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Number of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
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</table>

The College of Continuing Education has no tenure or tenure track faculty, only adjunct faculty, which hosts 27 industry professional faculty per year. (Data taken from our [Annual Report](https://cse.umn.edu/documents/DCP/BAS-CMGT-Annual-Report.pdf))
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Major(s)

*Please list each major your Unit offers:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Total # students enrolled in major as of AY 2013-2014</th>
<th>Total # students graduating with major AY 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

WEC Implementation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Implementation Process</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th># participated / # invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Edition</td>
<td>10/18/10</td>
<td>7 / 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Edition</td>
<td>11/29/10</td>
<td>8 / 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Edition</td>
<td>1/31/11</td>
<td>6 / 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple small website content meetings with selected faculty/staff</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>5 / NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meeting - third edition</td>
<td>3/5/15</td>
<td>14 / 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Writing Plan Narrative, 3rd Edition

Briefly describe the reason(s) this unit (department, school, college) became involved in the WEC project, the key findings that resulted from the process of developing this plan, and the implementation activities that are proposed in this Writing Plan, with particular attention to the following questions: what is new in this 3rd edition of the Writing Plan? What, if any, key changes have been made to the 2nd edition? What key implementation activities are proposed in this edition of the Writing Plan?

Since 1996, this advanced-standing program has served non-traditional students with some college coursework and industry work experience, with a course of study towards either a Bachelor of Applied Science (B.A.Sc.) degree, an academic minor, or an academic certificate. Today, the student body has evolved into a blend of adult learners and traditional students, many without any prior construction experience and also serves students from departments such as Architecture, Interior Design, Housing Studies, and Civil Engineering seeking relevant coursework to supplement their future professions. More recently, the program has expanded to include a Facility Management track, which will be immediately integrated into the Construction Management Writing Plan.

By virtue of its academic charter, CCE has no full-time or tenured faculty. This college relies on only a few University faculty, who agree to teach on overload, and mostly upon experienced adjunct professionals—many of whom have been with the program for many years—who generally teach one to two classes per academic year. CMgt faculty members typically work full-time in the construction or facility management industry and have significant outside commitments, thus only two faculty meetings are held per year. A rigorous program quality cycle has been in place to monitor program, course and faculty progress and improvement.

What We Have Accomplished

Since approval of our first- and second-edition Writing Plans, the following initiatives have been undertaken:

- Retained Ms. Heidi Wagner, a graduate research assistant with a construction management degree, to complete mapping, including one-on-one faculty interviews, of the entire curriculum against the identified writing criteria and industry-supported genres. Ms. Wagner also prepared a statistical analysis of the mapping for presentation to faculty. The result of this mapping is incorporated as Appendix A.1.
- Continually discussed and reinforced the importance of the Writing Plan and its results with faculty and have received very positive endorsement and support, especially in applying alternative assignments that more directly relate to their learning outcomes and the writing criteria. Have issued a “virtual” faculty meeting with a voice-over PowerPoint to all faculty of the mapping results, for their review, comment and discussion at the Fall faculty meeting (Appendix A.5).
- Started to implement a standard Writing Enriched Curriculum module within the course syllabi to make students aware of the program and how a particular class (CMgt 4011, CMgt 4041, CMgt 4072, CMgt 4196, CMgt 4422, CMgt 4562, CMgt 4861) is impacted by the writing criteria. The course syllabus text already incorporated in some courses is attached and marked Appendix A.2.
- Completed two rating sessions of capstone level writing in 2011(n14) and 2014 (n13) generated by an upper-division proposal assignment from the CMgt 4041W Specification and Technical Writing class (the “Gizmo” project). Over the intervening three year period evaluating the same assignment, most criteria indicated improvement, in some cases significant improvement. This sample of upper division writing assessment demonstrates the effectiveness of dedication to the improvement of student the writing within the program. The results of this rating covering both periods are included in Appendix A.3.
- Successfully converted CMgt 4041W Specification and Technical Writing class to Writing Intensive status. (First offered as Writing Intensive Spring 2012)
- After several technical delays, launched the planned Student Writing Style Guide January, 2015, Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style, a fully public facing website intended as a resource
specific to our industry, to be used and referenced by faculty and students alike within our curriculum, and attached to every Moodle site within the program. This site was researched and drafted by Ms. Rachel Fang, our second Graduate Research Assistant, and developed into a web platform by our own instructional designer, Dr. Kim Ballard.

- Successfully obtained International Facility Management Association (IFMA) provisional accreditation, and American Council of Construction Education (ACCE) accreditation. Demonstration of our Writing Plan was significant in the program presentation and has a direct impact on program quality that enables accreditation.
- Hilger and Wagner presentation to the 12th International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference (IWAC), June 2014 entitled: Integration of Industry Professionals' Feedback Into Improving Writing Skills of Construction Management Undergraduates.
- Hired Mr. Richard Kronik, a well known industry expert, to develop and narrate eight mini-web videos on basic writing principles, delivered by "Richard the Writing Guy", taped and produced within CCE to bring alive otherwise dry basics to our student audience in a fully web enabled platform.

