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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments about Faculty/Instructors:

Also included in the meetings and in the drafting of this plan were all 18 P&A language instructors and two graduate instructor representatives. One associate professor was out of the country in Spring 2019 and the other associate professor listed is visiting. Two new assistant professors will join the faculty, one in Fall 2019 and one in Fall 2020.

#### Major(s)

*Please list each major your unit offers:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Total # students enrolled as of Spring 2019</th>
<th>Total # students graduating with major as of Spring 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German, Scandinavian &amp; Dutch</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>WEC Meeting #1</td>
<td>October 31, 2018</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Meeting #2</td>
<td>November 28, 2018</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Meeting #3</td>
<td>February 27, 2019</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Meeting #4</td>
<td>April 3, 2019</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Plan Feedback Session</td>
<td>April 24th, 2019</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Writing Plan Narrative, 1st Edition

Please retain section headers and prompts in your plan.

Introductory Summary:
Briefly describe the reason(s) why this unit (department, school, college) became involved in the WEC program, key findings that resulted from the process, and the implementation activities that are proposed in this Writing Plan. (1/2 page maximum)

The department has arrived at a moment of transition that makes it an opportune time to take part in the Writing-Enriched Curriculum program. In Fall 2018, GSD (Department of German, Scandinavian and Dutch) formally merged with the program in Slavic Languages and Literatures to form GNSD. One new faculty member was hired in Scandinavian in Fall 2017 and two new German faculty members will arrive in Fall 2019 and Fall 2020, while one phased retirement has begun. In light of these and other anticipated faculty changes, the department recognizes the need for proactive planning and taking a fresh look at our undergraduate programs. The meetings and discussions surrounding writing instruction as a key component of the curriculum will also serve as a springboard for larger discussions of the curriculum as a whole, something that has not been addressed in some time. This first year of WEC meetings has led to many fruitful discussions and realizations concerning how our students are receiving writing instruction. We have discovered that while faculty have a general idea of what students should be able to do upon graduation, there is not a transparent plan for getting students to this goal. Many of our upper-division courses, some of which are writing-intensive, would benefit from clearer learning objectives and more robust articulation. Our flat, mosaic curriculum makes it challenging to identify opportunities for such articulation. As a result of WEC and the proposed curricular analysis and revisioning of the capstone paper, we hope to make strides towards outlining clear writing objectives for our writing-intensive courses and developing strategies for moving students through the curriculum in a way that maximizes their benefit from writing instruction. This next year, covered under this first writing plan, will launch further investigation into what current practices in the department are, catalyze much-needed discussions about the capstone paper and support professional development and community building. We will also embark on an articulation project in key areas of the German language curriculum, which if successful, will then serve as a model for future projects in the Scandinavian and Russian tracks. Finally, in the interest of strengthening the GNSD curriculum as a whole by strategically addressing areas that would benefit most from attention at this stage, we intend to develop a plan for writing instruction in the Slavic curriculum (for writing in both Russian and English) that can serve as the basis for further articulation within that program.

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

Writing in German, Nordic, Slavic and Dutch is grounded in research that works closely with primary and secondary literature.

Writing is analytical. Texts are explicated, not simply described.
Writing is **evidence-driven**. Arguments are supported by text-oriented readings. Texts comprise many forms—poems, fiction, non-fiction, drama, film, etc.

GNSD is **discipline-conscious**. Scholarship draws on socio-historical, cultural, and aesthetic approaches to contextualize analysis.

Writing is **motivated, original, and purposeful**. Authorship is valued for its responsiveness and engagement with other scholarship.

Writing is valued for its **cohesive and coherent** qualities, **sensitivity to language**, and an expressiveness attuned to syntactic and stylistic features.

Writing is **attentive and responsive to audiences**.

**Section 2: DESIRED WRITING ABILITIES**

With which writing abilities should students in this unit’s major(s) graduate?

