Director’s Introduction:

The Campus Writing Program at the University of Missouri will soon celebrate 30 years as one of the leading Writing Programs in the country and world. The following report attests to the strength of this program as a vital part of Mizzou’s undergraduate student experience. The 2011-2012 Academic Year included maintaining the ongoing work of the Writing Program, as well as adding some new events. The Writing Program and the MU Campus Writing Board addressed important topics during the year, including the sustained and continued funding of Writing Intensive courses. As a staff (Amy, Bonnie, Catherine, and Jackie), we are excited with the work we accomplished and with what the next year holds.

In July, 2012, Dr. Catherine Chmidling stepped down from her role as Coordinator with CWP and took a position at the University of Nebraska-Omaha. Dr. Chmidling has played a significant role in the success of CWP for many years. We are in the process of hiring a new Coordinator.

It continues to be an honor to direct this program. After one year as Director, I have transitioned into the role more completely and am thankful to the faculty and staff who have supported and informed our work. One of the most important and highly rewarding aspects of this position is joining faculty at the Conley House conference table to discuss course proposals, syllabi, assignments, writing instruction, assessment, and all of this for the goal of student learning.

Amy Lannin
July 2012
**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 as part of writing.
- Collaborative opportunities for faculty to share their work and their questions.

**Student Learning Objectives:** Writing Intensive Courses (WI) and Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) initiatives provide opportunities for students to think more critically and foster the ability to:
- Pose worthwhile questions
- Evaluate arguments
- Give and receive criticism
- Distinguish among fact, inference and opinion
- Articulate complex ideas clearly
- Deal with problems what have no simple solutions
- Consider purpose and audience
- Understand how given disciplines define themselves and their ways of communicating effectively
- Become informed, independent thinkers.

**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 a Revitalized and Re-energized Campus Writing Program**

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 a nationally known, well respected Campus Writing Program (CWP) that has worked continually with faculty since its inception in 1987 to offer students opportunities for putting this tool to use. In 2011 and 2012, and with a new Director, Dr. Amy Lannin, CWP’s work and accomplishments have been exceptionally comprehensive and constructive.
Special New Initiatives

Writing Retreats:

On September 30, 2011, CWP held the first Faculty Writing Retreat for faculty to come to the Conley House and write in a quiet, congenial atmosphere. These retreats have become quite successful offering faculty a “getaway” where they can write undisturbed by the usual interferences that can be overwhelming when trying to write in offices or home environments. The retreats were offered monthly during the year along with a continental breakfast, box lunch, and plenty of coffee and tea.

CWP also hosted two specialized writing retreats during the spring and summer of 2012. In May, Donna Strickland, Associate Professor in English and Director of English 1000, facilitated a week-long Mindful Writing Retreat at MU’s “Old Alumni Center,” and in July the CWP held a two-day retreat at the Historic Frederick Hotel in Boonville. This retreat followed the pattern of Conley House “getaways” plus made available editorial services from Missouri Life Magazine personnel who are housed at the Frederick. These workshops have all served to heighten awareness of teaching with writing and the particular opportunities MU offers in this area.

Special Campus Events:

On October 20, 2011, CWP joined the National Day on Writing sponsored by the National Council Teachers of English (NCTE). We established a place on the Mall where students could stop by, write a poem, and get a slice of pizza. We were rewarded with numerous wonderfully written poems and short “ditties” spread over white boards and tablets. The event also included “writing Marathons” wherein different “leaders” took interested writers to specific places on MU’s campus (e.g., Jesse Hall, specific gardens, museums) and everyone simply sat and wrote. These marathons proved to be fun and an excellent way to take the tension out of “having to write a paper” and enjoy the process on its own merit. Because these writing opportunities were fun and engaging, they accomplished CWP’s main purpose for celebrating the “National Day on Writing”: to draw attention to the importance and power of writing in our lives.

CWP also held its first Teaching Awards ceremony. Six Writing Intensive Faculty were selected by an Awards Committee of Campus Writing Board faculty and CWP staff and awarded $500 for innovative teaching in the spirit and mission of this Campus Writing Program.

In addition, Dr. Bonnie Selting, one of two CWP Coordinators, offered a series of invitational seminar meetings for experienced WI faculty only. These seminars were aimed at offering this particular faculty the opportunity to re-engage in WI philosophies and theories and to experience the collegiality that discussions of this specific teaching strategy provides. Often, workshops and seminars are conducted for those new to using writing as a teaching tool while our experienced WI faculty teach semester after semester without access to those of like mind. Indeed, one experienced WI faculty said that teaching WI in his department was like “teaching in a vacuum” with “no one to talk to” because no one else in the department taught WI. Participants in this seminar chose their own writing/teaching issue and presented on them during seminar meetings. CWP was on hand to run meetings, suggest resources, and contribute to discussions. Four of the seven participants then presented the same issue at a session of MU’s Celebration of Teaching event. According to involved faculty, the seminar was highly successful, and CWP has already selected seven faculty who wish to attend another in Fall Semester 2012.

Academic Year 2011 – 2012 Overview

Workshops & Seminars: (Please see Appendices at end of Report for Evaluations of CWP Workshops)

The Program has continued the tradition of offering 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. Along with these traditional, longer workshops, this year CWP designed several other seminars and workshops with specialized topics, purposes, and/or goals in mind. For example, along the same lines as the invitational seminar meetings described above, CWP plans to design and conduct a larger Writing Workshop Refresher for faculty who would like a review of writing instruction and assessment topics.

