TRIANGULATING TEACHER PERCEPTION, CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS, AND STUDENT WORK TO EVALUATE SECONDARY WRITING PROGRAMS

A Record of Study

by

DAPHNE CARR HENDERSON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Chair of Committee,	William Rupley
Committee Members,	Zohreh Eslami
	Mack Burke
	Li-Jen Kuo
Head of Department,	Lynn Burblaw

May 2016

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

ABSTRACT

This study triangulated multiple sources of data to evaluate a secondary writing program and determine the professional development (PD) needs of secondary writing teachers. The researcher began by designing a needs assessment survey for writing teachers based on practices in writing instruction that yield high to moderate effect sizes on student learning, particularly among struggling writers. The survey was then administered to writing teachers at a socio-economically disadvantaged high school in Texas after conducting classroom observations and analyzing samples of student work. Triangulating data from these three sources revealed a need for future professional development activities to focus on: teaching grammar and conventions in the context of writing; modeling self-regulation strategies while drafting, revising, and editing with students; providing specific, meaningful feedback to students about their writing; and organizing ideas according to the purpose and mode of the writing task.

These findings are significant because classroom observations and student work samples revealed instructional weaknesses in the school's writing program that teachers did not perceive as high areas of need on the survey. The discrepancies between teacher perception and actual classroom practice suggest that campus leaders should avoid exclusively basing PD programming and evaluation on subjective data from participants. Furthermore, the triangulation of data from three sources established a reference point for future PD programming in writing and enabled the researcher to identify PD needs

that more clearly aligned with students' instructional needs. While the specific PD goals that evolved from the study are not generalizable to other secondary schools, the process of collecting multiple forms of data to determine the quality and needs of a school's writing program can be applied in other campuses. If used appropriately, the methods employed in this study can help campus leaders close the gap between theory and instructional practice to facilitate improvements in student writing outcomes.

DEDICATION

In memory of my beloved sister, Amanda Carr Waller, and our incomparable grandmother, Vialline Esco Carr.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Rupley, and my committee members, Dr. Eslami, Dr. Kuo, and Dr. Burke, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. I am also appreciative of Dr. Stillisano, who served as an advocate and mentor during my first two years of doctoral study, and Dr. Hill-Jackson, who taught me how to reflect, adapt, and persevere in the face of adversity as an educational leader.

Equally important to this study are the teachers, instructional specialists, and administrators who shared their instructional beliefs and practices as part of the data collection process. In spite of their hectic schedules, these colleagues made time to participate, critique, and advise when needed. Without their involvement, the present study would not have been possible.

Finally, I wish to thank my friends and family members for being a constant source of love, support, and affirmation over the past four years of doctoral study. I am indebted especially to my husband, Joseph Henderson, for being steady and true amid all the changes to our family life, and to my children, Jared and Devyn, for offering hugs on the tough days. But above all, I want to thank God for placing in my life all the wonderful people I have mentioned, and for being my song, my strength, and the lifter of my head.

NOMENCLATURE

ELA	English Language Arts
ELL	English Language Learner
PD	Professional Development
STAAR	State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness
RTI	Response to Intervention

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 2012 the National Center for Education Statistics published The Nation's Report Card in Writing based on nationally representative samples of student writing from 24,100 eighth-graders from 950 schools, and 28,100 twelfth-graders from 1,220 schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). Raters scored student responses to persuasive and expository prompts on a 6-point scale based on idea development, organization, and language conventions. The results indicated that less than 24% of eighth and twelfth-grade students taking the National Educational Assessment of Educational Progress demonstrated a firm academic performance in writing (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). While African-American and Hispanic students scored significantly lower than White and Asian students, scores also tended to be lower among urban students from low-income families and among students whose parents did not attain a baccalaureate degree or higher. (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012).

The same year The Nation's Report Card in Writing catalyzed discussions about effective writing instruction at the national level, composition results from the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) sparked similar talks in Texas. More than 150,000 high school freshmen in Texas failed to make satisfactory progress on the new state assessment in writing during its first administration in 2012 (Statewide

Summary Report in English I Writing, 2012). Among the 180, 870 testers who did meet the standard, only 26% wrote accomplished or highly accomplished expository essays (Statewide Summary Report in English I Writing, 2012). Despite an increased focus on student writing at the state and local levels within the last two years, the number of Texas students writing suitable compositions on the English I exam in March 2014 plummeted to 19% (Statewide Summary Report in English I Writing, 2014). These results are particularly disturbing because the ability to plan, organize, and draft an academic essay is an essential college readiness skill (Llosa et al., 2011). Without proper instruction in expository writing, students are ill-prepared for salaried positions, promotions in the workplace, or full participation in the responsibilities of civic life (Kiuhara, Graham, & Hawken, 2009).

Like other students in Texas, ninth and tenth-grade testers at East Bay High School have struggled to achieve satisfactory composition scores on the writing portion of the state assessment. In April 2014, approximately 12% of students tested in English I at East Bay High achieved mastery on the English I expository essay, and 19% of students tested in English II achieved mastery on the English II persuasive essay (State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness Summary Report, 2014). While the cognitive complexity of responding to academic writing tasks in timed situations can be daunting for any student, the demographics of East Bay High School and the surrounding community are also some of the strongest predictors of low academic achievement among students (Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, and Hayek, 2006).

Located in a highly industrialized area, East Bay High School serves nearly 2,000 secondary students in the eastern portion of Brown County, Texas. The United States Census Bureau indicates that 81% of inhabitants within the surrounding community of East Bay High are Hispanic or Latino. Sixty-five percent of families speak a language other than English at home, and only 5% of persons older than 25 have earned a bachelor's degree or higher. During the 2013-2014 school year, more than 70% of students at East Bay High School qualified for free or reduced lunch. At least 60% of students were also classified as at-risk (Texas Academic Performance Report, 2014). In 2014, English language learners (ELLs) constituted 22% of the 745 students taking the English I exam and nearly 15% of the 585 students taking the English II exam. The average writing score of ELLs on the English I expository essay was 3.10 out of 8—a performance categorized by the state scoring rubric as "between limited and basic." English language learners taking the English II exam also scored an average of 3.06 for their persuasive compositions (State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness Summary Report, 2014).

CHAPTER II

PROBLEM

Conversations with various stakeholders at the high school campus and district levels in East Bay ISD confirm a tumultuous history of professional development (PD) for high school English teachers over the last nine years. In fact, some stakeholders attributed the lack of consistent, quality PD in writing instruction for teachers at East Bay High School to high turnover rates in instructional leadership positions at the district level. The program director of secondary English language arts at the time of this study joined the district in October 2013, two months after the beginning of the school year, because district leaders desperately needed someone in the position who was capable of providing the PD teachers needed to improve students' writing capabilities. Before the director's arrival, teachers were required to deliver scripted lessons based on rigid timelines and pacing guides. Teachers who deviated from the prescribed curriculum were subject to verbal warnings from district specialists or written reprimands in their personnel files. At East Bay High School, in particular, teachers were unfamiliar with the concept of professional learning communities and unaware of recent changes in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) in English language arts. Consequently, as late as the 2013-2014 school year, teachers knew little about the new state standards, the complexity of the new state assessment (STAAR), or best practices in writing instruction.

