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Director’s Introduction

The Campus Writing Program prepares to celebrate its 30th year during 2015-2016. On the eve of this milestone, I want to reflect on what CWP means to the University of Missouri—its faculty, students, teaching, and learning. Thirty years ago, under the guidance of Dr. Win Horner, a group of faculty formed the task force to address student writing. Their work resulted in two writing intensive course requirements for all MU undergraduates. As a result of their efforts, several benefits continue. The obvious is the focus on writing that has been and continues to be seen as important for students as they learn best when needing to write and as they learn the best approaches to writing in their disciplines. But what may not have been expected, planned, or realized, was the focus on teaching and interdisciplinary collaborations among MU’s faculty. That first task force became the inaugural Campus Writing Board. Today, the CWB is made up of 18 representatives from across campus. Faculty serve three-year terms during which they review approximately 400 courses per year, provide feedback and final approval on writing intensive project awards to support WI instructors, and continue to address issues that affect teaching and learning.

The strength of CWP is evident in this report of the 2014-2015 academic year. Underneath all of the data and details is the guiding direction of our Campus Writing Board (see p. 4). The monthly sub-committee meetings and monthly board meetings create the sparks of interdisciplinary work that the University of Missouri has fostered for many years.

We are thankful for the opportunity to work with the committed faculty who teach and support WI courses, student learning, and the importance of writing.

Amy Lannin
July 2015
CWP Mission Statement

Our mission is to support faculty as the primary agents of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) theories and practices in educating students through principles of “writing-to-learn” and “learning-to-write.” We believe that teaching by these principles will enhance students’ critical thinking abilities and better engage them in complex problem solving while they learn to communicate with clear, effective language in discipline-specific ways. CWP has been conceived, developed, and governed by faculty as a rallying point for collaboration and sharing of writing-to-learn and learning-to-write theories and practices.
CWP Program Objectives

Faculty Objectives
CWP is devoted to designing, instituting, and maintaining the following objectives:

• Programs and instruction that promote critical thinking and meaningful learning.
• Writing as a process that includes revision.
• Collaborative opportunities for faculty to share their work and their questions.

Student Learning Goals
Through Writing Intensive (WI) courses, students will think more critically as they use writing as a tool for learning and learn about writing in a particular discipline.

Student Learning Objectives
Students successfully completing the WI course will be able to [fill in as is appropriate for particular course objectives]:

• Pose worthwhile questions by...
• Evaluate and know types of arguments by...
• Give feedback and know how to use feedback on pieces of writing through...
• Distinguish among fact, inference and opinion by...
• Articulate complex ideas clearly by...
• Deal with problems that have no simple solutions by...
• Consider purpose and audience by...
• Understand ways of communicating effectively in the given discipline as shown through...

Program Methodologies to Attain Objectives

• Offering Faculty Writing Seminars featuring assignment and syllabi design, responding to student papers, utilizing revision techniques
• Understanding issues of plagiarism and other issues of WAC theory and practice
• Supporting faculty with Writing Intensive course offerings
• Making available the publishing support needed by both students and faculty
# A Year in the Life of University of Missouri’s Campus Writing Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2.5</strong></th>
<th>Average number of WI courses students completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>Faculty awarded for teaching excellence in WI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>Faculty Mentors Providing Support to New WI Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30+</strong></td>
<td>Published works from faculty who participated in writing retreats in AY 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50+</strong></td>
<td>Undergraduate student papers awarded and published in Artifacts, our undergraduate writing journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81%</strong></td>
<td>Of faculty somewhat, mostly, or completely satisfied with support from CWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
<td>Of faculty somewhat, mostly, or completely satisfied with teaching WI class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
<td>Approval of WI experience from undergraduate students in a recent case study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>96%</strong></td>
<td>Average Grade from WI Faculty and TAs who attend CWP semi-annual workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>376</strong></td>
<td>Writing Intensive Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research through the years has shown that writing is an unsurpassed tool for helping students learn to think more critically and grow intellectually. The University of Missouri (MU) houses nationally known, well respected Campus Writing Program (CWP) that has worked continually with faculty since its inception in 1987 to offer students opportunities for enhance their learning through writing.

