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II. **Unit Profile:** Psychology  
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Number of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>The counts at right do not include contract associate and assistant professors and instructors who teach our core curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major(s)</th>
<th>Total # students enrolled in major as of Fall, 2014</th>
<th>Total # students graduating with major AY 13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, BA</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, BS</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (BA &amp; BS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># participated /</th>
<th># invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>November 3, 2014</td>
<td>30 / 100+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>December 9, 2014</td>
<td>20 / 100+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting with graduate instructors</td>
<td>December 19, 2014</td>
<td>12 / 50+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>11 / 100+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>March 23, 2015</td>
<td>13 / 100+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department curriculum meeting</td>
<td>March 30, 2015</td>
<td>7 / 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing plan revision</td>
<td>June 11, 2015</td>
<td>4 / 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Writing Plan Narrative

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.

Psychology became involved in the WEC project out of a desire to be more effective in coaching students through the process of learning to recognize and produce accurate, well-grounded technical communication. Through the Year 1 Process, we discovered that students and instructors alike hold writing in high regard, but there is a disconnect in our evaluation of writing quality. In the process of defining our expectations for undergraduate writing, the following key elements were named: empiricism, thesis-driven argumentation, contextualization and mechanical mastery. As we wrestled with how we could effectively communicate these priorities to our undergraduate student body, we identified the following goals: develop an accessible resource that all instructors can reference in all courses; continuing to meet as a faculty to share tools we have learned that help us support students as they learn to write; provide better support to our Teaching Assistants, since it is they who provide almost all of the feedback and do almost all of the writing consultations in the department. The key implementation activities proposed in this plan are: workshops for instructors, development of a easily-accessible WEC page on the department website with a plethora of writing resources, development of a Moodle-based “writing badge” that allows instructors to assess whether students have learned the basic vocabulary we will use to talk about writing in our classes, and, finally, informal lunches to support continued conversation about specific writing abilities taught in our classes.

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

In the first WEC meeting, faculty listed characteristics of successful writing in the field, which were distilled to:

Evidence-based, objective, explanatory and descriptive
Mechanically correct, using grammar, graphs, tables, sections, citations, etc. appropriately
Purposeful, thesis-driven, and advancing a particular point (for class assignments, on-task!)
Integrative or synthetic, identifying themes in literature; conclusions that distill previous points
Reflective, i.e., showing creativity, understanding, and an interesting perspective
Illustrated – using effective visual elements as appropriate
Contextualized; showing understanding of literature and situating present argument
Analytical; critical
Logical, coherent

*Adjectives, or adjectival phrases are typically most useful here, for example, “transparent to logic,” (Nursing); “Analytic (versus journalistic) and argumentative” (Political Science).
Section 2: DESIRED WRITING ABILITIES **: With which writing abilities should students in this unit’s major(s) graduate?

1. Identify work that has already been done on the topic
2. Distinguish between your opinion and others’; track back to original research when citing others’ work.
3. Demonstrate understanding of reader's perspective; motivate readers to care by telling them what is at stake
4. Substantiate claims with examples; distinguish between actual results and opinion
5. Present findings with clarity and accuracy
6. Synthesize, rather than list or re-iterate, data
7. Base conclusions on accurate portrayal of findings; weigh evidence, demonstrating clear understanding of its strengths and limitations
8. Establish focal thesis, research question, or hypothesis early in papers
9. Include (only) data that are related to the central topic.
10. Data and facts build logically to a conclusion.
11. Highlight interaction of disparate ideas and link disparate ideas to create a new argument; evoke and address counter-arguments
12. Avoid distracting readers by using correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling; cite sources correctly and consistently using a standard style
13. Organize explicitly/write coherently; use section headings, transition smoothly between ideas, announcing moves as appropriate (as in, “in this section I will...”)
14. Use visual elements (e.g. graphs, tables, and diagrams) as appropriate to synthesize and convey meaning

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?

The WEC-driven curriculum mapping exercise revealed a surprising amount of writing being assigned at all levels, even in large-enrollment classes. Low participation rates in the survey motivate us to use a series of informal lunch-time discussions next year to continue to capture data not only on where students are writing but how assignments are being handled. We anticipate expanding this section of the Writing Plan in Year 2.

