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Introduction

In Academic Year 2009-2010, the Campus Writing Program continued to experience growth in course offerings and student capacity. In addition, the CWP extended its faculty development programming, offered new workshops, solicited invited speaker presentations, and created specialized Brown Bag talks. These activities provided MU faculty with additional resources regarding writing instruction. The CWP continues to fulfill its pedagogical mission assisting faculty from across the disciplines.

The CWP also initiated new collaborations with various departments (Education, Human Development and Family Studies, Journalism, Management, Nursing, Architecture, Art Education, Service Learning, Fellowships Office) in order to expand its campus relationships. Such work extends the CWP’s role as a center for learning and teaching.

The biggest challenge the CWP faces is the restructuring of its funding formula. Within the next two years, this challenge should be addressed so that the CWP can adequately fund WI courses, maintain faculty support, and better position itself for future programming and faculty development. For Academic Year 2009-2010, the CWP was unable to pay OTS funding without drawing from its E&E resources. Even with the $30,000 increase in OTS support via surge funding, the CWP could not meet WI demand. This demand stems from several items:

- Increases in MU enrollment translate into increases in WI enrollments
- Departments without college funding to support graduate education offer large WI enrollment courses in order to receive TA funding
- Rather than encourage faculty to offer many small classes as WI (below 40 students in enrollment), departments opt to funnel the majority of their students through one large course so that students can fulfill the WI requirement easily

The Budget Director has assisted the CWP by providing an additional $15,000 in surge money to accommodate WI growth. The CWP works with faculty in order to address the second two items on the above list and to persuade faculty to not offer too many large enrollment courses. While these efforts have had some success, given the projected University budget reductions in the next few years, the funding problem can best be addressed by a new funding formula. An Advisory Task Force will convene in Academic Year 2010-2011 in order to address this issue.

Technology

In the last two years, the CWP has made strides to introduce technology to faculty teaching WI. It is impossible to separate technology (or “new media”) from writing; writing is itself a technology. Our students write in online spaces, record videos, make audio presentations, and use a variety of new media to communicate in their daily lives. Yet across MU, little attention is paid to the types of new media writing found not only in personal communicative moments, but in professional moments as well. Social networking, mobile communication, and shared online, collaborative writing spaces
pose new challenges for writing pedagogy. It is important to teach students how new media extends and alters written communicative practices. While some faculty have opted to post courses in Blackboard or use lecture capture to record their courses, these items are not reflective of new media based writing. The CWP’s focus, on the other hand, is on writing technologies.

The fall and spring faculty workshops now include a technology section; workshop attendees learn about weblogs, wikis, and using various online spaces to teach writing and revision. The CWP has also hosted two smaller workshops focused on technology within the last two years, one hosted by the CWP Director and one by guest speakers John Foley and Cylde Bennett. In addition, Nancy West’s brown bag talk in Spring 2010 focused on the bookstore’s Espresso Machine and how this particular technology could be used to produce student composed books in a given course.

In addition, the CWP employs various new media tools to promote its work. The CWP website – [http://cwp.missouri.edu/](http://cwp.missouri.edu/) - is a Wordpress weblog installation. Its structure allows the CWP to efficiently organize and produce information as well as update faculty with semi-daily notices and ideas regarding teaching. Each semester, WI faculty are invited to use the CWP’s wiki – [http://cwp.missouri.edu/wiki](http://cwp.missouri.edu/wiki) - as a writing space for their courses. The CWP also maintains a Facebook page in order to utilize social media as a means for promoting writing intensive work (and the website is tied to Facebook). During Spring 2010, the Director and assistant John Estes worked on developing an in-house social media tool (BuddyPress) for faculty to use in their courses. The application was offered to Anne Marie Foley for a grant proposal regarding social media, Writing Intensive courses, and service learning.

**Enrollment**
To put CWP enrollment into context: In Fall 1995, the CWP supported 73 WI courses with a total WI enrollment of 3,748 students. In Fall 2008, the CWP supported 167 courses with 3,106 enrolled students, and in Spring 2009 it supported 193 courses with 5,695 enrolled students. Over the past 13 years, the number of Writing Intensive courses at MU has increased by 240%, or approximately 2.5 classes per semester (see Figure 1, below). WI enrollment has increased by 145%, or approximately 52 students per semester (see Figure 2, below). During this period, total OTS (Other Teaching Staff) funding allocations increased by 175% (see Figure 3, below), though most of that increase occurred from Fall 1995 to Fall 2000. OTS allocations leveled off from Winter 2001 to Spring 2008 (reflecting the effects the 2003 model for OTS allocations had on OTS support). For 2008-2009, OTS funding did not experience any increases. With the addition of surge money to accommodate recent growth, funding has increased again, though it is tied to continued University enrollment growth and is not considered permanent.
**WI Course Reviews**

During Academic Year 2009-2010, beginning with the Campus Writing Board’s first meeting in September through the Board Advisory Group’s final vote in July 2010, the Campus Writing Board reviewed and voted on 317 courses held over 6 semesters (including approvals for Fall 2010 and early approvals for Spring 2011).

