

MAROON & Write

Learn • Discover • Achieve
2020 Impact Report



MISSISSIPPI STATE
UNIVERSITY™

Quality Enhancement Plan

Submitted by Mississippi State University to the
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges



Mississippi State University Maroon and Write Executive Summary



Mississippi State University (MSU) has implemented its quality enhancement plan, entitled Maroon and Write. Building on a foundation of the institution's mission and strategic plan "...to offer excellent programs of teaching, research, and service," the Maroon and Write initiative will enhance the existing academic structure, which requires writing courses at the freshman and senior levels, by integrating writing-to-learn (WTL) strategies and formal writing instruction into all academic disciplines. Ultimately, MSU's mission is to produce graduates who are prepared to be leaders in their professions and communities and who are equipped with skills in communication and critical thinking.

Maroon and Write focuses on a single goal: Improve undergraduate student writing. The QEP will not transform all courses into writing courses nor all faculty into writing instructors. Rather, Maroon and Write will train faculty to adopt some of the writing pedagogies to (1) implement formal writing instruction and activities to enhance the quality of writing and (2) utilize writing-to-learn strategies and informal writing assignments to increase students' writing frequency.

To accomplish its goal, Maroon and Write must develop faculty who adopt writing instruction and WTL strategies in their classes. One approach, Maroon Institute for Writing Excellence (MIWE) includes an intensive faculty training program that occurs during the summer. In addition, Maroon and Write will sponsor ongoing training, workshops, seminars, and other events to educate faculty on incorporating writing pedagogies into the classroom. Maroon and Write offers writing coordinators to support faculty in developing and evaluating writing assignments, as well as graduate assistants to collect and evaluate data and writing samples.

Maroon and Write has developed or identified instruments for measuring the project's impact on student learning: the Maroon and Write Rubric, ETS Proficiency Profile, NSSE survey, and focus groups. To evaluate progress, Maroon and Write will utilize both direct and indirect instruments to measure the plan through three layers of assessment: (1) MSU courses, (2) the institution, and (3) peer comparisons.

MSU has designated resources for this endeavor. Maroon and Write has a budget of \$2,644,754 for the period 2013 through 2018; this includes expenses related to salaries, faculty training, travel, marketing, equipment, and assessment. The program utilizes existing campus facilities for faculty training, workshops, and seminars; in addition, the university has provided dedicated space for the Maroon and Write co-directors and staff in a central location on campus. Maroon and Write will coordinate with MSU's eight colleges and schools, Writing Center, MSU Libraries, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Effectiveness, the offices within Student Affairs, Career Center, MSU Athletics, Public Affairs, and Information Technology Services, among others, to generate support and enthusiasm for participating in the program. More information is available at qep.msstate.edu.

Dr. Deborah Lee
Co-Director
dlee@qep.msstate.edu
662-325-0810

Ms. Ann Spurlock
Co-Director
aspurlock@qep.msstate.edu
662-325-2359

Dr. Timothy Chamblee
Accreditation Liaison
t.chamblee@msstate.edu
662-325-3920

Mississippi State University (MSU) selected student writing as the subject of our Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), called Maroon and Write. Based on national datasets comparing MSU to our large public Southeastern peer institutions, our students scored lower in writing on the ETS Proficiency Profile Exam and on engagement with writing activities according to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). By the end of the five-year project, MSU closed the gap between our students and our peers on both instruments. Although student writing has not improved as much as the QEP intended, it did bring about a culture change toward writing as a tool to enhance learning course content and engagement in the classroom.

Initial Goals

The overarching goal of the program was to improve student writing. Maroon and Write did not set out to transform all courses into writing courses nor all faculty into writing instructors. Instead, it encouraged faculty to adopt writing pedagogies to improve students' writing skills and to use writing to connect to the course content. Doing so involved the following learning outcomes:

1. Students will write documents that are appropriately organized, well developed, and clearly worded.
2. Students will use Standard English correctly, avoiding error in syntax, grammar, and usage.
3. Students will be more engaged in writing activities.