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.).

**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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Psychology Writing Plan Section #2 Abilities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Psychology Writing Plan Section #4: Grading criteria</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify work that has already been done on the topic</td>
<td>1. ... provides sufficient background and context by summarizing previously conducted studies such that reader can understand methods and impact of present work without referring to other texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distinguish between your opinion and others'; track back to original work for citations.</td>
<td>2. ... distinguishes explicitly between the writer’s work (opinions, data) and that of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrate understanding of reader’s perspective; motivate readers to care by telling them what is at stake</td>
<td>3. ... addresses readers’ concerns, expectations, and level of understanding so they are motivated to care about content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Substantiate claims with examples; distinguish between actual results and opinion</td>
<td>4. ... provides factual basis for all claims by citing adequate examples, previous literature and/or statistically significant results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Present findings with clarity and accuracy</td>
<td>5. ... presents research results, whether from existing literature or present study, with direct statements about what was accomplished and how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Synthesize, rather than list or re-iterate, data</td>
<td>6. ... combines and interrelates previous studies to support a point, identifying themes in related studies instead of simply reiterating previous work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Base conclusions on accurate portrayal of findings; weigh evidence, demonstrating clear understanding of its strengths and limitations</td>
<td>7. ... connects conclusions directly (and logically) to results presented in text, acknowledging strengths and limitations of supporting evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish focal thesis, research question, or hypothesis early in papers</td>
<td>8. ... states a focal thesis, research question, or hypothesis before discussing methods or data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Include (only) data that are related to the central topic.</td>
<td>9. ... includes facts and data that are directly linked to the main idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Data and facts build logically to a conclusion.</td>
<td>10. ... organizes data and facts so they build to a conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Highlight interaction of disparate ideas and link disparate ideas to create a new argument; evoke and address counter-arguments</td>
<td>11. ... highlights interaction of disparate ideas to create a new argument by evoking and addressing arguments and counter-arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Avoid distraction by using correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling; cite sources correctly and consistently using a standard style</td>
<td>12. ... avoids distracting errors by adhering to a standard style (usually APA) and using correct or proofread grammar, punctuation, and spelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Organize explicitly/write coherently; use section headings, transition smoothly between ideas, announcing moves as appropriate (as in, “in this section I will...”)</td>
<td>13. ... makes explicit and logical transitions between points and conclusions (e.g., section headings, transition phrases) such that reader is not surprised by content of next sentence or paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Use visual elements (e.g. graphs, tables, and diagrams) as appropriate to synthesize and convey meaning</td>
<td>14. ... includes appropriate visual elements (e.g. graphs, tables, and diagrams) to synthesize and convey meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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?

The following priorities were identified for the Psychology Department WEC initiative:
1. **Workshops for training of TAs, faculty and instructors**, with a primary goal of continuing conversations about core writing values in the department and effective methods for teaching them.  
   **Timing**: 1-day collaborative workshop held once in August, 2015, and once in January, 2016. Attendance is limited, on a first-come/first-served basis (giving priority to 3001 section leaders and people who participated in the Year 1 WEC meetings), to 12 participants.
   **Content**: participants will arrive with syllabi for upcoming classes, and spend the time revising them to incorporate or invent Department WEC Elements focused on: evaluation of writing assignments in our current courses; tools we have found that are useful; current literature on effective writing criticism; resources at the University that our students find helpful. Participants agree to have the implementation tools they develop during these workshops shared on department websites.
   **Cost**: refreshments (2 coffee breaks + lunch for each of 2 workshops) = $800 total.
   **Instructional support request**: none.
   **Expected outcomes**: refinement of Department’s writing assessment tools; development of teaching tools such as Psychology-specific 5-minute workshops (created in break-out groups during the 2nd half of each workshop); equipping of TAs, faculty and instructors to give more effective feedback on writing; inculcating a department culture of providing targeted, useful writing instruction when giving writing assignments.

