SELF-REGULATED STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT WRITING APPROACH: A SINGLE

FIFTH GRADE CLASSROOM

A Record of Study

by

JACKLYN C. DAVENPORT

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Chair of Committee,	Sharon Matthews
Co-Chair of Committee,	Debra McKeown
Committee Members,	Radhika Viruru
	Monica Vasquez Neshyba
Head of Department,	Claire Katz

December 2022

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

ABSTRACT

Many students across the US, specifically in Texas, struggle with writing on grade level. On the last National Assessment of Educational Progress (2012), 70% of eighth- and twelfth-grade students were not writing on grade level. On the 2021 State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) Writing, only 26% of the fourth grade students met grade level writing standards, and 31% of seventh grade students met grade level writing standards. Writing is an essential skill students need to have. Writing is used to express ideas and opinions, write about what students are learning and reading about in their classes, and use it in their personal lives (e.g., social media, texting).

For this record of study, the researcher employed a one-group pretest/posttest design to explore the impact of the self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) persuasive writing approach on the quality of a class of fifth grade students' writing and the inclusion of persuasive elements. In this study, the researcher taught the six step SRSD persuasive writing approach through 15 lessons. A paired t-test analyzing the holistic quality scores data demonstrated the impact of the instruction on student writing quality. Another paired t-test analyzing the total persuasive elements data demonstrated the instruction's impact on student knowledge of the genre. Results indicated that the SRSD instruction positively impacted students' writing quality. Elementary teachers who want to improve their students' writing can integrate the SRSD writing approach into their curriculum. To help elementary teachers in a similar context, the researcher created a PD agenda to help teachers be able to implement the approach in their classrooms.

DEDICATION

To my parents

To all my students past, present, and future

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOMENCLATURE

EL	English Learner
ELAR	English/Language Arts/Reading
EOC	End-of-course
LD	Learning Disability
IRR	Interrater Reliability
M	Mean
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
PBPD	Practice Based Professional Development
PD	Professional Development
POW	Pick a topic, Organize your notes, and Write and say more
SD	Standard Deviation
SPED	Special Education
SRSD	Self-Regulated Strategy Development
STAAR	State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness
TEKS	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills
TREE	Topic sentence, Reasons, Evidence, Ending
US	United States
WWC	What Works Clearinghouse

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Students' ability to write has been discussed and reported on for decades. These discussions have led educators and employees to ask, "Is there a national writing crisis?" When discussing the writing crisis, Graham (2013) stated, "The problem is that the world has not remained the same since the 1970s. We have transitioned to a knowledge economy that demands higher literacy levels and stronger communication skills for all workers. Students who cannot meet these demands are at risk of being left behind in the 21st-century economy" (p. 3). This writing crisis can be seen in national, state, and local data. For example, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data revealed that only 27% of eighth and twelfth graders scored on grade level or above on the 2011 national writing assessment. These gaps in students' writing also transitioned into the business world. According to the National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and Colleges (2004), more than two-thirds of salaried jobs involved writing in some form and capacity. When students leave school with a fundamental lack of writing skills, employers spent $3.1 billion to train their employees to write (College Board, 2012). To address the gaps in writing, educators must make writing a priority. Graham's (2013) answer was to start with the "foundational skills in elementary school, which will help foster higher-level thinking and writing" (p. 3). The Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) writing approach is an evidenced-based writing approach elementary teachers can implement to help end this writing crisis (Baker et al., 2009; Graham & Perlin, 2007; Graham, 2013; Institute of Educational Services, 2012).

The Context

National Context

Writing is an foundational skill students need to use effectively. Writing is used in various settings to persuade and inform (Graham, 2013). However, nationally students were not performing on grade level in writing at all school levels. "The majority of US students write at a basic level or below the basic level, which makes it difficult for them to communicate in writing at school and limits further employment opportunities" (Kim et al., 2013, p. 461). The National Center for Education Statistics (2012) saw the NAEP writing scores stay about the same since the 1970s. According to the NAEP (2002), two-thirds of the students in grades 4, 8, and 12 wrote at or below basic levels. In 2007, NAEP reported slight increases in the proficient and above categories (Institute of Educational Sciences, 2007). On the 2011 NAEP assessment, 27% of eighth graders and 27% of twelfth graders scored proficient or advanced (last time this test was taken). This means that 73% of the eighth and twelfth graders scored below grade level. The NAEP writing assessment data has shown that US students struggle to meet grade level written communication expectations.

The struggle with writing was also seen in Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) data and in college writing. The 2012 SAT results showed that only 43% of SAT testers were ready for college-level work. The College Board (2012) reported declining writing quality on the SAT writing assessment. According to the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (2002), half of the first-year college students could not write an error-free paper, and one-fifth ha to take a remedial writing class. The writing deficits in both high school graduates and college students transitioned into workplace writing deficits.

Writing is vital for students to be career-ready, which is a significant focus for many school districts. Writing could be inherent to their jobs and needed to advance in their careers (National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and College, 2004). The

National Commission on Writing (2006) found that at least 80% of blue-collar and white-collar workers stated that writing was important for success. Not only did many jobs require employees to write, but writing affected how an employer viewed their employees. According to Beason (2001), writing errors lead to employees being seen as unprofessional and thus harmful to their credibility, which could lead to negative views of the writer. Employers could perceive the "writer" of the texts (employee) as careless, not detailed, and may harm customer relations and sales (Beason, 2001). The National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and College (2004) surveyed major American corporations about writing in the workplace and found that writing was crucial for obtaining salaried jobs in many fields. Of the companies that returned the survey, two-thirds of the salaried jobs required some writing. Writing was considered a "gatekeeper" (National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and College, 2004, p. 19). About 90% of the business stated that they frequently or almost always hold poorly written applications against a job candidate. "In a nutshell, the survey confirms our conviction that individual opportunity in the US depends critically on the ability to present one's thoughts coherently, cogently, and persuasively on paper" (National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and College, 2004, p.5). This is because society is moving towards a "knowledge-based" economy (Trilling & Fadel, 2009). According to the Business Roundtable (2009), current jobs required higher literacy skills than previously, and the trend will continue. The jobs that paid a living wage required those "high-level literacy skills" (Berman, 2009). Writing impacted how employers view their employees, success at one's job, and determined future career opportunities.

Writing matters in the 21st century because being able to communicate effectively is essential. Students who have writing deficits are at a disadvantage (Tracy et al., 2009). "Writing

well is not just an option for young people—it is a necessity. Along with reading comprehension, writing skill is a predictor of academic success and a basic requirement for participation in civic life and in the global economy" (Graham & Perin, 2007, p. 3). Lower grades, fewer job opportunities, and a more challenging time participating in their local community were a few ways students could be negatively affected by having below-average writing skills. Nationally, most US students struggled with mastery of writing skills at their grade level. According to Graham (2013), establishing foundational writing skills in elementary school was where the writing gaps needed to be addressed.

Situational Context

In Texas, students take State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) tests, a high-stakes standardized test taken once a year that is used to make vital decisions and played into a school rating. Texas students used to take the STAAR writing test in grades four and seven. This STAAR test consisted of writing a personal expository composition and answering revising and editing questions. There were also writing components on the English I (freshman), English II (sophomore), and English III (junior) end-of-course (EOC) exams in high school. In 2022-23, the writing components was added to the STAAR reading test for elementary students. This change for elementary students emphasized the importance that Texas was placing on writing skills for elementary students.

The STAAR writing results were marginally better than the NAEP writing results. In 2019, 65% of the fourth grade students approached standard on STAAR writing, which meant they were below grade level (Texas Education Agency, 2019). The majority of the fourth graders in Texas had not mastered the writing standards (TEKS). The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) were the standards teachers were expected to teach, and the students were

expected to learn. This score was 7% better than the last fourth grade NAEP writing assessment. The fourth grade students' average composition score was two out of four (where a score of three represents meeting grade level expectations). On the revision questions, the fourth graders averaged 66% correct and 72% on the editing questions. In 2019, 40% of the seventh grade students met standard on the STAAR writing test, which meant they were on grade level (Texas Education Agency, 2019). Again, this meant that the majority (60%) of seventh graders do not have the foundational writing skills expected of their grade level. The seventh grade students' average composition score was also two out of four. On the editing questions, 64% were answered correctly, while 68% of the revision questions were answered correctly. Composition writing was where both groups scored the lowest.

Once Texas students were in high school, they took three EOC English exams. These exams consisted of both reading and writing standards. In Spring 2019, English I EOC data demonstrated that the average points scored for the composition were 8.5 out of sixteen (Texas Education Agency, 2019). Students received a little more than 50% of the possible points they could have scored. The English I students answered 66% of revision and 65% of editing questions correctly. The English II EOC's average points for their written composition was nine out of sixteen [56%] (Texas Education Agency, 2019). These English II students answered 68% of the revision and 72% of the editing questions correctly. These English II students scored slightly higher than the English I students. The English III students scored lowest on the composition, with 7.9 out of 16 [49%] (Texas Education Agency, 2019). These English III students answered 63% of the revision and 68% of the editing questions correctly. Similar to the elementary and middle school students, the composition was where the high school students scored the lowest. These high school students were also struggling to write on grade level.

The data reported in the following two paragraphs were from a real district and a real school, but the names were changed to protect the participants' privacy. For this study, the district was named Bluebonnet District, and the elementary school was named Armadillo Elementary School. In Texas, schools received a report card and an accountable rating. The rating was based on three domains: student achievement, school progress, and closing the gaps. In 2019, Bluebonnet District's TEA report card revealed that about 25% of the fourth grade students who took the writing STAAR were on grade level for writing, which was lower than the state average (38%). The overall writing score for Bluebonnet District high school students was hard to find due to how data included both reading and writing. In 2017, about 50% of English I and English II students passed their EOC English exams (Texas Education Agency, 2019), and these scores decreased from 2016.

Writing has been a struggle in Texas, especially at Armadillo Elementary School. The State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness writing scores were the lowest STAAR scores the campus received, especially in the last five years. In 2019, about 30% of the fourth grade students met or exceeded grade level expectations, which was higher than the district's average (about 30%). About 60% of the fourth grade students scored at or above approaches, which meant they passed the score Texas set but did not meet grade level expectations. When the "did not meet expectations" group (about 10%) were added to the approaches, one can get a proper understanding of the below-grade level percentage (about 70%). Approximately two-thirds of the fourth grade students at Armadillo Elementary were not on grade level for writing. When looking at the composition scores, most of the fourth graders averaged two out of four points, meaning many of the students were below grade level regarding their writing. Getting the

students to apply what they learned to their written compositions was one of the struggles faced at Armadillo Elementary School.

This trend was not just shown in the 2019 data but shown for at previous five years across all Texas education levels. The 2019 STAAR writing data showed that most Texas students were still below grade level in writing. Writing gaps continued to build as students progress through school, so the students were not meeting the expectations (TEKS) set for each grade level. The SRSD writing approach could help close these writing gaps because once students master the foundations of the three genres (persuasive, informational, narrative), the foundation could be expanded to meet all grade level writing expectations.

The Problem

Relevant History of the Problem

According to the STAAR writing results, writing has been a struggle overall in the Bluebonnet District and at Armadillo Elementary School over the last five years. The data revealed that writing was the weakest STAAR tested subject and that the majority of the students were below grade level in writing. While writing was a struggle for the students, at least four writing programs from the Bluebonnet District were implemented at the elementary level.