The Campus Writing Board meets three times a semester (and three additional times in subcommittees). The Advisory Group consists of the subcommittee chairs and the Director of the Campus Writing Program. The Advisory Group is asked twice during the summer to review approvals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester of Course</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Tabled / Returned</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Withdrawn / Canceled</th>
<th>* 1-student courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WI Courses, Enrollment, And Support

For Academic Year 2009-2010, including Summer 2009, the Campus Writing Program disbursed $706,090 in OTS funding to support 369 Writing Intensive courses taken by 12,042 students.

### Writing Intensive Course Support by School or College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department / College</th>
<th>Summer 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Amount ($)</td>
<td>Courses Held (#)</td>
<td>Students Enrolled (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$5,170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Division (Honors College &amp; Interdivisional)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,470</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1-student courses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total vacant seats</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals for AY 09-10:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total OTS</th>
<th>Total Courses</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Total 1-student courses</th>
<th>Total vacant seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$706,090</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>12,042</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average course size including 1-student courses: 32.6 students per course
Average course size excluding 1-student courses: 36.1 students per course
**WI Demographics**
The rank distribution for faculty teaching WI courses during Academic Year 2009-2010 can be compared to the overall MU faculty population. We compared the distribution of WI faculty with the aggregate full-time rank distributions of MU faculty reported by University Institutional Research as of the last-available data, 2008 (Figure 1, below, first dataset). The population of WI faculty for academic year 2009-2010 (Figure 1, second and third datasets) contained higher percentages of full and Associate Professors, and lower percentages of Assistant Professors and Unranked/Non-tenure track faculty than the percentages of those ranks in the overall MU full-time faculty population. The category of Unranked Teaching/Research Faculty, as reported by the MU Office of Institutional Research, is presumed to include Clinical, Teaching, Visiting and research-only ranked faculty, as well as Adjunct ranked faculty, Lecturers, and Instructors.

Almost one-third of the WI faculty (32%) taught more than one section or course as WI during the academic year. 232 faculty taught 369 WI sections or courses in AY09-10. To account for WI faculty who teach multiple WIs, Figure 1 displays both the percentages of WI courses taught by instructors at each rank (Figure 1, second dataset), as well as the percentages of individual WI faculty at each rank with duplicates for multiple sections/courses removed (Figure 1, third dataset). 36% of WI faculty ranked as Professor taught multiple WI courses/sections; 33% of faculty at the rank of Associate Professor taught multiple WI courses/sections; 23% of WI faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor taught multiple WI courses/sections; and 33% of Non-Tenure Line faculty taught multiple WI courses/sections.
Figure 1. Academic Year 2009-2010 faculty rank comparisons between total MU faculty and WI faculty.

The population of WI faculty for AY09-10 contains higher percentages of Full (4.7% higher) and Associate Professors (12.9% higher), and lower percentages of Assistant Professors (7.6% lower) and unranked/Non-Tenure track faculty (10% lower) than the University’s full-time faculty population. The highest differences are at the Associate Professor and unranked/Non-Tenure track ranks (see Table 1 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>2008 MU FT Faculty distribution</th>
<th>AY09-10 WI courses taught by each rank</th>
<th>AY09-10 % WI faculty, separate individuals</th>
<th>WI faculty population % less MU FT faculty population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
<td>24.14%</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>19.86%</td>
<td>30.62%</td>
<td>32.76%</td>
<td>12.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>26.11%</td>
<td>15.45%</td>
<td>18.53%</td>
<td>-7.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked/Non-TT Faculty</td>
<td>34.63%</td>
<td>31.44%</td>
<td>24.57%</td>
<td>-10.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Academic Year 2009-2010 WI faculty rank percentages relative to MU full- and part-time, and full-time only faculty rank percentages.
OTS funding and student teaching, as well, are broken down by faculty rank (Figure 2, below). Full professors teach 24% of WI courses and WI students, and receive 24% of OTS support. The average course size taught by Professors is 33.4 students per course. Associate and Assistant Professors teach and receive smaller percentages of the WI students and WI OTS funding, indicating that they frequently teach smaller-enrollment WI courses, with average course sizes of 26.2 and 24.4 students per course, respectively. Unranked/Non-Tenure track faculty teach and receive higher percentages of WI students and WI OTS funding than the percentage of WI courses they represent in Figure 2, indicating that they frequently teach larger-enrollment WI courses, with an average of 42.2 students per course.

