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Annual Report 2015
Director’s Introduction

The Campus Writing Program has been actively celebrating its 30th year during the 2015-2016 academic year. We have been reviewing historical documents of the CWP, and a consistent finding is the unwavering support of MU faculty to see that writing is taught in meaningful ways across the curriculum. Many of the CWP founders and early leaders have maintained their support and involvement of this program. Whether through attending events, sending emails, stopping by the Conley House, we are thankful for this support of the CWP mission. This has been a time to celebrate but, more importantly, to continue the work of supporting faculty to teach with writing.

As we reflect on this year, and on the 30 years as a program, it is about the people. For four years, we have recognized Win Horner, first chair of the Writing Program Task Force. Our 2016 Win Horner Honoree for Innovative WI Teaching was Gerry Summers, Biological Sciences. Dr. Summers has been a consistent model of innovative WI teaching. We also recognize Doug Hunt, former CWP Director. Dr. Hunt assisted with the Celebration of Teaching Reception in May, and as we gathered artifacts to share, we appreciate his careful documentation of the first several years of CWP. We have records of the faculty input that resulted in the policies, guidelines, workshops, and what became thousands of reviewed and approved Writing Intensive courses. The past three years, Marty Townsend, CWP Director 1991-2006, served on the Campus Writing Board. Dr. Townsend has been a leader in WAC efforts nationally and internationally. We continue to gain valuable insight and direction from Marty’s experiences. Visitors at The Conley House will find the names of many other stalwart supporters of writing-across-the-curriculum at this campus. Yes, as we reflect on this year, and on the 30 years as a program, it is about the people—the faculty who started the program, the leaders who supported it, the faculty who continue leading and teaching, and the staff who make the day-to-day operations run smoothly. Most certainly, this program is about the students. We would not spend the extra time and energy to assign and grade thousands of pages of writing each semester if we didn't believe that this IS one of the best ways to teach. A few years ago, a member of the Campus Writing Board explained to me that she only writes letters of recommendation for students who have been in her WI courses because those are the students she really knows. This comment has stayed with me over the years. It is a reminder that through writing we get to know about our students. And it is through writing that our students can come to a deeper understanding of what we are teaching. May their words (and ours) make a difference.

Amy Lannin
June 2016
Our mission is to support faculty as the primary agents of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) theories and practices in educating students through principles of “writing-to-learn” and “learning-to-write.” We believe that teaching by these principles will enhance students’ critical thinking abilities and better engage them in complex problem solving while they learn to communicate with clear, effective language in discipline-specific ways. CWP has been conceived, developed, and governed by faculty as a rallying point for collaboration and sharing of writing-to-learn and learning-to-write theories and practices.
CWP Program Objectives

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

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

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

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

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

Program Methodologies to Attain Objectives

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Average number of WI courses students completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Faculty awarded for teaching excellence in WI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Faculty Mentors Providing Support for fellow Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46+</td>
<td>Published works from faculty who participated in writing retreats in AY 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Undergraduate student papers awarded and published in Artifacts, our undergraduate writing journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Of faculty somewhat, mostly, or completely satisfied with support from CWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Of faculty somewhat, mostly, or completely satisfied with teaching WI class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Approval of WI experience from undergraduate students in a recent case study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Average Grade from WI Faculty and TAs who attend CWP semi-annual workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Writing Intensive Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

13,810 WI Students
The Campus Writing Board is comprised of 18 voting faculty members divided into three subcommittees:

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

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

The Campus Writing Board, Chaired by Dr. Deanna Sharpe, Personal Financial Planning, addressed numerous topics, in addition to reviewing WI Course proposals and Writing Intensive Project Award proposals. The following topics were key agenda items:

• Selected members of a Task Force charged with revising CWP’s OTS (Other Teaching Staff) funding model
• Developed new OTS funding model through the work of a specially nominated Task Force
• Completed “Teaching with Writing” website
• Updated the Writing Intensive Guidelines, Large Enrollment Course Guidelines, and Guidelines for Group Work
• Continued and refined Peer Mentoring program
• Addressed the “straggler” issue for late courses and revised the procedure for more timely notification of approved courses
• And, most importantly, reviewed and approved over 375 WI courses just this past year!
Faculty Development Awards

During the 2015-2016 year, and with the continued support of the Provost and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the Campus Writing Program (CWP) refined and increased awareness of Faculty Development Awards (FDA). Writing Intensive instructors at all ranks can be awarded up to $10,000 for projects that align with our mission to support faculty as the primary agents in educating students to reason critically, solve complex problems, and communicate with clear, effective language in discipline-specific ways.

