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Number of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments about Faculty/Instructors:
As with all programs in CCAPS, the ITI program has no full time or tenure-track professors. All instructors are, by mission and by charter, adjunct faculty required to be working professionally in the field. ITI currently has 13 adjunct instructors.

Major(s)
*Please list each major your unit offers:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Total # students enrolled in major as of Sem/Year</th>
<th>Total # students graduating with major as of Sem/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>68 / 149</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEC Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># Participated</th>
<th># Invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEC Meeting 1</td>
<td>October 21, 2019</td>
<td>7 /</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Meeting 2</td>
<td>November 21, 2019</td>
<td>8 /</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Meeting 3</td>
<td>February 13, 2020</td>
<td>9 /</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Meeting 4</td>
<td>March 13, 2020</td>
<td>6 /</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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V. Writing Plan Narrative, 1st Edition

Please retain section headers and prompts in your plan.

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

Information Technology Infrastructure (ITI) is a Bachelor of Applied Science degree-granting program in the College of Continuing and Professional Studies (CCAPS). ITI courses bring together computer science and business courses that educate students on all aspects of the IT industry. Like all undergraduate programs in CCAPS, ITI intentionally limits its instructors to adjuncts who are currently working professionals in the IT and ITI fields. CCAPS’s core mission is to prepare students for immediate work in professional fields, and so our faculty’s ability to bring information into the classroom based on what is happening today in IT is critical to ensure our graduates are fully prepared for work in the IT industry.

All students take a series of “core” courses to which they then add related courses organized around one or more subplans or “tracks,” which include the following: Data Science, Data Management, Systems, Security, Development and Operations (DevOps), and Networking. (Students may also choose to work with advisors to “self-design” their subplan.)

ITI seeks to join the WEC program for a variety of reasons. First, since we draw students with backgrounds in computer-heavy technology fields, we find that they often struggle with coursework that is as much focused on management and communication as it is on technology. (For example, students often report surprise when their Internship experiences focus extensively on elements of communication.) Similarly, since we draw our faculty from the same backgrounds, they often (but not always) have less pedagogical training generally and specifically less experience working with the writing and communication than the technical components of the field. The more thorough and thoughtful integration of writing activities, assignments, and assessments into our curriculum would benefit both students and faculty.

By enrolling in the WEC program, ITI would also be joining its fellow CCAPS programs in Health Services Management and Construction Management as WEC members, making all of the undergraduate majors in the College WEC-enrolled -- an important milestone for CCAPS!

In Section 6 below, we detail our hopes for implementation for the coming academic year. In summary, we hope to do the following:

● Create videos and media of industry professionals and ITI writing experts to discuss writing in the field and the writing process; these videos will be integrated into ITI web materials and, where appropriate, classroom content
● Work with the WEC team to create dedicated workshops on pressing writing issues in ITI and professional contexts
● Create and implement writing templates for writing assignments and rubrics for writing assessment to be used across the curriculum to improve consistency and facilitate outcome data reporting
Leverage WEC expertise to better frame writing outcomes, and, in coordination with the CCAPS Academic Technology and Design team, collect writing outcome data for continuous program improvement and external reporting for accreditation

Fund an RA to catalog and organize writing assignments in all classes, with a particular focus on Core courses

Section 1: DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC WRITING CHARACTERISTICS

What characterizes academic and professional communication in this discipline?

As part of the College of Continuing and Professional Studies undergraduate programs in Applied and Professional Studies, writing in the Information Technology Infrastructure program encompasses both specific writing and general writing characteristics. Though this leads to a wide variety of typical writing characteristics, they can be categorized into three main categories:

1. Writers in ITI and ITI-related fields need to be able to write for a *variety of different audiences with a variety of different technical understanding and vocabulary*. ITI professionals can find themselves writing for colleagues with a great amount of technical knowledge, in which shorthand terms, acronyms, and other forms of “jargon” are not only permissible but acceptable, but they can also find themselves writing for others in their organization who lack the same background. Similarly, ITI professionals often have to write for end-users of products or other readers outside of the ITI field completely. In each instance, ITI professionals have to learn to be flexible in their writing style and thoughtful about adapting it to the particular audience.

2. Writers in ITI and ITI-related fields also need to understand the *formal aspects* of the materials and types of communication they are dealing with. ITI professionals deal with a variety of different kinds of writing tasks and genres, and they need to be able to recognize and master the different formal conventions that are called for. In a highly professionalized field with many standard documents, ITI professionals need to know what a formal report calls for, what a project management schedule looks like, what a statement of work or contract needs to include. Further, since many of our ITI students also work heavily with computer coding, they need to be able to think of their writing as code as well -- a type of writing that allows for variation but ultimately requires adherence to formal requirements.

