

Meeting the Needs of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students: A Framework for Inclusive Tutor & Faculty Development

Kathleen Turner Ledgerwood
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Sarah Kennedy
University of Maryland Global Campus

As higher education classrooms become increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse, faculty and tutors must be prepared to provide effective support for all learners. Communication centers are often at the forefront of this work, navigating the intersection of language, culture, and academic expectations. At Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (ERAU), these dynamics are especially salient. While ERAU has two residential campuses in Florida and Arizona, the Worldwide (WW) campus is predominantly online and serves students worldwide. The campus in Daytona Beach, FL, had 8,755 students in 2024, and the campus in Prescott, AZ, had 3,433 students in 2024. Comparatively, the Worldwide campus had an enrollment of 19,915 students in 2024, and currently has 20,666 students as of Fall 2025. Of these students, 76% are undergraduates. We have 1,248 international students from 119 countries, representing 6% of our total student population. ERAU-WW currently has an Asia Campus and a Europe Campus, in addition to 28 international locations and 76 locations within the US territories. ERAU-WW also offers contract-based Aviation English instruction. ERAU-WW site locations offer distance learning, face-to-face, and hybrid classes, and students can enroll in online asynchronous courses. Students who enroll solely in online programs account for 57.58% of students, and the rest are enrolled at one of these locations. Within this context, in November 2024, ERAU-WW had 133 full-time faculty and employed 628 part-time faculty members. ERAU-WW has increasing enrollment trends, with a 3.6% increase overall and a 6.7% increase in international student enrollment (from 2024 to 2025 enrollment data). We also have a high enrollment of active-duty military members, with 54% still serving, and only 27% of students have no military affiliation as a veteran themselves or a dependent. With our diverse student population and global campus locations, we believe that ERAU-WW is uniquely positioned to lead in embracing and supporting the linguistic and cultural diversity of our students, faculty, and tutors.

Communication Center & Writing Center Scholarship

Both writing center scholarship and communication center scholarship have been concerned with serving linguistically diverse students, without privileging one type of English, usually a standardized academic English that has privileged a white, middle-to-upper-class English in the United States. Since Victor Villanueva's 2005 keynote address "Blind: Talking About the New Racism" at the International Writing Centers Association, writing center scholarship has been grappling with racism and how writing centers can embrace diversity. The

field of composition and rhetoric has long struggled with the goals of embracing various dialects of English while “correcting” writing and promoting conformity with standardized written academic English. Elbow (2011) exemplified this juxtaposition when he wanted to invite the “mother tongue” into his classroom, “if the words that come naturally to our mouth or pen are labeled wrong, we feel ourselves to have a problem” (p. 642), but Elbow went on to say in this same article that we have to help them produce drafts that “conform to Standard Written English” in order to be “safe *outside*” our classrooms (p. 643, emphasis in original). However, scholarship has failed to recognize that language itself is not the only barrier to learning in an academic environment. Condon (2007) reflects on Villanueva’s address, emphasizing the importance of understanding “the ways in which learning, knowing, and representing knowledge are culturally situated” (p. 24). Often, our linguistic and language differences with multilingual learners enhance this dilemma through the nature of culturally and linguistically diverse populations. But we would like to stress that this same training extends to English dialects as well. Drawing from Grimm (2011), we recognize that “the policies and practices of a particular writing center can either encourage or discourage the process of developing an identity of belonging to an academic community” (p. 96). Thus, “If a community of practice wants to encourage learning, it must focus on ways to increase opportunities for participation” (Grimm, 2011, p. 96).

To encourage learning at our own institution, we emphasize the need for the communication center and faculty to understand and celebrate multicultural norms and practices, promoting an inclusive environment where all writers’ cultural backgrounds are recognized. As Camarillo (2019) notes, “the ultimate goal is usually conformity with standard written English,” which might be at odds with the very idea of inviting students into the writing center as a “cozy home.” This same idea is echoed in communication center scholarship, where speaking and communicating well are often reduced to what Kathleen Turner (2014) described in her National Association of Communication Centers’ keynote address as “talking pretty.” As Silva and Wiebel (2024) explain, the ways spoken English is judged in the US “are largely imported from written English” and these standards “function to enforce a very narrow definition of writing and speaking well” (p. 3). The twin fields of writing and communication centers problematize the role of these spaces as reinforcing a dominant and narrow idea of what constitutes “good” or “correct” communication, and this narrow definition often affects those who are working on an academic fluency in a non-native language the most harshly, as they encounter the added cognitive load of translating not only language, but also culture.

