Collaborative Writing

Faculty Mentors & Graduate Students

Workshop & Guide

CSU WRITES
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

CELL AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Table of Contents

FACULTY MENTOR

GRAD MENTEE

Dear Colleagues,

This project is a collaboration itself between Dr. Kristina Quynn, Director of CSU Writes (CSUW) and Dr. Carol Wilusz, Director of Cell and Molecular Biology (CMB). CSUW and CMB are Colorado State University programs invested in the successful research collaborations of CSU's research writers. The position of writing in successful collaborations may be so obvious to be overlooked and it has been little studied in the mentor/mentee relationship. This workshop with participant survey is a foray into our sharing current best practices for mentoring graduate student writers and to gathering data to better understand how Faculty PI mentors and graduate student mentees collaborate as writers.

We recognize the pressing need to understand, practice, and fine-tune writing collaborations. Scholarly careers are no longer built on sole-authored publications. Currently, more than 90% of STEMM publications have two or more authors and the majority of those include graduate students as authors. We also recognize that writing challenges (process, style, format, expectations, timeliness) reside at the heart of many of stressed or negative collaborations. The increasing pressures to streamline graduate student research writing into successful publications and proposals places unique pressures on the mentor/mentee relationship.

This *Guide/Workbook* is designed to accompany the spring 2020 workshops for mentor/mentees and to serve as a resource beyond the workshop. Our goal is to build additional mentor/mentee writing-focused seminars and series to serve the needs of faculty mentors and graduate student mentees.

We appreciate your participation in this workshop/surveys. Our work together will inform future projects for CSU Writes, the Graduate School, and CIMER trained mentors.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kristina Quynn
Carol Wilusz

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Collaborative Writing guide and workshop have been made possible by a CIMER grant from the CSU Graduate School, NIH, and additional funds from Cell & Molecular Biology.

WORKSHOP TIMELINE & PROCESS

SESSION 1

Introductory Session 1 for Graduate Students: 5/31,12-1:30pm
Introductory Session 1 for Faculty Mentors: 5/31, 2-3:30pm

Faculty Mentors and Graduate Students meet and discuss their responses to the Mentoring Conversation Questions and the Writing Reflections (est. 30-60 minutes)

Collaborators (Mentor and Mentees) decide on Writing Assignment and practice feedback techniques

ASSIGNMENT

Collaborators (Mentor and Graduate Student) continue to refine writing assignment.

Submit Writing Assignment by **6/30**

Collaborators attend 30-minute consultation session with CSU Writes facilitator in July or early August.

SESSION 2

Follow up Session 2 for Faculty Mentors and Graduate Students: 8/9, 1-3pm

Faculty Mentors and Graduate Students Complete a Qualtrics Follow-up Survey

COLLABORATIVE WRITING ASSIGNMENT

Choose one assignment to work on together before the second workshop.

1. *Student submits to Quynn a baseline writing sample with advisor feedback. If student has not yet received feedback from advisor on a piece of writing, submit feedback from another advisor or reader.*
2. *Student and Mentor select assignment and set expectations (timeline, format etc.).*
3. *Student prepares a draft.*
4. *Student pre-edits the draft with an eye to advisor's style expectations* before submitting to advisor for feedback (Session 1 information)
5. *Student submits writing to advisor with cover letter for feedback.*
6. *Mentor provides feedback using comments/track changes on Word/Google document and returns to student with time for student to revise (using track changes), incorporating feedback*
7. *Thus completed, the final or "feedback incorporated" document can then be submitted to quynn@colostate.edu by or in advance of 6/30.*
8. *Between 6/30-8/8, Dr. Quynn will meet with mentor/mentee pairs to discuss process.*

The conversation with Quynn offers facilitator insights and feedback to support the mentor-advisor/mentee-student collaborative writing process

The goal is for advisors and students to have a completed assignment with consultation and revisions available for common reference at the second workshop.

Assignments should be 0.5-2 pages (single spaced, 11pt or 12pt font, 1" margins)

1. An abstract for a conference presentation.
2. A perspective on a recent journal article in your field.
3. A specific aims page for a fellowship application.
4. A description of a method for inclusion in the Materials & Methods section of a publication.
5. A description of a multi-panel figure (as might be found in a paper).
6. Come up with your own assignment.