3. Finally, writers in ITI and ITI-related fields also need to write with a *high level of attention to detail*. Since the forms of writing that our students need to learn to create can often be high stakes -- computer coding, contracts, statements of work, and so on -- ITI is a field that tends to have a lower tolerance for writing mistakes at any level -- be it conceptual, organizational, or mechanical. Code fails when improperly written; programs cannot be run if instructions aren’t properly communicated; projects can overrun costs if processes are incorrectly planned or organizationally incoherent.

These materials manifest in a range of writing types and genres, including the following:

- Correspondence
- Presentations
Proposals
- Reports (often including research)
- Instruction manuals
- Product and process reviews

Section 2: DESIRED WRITING ABILITIES

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

Graduates of the ITI program should have a variety of writing abilities important for their field. A series of faculty meetings and ongoing conversations generated the following list of writing abilities required of ITI students:

Audience

1. Design messages in ways that are appropriate to the technical ability of the audience
2. Describe software and code according to the specific needs and functions of the context
3. Describe new technologies to IT professionals, clients, and users to the degree that they can implement them
4. Communicate recommendations and decisions in language appropriate to non-experts
5. Describe quality, methods, and design choices to technical and non-technical audiences

Mechanics

6. Use correct grammar, spelling, usage, punctuation, and syntax in written documents

Genre/convention

7. Recognize common forms of writing in ITI (including SOWs, contracts, trade-off studies, funding recommendations/business cases, standards and procedures, and others)
8. Adhere to the style conventions of programming languages like Python, Java, C++, and others

Collaboration

9. Effectively collaborate in groups to author team documents

Persuasion

10. Be able to seek information and evidence appropriate to technical problems and questions
11. Be able to make a persuasive case for implementation (ROI and other metrics)
12. Communicate technical details concisely but with adequate detail and explanation to convince an audience
13. Communicate how technology can solve business issues through use cases
14. Draw connections between pressing business issues and the information technology that can be deployed around it
Section 3: INTEGRATION OF WRITING INTO UNIT’S UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

How is writing instruction currently positioned in this unit’s undergraduate curriculum (or curricula)?

What, if any, course sequencing issues impede an intentional integration of relevant, developmentally appropriate writing instruction?

One of the most valuable takeaways from the WEC Meetings process relates to our deepened understanding of where writing instruction takes place in our curriculum, the sorts of expectations different faculty have for the different writing levels of students in various classes, and the how courses relate to each other over the entire curriculum.

Through the survey process, we discovered that some courses address many of the identified writing abilities and some address only a few; happily, all of the courses for which we have responses reported that at least 3 of the writing abilities are addressed in the course. Even more encouragingly, faculty have reported eagerness and enthusiasm for including more writing elements in their courses over the course of the WEC process.

However, it’s also clear that what emerges from this survey is that some courses are doing a disproportionate amount of writing instruction and assessment; while this might make sense in terms of writing intensive courses, we hope to make writing more thoroughly and consistently integrated throughout the curriculum. Please see Section 5: Implementation Plans for a more thorough discussion of this goal.

Another important realization of the curriculum mapping process is that ITI’s flexible approach to scheduling courses might require further analysis at the programmatic level. Currently, while students are guided by CCAPS’s strong advising team to approach their coursework in a logical and systematic way, there are inevitable constraints from the bulk of our courses being offered only evenings, and typically one or two course offerings per weeknight. This process has led to students often needing to take courses out of sequence (for instance, taking Data Science II before or concurrently with Data Science I). In such a context, mapping a consistent and logical progression through writing instruction and assessment can be especially challenging. An important goal of our first year implementation plans is thus to gain clarity about how this might be done (again, please see Section 5 below for more details).

Section 4: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT WRITING

What concerns, if any, have unit faculty and undergraduate students voiced about grading practices?

Please include a menu of criteria extrapolated from the list of Desired Writing Abilities provided in Section 2 of this plan. (This menu can be offered to faculty/instructors for selective adaptation and will function as a starting point in the WEC’s longitudinal rating process.).

Conversation at the WEC meetings revealed that while faculty have several shared criteria for evaluating written work, areas remain in our curriculum where criteria are as yet ill-defined or could be more clearly articulated. Although the list of criteria below indicates a promising start to this process, one of the central goals of our implementation plans is working in concert with the WEC
team to both better define these criteria and more thoroughly integrate them into our courses and assessment strategies.