Figure 2. Academic Year 2009-2010 WI faculty rank percentages teaching WI courses, WI students, and receiving WI OTS funds.

Figure 3 (below) displays the percentages of WI courses, WI student enrollment, and OTS support relative to course size as determined by Census Day enrollment. 55% of WI courses had enrollments in the 11-20 student and 21-40 student categories. There is a second minor peak at the 101-150 student category size. The distribution of enrolled WI students forms two peaks. The first, accounting for approximately 50% of WI students, covers courses with 11 to 60 students (size categories 11-20, 21-40, and 41-60 students). The second peak, accounting for approximately 22% of WI students, is at courses of 101-150 students. OTS funds also display two peaks at courses of 41-60 students and courses of 101-150 students. The 5% of WI courses that enroll 22% of WI students (course sizes of 101-150 students) account for 35% of OTS funds paid.
Figure 3. Academic year 2009-2010 percentages of WI courses, WI students, and OTS support grouped by course size as determined by Census Day enrollment.

The distribution of WI courses, WI student enrollment, and OTS support across the 1000 level to 4000 level course levels (Figure 4, below) reveals that over 60% of WI courses are offered at the 4000 level. They serve 35% of WI students, and receive 19% of OTS funds. WI student enrollment is relatively evenly distributed (27-35% each) across the 2000, 3000, and 4000 levels and is lower at the 1000 level. Largely, because they make up the majority of large course enrollments (above 60 students), 2000 and 3000 level courses together comprise 38% of the WI courses offered, contain 57% of enrolled WI students, and receive 68% of OTS funds paid.
Figure 4. Academic year 2009-2010 percentages of WI courses, WI students, and OTS support grouped by course level (1000- through 4000-level).

**WI Growth**

Academic year 2009-2010 continued the general growth trends in number of WI courses offered, the number of WI students enrolled, and OTS payments which have occurred over the program’s last 15 years. Figure 5 (below) shows the growth in WI courses and WI student enrollment, while Figure 6 (below) shows the parallel growth in WI student enrollment and consequent OTS support paid. Increases in WI student enrollment follow overall increases in University enrollments.
Figure 5. Number of WI courses and WI student enrollment for Fall 1995 through Spring 2010. Summer courses and enrollments are not shown.
Figure 6. WI student enrollment and OTS payments for Fall 1995 through Spring 2010.

The same pressures that apply to fall and spring enrollments have begun to apply to summer WI offerings as well. The majority of this growth comes from MU Direct course offerings. By offering WI courses in the summer, MU Direct fills all of its courses. The CWP works closely with MU Direct to cap summer courses at 20, but because of department or college needs, some offerings need to exceed this cap.

Figure 7. WI Courses & Enrollment, Summers 2006-2010

Figure 8. WI Enrollment & OTS Support
Summary of Campus Writing Board Activities

Program Policy Actions and Activities:

• **December 2, 2009:** Following Board review of CWP staff research on 1 student courses, the Board resolved to continue monitoring the frequency of 1 student WI courses, but opted not yet to set specific policies regulating the courses.

• **March 3, 2010:** The Board asked CWP staff to create guidelines for writing in a variety of genres.

• **April 21, 2010:** The Board voted to approve changes to the course approval process so that Updated courses include recent descriptions of assignments, page-counts, and percentage of grade derived from out-of-class writing. Subcommittees, therefore, will have more thorough information about updated courses. The Board also approved a 3-year limit on Updates, such that after 3 years (regardless of whether the course has been continuously taught or offered only once) instructors will be required to submit a New Course Proposal including a complete description of the course, assignments, critical thinking issues, use of revision and other related issues. These changes have been implemented in the Filemaker system.

Program Activities

Citation:


Seminars and Workshops:

• August 17-18, 2009 – 47th Faculty Writing Intensive Workshop.

• August 21, 2009 – TA/Faculty Writing Intensive Workshop, Assisting in the WI Classroom: Strategies for Success.

• October 1, 2009 – Revision Workshop for WI Courses.

• October 2, 2009 – Workshop: Assignment Creation and Design for Journalism Writing Intensive courses.

• October 15, 2009 – CWP-organized New Media Workshop with presenters John Foley and Clyde Bentley.

• October 23, 2009 – Workshop: Writing in Nursing.

• November 6, 2009 – Workshop: Revision in Journalism Writing Intensive courses.

• January 12-13, 2010 – 48th Faculty Writing Intensive Workshop.

