**Course Timeline for UW English (Fall)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Feb 3 | Introductory readings for Major Paper 2:[Raypole](https://www.healthline.com/health/self-actualization#what-it-isnt)[McLeod](https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html)IPIP-Neo home (de-activated webpage—pdf viewable on Canvas and website)[About IPIP-Neo](https://novopsych.com.au/assessments/formulation/international-personality-item-pool-neo-120-item-version-ipip-neo-120/#:~:text=The%20International%20Personality%20Item%20Pool,and%20adults%20(ages%2016%2B).) by NovoPsych |
| Feb 7 | Major Paper 2<https://www.personalitytest.net/ipip/ipipneo120.html> |
| Feb 10 | [Sequence Assignment 1](#sq1) |
| Mar 5 | Sequence Assignment 1 due by midnight |
| Mar 6 | [Sequence Assignment 2](#sq2) |
| Mar 16 | Sequence Assignment 2 due by midnight |
| Mar 17 | [Major Paper 2](#Maj2) overview |
| Mar 30 | Submit [Major Paper 2](#Maj2) draft for comments |
| Apr 13 | Final Submission Deadline for [Major Paper 2](#Maj2)—late MP2s will NOT be scored |
| Apr 14 | Baker’s favorite exemplar: Bennett et al. |
| Apr 15 | [Major Paper 3](#mp3) overview |
| May 13 | [Critical Reflection](#critref) and Major Paper 1 Fall and [Spring Requirements](#mp1spring) Overview[Portfolio Criteria and Rubric](#port) |
| May 18 | Final date to submit complete Major Paper 3 draft for comments |
| Jun 5 | PORTFOLIO DEADLINE submission is midnight—no late Portfolios accepted! No URLs—uploads only. |

**Daily Lessons (in chronological order—most recent lesson is at the end)**

February 3

Major Paper 2!

Introductory readings by Raypole and McLeod (linked on website and Canvas)

IPIP-Neo [instructions](https://ipip.ori.org/)

[About IPIP-Neo](https://novopsych.com.au/assessments/formulation/international-personality-item-pool-neo-120-item-version-ipip-neo-120/#:~:text=The%20International%20Personality%20Item%20Pool,and%20adults%20(ages%2016%2B).) by NovoPsych

February 7

**Sequence--Major Paper 2: *Mental Stimulus***

YOU, the real person YOU, have just landed a windfall of cash—$5 million—that YOU, personally must spend by the end of the fiscal year (June 30). Document your reading-writing-thinking-discussing-researching-questioning-drafting-rethinking-starting over-going back-going forward process for DECIDING **how much money you will invest in what specific ways** and JUSTIFYING, using data from your research, **why your investment plan would be plausibly effective at meeting the objectives** you set. This sequence will entail:

* A [line of inquiry](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#lineofinq) beginning with class readings: Raypole’s and McLeod’s discussion of Maslow’s [Expanded Hierarchy of Needs](https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html);
* Researching, collecting and gathering data from additional [tertiary, primary](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#primsec) as well as [academic/ professional](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#acpro) [secondary](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#primsec) [sources](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#sourcedef)
* Two sequence assignments leading up to the final submission of MP2
* Assessment of your final MP2 according to the [Outcome Traits](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#o1) as a *heavily-weighted* sequence grade.

**KNOWN UNKNOWNS FOR MAJOR PAPER 2**

* You must **disburse** **ALL $5 million** (USD, using exchange rate on Feb 5, 2025)—not a penny over and not a penny under—to documented, existing vendors of products, commodities or services including applicable taxes, delivery charges, etc.
* Purchase and delivery/possession of item/service must be complete by June 30, 2025 (everything you buy must be **realistically accessible to you on July 1, 2025,** *not arriving/finishing after that date*)—budget the costs/time of installation, set up, etc for anything you are not realistically capable of DIY.
* **No funds may be placed/held in accounts or securities** (so no buying bonds, shares, insurance, etc); **no transferring funds** to other **parties** so they can pay you back/rent/interest, etc after June 30—what you have purchased on June 30 is all you’ve got.
* **No speculative financing** (no use of dividends, profits, salary, inheritance or other unrealized, FUTURE funds) to achieve your objective; **only the $5 million can be used to purchase resources for the objective** “in hand” June 30.
* Your starting point is this: You ONLY “have *ensured* access to”
	+ the **materiel YOU, PERSONALLY own outright currently** (clothes, shoes, bedding, toiletries, etc)—***not*** your family’s house, car, food, etc—and
	+ **your current knowledge, skills, experience** (not your family’s, friends’, teachers’, etc).

You cannot assume you would be access anything other than these for your objective or for resources beyond what you spend your $5 million to obtain by June 30 (potable water? fuel?, etc)

**MP2 SEQUENCE ASSIGNMENT 1**:

Step One

CLOSE READ [Wikipedia’s entry on Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maslow%27s_hierarchy_of_needs) using its offered information (and additional resources YOU research as needed) to **OD** and **differentiate** the precise, [operating definitions](#od) of the two most basic needs in Maslow’s theory: those of ***biology* and of *safety***.

