I. Writing Plan Cover Page

Please fill in the gray areas on this form.

12 May 2018


Anthropology

WEC Unit Name

Anthropology

College of Liberal Arts

Department

College

Kieran P. McNulty

Professor

WEC Faculty Liaison (print name)

Title

kmcnulty@umn.edu

X50058

Email

Phone

Write Plan ratified by Faculty

Note: This section needs to be completed regardless of Writing Plan edition.

Date: 5/21/18

If Vote: 10 / 10

# yes / # total

Process by which Writing Plan was ratified within unit (vote, consensus, other- please explain):

Writing plan was disseminated to 19 faculty. Out of the ten responses received, 10 faculty approved the plan.
II. Unit Profile:

Anthropology

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

Number of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure-stream or tenured professors teach nearly all of the courses in the anthropology major.

Major(s)

*Please list each major your Unit offers:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: ~140 ~40

WEC Implementation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Implementation Process</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th># participated</th>
<th># invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Meetings to Implement WP1</td>
<td>Fall/2017-Spring/2018</td>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>Var.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redaction training for WEC RAs</td>
<td>Fall/2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone support meetings</td>
<td>Spring/2018</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-minute workshop planning meetings</td>
<td>Fall/2017-Spring/2018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1: Implementing 5-min. workshops</td>
<td>Fall/2017</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2: Implementing 5-min. workshops</td>
<td>Spring/2018</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3: Implementing 5-min. workshops</td>
<td>Spring/2018</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4: Implementing 5-min. workshops</td>
<td>Spring/2018</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5: Implementing 5-min. workshops</td>
<td>Spring/2018</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Writing Plan

Narrative, 2nd 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, 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 2nd edition of the Writing Plan? What, if any, key changes have been made to the 1st edition? What key implementation activities are proposed in this edition of the Writing Plan? (1 page maximum)

Anthropology applied to the WEC project because of widespread concern among the department faculty about the level of writing proficiency displayed by our undergraduate students and particularly those in the anthropology major. This became particularly obvious during the last few years as the department undertook a self-assessment of student learning outcomes. There are several challenges to improving the writing skills of our majors. A primary difficulty is the breadth of scholarship that makes up the discipline of anthropology; anthropologists in our department span the hard sciences, social sciences and humanities, and hence our students are exposed to – and trained in – all of these writing styles. Related to this, the diversity of courses offered in the department means that students can navigate through the major without necessarily getting all of the necessary skills, or without getting them in a sensible progression. A final challenge is that much of the writing in our courses is assessed by graduate students, some of whom may not have sufficient training in writing or writing assessment.

There were three key findings that resulted from the first year of the WEC process. First, we found a significant disconnect between students’ assessments of their own skill level and faculty assessments of student proficiency. Second, the faculty discovered that the writing abilities with which we want our major to graduate are remarkably similar across subdisciplines. The way these abilities are manifest in different disciplinary genres does vary, but fundamentally we all want our students to learn a similar set of skills. Third, a review of our curriculum revealed that many of the writing skills valued by the faculty are only rarely given explicit instruction in our courses.

During this writing plan, we propose three initiatives to improve writing instruction in our department. First, we will hold three workshops to help faculty develop grading rubrics for specific assignments in their courses. Second, we will offer a capstone course aimed at improving student writing and helping them create successful capstone projects. Third, we will develop a Canvas site for the organization, maintenance, and dissemination of WEC instructional materials.

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.)
Anthropology has always been a multidiscipline in that its practitioners span the hard sciences, social sciences, humanities, and critical theory. Anthropological writing is informed by all studies of human conditions and expressions – without restrictions on cultural origin – but also encompasses the breadth of species and depth of time framed by humanity’s prehistoric and contemporary relatives. Hence, the ontological and epistemological landscapes encountered within different subdisciplines of anthropology are quite distinct. Nevertheless, there are several characteristics of writing common to all anthropologists, reflective of both the historical inertia of the field as well as the nature of the evidence we collect.