2. **Small grants program**, with a primary goal of supporting extensive WEC development in a few classes.
   **Timing and eligibility**: in September, 2015, applications will be invited. All TAs and instructors who have participated in a Year 2 workshop (or similarly demonstrate on-going commitment to the Department WEC process) will be eligible to apply. Award decisions will be made by November 1, 2015, to support development activities during Spring 2016.
   **Process**: a committee comprising the liaison, the curriculum coordinator, and a member of the curriculum committee will review applications in October and make awards based on the following criteria:
   - clarity of stated need and degree to which the proposed project addresses that need
   - feasibility of accomplishing goals given the proposed timeline and budget
   - funds will be used to develop writing aspects of the course (i.e., not just hiring TAs for grading)
   - the plan includes a feasible dissemination element and paves the way for a sustainable contribution to curriculum
   - if the plan is submitted by temporary instructional staff, it must address development of core curriculum (1001, 3001, 3902) and include overt statements regarding sharing of all developments with future instructors.
   **Cost**: $6,000 total, anticipating 1-6 awards.
   **Instructional support request**: none.
   **Expected outcomes**: incorporation of WEC elements into Psychology Department classrooms. While it is too early in the process to envision all likely outcomes, the program anticipates supporting projects such as:
   - piloting a peer-teaching or writing consultant component for 3001 (department agreement for long-term funding would need to be verified in proposal, but it is reasonable to expect that a successful pilot would need to be completed before securing departmental funding)
   - funding an RA to compare efficacy of machine vs. human grading in PSY 1001
   - attending a WAC or WID conference, or similar professional development for permanent instructors
   - purchasing reference materials (e.g., APA manual, Strunk & White) for department library

3. **Development WEC page on Department website** that articulates and disseminates Department values in writing.
   **Timing**: developed throughout the year.
   **Content**: display of characteristics and abilities articulated in WEC-Year1, with practical illustration of each; archive of
papers the faculty have voted are prime examples of writing in the discipline (expert writing); showcase of good examples of student writing (Borine award winners, i.e., level we expect from students at graduation); bibliography and excerpts from resources commonly valued across the department, such as Pinker’s book and the illustrated Strunk and White.

Cost: **$8,600** to compensate to-be-named expert (e.g., 12.5% grad RA) in working with faculty to identify these resources and assemble them. Department will cost-share the website expertise required to host these resources. Instructional support request: feedback from WEC/Writing Center on tools as they are developed. Expected outcome: single source to which all members of department – faculty and student – can go for discipline-specific writing resources.

4. Development of Moodle-based badging system that courses can require undergraduates to complete. Goal is the opposite of off-loading writing instruction. Goal is to provide a mechanism for ensuring all students are exposed to a common framework through which writing instruction can be incorporated more uniformly across the department. Timing: developed throughout the year; beta tested by instructors during Spring 2016. Content: short course in which students learn to identify our articulated writing abilities.

Cost: **$8,600** to compensate to-be-named expert (e.g., 12.5% grad RA) to select writing samples and build examples around them.

Instructional support request: assistance from WEC/Writing Center selecting writing samples and demonstrating assessment.

Expected outcome: common vocabulary and skill set, for both students and instructors, on which to base conversations about writing in all our courses.

5. Department “Writing Lunch” series.

Timing: 2 per semester

Content: informal discussion centered around a series of topics: Short Answer Questions, Abstracts and Executive Summaries, Big Papers, Good Graphics.

Cost: lunch for an estimated 25 participants at each session (4 x $250 = **$1000**).

Instructional support request: presence of expert from WEC/Writing Center at these lunches.

Expected outcomes: sustain interest in writing in core community; instructors share good ideas with each other.

**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?

A series of 6 meetings was held in the Psychology Department during academic year 14/15:

**WEC M1, Monday, November 3, 2014 (Faculty Meeting).** Discussion, guided by Pamela Flash, introduced the process and presented the results of the survey students, faculty and instructors completed in September. Faculty brainstormed lists of criteria for Section 1.