**13,444 WI Students**
The Campus Writing Board is comprised of 18 voting faculty members divided into three subcommittees:

- **Education and Social Science (ESS)**
- **Humanities and Arts (HA)**
- **Natural and Applied Sciences (NAS)**

The Writing Board meets three times each semester, plus holds subcommittee meetings in advance of each full Board meeting, for a total of six meetings per semester. The Writing Board Advisory Group, comprised of the Board Chair, three subcommittee chairs, and Program Chair meets as necessary during Winter and Summer breaks – typically once over Winter break and one to two meetings over the Summer.

The Campus Writing Board, Chaired by Dr. David Schenker, Classical Studies, addressed numerous topics, in addition to reviewing WI Course proposals and Writing Intensive Project Award proposals. The following topics were key agenda items:

- Added two advisors to the Campus Writing Board as ex-officio members
- Updated the Writing Intensive Guidelines, Large Enrollment Course Guidelines, and Guidelines for Group Work
- Established a peer mentoring program
- Addressed the “straggler” issue for late courses and revised the procedure for more timely notification of approved courses
- And, most importantly, reviewed and approved over 370 WI courses just this past year!
CWP Initiatives

Faculty Development Awards
During the 2014-2015 year, and with the continued support of the Provost and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the Campus Writing Program (CWP) refined and increased awareness of Faculty Development Awards (FDA). Writing Intensive instructors at all ranks can be awarded up to $10,000 for projects that align with our mission to support faculty as the primary agents in educating students to reason critically, solve complex problems, and communicate with clear, effective language in discipline-specific ways.

We believe this kind of funding is groundbreaking for advancing faculty creativity, expertise, and productivity when teaching according to Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) principles. The most recently funded projects are listed below:

- **Carla Allen (Department of Clinical and Diagnostic Sciences)**: “Integrating Guided Inquiry into Problem Based Learning.”
- **Dr. Gene Barabtarlo (Department of German and Russian Studies)**: “Russian/Film Studies 2865 as a WI Course.”
- **Dr. Tony Barbis (Department of Learning, Teaching, and Curriculum)**: Award granted to plan, design, and initiate a much needed WI course in the major.
- **Dr. Caroline Brock (Department of Rural Sociology)**: “A Study of WI Graduate Assistants and Maintaining Optimum Teacher : Student Ratio.”
- **Dr. Sandra Crews (Trulaske College of Business)**: “Writing Widget Web Site.” (This project is tabled though the need for such a tool is still being considered.)
- **Dr. Enos Inniss (Department of Civil Engineering)**: “A Distributed Writing Curriculum.”
- **Dr. Clarence Lo (Department of Sociology)**: “New WI Course on Information Technology.”
- **Dr. Flore Zephir (Department of Romance Languages)**: “Using Specially Trained Graduate Instructors to Keep Teacher:Student Ratio at 20:1.”
The following previously funded WI Project Awardees presented their projects during 2014-2015:

**Dr. Clark Peters (Department of Social Work):** “Giving Voice Through Writing: Capturing The Stories Of The Disadvantaged.”

**Dr. Martha Townsend (Department of English):** “The Letter As Genre.” Award granted for designing and initiating a new, timely, and needed WI course open to all students, campus wide.

**Dr. Joan Hermsen (Sociology and Women’s Studies):** Funds granted to support a Research Assistant and to assist in course evaluation and redesign. This course is an introduction to social science methods, including secondary data analysis, ethnography, and interviewing.

**Dr. Miriam Golomb (Department of Biological Sciences):** “Developing an Online Writing Intensive Course in Biological Sciences: Comparison of Online and Classroom Strategies.”

**Dr. Michael Marlo (Department of Linguistics):** “Scientific Writing and Fieldwork Methodology in Linguistics.”

**Dr. Ann Bettencourt (Department of Psychological Sciences):** “The Science of Mindfulness: Designing a New WI Course.”
Third Annual Win Horner Awardee

In 2012-2013, The Campus Writing Program instituted a Win Horner Award for Innovative Writing Intensive Teaching. This year, the award went to Dr. Miriam Golomb, Department of Biological Sciences.