Current criteria as developed in the WEC process:

- Student generated statements of work, trade-off studies, recommendations, standards documents, user documents, and procedures should be completed in well organized formats and with sufficient technical detail.
- Technical problems and questions are addressed based on consideration of a range of evidence and options, and solutions should demonstrate evidence-based decision making. Documents should avoid unnecessary complexity or technical jargon.
- Documents will include relevant business metrics (e.g., cost, time, ROI) in order to justify the choice of a technology solution. Students should explain how metrics are obtained or derived.
- Documentation is conventional and largely free of common errors. Citations, when necessary, conform to an ascribed style sheet.
- The code should function within the coding environment and provide an expected output.
- Documents should be tailored to the particular needs of end users, IT professionals, or managers/decision makers.
- For technical/IT audiences, technical details are presented unambiguously and clearly (including charts and figures), with specific attention to the technical knowledge of the audience.
- For managers, recommendations and actions should be described and explained in language suitable to decision makers without technical expertise.
- Description in code is restricted to detailed needs and functions as defined by the coding platform. A competent coder should be able to clearly understand design choices and functions.
- Quality improvements, methods, and design choices are explicitly linked to client specified requirements and platform specifications.
- Use cases should provide examples of successful use and implementation of technology. Application of case conclusions to new contexts should be explained and inconsistencies should be addressed.
- Documents will identify problems and opportunities in business contexts and address the best technologies to address these issues.
- Documentation that accompanies a technical solution should allow audiences to engage with new technology to address specific business contexts.
- Team documents should be coherent and maintain a consistent, professional tone.

Section 5: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS, including REQUESTED SUPPORT

What does the unit plan to implement during the period covered by this plan? What forms of instructional support does this unit request to help implement proposed changes? What are the expected outcomes of named support?

The ITI Program seeks the assistance of the Writing Enriched Curriculum program and team to implement a variety of plans to improve the quality of writing instruction and assessment in its
curriculum. These implementation plans and requests are organized into the 3 categories: 1) tools for improving writing instruction and instructional materials, 2) a deeper understanding of the current situation of writing in the program (and potential areas for change), and 3) the coordination of writing assessment outcome data in relation to the programmatic goals and accreditation requirements. A more thorough discussion of each in turn follows.

Tools for improving writing instruction and instructional materials

- Request 1: Convene a panel of writers and/or create videos of writers, and integrate as instructional materials into classes

One of the more powerful tools available in CCAPS is a highly professional media team. For this request, we propose that we work with the WEC team to coordinate a series of video shoots with individuals or panels of individuals who are working professionals in the world of ITI. Videos would capture information about the kinds of “real life” writing activities these professionals engage, the amount of writing in their day-to-day work, and other discussion ideas as generated by ITI faculty and the WEC team. We would also like to produce “how I write” videos, starring faculty, professionals, or other ITI writing-adjacent individuals, in which they talk about their writing process, how they gather materials, put words to page, and so on. These videos would be integrated into the ITI website as well as individual Canvas courses as instructional and supplemental material.

Please note: In light of the University-wide effects of COVID-19, it’s possible that in-person panels could not be held. In this event, we would still be able to work with the CCAPS media team to record videos and other media content, though perhaps less expansively.

- Request 2: Dedicated WEC workshops on pressing writing issues in ITI and professional contexts

In conversation with our colleagues in Health Services Management and Construction Management (the other CCAPS programs currently enrolled in WEC), we’ve learned that one of the most beneficial elements of being in the WEC program is the opportunity to have WEC-led workshops on pressing writing issues in the field. Potential topics for these workshops that faculty have suggested include working with non-native speakers, creating and using meaningful rubrics, creating and using exemplary writing models for instruction, and methods for providing meaningful and efficient feedback on writing assignments.

Since both Construction Management and Health Services Management have reported interest in similar topics for workshops, we suggest that -- in the interest of efficiency and turnout -- that the WEC team consolidate some of these workshops for a CCAPS-wide delivery. CCAPS holds twice yearly Faculty Development days (once in January and once in August). We would suggest that these WEC-led workshops become a regularly-occurring component of these Faculty Development days, if possible.

Please note: In light of the University-wide effects of COVID-19, in-person faculty workshops might not be possible in the coming academic year. In the event that in-person events are prohibited, it’s likely that the CCAPS Faculty Development days would
move, in modified form, to online delivery. In this event, we would ask that the WEC program participate remotely.

