I. Writing Plan Cover Page

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

May 5, 2015

☑ First Edition of Writing Plan

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

Youth Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Unit Name</th>
<th>CEHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Assoc Prof and DUGS / Assoc Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda E. Jones / Ross VeLure Roholt</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Faculty Liaison (print name)</td>
<td>612-624-3691/612-624-8785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ljones@umn.edu">ljones@umn.edu</a> / <a href="mailto:rossvr@umn.edu">rossvr@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Writing Plan ratified by Faculty**

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

Date: May 5, 2015

If Vote: 14 / 14

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

All Youth Studies faculty, including Community Faculty, who participated in the WEC process leading to and including the development of the Year 1 Writing Plan voted. The final plan was distributed electronically, comments were gathered and an electronic vote was recorded.
II. **Unit Profile:** Youth Studies

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

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the three T/TT faculty, the Youth Studies faculty includes one .5 FTE P&A faculty and 12-15 Community Faculty (adjuncts).

**Major(s)**

*Please list each major your unit offers:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Name</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>YOUTH STUDIES</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

---

**WEC Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEC Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># participated</th>
<th># invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEC Survey / Faculty</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Survey / Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Survey / Students</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC Survey / Affiliates</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1</td>
<td>11/7/2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #2</td>
<td>11/21/2014</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #3</td>
<td>2/6/2015</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #4</td>
<td>3/6/2015</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year #1 Plan</td>
<td>May, 2015</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Signature Page

Signatures needed regardless of Writing Plan edition. Please fill in the gray areas on this form.

Electronic signatures may be submitted in lieu of this page. If this page is submitted as a hard copy, please include a print out of the electronic signature chain here.

WEC Faculty Liaison

Linda E. Jones  
Ross VeLure Roholt

WEC Faculty Liaison (print name)

Signature

Assoc Prof and DUGS / Assoc Prof

Title

May 5, 2015

Date

Department Head/Chair

James R. Reinardy

Print Name

Signature

Assoc Professor and Director, School of Social Work

Title

May 5, 2015

Date

Associate Dean

Na'im Madyun

Print Name

Signature

Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, CEHD

Title

May 5, 2015

Date

For College of Liberal Arts units only:

CLA - Curriculum, Instruction, and Advising Committee approved Writing Plan on

Date

Print Name

Title

Signature

Date
Executive Summary

For what reasons did this unit become involved in the WEC project? What key implementation activities are proposed in this edition of its Writing Plan, and what is the thinking behind these proposed activities?

The Youth Studies program (major/minor) is part of the School of Social Work, a unit within the College of Education and Human Development. Youth Studies is the only undergraduate major in the School of Social Work, which is predominantly and historically a graduate-level program (M.S.W. and Ph.D.). While the School of Social Work is almost 100 years old (2017), the Youth Studies major is only completing its eighth year. Prior to becoming a major, some undergraduate Youth Studies courses were located in the School, and Youth Studies, as a field, has a long and rich history at the University of Minnesota. The School of Social Work also includes the graduate level M.Ed. in Youth Development Leadership, as well as two undergraduate minors (Social Justice and Family Violence Prevention).

The Youth Studies program is relatively small, with about 100 majors and 30 minors. Over 50% of the program is comprised of students of color, and there is also a substantial number of first-generation college students and English Language Learners.

The 3.5 FTE faculty includes one full professor, one associate professor, one assistant professor, and one .5 FTE P&A faculty. Additionally, each year 10-13 dedicated, consistent, and highly involved community faculty (adjuncts) round out the instructional faculty. These faculty teach six required foundation courses and 13 regularly offered electives central to our proposed WEC initiatives.