The first program introduced was the engaged literacy strategy. The elementary teachers in Bluebonnet District attended a one-day training in January of 2018 to learn how to implement the engaged literacy strategy in classrooms. There were six steps to the engaged literacy strategy process: (a) determine the purpose and identify important information in the question/problem/prompt; (b) make the question/problem/prompt into a statement; (c) read the text actively; (d) complete a writing plan; (e) write the responses; and (f) read and revise/edit as

needed. The engaged literacy strategy was used for the rest of the semester, and then it was not used again.

Another approach used was called Patterns of Power by Jeff Anderson, which was introduced in November 2019. This program focused on teaching students grammar skills through mentor sentences. Teachers picked a sentence that demonstrated the skill they wanted to focus on from a text they had read. Together the teacher and students discussed what they noticed about the mentor sentence. Next, the students compared and contrasted two sentences: the first sentence and a new sentence. Once the discussions happened, the teacher stated the focus phrase. The students then imitated the skills by creating their own sentences, which can be done together as a class, with a partner, and/or by themselves. Students shared what they had written as well as connected it in action. Lastly, students edited in action, which meant they applied what they learned to their work from that point forward. Most fourth grade teachers in the district attended training on Patterns of Power to incorporate it into writing instruction.

The Bluebonnet District also used Lucy Calkins's writing, especially in the younger grades. Each English/Language Arts/Reading (ELAR) classroom had a Lucy Calkins kit. A couple of years ago, the fourth grade teachers went to a half-day training about using Lucy Calkins. For example, participants talked about using boxes and bullets to help students brainstorm for their personal expository. Teachers used the scope and sequence to reference Lucy Calkins's lessons to teach the different writing genres.

Last school year, ELAR teachers used the resources provided in the Pearson textbook, Lucy Calkins kit, and other resources they had on campus. Bluebonnet District's 2021-22 fifth grade instructional guide stated what genre the students were composing, the TEKS for that particular unit, and the units for Pearson.

At Armadillo Elementary, before the 2022-23 school year, teachers had leeway to use the program they preferred to teach writing. They were supposed to stay with the scope and sequence the district had created. As a classroom teacher, the author only knew what happened and what materials were being used in the grade levels she taught. When the author of this study taught fourth grade, she taught writing every day using an approach created by Gretchen Bernabei. Staff members attended a professional development (PD) taught by Bernabei. The group brought back Bernabei's approach, which the fourth grade team used for most of the years the researcher taught fourth grade writing.

In the 2021-22 school year, the researcher was the only teacher in fifth grade who consistently taught writing other than grammar skills. Based on the district and school scores, there needs to be an evidence-based strategy used to teach the basic, foundational writing skills. The SRSD writing approach could be used to help close the students' writing gaps.

Significance of the Problem

Several factors limited the implementation of the SRSD writing approach at Armadillo Elementary. First, time was a significant factor. Reading, math, and science took priority regarding instructional minutes in fifth grade due to being STAAR tested subjects. Teaching writing was not as high of a priority to the teachers and administrators at Armadillo Elementary School prior to the 2021-22 school year. The instructional focus was mainly on math and reading across the school, except for fourth grade, when the students took a state writing assessment.

In addition, there appeared to be concerns about the support from several of the stakeholders at Armadillo Elementary School. During the researcher's internship (Spring 2021), the administration supported implementing the SRSD writing approach. However, the 2020-21 STAAR results did not count due to COVID-19, which allowed writing to be a priority in the

researcher's classroom. This could have been different if the STAAR results were counted because the priority would shift to the tested subjects. The results impact the school rating, so the administration saw those subjects as a primary focus. With only one teacher at Armadillo Elementary School implementing the SRSD writing approach, this teacher's focus differed from the others on the team.

Finally, there was no set curriculum from the district in 2021-22, so teachers used various programs to teach writing. The only item in 2021-22 the district provided was a scope and sequence, which informed teachers what they should be teaching and when. For example, in the second six weeks, teachers taught personal narratives and listed the TEKS that support that writing genre. Giving the TEKS and genre to the teachers allowed them to find their own curriculum to use or use a nonevidence-based curriculum. Most teachers' options were nonevidence-based writing strategies (e.g., Pearson, Patterns of Power). These factors showed the obstacles faced when implementing an evidence-based writing strategy, SRSD.

The SRSD writing approach was an important way to supplement the lack of a writing curriculum with an evidence-based strategy. While SRSD was evidence-based, there were some areas that this study could help close. Much of the SRSD research did not focus on a single class of fifth grade students. The SRSD research involved either a handful of students (e.g., two or three) or multiple classes across grade levels (e.g., third through fifth grade). These studies also did not research if the students could maintain what they had learned more than four weeks later. This study will attempt to fill in the gaps.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether using the SRSD writing approach could improve the researcher's fifth grade students' writing and could these students maintain

what they learned five weeks after learning the approach. To evaluate if the SRSD writing approach improved their writing, the two central research questions of this study were:

1)   To what degree did the SRSD persuasive writing instruction impact student writing outcomes?

      a)   To what degree did the students' writing quality improve?

      b)   To what degree were the genre elements of the SRSD approach included?

2)   To what extent did the students maintain and apply their SRSD persuasive knowledge five weeks after the final lesson was taught?

      a)   To what extent did the students maintain the quality of their writing?

      b)   To what extent did the students incorporate the taught genre elements?

Personal Context

When the author of this study became a fourth grade writing teacher, she realized how many gaps students had in writing. Many of the researcher's students wrote below grade level, could not write an error-free sentence, and could only write a couple of sentences on a given topic, especially if it was expository. Their written work exposed their lack of exposure to basic writing concepts. There was an apparent disconnect between what the students were previously taught and applying those skills to their writing. This disconnect piqued the researcher's interest in finding ways to help her students have higher-quality writing.

The researcher implemented several writing programs. For example, strategies by Gretchen Bernabei, Randi Whitney's Writing Academy, and Jeff Anderson's <u>Patterns of Power</u> were used to teach writing. The Bluebonnet District used Pearson to teach writing to the students when this study was conducted. While these programs have helped, they were not

research-proven writing strategies. One thing was clear: the districts knew they needed to do address the students' writing gaps.

The author of this study believes that improving students' writing will have a lasting positive impact on their futures. Writing is an important skill to use proficiently and accurately because writing is used in every aspect of life. Writing is one of the most real-world applicable subjects taught in school. Experiences as a fourth grade writing teacher and her beliefs about the importance of writing led the researcher to pursue implementing an evidence-based writing strategy (SRSD) to improve her students' writing quality.

Researcher's Roles and Personal History

The author of this study has been an elementary school teacher for twelve years. Kindergarten, fourth grade, fifth grade, and an English Learner (EL) teacher were all grades/areas the researcher has taught. The majority of the researcher's teaching career was as a fourth grade teacher (seven years). One of those seven years, the researcher was the only writing teacher for the entire fourth grade. For four of those years, the researcher was a self-contained teacher, meaning she taught all subjects. In the 2021-22 school year, the researcher taught three sections of fifth grader math and taught her homeroom writing.

The researcher has taught mainly in Texas public elementary schools, which were Title I schools. Many of the students receive free and reduced breakfast and lunches. The elementary schools also had a majority of the students considered at-risk. One school's student population was mainly minority students, while the other was about 50% Hispanic, 30% white, and 20% other minorities. Both elementary schools were located in lower socio-economic communities. The Armadillo Elementary School had a large population of students who received special education services. The researcher's class usually included students who receive special

education support and students who have behavioral gaps. These demographics influenced the researcher's teaching style.

The author of this study grew up very differently from the students she taught. The researcher grew up in an upper-middle-class White household. Those experiences gave her one lens to look through, but her experiences teaching at Title 1 schools gave a new perspective. The researcher's personal experiences, students, and teaching experiences have influenced her teaching style and desire to find and implement evidence-based strategies. One such evidence-based strategy is the SRSD writing approach.

Journey to the Problem

When the researcher started her ROS journey, she planned to conduct her study on writing. Through her experiences in teaching writing, the researcher saw the gaps students had, and she wanted to find a way to help her students improve their writing. The topic was solidified when the researcher analyzed data for a project in one of her graduate school classes. The researcher chose to look at the STAAR writing data for her school, district, and the state. The comparison between the researcher's school, her district, and her state was eye-opening to see. The comparison revealed an issue with writing.

After the researcher talked to her co-chairs and completed more research, she finalized her topic at the end of her second year. She decided to focus on effects of implementing the SRSD writing strategy with her fifth grade students. Since the topic was decided, the researcher continued to read more research on SRSD. The author of this study took a PD course on the SRSD writing strategy to better understand the components. After the PD course was completed, the SRSD approach was implemented with the 2020-21 students. This allowed for practice

implementing the SRSD writing approach with students since the researcher had never used it before. The SRSD writing approach was implemented for the second time in March 2022.

Significant Stakeholders

This study was centered around the researcher's 5th-grade students, who were the most significant stakeholders. Their experiences with the SRSD writing approach informed this research. The lessons taught, writing completed, and genre foundation learned contributed to this action research project. All of the students participated in the lessons during the writing block every day for 15 lessons.

The other stakeholders included Armadillo Elementary School's administration, Bluebonnet district, and Armadillo Elementary's community members. Armadillo Elementary School's administration team allowed the researcher to use the SRSD writing approach instead of the Pearson writing curriculum. Administrators will see the positive results of the students' writing through their compositions and future state assessments scores. Bluebonnet District was invested in preparing students for college and career readiness. Through this study, the researcher helped her elementary students develop the foundational writing processes needed to succeed in later grades, which aligned with Bluebonnet District's goals. Improving students' writing is also vital to the community members. As stated in the national context, writing is essential to many jobs. Employers need their employees to possess the necessary writing skills.

<div align="center">

Terms

</div>

Action helpers - "words that go along with action words. They help tell more about the action. They tell how the action is done." (Harris & Graham, 1985, p. 30)

Action words - "words that tell what people, things, or animals do. They are doing words" (Harris & Graham, 1985, p. 30)

Cognitive-behavior modifications - "the selective, purposeful combination of principles and procedures from diverse areas into training regimens or interventions, the purpose of which is to instate, modify, or extinguish cognitions, feelings, and/ or behaviors" (Harris, 1982, p. 5)

Describing words - "words that tell more about people, animals, places, or things. They help to paint a picture." (Harris & Graham, 1985, p. 30)

Generalization - "apply them in new settings" (Rouse & Kiuhara, 2017, p. 182)

Maintenance - "students continue to use strategies" (Rouse & Kiuhara, 2017, p. 182)

Self-efficacy - "individual's belief in his or her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments" (Bandura, 1977)

Self-regulation **-** "described self-regulation as a general cognitive strategy, in which the child or adult determines a criterion and then observes his/ her own performance, compares the two, and appropriately self-reinforces or self-punishes" (Harris, 1982, p. 3)

Self-Regulation Strategy Development - "explicit instruction in writing and self-regulation strategies needed to carry out the processes involved in skilled writing and those needed to manage the affective, behavioral, and cognitive demands of writing independently and successfully" (Rouse & Kiuhara, 2017, p. 181)

Story elements - "elements identified by Stein and Glenn (1979): main character, locale, time, starter event, goal, action, ending, and reaction" (Sawyer et al., 1992, p. 343)

Closing Thoughts on Chapter I

Writing is a frequently used skill but is often not prioritized by educators. The NAEP and STAAR writing assessment scores demonstrated the lack of priority. Students and teachers need a writing approach to help close these writing gaps. The SRSD approach is an evidenced-based

strategy that has improved students' writing quality and that students can maintain what they were taught four weeks later.

