Grant Final Report Form

Principal Investigators (PIs) are required to submit final reports within **60 days** of their EIA grant end date. A delinquent report may jeopardize or delay future Network funding. The information you provide helps us improve and justify the continuation of this grant program. The Network may also contact PIs for longer-term impact reporting and may request permission to use elements of these reports in Network activities (Conference sessions, Academy sessions, etc.) and communication both within the CSU system and to external stake-holders.

Summary Grant Information

Grant Title:	Strengthening the Relationship between Writing Assignments and Equity
PI Name:	Dr. Kim Flachmann
PI Campus:	CSU Bakersfield
Grant Start Date (month/YYYY):	June 2022
Grant End Date (month/YYYY):	December 2023
Final Report Submission Date:	March 23, 2024

Major Outcomes

1. Summarize your project's outcomes against the original goals proposed for advancing equitable student learning, engagement, progression, and completion.

Our goal is to lower DFW rates in the courses we choose for this program. We currently have an 18.60% DFW rate (n=1651 DFW grades) in lower-division General Education courses that reinforce Written Communication (WC courses). This percentage drops to 11.12% in upper-division WC courses (n=1400 DFW grades). Additionally, we see an almost universal lower GPA for African American and Latinx students in a majority of General Education WC courses. Overall, First Generation students have a lower GPA in WC courses (2.78 vs 2.88) with large spikes in specific areas. From these data, we will choose the target courses for this program.

Results:

FALL 2022

A. History 1418: World History, Pre-History to 1520 (Dr. Andy Vosper)

In Fall 2022, three sections of HIST 1418 were offered. Beginning in AY 2020-21, there was a downward trend in pass rates for the course. This trend continued in the overall Pass/DFW rates for Fall 2022, but the embedded tutor group earned a passing mark in the course at a higher rate than the group overall and the control group.

15 total students
All students saw WRC tutor at least once (during the classroom session)
4 students saw WRC tutor 2 times (average grade A; B before tutor requirement)
1 student saw WRC tutor 3 times (A; B before tutor requirement)

93% of the students passed the course.
The average grade for the outline assignment was B-. (The average grade before tutor requirement was C.)
Extra credit was awarded based on how many times the student worked with a tutor. More visits=more EC.

Control Group:

Fall 2022 HIST 1418 Control Group		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	62	57.94%
DFW	45	42.06%
Totals	107	100.00%

Embedded Tutor Group:

Fall 2022 HIST 1418 Embedded Tutor Group		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	14	93.33%
DFW	1	6.67%
Totals	15	100.00%

HIST 1418 Historical DFW Rates

Year	Fall 2022		AY 2021		AY 2020		AY 2019	
Pass	76	62.30%	202	75%	259	78%	310	85%
DFW	46	37.70%	66	25%	74	22%	56	15%

The SSN class had a dramatically lower DFW rate than any of the other sections of Hist 1418. See more of the professor's comments in Appendix IA.

B. SOCIOLOGY 3408: Gender and Society (Dr. Dahna Rasmussen)

As with HIST 1418, pass rates fell beginning in AY 2020. As there were no other sections of SOC 3408 offered simultaneously, we have compared pass rates to previous offerings of the course. Our Fall 2022 cohort of SOC 3408, with added support, had higher pass rates than previous courses without the additional writing support.

36 total students (section 75 only had 7 students in it so I combined both sections for these calculations)
5 students saw WRC tutors for both papers with an average increase of 2.8 points.
2 students saw WRC tutors for the first paper only with an average decrease of 9.5 points.
9 students saw WRC tutors for the second paper only with an average increase of 12 points.

92% of students passed the course.
The average grade for each response paper was a solid C.

Control Group:

SOC 3408 Semester Average, Fall 2020 - Spring 2022		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	18.33	50.93%
DFW	17.66	49.07%
Totals	36	100.00%

Embedded Tutor Group:

Fall 2022 SOC 3408 Embedded Tutor Group		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	34	94.44%
DFW	2	5.56%
Totals	36	100.00%

SOC 3408 Historical DFW Rates

Year	Fall 2022		AY 2021		AY 2020		AY 2019	
Pass	34	94.44%	14	48%	41	55%	36	82%
DFW	2	5.56%	15	52%	39	45%	8	18%

The SSN class dramatically changed the high 3-year DFW trend in Sociology 3408. See more of the professor's comments in Appendix IB.