**By the time they graduate, undergraduate students majoring in GNSD should be able to:**

1. Formulate a feasible research question and a thesis in response to it, so that an argument’s line of reasoning is clear and focused
2. Develop arguments by having a clear plan for papers that includes identifying what the writer wants to prove, and what the writer needs to show in order to persuade
3. Use evidence to build and support an argument to a logical conclusion
4. Organize writing that is shaped by its argument, purpose, and genre, not a template
5. Balance exposition of the argument with the incorporation of textual evidence from primary and secondary sources
6. Summarize texts (novels, short stories, poems, movies, etc.) accurately by identifying main topics, main ideas, and the author’s point of view
7. Develop text-based analyses and interpretations that move beyond summary and explain meanings and their importance in particular contexts
8. Synthesize information in their own voice by identifying key ideas and articulating a perspective on them
9. Utilize multi-modal forms of communication such as PowerPoints, digital narratives, videos, etc.
10. Write in a range of voices and tones, including informal and formal registers
11. Express themselves coherently through the use of syntactic and stylistic features that include grammatically correct sentences, which are organized into paragraphs
12. Use language accurately and appropriately and strive for original and authentic expression
13. Use correct citational practices
14. Revise their own work, which entails critically rereading their own writing, restructuring ideas, identifying grammatical and syntactical concerns, and using reference materials and guides to correct errors
15. Write reflectively about their work by considering their expectations, how those expectations were met, and what they learned
16. Utilize writing strategies, including various forms of prewriting, invention and scaffolding strategies, to develop ideas
17. Invest themselves in the paper as an author, which involves being engaged in the topic, and going beyond treating the work as a mechanical exercise
18. Respond effectively to specific and skeptical audiences about specific situations that are connected to career-readiness themes
19. Identify work that has already been done on the topic
20. Substantiate claims with examples; distinguish between actual facts and opinions
21. Use and explain data and methods accurately
22. Use figures, tables, and charts to support argument, where applicable

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?

Instruction of writing is highly structured and uniformly integrated in our various language curricula (DTCH, FIN, GER, NOR, SWED 1001-1004, GER 1022), with the exception of the first four semesters of Russian, and is emphasized in the "gateway" composition courses GER 3011W, SCAN 3011W, DTCH 3011W, in introductory critical analysis courses (GER 3012W, GER 3104W, GER 3604W, GSD 3511W, GSD 3512W, SCAN 3501W, SCAN 3604W), and in the major project seminar (GSD 3451W, RUSS 3311W). During the first four semesters of language instruction, the practice of basic writing abilities (constructing sentences and paragraphs; relating personal experience; summarizing texts and developing a thesis) is standardized across several sections of each course and overseen by supervisors. Writing instruction in GER 3011W, "German Conversation and Composition," is uniform across sections and facilitates the transition from personal and practical communication to the critical evaluation of literary and cultural texts (SCAN 3011W and DTCH 3011W are similarly designed, though they have only one section; see Appendix A for example essay rubrics from GER 1002, GER 1004 and GER 3011W). The critical analysis courses, focused on culture or literature, are writing intensive and some are required for the majors (GSD 3511W, GSD 3512W; GER 3104W required for minors, but not majors): the writing component of these courses introduces students to the rhetorical modes and research methods specific to each discipline, although the way writing is integrated into individual sections is determined by instructors. The capstone project seminar is dedicated to the production of a 20-25 page research paper. However, many majors either complete the capstone in their second major or by taking a 5xxx-level elective, for which the requirements have varied greatly over time. In addition, scheduling of the capstone project course in the fall has meant that it has not been the final course in an articulated sequence, since students typically take other writing-intensive courses after it.

Review of the structure of writing practice across the department's offerings reveals that, although writing instruction is supervised and standardized at key points at the beginning of the major curriculum, many upper-division electives (7 required for the major) carry no specific writing requirements, objectives or
guidelines. Further, although courses such as GER 3104W, GER 3604W, GSD 3511W and GSD 3512W are all writing intensive, much could be done to articulate that component more effectively across courses.

Oversight of how writing is integrated into our majors is further complicated by the fact that German majors have the opportunity to practice writing in both English and German in upper-division courses, whereas Scandinavian, Dutch, Finnish, and Russian majors currently lack options in the target language beyond the sixth semester. For this reason, we focused mainly on writing in English at our WEC meetings, though agreeing that in the case of German some attention does need to be paid to the development of writing in the target language. Because the majority of our students are double majors and practice writing in other departments that reflect different skills from those specific to German, Nordic, Slavic and Dutch, there is usually broad variation in the level and style of student writing found in upper-division courses. Anecdotally we have observed that a significant proportion of students enrolled in the capstone seminar have never written a research paper and/or do not fully understand the main characteristics of writing in our discipline.