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

Dr. Ann Bettencourt (Department of Psychological Sciences): “Development of the Science of Intergroup Relations Writing Intensive Course”

Dr. Joanne Hearne (Department of English): “Audio Storytelling”

Dr. Mark Morgan (Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism): “Ozark Outdoors: A Collection of Hunting and Fishing Folklore”

Dr. Martha Kelly (Department of German and Russian Studies): “The Arts of Survival: Civilization in Soviet & Post Soviet Times”

Dr. Soren Larson (Department of Geography): “Place-Writing: A Writing Pathway for Campus and Community”

Dr. Peter Motavalli (Department of Soil, Environmental, and Atmospheric Sciences): “Innovative Media for Promoting Effective Undergraduate Student Science Writing”

Dr. Daniel Domingues (Department of History): “How to Change the World: Lessons from the Abolition of the Atlantic Slave Trade”

Dr. Ninive Sanchez (Department of Social Work): “Student Perceptions of Metacognitive Planning and Self Monitoring: An Undergraduate WI Course”

Dr. Flore Zephir (Department of Romance Languages): “Maintaining Optimum Teacher to Student Ratio in Foreign Language Classes”
The following previously funded WI Project Awardees presented their projects during 2015-2016:

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

**Dr. Clark Peters (Department of Social Work):** “Giving Voice Through Writing”

**Dr. James Noble (Department of Engineering):** Synthesizing the Industrial Engineering Curriculum in an Actual Industrial Setting”

**Dr. Caroline Brock (Department of Rural Sociology):** “Maintaining an Optimum Teacher-to-Student Ratio While Exploring what Makes for a Successful Writing Intensive Class on Minority Groups”

**Dr. Daniel Domingues (Department of History):** “how to Change the World: Lessons from the Abolition of the Atlantic Slave Trade”

**Dr. Carolyn Orbann (Department of Health Sciences):** “Reflective Writing, Social Media Use, and Student Learning During Study Abroad: A Curriculum Intervention to Promote Student Growth”

**Dr. Carla Allen (School of Health Professions/Clinical and Diagnostic Sciences):** “Integrated Guided Inquiry into Problem-Based Learning”
Fourth Annual Win Horner Awardee

In 2012-2013, The Campus Writing Program instituted a Win Horner Award for Innovative Writing Intensive Teaching. This year, the award went to Dr. Gerry Summers, Biology.

Dr. Amy Lannin, CWP Director and Dr. Gerry Summers, Win Horner Awardee

2016 Writing Intensive Teaching Excellence Awardees

Nathan First, Social Work
Nina Furstenau, Agricultural Journalism
Judith Goodman, Communication Science/Disorders
Keith Greenwood, Journalism
Harvey James, Agricultural and Applied Economics
Ninive Sanchez, Social Work

Award columns for Writing Intensive Teaching Excellence Awardees
Throughout 2015-2016, the Campus Writing Program has sustained its campus wide work to initiate and improve our methods for teaching faculty and graduate students “writing-to-learn” and “learning-to-write” strategies, theories, and philosophies. We believe that this kind of information is so important to maintain our efforts toward promoting meaningful learning experiences for students across disciplines. We have held innovative workshops, seminars, and writing retreats, and, as usual, find our WI faculty engaged, supportive, and willing to participate.

**Special Projects**

**Mentoring Program.** The project was initiated through funds obtained through a Writing Intensive Project Award submitted by three experienced Writing Intensive faculty members: Dr. Bob Bauer, Dr. Louise Miller, and Dr. Tim Safranski. During 2015-2016, we have continued this project and as in the past, we experienced the same remarkably active and engaged groups attending our bi-annual two-day WI Faculty Workshops. Mentors and Mentees found much to discuss, and the Workshops were rich with meaningful, productive questions and responses to the material presented. Our cadre of Mentors came from many, varied disciplines and thus reflected the spirit of Writing Across the Curriculum:

**2015-2016 Mentors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bob Bauer, Geology</th>
<th>Louise Miller, Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Fischer, Engineering</td>
<td>Tim Safranski, Animal Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Golomb, Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Deanna Sharpe, Personal Financial Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Schwarz, Architectural Studies</td>
<td>Roy Fox, English Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Mabary, Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think we will find that this project is somewhat “organic” in that it will take on a life of its own depending on the needs of the given mentee and the experience, skills, and investment of their mentor. There is no “formula” or one approach that fits all mentee/mentor relationships. One of the contributions of this project will be discovering the various ways we can be helpful to new WI faculty. (Financial Planning)

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

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

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

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

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

Over time, we plan to invite other faculty to write pages so that the site is frequently updated with new content and ideas for teaching with writing.
Workshops & Seminars

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

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

• Innovations in WI Teaching
• Speaking of Collections and Artifacts for Teaching (with MU Library)
• Using Rubrics
• Best Practices in Group Work
• Apps for Academic Writers and Researchers
• ESL Writing
• Literature Reviews
• Mentoring Graduate Student Writers
Specialized workshops. CWP also customized workshops to specific initiatives across campus.