At ERAU–Worldwide, I (Kathleen) was hired as the director of the Virtual Environment for Communication: Teaching, Outreach, and Research (VECTOR), which serves as the communication center that houses the Virtual Communication Lab (VCL) tutoring service dedicated to all forms of communication, including written, spoken, and multimodal communication. As a worldwide campus with a global population, we offer both synchronous and asynchronous tutoring appointments. I also work with faculty on effective communication, teaching, and research. I began this role in January 2025, and during my needs assessment with

faculty, in both surveys and listening sessions, faculty discussed how VCL tutors need to help NNES students become “better writers.” While this echoes what many faculty think we do, it belies Grimm's (1996) point that “literacy practices reproduce the social order and regulate access and subjectivity” in traditional writing centers (p. 5). Camarillo (2019) builds this argument when he explains that writing centers were created to “deal with” those who don't conform to the norm of our academic discourse, and he states, “We want students, then, to develop and write in their own voice, but only if it's the right kind of voice” (para. 6). As so many scholars have noted, the notion of an “ideal” or “standard” dialect of English is incredibly problematic in all aspects of communication (Camarillo, 2019; Greenfield, 2011; Turner, 2014; Turner Ledgerwood, 2021; Turner Ledgerwood, 2024).

Both communication center and writing center scholarship have long advocated for a cultural and linguistic understanding of multilingual and multicultural writing practices. Foltz & De Rutte (2023) “explore best practices for communication center tutors when working with ELL clients” (p. 36). Foltz & De Rutte frame their work within the American Association on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (ACTFL, 2015): Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons and Communities and utilize Byram's (2021) model of intercultural communicative competence (ICC), which combines linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competences with dimensions of intercultural competence. Foltz and De Rutte provide an excellent understanding of how Second Language Acquisition and intercultural communication fields can intersect to help communication tutors understand and work with multilingual learners. Foltz and De Rutte “argue for an organizational structure of support and inclusivity, which may be achieved with a stronger emphasis on intercultural competency and intercultural citizenship, including ways to address proficiency levels and practice cultural empathy” (p. 36). Bugingo & Zatoryb (2024) further discuss how they have encouraged multilingualism in the writing center at UConn. Any discussion of helping students improve their communication practices to a US-centric academic norm is complicated when we begin to consider linguistic justice and what it means to “talk pretty” in communication and writing centers (Silva & Wiebel, 2024; Nguyen, 2021; Turner, 2014; Turner Ledgerwood, 2021; Turner Ledgerwood, 2024). The call for change and reflection on our practices has to be ongoing, and examining the demographics of our changing student population emphasizes this need for change.

According to the International Education Exchange (2024), 5.9% of the total U.S. higher education population are International students. In 2023-24, the U.S. had the largest international population compared to other nations, with approximately 1.13 million international students enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities (Statista, 2024). As of October 2025, *The New York Times* and other media outlets used August arrival data from the International Trade Administration to estimate a 19% decrease in international students across the United States (Bhatia & Fan, 2025). While we know that the number of international students is currently decreasing due to mass deportations and newly restrictive rules surrounding international students and travel, given the current political climate under Donald Trump's second term as

president. President Trump's Executive Orders, including the EO declaring that "it is the policy of the United States to recognize two sexes, male and female," in addition to orders tied to immigration and border policies (Chang, 2025; Exec. Order No. 14168, 2025). In considering multilingual learners, though, we must account for more than just the international student population. Many students are labeled "domestic" by universities because they graduated from a high school in the US or in a US territory, including Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. These students are often included in counts of domestic students, but many of them are multilingual learners with a wide range of proficiency in Standardized Academic American English. Additionally, we must also consider Generation 1.5 students (students who immigrated to the U.S. during their K-12 education) and domestic students from multilingual homes (second-generation and beyond Americans, as well as students raised in bilingual or multilingual environments). Students are often deemed "domestic" and, therefore, it is assumed that they are proficient in Standardized Academic American English, even if they come from a country where English is one of the official languages that is taught to varying levels in secondary schools.

