evaluation forms/surveys.

Workshop 4. Teaching Students How to Increase Conceptual Clarity Through Diagramming (Room 1010)

Jane Freeman, University of Toronto

Presenter Information.

In the last eight years, Dr. Freeman has taught a course that she designed called "Prewriting Strategies for Developing and Organizing Your Ideas" to more than 1,000 graduate students at the University of Toronto from all divisions (Humanities, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Life Sciences). In this CGC workshop, she will share some of the strategies from the course that have been most popular with students.

Session Description.

In our work as teachers of writing to graduate students, we usually work with students who are writing. Whether they are working on a proposal, a course paper, or a dissertation, students most often come for guidance motivated by problems in their current written drafts. While teaching a course on "Prewriting Strategies for Developing and Organizing Your Ideas," however, I have had the opportunity to see graduate students' work long before they begin to write: work done at the prewriting stage, such

as their notes, diagrams, and outlines. Many of my students use diagrams and outlines to organize their writing, but until I saw their diagrams and outlines I did not realize how much trouble they were having in using these techniques effectively; indeed, some of my students' diagrams and outlines actively increase the very confusion the students are trying to address. Seeing their prewriting material has not only helped me to understand more fully the nature of the problems some students have with achieving conceptual clarity in the early stages of their writing but also helped me to develop a series of strategies to guide them as they work to lift the fog of their own confusion. In this workshop, I will introduce participants to a sequence of prewriting strategies I designed that help graduate students to clarify their thinking before they write. This sequence includes specific uses of spreadsheets in note taking, and a series of diagramming techniques, shaped by Aristotle's Topics of Invention, for use at the early, middle, and late stages of the prewriting process. The workshop will have three parts. First, I will introduce a sequence of spreadsheeting and diagramming strategies designed to help students who are embarking on large writing projects, such as long course papers or dissertations. The strategies introduced encourage students to harness spatial logic in the service of their writing, and each strategy we will consider has a specific function (such as brainstorming, summarizing, correlating, synthesizing, proposing, preparing an outline, etc.). The strategies chosen for the workshop are those that have been most popular with the graduate students in my Prewriting class. Second, workshop participants will try the techniques themselves to get a feel for how they work in performing the range of functions listed above. Third, as a group of experienced teachers of graduate writing, we will discuss the ways in which the prewriting strategies introduced in the workshop can be used to help address several specific writing challenges faced by our students. The goal of the workshop is to give teachers of graduate writers a series of practical strategies for teaching students how to clarify their own thinking.

Workshop 5. Using linguistic needs analysis to inform discipline-specific EAP course design (Room 747)

Natalia Dolgova, George Washington University

Presenter Information.

Natalia Dolgova is Teaching Assistant Professor of EAP at the George Washington University in Washington DC. She has conducted targeted needs analyses, designed curriculum for, and taught targeted EAP/ESP courses to a number of discipline-specific cohorts, such as Finance and Statistics/Data Science.

Session Description.

Addressing the last question on the 2018 CGC agenda (What programs, courses, and workshops have been designed to help graduate students develop their identities as effective communicators in their fields?), this workshop reports generalizable principles

and findings from the process of a needs analysis project focused on determining language-related needs of international graduate students in Statistics and Data Science. Participants will learn about the main case study from the presenter's home context and will attempt applying select relevant principles to similar situations in their own institutional settings. Ultimately, upon completion of the workshop participants will gain a better understanding of how to utilize needs analysis findings for the purpose of course design.

A language needs analysis serves to determine types and ranges of real-world tasks in order to inform the creation of pedagogic tasks. The use of needs-to-tasks progression is particularly relevant for EAP (English for Academic Purposes) and ESP (English for Specific Purposes) graduate-level contexts and professional settings (Long, 2005; Boshier & Smalkoski, 2002; Crosling & Ward, 2002). If used appropriately, the results of such needs analyses provide a basis for developing a number of targeted pedagogic tasks and suggest next steps for further curriculum development in EAP/ESP programs.

Within the presenter's institutional context, exponential growth of graduate student population in Statistics and Data Science made determining these students' specific academic needs and subsequently adjusting EAP/ESP instruction an institutional priority. The research questions guiding the needs analysis focused on identifying specific tasks that graduate students in Statistics and Data Science needed to master in order to participate successfully in their graduate academic communities and in the future workplace. Both qualitative (classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, discourse analysis of target genres) and quantitative (online questionnaires) methods involving multiple sources (students, faculty, experts, and writing samples) were used for data collection.

The results indicated real-world tasks and genres crucial for Statistics/Data Science classes or professional contexts. Next, a number of pedagogical tasks were developed to address both speaking/listening (e.g., oral presentations, poster session presentations) and writing (e.g., writing research reports) skills necessary for success in working with data.

The workshop will report the lessons learned from the process of organizing these tasks into a cohesive course syllabus and subsequently implementing it with a pre-selected group of Statistics/Data Science EAP graduate students. In conclusion, a number of possible directions for further curriculum development in Statistics and Data Science EAP/ESP programs will be proposed.

Following the theoretical introduction and reporting the research results, the workshop will provide the audience with a step-by-step procedure to use for transforming

research findings into pedagogic tasks and course syllabi. Examples of discipline-specific pedagogic tasks addressing different language skills will be presented for audience discussion and feedback. Participants will engage in small-group discussion and hands-on activities focusing on transferring/applying select takeaways from the workshop into their own instructional contexts. To get maximum benefit from this process, participants are encouraged to bring to the workshop their own questions, materials, course syllabi, etc. they would like to get feedback on.

Workshop 6. Strategies for Teaching a One-Size-Fits-All Graduate Writing Course (Room 555)

Shyam Sharma, Stony Brook University

Presenter Information.

Shyam Sharma teaches graduate writing courses, facilitates writing workshops, and promotes graduate-level writing and communication in his university. His research focuses on writing in the disciplines, especially at the graduate level and as it intersects with issues of language politics/policy and cross-cultural issues. His upcoming book, *Writing Support for International Graduate Students*, is based on research conducted by visiting 20 universities and data collected from many more; the book documents and theorizes effective support practices and shows how writing support for the student body offers important opportunities for the advancement of writing programs/pedagogies. He received some of his education in South Asia and masters and doctoral degrees in Rhetoric and Composition from the University of Louisville.

Session Description.

Imagine that you are asked to develop the first graduate-level writing course in your university, that your department and graduate school as well as faculty advisors who have demanded the course want it to be “remedial,” and that the course will enroll students from across the disciplines and with various levels of writing skills among both domestic and international students whose linguistic proficiencies further widely vary. In other words, it is a one-size-fits-all class for all graduate students, some of whom you anticipate may be anxious about their language proficiency and “basic” issues about graduate-level writing in the US and others are interested in writing skills for academic publication and the job search. One way to proceed would be to pick a certain area or areas to focus on, advertising the course accordingly and letting students who attend the class decide whether they want to continue. A “universal design” approach could be useful in this case for engaging the diverse students (as much as possible). But there is another approach, or one among other approaches, that can be taken, as I did when developing (and also for gradually adapting over the last four years) the first graduate-level writing course at a large public university in New York.

I will begin the proposed workshop by asking participants to list a few possible assignments and activities that they would use in an “open enrollment” course like the above—asking them to discuss with a neighbor how they would maximize student engagement/interest with those assignments. Then I will share the four assignments that I use in my course WRT 621—including (1) Self-Assessment, (2) Rhetorical Analysis, (3) WID Interview, and (4) Final Paper—illustrating strategies for (1) identifying their own needs and strengths as writers, (2) using activity theory to develop genre-and discipline- awareness, (3) learning systematically from more experienced writers in their disciplines, and (4) implementing what they learn from the first three assignments to a standard academic paper/essay that they write or revise for the course. I will follow up this activity with a brief open discussion, asking the audience to take notes and share ideas about assignments that can benefit diverse students in the same class.

In the second half of the workshop, I will ask the audience how they might adapt, for their own contexts, a handout each that I use for teaching: rhetorical analysis of in-text citation in academic articles, genre and WID-informed analysis of the discussion section in academic articles, and a rubric for workshopping a job application (cover) letter. The participants will also browse through the courses and relevant resources on CGC website, as well sharing their teaching strategies. The objective of this activity is to try to collectively generate pedagogical strategies (and materials) for teaching writing to highly diverse classes of students, helping students transfer rhetorical knowledge and skills for different kinds of writing needs in different disciplines and stages of their academic and professional development trajectories. I will conclude the workshop by providing participants the opportunity to begin developing their own materials based on the conversation.

Roundtable Descriptions

Roundtable Discussion 1. An Open Discussion on Reviewing and Publishing Work in your Field (Room 855)

Led by Christine Feak and friends

This roundtable discussion focuses on two general areas: 1. advice for graduate communication professionals who are asked to review manuscripts for an academic journal or publisher, and 2) general strategies for researchers and practitioners hoping to place a manuscript with a journal or publishing company. The roundtable is hosted by Christine Feak, co-editor of *English for Specific Purposes Journal*, and several seasoned, well-published graduate communication specialists.