For several years, the Youth Studies faculty expressed an interest in applying to become part of the WEC process. In fact, the program applied one time before it was ultimately selected for the 2014 cohort. Given that the major is old enough to have substantial experience with its curriculum and the students who are attracted to it, but new enough to require a consistent focus on development and improvement, it seemed timely to try to simultaneously attend to ways in which knowledge and skills related to writing and other forms of communication could be systematically and expertly woven through the program in a developmental fashion. Involvement in WEC is enthusiastically endorsed both by the resident faculty and the community faculty, and participation in the 2014-15 activities was high.

Proposed implementation plans for Year 1, detailed in Section 5, primarily center on the understanding, conceptualization, improvement, and assessment of assignments across the major. One additional element of the plan involves inviting youth work practitioners to speak to the students and faculty about the many ways in which writing, as well as other forms of communication, are critical to the field. The faculty strongly believes that these activities are foundational to and a first step toward providing coherence within the curriculum, as it strives to help develop and assess the desired writing abilities we hope our graduates will achieve.
Section 1: Discipline-Specific Writing Characteristics
What characterizes academic and professional communication in this discipline?

Youth Studies is an interdisciplinary field focused on understanding and responding to the everyday lives of young people. It brings together insights and evidence about and by young people from a wide-variety of academic disciplines, including: sociology, anthropology, geography, philosophy, cultural studies, history, education and social work. It is both a professional and academic discipline focused on personal and social development of young people.

Over the WEC planning process, all faculty were actively involved in all discussions and decisions. The program could not function without the dedication of the community faculty. They also provide a grounded understanding of the field for the program, as all work in different capacity in the field. In the writing plan, when faculty are mentioned it is in reference to both tenure/tenure track and community faculty. In discussions with faculty (including community faculty) all agreed that good writing in the field can include a wide-range of writing characteristics.

The wide-range of writing characteristics in the field also emerged in the WEC characteristics of writing in the field survey completed by faculty, students, and affiliates. In the final analysis Youth Studies faculty and students agreed on writing characteristics (Expressive, Critical, Exploratory, and Descriptive), while affiliates emphasized additional writing characteristics (Explanatory, Concise, Descriptive, and Persuasive). In faculty discussions, these two different ways of characterizing writing in the field were described as related and often sequential. As one community faculty member described: “If I wear the faculty hat, I want to see that students understand all concepts by having them give me everything and demonstrate the ability to apply these concepts. In my affiliate hat, I would tell students that they can’t write like that, that they must be more journalistic in telling the story and not go on too long.” All the faculty agreed that to build students’ professional writing abilities, they should be asked to understand core concepts and write to both explore and express these concepts and how they relate to practice.

Over the course of the WEC process, the Youth Studies faculty agreed the program supports students becoming scholar-practitioners. Bringing together these multiple characteristics, a primary emphasis emerged: to develop competent and skillful scholar-practitioners who can “exercise many voices.” Given this overall goal, the faculty all agreed that good communication in Youth Studies can be characterized as follows:

- **Critically reflective and reflexive:** Reflecting on one’s own lived experience in relation to another person supports high quality practice, and also informs scholarship on practice (and scholarship in practice). It includes identifying one’s own assumptions, situating the experience in relation to another person, and recognizing and acknowledging that there are multiple perspectives to any single experience.
• **Descriptive:** Scholar-practitioners need to be able to describe a situation and have the capacity to separate self from interpretation and judgments. They need to be able to describe what happened and the multiple ways this situation or experience has been/or could be interpreted by others. Students should also know how different theoretical perspectives provide unique explanations of situations and experiences.

• **Analytic:** Faculty also agreed that students need to move beyond describing positions to analyzing and bringing in multiple forms of evidence to critique and challenge personal, practice, and scholarly assumptions. Special emphasis should be placed on connecting and attending to how ideas are historically constructed, and how certain assumptions about young people are presented as “scientific,” when often they connect more to a moral stance. Good Youth Studies writing brings together multiple points of view and draws a conclusion using supporting evidence.

