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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Comments about Faculty/Instructors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The counts at left do not include contract associate and assistant professors and instructors who teach our core curriculum, which contains the majority of our formal writing instructors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major(s)

*Please list each major your unit offers:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Total # students enrolled in major as of Fall 2019</th>
<th>Total # students graduating with major as of AY 17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, B.A.</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, B.S.</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, 2nd Major</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1290</strong></td>
<td><strong>483</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEC Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># Participated</th>
<th># Invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Grants program</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Feedback</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Refining WEC Abilities</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Sabbatical</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: 5-min.</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Ratify New Abilities</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Writing Plan Narrative, 3rd Edition

Please retain section headers and prompts in your plan.

Introductory Summary:
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? (1 page maximum)

Psychology began participating in WEC in AY14-15. As is typical, we spent the first year developing a list of Writing Abilities and Criteria by which we could judge them. Our First Edition Writing Plan set aside funds for (1) an RA to develop http://writing.psych.umn.edu and a Moodle-based badge program so it would be easy for all instructors to require students to familiarize themselves and (2) a small grant program for faculty and graduate students. Small grants were awarded during AY 15-16 to (1) purchase APA manuals, (2) develop a Moodle-based self-assessment exercise, and (3) offer a writing intervention on “argument crafting” in PSY 1001. Unfortunately, the Moodle-based efforts were rendered useless by the University’s shift to Canvas (and they did not have enough perceived value to pursue re-development in Canvas), and the PSY 1001 intervention was foiled by the fact that the course uses computer-graded writing so students were not motivated to think about argument structure in that context.

Our Second Edition writing plan chose not to ask for additional funds, since we retained the funds that were not spent on the planned PSY 1001 intervention. Our implementation activities were: (1) for faculty, advertise and support 5-minute workshops for all faculty, emphasizing their utility in our large-enrollment 3000-level courses, and (2) for graduate students, host a workshop each semester focusing on supporting different aspects of their jobs. So far, we have held 2 workshops on giving feedback on writing, a workshop on helping students identify the appropriate scope for a paper, and a workshop on revising our Writing Abilities and Criteria. In Fall 2017, Faculty ratified a revised streamlined set of Writing Abilities and Criteria, reflected in this document. Those revised criteria were used in the 2nd Assessment of Psych Capstone papers, which occurred in Summer 2018.

The activities proposed for this edition of the Writing Plan will be carried out over the final 2 years of the Writing Plan 3 period. Some of the activities are proposed to further embed activities undertaken in the previous writing plans (e.g., writing criteria application and website development). Other activities are proposed to expand our writing curriculum knowledge (e.g., instructor idea-sharing and alumni conversations). We also plan to collect feedback about how the activities are being used and received by instructors and students. A notable aspect of the activities proposed in this version of our plan is communication. In the past we have fallen short of our hopes for faculty participation and the current plan addresses this issue by communicating frequently about curriculum resources and opportunities and also communicating specifically through 1-to-1 collaboration between the liaison and instructors and personalized invitations to participate. A brief list of the proposed activities follows below. A more detailed description of these activities can be found in Section 5.

In this edition of the writing plan, we propose to:
1) Target classes for alignment with department writing criteria.
2) Develop the department WEC website.
3) Create a frequent, department writing communication.
4) Host instructor cross-pollination lunches.
5) Host SL/TA workshops.
6) Host a non-academic, Psychology Alumni conversations.
7) Host a Psychology student successful-writer conversations.
8) Create 5-minute student pre-writing surveys for targeted classes and others.
9) Create 5-minute student writing workshops for targeted classes and others.
10) Create instructor, department, and student writing plan response surveys.

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

☒ There have not been substantial revisions to this section of the Writing Plan.
☐ There have been substantial revisions to this section of the Writing Plan. (Discuss these explicitly.)