Roundtable Discussion 2. Graduate Course Content: Where Do We Go from Here? (Room 855)

Led by Kelly Sippell and friends

This roundtable discussion focuses on changes in graduate communication textbook use and delivery methods/formats. In particular, the session seeks to learn how instructors are using textbooks and course materials and what they would like to see made available. The roundtable is hosted Kelly Sippell of MICHIGAN ELT and other seasoned graduate communication specialists

Works-in-Progress Speakers and Abstracts (Alphabetical)

Kyung-Hee Bae

Rice University

Recognizing the need for such a program, many institutions now offer manuscript writing courses to their multilingual graduate students. Not much has been really studied, however, as I understand, with regards to the effectiveness of these courses and/or how students perceive the instruction they receive. Partly to understand how well students achieve the learning outcomes of such a course as well as how students perceive the course (and its objectives), I have begun collecting data to assess one particular manuscript writing course offered at my institution. The assessment includes four types of items: pre- and post-course student surveys, faculty/advisor questionnaire, evaluation of student manuscripts, and focus group with students. In the session, I will briefly describe the course (along with the learning outcomes) and discuss my assessment project. I also hope to have more in-depth conversations with other instructors/researchers who have similar projects.

Katie Baillargeon

UC Santa Barbara

“Go write a book without any help” is how one graduate student in the humanities described the tenor of the advice she’s received from her advisors. My research focuses on UCSB’s Dissertation Write-in and explores possibilities of how and why dissertation boot camps might be effective program offerings. I argue that these retreats are helpful for a specific population “doctoral students in the middle, liminal stage of their dissertation. These students are struggling with varying levels of help from advisors while trying to transition into being a full-fledged member of their discipline” this threshold causes a lot anxiety when the graduate student should be working hard to ‘write into expertise,’ a concept Sommers and Saltz have applied to first year composition (FYC) writers. Just as FYC students write through concepts to move into different states of knowing, so too do graduate students. Yet, the interviewees largely described any trouble with the dissertation as being more with articulating already-formed concepts as opposed to developing the concepts to make new knowledge (research/conceptual thresholds). This lack of understanding about writing through to expertise, writing as a tool to develop concepts, may be why the dissertators were more likely to seek help from our writing program as opposed to their advisors, a key piece of information for why writing faculty and centers may be needed to fill this gap.

Estee Beck

The University of Texas at Arlington

The speaker will present on a course design and campus politics of designing and implementing a pilot skills-based course for international graduate students at a R1 Hispanic-serving STEM-focused institution with a course cap of 40 students. The

course, Technical Writing for International Graduate Students, focuses on student development of rhetorical practices common within technical writing (user-centered communication, navigable document design, and persuasive & truthful writing with accurate & credible research) and writing proficiency (topic development, organization, grammar, and punctuation). The speaker will discuss the rationale behind using EliReview to guide students through two revisions of each course project of a summary, evaluation (of a peer-reviewed journal article), a micro literature review, and a proposal (dissertation or grant). Additionally, she will talk about the embedded language specialist and four planned visits of writing consultants from the campus writing center. Finally, the speaker will discuss the institutional politics involved in developing this course along with securing funding to pay for the language specialist and in the second iteration (Fall 2018) of the course and course graders.

Pamela S.H. Bogart

University of Michigan

I'm developing corpus-based materials to revise a graduate pronunciation fundamentals course, the first in a set of three elective pronunciation classes. The goals of the course are to raise student awareness about segmental and suprasegmental features of pronunciation that impact comprehensibility, to enable students to identify their own pronunciation patterns, and to equip students to continue to improve their pronunciation clarity independently. I'm shifting from an analytic "here are the parts, let's see how they fit together" approach to an emphasis on high frequency chunks of academic formulaic spoken language as a more contextualized starting place and site of practice. I'm identifying corpora that offer a range of audio and video samples of these high-frequency phrases, with particular enthusiasm for the TED Corpus Search Engine (yohasebe.com/tcse). I'm developing activities that model corpus-based strategies students can use to enhance pronunciation clarity and confidence.

Heather Boldt

Emory University

The Moves for Talking About Your Research: a Corpus-Analysis of the 3MT

Work in Progress by Heather Boldt, Emory University

ESP teachers who assist graduate students and researchers with their writing have long known the value of the moves (Swales, Swales & Feak, and many others). There is no doubt that knowing the moves of various sections of research papers and using the expected language of those moves are powerful tools for writers. Indeed, University of Manchester's well-known academic phrasebank is organized around these moves and many writers, both novice and experienced, native and non-native, find the skeletal phrases there to be very valuable. But what about "moves" for talking about research? And why isn't there an "academic speaking phrasebank" that provides the spoken counterparts for introducing work, describing a gap, proposing a solution, and other common moves? Fortunately, the 3-Minute Thesis competition can provide an answer. Since this high-stakes research speaking competition involves graduate students describing their research to a general audience, its transcripts are full of examples of clear, concise, spoken versions of the written moves. Through a corpus-analysis of

over 60 winning 3MT transcripts, my research will introduce a sequence of basic speaking moves and provides the language of each of these moves. Knowing this framework and the language to use in order to follow it while speaking can help scientists describe their research and its value clearly and convincingly to any audience.

Daniel V Bommarito

Bowling Green State University

I am currently designing a study to investigate graduate writers' use of live-broadcasting software to share their writing processes publicly. I plan to focus on live-broadcasts that are hosted on Twitch, a popular online video platform in which users stream video captures in real time and communicate synchronously with a viewing audience. While the vast majority of Twitch users are video gamers, a small community of writers has formed, and among members of that community are graduate students drafting various types of academic writing.

I envision this study contributing to our understanding of ways digital writing technologies can be leveraged to support graduate writing. As far as I know, no study has investigated writers' use of live-streaming, and, through informal conversations with graduate writers in the community, I have found that some see live-streaming as a helpful form of social accountability and a generative opportunity to interact with other writers. Through the study, I hope to learn more about the benefits live-streaming may hold for graduate writers, for viewing audiences, and for writing researchers. Additionally, given the public nature of the writing under investigation, this study would seem to have theoretical implications, calling into question common assumptions about writing as a private, solitary act.

I intend for this project to be an exploratory, interview-based study. With CGC institute members, I hope to discuss effective and ethical strategies and tools for conducting online interviews, a method of data collection that I have not used.

Michael Bowen

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

In our ESL Graduate Writing course, we designed a unit on Research Project/Grant Proposal Writing. The unit assignment asked students to write an 800-word preliminary proposal, which included a statement of need, statement of purpose, and an implementation plan. To give the assignment an element of authenticity, we decided to conduct a video-recorded interview with the assistant director of External Fellowships at the Graduate College. This work in progress presents our considerations in designing the assignment and modules for this unit in collaboration with our Graduate College.

Sarah Burcon and Katie Snyder

University of Michigan

The College of Engineering at University of Michigan offers a class titled “TC 610: Technical and Professional Writing.” In this class, graduate students (typically ESL students) work to improve their writing (e.g. a journal article, proposal, or dissertation) through lectures, seminars, and tutoring sessions. We are now considering changes to this model to improve enrollment and to encourage more native English speakers to attend.

After researching other approaches to teaching graduate level writing courses, we are considering the following for our new model of TC610.

We plan to hold 16 **lectures** (1.5 hours/once per week) and 16 seminars (1.5 hours/once per week) during the semester on topics such as (but not limited to) readability, literature review, argumentation, incorporating sources, grant writing, and writing abstracts and/or conference proposals.

In **seminars**, students will put into practice what they’ve learned during lecture, and instructors will facilitate discussions/revision processes.

We will encourage students to attend ALL lectures; however, they may **choose** to attend 10 relevant lectures and 10 corresponding seminars, if they wish.

We are interested in hearing opinions about the following:

- *Should students work exclusively with their own writing, OR should we ask them to do assignments that are not related to their other work to give them experience with writing for different audiences/purposes?*
- *At present, grad students are given one-on-one tutoring once a week. We are considering not continuing with these tutoring sessions, but instead, having students work on their writing during the group Workshop sessions. We would like to know what benefits and disadvantages others see with each model.*

Cameron Bushnell
Clemson University

Graduate Writing Teaching Assistants: Moving from Pilot to Program

Clemson University piloted a professional development program for an interdisciplinary cohort of graduate teaching assistants; the pilot was designed to help TAs increase the amount of, and improve the quality of, writing expected from their undergraduate students in labs and classrooms. The Graduate Writing TAs (GWTA), from Mechanical Engineering, Parks Recreation & Tourism Management, and English, were all seeking ways to increase writing opportunities within prescribed syllabi.

