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Please fill in the gray areas on this form.

Date

☑ First Edition of Writing Plan

☐ Subsequent Edition of Writing Plan: previous plan submitted SEM/YR, First edition submitted SEM/YR

Department of Civil, Environmental, and Geo- Engineering (CEGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Unit Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil, Environmental, and Geo- Engineering</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEC Faculty Liaison (print name)

maras002@umn.edu

Email

maras002@umn.edu

Phone

612-625-5558

Writing Plan ratified by Faculty

Note: This section needs to be completed regardless of Writing Plan edition.

Date: 04/24/2015

If Vote: 21 / 25

# yes / # total

Process by which Writing Plan was ratified within unit (vote, consensus, other- please explain):

A secret vote was taken during the last faculty meeting of the spring semester. There were 21 "yes" votes and 4 "abstain" votes.
II. Unit Profile: CEGE

*Please fill in the gray areas on this form.*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments about Faculty/Instructors**

**Major(s)**

*Please list each major your Unit offers:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Total # students enrolled in major as of Spring 2015</th>
<th>Total # students graduating with major AY 14-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo- Engineering</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEC Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># participated / # invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>28 / 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>December 17</td>
<td>7 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3a</td>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>15 / 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3b</td>
<td>March 27</td>
<td>20 / 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>April 3</td>
<td>19 / 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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IV. Writing Plan Narrative

Please retain section headers and prompts in your plan.

Executive Summary (1-page maximum): For what reason(s) did this unit (department, school, college) become involved in the WEC project? What key implementation activities are proposed in this edition of its Writing Plan and what, briefly, is the thinking behind these proposed activities? If this is a second+ edition of this unit’s Writing Plan, please describe activities that have been successfully completed and those that are new to this edition.

The Department of Civil Engineering, now the Department of Civil, Environmental, and Geo- Engineering (CEGE), applied two years ago to engage with the Writing-Enriched Curriculum (WEC) Project and was waitlisted the first year. The involvement in the WEC project was triggered by the desire to improve the writing abilities of CEGE students. For years, faculty in the department had numerous conversations on how to improve these abilities, but lack of resources and time had prevented us from making any significant improvements in this direction. We plan to use WEC to clarify and connect the writing expectations for courses offered in the department to address complaints from students over the years about expectations being unclear and different for each course.

The main goal of this first edition of the Writing Plan is to better understand where the department is and then propose activities to further improve the plan and move to the next step of strategic deployment of resources to address desired writing abilities throughout the entire curriculum and not in only the two writing intensive courses. The key implementation activities proposed in this first edition are:

- Further develop (and refine) the curricular matrix: break out between majors and core requirements and electives
- Use the criteria menu in order to provide consistent feedback to students on writing
- Develop instructional supports (consultations/workshops) focused on collaboration, peer review, group work
- Develop a style guide as a dynamic library of templates and well-written student samples.

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

If this is a subsequent edition and changes have been made to this list, please highlight and explain the changes.

Based on the results of the survey and faculty discussions in the first two faculty meetings, the following discipline specific writing characteristics were identified:

Logically-prepared and presented
- Logical structure in overall organization
- Paragraphs and sentences arranged logically by showing linearity of ideas (e.g., If “A” happens, then “B,” and so forth)
- Orderly and logical at level of writing mechanics (e.g., by providing transitional phrases connecting one part in the sequence to another)

Clear and efficient
- Precise, coherent, and focused; sentences are crisp, terse, succinct, yet communicate all that is needed
- Short but sufficient; descriptive but complete (for example: “the composite wall includes at least two masonry wythes joined by a collar joint that is filled with grout or mortar”)
- Apt for requirements and expectations of the specific writing task
- Thoughtful and attentive to given instructions

*Adjectives, or adjectival phrases are typically most useful here, for example, “transparent to logic,” (Nursing); “Analytic (versus journalistic) and argumentative” (Political Science).
- Comprehensive in responding to all that was asked

**Grammatically and mechanically sound**
- Avoids grammatical errors and misspellings
- Provides adequate citations to references and sources whenever needed
- Uses quantity units properly and consistently
- Features some visual appeal and is visually legible (uniformity, spacing, shapes, etc.)