FACULTY MENTORS:
Reflecting on Professional Writing Experiences

Research writing is highly constructed and its production, demanding--regardless if we write for a specialized journal or to a communicate to a broader audience. As experts or becoming experts in a field of study, we gradually hone our skills through a variety of experiences with mentors, instructors, editors, and colleagues.

Reflecting on this professionalizing process can build awareness (meta-cognitive skills) by illuminating our oft hidden processes, assumptions, or expectations about the writing process, product, and practice. The better we know ourselves as field experts and professional writers, the better we can support the professional growth of graduate students. Consider your responses to the collaborative writing topics and questions below. When you meet with your mentee to discuss your mentoring/writing philosophy and background, you may wish to share some of your responses to help them understand you as a field expert, writer, mentor, and collaborator.

1. **Describe your approach for working with graduate students on their writing.** How formalized or structured is your process? How explicit are your instructions? How often do ask for drafts? How often and in what manner do you provide feedback?

2. **Recall a valuable writing training experience with a mentee.** What part did you play in the crafting of the document? What made the collaboration valuable or a success?

3. **Recall an example of when you tried to train a writer and it went poorly.** What were the circumstances and challenges?

4. **What do you understand to be the consequences of not having enough time to improve the quality of scientific writing?**

5. **What do you see as the consequences and/or outcomes of "fixing" graduate student writing?** What are some of the positives? What are some of the negatives?

GRAD MENTEES:

Reflecting on Professional Writing Experiences

Research writing is highly constructed and its production, demanding--regardless if we write for a specialized journal or to a communicate to a broader audience. As experts or becoming experts in a field of study, we gradually hone our skills through a variety of experiences with mentors, instructors, editors, and colleagues.

Reflecting on this professionalizing process build self-awareness (meta-cognitive skills) by illuminating our oft hidden processes, assumptions, or expectations about the writing process, product, and practice. The better you know yourself as a becoming expert and professional writer, the better you will communicate with your faculty mentor. Consider your responses to the collaborative writing topics and questions below. When you meet with your mentor to discuss your research writing background, you may wish to share some of your responses with your mentor so that he/she/they might better understand you as a learner, writer, and collaborator.

1. **Describe the process of producing a manuscript in collaboration with your faculty mentor.** How formalized or directed is the process?

2. **What are your strengths as a writer?**

3. **What are some areas for improvement?**

4. **Describe an instance of writing feedback and support that helped you learn and become a better academic writer.** What was the project? What was the feedback? What about the process did you find most beneficial?

5. **What do you understand to be the consequences of not having enough time to improve the quality of scientific writing?**

6. **What do you see as the consequences and/or outcomes of your faculty mentor "fixing" your writing?** What are some of the positives? What are some of the negatives?

SKILLS CHECKLIST for Competent Scientific Writing

Identify the skill competencies you currently possess or feel confidence about when you write. Consider the competencies that would most improve the quality of your writing **(focus time/effort there).**

☐ **Be Aware of Expected Document Organization / Structure.**
Most fields have accepted formats for documents like abstracts, manuscripts, reports, grant proposals. Take note of the preferred formats before you start writing!

☐ **Be Clear and Concise.**
Scientific writing needs to convey complex concepts. Extraneous words and phrases that do not convey useful information should be avoided. Complex words should be avoided if a simpler or more familiar word can convey the same meaning. Sentences should be short and simple. Avoid redundancy, and irrelevant details.

☐ **Master Field Specific Vocabulary.**
Each field has its own terms/jargon. It is important to use these words appropriately when writing for the expert (but avoid or define them when writing for a lay audience). Define acronyms.

☐ **Appropriate Use of the Passive and Active Voice.**
In general, the active voice is preferred ("We wish to suggest a structure for the salt of deoxyribose nucleic acid"). Methods sections more commonly use the passive voice ("A structure is suggested for the salt of deoxyribose nucleic acid").

☐ **Precision and Accuracy.**
Words like "significance" and "correlation" have precise statistical connotations and must be used with care. Be quantitative – "mRNA abundance increased 20 fold" is more informative than "mRNA abundance increased".

☐ **Minimize Figurative Language.**
Use metaphors and similes with care. Avoid clichés, puns, and hyperbole.

☐ **Synthesize Information.**
Avoid listing facts from different sources. Summarize and make connections for the reader.

☐ **Transitions.**
Make logical connections between ideas and paragraphs.