* **Document** and save your close reading as a written resource to use for your work throughout this sequence.

***CLOSE READING* AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL**

1. [**OD**](#od) the task/goal you are using the text to achieve (your prompt, research question, etc) for its [rules](#rhetsit) and [stakes](#stakes).

THEN **decode** the whole text to “get” *its* words/materials meaning relevant to that task

(it’s *on you* to try different [techniques](#technique), including researching other sources, until you can define [known unknowns](#rums) like unfamiliar references, words, concepts in the task and/or the text).

1. [**Peruse**](#peruse)the relevant materials in the text. **Interpret** these to **state** the text’s [argument](#fopa)(s) relevant to the task. You may [quote or summarize if appropriate](#sumparaquot) or paraphrase the texts’ words/images/material, in which you **translate** what it claims/proves into words that communicate *the same info* in a way that makes sense in your [rhetorical situation/to your audience](#o1) as a writer. Your goal is to “get out of” the text its [clear, complex, significant and manageable argument](#uwthesis), not vague/generalized, simple, safe/established and/or broad [facts, opinions and/or perspectives](#fopa).
2. **Cite** using [MLA](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/mla_style/mla_formatting_and_style_guide/mla_formatting_and_style_guide.html) to capture [*clearly, honestly and comprehensively*](#valrelethic) where/how its relevant argument shows up in the text—*explicitly and implicitly, agreeable to you and not*.
3. [**Analyze**](#analysis) WHY the details in your cited material MEAN what YOU interpret them to mean (how you know you’re right about what you think it says) individually *and* in context with the text’s other relevant material.
4. **Draw** [implications](#implications): what should you do next in your [line of inquiry](#lineofinq) for this task because of what you interpret this text arguing?

Step Two

Brainstorm/research/assemble ideas to **determine** **YOUR IRL PERSONAL** **minimum** (can’t do without/need at least this/this much: medication? food?, etc) **and maximum** (cannot have more than this/this much: carbon dioxide? human waste?) **resources** **required for long-term physical survival**. Choose a format for documenting that gives YOU PERSONALLY the best chance to keep track of sources and info you use in your line of inquiry (especially those that reveal complexities, possibilities, overlaps, gaps, conditions/rules) for what you MUST HAVE and MUST NOT HAVE for health/survival.

* **Document** your minimum(s) and maximum(s) in the format of writing you chose.

Step Three

Brainstorm/research/assemble ideas to **create a list** of concrete, specific, tangible, nameable, existing, real **examples** of what you could realistically purchase or could contract to create/produce by **spending ALL of** your windfall money by June 30 on **THIS objective ONLY**:

**Access *for as long as possible* to at least the *minimum* necessary resources to ensure YOUR PERSONAL** **physical survival.**

Step Four

Craft a detailed **Purchasing** **Plan** of purchases/spending in a format that captures

* each specific item/contracted service and the amount of each item/duration of contract you buy (June 30, 2025 is final date allowed)
* how/how much/through whom (cite vendor/contractee and terms of sale--incl. tax, shipping, license fee, etc) your money goes to pay for each purchase
* way(s) each item/service contributes to achieving *THIS* OBJECTIVE

**Document**, save and SUBMIT your *Survival Purchasing Plan* as a sequence assignment by March 5 midnight.

March 5

**MP2 SEQUENCE ASSIGNMENT 2:**

Step One

[CLOSE READ](#closeread) IN WRITING [Wikipedia’s entry on Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maslow%27s_hierarchy_of_needs) using its offered information (and additional resources YOU research as needed) to [**OD**](#od) **psychological and human development concepts** *underlying* Maslow’s love/belonging and esteem needs and to **differentiate** these from concepts *underlying* safety, biology, cognition/mental, aesthetic, self-actualization and transcendence needs.

* **Document** and save your close reading in writing as a resource to use for your work throughout this sequence.

Step Two

Brainstorm/research/assemble ideas to **map out** **YOUR IRL PERSONAL *external*** **social-emotional** **support system.** Choose a format for documenting that gives YOU PERSONALLY the best chance to reveal complexities, possibilities, overlaps, gaps, conditions/rules for **how those you love, trust and connect with *in positive ways* relate to you.** You may wish to consider these example formats:

 

<https://whatsyourgrief.com/support-system-superlatives-a-journaling-exercise/>

* **Document** your externals map as a resource to use for your work throughout this sequence.

Step Three

Brainstorm/research/assemble ideas to **map out** **YOUR IRL PERSONAL** ***internal* social-emotional** **support system** Choose a format for documenting that gives YOU PERSONALLY the best chance to reveal complexities, possibilities, overlaps, gaps, conditions/rules for **the habits, rituals, actions, techniques, strengths YOU rely upon to manage stress, solve problems and find motivation.** You may wish to consider descriptors contained in these sources:

<https://biglifejournal.com/blogs/blog/build-self-esteem-confidence-teens>

<https://www.cci.health.wa.gov.au/~/media/CCI/Consumer%20Modules/Improving%20Self-Esteem/Improving%20Self-Esteem%20-%2006%20-%20Accepting%20Yourself.pdf>

<https://positivepsychology.com/self-confidence-self-belief/>

* **Document** your internals map as a resource to use for your work throughout this sequence.