Changes to the Program

The program was very fortunate to enjoy stability in the university's leadership and budget during its six years of implementation. The changes it experienced were mainly in process and to adjust its strategies in response to assessment data.

In between the third and fourth year, the Maroon and Write team changed the evaluation rubric from one that was heavily composition focused to one that was based largely on the VALUE rubrics from AAC&U. The scale moved from 5 points to 4 points, which dramatically reduced the effort to discern scores among the various options, particularly the difficulty in distinguishing a 3 from a 4. Furthermore, it was the hope of Maroon and Write that the revised rubric would be easier for faculty (particularly those who were not formally trained to teach writing composition) to use on their own once the Maroon and Write ended as the Quality Enhancement Plan. Along with the change in rubrics, the co-directors opted for a change in targets to reflect a hope for a 5% increase over the baseline year. For the first rubric, the baseline year was the 2014-15 year and for the second rubric, the baseline year was the 2016-17 year.

Maroon and Write experienced some changes from its proposed organizational structure. The co-directors found that it required fewer Writing Coordinators than originally planned (one for each college) because the work to revise assignments and support classes was manageable with three Writing Coordinators. Coordinators were able to support their current MIWE faculty members, as well as their former MIWE faculty. Furthermore, one of the co-directors left her position with the QEP during its fourth year to become the associate dean of the University Libraries. The remaining co-director assumed leadership as the director.

Impact on Student Learning

Maroon and Write focused most of its activities on developing faculty who adopted writing instruction and strategies in the classroom. Each summer, 10-15 faculty members participated in the Maroon Institute for Writing Excellence (MIWE), an intensive three-week training program. Faculty revised their syllabi, assignments, and lesson plans to incorporate the writing strategies. They implemented these modifications during the following academic year. Maroon and Write collected student writing samples from across the university and evaluated those samples using a rubric. Targets were set for students in QEP classes and for the university's seniors as a whole.

Learning Outcome 1

For the first student learning outcome, the QEP collected student writing samples from MIWE-trained faculty. Trained graders were paid summer stipends to evaluate each anonymized writing sample based on the QEP rubric. These graders worked in teams of two, and each grader read and evaluated the same samples individually before then comparing their scores to determine a validated score. If graders differed by more than 2 points for the first rubric or 1 point for the second rubric, a third grader evaluated the same sample. If all three graders were unable to form a consensus, that writing sample was removed from the evaluation pool. Graders had more difficulty validating scores with the first rubric than they did the second rubric. Table 75 provides the results of these grading sessions.

Notably, the first rubric had declining scores as the program progressed, while the second rubric had increasing scores. Some of this variation had to do with the difficulty in applying the rubric consistently, but variation also occurred because the second rubric was more relatable to the faculty, who were better able to tailor writing assignments to meet the new expectations. For example, every field has writing expectations for setting a purpose, describing content, and providing evidence. Furthermore, every paper has an ending, whether an intentional conclusion or the student stopped writing. These concepts were easier to transfer across academic disciplines than terms such as thesis and word choice.

Table 75. Average rubric scores from student writing samples in MIWE classes

Measure	Description	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Target
Rubric 1	Context / Problem	3.92	3.65	3.20			4.1
	Clarity of thesis	3.68	3.40	3.19			3.9
	Support for thesis	3.63	3.29	3.06			3.8
	Structure & word choice	3.92	3.34	3.03			4.1
Rubric 2	Purpose			2.41	2.71	2.61	2.5
	Content			2.51	2.58	2.49	2.6
	Evidence			2.30	2.38	2.54	2.4
	Conclusion			2.15	2.26	2.32	2.3

With such a small and intensive summer program for MIWE-selected faculty, Maroon and Write also hoped to train faculty through "MIWE-light" programs. Each year, Maroon and Write sponsored a writing-related speaker to address the entire campus, and these events drew 50-70 faculty members. The co-directors also offered at least one faculty seminar each semester through the Center for Teaching and Learning. Furthermore, many former MIWE faculty continued to teach their classes with

the same writing pedagogy, thereby increasing exposure to writing for more students across the institution. The co-directors built a cadre of faculty who were equipped to integrate writing pedagogies, even if on a small scale, to reach greater numbers of students.

