I. Writing Plan Narrative, Legacy Edition

Please retain section headers and prompts in your plan.

Introduction:
Describe the reason(s) this unit (department, school, college) is interested in extending your work with WEC, 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 4th edition of the Writing Plan? How is your work informed by previous plans and implementation activities? What are the new implementation activities proposed in this edition of the Writing Plan? (2-page maximum)

Key Findings

Teaching writing is central to the teaching of history. All of the instructors in the History Department take this work incredibly seriously and are dedicated to teaching the skills that are core to our intellectual work as well as to preparing our students to actively and critically engage in all aspects of life. The key findings from our fall 2019 WEC survey and the series of WEC conversations over the course of the year are that there is a great deal of faculty energy, excitement and expertise in teaching writing especially in the highly scaffolded senior capstone seminar where students do substantial original research and develop and write a long paper. At the same time, our faculty have expressed some concern about teaching writing at the 3xxx- and 1xxx-levels where the majority of our students are not history majors and where students enter with a wide range of writing skills and are less familiar with the conventions of historical writing. There is an eagerness on the part of all of our instructors to better meet the needs of the range of students taking our courses, from majors to non-majors. Our History majors are largely satisfied with the range of writing instruction, but some are looking for more rigorous writing instruction and assessment. Our graduate students, especially those working as Teaching Assistants, are looking for more guidance and greater collaboration in the teaching of writing, especially in our larger WI survey courses, where a great deal of the actual assessment as well as writing instruction falls on the shoulders of Teaching Assistants.

Overview of our Implementation Activities – What’s New, Building on Previous Plans, and Proposed Activities

A great deal has changed in the History Major since the last iteration of our WEC Writing Plan. We have streamlined the major -- removed a range of geographic and temporal requirements, decreased the WI requirements from three to two, removed the 1000W survey requirement, and added a new required course, a faculty-led, methods seminar. This model centers the student and encourages our students in conjunction with departmental faculty and our History Advisor to develop an area of concentration and to critically and creatively identify and take a range of courses outside of their area of concentration.

We now have two courses that are specifically reserved for our majors, the Senior Capstone as well as our 3020 methods seminars, the former is a WI course and the latter encompasses a range of writing assignments, but is not a WI course. We continue to offer a range of WI survey courses with discussion sections as well as approximately ten WI courses at the 3xxx level, with 2-3 regularly offered each semester. Writing skills are developed throughout our curriculum in WI and non-WI courses. Although we have reduced the WI requirements for our majors we are curious about what this means with respect to writing instruction across the curriculum and the Legacy funding will
allow us to get a better sense of writing instruction across the curriculum and in light of the changes to the major.

The composition of our students has also changed over the past decade, with more non-majors in many of our classrooms, which raises questions about the best ways to meet the instructional needs of both our majors as well as non-majors in those shared settings. There is at times a struggle to figure out how to continue to develop the more specific critical historical writing skills among our majors as they advance through the major while also developing the writing skills of the broad range of students who take our courses, especially our 3xxx-level courses. In some ways, it seems that our mixed student body might be best served by writing assignments that target the specific needs of the students. Can this be done through a standard set of assignments or is there a need for greater differentiation in our writing instruction and assignment design? How can we accomplish this?

We will use a portion of our funds to learn how to maximize these online platforms and help our students develop the types of critical writing skills that will allow them to excel both within and beyond the classroom. The platforms across which writing is taking place have also changed considerably over the past decade, from the range of Canvas tools and the prevalence of group collaboration through google docs to the accessibility of Story Maps and similar digital platforms that encourage new types of writing and broader collaboration. Many faculty have become quite conversant with these tools and are using them in innovative ways to develop and support critical writing skills among our students. These platforms also remind us that while many of our students see their instructors as the primary audience, we are actually training all of your students to write for wider audiences and to use writing as a tool for both thinking historically as well as to thinking across any set of issues, problems or challenges and to do so in a way that is evidence-based, powerful and persuasive. As a faculty we are very interested in working with the Op-Ed Project and their “Write to Change the World” programs. The Op-Ed Project sees its mission has transforming knowledge producers into scholars who can change the world through a different type of writing. These are skills that our faculty want to marshall in their own work and these are skills that we want to impart to our students through writing instruction.