**The Final Phase: Path Toward Sustainable Self Sufficiency**

What we need to do to fully implement this third edition of our Writing Plan is best summarized as follows:

- Continue to develop and refine *Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style*:
  - Establish the site on the U of MN web platform rather than as a Google Site, to improve access and searchability (currently underway with CCE’s marketing group)
  - Annual review and update of the writing style guide web based content as collected over the previous academic year, based upon student, faculty and public input and assessment from their direct use of the site.
  - Starting in Summer 2015, every regularly scheduled course update will link specific assignments to specific resources in the site that will help both faculty and student alike.
- Develop tools to enable our mostly adjunct faculty to teach with writing, which would include both teaching about writing in the discipline as well as assessing student writing that is measurable. We anticipate creating a companion Moodle site loosely called *Teaching Construction With Writing: Guidelines for Faculty* that is specific to our industry disciplines.
- As each of the program's two accreditation bodies have moved to an outcomes based assessment, of which communication, both written and oral, is a key component, the WEC abilities (translated as "competencies" within the accreditation jargon) will be mapped across the curriculum and tied to specific assessment of student writing by the faculty. As part of the process, evidence from WEC will be used to demonstrate our fulfillment of accreditation requirements (described as competencies by FMAC and ACCE). Specifically, we expect to guide our faculty to not only use writing to teach construction management principles, but to use the very assessment of that writing as a basis for measurement not only of improvement of writing over time, but of the construction management abilities guided by our academic accreditation agencies.
- Since we have no regular faculty that could take on this role, the College of Continuing Education has retained a part time writing consultant to help not just the Construction Management program, but the entire CCE Applied and Professional programs to connect teaching with appropriate writing assignments and rubrics.
- Extend the rating of the “Gizmo Proposals” (senior level writing project) for a third and final review after Spring 2017, after which the review will be internalized as part of a regular assessment.
• Begin to collect writing samples from select courses representing a variety of academic experience levels and representing at least one piece from each genre, and measure the assessment progress for each of the writing ability/competencies annually.

• Engage Writing Center staff on limited consulting, particularly in support of specific tools that can help our Adjunct faculty teach with writing.

The unique structure of the CMgt program within the University environment calls for a unique approach to teaching with writing. Industry’s demand for graduates who communicate well on all levels was clearly expressed and supported by 90% of the WEC “Professional Affiliate” survey respondents who considered writing very or extremely important. Our third edition Plan, which primarily involves completing the development of faculty resource tools, combined with our unique program quality control initiatives tied to outcome standards, will deliver graduates who meet or exceed the standards for the abilities identified, as well as the University’s Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
Section 1: DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC WRITING CHARACTERISTICS
What characterizes academic and professional communication in this discipline?

The construction industry is a client-focused, relationship-centric business requiring of its workers communication skills involving technical knowledge of building and efficient use of resources. Writing in the construction industry is characterized by concise, focused communication that satisfies contractual requirements, identifies and solves problems, and establishes a historical record of a project or process. Very little academic writing is produced within the industry, with the greatest writing efforts focused on professional communication. The primary industry-standard writing genres, as determined overwhelmingly by our industry-rooted faculty and confirmed by the WEC industry survey¹, consist of the following (% industry response):

- Correspondence (letters, memoranda, e-mails, etc.) (98%)
- Proposals, presentations, or feasibility studies (92%)
- Reports: observation, recordkeeping, or minutes (82%)
- Budgets or cost delivery (71%)
- Interpretations of sketches, graphics, or technical drawings (49%)
- Technical documents (specifications, lab reports) (16%)
- Procedures or manuals (16%)
- Schedules, written or graphic (16%)
- Industry-standard contract documents and forms (CO, COR, PR, RFI) (16%)

Following the WEC survey of our faculty and industry constituents, the following predominant writing characteristics emerged² (faculty % / industry %):

1. Descriptive: ability to convey process, describe objects, data, environments, etc. (86% / 68%)
2. Explanatory: translating complex content into comprehensible definitions and/or instructions (57%/50%)
3. Analytical: emphasizing the logical examination of subjects (93% /45%)
4. Argumentative: positioned to persuade readers (43%/31%)
5. Technical: emphasizing accurate, complex, and relatively objective information, data, etc. (57%/22%)

Further, summarizing the WEC survey, faculty overwhelmingly identified the following abilities they most wanted to strengthen in their students through their teaching³:

- Analyzing and creating concise summaries of ideas, texts, or events
- Appropriately using terminology and jargon along with correct grammar and punctuation
- Creating precise descriptions of processes, objects, and findings.

“Conveying information using proper grammar and punctuation is essential! The reader wants to know what you are requesting. State it clearly up front, develop the thought, re-state the request. Anything more is a waste of everyone’s time.” - Affiliate survey response

¹ The effective response rate for faculty and industry was in excess of 61%. WEC Industry Affiliate survey, question 7: “What kinds of writing do you do in your job?”
² WEC industry and faculty survey, “. . . which three characteristics are most important?”
³ WEC faculty survey: “Which writing abilities do you hope your assignments strengthen in students . . .”
Section 2: DESIRED WRITING ABILITIES
With which writing abilities should students in this unit’s major(s) graduate?

After receipt of the survey results, the faculty and administrative staff jointly crafted criteria describing those abilities that students should master prior to graduation, and are maintained without revision:

**Communicate clearly:** Articulate problems, proposals, procedures, and policies using concrete, unambiguous language.

**Use evidence:** Habitually maintain and comprehensively recall, recite, and apply documents, records, notes, data, and independent research in support of critical thinking.

**Communicate about problems and conflicts:** Objectively analyze, recite, assess, evaluate, interpret, and communicate issues, problems, conflicts, and their solutions.

**Understand and address stakeholder concerns:** Inspire confidence using language, tone, authentic voice, and technical detail appropriate to the stakeholder perspective and ability to comprehend.

**Correctly use industry-standard documents:** Read, create, modify, and interpret drawings, forms, and other industry-standard documents.

**Interpret technical material:** Demonstrate mastery and proper application of technical terminology, tools, jargon, and software.

