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IV. Writing Plan Narrative, 1st Edition

Please retain section headers and prompts in your plan.

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

The Health Services Management (HSM) major was introduced in the College of Continuing Education (now named the College of Continuing and Professional Studies (CCAPS) in Fall 2015; since then, there has been a dramatic growth in the number of enrolled students (200+) with a 46% ethnic diversity, a trend we expect to continue. Joining the WEC at this moment of growth and expansion is not only exciting but strategic: we expect, through our participation in WEC, to tie writing abilities to our accreditation through Association of University Program in Health Administration (AUPHA) and to make the HSM major at the University of Minnesota a leader in health service management programs by delivering innovative writing instruction of consistently high quality across the curriculum.

HSM will be the second of the CCAPS Applied and Professional Studies programs in the WEC project, following in the footsteps of the Construction Management Program (CMGT). Like the CMGT program’s faculty of practicing professionals, HSM’s faculty consists almost exclusively of adjunct-faculty cultivated from the health services management industry who partner for course development with our curriculum design experts in Online Educational Services (OES). Our faculty’s unique and extensive background in the field makes the opportunity to participate in the WEC project even more valuable; as working professionals, faculty have a deep and extensive knowledge of how writing is manifested in the field and what abilities students will need to develop before joining the workforce. Also, having been drawn from the industry rather than from the more traditional academic or scholarly tracks, HSM’s faculty are exceptionally open to learning more about writing pedagogy, to developing new approaches to writing instruction and assessment, and to honing best practices that improve students’ writing abilities, all of which the WEC project and its experts promise to provide.

As described in further detail below, this Writing Plan was developed through a series of four meetings convened by the faculty of HSM, WEC staff Matthew Luskey and Heidi Solomonson, and key members of CCAPS administration, including program administrators, librarians, and representatives from the instructional design team. In addition to creating a deeper understanding of the writing abilities and characteristics desired of the program’s students, the meeting process (and subsequent meetings of subcommittees) also served the valuable purpose of getting faculty to talk to each other about their struggles with teaching writing, their various expectations for student performance, and the alignment (or problems of alignment) of writing instruction across the different courses that make up the curriculum. A series of implementation plans, detailed in Section 6 below, emerged from this process that promise to make writing instruction, assignment, and assessment in the HSM major stronger.

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

In the first WEC meeting, the HSM faculty had a robust and productive discussion of the sorts of characteristics
that typify writing in the health services management field. Though subject to further expansion and refinement (particularly as a result of what we learn through our implementation plans, described below), the following characteristics were determined to be vital to successful writing in the discipline and field:

- **Professional** in tone, style, voice, and format
- **Purposeful** in accomplishing a communication goal
- **Persuasive** when needed
- **Clear, concise, focused, and accurate**
- **Audience aware** such that writing is keyed to the specific audience for the communication (of the many potential and different audiences in the field)
- **Well-reasoned** in its application of quantitative and qualitative evidence
- **Well organized** so that the communication is logically sequenced, cohesive, and coherent
- **Multimodal** when relevant, combining written, spoken, and visual presentations
- **Descriptive** with appropriate and sufficient detail
- **Effective use of Executive Summary** for detailed reports
- **Effective in its use of review, analysis, and synthesis of literature, industry, and information**
- **Unbiased and objective**
- **Grammatically and syntactically correct**
- **Properly sourced, cited, and documented**

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

As with the descriptions of characteristics typifying writing in the Health Services Management discipline, the WEC meetings were also instructive in developing a more refined sense of how those characteristics manifest in the field and what particular writing abilities students should have developed by graduation. The following list represents the consensus obtained through discussions and later refined by a faculty subcommittee:

1. **Make effective choices that are aligned with the specific purpose of communication.**
   
   1a. Write persuasively, drawing on appropriate sources of research and evidence to support an issue, project or argument. Includes multiple facts and resources that are correct, complete, and complement the argument or reinforce the thesis.

   1a(1). Establishes and develops an argument by supporting points with references and evidence

   1a(2). Uses evidence-based Health Services Management research and sources that are appropriate to the issue or project and supports conclusions and recommendations

   1b. Uses multimodal communication descriptively and at an appropriate level of detail.
1b(1). Presents work in the modality or modalities (papers, slide decks, etc.) that is best suited for the communication purpose.

1c. Sources cited are free from known bias and/or citations of differing views are balanced

1d. Facts, opinions, and inferences are clearly differentiated and used in appropriate contexts.