Step Three

Brainstorm/research/assemble ideas to **create a list** of concrete, specific, tangible, nameable, existing, real **examples** of what you could realistically purchase or could contract to create/produce by **spending ALL of** your windfall money by June 30 on **THIS objective ONLY**:

Celebrate ***what’s working* for YOUR PERSONAL emotional/ mental well-being AND** improve***what’s not* THIS SUMMER**(finish beforeLabor Day).

Step Four

Craft a detailed **Calendar and** **Plan** of purchases/spending in a format that captures

* activity time/date schedule(s), venue(s)/location(s), equipment/supplies/staff, etc
* each specific item/contracted service, rental, etc and the amount of each item/duration of contract you buy (June 30, 2025 is final date allowed for purchase; August 30 is last date for activities to be scheduled)
* how/how much/through whom (cite vendor/contractee and terms of sale--incl. tax, shipping, license fee, etc) your money goes to pay for each purchase
* way(s) each item/service contributes to achieving *THIS* OBJECTIVE

**Document**, save and SUBMIT your *Celebration Purchasing Plan* as a sequence assignment by March 16 midnight.

**KNOWN UNKNOWNS FOR MAJOR PAPER 2**

* You must **disburse** **ALL $5 million** (USD, using exchange rate on Feb 5, 2025)—not a penny over and not a penny under—to documented, existing vendors of products, commodities or services including applicable taxes, delivery charges, etc.
* Purchase and delivery/possession of item/service must be complete by June 30, 2025 (everything you buy must be **realistically accessible to you on July 1, 2025,** *not arriving/finishing after that date*)—budget the costs/time of installation, set up, etc for anything you are not realistically capable of DIY.
* **No funds may be placed/held in accounts or securities** (so no buying bonds, shares, insurance, etc); **no transferring funds** to other **parties** so they can pay you back/rent/interest, etc after June 30—what you have purchased on June 30 is all you’ve got.
* **No speculative financing** (no use of dividends, profits, salary, inheritance or other unrealized, FUTURE funds) to achieve your objective; **only the $5 million can be used to purchase resources for the objective** “in hand” June 30.
* Your starting point is this: You ONLY “have *ensured* access to”
	+ the **materiel YOU, PERSONALLY own outright currently** (clothes, shoes, bedding, toiletries, etc)—***not*** your family’s house, car, food, etc—and
	+ **your current knowledge, skills, experience** (not your family’s, friends’, teachers’, etc).

You cannot assume you would be access anything other than these for your objective or for resources beyond what you spend your $5 million to obtain by June 30 (potable water? fuel?, etc)

March 17

**Major Paper 2: *Well Actually***

YOU, the real person YOU, have just landed a windfall of cash—$5 million—that YOU, personally must spend by the end of the fiscal year (June 30). You may reuse/adapt sequence assignment responses or completely begin fresh for this paper.

Document **how much money you will invest in what specific ways** and JUSTIFY, using data from your research, **why your monetary investments will be plausibly effective at meeting the *clear, complex, significant, manageable* personal development objectives** you set.

Your paper should demonstrate:

* A line of inquiry beginning with class readings—Raypole’s and McLeod’s discussion of Maslow’s [Expanded Hierarchy of Needs](https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html)—and integrating IPIP-Neo or other credible assessment of areas of development strength/weakness (IPIP-Neo [instructions](https://ipip.ori.org/); [About IPIP-Neo](https://novopsych.com.au/assessments/formulation/international-personality-item-pool-neo-120-item-version-ipip-neo-120/#:~:text=The%20International%20Personality%20Item%20Pool,and%20adults%20(ages%2016%2B).) by NovoPsych)
* Research, collection, citation and analysis of data from additional [tertiary, primary](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#primsec) as well as [academic/ professional](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#acpro) [secondary](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#primsec) [sources](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#sourcedef) for documentation and for claims justifying your choices.
* [Outcome Traits](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#o1) (1.1; all of outcome 2; all of outcome 3; 4.1, 4.2)

Craft a detailed **Calendar and** **Plan** of purchases/spending in a format that captures

* activity time/date schedule(s), venue(s)/location(s), equipment/supplies/staff, etc
* each specific item/contracted service, rental, etc and the amount of each item/duration of contract you buy (June 30, 2025 is final date allowed for purchase)
* how/how much/through whom (cite vendor/contractee and terms of sale--incl. tax, shipping, license fee, etc) your money goes to pay for each purchase
* way(s) each item/service contributes to achieving *THIS* OBJECTIVE