Evidence-based, objective, explanatory and descriptive
Mechanically correct, using grammar, graphs, tables, sections, citations, etc. appropriately
Purposeful, thesis-driven, and advancing a particular point (for class assignments, on-task!)
Integrative or synthetic, identifying themes in literature; conclusions that distill previous points
Reflective, i.e., showing creativity, understanding, and an interesting perspective
Illustrated – using effective visual elements as appropriate
Contextualized; showing understanding of literature and situating present argument
Analytical; critical
Logical, coherent

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

☒ There have not been substantial revisions to this section of the Writing Plan.
☐ There have been substantial revisions to this section of the Writing Plan. (Discuss these explicitly.)

As we worked with the abilities and criteria, there were too many to keep track of, and they seemed to overlap, so in Fall, 2017, we had a workshop in which everyone re-wrote their abilities, and then the faculty ratified a new grid of abilities and criteria. The new set of abilities is:

Context
1. Identify work that has already been done on the topic
2. Demonstrate understanding of reader’s perspective
3. Substantiate claims

Argument
4. Synthesize, rather than list or re-iterate data
5. Establish focal thesis, research question, or hypothesis early in papers
6. Data and facts build logically to a conclusion

Style
7. Avoid distracting the reader with low-level mistakes
8. Use large-scale organization that supports comprehension
9. Use visual elements as appropriate

Some of the complexity in the original set of abilities was resolved by articulating criteria at several levels of performance, as shown in Section 4.

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?

☒ There have not been substantial revisions to this section of the Writing Plan.
☐ There have been substantial revisions to this section of the Writing Plan. (Discuss these explicitly.)

In general, the sequencing in the core curriculum in Psychology supports writing instruction well; in spite of the large course size, writing is incorporated in Psy 1001; in Psy 3001 (Research Methods) students receive explicit instruction on the structure of a research paper; in Psy 3901/3902/3903 (Psy Capstone) students are supported by frequent contact with their SLs (section leader) as they develop their paper.

The resistance we heard from students about argument crafting, rather than listing facts, in our aborted intervention in 1001 gives us a chance to consider whether there are different kinds of instruction we can offer about argumentation vs. fact regurgitation early on in the curriculum. Instruction in 3001 focuses on mechanics, which is appropriate as it’s the first-time students are pulling together a full-length research paper.

Before WEC officially started in Psychology, the instructors of Research Methods (3001) and Psy Capstone (3901/3902/3903) had already participated in several Teaching with Writing workshops and worked extensively with the Writing Center to incorporate and adapt many best practices in their courses. These activities, which are on-going, include:
- peer review of drafts of papers in Research Methods (3001)
- guiding students through an analysis of a poor writing sample (3001)
- randomized controlled studies of the effect of peer review and different methods of delivering feedback (3001)
- multiple rounds of revision and feedback (both 3001 and Capstone 3901/3902/3903)
- mapping exercises to help students organize their references and arguments before they start writing (3901/3902/3903)
- talk-aloud protocols in small groups to work through arguments as students are drafting papers (3901/3902/3903)
- a department-level award is offered each year for the top paper in Psy Capstone (3901/3902/3903 SLs each set aside their best example, and then faculty reviewers rank 3 winners).
All of the above activities are synergistic with and complementary to the activities that are specifically organized in our department under the WEC umbrella. There is strong overlap between the established grading rubrics in both classes and the Abilities and Criteria defined as part of the WEC process.

Part of our Third Edition Writing Plan includes active, one-to-one coordination between the WEC liaison and the instructors of Psy 1001, Psy 3001, and Psy 3901/3902/3903 (Note: the current liaison is the instructor of 3901/3902/3903). We will continue to work to align the language in all three places so, as faculty adopt the WEC criteria more broadly throughout the department, students will become more familiar with the consistent expectations.