1e. Facts and resources cited are appropriate to the reader’s level of understanding.

2. Make effective choices that are aligned with the specific audience addressed

2a. Addresses the target audience appropriately by demonstrating sensitivity to beliefs and views

2b. Offers critiques that are constructive and lead to appropriate behavioral change

2c. Uses clear and concise language that is age- and industry-specific for the target audience

2d. When appropriate, concisely portrays larger documents in a one-page executive summary that convinces the target audience to take action and/or accept recommendations

3. Make effective choices that are aligned with the specific forms and modes of communication.

3a. Uses legible and specific visuals that can stand on their own and do not require extensive explanation

3b. Axes in graphs are clearly and accurately labeled and are not truncated without cause

3c. Graphs are clear, fully transparent, and show data realistically

3d. The verbal and visual information presented in documents, reports, and slide decks is professional in appearance and tone

3e. All figures and tables are referenced and discussed in the text so that their connection to the communication’s purpose is clear and identifiable

3f. Uses APA citation and conventions so that readers can track down or verify sources.

4. Display strong critical thinking and reasoning.

4a. When necessary, the communication anticipates or refutes counter-arguments

4b. Provides sufficient evidence and explanation to convince readers of the communication’s legitimacy and purpose

5. Organize and present ideas effectively and efficiently.
5a. The central idea (or, when relevant, the thesis) is clearly communicated, worth developing, and limited enough to be manageable

5b. Uses a logical structure and transition language that guide the reader through the chain of reasoning or progression of ideas

5c. Avoids needlessly complex sentence structure or language to allow the reader to parse meaning quickly

5d. When relevant, concludes communication with a summary of arguments and/or final recommendations that leaves the reader with a clear understanding of the author’s intent

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?

As part of the WEC meeting process, HSM faculty were invited to reflect on how writing is integrated into and across the different courses in the curriculum. This process was especially valuable since, like most programs across the University, there are few opportunities to explore how an individual class, and the approach the instructor(s) has for that class, connects with the other classes in the curriculum, allowing a better view of how writing instruction is encountered, experienced, and reinforced over the course of a student’s education in the program.

The HSM degree major courses are developed as a sequencing from introductory level to capstone level. The students are asked to get their foundation (pre-requisite) courses in towards the beginning. This includes a Freshman Compositions (WRIT) course requirement. For example, HSM 3521 is our Introduction to US Healthcare Delivery Systems (introductory level) course and HSM 4861 is our HSM Senior Capstone/Leadership course (should be one of their last courses). From the writing intensive courses, in their 2nd year we recommend ABus 4013W and HSM 4561W as two of the courses after the introductory HSM 3521 course. In their 3rd year or 4th year, we suggest the students take an upper division writing intensive course such as ABus 4571W or ABUS 4023W Communicating for results or ABus 4022W Management in Organizations.

Some of the key findings resulting from the WEC-facilitated curriculum mapping are as follows:

- All courses surveyed covered at least three of the identified abilities; most covered more, with an average of about 10 of 16 abilities, and a median of 11 of 16, covered across the 16 courses surveyed.
- While faculty members rarely rated students as entering their course at an introductory level for a particular skill—which is to be expected for most majors, since they enter the program as sophomores and transfer-ins can be juniors—most faculty rated most students as having a “developmental” level of skill in most areas. Students in the Capstone course and a 2nd-year internship course were rated as
demonstrating “advanced” ability in most areas.

- An important aspect brought out by the curriculum mapping facilitated by WEC was the persistent consistency (for most courses) of “developmental” ability levels. In other words, though students were receiving instruction in (or at least were engaging in tasks designed around) particular writing skills in many of their classes, the faculty members’ description of those abilities remained static across the different courses, including those taken earlier and later in a typical student’s class schedule. Questions were raised as to the cause of this static state; ideas to address it are presented in Section 5 below.

- Another persistent issue raised by faculty related to the writing challenges related to English Language Learning (ELL) students as well as international students, which together comprise nearly 46% of total enrollment in the program. Since these students often come to the writing process with needs unrelated to their mastery of content or facility with materials, faculty (as in most programs across the University) often struggle with finding successful techniques, strategies, and practices in terms of working with these students and their written production.

