Uncommon Conversations: How Nearly Three Decades of Paying Attention Allows One WAC/WID Program to Thrive

Martha A. Townsend, Martha D. Patton, and Jo Ann Vogt

ABSTRACT

The former director, assistant director, and coordinator of student services of an internationally renowned WAC/WID program, who together spent forty-four years working with the program, reflect on the program's evolution during their tenure. Responding to Rose and Weiser's edited collection The Writing Program Administrator as Researcher: Inquiry in Action and Reflection which calls for programmatic histories, archives, and stories as a means of documenting intellectual work, the authors trace the program's periods of growth, stability, instability, and recovery. They contend that "paying attention" to the faculty who taught the university's required writing intensive courses led to "uncommon conversations" about teaching and learning, conversations which, in turn, account for the program's continued vitality and viability some twenty-eight years after its founding. The article offers an overview of circumstances that apply to many WAC/WID programs and suggests recommendations for continued programmatic improvement for the field in general.

David Russell notes that writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) programs tend to have short life spans.[1] He claims that, even when individual professors use WAC principles, academic institutions fundamentally resist WAC (295). For the most part, we agree that institutional factors often trump other factors and can kill good programs in little time. Nonetheless, we concur with Susan McLeod et al. that some WAC programs do work, and some programs last for a long time. Our WAC program, the University of Missouri's Campus Writing Program (CWP), is thriving after nearly three decades, beating the institutional odds, thanks to a combination of luck,

leadership, and administrative support that allowed us to pay attention to the things that matter.[2]

The occasion for this retrospective is that our collective forty-four years with CWP came to an end a short while back. We three—formerly the director, assistant director, and coordinator of student services—have since embarked on new paths.[3] What the long-term future of Missouri's program holds is unknown, except that the program will be different and the three of us who have the longest history with it are no longer associated with it and with one another in the ways that we formerly were. During our tenure, CWP grew into its maturity, achieving both national and international acclaim. We hope CWP will earn further acclaim; undoubtedly, it will continue to change in ways beyond what it already has since our departures.

In these pages, we reflect on the conditions that worked both for and against our program, conditions that also affect many other WAC programs. In doing so, we offer a partial program history, a biography of sorts, of the University of Missouri Campus Writing Program from 1983 through 2007, the years we were most closely associated with it, and then a brief update of the program since we left.[4] We agree with Shirley Rose and Irwin Weiser who argue that WPAs should document their programs' histories through research, reflection, archival material, and stories as a means of illustrating intellectual work, establishing programmatic identity, and ultimately improving programs. Our years with CWP were formative for us and for the program. We believe the lessons we learned and the insights we gained can be applied to other WAC programs. We hope, then, that this essay will serve as one model and will inspire other WPAs to undertake similar reflections aimed at helping shape WAC's future by understanding its past.

We note straightaway that we are not the program's birth parents and that those who were presented us with a healthy offspring clamoring for action. (We will return to CWP's progenitors shortly.) But, even if we were not the birth parents, neither were we frail aunts on the sideline. In 1991, Marty Townsend came to MU and adopted the program wholeheartedly, including the tutors and the person in charge of them, Jo Ann Vogt. Townsend proceeded to make requests that other directors might not have dared to make. She asked for positions, lots of them. She hired a number of people to work with her and Vogt to further develop the program, including Marty Patton, who was completing a dissertation on writing in the sciences. Townsend sought funding for other positions as well, and with those new hires, CWP created a sort of extended family and with it the potential for rich, multi-layered dialogue. Through that dialogue, each staff member was allowed the time and space to pay attention to what mattered most.

That is, staff members became "apprentices of listening rather than masters of discourse," as Krista Ratcliffe, nodding to Gemma Fiumara, calls upon us to do in writing programs. If we were "writing consultants," we approached new questions dialogically, suspending disciplinary expertise enough to engage fully in what Ratcliffe calls "rhetorical listening" (203).

Sue McLeod and Eric Miraglia, paraphrasing Michael Fullan, who studies educational change, have noted that successful programs tend to have support at both ends, top-down and bottom-up (20), and this was true for our program as well, both in its infancy and later on. This support is critical. We add another dimension and suggest that support, whether top-down or bottom-up, is more vigorous when it moves from endorsement to engagement, from passive approval of requirements to active intellectual engagement with open-ended questions. Our writing program was most vulnerable when "support," especially top-down support, was little more than bureaucratic endorsement of a curricular requirement. Our program was most dynamic when support, especially bottom-up support, entailed engaged, substantive, interdisciplinary conversation. Put another way, we extend from the classroom to the program itself John Bean's wise counsel to stimulate problem-based, active learning.[5] Because we had sufficient staff to engage one-to-one with faculty, we could initiate genuine, solution-seeking conversations. Rather than tell faculty what criteria they should use in designing assignments, we framed questions and helped them to discover their own best solutions. That approach is time-consuming, but it results in a kind of faculty investment that may be impossible to generate any other way.

Russell rightly suggests that this kind of substantive conversation is not fostered by the institutional structure and reward system of most U.S. universities. These conversations are possible, as McLeod insists, but when they do come about, they are uncommon and tend to develop in the margins of the institutional structure. These conversations need to be modeled by energetic leaders, sustained by faculty and staff who are genuinely interested in cross-disciplinary collaborations, and protected from predatory administrators who may be wary of the seeming slowness of results and the cost attached. These conversations can happen only when WAC programs are supported at a level that allows staff to devote attention to individual classes, faculty, assignments, and the processes related to them. From its infancy, CWP had that kind of support as the following historical outline details.

1983-1986: Program Conception and Birth

As David Russell has noted, many WAC programs born in the 1970s and 1980s came about partly as a response to a perceived literacy crisis (275-6). This view was certainly the case at MU in the early 1980s, when a perceived literacy crisis led faculty from several colleges to express their concerns to Arts and Science dean Milton Glick.

In response, Glick took three notable steps. He commissioned a visit by University of Iowa Rhetoric professor Richard Lloyd-Jones, whose April 1983 report confirmed that increased attention and resources for composition were needed. Next, Glick invited English department faculty to help draft the charge for a Task Force on English Composition. And finally, along with then-provost Ronald Bunn, he created a campus-wide task force, chaired by English professor Winifred Bryan Horner, to study the state of composition at the University.

Among the task force members was former Rhodes Scholar and founder of MU's writing center, Douglas Hunt. As Hunt recalls it, the dean may have had only a dim idea of what the solution to the perceived crisis should be, but he had a very clear idea of what the solution should *not* be: more English composition. In the dean's view, according to Hunt, if the problem with writing was inadequate outcomes from one or two semesters of freshman composition, the solution was not to be found in offering even more. Moreover, the dean, a chemist, suspected that there were effective writers outside the English department who might have something to say about writing, and he made sure that the task force included faculty from an array of disciplines.[6] (See Appendix A.) The default assumption for the dean and most task force members from outside English was that "good writing" was roughly "error-free writing" and that something must be wrong with instruction in English composition if students were not producing error-free writing in their content courses. Flawed as this thinking was, it led to a robust interdisciplinary conversation about writing, one that Horner facilitated with remarkable grace and spirit.[7]

In the fall of 1983, the Task Force on English Composition began a lively, year-long conversation with many questions about the teaching of grammar and correctness. Hunt tells us that the shift to questions about discipline-based writing came about indirectly, largely as a result of the informal conversations that task force members had about their own research. They were intrigued by one another's research problems and writing processes, and they began to entertain the possibility of designing writing assignments for their own students that would require explanations about research problems. As they talked through their own research and

writing processes, task force members abandoned band-aid solutions about teaching students to write correctly and began to explore the complexity of reasoning and writing about research problems, problems that varied significantly from one discipline to another. Through this grass-roots process, the task force moved to a "solution" that involved writing instruction in courses beyond English composition, courses to be taught by faculty in the disciplines who might be willing to take some pedagogical risks by engaging in "writing-intensive" (WI) teaching.