Through our WEC-led discussions over the last several years, we have also become aware that writing is more broadly embedded throughout our curriculum than we were originally aware. Faculty throughout the department incorporate a wide range of writing assignments in their courses, even in large enrollment courses that are not writing intensive and would not be expected to use writing meaningfully. Assignment types include short answers, short essays, lab reports, and full-length papers. A non-exhaustive list of instructors who have participated in discussions about how they are using writing in their courses and how to align their teaching/grading efforts with the WEC program is:
- PSY 3031 - Introduction to Sensation and Perception (Olman): students submit weekly 1-paragraph writing assignments, focusing on citing facts some weeks and synthesizing arguments on other weeks.
- PSY 4032 - Psychology of music (Oxenham): summary and critique of research article; students are encouraged to focus on synthesizing points that came up during a class discussion that precedes the paper submission. Feedback emphasizes Abilities 2-7.
- PSY 4521 - Psych of Stress and Trauma (Frazier): research dissemination paper (emphasizing abilities 1-3, 5-7)
- PSY 5137 - Introduction to Behavioral Genetics (Matt McGue): research paper scaffolded by outline.
- PSY 5993 - Directed Research (MacDonald): research paper. Feedback emphasizes abilities 1, 4, 5, 6)

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’s longitudinal rating process.).

☒ There have not been substantial revisions to this section of the Writing Plan.
☐ There have been substantial revisions to this section of the Writing Plan. (Discuss these explicitly.)
Ability
Gateway course work should ...
Upper level work should ...
Graduate-ready work should ...

1. Identify work that has already been done on the topic
   ... provide accurate descriptions of existing scholarship in the field using direct statements about what was
   accomplished and how.
   ... track back to original work for citations.
   ... summarize previously conducted studies so reader can understand methods and impact of present
   work without referring to other texts.

2. Demonstrate understanding of reader’s perspective
   ... anticipate reader’s level of understanding.
   ... anticipate reader’s concerns and expectations.
   ... motivate readers to care by telling them what is at stake.

3. Substantiate claims
   ... portray previous literature accurately.
   ... provide factual basis (previous literature or statistically significant result) for all claims.
   ... distinguish explicitly between the writer’s work (opinions, data) and that of others.

4. Synthesize, rather than list or re-iterate data
   ... identify themes in related studies, rather than simply reiterating work.
   ... both compare and contrast previous work.
   ... evoke and address arguments and counterarguments.

5. Establish focal thesis, research question, or hypothesis early in papers
   ... state the thesis or question before discussing methods of data.
   ... address a research question of the appropriate scope (i.e., focused enough that background can be covered thoroughly within page limit).
   ... tackle a question that is arguable or present a novel idea.

6. Data and facts build logically to a conclusion
   ... connect conclusions directly (and logically) to results presented in text.
   ... include only previous work that is directly linked to current argument.
   ... weigh evidence, acknowledging strengths and limitations of supporting evidence.

7. Avoid distracting the reader with low-level mistakes
   ... use correct grammar, punctuation and spelling.
   ... adhere to a standard style for citing sources (generally APA).
   ... adopt the appropriate level of formality (voice); use succinct writing style.

8. Use large-scale organization that supports comprehension
... make explicit (and hopefully smooth) transitions between ideas (e.g., “First ... Next ...” or “On the other hand ...”).
... use section headings as appropriate.
... announce argument moves as appropriate (e.g., “In this section I will ...”).

9. Use visual elements as appropriate
... use tables to organize comparisons between numbers or ideas.
... use graphs to plot data in which the reader should see trends.
... use visual elements to advance the argument of the paper.

Section 5: 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 3rd edition Writing Plan relate to implementation activities from the 2nd and 1st 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?

Our implementation plan for the current period includes activities that fall into 3 categories: Integration, Expansion, and Assessment. Integration activities are those that further embed and utilize the WEC accomplishments of Writing Plans 1 & 2. Expansion activities are those that help us gather additional writing resources, both within and beyond our department. Assessment activities are those that allow us to evaluate whether the resources and tools we are developing in this 3rd plan are being sought out and used by instructors, TA/SLs, and students.

INTEGRATION

(1) Embed Departmental Writing Criteria.
- Liaison to meet with instructors of targeted classes; target based on:
  - key locations in curriculum map (entry, middle, exit)
  - previous engagement in WEC
  - interest/willingness to participate

(Targeted classes to include Psy 1001 (Intro Psych), Psy 3001W (Research Methods), and Psy 3901, 3902, and 3903W (Psy Capstone), but may also include any 3000-, 4000-, or 5000-level courses with interested instructors. The liaison has already met with the instructors of the targeted courses [Psy 1001: Liza Meredith,
Psy 3001: Mark Stellmack and Penny Nichol, Psy 3901-03 are taught by the current liaison] to determine a willingness to collaborate on this activity. All instructors have agreed to collaborate.)

