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II. **Unit Profile: COMMUNICATION STUDIES**

*Please fill in the gray areas on this form.*

**Number of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments about Faculty/Instructors**

We also have 20 FTE P&A & 32 GS teaching

**Major(s)**

*Please list each major your Unit offers:*

- Comm Studies BA

**Total # students enrolled in major as of Sem/Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15 Fall</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total # students graduating with major AY 0##-##**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEC Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># participated</th>
<th># invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEC intro meeting with tt faculty</td>
<td>9/2/15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC #1 meeting</td>
<td>10/23/15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC #2 meeting</td>
<td>11/13/15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC #3 meeting</td>
<td>2/5/16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC #4 meeting</td>
<td>3/4/15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Writing Plan Narrative, 1st Edition

Please retain section headers and prompts in your plan.

Introductory summary:
Briefly describe the reason(s) this unit (department, school, college) become involved in the WEC project, key findings resulted from the process of developing this plan, and the implementation activities are proposed in this Writing Plan. (1/2 page maximum)

The department decided to become involved in the WEC process for two reasons. First, we identified an ongoing frustration, especially among tenured faculty, about the level and variability of writing ability present in students completing their senior papers in upper division courses. Second, we realized that while there is a lot of student writing within the curriculum, it is often uncoordinated and isolated and there is no coherent plan in place to teach writing in a systematic and deliberate way across courses. Initial data collected by the WEC office about writing in the curriculum of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates collaborated those feelings. While everyone reported a significant role of writing in the curriculum and often substantial efforts of writing instruction, neither instructors nor UG students felt that there were clear expectations and guidelines as to what constitutes competent writing that applied across the department as opposed to just individual classes. As such, there was no clear sense of what exactly is taught and learned in regard to writing.

In response, the current writing plan is designed to first, create a comprehensive overview of how writing is taught at the level of individual courses. This will be achieved by hiring a graduate research assistant who will collect data on all writing assignments and teaching from our complete UG catalogue to create a complete and comprehensive map of writing instruction and assignments in our UG curriculum. Then, we will compare current practices to the writing competencies identified in the WEC meetings. Finally, we will formulate a plan detailing what writing instruction and assignments should occur at what level so that we can make sure that all students will encounter teaching of the competencies ideally before embarking on the senior project and graduation.

Section 1: DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC WRITING CHARACTERISTICS
What characterizes academic and professional communication in this discipline?

Communication Studies is a discipline firmly anchored within the liberal arts that ranges from social science over humanism to critical theory. As such, making arguments is central to all writing that is done in the discipline. Thus, writing generally involves making claims about messages, media, and human communication behaviors and supporting these claims coherently and with appropriate evidence, usually in the form of longer essays. Different areas of the discipline, however, are committed to different epistemologies, from scientific realism to hermeneutics. Thus, how arguments are crafted and what counts as evidence varies greatly between different areas, as do certain conventions regarding style, the most typical being APA, MLA, and Chicago.

In addition to the argumentative essay, there are a number of other documents that routinely are produced. Frequent are informal writings such as reflection papers or blog posts; technical reports and summaries of articles and other texts; and some specific genres of writing, such as story boards, campaign messages, survey questions, etc.

Section 2: DESIRED WRITING ABILITIES
With which writing abilities should students in this unit’s major(s) graduate?

1. Articulate and develop a clear argument based on a thesis statement.
2. Demonstrate understanding of the relationships between claim and evidence (considered broadly, as well as specifically in the context of argumentation).
3. Build upon an understanding of claims and evidence to interpret and evaluate arguments (to consider the meaning and value of claims in context).
4. Show awareness of and adaptation to purpose and audience.
5. Explicitly recognize the constraints and possibilities offered by the subject, the audience, and other contextual factors and adapts writing in light of these factors.
6. Recognize the expectations of genres, both as conventional modes of written expression and as elements of document design and organization, and possibly intentionally interrupt those expectations.
7. Capably communicate theoretical and abstract notions, with attention to their larger implications to society and politics
8. Demonstrate processes of reasoning as appropriate to the analytical moves of the document (inductive and deductive specifically, but also broadly considered)
9. Address theories and concepts in ways that move beyond textbook definitions to application, synthesis, and critique
10. Produce writing that is grammatically and mechanically proficient
11. Display creativity and originality

These desired writing abilities were identified and formulated during our WEC meetings #2-3, with input from faculty, teaching specialists, and graduates instructors.