A needs assessment survey was administered to secondary English language arts teachers and their supervisors in October 2013 to determine instructional topics for future PD sessions (Ellis 2013). After triangulating data among teacher surveys, administrator surveys, and administrator interviews, the program director concluded that teachers and administrators most desired training and support in working with special populations, planning with district curriculum documents, implementing the lesson cycle, facilitating the writing process, and increasing rigor (Ellis, 2013). At least 48% of the 116 secondary English teachers responding to the survey believed they had received adequate training in teaching persuasive writing. Approximately 70% of the same responders also felt they had received sufficient training in teaching expository writing (Ellis, 2013). In fact, teachers reported needing more assistance with teaching dramatic conventions than expository writing (Ellis, 2013). Despite teachers' self-reported strengths, only 12% of the 2,317 students in East Bay ISD taking the English I exam five months later earned, at least, a satisfactory score on their expository compositions (State of Texas Summary Report Spring 2014).

The discrepancy between secondary writing teachers' perception of their instructional strengths and secondary students' writing outcomes on STAAR has complicated efforts to improve student achievement in East Bay ISD through PD for teachers. As staff development researchers Joyce and Showers (2002) have noted, teachers' "beliefs and theories about the cause of perceived problems" in schools significantly impacts "the eventual selection of content to address [them]" (p.61). Administrators and school

leaders often defer to the opinions of their teachers regarding PD content to create a collaborative campus culture. Furthermore, content supervisors in ELA may lack confidence in their own writing abilities if they majored in a content area other than English or humanities as an undergraduate. In fact, several administrators who supervise secondary ELA teachers in East Bay ISD indicated on the needs assessment survey they had no idea what teachers needed regarding PD content (Ellis, 2013). This response is not surprising because administrators and instructional leaders in East Bay ISD have had no way of determining what teachers already know or need to know about writing instruction. Administrators have lacked data to elucidate secondary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge about writing or the status of teaching and learning writing in ELA classrooms for the last few years. Without this information, leaders have been unable to work effectively with secondary ELA program directors to select appropriate PD content for teachers that can bring about positive changes in students' writing outcomes.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

Joyce and Showers (2002) recommend that school leaders design PD experiences around curricular and instructional strategies that "have a high probability of affecting student learning" (p. 4). Therefore, identifying PD needs that can impact curriculum, instruction, and student behavior in a positive way at East Bay High School must begin with an analysis of research literature about best practices in writing instruction, particularly for ELLs. The following literature review highlights key research findings related to the essential knowledge and skills writing teachers should possess, the instructional practices that yield the highest effect sizes in students' writing—particularly in regards to ELLs, and best practices in professional development for teachers of writing.

Essential Knowledge

Researchers note that understanding how writing develops is crucial to delivering effective writing instruction (Graham & Perrin, 2007; Kaplan, 2008; Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013). By growing in their understanding of composition theory and practice, teachers increase their ability to make informed decisions in the classroom that can make a positive difference in the capabilities of student writers. In 2004, The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) published a position statement on writing instruction expressing what the organization believed teachers

needed to understand about writing to help students. Some of these key understandings included: how to confer with and assess student writers; how to cultivate a sense of community and personal safety in the writing classroom; multiple strategies for approaching the writing process and the typical problems writers face; appropriate conventions for academic English; text structures and reader expectations for various genres of writing; the relationship between conventions and rhetorical effect; ways to analyze qualitative or quantitative writing assessments and provide appropriate feedback; and how to use student writing portfolios for self-assessment and reflection.

Understanding cognitive and linguistic theory within the context of the composing process can especially help teachers address problems ELLs face in timed writing situations. The cognitive demands of deciphering academic prompts, deciding what to say and how to say it, and transcribing these thoughts on paper often overload ELLs' working memory (Olson, Scarcella, & Matuchniak, 2015). As a result, ELLs typically resort to superficial writing that merely summarizes or retells what they know about an assigned topic. Planning and translating absorb so much of students' time that they have insufficient working memory capacity to revise and edit their texts for clarity, cohesion, or the quality of their ideas (Olson et al., 2015). In order to help ELLs improve, researchers in the field of second language acquisition purport that teachers of ELLs need the same familiarity with process-oriented writing pedagogy that other composition instructors need. This is in contrast to "the strictly product-focused concerns of correctness in grammar, usage, and mechanics" that characterized ELL instruction

during previous decades (Panofsky, Pacheko, Smith, Santos, & Fogelman, 2005, p. 14). Explicit strategy instruction in writing can help students automatize writing processes and create more room in their working memory to engage in more complex linguistic tasks (Olson et al., 2015). Based on his research with ELLs in middle schools, Reynolds (2005) considers process writing strategies to be more beneficial for ELLs when they involve students in a deep revision based upon changes in audience and rhetorical purpose instead of implementing or correcting surface features. Matsuda (2003), Grabe (2003), and Johns (1999) refer to this as a "socio-literate" or "post-process approach" to writing instruction because it integrates reading and writing through the study of rhetorical moves implicit in various genres of writing and their effects upon readers in different contexts.

Effective Practice

Surveys and meta-analyses of research studies about writing instruction published in Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Educational Research, and American Educational Research Journal over the last ten years provide the most comprehensive coverage of best practices in writing instruction for teachers of writing. In a report detailing the findings of their meta-analysis of empirical research related to writing instruction, Graham and Perrin (2007) ranked 11 elements of effective adolescent writing instruction based upon their effect sizes. Although these components were not intended to constitute an entire writing curriculum, effective classroom instruction for students in grades 4-12 ideally includes various combinations of these elements in order

to meet the diverse needs of student learners: writing strategies (ES = 0.82), summarization (ES = 0.82), collaborative writing (ES = 0.75), specific product goals (effect size = 0.70), word processing (ES = 0.55), sentence combining (ES = 0.50), prewriting (ES = 0.32), inquiry activities (ES = 0.32), process writing approach (ES = 0.32), study of models (ES = 0.25), and writing for content learning (ES = 0.23) (Graham and Perrin, 2007).

In a meta-analysis of empirical studies involving the writing process published four years later, Graham and Sandmel (2011) found that engaging in the writing process improved the writing of general education students, but not struggling writers. Consequently, the authors suggested combining process writing with sentence combining and other traditional methods of instruction in order to meet the needs of struggling or at-risk writers. According to meta-analyses of research studies assessing the impact of specific writing interventions for special education students, the most documented intervention strategy by researchers is self-regulated strategy development (SRSD), with an effect size of 0.95 (Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2006; Graham & Perin, 2007; Graham & Sandmel, 2011). This particular strategy entails a study of writing exemplars in a selected genre, explicit strategy instruction in generating and organizing ideas, and mnemonic devices that assist struggling students with self-monitoring and reflection during the composition process.

Graham and Sandmel's (2011) observations about the need for explicit strategy instruction in writing for struggling students are also applicable to ELLs. As second-language researchers like Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) have noted, pre-writing strategies like freewriting, brainstorming, and listing are uncomfortable activities for ELLs and should be used with caution since they have only small positive effect sizes on student writing performance. Other researchers have also emphasized the need for teachers to supplement process writing strategies with sustained, intensive instruction in grammar and vocabulary since ELLs lack an intuitive sense of grammar and syntax rules (Hinkel, 2004). Research by Olson and Land (2007) substantiates the effectiveness of explicitly teaching and modeling strategies that enable learners to construct meaning and craft responses to complex texts. The two researchers engaged 55 secondary teachers in ongoing PD related to cognitive strategy instruction in reading and writing over an eight-year period. The study took place in a large, urban, socio-economically disadvantaged school district in California where 93% of students spoke English as a second language. Students of teachers who consistently modeled the use of "thinking tools" while reading and writing complex texts showed greater gains on large-scale writing assessments than their peers. In fact, the average effect size over a seven-year period was .34, ranging as high as .64 (Olson & Land, 2007, p. 289).