**Effectively integrates different types of writing**
- Math and prose clearly integrated
- Descriptive, qualitative writing
- Quantitative results stand out whenever present
- Figures and drawings of structure(s) properly and clearly integrated into writing
- Verbal explanations provided between formulas whenever needed

**Focused and purposeful**
- Articulates how writing is a contribution to human knowledge
- Synthesizes concepts into bigger ideas
- Includes clear presentation of different parts of presentation (e.g., description of assumptions, evaluations, definition of hypothesis, presentation of conclusions)
- Recognizes the different audiences for different writing tasks and makes proper adjustments
- Logic is effectively transparent to audience
- Writing is effectively shareable by meeting requirements for reproducibility

**Intentional in writing choices**
- Captures the most important concepts
- Features important observations with appropriate prominence
- Encourages singular, intended interpretation
- Helps reader understand what was done, how it was done, and for what reason
- Demonstrates clear thinking and understanding

---

**Section 2: DESIRED WRITING ABILITIES **: With which writing abilities should students in this unit’s major(s) graduate? If this is a subsequent edition and changes have been made to this list, please highlight and explain the changes.

The following represents the faculty generated list of writing abilities that CEGE majors should be able to demonstrate by the time they graduate. The list is a result of discussions during the first three WEC faculty meetings in the department. The focus of this list is on what students are able to do.

1) Evidences appropriate pre-planning processes and sufficient levels of knowledge
2) Recognizes and uses audience specific writing conventions
3) Uses and defines appropriate terminology and notation
4) Makes effective use of charts, visuals, and non-textual representations
5) Organizes communications effectively
6) Presents technical processes effectively
7) Describes uncertainty of analysis

**Verbs or verbal phrases are typically most useful here, for example, “Take a principled, not arbitrary position” (Geography); “Visually represent designs and explain salient features of a part or concept” (Mechanical Engineering).**
8) Expresses complex data succinctly but comprehensively
9) Clearly communicates abstract ideas or complicated phenomenon
10) Writes with proper mechanics and formal presentation (grammar, proofreading, etc.)
11) Demonstrates proper scholarship and avoids plagiarism
12) Critically evaluates own work

Section 3: INTEGRATION OF WRITING INTO UNIT’S UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM: How is writing instruction currently positioned in this unit’s undergraduate curriculum (or curricula)? What, if any, structural plans does this unit have for changing the way that writing and writing instruction are sequenced across its course offerings? With what rationales are changes proposed and what indicators will signify their impact?
If this is a subsequent edition and changes have been made, please highlight and explain the changes.

CEGE’s curricular matrices were created from the worksheets faculty completed for their classes and discussed during the third WEC faculty meeting. These matrices provide faculty with a snapshot of curricular connections or gaps, which were used to develop the implementation activities for the first edition of the Writing Plan.

Based on the results from Matrix 1 (instructional address of desired writing abilities), it was concluded that there are criteria that don’t seem to be well-addressed, that in the future it would be interesting to see these broken out by the three majors, and that the three writing abilities seeing the least explicit instruction according to instructor response include 1) read, cite, and summarize literature, 2) recognize or evidence cause-consequence relationships, and 3) express complex data succinctly without sacrificing depth and richness of information.

The results in Matrix 2 (student proficiency levels at entrance to a course) generated many discussions among faculty without reaching a consensus on the definition of proficiency levels for different courses. One faculty member remarked, “I think they are all novices because they are undergraduate students.” Another faculty member noted, “My interpretation was that novice is where they enter our program, advanced is when they graduate. If we all have different interpretations of this then this is has zero value. We need a norm.”

Most faculty responses to Matrix 3 (instructor willingness to adjust or add instruction) were positive, which indicates a high willingness of the department to change writing instruction in CEGE classes.

No specific changes were suggested related to course sequencing or course offerings in order to ensure that students experience a specific sequence of writing instruction in the CEGE curriculum. Instead, most faculty favor having existing courses work more intentionally with writing instruction. The department head added that, as part of the strategic plan effort, some curricular changes are being considered, but they are not related to writing.

Section 4: ASSESSMENT of STUDENT WRITING: What concerns, if any, have unit faculty and undergraduate students voiced about grading practices? What, if any, new grading systems or practices are proposed, whether for individual courses or for a program? How satisfied is the unit faculty that students are adequately familiar with writing expectations? What do these expectations look like when they are translated into grading criteria? Please include a menu of criteria extrapolated from the list of Desired Writing Abilities provided in Section II of this plan. (This menu can be offered to faculty/instructors for selective adaptation and will function as a starting point in the WEC Project’s longitudinal rating process.)
If this is a subsequent edition, please describe faculty reaction to the most recent report of triennial rating results and highlight changes made to the menu of criteria.
Many faculty indicated dissatisfaction with the level of student writing. It was pointed out that the progression or lack thereof, affects students’ ability to meet expectations at the point of graduation, which indicates that there may be some places for intervention in the curriculum.