To measure overall campus impact, the QEP collected writing samples from senior-level courses across the institution regardless of whether those papers were completed for current MIWE, former MIWE, MIWE-light, or non-MIWE faculty. The goal was to see an increase in student writing scores across the entire campus, but at a lower expected growth of 3% over the life of the QEP. These papers were also graded over the summer with the same grading process as previously described. The graders, who were familiar with the goals and outcomes of Maroon and Write, did not know which class the papers were collected from, preventing any type of bias that could skew the results. Table 76 provides the results of the senior-level writing scores.

Table 76. Average rubric scores from senior-level student writing samples from across the institution

Measure	Description	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Target
Rubric 1	Context / Problem	3.76	3.59	3.13			3.9
	Clarity of thesis	3.63	3.40	3.12			3.7
	Support for thesis	3.57	3.42	3.08			3.7
	Structure & word choice	3.86	3.37	3.02			4.0
Rubric 2	Purpose			2.45	2.69	2.69	2.5
	Content			2.50	2.62	2.60	2.6
	Evidence			2.16	2.50	2.52	2.2
	Conclusion			2.05	2.38	2.36	2.1

Maroon and Write noticed dramatic differences in writing scores depending on the student level (e.g., first-year students wrote very differently than senior students), the class size, and on the type of course (e.g., general education versus an upper division major course). Student writing scores were higher in upper division major courses, and students who participated in QEP courses had higher averages on the rubric. Furthermore, writing samples were not always consistent from year to year as faculty turned over, moved into administration, or taught different classes. For this reason, MSU's rubric scores were not the most reliable measure for whether student writing improved. Regardless, Maroon and Write staff adjusted the summer training program based on writing scores from the previous academic year.

To determine the impact of Maroon and Write on student writing scores, a multiple linear regression was applied to each of the rubric scores controlling for the number of QEP classes a student completed, his/her ACT score, his/her overall GPA, the number of hours transferred into MSU, and the number of hours completed at the time of the writing sample. The regression for the first rubric was inconclusive; however, data from the second rubric indicated significant positive impact as a result of QEP courses. Table 77 provides the results of the five multiple linear regressions combined into one chart to indicate the standardized beta coefficients and t-scores. All highlighted cells are significant with 95% confidence or better. The more MIWE courses students completed, the higher their scores in Purpose, Evidence, and Conclusion, even after controlling for ACT, GPA, and number of credit hours from either MSU or from a transfer institution. It is interesting that the number of hours completed had no significant effect on students' performance in writing.

Table 77. Combined results of multiple linear regressions for the 5 rubric elements

	Purpose		Content		Evidence		Conclusion		Syntax	
	Beta Coeff.	t	Beta Coeff.	t	Beta Coeff.	t	Beta Coeff.	t	Beta Coeff.	t
(constant)		13.390		13.044		10.395		7.906		8.091
ACT	0.124	4.577	0.193	7.255	0.122	4.356	0.137	5.034	0.324	12.578
GPA	0.109	4.260	0.122	4.832	0.131	4.991	0.116	4.529	0.089	3.628
Transfer hours	-0.016	-0.601	0.016	0.607	-0.020	-0.718	0.013	0.486	0.035	1.423
Total hours	0.056	2.165	0.022	0.847	-0.004	-0.134	-0.006	-0.218	0.000	-0.018
Number of QEP courses	0.044	1.943	0.032	1.453	0.124	5.280	0.048	2.089	0.037	1.698
Adj R ²	0.050		0.075		0.062		0.046		0.134	

Note: Dependent variables are listed across the top in the columns and independent variables are listed in the rows along the left. All shaded cells indicate the variables were significant with 95% confidence or better.