• **Persuasive:** Youth Studies aims to develop scholar-practitioners. Communication in this field often requires persuasion. Indeed, Youth Studies writing seeks to spark action: to receive funding, to gain permission to offer a new program, to support youth voice and agency, and to create community, policy, or organizational change that better supports young people to flourish. Much of the writing is directed outward to convince others of a better response, intervention, or program. Writing is always audience directed, and writing in the field is characterized as responding to multiple audiences (community, practitioner, scholar, and policy-maker). Writing often requires translation of evidence (including narratives) to other audiences and writing concisely and descriptively so that evidence is understood and can be responded to by additional stakeholders.

This section describes writing characteristics for the Youth Studies field. It is anticipated that many of these will be developed within the first couple of years of practice and within continuing education programs, including graduate school. By the end of their undergraduate program students should be able to write descriptively, analytically, and reflectively about their practice and the observations they make, and have developed a beginning understanding of writing reflexively and understand its use for deepening practice understandings as well as addressing practice issues. They will have an ability to also craft persuasive pieces based on their practice experience and related academic research. An emphasis in the undergraduate program will be on how to write persuasively about a desired practice model and program. We understand this to be a critical need for the field as practitioners are increasingly being asked to justify their practice with supporting evidence from research and evaluation.

**Section 2: Desired Writing Abilities**

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

In conversations among faculty, a consensus formed around the desired writing abilities. In these conversations, faculty also sought to narrow the divide between
affiliates (practitioners) and academics (faculty and students) that emerged in the initial survey for the WEC process. Faculty agreed that the divide between faculty/students and affiliates is not so wide and the undergraduate program needs to provide students with grounded writing abilities that allow them to further develop as professional writers over the first couple of years in practice. Over the course of several meetings, a list of desired writing abilities solidified. These abilities were seen to support the development of scholar-practitioners in the youth development field. It is understood that scholar-practitioners have to be skillful at not only analyzing and synthesizing data and theory but also creating data and using data to inform and persuade others. The writing abilities support each of these larger categories of practice.

Create Data: Students have to be able to convert what they see, hear, and experience into data that can be analyzed, not only to document and improve their own practice but also to demonstrate, with evidence, that what they did mattered and how. Writing abilities expected of students include:

- Create detailed, concrete, concise descriptions of situations, experiences, and practice.
- Situate and understand one's lived experience in relationship to someone else, such that one can recognize and appreciate what is shared and what is not.

Analyze Data: Human service practitioners also need skills in analyzing, interpreting, and drawing out insights from data that can be used to inform and shape practice. This includes not only nomothetic forms data but also idiographic forms of data. Skillful practitioner-scholars can synthesize and contextualize data in ways that expand how the data can be read and understood. Analysis also includes bringing in a wide-range of data to critically analyze data and demonstrate its limitations. Writing abilities expected of students include:

- Locate, understand, and apply relevant theories, concepts, and discipline-specific content to expand understanding of young people's everyday lives.
- Gather relevant data from a variety of empirical, narrative, and historical sources.
- Mobilize a variety of types of data for constructive, value-based arguments about the situations and conditions of young people's everyday lives.
- Analyze and synthesize data collected to create better ways of understanding young people's everyday lives and how individuals, communities, and society could respond.
- When interpreting an issue/situation/action, notice and analyze personal assumptions and biases and construct alternative interpretations based on different assumptions and biases.

Inform and Persuade: As a program focused on developing scholar-practitioners, Youth Studies also wants students to write in a way that both informs and
persuades others to take action. It is not enough to communicate what one knows about an issue, but they must also understand their audience and write in a way that prompts the reader to act on what they know. Writing abilities expected of students include:

- Inform and persuade a variety of lay, scholarly, and professional audiences about one's programs and services in ways that capture the voices of subjects and that (where appropriate) evoke empathy and actions in readers.
- Use appropriate scholarly citation styles when required (Youth Studies recommends APA, but supports Chicago as well).
- Depending on writing style and audience, paper uses appropriate grammar and spelling.