Because the population of culturally and linguistically diverse students is growing steadily and the call for inclusivity reaches beyond other languages into other dialects of English, we set out to create a training course for both faculty and tutors in the communication center at ERAU to bring this to the forefront of the teaching of communication. The rest of our article outlines the structure of and strategies used in an asynchronous, self-paced training, emphasizing how the training aims to promote inclusive pedagogical practices. Building on the discoveries from a native language survey of our student population, this article outlines how a director from the Rothwell Center for Teaching and Learning (RCTLE) and the director of the Virtual Environment for Communication: Teaching, Outreach, and Research (VECTOR) partnered to develop training that focuses on building the intercultural competency of both faculty and communication consultants, rather than simply remediating communicators with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Communication centers can use inclusive pedagogy and intercultural competency to foster an inclusive and diverse community of intercultural citizenship.

Gathering Data for Our Student NNES Population

In 2023, I (Sarah) initiated a project to investigate institutional support for non-native English-speaking (NNES) students at ERAU–Worldwide. Early analysis revealed a gap in existing data collection practices. At the time, the student information system only prompted questions about native language under narrow conditions: when a student was either from a country in which English is not the official language or when a student's high school education occurred in a country in which English is not the official language. These criteria suggested a potentially significant gap in data collection as country of origin is not a reliable indicator of native language, and given that there is notable linguistic diversity within the United States. National trends underscored the importance of addressing this gap. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2024), 10.6% of students enrolled in U.S. public K–12

schools in Fall 2021 were classified as NNES—approximately 5.3 million students. This reflects a 35% increase since 2000. Importantly, the majority of NNES students are U.S.-born: 82% of those in Pre-K through grade 5 and 65% in grades 6 through 12. Projections estimate that by 2030, 40% of all K–12 students in the United States will speak a home language other than English (Gardner, 2024). These statistics illustrate the growing linguistic diversity of future higher education populations and point to the need for more comprehensive data collection practices in postsecondary institutions.

To better understand the linguistic backgrounds of ERAU–WW students, I reached out across departments to explore the feasibility of collecting this data from the full student body. An initial proposal to add a native language question to the admissions application was declined due to concerns that applicants might view it as a barrier to admission. Instead, admissions leadership recommended leveraging the student portal by creating an “activity guide”—a system-generated task on students’ personalized “To Do Lists.”

Following cross-departmental collaboration to evaluate the feasibility of a campus-wide activity guide, the task—an optional native language disclosure survey—was approved for implementation. Student Advising leadership agreed to assume administrative oversight, as advisors would ultimately respond to student questions about the survey. The activity guide was introduced to all currently enrolled students and embedded into the workflow for all newly admitted students beginning in April 2024. Students were provided with a clear, concise statement explaining that the survey was optional and that data was being collected in an effort to better understand and thus serve ERAU-WW students. Students also had the option to select “prefer not to disclose.”

This approach resulted in an unusually high level of participation. By April 2025, 16,160 enrolled students had completed the survey, representing 83.62% of ERAU–WW’s total headcount. The high response rate may be attributed to several factors: the survey’s purpose was clearly communicated, there was strong buy-in from interdepartmental leadership, advisors provided excellent support and raised thoughtful questions that were resolved along the way, and the survey was seamlessly integrated into students’ existing “To Do Lists.”

Analysis of the responses revealed that 17.55% of students identified a native language other than English—nearly one in five learners, a population previously invisible in institutional data. Notably, 75.33% of these NNES students did not fall under the institutional international student definition (either from a country in which English is not the official language or high school education occurred in a country in which English is not the official language), confirming that traditional data collection methods had underrepresented the linguistic diversity of the ERAU–WW student body.

In response to the survey findings, I had already begun developing and delivering professional learning opportunities for faculty on supporting non-native English-speaking (NNES) students, and requests for more information quickly followed. Kathleen received similar requests, underscoring the need for additional faculty resources. To meet this need, the authors

collaborated to develop a course for both Worldwide faculty and tutors in the Virtual Communication Lab (VCL).

Multilingual Student Support Certificate Course Outline

ERAU-WW employs 628 adjunct faculty and 133 full-time faculty in remote positions. At the time of writing this article, the university was not collecting data on faculty locations. Our Communication Center staff is currently comprised of two administrators, one part-time administrative support staff member, three professional adjunct tutors, and nine student tutors who attend the Daytona Beach campus. For our professional positions, we can hire anyone in the United States, but our student employees must be in Florida or Arizona while working, which often leaves us hiring student tutors who attend the physical campus locations. Given our population of remote faculty and communication center tutors, we determined that a fully asynchronous, self-paced training would best meet their needs. This format allows us to address varying levels of experience while preparing participants to support culturally and linguistically diverse students.