- Liaison and instructors to explore:
  - Align writing assignments and rubrics with Departmental Writing criteria.

**When:** S20 with targeted classes. Meetings with instructors of other classes to happen throughout the Writing Plan 3 period.

**Why:** We hope to increase student familiarity and competence with the Department’s writing criteria (as applicable for the writing assignments in the targeted classes).

**Relationship to prior writing plans:** In prior plans, faculty involvement in WEC was broad-based. Faculty were provided information and asked for input during faculty meetings. Further involvement in implementation of writing criteria and workshops was left up to individual initiative. In the current plan, collaboration between the liaison and faculty is targeted and one-on-one. Faculty in targeted classes have already been approached for their participation and all have expressed a willingness to explore these ideas for potential implementation in their classes. After implementation in the targeted classes, the liaison will reach out to additional faculty using writing with UGs to discuss individualized implementation in their courses.

**Assessment:** See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys.

- Resources needed: Liaison to collaborate with targeted course instructors.

---

**(2) Develop the Psychology WEC website**

- Increase visibility (link to Psych Intranet and Psych main sites).
- Develop navigation, engagement, and function.
- Expand instructor materials, TA materials, campus writing resources and events for instructors, TAs, and students.
- Expand empirical references for writing instruction (tied to Departmental assignments used and criteria).
- Curate timely campus writing resources and events.

**When:** To begin S20.

**Why:** By making the website easy to locate and navigate we hope to increase its use by instructors and TAs.

**Relationship to prior plans:** A Psychology WEC website was developed in prior plan implementations. However, the site is not linked to either of our 2 main departmental websites. By linking to the frequently-used main sites, committing to regular updates of content, and orientation of potential users through regular communication (see Item 3 below) we hope to increase usage of the website.

**Assessment:** See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys. Website usage can also be tracked.

- Resources needed:
  - Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Psy Department Communication & IT).
  - WEC consultation for empirical resources.
  - UG RA to curate campus writing resources and events.
(3) Create a monthly, Departmental writing communication
- Send email or newsletter written by liaison.
- Communicate 6x year while school is in session.
- Prompt readers to visit Department website for material relevant for that part of the term (e.g., syllabi and rubrics before term starts).
- Highlight upcoming writing-related events for instructors, SLs/TAs, and students.
- Spotlight an instructor (demonstration of a writing assignment or lesson or rubric).

When: To begin S20.
Why: By increasing awareness of writing resources and practices we hope that instructors will feel supported and inspired.
Relationship to prior plans: This proposal of regular writing-focused communication by the liaison has not been proposed in prior writing plans.
Assessment: See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys.

- Resources needed:
  - Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Department Communication & IT).
  - UG RA to conduct instructor interviews and write up spotlights.

(4) Host instructor cross-pollination lunches.
- Invite groups of 3-4 instructors (include faculty, P&A instructors, grad student instructors, and SLs).
- Host 4x year while school is in session.
- Ask each participant to share a writing tool (e.g., assignment, rubric, lesson, or activity).
- Discuss what is working and what is not.
- Compare with departmental criteria and discuss alignment ideas.
- Ask participants to share feedback and ideas.

When: To begin S20.
Why: To foster writing instruction idea-sharing and collegial support.
Relationship to prior plans: This proposal of invitational, lunch meetings for instructors of UG classes has not been proposed in prior writing plans.
Assessment: See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys. Attendance will also be taken.

- Resources needed:
  - WEC facilitator
  - Funds for participant lunches.

(5) Host SL/TA workshops
- Invite all SLs and TAs who work with writing assignments.
- Host 4x year while school is in session.
- Select topics based on types of writing assignments used in targeted classes and classes with highest TA/SL employment.
• Discuss Departmental writing criteria.

When: To begin S20.
Why: To train and support student TAs and SLs involved in grading and feedback for undergraduate writing assignments.