Professional Development

In 1982, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, an affiliate of NCTE, published a position statement detailing how professors, administrators, and

professional development specialists should design effective learning experiences for teachers wanting to improve their writing instruction. Though dated, this position statement still serves as a guiding document for professional development programs intending to build capacity in writing instruction among classroom teachers. The conference recommended that professional development programs in writing include opportunities for participants to: 1) write for various purposes and audiences in various forms; 2) read and respond to the writings of other colleagues, students, or professional writers, 3) reflect on their written compositions; 4) study and teach writing as a process; 5) experience writing as a way of thinking; 6) learn to assess the progress of individual students; 7) study research and other scholarly work on the discipline of teaching writing; and 8) study writing in relation to other disciplines.

Recent research and reports in the field of professional development also recommend that districts and campuses build capacity in teachers by increasing opportunities for teachers to engage in job-embedded professional development (Bransford, Brown, and Cocking, 2000; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Langer, 2000; Joyce & Showers, 2002; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009; Dierking & Fox, 2012). According to Croft, Coggshall, Dolan, Powers, and Killion (2010), job-embedded professional development is a term used to describe teacher learning that occurs within the daily environment of a professional educator. Its purpose is to enhance a teacher's instructional delivery or pedagogical content knowledge while also keeping in mind the ultimate goal of increasing student outcomes. Because this

type of learning takes place within the context of the school itself, the school building or classroom no longer serves as a place where unilateral decisions and transactions occur between administrators and teachers or even teachers and students. Instead, the school building becomes a community—a place where learners of all ages collaborate and solve problems for the good of the whole.

Research studies have shown that the establishment of professional learning communities through job-embedded professional development can yield favorable results in improving instruction and student performance in writing. For example, Langer's (2000) five-year study of the professional lives of 44 English language arts teachers in 25 secondary schools identified important commonalities among teachers whose students were high achievers in reading and writing. Having constant exposure to instructional theories and practices within professional learning communities was one of six notable similarities among teachers in these high-performing schools. The school environments in which these educators worked: 1) orchestrated coordinated efforts to improve student achievement, 2) created structured improvement activities in ways that offered teachers a strong sense of agency, 3) valued commitment to the profession of teaching, 4) engendered a caring attitude that extended to colleagues and students, and 5) fostered a deep respect for life-long learning (Langer, 2000). Another study by Pella (2011) found that four middle school language arts teachers transformed their teaching perspectives and writing pedagogy through participation in a small-group lesson study focused on teaching and learning writing. During monthly meetings, weekly email

correspondence, peer observations, and common lesson planning, participants negotiated conflicting theories of student learning that led to positive changes in thinking and instruction.

According to Guskey (2014), producing the right results with job-embedded professional development requires beginning with the end in mind. Just as educators plan units by first thinking of their standards and the appropriate assessments, school leaders should plan backward for campus success in the area of adult learning. Great results will not occur simply because schools say they are a professional learning community. Well-organized and effective job-embedded learning opportunities must be clearly tied to student achievement and offer opportunities for content-based, collaborative activities to occur on site with sufficient time provided for instructional planning (Guskey, 2003; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007).

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION

Too often, the pressure of high-stakes testing leads to superficial coverage of the state curriculum by way of extensive test-taking practices and "drill and kill" worksheets (Darling-Hammond, 2010). However, studies of educational reform in countries such as Finland, Korea, and Singapore indicate that comprehensive frameworks for PD are much more effective in producing long-term, sustainable increases in student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2010). In 2003, The National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges made a similar observation when it called for a writing revolution in American education that included increased instructional support for classroom teachers:

> We recommend that state and local agencies provide comprehensive professional development for all teachers to help improve instructional practice. They should provide pre- and in-service opportunities so that teachers themselves can write and enjoy the opportunity to respond to examples of student and peer writing. These efforts can help teachers experience writing both as a way of demonstrating knowledge and as a complex form of learning and discovery (p. 32).

As further evidence of the need for professional development in writing, a national survey of secondary teachers conducted by Kiurhara et al. in 2009 revealed that many teachers have an awareness of evidenced-based writing strategies even though they fail to implement consistently these strategies in the classroom. Teachers reported using verbal reinforcement and direct instruction for writing assignments, but very few noted the use of "inquiry activities, process writing, student collaboration, or exemplar models

of writing for students to emulate" (Kiurhara et al., 2009, p. 143). Most teachers were assigning infrequent, low-quality writing assignments and rarely providing effective instructional strategies and differentiation techniques for struggling student writers (Kiurhara et al., 2009).

Improving the academic writing of secondary students must begin with teacher education and improved classroom instruction. A critical first step in this process is obtaining a current picture of writing instruction and student learning in secondary ELA classrooms so that school leaders can evaluate more effectively the impact of PD on student achievement (Earley & Porritt, 2014). Previous efforts at designing PD for writing teachers in East Bay ISD have neglected to gather baseline data on teaching and learning writing. This omission has made it difficult for administrators to ascertain positive differences in student and teacher behaviors that can be attributed to training offered at the campus or district level. To create a comprehensive PD program that can lead to increased student outcomes in writing, school leaders in East Bay ISD need a method for collecting baseline data about writing instruction that can be translated into student-centered PD goals for teachers.

The present Record of Study uses East Bay High School as a model for addressing this problem of practice by gathering and analyzing data to create a current picture of writing instruction and student learning in secondary ELA classrooms on campus. The study includes an analysis of state assessment data and random samples of low-scoring student

essays, followed by the administration and analysis of a needs-assessment survey for teachers and classroom observation data. These findings are used to determine PD content and goals for English teachers at East Bay High School that can serve as reference points for future PD activities related to writing instruction. If applied appropriately, these goals will enable school leaders at East Bay High School to design comprehensive PD plans that focus on improved student outcomes in writing and the corresponding knowledge and skills that teachers need to facilitate them (Loucks-Horsley et al., 2010).

CHAPTER V

METHODS

Statement regarding Human Subjects and the Institutional Review Board

A preliminary review of methods for collecting information from human subjects determined that the methods proposed for this study did not meet the federal definition of "human subjects research with generalizable results." The proposed information gathering methods are within the general scope of activities and responsibilities associated with my current position; therefore, I was not required to seek human subjects approval. Please see Appendix B, which is a copy of the email communication regarding the IRB's decision about the study.

Objective 1

The first step in this study was to establish specific goals for PD in writing instruction that connect identified students' writing weaknesses and needs to the corresponding knowledge, skills, and understandings that teachers should acquire to provide instruction to meet these needs. To identify students' writing weaknesses and needs, the researcher analyzed scanned images of students' written compositions from last year's state assessment using an error analysis protocol aligned with the scoring rubric for the state writing assessment (Fisher & Frey, 2013). The researcher compiled a random sample of 40 out of 368 compositions that received a score of 2 (Very Limited), 3 (Between Very Limited and Basic), or 4 (Basic) based on adjacent scoring on the English I writing

assessment and 40 out of 362 compositions receiving the same low scores on the English II assessment. These compositions represent the performance of East Bay High School's most struggling writers since neither of the two scorers evaluating each composition considered the student's performance to be at a satisfactory level. Two other district specialists with over five years of teaching experience in high school English language arts and extensive training in writing instruction served as second raters. The researcher calculated inter-rater reliability using percent agreement in the two-rater model based on 20% of the sample sizes for both writing assessments. Among the eight categories on the error analysis checklist, the percentage of agreement among raters was 77.8% on the English I exam and 78.4% on the English II exam.

Disaggregated multiple-choice data related to revising and editing skills on the state assessment were also examined with the following two questions in mind:

1. Where are the gaps between the state standards for student writing and current student performance?
2. Do goals for teachers' professional development in writing instruction emerge from students' writing performance?

