

October 2024

Flourishing in Academia: A Collaborative Writing Team Approach for Higher Education Faculty

Tamara G. Lynn
Northwest Missouri State University, tglynn@nwmissouri.edu

Shantel M. Farnan
Northwest Missouri State University, sfarnan@nwmissouri.edu

Adam M. Moore
University of Rhode Island, adam_moore@uri.edu

Jessica A. Rueter
The University of Texas at Tyler, jrueter@uttyler.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openriver.winona.edu/jaep>



Part of the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lynn, T. G., Farnan, S. M., Moore, A. M., & Rueter, J. A. (2024). Flourishing in Academia: A Collaborative Writing Team Approach for Higher Education Faculty. *The Journal of Advancing Education Practice*, 5(2). <https://openriver.winona.edu/jaep/vol5/iss2/1>

This Reflection Paper is brought to you for free and open access by OpenRiver. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Advancing Education Practice by an authorized editor of OpenRiver. For more information, please contact klarson@winona.edu.

Introduction

The measure of one's worth in academia is deeply intertwined with their ability to write and get published (Jensen, 2017). This production of scholarly writing cannot be ignored in our conversation surrounding an approach to collaborative writing, as adding to the curriculum vitae (CV) through the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles, chapters, and books is how higher education faculty achieve tenure and promotion. For faculty, producing scholarly work is survival in the *publish or perish world* (Savage, 2003). Pololi et al. (2004) noted most faculty receive little instruction on how to produce scholarly work. Thus, we propose a collaborative writing team approach that will aid faculty in improving their scholarship and promote a more supportive writing environment within academia. Furthermore, scholarly production is riddled with barriers which often hinder the success of many faculty. These barriers appear in a multitude of literature and need to be addressed to understand how we employed a collaborative writing team approach to navigate these barriers. The purpose of this article is to improve academia through proposing a collaborative writing approach focused on collaboration, accountability, and authenticity, which the authors developed and utilized. We include the exploration of barriers to scholarly writing while proposing relevant solutions, methods, tips, and tools to implement for effective collaborative writing.

Proposing a Collaborative Writing Team Approach

Our team consisted of a first-year Assistant Professor, a senior faculty member applying for promotion to Full Professor, and two mid-career Associate Professors. In addition to being at various stages in our higher education careers, we represented different states and university affiliations. The diversity of our writing team was advantageous to including varied perspectives in our writing. Throughout this article, we will provide a careful analysis into the driving factors influencing the culture of a collaborative team, how efficacy and efficiency in this approach to writing was established through the process, and the reasons and results which led to the endorsement of our approach.

Barriers to Scholarly Writing

When faced with the reality that the perfect writing situation does not exist within academia, we can begin to address the circumstances, myths, and barriers which hinder the production of scholarly writing. Academic writing can be an emotionally difficult task with psychological effects particularly when it is used as a measure of worth rather than a contribution to the profession or a learning process (Bryce, 2021; Jensen, 2017). Academic life tends to not be supportive of scholarly

production (Jensen, 2017), likewise, we found there are barriers within our everyday work life that make writing a challenging and stressful task when added to our other responsibilities yet is a passion we share. Among the barriers we each experienced as individual authors, collectively we connected to common barriers such as lack of time, lack of energy and motivation, avoidance due to anticipated failure, lack of support or guidance through the writing process, and uncertainty of how to navigate the scholarly writing process, therefore, learning how to overcome those barriers was an essential part of this collaborative writing process. Mills and Gitlin (2000) suggested to overcome these barriers, faculty need to establish the craftsman mentality, treating academic writing as a craft rather than an emotional task while avoiding rigid methodology. This still holds true today. Furthermore, many professors find the drama and politics in higher education creates fear and doubt such as ‘imposter syndrome’ which can be accompanied with a lack of genuine conversations surrounding writing and comparison to other faculty within the department (Jensen, 2017). Imposter syndrome is often felt by academics when they believe their academic abilities have fooled their peers (Jensen, 2017). These barriers and the lack of authenticity create a negative perception of the writing process for many scholars within higher education.