History also has a number of new faculty that were not a part of the department during our initial implementation of the WEC plans. In light of the changes to the major and the introduction of a number of new faculty, this is an excellent time to revisit and reevaluate the Writing Criteria developed over a decade ago and to work as a faculty to further articulate our current best practices. We will also use a portion of our budget to build both an instructor- as well as a student-facing Canvas site focused on writing in history.

**How is this work informed by previous plans?**

This plan is greatly informed by our earlier plans. First, all of this work is in conversation with the Writing Criteria that we articulated in our original plan. Second, early iterations prioritized instructor collaboration and our approach here prioritizes and attempts to institutionalize collaboration as essential to improving writing instruction across our curriculum. Third, our early plans grounded the WEC work in our WI courses, but in History writing instruction is built into all of our coursework. The major departure between this plan and earlier editions will be clarifying expectations and best practices with respect to writing instruction across our curriculum in both WI and non-WI courses.

**New Implementation Activities (See page 6 for a detailed implementation plan):**

Over the next two years, we will:
• Create a space for ongoing collaboration amongst our instructors about best practices in writing instruction (12 regular meetings over two years)
• Work with our faculty and graduate students to develop and institutionalize best practices around writing instruction in all classes with TAs, especially our large 1xxx-level WI courses
• Develop clear guidelines and implement best practices with respect to faculty-led writing instruction and faculty direction, mentoring, and support of teaching assistants and reader/graders responsible for student assessment
• Develop an Instructor-facing Canvas site where we will collect and share materials related to writing instruction, writing assignments, and writing assessment
• Develop a Student-facing Canvas site for History majors
• Convene a Summer/Fall All-Instructor Retreat on teaching writing across the curriculum
• Create a space for ongoing conversations with History majors about writing instruction in our program
• Train all instructors on teaching writing across various digital platforms
• Train all instructors on writing and teaching students how to write for wider audiences

**Section 1: Summary of Previous WEC Activity**

In this section, review the work your unit has performed in the previous three editions of your writing plans. What were your greatest successes? What challenges and obstacles have you encountered? What work remains to be done or can be extended with additional support? (1 page)

**Successes**

WEC has consistently created a space for pedagogical innovation around writing instruction in the Department of History. Our department has always taken writing and its instruction quite seriously but with each iteration of a Writing Plan, WEC created a space for all of our instructors to think together about writing across the curriculum. The development of History Writing Criteria was one important outcome. The History Department has also made a number of curricular changes over the years to create a writing pathway for our students and for the many non-majors that take our courses to fulfill LE requirements, especially the WI requirements. The History Major has continued to change over the years and each time those changes were frequently guided in part by something that was learned through our WEC work. We are excited to engage again through a structured WEC Writing Plan, especially in light of recent changes to the major that did not grow directly out of our WEC work but do highlight certain changes in the History Department with respect the writing, especially the sense, really the conviction, that writing instruction takes place across our curriculum and while WI courses create certain specific and important requirements, especially with respect to minimum pages drafted and required revisions, that these are actually practices prevalent across much of our curriculum. We see this as a moment to reevaluate and strengthen the department’s understanding of writing instruction across the curriculum and to build learning communities as well digital tools that will support this ongoing work.

**Challenges**

The primary challenge has been sustaining the type of attention to writing instruction that was possible in the first years of the fully-funded WEC program. All of our early writing plans made
excellent use of a regular 50% WEC TA to help organize the department’s WEC work. We have found that is it not possible to simply transfer that workload, which included “(1) working closely with the WEC faculty liaison and departmental officers in implementing the revised WI curriculum; (2) researching, compiling, and developing instructional support for WI courses, including the development and customization of a Moodle website that offered a wide range of resources for writing instruction; (3) providing in-class presentations and other writing instruction support to those faculty and instructors; and (4) serving as a liaison between History faculty and graduate TAs/RGs, coordinating meetings, conducting surveys, providing individual consultations, and raising issues as necessary,” to a faculty member (WEC, 2009). No faculty member is able to take this on and continue to fulfill their own teaching, research, and service responsibilities. What this has meant over the past few years is that the WEC Liaison works, first, to maintain connections between our WEC support team and our instructors largely through in-service activities and through updates on WEC activities and services and, second, by helping to facilitate ongoing writing support through individual instructor consultations.