In an attempt to attract as many majors as possible, the curriculum was designed to be flexible and to allow for many different paths. The challenge, however, in such a flat, mosaic curriculum is that the structure does not present a single path to articulating a clear writing curriculum. We have also had two separate tracks for students to follow if they decide to have a German emphasis (take GER courses) or a Scandinavian emphasis (take SCAN courses) for their major, and now with the merger there is a third curricular pathway with the Russian track. Clearly, we still have much to learn and accomplish.

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.).

Due to the nature of language instruction and learning, the assessment of writing is already a regular part of our department’s curriculum from beginning to end. All language courses in German, Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish, and Dutch (but not Russian) are closely supervised and follow the harmonized course syllabi that focus on the development of the four skills: reading, listening, speaking and writing. Students' writing is evaluated through the writing portion of the Language Proficiency Exam (LPE) after four semesters of a language (in all languages). It is recommended that students attain a Pass for enrollment in more advanced courses. In German, Scandinavian, and Dutch students then progress to 3011W, a “gateway” course focused on preparing students for more advanced and academic writing in the target language. These courses also have a clear assessment structure. The language instruction curriculum thus establishes clear and ratable expectations for student writing. In the upper-division curriculum for majors and minors (including two writing-intensive critical analysis courses for GSD majors and several electives in literature, culture, and linguistics, some of which are also writing-intensive) each instructor is responsible for communicating to students the writing abilities practiced or expected in individual courses as well as for developing appropriate writing assignments. It became clear in the discussions facilitated by the WEC project that although instructors of content courses had a general idea of the writing abilities graduating
students should have and how to teach them, no specific parameters existed as to how to address and evaluate these abilities between the 3xxx gateway courses and the capstone seminar. The criteria below, though far from complete, represent a first stab at developing a menu of criteria from which faculty and instructors can choose from when assessing writing in upper-division courses. Some of these criteria would be more effective in certain types of courses or might vary depending on level and language of instruction used. Over the next year, we hope to refine these criteria, especially after receiving feedback on them from the WEC baseline summer ratings. Further, through the curricular mapping project we will be able to pinpoint which of these criteria would be most appropriate for which types of courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty-generated list of writing abilities expected of GNSD majors <strong>by the time they graduate.</strong></th>
<th>Faculty generated evaluative criteria (What observable textual features can be used to evaluate the students’ ability?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These students will be able to…</td>
<td>The text…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Formulate a feasible research question and a thesis in response to it, so that an argument’s line of reasoning is clear and focused. | 1a. Formulates a research question that can be adequately addressed in the scope of the assignment.  
1b. Includes a debatable thesis statement in the opening paragraph. |
| 2. Develop arguments by having a clear plan for papers that includes identifying what the writer wants to prove, and what the writer needs to show in order to persuade. | 2a. Establishes a clear plan and structure that indicates what the writer wants to persuade readers of or prove. |
| 3. Use evidence to build and support an argument to a logical conclusion. | 3a. Integrates and cites evidence succinctly and appropriately in support of the thesis.  
3b. Considers and responds to evidence that challenges the validity of the argument.  
3c. Utilizes an effective balance of exposition and textual evidence to develop its line of reasoning.  
3d. Organizes evidence so that it builds to a focused conclusion. |
| 4. Organize writing that is shaped by its argument, purpose, and genre, not a template. | 4a. Is shaped by its rhetorical situation (i.e, argument, purpose, genre), not by a generic template. |
| 5. Balance exposition of the argument with the incorporation of textual evidence from primary and secondary sources. | 5a. Paraphrases source materials and avoids excessive use of direct quotations.  
5b. Identifies those parts of an argument that readily profit from direct citations and the use of secondary sources.  
5c. Contextualizes and interprets direct quotations, such that the reader understands how they apply to the argument. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Summarize texts (novels, short stories, poems, movies, etc.) accurately by identifying main topics, main ideas, and the author’s point of view.</td>
<td>6a. Summarizes the main features of a work (main topic, ideas, point of view, etc.) such that the reader understands their importance to the writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop text-based analyses and interpretations that move beyond summary and explain meanings and their importance in particular contexts.</td>