**OD:**

personal development

clear, complex, manageable, significant objective

integrate

justify

**KNOWN UNKNOWNS FOR MAJOR PAPER 2**

* You must **disburse** **ALL $5 million** (USD, using exchange rate on Feb 5, 2025)—not a penny over and not a penny under—to documented, existing vendors of products, commodities or services including applicable taxes, delivery charges, etc. Include links/screencaps of order per item.
* Purchase and delivery/possession of item/service must be complete by June 30, 2025 (everything you buy must be **realistically accessible to you on July 1, 2025,** *not arriving/finishing after that date*)—budget the costs/time of installation, set up, etc for anything you are not realistically capable of DIY.
* **No funds may be placed/held in accounts or securities** (so no buying bonds, shares, insurance, etc); **no transferring funds** to other **parties** so they can pay you back/rent/interest, etc after June 30—what you have purchased on June 30 is what you’ve got.
* **No speculative financing** (no use of dividends, profits, salary, inheritance or other unrealized, FUTURE funds) to achieve your objective; **only the $5 million can be used to purchase resources for the objective** “in hand” June 30.
* Your starting point is this: You ONLY “have *ensured* access to”
	+ the **materiel YOU, PERSONALLY own outright currently** (clothes, shoes, bedding, toiletries, etc)—***not*** your family’s house, car, food, etc—and
	+ **your current knowledge, skills, experience** (not your family’s, friends’, teachers’, etc).

You cannot assume you would be access anything other than these for your objective or for resources beyond what you spend your $5 million to obtain by June 30

April 14

It’s the last quarter of the year! Here’s what’s left:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Apr 15 | Major Paper 3 overview |
| May 18 | Final date to submit complete Major Paper 3 draft for comments |
| Jun 5 | PORTFOLIO DEADLINE submission is midnight—no late Portfolios accepted! No URLs—uploads only. |

To get us started, let me share a favorite study—as an exemplar idea for a Major Paper 3 project:

Bennett et al. 2009 [**Neural Correlates Of Interspecies Perspective Taking In The Post-Mortem Atlantic Salmon**](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=neural+correlates+of+interspecies+perspective+taking+in+the+post-mortem+atlantic+salmon&hl=en&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholart)

April 15



Time to reveal myself. I am a ***wicked*** composition teacher. Huh, *what*?

Leverenz, Carrie S. "Design Thinking and The Wicked Problem of Teaching Writing." *Computers and Composition* 33 (2014): 1-12.

How can we teach writing in ways that encourages—and rewards—more divergent thinking? One way to start is by making sure writing assignments are, like design problems, ***wicked***, in Richard Buchanan’s (1992) terms: “ill-formulated, where the information is confusing, where there are many clients and decisions makers with conflicting values, and where the ramifications in the whole system are thoroughly confusing” (15). Many of us would acknowledge the wickedness of most real life writing tasks, but as teachers our impulse is often to take the wickedness out of writing assignments—we make our expectations as explicit as possible in order to avoid confusing or frustrating students. Obviously, confusion and frustration do not in and of themselves lead to creative engagement in complex problem solving; rather, we tolerate these unpleasant feelings because we are engaged in addressing a problem that we care about or because there is something compelling at stake for someone. But most of us also know the pleasure of working on a hard problem long enough that we ultimately find a way to address it. By eschewing easy or obvious solutions, wicked problems require us to think creatively about the problem as well as the solution. As a result, we come to own the problem—as our vision—rather than merely fulfilling someone else’s idea of what should be done.

**Major Paper 3: *Subversive Paradigm***

UW’s mission is, in part, to “discover timely solutions to the world’s most complex problems and enrich the lives of people throughout our community, the state of Washington, the nation and the world.” Use the *reading-writing-thinking-discussing-researching-questioning-drafting-rethinking-starting over-going back-going forward process* of composing to IDENTIFY a proveable **existing “**[**misconception/myth**](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#misund)**” related to your field** andFORMALLY PROPOSE valid and reliable **real world actions to correct/ respond to the misconception/myth** as required by the [**Grant Application**](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#grantprop)based on [National Institutes of Health **R03 Grant Proposal**.](https://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/r03.htm)

MP3 wicked design steps include researching, assembling and evaluating sources of data for hypotheses, methodologies, risks, project/test models, relevant locations, times, materials, participants, estimated costs, permissions, etc and appropriate research guides to successfully compose

* **an abstract** naming the misconception/myth, its significance to/impact on your field; and outlining the project steps, aims and likely effect on the public
* a [literature review](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qod2mKjCZey3k2dXmOUkgDeWmYoSCOOEUMRxqlYVy3A/edit#bookmark=id.2lwamvv) **summarizing** how5 academic/professional sources of research data/conclusions **validate** your hypothesis [what’s “truth” versus misconception] and **evaluating** documented relevant, effective methods used by others for improving/ correcting/ responding to analogous misconceptions in a valid and reliable manner
* a **rationale** for why proposed actions (methods) are appropriate for your specific, significant, manageable proposed project to succeed (effectively improve/address the misconception) and **description** of your project’s unique features/ innovation (how is it different than what has already been done)
* your project’s **timeline, sequence of actions, resources utilized** and **personnel involved**, actions’ estimated **costs** and **justification** for your choices to be necessary/likely to achieve the **results** you seek
* description of **significant risks/ difficulties** to the project’s efficacy—including alternate plans/alternatives to “save” the plan from failing from the most significant risks/difficulties.