To accommodate different levels of engagement and professional growth, the course offers three certification tiers. The first level is the Explorer level. At this foundational level, participants explore key concepts and reflect on their application. They complete the course, develop an implementation plan with at least two strategies to apply in an upcoming term, and submit a summative reflection. The Practitioner level requires application of research-based strategies over a full term, accompanied by reflective analysis of outcomes. Finally, the Champion level recognizes participants who extend their impact by assessing the effectiveness of strategies and contributing to the broader field through scholarly or professional deliverables, such as mentoring, presentations, or publications. These tiers provide a structured pathway for faculty to deepen their practice and leadership in supporting multilingual learners.

Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of this course, learners will be able to:

- Identify key second language acquisition (SLA) theories and apply them to relevant classroom scenarios. (LO 1)
- Recognize common linguistic and academic challenges faced by multilingual learners across modalities. (LO 2)
- Develop or refine support strategies that address these challenges in alignment with their instructional or student-facing role. (LO 3)
- Employ targeted feedback techniques that promote multilingual students' language development and academic growth. (LO 4)
- Create a reflective practice framework to guide ongoing improvement in teaching multilingual learners. (LO 5)

The Multilingual Student Support Teaching Certificate course was developed in Canvas LMS and has eight modules, as outlined below:

1. Module 1: Introduction and Foundation
 - a. Course Overview and Objectives
 - b. Certification Levels
 - c. Introduction Discussion
 - d. Glossary of Terms
 - e. Multilingual Learners in the US
 - f. Multilingual Learners at ERAU-WW
 - g. Native Language Data Reflection

2. Module 2: Understanding Second Language Acquisition (SLA)
 - a. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Overview
 - b. Stages of Second Language Development
 - c. Key Theoretical Foundations
 - d. Overview of Factors Affecting Language Acquisition
 - e. Common Challenges and How They Manifest
 - f. Understanding SLA: Application of Knowledge

3. Module 3: Linguistic Challenges and Opportunities
 - a. Linguistic Challenges and Opportunities Overview
 - b. Language Barriers and Processing Challenges
 - c. Academic Skills and Classroom Participation
 - d. Time, Technology, and Translation
 - e. Generative AI Challenges and Considerations
 - f. Common Misconceptions
 - g. Supporting Multilingual Students Across Modalities
 - h. Branching Scenario - Supporting NNES Students
 - i. Putting It Together: Reflecting and Adjusting Your Practice

4. Module 4: Cultural Impacts and Inclusive Teaching
 - a. Cultural Impacts and Inclusive Teaching Overview
 - b. Cultural Perspectives on Learning and Classroom Participation
 - c. Academic Integrity and Cultural Background Knowledge
 - d. Writing Structures Across Cultures
 - e. Inclusive Teaching Strategies
 - f. Culture, Communication, and Classroom Practice: A Reflective Application

5. Module 5: Effective Feedback for NNES Students
 - a. Effective Feedback for NNES Students Overview
 - b. What Is the Purpose of Feedback?
 - c. The Purpose of Feedback in Language Development
 - d. Balancing Local and Global Issues in Feedback
 - e. Feedback Strategies For Multilingual Learners
 - f. Feedback in Practice: Min's Discussion Post
 - g. Practice Assignment: Feedback Strategy & Prioritization

6. Module 6: Reflective Teaching
 - a. Reflective Teaching Overview
 - b. What is Reflective Teaching?
 - c. What Reflective Teaching Looks Like in Practice
 - d. Building a Reflective Teaching Practice
 - e. Reflective Teaching Practice Assignment

7. Module 7: Institutional Resources
 - a. Institutional Resources Overview
 - b. RCTLE
 - c. VECTOR

8. Module 8: Certification Assessments
 - a. Certification Tiers & Digital Credentials
 - b. Explorer Tier Implementation Plan
 - c. Practitioner Tier Reflection
 - d. Champion Tier Deliverable
 - e. Congratulations!