This action research study investigated how teaching with the SRSD writing approach will improve the researcher's fifth grade students' writing quality and inclusion of the genre elements. A series of lessons on writing using the SRSD six step process was taught to a classroom of fifth grade students. Quantitative data was collected to determine the effectiveness of the SRSD approach and was used to answer the research questions. In Chapter 2, the researcher read and analyzed previous research using the SRSD writing approach, while in Chapter 3, the methods used in this action research study were discussed. Next, in Chapter 4, the results were discussed and analyzed. Lastly, in Chapter 5, the conclusions were stated.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing is an essential skill in which students need to achieve mastery. Besides reading and mathematics, writing is among the most used and applicable real-world subjects. Writing is used throughout all levels of school, one's career, and everyday life. Students use writing to express their ideas and opinions in school, write about what they are learning in their classes, and reflect on what they are reading. According to Rouse and Kiuhara (2017), students use writing to understand and participate in the world around them. Writing is used in a variety of jobs and careers. For example, jobs can require writing emails, reports, contracts, and advertisements. Writing is also used in everyday life (e.g., texting, social media, emailing, journaling). Because writing is used throughout life and for various purposes, students need a strong writing foundation. One evidence-based approach to improving students' writing and building a solid writing foundation is the self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) writing intervention. Throughout this ROS, the researcher will use the SRSD writing approach to improve her students' writing.

This literature review will begin by discussing prior research about how students placed nationally on high-stakes writing assessments. The researcher will then narrow her focus to discuss how students performed on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) writing assessment. Following the national and state writing assessments, the researcher will then discuss why writing is an important for employers. Next, prior research will be shared about necessary writing skills lower-elementary students needed and then discuss research-based pedagogical skills used in writing. After this background research on essential skills for successful writing will be included, the researcher will include a brief description of the

SRSD writing strategy, which was the focus of this study. Then, several meta-analyses will be presented, followed by various studies that use SRSD writing as an intervention. Lastly, the researcher will compare and contrast the SRSD studies presented in this literature review.

Review of Literature

Students initially use and learn writing in school starting around four years old; however, nationally, students are not performing on grade level in writing. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2002), two-thirds of the students in grades 4, 8, and 12 displayed a partial mastery of grade level writing skills. The results are about the same for the NAEP 2007 and 2011 writing assessments. Achieve, Inc. (2005) found that about 50% of college students were not prepared for college-level writing. Along with this research, students who had writing deficits were at a disadvantage (Tracy et al., 2009). Remediation classes in high school and college, fewer job opportunities, and a more challenging time participating in civic life were a three ways students could be negatively affected by having below-average writing skills. Nationally, the majority of US students struggle with showing mastery of writing skills at their grade level. STAAR data also showed that students were not on grade level for writing. In 2019, about 65% of the fourth graders were below grade level in writing. Students are showing that they have writing gaps in several grade levels, which can show up in other areas of their lives and their future.

Writing is vital for students to be career-ready. Writing is a significant focus for many school districts because writing could be inherent to their jobs and needed to advance in their careers (National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and College, 2004). Writing could affect how an employer views their employees. According to Beason (2001), employers may perceive the "writer" of the errored texts (employee) as careless, faulty thinkers,

and could harm sales. Writing is considered a "gatekeeper" because many salaried jobs require some writing (National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and College, 2004, p. 19). About 50% of the corporations who completed the survey stated they considered writing when deciding upon promotions. Jobs in the US rely on employees to articulate one's thoughts coherently through writing (National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and College, 2004). Writing has an impact on how employers view their employees as well as determines future career opportunities.

Foundational Writing Skills

Because writing is essential for many careers, it is vital to develop foundational writing skills in elementary school. "While composing, a writer must manage complex problem-solving writing processes that include planning, considering the audience's needs and perspectives, generating organized content, and revising for form and ideas" (Saddler, 2006, p. 261). Several researchers identified skills needed for elementary students to become proficient writers. Kent et al. (2013) found these writing skills were needed for successful writing:

1. Automaticity of handwriting led to the efficient production of writing.

2. Difficulties with attention and working memory led to poor writing outcomes.

3. Oral language was related to the quality of writing in first grade students.

Teachers need to devote at least 30 minutes to writing every day to work on these skills. Kim et al. (2013) also determined which skills predicted quality writing in first grade students. Several components were critical for quality writing: teacher responsiveness, grammar knowledge, reading comprehension, spelling, letter writing, high-quality instruction, and student attentiveness. Along those same lines, Kim et al. (2015) focused on the skills needed for quality written composition. There were two necessary components: writing ideation and transcription

skills. Writing ideation dealt with the quality of ideas and the development and organization of ideas. Transcription skills included being able to write out the ideas generated. These researchers found skills needed to improve writing at the lower level (e.g., grammar, punctuation, handwriting, and spelling). However, other problems existed at a higher level (e.g., writing ideation, audience awareness, planning, and revising). Students need skills at both levels to have quality writing. As students progress through school, they learn about and practice writing various writing genres (e.g., personal narrative, informational, option) and how to plan their writing. Students need time to write and practice the writing skills they are taught.

What is Self-Regulated Strategy Development?

Self-regulated strategy development has been around since the 1980s as a writing strategy. Harris (1982) employed previous research that used behavior modifications and cognitive-behavior modifications (CBM) with students who received special education services to promote ideas about implementing CBM with writing. Harris and Graham (1985) used the ideas of CBM to help create SRSD. In 1985, the term was self-control strategy training, which was eventually transformed into what is known today as SRSD. Harris and Graham's (1985) study wanted to learn more about the effectiveness of self-control strategy training on compositions written by participants with a learning disability (LD). They implemented a six-step intervention on the action words, action helpers, and describing words with two participants with a LD. At the end of the intervention, both participants had more than doubled the use of action words, action helpers, and describing words in their stories. These increases led to overall higher quality of compositions.

Today, more than 100 studies have been conducted using the SRSD strategy, which has proven the positive effects of using SRSD. "SRSD has resulted in improvements in five main

aspects of participants' performance: genre elements including writing, quality of writing, knowledge of writing, approach to writing, and self-efficacy" (Harris & Graham, 2009, p. 117). Self-regulated strategy development writing strategy has been an intervention used in numerous studies to improve students' writing quality.

The self-regulated strategy development writing approach uses explicit instruction and self-regulated strategies to teach students the complicated writing process effectively. "Students' needs drive SRSD instruction, and lessons are criterion-based so that individual student progress determines when students move on to subsequent lessons and instruction" (Rouse & Kiuhara, 2017, p. 181). Along with SRSD writing instruction, students learn about setting goals and reflecting on their progress toward those goals. Teachers and students also have collaborative experiences with writing. According to Rouse and Kiuhara (2017), there are six flexible and recursive stages: develop background knowledge, discuss it, model it, memorize it, support it, and independent performance (p. 182). Researchers have found that during the SRSD process, students learn: "(a) general strategies for powerful writing; (b) strategies for writing in the target genre; (c) the knowledge necessary to use these strategies" (Rouse & Kiuhara, 2017, p. 181). The SRSD strategy has embedded maintenance and generalization. "One could reasonably argue that writing-related success depends heavily on enhancing learners' ability to plan, monitor, and self-regulate their writing along with exerting the effort necessary to accomplish their intended goal" (Teng, 2020, p. 1). According to Graham (2006), the purpose of SRSD is for students to generalize self-regulation strategies so quality independent writing will increase. Using the six steps plus self-regulation has helped many students build the foundation to be successful writers.

SRSD: Meta-analyses

Since many studies have been conducted with SRSD as a writing intervention, meta-analyses demonstrated SRSD writing approach as an evidence-based strategy (or intervention). According to Harris et al. (2003), SRSD had an average effect size of .80 for upper-elementary and middle school students in four writing areas: quality, writing knowledge, approach to writing, and self-efficacy. Baker et al. (2009) also conducted a meta-analysis on SRSD research. Five experimental and quasi-experimental research studies met their inclusion criteria. All five SRSD group studies met the criteria for quality, and those studies had an effect size ranging from 0.80 to 1.85. Sixteen single-subject SRSD research studies met Baker et al.'s (2009) inclusion criteria, but only nine studies met the quality requirements. Both groups have several quality studies, "SRSD would be considered an evidence-based practice" (Baker et al., 2009, p. 312). Finlayson and McCrudden (2019) also found that when looking at writing instruction for general education, elementary students using SRSD had a positive effect. When conducting a meta-analysis on writing instruction for elementary students, Graham et al. (2012) included 14 studies involving SRSD. The SRSD studies, which met the inclusion criteria, had an average effect size of 1.17, ranging from 0.25 to 3.19. These meta-analyses demonstrated that SRSD had a positive and sometimes large effect size. The SRSD writing approach is an effective, evidence-based strategy that will help students improve their writing.

SRSD: Special Education Students (SPED)

The SRSD strategy has been used to help students with learning disabilities (LD) improve their writing quality. Sawyer et al. (1992) conducted an experiment with 43 fifth and sixth grade participants who have a LD. They had four conditions: direct teaching, SRSD without explicit self-regulation instruction, full SRSD, and a practice-control group. The results showed that the two SRSD conditions received higher story grammar and story quality scores than the control

group. There was no statistical difference in grammar and quality scores between the two SRSD conditions and the direct teaching condition. In Lane et al.'s (2010) study, they used the SRSD story strategy with thirteen second graders who had emotional and behavior disorders. The participants increased the number of story elements they included in their story compositions, wrote higher quality story compositions, and increased the length of what they were writing.

Miller and Little (2017) conducted an experimental study with three third grade participants with a LD. The SRSD opinion writing approach was used along with video self-monitoring. After the first lesson, each participant recorded a video of the mnemonics and the elements they used during the intervention. They watched the video before they came to the remaining lessons. The three participants increased the use of opinion elements in their compositions. Two of the participants increased their word count, while one had a decrease. All three participants increased the time they spent planning and writing their compositions.

Saddler (2006) conducted an experimental design with six second grade students with a LD by pulling the students with a LD in pairs out of their classroom to receive SRSD instruction. After receiving SRSD instruction, the participants included more story elements in their writing. All the participants also increased the word count and the overall quality. The participants did not maintain what they learned regarding the length of their writing; however, they did maintain the use of story elements.

Sawyer et al. (1992) conducted an experimental design with 53 fifth and sixth grade students who received resource room support. Students were randomly assigned to the full SRSD story element condition, SRSD instruction without goal setting and self-assessment, direct teaching, or the control group. Also randomly assigned to a condition were 13 students who were normally achieving. The most significant difference was that the full SRSD condition received

higher story structure scores than the control condition. There were no significant difference in schematic structure between SRSD conditions and direct teaching. The SRSD writing approach helped these students with SPED services improve their writing composition by increasing the elements, word count, and time they spent writing. Overall, students with special needs writing improved after receiving SRSD instruction.