Section 3: Integration of Writing into Unit's Undergraduate Curriculum
How is writing instruction currently positioned in this unit's undergraduate curriculum?

When designed, Youth Studies had a hierarchical structure. It was assumed that most students would enter the major as freshmen or early in their sophomore year and have at least 3, if not more, years in the major. This was a faulty assumption. Most students in the major enter at the end of their sophomore or the beginning of the junior year, often by transferring from another CEHD major, from another College within the University, or from another University. While designed with a hierarchical structure in mind, with students taking 1000-level courses and progressing through the 2000 and 3000 before taking 4000-level courses, the experience of offering the major over 8 years indicates that there are multiple pathways through the major. It is less vertical than horizontal, with students often taking 1000-level courses and 3000-level courses at the same time, or simply completing the major in ways not fully anticipated in the original design. One thing that generally remains as originally anticipated is that most students complete the 4000 level courses in the last year of their program.

The student pathways in the major, while not fully understood, appear to be non-standardized. Youth Studies faculty are planning, in the next year, to review the current curriculum and revise the major, given the realities of how students typically progress through it. This will begin with a review of the six foundation courses.

During this review, the Youth Studies faculty will also begin to address some of the data that emerged during the WEC process, especially the faculty assessment of student proficiency when beginning the courses. Few faculty indicate that student proficiency improves much over the course of the major; this may be explained by the non-standardized pathways students take to complete major coursework. Over the next several years, Youth Studies faculty will continue to revise curriculum to support student proficiency in writing and academic content.
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 Project’s longitudinal rating process.)

One of the most helpful aspects of the WEC process has been to clarify among faculty what writing abilities we expect students to develop and how these abilities can be assessed. The initial survey of strength of writing illustrated fairly wide agreement between faculty and students. Students and faculty most widely disagreed when it came to perceived strength in the use of correct grammar, spelling, and mechanics; students rated themselves as “strong” while faculty rated students as “weak.” This may be explained in that in certain courses grammar, spelling, and mechanics are often underemphasized, and presenting critical reflection receives greater emphasis. This is something that faculty have chosen to work on clarifying more for students within the WEC process.

Students and faculty responses diverged on two other categories. In these two cases (co-author texts with one or more writers; report complex data or findings), students rated themselves as satisfactory and faculty indicated that they were unable to generalize. This illustrates a major theme in faculty discussions during the WEC planning process. Faculty could often speak clearly about specific students and their writing ability, but were less able to speak in general about student writing abilities. This is a strength we do not want to lose as we work on developing a writing enriched curriculum for our Youth Studies students. In this first year WEC plan we emphasize both how to retain an individual understanding of students and work to create a more cohesive and thoughtful writing enhanced curriculum across Youth Studies.