Continuing Work

Given both the ways in which WEC work has enriched our curriculum and improved our practices and the challenges of sustaining this model without funding, the work that we propose in this edition of the plan will work to build and model a sustainable culture. This culture can not replicate the work done in the earlier editions of the Writing Program, but it will allow us to see what we can create and sustain and how we can continue to learn from each other as well as how we might make the best use of external resources that do not require considerable expenditures.

Section 2: Using WEC data

How have survey results from faculty, students, and/or affiliates informed the process of developing this plan? How have previous WEC writing assessments informed the process of developing this plan? What other sources of data about student writing have contributed to this plan? (1 page)

Overview of WEC Surveys and Assessments Used to Develop this Plan

This plan was developed in collaboration with our WEC support team and History faculty, graduate students and undergraduate majors. In Spring/Summer 2019, the Chair of the History Department, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and WEC Liaison worked with our WEC partners to develop a survey that was disseminated to History faculty (64 percent response rate), graduate instructors (53 percent response rate), and undergraduate majors (26 percent response rate).

Using the History Writing Criteria that we developed in our earlier Writing Plans, we asked all three groups to rate and assess the value of those criteria. We found that while there is some variation that most instructors agree that these criteria are appropriate and there is also a strong convergence around which criteria most instructors believe to be the most important. Faculty and grad instructors also offer similar ratings of students’ acquisition of these writing skills, with faculty usually rating student writing higher, which is not surprising since faculty are more likely to work with our majors in upper division courses and since faculty instruct all of our WI capstone seminars where majors have the opportunity to put all of these skills to work in their final capstone project. Students reported a high level of satisfaction with their proficiency with respect to these writing criteria, but also were looking for more targeted instruction. Given the mixed composition of all of our classrooms with the exception of the WI capstone and our new 3020 methods course, it is
frequently the case that History majors are amongst the strongest writers in our courses and given these baseline strengths they are pushing for more critical feedback and more advanced instruction in historical writing as they move through their program. All of our instructors also noted the struggle between meeting the diverse writing needs of our diverse student body, especially in our mixed classrooms. This is an issue that we hope to explore and address in this iteration of our Writing Plan.

Our graduate teaching instructors, however, were most concerned about the lack of clear guidance and practices in the main WI sections they lead as TAs. It is clear that the department has no standard set of practices with respect to how writing instruction is delivered in our large survey courses. Graduate students describe themselves as the primary instructors of writing and would like to see the department develop a clear set of standards and practices that all faculty working with grad students will adhere to (or at least use as a baseline for developing a collaborate process with respect to writing instruction in the large WI intro level survey courses). Faculty have also noticed the very different approaches to writing instruction in these courses and have echoed this call for clarity and support for both faculty as well as TAs with respect to modelling best instructional/mentoring practices in the large, lecture-based, discussion-support WI surveys. We will focus on this work immediately. It is our intention to begin the Fall 2020 academic year with an all-instructor retreat where these new guidelines will be discussed, revised, and agreed to. We will evaluate faculty, TA, and student reception of these practices at the end of each semester and make changes that will be shared with all instructors before the start of each semester.

The WEC surveys have verified for us the nature of the work that we would like to complete in this fourth edition of the Writing Plan.