At its core anthropological writing is descriptive, conveying complex subject matter in ways that allow the reader to experience a situation, see patterns and relationships, visualize an object or artifact. The primary data of anthropological discourse are most often distal to the reader’s experience, and hence accurate and detailed description is the necessary foundation upon which arguments are propagated. Anthropological writing is also analytic in nature, emphasizing the logical examination of subjects often through the juxtaposition of ideas, behaviors, artifacts or even species. Finally, anthropological writing is interpretive. It situates evidence within specific contexts – cultural, geographic, temporal, phylogenetic – and seeks to understand how each context, individually or in combination, interacts with both the primary data as well as current and previous observers.

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.)

Students should be able to...
- articulate specific, relevant, and compelling research questions and theses that are appropriately scaled to the assignment.
- situate their writing within the broader questions and themes of the discipline.
- weave analyses of direct, specific data into a coherent text that directly addresses the thesis/research question.
- convey observations in specific, accurate, and rich detail.
- contrast and synthesize multiple lines of evidence.
- strategically employ figures and tables to enhance argumentation.
- cite sources appropriately, distinguishing primary sources from general knowledge.
- draw specific conclusions based on a thorough assessment of the strengths and limitations of evidence and alternate interpretations.
- recognize the impact of assumptions and biases.
- engage ambiguity and uncertainty.
- formulate and express independent ideas that deeply interrogate the literature.
- utilize correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation to reinforce the intellectual content of their writing.
- recognize and write to multiple anthropological genres.
- engage in recursive writing processes involving self-assessment of drafts and revision.
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.)

Writing assignments are evenly distributed throughout the undergraduate curriculum, across all course levels and subdisciplines. However, writing-intensive courses are heavily concentrated in sociocultural and linguistic courses, with only one each in archaeological and biological anthropology. Hence, developing additional writing intensive options in these subfields will help to canalize writing instruction across the major.

A large factor that impedes the intentional integration of writing instruction is related to the breadth of anthropological subject matter. Many of our majors have an affinity for only one or two of the anthropological subfields. Such students often narrowly focus their coursework for as long as they can, going back to “fill in” the subfield distributive requirements just before graduating. This makes it difficult sequentially develop writing skills across the variety of styles employed by anthropologists.

A final obstacle to fully developing our students’ writing potential is the informal process by which our capstone experience is implemented. Currently, students undertaking a senior thesis (or Honors senior thesis) contract with faculty supervisors who assists them in planning, researching, and writing original manuscripts. This process works very well for some students, but others struggle to make steady progress in a manner that allows significant instruction and improvement in writing skills.

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 II 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.).

☒ 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.)

A consistent response from students in the WEC survey was that they often find the grading criteria for writing to be ambiguous or inconsistently applied. From the faculty, many voiced the difficulty in evaluating students’ descriptive, analytical, and interpretive abilities when the fundamentals of writing (grammar, punctuation, coherent structure, etc.) were lacking. There was a specific tension between students wanting explicit grading standards but faculty not wanting to be confined (or, likewise, to confine their students) with grading criteria that limit one’s capacity to support and critique creative or extrapolative writing. Interposing our dialog between student and faculty concerns resulted in a menu of grading criteria that, we think, provides both concrete direction to student writers as well as a solid foundation from which faculty can substantively advance writing tuition:
The text...
- articulates a specific and compelling research question and/or thesis that engages the reader and is directly relevant to the discipline.
- articulates a thesis or research question that is appropriately scaled to the size and time-frame given for the assignment.
- situates writing within the field so that the reader can connect the work to relevant previous research.
- exhibits a coherent underlying structure that is organized to effectively and directly address the thesis/research question.
- conveys observations using specific, accurate, and rich details, such that the reader can envision the situation or object.
- brings multiple lines of evidence into dialogue to convey the strength of support for specific ideas, arguments or conclusions.
- integrates relevant figures and tables with the writing, citing them appropriately in the text, to enhance or substantiate the argument.
- uses citations appropriately by documenting sources of each unit of knowledge or information, including using multiple citations for ideas/evidence found in more than one place.
- clearly differentiates conclusions based on ethnographic, experimental, or observational data from those derived from the literature or considered to be general knowledge.
- draws specific conclusions based on considerations of the strengths and limitations of evidence.
- contributes to a broader anthropological dialogue by putting thesis/research question into discussion with relevant disciplinary theories, ideas, and perspectives.
- explicitly addresses how the author’s assumptions/biases relate to the thesis or results with regard to alternative interpretations.
- engages ambiguity and uncertainty such that multiple, even contrasting, possible interpretations interact rather than compete to provide explanations.
- includes fresh insights, ideas, or conclusions that are informed by the literature but original to the writer.
- utilizes grammar, spelling, and punctuation that allows information, ideas, and reasoning to communicate directly and easily to readers.
- is written in a consistent anthropological genre and/or style that is appropriate to the topic and material.
- in its multiple drafts, evidences thoughtful and substantive revisions that address all of the feedback
- provided by the instructor and apply that feedback to further revisions of the entire text.