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?

Currently, writing instruction for ALL majors is concentrated at two points. COMM 1313: Analysis of Argument, which is required “intro-level” course and a pre-requisite for the senior project course, and the 4000 and 5000 level courses taught mostly by tenured faculty in which students complete the senior project. COMM 1313 focuses on the basic structure of arguments and the various forms of evidence that are employed in support of arguments in different epistemologies. As such, it does teach the fundamental organization of academic writing in the discipline. It is not, however, concerned with teaching the technical aspects of writing, such as spelling and grammar, nor does it go into depth of the different style employed in the discipline. By contrast, writing instruction in the 4/5000 level courses in which students complete their senior theses is primarily focused on how to construct a 15-20 page length essay: including outlining drafting, revising, and finally completing the essay. Here, more attention is paid to the different style guides and students are expected to be proficient in it.

What became apparent during the WEC review is that two courses that bracket the students’ career are insufficient to cover all material needed to make our students more competent writers in the discipline. The result is often frustration for professors in the upper division courses, because students lack basic writing skills and are not familiar enough with the styles and genres in which they are expected to write. Professors report that they feel that they are frequently required to teach remedial writing rather than guide students in articulating complicated, essay lengths arguments. While there is writing instruction in the other courses that constitute the curriculum in Communication Studies, this instruction is un-coordinated with the writing instruction offered in other courses driven either by the demands of that particular course and/or instructor preferences, but not the need to prepare students to write competently in the discipline (a.k.a., senior project). In addition, the major is extremely flat, with the only currently enforced prerequisite being COMM 1313 for the senior project. As a result, there is no common path that students
take to complete the major, and no obvious sequencing of courses. Combined, the situation created is one where there is no coherent process that guides students through the major to become competent writers. The one exception are students that take one of our writing intensive courses. These courses usually focus on a specific genre of writing and prepare students well for the senior project. However, only a small fraction of students take these courses and the department does not have the resources to significantly increase the number of seats it can make available to students.

**Section 4: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT WRITING**

*What concerns, if any, have unit faculty and undergraduate students voiced about grading practices? Please include a menu of criteria extrapolated from the list of Desired Writing Abilities provided in Section 2 of this plan. (This menu can be offered to faculty/instructors for selective adaptation and will function as a starting point in the WEC Project’s longitudinal rating process.).*

Both faculty and students have similar perceptions of the importance of writing in the discipline and of how papers are graded. The big disconcert is where the technical (objective) aspects of writing and content intersect. In our discipline, there is an inherent overlap between the two that is not easily articulated and for undergraduate students often difficult to discern. The way in which an argument is presented (e.g., written) is directly linked to how persuasive (good) it is. While there are broad areas of agreement about what makes an argument a good one, these areas are both abstract and also fluid and context dependent. Consequently, it is easier for instructors to mark and comment on technical aspects that are demonstrably right or wrong (# of words, # of references, spelling or grammatical errors, etc.) and for students to think that those errors determine the grades they receive, than to focus and comment on the more abstract issues relating to argument structure.

Criteria for the writing abilities were established to be:

1a. offers an explicit thesis statement based on a debatable proposition
1b. sets up the topic and introduces the writer’s position- which is followed through in the document.
2. has a coherent structure, including elements typical of the genre (reading response, research paper, storyboard, etc.).
3a. makes a claim, uses evidence, and explicates how/why the evidence proves the claim.
3b. incorporates paragraph structures that allow distinction between claims and evidence (i.e. topic sentences, internal summaries).
3c. uses explicit language regarding conclusions (thus, therefore, because, etc.) and evidence (example, anecdote, empirical).
4. contextualizes evidence within the broader argument/paper or issue.
5. selects evidence suitable to the claim advanced.
6. identifies strong and weak arguments and articulates an explanation as to why.
7. addresses validity on epistemological grounds; recognizes in what framework other arguments make sense and compares the relative merit of those frameworks.
8. demonstrates attention to audience and purpose in the selection of genre and medium and offers specific appeals to audience needs and expectations.
9a. accurately uses the terms from the text and the field to explain their object of analysis.
9b. articulates an argument in relationship to a theoretical position.
10. answers the “so what?” question, explicitly addresses the implications of thesis/research/paper beyond the immediate assignment
11. is committed to particular epistemology and is coherent in that context (i.e. follows a logical pattern or a coherent system of values or reasoning).
12. connects theory to application or critique.
13. connects theories to real world examples or media texts.
Section 5: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS, including REQUESTED SUPPORT

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?