It was not self-evident, however, that what might be an ideal "solution" in theory would work in practice. One task force member feared that too few faculty would offer WI classes to sustain a program, a fear that prompted discussion of various rewards and incentives for faculty, as well as methods for funding such a program. To succeed, the task force would have to undertake an intensive public relations campaign, involving presentations to scores of departments. It would also have to resolve questions about WI course requirements, WI course proposal review processes, and faculty development workshop procedures. By the end of 1985, three faculty members had volunteered to pilot WI courses; the task force, slightly reconfigured and enlarged, became the first Campus Writing Board; and Hunt was named the program's founding director. The 1985-86 academic year was historic in several other respects. Hunt and the Board hashed out the *Guidelines for WI Courses,* modeled on guidelines adopted by Indiana University in 1979 with one notable addition. Hunt, inspired by his Rhodes scholarship study at Oxford and steeped in reading about college students' intellectual development, made a case for including a guideline that echoed William Perry: at least one writing assignment should pose a question about which reasonable people could disagree. With minor adjustments, CWP's guidelines have served the program for nearly three decades. (See Appendix B.)

Meanwhile, persuaded that a WAC program was worth supporting, Glick provided substantial seed money from his own College of Arts and Science budget and convinced the provost to help as well. Notably, in this era when it was common for institutions to seek external funding for new WAC programs, MU assumed budgetary responsibility by reallocating monies internally. By "taxing" some departments a portion of their graduate program funding and giving those monies to CWP, an "intentional symbiosis" was created: departments could "earn back" what they had "contributed" by offering large-enrollment WI courses to which their own graduate students could then be assigned as teaching assistants for the WI faculty instructor. Faculty who had no other way to support graduate students, and departments that had no other way to fund graduate programs,

thus had a carrot to entice them to offer WI courses. A further benefit of this symbiosis was that graduate students across the disciplines could acquire new exposure to writing practices in their own fields.

The carrot helped, but a stick was also needed, and that eventually arrived in the form of a university-wide WI graduation requirement. In 1986, however, MU had no university-wide curricular requirements of any kind. All nine undergraduate colleges determined requirements independently. The challenge for Hunt and the Writing Board was to lobby faculty in one department meeting after another, gradually persuading faculty in all disciplines about the virtues of sharing responsibility for student writing.

Given the time-consuming nature of these faculty conversations, Hunt needed help. Help arrived in the form of Ray Smith, then a doctoral student in English at MU, and John Peterson, an accomplished, hands-on administrative assistant. Smith, a Renaissance scholar with a wit and sense of humor close to that of the great bard, made a huge impact on the faculty with whom he talked. In Smith's words, Hunt was father, mother, and midwife of the program, while, in Hunt's words, Smith was a man of many talents, just one of which was the power of persuasion. John Peterson, the intellectual equal of Hunt and Smith—a man who, for instance, read about chaos theory for recreation—proved an invaluable asset. He served as sounding board for what Hunt and Smith often referred to as their "hare-brained schemes" and explained the program practically and theoretically in terms faculty who called or dropped in could understand. Peterson recalls that after Hunt and Smith would visit departments, faculty would be "surprised and excited." The revolutionary WAC approach "changed people" and "made [him] want to go work in the morning."[8] One of Peterson's lasting contributions was laying the foundation for CWP's meticulous record-keeping system, the basis of what has become perhaps the world's most comprehensive archive of WI materials. Files were kept on each course, including assignments, grading criteria, and related memos; lists were maintained of who attended workshops; budget data were tracked; correspondence was organized and preserved. Peterson's efforts make it possible even now to trace the program's history back through its first "friendly and helpful" contacts with departments and with individual faculty striving to design the assignments envisioned by the WI *Guidelines*.[9]

The collective energy and intelligence of the early program staff and Writing Board members was palpable. By the end of the campaign, faculty agreed to take a college-by-college vote on establishing a WI requirement. All nine colleges endorsed the idea. Engineering requested the single exception, to be allowed a one-year "bye" before implementation to plan for the integration of the new requirement into its already tight curriculum.

In the meantime, in the basement of the English department, Smith had spotted another wit nearly his match—linguistics graduate student Jo Ann Vogt, whom he hired as a tutor in the newly established WI Tutorial Services (WITS). As a tutor, she would draw not only repeat student visitors, but also reticent faculty who would come back for more of her kind but spot-on help. As both workshop facilitator and tutor, Vogt rarely gave advice; she simply posed the questions that most needed asking. As we discuss later, Vogt had two of the most needed and rare talents in academic institutions: the ability to be a good listener and inexhaustible intellectual curiosity, traits she regularly displayed in faculty workshops.

Notably, though, CWP's inaugural faculty workshop was held only after the first WI courses had been piloted. The Early and Middle Childhood educator, the political scientist, and the biologist who gamely offered the first WI courses in their respective departments had vastly different approaches to the use of writing in their teaching, even though they held in common certain principles. As presenters at the first workshops, they were able to provide workshop participants not one model but a powerful range of possibilities. Participants came with a variety of motives. Some had been intrigued by Hunt's, Smith's, and Peterson's arguments; some came because of the carrot of GTA support if they taught large-enough WI courses (the ratio was one instructor to every twenty students); some came because the graduation requirement "stick" meant that WI courses had to be offered so students could graduate. Some, perhaps, were lured by the $200 stipend Hunt had promised, stipends that he planned to fund from his summer salary. (When made aware of this arrangement, the dean funded the stipends.)

Over the years, faculty workshops relied primarily on in-house presenters—CWP staff and MU faculty teaching WI courses. Early on, though, Indiana University biology professor Craig Nelson offered his unique perspective, clearly tying writing to critical thinking. Nelson no doubt helped to persuade many faculty—especially those in the sciences—that writing was the only tangible way to determine what their students were really learning. Participants rated the workshops highly and, while on average only half of them would ultimately offer formally designated WI courses, subsequent research showed that most non-WI faculty participants employed some of the principles that had been advocated. A campus culture for writing had begun to take root.

1986-1991: The First Five Years – Youth

By the fall of 1986, all undergraduate colleges at the University of Missouri had adopted the new two-course writing requirement—one semester

of composition followed by one WI course in the disciplines—to become effective for students entering in Fall, 1987. However, the new requirement meant that the old one- or two-semester composition system in English no longer existed, a change that did not occur without heated discussion in department meetings. Any changes to longstanding curricular requirements typically meet with faculty resistance, and this one was no exception. The previous freshman and sophomore composition courses were going to be eliminated or significantly reconfigured.[10] However, despite concerns about whether the curriculum should be revised, English faculty realized that the department lacked the resources to meet the demands of the old curriculum. Seniors due to graduate, for example, often usurped the available seats in the required course, leaving insufficient room for the lower-division students who needed to be enrolled—one of the problems that led Lloyd-Jones to recommend a new plan for writing.

With the campus having endorsed the new writing requirement, the composition program in the fall of 1986 invited John Bean to conduct a workshop for English faculty and TAs to discover how the new composition course, to be offered in the freshman year, might articulate with the new WI courses. Over the next few years, the composition program experimented with several WAC-leaning composition texts, including Bean's and Ramage's *Form and Surprise in Composition: Writing and Thinking Across the Curriculum* and later Charles Bazerman's *The Informed Writer: Using Sources in the Disciplines.* In theory and text, if not always in practice, the freshman composition program paved the way for the emerging WAC program. By the time the first required credit-bearing WI courses were offered in January 1988, 2440 students had already taken 68 pilot courses over six semesters. Enough faculty had experimented with the new model of teaching that the director, board, and university were ready to declare full implementation.

Other campus reforms were in process during this same period. In the fall of 1989, faculty endorsed the campus's first unified general education plan (though with a lesser margin of support than the WI proposal). As part of this new "General Education Architecture," faculty approved a second WI requirement. In doing so, they not only reaffirmed the acceptance of the first but also placed an even greater degree of responsibility on discipline-based faculty to use writing. The first WI course thus became a lower-division course, to be taken by students in any discipline they wished and through which students were encouraged to experiment intellectually outside of their anticipated program of study. The new, second WI course was to be taken in the student's major at the upper-division level, where students would receive practice with the vocabulary and conventions of

a specialized discourse. The three-course writing requirement—first-year composition followed by two WI courses—still holds today.