At the end of the third WEC meeting, a menu of grading criteria, which CEGE faculty and instructors can use to assess the desired writing abilities, was developed. Examples of the criteria and the writing abilities are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABILITY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty generated list of writing abilities CEGE majors should be able to demonstrate by the time they graduate</td>
<td>Grading criteria that CEGE faculty and instructors can use in courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus is on what students are able to do</td>
<td>Criteria to be used in WEC rating process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus is on what appears in writing itself...i.e., follows from the prompt, “The text...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Shows evidence of appropriate pre-planning processes and sufficient levels of knowledge

1a. Provides a preliminary list of steps or flow chart of major processes
1b. Identifies salient features and main topics of reading, including “gaps,” unstated assumptions, and problems to be addressed
1c. Unambiguously names purpose of writing
1d. Identifies or names potential sources of error

2) Recognizes and uses audience specific writing conventions

2a. Is written in tone, voice, and style appropriate to specified audience
2b. Specifies the audience when necessary

3) Uses and defines appropriate terminology and notation

3a. Uses terminology and notation correctly
3b. Uses terminology and notation that best transmits message to target audience (including avoiding jargon for readers outside field)

4) Makes effective use of charts, visuals, and non-textual representations

4a. Uses non-word based descriptions (visuals, tables, code, etc.) as appropriate to communication task
4b. Includes visuals that are drawn or drafted legibly
4c. Effectively incorporates mathematical equations and formulas into prose
4d. Uses consistent method of presentation of visuals
4e. Properly numbers, labels, and references visuals (legend, axes, in-text references, etc.)

5) Organizes communications effectively

5a. Sequences thoughts, words, notations, and results according to recognizable logic
5b. Omits needless words, sentences, and paragraphs
5c. Uses an organization scheme appropriate to purpose of assignment

6) Presents technical processes effectively

6a. Outlines process used to arrive at technical results
6b. Moves from problem statement to solution
6c. Presents processes such that they can be repeated by others
Section 5: SUMMARY of IMPLEMENTATION PLANS and REQUESTED SUPPORT: Based on above discussions, what does the unit plan to implement during the period covered by this plan? What forms of instructional support does this unit request to help implement proposed changes? What are the expected outcomes of named support? If this is a subsequent edition, please comment on previously implemented activity and its assessment prior to describing new plans.

The key implementation activities proposed in this first edition of the CEGE Writing Plan are:
• Further develop (and refine) the curricular matrix: break out between majors and core requirements and electives
• Use the criteria menu in order to provide consistent feedback to students on writing
• Develop instructional support (consultations/workshops) focused on collaboration, peer review, group work
• Develop a style guide as a dynamic library of templates and well-written student samples.

To successfully perform these key activities, the department requests the following instructional support:

1) One 25% writing RA position for two semesters to systematically collect information from the CEGE courses offered over one academic year to further develop the curricular matrix and help develop the style guide. It is anticipated that in Fall 2015, the RA will go through Phase I of conducting interviews, gathering syllabi and other relevant course materials that will be assembled in a master database. In Spring 2016, the RA will start to develop the style guide and other supporting materials, and in mid-spring the RA will make the style guides available for instructional use. This will include developing components of the CEGE website where students will have access to writing related documents and guidelines. The RA will work closely with Dr. Merry Rendahl, CEGE writing specialist, who will provide guidance on how
to utilize the information collected most effectively in terms of actual teaching practices. The work will be supervised by the CEGE faculty liaison.

2) Two workshops per semester for departmental faculty and TAs on writing assignment design and grading of writing assignments. The workshops will be coordinated by the WEC consultants, the CEGE writing specialist, and CEGE faculty liaison.

The workshops will be offered on Friday afternoons, during times when no classes are scheduled and faculty plan for departmental meetings. All faculty will be encouraged to come; many of the faculty have expressed a willingness to make changes to incorporate more writing in their classes, and lunch may be offered as a further incentive for participation.