Specifically, during Academic Year 2011-2012, the Campus Writing Program continued to experience overall growth in course offerings and student capacity. The Program continued to expand its faculty development programming by inviting faculty to give seminar presentations with CWP providing lunches and other refreshments. These activities included discussion of issues such as: Syllabus Design, Assessment, WI Tutors’ Perspectives, and Online Course Design. They provided MU faculty with additional resources regarding student mentoring and instruction using writing. The CWP continues to fulfill its mission of supporting faculty across the curriculum as the primary agents who guide students in critical thinking and effective discipline-specific communication.

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. CWP has also continued its collaboration with the School of Medicine’s Department of Anatomy and Physiology to assist with a “Communications in Death Investigation.”

During Academic Year 2011-2012, 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 (started in Spring 2010) of the online forms used to create WI Proposals, Renewals, and Updates. In addition, the Program has made strides in revising the its website (cwp.missouri.edu) to a format compatible with all major web browsers and to improve organization and access to frequently consulted pages.

WI Course Reviews and Campus Writing Board

During Academic Year 2011-2012, beginning with the Campus Writing Board’s first meeting in July 2011 through the Board’s final vote in May 2012, the Campus Writing Board reviewed and voted on 395 courses, including 13 individual experiences, held over 7 semesters (see Table 1 below).

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 Director, meets as necessary during Winter and Summer breaks – typically once over Winter break and one to two meetings over the Summer. Board members review proposals in which faculty have applied for WI designation. These proposals come in three formats:

- New Proposals of courses which have not previously been offered as WI by the proposing faculty member
- Third-Year Renewals of previously offered WI courses which have been taught more than three years since first being proposed
- Semester Updates of previously offered WI courses which have been Proposed or Renewed within the previous three years.

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

Table 1: Table of courses reviewed and voted on by the Campus Writing Board or Campus Writing Board Advisory Group during Academic Year 2011-2012.
Wi Courses, Enrollment, and Support

For Academic Year 2011-2012, including Summer 2011, Fall 2011, and Spring 2012, the Campus Writing Program offered 400 Writing Intensive courses taken by 14,054 students, and disbursed $850,960 in OTS funding support (see Table 2 below). The WI courses had an academic-year total of 1,669 open seats, as calculated based on course capacity and each semester’s Census Day enrollment figures. The open seats calculation includes courses with prerequisites or otherwise-restricted access (such as instructor’s permission).

<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>Spring 2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>0**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Single-student courses include departmental theses & honors theses, and individual General Studies readings/capstone courses.

**All concerns on courses were resolved within each review-cycle; no courses were tabled for votes at a subsequent review-cycle.
Table 2: Summary of WI courses, WI enrollments, and WI course support across MU Schools and Colleges for the 2011-2012 fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College / School</th>
<th>Summer 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses Held (#)</td>
<td>Students Enrolled (#)</td>
<td>Support Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environ. Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Division (Honors College &amp; Interdiv.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>$5,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1-student courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals for AY 11-12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total OTS</th>
<th>Total Courses</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Total 1-student courses</th>
<th>Total open seats*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$850,960</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>14,054</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average course size including 1-student courses: 35.1 students per course

Average course size excluding 1-student courses: 36.8 students per course

* The number of open seats was calculated using course capacity minus course enrollment on Census Day. This calculation does not take into account courses limited to majors / grade-levels or with prerequisites. Mizzou Online / CDIS courses report capacities of 200 per course, but to avoid obscuring the number of available classroom seats capacities for Online/CDIS courses were calculated for this report as equal to enrollment (zero seats available).
**WI DEMOGRAPHICS**

**WI Faculty Rank Distribution**
The rank distribution for faculty teaching WI courses during Academic Year 2011-2012 is more evenly proportioned than the rank distributions of the overall MU faculty population (Figure 1, below). The population of WI faculty for academic year 2011-2012 contained a higher percentage of Assistant Professors, and lower percentages of Associate Professors, (Full) Professors, and Non-Tenure Line faculty than the percentages of those ranks in the MU full-time faculty populations. CWP’s data category of Non-Tenure Track (NTT), created for comparison with the MU Office of Institutional Research category of Non-Regular Faculty, includes all faculty who self-identified as ‘Non-Tenure Line Teaching/Clinical Faculty,’ ‘Non-Tenure Line Visiting/part-time Faculty,’ and ‘Grad Teaching Asst/Grad Instructor.’

Figure 1: Academic Year 2011-2012 faculty rank comparisons between MU faculty and WI faculty populations.
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**WI Course Level Distribution**
The distribution of WI courses, WI student enrollment, OTS support, and available seats in WI courses (as of Census Day) across the 1000 to 4000 course levels (Figure 2, below) reveals that 58% of WI courses are offered at the 4000 level. They serve 34% of WI students, received 21.6% of OTS funds, and had 57.5% of the available open WI seats as of Census Day. WI course offerings at the 3000-level represents 26% of WI courses, served 31.7% of all WI students, received 32.6% of OTS funds, and had 16% of the available open WI seats as of Census Day. The 2000-level WI courses were similar to the 3000-level courses in percent of OTS support and percent of open seats, but served slightly fewer students (25% of all WI students) and represented considerably fewer courses (12% of all WI courses). WI courses at the 1000-level represent only 2.75% of WI courses and 7.6% of WI student enrollment. The 1000-level WI courses receive 11% of OTS support and had 4% of the available open WI seats on Census Day.
**Figure 2:** Academic year 2011-2012 percentages of WI courses, WI students, OTS support, and available seats as of Census Day grouped by course level (1000- through 4000-level).