The survey given to both faculty and students on grading practices indicated that most students did not have concerns about the methods used to respond to and/or evaluate writing, and most faculty were satisfied with the overall quality of student writing in the undergraduate courses they taught. Students and faculty also confirm that most of the time students are provided with grading criteria and this is discussed before the assignment is due. What we learned in the WEC process is that the expectations of faculty for students are not always consistent. Through the WEC process we have found it useful to define abilities and develop grading criteria. At this time Youth Studies has a beginning, not a final list, of grading criteria. The following table of grading criteria has been developed, based on the desired Youth Studies writing abilities:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Studies Criteria</th>
<th>From Writing Plan</th>
<th>For 2015 rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The text...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Includes detailed and concrete descriptions that convey relevant sights and sounds.</td>
<td>...includes detailed and concrete descriptions that convey relevant sights and sounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Creates personal and practice reflections that concretely describe a situation encountered and what happened, with limited interpretation.</td>
<td>...contains personal and practice-oriented reflections that concretely describe a situation encountered and what happened, with limited interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uses relevant data from a variety of empirical sources.</td>
<td>...uses relevant data from necessary empirical sources in order to support arguments and clarify positions the author takes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrates an ability to find and use one or more theories to convince a specific audience about an issue.</td>
<td>...demonstrates an ability to find and use one or more academic theories presented in class or from relevant sources to convince a specific audience about the importance of an issue/program design/practice decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describes how they made sense of their experiences and recognizes how this same experience could be described and interpreted differently by someone else.</td>
<td>...provides multiple ways student writer’s experience can be understood by drawing from necessary and relevant theoretical, scholarly, and community sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Presents more than one interpretation to explain a situation/organization/theory/program/practice using course (and other) material.</td>
<td>...addressed in #4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Demonstrates an ability to synthesize data by summarizing or critiquing two or more individual sources and explicating a relationship between them.</td>
<td>...demonstrates an ability to synthesize data by summarizing or critiquing two or more individual sources and explicating a relationship between them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides relevant evidence to support arguments.</td>
<td>...addressed in #3-5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inform and Persuade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Consistently uses APA or Chicago style of citation appropriately.</td>
<td>...consistently uses APA or Chicago style of citation appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Paper has been proofread.</td>
<td>...has been proofread and is free of errors that prevent comprehension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Captures the voices of the subjects that (where appropriate) evoke empathy and or/action in readers.</td>
<td>...captures the voices of the subjects that (where appropriate) evoke empathy and or/action in readers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Offers context-specific and audience-appropriate calls to action.

...demonstrates an understanding of the target audience by writing in a style that fits the audience, for example: scholarly, journalistic, practice-focused, policy-focused.

...includes an action and response that is reasonable and realistic given evidence provided.

Section 5: Summary of Implementation Plans and Requested Support

What does Youth Studies plan to implement in Year 1? What forms of instructional support does this unit request to help implement the proposed changes? What are the expected outcomes of named support?

The data collection, analysis, synthesis, reflection and discussions carried out with the assistance of the WEC program staff during the 2014-15 academic year led to the following implementation plan to be accomplished through three discrete types of activities.

1) Compile writing assignments across YOST required and elective courses and map them to the desired writing abilities outlined in Section 2 of this plan. There are several significant things we believe will be accomplished by this activity. First, the program will have a complete record of all the current writing assignments in the courses offered for the 2015-2016 academic year. This includes all of the core major courses and many of the electives. All faculty were extremely interested in doing this, both to develop a baseline of where we are and as a method of learning more about each other’s courses and assignments. Mapping each current writing assignment to determine its alignment with our desired writing abilities will allow us to determine the extent to which each ability is being focused on, to see if there are abilities that are not being sufficiently addressed in our courses, and to help us see if there is a logical and cumulative flow to the types of desired abilities as students move from 1000 and 2000 courses to the more advanced 3000 and 4000 courses. For example, we would hope to see that students are being introduced to and instructed in excellent descriptive writing before there is too much emphasis on analytic and persuasive writing.

2) Four meetings (two each semester) to bring together the 3.5 FTE YOST faculty and the 13 2015-16 community faculty members to systematically focus on various elements of assignment conceptualization, development, and assessment.

The basic purpose of and plan for each of these meetings is as follows:

Meeting #1 (Fall semester; Week 4 or Week 5) - A ‘Gallery Walk’ of Current Writing Assignments. During this two hour meeting, each faculty will select one or two major writing assignments from each course taught and prepare a brief description
of the assignment on poster paper. These assignment descriptions and explanations will be arranged around the room and faculty will be asked to circulate and read the assignments. Each faculty will have the opportunity to discuss his or her assignment's strengths, weaknesses, and implementation issues with the other faculty. Faculty expressed a great deal of interest in carrying out this activity early in the fall semester, as they are not fully aware of the major assignments in courses other than their own. This meeting will be facilitated by the two YOST liaisons.