Workshop topics might include helping instructors develop writing assignment(s) for their classes, helping instructors integrate the criteria (which were developed as part of the WEC process to develop consistent feedback for students on writing in engineering) into their grading rubrics, helping instructors develop efficient ways to deliver feedback to students on writing, and evaluating the effectiveness of implemented writing assignments. All of these topics will contribute to discussions and incremental changes leading to the integration of desired writing abilities throughout the CEGE curriculum. Specific feedback can be gathered from faculty participants about the use of writing in their classes.

Section 6: PROCESS USED TO CREATE THIS WRITING PLAN: How, and to what degree, were stakeholders in this unit (faculty members, instructors, affiliates, teaching assistants, undergraduates, others) engaged in providing, revising, and approving the content of this Writing Plan?

The process to create the writing plan consisted of a number of activities: WEC liaison meetings attended by the department faculty liaison, WEC survey at the beginning of the program, and four WEC faculty meetings organized and prepared by WEC consultants and the faculty liaison. A summary of the four faculty meeting is presented below.

Meeting #1 - November 14, 2014: 12:00-2:00pm
Attendees: 28 (85%) faculty members, CEGE writing specialist, and 3 WEC consultants
Handouts Presented: Selected WEC survey results
Meeting objectives: (a) review the results of faculty, student, TA, and affiliate surveys and (b) begin to create content for the unit’s Writing Plan by generating a list of writing characteristics and abilities relevant to CEGE curriculum.

Meeting #2 - December 17, 2014: 11:00am-12:00pm
Attendees: 6 faculty, members of the undergraduate studies committee (100%), CEGE writing specialist and 3 WEC consultants
Handouts Presented: Summary of Meeting 1, Draft of Writing Plan Section 1 (Characteristics) and Section 2 (Abilities), Basic curriculum map of CEGE major, Writing Plan Narrative
Meeting objectives: a) review draft-versions of Writing Plan Sections 1 and 2 (lists of Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering’s writing characteristics and writing abilities that CEGE majors should be able to demonstrate upon graduation) and (b) begin generating content for Writing Plan Section 3 (present and future locations of writing instruction throughout the CEGE undergraduate curriculum).

Meeting #3a and #3b - March 13, 2015: 2:00-3:00pm and March 27, 2015: 12:00-1:00pm
Attendees: 15 (45%) and 20 (61%) faculty members, respectively, CEGE writing specialist, and 3 WEC consultants
Meeting #4 - April 3, 2015: 12:00-1:00pm
Attendees: 19 (58%) faculty members, CEGE writing specialist and 3 WEC consultants
Handouts Presented: Meeting 3 summary, CEGE’s Abilities to Criteria, Three student samples from 4000-level courses, Writing Plan Narrative
Meeting objectives: In this fourth and final meeting, faculty reviewed content generated for previous sections of their Writing Plan and brainstormed content for the fifth, ideas for Writing Plan implementation activity.

Section 7: Briefly, please describe the ways that the ideas contained in this Undergraduate Writing Plan address the University's Student Learning Outcomes (http://www.slo.umn.edu).

In section 2, a faculty generated list of writing abilities that CEGE majors should be able to demonstrate by the time they graduate was presented. The list is a result of discussions during the first three WEC faculty meetings in the department. In the table below, it is shown how these abilities cover all seven University's Student Learning Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student learning outcomes</th>
<th>Can identify, define, and solve problems</th>
<th>Can locate and critically evaluate information</th>
<th>Have mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry</th>
<th>Understand diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies</th>
<th>Can communicate effectively</th>
<th>Understand the role of creativity, innovation, discovery, and expression across disciplines</th>
<th>Have acquired skills for effective citizenship and life-long learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidences appropriate pre-planning processes and sufficient levels of knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes and uses audience specific writing conventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses and defines appropriate terminology and notation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes effective use of charts, visuals, and non-textual representations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes communications effectively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents technical processes effectively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes uncertainty of analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses complex data succinctly but comprehensively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly communicates abstract ideas or complicated phenomenon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes with proper mechanics and formal presentation (grammar, proofreading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates proper scholarship and avoids plagiarism</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically self-evaluates own work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. **WEC Research Assistant (RA) Request Form**

*This form is required if RA funding is requested. If no RA funding is requested please check the box below.*

☐ No RA Funding Requested

RAs assist faculty liaisons in the WEC Writing Plan implementation process. The specific duties of the RA are determined in coordination with the unit liaison and the WEC consultant, but should generally meet the following criteria: they are manageable in the time allotted, they are sufficient to their funding, and they have concrete goals and expectations (see below).