Section 5: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS, including REQUESTED SUPPORT and RELATION TO PREVIOUS IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES
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 2nd edition Writing Plan relate to implementation activities from the 1st edition Writing Plan? What has been successful? What was not successful? How do implementation plans build on what was learned from the first year of implementation?

Our plan for the second increment of WEC support builds directly on work accomplished during Writing Plan 1, and addresses specific obstacles to teaching writing that were noted by faculty and grad instructors. To continue the
development and implementation of writing instruction in our department, we are requesting support for three initiatives: 1) a series of workshops to help faculty develop grading rubrics for specific course assignments; 2) a new capstone course aimed at improving student writing; and, 3) a Canvas site to organize, maintain, and provide access to WEC materials developed during this process. For example, seventeen five-minute writing workshops were developed during Writing Plan 1 (see Appendix 1), and we anticipate more as faculty begin to contribute their own examples. Likewise, curriculum and lesson materials for a capstone course were also created during the first writing plans (see Appendix 2). These resources plus those anticipated for Writing Plan 2 need to be archived, organized and available for faculty and graduate instructors.

One obvious area of disconnect between faculty and students – as highlighted by the WEC survey – is in expectations. Whereas faculty and grad instructors felt that students often failed to follow instructions for writing assignments, students indicated that in many cases instructions and expectations were unclear. This suggests that faculty are communicating the requirements of assignments in ways that students cannot fully interpret. Hence, we request funds to hold three workshops designed to help faculty create authentic rubrics that articulate directly with department writing criteria, provide clear expectations for students, and give faculty supportive guidelines for assigning grades. One of the major concerns noted by faculty during the initial WEC meetings was that grading rubrics seem important for communicating expectations to students, but often have the effect of constraining the way we grade papers; instructors indicated that there were cases when they felt they had to assign grades that were higher or lower than was earned because of the wording of the grading rubric. After discussion with the WEC facilitators, it became clear that there are ways to develop rubrics that still communicate expectations without such constraints.

These workshops will be held at the end of the first three semesters, aimed at helping faculty develop rubrics for the subsequent semesters. Importantly, these workshops will be targeted to specific assignments so that faculty are spending the time developing the materials they will use in the classroom. This component builds directly on the workshops hosted during Writing Plan 1, as instructors will be encouraged to also work into their lesson plans the “five-minute workshops” created during that phase. In other words, an instructor developing a rubric aimed at specific writing criteria will also be able to strategically schedule five-minute workshops in the syllabus that will teach students how to address those criteria. The main difficulty noted during the first Writing Plan was that our workshops were not related directly to any specific course content; faculty to see the value in the workshops, but were not specifically engaged in implementing the ideas in their classes. Workshops during Writing Plan 2 will help move the WEC materials out of virtual and theoretical substrates directly into the classroom.