C. Biology 3120: Research Design and Analysis (Dr. Lucas Hall)

	Spring 2023
The total number of students in your class	24
Students with grades of D, F, and W	1
The percent of students who went to the WRC	100%
The average grade in your class	81%
The number of students who dropped/persisted in your course	0
The number of students who completed all the work in the course	24

93.33% of the students passed the course.
Students scored 2% higher on their research papers than students from a few semesters ago.
Students scored 6% higher on their research projects than in previous semesters.
All students persisted in the course and completed all their work.

Control Group

BIOL 3120 Control Group		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	15	75.00%
DFW	5	25.00%
Total	20	100%

Embedded Tutor Group

BIOL 3120 Embedded Tutor Group		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	23	95.83%
DFW	1	4.17%
Total	24	100%

BIOL 3120 Historical DFW Rates

Biology 3120 – Previous 3 Academic Years[1]		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	248	80.00%
DFW	62	20.00%
Total	310	100%

This professor saw a marked improvement in the students' written assignments in both Spring 2023 and Fall 2023. See more of the professor's comments in Appendix IC.

---

[1] Data provided by CSU Graduation Initiative Data Dashboard.

D. Philosophy 1019: Critical Thinking (Dr. Fran Fairbairn)

Number of students in your class	14
Percent of DFW	33.33%
Tutors embedded	2 tutors (content and writing)
Students who participated in tutoring	100%
Pass rate	66.67%

Control Group

PHIL 1019 Control Group		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	382	87.02%
DFW	56	12.98%
Total	419	100%

Embedded Tutor Group

PHIL 1019 Embedded Tutor Group		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	14	66.67%
DFW	7	33.33%
Total	21	100%

PHIL 1019 Historical DFW Rates

Philosophy 1019 – Previous 3 Academic Years[2]		
	# of Students	% of Students
Pass	2028	77.08%
DFW	603	22.92%
Total	2631	100%

The professor was very pleased with the additional understanding of the course content the students demonstrated in their writing. But this was the first time she required writing in her course, and she believes her pacing of the writing assignment contributed to the lower pass rate in the course. See more of the professor's comments in Appendix ID.

E. **Business Administration 3008: Diversity in Business Organizations (Cindy Zuniga-Prado)**

Fall 2023 (SSN Grant Participant)
       In-Person Section 01 – 32 Students
              DWF Grades: 1 D- and 1 WU
              Students who went to WRC: 6 students attended tutoring sessions
              Average grade: A+
              Number of students who dropped: 2
              Number of students who completed all course work: 30
       Zoom Synchronous Sections 70, 75, & 760 - 29 Students
              DWF Grades: 1 D- and 1 WU
              Students who went to WRC: 0 Students
              Average grade: B-
              Number of students who dropped: 6
              Number of students who completed all course work: 23 students
Spring 2023 (Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum, Training for the SSN Grant)
       In-Person Section 05– 37 Students
              DWF Grades: WU 2
              Students who went to tutoring: 37
              Average grade: B
              Number of students who dropped: 2 WU
              Number of students who completed all course work: 37 (all students)

Embedded Tutor Group

	#	%
Pass	57	93.44%
DFW	4	6.55%
Total	61	100%

Last 3 Academic Years, Overall

	#	%
Pass	1232	89.80%
DFW	140	10.20%
Total	1372	100%

This professor saw a dramatic improvement in her students' writing with the new reading and writing strategies she implemented and the embedded tutor helping her implement them. See more of the professor's comments in Appendix IE.

F. Communications 3090: Strategic Social Media (Dr. Kyung Jung Han)

Comparison between the past and the present COMM 3090

Course Term	Fall 2022 (Control Group)	Fall 2023
The total number of students	18	29
Students with grades of D, F, and W	4 (22%)	5 (17%)
The percent of students who went to the WRC	0%	6%
The average grade in your class	80.09	83.86
The number of students who dropped the course	3	3
The number of students who completed all the work in the course	10	17
The average grade of final project (writing tutor-embedded)	No, tutor 15.93/20	Yes, tutor 18.92/20

Embedded Tutor Group

	#	%
Pass	24	88.89%
DFW	3	11.11%
Total	27	100%

Last 3 Academic Years, Overall

	#	%
Pass	105	82.03%
DFW	23	17.97%
Total	128	100%

Dr. Han felt that the combination of the reading and writing strategies she used from Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum and her embedded tutor made an important improvement in her students' writing. See Appendix IF for her detailed comments about this improvement.