If luck is part of the historical equation, MU was incredibly lucky to have had Hunt, Smith, and Peterson at the helm in the early years—men whose intellectual gymnastics moved one professor after another to see the virtues of sharing the responsibility for the teaching of writing. MU was also fortunate to have had passionately committed faculty members on the task force and early Campus Writing Boards who modeled for their peers a variety of approaches for the teaching of writing and who established a precedent for high standards of course review and certification.

The Writing Board acquired a reputation as a committee with integrity and clout, one to respect and emulate. Other entities such as the new General Education Program and the Honors College subsequently modeled their governance structures on the Writing Board, partly because of the standards and commitment of early Writing Board members. The structure and function of CWP's Board owes much to its predecessors at Indiana University and Beaver College, but its integrity and clout are owed to the deep investment of the faculty who served over the years. They saw maintaining the integrity of the WI designation as their mission, and they resisted any efforts by faculty, department chairs, or administrators to dilute the standards set out in the *Guidelines*.

Eventually, Hunt, Smith (after having been interim director for a year following Hunt), and Peterson moved on to other positions, and English professor Howard Hinkel was appointed interim director while MU conducted a national search for a new director. Having served many years as composition director for the English Department, Hinkel was well prepared to articulate the linkages between first-year composition and the WI courses. A superb stabilizer, Hinkel guided the fledgling program through one of many transitions.

1991-1996: The Second Five Years – Adolescence

When she arrived in 1991, Marty Townsend brought to the position of director an additional set of talents. Her instincts were political and social as well as academic. She had an intuitive sense for networking within and beyond the university and understood that building and maintaining a high profile is necessary for program longevity. Having been mentored since graduate school days by Win Horner, she adopted the overarching goal of ensuring that the program not be seen merely as a service unit and undertook a research agenda befitting MU's Research I designation.

Arriving shortly after the adoption of the new General Education Architecture, Townsend was charged with developing the new second tier of WI courses. This new tier not only doubled the number of WI "seats" needed, it required many more departments to step up to the WI plate. Up until this time, departments could rely on students taking WI courses from whichever benevolent departments were choosing to offer them. Now, every department offering an undergraduate degree had to ensure that its majors would receive upper-division, discipline-specific writing instruction. The earlier 1986 college-by-college vote to have WI courses hadn't required that every department offer them. The stakes thus became significantly higher.

As a condition of accepting her appointment, Townsend had requested that the university authorize a comprehensive self-study and external program review. Over the course of an entire year, two separate groups conducted interviews and surveys, collected and reviewed documents, and held a variety of meetings and forums to elicit feedback campus-wide. The institution's self-study was then presented to external reviewers Ed White and Lynn Bloom, who visited for three days under the auspices of the WPA Consultant-Evaluator Service.[11] In short, the self-study and external review produced exactly what CWP needed: assurance that the university and the faculty were ready to move ahead with the new WI courses. The external review also resulted in the MU News Bureau issuing a press release with the header "MU Campus Writing Program Cited As One of Best in Nation," a story that was picked up by many newspapers across the state. Not long after the departures of White and Bloom, Townsend crafted a three-page memo to Vice Provost Jo Behymer laying out what had been discovered and declaring (as much to herself as anyone) that MU was ready to begin implementing the new upper-division WI courses. With that implementation came lines for hiring Patton and others, along with substantial new resources for additional WI TAs and faculty development.

When the second WI requirement took effect in 1993, the job of the Writing Board both intensified and specialized. Board members were appointed jointly by the provost and the dean of Arts and Sciences for three-year terms, with one third of the members rotating off each year. While the eighteen-member Board debated policy (such as the acceptable upper limit for class size), the real work of reviewing courses and writing assignments took place in each of three six-member subcommittees (humanities, the natural and applied sciences, and education and social sciences). The subcommittees took seriously their charge to evaluate courses and frequently tabled proposals if they did not include writing assignments that fostered critical thinking and provide adequate grading criteria. While the subcommittees did use their power to legislate change, Board members

practiced what they preached by encouraging faculty to revise proposals for resubmission. They intentionally did not reject proposals out of hand, as is often the case in major grant competitions. In cases where WI course proposals did not meet the *WI Guidelines*, CWP staff were empowered to meet with the faculty proposers, to suggest the necessary revisions diplomatically. The Board thus provided the impetus for the conversations; the staff made sure the chats were "friendly and helpful," ensuring that *WI Guidelines* were met without doing violence to the teacher's course goals or autonomy.

In these years, subcommittees met three times each semester to review between three and fifteen proposals each time. Discussion was typically lively. Subcommittees approved courses for one semester only and each approval was tied to its particular instructor, so that an established WI course still had to be re-proposed each time it was offered. In later years, a modified update form simply asked what worked well and what changes were being considered; staff frequently facilitated the paperwork via e-mail dialogue. When subcommittees evaluated those later update forms, they relied heavily on input from CWP staff. Inevitably, we either had or got detailed, concrete knowledge about the courses via a web of interrelated conversations with the WI instructor, students, WI teaching assistants serving the course in question, and WITS tutors, as well as our own direct observations. Because of this "insider" knowledge, the decision to approve or reject an update was anything but *pro forma*.

From the beginning, all course approvals were coupled with the instructor, so that a new instructor taking over a previously approved WI course had to submit a new proposal. This move was a protection against the possibility of, say, a WI calculus course getting on the books and keeping its "WI" designation long after the original math professor had left and the WI pedagogy had fallen through the cracks. Practices like this made more work for WI faculty and for board members, but they also ensured that the "WI" on student transcripts had meaning.

Among the Board members who were the most articulate advocates of WI courses were mathematicians, engineers, and scientists. One mathematician, Dix Pettey, claimed he could imagine no other way to teach math, including his specialty, topology, except through writing. Another mathematician, Dennis Sentilles, taught introductory calculus courses; he, too, could imagine no other way to teach calculus except via extended analogies, including one of a film, in which each frame captured a different dimension of change over time. One of the first to pilot WI courses, biologist Miriam Golomb, still offers a WI course decades later. Biologist Gerald Summers and materials scientist Aaron Krawitz went on not only to serve as Board chairs, but also (much later) in CWP administrative roles.

Important as CWP staff and policy have been, MU faculty have always been the heart of the program. The list of faculty contributors numbers in the hundreds. One indicator of the range of faculty support over the years is the diversity of those who have chaired the Writing Board. They come from nineteen different disciplines and from eight of the university's fifteen undergraduate colleges and schools. (See Appendix C.)

Having Time and Staff to Pay Attention

For most of its history, CWP was fortunate to have staff in sufficient numbers to do more than simply maintain the program. It was also blessed by having staff who believed that CWP made a difference in the intellectual lives of MU faculty and students and who therefore bent their talents toward helping CWP serve those constituents. One such staff member was Peterson's replacement, Trish Love, who had once been an MU honors student. As CWP's administrative associate and fiscal officer for fourteen years, she brought to every communication that went out of the office a standard of professionalism unparalleled in most departments.[12] A master of numbers as well as words, she tutored herself in the potential of electronic databases to resolve the record keeping demands of a program in its adolescent growth spurt. She created the databases that tracked the assignments, TA support, and enrollments of every WI course ever offered at MU.

One of the benefits of having personnel with diverse talents is that staff members can be interdependent and still play to their strengths. Townsend not only tolerated working with upper administration and outside agencies, she genuinely enjoyed it. Vogt and Patton were, in different ways, academic gypsies who thoroughly enjoyed pulling up to a variety of texts and engaging in conversation about the issues at hand, with students or faculty. By playing on her strengths, Townsend created a space that enabled Vogt and Patton to play on theirs. Too often, when funding is short and positions are limited, there is no one left to pay attention—to really pay attention—to the intellectual life of a WAC program. CWP staff did not notice everything that needed attention, but they had both time and data to pay close attention to a good many things. Again, pulling through Ratcliffe's lessons about rhetorical listening, we argue that paying attention matters, not only for purposes of accountability, but also to stimulate the interdisciplinary conversations that are at the heart of "problem-based programs."