Flourishing as a Scholarly Writer

Although one of the main driving purposes of scholarly writing is production leading to promotion and tenure, the many barriers faculty members face make it challenging to produce quality scholarly work which often overshadows the intrinsic driving force of enjoyment. As authors, we wanted to participate in writing by working with others who share common interests and we each found satisfaction in achieving our goals. Sword (2017) noted successful writers wrote because they wanted to and they found pride in the production of writing. To find enjoyment and flourish as a scholarly writer, Janke et al. (2018) recommends authors “1) elevate the level of writing challenge, 2) experiment with creativity, 3) explore and cultivate curiosity, 4) exhibit courage intentionally, 5) approach writing with a growth mindset, and 6) examine and reposition [their] writing to align with [their] professional purposes.” (p. 3). Further, Jensen (2017) recommended having frequent contact with scholarly writing found enjoyable to create a low-stress experience. Schick et al. (2011) found community writing is productive and fun, therefore, our team did not want to fail to address enjoyment as a motivating factor for writing. Likewise, our team found further success and fulfillment resulted from the implementation of the collaborative writing team approach, leading to the desire to produce this article in hopes of fostering more positive attitudes towards writing in members of higher education.

Driving Factors

To grow professionally through collaborative scholarly writing, the driving factors with real meaning that go beyond the achievement of promotion and tenure were collaboration, accountability, and authenticity. Our team viewed this endeavor as a weekly professional development opportunity and mentorship between each other for both junior and senior faculty. For example, our team found during the COVID-19 pandemic, it was heartening to be able to support one another in our weekly writing meetings. In addition, the efficacy achieved through collaborative writing enhanced motivation and a belief that our set scholarly goals were achievable.

Collaboration

Updated technology has increased the ease in which teams can collaborate with one another using simultaneous editing platforms (e.g., Google docs) and video-conferencing software (e.g., Zoom) and has enhanced the collaborative experience (Oliver et al., 2018). Although these virtual methods assisted in facilitating collaboration, the underpinning of successful collaboration was the support provided to each other to accomplish a common goal (Ahern-Dodson & Dufour, 2021).

This collaborative writing team approach mirrors other initiatives in higher education utilized to leverage peer collaboration and support to assist faculty in achieving professional goals (Coria-Navia & Moncrieff, 2021). Through working together with others on an intellectual endeavor such as presentations, journal articles, or book chapters, teams have leveraged the expertise of individual faculty and maintained the individualization they each bring to the work (Oliver et al., 2018). The support provided through varied intellectual knowledge, different writing styles, and contrasting approaches to the work was reinforced even further by the accountability provided through a collaborative approach.

Accountability

Our team valued having accountability for oneself and for team members. Although differing levels of knowledge, skills, expertise, and experience may have led to varying degrees of distribution (Oliver et al., 2018) required for a collaborative approach, the process of developing norms and behaviors led to collective accountability for the group. The real focus on accountability is based on the commitments made to the endeavor and to one another as peers. This level of commitment and the accountability it provided served as social pressure and positive reinforcement (Silvia, 2007), which created disciplined writing.

The accountability needed for collaborative writing was focused on for multiple reasons. Not only did this process hold us accountable to the goals and writing to be achieved to learn, grow, and ultimately achieve tenure and a promotion, it moved us into the role of mentor for others. The process led us to learn from one another about the varied ways we approach writing, leading the process, and developing goals. These parts of the process turned into opportunities for all levels of mentoring and accountability where the mentor serves as a pipeline of resources to facilitate the team member's needs (Coria-Navia & Moncrieff, 2021).

Authenticity

For most higher education professors, scholarship leads to promotion and tenure which is a positive result, but often the process is spattered with competition, dread, worry, and stress. As a result, many early career faculty do not feel confident diving into the process. They may struggle with the writing myth of imposter syndrome and Jensen (2017) identified one way to overcome this is by writing productively. The collaboration and accountability provided in our approach supplied an avenue for productive writing and led us to more authentic beliefs in one's abilities. This format allowed for team members who have established trust, common goals, support, and accountability to begin to demystify this myth and allowed "participants to show up authentically and be together in the common enterprise of making progress on their work" (Dufour & Ahern-Dodson, 2021, p. 214).

As we continue to work on being successful in the world of higher education, we need to move toward breaking down the barriers and silos that are often fueled by competition, fearfulness, and the unknowns about the scholarly writing process. This also means we need to work on partnerships to be real and show our true selves to each other and the outside world beyond academia (Smith et al., 2022). Efficacy and efficiency in writing are benefits gained by all partners as we developed and honed the skills needed to hold each other accountable to the structure and routine needed to successfully collaborate to achieve our goals, both individually and collectively.