- Request 3: Creation and implementation of writing templates for assignments and rubrics for substantive writing assignments

One of the most important findings of the WEC meeting process was how writing assignments are both distributed across the ITI curriculum and how they are delivered to students. We’ve discovered a lack of consistency in how writing instructions are presented, the language around which they are structured, and the methods and criteria used to assess them. We would like to make the writing experience more consistent for students by working with the WEC team to determine and enact best practices for creating logical, clear, and customizable templates for both writing assignment descriptions and writing assignment rubrics. Not only would this help clarify the progress and process of writing skills acquisition for students, but it would also help us collect data helpful to the accreditation process (see Request 4 below).

Coordinating writing assessment data with programmatic outcomes and accreditation requirements

- Request 4: Work with WEC to frame writing outcomes and coordinate with the CCAPS Academic Technology and Design team to collect writing outcome data for continuous program improvement and external reporting for accreditation

The ITI program will be seeking accreditation by the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) in the near future (with an anticipated site visit in Fall 2021). One of the most powerful tools that CCAPS currently has for the accreditation process is a dedicated staff of instructional designers in the Academic Technology and Design (ATD) team who work closely with instructors to deliver course content as well as collect data from those courses. As the ITI team prepares materials for accreditation, we would like to work closely with both the ATD team and the WEC team to coordinate data collection. First, we would like to work with the WEC team to further develop and design our writing outcome language, criteria, and meaningful points of assessment. The WEC meeting process has given us a start toward these goals, but we need further help in terms of refining assessment criteria language, figuring out where it makes sense to incorporate the criteria for meaningful assessment, and how much assessment is meaningful across the curriculum.

With this established, we would then coordinate with the ATD team to tie these assessments to outcome reporting data. In CCAPS, we currently use a variety of tools to capture outcome data (Tableau as well as internally-developed tools). These data are highly customizable -- we can filter by course, by outcome, by student, as well as various timestamps -- and are therefore extremely valuable for external reporting as well as the ongoing process of programmatic improvement.

Creating a deeper understanding of the current situation of writing in the program (and potential areas for improvement)
● Request 5: Fund an RA to catalog and organize writing assignments in all classes, with a particular focus on Core courses

In order to enact the work needed for the above requests (and in particular Requests 3 and 4), we also ask for funding for a Research Assistant. The Research Assistant’s primary tasks would be to work with faculty to collect information and materials related to writing assessment activities in their courses. Currently, we have a general sense of the kinds of writing assignments that take place in our courses, but due to programmatic quirks related to having an all-adjunct faculty who move through the program and courses more often than in more traditional programs, creating a stable warehouse of assignments and other writing-related materials is essential.

By funding a Research Assistant with a writing background (perhaps from the Writing Studies department), we’d be able to collect these materials, code them according to the type of writing activity they are, and then map them against the curriculum. We’d use this information to determine 1) in a concrete way what sorts of writing work is taking place where in the curriculum, and 2) what touchpoints make sense for particular focus in terms of outcome data collection, and 3) where important improvements can be made.

We would anticipate the Research Assistant working 150 hours in the Fall 2020 semester and 150 hours in the Spring 2021 semester. Please see the attached budget form for further details.

Section 6: PROCESS USED TO CREATE THIS WRITING PLAN

How, and to what degree, were a substantial number of stakeholders in this unit (faculty members, instructors, affiliates, teaching assistants, undergraduates, others) engaged in providing, revising, and approving the content of this Writing Plan?

The materials presented in this Writing Plan were created throughout AY 2019-2020 through the WEC meeting process.

Meetings were held on the following dates:

● Meeting 1: October 21, 2019
● Meeting 2: November 21, 2019
● Meeting 3: February 13, 2020
● Meeting 4: March 13, 2020

Meetings were held on campus with optional online access (necessary for many faculty members who work in the profession during the day). Faculty members contributed to the development of the material presented in each section and voted to approve the plan.
VI. WEC Research Assistant (RA) Request Form

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

☐ No RA funding requested.
✓ RA funding requested.

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

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

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

RA Name (Use TBD for vacancies): TBD
RA Contact Information: email, phone
Period of appointment (Semester/Year to Semester/Year): Fall 2020 to Spring 2021
RA appointment percent time: 25% (10 hours/week)

Define in detail the tasks that the RA will be completing within the funding period:

As detailed in Section 5 of the Writing Plan above, the Research Assistant’s primary tasks would be to work with faculty to collect information and materials related to writing assessment activities in their courses. Currently, we have a general sense of the kinds of writing assignments that take place in our courses, but due to programmatic quirks related to having an all-adjunct faculty who move through the program and courses more often than in more traditional programs, creating a stable warehouse of assignments and other writing-related materials is essential.