My Works-in-Progress capitalizes and expands upon the GWTA pilot: Capitalize on Collaboration. The GWTA pilot had several potentially unique aspects: 1) it was co-taught by Writing Center and Pearce Center faculty, 2) it employed PhD students to assist with syllabus design, ESL instruction, data collection and reporting, and 3) it benefited from a faculty auditor from one of the participating departments. The first part of the paper explores the benefits and detractions of each point.

Re-establish WAC on campus. A main goal of the program is to re-establish Clemson as WAC/WID campus; the university has in the past been strongly oriented towards these programs, but the Pearce Center has recently taken other directions. This paper explores strategies for reinstating and reinvigorating a dispersed program, using the GWTA program as a vehicle.

Introduce Oral Communication into Professionalization. Finally, Pearce Center has recently been charged with incorporating more oral communication experience into its programs. This paper looks briefly at opportunities for adding professional oral communication to its writing mandate, again through the graduate TA cohort.

Tetyana Bychkovska & Susan Lawrence

George Mason University

Supporting Graduate Multilingual Writers: A Writing Center's First Semester Offering Graduate Writing Groups

Inspired by research on successful graduate English as a Second Language (ESL) writing groups in other universities (Phillips, 2012, 2013, 2016; Simpson, in press), our Writing Center at George Mason University decided to adopt these practices in our local context. After visiting the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to observe their ESL writing groups, we piloted this service in spring 2018 and received an unexpectedly overwhelming response from graduate multilingual writers. In our talk, we will report on our first semester of offering graduate ESL writing groups, sharing lessons learned in terms of marketing, scheduling, and attrition, as well as observations on managing group dynamics and supporting participants as they learn to provide feedback to each other. We will share statistics and anecdotes and provide recommendations for those considering offering this service. We hope to open a conversation about ESL graduate writing groups and attendees' experiences with or plans for offering such groups.

Daniel Calvey

Sabanci University

A popular approach among instructors to helping graduate students grow as writers is to have students provide feedback on each other's papers. Perceived benefits of such an exercise, aside from the immediate feedback received, might include students developing their perspectives as readers, hopefully leading to improvements in their own production. But how beneficial are such exercises? Do students really engage? Does the experience inform their practice?

In addition to these questions, how does second language use complicate the picture? Do L2 graduate students in an English medium program provide meaningful enough feedback to benefit each other? Are they overly challenged when it comes to providing thorough feedback to their colleagues? Do they "get it"?

This works-in-progress talk will hopefully be of interest to anyone interested in these questions. Over 3 semesters at Sabanci University in Istanbul, upwards of 250 graduate students from engineering, science, social science, and humanities

disciplines have completed structured peer writing consultations in groups of 2 or 3 students in their own programs. The exercise culminates in written reflections on the experience both of receiving feedback from a peer and of providing feedback to a peer. The assignment itself and the main themes that can be distilled from the reflections will be shared. What they seem to suggest for peer-to-peer feedback, especially among non-native users of English, might offer points for discussion.

Michelle Campbell

Purdue University

In recent years, Purdue University has funded three graduate student teaching positions through the Purdue University Writing Lab to offer WAC/WID support to nearly 11,000 graduate and professional students across the University, approximately 40% of whom are multilingual writers. I have served as both the ESL Coordinator for the Purdue Writing Lab, a position which serves both multilingual undergraduate and graduate students, and most recently as the Graduate Studies Writing Workshop Coordinator, a position which serves both monolingual and multilingual graduate students. In this session, I will discuss some of the workshop curriculum I developed and facilitated in both roles for graduate student writers as well as how the institutional relationships between the Purdue Writing Lab, the Graduate School, and the University at large impacted my role as a graduate student teaching other graduate students at the institution. Finally, I will draw some connections from these positions to my other role as a tutor for the Purdue Oral English Proficiency Program (OEPP), an oral English program for multilingual graduate students who want to becoming teaching assistants at Purdue University, and how having a foot in each support program “camp” for graduate students at Purdue University has affected how I approach oral and written English language teaching at the graduate student level.

Nigel Caplan

University of Delaware

I am going to share developments in our pre-matriculation writing classes for international graduate students. Specifically, I would like feedback on a new proposed assignment sequence leading to an annotated literature review rather than a report/research paper. Part of the discussion will focus on the proficiency international students can be expected to display before/upon matriculation to graduate programs.

Edwina Carreon

The Ohio State University

Helping dissertation students use textual mentors

Despite their advanced reading and writing skills, ESL Ph.D candidates from across academic disciplines register in a dissertation writing course to receive help in drafting their proposal or chapters of their dissertation. Their busy schedules demand that all class sessions and tutorials be tightly targeted to their individual dissertation projects. Confidence in the instructor’s ability to address each student’s needs creates a further challenge. One particularly effective approach is to use textual mentors, i.e., to have

students find potential “model” proposals or dissertations from their department/advisor which they then use as guides in determining dissertation and chapter organization, type and flow of information elements, rhetorical style, grammar elements, and citation use. I have found that this approach works best when carried out in 4 stages: students choose the texts, students analyze text macro-structures (Paltridge 2002), instructor-led modeling (e.g. of CaRS model by Swales 2004), and finally, reinforcement during multiple tutorials. While discussing the student’s draft in a one-on-one tutorial, the instructor finds opportunities to steer the student to find answers on organization, coherence, lexical choice, grammar, and citation use from the student’s “textual mentors”. In addition, rhetorical reading (Hirvela 2004) and interactive reading aloud by the instructor (Rosenbaum 1999, Belcher & Hirvela 2008) during tutorials appear to improve a student’s understanding of the model texts, as well as, his/her own draft’s complex meaning/form connections. Such scaffolded engagement and resulting awareness lead to improvements in the student’s written drafts.

Tyler Carter

Duke Kunshan University

I teach graduate communication at Duke Kunshan University, a joint venture between Wuhan (China) and Duke (U.S.A.). As is, there are separate 3-credit oral and writing courses, one in the Fall and one in the Spring. I would like to balance out the oral and writing work over the course of the academic year (6 credits total) thus, my work-in-progress is designing an integrated course that is two semesters long. Currently the oral communication course draws from ESP curriculum developed at Purdue to train international TAs, and the graduate writing course takes a RGS approach adapted from the syllabi on the CGC published by Michelle Cox. The big question then is how to integrate these two approaches. Further, I would like to incorporate more overtly rhetorical content (in the disciplinary sense), since my home discipline is Rhetoric and Composition. And of course I need to take into consideration the needs of the three graduate programs that we support and the fact that this teaching occurs not in an American context, but at a joint-venture university in China. For this works in progress presentation, after expanding on the tasks at hand as described above, the larger context, and how I am thinking about arranging the course, I would love to hear other ideas that people have and about any resources that come to mind. Questions about disciplinarily (language vs. writing), assignment sequencing, and how to incorporate rhetorical theory into communicative teaching are what I’d like to focus on.

Rachael Cayley

University of Toronto

In this project, I am asking former participants to reflect on their dissertation boot camp experiences two years later. These participants were initially queried about their experiences as soon as their boot camp was complete. At that point, however, participants are generally still somewhat euphoric at all the work they’ve just managed to finish; they also have my boot camp framing fresh in their minds. For those reasons, it can be hard to be sure that their enthusiasm and commitment to the boot camp model is indicative of any lasting impact. By following up two years later, I hope to

learn what ideas have had traction and whether participating in a boot camp can alter a writer's practice or their conceptions about writing. In particular, I want to focus on what participants remember about the boot camp and how they think it influenced their writing. While the responses to both those questions have proved interesting, there is an obvious caveat: those who chose to respond to this survey (about a third of the participants thus far) may be those who initially found the boot camp model most resonant. During this work-in-progress session, I would like to discover whether this inquiry seems relevant to others working in graduate communication; I'm also hoping to get ideas about how to frame these responses in a way that doesn't overgeneralize from the engagement demonstrated by those who chose to respond.

Ida Chavoshan

University of Pittsburgh

The purpose of my presentation is to share a course design for a graduate level research writing course and to discuss modifications for the future. Recently, I taught a Research Seminar course in a Master's in Foreign Language Education program. Over 90% of my students were second language (L2) speakers of English. While research and writing can be difficult for first language (L1) speakers of English, these difficulties may be exacerbated by cultural and linguistic differences for L2 speakers of English. In order to mitigate some of these difficulties, I redesigned the course to allow for writing workshops in addition to lectures. The objective of the course was to complete an action research or literature review project. The project was divided up into 5 tasks that would allow for step-by-step instruction, assessment, and feedback. After each task was completed, my TA and I would grade the task, provide individual feedback to the students, and design a workshop based on the task. Most of the workshops would focus on common issues that students had including: (1) grammar, (2) organization, (3) development of ideas, and (4) APA citations. Additionally, some workshop time was devoted to individualized tasks which were assigned by the instructor or which were chosen by the students themselves. At the end of the course, the students wrote reflections about the course in which many mentioned the positive effects of writing workshops. My hope is to modify the workshops in the future to improve the support provided to the students.