“The adjunct professors knew what actual writing we would be dealing with in construction, which was more useful than thesis papers.” - Student survey response

“Every email or letter we write (which we do very often) reflects on me and the company I work for.” - Affiliate survey response

“Even though I have developed into a better writer, I wish there was more ‘real world’ writing available in college. Also on that note, I wish critical writing was stressed more heavily in the Const. Mgmt. degree. It was never emphasized as an extremely important tool.” - Affiliate response
Section 3: INTEGRATION OF WRITING INTO UNIT’S UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

How is writing instruction currently positioned in this unit’s undergraduate curriculum (or curricula)? What, if any, course sequencing issues impede an intentional integration of relevant, developmentally appropriate writing instruction?

According to a 2010 WEC faculty survey, 73% of faculty rated the importance of writing to the discipline to be either “very important” or “extremely important.” Approximately 45% of classes assigned writing between 1 to 5 pages, and 52% between 6 and 20 pages⁴. Following the more detailed course mapping process, we have been able to assess the density and frequency of writing assignments and their match to the writing abilities across the curriculum (See Appendix A1.1 and A1.2).

In this third edition of the Construction Management Writing Plan, the following strategies are planned to comprehensively sequence writing into our undergraduate curriculum:

a. **Complete Mapping**
   1. Integrate, coordinate and connect the accreditation outcomes standards to the WEC program abilities/competencies, and assure assignments are being drawn vertically and horizontally across the entire program curriculum
   2. Work with faculty to establish measurable rubrics that will enable data collection via CampusLabs software for selected, repeatable assignments across the curriculum measuring each ability/competencies.
   3. Identify outcomes based assignments from the pure "learning based" assignments to establish WEC program "breadth and depth" across the curriculum.

b. **Standardize writing objectives within all CMgt Course syllabi**
   1. Refine the current language to simplify the identification of WEC precepts and parameters across the curriculum, and focus on identifying the WEC goals for the particular course are clear and concise.
   2. Standardize the measurement "standards" for common types of assignments.

c. **Expand faculty training with targeted writing instruction via the Moodle (or similarly appropriate) platform in the APS HomeBase, entitled "Teaching Construction with Writing"**
   1. Use the internal resources of an Instructional Designer (Dr. Kim Ballard) to develop the web based instructional guidelines, coordinating with WEC consultants and our part time Writing Consultant.
   2. Encourage targeted faculty consultations for three or four similar courses to share ideas for assignment types, rubrics, etc. to assure assignment differentiation and approach, using these consultations and incentives to create the foundational guidelines for the Teaching With Writing platform.
   3. Expand the awareness of the Student Writing Style Guide with all faculty, and based upon faculty input for the consultations identified above, tailor the content to make the site more meaningful for each faculty and their courses, using the faculty meeting for broader awareness, and course reviews for more specific awareness.
   4. Aside from the outcomes based, consistently measured assignments required for accreditation, emphasize how writing can improve learning beyond measuring through exposure to specific tools and strategies that not only deliver technical content or know-how, but also build writing skills by expanding (appropriately) the writing output of all courses.

---

⁴ WEC 2011 faculty survey: “How important is writing to the scholarly and professional work done in this major’s discipline?”
5. Incorporate a Writing snippet or tool within each Faculty meeting.

d. **Focus and Expand**
   1. Through faculty engagement on the importance of writing, work to change the culture of teaching with writing as part of a flipped classroom delivery model, and stimulate by example and tools the ways in which we can teach our technical and management content beyond lecture to industry appropriate writing assignments. This will be done one-on-one with the Faculty Director, as regular part of the twice annual faculty meetings, and through the regular course review process.
   2. Add one or two other Writing Intensive designated courses into our curricular mix.
   3. (Stretch Goal) Use our emphasis on writing not only at the program level, but also at the college level be exhibited in our program promotional materials, and also use the University branded *Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style* website to display our leadership in using writing as one important cornerstone in the foundation for teaching Construction Management, and therefore distinguish ourselves from our peer institutions.

**APPLIED AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES: CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT (CQI)**
The College of Continuing Education’s Applied and Professional Studies (APS) teaching and development guidelines support faculty in their teaching and uphold the high expectations of CCE and the University for teaching excellence with achievable benchmarks for regular course and teaching reviews, targeting development and mentoring opportunities. The guidelines are designed to:

- Improve student learning outcomes;
- Develop and support a community of effective teaching practice;
- Enhance and document teaching effectiveness;
- Model effective teaching and learning practice; and
- Adhere to University policy for instructor review.

The Writing Plan, along with the related teaching and style guides, are designed to fit within the CQI as a regular part of the course review process, assuring that the writing abilities are continuously fostered, taught, and maintained across the curriculum, and can be effectively taught by new or existing faculty members where such experience in teaching with writing may be more limited. Further, assessment and measurement of student writing abilities/competencies is an absolute indicator of where improvements need to be addressed within the curriculum.