The Process: Efficacy and Efficiency Through Structure and Routine

The success of teams can be largely attributed to structure and routines making collaboration a reality and reinforcing positive habits (Rigby, 2020). We valued efficiency, organization, and structure. As a team, the fluidity of conversation and dedication to each other allowed for transparency in the discussion of norms and group goals and were foundational to creating a structure for team success. Our team structure consisted of: 1) critical collaborative conversations, 2) established

writing time and norms, 3) a timeline and accountability, and 4) organizational components (see Appendix A).

Critical Collaborative Conversations

Another important feature of our writing team was the level of transparency shared by each team member. Critical and difficult conversations frequently occurred and because each member was valued as an equal participant these conversations were made easier. We learned from past writing partnerships that not all teams work in the same way. Some writing teams have an equitable distribution of tasks, while others may struggle with finding a rhythm conducive for collaborating. This knowledge made all of us leery to jump into a collaborative writing team with colleagues from our professional organization. In fact, we co-presented at an international conference before we decided to write an article together. Finding colleagues with like-minded work styles and approaches to the writing process helped establish the norms we used to guide our work. Similarly, the process allowed for a variety of perspectives and experiences to be represented in our manuscript, which enhanced the quality of our analysis having four different approaches being utilized to investigate the topic at hand. This process led to valuable learning from one another. Below explains the ways in which our writing team worked to create positive and productive synergy.

Work to Team Member Strengths

When working with a group, it is important to listen to and support the expertise and skills team members bring to the table. As a group we realized some members were better suited to organize, manage, and lead our team. As mentioned previously, the lead author took time to prepare an ongoing agenda, organize our meeting schedule, and assumed responsibility for final edits. Establishing a point person for organizing the group was particularly effective at keeping our project on target. The lead kept track of the agenda, goal setting documents, sent reminders about meeting times, and ensured all voices were heard in the process. Other team members were skilled at seeing the “big picture” in our writing project, offering examples from previous publishing experience. Having an attitude of acceptance and honoring each person’s strengths helped our team have a cohesive process.

Commitment to One Another

Our writing team intentionally invested in one another’s professional and personal well-being. Because of the commitment that success for one is success for all, members felt safe in sharing personal accomplishments and disappointments and

professional triumphs and defeats. At the outset of our writing meetings, and as part of our norms, we extended explicit flexibility in honoring one another's lives. For 10 minutes during the opening of each writing group we shared with each other any personal or professional news according to each member's comfort level. For example, during several of our writing times one member discussed her parents' divorce and the resulting implications. In other professional examples, members shared various writing projects and progress, assignments, and teaching ideas. Allowing time at the beginning of the meeting for members to "catch up" eliminated the hijacking of our writing time with conversations unrelated to the current manuscript and the success of the project. This level of collaboration, trust, mutual respect, and shared interest in each other's careers allowed our team to foster goodwill and recognize one another as valued members of the team.

Established Writing Time and Norms

Within the norms and goals discussion, the issue of time was mentioned as a barrier everyone had as a concern. This barrier led to the establishment of a common writing time. The team leader used a survey meeting tool (e.g. When 2 Meet or Doodle Poll) to identify common writing times for the team and followed up by scheduling an hour and a half weekly writing blocks. A calendar invite for the virtual weekly video-conference meeting (e.g. Zoom or Microsoft Teams) was sent to the teams and each team member was dedicated to fully maintaining this "sacred writing time" possible while allowing flexibility for unplanned or unexpected work or family obligations. Furthermore, the team also continued the weekly writing time when one member needed to be absent to stay on track with the team's goal. This weekly writing time was used for the actual writing of the manuscript with a "no homework" norm which was strictly adhered to which meant we only researched and wrote during the established time. During the writing time, team members would mute their microphone and stop their video if they desired but would remain on the entirety of the meeting while working on their assigned section. Each of our team members found the efficient use of the writing time did not add any additional burden to an already full plate.

Timeline and Accountability

In addition to a common writing time, the team leader facilitated discussion leading to the creation of a timeline and accountability document referred to as the Work Day Agenda (see Appendix B). The agenda contained our team norms, a guiding prompt for our personal check-in time, the purpose, target audience, target journal for the manuscript, and a calendar with meeting dates and weekly work goals. This agenda was used by the team leader to facilitate discussion and led to greater

efficiency within our writing time. If the weekly goal was not met or our team needed more time, the last 10 minutes of each meeting was used to reassess the following week's plan and adjust as necessary, which allowed our team to stay true to our no homework norm.