The second part of our request for support is to pilot a new capstone course to be taught by an advanced ABD graduate instructor. One of the major components of Writing Plan 1 was the development of the course materials for this capstone. A WEC RA created a comprehensive set of lessons, exercises and resources to use in a newly envisioned capstone course. We will pilot the new course during the first two semesters of Writing Plan 2, improving and refining the curriculum to suit the diverse needs of our student majors. Of note, the breadth of anthropology – from humanistic studies to social science to science – makes it difficult to create content that is applicable to all students. The capstone instructor will be tasked with updating and editing the current course materials during these two semesters.

Once the two semesters of WEC funding are exhausted, the Department of Anthropology is committed to teaching the course every semester (as required by the new capstone guidelines). The department will pick up the costs for instruction at that point. Although we plan to hire the same grad instructor for the first two semesters, it is likely that a different instructor will be used in subsequent years. To help facilitate the further development of this course, the WEC liaison will meet with the capstone instructor at least three times each semester. During the
second semester, the anticipated instructor for the following year will also attend the meetings to learn about the course scope and sequence.

The final component of our funding request for Writing Plan 2 is to support the creation of a Canvas site to help organize, maintain, and disseminate the WEC instructional materials. A major obstacle noted during the last Writing Plan was accessibility to materials. Some materials were not available to everyone; others were difficult to locate. A Canvas site will allow easy organization and access to WEC materials, and will enable faculty and student instructor to add new materials as they are developed for their courses.

Section 6: PROCESS USED TO CREATE THIS WRITING PLAN

How, and to what degree, were stakeholders in this unit (faculty members, instructors, affiliates, teaching assistants, undergraduates, others) engaged in providing, revising, and approving the content of this Writing Plan?

Many stakeholders in anthropology were involved in providing and refining the content of this writing plan. Nearly all of the faculty, plus many of the graduate and undergraduate students in the department participated in the initial WEC survey; even faculty on sabbatical were able to provide input through email contributions. This provided a broad profile of writing instruction in the department: the ways writing is implemented in our curriculum as well as the different perceptions among students and instructors about the importance of writing skills. This rich source of information was a strong guide for the process by which this Writing Plan developed.

As we moved through Writing Plan 1, faculty and grad instructors provided more specific details on how they teach writing, obstacles to teaching writing, and what they need to improve writing instruction. Five workshops were held during this time, and although the focus of these was developing “five-minute workshops” for classroom teaching, the discussions always circulated through more general writing issues. These were noted and collated, and formed the basis for the requests in Writing Plan 2.

Based on this information, the WEC Liaison compiled and wrote Writing Plan 2, which was sent to faculty members for comment and approval.
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 TBD, phone TBD
Period of appointment (Semester/Year to Semester/Year): Fall/2018-Spring/2019
RA appointment percent time: 50%

Define in detail the tasks that the RA will be completing within the funding period:
The WEC RA will serve as a graduate instructor to pilot anthropology’s new capstone course. S/he will be tasked with overseeing a capstone course to help students developed and complete their senior theses. Each student participant will still work directly with a faculty research adviser, but the capstone course will provide a formal setting to focus on the processes of research and writing. Responsibilities of the WEC instructor will include: 1) setting scheduled benchmarks for student progress; 2) forming peer writing groups; 3) helping students structure their theses; 4) enabling peer-review at multiple stages of the writing process; 5) providing feedback on thesis drafts or partial drafts; 6) leading 5MWs and discussions, and monitoring student progress. A complete draft of the course lessons, exercises, and resources has already been produced by our WEC RA from WP1, and hence the requested WEC RA will modify and edit these materials as the needs to our diverse student become apparent through teaching. The WEC instructor will pilot the course for the first two semesters, meeting with the WEC liaison at least three times each semester. During the second semester, the anticipated instructor for semesters 3 and 4 will attend these meetings. The Department of Anthropology will take on the instructional funding for the capstone after semester 2 in this Writing Plan.