G. BIOL 3120: Research Design and Analysis (Dr. Lucas Hall)

	Fall 2023
The total number of students in your class	23
Students with grades of D, F, and W	2
The percent of students who went to the WRC	100%
The average grade in your class	76%
The number of students who dropped your course	1
The number of students who completed all the work in the course	21

Embedded Tutor Pass Rate

	#	%
Pass	21	91.30%
DFW	2	8.70%
Total	23	100%

Last 3 Academic Years, Overall

	#	%
Pass	248	80.00%
DFW	62	20.00%
Total	310	100%

Dr. Hall participated in our SSN grant in Spring 2023 and in Fall 20-23. He commented on both sections of his course in Appendix G.

2. Comment on additional outcomes not directly associated with the project (e.g., partnerships formed, additional funding support gained).

The university has acknowledged the importance to student success of both the faculty professional development and the embedded tutoring. The Teaching and Learning Center will continue the PD, and the tutoring center is scheduling more embedded tutors in classes, starting in fall 2024.

3. Specify any unanticipated project developments (i.e., unanticipated barriers or unexpected wins)

We did not think online teaching would be a barrier to tutoring, but it was. The students in zoom and asynchronous classes generally didn't respond to tutor emails or invitations in Canvas for group work. As you can see from the data, the students in online classes did not succeed at the same rate as the students in the in-person classes.

4. If applicable, comment on any longer-term outcomes you anticipate from your Equity in Action Grant-funded project. Also please estimate anticipated achievement dates (month and year).

We believe this grant will permanently change the tutoring landscape on our campus.

Assessment and Communication

5. Describe efforts to communicate and disseminate project outcomes within your campus.

We have scheduled a grant report to the campus on May 3, 2024.

6. Provide a summary of your assessment activities and results, where available.

Please see my response to question #1.

Lessons Learned

7. As you reflect on the strategies and activities implemented during this grant, which were successful?

The strategies that the participating faculty referred to the most are those from the Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum Program. We are following up with all participating faculty to discuss their reactions since this grant.

8. By comparison, what strategies and activities did you find were unsuccessful?

The strategies that the participating faculty referred to the most are those from the Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum Program. We are following up with all participating faculty to discuss their reactions since this grant.

9. Given your experience with the Equity in Action Grant Program, what changes would you recommend to better support you toward your goals?

You did a fine job supporting us. Attending the group grant meetings was always enlightening and informative.

10. What can the CSU Student Success Network do to help your campus in its efforts to identify, understand, and disrupt inequities in our system?

Just continue doing exactly what you are doing with these funds. Thank you very much for giving CSUB this opportunity.

Appendix I: Instructor Comments and Reflections

A.   Dr. Andy Vosper, History 1418: World History, Pre-History to 1520

My HIST 1418 participated in this study during Fall 2022. History 1418 is a survey of world history from prehistory to 1500 CE. The class had 15 enrolled students, only one of whom was a history major. Student attendance, participation, and engagement throughout the semester were high. All but one student passed the class; the student who did not pass failed to submit the outline assignment despite multiple opportunities and encouragement to do so after the deadline. All other students submitted the assignment. There were several assignments involving writing throughout the semester, but for the purposes of this study, we focused our efforts primarily on the outline assignment.

I had kept the outline assignment essentially unchanged since Fall 2020. With the guidance and encouragement of Dr. Flachmann, I revised the prompt, framing it as a role-playing exercise. The topic and grading criteria remained the same, but I asked the students to think of themselves as candidates applying to consult on a museum exhibit. My subjective impression is that the combination of a role-playing approach and intervention from tutors resulted in higher-quality submissions.

In addition to revising the assignment, I offered extra credit to students who participated in writing tutoring during the semester. Students could receive one extra credit point for each session up to three sessions/points. I also regularly reminded students of the resources and extra credit available.