Learning Outcome 2

When MSU established student writing as its QEP, many faculty associated correct grammar or Standard English as an important outcome for this project. The original designer of MIWE cited literature explaining that the more frequently students engaged in reading and writing, the more their grammar improved. This outcome was measured both through the Maroon and Write rubrics, as well as with the ETS Proficiency Profile exam. Tables 78 and 79 provide the results of these measures for the second outcome.

Table 78. Results of grammar and correctness scores on the Maroon and Write rubric

Measure	Description	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Target
Rubric 1:	QEP Students	3.48	3.10	2.90			3.7
Correctness	All Seniors	3.35	3.22	2.89			3.5
Rubric 2:	QEP Students			2.57	2.53	2.34	2.7
Syntax	All Seniors			2.47	2.52	2.38	2.5

None of the writing strategies had a positive impact on correctness or syntax, and it was observed that students affiliated with distance learning QEP courses had significantly higher scores in correctness and syntax than their peers in face-to-face courses. These results have been shared with the institution's Center for Distance Education and with the Center for Teaching and Learning to determine whether best practices surrounding writing in the learning management system could serve all course delivery methods. Because content delivered through distance formats are text-based in lecture notes and online discussion boards rather than in-class conversation, students affiliated with distance courses had to read and write frequently. The difference in performance for students in distance programs seems to support the original designer's theory that the more students engage in reading and writing, the more their grammar and correctness will improve.

Similar to the first learning outcome, scores from the Maroon and Write rubric were not very conclusive about the success of the program regarding the second outcome. However, MSU's performance on the ETS Proficiency Profile Exam improved dramatically. The ETS Proficiency Profile Exam results indicate

what percentage of students score at proficient, marginally proficient, and not proficient within three levels of writing understanding:

- Level 1: recognize grammar and word usage
- Level 2: build upon simple components of writing and incorporate those simple components into more complex sentence structures
- Level 3: recognize how complex sentences work together for parallelism, idiomatic language, correct constructions, and reduction in redundancy.

At the time the Maroon and Write was developed, MSU performed far lower than its Carnegie R1 and R2 peers. The average peer score became the target for the measures in this outcome.

Table 79. Percentage who are proficient in writing on the ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Measure	Description	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Target
ETS Proficiency Profile	Level 1 proficiency	75.8%	78.5%	76.8%	74.0%	74.7%	82%
	Level 2 proficiency	30.4%	31.0%	33.7%	30.4%	29.6%	36%
	Level 3 proficiency	17.4%	18.7%	19.9%	17.4%	18.1%	18%

Although Maroon and Write did not achieve its targets, which were lofty from the start, the program did increase the institution's performance on this exam, particularly regarding Level 3. In 2011, MSU's scores were 75%, 28%, and 11%, across these three levels. It should be noted as well that the Carnegie R1 and R2 peer scores declined during the same time period, and now the institution out-performs its peers in this area. The current peer scores serve as our minimal threshold of acceptance for student achievement.

Learning Outcome 3

The most compelling outcome from Maroon and Write was its impact on the campus culture surrounding writing. During the QEP's creation, MSU was strongly encouraged (including advice from the on-site committee) to disregard culture among its outcomes for improved student writing because such an outcome is difficult to measure. The institution opted instead to track student engagement with coursework through writing activities; however, the co-directors continued to focus on improving faculty members' and students' attitudes toward writing with the help of writing-to-learn strategies. These low-stakes strategies included journaling/blogging, responses to discussion boards, and free-writing. Writing-to-learn, or informal writing activities, reinforced course content and helped develop the formal, summative assignments used for the rubric grading. Learning Outcome 3 was measured both through student responses on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and through focus groups with students and faculty.

The NSSE is a survey administered to first-year and senior students each spring, asking them to consider their engagement with MSU in terms of how they spend their time and how well the institution uses its resources to enhance student learning. Maroon and Write chose three questions from this survey to inform student engagement with writing. The targets for these questions represent 5% growth in the percentage of students who report engaging in these writing-related activities. Please note that MSU did

not administer the NSSE in 2016-17 as it was considering a different instrument; however, it resumed the NSSE in 2017-18.