By funding a Research Assistant with a writing background (perhaps from the Writing Studies department), we’d be able to collect these materials, code them according to the type of writing activity they are, and then map them against the curriculum. We’d use this information to

---

1 An example for determining funding for appointments can be found on the WEC Liaison Google site. This is for planning and example purposes only and cannot be used to determine final budget items for the Writing Plan.
determine 1) in a concrete way what sorts of writing work is taking place where in the curriculum, and 2) what touchpoints make sense for particular focus in terms of outcome data collection, and 3) where important improvements can be made.

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

The RA would be held to smaller and ongoing deadlines as determined by the faculty liaison. General deadlines, however, would be as follows:

- All writing materials collected from faculty: October 2020
- All writing materials categorized and coded: December 2020
- Writing materials mapped across curriculum: February 2021
- Writing assignment rubrics developed (in coordination with WEC team): March 2021
- Writing assignment rubrics integrated into Canvas courses: April 2021
- Final report & recommendations for improvement: May 2021

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

The RA will check in with the faculty liaison, the program director, and the ITI staff once per month at the regularly scheduled ITI Staff Meetings (which are held twice-monthly; the RA would be required to attend once per month). The RA would also be present at the all-faculty faculty meetings, held once per semester. The RA will also be expected to be responsive to email and phone contact from the faculty liaison and/or program director.

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

The RA will be required to attend these meetings in-person. In the possibility that COVID-19 related closures or suspensions of in-person activities occurs, the RA will meet according to the same schedule but virtually via Zoom or other online platforms.
**VI. WEC Writing Plan Requests**

**Unit Name:** Information Technology Infrastructure  
**Unit Financial Contact Name/Email:** Lynn Cross / cross047@umn.edu  
**Chart string for fund transfer:** 1000 10908 20028

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

**Total Financial Request:** $11,040.00

<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>WEC Research Assistant</td>
<td>$5,520.00</td>
<td>WEC Research Assistant</td>
<td>$5,520.00</td>
<td>WEC Research Assistant</td>
<td>$5,520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours x 15 weeks = 150 hours 150 hours @ $20/hr plus fringe</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 hours x 15 weeks = 150 hours 150 hours @ $20/hr plus fringe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semester 1 Total:** $5,520.00  
**Semester 2 Total:** $5,520.00  
**Semester 3 Total:** $0.00

**Rationale for costs and their schedule of distribution**

As described in Section 5 of the Writing Plan, we would like to fund an RA to work with our faculty to to work with faculty to collect information and materials related to writing assessment activities in their courses. We’d use this information to determine 1) in a concrete way what sorts of writing work is taking place where in the curriculum, and 2) what touchpoints make sense for particular focus in terms of outcome data collection, and 3) where important improvements can be made.

---

**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>
<th>Qty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and rationale for services**

As described in Section 5 of the Writing Plan, we would like to request the time and expertise of the WEC team for a variety of projects. First, we’d request one workshop in the Spring semester and a second workshop in the Summer term, to be presented as part of CCAPS scheduled Faculty Development Days (once in January, once in August). Second, we’d like to request several consultations in both Fall and Spring semester, as we develop a) writing outcomes and criteria language; b) rubrics and assessment materials; and c) videos on writing in IT!
May 19, 2020

To: Mark Langanki, Information Technology Infrastructure
CC: Steven Wandler, Michelle Koker, Pamela Flash, Matt Luskey, Bryan Mosher, Jennifer Reckner, Leslie Schiff, Heidi Solomonson, Reagan Mock-Nelson, Lynn Cross
From: Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn, Office of Undergraduate Education
Subject: Decision regarding WEC funding proposal

Thank you for providing the Office of Undergraduate Education with a 1st edition Writing Plan. On behalf of Information Technology Infrastructure, you have requested the following funding to support that plan’s implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Information Technology Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>WEC Research Assistant (10hrs x 15 weeks = 150 hours. 150 hours @ $20/hr plus fringe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>WEC Research Assistant (10hrs x 15 weeks = 150 hours. 150 hours @ $20/hr plus fringe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above items have been approved with the provision that the department provide an updated plan for meeting with the RA throughout the plan’s implementation. We would recommend a regular touch point (every 2 weeks) with the RA, liaison and WEC team consultant, for at least 15 minutes. Please update this information in your plan and send it to Heidi Solomonson (heidis@umn.edu).

Once your revised plan has been received, $11,040 will be transferred during FY21 (after July 1) to your department’s EFS account string: 1000-10908-20028.

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