Module Content

Module 1 provides an introduction to the certification course and to linguistically diverse student populations. It highlights the growth of international student enrollment in the U.S. as well as the linguistic diversity among domestic students. Participants also review ERAU–Worldwide native language survey data and consider how these trends shape our own student body, providing context that underscores the relevance of the training. This highlights the need for training in working with linguistically and culturally diverse student populations, and it aligns with Foltz and De Rutte’s first best practice to “educate consultants on intercultural communicative competence and intercultural citizenship” (p. 40). By introducing the need for understanding and additional training in the broader context of teaching in US higher education and also within our own particular student population, we hope to stress the need for this training and additional research or application of this information in our classes.

Module 2 provides an overview of second language acquisition (SLA) to help participants better understand the realities and complexities of learning in a non-native language. The module introduces key stages of language development, influential theories, and the cognitive, social, cultural, and emotional factors that shape acquisition. By exploring how these elements affect learning, participants gain a lens for interpreting student behaviors, challenges, and progress in academic settings. The module also examines common challenges that non-native English speakers may encounter, such as navigating academic writing, group work, and classroom communication. To apply this knowledge, participants are provided with real-world instructional scenarios rooted in communication challenges, such as difficulties understanding directions, participating in group projects, or bridging gaps between informal class discussions and academic writing. Participants analyze one scenario, identify the underlying language-related challenge, connect it to an SLA stage, theory, or factor, and propose strategies for supporting the student within their own teaching or tutoring context. In particular, this module aims to develop cultural empathy (Foltz and De Rutte, 2023), as well as an understanding of various proficiency levels in academic English and strategies for working with multilingual learners. We expand this beyond international or what we might think of as traditional English Language Learners (ELL) to encompass any student who might have developing English or academic English proficiency. In this module, we encourage both faculty and tutors to treat each student as individuals who arrive in the classroom or at the communication center with different abilities (Cuny, 2018).

Module 3 explores the day-to-day challenges that non-native English-speaking (NNES) students may face in college-level coursework, including cognitive demands such as mental translation, listening comprehension, and navigating academic expectations for writing, group work, and class participation. Awareness of these challenges equips faculty and tutors to respond effectively, recognizing that some students may encounter few to no barriers while others may face a number of challenges. While this serves to develop cultural empathy (Foltz and De Rutte, 2023), it also builds on an understanding of intercultural communication, while adding important discussions of the evolving role of AI and Large Language Models (LLMs) to the discussion of translation and intercultural communication. Therefore, the module also addresses the role of technology, including translation tools and generative AI. While these tools can support communication in specific contexts, they may inadvertently limit authentic engagement and impede language development. Faculty and tutors are encouraged to emphasize the importance of communicating in one's own voice over communicating "perfectly." To create a training that offers participants real scenarios, participants apply this knowledge through a branching scenario in which they support a student whose communication differs significantly between informal interactions (e.g., emails, discussion boards) and formal assignments. After exploring multiple responses and receiving feedback, participants engage in structured reflection. They consider the factors that may have led the student to rely on translation tools or generative AI, determine appropriate next steps following an initial conversation, and identify strategies to support this student and other multilingual learners throughout the term. This reflective process encourages faculty and tutors to move beyond reactive responses, fostering inclusive practices that promote

authentic communication and sustained language development using cultural empathy and an understanding of intercultural communication.

Module 4 examines how cultural perspectives shape students' approaches to learning, classroom participation, communication, and academic expectations. Participants explore the influence of high-context and low-context cultures on communication styles, problem-solving, and critical thinking, as well as broader global differences in educational approaches and classroom norms. Focusing on intercultural communication and education, the module also addresses writing conventions across cultures and provides guidance on supporting learners when cultural norms differ from U.S.-centric academic expectations. Participants are taught inclusive teaching strategies, supported by a downloadable guide highlighting practical approaches to fostering equity, engagement, and belonging in diverse classrooms (see Appendix). The module encourages participants to keep in mind that foreign language anxiety and cognitive load for NNES students are typically higher in academic contexts, particularly when they are being asked to present or write in academic English (Bhatti et al., 2016; Fabre-Marchán et al., 2017; Foltz, 2017; Khan, 2015). To apply their learning, participants complete a reflective assignment: they identify a cultural concept or insight that reshaped their understanding of multilingual/multicultural learners' experiences, analyze a current teaching or support practice that could be enhanced using this insight, and propose a culturally responsive strategy they plan to implement, including anticipated effects on student engagement and learning (Sivira-Gonzalez, 2023). This reflective activity encourages participants to translate cultural awareness, empathy, and intercultural communication into actionable classroom practices, reinforcing the connection between intercultural competency and inclusive teaching.