Section 4: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT WRITING

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

Based on the results of written comments from the WEC survey of HSM Faculty and Students, the following concerns were identified:

Faculty Writing Concerns About Students

- Repetitive writing with thin ideas and content; there are repeated statements and expansive writing in an effort to hit an arbitrary page limit.
- When the case studies are poorly researched, the writers will deliver what one side of an issue and use that as their recommendation; they can’t give you the flip slide of the argument. They do not demonstrate an understanding of the content; they just give a superficial response.
- I seem to get some students who don’t understand that in their writing they should be addressing a new issue or concept within each paragraph; it seems like just one long text.
- When you read something and you have no idea what you just read or what’s coming next.
- I have this wide gamut of people that really don’t understand what a reference is and how to refer to it within or at the end of the assignment. Or students will find an article and just take all of the references from it and plop them in at the end of their paper and done! Use of evidence based research is often insufficient.

Students Writing Concerns About Faculty

- I feel like our writing assignments are all forums which is not super helpful. The forums do provide a nice informative view on many topics or overview of chapters, but aren’t overly helpful. I think it may be beneficial to rotate forums and 2-3 page short essays on different topics.
- There was a great deal of variation between writing intensive courses in terms of difficulty and usefulness. I’ve had writing intensive courses that have felt easier and less writing than non-writing intensive courses. I wish that written communication was stressed more and that there were specific classes for it in the major rather than simply tacking on a writing portion to a class about something else with a professor who doesn’t care all that much about writing.
- More analytical writing and business writing would be helpful.
Every professor has their own preferences for our writing. Some professors lay out expectations completely, which is helpful to know what they are looking for. Other professors want us to challenge ourselves to figure out how we should be writing which can be frustrating at times; especially in new courses.

Please include a menu of criteria extrapolated from the list of Desired Writing Abilities provided in Section 2 of this plan. (This menu can be offered to faculty/instructors for selective adaptation and will function as a starting point in the WEC Project’s longitudinal rating process.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Make effective choices that are aligned with the specific purpose of communication.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Effectively define the purpose of communication required:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Descriptive and informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis and recommendations (technical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Innovative/creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Executive summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adheres to the purpose of communication (based on assignment instructions or given context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establishes and develops an argument by supporting points with references and other forms of evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uses research that is appropriate to the issue or project and fully supports conclusions and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Includes multiple facts and resources from evidence based HSM materials and related research; all facts included are correct and complete; facts complement the argument or reinforce the thesis and are appropriate to the reader’s level of understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1b. Use multimodal communication, using an appropriate level of detail to achieve the defined purpose |
| The writer . . . |
| - Presents work in multimodalities (papers, slide decks, etc.) in a manner that is best suited for the communication purpose (See 1A) |
### 1c.
Differentiate between opinions, experts and facts and determine their appropriate uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Uses and cites sources free from known bias, are respected HSM sources, and/or citations of differing views are balanced when appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clearly differentiates facts, opinions, and inferences, and uses them in their appropriate contexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Make effective choices that are aligned with the specific audience addressed.

#### 2a.
Be thoughtful and conscientious in responding to other writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Addresses the target audience appropriately with sensitivity to beliefs and views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offers critiques to other team members in ways that are constructive and lead to appropriate behavioral change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2b.
Be attentive to the needs and expectations of the target audiences:
- Patients and families
- Board/governance
- Senior/management
- Staff
- Clinicians
- Community partners
- Policy/legislative/association
- Contract/legal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Uses language, terms, and technical level(s) that match that of the target audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Considers multiple viewpoints when relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conforms to genre expectations for different communication tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2c. Adapt the message, length and approach to fit the audience (e.g. the ability to summarize work in an Executive Summary as needed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Uses clear and concise language that is appropriate to the target audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● When appropriate, concisely portrays larger documents in a one-page executive summary that convinces the target audience to take action and/or accept recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2d. Convey a professional tone through careful diction and stylistic choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Uses language and terminology that is age and industry specific for the target audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Make effective choices that are aligned with the specific forms and modes of communication.

#### 3a. Correctly label graphs, figures, and tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Uses legible and specific visuals that can stand on their own and do not require extensive explanation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3b. Avoid techniques (such as restricting the axes in a graph) that mislead the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Uses axes in graphs are clearly and accurately labeled and are not truncated without reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Presents graphs that are clear, fully transparent, and show data realistically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3c. Use HSM technical terms, acronyms, and details accurately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Uses terminology from Health Services Management fields accurately and clearly, and,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3d. Present information visually and concisely in documents, reports, and slide decks

- When appropriate, defines terminology for readers
- The writer . . .
  - Presents verbal and visual information in documents, reports, and slide decks that matches professional templates and expectations in appearance and tone.