Table 80. Percentage of seniors who responded positively to QEP-related NSSE questions

Measure	Description	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Target
NSSE 1b. How often did you write two or more drafts of a paper?	% scored often or very often	40.5%	43.0%		39.1%	38.0%	43%
NSSE 5d. How often did faculty provide feedback on drafts?	% scored quite a bit or very much	60.4%	61.1%		58.5%	58.9%	63%
NSSE 17a. The institution taught you to write clearly and effectively?	% scored quite a bit or very much	68.2%	73.2%		69.2%	72.3%	72%

Maroon and Write did not find much value in the NSSE results. Multi-drafting and faculty feedback on drafts were activities that were emphasized during MIWE, but not all faculty adopted this practice. Furthermore, having one or two MIWE classes during one's college career would not necessarily lead to a student indicating a higher frequency of these activities when students take 4-6 classes every semester for 4-6 years. However, multi-drafting and faculty feedback were mentioned specifically in focus groups with both students and faculty. Feedback in these focus groups was more valuable to the Maroon and Write assessment than data from the NSSE.

Each semester, Maroon and Write convened focus groups with students who were in QEP classes and with current MIWE faculty and former MIWE faculty. This qualitative research provided richer data than any of the quantitative measures. For the purposes of assessment, answering the overarching research questions was the target for both student and faculty groups.

Student Focus Groups: From the student perspective, Maroon and Write had the following research questions that the program attempted to answer through various questions and conversation:

- How did students engage with writing activities in the classroom (specifically in the MIWE class)?
- How did the writing activities support the course content?

For the first question, students seemed to have one of two mindsets about their writing experiences: (1) they did not notice any increase or extra writing activities, even though they reported specific writing activities; or (2) they noticed increased writing activities which were regarded as helpful in the course. What was interesting to observe was having students from both mindsets in the same focus group so that when those of the second mindset spoke, the ones from the first mindset would acknowledge having similar experiences even though they had reported not noticing any increases in writing activities. For example, one student from an Art class described his journaling experience, and another student from a Fish Physiology class, after first stating that she had not engaged in any writing activities, admitted that she had also journaled during her QEP class but she had not thought of it as writing. In

other cases, students in the focus group claimed that they did not write in their classes until after the facilitator listed examples of writing activities they may have experienced.

Some MIWE faculty indicated on their syllabi that their class was a writing class and others did not, which explained some of the variance in the two mindsets reported in the focus groups. Early in the project, a few faculty feared that students would avoid or drop their classes if they heard that one was more writing-intensive than others. The results of the focus groups were shared with MIWE faculty, and the co-directors began encouraging faculty during MIWE instruction to emphasize the importance of writing as a learning tool either in the syllabus or during class discussions.

For the second question, all students indicated that the writing experiences were positive in the learning process. Some came to college with strong writing skills but had not thought about applying those skills to the learning process. Others remarked that writing helped them connect to the course material. For example, the Fish Physiology student noted that her classmates before the MIWE class (although she used her own words) reported lower grades on tests and assignments; however, she and her classmates had a more positive experience. After reflecting on her writing experience in that class during the focus group, she concluded that writing activities had helped her pass a class that many before had not performed as positively.

Many other students reported that writing activities forced them to read or prepare for class. In a different group, students from a Marketing class remarked about having to prepare in anticipation of in-class free writes, and a student in an English class admitted that mini-reflection homework assignments were the reason he read his assigned homework before coming to class.

Faculty Focus Groups: Maroon and Write hosted far more faculty focus groups than student focus groups, because MIWE faculty seemed to have formed cohorts and used the opportunity to reconnect with each other and to reinforce the writing activities they had learned. The faculty provided advice and guidance to one another, and the focus groups seemed to establish a support network that had not been originally built into the QEP plan. Questions that guided the faculty focus groups were:

- How have you incorporated writing strategies into the classroom?
- What has been the effect on student writing?
- What has been the effect on student learning?
- How will you sustain the writing strategies in the future?