RA funding requests are made by appointment percent time (e.g., 25% FTE, 10% FTE, etc.). Appointment times can be split between two or more RAs when applicable (e.g., two 12.5% appointments for a total of 25% FTE request). Total funds (including fringe benefits when applicable) need to be calculated in advance by the liaison, usually in coordination with administrative personnel.

Please note that, outside of duties determined by the liaison, WEC RAs may be required to participate in specific WEC activities, such as meetings, Moodle discussion boards, and surveys.

**RA Name (Use TBD for vacancies):** TBD

**RA Contact Information:** email, phone

**Period of appointment (Semester/Year to Semester/Year):** Fall 2015 and Spring 2016

**RA appointment percent time:** 1x25%

Define in detail the tasks that the RA will be completing within the funding period:
The RA will systematically collect information from the CEGE courses offered over one academic year to further develop the curricular matrix and start developing the style guide.

Define deadlines as applicable (please note that all deadlines must be completed within the funding period):
In Fall 2015, the RA will conduct interviews, gather syllabi and other course materials that will be assembled in a master database. In Spring 2016, the RA will start developing the style guide and supporting materials, and in mid-spring the RA will make the style guides available for instructional use. This will include developing components of CEGE website where students will have access to writing related documents and guidelines.

Describe how frequently the RA will check in with the liaison:
The RA will work closely with Dr. Merry Rendahl, CEGE writing specialist, who will provide guidance on how to utilize the information obtained most effectively in terms of actual teaching practices.
The work will be supervised by the CEGE faculty liaison. The RA will meet with the liaison on a weekly basis.

Describe in detail the RA’s check-in process (e.g., via email, phone, in-person, etc.):
The RA will be located in the Department of Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering and will have in-person meeting on a weekly basis with the CEGE writing specialist and the faculty liaison.

1 An example for determining funding for appointments can be found on the WEC Liaison Moodle. This is for planning and example purposes only and cannot be used to determine final budget items for the Writing Plan.
VI. WEC Writing Plan Requests

Unit Name: Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Eng.

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

Total Financial Request: $18,214.56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% Grad RA, salary</td>
<td>$4,704.00</td>
<td>25% Grad RA 1, salary</td>
<td>$4,656.00</td>
<td>25% Grad RA 1, fringe benefits</td>
<td>$819.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Grad RA, fringe benefits</td>
<td>$827.90</td>
<td>25% Grad RA 1, fringe benefits</td>
<td>$819.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Grad RA, tuition</td>
<td>$3,622.08</td>
<td>25% Grad RA tuition</td>
<td>$3,585.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semester 1 Total: $9,153.98  Semester 2 Total: $9,060.58  Semester 3 Total: $0.00

Rationale for costs and their schedule of distribution

Stipend, fringe, and tuition benefits for the 25% appointment for graduate RA are based on expected rates for 2015-2016. The schedule for each semester is described in the WEC research assistant (RA) request form.

Service Requests drop-down choices will appear when a cell in the "service" column is selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description and rationale for services

The fall semester workshops will focus on implementing the criteria menu in order to provide consistent feedback to students on writing.
The spring semester workshops will focus on making small but incremental changes to integrate the desired writing abilities throughout the entire curriculum.
The workshops will be coordinated by the WEC consultants, the CEGE writing specialist, and CEGE faculty liaison.
The Department of Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering recently requested the following funding to support its Writing Enriched Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Grad RA 2, salary</td>
<td>$ 4743.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Grad RA 2, fringe benefits</td>
<td>$ 1361.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Grad RA 2, salary</td>
<td>$ 4947.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Grad RA 2, fringe benefits</td>
<td>$ 1419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 12,470.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for providing additional information clarifying the role of the Research Assistants. All of the requested items have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education, for a total of $12,470. This approval is in addition to the funds already approved in the letter from June 8, 2015. Those funds totaled $12,470, which brings your total approved funds to $24,940.

Please provide Pat Ferrian (ferri004@umn.edu) with your department’s EFS information within 30 days of the receipt of this letter so the $12,470 may be transferred.

CC: Suzanne Bardouche, Molly Bendzick, Dan Emery, Pat Ferrian, Pamela Flash, Sarah Hobbie, Mia Rampi-Lambertz, Leslie Schiff