During the period covered by this (first) writing plan, we intend to accomplish three interrelated goals. First, with the help of a GRA, we intend to map writing assignments and instruction of our entire UG curriculum. This will require us to collect syllabi for all courses, and multiple syllabi for multi-section courses, as there is considerable variation in how different sections of the same course are taught, as well as all writing assignments given in these courses. We will then overlay this map with the typical pathways our students take through our curriculum until graduation to give us a comprehensive and accurate picture of how writing is currently taught in our curriculum. Results from the mapping exercise and the pathways examination will be presented to the full faculty and will serve as the basis for continuing implementation.

The second goal is to plan writing instruction curriculum-wide such that all desired writing competencies are addressed in the curriculum before students will attempt their senior project and to assure that the writing instruction is distributed across the largest possible number of courses. Not only will this distribute the burden of writing instruction more evenly, but it will also allow important writing skills to be reinforced in different courses at different times. This goal will be achieved by an especially constituted Communication Studies WEC committee consisting of faculty, teaching specialists, and graduate students from across the different research traditions in the department. The committee will be a sub-committee of the departments Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and chaired by the liaison (who is also DUS). The end result will be a detailed plan laying out for each course what competencies should be taught in the course and providing strategies for achieving it.

The third goal is provide support for instructors in developing teaching strategies, such as exercises and assignments, for the identified writing abilities. We will achieve this goal in part by offering a regular (2 times per semester) series of writing workshops for instructors that focus on a limited set of abilities and provide hands on training in implementing the exercises and assignments. These workshops will be planned and staffed by the writing center in collaboration with the Communication Studies WEC committee. The first workshop will focus on designing writing assignments and incorporating writing instruction into course activities. The second workshop will focus on grading and responding to writing assignments. Topics for workshops 3 & 4 (Spring 17) will be developed based on feedback obtained in workshops 1 & 2. To maximize participation, these workshops will be scheduled during times currently reserved for professional development meetings (most faculty will not have classes scheduled during this time, which usually is on Mondays rather than Fridays as our WEC meetings were). In addition, food and drink will be provided. Another means of achieving the goal of developing teaching strategies will be a catalogue of assignments, exercises, and best practices that the RA will compose based on the review of current writing instruction and assignments.
The expected outcomes are a clear understanding of how writing instruction is currently distributed in our curriculum, a plan for when where, and how the identified writing abilities will be taught in our curriculum, and instructors that are well trained and prepared to teach the writing abilities in their courses as indicated in the plan.

The resources requested, therefore, are funding for the research assistant to map how writing is currently taught across the curriculum, planning and instructional support from WEC for the workshops, as well as consultation from WEC on the implementation and evaluation of the plan the Communication Studies WEC committee will design for how writing will be taught across the communication studies curriculum.

**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 writing plan as presented is the outcome of a yearlong process involving a substantial number of stakeholders in the department. As part of the regular WEC process, all faculty, instructors, TAs, and students were surveyed at the beginning of Fall 15 term. In addition, the tenure track faculty attended a WEC seminar during a retreat in September 2015 in which they learned about WEC and how it might be implemented. Then, interested tenure stream faculty, teaching faculty, and graduate teaching assistants met with representatives of the WEC program on four Friday afternoons to discuss writing and the WEC process. Attendance of these meetings was encouraged but not required, mainly because the one weekly meeting time that most department members keep open so that departmental meeting can be held was already occupied by faculty meetings, job talks, and professional development programs. Although at each meeting, there were representatives of each of the three groups of instructors, overall attendance was not as high as desired, especially during the spring semester (meetings 3 & 4). Nonetheless, participants were very engaged and the smaller format allowed for more involving discussions.