Dr. Miriam Golomb being presented with the Win Horner Award for Innovative WI Teaching

2015 Writing Intensive Teaching Excellence Awardees

Dr. Lisa Bauer, Psychological Sciences
Dr. Wayne Brekhus, Sociology
Dr. Daniel Domingues, History
Dr. Rachel Harper, Writing Center
Aaron Harms, Writing Center
Dr. Peter Motavalli, Soil, Environmental & Atmospheric Science

Award columns for Writing Intensive Teaching Excellence Awardees
Throughout 2013-2014, the Campus Writing Program has sustained its campus wide work to initiate and improve our methods for teaching faculty and graduate students “writing-to-learn” and “learning-to-write” strategies, theories, and philosophies. We believe that this kind of information is so important to maintain our efforts toward promoting meaningful learning experiences for students across disciplines. We have held innovative workshops, seminars, and writing retreats, and, as usual, find our WI faculty engaged, supportive, and willing to participate.

**Special New Projects**

**Mentoring pilot project.** The project titled *Grassroots Mentoring: Helping New Faculty Adopt WI into Their Teaching Portfolios* was initiated in the 2014-2015 Academic Year due to funds obtained through a Faculty Development Grant submitted by three experienced Writing Intensive faculty members: Dr. Bob Bauer, Dr. Louise Miller, and Dr. Tim Safranski. Because of this mentoring, we experienced two of the most active and engaged groups attending our bi-annual two-day WI Faculty Workshops. Mentors and Mentees found much to discuss, and the Workshops were rich with meaningful, productive questions and responses to the material presented. Our cadre of Mentors came from many, varied disciplines and thus reflected the spirit of Writing Across the Curriculum:

**2014-2015 Mentors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>2014-2015 Mentors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bauer, Geology</td>
<td>Deanna Sharpe, Personal Financial Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fischer, Engineering</td>
<td>David Schenker, Classical Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Hearne, English</td>
<td>Mike Sykuta, Agriculture Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Miller, Nursing</td>
<td>Marty Townsend, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Motavalli, Soil, Environmental &amp; Atmospheric Science</td>
<td>James Van Dyke, Art History &amp; Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Safranski, Animal Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think we will find that this project is somewhat “organic” in that it will take on a life of its own depending on the needs of the given mentee and the experience, skills, and investment of their mentor. There is no “formula” or one approach that fits all mentee/mentor relationships. One of the contributions of this project will be discovering the various ways we can be helpful to new WI faculty. (Financial Planning)

I think this is a very promising program, especially to support new faculty getting to know the campus culture as well as the technical elements of MU’s writing program. I thought that going through the workshop training together (mentees and mentors) was terrific for both—that is, it was helpful for me as a mentor to see what kinds of questions or issues came up, and we all benefited from the brainstorming that we did about assignments, while for the mentees who are new to campus it seemed especially helpful to have people on hand who know how the campus is structured and what resources students have access to. (English)

My mentoring experience included two mentees at opposite ends of the spectrum: one who is already quite an experienced professor (Art History and Archeology) and one who is working on a PhD in Science Education. I had very good conversations with both mentees during the workshop. (Geology)

I mentored visiting faculty from China -- mentoring visiting Chinese scholars takes a LOT of time. We started our mentoring when they first came, meeting once a week, every Friday afternoon evening, to “debrief.” My main comment is that SO much cultural background is necessary to understand American pedagogical methods that these debriefing sessions ranged FAR and WIDE. That’s where the time drain goes.