SRSD: Lower Elementary Students

Self-regulated strategy development has also been used in lower elementary grades. Saddler et al. (2004) taught second grade participants who were experiencing writing difficulties an SRSD writing strategy, which included five to six hours of instruction. The results demonstrated that participants wrote more complex compositions using the writing story elements. Four of the participants improved in the number of words written as well as the quality. Each of the six participants planned their post-intervention story. Even during the maintenance phase, all four participants who wrote a maintenance story maintained incorporating the story elements, and the length increased. The quality at the maintenance phase had also increased.

Harris et al. (2015) also conducted a study with 51 second graders who are considered at-risk. The teachers taught half of the participants the SRSD approach in small groups while the other participants received regular writing instruction. The SRSD group's stories included more story elements (1.22) and had higher quality (.89) stories than the control group both right after the intervention and four weeks later. The effect sizes maintained or improved: story elements was 1.65, and story quality was 1.01.

Harris et al. (2012) conducted a randomized control study with second and third grade teachers and students. The teachers attended PD on either the story writing or the opinion writing

SRSD approach, and then taught that SRSD approach to their students. Students were put into pair groupings: a student with behavior challenges and student who did not show these behaviors. "Effect sizes for SRSD instruction ranged from .51 to 1.15 for story and opinion writing quality, respectively, and .78 to .54 for number and quality of elements for each genre" (Harris et al., 2012, 185). The students without behavior challenges made greater gains. The students scored higher on the genre they were taught. Neither group demonstrated a reliable increase in the number of words written.

Zumbrunn and Bruning (2013) conducted a study with six average first grade students to investigate the effectiveness of SRSD on the students' story writing skills and knowledge. The six first grade students were randomly assigned to one of three groups. The students were taught following the SRSD instructional model. The results showed the students' stories were more complete (included more story elements), increased length, and story quality had improved. Majority of the students were able to articulate what they would do if they were having difficulty (self-regulation procedures) and mentioned they needed to include story elements when writing. These studies involving lower elementary students demonstrated that the SRSD writing strategy improved the quality, elements, and length of the SRSD participants' compositions, and they maintained what they learned over a month later.

SRSD: Upper Elementary Students

Self-regulated strategy development has also been studied using different genres with larger groups of upper elementary school children. Tracy et al. (2009) conducted a study with 127 third grade children in the Midwest. Half of the participants received SRSD intervention, and the other half were in the control group, which received writing workshop instruction. The participants in the SRSD group used the six-stages of the SRSD writing strategy. The results

showed that the SRSD group participants had stories and personal narratives that were

"qualitatively better, higher story scale scores, and were longer than those written by children in

the control condition" (Tracy et al., 2009, p. 328-329). The SRSD participants could maintain

what they learned and applied it two weeks later. The SRSD group also applied their learning to

another writing genre (personal narrative).

Graham et al. (2005) conducted a study with 86 third graders at-risk in writing from the

Washington DC area. The participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: SRSD

instruction only, SRSD plus peer support, and comparison. Graham et al. (2005) "demonstrated

that the writing performance and knowledge of struggling young writers can be improved

substantially by teaching them strategies for planning and writing in conjunction with the

knowledge and self-regulatory procedure needed to use these strategies effectively" (p. 238).

McKeown et al. (2019) conducted a quasi-experimental study using the SRSD persuasive

approach with 318 third, fourth, and fifth graders. They were looking to see how the SRSD

approach affected the quality and length of persuasive writing. Because McKeown et al. (2019)

relied on the teachers, there was more variability in student outcomes, which could have played

into the effect sizes being lower than other SRSD effect sizes ["holistic quality ES = 0.15;

analytic ES = 0.24; length ES = 0.15"] (p. 1483).

Mason et al. (2017) conducted a randomized controlled study involving fifth and sixth

grade teachers and students. A one-day SRSD PD training and one-day positive adjustment PD

was given to 19 general education teachers. The teachers also received virtual consultation

support. The teachers and students were sorted into two conditions: continue as is and SRSD

condition. The SRSD condition received five 30-minute lessons. The results demonstrated that

the SRSD condition increased in total reasons (.70), increased in total explanations (.79),

inclusion of a topic sentence (.21), inclusion of an ending sentence (.59), increased total words ($b = 20.73$, $p = .001$, $d = 0.47$), and increased inclusion of elements ($b = 2.17$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.90$). Regarding writing ability, the students identified as struggling did not show a significant effect size on writing ability ($d = 0.57$). The non-struggling writers showed a significant and positive effect ($d = 0.84$, $p < .001$) on writing ability after the intervention. The SRSD condition maintained the inclusion of reasons, explanations, topic sentence, ending sentence, total word count, and total elements.

McKeown et al. (2016) conducted a mixed methods study involving fourth grade teachers and students. The three teachers received individual practiced-based PD (PBPD) SRSD training focused on differentiation over two days. The teachers also received coaching from the PBPD trainers throughout the study. The students included more story elements (an average of 2.78 more elements). However, there was no significant difference in the holistic ratings. These upper elementary studies showed that the SRSD writing approach positively affected students' writing for various genres.

Synthesis

In this section, the SRSD studies are discussed and synthesized. First, participant inclusion is discussed. Second, the setting of the studies is examined. Third, the designs of the studies are reviewed. After that, SRSD genre writing is discussed. Next, the results from the SRSD studies are examined. Finally, a critique of the SRSD approaches used.

The SRSD studies included a variety of participants. The participants ranged from lower-elementary students to upper-elementary students. The SRSD included participants who were in general education as well as participants with special needs. The studies whose participants were students with special needs included emotional and behavioral difficulties and students with

learning disabilities. The studies included struggling writers as well as normally achieving writers. The studies also varied in the number of participants. Some studies were completed less than 10 participants, while others included more than a hundred participants. Again, the studies demonstrated that the number of participants, the behavior, or the participants' intellectual ability did not matter; there was still a positive effect on students' composition quality after receiving SRSD instruction.

Each of the studies mentioned how the participants were selected and provided either general information about the participants (larger studies) or more detailed information about the participants (smaller studies). In studies with less than five participants, detailed descriptions were included for every participant. The information included academic level, behavioral information, the child's personality, and demographic information. In the large participant studies, demographic information was given. The demographic information included ethnicity, free/reduced lunch, educational setting, grade level, gender, and the area/district the study took place. The smaller the participant group, the more detailed information the researcher gathered and presented.

The SRSD writing approaches were conducted mainly in the elementary school setting, particularly in the upper-elementary school grades. The initial studies were conducted in the 1980s and 1990s when the SRSD writing approach focused heavily on students who received SPED services. Over time and as the approach became more fine-tuned, researchers shifted to include participants in the general education setting. Now, researchers have used the SRSD writing approach with all types of students.

The settings of the studies mentioned in this literature review took place across the US. Two studies took place in the Washington D.C. area (Graham et al., 2004; Sawyer et al., 1992).

Another two studies took place in the northeastern part of the country (Saddler, 2004; 2006), and one took place in the Midwest (Zumbrunn & Bruning, 2013). Three studies took place in the southeastern US (McKeown et al., 2016; McKeown et al., 2019; Miller & Little, 2018). Two studies took place in Tennessee (Harris, 2012; Lane et al., 2010). Another study occurred across the US (Harris et al., 2012). Studies took place in the suburbs, inner-city, urban, metropolitan, and rural areas. The SRSD studies took place in a variety of locations and were effective in each place.

The majority of the studies included were of an experimental design. Five studies included different conditions participants were assigned, including having at least one SRSD group and one control group (Graham et al., 2005; Mason et al., 2017; Sawyer et al., 1992; Tracey et al., 2009). Some of the studies had more conditions than just those two. Saddler (2004; 2006) conducted a multiple-base-line-across-subjects design. Zumbrunn and Bruning (2013) also conducted a multi-baseline design. Harris et al. (2012) had a randomized control trial design, and McKeown et al. (2016) used a mixed methods design. While the majority of the SRSD research included in this literature review used an experimental design, a couple chose a different design to conduct their SRSD study.

The SRSD approach could be used for various writing genres and was effective with those writing genres. The SRSD studies included employed different writing genres when working with students in the process of writing. The SRSD writing approach uses mnemonic devices to help the students learn the elements. The approach moved through six-stages of SRSD instruction. Lane et al. (2010), Saddler (2004; 2006), and Sawyer et al. (1992) all used an intervention with their participants that employed the SRSD story strategy. In the story strategy, the instruction not only focused on self-regulation but on teaching the students the story elements

that should be included in a story composition. Mason et al. (2017), Tracy et al. (2009), and Zumbrunn and Bruning (2013) taught their participants the SRSD story writing strategy as well. McKeown et al. (2016) used the SRSD story strategy but focused on a fantasy element. Graham et al. (2005) taught their participants the SRSD story writing and persuasive strategies. Harris et al. (2012) and Miller and Little (2017) used the SRSD opinion writing strategy with their participants, focusing on including opinion elements in their compositions. Students improved their writing for a variety of genres as well as transferred what they learned from one writing genre to another.

The SRSD writing approach was taught in one of three ways: individual, small groups, or the whole class. Miller and Little (2017) were the only researchers in this literature review to conduct the intervention with individual students, and this was possible because they only had three students in the study. A majority of the other researchers used small groups to perform the SRSD writing intervention (Lane et al., 2010; Sawyer et al., 1992). Graham et al. (2005), Saddler (2004; 2006), and Zumbrunn and Bruning (2013) conducted their small groups in pairs. Mason et al. (2017), McKeown et al. (2016; 2019), and Tracy et al. (2009) conducted their interventions with the whole class. The SRSD writing approach was used in a variety of groupings and was effective.

The writing prompts for the compositions were given in different forms. Harris et al. (2012), Saddler (2004; 2006), Tracy et al. (2009), and Zumbrunn and Bruning (2013) used picture cards or line drawings to prompt the participants' writing topics. Mason et al. (2017) and Sawyer et al. (1992) did not mention what they used to let the participants know the writing topic. The rest of the researchers used writing prompts to guide the students to the topic they wanted them to write about (Graham et al., 2005; Lane et al., 2010; McKeown et al., 2016; 2019;

Miller & Little, 2017; Tracy et al., 2009). Any of these ways can be used to let students know what the topic they were writing.

Using college/graduate students or classroom teachers was the most common way to deliver the intervention. Graham et al. (2005), Lane et al. (2010), and Sawyer et al. (1992) all used college students or graduate students to perform the intervention. Harris et al. (2012), Mason et al. (2017), McKeown et al. (2016; 2019), and Tracy et al. (2009) all used classroom teachers to teach the SRSD writing strategy. Zumbrunn and Bruning (2013) used a teacher to administer the SRSD intervention, but not the participants' classroom teacher. Saddler (2004; 2006) used an outside person to perform the intervention. Miller and Little (2017) performed the interventions themselves. Again, several various people conducted the SRSD writing intervention and got a positive effect.

Some researchers also wanted to know if the participants could maintain what they had learned from the SRSD instruction. Sawyer et al. (1992) conducted a maintenance phase two and four weeks later. The full SRSD condition group maintained their skills, including the taught story elements, which kept the scores higher than before the intervention. Saddler (2004; 2006) also conducted a maintenance phase three and six weeks later. The quality score dipped slightly (0.1) from the post-intervention to the maintenance phase (average of 4.6 out of 8). Graham et al.'s (2005) study showed that the quality was higher with the SRSD groups than in the control group during the maintenance phase. Miller and Little (2010) had two of the three participants maintain the word count after the intervention and increase their time writing. One of the participants did not complete the maintenance probes. There was no holistic quality score taken during the maintenance phase. Tracy et al. (2009) conducted a maintenance phase two weeks after the end of the intervention and the participants retained what they were taught. Lane et al.'s

(2010) participants maintained the inclusion of story elements and quality scores. McKeown et al. (2019) did not conduct a maintenance phase. Zumbrunn and Bruning (2013) conducted a maintenance phase two weeks after the completed intervention. The participants performed higher at the maintenance phases in their story quality compared to the baseline, but three participants went down from their posttest. Overall, if there was a maintenance phase, most participants maintained or increased what they had learned several weeks after the intervention.