Lixia Cheng

Purdue University

A Mixed Methods Validity Investigation of Speaking Tasks That Measure Graduate Student Instructors' Pragmatic Interaction

Soo Jung Youn, Northern Arizona University

Shi Chen, Northern Arizona University

Lixia Cheng, Purdue University

This study uses a mixed methods approach to investigate the validity of two speaking tasks on the Graduate Student Instructor Oral English test (GSI OET). These two tasks (i.e., Office-hour Role-play, Video Questions) measure GSI candidates' spoken pragmatic abilities. They both reflect real-life language use in academic-institutional contexts, but differ in the degree of interactivity. The Office-hour Role-play task allows

candidates to interact with an interlocutor. The Video Questions task is a semi-direct form of assessment, which, however, is efficient at measuring candidates' pragmatic moves (e.g., how to address complaints, how to answer questions related to assignment instructions). GSIs' target language use domain is well reflected in both tasks. To strengthen the validity of GSI OET, necessary additional validity evidence includes the degree to which elicited performances from the two tasks differ in terms of pragmatic interactional features and how such features explain raters' scores. Employing a sequential mixed methods design, we will first transcribe and qualitatively analyze task responses to identify data-driven pragmatic interactional features, such as discourse markers and sequence organizations. Then, multi-faceted Rasch measurement will be used to extract candidates' ability logits. Based on the qualitative findings, ways in which coded interactional features explain candidates' spoken pragmatic abilities will be quantitatively examined using correlations, multiple regressions, and discriminant function analysis. The outcomes of this study include a list of distinct pragmatic interactional features indicative of varying levels of performances across task types. In addition, suggestions will be provided for improving the current rating scale of GSI OET.

Louis Cicciarelli

University of Michigan

This works-in-progress talk will share my experience in coordinating and implementing a pilot program offering 6 Write-Together sessions in Fall 2017 at the University of Michigan. I'll discuss working with our graduate college on this initiative, findings from our survey of program participants, and, after a hiatus for Winter 2018, the re-boot of this program for the 2018/19 academic year. I'll address compromises made while pushing the pilot program into action, coordinating key actors here on campus in my role as a lecturer, and changes we will make for this coming year.

This initiative began following the 2017 CGC colloquium in Portland where I had the opportunity to meet and talk with several graduate writing program administrators. I returned to Michigan intent on finding ways to build on the graduate writing support we provided at the Sweetland Center for Writing. After meeting with our director, we put together a working group to assess our current graduate writing support: Writing Workshop, the Dissertation Writing Institute, and Dissertation Writing Groups. We were also interested in ways to expand our support to better reach graduate student writers across the span of their writing careers. After surveying programs at peer institutions, we started with two initiatives: Write-Togethers and a two-year trajectory of workshops at UM's graduate college. While establishing Write-Together sessions seemed an immediate and obvious direction, the challenge in orchestrating the bits of funding, space, institutional support, and good will into a sustainable program is still a work-in-progress.

Michelle Cox

Cornell University

Designing a Writing Course for International Professional Masters Students

Most graduate writing courses focus on research writing, an area pertinent to doctoral students, yet 78% of first-time international graduate students are in masters and certificate programs (Okahana, Feaster, & Allum, 2016, p. 11). As masters programs are less selective than doctoral programs (Okahana, Feaster, & Allum, 2016, p. 9), these students typically have higher needs for communication support (Caplan & Cox, 2016). To meet these needs, Cornell University's English Language Support Office will offer two new courses: Preparing for the Professional Job Search and Writing for Professionals. This presentation will focus on the latter, as we are running into challenges in designing this course: most textbooks on workplace writing assume an undergraduate North American audience who uses English as a first language, the rhetorical contexts of workplace writing are difficult if not impossible to replicate in the classroom (Dias, Freedman, Medway, & Pare, 1999), and the students who enroll in this course will likely represent a range of experiences with English and a variety of professional programs, from apparel design to real estate to systems engineering. How might we design a single course that effectively prepares linguistically diverse masters students for the generic, rhetorical and linguistic challenges of writing for widely differing professional contexts? During this session, I will explore these and other issues, as well as share drafts of course materials, with the hope of receiving feedback and learning from those who have designed similar courses.

Kelly Cunningham
University of Virginia

The Graduate Writing Lab in the School of Engineering and Applied Science provides support to engineering graduate students and postdocs working on writing, presentations and posters through consultations, peer review groups, events and online resources. Starting with a director in February of this year, the lab is in the process of simultaneously starting programming and conducting needs analysis. The presentation will offer a brief overview of the current state of these endeavors with hopes to generate discussion around next steps and addressing challenges.

Meaghan Elliott Dittich and Jovana Milosavljevic-Ardeljan
University of New Hampshire

The speakers in this presentation address concerns raised by graduate students with regard to written and oral communication support across disciplines in a large, public, R1 institution in New England. We summarize what programs this institution already offers and point out what it is lacking. We then explore possibilities for creating a hybrid program which brings together the already existing support provided individually through the Writing Center, WAC programs on campus, and the Graduate School. The question we ask is where is the ultimate responsibility for training graduate students in writing and oral communication located; the Graduate School, the graduate program, the advisor, or the student? Our hypothesis is that it must be a collaboration between these entities. However, there should be a central unit that provides the structure for this cooperation, since none of these single programs can provide institutional support available to all graduate students, as scholars such as Michelle Cox, Steve Simpson, and Nigel Caplan all argue. That is where the Graduate School's role becomes vital in

providing centralized support. The presenters will share the plan they envision for a hybrid program and solicit participation by inviting the audience to discuss their institutional experiences of the best structures for program support and how those structures operate.

Jane Dunphy

MIT

There has been a growing awareness of the need for graduate student writing support in American universities, which is currently staffed by instructors with expertise (and often Ph.Ds) in literature, composition, rhetoric, and technical writing. However, robust support for academic and professional speaking and active listening competence in different contexts-e.g., interactive teaching, conference talks, facilitation of meetings and seminars, and difficult conversations in the hierarchy-is rare. I would like to present, elicit and explore different ways writing instructors can realistically integrate targeted speaking and listening tasks into their design of teaching materials and assignments to foster true communication competence in our multilingual graduate students in the disciplines.

Judy Dyer

University of Michigan

In this work in progress I will describe the rationale, and show some materials created for a new (academic) listening class for international graduate students. The goal of the class was to provide strategies and practice in listening to general spoken English based on Lynch's (2011) premise that listening in non-academic contexts is instrumental in improving students' academic listening. An equally important goal of the class was to provide encouragement for students to bring their whole identity to their graduate student role, and to explore their personal interests through listening in English.

Angela Garner

University of Kentucky

In Fall 2017, the Graduate School and the Center for English as a Second Language at the University of Kentucky initiated writing groups to extend writing support for international graduate students who had completed the only academic writing course offered. Participants self-selected and were assigned to groups of 3-4 students based on similar academic disciplines. In these groups, students received feedback on writing projects of their choosing from their peers and the instructor of the academic writing course who acted as the facilitator for these discussions. This session will discuss the successes and challenges of such groups from student, faculty, and administrative perspectives.

Austin Gorman
Clemson University

Employing Graduate Students as Collaborative Teaching Specialists

This “work-in-progress” explores how graduate students can be effectively employed both as instructors and ambassadors for generating communicative communities through developing both disciplinary and pedagogical expertise. Building on the work Lee Schulman and Jeffery Jablonski, who argue that “pedagogical content knowledge,” as distinct from mere “content knowledge,” should be treated as a separate field with its own particular theory and praxis, this paper discusses the benefits of pedagogical knowledge and how to implement its instruction in a variety of disciplines within a graduate student’s broader course of study.

This paper is based on a pilot program we initiated at our university this past semester, which had two primary goals: 1) to rebuild our WAC program at the undergraduate level, and 2) to improve writing among graduate students in a variety of disciplines. WAC offers a useful lens through which to view issues related to graduate communication and support. The issue of identifying interested stakeholders across the university is the perennial problem of successful implementation of WAC. At our institution, graduate students in the STEM fields and sciences perform the bulk of the teaching, and they are typically the most engaged and active members in the teaching of undergraduate. Reimagining their roles as both content-based experts in their disciplinary fields and the purveyors of “pedagogical content knowledge” not only assists in their own writing and research, but additionally builds a stronger community of scholars within their graduate programs and as future academic professionals.

Peter Grav
University of Toronto

In recent years, many post-secondary institutions across North America known for their Master’s and PhD research programs have witnessed a tremendous growth in demand for Professional Master’s degrees. At the University of Toronto, where I teach, there are now more than 57 such programs offering graduate degrees in fields ranging from business to nursing science, from urban design to engineering. While professional programs present both challenges and opportunities for those engaged in graduate communication training, we perhaps need to consider whether our standard teaching models predicated on helping students communicate original research are appropriate for this constituency.