• January 15, 2010 – TA/Faculty Writing Intensive Workshop, Assisting in the WI Classroom: Strategies for Success.

• February 23, 2010 – Workshop for Department of Management: “How to More Effectively Use Writing Instruction in your Teaching.”
• March 5, 2010 – “Lunch with the Veterans.” This luncheon is modeled on Colleague Circle Concept and brought new WI faculty together with veterans to discuss WI related issues.
• April 8, 2010 – Workshop on Large Lecture WI Courses.

**Brown Bag Lunch Talks**

**Fall 2009 series:**

- September 30, 2009 – George Justice, Interim Dean of the Graduate School. “Graduate Student Writing.”
- October 14, 2009 – Tom Marrero, Chemical Engineering. “Abstracts.”
- October 28, 2009 – Haskell Taub, Physics. “Barriers to Offering Writing Intensive Introductory Courses in the Physical Sciences, How We are Trying to Overcome them, and Why It's Worth Doing.”
- November 11, 2009 – Lynne Pye, MU Direct. “WI Online in Summer Session; An Innovative Approach to WI Courses.”

**Spring 2010 series, Creative Assignments:**

- April 7, 2010 – Chip Callahan, Religious Studies. “Mixing it Up: Using a Variety of Different Types Writing Assignments In Your Course.”

**Publications:**

- The CWP has created a Facebook fan page for the program website. The CWP publishes the MU undergraduate journal *Artifacts: A Journal of Undergraduate Writing*. *Artifacts* published two special issues during the academic year: First Year Writing and Environmental Studies.
- The CWP produces a newsletter, *e-WAC*, once a semester.

**University Initiatives**

**MU Advantage:**

- Jeff Rice received a $20,000 grant from E-Learning (along with co-investigator Roy Fox) to design virtual online courses for a certificate in Visual Literacy.
• Jeff Rice and Bonnie Selting worked with Louis Miller of Nursing on an Interdisciplinary Innovation Fund grant for $25,000 to develop new media pedagogy for Nursing students.
• Jeff Rice also worked with Anne Marie Foley of Service Learning on a proposal for Service Learning and Global Health that was not awarded.
• Collaboration with MU Libraries to promote 2010 Undergraduate Research Contest.
• Applications were submitted for the ET@MO sponsored Technology Liaison and for a facilitator position in the Mizzou Advantage program. Neither were awarded, but they demonstrate CWP commitment to campus involvement in technology education.

Program Staff Activities

Jeff Rice, Director

Professional Activities
• Member of Editorial Board for Computers and Composition
• Member of Editorial Board for WPA: Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators
• Member of Editorial Board for Enculturation
• Member of Editorial Board for College Composition and Communication Online
• Reviewer for College Composition and Communication
• Reviewer for Composition Forum
• Reviewer for Kairos

Professional Conferences:
• May 19-22, 2010 – 10th International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference, Bloomington, IN. Presented “Snapshots of a Campus Writing Program: Networked Assessment” with Catherine Chmidling and Bonnie Selting.
• May 28-30 - Rhetoric Society of America Conference, Minneapolis, MN. “Layered Images: The Michigan Train Station.”
• July 15-19, 2010 - Writing Program Administrator’s Conference, Philadelphia, PA. “Writing From Big Pink.”

Invited Talks:
• May 6, 2009 - Invited speaker, Dartmouth College Writing Program. “Folksono(me)s.”

Publications:

“Networked Exchanges, Identity, Writing” has been nominated for the NCTE award for Best Article Reporting Historical Research or Textual Studies in Technical and Scientific Communication.

Workshops:
Fall 2010 - Collaboration with Fellowships Office. “Writing a Personal Statement.”

Teaching:
• Fall 2009: English 8040 New Media Theory
• Spring 2010: English 4040: The Rhetoric of Pleasure

MU Service:
• General Education Task Force, member
• Teachology – presentation on wikis at ET@MO conference
• Works in progress talk for faculty in English Department
• Composition Committee, Department of English, member

Catherine Chmidling, Coordinator
Professional Conferences:
• October 15-16, 2009 – Focus on Teaching and Technology: A Regional Conference, University of Missouri St. Louis. Planning committee, session convener.
• March 17-20, 2010 – Conference on College Composition & Communication, Louisville, KY. “The Zen of Writing Assessment: Practices On and Off the Cushion (at the University of X)” with Marty Patton and Bonnie Selting.
• May 19-22, 2010 – 10th International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference, Bloomington, IN. “Snapshots of a Campus Writing Program: Networked Assessment” with Jeff Rice and Bonnie Selting.