Based on a decision by the Campus Writing Board, this peer mentoring program will be continued into Academic Year 2015-2016.
**WI Faculty website stemming from Invitational Seminars for Experienced WI Faculty.**

During the 2012-13, CWP held seminars for our experienced WI faculty to share ideas with colleagues from across campus. At each meeting, new ideas and strategies, were introduced and discussed. At the end of the seminar series, as the faculty reflected on their resources that had been shared, they realized this was important enough to share more broadly. It was decided that the group needed a website dedicated to this seminar and the work that it produced. Through the help of a Faculty Development Award, CWP hired a graduate assistant to get the seminar faculty together once again and plan, design, and assist in creating the website. The website is called Teaching with Writing at the URL [www.teachingwithwriting.missouri.edu](http://www.teachingwithwriting.missouri.edu), and it is currently under development. Faculty members are at various stages of drafting and revising on the following topics:

- Bob Bauer (Geology) – Fostering Critical Thinking
- Wayne Brekhus (Peace Studies) – Facilitating Revision through Instructor and TA
- Commenting
- Rainer Glaser (Chemistry) – Scientific Writing and Authoring
- Judith Goodman (Communication Sciences and Disorders) – Designing WI Courses
- Judith Mabary (Music) – Methods for Utilizing Peer Review
- Peter Motavalli (Soil Science) – Teaching with Technology
- Louise Miller (Nursing) – Teaching Writing using Rubrics
- Deanna Sharpe (Financial Planning) – Sequencing Assignments
- Tim Safranski (Animal Science) – Intentional Ambiguity in Assignment Design
- Marty Townsend (English) – Using WAC in FYC

When the website is complete and live, it will serve as a resource for instructors at MU and beyond. Over time, we plan to invite other faculty to write pages so that the site is frequently updated with new content and ideas for teaching with writing.
Workshops & Seminars

Two-Day workshops. The Program has continued to offer the important two-day Writing Workshops at the start of each semester. These workshops are attended by both new and experienced Writing Intensive (WI) instructors and cover such topics as Responding to Writing, Assignment Design, Assessment, Writing Instruction in an Online Course, Working with Multilingual Writers, and using writing as a learning tool in large WI courses.

Ongoing workshops. CWP designed workshops with specialized topics, purposes, and/or goals in mind as detailed below:

- Mentoring Teaching Assistants in WI Courses
- Faculty Writing Toward Publication
- Reading Across the Curriculum
- Faculty Innovations
- Grant Writing
- Collaborating with MU Librarians
- Literature Reviews
- Plagiarism
- Online Applications for Writing
- Review of online writing handbooks
- Scaffolding Assignments
- Writing in the Sciences
- Communication in Social Media
**Specialized workshops.** CWP also customized workshops to specific initiatives across campus.

**Nursing School workshops.** The CWP has continued to build upon its relationship with the School of Nursing’s RN-to-BSN program by teaching sessions on basic writing issues, writing style, and audience awareness at on-campus days for the program’s distance RN-to-BSN students.

**In-Class avoiding plagiarism workshops.** The CWP presented on avoiding plagiarism to several courses across the disciplines.

**Writing applications for efficient and effective academic research.** CWP has presented on digital tools for effective research to undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty.

**Writing retreats.** CWP holds Writing Retreats for all faculty who would like to come “write” for a day in Conley House. The atmosphere is conducive to writing, quiet and respectful from writer to writer. This project has been so successful that CWP now has a waiting list of people who would like to take advantage of the opportunity to concentrate on their own work while having consultants (CWP staff) at hand for feedback, suggestions, and encouragement. As a part of these Writing Retreats, CWP offers a two day event at the Frederick Hotel in Boonville, MO. This retreat is also well attended with participants usually staying overnight at the hotel and sharing a productive writing environment. A professional editor, Danita Wood (retired MU Journalism Professor and Editor of Missouri Life) provides warm-up activities and ongoing writing/editing conferences during the retreat.

**Establishing and Maintaining an Online Presence**

During the year, CWP continued maintaining its Twitter feed (@mizzouCWP), and Facebook presence (“University of Missouri Campus Writing Program”), publish the program newsletter e- WAC, and manage the undergraduate writing journal Artifacts. With programming support from ET@MO staff, CWP also continued the revision of the online forms used to create WI Proposals, Renewals, and Updates.
Writing Intensive Requirements for University of Missouri Undergraduates

The following items constitute the WI requirements for completion of undergraduate General Education and Graduation at MU:

- One WI course in any discipline and at any level
- One WI upper division course in the major (a department may ask a student to take a 3000- or 4000-level WI course in another department but still in an area closely related to the major)
- A grade of C- or better to count as WI
- Minimum of 6 WI credits*

It is recommended that English 1000 be completed before taking a WI course, and that WI courses be taken in separate semesters.