Define deadlines as applicable (please note that all deadlines must be completed within the funding period):
The WEC instructor will comply with university grading deadlines in both semesters. Further, s/he will complete any revisions to the capstone curriculum within 4 weeks of the final class meeting.
Describe how frequently the RA will check in with the liaison:
The WEC instructor will meet with the liaison at least three times each semester.

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

---

1 An example for determining funding for appointments can be found on the WEC Liaison Moodle. This is for planning and example purposes only and cannot be used to determine final budget items for the Writing Plan.
Appendix 1: One of seventeen five-minute workshops developed during Writing Plan 1

Read this paragraph:

“First and foremost, she intended for her final project to be a resource for the general public in understanding foreign social customs and norms. She recognized that overly complicated jargon prevents the average person from engaging in scholarly work, so she specifically did not write for academics. As Renato Rosaldo describes in “After Objectivism” while discussing Horace Miner’s “Nacirema” paper, ethnographic discourse often prevents us from clearly understanding the similarities and differences between two cultures because it is so distancing. “Clearly there is a gap between the technical idiom of ethnography and the language of everyday life. Miner’s description employs terms used by a certain group of professionals rather than the words most of ‘us’ Americans usually use in talking about brushing ‘our’ teeth” (Rosaldo 51). Mead does a fairly good job of sticking to “everyday” language, particularly when describing social relationships.”

Detect

“First and foremost, she intended for her final project to be a resource for the general public in understanding foreign social customs and norms. She recognized that overly complicated jargon prevents the average person from engaging in scholarly work, so she specifically did not write for academics. As Renato Rosaldo describes in “After Objectivism” while discussing Horace Miner’s “Nacirema” paper, ethnographic discourse often prevents us from clearly understanding the similarities and differences between two cultures because it is so distancing. “Clearly there is a gap between the technical idiom of ethnography and the language of everyday life. Miner’s description employs terms used by a certain group of professionals rather than the words most of ‘us’ Americans usually use in talking about brushing ‘our’ teeth” (Rosaldo 51). Mead does a fairly good job of sticking to “everyday” language, particularly when describing social relationships.”

• What is the point the author is trying to make?
  • Mead uses “everyday” language to make her book more accessible to a general audience.

• How does the author attempt to convey this idea to the reader?
  • Draws on lit (Rosaldo) that says the kind of language an author uses influences the comprehensibility of their text.

• Is this quote necessary to help the author make their point?
  • No, the quote does the same work as the paraphrase immediately preceding it. Quotes should only be used as points of analysis.

• Does this statement adequately encapsulate the point the author is trying to make?
  • No. This statement focuses on how well Mead sticks to using “everyday language” as opposed to the actual efficacy of that language for readers’ comprehension.
First and foremost, she intended for her final project to be a resource for the general public in understanding foreign social customs and norms. She recognized that overly complicated jargon prevents the average person from engaging in scholarly work, so she specifically did not write for academics. As Renato Rosaldo describes in “After Objectivism” while discussing Horace Miner’s “Nacirema” paper, ethnographic discourse often prevents us from clearly understanding the similarities and differences between two cultures because it is so distancing. “Clearly there is a gap between the technical idiom of ethnography and the language of everyday life. Miner’s description employs terms used by a certain group of professionals rather than the words most of ‘us’ Americans usually use in talking about brushing ‘our’ teeth” (Rosaldo 51). Mead does a fairly good job of sticking to “everyday” language, particularly when describing social relationships.

Mead wrote in an uncomplicated, non-specialist style to appeal to a more general audience. The idea that writing full of jargon and specialist terminology distances and obscures the subject matter for non-specialist readers was mentioned by Rosaldo in his discussion of Horace Miner’s famous essay on the Nacirema. According to Rosaldo, Miner purposely uses highly technical language to describe what is a rather mundane and pedestrian activity—brushing one’s teeth. It is this obfuscation through language that gives the Nacirema piece its intended effect and what makes it such an instructive piece of writing. Technical language can have the effect of making things seem too strange. Mead understood this which is why she chose to write in an “everyday” style to make her work accessible to a wider audience.
Appendix 2: Samples of Capstone course materials developed during Writing Plan 1