☐ **Citations.**
Know where and how to cite your sources. In general, you should be citing primary research articles. Review articles should only be cited when the topic is tangential to the central theme. Try to avoid listing more than two or three citations to support a single statement. Use a reference manager (Endnote, Zotero, Mendeley).

Basic Skills for All Writers – Foster a craft-to-expertise approach to continually develop skills.

☐ Spelling – *pay attention to your word processor!*
☐ Grammar and Punctuation – *ditto!*
☐ Paragraphs – *should support/describe one main idea.*
☐ Verb tense – *should be consistent within each section/paragraph.*
☐ Avoid repetition – *use a thesaurus judiciously (but see "Be Clear & Concise")*
☐ Use the right word – e.g. *affect vs effect, lose vs loose, accept vs except* (**tip**: peruse "commonly confused words" guides on the web or in a writing style guide regularly to learn or to refresh your memory.)

Resources:
The Writing Center - University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill - *Writing in the Sciences* https://writingcenter.unc.edu/tips-and-tools/sciences/
BioMedical Editor - *Clear Science Writing: Active Voice or Passive Voice?* http://www.biomedicaleditor.com/active-voice.html

MORE about Building Competency in Scientific Writing

GENRES OF PROFESSIONAL WRITING IN SCIENCE

Find excellent examples/models of each to study the structure (not the content) of the genre: the arrangement, the flow, the word-choice, and the authorial (personal) style.

Academic: course papers, syllabi, presentations, proposals, and more.

Scholarly: posters, articles, book chapters, encyclopedia entries, conference proposals, images/figures, abstracts, and more.

Professional: emails, cover letters, letters of recommendation, bio-statements, grant proposals, award applications, web pages, and more.

Job Market: research interest statements, cover letters, teaching/philosophy/ diversity statements, CV, portfolios…and more…

CLARITY & CONCISION - Craft-to-expertise

Clear economical expression of research is the mainstay of good academic writing and the pleasure of every journal editor and faculty mentor. The most common complaints from journal editors and proposal reviewers alike about the quality of submissions remains that the submissions are unclear, confusing, and verbose.

The challenge of writing with clarity and concision obviously exceeds any advice that might fit in this box or in a single workbook or workshop. Yet, what does fit are kind reminders:

- ❑ Approach research writing as a craft to be learned and honed over a lifetime of study -- you will continue to improve over time.
- ❑ Remember that telling the "story" of your research provides a crucial structure to organize your research for others, so spend time learning about the various ways that stories are arranged, make sense, and engage readers. There's not only one structure.
- ❑ Also remember that your research story will be constructed from sentences and words-- Get a good style guide and read examples of sentences edited (before/after).
    - SEE: Helen Sword's *The Writer's Diet* and *Stylish Academic Writing*
- ❑ Don't try impress readers (or yourself) but do revise drafts for pompous style (performing academic virtuosity) before submitting.

FIELD-SPECIFIC VOCABULARY vs. JARGON

A reminder from: Helen Sword's *Stylish Academic Writing* (2012):

Academics turn to jargon for a wide variety of reasons: to display their erudition, to signal membership in a disciplinary community, to demonstrate their mastery of complex concepts, to cut briskly into an ongoing scholarly conversation, to push knowledge in new directions, to challenge readers' thinking, to convey ideas and facts efficiently, and to play around with language. Many of these motivations align well with the ideals of stylish academic writing. Wherever jargon shows its shiny face, however, the demon of academic hubris inevitably lurks in the shadows nearby. Academics who are committed to using language effectively and ethically--as a tool for communication, not as an emblem of power--need first of all to acknowledge the seductive power of jargon to bamboozle, obfuscate, and impress.

Recommendation:

Read your draft with an eye to your motivation for using specialized language. Sword suggests that for every piece of jargon that you decide to keep, make sure you give your readers a secure handhold: a definition, some background information, a contextualizing word or phrase. By the time you have clarified your usage, you might even find that you can let go of the word itself.

PASSIVE & ACTIVE VOICE

In active voice sentences, the subject *does* the action. (The subject is clearly the "agent")

The biologist bisected the specimen.

In passive voice sentences, the subject receives the action. (The agent is "elsewhere")

The specimen was bisected by the biologist.

In passive voice sentences, sometimes the agent is omitted.

The specimen was bisected. (The agent is absent and "presumed.")