Critical to the success of our approach was honoring one another's commitment to the process even when events or conflicts arose that prevented attendance during our mutual writing time. This verbal acknowledgement, which was often discussed as part of the group norms, extended respect that all members, even if not in attendance, were an equally valued member of the team. Personal accountability was a common characteristic all members of the team embodied and endorsed.

Personal accountability when working with our team meant each member of the group shared equally in writing and in the conversations during the meeting. Although not a requirement, during our meetings members turned their phones to *do not disturb*, and if a member was in his or her office, they placed a sign on their door indicating they were in a meeting and would be available later. Moreover, members, at their own discretion, also signed out email, turned microphones on mute, and set videos to off so they would have uninterrupted writing time. All these small actions led to greater accountability and participation during our collaborative writing time.

Organizational Components

Our team organized the work with a shared Google folder allowing for easy access and sharing. Attention to small organizational details helped. For example, a link to the shared folder was included within the weekly calendar invite to enhance the team's organization. Additionally, the Google folder housed the Work Day Agenda and the Brain Dump (See Appendix C) which is an advanced organizer that members used for brainstorming ideas for the article. Having all components necessary for the manuscript in one location such as the articles referenced, publication submission guidelines, other articles from the target journal, and our original notes enhanced the efficiency of the scholarly writing. The high level of organization ensured vital components were included and provided a sense of security to all members so no one was left searching for essential elements needed to complete this important work.

Conclusion

Collaborative writing teams have been established as an effective way to move scientific knowledge forward (Bryce, 2021; Kaye et al., 2019; Oliver et al., 2018). Our experiences further highlighted the benefit of working with colleagues in the

writing process. As higher education faculty, we endorse collaborative writing teams and believe the use of these teams can change the narrative. Furthermore, our lessons learned and recommendations for applying the collaborative writing team approach can help others go beyond promotion and tenure and to find success in their own scholarly writing.

Change the Narrative

Although the focus on writing and getting published does not disappear through this approach, the perception of it has moved to one of support, instruction, and learning through this process rather than existing as a measure of our professional worth. As a diverse team of scholars at various career stages, we made it a point to step back to allow the more junior faculty the opportunity to be the lead author. The more seasoned researchers explicitly named the challenges of writing with colleagues, when early in our careers. Feelings of intimidation, difficulty knowing how the peer-review process operates, and having mid- and late-career colleagues take over were common themes that emerged from previous shared writing. Naming these challenges allowed us to acknowledge past hurdles and develop a more productive and collaborative writing plan, which focused on mentorship and authentic support of one another.

Go Beyond Promotion & Tenure

The authors share similar philosophical beliefs about the importance of scholarship production and dissemination of novel information to the broader community. Though outward pressure to publish is deeply rooted in higher education, the motivation to form a consistent writing team went well beyond securing promotion and tenure in our respective careers. We found comradery, professional support, and enjoyment in sharing with the broader research community. With a combined 43 years teaching in higher education, we have relied on one another for support at various career stages in the writing process. Working together lessened the feelings of imposter syndrome and the viewing of writing as an emotional task. The approach allowed for true collaboration, accountability, and authenticity for us as individuals and as a team.

This collaborative writing approach provided us all with frequent, low-stress contact with our scholarly work, which was often avoided when writing solo and certainly previously caused much stress. The support and mentorship of one another assisted in lessening the stress, pressure, and even some of the barriers. The process provided us with relevant, easily implemented methods to move us all closer to our goals both individually and as a team. We endorse the collaborative writing approach and share the process, our lessons learned, recommendations, and

our successes in this article in hopes of changing your narrative, helping you see beyond promotion and tenure, and finding a team to assist you in honing the craft of scholarly writing.

About the Authors

Dr. Tamara G. Lynn is an Assistant Professor at Northwest Missouri State University. Her research interests focus on novice teacher induction, collaborative scholarly writing, online teaching, course design and development, educator preparation, transition services, collaboration, professional development, and autism consultation. She earned an EdD of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Dr. Shantel M. Farnan is an Associate Professor/Coordinator of Special Education Programs. Her research interests focus on collaboration, high leverage practices, diverse field experiences, partnerships with school districts, transition, educator preparation with a focus on early career, and virtual learning and teaching. She earned an EdD of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Dr. Adam M. Moore is an Associate Professor and Coordinator of Graduate Programs in Special Education at University of Rhode Island. His research interests focus on inclusive education, family-centered partnerships in special education, the experiences of disabled college students, social justice in teacher preparation, and diversifying the special education workforce. He earned a PhD in Education at The University of Rhode Island and Rhode Island College joint doctoral program.