Much academic and popular-culture attention (such as Gladwell 2008, *Outliers*) has focused in recent years on the importance of frequent and extended time devoted to skill mastery with feedback on performance. Clustering over half the available WI courses at the 4000-level may be less beneficial to students’ development of critical thinking and clear communication skills for use and improvement *during* their undergraduate education, than if more WI courses were available and encouraged at lower levels earlier in individual curricula.

**WI Course Size Distribution**

Figures 3 and 4 (below) displays the percentages of WI courses, WI student enrollment, OTS support, and percent full-to-capacity relative to course size as determined by Census Day enrollment. Figure 5 (below) shows the percentages of WI courses, enrollments, OTS support, and capacity aggregated into only two categories. WI courses sized 60-students or fewer represent 87% of the WI courses offered, served 53% of WI students, and received 27.5% of WI OTS funds. WI courses sized 61 students or more represent 13% of the WI courses offered, served 47% of WI students, and received 72% of WI OTS funds. The courses of 60 students and fewer were on-average filled to 86% of capacity while those of 61 students or more were on-average filled to 94% of capacity.
Figure 3. Academic year 2011-2012 percentages of WI courses, WI students, and OTS support grouped by course size as determined by Census Day enrollment.
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Figure 4. Academic year 2011-2012 percentages of WI courses, WI students, and percent full-to-capacity, grouped by course size as determined by Census Day enrollment.
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Figure 5. OTS support aggregated into course sizes fewer and larger than 60 students, as determined by Census Day enrollment.

Campus Writing Program Growth

Academic year 2011-2012 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 16 years. Figure 6 (below) shows the growth in WI courses and WI student enrollment, while Figures 7 and 8 (below) show the parallel growth in WI courses and corresponding OTS support, and WI student enrollment and OTS support paid. Increases in WI student enrollment follow overall increases in University enrollments (see Figure 9, below).
Figure 6: Number of WI courses and WI student enrollment for Fall 1995 through Spring 2012. Summer courses and enrollments are not shown.

Figure 7: WI courses and OTS payments for Fall 1995 through Spring 2012.
Figure 8: WI student enrollment and OTS payments for Fall 1995 through Spring 2012.
Figure 9: Longitudinal comparison of WI Enrollments and WI OTS funds relative to total MU freshman class and total MU undergraduate class for Fall 1997 through Fall 2011. While WI enrollments have largely kept pace with overall undergraduate growth, suggesting adequate WI course availability, the WI OTS support (displayed in units of $100 in order to use the same vertical axis as WI and Freshman enrollment) has remained relatively flat since the funding model was changed from a per teaching assistant FTE to a per student calculation in Fall 2003.
Summary Of Campus Writing Board Topics

WI Requirements
CWP and the Campus Writing Board addressed the concerns raised regarding clarity of the Writing Intensive requirements at MU. It was brought to our attention that the requirements were worded differently in various published sources. The confusion rested on whether the WI requirements were two courses or six credits. After much deliberation as a Board, with CUE, with Undergraduate Deans, and others, we presented a draft to CUE for their approval (see Appendix 1 for the WI Requirements document). The CWB will re-visit this issue as other questions arise. For instance, there is still uncertainty about how best to address the English 1000 prerequisite.

OTS Course Funding Formula
Since WI courses exceeded CWP’s budget for course support by $33,000 in 2010-2011, throughout the 2011-2012 Academic Year CWP’s staff consulted with Deans, Chairs, and faculty to gather information and ideas on OTS funding models. The ever-increasing demands on CWP’s course support budget are due to continued increased enrollment in courses larger than 20 students. While the CWP WI Guidelines and WAC philosophies recommend a 20:1 student:instructor ratio, the current funding formula offers strong financial incentive for departments to design single, very large WI courses as both standardized curricular WI course offerings and sources for departmental revenue. These large WI courses exhaust CWP’s budget at a growing rate and will in the near future affect the efficacy of one of the best-known, and most well-respected campus-wide programs in the country.

CWP and Campus Writing Board Chair, Catherine Rymph, visited with Department Chairs, Faculty, Deans, and others about the funding formula for Writing Intensive courses. We compiled the information gathered from these visits and prepared numerous versions of funding models. We presented these eventually to Provost Brian Foster and MU Budget Director Tim Rooney. It was determined that the current funding allocation is inadequate. Therefore, a funding model that is indexed to enrollment will be adopted by Fall 2013. In addition, WI courses will only be funded up to 300 students. At this point the current model will continue to be used ($110 per student over the first 20 enrolled) for 2012-2013.

Faculty Development Awards
On July 1, 2012, the Campus Writing Program began accepting proposals for newly established awards to provide faculty and departments funds to create new programs or courses to enhance their Writing Intensive offerings. The initial accepted proposals will be funded by Fall 2012.

Seminars & Workshops
August 15/16, 2011 Faculty Workshop
August 20, 2011 TA Workshop
August 26, 2011 TA Workshop Makeup Session
September 21, 2011 CWP Seminar: Responding & Grading (Catherine Chmidling)
September 29, 2011 WITS Workshop
September 30, 2011 Faculty Writing Retreat
October 21, 2011 Faculty Writing Retreat
October 25, 2011 WITS Workshop
October 26, 2011 CWP Seminar: Managing a Large WI Course at MU (Cynthia Reeser, HDFS)
November 16, 2011 CWP Seminar: Syllabus Design (Bonnie Selting)
November 17, 2011 WITS Workshop
December 2, 2011 Faculty Writing Retreat
January 5/6, 2012 Faculty Writing Retreat
January 9/10, 2012 Faculty Workshop
January 12, 2012 HDFS Workshop
January 13, 2012 TA Workshop
February 3, 2012  Faculty Writing Retreat
February 15, 2012  CWP Seminar: Writing Assessment (Amy Lannin/Bonnie Selting)
March 9, 2012  Faculty Writing Retreat
March 14, 2012  CWP Seminar: Online Course Design and Instruction (Amy Lannin/Catherine Chmidling)
April 13, 2012  Faculty Writing Retreat
April 18, 2012  CWP Seminar: What Your Students Won’t Tell You, A WI Tutor’s Perspective (Rachel Harper/Aaron Harms, MU Learning Center)
May 4, 2012  CWP Awards & Recognition Ceremony/Reception
May 4, 2012  Faculty Writing Retreat
July 12/13, 2012  Faculty Writing Retreat (Boonville, MO)