*Writing in Engineering.* CWP offered several workshops and consultations with faculty in the College of Engineering.

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

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

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

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

Establishing and Maintaining an Online Presence

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

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

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

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

*Most WI courses are 3 credits, but some courses are sequenced and students may receive less than 3 designated WI credits as part of these multi-course sequences. Individual departments may apply to the Campus Writing Board to modify the requirement of 6 credits under these circumstances.
Writing Intensive Courses Reviewed by the Campus Writing Board, AY 2015

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

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

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

During AY 2015, the Campus Writing Board reviewed and subsequently approved 376 WI courses. Of those 376 courses, 83 courses were sent back to the instructor for revisions prior to WI approval. Coordinators worked with these instructors to ensure courses met the WI guidelines described above. For AY 2015, the Campus Writing Board requested revisions for approximately 22% of WI course proposals. Table 1 shows approved, revised, and withdrawn/canceled courses reviewed during AY 2015.

Table 1
*Writing-Intensive courses reviewed by the Campus Writing Board during Academic Year 2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Withdrawn/Canceled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>376</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: On average, the Campus Writing Board requested revisions for approximately 22% of proposed writing-intensive courses.
Writing Intensive Courses, Academic Year 2015

For AY 2015, including Summer 2015, Fall 2015, and Spring 2016, the Campus Writing Program offered approximately 412 WI courses taken by 13,810 students, and disbursed $876,700 in OTS funding support. The WI courses had an academic-year total of 2,668 open seats, by Student Information Systems (SIS) data, with an average of 16.5% open seats across course levels. Below, we review the distribution of WI faculty rank, the proportion of WI courses across academic sectors, the proportion of WI courses across class level, and WI course capacity for AY 2015.

Writing Intensive Rank Distribution

The current rank distribution of faculty teaching WI courses during AY 2015 indicates that the task of teaching WI courses is spread across the various faculty appointments (See Figure 1).

Who teaches Writing Intensive courses?

- NTT Professor: 2.7%
- Graduate Students: 3.2%
- NTT Associate Professor: 7.4%
- Assistant Professor: 11.1%
- NTT Assistant Professors: 14.6%
- Other: 15.6%
- Associate Professor: 22.3%
- Professor: 22.8%

Figure 1. Who teaches Writing Intensive Courses? This figure shows the distribution of faculty teaching WI courses in Academic Year 2015. “Other” refers to non-teaching staff, part-time faculty, and adjunct faculty.
Several conclusions can be made when reviewing who teaches WI courses across campus. For instance, even though teaching WI courses is rigorous, we are seeing strong support for the principles of writing to learn from all academic ranks. Tenured or tenure-track instructors teach well over half of all WI courses, which likely indicates broad support for the WI program and/or writing across the curriculum principles. We can also assume from these statistics that assistant tenure-track professors teach a slightly lower percentage than tenured instructors because departments may refrain from assigning them WI courses during the tenure process.

**Writing Intensive Courses Across Academic Sectors**

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

![Writing Intensive courses by sector](image)

*Figure 2. Writing Intensive courses by sector. This figure shows the number of WI courses relative to academic sector, AY 2015.*
Writing Intensive Course Level Distribution

The distribution of WI courses by course level is shown in Figure 3. The proportion of WI courses increases with course level. Capstone courses at the 4000 level with an expected enrollment of one student (1.5%) have been removed from the overall 4000 level calculation shown in Figure 3.

CWP makes a concentrated effort to increase the percentage of lower level WI courses, particularly through the use of Writing Intensive Project Awards. WI courses at the 2000 level rose from 14.8% in AY2014 to 17.7% in AY 2015. We hope these percentages continue to increase as the Writing Intensive Project Awards, which include a category for WI conversion of lower level courses, become more prevalent across campus.

Figure 3. Writing Intensive courses by course level. This figure shows the percentage of WI courses relative to course level for AY 2015. Single-student capstones, comprising 1.5% of courses, are not included.
Writing Intensive Capacity

CWP tracks the percentage of open seats by course level to determine to what degree WI course offerings match student needs. Figure 4 shows that the majority of empty seats are in 2000 and 4000 level courses. These numbers include only lecture WI courses and ignore self-paced online courses in order to report a more accurate figure.