During this time, CWP began the first of numerous explorations into what was happening with writing instruction in international settings. In 1994, MU provost and now chancellor Brady Deaton declared, "If MU is to become a truly great university, it must be an international university."

CWP wanted to do its part, so in 1995, when Townsend was invited to spend a month at Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu in Romania, she jumped at the opportunity. One outcome of that trip was Townsend's Romanian host coming to earn a Ph.D. in MU's English department. Nicoleta Raileanu returned to Romania to teach, subsequently emigrating with her family to Toronto where, among other things, she is involved with a WAC initiative at her new university. Collectively, Townsend, Patton, and Vogt visited twelve countries on WAC-related endeavors during their CWP tenure, with many of those trips resulting in exchange visits by faculty with whom they worked. CWP staff realized early on that paying attention to WAC outside the program leads to increased paying of attention inside as well.

1996-2001: The Third Five Years—Maturity

During these years, arguably CWP's most stable and productive, staff continued to build on strengths and to pay attention to WI faculty in a number of ways. Just as Hunt, Smith, and Peterson had listened closely to teachers talking about teaching, Townsend, Vogt, and Patton did as well. Some of these conversations were the predictable ones that every WAC WPA encounters: "How can I integrate writing in my course while also maintaining 'coverage' of all my material?" or "Can I assign two grades, one for content and another for writing?" But many of our conversations were truly open-ended and reciprocal, and they prompted both faculty and CWP staff to think about the problems at hand in novel ways. History professor Charles Timberlake, for example, eschewed the Writing Board's traditional concept of revision by arguing that his method of assigning weekly one-page themes constituted a more meaningful approach to revision in his course for his students. He didn't want students bogged down in rewriting short papers when, he argued, they could more productively move on to fresher topics while at the same time revising their ways of "thinking history" based on his feedback from the previous week's short paper. His argument persuaded Board members that the "alternative means to the same end" policy in the *WI Guidelines* was more than a gratuitous suggestion.

Likewise, as newer technologies began to take hold, faculty wanted to experiment with virtually all of them while, at the same time, maintaining the WI designation for their courses. The Board received—and enthusiastically approved—numerous technology-rich course proposals. Engineering, for example, calculated how many "words" their equations and graphs were equivalent to; MU's distance learning and nursing programs offered online courses; and several disciplines counted web page production and

blogs toward the *WI Guidelines'* word and page requirements. As was the Board's custom, each new proposal was discussed and debated, with members stretching their own understanding of what constituted "writing," often harkening to the longstanding "alternative means to the same end" policy. What mattered most to the Board was that substantive revision and critical thinking were involved, regardless of the medium. In our collective memory, no such thoughtfully proposed WI course was ever denied.

Experience taught us that faculty had few outlets for discussing their teaching. In fact, some faculty reported that such talk was actively discouraged in their departments, either because it took time away from research or because it demonstrated uncertainty about an activity that any respectable faculty member ought to be able to take for granted. Sensing a hunger for dialogue about teaching, CWP provided a variety of forums in which faculty could discuss designing assignments, commenting on student drafts, assigning grades, conducting peer review, and other teaching-related topics. Our semi-annual faculty workshops, ongoing norming sessions with WI faculty and TAs, and frequent one-to-one consultations gave faculty safe environments in which to talk about their successes as well as their struggles.

CWP's faculty workshops featured interactive sessions that encouraged cross-disciplinary dialogue. Seated together at round tables and focusing on real WI assignments and student writing, faculty from physics and engineering found that they had much in common with teachers from music and sociology. CWP staff opened each workshop with a mock norming session moderated by Vogt that raised many of the questions the remainder of the workshop attempted to answer. During this 90-minute foundational session (divided among individual work, small-group work, and whole-group discussion), participants analyzed a flawed WI writing assignment and then graded and commented on three responses, two from students and one staff-written ringer. This lively session helped faculty discover the critical role of good assignment design, the benefits and perils of using rubrics, and the wide variety of styles and formats that constitute "good writing" across the disciplines. Instead of offering pat answers, however, the session introduced faculty to the myriad possibilities of using writing to teach content. As a result, participants were typically eager to engage in remaining sessions that introduced a variety of individual assignments, sequenced assignments, rubrics, and commenting styles. The workshops often began conversations between CWP staff and individual faculty that have lasted as long as those faculty remain at MU.

The mock norming at the workshop also introduced faculty to another opportunity to talk about writing, teaching, and grading: norming ses-

sions with WI teachers, WI TAs, and CWP staff. Originally Smith, and later Vogt, assisted individual teachers and their TAs with grading in multiple sections of large-enrollment WI courses, to ensure that the process is as equitable as possible. In preparation for an upcoming norming session, teachers looked closely at their assignments with CWP staff. During the subsequent norming session with teachers and TAs, CWP staff focused on asking questions that caused faculty to articulate their standards. They helped faculty clarify abstract descriptions like "logically organized" by pointing to examples from sample student papers. Through diplomatic, focused questioning, staff brought to light the underlying causes of differences of opinion and often persuaded faculty to take a firm stand about what constitutes an exceptional response to the assignment versus a mediocre or inadequate one. More than anything, norming sessions were another opportunity for WI faculty to be actively listened to by CWP staff who took the time to ask questions that matter.

Sometimes interwoven with norming sessions, but more often standing alone, were one-to-one consultations with faculty about everything from alternatives for designing grading rubrics to dealing with the occasional surly student. Having first seen CWP staff "in action" at a faculty workshop, most teachers later viewed us as capable, willing allies. Over the years, for example, Vogt fielded questions from faculty baffled by an inexplicably bad set of student drafts; from teachers who were twenty minutes from a promised in-class peer review session but who found themselves with no plan, and from one eager instructor who called to ask—without preface— "JoNan, what's my teaching philosophy?" That kind of trust and confidence cannot be bought. It has to be earned by a staff willing to meet teachers where they are and work with them without judgment or condescension.

For some time, MU had operated a Writing Center staffed by graduate students and used primarily by undergraduates in composition courses. When CWP came into being, a second Writing Center attached to CWP was created—WITS (WI Tutorial Services)—tailored to WI students, faculty, and classes. Through WITS, CWP provided yet another audience for teachers keen to talk about teaching. Originally designed and staffed by Smith, WITS was staffed by advanced graduate students and professional tutors from the disciplines. Smith, Vogt, and other WITS directors through the years made a concerted effort to hire tutors with varied backgrounds who would be comfortable talking with faculty from a variety of disciplines. Vogt herself was originally hired by Smith because she had a degree in zoology, was pursuing a degree in English language and linguistics, and along the way had dabbled in literature, animal science, and French. Like Vogt, WITS tutors were selected not only because of their wide-ranging

academic backgrounds but also because of their intellectual curiosity. One long-time WITS tutor, for instance, held a PhD in biology but was also schooled in James Joyce and was a film buff. Another was an engineer who had worked eight years in industry before coming to MU to pursue simultaneously an MBA and a law degree.

Not only did Smith and Vogt seek out potential tutors with wide and deep backgrounds, they tested candidates by conducting hands-on interviews based on actual WI assignments and student papers. Having given tutor applicants time to prepare in advance, WITS directors spent 90-120 minutes with each candidate, asking questions, offering advice, introducing WITS and CWP philosophy, and doing subtle training about WI courses and teachers. This process allowed WITS directors to judge a candidate's diagnostic abilities, tutoring strategies, and attitudes toward faculty and students. All were essential if tutors were to make positive contributions to the ongoing dialogue with faculty about teaching.

The process worked. Because WITS tutors were recognized by many faculty as competent, engaged participants in the WI process, they were frequently sought out for consultations about assignments. One beginning art teacher, for instance, never handed out a writing assignment without seeking feedback from his WITS tutor, a history PhD student with a background in art and art history plus several semesters' experience tutoring students in WI art classes. Another instructor, an experienced geography professor, invited her tutor to conduct an hour-long writing workshop in her classroom, a session so successful that it was repeated in subsequent semesters. The degree to which WI teachers interacted with WI tutors varied widely, but those who took the time to get to know their tutors usually came to view them as trusted colleagues and as additional sources of safe, reliable advice. Thus, WITS became an integral part of the CWP feedback loop upon which so many WI teachers came to depend. In due course, Vogt moved on to a larger role with WI faculty, especially in the Education and Social Sciences area; in turn, Andy White and Sally Foster directed WITS, bringing their own strengths to the tutoring operation while maintaining staff diversity and individual attention to courses and teachers.