Anthropology Capstone Course Syllabus
4XXX ANTH

Instructor: TBD
Office: 320 Blegen Hall
Email: ...@umn.edu

Class Location: HHH Center 389
Time: 3:00-4:00 pm Monday

Course Description:
This Senior Writing Course is designed to supplement the traditional Senior Thesis Writing Program by providing support and guidance during the writing process. Students will meet for one hour a week with the instructor to review writing techniques and perfect their own writing style. The students will participate in peer review, active learning activities, conversations that will further their writing abilities and polish their Senior Projects. This class is a complement to the Advisor-Student relationship in the thesis process.

Student Learning Outcomes:
This course will refine the students’ ability to articulate their argument clearly, situate their research within a broader framework, collect and synthesize data, utilize figures and images to support their argument, along with researching effectively and producing a well-written finished product. Students will have mastered a body of knowledge defined by their research interest. Students will also elevated their writing skills (through peer review, in class exercises, and practice) and research abilities (using the Library and identifying peer-reviewed materials).

Students are required to attend each one hour weekly meeting and engage fully in the discussion and learning process. While your grade for your thesis is assigned by your advisor, a portion of that grade will be based upon your participation in this class.

Students are required to meet with the Instructor once during the semester to discuss their writing.

Policies and Procedures:
All policies and procedures for student conduct listed on the University of Minnesota website will be adhered to in this class.
(https://policy.umn.edu/education/syllabusrequirements-appa)
If you have any concerns, please email or discuss them outside of class with the instructor.
Suggested Readings:

Schedule of Class Meetings

I. RESEARCH BASICS

Class 1. Research question
   Exercise 1: Research topic  
   HW: Research Question/Ideas

Class 2: Thesis
   Exercise 2: Compose Thesis  
   HW: Outline 1

Class 3: Outline
   HW: Revise Outline + Key Words List

Class 4: How to research
   Discussion 1: Personal Biases  
   HW: Introduction

II. WRITING TIPS

Class 5: Compelling paragraphs/sections
   Exercise 2: Assessing Sample Intros  
   HW: Background/Literature Review Section

Class 6: Grammar Tips
   Exercise 3: Correcting Sample Paragraphs  
   HW: Draft 1 = 1/2 of final paper

Class 7: Citations
   Peer Review 1  
   HW: Outline 2

Class 8: Quotes: when and how
   Discussion 2: How you are doing

Class 9: Plagiarism: how to paraphrase
   Exercise 4: Practice paraphrasing  
   HW: Full 1st Draft

Class 10: Description vs. analysis
   Discussion 3: Limits of Interpretation  
   HW: Outline 3
   Peer Review 2
Class 11: Conclusions

Exercise 5: Conclusions

HW: 2nd Draft

III. REFINING YOUR WRITING

Class 12: “Wordy” words

Exercise 6: practice cutting down words

HW: Self- Assigned: what do you want help with?

Class 13: TBD

WEC LESSON PLAN 3: Outline

Prep: Post articles to Moodle or print for students

Bring paper for the outline comments in case students don’t bring printed versions

Purpose: To teach the students to form well structured outlines

Many students discount the value of outlines, which is detrimental to their writing progress.

First, discuss how to create an outline. Point out the good features of each and also that there are many ways to write an outline. However, the more detail, the easier it is for them to start their writing. (5 min)

Then ask the students to get into groups of three or four and exchange their outlines. Each student will get a copy of their group member’s outlines and they will spend the next 20 min reviewing and discussing their outlines.

They should have already reviewed sample outlines on Moodle and should have an idea of what needs to be included in them.

Have the groups address the following questions:

1. Do they have a clear research question and thesis? Any suggestions?
2. How does the argument progress through the outline? Is the order of the material logical? Should the argument be reordered?
3. Does the theory section make sense?
4. Do they have any content suggestions or ideas of materials to add?
5. Can they follow the logic and progression of the outline?