Arguments for ACTIVE Voice

- Active sentences are generally shorter and clearer.
- Active voice is more direct, engaged, and/or personal.
- Active voice "appropriately describes science."
- Many Journals prefer active voice.
- Passive voice sounds pompous & impersonal.
- Passive voice constructs ambiguous "agents."

Arguments for PASSIVE Voice

- Passive voice stresses what was done.
- Active voice requires personal pronouns.
- Passive voice is "more scientific." (crafting objectivity).
- Passive voice offers syntax (sentence structure) control. The writer can vary sentence structures for flow, connection, and interest.

FEEDBACK ~~Strategies~~ Culture for Mentors

While pursuing feedback strategies for collaborative writing, we do well to remember Peter Drucker's quip that "culture eats strategy for breakfast, lunch, and dinner." Meaning that the best strategy is to create a writing-focused lab culture in which graduate students are continually writing and receiving low-stakes regular feedback on their work (weekly or bi-weekly, if possible). Such a culture CANNOT situate the faculty mentor in the position of being the only advisor or reader to provide feedback. Who has that much time?! Instead:

Foster a culture through which lab/program members:

- Consider writing as process-oriented, not necessarily product-oriented, especially for developing graduate writers.
- Value and promote protected space and time to write.
- Display a willingness to share writing at any stage knowing it will be thoughtfully assessed.
- Understand that every writer has different capacities for production and quality.
- Consciously choose to think about writing as a necessary aspect of graduate student professionalization that may or may not be enjoyable, but should not be fearsome, daunting, or debilitating.
- Nurture a culture where seeking assistance and feedback is normal and aligns with best writing and mentoring practices. (modified from: Purdue, *Writing Lab*)

Clarify writing plans (projects) & agreements (process) early on:

- Writing plans and agreements you set with your graduate students need not be elaborate, but they should be clear and written down for quick reference. What is due, when and to what quality standard?
- Keep plans simple. Clear. Flexible.
- Check in regularly and as agreed (weekly, bimonthly).

Recognize diversity engage openly among your lab/program members. Some options include:

1. Start with a beginner's mind. Listen actively and without judgement to colleagues talk about their experiences.
2. Listen to understand differences in experience, belief, culture.
3. Craft a community agreement to signal appropriate community behaviors and collegial support for writers. A sample from CSU Writes:
    - Be present, honest, authentic
    - Listen actively and with respect
    - Share speaking time (avoid dominating)
    - Encourage others as participants
    - Be open to and considerate of other perspectives (race, ethnicity, nationality, sexuality, gender, discipline, rank, appointment)
    - If uncertain, ask clarifying questions
    - If challenged, respond with grace
    - After our time together, share only what is yours to share

FEEDBACK Stages & Types

EARLY STAGES: Non-expert or Reader-based Feedback

Writers can rely on a broad community of non-expert readers who may, or may not, have field-based knowledge. Have non-experts or outside-of-discipline readers review short pieces (1-5 pages) for a draft's readability:

- Does the draft maintain the reader's interest?
- Is the point, purpose, or argument clear?
- Do ideas flow clearly from one sentence to the next?
- Where do reader's get stuck? Where does the draft need more detail or information?

MID STAGES: Non-expert & Expert: Criteria-based Feedback

Writers can also network/connect with an expert or becoming-expert community of readers who can provide more in-depth feedback, perhaps on longer pieces of writing, about the MACRO structure (Big Picture) of the draft or about *micro* structure (sentence-level) quality of the writing. These can be peer colleagues, campus writing groups, committee members and advisors

To ask for MACRO or *micro* feedback, tell your reader when you submit what stage the document is in and what type of feedback will be most helpful (see cover letter on page 16):

MACRO issues:

- organization
- clarity
- gaps
- eliminate redundancies

micro issues:

- grammar
- punctuation
- style

LATE STAGES: Expert Feedback

As writers move a manuscript or proposal draft into later stages of completion, they rely on the feedback of knowledgeable readers who can provide field-specific insights, guidance, and corrections. As your expert readers to provide feedback on genre and research/scholarly specifics:

- scope of content
- accuracy (data, evidence, analysis)
- argument & development
- contribution (incl. connection to literature)

Collaborative Writing Types

Collaborative Writing
can denote 1) the production of a single text by two or more writers and 2) the production of multiple texts by writers occupying the same writing time and space. The first definition is most commonly used. When we hear "collaborative writing," we tend to think "a single text with plural authors." It describes most professional research and scholarly writing relationships today, and it is the primary definition shaping the advice in this guide May also be known as *team writing, collaborative composing, cooperative writing, collaborative authoring, group authoring, group drafting, group editing.*

Synchronous Writing
refers to the processes by which two or more writers work on the same document, section, or sentence at the same time. Writers may be engaged in drafting, editing, adding data and figures, tinkering with a bibliography, or any other tasks typical of building a manuscript. The document phase does not define *synchronous writing*, rather the definition hinges on writers working on document at the same time.