**Model CONCEPTIONS that** [**pro/ac**](#acpro) ***researchers we’ve read* addressed as part of their research:**

**Broockman and Kalla:** Does partisan news media cause partisan views of the world, or is it *vice-versa*?

**Bennett et al.:** Are accepted measures of statistical significance valid for functional MRI studies?

…from Fall semester….

**Chang and Kajackaite:** Does physical environment (room temperature) significantly affect cognitive performance? Is the effect universal or differential based on gender?

**Denning et al.:** What actually succeeds in improving college student outcomes—changes in students? new resources offered? quality of the college?...or is it EASIER GRADING?

**Hitt, McShane and Wolf:** Do reported “successful” K-12 techniques actually improve long term outcomes, or do they just bump up assessment scores short term?

**Weatherton and Schussler?**

**Wang et al.?**

**Love et al.?**

Where/how to start?

**Preapplication Preparation**

**Step One**

Close read ([OD](#od)) the **Grant Application** on Canvas MODULES and my website. Filling out ALL of these parts IS your Major Paper 3. I pasted it in below, too.

Compose a list of questions to verify your known knowns and fill in your known unknowns. Baker will run Q and A on Wednesday.

# Grant Application (Major Paper 3)

1. ***Pre-application Preparation****:* Class readings to prompt your wicked problem solving. These are NOT eligible to be cited as sources of data (see Lit Review below).
2. ***MP3 Draft due date: May 18.*** *Components 6-9 below must be attempted to get comments*.
3. ***Portfolio*** *(including MP3)* ***due date: June 5*.** MP3 MUST BE COMPLETE for Portfolio to be complete.
* 200-400 word justification for how THE WRITING PROCESS for the co-application matches the complexity and/or difficulty level for the number of writers proposing to work together (including extra layers/steps/alternates for application project)
* 50-100 word explanation of each co-applicant's relevant experience/qualifications and assigned logistical role(s) in the preparation of the co-application.

4. *For co-applications*, a **Shared Leadership Plan** submitted by **April 25** for pre-approval:

1. **Purpose of Grant:** This opportunity is intended to improve, correct or mitigate a misconception with **small, self-contained projects** that can be carried out in a short period of time with limited resources. Your proposal must match this purpose to be considered.
2. **Project Plan:** The total project period may not exceed 366 days (1 year). Costs are limited to $50,000 total. *Proposed Plan* adhering to these restrictions includes:
	* **Timeline** detailing the sequence of steps planned to prepare, implement and process actions, with estimated durations (hours)/ target calendar dates, referencing personnel duties and resources (from budget) involved.
	* **Budget** detailing item/job title, actual cost, quantity/hours needed, vendor and USE/PURPOSE for each resource utilized in project’s steps (e.g., $X rental charge, Y days, Z equipment and staff hours used to record participant interviews).
	* **Alternate plan for critical action/resource** identifying specific “backup” alternative (replaced/altered) items, personnel, action and/or sequence; and the contingency accounted for (e.g., pre-charge & bring power bank in case of long electricity outage).

# Project Abstract:

1. 300-600 words, suitable for dissemination to the public.
2. Summarizes the **misunderstanding/misconception** and *cites sources* to justify its **negative impact**.
3. Establishes the misunderstanding's **relevance** to at least **ONE academic major/field** *citing sources*.
4. Outlines **proposed actions/experiment** to address (improve/respond to) misunderstanding.
5. Identifies **specific aims** (*how* actions will succeed in correcting/addressing misunderstanding)
6. Describes project's **significance** (likely positive impact of project for the public) *citing sources*.

# Project Rationale:

* + 750-1000 words, succinct and plain language appropriate for a lay audience.
	+ Documents **3 discrete** EXAMPLES/CASES of misunderstanding in actual (not hypothetical) situations.
	+ Establishes the **valid/correct understanding/errors in understanding** *citing professional/academic sources of evidence*.
	+ Compares project’s steps with *cited* **documented model(s);** describes the extent and intent of project’s INNOVATIONS.
	+ Analyzes the **feasibility/appropriateness** of proposed timeline and budget for actions (*why* they are likely to be sufficient/effective for specific aims) *citing data from credible sources*.
	+ Identifies **reasonable risks and/or anticipated difficulties** for implementing critical parts of the project; explains how **targeted contingencies** are adequately addressed by alternate plan of action.

# Literature Review:

* + CLASS READING(S) **quoted/paraphrased**; **explanation** of relationship *to project’s targeted misunderstanding, relevance, aims and/or significance*.
	+ ONGOING OR COMPLETED MODEL(s)/EXAMPLE(s) appropriately similar to project’s actions/experiment **documented; evaluation** of the efficacy of model's methods (strengths *and* weaknesses) *citing data from credible sources*.
	+ 5 or more SELF-SELECTED PROFESSIONAL/ACADEMIC SOURCES’ DATA **paraphrased/quoted; explanation** of source data’s relationship to *hypothesis* (correct understanding)*, methods* (steps of project), *feasibility/efficacy of steps, evidence of impact and/or project risks/difficulties*.