Professional Activities:
• Multiple dates: Met with Tanys Nelson, ET@MO, regarding redesign of CWP Filemaker database and layouts.
• Multiple dates: Attended MU Filemaker user-group meetings.
• Multiple dates: Attended Conversations in College Science Teaching talks.
• Multiple dates: Attended English 1000 seminar talks.
• Enrolled in Geography GIS Certificate program.
• July 22, 2009 – Attended ET@MO brownbag on Quality Matters online course design criteria.
• August 10, 2009 – Attended Filemaker “Introduction to Database Design” training.
• August 12, 2009 – Consulted with Nursing faculty regarding writing in the Nursing curriculum and in specific courses (with Bonnie Selting).
• August 27, 2009 – Attended WITS tutor-training held by Rachel Harper and Greg Foster, Writing Center (with Bonnie Selting).
• September 17, 2009 – Attended campus-organized student panel on classroom learning activities.
• September 23, 2009 – Spoke to HDFS 2400 lecture regarding student use of grading rubrics when writing.
• September 23, 2009 – Attended MU Corps of Discovery lecture.
• October 20, 2009 – Met with Computer Science 4970 (WI) student in role as census-data end-user regarding data search class project (at request of course instructor).
• March 4, 2010 – Met with faculty member from Spanish regarding discipline-specific WI TA workshops (with Bonnie Selting & Jeff Rice).
• March 11, 2010 – Met with faculty from Nursing RN to BSN program regarding writing in program curriculum (with Bonnie Selting).
• April 8, 2010 – Met with faculty member from Food Science regarding adapting a course to WI.
• April 14, 2010 – Presented seminar for Graduate School on “Developing College Students’ Writing Skills.”

Publications:
Workshops and Norming Sessions:
- Multiple dates: Attended HDFS 2400 TA meetings to assist with norming.
- Multiple dates: Attended HDFS 3420 TA meetings to assist with norming.
- Multiple dates: Attended Management 3200 TA meetings to assist with norming.

Dr. Bonita Selting, Coordinator
Professional Conferences:
- March 17-20, 2010 – Conference on College Composition & Communication, Louisville, KY. “The Zen of Writing Assessment: Paying Attention to WAC Assessment.” (with Marty Patton and Catherine Chmidling)

Works in Progress
- The Rhetoric Primer, a book on simplifying the teaching of writing through understanding rhetoric.

Workshops and Norming Sessions:
- Fall, 2009: Conducted workshop—“Writing In Nursing” with Catherine Chmidling
- Fall 2009 and Spring 2010: Conducted workshops on writing in professional nursing
  Senior class, Daytime, Community Health Nursing 4970 (Fall 2009)
  RN to BSN class, Community Health Nursing 4970, Glenda Nickell, instructor
  (Fall 2009)
  RN to BSN class, Community Health Nursing 4970, Glenda Nickell, instructor
  (Spring 2010)
  RN to BSN class Communication and Computers Nursing 3080, Valerie Bader, instructor (May, 2010)
  RN to BSN class Communication and Computers Nursing 3080, Valerie Bader, instructor (June, 2010)
- Summer, 2009: Attended WITS tutor-training held by Rachel Harper and Greg Foster, Writing Center (with Catherine Chmidling).
- Spring Semester, 2010: met with faculty member Steve Hessel, Spanish, regarding discipline-specific WI TA workshops (with Catherine Chmidling and Jeff Rice).
- Spring Semester, 2010: Conducted workshop on using writing-to-learn strategies in Romance Language classes, Spanish and French (with Steve Hessel, Spanish faculty)
• Ongoing Spring Semester, 2010: Attended HDFS Teaching Assistant (TA) weekly workshops, Instructor: Dr. Cynthia Reeser. Input consisted of:
  ▪ Advice on Best Practice theory for using writing to learn concepts, assignment design, and rhetoric/composition theory.
  ▪ Assistance with norming papers
  ▪ Assistance with last lecture class by reading the best of student writing
• Spring 2010: Designed and Facilitated Faculty Roundtable on teaching large WI classes with TAs.
• Ongoing: Consulting with professional nursing faculty Valerie Bader on course design and assignments for RN to BSN program’s Research Theory and Methodology course
• Ongoing: Consulting with professional nursing faculty, Louise Miller, on Nursing 4930, Evidence Based Nursing.

Teaching:
• Adjunct Assistant Professor faculty status in English Department and Sinclair School of Nursing.
• Fall Semester 2009: Taught English 1000

MU Service:
• CWP representative on CUE.