We had a dedicated writing tutor, Chelsea Arredondo, assigned to our class, and she visited three times. The first visit took place in the context of my introducing the assignment to the class in week 5 of the semester. At that time, she delivered a presentation on best practices of essay writing, which I supplemented with some additional history- and assignment-specific information. The second visit took place in week 9, and she worked with the students in small groups. I ended class early and told students that they were not required but strongly encouraged to stay. All students were present, and all students stayed for tutoring, which I counted as one session and extra credit point. Chelsea also encouraged students to sign up for individual appointments at that time. She returned in week 12 to encourage students to sign up for appointments.
All students participated in writing tutoring at least once during the semester. Four students participated twice, and one student participated three times. 14/15 students (93%) passed the class and only one failed to submit the outline assignment. In the previous semester I taught the class (Spring 2022), there were 31 enrolled students, of whom 22 earned a grade of C- or above, for a pass rate of 71%. 25/31 students submitted the outline assignment.

Though the sample size was small and there may have been other factors at play, the pass rate and submission rate were significantly higher with dedicated support. Students indicated that the additional support was helpful and increased their confidence.

B.   Dr. Dahna Rasmassen, Sociology 3408 Gender and Society

The primary changes made to the course were the design and grading of the reflection paper assignment and the interaction with the tutors.

The design of the assignment came directly from the training we received. The suggestion to incorporate role playing into the assignment was used. Furthermore, an outline and two drafts were required to be submitted prior to the final paper based on the conversation we had during the training. The idea of breaking the assignment up into manageable components made the assignment less intimidating and allowed for more feedback from both me and the tutors.
While the assignment was initially met with some confusion, students seemed to enjoy the idea of the role playing instead of the standard essay they are used to writing for classes. Once they understood what was being asked of them, some students indicated that it was a little easier to organize their thoughts. I noticed that the transitions between required elements was a lot smoother. In the role of the podcast host, students were able to indicate the change of topics by reiterating the previous subject and asking how it ties into the next. For example, "Oh wow! I never considered that gender is a social construct. So, how does that work in our society as opposed to another?"

Grading of drafts was based on the sharing drafts idea provided during the training. Drafts were used as an opportunity for me to provide quick feedback about what was interesting and what needed improvement, development, etc. Each draft was worth 10 points, and students received the points if they submitted a draft and it was clear they had worked on it since the last submission. Making this element "low stakes" helped some students feel less anxious about the assignment yet, at the same time, requiring them to engage with the material and plan for the final submission.

For the first reflection paper assignment, I offered extra credit for the tutoring element. Which did not produce the desired enthusiasm or interaction with tutors we had hoped for. So, for the second paper, tutoring visits were required and built into the point value of each element of the assignment (outline, drafts and final) and that had a significant impact on students' interaction with the tutors and the quality of work submitted.

C. Dr. Lucas Hall, Biology 3120: Research Design and Analysis

I felt that the RWAC strategies that I used in my course helped students understand better the reading and writing process. The students seemed to like (and benefit from) the in-class editing exercises. Having students re-edit the same writing that they had already edited was helpful because it compelled them to look past the "low-hanging fruit" (i.e., typos) and look deeper in the writing for other issues.

On average, students greatly improved their scientific writing. Based on how students performed with their research proposals compared to their research papers, the average increase was 11% higher, which is a whole letter grade of improvement. Moreover, it was interesting to see how much better the students this semester performed in their scientific writing compared to the students from a few semesters ago. Students from this semester scored 2% higher on the research paper and 6% higher overall for their research project than students from a few semesters ago.

While I was unlikely to implement Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum (RWAC) strategies ideally in my course, I am pleased with how the students performed. I will be using the same strategies in the fall when I teach this course again and will be adding a couple other RWAC strategies that will likely be helpful for the students.