My current research aims to achieve a greater understanding of the needs of professional Master’s students, specifically whether/how they differ from their research-oriented peers and in what ways. To do so, I have been surveying professional master’s students and their professors, asking for specifics concerning the type of writing and presenting tasks required in their programs. Beyond generating an “inventory” of the types/genres of assignment these students are doing, I am also interested in whether their professors perceive their students’ needs to be any different from those engaged in original research. While we may perceive professional

programs to be different, I'm curious to discover whether these students still, for example, need to know how to write and deliver a conference-style paper as well as a policy pitch. In this Works in Progress session, I'll present some of my preliminary findings and solicit feedback based on participants' experience at their home institutions.

Marilyn Gray
UCLA

Graduate Writing Needs Survey.

In 2017 we surveyed UCLA graduate students about writing support needs for the purpose of improving support and advocating for more resources. We asked questions about support needs more indirectly than directly: what genres students had spent a substantial amount of time working on in the past year, from whom did they seek guidance or assistance, whether they had any writing or communication courses in graduate school, and whether they had accessed any workshop on writing in graduate school. In addition, we asked open-ended questions about writing challenges in graduate school, workshop topics that they would be most useful, and reasons they hadn't used GWC appointments or workshops if they indicated they had not. I will share the survey instrument and briefly discuss preliminary findings.

Part 2 of the presentation will describe my adventures in taking methods and statistics courses in the School of Education that have led me to redevelop the survey into an instrument that measures writing support needs more directly through questions about preparation, adequacy of support from departments and advisors, and ratings of the importance of various skills and genres with parallel ratings of how much they would benefit from writing support for those skills and genres. The revised survey tries to incorporate design approaches that better meet expectations for demonstrating validity, reliability, and dimensionality of results in survey research. I would like to design effective assessment tools to help us make the case for more graduate writing support at our institutions.

Mark Haugen
Purdue University

Linking Interests and Identity to Task Based Goals

This pedagogical works in progress presentation will discuss the connection between semester long task based goals (TBGs) and student interests in an oral English support program for international graduate students. A finding that stands out from ecological studies of international graduate students is that they do not spend enough time speaking English outside the program. TBGs are individualized with students and their tutors in order to increase the amount of time students are using oral English and to motivate student improvement on oral language skills. TBGs focus on student inputs i.e. the specific work the student will do to improve their oral English; they articulate what, how often, and for how long the activity will be done. An example semester long TBG developed with a student is to identify three idioms or unfamiliar chunks of

language used in The Big Bang Theory each week, use Youglish.com to identify ten examples of each idiom, and record one of their own examples each day. This TBG is also built on throughout the semester to include summaries of episodes using discourse markers, prosodic work, and fluency practice. Each week TBGs are evaluated, discussed, and expanded with the student's tutor. A robust set of examples, potential expansions, and applications will be discussed.

Sarah R Huffman

Erin Todey

Iowa State University

Devising Malleable Graduate Peer Review Group Models to Address Unique Disciplinary Communication Needs

Despite recent and ongoing decreases in institutional, departmental, and programmatic support in the academy, graduate programs maintain high standards of achievement for students in their dissemination of research. As disciplines articulate their dedication to strengthen graduate students' academic communication skills, it is imperative we develop interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary approaches to assist these students in growing communicative competencies.

In response to demonstrated need, the Center for Communication Excellence (CCE) at Iowa State University has generated programming allotting choice in how graduate students decide to engage in their own communication development. One specific area of programming takes the form of Peer Review Groups (PRGs), small groups of graduate students who review each other's written and oral academic communication. Drawing from interactionist (Long, 1996), social constructivist (Vygotsky, 1978), and collaborative learning (Bruffee, 1984) theories, PRGs represent valuable venues for both the writer and reviewers to engage in critical and collaborative examination of texts (Aitchison, 2009; Boud & Mallory, 2012).

Our presentation will provide an overview of the CC's current PRG model, a weekly 1.5 hour meeting of 5-10 students in the same and similar disciplines, as a practical means of facilitating an effective review process. We will also discuss future directions that prioritize choice and flexibility in PRG structures, consider peers' disciplinary background, and capitalize on trained writing consultants' content knowledge expertise as we respond to the call to support graduate communication.

Lindsey Ives

Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Adjusting rhetorical situations to respond to diverse experience levels in a public speaking workshop for MBA students Together with two other professors, I created a workshop designed to prepare new MBA students to meet industry demands for presentation skills and strategies. After several successful pilot runs, the workshop became part of the mandatory new MBA student orientation. Data from post-workshop surveys indicated that satisfaction levels dropped after the workshop became mandatory. In response, we revised the workshop in order to connect the workshop

more closely to the students' academic and professional goals and make the speaking task more challenging for experienced participants without overwhelming less experienced participants. In order to achieve these goals, for the workshop's speaking task, we separated students into groups based on experienced level and altered the elements of Bitzer's rhetorical situation: audience, purpose, and constraints, to make the speaking task increasingly difficult with rising experience levels. Participants in small groups were given the opportunity to practice and give each other feedback, and for the final speech, participants from other groups were invited to guess the rhetorical situation to which each speaker responded. My works-in-progress presentation will describe the workshop revisions and survey responses.

Najma Janjua

Kagawa Prefectural University of Health Sciences

Making the Most at a Japanese Graduate School of Medicine.

Although many Japanese medical schools now include courses in English for medical purposes in their undergraduate programs, few provide English language instruction at the postgraduate level. This session looks at the content and pedagogy from Medical English for Researchers (MER) part of a broader general introductory course taught at a Japanese graduate school of medicine. The MER part comprises two main sections titled: 1) English as a means of communication in medical research; and 2) Fundamentals of reading and writing an English language medical research paper. The class size for the course ranges from 19-34 and students' research areas vary from basic sciences such as biochemistry and cellular biology to clinical specialties such as emergency medicine, and gastrointestinal surgery. Although the time devoted to MER instruction out of the total course time of 30 hours is less than 15%, its benefits appear to be enormous as judged from the results of course evaluations. The presenter shares examples of course materials and classwork and engages the participants in a discussion on making the most in achieving the course objectives despite the least favorable circumstances.

Talar Kaloustian

Community College of Philadelphia

This research is based on the personal narratives of 7 international students during their first year of U.S. graduate education, particularly on their experiences with language and personal growth within a U.S.-centric setting. Serving as the basis for this research are in-depth one-on-one interviews with first-year international graduate students from Afghanistan, Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, Indonesia and Thailand conducted over the course of one year, in 60-90 minute sessions. Themes from these interviews revolve around language acquisition challenges, and development in intercultural understanding.

In representing these students' voices, this research serves to enrich learning and teaching practice as follows: 1) reassure current students by demonstrating that most, if not all, international graduate students face similar challenges in this enormous endeavor of pursuing a graduate degree in new setting in a language other than their native language; 2) help students mitigate the effects of the imposter syndrome, a

phenomenon that is common particularly among international graduate students, and 3) help instructors and advisors more fully understand international student experiences, and consequently enrich their teaching, advising and mentorship capabilities.

Unique about this research is that to date, no other research has provided a real time, moving picture of the international student experience during year one of graduate work with such depth. Further, my status as an “insider,” having been an international graduate student myself, and being an instructor of ESL and content courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels gives me a unique perspective to present this study.

Lenore Latta

University of Guelph

A Writing Camp for English Language Learners in Graduate Programs

Writing Services at the University of Guelph Library offers a number of programs throughout the year, specifically targeted at English language learners. In this session, I will discuss the format and delivery of the University of Guelph’s EAL (English-as-an-Additional-Language) Graduate Writing Camp, offered once a year in the summer as a free 4-day intensive writing camp. The program offers workshops, focused self-editing sessions, and writing consultations with advisors.

Nathan Lindberg

Cornell University

Researching M.Eng Students from a Summer Intensive English Program

My colleagues and I are conducting a longitudinal study on professional masters of engineering (M.Eng) students in an intensive language program. We would like to share our results and get feedback and suggestions about possible directions we could take. Professional degrees are designed to graduate students into the job force, as opposed to prepare students to continue in academia. Professional degrees are becoming more popular, particularly in Engineering, which is chosen by international graduate students more than any other field.

In 2015, Cornell’s English Language Support Office (ELSO) and M.Eng program set up a four-week intensive summer immersion program to prepare incoming students for the linguistic and cultural challenges they would face. To create and improve the program, my colleagues and I at ELSO interviewed faculty and also surveyed and interviewed students. On one hand, we found that M.Eng teachers’ wanted their international students to communicate more. On the other hand, international M.Eng students wanted to become culturally adept at communicating in various situations, but they had difficulty finding opportunities to use English. (I presented some of these findings at last years’ CGC.)

We would like to expand our study and follow students after they graduate and enter the workforce. One of our study goals is to improve our summer immersion program,

but we are open to other objectives. In addition, we are trying to determine how our longitudinal study should be formatted and how we can prevent losing participants.