Ongoing Projects:
• Designing, consulting, and gathering data for initial phase of study on “The Use of Narrative in Content Learning,” with Dr. Cynthia Reeser, Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS)

Outreach:
• Consulting on design of a newsprint document for local community radio station, KOPN, in collaboration with MU Journalism faculty Dr. Mary Kay Blakely.
• Working with Independent Study Journalism student, David Teeghman, toward publication of this document for mass marketing.

John Estes
CWP Assistant
• Initiated two Artifacts issues: First Year Writing and Environmental Writing. Formatted submissions, designed issues.
• Updated Wiki for security and design
• Setup BuddyPress Social Networking for website
• Organized and wrote materials for online resources database
APPENDIX 1
Workshop for Prospective Writing Intensive Faculty
August 17th-18th, 2009

29 Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 Assistant Professors</th>
<th>2 Associate Teaching Professors</th>
<th>1 Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Assistant Teaching Professors</td>
<td>4 Clinical Instructors</td>
<td>1 Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Assistant Visiting Professor</td>
<td>3 Graduates</td>
<td>1 Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Associate Professors</td>
<td>1 Instructor</td>
<td>1 Research Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Senior Editor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants:

Valerie Bader, Nursing
Matthew Ballou, Art
Jonathon Beckmeyer, Human Development And Family Studies
Matthew Bernards, Chemical Engineering
Tina Bloom, Nursing
Michelle Boatman, Occupational Therapy
Antonio Castro, Learning, Teaching and Curriculum
Nancy Cheak-Zamora, Health Psychology
Linda Davis, Respiratory Therapy
Edward Drott, Religious Studies
Mary Fagan, Communication Science And Disorders
Mary Fete, Nursing
Crystal Gateley, Occupational Therapy
Robin Hurst, Biological Sciences
Meena Iyer, Occupational Therapy
Dorina Kosztin, Physics
Lyudmyla Kvochina, Veterinary Biomedical Science
Ying Liu, Nutritional Sciences
Thomas Marrero, Chemical Engineering
David McDonald, Psychological Sciences
Marcie McGuire, Extension
Amber Moodie-Dyer, Social Work
Glenda Nickell, Nursing
Loren N. Olson, Communication
Cynthia Reeser, Human Development And Family Studies
LuAnne Roth, English
Jessica Roy, Cardiopulmonary and Diagnostic Sciences
Catherine Rymph, History
Brian Silvey, Teacher Development Program
Carlos Souza, Veterinary Medicine And Surgery
Chun Tang, Biochemistry
Jennifer Upah, Parks, Recreation And Tourism
## Evaluation Summary

**SA** = Strongly agree  
**D** = Disagree more than agree  
**A** = Agree more than disagree  
**SD** = Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>SA/A</th>
<th>D/SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The workshop’s objectives were clear.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to remain attentive.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. The workshop content was worthwhile.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. The handouts were worthwhile.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Bean’s book, <em>Engaging Ideas</em>, was worthwhile.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would have preferred other methods of presentation.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The presenters did <em>not</em> synthesize, integrate, or summarize effectively.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Some things were not explained well.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The workshop encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The information presented seemed timely and up to date.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Presenters wasted time by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. During the workshop I felt free to ask questions or express my opinion.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was covered.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s).</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The workshop acknowledged the connections between writing, reading, and thinking.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The workshop offered practical advice about responding to student writing.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing. I would advise colleagues to attend future workshops.

OVERALL SCORE: 91.0% (A-)

Selected Comments

“I got some great ideas on technology, assignments, etc. Some other material seemed geared toward those who don’t assign writing already.”

“I am hoping to continue my dialogue with CWP and improve my knowledge base about facilitating writing in the classroom. Excellent workshop!”

“It validated much of what I am already doing plus giving me new ideas.” [emphasis in original]

“I have a much better idea of how to incorporate writing into the class. I liked the opportunities to stop and write a response to a question, then share.”

“I have a better idea regarding the scope of my projects - i.e. the level of dedication I was expecting was probably a little unrealistic. This workshop helped me limit things a bit.”

“Lots of ideas I can incorporate into my course.”

“I have ore creative ideas, improved responding & grading, & implement writing throughout course.”

“More on plagiarism – [I’m] still not comfortable about the definition I should use.”

“It has gotten me to break down large assignments into pieces to better teach the students and to lessen my grading responsibilities at the end of a semester.”

“The workshop made me aware of many issues/pitfalls that one has to deal with in a WI course. It also provided me with wonderful ideas for implementing WI components in a physics course.”

“Thank you, I have learned a lot and I am looking forward to using this information in a new course.”

“More ideas on writing assignments and selective grading such as daily or reading summaries.”

“I will be able to construct better writing assignments.”

“I plan on attending a few more of your workshops. You did a great job!”