**Section 3: Characteristics, abilities, and rating criteria**

How have members of the department used the previously established writing characteristics, abilities, and rating criteria? When and how are WEC criteria made apparent to students? How do the characteristics, abilities, and criteria contribute to the development of writing across courses? What changes and updates have unit faculty recommended or proposed for this plan? (2 pages)

**Current History Writing Criteria**

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the importance of historical context
2. Explain the context of historical events through the use of primary sources
3. Demonstrate an awareness of the particular nature, value, limitations, incompleteness of historical sources
4. Formulate and express viable historical research questions and hypothesis
5. Engage in persuasive analysis and interpretive problems
6. Make a persuasive and logically organized argument that is supported by the evidence
7. Articulate this argument in a thesis statement
8. Explain the broader significance of the topic
9. Identify & summarize the main arguments, evidence, and historiographical context of scholarly work(s)
10. Communicate ideas in a tone and style that is appropriate for the audience
11. Cite evidence accurately to support argument
Visability of WEC criteria to students and Contributions to the Development of Writing Across the Curriculum

The History Writing Criteria are most visible to our majors as they complete their capstone projects, but all students encounter some portion of these criteria in every history course. In our first three writing plans we built our WEC work around our WI courses so many of these criteria appear in our WI syllabi and are central to student assessment in those courses. Still, many of these skills are also taught in other history courses, though they may not be as prominently described as they are in the WI portions of the curriculum. One of the goals of this 4th edition writing plan will be to clarify where these various skills are specifically taught and developed through our curriculum so that our majors can use this as a guide as they navigate through the major.

Currently, the capstone seminar is the place where students are required to demonstrate proficiency across these criteria. The course rubrics and descriptions of the final capstone projects lay these requirements out in a variety of ways. One conversation that we will have as a faculty this year will be whether we will develop a standard description of our History Writing Criteria that would be shared with all of our majors as they begin their capstone research. We are a department that generally defers to faculty, allowing them to present, teach, and assess these required skills with a maximum of flexibility. At the same time, there is a recognition that our instructors and our students might benefit from more of a shared language around the critical thinking and critical writing skills that we are helping our students learn, practice, and develop.

Similarly, we plan to collect recent syllabi from across the curriculum to get a clearer sense of where and how these criteria are and are not visible to our students. It is our impression from our recent conversations with instructors, who were able to write and speak in considerable detail about the ways in which these skills are introduced to students, that our instructors have embedded many of these criteria in how they teach history, historical thinking, and writing. While these criteria are almost always at the forefront of our mind as instructors that does not mean that they are always clearly articulated in our course syllabi. Developing shared resources around each of these criteria will help us to make these criteria more visible to students.

In our new required methods course, we have developed a list of methods, skills, and activities that students will be introduced to. At present, faculty choose which areas they will focus on and highlight those in their syllabus. This is not a WI course and there has been some discussion about making this course WI or creating the option for students to take this as a WI or non-WI course. Whether the course changes, becomes WI, or adopts a hybrid approach, it can become a course where these criteria are, at minimum, formally introduced to our majors. This might also be an excellent setting for faculty to develop a range of assignments, especially short assignments, where students can be introduced through reading, discussion, reflection, writing, and peer-review to these critical historical skills.

Use and review of the rating criteria

The faculty engage with these criteria through the capstone review of these criteria which happens every three years. During our last review, the members of the Undergraduate Studies Committee
began the process of revising these criteria. Their work will be the baseline for possible revisions finalized through this Legacy Project.

**Proposed Revisions**

1. Provides relevant historical context (reformulation of old 1 and 2)
2. Effective use of primary sources to critique historiography or persuade the reader of an historical point (new)
3. Considers the strengths and weaknesses of the primary sources they employ (revised 3)
4. Proposes viable historical research questions (revised 4)
5. Makes a persuasive argument that is supported by the evidence (narrows old 5)
6. Crafts a paper that is logically organized (takes up the second characteristic of the old 5 as its own)
7. Articulates their argument in a thesis statement
8. Explains the larger significance of the argument (either historiographically or in terms of contemporary problems) (parathentical addition to the original)
9. Identifies and summarizes relevant historiography (shortened from original)
10. Communicate ideas in a clear and compelling tone and style (shortened from original)
11. (previously 12) Uses a consistent citation style
12. (previously 13) Any grammar and stylistic issues don’t interfere with clarity of argument

**Changes and Updates recommended or proposed**

Throughout this section, we have pointed to the ways in which we plan to move forward with respect to the writing criteria. Engaging with these criteria will be central to our work. At the same time, as we move into the second year of our Legacy programming we will engage directly to the transferability of these writing skills to the variety of digital media platforms we will be exploring and to the question of writing for the broadest audiences and in the public interest. As we grow our instructional capacity we will consider how media platforms and the audience (especially external to the University) impact and interact with our emerging History Writing Criteria.