The following table presents the writing abilities with their associated assessment qualities and likely industry genres.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABILITY</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT QUALITIES</th>
<th>GENRE USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Communicate clearly:**  
Articulate problems, proposals, procedures, and policies using concrete, unambiguous language. | - Correct grammar and punctuation  
- Accurately presented  
- Clear, concise, correct | - Correspondence  
- Proposals  
- Directives, instructions  
- Estimates, schedules  
- Specifications |
| **Use evidence:**  
Habitually maintain and comprehensively recall, recite, and apply documents, records, notes, data, and independent research in support of critical thinking. | - Maintain notes  
- Data and research adequately cited  
- Data and research applied to analyze and solve problems  
- Arguments supported by logic | - Field and observation reports  
- Specifications  
- Proposals and studies  
- Negotiations  
- Meeting minutes  
- Research papers |
| **Communicate about problems and conflicts:**  
Objectively analyze, recite, evaluate, interpret, and communicate issues, problems, conflicts and their solutions. | - Stakeholder perspectives presented, compared, and contrasted  
- Clear and bias-free restatement of problems | - Correspondence  
- Change management schedules  
- Lab reports  
- Feasibility analysis  
- Essays and minute papers  
- Daily logs |
| **Understand and address stakeholder concerns:**  
Inspire confidence using language, tone, authentic voice, and technical detail appropriate to the stakeholder perspective and ability to comprehend. | - Audience is consistently addressed in a clear way  
- Appropriate tone is used  
- Anticipate audience objections  
- Portrayed in writer’s own voice | - Presentations  
- Proposals  
- Change management and negotiation  
- Feasibility studies  
- Meetings |
| **Correctly use industry-standard documents:**  
Read, create, modify, and interpret drawings, forms, and other industry-standard documents. | - Correct application and timing of documents  
- Correct description and application and citation of drawings | - Contracts  
- Construction drawings and specs  
- Shop drawings, survey notes  
- Change management docs  
- Completion / commissioning documents |
| **Interpret technical material:**  
Demonstrate mastery and proper application of technical terminology, tools, jargon, and software. | - Correct application and understanding of technical terms and jargon  
- Integrate properly captioned graphic and written content  
- Effective use of trade software to communicate message | - All forms of written communication and drawing  
- MS Excel, Word, Project, AutoCAD  
- Survey, lab reports |
Section 4: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT WRITING

What concerns, if any, have unit faculty and undergraduate students voiced about grading practices?

“Writing in construction is much different than any writing I have ever been taught in my entire schooling. It is important to learn the difference.” - Student survey response

The communication of writing expectations and assessment of student writing is presently conveyed at the course level, and at the program level on our website. Whether or not a rubric is utilized, and how such writing is measured against any sort of “standard,” be it industry or individual preference, writing assessment is typically described at the assignment level via written and/or oral instruction. Examples of correct applications or documents are also typically used. All instructors are professionals working within the construction industry, with 10-25 years’ experience. Their familiarity with industry written genres is strong; however, their frustration with the student output has also been the subject of regular complaint.

Assessment of student writing will become more critical if we use writing as one of the key drivers for accreditation. Both of our new accreditation standards have shifted to an outcomes-based model wherein ratable, measureable assessment is critical for evaluation. Key to our assessment of student writing is establishing those regularly offered, consistently measured assignments that map to our accreditation outcomes that have the effect of improving writing abilities, separate from those that are merely used to teach management concepts through writing assignments. Establishing a uniform metric for teaching and evaluating writing is essential to our program, and measurement and assessment focus will lead to a more deliberate and robust structure across the curriculum to assure that discipline-appropriate writing abilities are addressed at all levels of the curriculum and upon graduation, and that progress can be affirmatively and effectively measured and demonstrated.

One of the best outcomes of this effort will be the mapping of all curricular writing assignments to the proposed criteria and assessment rubrics. This will in turn allow us to discern the assignment types, and the teaching and assessment techniques that will consistently yield high-quality, industry- and University-appropriate student writing. The creation of the Moodle site, *Teaching Construction with Writing: Guidelines for Faculty*, to guide adjunct faculty is essential to maintaining continuity and consistency of approach, and to avoiding redundancy and/or gaps in our curriculum-wide approach. The handbook will:

- Reinforce the principles of writing enrichment geared toward industry and University expectations across the program;
- Establish guidelines for conveying expectations about what constitutes good writing for any given assignment individually, and collectively for the course as a whole;
- Establish guidelines, when appropriate, for assessment techniques, applying rubrics, either explicit or implicit; applied uniformly against the genre identified within the writing plan, and
- Sequence the level and complexity of writing coursework across the CMgt curriculum to foster the desired writing abilities, and
- Reinforce how writing can be a "teaching moment" within our industry focused curriculum.
PRESENT RATING CRITERIA
The key to measuring progress across the course and the curriculum is to have a generally uniform set of rating criteria that reflect the writing abilities we want students to possess upon graduation. Following the initial rating of student writing, the following list reflects a more granular set of rating criteria, unchanged from previous editions:

1.0 - Communication is clear: Problems, proposals, procedures, and policies are articulated using concrete, unambiguous language.

   1.1 Is mechanically correct: Correctly applies grammar, spelling, word usage, and punctuation.
   1.2 Language is clear: Meaning is easily and rapidly comprehensible and statements are not subject to multiple interpretations. Uses no unnecessary words. Sentences are not overlong or run together.
   1.3 Presentation has satisfactory construction: Paragraphing is used effectively; bullet points and subheads used where appropriate.
   1.4 Purpose or central objective is made clear.
   1.5 Follows a coherent and logical progression (can be outlined easily): transitions are clear and show connected ideas.

2.0 - Evidence is used: Documents, records, notes, data, and independent research are habitually maintained and comprehensively recalled, recited, and applied in support of critical thinking.

   2.1 Documentation is sufficient: Notes, minutes, and results are consistently, accurately, and comprehensively recorded without bias as to fact, date, time, and place.
   2.2 Arguments have support: Relevant notes, data, research, and records are cited sufficiently in support of arguments or positions.
   2.3 Evidence is used logically: data, research, and records are applied to analysis or problem solving in a logical manner.

3.0 – Problems, conflicts, and issues are objectively analyzed, recited, assessed, evaluated, and interpreted, and solutions are proposed.

   3.1 Problems analyzed sufficiently: Issues, problems, or conflicts and their solutions are recited and/or accurately summarized.
   3.2 Problems analyzed without bias, supported by facts.
   3.3 Problem presentation is balanced: Varying relevant stakeholder positions are presented and contrasted toward a balanced perspective of the problem or conflict.
4.0 – Stakeholder concerns understood and addressed: Language, tone, authentic voice, and technical detail are used appropriate to the stakeholder perspective and ability to comprehend and in a manner that inspires confidence.