**Meeting #2 (Fall semester; around Week 10)** - A Two Hour WEC Training/Workshop Focusing on Informal In-Class Writing Activities. This workshop will provide faculty with concrete and specific writing methods to incorporate in their classes. The YOST faculty is highly motivated to improve its knowledge of writing instruction in order to enhance the opportunities for students to become better writers. Faculty requested the opportunity to learn from the WEC staff about how to improve writing instruction within individual classes, and have expressed a commitment to work together to create a integrated writing curriculum across the program. This training is different from the curricular mapping and assignment sharing described above. This meeting will be facilitated by the WEC staff.

**Meeting #3 (Spring semester; Week 5)** - Presentation of the Findings from the Curricular/Writing Mapping. In this meeting, all faculty will be presented with the findings of the mapping begun early in the fall semester. Based on these findings, the faculty will begin to discuss and craft any curricular changes that may be in order. This meeting will be facilitated by two YOST liaisons with support from the WEC staff.

**Meeting #4 (Spring semester; Week 10)** - A Two Hour WEC Training/Workshop Focusing on Articulating Assignment Expectations and Grading. Faculty specifically requested that a workshop focusing on clearly articulating expectations and grading assignments be part of the Youth Studies Year 1 Writing Plan. This workshop will be led by WEC staff.

3) **Two panels of community-based youth work professionals will be invited to speak to specific Youth Studies classes during the fall and spring semesters and to address specific topics related to writing in the field.**

**Panel #1 (Fall semester; invited to YOST 2101 - Urban Youth and Youth Issues and YOST 3001 - Introduction to the History and Philosophy of Youthwork).** The two designated courses meet at the same time, are required, and are typically taken the first half of a student's time in the Youth Studies major. The 3-4 person panel will speak to the combined classes (about 70 students) and address the many ways in which writing is imperative to youth work as a field. The goal of the presentation is to inform students, from the perspective of practitioners in the field, of the many ways in which writing is critical to successful youth work practice and to encourage them to improve their writing while in the program. All Youth Studies students and
faculty will be invited to attend. This panel will be facilitated by the two WEC liaisons and the graduate assistant.

Panel #2 (Spring semester; invited to YOST 3032 - Adolescent and Youth Development for Youthworkers). Students are led through a grant writing process in this course. A three person panel will be invited to speak to the class of 30 students about the importance of developing this skill and speak about how they developed skills in grant writing. The panel presentation and discussion will be open to all Youth Studies students and faculty. This panel will be facilitated by a WEC liaison.

In order to implement this first-year plan, the following supports are requested:

1) A 25% time graduate assistant, for both fall and spring semesters, who will serve as the assistant to the WEC liaisons. This GA will be supervised by Linda Jones, co-WEC liaison and Director of Undergraduate Studies for the School of Social Work. The GA will be hired prior to fall semester, 2015. The assistant’s responsibilities will include the following: a) collect and organize all writing assignments in the six required and 13 elective YOST courses. Once assignments are compiled, the GA will work in consultation with faculty, to map writing assignments onto the YOST desired writing abilities. The GA will work with the liaisons to develop initial observations from this mapping to be presented to all faculty; b) work with all YOST faculty to determine which one or two assignments the faculty will present and discuss to other faculty during Meeting #1 - The ‘Gallery Walk’ of Current Writing Assignments. The GA will be responsible for getting all posters ready and will coordinate all Meeting #1 logistics; c) coordinate all planning and logistics related to Meetings #2, #3, and #4, in consultation with the WEC liaisons; d) help plan, coordinate, and oversee the two panels of youth work professionals in the field; e) assist the two WEC co-liaisons in reviewing the implementation of the Year 1 Plan and developing the Year 2 plan.

2) Consultation with WEC staff related to the incorporation of findings from the curricular assignment mapping and the development and delivery of the two training workshops described above;

3) Funding for the cost of lunch for all faculty and for parking for the community faculty to attend the four meetings outlined in this plan;

4) Funding for a small honorarium to be paid to the 7 community youth workers invited to participate on the two proposed panels.
Section 6: Process Used to Create this Writing Plan

How, and to what degree, where stakeholders in this unit engaged in providing, revising, and approving the content of the writing plan?