Faculty attendees: Cheryl Olman (WEC Liaison), Monica Luciana (Department Chair), Matt McGue, Randy Fletcher, Angus MacDonald, Andrew Oxenham, Yuhong Jiang, Gordon Legge, Dan Kersten, Nate Helwig, Tom Brothen, Pat Frazier, Rich Lee, Shmuel Lissek, Wilma Koutstaal, Sheng He, John Campbell, Nathan Kuncel, Jeff Simpson, Paul Sackett, Dave Weiss, Marti Gonzales, Niels Waller, Chun Wang, James Lee, Deniz Ones.
Other attendees: Kate Briggs (1001 coordinator), Mark Stellmack (Instructor for key courses 3001 and 3801), Michael Walsh (Instruction Coordinator), Holly Hatch-Surisook (Head of Undergraduate Advising),

**WEC M2, Tuesday, December 9, 2014.** Discussion, guided by Pamela Flash, summarized characteristics of writing in Psychology (Section 1) and elicited descriptions of the abilities we expect our students to demonstrate when they write. Faculty attendees: Andrew Oxenham, Dan Kersten, Tom Brothen, Kate Briggs, Cheryl Olman, Monica Luciana, Pat Frazier, and about 6 others. Other attendees: Caprice Niccoli-Waller, Michael Walsh.

**Lunch with graduate students, Friday, December 19, 2014.** Discussion, guided by Cheryl Olman, engaged graduate students in the process and elicited ideas for how the department can better support their roles as the TAs who provide the vast majority of feedback on undergraduate student writing. Graduate student attendees: Juraj Mesik, Tori Espensen-Sturges, Dustin Meriwether, Keven Joyal-Desmarais, Sarah Semmel, Dominic Mussack, Jack Kostal, Liz Fast. Other attendees: Michael Walsh, Holly Hatch-Surisook, Robin Peterson (Graduate Student Liaison)

**WEC M3, Monday, March 9, 2015.** Discussion, guided by Pamela Flash, centered on assessment of how writing is distributed throughout our curriculum and conversion of writing abilities to statements useful for assessment (2nd column in Section 3). Faculty attendees: Cheryl Olman (WEC Liaison), Monica Luciana (Department Head), Matt McGue, Pat Frazier, Tom Brothen, Rich Lee, Wilma Koutstaal, Andrew Oxenham, Steven Engel, Nate Helwig. Additional attendees: Kate Briggs, Juraj Mesik (graduate student), Michael Walsh (instruction coordinator).

**WEC M4, Monday, March 23, 2015.** Discussion, guided by Pamela Flash, centered on ideas for modifying writing instruction in the department in coming years. Faculty attendees: Cheryl Olman (WEC Liaison), Pat Frazier, Tom Brothen, Nate Helwig, Wilma Koutstaal, Jeff Simpson, Shmuel Lissek, Andrew Oxenham, James Lee. Other attendees: Tori Espensen-Sturges and Brent Carpenter (graduate students), Michael Walsh, Kate Briggs, Mark Stellmack.

**Psychology Department Curriculum Committee Meeting, Monday, March 30, 2015.** Discussion, led by Cheryl Olman and Tom Brothen, centered on prioritizing activities and budget for WEC in the coming year. Present: Randy Fletcher, Kate Briggs, Jonathan Gewirtz, Cheryl Olman, Michael Walsh, Holly Hatch-Surisook, Tom Brothen.

After these meetings, Cheryl Olman drafted the Writing Plan and circulated it to the Curriculum Committee, Department Faculty, and everyone else who had attended at least one WEC meeting for comment.

The original draft of the Writing Plan was discussed at the April 6 faculty meeting and received unanimous support.

After the Campus Writing Board rejected the Workshop honoraria portion of the plan, Cheryl Olman, in consultation with Monica Luciana, Jonathan Gewirtz, Michael Walsh, and Pamela Flash, reduced funding of the Workshops to food-only and created the small-grants program to provide more targeted support of WEC development activities.
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).

The University’s 7 Student Learning Outcomes are:
- Can identify, define, and solve problems
- Can locate and critically evaluate information
- Have mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry
- Understand diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies
- Can communicate effectively
- Understand the role of creativity, innovation, discovery, and expression across disciplines
- Have acquired skills for effective citizenship and life-long learning.

The items (in bold above) that are most directly addressed by this Writing Plan are:

Can identify, define, and solve problems: explicit training in writing abilities and self-assessment of writing will help undergraduates identify and address problematic written communication in the future.

Can locate and critically evaluate information: synthesizing data and evaluating arguments and hypotheses is a key type of critical evaluation of information, both new (newly collected data in a study) and old (from previous studies/articles).

Have mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry: Psychological literacy and writing for the discipline are intertwined; improved instruction in writing cannot be accomplished without honing our students’ literacy in the field.