During WEC #1 meeting, the WEC team presented the results of the department survey on writing. Overall, we interpreted the results to suggest that both instructors and students regard writing as very important and writing instruction as a central part of the curriculum, but also heavily concentrated in COMM 1313 and SP and writing intensive course. Also, both instructors and students evaluated student writing as of relative high quality, although both acknowledged room for improvement. We also learned that students perceive that grading is based on mechanics, such as spelling and grammar, whereas instructors felt that grading was mainly based on content, organization, and coherence. We also discussed the extent to which the different areas in the department favor different writing styles and modes of presentation, but that there are also a number of commonalities, especially those regarding presentations of arguments. We finished the meeting by compiling a first draft of writing characteristics and desired writing abilities for our students.

WEC # 2 meeting was devoted to discussing and finalizing the lists of writing characteristics and abilities. During this discussion, it emerged that writing abilities could be loosely classified into five different clusters: Articulate clear arguments; rhetorical sensitivity; writing about abstract ideas; analysis and synthesis; and creativity and structure. We then mapped the different characteristics and abilities vis a vis one another and finalized a list of 11 desired writing abilities. We concluded the meeting by discussing how these abilities might be taught in the different courses in our curriculum.

WEC #3 meeting was mainly concerned with the question which of the desired writing abilities are currently taught in the curriculum and where and how, as well as with developing grading criteria for the abilities. In regard to the former, we looked at the results of a questionnaire about how we teach the abilities and which abilities the students struggle most with that was distributed to faculty at the end of meeting #2. Results indicate that instruction is concentrated in the 1000 level and 4/5000 level courses and that the subjects the students struggle
with are basically the same. It was discussed but not resolved whether the reason that students still struggle with the same issues was due to the absence of progress in writing ability or higher expectations in higher level courses or both. When then in small groups worked on developing grading criteria for the writing abilities that can be used for individual student assessment as well as to assess the general progress students make curriculum wide.

WEC #4 meeting was primarily concerned with testing and evaluating the developed grading criteria by using them to evaluate sample papers collected from 3000 level courses as part of the initial WEC evaluation of the program. Participants started by evaluating the papers individually and then discussed their evaluations in small groups before sharing them with the larger group. This process led to several insights. One was that the abilities present fairly high level cognitive and writing skills that cannot be reasonably be expected to be learned or taught in one course. Consequently, the writing instruction in the curriculum must be designed to scaffold students’ writing. Another insight was that even though the papers came from areas representing different epistemologies, the criteria worked surprisingly well for both, suggesting that there truly are discipline wide writing abilities. Other insights more specifically referred to particular courses of assignments. We also discussed how teaching these abilities could be integrated more fully in writing assignments and other activities, such as exercises, that reinforce the abilities but do not require the effort of full lengths essays. Finally, we also discussed the possibility to distribute instruction of writing abilities across courses to maximize student exposure to them. We concluded the meeting by critiquing the process thus far and how to get more buy in from faculty not present at the meeting. We concluded that we need better meeting times, more explicit expecations about attending these meetings, but also confidence that even though not everyone took part in developing our writing abilities and criteria, there would be broad support in incorporating them into the curriculum.
Section 7: CONNECTION TO STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

The writing plan at this stage mainly focuses on a survey of current teaching and the planning of future writing instructions. As such, it most closely aligns with SLO #5, “Can communicate effectively.” Nevertheless, our expectations of student writing abilities are also aligned with other Student Learning Outcomes (see table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Communication Studies Desired Writing Abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can identify, define, and solve problems.</td>
<td>2. Demonstrate understanding of the relationships between claim and evidence (considered broadly, as well as specifically in the context of argumentation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Demonstrate processes of reasoning as appropriate to the analytical moves of the document (inductive and deductive specifically, but also broadly considered).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can locate and critically evaluate information.</td>
<td>4. Show awareness of and adaptation to purpose and audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Explicitly recognize the constraints and possibilities offered by the subject, the audience, and other contextual factors and adapts writing in light of these factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry.</td>
<td>1. Articulate and develop a clear argument based on a thesis statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Address theories and concepts in ways that move beyond textbook definitions to application, synthesis, and critique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies.</td>
<td>4. Show awareness of and adaptation to purpose and audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Capably communicate theoretical and abstract notions, with attention to their larger implications to society and politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can communicate effectively.</td>
<td>All abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the role of creativity, innovation, discovery, and expression across disciplines.</td>
<td>6. Recognize the expectations of genres, both as conventional modes of written expression and as elements of document design and organization, and possibly intentionally interrupt those expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Display creativity and originality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have acquired skills for effective citizenship and lifelong learning.</td>
<td>All abilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. WEC Research Assistant (RA) Request Form

This form is required if RA funding is requested. If no RA funding is requested please check the box below.