Using multiple sources of data to answer these two questions lead to a more comprehensive assessment of student needs (Murray, 2014). In this particular situation, a mixed-methods approach to data collection ensured that the determination of students' needs balanced overall trends in large-scale assessment data with insights from individual student compositions.

Objective 2

The next step was to identify teachers' instructional needs in writing that match the identified needs and weaknesses of students. This phase of the data collection process focused on answering the following questions:

1. What new knowledge, understandings and skills do English teachers at East Bay High School believe they need to more effectively address current student needs?
2. Can specific goals for PD in writing instruction emerge that connect the knowledge, skills, and understandings that teachers need to address identified student weaknesses in writing with teachers' self-perceived PD need in writing instruction?

Data collection processes for this objective entailed the following:

1. Administering anonymously PD surveys to English teachers to identify self-perceived areas of writing instructional needs. The knowledge and skills recommended by NCTE (2004) and the Texas State Board of Educator Certification (2006) were used as skill descriptors on the needs-assessment survey. The survey design was similar to the one created by Spanneut, Tobin, & Ayers (2012) to identify the professional development needs of high school principals based on licensure standards. Participants identified their level of PD needed in each of the skills listed on a four-point scale. The four levels were: 1 = not a need, 2 = low need, 3 = moderate need, or 4 = high need.
2. Conducting classroom observations of English teachers and taking field notes of writing instructional practices using an adapted form of the writing instruction observational protocols created by Henk et al. (2004) and Kotula et al. (2014). The presence or absence of identified teacher and student behaviors that aligned with effective writing instruction were coded as Y (yes/observed), N (no/not observed) or NA (not applicable to the lesson observed).
3. Identifying specific learning goals by triangulating data for agreement among survey results, classroom observations, and student work.
4. Translating areas of agreement identified into specific learning goals for teachers.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

Objective 1

Expository prompts typically ask students "to examine or convey complex ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately" (National Governors Association, 2010, p. 4). To accomplish this task, students must present a clear thesis, or statement of purpose for the essay, and provide concrete details and facts in order to teach readers about the assigned topic. The student essays examined in this study attempted to explain "whether failure can strengthen a person." Each of the 40 samples already received a basic or below satisfactory score from two raters on the state exam based on the essay's overall performance in the areas of idea development, organization, and language conventions. However, these holistic labels provide little information about specific errors that contributed to each essay's general impression. Using a protocol recommended by Fisher and Frey (2013), the researcher converted the state's performance descriptors for low achievement in each of these three areas into an item-analysis checklist of composition errors. This checklist was then used to identify specific traits in each sample that most likely led to its overall score.

An error analysis of 40 English I compositions from East Bay High School suggests that 25 students (62.5%) scoring less than satisfactory on their expository compositions used inappropriate, vague, or insufficient details and examples to support their thesis

statements. Nineteen students (47.5%) used simplistic, awkward, or uncontrolled sentences, and 16 students (40%) demonstrated little command of grammar and usage conventions. These results are consistent with research done by Llosa, Beck, and Zhao (2011) who found that translating ideas into words and generating adequate ideas to support assertions were the two most difficult tasks for both ELLs and non-ELLs when writing expository texts. In the case of ELLs, however, the inability to translate ideas into words often prevented them from writing anything at all whereas non-ELLs were more likely to make repeated attempts in articulating their thoughts (Llosa et al., 2011). Olson, Scarcella, and Matuchniak (2015) have also found that English language learners at both proficient and emergent levels require instruction in supporting key points, sentence complexity, pronoun reference, using transition words, cohesive devices, verb tense, and content-specific words and the academic words that support them.

Results from the multiple-choice portion of the English I exam further substantiate the need to provide students with increased instructional support in idea development and language conventions. Only 34% of low-performing students answered 3 or more out of 5 multiple-choice questions correctly about revising the thesis statement and supporting details of an expository text. Interestingly, more than half of these students (59%) fared better with questions about appropriate diction and transitional phrases, which is also consistent with observations of student work. Regarding language conventions, however, students taking the English I exam generally answered 51% of 11 test questions in Reporting Category 6 correctly. Questions in this category assessed

students' understanding of capitalization, spelling, and punctuation rules, in addition to conventions of academic language such as consistent verb tense and pronoun-antecedent agreement. Among ELLs, the results were much lower. On average, ELLs correctly answered 36% of the same 11 test questions.

In contrast to expository writing, persuasive or argumentative writing requires students to support claims with logical, relevant, and sufficient evidence (National Governor's Association, 2012). Students must present a reasoned opinion with supporting ideas to persuade readers to take action or adopt a certain viewpoint or belief. Ideally, students also acknowledge any opposing viewpoints and refute those ideas with evidence such as facts, examples, or expert testimonials to further substantiate their opinions. The essays examined for the present study were written in response to a persuasive prompt which asked students to "write an essay stating your position on whether learning always has a positive effect on a person's life." Just like the samples for the English I exam, each of the 40 persuasive essays received a basic or below satisfactory score from two raters on a scale of 1-4 based on the essay's overall impression.

Results from the error analysis of student samples suggest that inadequate idea development is even more troublesome for students when writing persuasive essays. Approximately 93% of the 40 essays examined by the researcher struggled with asserting clear reasons or sufficient evidence in support of a position statement. Eighteen essays (45%) were not organized appropriately for the demands of a persuasive

prompt. In particular, these essays failed to adapt an authoritative stance that imposed a "stepwise argumentation structure to a series of ideas" (Uccelli, Dobbs, & Scott, 2013, p. 40). Instead, these essays tended to provide general or irrelevant examples and anecdotes without making definitive claims. Fourteen essays (35%) demonstrated major problems with sentence boundaries due to sentence fragments, comma splices, and run-on sentences.

An item analysis of assessment questions on the English II exam revealed similarities between errors in students' writing and errors in students' answer choices. Only 22% of low-performing students were able to answer correctly two questions about establishing a clear position statement and supporting a claim with relevant evidence. Furthermore, only 7% of these students answered correctly two questions that specifically assessed their ability to identify and correct comma splices. These results suggest that students need to be targeted for instruction in language conventions, especially in constructing compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation. It can also be inferred that students' inability to organize their persuasive essays as a sequence of claims, reasons, and evidence or to identify these features in the writing of others reflects an overall unfamiliarity with persuasion as a genre of reading and a mode of writing. Students seemed to lack what Uccelli et al. (2014) refer to as the "organizational markers" of persuasive writing—specific rhetorical moves that signal the onset of claims, opposing viewpoints, rebuttals, and concluding statements—to improve the quality of their writing. In their linguistic analysis of the persuasive essays of high school students for

high-stakes exams, Uccelli et al. (2014) observed that aside from length, the frequent use of organizational markers (i.e. some people think, one reason is, for instance, to summarize) was consistently associated with high writing quality among instructors and essay scorers.

To summarize, STAAR assessment data from April 2014 highlight a noticeable gap between state standards for expository writing and actual student outcomes in regards to idea development and language conventions. The needs are the same at the sophomore level with the English II exam, with the added concern of students understanding tone, purpose and structure in persuasive writing. Thus, the goal for PD, regarding student performance, would be to increase the number of pupils who can correctly answer multiple-choice questions about idea development, organizational structure, and sentence construction and incorporate these skills into their writing.

Objective 2

As stated in the introduction, teachers' opinions about the root of perceived problems in schools significantly impact the PD content that administrators and instructional leaders select to address these problems (Joyce & Showers, 2002). Although goals for teachers' PD in writing instruction emerged from an analysis of student data, teachers' perceptions and ownership were also an integral part of the PD goal-setting process. A needs survey (see Appendix) was given to determine what English teachers at East Bay High School believed they needed to know or understand to address students' needs in writing

instruction more effectively. Of specific interest were any areas of agreement between identified student weaknesses and teachers' perceptions of PD needs.