<td>7a. Provides concrete examples (literary, filmic, linguistic, etc.) of style, technique, and form and explains their connection to the text as a whole and/or to broader aesthetic, cultural and political contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. Synthesize information in their own voice by identifying key ideas and articulating a perspective on them. | 8a. Synthesizes information and key ideas, such that the reader can see a logical and plausible relationship among the sources used by the writer.  
8b. Provides a synthesis of sources that still maintains the writer’s voice and perspective. |
| 9. Utilize multi-modal forms of communication such as PowerPoints, digital narratives, videos, etc. | 9a. Utilizes and balances modes of communication (word, image and sound) effectively to convey intended meaning and purpose of communication.  
9b. Combines modes of communication to engage the audience’s interest.  
9c. Runs smoothly without tech glitches that distract from communication. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Write in a range of voices and tones, including informal and formal registers.</th>
<th>10a. Uses effective word choice and correct pronouns appropriate for formal and informal writing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11. Express themselves coherently through the use of syntactic and stylistic features that include grammatically correct sentences, which are organized into paragraphs. | 11a. Utilizes effective syntactical variation and stylistic features to communicate persuasively.  
11b. Includes grammatically correct sentences that do not interfere with the transmission of meaning (or distract the reader).  
11c. Is organized into cohesive sentences that clearly indicate the relationship between one idea and the next.  
11d. Is organized into coherent paragraphs linked with clear transitions such that the reader is able to follow the writer’s reasoning.  
11e. Expresses the student’s ideas through the appropriate genres, models and examples encountered in class. |
| NOTE for future plans: More specific criteria needed to address appropriate proficiency level when in target language. |
| 12. Use language accurately and appropriately and strive for original and authentic expression. | 12a. Uses language structures, vocabulary, and phrases proficiently at the appropriate course level.  
12b. Uses accurate vocabulary for the topic (e.g literary, linguistic, filmic, sociological etc.) and, when appropriate, defines terms. |
| 13. Use correct citational practices. | 13a. Includes parenthetical, in-text references that correspond to sources given in the works cited page.  
13b. Uses a style guide appropriate to the discipline. |
<p>| 14. Revise their own work, which entails critically rereading their own writing, restructuring ideas, identifying grammatical and syntactical concerns, and using reference materials and guides to correct errors. | 14. When compared with previous drafts exhibits signs of careful revision, including the restructuring of ideas and the improvement of stylistic, syntactical and mechanical features. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Write reflectively about their work by considering their expectations, how those expectations were met, and what they learned.</td>
<td>15a. Reflects on the student’s work by identifying the expectations (i.e. learning objectives, key questions) for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15b. Reflects on the student’s work by analyzing whether the project’s expectations were met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15c. Reflects on the student’s work by articulating what the student learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Utilize writing strategies, including various forms of prewriting, invention and scaffolding strategies, to develop ideas.</td>
<td>16. When viewed in the context of the writing process exhibits evidence of having effectively used invention and planning strategies to develop ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Invest themselves in the paper as an author, which involves being engaged in the topic, and going beyond treating the work as a purely mechanical exercise.</td>
<td>17a. Develops an argument that is driven by an aspect of the text that is of interest to the writer, so that the writer’s engagement is clear to the reader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17b. Conveys the clear interest and engagement of the writer in the topic and purpose of the writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17c. When possible, takes innovative approaches to developing the line of reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Respond effectively to specific and skeptical audiences about specific situations that are connected to career-readiness themes.</td>
<td>18. Considers the specific needs and circumstances of the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Identify work that has already been done on the topic.</td>
<td>19. Provides sufficient background and context by summarizing previous work on the topic such that the reader can understand the impact of the present argument without referring to texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Substantiate claims with examples; distinguish between actual facts and opinion.</td>
<td>20. Provides factual basis for all claims by citing adequate examples, previous literature and/or statistically significant results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Use and explain data and methods accurately.  
21. Cites and explains data and methods accurately to develop the argument.