**Section 4: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS, including REQUESTED SUPPORT and 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 4th edition Writing Plan relate to implementation activities from the 3rd, 2nd and 1st edition Writing Plans?

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?

**Relationship to the Implementation Activities of the Earlier Plans**

Our implementation plan adopts many of the strategies used in our earlier writing editions. First, it centers the shared knowledge that we already have in our department and works to surface it in ways that allow us to move from our shared History Writing Criteria to a shared set of pedagogical
practices. The 1000-level courses will be an initial area of concentration to show what instructional and lecture integration can look like. Second, it identifies a set of core faculty who will already be thinking around these issues over the next two years because of their courses and will rely on their expertise as a spring board into this work. Third, we will hire an undergraduate RA, who will not be able to function in the same way as a graduate RA, but will help with data collection and with the development of a new Canvas site, which will replace the moodle site that was built a decade ago. Fourth, we will use the panoply of WEC planning and evaluation resources to complete this work. The WEC team has worked closely with us over the past decade and in the past year has collaborated in the planning of each WEC conversation as well as with the development of a faculty and graduate and undergraduate student surveys and with the development of this final plan. We will continue to work with WEC throughout the implementation of this legacy edition of the writing plan. Some of the hallmarks of the legacy edition of the plan are identifying a regular time to discuss pedagogy that we will work to institutionalize as a department and greater collaboration with new partners both through LATIS and possibly through the Op-Ed project or a similarly-trained consultant.

Implementation Plan and Budget

Spring 2020 (Hiring and Recruitment)

Hire Undergrad RA ($15.00 p/h for 100 hours=$1500)**

Recruit Faculty to participate in Summer Teaching with Writing Collaboratives (6/$200 appreciation stipend=$1200)

Recruit Grad Students to participate in Summer Teaching with Writing Collaborative to discuss Best Practices in Teaching Writing and Best Practices in Faculty-Grad Mentoring (6/$200 appreciation stipend=$1200)*

*These very modest stipends will not compensate faculty and graduate students for their participation in these efforts that fall well beyond their expected workload. Rather, they are on effort to recognize their specific contributions to extending these conversations over the summer and to their assistance in developing the Canvas site and Faculty/TA Guidelines.

**The WEC Liaison will be responsible for managing the undergraduate research assistant’s workload over the summer. Including the work that is generated in collaboration with all of the faculty and graduate participants.

Summer 2020

Coordinate the work of the Undergrad RA, which will include,

- the collection of Faculty/Grad Instructor syllabi, assignments, and writing instruction materials
- the development of a user-friendly Canvas site where these materials will be well-organized and easily accessible to faculty and graduate students
- taking notes during all summer WEC meetings
- participating in the Fall Retreat and completing tasks generated during the retreat
Meet with Faculty Leads three times over the summer to:

- collaborate on the construction of the Canvas site with respect to writing instruction in our 1000, 3000, and 4000 courses
  
  - The 1000-level courses will be an initial area of concentration to show what instructional and lecture integration can look like
  
  - The 4000-level capstone courses will offer models of our most scaffolded writing instruction.
  
  - The 3000-level courses will think across the ranging of writing assignments and instruction to meet the needs of our mixed student body and the role of the required 3020 methods course.