CWP continues to work in collaboration with a growing number of university departments and programs such as:

- Human Development and Family Studies 2400 assignment design, Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA) training, and “norming” sessions to promote consistent assessment of student writing across multiple graders.
- Graduate School Preparing Future Faculty seminar series session on using writing assignments across the curriculum and working with student writing.
- Graduate School Dissertation BootCamp and new strategies for facilitating dissertation writing for both graduate students and their advisors. A CWP Coordinator will serve as Advisor to a new organization graduate students have developed and designed around dissertation writing activities.
- Sinclair School of Nursing on consulting and helping write a growing number of proposals for funding WI initiatives.
- Sinclair School of Nursing on Evidence Based Practice course
- CWP participation in Advisors on the Mall, to facilitate communication on WI course availability to advisors and students preparing for early registration.
- CWP collaboration with the School of Medicine’s Department of Anatomy and Physiology and Columbia Police Department to assist with a Communications in Forensics training course.

AY 2011-2012 Program staff:
Dr. Amy Lannin, Director (started June 2011)
Dr. Catherine Chmidling, Coordinator
Dr. Bonita Selting, Coordinator
Jackie Thomas, Administrative Assistant
Brittany Meador, Graduate Research Assistant

Program Staff Activities:

**Dr. Catherine Chmidling**
Coordinator: Campus Writing Board Education and Social Science Subcommittee and Natural and Applied Sciences Subcommittee

**Coordinating activities:**
CWP internal research on program growth and change.
Maintain records and troubleshoot problematic issues for Writing Intensive faculty submissions of New Course Proposals, Updates, and Renewals for WI approval.
Maintain CWP database and webforms with Tanys Nelson, ET@MO.

**Consultations / Collaborations:**
Consulted with multiple WI faculty: individual appointments, WI workshops and retreats, Fall 2011 - Spring 2012
Consulted with multiple attendees, Graduate School Dissertation Bootcamp, Fall 2011

**On-Campus Professional Development:**
Abell Conversations in College Science Teaching
Teaching Experience:
Spring 2012, Adjunct Faculty, Anthropology 230: Old World Archaeology, and Computer Science 150: Introduction to GIS (Geographic Information Science), Missouri Valley College, Marshall, MO.
Fall 2011, Adjunct Faculty, Liberal Arts 186: Introduction to Anthropology, Stephens College, Columbia, MO.

Newsletter Publications:

Workshops and Seminars:
Fall 2011 - Conducted two day Faculty Workshop on Writing Intensive courses with Amy Lannin and Bonnie Selting.
Fall 2011 - Conducted full day Teaching Assistant Workshop for TAs assigned to Writing Intensive courses with Bonnie Selting.
Fall 2011 – Designed and presented Basic Communications Skills discussion for Communications in Forensics Conference, MU Medical School Department of Pathology and Anatomical Sciences.
Spring 2012 - Conducted two day Faculty Workshop on Writing Intensive courses with Amy Lannin and Bonnie Selting.
Spring 2012 - Conducted full day Teaching Assistant Workshop for TAs assigned to Writing Intensive courses with Amy Lannin and Bonnie Selting.
Spring 2012 - Designed and conducted WAC seminar for Missouri Valley College with Bonne Selting.
Spring 2012 - Designed and presented Celebration of Teaching seminar on plagiarism with Bonne Selting.

Campus Outreach:
CWP representative to MU Advisors Forum

Dr. Bonita Selting
Coordinator, Campus Writing Board Humanities and Arts (HA), (temporarily) Natural and Applied Sciences (NAS) and Education and Social Sciences (ESS) Subcommittees

Coordinating Activities:
Ongoing: Conducting original research on the use of Rubrics for writing assessment, working with MU WI faculty
Ongoing: Maintain records and troubleshoot problematic issues for Writing Intensive faculty submissions of New Course Proposals, Updates, and/or Renewals for WI approval
Ongoing: Work with Campus Writing Board and Humanities and Arts Subcommittee on WI issues and programmatic practices / problems

Consultation / Collaboration:
Ongoing: Consult/ Collaborate with HDFS 2400 instructor: Dr. Cynthia Reeser on
- Best Practice theory for using writing to learn concepts, assignment design, and rhetoric / composition theory.
- Norming papers, Assessment
- Presenting best of student writing to Dr. Reeser’s lecture class.
Ongoing: Consulting with professional nursing faculty, Louise Miller, on RN to BSN Program
- Nursing Evidence Based Practice 4930

Professional Conferences:
- Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), St. Louis, March, 2012
- International Writing Across the Curriculum (IWAC), Savannah, Georgia, June 7-9, presented workshops on Interdisciplinary Writing Programs with Amy Lannin and Catherine Chmidling
- Writing Program Administrator (WPA) Conference

Publications
- “Using Service Learning to Help Military Veterans Adjust to College Life” in forthcoming book Generation Vet, Editors: Sue Doe and Lisa Langstraat, Colorado State University: University of
Workshops and Norming Sessions:

**Fall Semester, 2011:** Facilitated 51st Faculty Writing Workshop, August 2011 with Amy Lannin, Catherine Chmidling, and Jackie Thomas

 Designed and facilitated Teaching Assistant (TA) Workshop, with Catherine Chmidling, August 2011

**Spring Semester, 2012:** Facilitated 52nd Faculty Writing Workshop, January 2012 with Amy Lannin, Catherine Chmidling, and Jackie Thomas

 Designed and facilitated Teaching Assistant (TA) Workshop, with Catherine Chmidling, August 2011

 Designed and facilitated a “make-up” TA workshop for TAs and their faculty

 Designed, organized, and facilitated new Experienced Writing Intensive (WI) Faculty Seminar

- Assigned projects
- Facilitated with composition resources and theories
- Arranged meetings and met with individual attendees

 Participated (consulting, assisting writers; personal/professional writing) in eight Writing Retreats at Conley House

 Conducted workshops on writing in professional nursing for Community Health Nursing Evidence Based Practice (EBP) 4930, Sinclair School of Nursing to following classes:

- Two workshops per Fall and Spring Semesters dealing with on higher order (critical thinking for development and persuasive strategies, organization, audience and purpose, etc.) and lower order issues (punctuation and other mechanical considerations)
- Design sessions with instructor: assignment issues, storyboarding, script writing
- Writing sessions with instructor for article stemming from this teaching project
- Basic assignment and assessment designs

Teaching:

- Assistant Teaching Professor faculty status in English Department and Sinclair School of Nursing.
- Taught English 1000, one section, Fall Semester 2011 and one section, Spring Semester 2012
- Taught English 1000, one section, Spring Semester 2012

MU Service:

- Assist WI faculty on Celebration of Teaching presentations
- Work with CWP Director to acquaint MU campus with National Writing Day
- CWP representative for CUE

Special Projects:

- Worked with Louise Miller, Ph.D., RN on Grants to obtain funds for new courses in nursing.
- Ongoing study of using writing in professional nursing
- Seminar for Experienced WI faculty
- Research ongoing on Writing Program Assessment methodology

Outreach:

- Conducted Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Workshop at Missouri Valley College (MVC)
- Planned, designed, arranged for future WAC Workshop (August 2012) as requested by MVC
- Worked with CWP Director on National Writing Project seminars and projects

Dr. Amy Lannin
Director, Campus Writing Program

**Director Activities:**

Ongoing: Oversee the CWP programs, including weekly staff meetings, coordination with the Campus Writing Board Chair, attending all CWP sub-committee and Board meetings, representing CWP at campus-wide meetings,
completing the tasks established by the board (i.e. Funding Models, WI Requirements, and other policies), working on budget/fiscal documents with Jackie Thomas, and coordinating the Awards Task Force.

Research Activities:
Ongoing: Conducting research on writing instruction and assessment, working with high school English-Language Arts faculty (finished Year 2 of a 3-year study through Missouri State University, supported by the Local Site Research Initiative of the National Writing Project).
Assisting with Dr. Rebecca Dierking, Truman University, on E-Reader research study.

Consultation / Collaboration:
Ongoing: Consult/ Collaborate with instructors (Dr. Cynthia Reeser, Dr. Bill Lamberson, Dr. Arthur Mehrhoff, Dr. Louise Miller, Dr. Ellis Ingram) and with Mizzou Online staff.

Professional Conferences (presented at each of the following):
- National Council Teachers of English, Chicago, IL, November 2011
- Literacy Research Association, Daytona, Fl, December 2011
- Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), St. Louis, March, 2012
- Write to Learn, Missouri Language Arts Conference, March 2012
- International Writing Across the Curriculum (IWAC), Savannah, Georgia, June, 2012
- Writing Program Administrators Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico, July 2012

Publications
- “Let Them Write! Using Freewriting in the Classroom” (under review for The English Journal)
- “The Importance of Interdisciplinarity in a Writing Program” with Bonnie Selting, (Forthcoming)
- “Juggling and Dodgeball: Learning from a Two-year Study of Professional Development Experiences on the Teaching of Writing” with Keri Franklin (under review for Professional Development in Education)

Workshops:
Fall Semester, 2011:
- Facilitated 51st Faculty Writing Workshop, August 2011 with Bonnie Selting, Catherine Chmidling, and Jackie Thomas
- Assisted with Teaching Assistant (TA) Workshop, with Bonnie Selting and Catherine Chmidling, August 2011
- Presented to English 8640 Seminar in English for Marty Townsend, with Bonnie Selting and Catherine Chmidling September 2011

Spring Semester, 2012:
- Facilitated 52nd Faculty Writing Workshop, January 2012 with Bonnie Selting, Catherine Chmidling, and Jackie Thomas
- Facilitated for the January 19 Faculty Seminar, with Marty Townsend
- Facilitated the CWP Workshop on Assessment, February 15, with Bonnie Selting

Facilitated and participated in eight Writing Retreats at Conley House and two summer writing retreats.

Teaching:
- Assistant Professor in English Education
- Taught LTC 8615, The Missouri Writing Project, Summer 2012
- Advise and serve on 18 doctoral committees (Chair or Co-Chair of 4 during 2011-2012)

MU Service:
• Presented twice at the 2012 MU Celebration of Teaching
• Coordinated MU events for National Day on Writing
• Serve on the Literacy Committee in the College of Education

Outreach:
• Conducted Writing Workshop and Consultations at Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, MO, 2011-2012
• Director, Missouri Writing Projects Network
• Board Member, Missouri Council Teachers of English
APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Writing Intensive (WI) Requirements for University of Missouri Undergraduates

The following items constitute the Writing Intensive 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.