Asynchronous Writing
refers to the process by which two or more writers work on the same document at different times. Writers will pass a document back and forth (for pairs) or sequentially (for a team) to build, revise, and edit. Historically, the document would be generated and passed in hardcopy. Today, we commonly add to a digital document, use track changes and comments in the margins, and forward by email to our collaborator(s). Asynchronous is common to collaborative writing among academics, faculty mentors and their student mentees.

Collegial (or Lead Author) Method
refers to a mode of collaborative writing in which one research writer takes the lead on generating and compiling a working document for the group. The partner or rest of the team will provide editorial and field expertise in the shaping of the final document.

Sequential Method
refers to an asynchronous process of document drafting and revising in which each writer contributes their section(s) before forwarding to the next to add or edit (Lowry, et al. 2004).

Parallel Method
refers to the arrangements of synchronous or asynchronous processes for document generation in which writers produces designated sections of a document. When writing synchronously, collaborators may gather in a room (physical or virtual) to speak and write sections while one-member (lead author, scribe, or a subgroup acting as lead) compiles (Ede and Lunsford 1990, Lowry et al. 2004).

Reactive Method
refers to an arrangement of synchronous generative and revision processes through which writers create a document in "real time" (Lowry et. al 2004).

Mixed Mode (for Collaborative Writing)
refers to the strategic use of more than one of the collegial (lead author), sequential, parallel and reactive methods during the phases of drafting and revising their document.

Collaborative Writing Agreements

Agreements that support collaborative relationships are best generated through consensus on the needs and goals of each person in the collaboration. As writers in collaboration you can create agreements to support your work together. In addition to a general mentor/mentee agreement, these two writing-focused agreements would offer necessary support: 1) Mentor/Mentee Writer's Agreement--a relational and operational set of guidelines that supports the vision and processes of your mentor/mentee writing relationship and 2) Co-Author Agreement--a formal legally binding agreement of co-authorship.[1]

Mentor/Mentee Writer's Agreement

Your responses to the following questions can assist you in crafting a mutually agreed upon set of writing-related objectives and guidelines to support your mentoring relationship. If you already have a broader mentoring agreement, select topics--for instance, when and how often to meet--may already be covered by your prior agreement. Even then, you may find it helpful set separate meetings dedicated to the writing project itself. Please adjust and add questions to suit your individual needs.

1. **How often will we meet to discuss the writing project?** (*Some options: weekly, bimonthly, monthly, as needed*)

2. **How long should we plan to meet?** (*Some options: 10-15 minutes, 30 minutes, 60 minutes, 2 hours, as long it takes*)

3. **Who is responsible for setting the meeting?**

4. **How far in advance should writing be submitted to receive advisor feedback?** (*Some options: 24 hours, 2 days, 1 week, 2 weeks, more*)

5. **How often should writing be submitted to the advisor for feedback? And In what state should writing be submitted?** (*Some options: weekly loose drafts; monthly polished sections; multiple months polished manuscript/proposal, depends on the project and context)*

6. **What is the preferred method for submitting writing?** *(Some options include:* Email, Googledoc, Dropbox, OneShare, Other)

[1] *The authors of this workbook are not lawyers nor are they dispensing legal advice. To assure the legality of an co-author agreement, seek the advice of legal counsel.*

7. **When should revised documents (based on feedback) be returned?** (*Some options: 24 hours, 2 days, 1 week, 2 weeks, more*)

8. Grad Student Mentee: **What mutual conversations or support would most support you as a writer** (practice, process, product, project)?

9. Faculty Mentor: **What will mutual conversations would best support you as a writer** (practice, process, product, project)?