The more that CWP staff learned about WI teaching practices through tutors and Writing Board members (always an invaluable source of information), the more ideas we could offer in workshops and one-on-one consultations. The process snowballed. The more that faculty were invited to consider new variations of old assignments, the more they were inspired to experiment in still other ways with assignment design, standards for peer review, and ways of providing formal and informal feedback. We needed—and were able—to supplement general rhetorical principles with

home-grown writing assignments addressing a range of discipline-specific problems, problems ranging from applications of Darcy's Law in civil engineering to complications of glycolysis in biochemistry. In a self-perpetuating process, then, we collected, reviewed, archived, and shared (with permission) hundreds of faculty documents, and we had hundreds of one-to-one conversations about these documents.

What distinguished CWP most, though, was not the collection and archiving of such documents, but the many opportunities to read, reflect on, and then talk about the ideas in them with the people at the heart of the writing program—the WI faculty. That is, we were fortunate to have the staff and time to be able to pay close attention to the people who make the program work. WITS provided one way to pay attention to WI assignments and the various ways in which students interpret them. The Writing Board provided another, giving CWP staff a reason to talk to faculty who were in the process of proposing new courses and recertifying old ones. Board members, too, had a chance to talk with each other as well as CWP staff and prospective WI teachers about assignments and writing-related issues.

Yet another mechanism for paying attention to WI faculty was conducting qualitative studies of writing. Beginning with her dissertation research, Marty Patton showed her talent for close observation in the WI classroom. Her collaboration with select WI teachers resulted in insights for the program and for the faculty who generously invited her into their classes and into dialogue with them and their students.[13] In addition to Patton's WI classroom collaborations, Townsend invited a number of WI faculty to accompany her on site visits to other campuses where she was conducting faculty workshops. These WI teachers who spoke from "within the trenches" were always received as authoritative representatives for the writing-in-the-disciplines pedagogies we were advocating. Finally, we made conscientious efforts to assemble panels of WI faculty who presented on their work at professional conferences. Venues including CCCC and the national WAC conference featured MU WI faculty on multiple occasions. Several of those presentations led to further consultations at other schools and to publications by WI faculty independent of CWP staff.[14] All of these opportunities to pay close attention gave us a chance to honor, even if inadequately, good teachers and good teaching. Moreover, these opportunities gave us a chance to keep alive the healthy self-consciousness needed for grass-roots accountability.

But none of these opportunities would have existed if we had not had an unusual degree of administrative and fiscal support, for it takes people and salaries to pay attention to scores of WI faculty. It takes time and staff

to read textbooks, to read drafts of assignments, to think about the intellectual problems in question, to attend classes, to notice unusual features, and to meet with faculty. CWP staff had private conversations with nearly every single professor after his or her first semester teaching a WI course, conversations that allowed us to learn from and build on their experiences and that allowed them to reflect on and revise their assignments and syllabi. For two decades, we had leadership in CWP to solicit these funds; we had an administration responsive to our needs; and we had a staff that earned the trust of many of the WI faculty.

We had the opportunity, then, to couple observation and reflection, two activities that John Dewey insists are necessary for thinking and that we suggest are necessary for an intellectually robust program. We make no claim that we did the best or the most that we could with the resources at our disposal; we simply claim that we had ample opportunities to observe and to reflect upon—to pay attention to—our WI faculty and their spectacular radiation of disciplinary ways of writing. Because of their focus on "traditional" research (as opposed to research on or attention to pedagogy), very few research institutions make similar opportunities available. But without them, it is hard to keep WAC theory connected to WAC practice and to allow WAC practice to continue to modify WAC theory.

Because our administration did support a cadre of WAC consultants, we had uncommon opportunities to pay attention to faculty and to have uncommon conversations about writing in particular situations—in genetics, in human development, in physics. We found that our loosely-scripted roles as WAC consultants enabled us to move back and forth among all four of the consulting models that Jeff Jablonski describes in *Academic Writing Consulting and WAC: Methods and Models for Guiding Cross-Curricular Literacy Work*. Together and independently, we functioned as workshop facilitators (workshop model), writing experts (service model), co-inquirers (reflective inquiry model), and researchers (discipline-based research model). How much we emphasized our own expertise and how much we deferred to that of faculty in the disciplines depended entirely on the problem at hand. With the same physics professor, we might on different occasions assume very different roles: expert, co-inquirer, or researcher. Common to all of the consulting roles, though, was a dialogic quality: we could ask questions that others might not think to ask and the faculty often answered our queries in ways we would never dream.

2001-2007: Our Last Years – a Near-Death Experience, but Revived and Moving Ahead

CWP's maturity meant not only bringing some of its work to fruition and receiving professional recognition for its accomplishments, but also experiencing problems that threatened its well being. Some problems may have been inevitable with an aging program; some may trace to us, in our CWP staff roles of wanting to be protective of the program we had nurtured; and some may trace to accelerating differences with higher administration. In any case, the problems peaked in 2005. Were it not for strong support from both WI and non-WI faculty, the Writing Board's persistence in its commitment to quality writing instruction, and the staff's conviction about the value of their work, CWP might have succumbed.

The maturing of anything, including writing programs, is not inherently bad, but it can be problematic if ignored or left unaddressed. So much had worked so well for so long that we CWP staff members may have become complacent when, in fact, some things were changing under our noses. For example, the proportion of new WI courses diminished relative to old WI courses; thus, the Writing Board was charged with less primary evaluation and more secondary, mediated evaluation. Board members tended to approve updates if CWP staff had good reports, so their discussions, while not rubber-stamping exactly, were less dynamic than they had been. Likewise, while CWP staff continued to have one-on-one conversations with newer WI faculty, we did not necessarily book appointments with professors like Jack Kultgen who had offered over twenty-five sections of his philosophy WI course over the decades. Our conversations continued but were, perhaps, less frequent and probing than they had been. Similarly, we had faith that our assessment program followed the best practices advocated by knowledgeable scholars in our field; in fact, CWP's multi-modal assessment program was cited by CCCC as instrumental in our receiving the organization's "Writing Program Certificate of Excellence" award in 2004. Still, we perhaps could have done more to assuage the concerns of some administrators who were responding to the increasingly assessment-driven academic culture when they urged us to adopt assessment measures that we believed inappropriate.

Moreover, some change may have been needed, simply because change stimulates new modes of problem solving. As Laura Brady argues in "A Greenhouse for Writing Program Change," change is beneficial for living, dynamic writing programs. Living in the WAC program we had helped create and seeing it through the lens of pride and investment, we may have lacked the perspective to anticipate necessary changes.

However, these problems were not the only ones or, arguably, even the primary ones leading to the crisis of 2005. The problems CWP encountered involved two factors beyond our control: a substantial reduction in the state of Missouri's fiscal support for higher education and new administrators to whom the Program reported. With regard to the first, the 2001 terrorist attacks on 9/11 led to the decline of financial markets everywhere. In Missouri as elsewhere, lower tax collections led to significantly reduced appropriations to higher education. In fiscal year 2002 alone, the University of Missouri's state appropriation declined by $23 million. As this new dismal fiscal reality set in, virtually all entities on campus felt the pinch.

On one hand, CWP fared surprisingly well during the early period of retrenchment. Budgets across campus were slashed, but CWP's was kept intact—a remarkable sign of support from MU's senior administrators. As time went on, though, gradual adjustments allowed for recovery elsewhere on campus, but CWP's budget remained static and the program was expected to serve increasing numbers of new students with no new resources.