Appendix 2

Fall 2011 Faculty WI Workshop
August 15-16, 2011

21 Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Assistant Professors</th>
<th>4 Graduate Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Associate Professors</td>
<td>6 Teaching/Clinical Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Professor</td>
<td>2 Visiting/Part-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants:

- Eileen Bjornstrom: Sociology
- David Brune: Agricultural Systems Management
- Andrew Clarke: Food Science
- Marvin Feldman: Cardiopulmonary and Diagnostic Sciences
- Kristin Flynn-Peters: Health Professions
- Nina Furstenau: Agricultural Journalism
- Adam Galovan: Human Development And Family Studies
- Martha Hawkins: Curriculum And Instruction
- Lindy Hern: Peace Studies
- Marilyn James-Kracke: Medical Pharmacology And Physiology
- Jennifer Keely: Respiratory Therapy
- Ashlie Lester: Human Development And Family Studies
- Monica Marcos-Ilinas: Spanish
- Jeimmie Nevalga: Journalism
- Clark Peters: Social Work
- Victoria Shaffer: Health Professions
- John Stansfield: Finance
<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>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2. It was easy to remain attentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>6%</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>89%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3c. Bean’s <em>Engaging Ideas</em> chapters were worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4. I would have preferred other methods of presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5. The presenters did not synthesize, integrate, or summarize effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6. Some things were not explained well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7. The workshop encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10. The information presented seemed timely and up to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12. Presenters wasted time by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0%</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>11%</td>
<td>89%</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>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20. I would advise colleagues to attend future workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unanswered questions and fractional scores (2.5, 3.5, etc) yield Agree/Disagree percentages of less than 100%*
OVERALL SCORE: 87.5% (B+)

Comments:

How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?

- I will provide more info to students about the WHY of writing. I understand better how to grade HOC vs LOC.
- Helped with syllabus preparation; ideas about handling plagiarism; ideas about grading.
- J. Stansfield - I’ll be more kind in responding to bad writing.
- I am better aware of how writing can be used to stimulate thinking and student growth.
- I will be able to create grading rubrics for grading papers.
- I will try not to edit student papers, rather provide comments on larger issues.
- I have already incorporated some of the new ideas into my syllabus and writing assignments.
- I felt relieved to hear that we are not obligated to give feedback on all of the changes required for the student to receive an 'A'. It will also help with syllabus design and assignment clarity.
- Focus on the purposes of WI courses.
- 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?)

- Plagiarism talk initially good, but data of what is in Provost Office is misleading. Preventing plagiarism - info on how to handle would be more useful.
- the 1-hour presentations could be more concise.
- more on grading - J. Stansfield
- Discuss a bit about norming sessions and how WI may be implemented in large courses.
- The Comp1000 discussion could include more specifics about what they do in that class.
- If participants are asked to work on a project, it is hard to do that if the presenter keeps talking.

What should CWP do now to follow through with further assistance for you? (Such as consultations, norming sessions, departmental workshops, or other?)

- I went to a norming session once and I found it helpful. - R. Summerville

Any other comment you care to add?

- Great food.
- J. Stansfield - You could do this in 1 day - start w/ breakfast, end with drinks @ 5:00 pm.
- I had fun! Thanks for the awesome lunches!
- Thank you.
- Fantastic food & snacks!
- Really liked sample course syllabus
- Clear that presenters are partners & allies with students (which is great), & that you have an uphill road working with faculty who have a definite ‘us vs them' mentality. My only constructive comment would be structuring group discussions to limit this dynamic.
Appendix 2
Fall 2010 Faculty/TA WI Workshop
August 19, 2011

3 Faculty Attendees:
- Computer Science
- Food Science
- Psychological Sciences

44 Graduate Teaching Assistant Attendees:
- Accountancy (1)
- Agricultural Economics (2)
- Anthropology (1)
- Art History and Archaeology (1)
- Biochemistry (3)
- Biological Sciences (3)
- Cardiopulmonary and Diagnostic Sciences (1)
- Computer Science (1)
- Diagnostic Medical Ultrasound (2)
- Fisheries and Wildlife (1)
- Food Science (1)
- German (2)
- Human Development and Family Studies (13)
- Political Science (3)
- Psychological Sciences (1)
- Respiratory Therapy (1)
- Sociology (1)
- Textile and Apparel Management (3)

Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>SA = Strongly agree</th>
<th>D = Disagree more than agree</th>
<th>A = Agree more than disagree</th>
<th>SD = Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The workshop’s objectives were clear.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to remain attentive.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. The workshop content was worthwhile.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. The workbook and handouts were worthwhile.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would have preferred other methods of presentation.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The presenters did not synthesize, integrate, or summarize effectively.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Some things were not explained well.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The workshop encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The information presented seemed timely and up to date.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Presenters wasted time by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. During the workshop I felt free to ask questions or express my opinion.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SA/A | D/SD | Evaluation Questions
---|---|---
9% | 91% | 15. The scope of the workshop was too limited; not enough material was covered.
97% | 3% | 16. I will be able to use some of the ideas from the workshop in teaching my course(s).
100% | 0% | 17. The workshop acknowledged the connections between writing, reading, and thinking.
97% | 0% | 18. The workshop offered practical advice about responding to student writing.
94% | 6% | 19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing

*Note: Unanswered questions and fractional scores (3.5, 2.5, etc) yield Agree/Disagree percentages of less than 100%*

OVERALL SCORE: 91.7% (A)

Comments:

What information was the most helpful for you?
- Grading; TA scenarios
- Discussing the scenarios
- Possible scenarios we may encounter; how to comment on student papers most effectively
- The hints/tips to focus and prioritize writing issues will be very helpful.
- Difficult scenarios discussion.
- Connecting grading with the professor's grading rubric.
- I am new so the entire presentation was helpful.
- The scenario discussion & plagiarism info.
- Grading & commenting section.
- Scenarios; commenting on 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?)
- ESL issues; how to deal with athletes who know in advance they'll be missing class time.
- I thought the day's presentations were clear and informative.
- ESL.
- Longer time to discuss scenarios.
- More discussion of ESL.
- Providing a list of resources for students to utilize.
- Other resources on campus to address difficult scenarios.
- Possibly ESL issues.
- Discussions can be more detail to solve the different issues.
- Handout to give students with resources.