A total of 14 secondary English language arts teachers participated in an anonymously administered survey online. The participants' years of experience in the teaching profession ranged from one year to over twenty years. Two respondents were male, and twelve respondents were female. Regarding ethnicity, one participant was African-American, four were Hispanic, and nine were Anglo-American. The survey listed 27 skill descriptors related to writing instruction and asked participants to indicate their level of PD need for each one based upon a four-point scale. The four levels were: 1 = not a need, 2 = low need, 3 = moderate need, or 4 = high need.

According to the results, the majority of teachers at East Bay High School considered incorporating technology in all phases of the writing process (57%), providing students with models for writing (57%), showing students strategies for addressing concerns that writers face during the composing process (57%), and teaching students how to critically evaluate sources for inclusion in their essays (57%) to be areas of high need for PD. However, regarding the teacher skills or behaviors most closely aligned with the identified needs of students, teacher interest was less conclusive. Four teachers (28.6 %) considered "understanding and teaching how a writer's purpose and audience define appropriate text organization" to be an area of low need while the remaining ten teachers were evenly split (35.7%) in identifying it as a high or moderate need. Responders

posted similar results for "providing students with explicit instruction in writing conventions (spelling, punctuation, usage, etc.) during the writing process." Four teachers (28%) perceived this skill as a low area of PD need while five deemed it a high need (35.7%), and five (35.7%) considered it a moderate need. There was slightly more agreement that "teaching grammar and usage without excessive terminology" was an area of high need for PD among teachers (42.9%), yet a few still regarded this skill as a low (21.4%) or moderate (35.7%) need. At least two responders thought that teacher behaviors related to instruction in writing conventions and grammar should be addressed in PD sessions across the district. In the words of one participant, "We need to get back to basics. Teachers need to be trained in how to implement this type of teaching without the drill and kill technique. Also, teachers need to refresh their skills and usage for grammar also. We cannot teach what we don't understand or do correctly."

In light of teachers' varied responses to PD topics related to students' weaknesses at East Bay High School, classroom observation data played a crucial role in further determining teachers' instructional needs for PD. Research studies have shown that teachers are sometimes unable to detect inconsistencies between their stated beliefs about effective pedagogy and actual classroom practice—particularly in high-stakes testing environments (Brindley & Schneider, 2002). This potential contradiction between belief and practice is a major reason schools should not exclusively rely on self-reported anecdotal evidence or subjective post-event evaluation sheets to determine future PD needs or gauge program effectiveness (Earley & Porritt, 2014). Initially, observations of

writing instruction at East Bay High School were conducted to determine if teachers' instructional weaknesses matched weaknesses in student performance. After analyzing the results of the needs survey, determining which high-yield instructional strategies teachers were currently using and whether these strategies were in agreement with teachers' perceptions of their instructional strengths became an area of interest, as well.

All fourteen English teachers were given the opportunity to schedule their classroom observation at least two weeks in advance. The teachers were encouraged to teach a lesson related to any phase of the writing process that best exhibited their skills in delivering writing instruction so that future PD activities could be personalized to meet their instructional needs. The researcher believed that the Hawthorne Effect would allow for the best possible scenario in writing instruction for each teacher. But even with the opportunity to schedule their observations in advance, four teachers (28%) were not teaching writing or engaging students in activities related to writing on the day of their scheduled observation. Consequently, the researcher and an assistant were only able to conduct observations of 10 teachers.

Although low-performing students at East Bay High School struggle with language conventions and sentence construction, no students were observed editing compositions or engaging in peer review using a teacher or student-generated checklist. Students were involved in revising compositions in only three classrooms. In light of students' difficulties with editing and language conventions, it is also interesting to note that only

one teacher encouraged students to use a dictionary or thesaurus during the revision process. In fact, in 90% of the classrooms observed (see Appendix), dictionaries, thesauruses, and style manuals remained on shelves away from students during instruction. There was also no evidence of students accessing reference materials using apps on mobile devices or tablets.

Agreement also emerged between teachers' perceived needs for PD related to providing students with exemplars for writing (57%) and modeling strategies to help students cope with various challenges writer's face throughout the writing process (57%). Only 30% of the teachers observed provided students with student models or professional essays to reference as they composed, and only two teachers (20%) actually modeled the drafting process for students. Five teachers total were observed writing along with students, but 3 of the 5 teachers merely showed completed versions of their drafts after composing each paragraph as opposed to thinking aloud and allowing students to see how they transformed words and phrases into complete sentences.

Regarding perceived instructional strengths, results from the needs survey indicated that teachers at East Bay High School considered teacher behaviors related to conferring with students (M 4.4) or facilitating the revising and editing phases of the writing process (M 4.7) to be the least urgent PD needs. Nearly half of the survey participants (42.9%) thought that "providing students with explicit instruction, meaningful practice, and effective feedback as they compose" was a low area of need for PD, with one responder

(7.1%) indicating that PD in this skill was not necessary at all. One participant commented that "this is expected and implemented in classrooms already" while another remarked that "what we are really missing is the time in the classroom to give instruction, allow students to compose, and then provide effective feedback."

Observational data did reveal that 70% of the teachers observed during writing instruction conversed with students during the drafting process. However, all of these conversations were between teachers and individual students in response to students raising their hands to ask a question about the assignment. Students who did not ask for help did not receive feedback on their writing at all during the lesson. Only one teacher was observed discussing writing with students and encouraging students to talk with peers about their writing. But even in this instance, neither the teacher's individual conversations nor the discussions among students were planned in advance or structured to address specific skills related to the writing task.

Thus, after triangulating data from student work, a needs survey for teachers, and classroom observation data, goals for PD clearly emerged. To improve writing outcomes on the state's writing assessment, struggling students at East Bay High School must be able to: 1) avoid comma splices and run-ons by writing compound or complex sentences with proper punctuation; 2) develop ideas in expository essays with specific details and examples; and 3) structure persuasive essays with claims, reasons, evidence, and rebuttals for opposing viewpoints. In order to teach these skills to students, teachers

at East Bay High School need PD activities that provide opportunities for them to study, practice, and receive feedback on their implementation of high-yield strategies related to: 1) teaching grammar and conventions in the context of writing; 2) modeling self-regulation during drafting, revision, and editing; 3) providing meaningful, specific feedback to students; 4) developing and organizing ideas appropriately according to the purpose and mode of the writing prompt—especially persuasive texts.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

Limitations

Due to the uniqueness of student and teacher needs at East Bay High School, the particular PD goals of this study are not generalizable to other schools with similar demographics. However, the process of collecting multiple forms of data to determine the quality and needs of a secondary writing program can be applied in other schools. The timed conditions under which students wrote their essays for the state assessment created a contextual constraint for struggling writers, particularly ELLs (Olson et al., 2015). Students at East Bay High School also were subjected to at least one district writing assessment and another state assessment for English language proficiency four weeks prior to taking STAAR in 2014. These constraints undoubtedly lead to testing fatigue and anxiety among the struggling writers whose compositions appeared in the study. Furthermore, some observations of classroom instruction occurred after the state assessment when many teachers no longer worried about teaching writing since, in the words of one teacher, they could now teach "the novels and plays [they] are not able to teach before the exam." These external factors likely impacted the quality of students' writing samples and the quality of instructional preparation and delivery during the study.