10. **How might we create a meeting space of trust, authenticity, and clear communication?** (*Some options: be present; listen actively; keep feedback directed at task and document quality [not personal]; be open to multiple perspectives--particularly those that arise from differences across race, national origin, ethnicity, sex/gender identity, orientations, rank, appointment; if uncertain, ask clarifying questions; if challenged, respond with grace.*)

11. **What shall be kept confidential?** *(Some options: all information disclosed within the mentoring relationship and personal disclosures about writing challenges; Exceptions include "legal exceptions" that might require information about a participant to be disclosed to a third party in situations where a participant is believed to be a danger to self or others, where a participant is in need of immediate medical attention, or where a court order or subpoena requires disclosure.)*

12. **What will communicate our commitment to this writing collaboration of faculty advisor and graduate student?** (*Option:* print and sign 2 copies your responses to the questions comprising this "Mentor/Mentee Writer's Agreement." Add a statement of commitment: "I understand the effectiveness of this writing relationship is dependent upon my commitment to doing my part in drafting, revising, providing feedback, and in meeting regularly about our writing project[s]. I commit myself to doing so, barring illness or emergency.")

COVER LETTERS: When submitting a draft to a mentor, graduate students can help facilitate a smooth feedback process with their reader/advisor by sending the draft with a brief cover letter (three sentences or a concise paragraph) that outlines: 1) what they think the draft is about, 2) what they think went well, and 3) what they still require help with.

Sample Co-Author Agreement (*from: APA.org*)

Contract Regarding Publication Intent

We hereby enter into an agreement, as outlined below, regarding the publication of the project *tentatively* titled: _____

FIRST AUTHOR

Name (print): _____ Signature: _____

Percent effort: _____ Activity Score: _____

Brief description of basic responsibilities/role on project:

SECOND AUTHOR

Name (print): _____ Signature: _____

Percent effort: _____ Activity Score: _____

Brief description of basic responsibilities/role on project:

THIRD AUTHOR

Name (print): _____ Signature: _____

Percent effort: _____ Activity Score: _____

Brief description of basic responsibilities/role on project:

It is agreed that authorship order may be renegotiated should an individual's responsibilities substantially change, or should an individual fail to perform their role as stated above. Furthermore it is agreed that if the project involves a student milestone, the manuscript (MS) or poster must be submitted for possible publication no later than 12 months from the date of the successful defense of the project. Should the manuscript not be submitted within 12 months time, it is agreed that the faculty supervisor will take primary responsibility for submission of the manuscript and will become first author.

Date contract signed: _____
Expected date of data completion: _____ Date project actually complete: _____ Expected date of MS/poster submission: _____ Date MS/poster submitted: _____

Sentence-Level Error Tracker

Graduate-level writing is expected to meet scholarly (academic, professional, and publisher) standards for language and style. Since "Scholarly Style" is no one's first language or dialect, the following list is meant to help graduate students focus on sentence-level issues that can be most problematic in scholarly writing.

Faculty mentors can create such list to focus their sentence-level feedback and help their student(s).

Errors that **will interfere** with reader understanding	
unclear	The meaning is not clear. The sentence should be re-written completely.
fragment	The sentence is incomplete
run-on or comma splice	Run-on – two sentences have been joined without punctuation or transition. Comma splice – two complete sentences separated by a comma
verb tense	The verb is in the wrong tense (problem with tense/mood/aspect)
syntax	Word order is incorrect or awkward
wdch	The word does not say what the writer me. If significant, the incorrect choice of word (word choice = wdch) can affect both the accuracy as well as the general readability of the writing.
Errors that **are likely to interfere** with reader understanding	
tran/conn	The connector is incorrect or missing
Dangling or misplaced modifier	Descriptor (modifier) is too far from the word it modifies (i.e., is misplaced); the intended subject that is to be modified is absent (dangling modifier).
passive	The passive voice has not been formed or used correctly
pro/ant	Pronoun reference is not clear, or the pronoun doesn't agree with its antecedent (the noun to which it refers)
wdch	The word does not say what the writer means, to the degree it can impact reader's understanding.
// or parallel	Mixed or non-parallel structures of lists, comparisons.
Errors **less likely to interfere** with reader understanding but affect the perceived quality of writing	
AWK/non-idiom	The wording is non-idiomatic, sounds awkward or is difficult to understand
prep	The wrong preposition is used, or the preposition is missing (*on, in, out, about, over, under, before, beyond, for, so,* and more.)
sub/vb	The subject and verb do not agree
Less serious issues that should be addressed by careful editing	
sp	Spelling
punct	Punctuation is incorrect or missing
art	Articles (a, an, the) are incorrect or missing

GRADUATE STUDENTS: Use your mentor's feedback to proactively target your sentence-level skill-building efforts. Track the number and type of errors your mentors or readers identify. Tracking your errors will help you see where your writing improves most significantly.