*Most WI courses are 3 credits, but some courses are sequenced and students may receive less than 3 designated WI credits as part of these multi-course sequences. Individual departments may apply to the Campus Writing Board to modify the requirement of 6 credits under these circumstances.
Writing Intensive Courses Reviewed by the Campus Writing Board, AY 2014

Board members review all WI proposals. These proposals come in two formats:

- New Proposals of courses, which have not previously been offered as WI by the proposing faculty member
- Semester Updates of previously offered WI courses, which have been previously proposed.

The Writing Program Coordinators work with faculty in advance of the Board’s reviews to bring courses into accordance with the WI Guidelines (available on the CWP website).

During AY 2014, the Campus Writing Board reviewed and subsequently approved 376 WI courses. Of those 376 courses, 72 courses were sent back to the instructor for revisions prior to WI approval. Coordinators worked with these instructors to ensure courses met the WI guidelines described above. For AY 2014, the Campus Writing Board requested revisions for approximately 20% of WI course proposals. Table 1 shows approved, revised, and withdrawn/canceled courses reviewed during AY 2014.

Table 1
Writing-Intensive courses reviewed by the Campus Writing Board during Academic Year 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Withdrawn/Canceled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>376</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: On average, the Campus Writing Board requested revisions for approximately 20% of proposed writing-intensive courses. Table 1 does not include single-student courses or online self-paced courses.
Writing Intensive Courses, Academic Year 2014

For AY 2014, including Summer 2014, Fall 2014, and Spring 2015, the Campus Writing Program offered approximately 379 WI courses taken by 13,444 students, and disbursed $843,150 in OTS funding support. The WI courses had an academic-year total of 2,413 open seats, by Student Information Systems (SIS) data, with an average of 13.7% open seats across course levels. Below, we review the distribution of WI faculty rank, the proportion of WI courses across academic sectors, the proportion of WI courses across class level, and WI course capacity for AY 2014.

**Writing Intensive Rank Distribution**

The current rank distribution of faculty teaching WI courses during AY 2014 indicates that the task of teaching WI courses is spread across the various faculty appointments (See Figure 1). Over 50% of WI courses are taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty.

**Who teaches Writing Intensive courses?**

- NTT Professor: 3.9%
- Graduate Students: 4.6%
- NTT Associate Professor: 4.9%
- Assistant Professor: 11.8%
- NTT Assistant Professors: 12.9%
- Other: 16.2%
- Associate Professor: 21.1%
- Professor: 23.7%

*Figure 1. Who teaches Writing Intensive Courses? This figure shows the distribution of faculty teaching WI courses in Academic Year 2014. “Other” refers to non-teaching staff, part-time faculty, and adjunct faculty.*
Several conclusions can be made when reviewing who teaches WI courses across campus. For instance, even though teaching WI courses is rigorous, we are seeing strong support for the principles of writing to learn from all academic ranks. Tenured or tenure-track instructors teach well over half of all WI courses, which likely indicates broad support for the WI program and/or writing across the curriculum principles. We can also assume from these statistics that assistant tenure-track professors teach a slightly lower percentage than tenured instructors because departments may refrain from assigning them WI courses during the tenure process.

**Writing Intensive Courses Across Academic Sectors**

Given the general acceptance of writing in the humanities, one might expect a vast majority of support for writing across the curriculum pedagogy to reside only in the Humanities and Arts sector. The data indicate, however, that the three sectors across campus—Humanities and Arts, Natural and Applied Sciences, and Education and Social Science—are nearly equivalent in their WI course offerings (See Figure 2). The data also suggest that the Campus Writing Program’s proactive approach toward implementing writing across the curriculum pedagogy in the physical and social sciences has thus far been successful.