- develop clear guidelines for faculty on how to mentor, collaborate with, and support teaching assistants on writing instruction in the 1000W courses as well as in other courses

Meet with Grad Participants three times over the summer to:

- develop clear guidelines in collaboration with faculty on how to mentor, collaborate with, and support teaching assistants in writing instruction in the 1000W courses as well as in other courses

- collaborate on the construction of the Canvas site with respect to writing instruction and assessment tools that will support graduate students who participate in both writing instruction and assessment in our 1000 and 3000 courses

Total Cost: $3900

Summer/Fall Faculty Retreat (in consultation with WEC Team)

All-day retreat to share: best practices in working with graduate students in WI courses, the new Canvas site, the work of the Faculty and Grad Leads, recommendations with respect to the revision of our Writing Criteria, tools for teaching writing in history, best practices in writing assignment design and assessment, and favorite writing assignment.

*In the case that all or many courses stay online, we will switch our focus to how to do this while teaching at a distance. We would also like to use these funds for lunch delivery even if the retreat is virtual.

Total Cost: $1000 for food (light breakfast and full lunch)

Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 Lunches with History Majors

Four lunch meetings with (10-15) History majors at different points in their program about their experiences with writing in the major. We will also invite 2 graduate instructors, 2 faculty members, and our WEC Liaison to join these meetings and talk with our majors.

Total Cost: $500 for food
Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 Curricular Meetings with Faculty and Graduate Students (support from WEC Team)

September – How to incorporate best practices in writing instruction into all of our classes and meet the needs of diverse students

October – To Rubric or not to Rubric? Assessments that Improve Student Writing

November – Teaching Writing in WI and non-WI courses? What’s the difference?

February – Meeting the needs of History Majors: From the Mixed Classroom to the Capstone

March – What can we agree on? Building a Student-Facing Canvas Site & Brainstorm Priorities for Year 2

April – Faculty Assessment of the Pilot Program and Solidify Writing Priorities for the Year 2

Total Cost: $1200 for food (These funds will come from the History Department’s discretionary budget since CLA does not allow regular meetings to budget for food expenses.)

Spring 2021 (Hiring and Recruitment)

Hire Undergrad RA ($15.00 p/h for 100 hours=$1500)

Recruit Faculty to participate in Summer Teaching with Writing Collaboratives (4/$200 appreciation stipend=$800)

Recruit Grad Students to participate in Summer Teaching with Writing Collaborative to discuss High-Impact Practices in Teaching Writing and Effective Practices in Faculty-Grad Mentoring (4/$200 appreciation stipend=$800)

Recruit two or three History Faculty to participate in the Op-Ed project training or Contract with the Op-Ed project to do a training with our department or contract with a historian/public interest writer to do a series of instructor workshops on writing for wider audiences ($3000)

Summer 2021 (Work)

Coordinate the work of the Undergrad RA, which will include,

- the continued collection of Faculty/Grad Instructor syllabi, assignments, and writing instruction materials
- the continuing development of a user-friendly Canvas site where these materials will be well-organized and easily accessible to faculty and graduate students
- the development of a user-friendly, student-facing Canvas site where materials related to a range of critical writing skills will be easily assessible for our majors

Meet with Faculty Leads three times over the summer to:

- collaborate on the construction of a student-facing Canvas site to support our majors as they develop and strengthen their writing skills
• evaluate and refine the guidelines for faculty on how to mentor, collaborate with, and support teaching assistants on writing instruction in the 1000W courses as well as in other courses

• participate in the planning of the Year 2 focus on Writing History Across Different Platforms and for Broad Audiences

Meet with Grad Participants three times over the summer to:

• evaluate and refine the faculty-guidelines on how to mentor, collaborate with, and support teaching assistants in writing instruction in the 1000W courses as well as in other courses

• collaborate on the construction of a student-facing Canvas site to support our majors as they develop and strengthen their writing skills

• participate in the planning of the Year 2 focus on Writing History Across Different Platforms and for Broad Audiences

Recruit two or three History Faculty to participate in the Op-Ed project training or Contract with the Op-Ed project to do a training with our department or contract with a historian/public interest writer to do a series of instructor workshops on writing for wider audiences

**Total Cost: $6100**

Fall 2021/Spring 2020 Lunches with History Majors

Four lunch meetings with History majors at different points in their program about their experiences with writing in the major. We will also invite 2 graduate instructors, 2 faculty members, and our WEC Liaison to join these meetings and talk with our majors.