Module 5 focuses on providing effective feedback to non-native English-speaking (NNES) students to support language development and academic growth. Participants begin by reflecting on how they perceive the purpose of feedback and what their goals are when providing it, setting the stage for applying evidence-based strategies. This initial reflection has several aims, including encouraging participants to consider how the concepts of "perfect" English and the types of feedback they may provide to students can influence students, often affecting their perceptions of whether their classroom spaces are inclusive (Camarillo, 2019; Turner Ledgerwood, 2021). The module reviews the debate on written corrective feedback, emphasizing progress over perfection and distinguishing local (form-based) from global (content and structure) writing concerns. Effective feedback strategies are also presented, including providing feedback in multiple modalities (audio, video, and written), supporting revision, modeling language, and considering the linguistic complexity of feedback in relation to student comprehension. Thinking through feedback as a communication act helps participants to consider how their message may be received, reinforcing the idea of thinking of the audience when we create feedback for students. To apply these strategies, participants analyze an anonymized discussion post from a real ERAU–WW class, evaluating examples of effective and ineffective feedback. For the summative assignment, participants review a brief anonymized student paper and reflect on strengths, prioritize feedback, and determine how they would frame

it to support learning. This discussion-based activity allows participants to learn from one another while practicing culturally and linguistically responsive feedback, while also encouraging them to think through what knowledge they want to stress in their own courses through their feedback for students.

Module 6 introduces reflective teaching as a purposeful, evidence-based approach to continuous improvement, with a focus on supporting multilingual learners. Participants explore how reflection helps educators adapt materials, uncover and remove hidden barriers, reconsider assumptions about language proficiency, and account for cultural and educational differences in student engagement. The module provides an overview of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, along with strategies for gathering meaningful insights, including student feedback, teaching journals, recorded lessons, peer observation, and assessment data. Participants then use a provided template to create a reflective practice plan tailored to their own teaching context.

Module 7 introduces participants to two key support centers at ERAU–WW: RCTLE and VECTOR. Participants explore the services and resources each center offers, including teaching consultations, professional learning opportunities, and faculty and student-focused resource sites. The module emphasizes practical tools, personalized support, and collaborative opportunities that can enhance teaching practices and help faculty better support multilingual learners.

Module 8 marks the end of the course, where participants are congratulated and submit the deliverables for their chosen certification tier—Explorer, Practitioner, or Champion—culminating in the awarding of a digital credential.

Conclusion

While this training merely scratches the surface of the issues that writing and communication center scholars have been grappling with, we hope it provides a valuable foundation for educating both faculty and tutors on important elements to consider in language usage, language learning, and communication with culturally and linguistically diverse students. We hope that building cultural empathy and intercultural communication knowledge among both faculty and tutors will increase support for our students and lead to inclusive pedagogy. While we could have included the many theoretical considerations and issues that plague teaching communication skills, we hope that faculty will leave this brief training with a deeper understanding of intercultural communication, improved teaching and learning outcomes, cultural empathy, and some tools to better support all of our students.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, this training will run for the first time in January 2026 at ERAU-WW. We are hopeful that tutors and faculty will engage in the training as a professional learning opportunity. In the Virtual Communication Lab, we are trying to engage our tutors in ongoing training and reflection, building a series of training options to advance their skills and understanding of their roles in the communication center. I (Kathleen) hope we will be able to offer additional pay and promotion for our tutors who seek additional professional development. This training would be one option, or attending writing or communication center conferences and events. What I'd like to cultivate among our tutors is a community of inquiry

and practice, in the hope of developing our center, our resources, and our research through one of our greatest assets, the tutors who work directly with students. Our communication tutors will have the same opportunity to complete the course or to further their reflection and practice across the different training levels.

The implications for other communication centers are that perhaps our work should always go beyond the students we mostly serve. When we tie into pedagogy and courses, we should also regularly tie into faculty professional development. Many university communication and writing centers do this work, but it is often treated as an afterthought or bonus rather than a central part of the center's mission. This could provide a model for proposing a need for additional professional development through data collection about students and from faculty. It could also provide a model for creating or expanding training.