Ryan McCarty

University of Michigan

This talk describes a set of practices piloted during a semester-long series of science communication writing workshops for graduate students in Chemistry. Designed to help students write press releases, faculty and department highlights, and alumni-related news, these workshops help students recognize the hybrid nature of such genres (Lassen, 2006) in order to craft pieces of writing geared toward the writer's envisioned audience and purpose. Rather than asking students to reinvent themselves as a new kind of writer, these workshops provide participants with tools for seeing how science communication frames research in terms of problems and innovations, drawing on students' knowledge of research writing in their discipline to straddle narratives of science and narratives of nature (Myers, 1990). This talk will provide a brief overview of the workshop's genre analyses as well as the local and global features students focused on during the semester. It will provide examples of student drafts and revisions to illustrate the ways students began to engage in the work of science communication. Finally, it will conclude with reflections on next steps and feedback from audience and other participants.

Thomas McCloskey

University of Maryland

The University of Maryland has a successful Oral Communication Center that serves undergraduate students. However, the university's 11,000-student graduate population has no access to those services. Moreover, graduate students simply have different needs than undergraduates, ranging from preparing for academic job interviews, to presenting their work at conferences, and explaining their scholarship to non-specialists, among others. To address this need, the Graduate School expanded the thriving Graduate School Writing Center this spring. A post-doctoral researcher began taking communication consultation appointments with graduate students, with the goal of hiring Graduate Communication Fellows for the fall semester for additional support. The expansion of the Graduate School Writing Center to include communication consultation appointments led to several questions. First, how are communication consultations different than writing consultations? To what degree should they be structured in similar ways? Second, how should graduate communication fellows be trained compared to writing fellows? What do communication consultants need to know in order to be successful? Third, what makes a communication consultation successful? Should the focus on skills rather than individual texts and assignments apply in a communication context?

This work in progress presentation will explore these questions. My argument is that our Graduate School Writing Center can address the speaking needs of graduate students by adapting the framework of writing appointments for speaking consultations, training speech fellows using modified writing training methods, and making better speakers instead of better speeches.

Melinda Matice
University of Michigan

Widening the Dialogue: Engaged Learning Course for International Graduate Students

International graduate students face challenges in adapting to their new environments, and many report discomfort speaking in social and academic interactions. They have also expressed a lack of understanding about how local institutions and organizations reflect regional values, culture and climate, and the differing voices that exist within these. Without this knowledge, it is sometimes more difficult for them to enter into and sustain dialogues even with solid language skills. In order to move beyond the traditional EAP courses and knowing that students are increasingly seeking opportunities to engage with the local community, the presenter has designed an engaged learning course - Gardening in the Local Community- to respond to these needs. In this course, students learn about salient socio-economic issues and engage with local community partners, while reflecting on their experiences in their interactions in order to: develop confidence and practice speaking with community members in authentic social settings; be exposed to different varieties of intonation, accents and speaking styles in informal social contexts; gain a deeper understanding of how community activities are integrated within community need and culture and discuss how this is similar to or different from their home countries.

The presenter will briefly describe this engaged learning course, and some student responses from the course that has been taught over the past three years before opening up to the discussion.

Christina Montgomery
University of Texas at Arlington

Recent scholarship and conversations about writing and graduate student performance in the disciplines has led to an increased focus on how and why students revise. The purpose of this research is to build on recent findings in faculty commenting practices so that scholars, faculty, and administrators can better address how disciplinary faculty might improve their writing pedagogy to promote revision to help graduate students not only in their disciplinary courses but in their majors and most importantly in students' professional lives. In a 2017 assessment of commenting practices Martha Patton and Summer Taylor identified directive/facilitative commenting as potentially significant in student revision. This research will address the following questions: (1) Do past experiences with writing affect students' understanding of comments? (2) Do directive/facilitative comments prompt revision? (3) What motivates students to make revision changes in their writing? To understand the connections between student revision and commenting practices, the researcher examined rough and final draft student writing samples from an introductory writing course designed for entry-level graduate students in the disciplines at the University of Texas at Arlington. The researcher then interviewed six of the students about their past experiences with writing and specific revision decisions on their drafts based on their response to directive/facilitative comments. The transcribed interviews were coded to identify

emergent themes. The findings from this research are expected to address if and how directive/facilitative comments can help students with revision in their papers.

Greer Murphy

Claremont Graduate University

Multilingual students are disproportionately represented in statistics on plagiarism and reported for violating academic integrity regulations at higher rates than domestic, monolingual counterparts. Even in a field like graduate communication, research has yet to fully address what happens and how students experience the academic integrity adjudication process--after faculty report them for suspected plagiarism but before they are found guilty and/or penalties are meted out. Most research approaches plagiarism as a pedagogical problem, focusing on classroom interventions like training students to write from sources or helping faculty infuse writing-to-learn into their teaching. Little research frames plagiarism as an administrative issue, investigating institutional concerns like advocating for multilingual students before/during/after adjudication or ensuring that faculty understand their school's plagiarism policies and document any accusations of wrongdoing fairly and appropriately.

As any graduate writing specialist who has attempted to help learners navigate plagiarism reporting would agree, we overlook the administrative dimension at our--and, most importantly, our students' --peril. This work-in-progress presentation seeks to attract writing specialists, program administrators, and others who advocate for multilingual students. I will present criteria for evaluating academic honesty policies--generality, specificity, and flexibility--and will share strategies for clarifying expectations and better articulating some of the challenges multilingual graduate students face writing from sources in new disciplinary contexts and learning to avoid inadvertent plagiarism. I will invite attendees to share plagiarism stories from their own school settings, as well as to brainstorm ways of turning these stories into robust, reliable, (potentially) multi-institutional research.

Melissa Myers

Cornell University

Benefitting Both Sides: Bringing together undergraduate anthropology students and multilingual graduate students

Multilingual graduate students often find it difficult to verbally communicate their ideas in academic settings. For some, the expectation to participate in a university level class is a new experience; others are hindered by a sense of uncertainty or lack of confidence. International students, far from home and adjusting to new cultural and social norms, can also experience isolation while in the US. Seminar and lab discussions, conversations with advisors, peers, and faculty, even informal exchanges at departmental gatherings and conferences are critical settings where graduate students must communicate to succeed.

In Fall 2018, the English Language Support Office is piloting a "Taking Part in Discussions" course in collaboration with the Department of Anthropology. The

initiative brings together international graduate students and domestic undergraduate anthropology students to not only address these needs, but to prepare anthropology students to better understand others who may have different backgrounds and life experiences. In this course, we hope to provide a foundation for both groups to benefit from meaningful interactions. Domestic students who may travel overseas can build connections and learn from the diverse research interests and cultural and linguistic backgrounds of international students. Multilingual students can gain confidence in a supportive environment by becoming more aware of speech practices in academic contexts and by establishing relationships with members of the Cornell community outside of their departments. In developing this course, I continue to explore how to best structure these interactions to benefit both sides.

Eunjeong Park

The Ohio State University

Using Lexical Bundles of a Learner Corpus to Improve Academic Writing in Instructed Second Language Acquisition: A Multimethod Research Design

Little research on the connection between linguistics and pedagogy through the multimethod research design exists in the field of L2 writing research and applied linguistics. Therefore, it is needed to carry out pragmatic approaches in the transdisciplinary framework (The Douglas Fir Group, 2016) of L2 learning and acquisition. This study analyzes lexical bundles from second language (L2) students' placement test essays and utilizes them to the L2 writing instruction in intentional and incidental language learning to examine the effectiveness of the lexical bundle interventions through a multimethod research design. Corpus research was employed as the first phase to generate a list of lexical bundles. Mixed-methods research with quasi-experiment and qualitative research was subsequently used as the second phase. 367 placement test essays were used for corpus research. With the extracted list of lexical bundles, mixed-methods research was implemented to 50 L2 students in the college writing classes. The interventions yielded some effectiveness of lexico-grammatical writing gains. The study promotes the awareness of lexical bundle use for L2 learners, learning transfer, and the need of corpus literacy for L2 educators, writing teachers and researchers. This study fills the gaps by analyzing L2 students' lexical bundles and utilizing a list of lexical bundles to the students' L2 writing instruction with diverse research methods: corpus research and mixed-methods research. The needs-based corpus approach is essential for improving the learners' awareness of language use and satisfying them with the appropriate language instruction. Finally, learning transfer is spotlighted in qualitative research.

Kristina Quynn

Colorado State University

"Low-Cost, High-Impact Writing Facilitation Offerings" CSU Writes encourages graduate students to develop a regular and healthful writing practice. An unexpectedly popular program offering has been our show up & write. drop-in writing sessions. These are collective writing sessions where students and faculty gather for a couple hours and write together. Proctored by graduate student and faculty volunteers, show

up & write. sessions cost little to get going and to maintain; however, they can make a huge impact on the writing graduate students produce and the writing climate of a campus. This Works-In-Progress presentation explores some of the strategies and outcomes of drop-in and write sessions.