Can communicate effectively: the goal of our participation in WEC is to support our students as they become better written communicators.

Have acquired skills for effective citizenship and life-long learning: clear written expression of thought will support our students’ efforts toward becoming effective citizens.
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-Spring, 2016

RA appointment percent time: 25%

Define in detail the tasks that the RA will be completing within the funding period:
1) Collecting WEC materials and constructing a website that archives our efforts and provides teaching resources to faculty. 2) Creating a Moodle badging system for inclusion in undergraduate courses.

Define deadlines as applicable (please note that all deadlines must be completed within the funding period):
Drafts of both sets of materials to be available by November, 2015; final products employed by start of Spring Semester, 2016; modifications responding to 1st semester of use incorporated by May, 2016.

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

Describe in detail the RA’s check-in process (e.g., via email, phone, in-person, etc.):
In-person meetings will review material repositories and website drafts or function.
VI. WEC Writing Plan Requests

**Unit Name:** Psychology

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

**Total Financial Request:** $24,800.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Semester 1: Fall 2015</th>
<th>Semester 2: Spring 2016</th>
<th>Semester 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEC Workshop</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle Badge Dev't (12.5% RA)</td>
<td>$4,300.00</td>
<td>$4,300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department WEC Website (12.5% RA)</td>
<td>$4,300.00</td>
<td>$4,300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Lunches</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Small Grant Program</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semester 1 Total: $9,400.00  Semester 2 Total: $15,400.00  Semester 3 Total: $0.00

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

1-day workshops (August 2015 and January 2016) will be held with up to 12 participants (faculty, TAs and instructors) to further WEC objectives and develop instructional materials and training on effective teaching strategies. Participants will be fed well (originally budgeted @ $400/wkshop, but CWB required we reduce it to $300). A senior graduate student with expertise in writing will be hired as a 25% RA to accomplish 2 things: (1) create a Moodle-based badging process to certify students are familiar with the basic terminology of our desired writing abilities, and (2) curate a collection of WEC and writing resources. Cost is estimated based on 25% grad RA with hourly rate of ~$20, with 16.6% fringe + tuition. Finally, topical lunches (est. $10/person for 25 at each of 4 lunches) will continue WEC conversations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Semester 1: Fall 2015</th>
<th>Semester 2: Spring 2016</th>
<th>Semester 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and rationale for services**
We would like consulting on the website and badge-course development (1 consultation for each effort during each semester) and someone with WEC expertise present at each of the 4 WEC lunches we'll host throughout the year.
To: Cheryl Olman, Psychology  
From: Robert McMaster, Office of Undergraduate Education  
Subject: Decision regarding WEC funding proposal

The Department of Psychology recently requested the following funding to support its Writing Enriched Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>WEC Workshop</td>
<td>$300.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Moodle Badge Dev’t (12.5% RA)</td>
<td>$4,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Department WEC Website (12.5% RA)</td>
<td>$4,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>WEC Lunches</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>WEC Workshop</td>
<td>$300.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Moodle Badge Dev’t (12.5% RA)</td>
<td>$4,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Department WEC Website (12.5% RA)</td>
<td>$4,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>WEC Lunches</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>WEC Small Grant Program</td>
<td>$6000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$24,800.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highlighted items were approved on June 26, 2015, for a total of $18,800 (*with the WEC Workshops funded at $300 per semester, rather than the originally requested $400 per semester). More information was requested regarding the Small Grant Program request before approval could be granted.

Thank you for providing the requested information and addressing the questions of the committee. The Small Grants Program funds have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education, for a total of $6,000. Please provide Pat Ferrian (ferri004@umn.edu) with your department’s EFS information within 30 days of the receipt of this letter so the funds may be transferred.

We understand that specific criteria will evolve later, based on the results you receive this time around. We look forward to hearing more about this in your next plan if you choose to continue with the Small Grants Program.

Finally, as a friendly reminder, please make sure that updated budget documents reflect the change from $400 to $300 allotted for the WEC Workshops.

CC: Suzanne Bardouche, Molly Bendzick, Dan Emery, Pat Ferrian, Pamela Flash, Sarah Hobbie, Terry Klosterman, Leslie Schiff