Manuscript	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Totals
Errors that will interfere with reader understanding											
unclear											
frag											
run-on											
bb tense											
syntax											
Errors that are likely to interfere with reader understanding											
tran/conn											
Dangling or misplaced modifier											
passive											
pro/ant											
wdch											
// parallel											
Errors that are less likely to interfere with reader understanding, but affect the perceived quality of your writing											
AWK/non-idiom											
prep											
sub/vb											
(other)											
Less serious issues that should be addressed by careful editing											
sp											
punct											
art											
Total per/submission:											

RESOURCES: WRITING & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CSU RESOURCES for GRAD MENTEES

Graduate School Professional Development Series:
https://graduateschool.colostate.edu/professional-development/
CSU Writes (shameless self-endorsement): https://csuwrites.colostate.edu
Writing Center: 30-minute consultations (not editing): https://writingcenter.colostate.edu
GRAD 550: STEM Communication (1cr course), Dr. Stuart Tobet, Biomedical Sciences, https://www.online.colostate.edu/courses/GRAD/GRAD550.dot
INTO CSU Grad Pathway (international graduate students)
https://graduateschool.colostate.edu/admissions-resources/intopathways/
WiSER: Writing in Science & Engineering to publish Research: (15-week no-cr. course) Dr. Susan DeLong, Civil & Environmental Engineering, on CANVAS

CSU RESOURCES for FACULTY MENTORS

CSU Talent Development: https://training.colostate.edu
CSU Writes (another shameless self-endorsement): https://csuwrites.colostate.edu
Graduate Center for Inclusive Excellence (GCIM): https://graduateschool.colostate.edu/diversity/
CIMER Trained Mentors (see below)
Center for the Improvement of Mentored Experiences in Research (CIMER):
https://cimerproject.org/mission-history/
Scientific Communication Advances Research Excellence (SCOARE): "Mentor Resource" page
https://www.scoareresources.com/for-mentors

RECOMMENDED READS for FACULTY & GRAD WRITERS

CSU Writes has copies of the following and can loan them, if you wish. Email query to: csuwrites@colostate.edu

Allen, Jan. (2019) *The Productive Graduate Student Writer*. Stylus Pub.

Glasman-Deal, Hillary. (2009) *Science Research Writing for Non-Native Writers of English*. LCP.

Goodson, Patricia. (2017) *Becoming an Academic Writer: 50 Exercises for Paced, Productive, and Powerful Writing*. 2nd ed. Sage Pub.

Heard, Stephen. (2016) *The Scientist's Guide to Writing: How to Write More Easily and Effectively throughout Your Scientific Career*. Princeton U Press.

Jensen, Joli. (2017) Write No Matter What: Advice for Academic Writers. Chicago U Press.

Schimel, Joshua. (2012) *Writing Science: How to Write Papers that Get Cited and Proposals that Get Funded*. Oxford U Press.

Swales, John and Christine Feak. (2012) *Academic Writing for Graduate Students.* 3rd ed. U Michigan Press.

Sword, Helen. (2017) *Air & Light & Time & Space.* Harvard U Press.

RECOMMENDED READS for FACULTY for MENTORING GRAD WRITERS

Casanave, Christine Pearson. (2016) "What Advisors Need to Know about the Invisible 'Real-Life' Struggles of Doctoral Dissertation Writers." *Supporting Graduate Student Writers: Research, Curriculum, and Program Design.* U. Mich. Press.

Goodson, Patricia. (2017) *Becoming an Academic Writer: 50 Exercises for Paced, Productive, and Powerful Writing.* 2nd ed. Sage Pub.

Kamler, Barbara and Pat Thomson. (2006) *Helping Doctoral Students Write: Pedagogies for Supervision.* Routledge.

Purdue Writing Lab. (2018) *Working with Graduate Student Writers* https://owl.purdue.edu/writinglab/faculty/documents/Writing_Lab_Faculty_Guide_Summer_%202018.pdf

University of Minnesota. "Guide for working with Non-Native English Writers." (not grad-specific, but techniques are relevant.) http://writing.umn.edu/sws/assets/pdf/WorkingNonnativeSpeakers.pdf