Owner/original source(s) MUST BE CREDITED for *any* material referenced, quoted, summarized or paraphrased in application; sources **cited in MLA in-text and works cited format.** Failure to credit owner/source is considered plagiarism**.**

Adapted from: <https://www.publichealth.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/legacy/R03_Guidance_Sheet_R2_Sept_2013.pdf>

**Step Two**

On Canvas MODULES and my website, you’ll find the following class readings for Major Paper 3, based on academic field:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Econ/****Govt Policy** | **Research:** **Academia** | **Education/****Life Sciences** | **Research:****Health Effects** | **Statistics/****Data Analysis** | **Psychology/****Culture** | **Medicine** | **Language** |
| Cassidy | Leslie et al. | Martin | Freedman | Wolchover | Love | MMWR | Williams |

Read the source assigned to your future field of study AND read **at least 1 other** of the above sources closely. You are reading to inform yourself on:

* specific **misconceptions/myths** that cause real world problems relevant to two fields
* actual **methods** academics use to uncover/test myths/misconceptions and trace their effects in two fields
* ways improving/correcting/responding to misconceptions/myths **matter** to academic audiences
* potential positive **impacts** on the public of correcting/responding to misconceptions/myths

Analyzing the readings’ info for these gives you your [line of inquiry](#lineofinq) “ongoing conversations” sources for your Major Paper 3. You **won’t** use these as academic/professional **data sources** for your project. Instead, what YOU learned from them about academically significant misconceptions and/or improving, correcting, mitigating them is what YOU cite in the Grant Application Lit Review (#9). Class readings aren’t answers or support; they’re resources that open YOU up to possibilities and precedents to begin YOUR process of solving the Wicked Problem: **proving the existence of a misconception/ myth and determining an effective way to correct/respond to it that real world academic audiences** would find significant and appropriate for funding.

Model Research Project: Broockman & Kalla (on Canvas MODULES and website)

Model for abstracting research project aims, methods, etc “for dissemination to the general public” (#7) based on this study:

<https://www.cnn.com/videos/media/2022/04/10/fox-viewers-study-media-stelter-rs-vpx.cnn>

*\*Broockman and Kalla is not a class reading—so, it is eligible for you to use as one of your 5 required professional/academic sources of data for your Major Paper’s hypothesis (correct understanding), methods (steps of YOUR project), feasibility/efficacy of steps, evidence of impact and/or project risks/difficulties.*

What’s the [**claim**](#claim) that Broockman and Kalla are making (what hypothesis did their study PROVE)?

Model Research Project: Broockman & Kalla (on Canvas MODULES and website’s COURSE READINGS)

Model for abstracting research project aims, methods, etc “for dissemination to the general public” (#7) based on this study:

<https://www.cnn.com/videos/media/2022/04/10/fox-viewers-study-media-stelter-rs-vpx.cnn>

Why? Why? Why? Why? WHY?

So, what is the MISCONCEPTION, the inaccurate UNDERSTANDING, that Broockman and Kalla are addressing with their project? Is their objective correcting, improving or mitigating it?

For working on Outcome 1 and choosing an appropriate [MISCONCEPTION](#misund)--

**Outcome 1**: Simplifying the Major Paper 3 prompt to a question you feel comfortable answering (*what are people blatantly/completely wrong about and how can I easily show them they’re wrong*?) avoids the wickedness of the prompt, which dilutes the creativity, skill and “ownership” of your composing. For a majority of students, simplifying the prompt set the whole Major Paper up to be below standard, no matter how well written.

Major Paper 3’s thesis is ***NOT*** informing ignorance, resolving disagreement or righting wrong *views*. **It’s correcting, improving or mitigating a significant** ***misCONCEPTION.*** Your thesis is X would **cause an accurate (or *more* accurate) UNDERSTANDING or create a way around misunderstanding to achieve an accurate/appropriate outcome despite it.**

That means you can’t base your project on a simplified “myth” unless you want a below standard score.

Remember?—I told you that it can often be the WORDING you choose, not the ideas you have, that is the problem with your drafting thesis/claims. In the case of Major Paper 3, I am seeing a little of both. So, allow me to share a technique I have found effective as an instructor to probe a student’s statement, view, opinion for that student’s underlying conception or understanding:

**5Ys** [insert your Burger Place punchline here]

This is a technique to dig deeper into the **explicit** words of claims to find out what [warrants](#warrant) are **implicit**. Warrants, again, are understandings, assumptions, conceptions that the person making a claim expects you to share. When you don’t share the understanding, their claims become *implausible* whether they are valid or not.

5Ys is useful because Major Paper 3 isn’t you looking at wrong/right claims (too simple); it’s you addressing understandings that are inaccurate (wicked).

Here’s what 5Ys looks like as an interaction:

X, Y, Z Boomers: High school is easy these days.

Me: Why [is that]?