22. Use figures, charts and tables to support argument.  
22. Integrates and cites relevant figures, tables and/or charts to support the argument.

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?

A. Re-focus and re-design of the capstone paper

In responding to the challenges outlined above in section 3, we plan to start with redesign of the capstone paper/major project so that we may work through backward design to refine the 22 writing abilities and the assessment criteria listed in sections 2 and 4. The structure of the current capstone was developed some time ago and there is a consensus among faculty that its purpose needs revisiting. Further, since we anticipate potentially adding Russian majors to this course, it is time to think about what we ask students to do with this paper and how we prepare them for it throughout the curriculum. With students increasingly choosing to work on topics that straddle both of their majors (including the social sciences and other fields), GNSD faculty have for some time felt that it would be important to define more clearly what we think the capstone project should look like, based on how we are best equipped to advise students in their writing. Moreover, as mentioned above, students can fulfill this requirement in one of two ways: either by taking the capstone/major project seminar or by writing a paper in a 5xxx-level seminar. Recently we have learned that these experiences may not be as similar as we had hoped and thus we plan to take care to create a system that clearly supports either option. We propose to start this conversation by laying out a game plan for pursuing this curricular reform at the “kick off” meeting during the faculty retreat, which takes place during Orientation Week, and then to continue the discussion in the Undergraduate Committee throughout the year. We will also report the results of the baseline WEC summer ratings at the “kick off” meeting and use these to spark discussion. The goal for the year will be to create a clear set of objectives and a clearer writing assignment prompt for the capstone paper that could then be piloted during the second writing plan and assessed for its effectiveness. As a last step before submitting our second writing plan, we hope to then take another look at our 22 writing abilities and assessment criteria to ensure that they continue to reflect the vision of the newly-defined capstone paper, and are in line with what we learned from the baseline summer ratings. The outcome of work on this implementation step will be a policy document to be shared with the department regarding expectations for the capstone paper for use by the DUS in communications with faculty about this requirement and in assessment reports.
B. Curricular mapping and analysis project

In addition, the department hopes to increase oversight and communication in the delivery of writing instruction, particularly in 3xxx-level/5xxx-level courses. As a result of the surveys and curricular matrices conducted by WEC this past year (see Appendix B for an example matrix), it became apparent that there was some discrepancy in writing instruction even among instructors of the same course, or at least in the perceptions of writing instruction. Through careful curricular mapping and analysis, we hope to determine what kind of writing practice students receive between GER 3011W/SCAN 3011W/RUSS 3101 and GSD 3451W/RUSS 3311W (and how this might differ between the various tracks) and to pinpoint writing abilities that are not taught effectively or sufficiently. In discussion with various faculty and instructors we also aim to ascertain what underlies the discrepancies noted in the curricular matrices developed by WEC. The bulk of this project will be taken on by the WEC faculty liaison, Helena Ruf, together with an RA; we will report our findings both to the Undergraduate Committee and the faculty at large. This project will also inform the discussion for refining our 22 writing abilities and assessment criteria, which will then be piloted in courses the following year and used for the next set of summer ratings. Eventually, likely as part of the second writing plan, we hope to develop statements of writing for all of our writing-intensive courses, as well as an advisory document that will help advisors and students have a clearer sense of direction in navigating the curriculum in all its various tracks. Thus, the tasks carried out in the next year will form the foundation for much of the work to be carried out in the second and third writing plans.

An offshoot of this curricular mapping and analysis project will be to pay special attention to the articulation between GER 3011W – GER 3104W – GER 3012W, as this is the one clear place where we have an opportunity for articulation in the upper-division courses. The goal here is to develop a model of articulation that we can then pilot and later apply in the other language tracks (SCAN, RUSS) where feasible. This articulation would include agreeing on shared objectives for the courses that build upon and support each other, sequencing written assignments (i.e., topic, length, genre), and sequencing other things such as spoken tasks, grammar instruction, and type of texts taught. This pilot will already begin during this writing plan as we hope to develop one or two instructional interventions during summer 2019 that can be tested in 3011W in the fall and 3012W in the spring. In order to assess the effectiveness of these new instructional interventions, we plan to survey students at the end of each of these courses. This work will be carried out by the WEC faculty liaison (who also serves as the coordinator of these courses), together with the RA and the other instructors for these courses. A curricular redesign of 3011W and 3012W was already planned for summer 2019 and this work aligns with the WEC plan goals we have developed for the department. To this end, we are requesting an RA position for 8 weeks this summer at 10 hours/week, a 25% appointment in the fall, and 10% appointment in the spring.