4.1 Audience level of comprehension is met: Target audience is consistently addressed by using understandable language and technical detail.

4.2 Is courteous and respectful: Tone that is appropriate to the audience and acknowledges its positions and concerns related to the issue is used in a manner that supports goodwill.

4.3 Sounds natural and friendly. Arguments or issues are portrayed using the writer’s authentic voice; is neither overly formal nor informal.

5.0 - Drawings, forms, and other industry-standard documents are correctly read, created, modified, and interpreted.

5.1 Standard documents used where needed: Contract forms are applied correctly for a given situation.

5.2 Documents contain all necessary information: Contracts, schedule of values, and other documents are accurately completed.

5.3 Document supporting materials well-explained: Drawings, contract documents, and forms are precisely interpreted.

6.0 - Technical material interpreted: Mastery and proper application of technical terminology, tools, jargon, and software is demonstrated.

6.1 Problems, proposals, or procedures are technically and factually correct.

6.2 Technical terminology and jargon is correctly used, and explained where necessary.

6.3 Software (scheduling, budgeting, and word processing) used on appropriate occasions; used correctly; and explained adequately.

6.4 Citations correctly used: included where needed to identify non-original information, in a complete and accurate manner.

6.5 Graphic content appropriately used: included when needed, clearly executed, and properly captioned and cited.
Section 5: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS, including REQUESTED SUPPORT, RELATION TO PREVIOUS IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES, and SUSTAINABILITY PLANS

What does the unit plan to implement during the period covered by this plan? What forms of instructional support does this unit request to help implement proposed changes? What are the expected outcomes of named support?

How do the implementation plans of the 3rd edition Writing Plan relate to implementation activities from the 1st and 2nd edition Writing Plans? What has been successful? What was not successful? How do implementation plans build on what was learned from the first year of implementation? How do implementation plans anticipate the ongoing application of this final edition Writing Plan?

How will the unit move toward ownership of the implementation process after the end of eligibility for WEC funding? When needed, what will be sources of funding and resource support? How will ongoing evaluation and improvement of the Writing Plan take place?

Construction Management has unique challenges not faced by other programs at the University. As an applied curriculum taught by working professionals serving as adjunct faculty, there are limited opportunities for faculty to gather and brainstorm ideas and approaches to implementing the writing plan, or even to ideas about how to teach with writing. With experience as industry professionals rather than teaching professionals they are eager to develop new approaches to teaching. Professional schedules are extraordinarily difficult to coordinate. Large scale workshops are impractical, despite the overall need for assistance with instructional design in general and the teaching of writing in particular.

Program administration relies on “one-to-one” consultation as a regular part of course reviews, end-of-semester course reflections by instructors, resources shared within a faculty community resource site, and faculty development activities including two annual blended workshops and remote synchronous resources incorporated within the faculty meetings. Based on strategies shown to meet the time demands of busy faculty, these implementation initiatives are planned:

1. **Course assessments and mapping**: While the assignments are largely mapped across the curriculum, the fine tuning of the plan to tie these assignments to measurable outcomes to meet accreditation standards as well as verification that all competencies are assigned and assessed for depth and width across the curriculum is now the critical final stage. (issued – see Appendix A.5 for current mapping)

2. **Targeted small grants program**: The goal of the targeted grants program is threefold: first, to build sustainable curricular resources for writing by bringing together our professionally qualified instructors with instructional designers and writing specialists; second, to document effective instructional practices in a way that can be modeled elsewhere in the curriculum and the college, and finally, to serve as the basis for the Moodle Handbook described in part 3.

At our Fall 2015 faculty meeting, we will discuss the grant opportunities and, along with the full faculty, select courses that include significant opportunities for writing as grant eligible. Selection will be based primarily on curricular needs, the interests of our instructors, and the practical demands of scheduling. While a “permanent” faculty might expect a competitive selection process, our unique team is well accustomed to collaboration and consensus based decision making. We anticipate selecting 6 courses and implementing 2 courses a year for development.
These small grants will provide some financial compensation to our part time instructors for course development and will fund an instructional designer to assist the faculty member in course, assignment, and rubric development. This model of funding is consistent with other curriculum development initiatives in the college and will follow college standards and cost estimates. This team of instructor and designer will coordinate with our WEC consultant during the development phase, identify specific assignment "connections" to the Student Writing Style Guide, and will make course resources available via Moodle as they are tested, implemented, and refined.

3. **Moodle Handbook**: Because of the nature of our diverse, professional faculty, we would develop an online handbook/tutorial coordinated by one of our instructional designers, *Teaching Construction With Writing: Guidelines for Faculty*, specific to the teaching of writing in our discipline. This methodology is consistent with the one-on-one faculty relationships we nurture. Even though our faculty members generally have fairly lengthy teaching records in the program, we do rotate new faculty into classes, so the creation of a handbook to guide new or “occasional” faculty toward writing enrichment is an essential sustainability tool that we would like to create, in conjunction with consistently clear and concise student guidelines within all course syllabi and the faculty supported *Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style* for students. In addition, the accessibility of this handbook will make it easier to ensure parity and consistency among our professional instructors.

4. **Blended faculty orientation**. Continue a practice of a Writing "teaching tip" at every faculty meeting, supported by either our WEC adviser, our part time Writing Consultant, or one of our instructional designers.

5. **Student Writing Style Guide**. Continuously update *Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style* for appropriate content discerned from faculty input from both the higher level faculty meetings to the more granular level course reviews, identifying specifically what tools or resources would support their teaching at the assignment level. Further, conversion to a more searchable web platform is currently underway to make the site widely accessible to the industry.