**Total Cost: $500** for food

Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 Curricular Meetings

September – Refresher: Best Practices in Teaching Writing and Collaborating with/Mentoring Grad Students in Writing Instruction; Writing Across Platforms and for Wider Audiences (Preview of the year)

October – From Canvas Posts and Story Maps to Digital Stories and Documentaries: How to design effective assignments and develop critical writing skills (in collaboration with LATIS)

November – Writing for Broad Audiences: How to write Op-eds (in collaboration with the Op-Ed Project or a consultant)

February – Writing for Broad Audiences: Teaching students how to write Op-eds (in collaboration with Op-Ed Project or a consultant)

March - Writing for Broad Audiences: Story Maps, Op-eds, Websites, Blogging (in collaboration with Op-Ed Project or a consultant); Brainstorm Writing Priorities for the coming year
April – Faculty Assessment of the Pilot Program and Solidify Writing Priorities for the coming year

**Total Cost: $1200** for food (These funds will come from the History Department’s discretionary budget since CLA does not allow regular meetings to budget for food expenses.)

Spring 2022 (Grant-writing and recruitment)

Grant writing to sustain some funding for this work, but even without funding it is our belief these over these two years we will have built and nurtured a collaborative pedagogical community around the teaching of writing in history. We have already identified potential funding opportunities that focus on teaching writing to our large international/multilingual student body and more general funds that we could apply for as we identify specific needs and areas requiring ongoing training and support.

**Total Budget: $14,400**

**Minus History Department Contributions: $2,400***

**Pilot Legacy Grant: $10,000 (plus WEC Liaison Funds $2000)**

**Discretionary WEC Liaison Funds Remaining: $1000**

*The History Department will cover the cost of light refreshments for all of the WEC meetings in order to support and encourage regular faculty/graduate student attendance at these new regular meetings. The History Department may also cover the additional expenses currently drawn from the WEC Liaison’s Discretionary Funds if the budget permits. Otherwise, the WEC Liaison will contribute these funds to the Legacy Pilot project.

**Evaluation and Continuing Improvement**

**Staggered Assessments over the Next Two Years**

Students: Rolling Assessments of Students in Classes where Faculty are adopting different practices (These will range from online surveys and reflection memos to small group conversations.)

Graduate Students: Spring 2021/2022 Online Survey and Conversation about each year’s activities (Evaluation of Legacy Pilot work and of History Writing Criteria)

Faculty: Spring 2021/2022 Online Survey and Conversation about each years’ activities (Evaluation of Legacy Pilot work and of History Writing Criteria)

We will collaborate with our WEC Team on the development of these assessments and on the interpretation of our results. We will use these results to continue to improve writing instruction, to support our faculty and graduate students in their teaching of writing, and to meet the needs of our students with respect to the development of writing as a tool of critical thinking and mechanism for reckoning with the past.

The fourth edition is very intentionally constructed around a set of pedagogical activities (scheduled during a shared block of time when none of our instructors are in class) with the goal of institutionalizing these practices and creating a culture of collaboration around the project of writing
instruction. Streamlining the major and the creation of two required undergraduate courses have started the process of creating this collaborative culture around these two, faculty-taught seminars. The WEC funds will be used to build upon these foundations and extend our pedagogical collaboration to writing, a skill set and a way of thinking that we all share. The Department is also committed to supporting this ongoing work by allocating a portion of our current undergraduate RA staffing to maintaining the new Canvas sites. We will also seek additional funding to support continuing activities as needed.