Concomitantly, new administrators were appointed to whom CWP reported. Part of their charge was to find ways to see the university through the fiscal challenges. Understandably, they sought ways to make current funding go further. If not a "do more with less" mandate, the expectation was to "do more with the same." In the fall 2002 semester alone, for example, Townsend attended at least twelve meetings intended to produce a new funding plan for WI courses that would spread current dollars more widely. A new funding formula for distributing resources to WI courses was designed, but did not prove particularly effective. The program's static budget, which had been admirably generous in earlier years, made funding new WI courses for a larger number of students difficult.

It is impossible to claim, however, that the problems CWP faced were attributable solely to a need for creative fiscal solutions. Perhaps a shift in administrators' educational philosophy occurred, or perhaps a lesser degree of understanding about WAC in general came about. In any case, the program experienced noticeably diminished support as evidenced by the following:

- an independent focus-group study of CWP was commissioned, but the overwhelmingly positive findings were not discussed with us, nor disseminated.
- our long-requested second external review was put on hold pending outcome data that would tie improvement in student writing to WI classes.

- the successful and highly integrated Writing Intensive Tutorial Service was removed from CWP's aegis to another unit on campus.[15]
- CWP's offices were moved to a less central (albeit historically significant) location,
- low- or no-cost requests for individual and whole-staff development were denied
- CWP staff were told, indirectly, that we should not be engaged in research on writing, that the program should be a service unit only, and that research on writing should come out of the English Department.

Ironically, these and other difficulties were occurring at the same time that CWP was being increasingly recognized beyond our own campus. Perhaps most noteworthy was the program's receiving the 2004 CCCC's Writing Program Certificate of Excellence, the first year that the profession's major national organization gave the award.[16] Other external acknowledgments of CWP's success included:

- MU's inclusion in U.S. News and World Report's annual Best College for You "Programs to Look For – Writing in the Disciplines" category every year from 2003 (the first year this category appeared) henceforward to 2011.
- an invitation to host the 2004 national WAC conference, for which we selected an international theme; the success of that event led conference organizers to rename and reconstitute the conference henceforward as the international WAC conference.
- numerous international scholars found their way to CWP, to study methods for integrating writing instruction in the disciplines; faculty from South Africa, Costa Rica, Thailand, South Korea and other countries spent up to a semester with us doing research on our methods which they hoped to replicate at their home institutions.

In sum, CWP continued its work. WI courses were delivered; faculty workshops were held; one-on-one consultations were conducted. We paid attention, as usual. The program's "near death" experience could be seen as a series of instances wherein CWP's new administrators neglected to employ dean Glick's strategy of including faculty in decision-making processes. Whereas Glick and other subsequent administrators invited external reviewers' expert opinions and placed responsibility for program policy in the hands of the Writing Board faculty, more recent administrators declined to invite external reviewers and ignored recommendations from the Writing Board. In their own consultancies for other institutions' WAC

programs, CWP staff had often cited MU's remarkable degree of faculty ownership as a key reason for CWP's success. When faculty ownership was threatened and ignored, the program suffered.

Ultimately, faculty did prevail. As word of the problems reached campus, upper administration received emails, letters, and telephone calls. Local newspapers carried stories about the program's possible demise. And the Faculty Council mounted an inquiry that resulted in a unanimous resolution of support for the program. (See Appendix D). The College of Education and the School of Journalism passed similar unanimous resolutions supporting the program.

2007—2011 A Short Update Since Our Departures

Now, some five years later, WI courses are being offered in ever increasing numbers. One-on-one follow-up consultations remain a key feature of CWP work. The Writing Board is as active and influential as it has been at any time in the past. The fifty-first consecutive semi-annual faculty development workshop was recently held, with its usual robust attendance. Longtime WI teacher and former Writing Board chair Aaron Krawitz, newly retired from Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, served a two-year term as interim director. English professor Jeff Rice succeeded him as director for a three-year term, bringing to CWP his considerable expertise with new media. Part of his legacy includes e-WAC, CWP's web-based newsletter; a CWP wiki; and *Artifacts*, a journal for student writing produced in WI classes. English Education professor Amy Lannin is newly named to a two-year term as director. Having directed Missouri's National Writing Project, she will surely forge important new relationships with the secondary education community. New hires replacing Patton and Vogt were quickly completed: Catherine Chmidling and Bonita Selting are now fully integrated into the ongoing activities, enabling the program to continue to pay attention to WI faculty and courses. And the program reports to a new administrator, one who, by every account, is listening and leading with the vigor CWP had been accustomed to. He and the Board continue to explore ways to identify a funding model that will sustain ever-larger WI course enrollments in what is still a difficult fiscal time for the university and state.

Under the new administrator, the university undertook a comprehensive review of the two-decade-old General Education Architecture, into which the original WI requirement had been incorporated and which gave rise to the second WI course. Interestingly, several key elements of the general education program have been eliminated or substantially revised, but the

WI requirement is unchanged. Throughout the campus-wide review process, faculty remained supportive of the place of WI instruction in MU's curriculum. It was, in fact, one of the least controversial aspects of the review.

A subtle but important shift is occurring in WAC programs nationally, away from labeled or designated courses, like our WI model, toward writing that is planfully embedded throughout a discipline, a degree program, or a department's whole curriculum. Often these new initiatives are tied to outcomes assessment that fosters discussion and decision-making within a group of faculty: "What is it we want our students to know and do with our degree when they have earned it? How can writing both help us get there and show that students have acquired the various skills we certify with our degree?" We find much to admire in this new development, which is a welcome evolution in WAC, not least since it harkens back to the liberal arts ideal for which the WI label has always been a somewhat artificial substitute. Even though MU's Geological Sciences Department has successfully adopted an embedded model for its WI curriculum, we nonetheless affirm the power of the WI model for many departments in our university, given the overwhelming faculty support it has developed, and for the local circumstances that WAC must always be sensitive to.

What We Think We Have Learned

Much of what we note about CWP illustrates points that others have made about writing program development, including the importance of both faculty and administration buy-in, the importance of rewards and incentives for faculty, and the importance of a strong, faculty-governed review process if WI-credit is mandatory. We also echo others' comments about the importance of ongoing conversation on both internal and external levels. For example, McLeod and Miraglia, citing Michael Fullan and Matt Miles, claim that the seventh lesson of program success is "connection with the wider environment," for "the best organizations learn externally as well as internally" (20). We affirm most of what we have read in WPA literature about program development.[17]

Some of what we wish to call particular attention to, though, are these interrelated issues:

1. We need to apply to faculty development what we advocate for classroom teaching: back-door, problem-based, discovery learning. As John Bean tells us, individuals who are engaged in real, open-ended problems tend to think more deeply about the issues.

This engagement was the case when the first task force members were allowed space for grass-roots discovery and given ownership in the results of their discovery. We notice that faculty development was a by-product of serving on the writing board, where faculty questioned, learned, and tutored each other in the process of critiquing proposals. We notice this in the power of Vogt's norming exercises. We notice this in Patton's interactions with science faculty. We notice this in the power of Townsend's philosophy of supervision.

2. We need to foster what Krista Ratcliffe calls "rhetorical listening," especially across disciplinary aisles, together with better recognition of individuals who do a lot of it. As Cheryl Glenn and Frank Farmer do, Ratcliffe notes that there is opportunity in silence and potential activity in listening. Unfortunately, the demands of teaching, research, and administration leave most tenure-track WPAs with little time to listen actively—to pay attention—to the intellectual activity in other disciplines.

3. We cannot emphasize strongly enough that #1 and #2 require substantial resources to support WAC personnel who can pay attention and who have time to listen rhetorically. Our university made that possible in ways that other institutions couldn't or didn't.

4. We affirm the value of keeping a detailed archive of WAC programs' work over time as a means of demonstrating the value of pedagogical work. The archival system established by John Peterson, and enhanced by Trish Love, keeps alive the contributions of hundreds of MU faculty and makes CWP's work visible now nearly thirty years later. Without these records, our efforts in this essay would be impossible.

5. We need to better articulate the degree to which the rights and responsibilities are out of kilter for those who engage in interdisciplinary work. That is, the WI faculty whose work we have recognized in this article are almost exclusively on tenure lines. Yet a substantial cadre of graduate students, professional staff, and adjunct faculty contributed to WAC here as well. Their work is embedded throughout CWP's history, but it is not as easily seen nor is it acknowledged to the degree it warrants.