For the first question, faculty were eager to discuss what changes they incorporated into their classrooms. Most faculty incorporated more informal or writing-to-learn strategies than formal writing strategies. The most popular informal strategies were in-class free writes, in-class think-pair-share activities, and at-home journaling or mini-reflection assignments. These strategies were graded either for effort or participation, or they were not graded at all.

About half of the faculty reported adopting formal writing strategies. By far, the most popular was scaffolded assignments or multi-drafting, where students write the final assignment in phases, and faculty grade and provide feedback at every level. Faculty expressed their initial concerns that this

strategy would be more work for them; however, they saw the payoff at the end of the semester when final assignments were superior to previous versions of the class. Faculty reported that the final papers resulting from this approach were faster to grade and more enjoyable to read.

Student reflection was another formal writing strategy that many faculty reported incorporating into their classes. This was a popular approach to formal writing for large classes or classes that were not intended to be writing intensive. Unfortunately, the graders had difficulty applying the Maroon and Write rubric to reflection papers, and reflection paper scores tended to be lower than other forms of formal writing assignments. Beginning with the MIWE training programs before the start of the fourth year, the co-directors encouraged faculty to explain the reflection concept to the students and to frame the reflection prompt in a way that could be graded with the rubric. Evidence from the 2017-18 and 2018-19 data suggests that this strategy was effective.

For the second question, generally faculty who incorporated formal writing strategies saw improvement in the final writing products, but those who used only informal writing strategies saw little effect. Faculty members commented that giving students feedback on multiple drafts generated better formal papers at the end of the semester. One faculty member said that his students started being more conscious of what they were writing. An example he gave was from a capstone course where students previously would send emails to mayors of towns that they worked with that included grammatical and spelling errors. After going through MIWE and applying changes to the course, he has seen significant improvement in professionalism. Although many faculty members noted seeing improvements, a few professors did note that they did not see improvement because their students did not seem to apply the feedback that was given. These comments generally came from faculty who were teaching lower division courses.

For the third question, MIWE faculty almost unanimously reported stronger student engagement with the course content, regardless of which writing strategies they used. Those who assigned journals or mini-reflection papers as homework stated that the result was enriched classroom conversations because students were more familiar with the topics being discussed. An English and African American Studies professor reported that his QEP class was a general education class, and frequently students did not read before coming to class and were hoping to “wing it” during the class discussion. When he started assigning mini-reflections due before the next class, the classroom conversation was much better. A Sociology professor decided to try a think-pair-share activity one day in one of his large, lower-division courses, and he was surprised at how much better the classroom experience was for him and his students.

Along with students being more engaged with classroom conversations, faculty also described how the writing strategies helped them identify areas where students were struggling so they could shape their lessons to address those issues. One faculty member explained that writing exercises gave students another platform to “let me know when they’re having issues.” Another who taught web design to Art students mentioned “the biggest advantage to having reflection homework was being able to determine what my students were and were not familiar with. It helped me fine-tune the lectures and course content accordingly.”

Other faculty members also noted that students felt more confident to ask questions because they were prepared for class. One Geosciences faculty member mentioned that by asking students to write their thoughts on evolution in their homework, they “felt heard” so that the class discussion could focus on

the content as opposed to their opinions about the content. More students volunteered to speak than in previous classes because, as she explained, they were not as worried as previous students about offending their classmates. Another professor who taught Landscape Architecture and Landscape Contracting courses noted that her contracting students seemed to have a better appreciation for and understanding of what architecture students do for the field instead of feeling as though the two majors were competing against one another. She felt that both groups of students were more confident in the field that they had chosen.

One engineering faculty member made a statement that summarizes the three most popular statements made about the impact on student learning: "I have set up the classes now in a way that (1) helps them learn more about the different styles of writing used in our field, (2) reduces their procrastination and forces them to read the text, and (3) gives them an outlet to let me know what questions they still have on the material."