![Writing Intensive courses by sector](image)

**Figure 2.** Writing Intensive courses by sector. This figure shows the number of WI courses relative to academic sector, AY 2014.
Writing Intensive Course Level Distribution

The distribution of WI courses by course level is shown in Figure 3. The proportion of WI courses increases with course level. Capstone courses at the 4000 level with an expected enrollment of one student (1.3%) have been removed from the overall 4000 level calculation shown in Figure 3.

CWP makes a concentrated effort to increase the percentage of lower level WI courses, particularly through the use of Writing Intensive Project Awards. WI courses at the 2000 level rose from 14.4% in AY2013 to 14.8% in AY2014. We hope these percentages continue to increase as the Writing Intensive Project Awards, which include a category for WI conversion of lower level courses, become more prevalent across campus.

Figure 3. Writing Intensive courses by course level. This figure shows the percentage of WI courses relative to course level for AY 2014. Single-student capstones, comprising 1.3% of courses, are not included.
Writing Intensive Capacity

CWP tracks the percentage of open seats by course level to determine to what degree WI course offerings match student needs. Figure 4 shows that the majority of empty seats are in 4000 level courses. These numbers include only lecture WI courses and ignore self-paced online courses in order to report a more accurate figure.

1000 Level

2000 Level

3000 Level

4000 Level

Figure 4. Open seats in Writing Intensive Courses for AY 2014. Reported percentages are a function of open seats at each course level.
Writing Intensive Faculty Satisfaction

Beginning in Fall 2014, CWP sent a brief survey to all current WI faculty in order to assess their satisfaction with their WI courses and the support they receive from CWP. Figure 5 shows that a large majority of WI faculty (77.2%) were “Mostly satisfied” or “Completely satisfied” with their WI courses. Figure 6 indicates that nearly 80% of WI faculty were “Mostly satisfied” or “Completely satisfied” with the support they received from CWP. Future analyses will enable CWP to assess satisfaction on both of these attributes across academic years.

CWP strives to provide constant support for WI faculty. Faculty members who expressed any dissatisfaction with their WI courses or CWP were contacted for follow up meetings, often resulting in fruitful conversations on WI strategy and pedagogy. For example, one faculty member requested a session on how to effectively mentor WI Teaching Assistants (TA) in her course. CWP subsequently provided this support to the faculty member and plans to expand our workshop series to incorporate mentoring TAs.

How satisfied were you with your WI class?

Figure 5. How satisfied were you with your Writing Intensive class? This figure shows that over three-quarters of WI faculty were mostly or completely satisfied with their WI courses.
Figure 6. How satisfied were you with the support from the Campus Writing Program? “Not applicable” (13.8%) is not shown.
New and Updated Writing Intensive Courses

According to Townsend, Patton, and Vogt’s (2012) assessment of the Campus Writing Program and similar university writing programs, the nature of updated and newly developed courses indicates a writing program’s overall health. For example, a sustained updated course number without new courses may portend a lack of confidence in the writing program across that university’s campus. Alternatively, programs that show an increase in new WI courses, paired with a consistent updated course number, can be considered healthy writing programs.

Given this finding, the Campus Writing Program continues to assess the ratio of updated and new WI courses on campus. Figure 7 shows the semester counts for updated and new WI courses on campus. Updated courses held relatively steady for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 at 121 and 119, respectively. Furthermore, Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 saw 47 and 55 new courses, respectively. Thus, in accordance with writing across the curriculum literature, the data indicate that the University of Missouri’s Campus Writing Program is currently in healthy standing across campus, showing a ratio of 14:70 new-to-updated courses across Mizzou’s campus.
Figure 7. New and updated Writing Intensive courses. This figure shows the count of updated WI courses paired with the count of newly developed WI courses, a ratio of 14 new courses for every 70 updated courses.
Funding of WI Courses

From AY 2006-2011, the University saw a consistent increase in the number of students enrolled in WI courses, with the total number of courses eligible for OTS funding paralleling that increase. According to our data, WI student enrollment and OTS funding seem to be approaching equilibrium. OTS funds distributed to departments decreased from $861,410 in AY 2013 to $843,150 in AY 2014. Our WI student enrollment aligns with the overall leveling of campus enrollment for undergraduate students.