Significance

In a time of budget constraints and limited resources for public education, school leaders cannot continue allocating large sums of money for staff development initiatives that do not result in student improvement on large-scale writing assessments. Campuses must be able to determine writing teachers' PD needs using methods that directly link best practices in writing instruction to desired student outcomes. Gathering baseline data on teaching and learning is a crucial first step in this process. Without baseline data to elucidate the state of writing instruction and student performance before PD occurs, campuses have no reference points for evaluating a PD program's effectiveness.

The present Record of Study addresses the need for baseline data by presenting a student-centered process for determining the declarative and procedural knowledge that secondary teachers need to improve student writing. Although using needs-assessment surveys to identify topics for PD is fairly common in schools, interpreting these results in light of student performance data and classroom observations is not.

As the present study has shown, the process of gathering and triangulating data from these three sources can make evident the link between student behaviors and teacher behaviors, particularly in cases where teachers' stated pedagogical beliefs are not consistent with actual classroom practice. The discrepancies that emerge between teachers' stated beliefs and practices about writing instruction can help campus leaders identify misconceptions that often hinder teachers' implementation of high-yield instructional strategies. One of the problem areas identified in this study of East Bay

High School was the inconsistency between teachers' stated beliefs and practices about providing feedback to students during writing instruction. Telling students what they are doing correctly and explaining how they can correct their errors is essential to student progress, especially for struggling writers. On the PD survey, teachers attributed students' poor revision skills to apathy and disinterest. However, observational data also pointed to the complicity of teachers due to infrequent, generalized feedback to students during instruction. Equipped with the knowledge of this gap between theory and practice, instructional leaders at East Bay High can design PD activities that engage teachers in learning what it means to give specific, meaningful feedback to students instead of only focusing on student motivation.

The program evaluation methods proposed in this study can also assist campuses with progress monitoring for ELLs in Response to Intervention (RTI). Barrera and Liu (2010) consider monitoring based exclusively on student outcomes to be inherently fallible because of the dynamic, interactive nature of learning a second language within a specific socio-cultural context. The present study addresses this criticism by providing schools with an evaluation process that investigates student work along with classroom observations and teachers' stated beliefs about instruction. Klingner and Edwards (2006) recommend that instructional leaders make investigating classroom environments and school contexts an integral part of progress monitoring for ELLs in RTI. Looking critically at the quality of instruction ELLs are receiving in general education classrooms contextualizes student performance on assessments designed to gauge responsiveness.

Once secondary campuses can triangulate data to define, support, and evaluate best practices in writing instruction in general education classrooms, students with more intense writing needs can be appropriately identified and serviced through Tier-2 interventions. Multiple sources of data may also reveal instances where perceived weaknesses in a student's academic performance are actually due to ineffective instruction by the general education teacher (Barrera & Liu, 2010). In such cases, the appropriate response for students may be instructional coaching or additional professional development for the instructor.

Future Research

After identifying student-centered PD goals, the next step is for campus leaders to select a method of job-embedded professional development that provides teachers with opportunities to work collaboratively on these goals in professional learning communities. On the needs survey, the majority of teacher respondents at East Bay High School highly ranked lesson study as a PD method highly compatible with the school's schedule, budget, and yearly calendar. Lewis, Perry, and Murata (2006) define lesson study as a process in which a group of teachers observe a live classroom lesson, record observations, and collaboratively debrief or analyze their findings.

Teachers at East Bay High could implement lesson study by working in grade-level teams to research linguistic and compositional theory, SRSD, or other forms of explicit strategy instruction in writing that yield high effect sizes. Team members would then

craft a lesson that incorporates these strategies and observe each other teaching it. During the lesson, observers would make note of student behaviors and responses to specific instructional strategies and discuss their notes afterward as a team. To formatively assess the effectiveness of the PD process, the researcher and campus leaders could collect qualitative and quantitative data evincing the impact of teacher learning and instructional practice on student writing. Similar to the present study, data would originate from multiple sources such as teacher interviews or focus groups, classroom observations, and students' writing assignments or assessments.

In closing, effectively evaluating teaching and learning in secondary writing programs must begin with focusing on students' writing outcomes. Then, as Guskey (2009) has noted, "Success will come from finding the optimal mix of effective practices based on core elements that work well in a particular context or collection of contexts" (p. 231). Triangulating data from multiple sources enables educational leaders to understand more thoroughly the contexts in which teaching and learning take place. In addition to classroom environments, educational contexts include teacher perceptions and behaviors that inadvertently limit or thwart the efficacy of instructional interventions. To tackle these concerns, PD activities for writing teachers must address the complexities of the writing process and the socio-cultural contexts in which writing instruction takes place. The present study demonstrates how instructional leaders can attend to these issues using multiple sources of data to evaluate secondary writing programs and determine PD content. Working backward from student data, classroom observations, and teacher

perceptions captures the complexity of teaching and learning writing in secondary schools more completely. More importantly, it transforms PD planning—an activity that typically takes place two days before faculty in-service dates—into a dynamic, inquiry-driven process focused on increasing student outcomes.

REFERENCES

Barrera, M. & Liu, K. (2010). Challenges of general outcomes measurement in the RTI progress monitoring of linguistically diverse exceptional learners. *Theory Into Practice*, *49*(1), 273-280.

Brindley, R., & Schneider, J. J. (2002). Writing instruction or destruction: Lessons to be learned from fourth-grade teachers' perspectives on teaching writing. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(4), 328-41.

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (Eds.) (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

College Entrance Examination Board, N. N. (2003). *The Neglected "R": The Need for a Writing Revolution. Report of the National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges*.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1982). *CCCC position statement on the preparation and professional development of teachers of writing.*

Croft, A., Coggshall, J., Dolan, M., Powers, E., & Killion, J. (2010). *Job-embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it done well*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. http://www.gtlcenter.org/

Darling-Hammond, L. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(8), 597-604.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future.* New York, N.Y.: Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Dierking, R., & Fox, R. F. (2012). "Changing the way I teach": Building teaching knowledge, confidence, and autonomy. *Journal of Teacher Education 64*(2), 129-144.

Earley, P. & Porritt, V. (2014). Evaluating the impact of professional development: the need for a student-focused approach, *Professional Development in Education*, *40*(1), 112-129.

Easton, L. B. (2008). *Powerful designs for professional learning*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Ellis, C. (2013). *Secondary language arts training to provide: A Needs assessment.* (Unpublished report) ----, TX: East Bay ISD.

Ferris, D. & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2013). *Common Core English language arts in a plc at work, grades 9-12.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gillespie, A., Graham, S., Kiuhara, S., & Hebert, M. (2014). High School Teachers Use of Writing to Support Students' Learning: A National Survey. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 27*(6), 1043-1072.

Graham, S. & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 446-476.

Graham, S. & Sandmel, K. (2011). The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research, 104*(6), 396-407.

Graham, S., MacArthur, C., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.) (2013). Best practices in writing instruction (2nd Ed.). New York: Guilford.

Guskey, T. (2003). What makes professional development effective? *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(10), 748-750.

Guskey, T. (2009) Closing the knowledge gap on effective professional development. *Educational Horizons 87*(4), 224-231.

Guskey, T. (2014). Planning Professional Learning. *Educational Leadership, 71*(8), 10-16.

Harris, K., Graham, S., & Mason, L. (2006). Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers: Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(2), 295-340.

Henk, W. A., Marinak, B., Moore, J., & Mallette, M. (2004). *The writing observation framework: A guide for refining and validating writing instruction 57*(4), 322-333.

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Johns, A. M. (1999). Opening our doors: Applying socioliterate approaches to language minority classrooms. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 191-209). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal. 3rd ed*. Alexandria, V.A.: ASCD.