How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?
- Get me into thinking as a TA instead of as an instructor - "I am not the boss!"
- I will be more aware of how I respond to students.
- I think it has helped my teaching skills
- The workshop will allow me to grade in a more economical manner.
- I will certainly continue to use the packet! It has great information.
- It will help because I am new.
- It will make me more prepared for grading papers!
- Significant improvement.
• More organized & effective.
• Positively, especially in comments.

How can the Campus Writing Program follow through with further assistance for you?
• Just be available!
• More workshops: follow-up.
• Send emails.
• Giving contact info for future programs.
• Be available to answer questions.
• CWP does a very good job of this as is.
• Just being there for us to contact if we need help later on.
• Email updates, events, resources.
• Other workshops throughout the semester regarding other WI-TA topics.

Would you advise colleagues to attend future workshops? Yes/No Why?
Yes: 27
No: 0
• General, not specific enough
• Too drawn out. Does not need to be a 5hr event. Streamline the content & eliminate some of the group work.
• It was geared specifically to WI courses, not just general TA issues
• It was nice being a first time TA and gathering some knowledge for my students.
• The workshop was helpful.
• This is very helpful for navigating a WI course, especially for new TAs.
• I liked the group work and communication with group members.
• Helpful for those who have never taught or want to hear how others run their classrooms.
• Definitely! Great resource.

Please write additional comments in the space below.
• I enjoyed the workshop, however some materials were too basic
• Enjoyed interaction and liveliness of presenters.
Appendix 3
Spring 2012 Faculty WI Workshop
January 9-10, 2012

15 Attendees:

5 Assistant Professors
1 Graduate Instructor
1 Associate Professors
1 Non-Teaching Staff
1 Professor
6 Teaching/Clinical Faculty

Participants:

Alicia Aviles-Quinones  Spanish
Lisa Bauer  Psychological Sciences
Angela Curl  Social Work
Yujiang Fang  Surgery
Maya Gibson  Music
Jonathan Green  Animal Sciences
Aaron Harms  Student Success Center
J. Brian Houston  Communication
Mike Jenner  Journalism
Chris Lee  Biochemistry
Michael Marlo  English
Jeffrey Mccully  Sociology
Heidi Monroe  Nursing
Dale Musser  Computer Science
Mario Pennella  Biochemistry

Evaluation Summary

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

NOTE: Questions 4, 5, 6, 12, and 15 were changed from those used in Fall 2011

<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>0%</td>
<td>3a. The workshop content was worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3b. The handouts were worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3c. Bean’s Engaging Ideas chapters were worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4. The presentation methods were effective and efficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5. The presenters effectively synthesized, integrated and/ or summarized information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6. Explanations were clear and comprehensible, including answers to questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7. The workshop encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA/A</td>
<td>D/SD</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10. The information presented seemed timely and up to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12. Presenters did not waste time by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</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>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15. The scope of the workshop was appropriate for its purpose and audience.</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>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20. I would advise colleagues to attend future workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unanswered questions and fractional scores (2.5, 3.5, etc) yield Agree/Disagree percentages of less than 100%*

**OVERALL SCORE: 91.6% (A-)**

**Comments:**

How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?

- Well, I agree with 99% of what you say, so the good news is making the connections with faculty was awesome. - Aaron Harms
- It makes me more confident and gives me lot of basic skills in handling WI. - Yujiang Fang
- I learned to really organize and explain my assignments thoroughly. - Jeffrey McCully
- Positive effect. Many ideas will be integrated. - Dale Musser
- I came away with some good ideas for crafting assignments, syllabi, for working with the writing center, for revision assignments.
- Positive ways mostly. - Maya Gibson
- There are rubric things I did not think about that I will definitely incorporate into my assignments. - Chris Lee
- I really like the idea of grading/providing feedback using audio recordings.
- Clarity of instruction regarding assignments will be stronger.
- It will help me provide better feedback on writing and will help encourage my students in their writing. - Heidi Monroe

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?)

- The present content’s already good enough due to it’s only two days lecture. - Yujiang Fang
- You don’t need to print out all the powerpoint slides. - Jeffrey McCully
- Perhaps have people in similar disciplines work together on projects.
- General info about the board and history were less practical. - Maya Gibson
A movie after lunch = bad idea. I did not like or understand the relevance of the selfish gene theory handouts. - Chris Lee

the history of the CWB board didn’t see necessary. Although Donna Strickland was a fine presenter, her presentation topic did not seem very pertinent to my situation and the time slot seemed a little longer than necessary.

I would have liked more examples of work and how others would have graded it and maybe a table discussion on it. - Heidi Monroe

What should CWP do now to follow through with further assistance for you? (Such as consultations, norming sessions, departmental workshops, or other?)

- Definitely follow-up at opportune times throughout the semester. - Aaron Harms
- Consultations. - Yujiang Fang
- Please keep me posted on the status of my proposal. - Jeffrey McCully
- I’d need more time to think about this. - Maya Gibson
- A shorter 1-day review workshop would be good for people after attendign this workshop. I would definitely attend. - Chris Lee
- Maybe more of the above. - Heidi Monroe

Any other comment you care to add?