6. **Ability/Competency assessment**: As part of our accreditation process, the effectiveness of this writing program will be evaluated using graded student samples (See assessment summarized support below) that will be measured and published consistently year-over-year. We propose to consult with the Writing Center staff on the development of our metrics and rubrics that will most effectively transform a potentially subjective assessment into a directly objective measure. We will also request a re-assessment of the upper division writing assignment (Gizmo) after Spring 2017, to establish a firm pattern of writing assessment for Capstone. Finally, we will seek consulting assistance developing simple faculty assessment procedures specific to their discipline assignment so faculty can consistently assess and rate student work, as well as tools and tricks that can be incorporated into the *Teaching Construction with Writing* faculty guide.

“Creating a business proposal to solicit business from a client. By competing against both real classmates and imaginary industry norms/firms, I was able to understand the importance of being both complete and precise. This particular exercise also emphasized the ‘human’ aspect of persuasion and the importance of winning the job before executing it.”

- Student survey response on a particularly useful writing assignment [ed: referring to Gizmo Distribution Project]
Implementing the 3rd Writing Plan Initiatives

In order to effectively implement this third writing plan, we are requesting continuing partial financial support through the proposed targeted micro grants to retain Dr. Kim Ballard, the lead instructional designer for this initiative, and a Faculty member, whom, with our WEC adviser, and Peter Hilger, (program curriculum adviser and WEC liaison), develop strategies to implement the assessment objectives for the program, and each course and assignment, using a one-on-one approach to strengthen their teaching with writing. The best practices developed through this targeted grant process would be synthesized into the Teaching Construction Writing: Guidelines for Faculty Moodle site that would be professionally developed and launched by Dr. Ballard. This would commence immediately upon funding.

To do this effectively, the following schedule is proposed based on existing course offering schedules and the natural cyclical timing of faculty preparation for these courses. Since some courses are fully online or hybrid courses, these will require earlier preparation in order to effect the changes within online development schedules.

**SUMMER 2015 (for classes taught Spring 2016)**
- Internally, complete a mapping process to identify strategic courses and potential assignments that would be targeted (no support sought for this initiative)
- Internally, outline the structure for the Teaching Construction Writing: Guidelines for Faculty and schedule its structural implementation (no support sought for this initiative).
- Prepare detail for the grants and deliver to Faculty
- Host a writing centric Faculty meeting, Fall 2015 (no support sought for this initiative)
- Refine and "test" the model with two existing courses taught by Hilger, Spring 2016 (no support sought for this initiative)
- Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style (for faculty and students) updated by Hilger and Ballard (no support sought for this initiative)

**FALL 2015 (for classes taught Fall 2016)**
- Evaluate the first 1/3 of the curriculum using small group workshops of related courses, and one-on-one faculty meetings, particularly those courses up for regular curricular review, and those that have been used as a "trial" for assessment measures.
- Beta test assessment data capture and develop model reports using Campus Lab and Moodle integration
- Publish progress on this initiative in our Annual Report

**SPRING 2016 (for classes taught Fall 2016)**
- Evaluate the second 1/3 of the curriculum using small group workshops of related courses, and one-on-one faculty meetings
- Continue to test assessment data capture and develop model reports using Campus Lab and Moodle integration, with a permanent testing parameter rolled out by Fall 2017 for all courses and measuring all competencies.

**SUMMER 2016 (for classes taught Spring 2017)**
- Evaluate the final 1/3 of the curriculum using small group workshops of related courses, and one-on-one faculty meetings
- Continue to test assessment data capture and develop model reports using Campus Lab and Moodle integration, with a permanent testing parameter rolled out by Fall 2017 for all courses and measuring all competencies.
- Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style (for faculty and students) updated by Hilger and Ballard (no support sought for this initiative)
FALL 2016 (for classes taught Fall 2017)
• Review "findings" from faculty on the system/process at Fall faculty meeting.
• Refine "lessons learned" from previous course offerings and tweak as necessary
• Publish progress on this initiative in our Annual Report

SPRING 2017
• Extend rating of "Gizmo Proposals" for a third and final time.
• Final group of classes rolled out in "tweaked" model

SUMMER 2017 (Teaching Support Materials)
• Develop and launch Teaching Construction With Writing: Guidelines for Faculty including a self-paced Moodle tutorial developed by Dr. Kim Ballard and the CCE-ODL team.
• Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style (for faculty and students) updated by Hilger and Ballard each of Summer 2015, 2016, 2017 (no support sought for this initiative)

FALL 2017
• Standardize assessment measures report and publish in our Annual Report

ASSESSMENT SUPPORT
Initial course assessments were carried out in three courses to establish a program baseline, including:
• CMGT 3001: Introduction to Construction Management (minimal writing samples obtained)
• CMGT 4011: Construction Documents and Contracts (minimal writing samples obtained)
• CMGT 4041W: Specifications and Technical Writing for Construction Professionals (prolific writing samples obtained, two assessments completed).

Studies of the impact of the writing plan were conducted only on CMGT 4041W following spring semester of the 2013-14 academic year to measure progress. As a result of the impending mapping of outcomes for accreditation, a detailed mapping of assignments identified to be measured will be prepared for the entire curriculum. From these assignments, appropriate rubrics will be established, assessment guidelines prepared for faculty use, and data collected and integrated into the CampusLabs database. For this particular exercise, we would like the direct support of WEC to help us ascertain that we have a solid, workable assessment plan in place, and that we have a Quality Improvement strategy in place when the assessment indicate the need for improvement. We develop the materials, you serve on our "fly spec'ing advisory board" to see that we have covered what we need to cover.