“Several course assignments will be amended to incorporate more writing & revisions. It will impact my grading style/commenting on papers.”
“More info on plagiarism, specifically guidelines to pass along to students.”

“This has given me several ideas to modify my syllabus & specific assignments.”

“I really learned a lot from others at the table. One person here actively incorporates writing & technology. He showed very good ideas.”

 “[Future teaching will include…] More emphasis on revision. More use of technology.”

“Most useful info from those at table. Discussion with peers most valuable.”
APPENDIX 2

TA/Faculty Workshop
Assisting in the WI Classroom: Strategies for Success
August 21, 2009

53 GTA and Faculty Attendees:

Faculty:
- Ag. Journalism
- Biochemistry
- Biological Sciences
- Human Development & Family Studies
- Political Science
- Social Work

GTA:
- Art (1)
- Ag. Economics (1)
- Ag. Journalism (1)
- Animal Sciences (1)
- Anthropology (1)
- Art History (4)
- Biochemistry (8)
- Communication (2)
- Forestry (1)
- German (1)
- Human Development & Family St. (8)
- History (1)
- Journalism (4)
- Parks, Rec. & Tourism (1)
- Political Science (4)
- Russian (2)
- Social Work (1)
- Sociology (2)

Selected Evaluation responses

What information was the most helpful for you?
“Sample article edit & comparison of three commentators.”

“I really appreciated the scenarios, and also the examples of commentators.”

“The practice activities & discussion; Powerpoints in the handbook – glad to have something as a reference.”

“The information provided during discussions, especially the experiences of those who have already TA’d a WI course.”

“The scenarios were most helpful.”

“I feel so much better [about] my abilities now. Brainstorming was helpful. Norming with papers [was], too!”

“Rubrics and strategies to assign homework.”

“The discussion on providing feedback to the student was the most helpful. I will try several new techniques this semester.”

What might we have included that we didn’t (or) what could we improve next time around?
“Perhaps a list of various student services that we may refer to (Disabilities Office, International Student Office, etc.”

“Having a WITS tutor present may be helpful.”
“I work in a science field. Specific examples from this field would be helpful.”

“Include common grammar examples in the workbook.”

“Marking techniques would be nice.”

“Include information for syllabus preparation.”

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

“Know how to effectively respond to students.”

“I feel I will be a more impartial and confident instructor.”

“This is great. I am newer to the field compared to full professors, and I found this helpful.”

“Gave some good ideas on how to interact with students.”

“Will definitely help! Thank you!”

“It'll probably improve my grading skills.”

“To be more involved in the content of the paper instead of the editing – I tend to focus on editing grammar.”

**How can the Campus Writing Program follow through with further assistance for you?**

“I plan on referring students to WITS! Didn’t know it existed & glad that it does.”

“This was filled with good examples for college students.”

**Would you advise colleagues to attend future workshops?**

**Why?**

“40 ‘Yes’; 2 ‘No’

“The more prepared we are, the better!”

“Grading assistance if you’ve never taught writing intensive classes.”

“Because it refreshes ideas on grading & offers interesting insights on how others grade.”

“Provides adequate info for why we are here as GTAs.”

“For 1st time TAs, very beneficial. I think it would be a good tune-up workshop for the experienced as well.”

**Additional comments.**

“Thank you!”
APPENDIX 3
Workshop for Prospective Writing Intensive Faculty
January 12th & 13th, 2010

20 Attendees:
2 Adjunct Instructors 1 Grader 1 Professor Professional Practice
2 Assistant Professors 1 Graduate 1 Theatre Assistant
4 Assistant Teaching Professors 3 Instructors 1 Visiting Instructor
2 Associate Professors 1 Professor

Participants:
Linsey Barker, Industrial And Manufacturing Systems
Miriam Barquero-Molina, Geological Sciences
Elizabeth Bryda, Veterinary Pathobiology
Viviane Ducret, French
John Fresen, Statistics
Lynn Frey, Nursing
Clark Gantzer, Environmental Sciences
Peter Gardner, Anthropology
Steve Hackley, Psychological Sciences
Stephen Hessel, Spanish
Enos Inniss, Civil & Environmental Engineering
Kate Kelley, Religious Studies
Mark Kuhnert, Psychological Sciences
Debra Mason, Journalism
Sam Masters, Civil & Environmental Engineering
Shawna Mefferd-Kelty, Theater
Joseph Otabela Mewolo, Spanish
Alecia Swasy, Journalism
Teresa Van Dover, Educational Leadership And Policy Analysis
Bina Vanmali, Biological Sciences
### Evaluation Summary

**SA** = Strongly agree
**D** = Disagree more than agree
**A** = Agree more than disagree
**SD** = Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA/A</th>
<th>D/SD</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1. The workshop’s objectives were clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2. It was easy to remain attentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3a. The workshop content was worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3b. The handouts were worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3c. Bean’s book, <em>Engaging Ideas</em>, was worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4. I would have preferred other methods of presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5. The presenters did <em>not</em> synthesize, integrate, or summarize effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>6. Some things were not explained well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7. The workshop encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10. The information presented seemed timely and up to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12. Presenters wasted time by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14. During the workshop I felt free to ask questions or express my opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>15. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17. The workshop acknowledged the connections between writing, reading, and thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18. The workshop offered practical advice about responding to student writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing.