1000 Level

2000 Level

3000 Level

4000 Level

Figure 4. Open seats in Writing Intensive Courses for AY 2015. Reported percentages are a function of open seats at each course level.
Writing Intensive Faculty Satisfaction

Beginning in Fall 2014, CWP sent a brief survey to all current WI faculty in order to assess their satisfaction with their WI courses and the support they receive from CWP. Figure 5 shows that a large majority of WI faculty (83%) were “Mostly satisfied” or “Completely satisfied” with their WI courses. Figure 6 indicates that 81.4% of WI faculty were “Mostly satisfied” or “Completely satisfied” with the support they received from CWP. Future analyses will enable CWP to assess satisfaction on both of these attributes across academic years.

CWP strives to provide constant support for WI faculty. Faculty members who expressed any dissatisfaction with their WI courses or CWP were contacted for follow up meetings, often resulting in fruitful conversations on WI strategy and pedagogy.

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

**New and Updated Writing Intensive Courses**

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

Given this finding, the Campus Writing Program continues to assess the ratio of updated and new WI courses on campus. Figure 7 shows the semester counts for updated and new WI courses on campus. Updated courses increased for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 at 132 and 150, respectively. Furthermore, Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 saw 44 and 44 new courses, respectively. Thus, in accordance with writing across the curriculum literature, the data indicate that the University of Missouri’s Campus Writing Program is currently in healthy standing across campus.
New and updated Writing Intensive courses

Figure 7. New and updated Writing Intensive courses. This figure shows the count of updated WI courses paired with the count of newly developed WI courses.
**Funding of WI Courses**

From AY 2006-2011, the University saw a consistent increase in the number of students enrolled in WI courses, with the total number of courses eligible for OTS funding paralleling that increase. OTS funds, including distributions to departments and workshop stipends, increased from $843,150 in AY 2014 to $876,700 in AY 2015.

Annual course eligibility for OTS funds (i.e., courses with students over 20 enrollment) has averaged 57% since AY 2009. For AY 2015, 56.5% of students (7,805 out of 13,810) were enrolled in WI courses eligible for OTS funding. OTS Funds paid since AY 2010 are shown in Figure 8.

---

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

In contrast to the enrollment and course growth seen during AY 2005-2010, AY 2015 continues to stabilize in the number of WI students enrolled and the number WI courses offered. Figures 9 and 10 show the growth and stabilization in WI student enrollment and WI courses by semester. Both variables began to stabilize in AY 2011.

**Figure 9.** Writing Intensive students by semester, AY 2011-2015. This figure shows WI student enrollment from Fall 2011 through Spring 2016. Summer courses and enrollment are not shown.
Figure 10. Writing Intensive courses per semester, AY 2006-2015. This figure shows the number of WI courses from Fall 2006 through Spring 2016. Summer courses are not shown.
APPENDIX I

Scholarly Work, Research, and Presentations Conducted by CWP Staff, AY 2015

Amy Lannin, Ph.D.

Academic Publications


Lead Editor for Literacy Research Association Yearbook, 2016; member of Editorial Team 2015.

Academic Presentations


Lannin, A. (2015). Red Cedar Writing Project’s Project WRITE Scoring Conference, Michigan State University. Facilitated a 3-day scoring conference for the National Writing Project, Flint, MI.


**External Funding**


Jonathan Cisco, Ph.D.

**Academic Publications**


**Academic Presentations**


Cisco, J. (2016, May). *Apps for academics 2.0: How to be an effective, efficient professor and researcher*. Presented at the University of Missouri’s Celebration of Teaching conference, Columbia MO.


Cisco, J. (2015, February). *English teachers are the C3POs of disciplinary discourse: how to teach ‘Disciplinary Literacy Bridges’*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Write to Learn, Osage Beach, MO.
Bonnie Selting, Ph.D.

**Academic Presentations**

Selting, B., Bader, V., Marc L., (May 2016) Redesigning RN to BSN Online Professional Nurses Program: Process and Recommendations. Celebration of Teaching Conference, University of Missouri

Selting, B. Including the gypsies: Health Science students tackle the power of expressive language. (June 2016) Presentation at the International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference.

Selting, B. (June 2016) Technical Writing at the Missouri Conservation Department. Day long workshop/presentation.


**Academic Publications**

We offer here the questions asked at the end of all Faculty Workshops and examples of the comments from participants regarding the Spring, 2016, Faculty Workshop. These workshops received some of the highest scores of approval we have seen, with Faculty Workshop for Spring 2016: 94%

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

Examples of Comments Received

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

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

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

- Need some discussion of timing for assignments.
- Need more time on practical application [of techniques], “apps” discussion.
- Discuss a bit about norming sessions and how WI may be implemented in large courses.
- More time to work on a projects
We offer here the questions asked for both Faculty/TA Workshops and some examples of the comments we received for Spring, 2016. These workshops received some of the highest scores of approval we have seen, with Faculty/TA Workshop for Spring 2016: 94.5%

Questions Asked

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

Examples of Comments Received

What information was the most helpful for you?

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

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

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