Dr. Jessica A. Rueter is a Professor of Special Education and Program Coordinator of the Masters of Special Education at The University of Texas at Tyler. Her research interests focus on best practices of assessment of students with disabilities and translating assessment results into evidence-based instructional practices. She earned a PhD in Special Education at Texas Woman's University.

References

- Ahern-Dodson, J., & Dufour, M. (2021). Supporting faculty as writers and teachers: An integrative approach to educational development. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, 40(1). <https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.964>.
- Albert, T. and Wager, E. (2003). How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers. *The COPE Report*, <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2018.1.1>.
- Bryce, N. (2021). A year in a faculty writing group: Equity for women academics in higher education. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 35(1), 70-75.
- Coria-Navia, A., & Moncrieff, S. (2021). Leveraging collaboration and peer support to initiate and sustain a faculty development program. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, 40(2). <https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.970>.
- Friend, M. (2021). *Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Janke, K.K., Dy-Boarman, E.A., & Von Hoff, B.A. (2018). A Journey to Understand Enjoyment in Academic Writing. *Innovations in Pharmacy*, 9(3), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.24926/iip.v9i3.1526>.
- Jensen, J. (2017). *Write No Matter What: Advice for Academics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kaye, J. P., Brantley, S. L., Zan Williams, J., and the SSHCZO team. (2019). Ideas and perspectives: Proposed best practices for collaboration at cross-disciplinary observatories, *Biogeosciences*, 16, 4661–4669, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-16-4661-2019>.
- Mills, C. W., & Gitlin, T. (2000). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford University Press.
- Oliver, S. K., C. E. Fergus, N. K. Skaff, T. Wagner, P.-N. Tan, K. S. Cheruvellil, and P. A. Soranno. (2018). Strategies for effective collaborative manuscript development in interdisciplinary science teams. *Ecosphere* 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2206>.
- Pololi, L., Knight, S., & Dunn, K. (2004). Facilitating scholarly writing in academic medicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 19(1), 64–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.21143.x>.
- Rigby, A. (2020). *What Astronauts And Submariners Can Teach Us About The Necessity Of Team Routines*. Trello. <https://blog.trello.com/team-routines-in-the-face-of-uncertainty>.
- Savage, W. W., Jr. (2003). Scribble, scribble, toil and trouble: Forced productivity in the modern university. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 35(1), 40–46.

- Schick, K., Hunter, C., Gray, L., Poe, N., & Santos, K. (2011). Writing in action: Scholarly writing groups as faculty development. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 3, 43-63.
- Silvia, P. J. (2019). *How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing*. American Psychological Association.
- Smith, A. H., Grupp, L. L., Doukopoulos, L., Foo, J. C., Rodriguez, B. J., Seeley, J., Boland, L. M., & Hester, L. L. (2022). Taking teaching and learning seriously: Approaching wicked consciousness through collaboration and partnership. *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*, 41(1). <https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.453>.
- Sword, H. (2017). *Air & Light & Time & Space: How Successful Academics Write*. Harvard University Press.

Appendix A

Collaborative Writing Team Approach Components

<p>Critical Conversations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify like-minded, yet diverse professionals for collaborative writing • Commit to one another and to team member transparency throughout the writing process • Discuss and determine lead author and team member roles (revisit regularly) • Create team safety and focus on members' well-being through personal "catch-up" discussion time • Allow for team member flexibility by discussing attendance expectations, common goals, and work style preferences • Determine distribution of tasks on a regular basis • Have difficult conversations when necessary • Discuss team members' strengths and weaknesses to leverage expertise
<p>Established Writing Time and Norms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize a survey meeting tool to determine common, regularly occurring writing time • Create a calendar invite with link to shared Google folder and virtual meeting platform • Establish a sacred regularly occurring writing time • Schedule a regularly occurring video conference meeting • Document group norms in a frequently visited location • Adhere to a no homework group norm
<p>Timeline and Accountability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine a target submission date • Design a work day agenda with dates and anticipated work tasks • Start each meeting with a personal check-in and connection time • Revisit norms, project goal, and work tasks during each session prior to individual work time • Outline time commitment and norms for establishing flexibility within work day agenda • Maximize worktime through the utilization of time management tools (i.e.-Do not disturb on phone and sign on office door, closing emails, etc.) • Facilitate a discussion at the end of each session to clarify questions, revise upcoming work tasks within the work day agenda, and provide closure
<p>Organizational Components</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a shared Google folder to store all documents, tables, figures, author guidelines, and articles referenced • Add link to shared Google folder to the reoccurring calendar invite • Implement the utilization of a work day agenda to support organization and commitment to on-task work sessions • Document brainstorm, organizational ideas, and submission guidelines, etc. within a brain dump document to ensure vital pieces do not get left out or ignored as the manuscript develops