Ask the students to be thoughtful in their comments and suggestions.

(20-30 min)
The students will likely need to rework their outlines, which is their homework for the next class.

In the last 15-20 min of class, ask the students to write down the struggles they have with researching and writing.

Are they having trouble still finding materials? Do they need more key terms? Do they struggle to start writing?

Bring it into a class discussion, the more support they have in the writing process, the less overwhelming it will seem. Review some writers-block strategies and point them to the articles posted on Moodle. Having a good group discussion about how to start writing and how to conquer some of the more common writing problems will help them start writing.
### VI. WEC Writing Plan Requests

**Unit Name:** Anthropology

**Financial Requests** *(requests cannot include faculty salary support)*

*drop-down choices will appear when cell next to "semester" is selected*

**Total Financial Request:** $24,983.00

#### Semester 1: Fall 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructor (50%)</td>
<td>$12,139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad assistant to create WEC Anthropology Canvas site</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Rubric creation workshop</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semester 1 Total:** $12,574.00

#### Semester 2: Spring 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructor (50%)</td>
<td>$12,139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Rubric creation workshop</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semester 2 Total:** $12,274.00

#### Semester 3: Fall 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEC Rubric creation workshop</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semester 3 Total:** $135.00

#### Semester 4: Spring 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Semester 4 Total:** $0.00

**Total Financial Request:** $12,139.00

### Rationale for costs and their schedule of distribution

One senior ABD graduate instructor (50%) will pilot the new capstone course created during WP1 in each of the first two semesters of WP2. S/he will meet weekly with the students working through a detailed series of lesson plans designed to help students improve their writing and complete successful capstone projects. After two semesters of piloting and refining the course, the Department of Anthropology will take on the instructor costs for the capstone and continue offering it each semester. One semester of funding is requested to hire an undergraduate worker ($15/hour for 20 hours) to create a Canvas site for all of the department's WEC materials. The Canvas platform is thought to be the simplest option for all faculty, GIs, and TAs to access and navigate, and for upkeep and maintenance. Finally, three lunchtime workshops will be used to help faculty develop grading rubrics for specific assignments in their courses that match the department's writing criteria. These will be held at the end of the first three semesters to assist faculty in preparing for their classes in the subsequent semesters.

### 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>1</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and rationale for services**

One of the main areas of concern among faculty, TAs, and GIs was how to create authentic rubrics that strongly articulated with the department's writing criteria but still allow flexibility to grade writing in a way that is consistent with disciplinary standards. A number of examples were given by faculty where they felt that grading rubrics had locked them in to giving grades that were inconsistent with the actual quality of the work. The WEC facilitators were able to respond to these concerns with great ideas about how rubrics can be created to provide clear expectations while still affording the necessary flexibility to give appropriate grades. In light of this, we request having a WEC facilitator attend our workshops to help instructors create grading rubrics that will enhance the learning process for our students.
June 18, 2018

To: Kieran McNulty  
From: Robert McMaster, Office of Undergraduate Education  
Subject: Decision regarding WEC plan and funding proposal

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Graduate Instructor- 50%</td>
<td>12,139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Ugrd assistant to create WEC Anthropology Canvas site</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>WEC rubric creation workshop</td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>Graduate Instructor- 50%</td>
<td>12,139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>WEC rubric creation workshop</td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>WEC rubric creation workshop</td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24,983.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All requested items have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education for a total of $24,983.00.

Please email Lori Smith (llsmith@umn.edu) and Heidi Solomonson (heidis@umn.edu) within 30 days of the receipt of this letter with the EFS account string in your department that will receive these funds. $24,848.00 will be transferred during FY19 and $135.00 will be transferred in FY20.

CC: Dan Emery, Pat Ferrian, Pamela Flash, Matt Luskey, Heather McNeff, Bryan Mosher, Jennifer Reckner, Rachel Rodrigue, Leslie Schiff, Lori Smith, Heidi Solomonson