Relationship to prior plans: Two TA/SL workshops were implemented across prior plan periods and met with favorable response. In fact, requests were made that they be offered more frequently. In this plan, we propose to hold 2 workshops each semester.

Assessment: See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys. Attendance will also be taken.

• Resources needed:
  o WEC facilitator
  o Funds for participant lunches.

(6) Host Non-academic Psychology Alumni Conversations.
• Professions and individuals chosen in consultation with Psych Advising and CLA-Career Services (to select top fields entered by our graduates).
• Discuss how writing is used in their professions and expectations in entry-level positions.
• Discuss UG writing experiences that most helped to prepare them for work.
• Post-conversation discussion with faculty of how these compare to our assignments and criteria.
• Record key discussion points and conclusions for monthly email, Department WEC website, and faculty meeting presentation.

When: To begin F20.
Why: To gather information about how our students will be expected to use writing in their future careers. To enable faculty discussion of ways to prepare our students for their future careers.

Relationship to prior plans: This proposal of an alumni panel has not been proposed in prior writing plans.

Assessment: See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys. The information gathered will be included in our WEC resources posted on the website and in communications. Numbers of alumni participants will also be recorded.

• Resources needed:
  o Liaison to consult with Laura Heilman (CLA Career Services) and Mike Houlahan (Psych Advising) for alumni contacts.
  o Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Department Communication & IT) and possibly LATIS for recording and linking.
  o Funds for coffee/tea.

(7) Host Successful Student-Writer Conversations.
• Successful student writers invited from targeted classes (e.g. Borine winners and “A” capstone papers) in consultation with course instructors.
• Discuss writing process, useful tools, support used, and Department writing criteria.
• Record key discussion points and conclusions for monthly email, Department WEC website, and class presentation.
When: To begin F20.
Why: To gather information about how our successful student writers develop and support their writing skills. To enable student discussion of ways to prepare for psychology writing assignments.
Relationship to prior plans: This proposal of a student writer panel has not been proposed in prior writing plans.
Assessment: See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys. The information gathered will be included in our WEC resources posted on the website and in communications. Numbers of student-writer participants will also be recorded.

- Resources needed:
  - Liaison to consult with course instructors to solicit student participants.
  - Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Department Communication & IT) and possibly LATIS for recording and linking.
  - Funds for coffee/tea.

(8) Create 5-minute Pre-writing Student Surveys
- Ask students in targeted classes what they need (e.g., info, resources) based on scheduled writing assignments and Department writing criteria.
- Time surveys to precede scheduled writing assignments.
- Format based on class format or instructor preference (e.g. Canvas or paper).
- Expand beyond targeted classes based on instructor interest.
- Provide information about surveys and how to implement on Department WEC website and in monthly email/newsletter.

When: To begin in S20 in targeted classes. Expansion to other classes of interested instructors throughout the Writing Plan 3 period.
Why: To foster communication about writing-support needs between students and instructors.
Relationship to prior plans: This proposal of pre-writing student surveys was not proposed in prior writing plans.
Assessment: See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys.

- Resources needed:
  - Liaison to consult with course instructors to solicit student participants.
  - Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Department Communication & IT) for email/newsletter and website.

(9) Create 5-minute Student Writing Workshops
- Time workshops in targeted classes to follow Student Surveys and precede scheduled writing assignments.
- Format based on class format or instructor preference (e.g. Canvas or paper).
- Select topic based on Student Surveys, scheduled writing assignments, and Department writing criteria.
• Expand beyond targeted classes based on instructor interest.
• Provide information about workshops and how to implement on Department WEC website and in monthly email/newsletter.

**When:** To begin in S20 in targeted classes. Expansion to other classes of interested instructors throughout the Writing Plan 3 period.

**Why:** To provide specific, targeted writing instruction to support student writing.

**Relationship to prior writing plans:** The idea of 5-minute workshops was introduced to faculty and two workshops created in prior writing plan implementations. In the current plan, collaboration between the liaison, WEC consultant, and faculty is targeted and one-on-one. Faculty in targeted classes have already been approached for their participation and all have expressed a willingness to explore these ideas for potential implementation in their classes. After implementation in the targeted classes, the liaison will reach out to additional faculty using writing with UGs to discuss individualized implementation in their courses.