D.   Dr. Fran Fairbairn, Philosophy 1019: Critical Thinking

I'll admit I was quite nervous about the results of the final paper assignment as we went through the semester and students attempted to navigate the different assignment stages, get a grip on what I was looking for, understand what the purpose of the assignment was, etc. When I (took a deep breath and) started to grade their final submissions, I was actually thrilled with the results. I truly did see depths of understanding picked up in the written portions of the paper which were missed by my other quizzes and the mid-term exam. Students in this iteration of the course demonstrated more success in writing about the strengths and weaknesses of arguments. Their ability to write about the comparative benefits and weaknesses of arguments – to analyze them in prose – also showed a marked improvement over the course of the semester. This was demonstrated especially clearly by the contrast between students' introductory paragraphs (completed at the beginning of the semester) and conclusion paragraphs (completed at the end of the semester). Comparing the two gave a very nice indication of their growth and ability to use the notions we covered in the course – you can see analysis happening in the way they discuss the argument, in what they are noticing, and in what they are focusing on. What follows makes for qualitative comparisons.

When we compare students' scores on their final assignments from Fall 2022 and Spring 2023, we see a much greater spread in the Fall 2022 course. The most substantial change between the Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 iterations of the course was the addition of a written assignment with dedicated writing tutors to help guide students through the writing process. The low score in Fall 2022 was 41% in comparison with 73% in Spring 2023. This suggests that the supportive writing tutors had a high positive impact on the students most in need of support. I will also note that none of the Spring 2023 students took me up on my offer to help guide them in writing their final papers. In comparison, they were required to meet with both writing tutors (content and writing) regularly. Hence this improvement can be attributed to the presence and support of the dedicated writing tutors.

Students in the Fall 2022 classes completed the same mid-term exam as students in the Spring 2023 class. Though the Spring class had not completed the final paper assignment at the time of the mid-term, they had completed several stages of the final paper, met with Mary (writing tutor) 1-2 times and met with Alex (content tutor) 5-6 times (the frequency depended on scheduling restrictions). The spread of students' scores on the mid-term was also much improved in Spring 2023. This is despite the fact that students in Spring 2023 completed the same mid-term assignment as those in Fall 2022. It is important to note that, in the Fall 2022 class, scores on students' initial submitted mid-term exams were so low that I elected to have them re-do the exam in groups and then supplemented their individual mid-term grades with the scores they achieved on the group version of the mid-term. The scores for students in Fall 2022 were significantly lower before I did so (low score was 19%, high score was 53%). I did not do this in the Spring 2023 class.

In reviewing the final paper submissions, I saw depths of understanding picked up in the written portions of the paper which were missed by my other quizzes and the mid-term exam. Students in the SSN course demonstrated more success in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of arguments as a result of continued consultations with their writing tutor. When students met with their content tutor – Alex – they discussed the content of the course through written prose which is explanatory and analytical. Importantly, Alex helped them better demonstrate their understanding through written explanations. She did this with a central focus on clarity of explanation which made use of students' own voice. Through meetings with the dedicated writing tutor – Mary – students learned to organize and synthesize the thoughts they had practiced with Alex and construct a narrative which made sense of the different components of argument analysis we had focused on throughout the course. Students responded positively to both kinds of meetings both in terms of their general understanding and their ability in relation to the final paper. The ongoing discussions with and guidance from Alex in how to use written prose (in addition to diagrammatic representations) to express concepts and analyses were instrumental in their developing a successful final assignment. The meetings with Mary helped them to synthesize the work they had completed over the semester and arrange their findings in a clear and meaningful way such that the various sections were properly linked and transitions between different forms of analysis were successfully explained.

E. Cindy Zuniga-Prado, Business Administration 3008: Diversity in Business Organizations

In Fall 2023, I implemented the strategies I learned during the Reading and Writing across the Curriculum for our signature assignment, which is a paper at the end of the course. Beginning in October 2023, students had three checkpoints sharing drafts with their peers for the major assignment paper. Students shared their documents in Google Docs to provide feedback to each other. I also allowed two additional opportunities for me to review a draft for quick feedback before the assignment was submitted. They were offered the embedded tutor option as extra credit. Our embedded tutor attended the class every week when we had diversity presentations. This helped the students improve their writing as many students took that opportunity to ask the tutor questions during class. My in-person class really embraced the tutor and attended tutoring sessions. The writing improved for the in-person class and more students stayed engaged with the class until the end. The embedded tutor was able to build a better relationship with students in person. And many expressed they would continue to use tutoring because of their positive experience with the embedded tutor. My Zoom class was not receptive to the tutor, and no students attended tutoring sessions. I also don't believe students asked the tutor questions during or after class. I noticed significant engagement increase in my in-person class through the remainder of the term.