### 3e. Articulate in words and graphics the results of data and numbers

- The writer . . .
  - Designs graphs that share information clearly
  - References and discusses all figures and tables in the text.

### 3f. Use unambiguous and unbiased language

- The writer . . .
  - Chooses words for their precise meaning and appropriate level of specificity so that only one interpretation of meaning is possible

### 3g. Follow APA citation conventions

- The writer . . .
  - Uses APA citation and conventions so that readers can track down or verify all sources

### 4. Display strong critical thinking and reasoning.

### 4a. Find and use legitimate evidence and appropriate data to support claims

- The writer . . .
  - Includes facts and resources that are correct, complete, and complement the argument or reinforce the thesis
| 4b. | Show discernment when evaluating and using sources | The writer . . .
|     | ● Cites facts and resources that are appropriate to the given audience’s background and level of understanding
|     | ● When necessary, anticipates or refutes counter-arguments
|     | ● Provides sufficient evidence and explanation to convince readers |
| 4c. | Prioritize relevant information | The writer . . .
|     | ● Organizes communications so that main and supporting ideas are logically sequenced and clearly connected |
| 4d. | Clearly and succinctly summarize key concepts, trends, findings, conclusions, and recommendations from readings, interviews, and/or discussions | The writer . . .
|     | ● Includes all key elements in the summary
|     | ● Condenses and paraphrases information effectively and properly
|     | ● Uses transition language to show connections between concepts and ideas presented in the summary |
| 4e. | When required, push beyond overview of information to analyze, compare and contrast, and summarize information | The writer . . .
|     | ● Uses language that clearly differentiates summary from analysis
|     | ● Compares and contrasts information to reach new conclusions rather than describe similarities and differences |
### 4f. Integrate and synthesize data into information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Includes multiple facts and resources from research of the overall organization. All facts are accurate and complete; facts complement the argument or reinforce the challenge statement and are appropriate to the reader’s level of understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effectively researches and cites pertinent and up-to-date facts and data, translating them into findings that are used to create meaningful charts and graphs that clearly show the student analyzed the data and can display conclusive information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4g. Articulate a strong conclusion with clear recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Uses a creative transitional phrase to start the conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restates the main idea in the conclusion in a new way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restates main points in the conclusion clearly and in a new way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makes a connection back to the information in the introduction (a name, a story, an event, stats, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organize and present ideas effectively and efficiently

#### 5a. Give a clear statement of objectives, intent, and/or hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clearly communicates the central idea/thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 5: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS, including REQUESTED SUPPORT

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

In light of the discussions during and as a result of the WEC-facilitated faculty meetings, the following four implementation plans have been determined for HSM’s first year as a member of the Writing Enriched Curriculum. For this implementation plan, we request funding for a Research Assistant to do the following:

1) **Internal Writing Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 5</th>
<th>5b. Establishes why the central idea/thesis is worth developing and limited enough to be manageable</th>
<th>Use strong topic sentences and develop paragraphs that address a specific thought or idea</th>
<th>The writer . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5c. Use a clearly identifiable and logical structure</td>
<td>Structure order of paragraphs to present flow of ideas in a logical way</td>
<td>The writer . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5d. Avoid run-on sentences and other syntactical errors</td>
<td>Avoid run-on sentences and other syntactical errors</td>
<td>The writer . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5e. Use correct spelling, grammar and punctuation</td>
<td>Use correct spelling, grammar and punctuation</td>
<td>The writer . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We request funding to organize and run an internal assessment of student writing at the entry level. It is clear that the WEC-sponsored rating of student writing at the Capstone level will be immensely helpful in measuring the writing ability levels at which students are graduating as compared with established expectations. To strengthen this process it would be valuable to rate students according to these same criteria earlier in their career as HSM majors. Since many HSM students transfer into the University from other institutions (typically junior or community colleges), and since HSM students join the program after what are often less-traditional college paths (46% ethnic diversity), we would like to be able to better understand the baselines against which instruction and improvement can be measured. In this way, the internal writing assessment would serve as a useful complement to the WEC-sponsored rating of student writing taking place in Summer 2018.