The data and thinking informing this plan accumulated during the fall, 2014 and spring, 2015 semesters as the Youth Studies major completed the initial WEC assessment process. From the data collected in the initial surveys of stakeholders, through the four structured meetings held with faculty, our thinking about useful steps for the Year 1 plan systematically evolved.

At any time, there are about 100 majors and 30 minors in Youth Studies. The program includes 3 T/TT faculty and one .5 P & A faculty. These four faculty teach only in Youth Studies. In addition, the major is greatly enhanced by a cadre of stable and dedicated community faculty (adjuncts) who teach a number of our courses. All 8 community faculty who taught required and elective courses in 2014-15 were consistently and strongly involved in our assessment and planning work this past year. These faculty are typically highly experienced community-based youth work practitioners, program leaders and executives, and researchers working in State agencies or non-profit youth serving programs and organizations. Without exception (as evidenced by their high degree of attendance and participation), all faculty were and are very enthusiastic about and supportive of these efforts. It is expected that all faculty involved in the assessment and planning phase, plus a few new community faculty, will continue to be part of the Youth Studies program during the Year 1 plan implementation.

By the time of the fourth meeting on March 6, 2015, the faculty was able to conceptualize and articulate the initiatives they felt would be most useful to them and to the program in Year 1. These initiatives are all represented in this plan. A draft of the Year 1 plan was circulated among the faculty so they could comment. Finally, the plan was approved unanimously by electronic vote.

The buy-in and enthusiasm of the faculty is very high. There is every reason to believe that this level of interest and participation will continue during the implementation phase.

Section 7: How Undergraduate Writing Plan Addresses University Student Learning Outcomes

Briefly describe how the ideas contained in this Undergraduate Writing Plan address the University’s Student Learning Outcomes (http://www.slo.umn.edu).

The University of Minnesota’s Student Learning Outcomes codify an educational vision and set of values. The University states that at time of graduation, students:

1. Can identify, define and solve problems
2. Can locate and critically evaluate information
3. Have mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry
4. Understand diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies
5. Can communicate effectively
6. Understand the role of creativity, innovation, discovery and expression across disciplines
7. Have acquired skills for effective citizenship and life-long learning

The Youth Studies WEC plan supports all of the learning outcomes by clarifying writing expectations and strengthening course assignments within the major. As a major with the primary goal of developing scholar-practitioners, emphasis is on developing an intermediary ability to identify, define and solve problems through locating and critically evaluating information. As scholar-practitioners, graduates will need to know how to use writing as a way to support their own civic commitments to the field and to support their life-long professional learning and development. As such the plan prioritizes these learning outcomes.
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:

A 25% time graduate assistant, for both fall and spring semesters, who will serve as the assistant to the WEC liaisons. This GA will be supervised by Linda Jones, co-WEC liaison and Director of Undergraduate Studies for the School of Social Work. The GA will be hired prior to fall semester, 2015. The assistant’s responsibilities will include the following: a) collect and organize all writing assignments in the six required and 13 elective YOST courses. Once assignments are compiled, the GA will work in consultation with faculty, to map writing assignments onto the YOST desired writing abilities. The GA will work with the liaisons to develop initial observations from this mapping to be presented to all faculty; b) work with all YOST faculty to determine which one or two assignments the faculty will present and discuss to other faculty during Meeting #1 - The ‘Gallery Walk’ of Current Writing Assignments. The GA will be responsible for getting all posters ready and will coordinate all Meeting #1 logistics; c) coordinate all planning and logistics related to Meetings #2, #3, and #4, in consultation with the WEC liaisons; d) help plan, coordinate, and oversee the two panels of youth work professionals in the field; e) assist the two WEC co-liaisons in reviewing the implementation of the Year 1 Plan and developing the Year 2 plan.
Define deadlines as applicable (please note that all deadlines must be completed within the funding period):