Conclusion

In all of the SRSD studies reviewed, results demonstrated that SRSD writing instruction could be used to teach students to write and could be maintained weeks after. The meta-analyses demonstrated that the SRSD writing strategy had a positive effect. Several meta-analyses have shown that the SRSD writing strategy had an effect size ranging from 0.25 to 3.17 (Baker et al., 2009; Graham et al., 2012; Harris et al., 2003). "SRSD would be considered an evidence-based practice" (Baker et al., 2009, p. 312). Researchers have found that students who receive an SRSD writing instruction/intervention displayed an overall higher quality in their writing compositions (Graham et al., 2005; Harris & Graham, 1985; Harris & Graham, 2009; Harris et al., 2003; Harris et al., 2015; Saddler, 2006; Saddler et al., 2004; Sawyer et al., 1992; Tracey et al., 2009). The meta-analyses and studies mentioned in this literature review revealed that the SRSD writing approach had a positive and had large effect sizes, ultimately improving students' composition quality.

Some areas still need to be explored using the SRSD writing approach. One area that seems to be lacking was with participants who attend a Title 1 school. Prior researchers focused on students who received SPED services or students who were considered at-risk, but there was little mention of Title 1 schools. Also, not many prior research studies focused on students in a

single classroom at the elementary level. These prior studies involved either large groups (e.g., multiple classes in a single grade level) or a handful of participants (e.g., two to four students). Next, there were only two studies that included fifth grade participants. One of those two studies involved students with LD, and the other was a large study of a couple hundred students. Lastly, the maintenance phase was conducted around the fourth week after completing the SRSD writing intervention. This ROS study implemented the SRSD writing approach with a single fifth grade classroom that attended a Title 1 school and contained a maintenance phase five weeks after the intervention was completed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Proposed Solution

The teacher-researcher taught a class of fifth grade students the SRSD persuasive writing approach. The SRSD model uses six steps: develop background knowledge, discuss it, model it, memorize it, support it, and independent performance. The teacher-researcher used each of the steps over 15 lessons to improve persuasive writing for these fifth grade students. After the intervention, the students are predicted to display improvements in writing quality and an improvement in including persuasive writing elements.

Justification of Proposed Solution

In the realm of elementary school teaching, What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) highlights/recommends four teaching methods that produce more effective writers: (a) provide time daily; (b) teach writing for a variety of purposes; (c) teach to develop fluency with handwriting, spelling, sentence construction, typing, and word processing; and (d) create an engaged community of writers (p. 2-8). Purpose b was particularly important to this study because the SRSD writing approach focused on writing for different purposes. The SRSD writing approach was the only writing approach mentioned by WWC as an evidence-based or recommended instructional program, with several studies supporting its effectiveness. According to Baker et al.'s (2009) meta-analysis, "the effect size for each of the five SRSD group studies ranged from +0.80 to +1.25." (p. 311). Graham et al.'s (2012) meta-analysis also found 14 SRSD studies with an average effect size of 1.17 on student writing quality. Both these meta-analyses showed that the SRSD writing approach had a significant effect size for improving students' overall quality of writing, increased the genre elements in their writing, and increased the

number of words written. These effect sizes influenced the decision to use the SRSD writing approach to improve the students' quality of writing.

<center>**Study Context and Participants**</center>

School

The intervention occurred in an elementary school located in a large metroplex in the southwestern part of the United States, which served pre-kindergarten through fifth grade. There were approximately 750 students in the school at the time of this study, where about 20% of the student population were African American, approximately 50% were Hispanic, and about 30% were White. The remaining student population was comprised of American Indian (> 1%), Asian (> 2%), Pacific Islander (> 1%), and Two or More Races (> 5%). The school was approximately 80% economically disadvantaged. About 15% of the population received special education services. English Learners (EL) comprised about 25% of the student population (based on district demographic data, not disclosed for confidentiality purposes). The mobility rate was about 20%.

Participants

This study took place in a single, fifth grade classroom of 29 students. The classroom was composed of 13 male and 16 female students. Less than one-third of the participants were Hispanic (n = 7), a little more than one-third of the participants were White (n = 12), and one-third of the participants were African American (n = 10). One-sixth of the class received dyslexia services (n = 6), and two students received special education services (one in literacy and one in speech). About one-sixth of the students received gifted and talented services twice a six weeks (n = 6) [see Table 1].

Of the 29 students identified for this study, 22 completed the pretest, posttest, and maintenance compositions. Two students reregistered after the pretest was given, one student

<center>35</center>

missed the posttest due an absence, one missed the maintenance due an absence, one student missed both the posttest and the maintenance due to absences, and two students received dyslexia services during writing time because dyslexia service were taken out of the reading and writing block. The group was composed of 11 male and 11 female students. The average age of the students was 10 years and 7 months. About one-fourth of the participants were Hispanic (n = 6), about half of the participants were White (n = 11), and about one-fourth of the participants were African American (n = 5). About one-sixth of the participants received dyslexia services (n = 3), and about one-fourth received gifted and talented services (n = 6) [see Table 1].

Table 1

Student Demographic Data

Baseline Characteristic	Fifth grade classroom	
	n	%
Gender		
Female	11	50
Male	11	50
Ethnicity		
African American	5	22.72
Hispanic	6	27.27
White	11	50
Services received		
Dyslexia	3	13.63
Gifted and talented	6	27.27
Speech	1	4.54

Note. N = 22. Participants were on average 10.77 years old.

Teacher

As the teacher of record for the class, the author of this study was the interventionist conducting this action research project. The author implemented the 15 SRSD persuasive lessons, collected data, and participated on the scoring team. The author has taught at Armadillo Elementary School for eight years. The researcher holds a Master's degree in curriculum and instruction and was working toward an Educational Doctorate in curriculum and instruction. The author has certifications in EC-4 generalist, 4-8 generalist, Gifted and Talented, and English as a Second Language.

Proposed Research Paradigm

In this action research study, the researcher used a quantitative one-group pretest and posttest design. This design was used because the researcher was interested in the impact of the SRSD writing intervention on her homeroom students.

Action research was chosen because the author wanted to change her writing instruction to see if she could improve the quality of her students' writing. Action research allowed for reflection on the author's teaching practices and conditions, which allowed for success. The researcher's active participation in the research was meaningful because action research is a problem-solving approach educators can use to improve teaching and learning by addressing problems they see in their classroom or school. Action research can "impact directly on practice" (Glanz, 2014, p. 35). Action research is a cyclical process in which there is reflection, identifying a problem, collecting data, analyzing and interpreting data, implementing an intervention, reflecting on the intervention, and modifying based on the reflection (Efron & Ravid, 2020; Glanz, 2014; Ivankova, 2015). "By engaging in systematic and intentional inquiry, teacher action researchers theorize and act to improve teaching with greater mindfulness or cognition about the impact those practices have on students" (Manfra, 2019, p. 166). In this study, action research

was used to address the need to improve writing outcomes within a classroom of students who vary in their writing ability.

Data Collection Methods

The participants wrote a composition in response to writing prompts of similar difficulty and interest at three time points: pretest, posttest, and maintenance (five weeks following the posttest). The students had a choice of two persuasive writing prompts each time, and the students chose one prompt to write (Jolivette et al., 2001). Each time the students wrote a composition, the same steps were completed: (a) a discussion about what a persuasive text is and what needed to be included to make it persuasive; (b) both prompts were read aloud; (c) students were reminded of the time they had to write (45 minutes); and (d) students were reminded to write their final piece on the lined paper. The students' compositions were scored by the researcher and another teacher at the campus.

Measures

Persuasive Prompts

The pretest prompt options were the following: (1) Elementary and secondary schools around the country are beginning to actively address the problem of bullies. In your opinion, is bullying an issue that should be addressed by schools or should bullying be addressed by parents? Use specific reasons and examples to support your position; or (2) Some people think school lunch rooms should be required to provide low-fat and vegetarian lunch options to meet the diet choices of all students. Do you agree or disagree? Explain your position and use specific reasons and examples as support.

During the posttest, the students chose between the following two prompts: (1) Standardized tests are used as a measuring stick for student performance. In your opinion, should

students take standardized tests? Use specific reasons and examples to support your position; or (2) School is a student's job. In your opinion, should students get paid to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your position.

At the maintenance stage, the students chose between the following two prompts: (1) Last year all students received free breakfast and lunch. Should school lunches be free for all students? Use specific reasons and examples to support your position; or (2) Some parents limit the amount of time their kids spend on their devices or watching T.V., while others do not. In your opinion, should screen time be limited for children? Use specific reasons and examples to support your position.

Holistic Quality Scoring

The scorers were trained to score holistic quality on a scale between 0-6, using anchor papers to ground scoring decisions. The second scorer and the researcher read through each anchor paper and discussed the elements that were included to justify the score. Descriptors were added to the bottom of the anchor papers for reference. The scoring team then practiced rating with seven student compositions not related to the pretest, posttest, or maintenance). The IRR during training was .86. If the scoring team disagreed, then a discussion was held about the rating. After practicing, the researcher rated all the compositions. Then, the second scorer rated 66% of the compositions, 15 or 16 compositions for each data collection point. The second rater scored five or six compositions at a time and then shared her rating, which was recorded. The scoring team then discussed when there was a different score. The exact process was repeated until 66% of the compositions were rated. No scores were changed after the discussions. The IRR of the compositions was .81.

Persuasive Elements Scoring

The scorers identified persuasive elements included in their compositions. Compositions were scored for: (a) a topic sentence stating the opinion (1 point); (b) three reasons that support the topic sentence (1 point each, 3 points total); (c) evidence to support each reason (1 point each, 3 points total); (d) transition words (0.33 points for each, 1 point total); and (e) an ending (1 point). The possible score ranged from 0-9. The researcher scored all essays, and another trained assistant scored 33%. Interrater reliability (IRR) was .90 during training and .85 for all compositions.

Justification of Use of Instruments in Context

The prompts chosen have been used in other SRSD research. The prompts were chosen because they were age-appropriate, engaging, and were in the persuasive genre. The rubrics used to score the compositions have also been used in other research to identify the elements of persuasive writing. The elements rubric were directly from the SRSD PD training. Raters used anchor papers to score writing quality holistically. These anchor papers were also used in other classroom-based SRSD research.

Data Analysis Strategy

A pretest/posttest design was used in this study, where data was collected at three different points: at the start (pretest), at the end of the intervention (posttest), and five weeks after the end of the intervention (maintenance). The students wrote a persuasive composition at each of the three points. The researcher scored each composition on persuasive elements and holistic writing quality. A second scorer scored a portion (66% for holistic quality and 33% for persuasive elements) of the compositions.

Holistic Writing Quality Analysis

The holistic scores were entered for each composition into a spreadsheet. IRR was .81. Students who had not completed all three compositions were removed. Five students were removed from the final data set due to missing at least one composition due to absences.