- Food was great!! - Aaron Harms
- Two days is a bit much. Could this be consolidated into one day? Would be long, but some of the discussion/work time could be cut. The work time was a little weird anyway since everyone wasn’t at the same stage of their course. In other words, some attendees were already teaching, planning on teaching, just thinking about teaching, etc.
- This workshop was informative and fun. The facilitators offered great advice and answered questions thoroughly. - Jeffrey McCully
- Great sessions! - Dale Musser
- I might revise sessions for more specific break out info like having people who need suggestions on peer review spend time talking to "experts" about peer review and other stuff like that. - Maya Gibson
- I enjoyed the discussion with fellow faculty members from across the campus. It was very helpful. - Chris Lee
- I find the timing of the workshop a bit unfortunate. I’m teaching my course beginning in one week and wish I had had the workshop much earlier in my planning for the course.
- the presenters and the CWP staff were amazing! - Heidi Monroe
Appendix 4  
Spring 2011 Faculty/TA WI Workshop  
January 13, 2012  

4 Faculty Attendees:  
- Classics  
- Health Professions  
- Geography  
- Textile and Apparel Management  

24 Graduate Teaching Assistant Attendees:  
- Agricultural Economics (1)  
- Art History and Archaeology (1)  
- Biochemistry (1)  
- Biological Sciences (1)  
- Classics (4)  
- Educational, School and Counseling Psychology (1)  
- Geography  
- Nursing (1)  
- Physical Therapy (1)  
- Political Science (3)  
- Social Work (3)  

Evaluation Summary  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>SA = Strongly agree</th>
<th>D = Disagree more than agree</th>
<th>A = Agree more than disagree</th>
<th>SD = Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The workshop’s objectives were clear.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to remain attentive.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. The workshop content was worthwhile.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. The workbook and handouts were worthwhile.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The presentation methods were effective and efficient.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The presenters effectively synthesized, integrated and/or summarized information.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Explanations were clear and comprehensible, including answers to questions.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The workshop encouraged development of new viewpoints and appreciations.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The workshop provided opportunities to apply learned experiences to demonstrate understanding.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My interest in this topic has been stimulated as a result of this workshop.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The information presented seemed timely and up to date.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The pace at which the presenters covered the material was just about right.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Presenters did not waste time by dwelling on insignificant, irrelevant material.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The workshop raised challenging questions or problems for discussion.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. During the workshop I felt free to ask questions or express my opinion.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The scope of the workshop was appropriate for its purpose and audience.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Questions 4, 5, 6, 12, and 15 were changed from those used in Fall 2011.
<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>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>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19. The workshop offered practical advice about grading student writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unanswered questions and fractional scores (3.5, 2.5, etc) yield Agree/Disagree percentages of less than 100%*

**OVERALL SCORE: 92.5% (A)**

Comments:

**What information was the most helpful for you?**
- I liked the writing = thinking idea.
- Exercises in grading/commenting; exercises in responding to scenarios.
- Exercises were helpful.
- Comments on student papers.
- Practical info about norming and plagiarism, but all was interesting.
- The 3 comments on the one paper were helpful in that I could get a better idea of what is and isn’t helpful to students.
- The group discussion about the teaching/TA scenarios.
- The rubric guide. I will use it in the future.
- The sample grading exercise.
- The session on marking students’ papers: great examples, useful suggestions.

**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?)**
- Some pointers on establishing a rapport with students and creating a safe, 'discussion-friendly' setting.
- Spend more time on grading exercises and rubric examples.
- More on Professor-TA collaboration.
- Hit all the high points well! Maybe more about protecting TA’s time?
- A little long... more hot coffee?
- I would have liked to practice grading with different types of rubrics.
- How best to assist ESL students: come up in WIT session, but needs to be addressed.
- Could be a little shorter.
- More time on how to grade jointly (Instructor/TA)
- I can’t think of anything that needs to be added.

**How do you think the workshop will affect your teaching?**
- I’m more excited about the semester now and more confident. Reminded me why this is important and why it matters.
- Very helpful suggestions I will include in syllabus.
- I will continue to clarify and modify assignments.
- TAs and I have a shared vocabulary for working with the class and shared goals. This session underlined and developed further some of what I’ve already been discussing with them.
- There were helpful reminders in regard to dealing with students that I hope to use this semester.
- This workshop has been very helpful to me as a first year TA, and I have learned how to address and comment on my students’ papers.
- It has given me a good place to start from.
- I feel enabled to give much more helpful and encouraging feedback to students.
- I am hoping to be a fair grader; I feel as though I know where/how to steer my comments on papers.
- I feel more prepared in facing the potential adversities of grading papers.

How can the Campus Writing Program follow through with further assistance for you?
- Mid-semester check-in - how’s it going?
- Maintaining a strong relationship with both students and departments.
- Nada. Great job!
- I am happy to know that I have back up support.
- Not sure.
- More information about learning opportunities.

Would you advise colleagues to attend future workshops? Yes/No  Why?
- Yes: 21
- No: 0
- Particularly if this is your first time through it’s a helpful orientation.
- It was informative.
- You may not realize the impact your comments have.
- The workshop was great!
- Very helpful.

Please write additional comments in the space below.
- I didn’t understand some of the words used in the critical thinking presentation.
- Thanks for lunch!
- Very informative workshop. Material and speakers were very engaging.
- Thank you!
- The presenters (all three) were fantastic - engaging, knowledgeable, enthusiastic, and helpful.