Boomers: Uh, ‘cuz kids these days don’t have to work as hard as we did.

Me: Why [not]?

Boomers: ‘Cuz computers and phones and stuff.

Me: Why? [How so?]

Boomers: They don’t have to think or know anything; they just look up the answers.

Me: Why [is that easier]?

Boomers: It’s harder to sort out information on your own, remember it all and know how to apply it than it is to just Google it.

Me: So, I see why you said “high school is easy these days.” Your understanding/conception is that current classes do not involve students in thinking and independent problem solving, only showing they have “rote” knowledge, which is different than how classes used to be?

If you aren’t interacting with the person, YOU have to analyze what they say in depth to tease out the clues to their warrants.

 If ONLY we had a technique for doing that. You know, one that is the BASIS of this whole class? That we have practiced over and over?

[OD](#od), dammit.

Target of your Writing Process: Differentiating [misconception](#misund) vs ignorance, disagreement or wrong view.

Technique to use: [5Ys](#fivey), remember?

Try it out!

May 13

Getting the sense that a reminder of what’s left and why it matters is needed right now.

**Year-End Portfolio (70% of class grade)**

Must contain the following items to be complete:

1. Final Major Paper 1—attempting ALL Fall and [Spring requirements](#mp1req).
2. Final Major Paper 3—attempting ALL requirements.
3. Year-End Critical Reflection—attempting ALL requirements.

This is graded according to the [Portfolio rubric](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cgadgm%5CDownloads%5CUW2022.docx#portrub) (see below).

What are the **Portfolio’s Spring Requirements for your Major Paper 1**?

In addition to revising so you meet ALL the requirements of the original assignment, you must ALSO:

1. In the **introduction**, if you do not already include them, lay out the **ACADEMIC *and*** **PERSONAL stakes** (why asking the question “Is what students are told by educators about succeeding in college accurate?” **matters** to YOU and to colleges).
2. In the **argumentation**, if you do not already include it, integrate a **PERSONAL experience or firsthand observation** as evidence to support your argument (is not cited, since you/your life is not a source). Summarizing, paraphrasing or describing it should help PROVE a sub-claim of your Major Paper.
3. In your **conclusion**, if you do not already include it, identify at least one **PERSONAL implicated next-step, action or change** (what YOU personally will/did do with the information you presented).

You can review the original Fall requirements for the Major Paper 1 on my website COURSE READINGS and on Canvas MODULES.

You need to submit a COMPLETE Major Paper 1 in your Portfolio for it to receive a passing grade.

**Year-End Critical Reflection**

Produce a valid and reliable self-evaluation of your Portfolio items, which includes all of the following:

* identifies specifically where/how outcomes traits are improved, consistent or deteriorated in the Portfolio compared to your Major Paper 1. (outcome traits: 1.1; outcome 2; outcome 3; 4.1, 4.2)
* evaluates the strengths AND weaknesses of your wicked composing process for Major Papers 2 and 3. (1.2, 1.3, 4.3, 4.4)
* explains what your composing strengths prepare you to do well in your planned 2026 work
* explains the likely effect of your composing weaknesses on your planned 2026 work
* concludes with next steps for improving composing weaknesses as part of your planned 2026 work

Portfolios will be assessed according to their demonstration of the following four criteria:

**Substantial in-progress learning and development of writing capacities, skills, and knowledges in learning outcomes**

Portfolios should demonstrate an in-process understanding of the writing knowledge and development/growth in the skills and capacities emphasized in course outcomes and as taught in the course. These writing skills, knowledges, and capacities include but are not limited to rhetorical/genre/audience awareness; critical reading and analytical skills; developing and supporting inquiry and argument; and responding to rhetorical situations by negotiating language and other composition choices within dynamic contexts and diverse audiences.

**Metacognitive awareness of writing concepts as well as of authorial positionality and the impacts, stakes, consequences, and ethicality of composing choices**

Within the critical reflection (or other reflective assignments), portfolio materials must articulate an in-process understanding/metacognitive awareness of the writing knowledges within the course learning outcomes and the stakes of why and how this knowledge matters for ethical and effective writing across contexts. Students’ reflections should draw on multiple sources of evidence, including material from their writing, specific points of feedback they received, and/or their own experiences to illuminate how their composition and revision choices draw on and negotiate writing knowledge, respond to their rhetorical situations, and account for their authorial positionality as well as the stakes, ethicality, power dynamics, and consequences of various composing and language choices (one’s own and others’) for diverse audiences.

**Substantial revision and metacognitive awareness of revision choices**

Portfolios should demonstrate significant revision and writing development over the course of the quarter and should reflect students’ metacognitive awareness of their revision choices in relation to project goals and the course learning outcomes. Revision must go beyond surface-level work and engage in various substantive revisions across showcase projects, such as rethinking and extending ideas and inquiries, listening and being accountable to different perspectives and arguments, incorporating critical considerations of one’s authorial social positions and ideologies into the revision and rewriting process, revising and/or nuancing composing choices for the various genres, audiences, and situations that students (and the assignments) are engaging.