Annual course eligibility for OTS funds (i.e., courses with students over 20 enrollment) has averaged 57% since AY 2009. For AY 2014, 56.9% of students (7,655 out of 13,444) were enrolled in WI courses eligible for OTS funding. OTS Funds paid since AY 2009 are shown in Figure 8. The equilibrium referenced above can be seen from AY 2011 to the current AY 2014.

![OTS funds paid by Academic Year](image)

Figure 8. OTS funds paid by Academic Year. This figure shows OTS funds dispersed by academic year. Part of the AY 2010 increase in OTS expenditures was due to CWP funding more consistently across departments, primarily with Journalism 2100 courses. Since AT 2011, OTS funds have stabilized.
Longitudinal Comparisons of Campus Writing Program Growth

In contrast to the enrollment and course growth seen during AY 2005-2010, AY 2014 continues to stabilize in the number of WI students enrolled and the number WI courses offered. Figures 9 and 10 show the growth and stabilization in WI student enrollment and WI courses by semester from AY 2005 to AY 2014, respectively. Both variables began to stabilize in AY 2011.

![Writing Intensive students by semester](chart)

*Figure 9.* Writing Intensive students by semester, AY 2005-2014. This figure shows WI student enrollment from Fall 2005 through Spring 2015. Summer courses and enrollment are not shown.
Figure 10. Writing Intensive courses per semester, AY 2005-2014. This figure shows the number of WI courses from Fall 2005 through Spring 2014. Summer courses are not shown.
Appendices

APPENDIX I

Scholarly Work, Research, and Presentations Conducted by CWP Staff, AY 2014

Amy Lannin, Ph.D.

Academic Publications


Lannin, A. & Townsend, M. (forthcoming). Graduate student perspectives: Career development through serving as writing-intensive GTAs. Book chapter accepted to *Across the Disciplines: Graduate Writing Across the Disciplines*.

Member, Editorial Team for *Literacy Research Association Yearbook*, 2015.

Academic Presentations


Lannin, A. (2014, June). Writing program administration and interdisciplinary committee work: Transforming friction into productive sparks. Presentation at the International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference, Minneapolis, MN, USA.


External Funding

**STEM-based Literacy: A Statewide Initiative.** Improving Teaching Quality Grant, Department of Higher Education. Total Budget: $1,656,217.20. Role: PI / Project Leader. Funded. 2015.


**Missouri Writing Projects Network,** Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Total annual budget: $330,000 (distributed to five National Writing Project Sites; $58,000 to University of Missouri’s Missouri Writing Project). Role: PI. Funded annually since 2011. Renewed for 2014- 2015 at $200,000 ($37,476 to MWP work at the University of Missouri).

Jonathan Cisco, Ph.D.

**Academic Publications**


Cisco, J. (accepted, in press). A case study of university honors students in the humanities. *Literacy Research and Instruction*.


**Academic Presentations**

Cisco, J. (2015, May). *Apps for academics: How to be an effective, efficient professor and researcher*. Presented at the University of Missouri's Celebration of Teaching conference, Columbia MO.


Cisco, J. (2014, June). *Extending the Burkean parlor metaphor: Teaching strategies for writing literature reviews for undergraduate and graduate writers*. Session presented at the meeting of the International Writing Across the Curriculum Association, Minneapolis, MN.

**Bonnie Selting, Ph.D.**

**Academic Presentations**

Selting, B. (2014, June). *Confounding the rubric ritual: How conventional interdisciplinary faculty look at unconventional writing criteria*. Session presented at the meeting of the International Writing Across the Curriculum Association, Minneapolis, MN.


Selting, B., (2014, May) *Designing writing assignments to encourage intellectual growth and “critical thinking” ability*. Session presented at the University of Missouri’s Celebration of Teaching conference, Columbia MO.