**Assessment:** See Assessment section below for instructor and student surveys.

• **Resources needed:**
  o Liaison to consult with course instructors to solicit student participants.
  o WEC facilitator
  o Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Department Communication & IT) for email/newsletter and website.

### ASSESSMENT

**(10) Create an Instructor Response Survey**

• Administer to targeted class instructors.
• Administer at the end of each academic year (1x year).
• Ask about use of WEC resources, liaison consultations, changes made in instruction, assignments, or rubrics, and perceived student response.

**When:** To begin S20 (end of term).

**Why:** To collect feedback from targeted faculty on implementation of Writing Plan 3.

**Relationship to prior plans:** This proposal to create an instructor response survey was not proposed in prior writing plans.

• **Resources needed:**
  o WEC consultant and facilitator
  o Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Department Communication & IT) for survey creation and administration.

**(11) Create a Departmental Response Survey**

• Administer to all instructors, TAs, and SLs of undergraduate courses.
• Administer at the end of each academic year (1x year).
• Ask about use and value of WEC resources, changes made in instruction, assignments, or rubrics, and perceived student response.
When: To begin S20 (end of term).
Why: To collect feedback from undergraduate instructors and teaching support staff on implementation of Writing Plan 3.
Relationship to prior plans: This proposal to create a departmental response survey was not proposed in prior writing plans.

- Resources needed:
  - WEC consultant and facilitator
  - Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Department Communication & IT) for survey creation and administration.

(12) Create a Student Response Survey
- Administer to students in targeted classes.
- Administer at the end of each semester (2x year).
- Ask about helpfulness of 5-minute surveys and workshops.
- Ask about use and value of WEC resources, including website and communication.

When: To begin S20 (end of term).
Why: To collect feedback from students on implementation of Writing Plan 3.
Relationship to prior plans: This proposal to create a student response survey was not proposed in prior writing plans.

- Resources needed:
  - WEC consultant and facilitator
  - Liaison to partner with targeted course instructors for student participation.
  - Liaison to partner with Amanda Schmit and/or Silke Moeller (Department Communication & IT) for survey creation and administration.

All 3 of the assessments described here (faculty, department, and student) will supplement the collection of writing samples (strong/weak) on our key target areas (scope/argument) by raters during triennial writing assessment funded by WEC. The samples gleaned in Summer 2018 have provided several useful teaching examples for SL/TA workshops. They are also useful exemplars around which to anchor conversations about the nature of our identified Abilities and the use of our Criteria. Assessment will also include a tally of participation in all activities (student surveys and workshops, instructor idea-sharing lunches, TA/SL workshops, alumni and student-writer conversation participation, website usage, email distribution).

Sustainability: The activities outlined in this writing plan are aimed at producing a cultural shift within the department. A shift toward open discussion and idea-sharing about the value and practice of writing, giving writing a greater saliency in our curriculum. In the period covered by this plan, the liaison carries a good deal of the responsibility for getting these discussions underway, but this is a ball that should be fairly easy to keep rolling. The activities proposed require some planning and communication, but not much funding. After 2 years of implementation our department will have a template to guide the planning and communication making
the burden of doing so lighter. The current liaison was hired intentionally with WEC as a formal part of her responsibilities. This demonstrates a commitment by the department to prioritize further development of our writing curriculum in this 3rd Writing Plan to support long-term success.

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 current writing plan was written by the WEC liaison following review of Writing Plans 1 & 2, discussion with Department Chair, Jeffry Simpson, Department Associate Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies, Moin Syed, discussions with instructors of the targeted courses in the current plan, Liza Meredith (Psy 1001), Mark Stellmack (Psy 3001), Penny Nichol (Psy 3001) [Note: the current liaison is the instructor of Psy 3901/3902/3903.], consultation with Department Communications and Technology staff, Amanda Schmit and Silke Moeller, respectively, discussion with WEC consultant and Co-director of the Center for Writing, Pamela Flash, and discussions with former WEC liaison, Cheryl Olman. The current plan was also made available to all faculty members for review and comment weeks before being presented for ratification.
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.
☒ 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, Canvas discussion boards, and surveys.