The outcome of work on this implementation step will be a curricular map document to be shared with the department as a whole. This document will be useful for Orientation Week and other professional development workshops conducted by the DLI and the DUS, as well as for general communications with faculty about requirements and in assessment reports.
C. Kick-off meeting and writing workshops

The kick-off meeting and writing workshops are intended to create a platform for discussion and ongoing professional development for instructors at all levels. By bringing together different department constituencies (P&A, graduate instructors, faculty), these events will foster ongoing dialogue about our shared understanding of the way in which our disciplinary focus on critical reasoning is relayed through writing instruction. They will also encourage consistency in the way GNSD conveys writing expectations to students, both in language courses and in advanced content-based courses.

(1) The kick-off meeting, held in early Fall 2019 during Orientation Week, will be a half-day event attended by GNSD faculty and other key people. An opening session facilitated by WEC staff and assisted by the WEC Liaison and the DUS will solicit discussion around the capstone project; subsequently, participants will be made aware of the planned curricular mapping and analysis project and their need to support this project by submitting syllabi, writing assignments, and grading criteria to the RA. The goals for these projects will be explained and agreed upon.

(2) We are also requesting two workshops for next year (one in the fall, one in the spring) that will support our work and provide instructors with background knowledge and new expertise on these topics. These workshops will be facilitated by WEC staff together with the WEC faculty liaison. Food will be served in order to encourage participation in these workshops. The topics for these workshops will be “Designing effective writing assignments” and “Utilizing writing strategies, prewriting and scaffolding.”

The impact of this implementation step will be assessed at the end of the year by means of a survey of participants about the workshops’ usefulness and suggestions for future areas of discussion.

D. Support for the Russian program

The Russian program has had many new instructional hires in the last five years and has been undergoing changes in its lower-division curriculum. To assist with development of a writing plan appropriate to the Russian curriculum, we would like to hold four workshops with Russian faculty and staff, the GNSD DLI (who is also the WEC faculty liaison) and the GNSD DUS to develop a clear set of objectives and writing goals for the four-year Russian curriculum (both in the target language and in English). This new set of objectives and writing goals can then be integrated into the Russian curriculum during the second writing plan. The 2013 Second Language Task Force report laid out an outcomes structure for what Tier IV languages like Russian should achieve at lower/upper division levels. However, this framework has not yet been addressed in any systematic fashion and needs to be refined and specifically tailored to writing. In addition, the Russian curriculum needs to be mapped in terms of program-specific SLOs for the upper division courses that are being taught and the types of writing assignments in use. It is time to think about the intersection in the development of writing/field-specific content knowledge that is vital for students in developing critical thinking and global perspectives. These intellectual values are shared with the GSD
major and reflect our conviction that by the time students complete the capstone project, the continuum of language, content, and critical thinking/analysis skills come together. With WEC we have the opportunity to explicitly articulate for the Russian track the intersection of learning outcomes at this stage.

To this end, we request funding to provide lunch at each of the four workshops we plan to hold over the next academic year, two during the fall semester and two during the spring semester. We also request WEC consultation as needed, not to exceed help on two workshops. Upon hearing that our initial request would not be funded, the WEC faculty liaison met with the Russian faculty in May 2019 and discussed a plan for four workshops that would still carry the work forward, but not be too onerous in time demands. The goals of each workshop are highlighted below:

- **Workshop #1**: Develop learning objectives for presentational writing in Russian for each course level (1-6), based on ACTFL performance descriptors for novice and intermediate levels, the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can Do statements, and the CEFR descriptors. Include reference to the WEC criteria and abilities.
- **Workshop #2**: Develop a writing assessment to assess these objectives for levels 2, 4, and 6, also tied to curricular and content goals for the level. These assessments will be piloted in the spring.
- **Workshop #3**: Create rubrics for the grading of these assessments (use some of WEC criteria), work with rubric grading.
- **Workshop #4**: Rate some of the samples together using the rubrics and discuss the success, potential revisions for the future; also discuss future goals outside of WEC:
  - Creating other assessments that will be similar across course sections
  - Working towards greater articulation of syllabi and methods
  - Heritage-learners and a potential 7th semester course

These four scheduled meetings are the essential stepping stone to further development work in the Russian curriculum. Until now, the Russian faculty has not met on a regular basis and as a consequence has not shared common information about instructional practices across courses as occurs in other languages in the department. As a result, instructors do not at present know enough about what is happening in the courses they are not teaching themselves to collaborate effectively on WEC plan objectives. Thus, it is crucial that these meetings now occur with the hope being that these meetings will inspire further collaboration in the future to further strengthen the impact of WEC on the curriculum as a whole.

The outcome of work on this implementation step will be a document articulating program-specific learning outcomes for writing appropriate to Slavic Languages and Literatures as a program, and in particular to Russian instruction. This document will be a useful point of reference for the GNSD DLI and DUS for general communications with faculty about course expectations and in assessment reports. Work on writing in English in upper-division Russian courses will be folded into the already funded curricular mapping and analysis project and the discussion of the capstone project.
E. Financial and service requests

1. We request $350 to provide materials and lunch for the kick-off meeting to be held in early Fall 2019. This support will be used to provide lunch to participants (approx. 22).

2. We request $900 to provide lunch and materials for the two writing workshops to be held during the year covered by this plan (F19-S20). Attendance would be approx. 30 people.

3. We request $300 to support the Russian program. The $300 will be used to purchase lunch for 6-7 people for each of the four workshops throughout the 2019-2020 academic year.

4. We request $13,147 to hire a 25% Research Assistant for Fall 2019 and a 10% Research Assistant for Spring 2019 (plus $2,213 for 8 weeks of 10 hours/week this summer 2019) for a total of $15,350 to assist in collecting and reviewing course syllabi, writing assignments, and grading criteria for all GER, GSD, RUSS and SCAN upper-division courses. The RA will work over the summer to assist the third-year coordinator in developing two instructional interventions for GER 3011W and GER 3012W to be piloted during the academic year. The 25% appointment for Fall 2019 and 10% appointment for spring 2019 have the job code 9521 at a fringe rate of 16.1%, plus $20.50/hr tuition charge. The 8 weeks of summer from July 1st to August 25th would be job code 9572 with a fringe rate of 16.1%. The same RA would work all three positions.

5. We request consultation and facilitation of the Fall 2019 kick-off meeting and one "check-in" consultation for each semester covered by this plan (Fall 2019 - Spring 2020), which will include attending a meeting with Russian faculty. We also request consultation and facilitation for the two workshops described above (in point 2, not listed here).

As a result of the measures described and the support requested, we expect to use the findings to establish the second writing plan. Our sense after this first year of meetings is that there is still a lot to learn about what is happening in practice with writing instruction. We will also be welcoming new faculty to the department over the next two years, and this, together with including all members of the instructional faculty and staff, will give WEC-inspired practices the additional role of fostering community and consensus within a department structure that often seems divided between language instruction and advanced content courses. The potential outcomes of the current plan's WEC activities are thus of integral importance to GNSD's undergraduate mission.

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?

This current writing plan is the result of four WEC meetings held throughout the 2018-19 academic year, led by WEC staff and the departmental faculty liaisons (Leslie Morris in the fall, Helena Ruf in the spring). These meetings were designed to provide us with information about how faculty, P&A instructors, grad
instructors, and students view writing instruction in GNSD, which in turn helped us to define how we see writing in the field of GNSD and translate that into the 22 writing abilities outlined here. We then completed a survey asking us to think about where in our curriculum each of these criteria were being taught and began work on creating assessment criteria for the 22 writing abilities. At each of these meetings, most, if not all, of the faculty were present. In addition, many key P&A instructors (e.g., the various language coordinators who are in charge of the 1001-1004 curriculums) were also in attendance, as well as interested others. Although many could not attend the meetings due to their teaching schedules, the results of these meetings were shared more broadly and at times discussed outside of the meetings. The writing plan was shared with all relevant members in the department and they were given ample time and opportunity to provide feedback on the draft. Revisions were then made and the final plan was sent to all members for an electronic vote.