SUMMARY OF SUPPORT REQUESTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project planning, administration and micro-grant prep (10%)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Grants (1 each of 9 genre @ $2,500 each, 3 per year)</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUESTED ($25,000):</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this schedule, the following requested support is proposed:

Micro-Grants
For each of our typical industry genre, we will develop nine grants that assess the six writing abilities (as applicable to a particular course or instructor), using the fixed funds to support a teaching faculty member's time crafting the assignment criteria, rubrics, measurement, etc. in consultation with our internal Instructional Designer and with our WEC consultant. The grant would be divided in an appropriate proportion to the faculty member and the
instructional design staff to complete the work and implement within the next teaching cycle. In turn, the instructional designer will catalogue the "best practices" gleaned from this grant that could apply to other faculty and courses using the same genre or assessing similar writing abilities, into the Teaching Construction With Writing: Guidelines for Faculty site. This takes a single (grant) event, rigorously develops it for a specific course application, and then applies it broadly into a centralized sustainable teaching resource for other faculty.

Planning and Administration
Ten percent of our proposed allocation would be used to set up the third writing plan initiatives, particularly identification of the targeted curriculum to receive the grants, and the structural construction of the grants and their administration. Basically, the framework for implementation will be laid out in the first trimester of this proposal.

WEC Support
In addition, some level of training and evaluation support from the WEC program is requested to review the proposed Teaching Construction With Writing Guide, to re-assess the CMGT 4041W assignment in 2017, to review and help administer the proposed Micro-Grants, and to review the assessment component of our curricular writing abilities/competencies, the rubrics and other "tools" for teaching suggested within the grants.

What Is Not Funded
The Construction Management program has previously committed its own resources to the development and implementation of pieces of the second edition writing plan, and will continue implement the following elements independently, requiring no additional WEC support, demonstrating our commitment to making this a long term, sustainable objective of our program well beyond this final grant:

- Develop the technical framework of the website using our own ODL staff resources
- Ongoing faculty training and course reviews that strengthen implementation of teaching with writing
- Mapping the writing abilities/competencies to the courses and assignments
- Annual data collection and reporting
- Continuous updating of Writing for Construction Managers: A Guide to Content and Style

Supervision of Grant
The requested program support would be directly supervised by Peter Hilger, who as the program curriculum adviser will establish the project implementation plan and direct the course outcomes mapping, according to the schedule outlined above, from which all other activities follow. The Micro Grant will be internally generated and submitted to the WEC Consultant for review and authorization of funding.

Expected Outcome
The implementation of the Construction Management Third Edition writing plan, supported by the development strategies cited herein, is expected to show a direct and measurable improvement in student writing across the curriculum and satisfaction with the program, using analysis of student coursework, student focus groups, faculty discussion, and assessments of student writing over time. And further, development of a sustainable Teaching with Writing resources for our unique faculty structure enables a consistent application of the WEC principles, and their uniform measurement, as faculty change over time. Our objective is to make the Writing focus a central, sustainable element of our program, and have it influence improvement of other programs across the College.
Section 6: PROCESS USED TO CREATE THIS WRITING PLAN
How, and to what degree, were a substantial number of stakeholders in this unit (faculty members, instructors, affiliates, teaching assistants, undergraduates, others) engaged in providing, revising, and approving the content of this Writing Plan?

The Construction Management program is a unit of the College of Continuing Education, Applied and Professional Studies (APS) programs. The structure of the Degree and Credit program within the college is chartered to include only adjunct faculty, including both University faculty who teach on overload and practitioner faculty from the community; however, ACCE accreditation requires one full-time-equivalent faculty member. The CMgt program differs from typical academic departments within the University in that our faculty consists of one full-time-equivalent and 27+ adjunct faculty—all of whom are experts in their disciplines, and who directly benefit from support in the design and assessment of professional writing assignments. Only two faculty meetings are held per year. Special meetings are arranged well in advance to work around busy professional schedules. It is for this special adjunct cohort that investment in guiding the teaching of Construction Management using writing is centered with this plan.

To develop the original writing plan, Peter Hilger, a full-time Morse Distinguished Teacher, led the initiative and drafted the first and second writing plans, supported by the Center for Writing, faculty, and department staff. The courses taught by Mr. Hilger were central to the program’s pre-WEC writing requirements. This revised plan written by Mr. Hilger is the result of an understanding of required management of the outcome/ability/competency course mapping initiatives required for re-accreditation. Steps taken since the second WEC plan approval include:

- Review of writing plan implementation results with faculty at the semi-annual faculty meetings
- Review of writing with individual faculty members as part of our ongoing course review procedures.
- Acceptance of writing as a key and interrelated component of the program accreditation outcomes central to both accreditation agencies.
- Presentation and discussion of the WEC findings and progress to the program’s advisory board, consisting of industry constituents;
- Presentation of our research and plan implementation to interested third parties that could benefit from our work (dissemination)
- Refinement of proposed rating criteria to be more defined and easier to assess;
- Incorporation of WEC plan criteria into all new and existing courses, and reviewed as part of the regular course review cycles for each class
- Revised and updated Writing Plan and presentation to faculty and staff.

It is no exaggeration to state that the Writing Plan has been well received among staff, industry Advisory Board members, Accreditation site team reviewers, third party groups and faculty, as well as spurring a greater attention to the benefits of the WEC program to the College as a whole.
Section 7: CONNECTION TO STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Briefly describe how the ideas contained in this Undergraduate Writing Plan address the University's Student Learning Outcomes (http://www.slo.umn.edu).