RA Name (Use TBD for vacancies): TBD

RA Contact Information: email: _____, phone: _____

Period of appointment (Semester/Year to Semester/Year): Spring 2020-Fall 2021

RA appointment percent time: NA, Undergraduate RA to be paid hourly

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

RA will curate campus writing resources and events and conduct/write-up faculty interviews (spotlights) for presentation in departmental WEC newsletter/email and on departmental WEC website.

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

RA will curate resources and conduct/write-up interviews once a month during regular semesters S20-F21.

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

The RA will check in with the liaison several times a month during regular semesters.

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

The RA and liaison will meet in-person at the start of each semester and then in-person and via email throughout the term as needed.

---

i An example for determining funding for appointments can be found on the WEC Liaison Google site. 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: Psychology

Unit Financial Contact Name/Email: Sarah Jahn swen0432@umn.edu

Chart string for fund transfer: 1000-10986-20043-3576453

Total Financial Request: $6,345.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Requests (requests cannot include faculty salary support) drop-down choices will appear when cell next to &quot;semester&quot; is selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1:</th>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 2:</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 3:</th>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 4:</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 5:</th>
<th>Semester 6:</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semester 1 Total: $1,530.00  
Semester 2 Total: $1,605.00  
Semester 3 Total: $1,605.00  
Semester 4 Total: $1,605.00  
Semester 5 Total: $0.00  
Semester 6 Total: $0.00

Rationale for costs and their schedule of distribution

Undergraduate RA: 5 hours per week x 15 weeks x $12/hour. Instructor lunches: 6 participants x $15 x 2 times during the term. TA Workshop lunches: 12 participants x $15 x 2 times during the term.

### Service Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Requests</th>
<th>drop-down choices will appear when a cell in the &quot;service&quot; column is selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1:</th>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 2:</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 3:</th>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 4:</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 5:</th>
<th>Semester 6:</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Description and rationale for services

Undergraduate RA: 5 hours per week x 15 weeks x $12/hour. Instructor lunches: 6 participants x $15 x 2 times during the term. TA Workshop lunches: 12 participants x $15 x 2 times during the term.
December 13, 2019

To: Caprice Niccoli, Department of Psychology  
From: Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn, Office of Undergraduate Education  
Subject: Decision regarding WEC funding proposal - REVISED

This letter is revised from the one sent on December 6, 2019, to reflect the rollover of funds previously dispersed for WEC implementation. The revised funding is bolded below.

Thank you for providing the Office of Undergraduate Education with a 3rd Edition Writing Plan. On behalf of the Department of Psychology, you have requested the following funding to support that plan’s implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychology</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>Alumni Conversation coffee/tea</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>Student-writer conversation coffee/tea</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>Alumni Conversation coffee/tea</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>Student-writer conversation coffee/tea</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>Undergraduate RA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>Instructor lunches</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>TA Workshop lunches</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>Alumni Conversation coffee/tea</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>Student-writer conversation coffee/tea</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,345.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requested funding for event-oriented lunches has been granted with the understanding that participant counts will vary and should be tracked. Excess funding will either be rolled over to cover future WEC-events held within the period outlined by this plan or that it will be returned to OUE at the conclusion of that period. Obtaining RSVPs in advance of events will help anticipate these fluctuations and tracking attendance at these meetings may be useful in obtaining departmental/collegiate funding to support the continuation of these events in future.

The items highlighted in yellow above have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education, for a total of $6,345. Your department had a rollover from previously dispersed funds in the amount of $4,234.07. The remaining amount, 2,110.93 will be transferred in full during the FY20 to your department’s EFS account string: 1000-10986-20043-3576453

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

CC: Jeffry Simpson, Ascan Koerner, Dan Emery, Pamela Flash, Matt Luskey, Bryan Mosher, Jennifer Reckner, Leslie Schiff, Heidi Solomonson, Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn, Reagan Mock-Nelson, Sarah Jahn