The spreadsheet formulas were used to run basic descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, median, standard deviation, mode, range) on the holistic writing quality scores. To test if the SRSD persuasive intervention directly impacted the students' holistic writing quality, the researcher ran a paired *t*-test between pre to posttest, posttest to maintenance, and pretest to maintenance. The results of the *t*-test allowed for conclusions to be drawn about whether the differences in the holistic quality writing were statistically significant (Ivankova, 2015, p. 228).

Persuasive Elements Analysis

Once the persuasive elements were scored, the researcher added genre element data to a spreadsheet. IRR was .85. Students who had not completed all three compositions were removed. Five students were removed from the final data set due to missing at least one composition.

Spreadsheet formulas were used to run basic descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, median, standard deviation, mode, range) on the total persuasive element scores. The researcher used the total persuasive element scores to run a paired *t*-test, which showed the difference between the total persuasive element scores. The researcher ran a paired *t*-test between pretest to posttest, posttest to maintenance, and pretest to maintenance. The results of the *t*-test allowed for conclusions to be drawn about whether the differences between the total number of persuasive elements included were statistically significant (Ivankova, 2015, p. 228). This *t*-test analysis could show if the SRSD persuasive intervention directly impacted the students' inclusion of persuasive elements.

<div align="center">

Procedures

</div>

All students in the researcher's homeroom who did not receive other instruction (dyslexia) during the writing time received the SRSD instruction whether they ended up in the final study. Before any data was collected or the intervention administered, a letter was sent home with the students describing the study, giving them a chance to opt out, and giving the researcher's information if they had questions (see Appendix B). No guardians opted out of the study. Students who enrolled after the pretest received the SRSD persuasive instruction starting when they enrolled but were not included in the data analysis.

Pretesting

Before the pretest was administered, a book called <u>I Wanna Iguana</u> was read. The class discussed why <u>I Wanna Iguana</u> could be considered a persuasive text and what is a persuasive text. The next day the students had a choice between two persuasive prompts and were asked to write a composition in response to the chosen prompt. The students had 45 minutes to complete their writing composition. The pretest compositions served as a baseline. The pretest data showed the number of persuasive elements included in students' compositions and the quality of writing before intervention was provided. The pretest data guided the tailoring of the SRSD lessons to areas of weakness for this particular group of students. Once the pretest data was collected, the researcher taught the SRSD persuasive lessons.

Instruction

There are six stages in the SRSD writing approach: (1) activating background knowledge, (2) discuss it; (3) model it; (4) memorize it; (5) support it; and (6) independent practice. In the first stage, background knowledge of the persuasive genre was activated by reading <u>I Wanna Iguana,</u> a discussion on what the boy in the story wanted, and what reasons the boy used to

convince his parents to let him get an iguana. As suggested by the SRSD persuasive lesson plan layout, activating background knowledge was completed before the pretest.

During the second stage (discuss it), the mnemonic POW (pick an idea, organize your notes, and write and say more) was introduced. Students used POW as a way to remember the writing process. Next, students were introduced to the mnemonic TREE (topic sentence, reasons, evidence, and ending sentence), which helped them remember the basic elements of a persuasive composition. The class then discussed each part of TREE: a) Topic Sentence - what I believe; b) Reasons - three or more, why I believe; c) Evidence - say more about each reason; and d) Ending - wrap it up. After POW and TREE were introduced, the students and researcher read grade-appropriate persuasive compositions and identified the elements (TREE). As the elements of the persuasive compositions were found, the students wrote the elements in the TREE graphic organizer. After the persuasive example papers were read and analyzed, students received a copy of their pretest composition to identify the persuasive elements they included and recorded them on a TREE graphic organizer. If students were missing elements, they added the missing elements to their TREE graphic organizer. Stage 2 (Discuss It) was taught over several lessons, and during each of those lessons, the researcher and students reviewed the meaning of POW and TREE.

Following the practice of identifying the persuasive elements, the researcher modeled writing a persuasive composition and used self-regulation while writing. After reading a persuasive prompt, the researcher modeled thinking aloud about what the prompt asked and set a goal for the number of elements she wanted to include in her composition. The researcher then modeled writing POW on the top of the TREE graphic organizer and discussed why POW was placed at the top of the paper. The researcher modeled picking an idea that answered the

persuasive prompt and created a topic sentence. After the P in POW was completed, the researcher placed a check mark under the P to show that step was completed. The researcher then went through a think-aloud and modeled using the TREE graphic organizer to add all the persuasive elements. A check was placed under the O in POW when the graphic organizer was completed to show that step was finished. After completing the TREE graphic organizer, the researcher completed POW by modeling the write and say more. While the researcher modeled, the students filled out a graphic organizer to use as a reference later if needed.

As the researcher modeled the writing process, she was also modeling self-regulation. For example, the researcher became frustrated when she could not think of another reason and showed a way to work through the frustration. One lesson was spent identifying, creating, and practicing using self-regulation statements. As a class, students created self-regulation statements they could use before, during, and after the writing process. After the class developed a list, each student picked at least one self-regulation statement for before, during, and after they could use during the process. They created their own mini anchor chart of self-regulation statements to reference during the writing process. The researcher taped each person's self-regulating mini chart to their personal persuasive folder so students could reference it during writing. The model it stage was taught over three lessons.

While moving through the first three stages, the students memorized the mnemonics POW and TREE to help them remember the writing process and the persuasive elements that are included in the persuasive genre. Students wrote the meaning of each letter of the mnemonics at the end of every other lesson. By the fourth stage, students had the mnemonics memorized and were able to explain each part of POW and TREE.

In the fifth stage (support it), the researcher gradually released the persuasive genre process to the students. Stage five was started by writing a persuasive composition using the persuasive process (POW and TREE) with the students. After completing a piece together, students worked with a partner to practice adding explanations to a partially filled-out TREE graphic organizer. Writing out explanations to support their reasons was the area that the students struggled with when the researcher analyzed their pretest compositions. Next, students went through the POW process with a partner by picking an idea related to a persuasive prompt, created a notes page using TREE, and then used their notes page to write out and say more. The students practiced adding explanations and practiced the persuasive process again with different partners. The researcher conducted small groups at her table during the practice times to support students with POW and TREE. The support it was taught over six lessons.

Lastly, the students independently wrote a persuasive composition. The independent practice stage was the posttest composition. See Appendix C for the detailed lesson plans.

Posttest

After the 15 lessons were taught, the students took a posttest. The same steps were followed as during the pretest. The students' posttest compositions were scored for writing quality and persuasive elements.

Maintenance

Five weeks later, the students were given a third set of persuasive prompts to determine if they maintained what they learned during the SRSD persuasive lessons. The same steps were followed when the maintenance prompts were administered. The scoring team scored the maintenance pieces for writing quality and persuasive elements.

Timeline

The study started after Armadillo Elementary School's spring break on March 21st. After the pretest was completed, SRSD persuasive writing instruction was administered over 15 lessons. Since the SRSD intervention was administered in an elementary school, there were a few interruptions due to a fire drill, a district meeting, a school holiday, and school programs. Appendix C shows the exact lesson plans that were used during the 15 lessons. The timeline of activities gives the state and a description of each day.

Table 2

Timeline of Activities

When	What	Stage	Description
February 2022	The researcher was trained on scoring procedures		
March 7, 2022	Notified Guardians of the Study		
March 21, 2022	Activate Background Knowledge	Stage 1	Read I Wanna Iguana
March 22, 2022	Pretest & Scored by researcher		
March 23, 2022	Lesson 1	Discuss It	Introduce POW & TREE
March 24, 2022	Lesson 2	Discuss It	Identify persuasive elements
March 25, 2022	Lesson 3	Discuss It	Identify persuasive elements
March 28, 2022	No School		
March 29, 2022	Lesson 4	Discuss It	Identify persuasive elements
March 30, 2022	Lesson 5	Discuss It	Identify persuasive elements

When	What	Stage	Description
March 31, 2022	Out for District Meeting		
April 1, 2022	Lesson 6	Discuss It	Identify persuasive elements: Pretest
April 4, 2022	Lesson 7	Model It	Model TREE
April 5, 2022	Lesson 8	Model It	Model Write and Say More
April 6, 2022	Lesson 9		Self-Regulation Statements
April 7, 2022	Lesson 10	Support It	Together wrote an outline
April 8, 2022	Lesson 11	Support It	Together wrote and say more
April 11, 2022	Lesson 12	Support It	Practice Explanations
April 12, 2022	Lesson 13	Support It	TREE with Partners
April 13, 2022	School Program		
April 14, 2022	Lesson 14	Support It	Practice Explanations
April 15, 2022	No School		
April 18, 2022	Lesson 15	Support It	TREE with Partners
April 19, 2022	Posttest	Independent Writing	
May 26, 2022	Maintenance Test	Independent Writing	
June 2022	Second Scorer Trained & Scored Compositions		

When	What	Stage	Description
June & July 2022	Data Analyzed		

Reliability and Validity

Fidelity of implementation

The lessons used in this study followed the SRSD persuasive lesson format. A checklist of lesson components was used to ensure each lesson was taught following the SRSD model. As each step was completed, the researcher checked off components while teaching. The researcher repeated this process for every lesson taught. The researcher also controlled for contamination by not teaching the other SRSD genres. Pearson was used before collecting any data for this study, which did not contain any of the six-stages of the SRSD writing instruction.

Reliability

An expert in the field of SRSD trained the researcher on using holistic anchor papers to score compositions. The researcher then trained another fifth grade teacher on the campus on using the holistic anchor papers to score compositions. The researcher scored 100% of the compositions and the second scorer scored 66% of the writing compositions for holistic writing quality. IRR was .81 for the holistic writing quality. When scoring for persuasive elements, the researcher scored 100% of the compositions nd the second scorer scored 33% for each set of compositions. IRR was .85 for the persuasive elements.

Closing Thoughts on Chapter III

In this study, the researcher proposed using the SRSD persuasive model to improve persuasive writing. In chapter 3, the researcher described the procedures for implementing the SRSD persuasive model in a fifth grade classroom. The researcher measured effectiveness

through data collection and analysis of persuasive holistic scoring and the inclusion of persuasive

elements.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study aimed to examine the effects of implementing Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) on fifth grade students' writing in terms of holistic quality and persuasive elements. For this study, a pre-test, a post-test, and maintenance writing composition were collected in response to writing prompts to answer the following questions:

1)   To what degree did the SRSD persuasive writing instruction impact student writing outcomes?

        a)   To what degree did the students' writing quality improve?

        b)   To what degree were the genre elements of the SRSD approach included?

2)   To what extent did the students maintain and apply their SRSD persuasive knowledge five weeks after the final lesson was taught?

        a)   To what extent did the students maintain the quality of their writing?

        b)   To what extent did the students incorporate the taught genre elements?

Presentation of Data

Before and after the intervention, the researcher asked the students to write a persuasive composition. The students completed a maintenance composition five weeks after the intervention was administered. The students had a choice between two writing prompts each time they were asked to write. Each composition collection started the same way: (a) reviewed what persuasive means; (b) informed the students of the time they had to complete (45 minutes) their composition; and (c) read both writing prompt options. The researcher analyzed the student compositions to identify the progress in their writing quality and their ability to include more persuasive elements. In this section, data are presented by each strand.

Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) Writing Instruction: Student Outcomes

Writing Quality

Pretest to Posttest. On average, students scored significantly higher on holistic writing quality from pretest to posttest with an average holistic score of 1.59 (SD = 1.10) at pretest to 2.81 (SD = 1.37) at posttest, $t(22)$ = -5.40, p = <.001 (see Table 3). The effect size was 1.066 (Cohen's d), which was considered to be a large effect size (Morgan et al., 2020; see Table 4). Other basic descriptives about the writing quality were included in Table 3. The TREE strategy was used by 72% of the students to plan for their posttest persuasive compositions before they started writing their compositions.

Posttest to Maintenance. The majority of students maintained what they learned about persuasive writing. The average of the students' holistic scores decreased from 2.81 (SD = 1.37) to 2.59 (SD = 1.37) during the maintenance phase (see Table 3). Other basic descriptives about the writing quality were included in Table 3. The TREE strategy was used by 77% of the students to plan their persuasive maintenance compositions before they started writing their final composition, which was an increase from the posttest phase. The paired t-test analysis results suggested that the decrease in writing quality is not significant (see Table 4). The difference between posttest and maintenance scores, $t(22)$ = 1.23, p = .117, indicated that students had a lower average score on the maintenance than on the posttest. At the maintenance phase there is an expected slight decrease in holistic writing quality. The effect size was .87 (Cohen's d), considered a large effect (Morgan et al., 2020). Even though there was a lower average on the maintenance compositions, most students maintained what they learned from the SRSD persuasive instruction.

Pretest to Maintenance. Students demonstrated an improvement in holistic scores from pretest to maintenance. The average holistic scores increased from a 1.59 (SD =1.10) to 2.59 (SD = 1.37; Table 3). Other basic descriptives were included in Table 3. The paired *t*-test suggested that the increase in writing quality was significant (see Table 4). The difference between pretest and maintenance scores, $t(22) = -5.07$, $p = <.001$, indicated students had a higher average score on the maintenance than on the pretest. The effect size was .93 (Cohen's *d*), a large effect size (Morgan et al., 2020).

Refer to Table 3 for the descriptive data for the holistic writing quality scores. Refer to Table 4 for the *t*-test results of holistic quality scores.

Table 3

Holistic Scores - Basic Descriptives

	Pretest	Posttest	Maintenance
Mean	1.59	2.82	2.59
Median	1.5	3	2.5
Mode	1	2	2
Range	4	4	5

Table 4

Holistic Scores - t-test

	M	SD	t(22)	df	p	Cohen's d
Comparison 1			-5.400	21	<.001	1.066
Pretest	1.591	1.098				
Posttest	2.818	1.368				
Comparison 2			1.226	21	.117	.869
Posttest	2.818	1.368				
Maintenance	2.591	1.368				

	M	SD	t(22)	df	p	Cohen's d
Comparison 3			-5.066	21	<.001	.926
Pretest	1.591	1.098				
Maintenance	2.591	1.368				

Persuasive Elements

Pretest to Posttest. Students included more elements in their composition during the posttest. At pretest, students on average included 3.32 elements, while the posttest compositions included an average of 5.21 elements (see Table 4). All of the students included a topic sentence at the posttest. Students showed an improvement in including reasons in the compositions (see Table 5). Students also improved in supporting their reasons using evidence (see Table 5). Students improved in adding transition words to their composition and more included an ending sentence (see Table 5).

The paired *t*-test analysis results suggested that the increase in including persuasive elements was significant (see Table 6). The difference between pre and posttest persuasive element total scores, $t(22) = -3.93$, $p = <.001$, indicated students had a higher total average score on the posttest than on the pretest. The effect size was .897 (Cohen's *d*), a large effect size (Morgan et al., 2020).

Posttest to Maintenance. Students included more elements in their composition during maintenance. At posttest, students on average included 5.21 elements, while the maintenance compositions included an average of 5.68 elements (see Table 4). Students included more reasons to support their topic sentence (see Table 5). Students demonstrated a slight decline in supporting their first and second reasons but showed an improvement in supporting their third reason (see Table 5). Fewer transition words were included in their maintenance compositions

(see Table 5). More students included an ending sentence in their maintenance compositions (see Table 5).

The paired *t*-test analysis results suggested that the increase in including persuasive elements is not significant (see Table 6). The difference between posttest and maintenance persuasive element total scores, $t(22) = -.857$, $p = .401$, indicated there was not a higher total average score on the maintenance than on the posttest. The effect size was .178 (Cohen's *d*), a small effect size (Morgan et al., 2020).

Pretest to Maintenance. Students included more elements in their composition during the maintenance phase than during the pretest. At the pretest, students on average included 3.32 elements, while the maintenance compositions included an average of 5.68 elements (see Table 4). A topic sentence was included by 21 students on both the pretest and maintenance (95%). Students demonstrated an increase in including a second and third reasons in the maintenance compositions (see Table 5). The inclusion of adding a first reason stayed the same between the two collections. There was an improvement in including a second and third reason. Students also improved on supporting their reasons using evidence (see Table 5). Students improved in adding transition words to their composition and more included an ending sentence (see Table 5).

The paired *t*-test analysis results suggested that the increase in including persuasive elements was significant (Table 6). The difference between pretest and maintenance compositions regarding persuasive element scores, $t(22) = -4.332$, $p = < .001$, indicated a higher total average score on the maintenance than on the pretest. The effect size was 1.024 (Cohen's *d*), a large effect size (Morgan et al., 2020).

Refer to Table 5 for basic descriptives of persuasive elements. Refer to Table 6 for percentages of students who include TREE elements. Refer to Table 7 for *t*-test results of persuasive elements.

Table 5

Persuasive Elements - Basic Descriptives

	Pretest	Posttest	Maintenance
Average Total Elements Included	3.32	5.21	5.86
Median	3	5.83	6
Mode	3	8	8
Range	8	8	8

Table 6

Percentage of Students who Included TREE Elements

	Pretest	Posttest	Maintenance
Topic Sentence	95%	100%	95%
Reasons			
Reason 1	86%	95%	86%
Reason 2	50%	77%	77%
Reason 3	5%	64%	64%
Evidence			
Evidence 1	41%	55%	46%
Evidence 2	18%	50%	45%
Evidence 3	5%	23%	59%
Ending	23%	50%	59%
Transition Words	9%	44%	36%

* Percentages are based off of the number of students who included the element divided by the total number of students, except for transition words.

** There was an opportunity for a total 66 transition words to be used in all of the students' compositions during each set.

Table 7

Persuasive Elements - t-test

	M	SD	t(22)	df	p	Cohen's d
Comparison 1			-3.926	21	<.001	.897
Pretest	3.318	1.673				
Posttest	5.211	2.472				
Comparison 2			-.857	21	.401	.178
Posttest	5.211	2.472				
Maintenance	5.681	2.803				
Comparison 3			-4.332	21	<.001	1.024
Pretest	3.318	1.673				
Maintenance	5.681	2.803				

Summary

Results showed that students' quality of writing improved from the pre to posttest and from pretest to maintenance. Overall, there was significant growth in the quality of students' writing due to the SRSD persuasive writing instruction. There was no significant growth from posttest to maintenance, but students maintained what they learned about the persuasive genre without further instruction. The students increased the persuasive genre elements included in their writing at each phase. There was significant growth in including persuasive elements from the pre to posttest and from the pretest to maintenance. The students maintained the inclusion of persuasive elements without further instruction.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

This study aimed to determine if implementing the SRSD persuasive writing approach would increase the quality of students' writing and increase the number of persuasive elements included in their writing. Results indicated that students' holistic writing quality had significantly improved. The number of genre elements included in their compositions was significant as well, especially from pretest to maintenance.

Writing Quality Outcomes

Students improved in the holistic quality of their persuasive writing from the pretest to posttest and from pretest to maintenance after receiving the SRSD persuasive instruction. Most students maintained what they learned about the persuasive genre without further instruction. The maintenance phase may have been affected by the date and the time of the collection. Due to several last-minute school programs, the maintenance measure was administered at the end of the day (writing instruction usually happened in the mornings) t he day before the students' promotion ceremony.

Persuasive Elements Outcomes

Students demonstrated an increase in the inclusion of persuasive elements in their writing. There was an improvement from pretest to posttest and from pretest to maintenance. Most of the students maintained what they learned about persuasive elements without further instruction. Again, this result may have been affected by the time and date the maintenance sample was collected.

Relation to Extant Literature

57

Holistic Writing Quality

The results of this study showed that the students wrote higher quality persuasive compositions during the posttest and the maintenance stages than on the pretest. This aligned with other SRSD research conducted using the SRSD writing approach (Harris & Graham, 1985; Harris et al., 2012; Harris et al., 2015; Lane et al., 2010; McKeown et al., 2016; Saddler, 2006; Saddler et al., 2004; Sawyer et al., 1992; Tracey et al., 2009; Zumbrunn & Bruning, 2013). The results showed the holistic quality gains were overall larger than the persuasive elements. This study added to the literature, demonstrating that classroom teachers could effectively implement the SRSD persuasive writing approach with a significant positive impact on student writing outcomes.

The results of this study had a larger effect size (ranged from .869 to 1.066) on writing quality that other SRSD research. McKeown et al. (2019) had a quality effect size was .15 after receiving seven lessons. McKeown et al. (2016) had a quality effect size of .18 over story quality elements over five lessons. Harris et al. (2012) had a quality effect size of ranging from .54 to .78 (p. 198) on story and opinion writing after receiving 10 SRSD lessons. Mason et al. (2017) had an effect size of .57 for struggling and .84 for non-struggling writers over opinion writing after receiving five SRSD lessons. This showed there was a significant improvement over quality when given longer time to teach the SRSD instruction.

Persuasive Elements

Including genre writing elements is a major part of the SRSD writing approach. Similar to the upper-elementary students in Mason et al. (2017)'s study, the fifth grade students in this study displayed an improvement in the inclusion of the persuasive elements, and they maintained what they learned about the persuasive genre at a later date. The increase in the inclusion of

persuasive genre writing elements in this study also supported other SRSD researchers' results (Harris et al., 2012; Harris et al., 2015; Lane et al., 2010; Miller & Little, 2017; Saddler, 2006; Saddler et al., 2004; Sawyer et al., 1992; Zumbrunn & Bruning, 2013). The results of this study, along with the previous research, demonstrated that teaching the SRSD persuasive approach helped students include more persuasive elements in their writing.

Discussion of Lessons Learned

Writing is expected to be taught in all elementary grade levels, but at times, no evidence-based writing curriculum is provided to teachers. At the time of the study, teachers were expected to use the reading program that integrates writing (e.g., Pierson, Amplify) to teach students to write. In the researcher's personal experiences, those programs were disjointed, and the students were left with areas of improvement. Using the SRSD writing approach allowed teachers to support their students in three genres and build upon the foundation the SRSD approach laid through their given district curriculum.

At the time of the study, the Bluebonnet School District did not have a writing intervention. The SRSD approach was easy to implement because the approach provided lesson plans and a fidelity checklist for each stage. The SRSD writing approach walked teachers through the six-steps and showed ways teachers could adjust the lessons to meet the needs of their students. The approach also had rubrics and examples of what students' writing should look like at different levels. The SRSD approach also had a PD course teachers could take to help implement it with their students.