As a part of this fixed quality improvement process, the Writing Enriched Curriculum is an ideal metric to implement the University’s seven learning outcomes across each course through the course review process, and thus across the entire curriculum. The criteria set forth in this Writing Plan specifically reinforce the following University Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Can identify, define and solve problems
2. Can locate and critically evaluate information
3. Has mastered a body of knowledge and mode of inquiry
4. Understands diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies
5. Can communicate effectively
6. Understands the role of creativity, innovation, discovery, and expression across disciplines
7. Has acquired skills for effective citizenship and lifelong learning

Furthermore, our program now has a mapped scaffolded outcome structure, as follows, from highest order to most granular order:

- University Student Learning outcomes
- Program Student Learning outcomes
- Course Student Learning outcomes
- Assignment Student Learning outcomes

The implementation of the Writing Plan within the current curriculum will clearly support the University Student Learning Outcomes, and the regular course review process, the standardization of language within the syllabi, and the development of a uniform, industry-specific approach to teaching with writing will assure that the results are not merely momentary, but broadly and completely infused into the future fabric of the program.

“If you don’t know how to write specific documents and effectively communicate by the time you graduate or are in the end of your JR year, you are seriously behind the curve. Our whole job is [to] be a huge communication hub between all the parties involved on a project. If you can’t communicate your thoughts or ideas, or ask specific question[s] so someone can look at it once and understand it, then your whole project is going to fail.”

- Student survey response on the importance of writing
V. WEC Research Assistant (RA) Request Form  
√ No RA Funding Requested

RAs assist faculty liaisons in the WEC Writing Plan implementation process. The specific duties of the RA are determined in coordination with the unit liaison and the WEC consultant, but should generally meet the following criteria: they are manageable in the time allotted, they are sufficient to their funding, and they have concrete goals and expectations (see below).

RA funding requests are made by appointment percent time (e.g., 25% FTE, 10% FTE, etc.). Appointment times can be split between two or more RAs when applicable (e.g., two 12.5% appointments for a total of 25% FTE request). Total funds (including fringe benefits when applicable) need to be calculated in advance by the liaison, usually in coordination with administrative personnel.

Please note that, outside of duties determined by the liaison, WEC RAs may be required to participate in specific WEC activities, such as meetings, Moodle discussion boards, and surveys.

RA Name (Use TBD for vacancies):
RA Contact Information: email, phone
Period of appointment (Semester/Year to Semester/Year):
RA appointment percent time:

Define in detail the tasks that the RA will be completing within the funding period:

Define deadlines as applicable (please note that all deadlines must be completed within the funding period):

Describe how frequently the RA will check in with the liaison:

Describe in detail the RA’s check-in process (e.g., via email, phone, in-person, etc.):

---

1 An example for determining funding for appointments can be found on the WEC Liaison Moodle. This is for planning and example purposes only and cannot be used to determine final budget items for the Writing Plan.
VI. WEC Writing Plan Requests

Unit Name: Construction Management

Financial Requests (requests cannot include faculty salary support) *drop-down choices will appear when cell next to "semester" is selected*

**Total Financial Request:** $25,000.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Fall 15</th>
<th>Spr 16</th>
<th>Sum 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning and Administration</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>Micro Grants (2)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Grant (1)</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>Micro Grants (2)</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semester 1 Total: $5,000.00  Semester 2 Total: $5,000.00  Semester 3 Total: $5,000.00

Rationale for costs and their schedule of distribution:

See Writing Plan for Micro-Grant disposition of funds, split between Adjunct faculty support and ODL instructional designer.

**Service Requests** *drop-down choices will appear when a cell in the "service" column is selected*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Fall 15</th>
<th>Spr 16</th>
<th>Sum 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Qty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4 Consultation</td>
<td>3 Consultation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description and rationale for services:

Consultation: advising CMgt staff on special techniques applicable to the specific assignments and potential approaches to the grant genre applied, as well as attending faculty meeting on a writing based topic. Workshop (Spr17) is the re-rating of the Gizmo project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro Grants (2)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Micro Grant (2)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semester 4 Total: $5,000.00  
Semester 5 Total: $5,000.00  
Semester 6 Total: $0.00
To: Peter Hilger, Construction Management  
From: Robert McMaster, Office of Undergraduate Education  
Subject: Decision regarding WEC funding proposal  

The Department of Construction Management recently requested the following funding to support its Writing Enriched Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Planning and Administration</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Project Planning and Administration</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Micro Grant (1)</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Micro Grants (2)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Micro Grants (2)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Micro Grants (2)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>Micro Grants (2)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$25,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) is supportive of your plans for your Writing Enriched Curriculum. There are just a few areas of clarification needed before funding approval can be granted:

- The goals of your fiscal request are a good fit for your unit, but the micro-grant structure is not transparent. Please consider alternative ways to describe your fiscal needs, and address the following questions when preparing a revised budget:
  - Specifically who will receive funding, and how will that be divided amongst the instructors and instructional designers?
  - Will there be a unique instructional designer for each course, or is it possible that one person would be the instructional designer for two or more courses? In that case, will that one person receive the allotted “instructional designer” amount for each of those courses?
  - Which courses will be involved in the program?

- OUE is disinclined to approve funding for the Project Planning and Administration line item because it appears to overlap significantly with the responsibilities of the WEC Liaison (for which each Liaison already receives a stipend). If these funds are intended for other purposes, please clarify that in updated proposal materials.

Leslie Schiff and Pamela Flash will be happy to answer any questions you might have about the above requests. Please submit updated materials to the Writing Across the Curriculum Office, which will consult with OUE. The updated funding proposal will not need to be reviewed by the Campus Writing Board prior to approval.

CC: Suzanne Bardouche, Molly Bendzick, Dan Emery, Pamela Flash, Michelle Koker, Leslie Schiff