**Academic Publications**


APPENDIX II

Faculty and TA Workshop Evaluations

Fall 2014 Faculty WI Workshop, August 18-19, 2014
Spring 2015 Faculty WI Workshop, January 12-13, 2015

We offer here the questions asked at the end of all Faculty Workshops and examples of the comments from participants regarding the Spring, 2015, Faculty Workshop. *These workshops received some of the highest scores of approval we have seem, with Faculty Workshop for Spring 2013: 94.52%*

Questions Asked

3b. The handouts were worthwhile.
3c. Bean’s Engaging Ideas chapters were worthwhile.
4. I would have preferred other methods of presentation.
5. The presenters did not synthesize, integrate, or summarize effectively.
6. Some things were not explained well.
7. The workshop encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.
8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding.
9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop.
10. The information presented seemed timely and up to date.
11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.
12. Presenters wasted time by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.
13. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion.
14. During the workshop I felt free to ask questions or express my opinion.
15. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was covered.
16. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s).
17. The workshop acknowledged the connections between writing, reading, and thinking.
18. The workshop offered practical advice about responding to student writing.
19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing.  
20. I would advise colleagues to attend future workshops.

Examples of Comments Received

**How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?**

- I will emphasize the power of writing to critical thinking.
- By creating assignments differently – more question-based, less statement-based.
- The workshop taught me how to apply more technology to my teaching, how to design an assignment, and with my mentors’ help, I designed my first successful and effective assignment, which will facilitate my students to learn through writing.
- Very timely advice for my first WI class!
- I have a whole new approach to designing assignments and integrating writing with course content.
- It will enable me to add more tools to my teaching “toolbox” to help students learn material at a deeper level.
- I will be much more direct, clear, and upfront about my expectations for written work and why it’s important.

**What might we have included that we didn’t (or) what should we leave out next time around? (Such as more discussion of plagiarism, ESL issues, or other?)**

- Need some discussion of timing for assignments.
- Need more time on practical application [of techniques], “apps” discussion.
- Discuss a bit about norming sessions and how WI may be implemented in large courses.
- More time to work on a projects
APPENDIX 3

Fall 2014 Faculty/TA WI Workshop, August 22, 2014
Spring 2015 Faculty/TA WI Workshop, January 15th, 2015

We offer here the questions asked for both Faculty/TA Workshops and some examples of the comments we received for Spring, 2013. These workshops received some of the highest scores of approval we have seen, with Faculty/TA Workshop for Spring 2013: 91.8

Questions Asked
1. The workshop’s objectives were clear.
2. It was easy to remain attentive.
3a. The workshop content was worthwhile.
3b. The workbook and handouts were worthwhile.
4. I would have preferred other methods of presentation.
5. The presenters did not synthesize, integrate, or summarize effectively.
6. Some things were not explained well.
7. The workshop encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.
8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding.
9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop.
10. The information presented seemed timely and up to date.
11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.
12. Presenters wasted time by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.
13. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion.
14. During the workshop I felt free to ask questions or express my opinion.
15. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was covered.
16. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s).
17. The workshop acknowledged the connections between writing, reading, and thinking.
18. The workshop offered practical advice about responding to student writing.
19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing.

Examples of Comments Received

**What information was the most helpful for you?**

- More time spent on comparative grading.
- [Teaching] scenarios.
- Plagiarism
  - Just the different scenarios as well as emphasizing the importance of matching a rubric with assignment.
- Perspectives on student learning; will make me more aware of proper amount of feedback.
- Different ways to handle difficult situations
- Discussions of critical thinking and higher order concerns.
- Group discussion of personal experiences.
- Materials on responding to student writing.

**What might we have included that we didn’t (or) what could we improve next time around? (Such as more discussion of plagiarism, ESL issues, or other?)**

- Maybe a variety of delivery methods
- Other resources on campus to address difficult scenarios.
- Possibly ESL issues.
- More professional experience sharing from presenters; maybe video or two.
- Adding a second paper to grade would be good practice.
- More time on plagiarism
- More opportunities to discuss.