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 TBD, phone TBD
Period of appointment (Semester/Year to Semester/Year): July 2019-May 2020 (summer 19, fall 19, spring 20)
RA appointment percent time: 80 hours in the summer (8 weeks at 10 hrs/wk), 25% in the fall, 10% in the spring

Define in detail the tasks that the RA will be completing within the funding period:
The RA will be responsible for handling collection of syllabi, writing assignment prompts, and grading criteria from the various faculty in the department. A system for coding and categorizing these according to the 22 writing abilities will be devised together with the WEC faculty liaison. The RA will then perform the coding and categorization and assist the liaison with readying the results for a discussion in the Undergraduate Committee, and later for the entire faculty. This work will be primarily carried out during the fall semester (collection, coding, categorization), with the meetings and discussion happening during the spring semester. The RA will also assist in revising the current 22 writing abilities and associated assessment criteria after the WEC summer rating, as this new set of criteria will be the foundation for the curricular analysis project outlined above. In turn, the RA will also participate in discussions in the Undergraduate Committee regarding the capstone paper, which will likely result in future revision of the writing abilities and grading criteria.

This summer the RA will assist the WEC faculty liaison, who is also the coordinator for third-year German courses, and 1-2 other instructors in re-designing GER 3011W and 3012W with an eye towards better articulation between the two. We will specifically work towards developing two units (or interventions). Tasks include, but are not limited to, finding and selecting mentor texts, developing scaffolded written assignments to accompany the texts, and revising current methods of peer review and reflection. This articulation will also include meetings with faculty teaching GER 3104W and the RA will be part of those meetings as well. The RA will also help plan and facilitate the Writing Plan activities for the year.

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

Work on the GER 3011W materials should be concluded this summer, with revisions happening during the fall, while work on GER 3012W should be concluded by January 2020, with revisions and discussion happening by the end of the funding period. The collection, coding and categorization of the syllabi, writing prompts, and grading criteria should be concluded by January 2020 with discussion happening in the spring and concluding before the end of the funding period. The final revision of the writing abilities and assessment criteria will be concluded by the end of the funding period.

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

The RA will work closely with the WEC liaison and will check in weekly, unless otherwise agreed upon.

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

The RA and liaison will have bi-weekly meetings and will check in during the off weeks via e-mail.

---

1 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.
To: Helena Ruf, Department of German, Nordic, Slavic & Dutch  
From: Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn, Office of Undergraduate Education  
Subject: Decision regarding WEC funding proposal

Thank you for providing the Office of Undergraduate Education with an addendum to your 1st Edition Writing Plan. This addendum has been reviewed by the Executive Committee and this letter replaces the one sent on May 14, 2019.

As indicated in previous correspondence, the Campus Writing Board approved the GNSD faculty’s Writing Plan, particularly commending the faculty’s plan to integrate WEC work into its broader curriculum in a sustainable manner. At the same time, the approval letter also indicated the Board’s concerns with the proposal for external consultation. The Board questioned whether the writing and writing instruction (the purview of the WEC initiative and CWB) were the primary focus of the proposed consultation. Board members also wondered how/if the information gathered would be generalized to all four language groups taught by GNSD. The executive committee is not opposed to supporting external consultation about writing and implementing your WEC plan, but it requires more details about this process as well as how WEC staff could be involved.

Additionally, the executive committee had questions about your P&A professional development plan and how curricular development is construed by the department. Specifically, the executive committee would like to know whether course and curriculum development are already compensated within your current employment structure for faculty members and P&A employees. Committee members wonder why a request of this nature would not fall to the department rather than the Office for Undergraduate Education.

You provided an addendum to your original Writing Plan, which requested $300 to support the Russian program in place of the original requested $6500. The items highlighted below have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education. In addition to the funds previously approved, the total approved is $16,910. These funds will be transferred in full during the FY20 to your department’s EFS account string, 1000-10967-20080.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German, Nordic, Slavic, and Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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