Kaplan, J. (2008). The national writing project: Creating a professional learning community that supports the teaching of writing. *Theory Into Practice 47*(1), 336-344.

Kiuhara, S., Graham, S., & Hawken, L. (2009). Teaching writing to high school students: A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology 101*(1), 136-160.

Kiuhara, S. A., O'Neill, R. E., Hawken, L. S., & Graham, S. (2012). The Effectiveness of Teaching 10th-Grade Students STOP, AIMS, and DARE for Planning and Drafting Persuasive Text. *Exceptional Children, 78*(3), 335-355.

Klingner, J. and Edwards, P. (2006). Cultural considerations with response to intervention models. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(1), 108-117.

Kotula, A. W., Aguilar, C. M., & Tivnan, T. (2014). *Developing a writing instruction observation protocol: Implications for practice, research, and policy*. Waltham, MA: Education Development Center, Inc.

Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J., Bridges, B., & Hyek, J. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature.* Retrieved from National Center for Education Statistics website: http://nces.ed.gov/npec/pdf/kuh_team_report.pdf

Langer, J. (2000). Excellence in English in middle and high school: How teachers' professional lives support student achievement. American Educational Research Journal 37(2), 397-439.

Lewis, C., Perry, R., & Murata, A. (2006). How should research contribute to instructional improvement? A case of lesson study. *Educational Researcher*, 35(3), 3-14.

Llosa, L., Beck, S., & Zhao, C. (2011). An investigation of academic writing in secondary schools to inform the development of diagnostic classroom assessments. *Assessing Writing 16*(1) 256-273.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Stiles, K., Mundry, S., Love, N., & Hewson, P. (2010). *Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historic perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15-34). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, J. (2014). Designing and implementing effective professional learning. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Writing 2011: National assessment of educational progress at grades 8 and 12*(NECS 2012-470), Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education, Washington, D. C.

National Council of Teachers of English. (2004). *NCTE beliefs about the teaching of writing*. http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/writingbeliefs

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects.* Washington, DC: Authors. Available at http://ww.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/

Olson, C. & Land, R. (2007). A Cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction for English language learners in secondary schools. *Research in the Teaching of English, 41*(3), 269-303.

Olson, C., Scarcella, R., & Matuchniak, T. (2015). *Helping English learners to write: Common core standards grades 6-12.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Panofsky, C., Pacheko, M., Smith, S., Santos, J., & Fogelman, C. (2005). *Approaches to writing instruction for adolescent English language learners: A discussion of recent research and practice literature in relation to nationwide standards on writing*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University.

Pella, S. (2011). A situative perspective on developing writing pedagogy in a teacher professional learning community. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 38*(1), 107-125.

Penuel, R., Fishman, B., Yamaguchi, R. & Gallagher, L. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(4), 921-958.

Quick facts from the U. S. Census Bureau (2010). Retrieved from: http://quickfacts.census.gov/

Reynolds, D. W. (2005). Linguistic correlates of second language literacy development: Evidence from middle grade learner essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(1), 19-45.

Rogers, L. A., & Graham, S. (2008). A meta-analysis of single subject design writing intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(4), 879-906.

Spanneut, G., Tobin, J., & Ayears, S. (2012). Identifying the professional development needs of public school principals based on the interstate school leader licensure consortium standards. *National Association of School Principals Bulletin, 96*(1), 67-88.

State Board for Educator Certification. (2006). *Texas Examination of Educator Standards Preparation Manual: English Language Arts and Reading 8-12.* Texas Education Agency.

State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness: Statewide Summary Report in English I Writing. (2012). Retrieved from Texas Education Agency website: http://tea.texas.gov/staar/rpt/sum/

State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness: Statewide Report in English I Writing. (2014). Retrieved from Texas Education Agency website: http://tea.texas.gov/staar/rpt/sum/

State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness: Summary Report for ----- High School. (2014). Retrieved from Texas Education Agency website: http://tea.texas.gov/staar/rpt/sum/

Texas Academic Performance Report for ----- High School. (2014). Retrieved from Texas Education Agency website: http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/tapr/2014/index.html

Wei, R., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad. (Technical Report). Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

A-1 Error analysis of expository essays

Error	Number	Percentage
Does not organize essay appropriate to the demands of the prompt	11	27.5%
Does not include a clear, logical thesis	5	12.5%
Does not maintain focus on the topic or issue	13	32.5%
Does not include appropriate transitions	9	22.5%
Uses inappropriate, vague, or insufficient details/examples	25	62.5%
Word choice hinders quality and clarity of the essay	11	27.5%
Uses simplistic, awkward, or uncontrolled sentences	19	47.5%
Little command of grammar and usage conventions	16	40%

N=40

A-2 Error analysis of persuasive essays

Error	Number	Percentage
Does not organize essay appropriate to the demands of the prompt	18	45%
Does not include a clear, logical position	6	15%
Does not maintain focus on the topic or issue	9	22.5%
Does not include appropriate transitions	12	30%
Uses inappropriate, vague, or insufficient reasons/evidence	37	92.5%
Word choice hinders quality and clarity of the essay	7	17.5%
Uses simplistic, awkward, or uncontrolled sentences	14	35%
Little command of grammar and usage conventions	12	30%

N=40

A-3 Student behaviors during observations

Observation occurred while students were engaged in:	
Conferencing	1
Revising	3
Pre-writing	8
Drafting	8
Editing/Publishing	0
Assessing/Reflecting	0

N=10

A-4 Teacher and student behaviors during revising

Behavior	Y	N
The teacher provides an example of the revision skill or strategy.	3	0
The teacher models use of the revision skill or strategy.	2	1
The teacher provided a clear explanation about the nature of the writing skill or strategy to be learned, describing when, why, and how it could be used.	1	2
The teacher provides time, in class, for students to practice the revision skill/strategy.	3	0
The teacher works with individuals and/or small groups as students practice the revision skill/strategy.	1	2
Students were encouraged to use writing tools such as a dictionary or thesaurus during the revision process	1	2
Students were provided with appropriate opportunities and time for making revisions.	2	1

N=10

A-5 Participant behaviors during drafting and conferencing

Behaviors	Y	N
Students were encouraged to plan how to start, proceed with, and end their writing.	5	2
The teacher regularly encouraged to use writing tools during drafting such as a dictionary or thesaurus.	0	9
The teacher works with individuals or small groups while students are composing.	7	2
The teacher provides an example of writing related to the composition lesson.	3	6
The teacher models the drafting process for students.	2	7
When appropriate during drafting, the teacher held whole-class discussions to clarify expectations or to provide direction to the group.	6	3
The teacher initially encouraged students to get their ideas down on paper and not to focus too intently on print conventions.	2	7
The teacher reminded students to make use of their knowledge of text structure in writing their drafts.	6	3
Opportunities are provided and students are encouraged to have peer conferences to discuss their writing with a partner or in a small group.	1	0
As appropriate, writing conferences are held to assist students with their prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing.	1	0
During the conference, the teacher and student negotiated goals for the revision/editing of the work under review.	0	1
The purpose of the teacher-led writing conference(s) was clearly stated and understood by the student(s).	0	1
The teacher conducts informal or scheduled writing conferences that are timely, focused, and positive in nature.	0	1
The teacher helped students prepare for the conference(s) by providing a checklist, chart, or guiding questions.	0	1

N=10

APPENDIX B

Jul 4, 2014

Carol Stuessy <c-stuessy@tamu.edu>

Dear Daphne,

The IRB has determined that your proposed ROS plans do not require IRB approval. Once the fall internship begins, you will be able to begin collecting information to frame your problems as soon as we complete preparations to "frame" your ROS problems. I would suggest that you re-read the documents associated with the Cohort III Interim Report and begin reading your text for the internship:

Cuban, L. (2001). How can I fix it? Finding solutions and managing dilemmas: An educator's road map. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

With my best regards,

Dr. Carol Stuessy, Director
Online Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture

APPENDIX C

WRITING INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Observer: _____ School: _____ Date: _____ Time: ____

Observation occurred while children were engaged in:
__Pre-writing ___Drafting __ Conferencing __Revising __ Editing/Publishing ___
Other:_____

Classroom Climate	**Y**	**N**
The classroom environment indicates that writing is valued and actively promoted. A variety of the students' formal/published writing and informal writing such as notes, lists, and reminders are displayed in the classroom.		
The tools of writing (e.g., dictionary, thesaurus, style manuals) are available for student use at all times		
The teacher talks about what good writers do and shares examples of high-quality writing.		
The teacher participates in the learning process by writing alongside the students.		
Positive and supportive social interaction occurs within the writing classroom.		
The teacher and students share a common language for discussing writing.		
The teacher explicitly states, verbally, the writing session's objective.		
The teacher explicitly explains how previous lessons relate to today's writing session.		
Pre-writing	**Y**	**N**
The teacher helped students activate their background knowledge about the writing topic and the intended audience.		
Students were encouraged to prewrite using one of a variety of organizers such as concept maps, webs, lists, and outlines.		
The teacher reviewed students' prewriting organizers and provided verbal or written feedback.		
Students were provided with adequate time for prewriting.		
Drafting	**Y**	**N**
Students were encouraged to plan how to start, proceed with, and end their writing.		
The teacher regularly encouraged to use writing tools during drafting such as a dictionary or thesaurus.		
The teacher works with individuals or small groups while students are composing.		
The teacher provides an example of writing related to the composition lesson.		
The teacher models the drafting process for students.		
When appropriate during drafting, the teacher held whole-class discussions to clarify expectations or to provide direction to the group.		
The teacher initially encouraged students to get their ideas down on paper and not to focus too intently on print conventions.		
The teacher reminded students to make use of their knowledge of text structure in writing their drafts.		

Conferencing	**Y**	**N**
Opportunities are provided and students are encouraged to have peer conferences to discuss their writing with a partner or in a small group.		
As appropriate, writing conferences are held to assist students with their prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing.		
During the conference, the teacher and student negotiated goals for the revision/editing of the work under review.		
The purpose of the teacher-led writing conference(s) was clearly stated and understood by the student(s).		
The teacher conducts informal or scheduled writing conferences that are timely, focused, and positive in nature.		
The teacher helped students prepare for the conference(s) by providing a checklist, chart, or guiding questions**.**		
Revising	**Y**	**N**
The teacher provides an example of the revision skill or strategy.		
The teacher models use of the revision skill or strategy.		
The teacher provided a clear explanation about the nature of the writing skill or strategy to be learned, describing when, why, and how it could be used.		
The teacher provides time, in class, for students to practice the revision skill/strategy.		
The teacher works with individuals and/or small groups as students practice the revision skill/strategy.		
Students were encouraged to use writing tools such as a dictionary or thesaurus during the revision process.		
Students were provided with appropriate opportunities and time for making revisions.		
Editing/Publishing	**Y**	**N**
Students were provided with the opportunity and to engage in peer-review prior to publishing their writing.		
The teacher provided opportunities for students to share their published writing with the intended audience and one another.		
The students used a checklist generated by the class and/or the teacher to edit their work prior to publication.		
Assessment	**Y**	**N**
The teacher's planned goals, actual instruction, and assessment practices were aligned.		
The teacher maintains a writing folder or portfolio for each student.		
Students maintain evidence of their work at all stages of the writing process in their portfolios or writing folders.		
The teacher or students use scoring rubrics to evaluate the quality of students' writing.		

APPENDIX D

WRITING INSTRUCTION PD SURVEY

COMPOSITION THEORY & CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

This survey gathers data to determine what PD topics or activities should be offered to secondary English teachers in order to increase teacher efficacy and student achievement in writing. Select the button that best describes your level of need for professional development in the areas listed below. Comments for each question are welcomed, but not required.

1) Creating a sense of personal safety in the classroom so that students are willing to write freely and at length.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

2) Knowing and understanding the stages and recursive nature of the writing process.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

3) Knowing and understanding various factors that influence student writing.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

4) Understanding and teaching writing as a tool for inquiry, research, and learning.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

5) Understanding and promoting the use of technology in all phases of the writing process and in various types of writing.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

PRE-WRITING & DRAFTING

6) Teaching the distinguishing features of various forms of writing (i.e. reflective essays, editorials, reports, abstracts, résumés, plays, etc.).*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

7) Providing students with explicit instruction, meaningful practice, and effective feedback as they compose.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

8) Providing students with multiple strategies for approaching typical problems writers face while composing.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

9) Providing students with professionally written, student-written, and teacher written models of writing.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

10) Teaching students to evaluate critically the sources they use for their writing.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

CONFERENCING

11) Structuring peer conference opportunities that elicit constructive, specific responses and promote students' writing development.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

12) Organizing the classroom and/or schedule to permit individual teacher-student conferences.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

13) Knowing when and how students should talk about their writing.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

14) Establishing a balance between talk and writing in classroom management.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

15) Setting up and managing student talk in partnerships and groups.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

REVISING & EDITING

16) Providing students with explicit instruction in writing conventions (spelling, punctuation, usage, etc.) during the writing process.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

17) Teaching grammar and usage without excessive terminology.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

18) Applying strategies for developing voice and style in students' writing.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

19) Understanding and teaching how a writer's purpose and audience define appropriate text organization.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

20) Analyzing and teaching the use of literary devices (for example, imagery, tone, dialogue, characterization, irony, figurative language) in writing.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

21) Understanding and teaching students the importance of using acceptable formats for communicating research results and documenting sources (for example, manuals of style such as *Modern Language Association Handbook* [MLA

style],*Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* [APA style], and *The Chicago Manual of Style* [Chicago style]).*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

22) Providing instruction about plagiarism, academic honesty, and integrity in students' written work and their presentation of information from different sources.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

ASSESSMENT

23) Using assessment results to plan and adapt instruction according to students' strengths, needs, and interests. *

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

24) Setting up procedures for monitoring and assessing students' writing development.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

25) Using portfolios to assist writers in their development.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

26) Using criteria from scoring guides and rubrics to evaluate students' written work. *

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

27) Teaching students effective strategies for evaluating their own writing and the writings of others.*

( ) Not a need ( ) Low need ( ) Moderate need ( ) High need

Comments:

APPENDIX E

ERROR ANALYSIS CHECKLIST: EXPOSITORY

	Error
	Student does not organize essay appropriate to the demands of the prompt.
	Student does not include a clear, logical thesis.
	Student does not maintain focus on the topic.
	Student does not include appropriate transitions
	Student uses details and examples that are inappropriate, vague, or insufficient.
	Student's word choice hinders quality and clarity of the essay.
	Student uses simplistic, awkward, or uncontrolled sentences.
	Student has little command of grammar and usage conventions

APPENDIX F

ERROR ANALYSIS CHECKLIST: PERSUASIVE

	Error
	Student does not organize essay appropriate to the demands of the prompt.
	Student does not include a clear, logical position.
	Student does not maintain focus on the issue.
	Student does not include appropriate transitions.
	Student uses reasons and/or evidence that is inappropriate, vague, or insufficient.
	Student's word choice hinders quality and clarity of the essay.
	Student uses simplistic, awkward, or uncontrolled sentences.
	Student has little command of grammar and usage conventions