During Fall semester, 2015: Coordinate the Gallery Walk of Current Assignments; Assist with Meetings #1 and #2; Collect from and consult with each faculty about the alignment of current writing assignments with desired writing abilities in plan; Coordinate the first of two Community Expert Panels

During Spring Semester, 2016: Coordinate Meetings #3 and #4; Prepare the Assignment Mapping documentation for delivery to all faculty; Coordinate the second of two Community Expert Writing Panels; assist the WEC co-liaisons in preparing the Year 2 Writing Plan

Describe how frequently the RA will check in with the liaison:
The RA will check in with the co-liaisons once per week, or more when specific tasks require more frequent check-in.

Describe in detail the RA’s check-in process (e.g., via email, phone, in-person, etc.):
In-person check in is preferable; email check in will be used when needed. The RA will receive a clear listing of upcoming tasks and responsibilities, with due dates, and will report on progress.

---

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.
## Financial Requests

(requests cannot include faculty salary support)

*Drop-down choices will appear when cell next to "semester" is selected*

**Total Financial Request:** $17,429.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Semester 1: Sp</th>
<th>Semester 2: Spring, 2016</th>
<th>Semester 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% Ph.D. Graduate Assistant (salary/fringe) 2015-16 est.</td>
<td>$8,020.00</td>
<td>$8,103.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch for Meetings #1 and #2 (18 attendees @ $12)</td>
<td>$192.00</td>
<td>$216.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking coupons for community faculty and panelists</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$96.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria for 4 Community Expert Panelists</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semester 1 Total:** $8,714.00  
**Semester 2 Total:** $8,715.00  
**Semester 3 Total:** $0.00

### Rationale for costs and their schedule of distribution

The Graduate Assistant will assist the WEC co-liaisons with all proposed activities (Gallery Walk; Faculty Meetings; Trainings/Workshops; Community Expert Panels). Assistance will include organizing, coordinating, communicating, and follow-up related to each activity. Lunch will be provided to all faculty, the GA, and WEC staff (n=18) at the two fall semester and two spring semester meetings. Approximately 13 Community faculty (fall and spring semesters) and 7 Community Expert panelists (4 in fall; 3 in spring) will be offered a discounted parking coupon for the ramp across from the School of Social Work. The Community Expert Panelists (4 in fall; 3 in spring) will be paid a $100 honorarium.

## 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>Workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description and rationale for services

Fall Semester, 2015: WEC Consultation regarding findings from Meeting #1 (Gallery Walk of Current Assignments); Workshop on Informal In-Class Writing Activities.  
Spring Semester, 2016: Consultation regarding the Curricular Mapping; WEC facilitated workshop on Articulating Assignment Expectations and Grading.
June 8, 2015

To: Linda Jones and Ross VeLure Roholt, Youth Studies  
From: Robert McMaster, Office of Undergraduate Education  
Subject: Decision regarding WEC funding proposal

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>25% PhD Grad Asst.</td>
<td>$ 8,020.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Lunch for Meetings #1 and #2 (18 attendees at $12)</td>
<td>$ 192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Parking coupons for community faculty and panelists</td>
<td>$ 102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Honoraria for 4 Community Expert Panelists</td>
<td>$ 400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>25% PhD Grad Asst.</td>
<td>$ 8,103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Lunch for Meetings #3 and #4 (18 attendees at $12)</td>
<td>$ 216.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Parking coupons for community faculty and panelists</td>
<td>$ 96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Honoraria for 3 Community Expert Panelists</td>
<td>$ 300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 17,429.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All items above have been approved by the Office of Undergraduate Education, for a total of $17,429. 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.

CC: Suzanne Bardouche, Molly Bendzick, Will Durfee, Dan Emery, Pat Ferrian, Pamela Flash, Leslie Schiff, Julie Cutting