**Portfolios must be substantially complete and include a critical essay that articulates student learning and writing choices in relation to the course outcomes and revised showcase pieces**.

To be substantially complete, portfolios should contain a complete compendium of all short and major projects (revised and unrevised). Assignments, especially the critical essay and showcase projects, must meet the criteria and expectations outlined in the instructor’s prompt to be considered complete. If students are missing some components of the portfolio or minimally meet criteria expectations, it is still possible to earn the composition credit (see below).

**Grading:**

**Meets All Expectations Portfolio** 3.7-4.0 (high A- to A+ grade range)

When read holistically, **portfolios in this category generally satisfy all criteria very well and are not missing any class formative assignments. Portfolios in the “Meets All Expectations” category must contain substantially revised showcase pieces and a critical reflection**; showcases and critical reflection meet the word count and expectations per instructors’ prompts. Each of the showcase projects must be substantially revised from students’ earlier drafts based on feedback from the instructor, peers, and/or students’ own reflections. Revised projects in the “Meets All Expectations” grade range might still have some typos and language issues, as well as opportunities for future revisions that went unaddressed, but the student should have awareness of and be able to articulate strengths and areas for improvement.

**Meets Most Expectations Portfolio** 3.1-3.6 (A- to B+/B grade range)

When read holistically, these portfolios generally satisfy criteria well but may be **uneven** in one or two criteria. **Portfolios in the “Meets Most Expectations” range should generally demonstrate most of the characteristics in the Meets All Expectations category. In the “Meets Most Expectations” grade range, there may be a few concerns** such as limited revision of one showcase project; an overall strong but uneven critical reflection and/or understanding of course concepts and writing knowledges within the learning outcomes; or a showcase that is present but may be slightly short on word count or expectations per the prompt. **If a student is missing major class formative assignments but all aspects of the portfolio fall into the “Meets All Expectations” portfolio range, a student might earn a grade in the lower end of the “Meets Most Expectations” range.** Portfolios that have a combination of several issues do not meet the criteria for the “Meets Most Expectations” range.

**Emerging Portfolio** 2.5-3.0 (B to B- grade range)

When read holistically, these portfolios generally satisfy criteria fairly well but are uneven across several criteria and/or they may have multiple missing class formative assignments. Overall, **portfolios in the “Emerging” range have showcase projects that are moderately revised from earlier drafts or might have uneven revisions where one showcase project is substantially revised while others are only marginally revised. Portfolios in this range must have critical reflections that do most of the metacognitive reflection described in the “Meets All Expectations” range, but these reflections may be overall less substantive, uneven, or spare**. While portfolios in the “Emerging” range may contain all of the basic components (critical reflection, revised showcase projects, compendium), they may have a combination of serious concerns such as: limited to no revision of one of the showcase projects; one or two showcase or compendium projects that are present but do not fully meet expectations; sparse critical reflections on writing choices; or uneven or misunderstanding of several learning outcomes and course concepts. Portfolios that exhibit all or numerous of these issues do not meet the criteria for the “Emerging” grade range.

**Minimally Acceptable Portfolio** 2.0-2.4 (C to C+ grade range)

When read holistically, these portfolios just meet most criteria and have room for significant improvement and/or they are missing some portfolio components. **Portfolios in the “Minimally Acceptable” range meet the minimum requirements for the portfolio, but might exhibit numerous concerns** such as: unevenly revised showcase pieces; questions about completeness formative assignments; little to no revision of the showcase pieces; formative assignments or critical reflections are attempted but do not meet expectations detailed in the prompt; critical reflections are very spare and/or show limited articulation of the writing knowledges/concepts covered in the class; reflections may not articulate or offer only a tenuous sketch of students’ awareness of their writing choices/learning outcomes; they may misunderstand the writing knowledge in the learning outcomes; or they might be missing a minor formative assignment (or two with no other major concerns). For example, given the program’s emphasis on revision labor and development and awareness of writing knowledges in the outcomes, these portfolios may show students’ movement towards demonstrating understanding of their writing choices and reflect some revisions implemented but do not evenly or thoroughly demonstrate the writing knowledge and skills taught in the course. **To fall in this range, both major projects, some formative assignments, and the critical reflection, even if falling short on expectations, must be present.** Students with portfolios in the “Minimally Acceptable” range earn the “C” requirement unless there are significant participation concerns that pull the overall course grade below 2.0.

**Does Not Meet Standards/Incomplete Portfolio** 0.0-1.9 (D to low C grade range or lower)

Portfolios in this category do not meet criteria. They are likely missing major portfolio components and/or **they may have assignments that do not meet assignment expectations.** Portfolios in the “Does Not Meet Standards/Incomplete” range might meet some of the requirements but are missing significant parts of the portfolio, such as a major project and/ or several short assignments, and/or a combination of several significant other issues such as limited or no revision of two or more showcase projects, several assignments that miss the word count or expectations, spare or missing critical reflection. **Most portfolios in this category do not demonstrate sufficient work to be credited with the “C” requirement**.