20. I would advise colleagues to attend future workshops.

OVERALL SCORE: 91.4% (A-)

Selected Comments

“I am planning to incorporate the “chunk method” in all of my classes – WI and other ones.”

“I think more time spent on responding and commenting on student essays would be helpful. It can be difficult to find positive things to say & it’s important to encourage students.”

“I am energized & excited about my WI class!”

“I will incorporate some of the assignment ideas & methods for grading in my class. Great mix of faculty – this was helpful in getting different ideas that I can incorporate in my class.”

“I am more conscious of writing as a tool for acquiring and critically thinking about new information.” [emphasis in original]

“Helpful ideas & strategies for courses.”

“I will be a more helpful critic.”

“Now that I know what to look for, I can be effective in leading the class.”

“I have a lot of great ideas to work with, especially in creating assignments in steps.”

“I plan to focus on critical thinking & revision.”

“I am thinking more about how to formulate writing assignment that reinforce [students’] understanding of professional practice.”
APPENDIX 4

TA/Faculty Workshop
Assisting in the WI Classroom: Strategies for Success
January 15, 2010

26 GTA and Faculty Attendees:

Faculty:  
- English
- Biochemistry
- Geography
- Computer Science
- Human Development & Family Studies
- Theatre

GTAs:  
- Biochemistry (2)
- Cardiopulmonary & Diagnostic Sci (2)
- Computer Science (1)
- Computer Science (1)
- English (1)
- Geography (1)
- Human Development & Family Studies (5)
- Parks, Rec & Tourism (1)
- Political Science (3)
- Social Work (2)
- Sociology (1)

Selected Evaluation responses

What information was the most helpful for you?
1. Tutoring Services  2. Responding to writing – higher & lower order

The responding to student work section with examples and group discussion were the most helpful.

Specifics related to resources available to students & TAs, e.g. Student Success Center

Lots of general info – actually thought this more effective & useful than the faculty version (but now I know the Qs & issues better).

The information generated by questions from the audience members – i.e., questions that concern a hypothetical scenario that the TA or the professor or both have been anticipating.

The discussions of rubrics, the sample papers & comments, & discussion of norming. I enjoyed hearing from the experienced faculty & appreciated their coming.

Scenarios & discussions. Thanks for this very much!

The resource book is great!

What might we have included that we didn’t (or) what could we improve next time around?

Relationships to other student services (Counseling, ESL, etc.). Work a bit more on rubrics and norming.

The WI teaching scenarios could be discussed less a small groups to give more time for full room discussion.

Further details on resources available, perhaps included as an appendix to the booklet.

I would have preferred less exercises & more concise question-and-answer sessions.

I would have found additional time spent on plagiarism concern. While not the greatest concern, it does help those teaching to establish a level of academic standard.
More time to work on tasks and to understand what we are doing with tasks.

**How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?**
Each year the information is better – new insights. I will improve explanations.

Helpful – esp. ides of “norming”

Provides a starting place for questions on resources/procedures.

More explanation of expectations.

I will definitely base my rubrics & norming practices on yours; also I learned some strategies for grading & teaching revision.

It helps me get different views about teaching than my own.

Help me to be more consistent and content-oriented.

**How can the Campus Writing Program follow through with further assistance for you?**
Knowing where to go is help enough for now.

Following up with WIT info on website.

Offer assistance/tips for grading & grading rubrics.

I know you’re available and feel good about using your experience if necessary.

**Would you advise colleagues to attend future workshops?** _21_ ‘Yes’; _1_ ‘No’ **Why?**
This information is relevant to any course that has writing, essay tests, etc.

Helpful info which at the very least gives perspective on writing education across campus.

Writing skills will often serve as the most consequential element of a student’s skills gained while [in] college.

This is good general info everyone should have.

In order to learn effective strategies.

Common sense. [‘No’ vote]

I was a lot more informed about what it means to be a WI TA after the training. I have a better understanding of how I grade will affect students.

**Additional comments.**
More restroom breaks!
Thank you!