While we call for better recognition of these issues, we also recognize the constructive power of change. As Laura Brady notes in "A Greenhouse

for Writing Program Change," quoting E. Shelley Reid: "Although Reid focuses particularly on the need for curricular change as an ongoing condition, her points are clearly applicable to program administration generally" (31).

We also closely paraphrase Louise Wetherbee Phelps who, in Rose and Weiser's collection, reflects on how she told the story of her own program's tenth anniversary:

> To articulate the program's identity through the story we have told is not, we hope and believe, to singularize our own work as leaders but to understand all leaders' symbolic work…as a collaboration with the rhetoric of an audience, as narrators of complementary, intertwining, and counter stories….We have tried to imagine an ethical practice of administration and its rhetoric in terms of continuities….We have tried to use the privilege of speech accorded past leaders to understand, express, celebrate, and perpetuate these continuities. (181-82)

Our hope is that our own history of one successful WAC program will serve as a resource for those currently building and sustaining WAC programs wherever they may be. Finally, we wish our new CWP colleagues, and the WI faculty they work with, ever more productive and uncommon conversations about using writing in their classrooms and with the students they teach.

Appendix A: 1983-84 Task Force on English Composition

Winifred Bryan Horner, English, Chair
Kenneth Benson, Sociology
Robert Breitenbach, Biological Sciences
Albert Devlin, English
Micki Flynn, English graduate student
Louanna Furbee, Anthropology
Richard Hocks, English
Doug Hunt, English
Robert Hunt, English graduate student
Jean Ispa, Human Development & Family Studies
Jack Lysen, Engineering
Timothy Materer, English
Ben Nelms, English Education
Donald Ranly, Journalism
Robert Robinson, Religious Studies
Joseph Silvoso, Accountancy
William Stringer, Agriculture
Theodore Tarkow, Classical Studies & Dean's Office

Appendix B: WI Guidelines

The Campus Writing Board is looking for classes that use writing as a vehicle for learning, classes that require students to express, reformulate, or apply the concepts of an academic discipline. The emphasis on writing is not intended primarily to give students additional practice in basic composition skills but to encourage students to think more clearly and express their thoughts more precisely. The Board certifies as Writing Intensive courses that take a two-pronged approach to learning, with the students addressing the subject matter via written assignments and the professor attempting to improve the quality of students' performance by giving feedback and requiring revision.

The success of a Writing Intensive course depends far more on the teacher's professional commitment to this style of teaching than it does on adherence to any particular formula. Because of the importance of this commitment, the Campus Writing Board prefers to certify courses that are proposed by voluntary faculty participants, rather than courses that are selected for WI status by departments and then assigned to instructors.

The guidelines below are not inflexible, but they give applicants a picture of the sort of course the Board envisages. Alternative means to the same end will certainly be considered.

1. Writing Intensive courses should be designed and taught by faculty members, at a 20:1 student-to-faculty ratio. This recommendation precludes consideration of graduate students as primary instructors.

   (See Guidelines 7 and 8 for classes larger than 20.) The Board prefers that WI courses be taught by MU tenure-line faculty. If asked to approve non-tenure-line faculty for WI teaching, the Board may ask for a letter from the sponsoring department's chair addressing (1) a rationale for this faculty member's WI teaching assignment, (2) the nature and duration of the WI proposer's academic appointment (adjunct, visiting professor, etc.), and (3) the faculty member's other teaching duties. Although such a letter will assist the Board in determining whether to grant WI status, it will not guarantee approval. The faculty member is expected to provide his or her own WI course proposal, including a syllabus, which reflects a personal understanding and commitment to WI

pedagogy. The faculty member should expect to work with Campus Writing Program staff throughout the course and to attend a CWP workshop prior to teaching the WI course.

2. Each course should include multiple assignments that are complex enough to require substantive revision for most students. Students should submit a draft or other preliminary writing, consider responses from a teacher (and, whenever possible, from other students), revise, and finally edit. The final versions of these assignments should total at least 2000 words (8 pages).

   Writing Intensive courses usually include some assignments so demanding that only a few students will do a completely satisfactory job in a single draft. The first draft or preliminary writing then becomes a testing ground for the student's ideas and reasoning, and the professor's or peers, responses to the writing are an integral part of the instruction in the course. Clearly, the sort of revision the Board has in mind involves rethinking and rewriting, not merely the correcting of grammatical and stylistic errors.

3. Writing for the entire course should total at least 5000 words (20 pages). This writing may take many forms and includes the drafts or preliminary writing and final versions of the assignments in Guideline 2.

   In allowing preliminary drafts to count toward the 5000-word total, the Board assumes that revision of these drafts will mean substantial rewriting for most students (see #2 above). When the professor's expectation is that the final draft will be merely a "cleaned-up" version of the preliminary draft, we ask that the words in the preliminary draft not be counted as part of the 5000-word total.

4. Each course should include at least one revised writing assignment addressing a question for which there is more than one acceptable interpretation, explanation, analysis, or evaluation.

   A Writing Intensive course, because it exposes students to "live" questions in an academic discipline, provides an excellent opportunity to develop critical-thinking skills. The Campus Writing Board, therefore, encourages WI teachers to use assignments that require students to accept the burden of proof and to understand what types and amounts of evidence are necessary to proving an assertion in the discipline. The Board realizes that in many scien-

tific, technological, and quantitative fields, introductory students are in no position to challenge the axioms of the discipline or to take a stand on unsettled questions. In such fields, however, the Board encourages assignments that require students to explain the reasoning they use in solving a problem, to justify their answers by referring to expert opinion, or to articulate the distinction between elegant and inelegant approaches to a project (e.g., designs for an experiment to prove a given hypothesis).

5. Writing for the course should be distributed through the semester rather than concentrated at the end.

    If writing is being used as a mode of instruction, then it is clearly not appropriate to have written assignments concentrated at the end of the semester. The best WI courses tend to contain a series of short papers distributed through the semester rather than one or two major projects. Some successful courses use only two papers but take these papers through a multistage revision process.

6. Written assignments should be a major component of the course grade.

    In perhaps two-thirds of WI courses, out-of-class papers account for 70% or more of the semester grade. It is very unusual for papers in a WI course to account for less than 30% of the course grade.

7. Faculty members may use graduate teaching assistants to bring the student/faculty ratio down to a manageable level.

    The Board prefers courses with a maximum student/faculty ratio of 20 to 1. Effective Fall 2003, the Board implemented a new funding system for WI courses with enrollments over 20. Departments will receive OTS funding, as a departmental transfer of funds, based on the total number of WI students enrolled. Under this OTS plan, the departmental allocation is $110 per student beyond the first 20 students in a class. See the *Suggestions for Large Enrollment Courses* for additional information.

8. In classes employing graduate teaching assistants, professors should remain firmly in control not only of the writing assignments, but of the grading and marking of papers.

The most common practice in courses with enrollment below 50 is to have the professor read every major written assignment and either assign a grade or approve the GTA's grade. In such courses marking and commenting on papers is usually a responsibility shared by the graduate teaching assistant and the professor. As courses get larger, the professor's role becomes increasingly managerial: he or she may train GTAs in "standard-setting" sessions such as those featured in Campus Writing Program workshops and then entrust the actual grading to the graduate teaching assistants. In such circumstances, the Board needs to be assured that the GTAs assign essentially the same grade the professor would, for essentially the same reasons. Professors are, therefore, encouraged to read a large enough sample of the papers to verify the accuracy of the GTAs' evaluations. This sampling will also help the professor assess the effectiveness of the assignment and the need the class may have for additional instruction.