This internal writing assessment would also serve as a rare chance for several faculty members to come together, see what assignments in courses other than their own look like, and to calibrate how they are assessing student writing alongside colleagues. This process was initially addressed in the 4th WEC meeting and proved quite useful; duplicating it with an internal writing assessment would prove equally useful in this regard.

The results of the internal writing assessment will be used to review and revise courses to better meet discovered gaps in writing skills, as well as, in the longer-term, to establish core writing expectations for admittance into the program.

2) Faculty Workshop Series

One of the main things that came out of discussions during the WEC meetings was the unanimous desire of faculty to have access to further instructional resources, information, and best practices to use in their own courses. Since many faculty come directly from the HSM professional field rather than the more pedagogically oriented academic or scholarly backgrounds, sharing of resources, particularly as they relate to writing instruction, will be immensely useful. In addition to HSM faculty attendance, we would like to integrate members of the CCAPS instructional design team (OES) into these workshops, as both audience members and facilitators. Instructional designers are a key component of the CCAPS instructional structure and, by bringing them into the process, key ideas, concepts, and practices can be enhanced and sustained across the entire curriculum.

In coordination with WEC and OES staff, we would like to organize Faculty workshops focused on the following issues:

- Assessing English Language Learning (ELL) student writing: establishing goals, learning best practices, and connecting to UMN resources
- Ensuring consistent academic integrity and citation knowledge as it relates to writing in the academic and professional worlds (APA & MLA)
- Developing clear, useful, and flexible assignments and rubrics for writing in HSM that ensure increased faculty consistency.
- Further needs as determined by Implementation Plan #4, described below

3) Integrating the Writing Enriched Curriculum into all aspects of the HSM student experience

- Import the WEC language regarding writing abilities and grading criteria into all HSM syllabi by Spring 2019. Particular language would be mapped to particular writing assignments so that
relevant expectations are echoed, reiterated, and reinforced across the different classes a student takes throughout the major. Accomplishing this task will require collecting and then coding writing assignments according to the skills emphasized from across the program.

• Develop a series of short student videos describing their experiences with writing and writing-related resources at different parts of their careers. For example, videos can be created of students talking about their experiences in their first HSM course, in the middle of their schedule, at the Capstone stage, and even of recent graduates talking about their experiences with writing in the professional world. Since students and working professionals are often better ambassadors of the importance of writing than instructors, we would like to create these videos, capture them, and link them to all syllabi with further information on WEC, writing instruction, and writing resources.

• All incoming HSM students will attend an orientation at the HSM program; information on the importance of writing and access to writing resources noted in the above materials will be provided.

• Develop a panel discussion of working professionals discussing the uses of, and importance of, writing in their work. This panel would be captured on video and linked to syllabi and other HSM course resources.

4) Develop a Needs Assessment and Action Plan report

One result of the WEC process has been to show that faculty are both willing and excited to integrate more and better writing instruction into their classes. The four WEC meetings were productive but only scratched the surface of potential for further discussion and engagement.

• Interview faculty in order to determine the most common and immediate needs for improving writing instruction to be implemented in Writing Plan #2 next year.

• Review the requirements of the accrediting body AUPHA as they relate to our identified writing abilities and characteristics, with the goal of connecting them as closely as possible to improve the curriculum assessment and certification process.

• Create a report and action plan for HSM’s Writing Plan #2 to build on the success and momentum of Writing Plan #1 and the WEC process in general.

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?

As part of the WEC process, four WEC meetings were convened and attended by faculty, administrators, and WEC personnel. Meetings were well-attended and promoted robust discussion about writing characteristics, expectations, and realities in the classroom. Much of the discussion, captured by Heidi Solomonson in meeting minutes and transcriptions of discussion, has been used in the construction of this Writing Plan.

In addition to the formal WEC meetings, subcommittee meetings of interested faculty volunteers were convened to further refine, revise, and hone materials relating to writing characteristics, grading criteria, and writing implementation plans.
An online vote of the entire writing plan and action plan was shared with all faculty, with 16 out of 22 faculty members responding with a yes vote. This was used for final approval of this First Edition Writing Plan.

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 personnel¹.

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): September 2018 to August 2019
RA appointment percent time: 30%

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

There is a plan for 2 RA’s due to the different skills and responsibilities.

Job Description RA 1 (15 hours per week)

Job Description RA 2 (5 Hours per week

Role and Responsibilities

Assist the HSM Faculty Director & WEC Liaison with HSM Program Writing Enriched Curriculum (WEC) duties such as administrative and faculty relationships and HSM Faculty support, including organizing faculty ratings, WEC writing assessment research including minutes & data analysis and creating presentations. This position involves research administrative duties and some duties can be done remotely and some need to be done in person on the UMN St.