Lisa Russell-Pinson

University of North Carolina-Charlotte

Susan Barone

Vanderbilt University

One Professional, Many Roles: The Complexity of Supporting EAL Graduate-level Learners

Administrative decision-making related to the kinds of writing support offered to English as an Additional Language (EAL) graduate students and how such support should be delivered is complex, since administrators must consider the perceived needs and interests of the students, institutional structure, university mission, targeted professional expectations, and importantly, available resources, including personnel. Traditionally, language staff have served in either academic or support-services roles, but increasingly, they are being called upon to bridge the professional gap between these two positions. Whitchurch (2008: 382) characterizes those who fill this niche as blended professionals, whose “appointments [span] professional and academic domains.” She further describes the place where such blended work occurs as the third space, i.e., “an emergent territory between academic and professional domains, which is colonised primarily by less bounded forms of professional” (377). Working in the third space can be fraught with frustrations, such as being accorded credibility but lacking authority. However, simultaneously residing on the periphery and in the center of activities in the workplace can also present opportunities for better serving students’ needs as well as contributing to personal and professional growth.

This work-in-progress presentation applies Whitchurch’s framework to English for Academic Purposes (EAP) professionals who work with graduate-level learners and uses examples from the two universities represented by the presenters to illustrate the multifaceted roles they inhabit within their institutions. Furthermore, questions involving the implications of the expanding roles of these professionals will be considered.

Stacy Sabraw

Duke University

The English for International Students program at Duke University is moving from an EAP to an ESP model for writing. The newest course, which will debut Fall 2018, is Writing in STEM fields. The population for this course is largely first-year master’s students in fields such as biostatistics, environment and computer engineering who are industry-bound. The course development process and the proposed course schedule will be presented. Input from those who have developed courses/materials and worked with this population is encouraged.

Julia Salehzadeh
Duquesne University

Should we be addressing listening comprehension with our graduate students? In what ways are we already doing this? In contexts where PowerPoint slides are nearly ubiquitous, do students still struggle with lecture comprehension? If they do, what do students most need to know and be able to do when it comes to EAP listening? How does the proliferation of online courses change the equation for lecture comprehension? Or does it? Aside from monologic lectures, what other types of listening contexts should we/can we address: interactive lectures, class discussions, small group interactions, informal interactions? How do we best address the diverse needs of students in various disciplines? Are TED talks an appropriate resource for learning lecture comprehension? Are they better utilized for listening comprehension in general?

To inform an ongoing materials development project for EAP listening, the presenter would like to elicit what student needs CGC participants have identified and discuss the issues outlined above. The presenter will share the rationale and framework for a “work in progress” that addresses academic listening, primarily in classroom contexts.

Sara Saylor
University of Texas at Austin

I plan to present a synopsis of the Dissertation Boot Camp course that I developed and taught in Summer 2017, following my university’s first academic year of offering interdisciplinary writing support for graduate students. This 3-week course combined daily instruction on writing and personal wellness, peer review sessions, and structured quiet writing time. My talk will focus on the pedagogical approaches and materials that I incorporated into the course design. During follow-up discussions, I will gladly elaborate on administrative logistics of advocacy, funding, and enrollment; responses from doctoral students and other members of the university community; and lessons learned from my experience teaching this course as an early-career postdoctoral fellow.

Kathleen Steeves
McMaster University

I am thinking about and working on the connection between the development of scholarly identities among graduate students, and writing, for both international and domestic students. Based on my hands-on experience as a Graduate Student Writing Consultant, as well as recent literature in this area, I would like to discuss the importance of providing graduate student writing support for increasing the research potential of students, as it encourages and supports them in growing into their own scholarly identities.

James Tierney and Anna Moldawa-Shetty
Yale University

Helping graduate students negotiate issues of identity, diversity, and equal inclusion While colleges and universities have long recognized the need for students and faculty to develop greater and more nuanced discussions of diversity and inclusion, there is also consensus that one-off workshops can do little to bring about the substantive change all agree is necessary This matter is particularly timely as of this writing, as recent events have brought issues of race, ethnicity, sexual identity, and religion once again to the fore.

Issues of diversity, equality and inclusion bear on graduate students in multiple and complex ways. While enriching campus diversity, they are also subject to various kinds of discrimination and unfair treatment. At the same time, as they enter their programs and undergo adjustment and acculturation, they may require additional cultural and linguistic background to process and negotiate issues of race, gender, sexual equality. This work-in-progress presentation discusses a multi-year joint project designed to provide awareness of rights and obligations, and to help students voice previously unrecognized or poorly-understood concerns, in short, to bring international graduate students more fully into the conversation.

Presenters will begin with a brief overview of the project, followed by a description of how the program developed in collaboration with other campus units. We will focus on one aspect of the program, a unique case-study approach used as a catalyst for students to connect issues of campus diversity to broader diversity issues, their own cultural contexts, and personal experiences. Finally, we will explore how early results of the project are being used to shape further projects and collaborations. Participants will have an opportunity to discuss how the ideas presented apply to their teaching contexts and will come away with ideas for designing a diversity training program and sample case studies.

Taylor Tolchin

University of Denver

Universal Design and Graduate Writers in the Neoliberal University's Writing Center

Universal Design (UD), while positive, risks becoming what Jay Dolmage calls a "neoliberal buzzword," in which case(s) "disability is so overdetermined by the accommodation process in higher education, and these accommodations can be so efficiently stripped of their effectiveness, that the university is a machine for qualifying (and portioning out only minimal) access and rights" (141, 139). At its worst, the writing center can be the place students go to have their writing "cured," "fixed," and "eradicated"—processes tied to historical and pervading social treatments of disability that continue to bolster academic ableism and turn UD into a neoliberal industry with false promises. However, at its best, the writing center can resist the neoliberal agenda by being a space where UD helps position disability as vital and agential, and where meaningful accessibility and inclusion occur.

For CGC, I plan to discuss a mixed-method study on accessibility and inclusion for graduate students with disabilities. Broadly, I am looking at how my writing center implements UD, how we meet this population's needs, and how we fall short. How can

we train tutors to emphasize identity over difference so that disability is not an obstacle that results in the removal of that same individuality? How do we ensure that we empower writers with disabilities who don't necessarily know their specific needs? In catering to writers, how do we take care of graduate tutors with disabilities as well?

Olivia Tracy

University of Denver

Prompts are one of the most ubiquitous academic genres, but, as a form of graduate communication, the development and revision of these pedagogical materials is understudied. While most graduate students encounter prompts as students and instructors, engagement with these materials often rests on unexamined assumptions. How might explicitly discussing how graduate students read, and how faculty develop, prompts improve the prompts given to graduate students, and how might we more effectively support graduate students in our writing centers as they develop their own course and workshop materials?

To begin these conversations, I designed and facilitated a workshop that positioned writing center consultations as spaces where faculty and graduate students could discuss prompt development and revision. During the workshop, participants had the opportunity to implement specific revision strategies through conversation with writing center consultants.

Participants in the first workshop were open to and excited about this model, and the workshop conversations raised new questions and possibilities. Before I implement a similar model in future workshops, I would like to consider the following:

How should we understand prompts for graduate students to be different from prompts for undergraduates, and what resources are available to guide faculty in writing them?

- How might we create space for explicit dialogue about prompts in content-focused graduate classrooms?
- What types of support for pedagogical materials development might we offer to graduate students?
- How might we better prepare graduate student consultants to have conversations with both faculty and students?

Sukyun Weaver

MICA (Maryland Institute College of Art)

This preliminary study explores our evaluation of English Language Learning support courses specific to a graduate art and design curriculum. Currently we are using three tools to assess graduate student satisfaction: an augmented course evaluation, an open-ended survey, and individual interviews. We hypothesize that students who participate in ELL coursework will show overall positive perceptions, emotions, and attitudes in their feedback. Making a substantive test of our hypothesis will require a variety of methods deployed over the course of several years, possibly longer. We are beginning this process with lightweight tools that will help us to better understand our student population, the qualities of the data we have available, and the routes we can

take to assessing student satisfaction and success. In our first phase we are approaching data gathering in three ways: augmenting anonymous course evaluations for ELL coursework, a survey of open-ended questions about linguistic and cultural adjustment to student life at MICA, and a series of face-to-face interviews. This preliminary research is in a needs analysis stage and will be refined and expanded over time. How might we build out a systematic program evaluation that incorporates objective measures of assessment as well as best practices?

Information about Ann Arbor

Parking

If you will be driving to campus, please use the [Forest Avenue Parking Structure](#), 650 S. Forest Ave, Ann Arbor, MI 48104.

Maps and Local Transportation

The University of Michigan Central Campus is located in the heart of downtown Ann Arbor. Here is a printable [campus map](#), highlighting Weiser Hall, Graduate Inn, and the Forest Street Parking Structure. You can also view our [online interactive map](#).

The U-M Campus provides a free bus service on around campus. See this printable [bus map](#) or view the [real-time bus locations and routes](#).

Ann Arbor's city bus service "[The Ride](#)" offers extensive service to destinations in town and the surrounding areas.