Appendix C: Campus Writing Board Chairs

1985-88	Robert Breitenbach, Biological Sciences
1988-89	Marilyn Coleman, Human Development & Family Studies
1989-90	Stuart Palonsky, Curriculum and Instruction
1990-91	David Roediger, History
1991-92	Doug Hunt, English
1992-93	Joseph Thorpe, Psychology
1993-94	Laurel Wilson, Textile & Apparel Management
1994-95	Gerald Summers, Biological Sciences
1995-96	Dix Pettey, Mathematical Sciences
1996-97	Kay Libbus, Nursing
1997-98	Aaron Krawitz, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
1998-00	Don Sievert, Philosophy
2000-01	Pat Okker, English
2001-02	Michael Kramer, Communication
2002-03	Craig Israelsen, Consumer & Family Economics
2003-04	Joan Hermsen, Sociology
2004-05	Nancy Knipping, Early Childhood and Elementary Education
2005-06	Stephanie Craft, Journalism
2006-08	Anne-Marie Foley, Service Learning
2008-10	Mary Beth Marrs, Business
2010-11	Judith Goodman, Communication Science and Disorders

Appendix D: MU Faculty Council Resolution Regarding the Campus Writing Program

(adopted unanimously April 27, 2006)

Whereas effective writing is an essential skill required by all educated people regardless of their disciplines; AND

Whereas many courses and programs of study at MU did not historically provide adequate training in writing; AND

Whereas the Campus Writing Program, Writing Intensive (WI) courses, and Campus Writing Board were founded in 1985 by a vote of the faculty; AND

Whereas Provost Foster expressed to the Faculty Council Executive Committee on April 18th his support for the continuation of this program at the same level of funding, AND

Whereas Provost Foster expressed at this meeting his intent to designate an interim director of the program before the end of the current semester after consultation with the Campus Writing Board and other faculty, AND

Whereas Chancellor Deaton expressed his support for the continuation and enhancement of this program at the April 19th General Faculty Meeting, THEREFORE

Be it resolved the MU Faculty Council:

1. Expresses appreciation for work done by the campus writing staff, the Campus Writing Board and confidence in their work with the program.

2. Expresses appreciation for the support by Chancellor Deaton and Provost Foster for the Campus Writing Program.

3. Urges quick actions to replace the other three departing members of the writing staff.

4. Calls for the Provost to start in the fall a comprehensive review of the Campus Writing program.

Notes

1. We dedicate this article to the memory of Milton Glick, who helped the program in its earliest stages. Glick was dean of MU's College of Arts and Science from 1983 to 1988; he died April 16, 2011, while serving as president of the University of Nevada at Reno.

2. We use "WAC/WID" in the title of our essay to signal that our program contains elements of both writing-across-the-curriculum and -in-the-disciplines

as they are generally known. For simplicity's sake, however, we use the shorter "WAC" throughout.

3. Jo Ann Vogt was hired in 1989, Marty Townsend in 1991, and Marty Patton in 1994. Patton and Townsend ended their CWP affiliations in 2006 and are in the University of Missouri English Department where both are firmly grounded in WAC/WID professionally and philosophically. Vogt stepped down in 2007 to become Director of Writing Tutorial Services and Associate Director of the Campus Writing Program at Indiana University, Bloomington.

4. We wish to thank everyone who helped fill in some of our historical gaps and to identify where these colleagues are now: Sharon Black is Executive Staff Assistant to the chair of the English Department at MU; Al Devlin, Tim Materer, and Doug Hunt have all retired from English at MU and all still live in Columbia; Win Horner, an emerita professor of English at MU as well as from Texas Christian University, lives in Columbia; Trish Love is retired from MU and works at Missouri State University; John Peterson works with Jo Ann Vogt at Indiana University's Campus Writing Program; Ray Smith is also at Indiana University.

5. Our program owes much to Bean's *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. Since 1996, we have given a copy to each faculty member who attends our workshops, the content of which is based in large part on the concepts in the book.

6. One notable sign of Glick's support for the program is the article he wrote for *WPA: Writing Program Administration*. See "Writing Across the Curriculum: A Dean's Perspective," 11.3 (1988) 53-58.

7. One of Horner's favorite stories about chairing this large committee is that the only common time everyone could meet was 7:30 a.m., so in order to compensate for the early hour, she insisted that their coffee not be served in Styrofoam, but in real china cups.

8. Telephone interview, 11/13/07.

9. "Friendly and helpful" became the mantra for CWP staff's philosophy of interaction with all of our colleagues across campus. Anything else was not going to serve the program's long-term interests.

10. The composition program at the time required one semester of English 60, taken at the sophomore level, preceded *for some students* by one semester of English 1, taken at the freshman level.

11. A detailed description of the self-study and external review may be found in Townsend's "Integrating WAC Into General Education: An Assessment Case Study."

12. An often told (and completely true) story in CWP concerned Jo Ann giving Trish a document she had written so Trish could critique it. Trish's comment on returning the draft to Jo Ann was, "Nice title. Start over."

13. See http://english.missouri.edu/graduate-and-doctoral-faculty/132-martha-d-patton.html for citations.

14. WI faculty who collaborated in these off-campus workshops include Jean Allman, history; Elaine Backus, entomology; Greg Casey, political science; Benyamin Schwarz, environmental design; and Dennis Sentilles, mathematics. Faculty who presented at national conferences include Aaron Krawitz, engineering; April Langley, English; Kay Libbus, nursing; Joshua Millsbaugh, fisheries and wildlife; Mark Ryan, fisheries and wildlife; Pat Okker, English; and John Zemke, romance languages.

15. Wendy Strachan's history of her institution's developing a WI component relates an unfortunate story of administration's requiring the merger of the new WI requirement with an older teaching and learning unit on campus. The parallel between Simon Frasier University's and WITS' forced mergers is striking.

16. Indicative of the atmosphere of the time was our administrator's sole response on learning of the CCCC award: "Did that come with any money?"

17. Townsend's essay "WAC Program Vulnerability and What To Do About It: An Update and Brief Bibliographic Essay" elaborates on WAC program sustainability.

Works Cited

Bazerman, Charles. *The Informed Writer: Using Sources in the Disciplines*. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1989. Print.

Bean, John C. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide To Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996. Print.

Bean, John C. and John D. Ramage. *Form and Surprise in Composition: Writing and Thinking Across the Curriculum*. New York: Macmillan, 1986. Print.

Brady, L. "A Greenhouse for Writing Program Change." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 29.3 (2006): 27-43. Print.

Farmer, Frank. *Saying and Silence: Listening to Composition with Bakhtin*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2001. Print.

Glenn, Cheryl. *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.

Jablonski, Jeff. *Academic Writing Consulting and WAC: Methods and Models for Guiding Cross-Curricular Literacy Work*. Cresskill: Hampton P, 2006. Print.

McLeod, Susan H. and Eric Miraglia. "Writing Across the Curriculum in a Time of Change." *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum*. Ed. Susan McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margaret Soven, and Christopher Thaiss. Urbana: NCTE, 2001. 1-27. Print.

Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. "Telling a Writing Program Its Own Story: A Tenth-Anniversary Speech." *The Writing Program Administrator as Researcher: Inquiry*

in Action and Reflection. Ed. Shirley K Rose and Irwin Weiser. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Heineman, 1999. 168-183. Print.

Ratcliffe, Krista. "Rhetorical Listening: A Trope for Interpretive Invention and a Code of Cross-Cultural Conduct." *College Composition and Communication* 52.2 (1999): 195-224. Print.

Rose, Shirley K, and Irwin Weiser. "The WPA as Researcher and Archivist." *The Writing Program Administrator as Researcher: Inquiry in Action and Reflection*. Ed. Shirley K Rose and Irwin Weiser. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Heineman, 1999. v-xi. Print.

Russell, David. *Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 1870-1990: A Curricular History.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991. Print.

Strachan, Wendy. *Writing-Intensive: Becoming W-Faculty in a New Writing Curriculum.* Logan: Utah State UP, 2008. Print.

Townsend, Martha A. "Integrating WAC into General Education: An Assessment Case Study." *Assessing Writing Across the Curriculum: Diverse Approaches and Practices*. Ed. Kathleen Blake Yancey and Brian Huot. Greenwich: Ablex, 1997. 159-172. Print.

—. "WAC Program Vulnerability and What To Do About It: An Update and Brief Bibliographic Essay." *WAC Journal* 19 (2008): 45-61. Print.