☐ 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): TBD
RA Contact Information: email _____, phone _____
Period of appointment (Semester/Year to Semester/Year): Fall16 to Spring 17
RA appointment percent time: 50%

Define in detail the tasks that the RA will be completing within the funding period:
Collect all syllabi and all writing assignments from all courses and all sections offered by the department from Fall ’15 to Spring ’17. For each course, the RA identifies the writing abilities addressed in lectures, discussions, exercises and assignments. If this is not discernable from the materials collected, the RA will contact the instructor to clarify. The information about writing abilities will be translated to a curriculum map identifying all writing instruction in the department. The RA will supply this information to the department WEC committee, which will use this information to design a comprehensive plan for writing instruction across the curriculum. This plan will specify which writing abilities will be addressed in each course and distribute the requirements across courses in a way that ensures that the maximum number of students will encounter a maximum number of writing abilities during their course of study.

Define deadlines as applicable (please note that all deadlines must be completed within the funding period):
December 16. Collect all syllabi and assignments from Fall 15 to Fall 16. Map the identified writing abilities to each course. May 17, Collect all syllabi and assignments for Spring ‘17, Map identified writing abilities to each course. Assist departmental WEC committee on designing curriculum wise writing plan. Compile a list of best practices for writing instruction and a catalogue of exercises and assignments for each writing ability.

Describe how frequently the RA will check in with the liaison:
Liaison and RA will meet weekly.

Describe in detail the RA’s check-in process (e.g., via email, phone, in-person, etc.):
RA will meet with liaison once a week in a face-to-face meeting at liaison’s office.
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.
Revision to the Writing Plan for Communication Studies.

Please clarify the role of the research assistant in relationship to curricular mapping. The CWB recognizes the complex task of both building on earlier curricular mapping and identifying the ways your curriculum addresses the faculty-generated list of criteria, but it would be helpful if you articulated the current queries motivating the continuation of this activity and the specific roles that the RA and liaison will play. We anticipate that the faculty liaison and RA will work closely with department instructors to ensure progress on this task, but that they will play quite different roles. To this point, please verify that the proposed RA appointment correlates with the expected RA responsibilities. For example, if the RA will be expected to gather all teaching artifacts, conduct interviews, and code writing abilities, that could conceivably be a 50% appointment. If the RA is primarily collecting and organizing instructional artifacts, that would more appropriately be a 25% appointment.

The curriculum mapping project is motivated by the need to gain a more complete picture of how writing instruction is currently woven into the curriculum. Our plan is ultimately to distribute writing instruction more evenly across the curriculum, which may require us to specify the specific writing skills that should be addressed in each course. Although the curriculum mapping that was conducted as part of the WEC last year is a useful point of departure, we still require a more complete picture. We are a tremendously diverse department, offering about 101 sections in 37 courses (Fall 15) per semester. The curriculum is delivered by 52 different instructors (11 TT faculty, 20 P&A faculty, and 32 Graduate student instructors who serve as instructors of record). We have maintained a strong tradition of autonomy with instructors of any rank in regard to what or how they teach. There are no explicit requirements, no predetermined books, and no processes for approving or reviewing syllabi. As a result, there is no systematic knowledge about what is taught anywhere in the department. Furthermore, the curriculum is extremely flat, with only two courses required of all students (and about 40% use transfer credit to fulfill one of them, public speaking), which makes it even more difficult to determine what type of writing instruction students are exposed to without a complete curriculum map.