Appendix B

Work Day Agenda Example

Norms: This is our writing time. Homework is not a thing. Honor each other by extending respect and grace as life occurrences interfere with scheduled work time. We can be flexible in this group and with this work and still meet our goals.

Updates: Personal & Scholarship Goals

Plan: Following each meeting, revisit and plan work goals for the next meeting based on progress.

Article Purpose: A practical process for collaboratively producing and enjoying scholarship

Target Audience: All higher education faculty

Journal Target: <https://podnetwork.org/publications/to-improve-the-academy/>

Date	Notes	Weekly Goal
08/26		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Introductions/Catch-up ● Personal Goals for semester ● Processing takeaways-What worked/what needs to change ● Revise and edit norms ● Article goal-ideas and overall concept, target audience, etc. ● Journal ideas for submission (collaborative scholarly writing)
09/02		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No meeting
09/09		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revisit and update: Norms, Personal & Scholarship Updates, and Plan ● Revisit journal selection with Adam/re-read ● Skim a few previously published articles for “fit” ● Start outline purpose topic/discussion-revisit the brain dump and add to the goals we hope to accomplish by sharing our work

Appendix C

Brain Dump Organizer with Question Prompts to Consider

Category	Questions to Consider
Initial Manuscript Brainstorm	<p>Why is this concept important?</p> <p>What are we adding to the literature base?</p> <p>What are the key takeaways we hope to leave our readers?</p> <p>What diverse perspectives can we offer to our readers?</p> <p>What is the purpose of this article?</p>
Example Articles to Review in Target Journal	<p>What target journals do we have in mind?</p> <p>Can we link articles from our target journal into our shared writing space to reference and guide our own manuscript?</p> <p>What topics have not been explored in the target journal?</p>
Submission Guidelines	<p>What are the submission guidelines for our targeted journal?</p> <p>How many pages does this venue require?</p> <p>What (if any) special calls for journal topics are currently being sought?</p> <p>Does the journal have guidelines for types of submissions (i.e., book reviews, qualitative/ quantitative research studies, perspective pieces)?</p>

Writing Time Norms	<p>What do we care most about as a collaborative writing team?</p> <p>What is the goal of our collaborative writing time?</p> <p>What are our team members' concerns, apprehensions, and worries?</p> <p>What are the “dos and don’ts” our team is comfortable with?</p> <p>What types of experiences in past collaborative writing have been helpful or harmful to the writing process?</p> <p>How can we structure our time together so that we are productive and useful to one another?</p> <p>Will we require members to work outside of our dedicated writing time?</p> <p>What is our timeline for submitting this manuscript?</p>
Ideas and Study Type	<p>What theoretical framework guided our article?</p> <p>How new and novel information does our manuscript offer?</p> <p>Are we following the standards in our professional field in approaching our writing?</p>
Important Literature to Cite	<p>What previously authored empirical evidence supports our work?</p> <p>Are there practitioner articles that help explain our topic?</p>
Possible Topics and Headings	<p>What are the main points we need to discuss?</p> <p>Are these ideas: (1) grounded in literature; and (2) representative of our lived experiences?</p> <p>How can we divide up the various topics and headings for equitable work?</p>

Appendix,
Figure, and
Table Ideas

What types of appendices, figures, and tables (if any) should be used in the article?

What format does our target journal require of appendices, figures, and tables?

Author
Strengths &
Preferences

What strengths and preferences best suit each member of our team?

Who likes to write literature reviews?

Who is well-versed in APA 7?

Do each of us have time to commit to this collaborative writing time?