References

- ACTFL. (2015). *ACTFL standards*. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. <http://www.actfl.org/publications/all/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages>.
- Bhatti, N., Memon, S., Pathan, H. (2016). Investigating the perceptions of Pakistani English language learners on language learning anxiety in EFL classroom. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(5), 23-34.
- Bhatie, A. & Fan, A. (2025, October 6). Nearly 20 Percent Fewer International Students Traveled to the U.S. in August. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2025/10/06/upshot/us-international-student-travel.html>
- Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2019). Context matters: Multilingual learners on public speaking courses. *Communication Teacher*, 33(1), 63-79.
- Brown, J. A., (2020). Communication consultant proficiency: Benefits of building better consultants. *Communication Center Journal*, 6(1), 103-105. <http://libjournal.uncg.edu/ccj/article/view/2065>
- Bugingo, M. & Zatoryb, R. Aquí Se Habla Deutsch, Française, Kinyarwanda y ကညီ: Making Multilingualism Audible In Writing Centers. *The Peer Review*, 8(1). <https://thepeerreview-iwca.org/issues/issue-8-1-featured-issue-enacting-linguistic-justice-in-through-writing-centers/aqui-se-habla-deutsch-francaise-kinyarwanda-y-%e1%80%80%e1%80%8a%e1%80%ae-making-multilingualism-audible-in-writing-centers/>
- Byram, M. (2021). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Camarillo, E. C. (2019). Burn the house down: Deconstructing the writing center as cozy home. *The Peer Review*, 3(1). <https://thepeerreview-iwca.org/issues/redefining-welcome/burn-the-house-down-deconstructing-the-writing-center-as-cozy-home/>
- Carpenter, R., Cuny, K., & Mabrey, P. E. (2019). *Statement on inclusion*. NACC - Statement on Inclusion. <http://commcenters.org/journal/special-statement>.
- Chang, R. (2025, July 30). The full list of countries that have updated their US travel guidance. *Condé Nast Traveler*. <https://www.cntraveler.com/story/which-countries-have-issued-travel-advisories-for-the-us-2>
- Cuny, K. (2018). A case study of outside events versus the thriving speaking center. *Communication Center Journal*, 4(1). 39-47.
- Condon, F. (2007). Beyond the known: Writing centers and the work of anti-racism. *Writing Center Journal*, 27(2). <https://doi.org/10.7771/2832-9414.1628>
- Elbow, P. "Inviting the mother tongue: beyond 'mistakes,' 'bad English,' and 'wrong language.'" *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory*, eds. Victor Villanueva and Kristin Arole. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE. 641-672.

- Exec. Order No. 14168, 3 C.F.R. 1 (2025). <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/DCPD-202500135/pdf/DCPD-202500135.pdf>
- Gardner, S. (2024, July 24). *Education's future for English learners must start now*. Columbia University Teacher's College. <https://www.tc.columbia.edu/articles/2024/july/educations-future-for-english-learners-must-start-now/>
- Grimm, N. M. (2011). Rethorising writing center work to transform a system of advantage based on race. In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing Centers and the New Racism: A Call for Sustainable Dialogue and Change* (pp. 75–100). University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgk6s.8>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2024). *English Learners in Public Schools*. Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgf>.
- Nguyen, Y.H. (2021). The importance of antiracism in Speaking Center pedagogic materials: “Neutral” is no longer neutral. *Communication Center Journal*, 7(1), 127-129.
- Silva, V.T. & J. Wiebel. (2024.) “Resisting the Notion of ‘Proper Literacy’ as the standard for speaking well.” *Communication Center Journal*, 10(1), 4-19.
- Sivira-Gonzalez, Yohimar. (2023). Culturally Responsive Practices or Assimilation? Views and Practices on Linguistic Diversity of Community College Instructors Working with Multilingual Learners. *Education Sciences*, 13(6), 603. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13060603>
- Turner, K. (2014). Students at the center: Appreciating the value of oral communication. Keynote Address. National Association of Communication Centers Conference. Commcenters.org/content/06-resources/6-keynote/nacc.14.keynote.pdf
- Turner Ledgerwood, K. M. (2021). Interventions Foregrounding and Honoring Black Language in FYC from a HBCU/PBI Perspective. *Writing Program Administration* 44(3), 158-161.
- Turner Ledgerwood, K. Teaching Critical Language Awareness to combat failure of Black language in education. *Feminist Pedagogy*, 4(5), 9-14.
- Villanueva, V. (1993). *Bootstraps: From an American academic of color*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Villanueva, V. (2005). Blind: Talking about the new racism. Keynote Address. International Writing Centers Association.