Event though the mapping conducted as part of the WEC process had a good response rate (52 sections of 28 courses, which represent 51% and 75% of what we offered that semester, respectively), some areas of the curriculum are not well represented. In addition, those instructors who responded probably are those interested in writing instruction, leading to a biased sample and, more importantly, a potentially biased assessment of the curriculum. In addition, instructors were asked which writing ability they explicitly address in their courses, but not HOW. As a result, it is not possible to determine whether the explicit instruction consists of a verbal reminder by an instructor or is the core of a 20 page writing assignment.

For these two reason, it is important for us to create a complete map of all writing instruction in the department that does not rely entirely on instructors’ self-report of whether they address a certain writing abilities in their courses. Rather we would like a map based on a systematic assessment of the actual writing assignments and
activities in each course. Only with this knowledge will we be able to intervene with success on how writing instruction is part of our curriculum.

The role of the RA in this process is to collect all syllabi and assignments of courses offered in the Communication Studies Department for AY 16-17. In addition to collecting this information, which will no doubt require the RA to track down individual instructors and potentially archival syllabi and assignments, the RA will have the responsibility to code the syllabi and assignments for each of the identified writing abilities and enter this into a data base. I expect that collection of the data will consume most of the RA’s time in semester one, while coding and mapping will be accomplished in semester two. If time allows, the RA will also be involved in developing the plan on how writing instruction should be distributed so that students following typical pathways (informal tracks) to graduation (i.e., take similar clusters and sequences of courses) will receive optimal and complete writing instruction. This task will be shared by the WEC sub-committee of the department’s UGC committee, but the more the RA can contribute to it, the better.

The RA will be closely supervised by the faulty liaison (Ascan Koerner), who will meet at least weekly but probably more frequently with the RA. Koerner and the RA will work closely together in developing and training for the coding scheme. In addition, the RA will, depending on his/her ability, work closely with Koerner on mapping typical pathways and identifying key courses (courses that most or all students in a particular track take) and developing the WEC interventions for the department. Koerner has extensive experience on curriculum mapping, meaning that the success of this activity will not depend on the abilities of the RA. Finally, the RA will work closely with the WEC sub-committee of the UGC committee of the department. Overall, the effort of the RA will be at least at 50%. I want to stress in this context that the department and its instructors are committed to revise and to intervene in the writing instruction in the undergraduate curriculum.
VI. WEC Writing Plan Requests

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

Total Financial Request: $25,100.00

<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>50% GRA</td>
<td>$11,750.00</td>
<td>50% GRA</td>
<td>$11,750.00</td>
<td>50% GRA</td>
<td>$11,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza &amp; drink for workshops</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>Pizza &amp; drinks for workshops</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>Pizza &amp; drinks for workshops</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lunches for SC WEC committee</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>lunches for SC WEC committee</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>lunches for SC WEC committee</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semester 1 Total: $12,550.00 Semester 2 Total: $12,550.00 Semester 3 Total: $0.00

Rationale for costs and their schedule of distribution

The GRA will catalogue all writing instructions in all courses offered in our curriculum. Because we have about 40 courses/110 sections per semester, this will require a 50% appointment for 2 semesters. We also found that providing food for workshops and committee meetings significantly increases turn out and participation.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Qty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description and rationale for services
The workshop will help us to train
June 21, 2016

To: Ascan Koerner, Communication Studies
From: Robert McMaster, Office of Undergraduate Education
Subject: Decision regarding WEC plan and funding proposal

The Department of Communication Studies recently requested the following funding to support its Writing Enriched Curriculum:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>50% GRA</td>
<td>$11,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Pizza/drinks for Workshops</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Lunches for SC WEC Committee</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>50% GRA</td>
<td>$11,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Pizza/drinks for Workshops</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Lunches for SC WEC Committee</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$25,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All items above have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education, for a total of $25,100.00. Dan Emery in the Writing Enriched Curriculum office is also available to support your implementation of this plan.

Please provide Pat Ferrian (ferri004@umn.edu) with the EFS account string in your department that will receive these funds. **Pat will transfer $25,100.00 at the start of FY17.**

CC: Suzanne Bardouche, Molly Bendzick, Angela Brandt, Dan Emery, Pat Ferrian, Pamela Flash, Sarah Hobbie, Gary Oehlert, Rachel Rodrigue, Leslie Schiff