Section 5: 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 plan was created over the past year in close collaboration with departmental faculty and graduate students. Faculty and graduate students met three times over the course of the year (November, February, and April) to discuss and develop this pilot program. Faculty and graduate students read, revised, and offered feedback on the Key Findings and Implementation Plan portion of this plan during our meeting on April 20, 2020. All participants endorsed the plan. The History Advisory Committee and our WEC partners also reviewed and provided feedback on this completed writing plan.
May 19, 2020

To: Malinda Lindquist, History
CC: Pamela Flash, Matt Luskey, Bryan Mosher, Jennifer Reckner, Leslie Schiff, Heidi Solomonson, Reagan Mock-Nelson, Bryan Pekel
From: Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn, Office of Undergraduate Education
Subject: Decision regarding WEC funding proposal

Thank you for providing the Office of Undergraduate Education with a Legacy Writing Plan. On behalf of History, you have requested the following funding to support that plan’s implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit faculty to participate in Summer Teaching with Writing Collaboratives (6/$200 appreciation stipends)*</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit grad students to participate in Summer Teaching with Writing Collaboratives (6/$200 stipends)*</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire undergrad RA ($15/hr for 100 hours)</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day faculty retreat to revise TA/Faculty coordinated approaches to large enrollment introductory-level courses (catering expenses)</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunches with history majors (10-15 students, 2 grad instructors, 2 faculty, WEC liaison)**</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular meetings with faculty and graduate students (support from WEC team) (catering expenses)</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunches with history majors (10-15 students, 2 grad instructors, 2 faculty, WEC liaison)**</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular meetings with faculty and graduate students (support from WEC team) (catering expenses)</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire undergrad RA ($15/hr for 100 hours)</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit faculty to participate in Summer Teaching with Writing Collaboratives (4/$200 appreciation stipends)*</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit grad students to participate in Summer Teaching with Writing Collaboratives (4/$200 stipends)*</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contract with the Op-Ed project / public interest writer to do a training with department on writing for wider audiences  $2,500.00

Recruit History Faculty to participate in Op-Ed training  $500.00

Fall 2021
Lunches with History majors  $250.00
Curricular meetings with faculty and graduate students (catering expenses)  $600.00

Spring 2022
Lunches with History majors  $250.00
Curricular meetings with faculty and graduate students (catering expenses)  $600.00

Total History/Liaison contribution
History Department Expense  $2,400.00
WEC Liaison Funds  $2,000.00

TOTAL WEC Request
WEC Funding (Office of Undergraduate Education)  $10,000.00

Combined Total  $14,400.00

These proposed activities are approved. Because this plan is the first WEC Legacy Plan to have been submitted to the Writing Board and Office of Undergraduate Education, we’re in uncharted waters. While the fiscal requests made as part of this plan are both meritorious and supported by WEC data gathered from you and your colleagues, some of them are unprecedented for this program. As we move forward with the Legacy Pilot Project, OUE is interested in learning from History’s experience with this project.

To that end, we’re pleased to see that you plan to conduct rolling assessments with all participating stakeholders (as you describe on page 12 of the Plan). We ask that you, as Liaison, share some of this assessment data with us annually (May 2021 and May 2022) so we can learn from your experience. We don’t need anything formal: informal, reflective updates would be fine. You can address them to Leslie Schiff (schif002@umn.edu) and copy Matt Luskey (mluskey@umn.edu) as your WEC Program consultant. We’re particularly interested in hearing about the following:

1. Reflections from faculty members and graduate student TAs who participate in the Teaching with Writing Collaboratives: What’s their reaction to this programming? Moving forward, what, if any, of the ideas discussed have impacted their approaches to teaching with writing
(2) For the OpEd Project (Spring 2021), we’d like to hear about who you hire as a speaker facilitator and a cost breakdown of the $2500 awarded to this effort. Post-event, we’d be interested in hearing about participant reactions. If particular assignments are developed as a result, it would be terrific if instructors would be willing to share them with other departments developing more approaches to public discourse. Perhaps, if the instructors are willing, these materials could be posted on History’s WEC page.

All approved funds in the amount of $10,000 will be transferred during FY20. Please direct your accountant to contact Reagan Mock-Nelson (rmocknel@umn.edu) and Heidi Solomonson (heidis@umn.edu) as soon as possible with the appropriate EFS information so that funds may be transferred before July 1.

We wish the department continued success in this ongoing effort to support students and faculty.