Things to Do Around Town

Looking for other things to do while you are visiting? We hope your travel plans will allow some time to get out and wander around town: "A2" is consistently rated one of the 'best college towns' and 'best places to live' in the US, based on its walkability, cultural offerings, and many top-notch restaurants and bars. A couple of fun spots on or around campus include:

- [Zingerman's Deli](#) – 422 Detroit Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 (They will be catering two of our lunches, but this world-famous Deli is an experience in itself and well worth a visit if you have time to drop in.)
- [University of Michigan Art Museum \(UMMA\)](#) -525 S State St, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
- [Nickel's Arcade](#) – 328 S State St, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
- [Blank Slate Creamery](#) – 300 W Liberty Rd, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

(Gourmet ice cream that has 'em lining up every evening)

- [Detroit Filling Station](#) – 300 Detroit Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 (Haute vegan cuisine, down the block from Zingerman's)

Evening Reception

Our evening reception on Sunday is at the **ABC Brewpub**. The walk from Weiser Hall to ABC brewpub (15-20 min) runs right through campus, allowing you to walk along the

famous “Diag” and see iconic U-M buildings such as Hatcher Graduate Library, Angell Hall, and Hill Auditorium. If you’d like company on your walk to the reception, a group will be walking over together from Weiser Hall right after the CGC sessions end for the day (a few minutes after 5:00 PM). To join, please meet on the ground floor by the double doors farthest from the elevators.

If you choose to drive to the reception from Weiser Hall (5-7 min), there is a convenient public parking garage across the restaurant from the brewpub on 4th Ave and Washington St.

If you’re staying at the Graduate Ann Arbor hotel, ABC brewpub is conveniently located just a couple blocks from the hotel.

While in Ann Arbor...

For more ideas, check out the [U-M Campus Events Calendar](#) or [VisitAnnArbor.org](#).

The Summer Institute coincides with the [Ann Arbor Summer Festival](#), a month-long celebration featuring indoor and outdoor music, performance, food, drink and fun. The stage in front of U-M’s Rackham Graduate School is on the way from the Graduate Inn to Weiser Hall, so you can check out up-and-coming acts or grab a cold one in the beer garden.

And if you have some extra time, check out nearby Detroit, which after a few rough years is hopping again. It is home of the world-class [Detroit Institute of Art](#) and a [hot foodie scene](#). Be sure to ask [Angelo](#) for his Detroit sightseeing tips!

University of Michigan Map



List of 2018 CGC Institute Participants

Name	Institution
Mariam Alamyar	Purdue University
Kyung-Hee Bae	Rice University
Katie Baillargeon	UC Santa Barbara
Ila Baker	Western Michigan University
Estee Beck	The University of Texas at Arlington
Joel Bloch	The Ohio State University
Pamela Bogart	University of Michigan
Heather Boldt	Emory University
Dan Bommarito	Bowling Green State University
Michael Bowen	University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
Thad Bowerman	Texas A&M University
Cathleen Bridgeman	Adler University
Mackenzie Bristow	Emory University
Sarah Burcon	University of Michigan
Cameron Bushnell	Clemson University
Tetyana Bychkovska	George Mason University
Dan Calvey	Sabancı University
Doug Campbell	Western University
Michelle M. Campbell	Purdue University
Nigel Caplan	University of Delaware
Fernanda Capraro	Bowling Green State University
Janine Carlock	Duquesne University
Edwina Carreon	Ohio State University
Tyler Carter	Duke Kunshan University
Rachael Cayley	University of Toronto
James Wright	University of Maryland, Baltimore
Ida Chavoshan	University of Pittsburgh
Lixia Cheng	Purdue University
Louis Ciciarelli	University of Michigan
Andrea Cole	McMaster University
Eva Copija	Western Michigan University
Michelle Cox	Cornell University
Kelly J Cunningham	University of Virginia
Kristen Danek	University of Michigan
Meaghan Elliott Dittrich	University of New Hampshire
Natalia	George Washington University
Trisha Dowling	University of Michigan
Jane Dunphy	MIT
Judy Dyer	University of Michigan
Mary Ebejer	Western Michigan University
Chris Feak	University of Michigan
Nadine Fladd	University of Waterloo
Alan Forsyth	Emory University
Robin Fowler	University of Michigan
Jane Freeman	University of Toronto

Amanda Gallogly
 Jordana Garbati
 Angela Garner
 Sarah Gibbons
 Carmela Romano Gillette
 Austin Gorman
 Peter Grav
 Marilyn Gray
 Jenny Grill
 Mark Haugen
 Mary Hedengren
 Heather Herrera
 Sarah Huffman
 Ordoitz Galilea
 Brenda Prouser Imber
 Lindsey Ives
 Najma Janjua
 Deborah Des Jardins
 Elena Kallestinova
 Talar Kaloustian
 Steve Kopec
 Lenore Latta
 Susan Lawrence
 Joanne Lax
 Kim Lewis
 Nathan Lindberg
 Robyn Brinks Lockwood
 Adrienne Lynett
 Linda Macri
 Shannon Madden
 Melinda Matice
 Isabell May
 Ryan McCarty
 Thomas McCloskey
 Jacqui McIsaac
 Gerri McNenny
 Jovana Milosavljevic-Ardeljan
 Anna Moldawa-Shetty
 Christina Montgomery
 Greer Murphy
 Melissa Myers
 Chris Nelson
 Mariam Osman
 Eunjeong Park
 Juli Parrish
 Talinn Phillips
 Karie Pieczynski
 Nadya Pimenova
 Brad Pingel

University of Iowa
 Wilfrid Laurier University
 University of Kentucky
 University of Guelph
 University of Michigan
 Clemson University
 University of Toronto
 UCLA
 Florida State University
 Purdue University
 University of Houston, Clear Lake
 University of San Diego
 Iowa State University
 University of Connecticut
 University of Michigan
 Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
 Kagawa Prefectural University of Health Sciences
 University of Michigan
 Yale University
 Community College of Philadelphia
 University of Pennsylvania
 University of Guelph
 George Mason University
 Purdue University
 University of Michigan
 Cornell University
 Stanford University
 UCLA
 University of Maryland
 University of Rhode Island
 University of Michigan
 University of Maryland Baltimore
 University of Michigan
 University of Maryland
 University of Guelph
 Chapman University
 University of New Hampshire
 Yale University
 University of Texas at Arlington
 Claremont Graduate University
 Cornell University
 Oregon State University
 American University in Cairo
 The Ohio State University
 University of Denver
 Ohio University
 Nazarbayev University
 Purdue University
 University of Michigan

Angelo Pitillo
Jirina K. Poch
Kristina Quynn
Lisa Russell-Pinson
Stacy Sabraw
Julia Salehzadeh
Jodie Salter
Sara Saylor
Paul Schmidt
Melanie Seitzer
Shyam Sharma
Steve Simpson
Kelly Sippell
Katie Snyder
Grace Song
Lisa Sperber
Linnea Spitzer
Katie Steeves
Ginger Stelle
Kay Stremmer
John Swales
Jim Tierney
Erin Todey
Taylor Tolchin
Olivia Tracy
Sharon Ultsch
Peggy Wagner
Elliott Walters
Sukyun Weaver
Katie Weyant
Jessica Wyman

University of Michigan
University of Waterloo
Colorado State University
University of North Carolina-Charlotte
Duke University
Duquesne University
University of Guelph
University of Texas at Austin
Western University
University of Nebraska Omaha
Stony Brook University
New Mexico Tech
University of Michigan Press
University of Michigan
Emory University
University of California, Davis
Portland State University
McMaster University
Asbury Theological Seminary
Eastern Michigan University
University of Michigan
Yale University
Iowa State University
University of Denver
University of Denver
University of Vermont
Emory University
Carnegie Mellon University
Maryland Institute College of Art
University of Michigan
OCAD University Toronto

About the Consortium on Graduate Communication



The **Consortium on Graduate Communication** is an international association whose members provide professional development in written, oral, and multimodal communication to students before and during their (post-)graduate academic and professional programs. CGC members work with graduate students in their first and second/additional languages.

CGC's primary activities include face-to-face and online opportunities to discuss and share resources, pedagogy, research, curricula, and program models for graduate communication.

The Consortium was created in April, 2014, and its listserv and online membership survey quickly gathered over 500 members in at least 27 countries. On this website, you can find information about meetings, resources, and programs offering graduate communication support.

If you would like to host a CGC meeting at conference or other venue (perhaps outside North America!), please contact us. We are also interested in online communication, such as chats and webinars. As an entirely volunteer-run community, we welcome all expressions of interest.

For more information about membership dues and coming events, please visit our website at www.gradconsortium.org. To join our listserv, send an empty email to gradconsortium-subscribe@yahoogroups.com. A Yahoo! account is not required to send and receive email (only to access the message archives on the [group website](http://www.gradconsortium.org)).

Mark your Calendars!

2019 CGC Summer Institute

June 13-15

George Mason University,
Arlington Campus