F.   Dr. Kyung Jung Han, Communications 3090: Strategic Social Media

Student Success Strategies
  1. Two reading and writing strategies
Among many strategies, there are two main strategies applied in one of the assignments for students' success. The first one is "Descriptive Outlining" to support Reading, and "Final Draft Reflection" to support Writing. In detail, the first reading reinforcement assignment was to help students read the involved chapter from the textbook more efficiently; and the second assignment was to make students have more confidence in what they were finalizing for the final project. Although the final project was a group assignment, I asked students to do the "Final draft reflection" assignment individually.

  2. Tutor assignment
For COMM 3090, a tutor (Mr. Nicklas Chiang) was assigned. The tutor announced the details of his office hours.

Reading and Writing Strategies Applied Course Performance
  1. General impression of students' writing ability
If the course was previously a more idea-oriented course, the same course for Fall 2023 (the SSN grant) was a more idea-writing/reading balanced course, as the instructor implemented more writing and reading reinforced assignments and activities. It helped students be aware of specific directions and rubrics for each assignment before submitting their assignments. Students produced more well-written assignments followed the direction/requirements by the instructor, compared to the past semesters.

  2. The specific changes you made to your writing assignment(s)
In the past, weekly assignments were just summarizing the content after reading; "descriptive outlining" helped students read the text more seriously/critically.
Besides, self-reflection for the final paper helped students revise their final papers resulting in fewer grammar mistakes and a better logical flow. They also had more confidence in what they did. Although I implemented this assignment for the last two reading assignments, I am planning to include this reading assignment for the whole semester in the next semesters.

  3. The specific changes you made in the support you provided in writing for your students
This time teaching the course, I put emphasis on proofreading and logical re-reading of their writing for my students. The strategies also applied to students' weekly textbook reading. I applied "descriptive outlining" twice as weekly assignments, and it helped students have better understanding of the chapter content.

The second assignment—"self-reflection for the final paper"—was an effective strategy that required students to reflect on their writing by themselves. Compared to the past semesters, the quality of the final paper was better, and more students received A on the final project. I could see how seriously students spent their time to read/write and re-read/re-write. It is very impressive that students were able to reflect on their own writing and had the ability to critically evaluate their and others' writing.

  4. Tutoring

As it was the first time I encouraged students to attend the writing center, I will continue to encourage students to use the tutoring service and to get support so they can succeed without dropping or failing the course.

G.   Dr. Lucas Hall, BIOL 3120: Research Design and Analysis

I did not make any changes to the writing assignments from last semester (Spring 2023) and this semester (Fall 2023). I was a participant on the Student Success Network Grant both semesters. Most of the improvements that I saw in my students' writing were compared to the times that I had this course prior to the Spring of 2023.

Your general impression of your students' writing ability

I saw a significant improvement in my student's writing over the course of the semester. I was pleasantly surprised with the quality of their writing in their final research papers. Most deficiencies in their final research papers involved issues with writing scientifically and not grammar or composition.

The specific changes you made to your writing assignment(s)

Most of the changes that I made to my writing assignments included providing students opportunities to self-reflect. Additionally, I gave students full credit if they provided a reflection so that they could be open and honest about their writing without fear of losing credit. Based on my assessment of their self-reflection assignments, students were able to recognize and share their struggles and accomplishments with respect to their writing. Helping students identify areas of writing weakness is the first step to improving performance in that area of writing.

The specific changes you made in the support you provided in writing for your students

In my written feedback, I tried to focus on the idea of "not yet." That is, when an aspect of their writing was not what I expected, I did not provide negative feedback. Instead, I provided feedback that painted a larger picture of the writing process that they are a part of and used phrases like "almost there," "getting close," or "you've nearly got it."

What worked (in reference to your writing assignments) and why

In addition to the opportunities for self-reflection on writing, I attempted to break up their major writing assignments by having different sections of their writing due at different points in the semester. The motivation for this strategy was to not burden students with an entire research paper due at the end of the semester. This approach seemed to help students not feel like they had so much to do during finals week and help them review and edit their own work over the semester.

Which of these features was directly or indirectly a result of this grant:
- **The writing assignments** were a direct result of participating in this grant.
- **The tutoring the students received** was a direct result of participating in this grant.