Finally, all faculty mentioned that they not only would sustain the writing activities they learned during the MIWE training, but they also incorporated them into other classes. Many noted that they had attempted too many strategies and would scale back to the ones that were most effective. Formal reflection papers were the most likely to be dropped from future versions of the class, along with certain informal writing strategies such as peer review and daily journals. Several informal writing strategies, such as mini-reflections or class summaries as homework and think-pair-share in-class activities, were popular among faculty and were reported as being retained in future versions of the QEP class and in other classes as well. The scaffolding/multi-drafting exercises were the most widely adopted strategy that was incorporated into many classes beyond the QEP project. Faculty kept this formal writing strategy in their classes, and some even expanded the assignment into more drafts and additional projects beyond the formal paper. Those who have mentored other faculty reported recommending this approach to student writing more than anything else.

A theme that emerged across multiple focus groups and continued conversation with MIWE faculty was that Maroon and Write taught them pedagogical approaches that were good for their students. Whenever they found an activity that improved class engagement or student performance on assignments, they were eager to adopt and expand those activities not only to other classes they taught, but also to encourage their colleagues to consider adopting these strategies in their classes.

Ripple Effects

MSU enjoyed an unintended benefit from engaging in Maroon and Write: a rejuvenated emphasis on teaching effectiveness. Faculty who participated in MIWE or other Maroon and Write events revitalized or enhanced their love of teaching and learning. Many, whether associated with MIWE directly or indirectly, revised their courses to adopt writing strategies. In addition, entire academic programs engaged in curricular reforms as a result of the MIWE process. The departments of Biological Sciences, Geosciences, Music, and to some extent Landscape Architecture reformed their programs to incorporate more writing-infused classes into the curricula. All sent course and program modifications through the university's curriculum review process, replacing the minimum expectations of 2-3 dedicated writing courses outside of the major with several courses and many opportunities for students to practice discipline-specific writing within their majors. These programs sent faculty representatives through the MIWE program every year, and former MIWE participants instructed other faculty about the writing

strategies that were most effective for them. These faculty members remain staunch advocates for Maroon and Write as it transitions to its new home in the Department of English.

Finally, MIWE became a vehicle through which faculty were promoted either within rank or to administrative functions, thereby instilling the mindset of the importance of writing pedagogy in the faculty and administration. Of the 65 participants in MIWE, 12 were promoted in academic rank, 3 became academic program coordinators for their departments, 3 became department heads, 4 became associate or assistant deans, 2 became directors within Academic Affairs, and 1 is an interim assistant vice president in the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President. One could argue that a selection bias was at work in that those who were already interested in teaching and learning chose to participate in MIWE. Although most were already inclined toward teaching and learning, some were recommended by their department heads or program coordinators to enhance teaching effectiveness. Regardless, Maroon and Write has a legacy that is being perpetuated across the faculty and academic administration.

Reflection

The Maroon and Write experience was positive for MSU, and many of its teachings will live on in its new formation within the Department of English, where Writing Coordinators will continue to partner with the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Writing Center, and other university programs to support faculty and students in written communication of all kinds.

Looking back, several experiences will inform MSU's future QEPs. Maroon and Write was created in three phases using three different university committees: (1) Topic Selection, (2) Development Committee, and (3) Implementation Committee. All three committees had different chairs or co-chairs. The co-chairs from the third committee became the co-directors of the program. They essentially inherited a plan that they did not craft but were charged with implementing. As a result, they compromised on learning outcomes that they may not have set for the plan had they been the original creators. These compromises created variable data and results that were not always useful to the program. These phases were important to the QEP; however, those who lead the program will need to be the ones who develop the plan.

MSU has learned a valuable lesson in setting learning outcomes that resonate with those leading educational efforts. In the end, the missing "culture" outcome, as it became known, was the most impactful outcome for the institution. Qualitative evidence suggests that faculty who were eager to embrace writing as a tool not only changed their personal attitudes toward writing, but also improved their students' attitudes as well. So many faculty and students indicated that writing-to-learn enhanced their connection to the course content, livened the classroom, and strengthened their learning practices.