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.
Paul campus in 20 Ruttan Hall due to access to printing and copying resources through the CCE offices. Assisting with the HSM WEC Faculty and Student development process and class will be required.

Assist the HSM Faculty Director with the following:

- Prepare and participate in WEC online discussions and meetings.
- Meet regularly with HSM Faculty Director to discuss WEC work assignments and expected outcomes.
- Assist and organize the development and administration of rating of HSM Program internal assessment of student writing for HSM 3521 and HSM 4561. Assessment of student writing ratings may include analysis by student entry source and other socio-economic factors.
- Organize and assist with the development of a faculty workshop series including Faculty & OES by interviewing and prioritizing from faculty and OES interviews the issues to address in the series. Development, communications and scheduling events regarding faculty WEC workshop series to support faculty WEC.
- Assist with integration of WEC with the student experience and connecting to industry by reviewing grading criteria, rubrics, use of technology to interest HSM Students and Alumni (for example student videos) in the WEC will require collection and coding of student writing and review of assignments of HSM courses.
- Assist with development of mapping writing curriculum using AUPHA certification and faculty criteria within HSM curriculum, documentation and review of courses and data collection.
- Assist with developing identified WEC materials and resources for HSM Website related to internships and employer communications.

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

Deadlines would be determined upon hiring and final assignment of duties.

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

Weekly updates via email.

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

Meeting phone and/or google meet/in person meeting.

VI. WEC Writing Budget Requests

HSM Budget Request: Overview of Budget detail:

As our HSM program is an applied program, we work directly with industry leaders in our curriculum and internship work. We would like to work with 2 people from industry to provide workshops for our faculty on HSM writing needs in the industry. All of our faculty are busy working executive professionals and thus to take time to prepare and or rate student writing, they are taking off time from work to participate. The pay rate for an industry professional would be about $250 per session and we have budgeted 2 of them. In addition, we would like our faculty to conduct the student rating and would pay them $250 per day of rating (there would be no prep time for them). The food at events is helpful to increase attendance as we usually schedule around breakfast, lunch or early evening in order to accommodate their busy schedules. The duties for the RA’s would be slightly different and therefore the duties and hours have been
identified separately. There is a request for an Honorarium for a WEC co-liaison with a stipend that again might be unusual but because of the busy working professionals that make up our faculty, it would be important to have some assistance in oversight for the RA’s and projects with faculty workshops. The HSM program has grown to over 208 students in three years and despite my significant commitment of time and support for the WEC program, this co-role will facilitate our success with the faculty and students.
## VI. WEC Writing Plan Requests

**Unit Name:** Health Services Management

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

**Total Financial Request:** $24,583.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA 2 * 5 Hrs per week * 1 semester</td>
<td>$2,935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rating of HSM 3521 @ $250 per rater * 5 + Food ($12*5=$70)</td>
<td>$1,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA 1 - 2 Semesters @ 15 hrs per week * 15 weeks</td>
<td>$8,804.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semester 1 Total:** $11,844.00  
**Semester 2 Total:** $12,739.00  
**Semester 3 Total:** $0.00  

**Rationale for costs and their schedule of distribution**

**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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 28, 2018

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Faculty workshop series</td>
<td>$1,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>RA 1 – 2 semesters @ 15 hours/week for 15 weeks</td>
<td>$8,804.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Faculty rating of HSM 3521</td>
<td>$1,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>RA 1 – 2 semesters @ 15 hours/week for 15 weeks</td>
<td>$8,804.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>RA 2 – 1 semester @ 5 hours/week</td>
<td>$2,935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>Honorarium for industry faculty WEC co-liaison</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,583.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All requested items except for the co-liaison honorarium have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education for a total of $23,583.00. You are welcome to work with a co-liaison; several other units have done this and the precedent is for them to split the liaison stipend. We recognize that this may result in you deciding that some of the projects outlined in this plan need to wait to be implemented. If that’s the case, you would just want to describe that decision in the next edition plan.

It is also OUE’s assumption that the honoraria for Fall 2018 will go to folks who attend the four workshop series.

The Campus Writing Board and OUE look forward to hearing about the results of the many proposed and exciting projects. 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. All approved funds, totaling $23,583.00, will be transferred during FY19.

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