The SRSD persuasive approach is valuable because it teaches students the basic elements of a persuasive text, which is a skill students can use for the rest of their lives. Students, for the most part, were engaged in the lessons due to the inherent nature of being able to state their

opinion. This engagement was more than the researcher had experienced in the past during writing time because students were excited to write. Students enjoyed being able to state their opinion on topics that were relevant to them. By the end of this intervention, students stated an opinion and give reasons to support their opinion. Educators who receive PD on the SRSD approach will be able to support their students' writing with engaging lessons.

Implications for Practice

In the Context

This study occurred in a fifth grade classroom at an urban elementary school within a large metroplex in the southwestern US. According to the STAAR writing results (Texas Education Agency, 2019), about 40% of the students in the fourth grade scored below grade level in writing. The results of this study demonstrated that the students' writing quality improved after implementing the SRSD approach. Therefore, it was reasonable to conclude that teachers in this context improved student writing by using the SRSD persuasive approach. The researcher created a PD agenda to help implement the SRSD persuasive writing approach at this site (see Appendix D). This agenda will inform the administration and teachers of the SRSD process they will go through to learn how to implement the SRSD approach in their classrooms. The agenda shows the plan for the two days and a description of each activity that will be conducted. By giving the teachers a hands-on experience with SRSD, they will be more open to implementing the SRSD approach into their writing block.

For the Field of Study

Results of this study revealed that by implementing the intervention, SRSD persuasive approach, students' writing quality improved, and they included more persuasive elements in

their writing. Teachers who teach writing can implement the SRSD persuasive approach to improve their students' writing.

Elementary administrators and instructional coaches who want to improve student writing would benefit from seeking PD on implementing the SRSD approach in elementary classrooms. This intervention can supplement the writing curriculum that is already being used. The SRSD approach helps to lay the foundation for writing by introducing the basic elements of the genre. Implementing the SRSD approach can start in the lower grades and continue to build upon it as the students move through elementary school.

Recommendations

There were several limitations to this study. First, the teacher implemented the intervention in her classroom of students. The intervention was also only implemented with one class of fifth graders, so the results were not measured across multiple fifth grade classes. Future research should explore the impact of implementing the SRSD persuasive approach with multiple instructors across multiple fifth grade classes.

Second, the sample size of the intervention group was small. Thus, use caution in interpreting outcomes, including effect sizes.

Third, the time and date of the maintenance data was compromised. Due to some last-minute schedule changes during the last week of school, the day and time of the collection were not ideal. The maintenance stage was collected on their last day of class before their promotion ceremony, and it was collected during the last 45 minutes of the day, which was not the regular writing block time. Writing normally occurred the first 45 minutes of the day.

Closing Thoughts on Chapter V

Elementary students should leave elementary school with a foundation of knowledge about different types of writing. They will build on this knowledge as they move through middle and high school. Data showed that students were leaving fourth grade below grade level expectations in writing (Texas Education Agency, 2019). This meant that fifth grade teachers have to help students close the writing gaps. Teachers were then left to teach writing through reading-based programs. WWC has only one approved writing program that helps students learn the foundation of writing: SRSD (Institute of Educational Science, 2012). This study attempted to help students develop a basic foundation of the persuasive genre by helping to increase persuasive elements included and improve the quality of writing.

As the writing teacher, the researcher implemented the SRSD persuasive writing approach with her fifth grade classroom over four weeks. The students moved through the six-stages of the SRSD approach: (a) active background; (b) discuss it; (c) model it; (d) memorize it; (e) support it; and (f) independent practice. Each stage varied on the number of days depending on what the class needed. The focus was on modeling and supporting the inclusion of persuasive elements in their compositions. Overall, results of the study implied that students improved in both their quality of writing and the inclusion of persuasive elements in their compositions.

Teachers of have elementary students, who are performing below grade level on their writing, would benefit from this research. Campus and local contexts would further benefit from introducing the SRSD persuasive approach into curriculum, training teachers to use the approach, and providing coaching on implementing the SRSD persuasive approach. If teachers are properly trained and implement the SRSD approach with fidelity, students' writing quality would improve. With an evidence-based writing approach, such as SRSD, students will leave

with higher-quality writing. Students with higher quality writing skills improve their chances of success in school and in their future careers.

REFERENCES

Achieve, Inc. (2005). *Rising to the challenge: Are high school graduates prepared for college and work?* https://www.achieve.org/files/pollreport_0.pdf

Baker, S. K., Chard, D. J., Ketterlin-Geller, L. R., Apichatabutra, C., & Doabler, C. (2009). Teaching writing to at-risk students: The quality of evidence for self-regulated strategy development. *Exceptional Children, 75*(3), 303-318.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Beason, L. (2001). Ethos and error: How business people react to errors. C*ollege Composition and Communication, 53*(1), 33-64.

Berman, I. (2009). Supporting adolescent literacy achievement. *Issue Brief*, 1–15.

Business Roundtable. (2009). Getting ahead—staying ahead: Helping America's workforce succeed in the 21st century. Retrieved from businessroundtable.org/.../BRT_Getting_Ahead_online_version_1.pdf.

College Board. (2012). Report on college and career readiness 2012. Retrieved from http://research.collegeboard. org/programs/sat/data/cb-seniors-2012.

Efron, S. E. & Ravid, R. (2019). *Action research in education* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Finlayson, K., & McCrudden, M. T. (2019). Teacher-implemented writing instruction for elementary students: A literature review. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 36*(1), 1-18.

Glanz, J. (2014). *Action research: An educational leader's guide to school improvement* (3rd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.

Graham, S. (2006). Strategy instruction and the teaching of writing: A meta-analysis. In C.A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.). *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 187–207). Guilford.

Graham, S. (2013) It all starts here: Fixing our national writing crisis from the foundation. Saperstein Associates.

Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Mason, L. (2005). Improving the writing performance, knowledge, and self-efficacy of struggling young writers: The effects of self-regulated strategy development. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 30*, 207-241.

Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kiuhare, S., & Harris, K. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(4), 879-896.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007a). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 99(3), 445–476.

Harris, K. R. (1982). Cognitive-behavior modifications: Application with exceptional students. *Focus on the Exceptional Children, 15*(2), 1-16.

Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (1985). Improving learning disabled students' composition skills: Self-control strategy training. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 8*, 27-36.

Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2009). Self-regulated strategy development in writing: Premises, evolution, and the future. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1*(1), 113-135.

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Adkins, M. (2015). Practice-based professional development and self-regulated strategy development for tier 2, at-risk writers in second grade. *Contemporary Education Psychology, 40*, 5-16.

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. (2003). Self-regulated strategy development in the classroom: Part of a balanced approach to writing instruction for students with disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 35*(7), 1-16.

Harris, K. R., Lane, K. L., Graham, S., Driscoll, S. A., Sandmel, K., Brindle, M., & Schatschnedier, C. (2012). Practice-based professional development for self-regulated strategies development in writing: A randomized controlled study. Journal of Teacher Education, 63(2), 103-119.

Harris, K.R., Lane, K. L., Driscoll, S. A., Graham, S., Wilson, K., Sandmel, K., Brindle, M., & Schatschneider, C. (2012). Tier 1, teacher-implemented self-regulated strategy development for students with and without behavioral challenges. *The Elementary School Journal, 113(*2), 160-191.

Institute of Educational Sciences. (2007). *The condition of education 2007*. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007064.pdf

Institute of Educational Sciences. (2012). *Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers*. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/WWC_Elem_Writing_PG_Dec 182018.pdf

Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California. (2002). Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California's Public Colleges and Universities. Sacramento, CA: ICAS. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED469982.pdf.

Ivankova, N. (2015). *Applications in action research: From methods to community action*. Sage.

Kent, S., Wanzek, J., Petscher, Y., Al Otaiba, S., & Kim, Y. S. (2013). Writing fluency and quality in kindergarten and first grade: The role of attention, reading, transcription, and oral language. *Reading and Writing, 27*, 1163-1188.

Kim, Y. S., Otaiba, S. A., Silder, J. F., & Gruelich, L. (2013). Language, literacy, attentional behaviors, and instructional quality predictors of written composition for first-graders. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 28,* 461-469.

Kim, Y. S., Otaiba, S., Wanzek, J., & Gatlin, B. (2015). Toward an understanding of dimensions, predictors, and the gender gap in written compositions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*(1), 79-95.

Lane, K. L., Graham, S., Harris, K. R., Little, M. A., Sandmel, K., & Brindle, M. (2010). The effects of self-regulated strategy development for second-grade students with writing and behavioral difficulties. *The Journal of Special Education, 44*(2), 107-128.

Manfra, M. M. (2019). Action research and systematic, intentional change in teaching practice. *Review of Research in Education, 43*, 163-196.

Mason, L. H., Cramer, A. M., Garwd, J. D., Varghese, C., Hamm, J., & Murray, A. (2017). Efficacy of self-regulated strategy development instruction for developing writers with and without disabilities in rural schools: A randomized controlled study. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 36*(4), 168-179.

McKeown, D., Brindle, M., Harris, K. R., Graham, S., Collins, A. A. & Brown., M. (2016). Illuminating growth and struggles using mixed methods: Practice-based professional

development and coaching for differentiating SRSD instruction in writing. *Reading & Writing, 26*, 1105-1140.

McKeown, D., FitzPatrick, E., Brown, M., Brindle, M., Ownes, J., & Hendrick, R. (2019). Urban teacher' implementation of SRSD for persuasive writing following practice-based professional development: Positive effects mediated by compromise fidelity. *Reading and   Writing, 32*, 1483-1506.

Miller, K. M., & Little, M. E. (2017). Examining the effects of SRSD in combination with video self-modeling on writing by third grade students with learning disabilities. *Exceptionality, 26*(2), 81-105.

Morgan, G.A., Leech, N. L., Gloeckner, G. W., & Barrett, K. C. (2020). *IBM SPSS for introductory statistics: Use and interpretation*. Routledge.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). The Nation's report card: Writing 2011. Retrieved from http://nationsreportcard.gov/writing_2011/summary.asp

National Commission on Writing in America's Schools. (2006). Writing and school reform. Retrieved from https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/2542

National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). The nation's report card: Urban district assessment writing 2002. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/dst2002/2003530.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). The nation's report card: Writing 2011 grade 8 national results [Data file]. Retrieved from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/writing_2011/g8_national.aspx

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). The nation's report card: Writing 2011 grade 12 national results [Data file]. Retrieved from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/writing_2011/g12_national.aspx?tab_id=tab2&subtab_id=Tab_1#chart

National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *The nation's report card: Writing 2002*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2002/2003529.pdf

The National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and Colleges. (2004). *Writing: a ticket to work ... Or a ticket out: A survey of business leaders.* Retrieved from https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/2540

Rouse, A. G., & Kiuhara, S. A. (2017). SRSD in writing and professional development for teachers: Practice and promise for elementary and middle school students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 32*(3), 180-188.

Saddler, B. (2006). Increasing story-writing ability through self-regulated strategy development: Effects on young writings with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 29*, 291-305.

Saddler, B., Moran, S., Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2004). Preventing writing difficulties: The effects of planning strategy instruction on the writing performance of struggling writers. *Exceptionality, 12*, 3-17.

Sawyer R. J., Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1992). Direct teaching, strategy instruction, and strategy instruction with explicit self-regulation: Effects on the composition skills and self-efficacy of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 340-352.

Teng, M. F. (2020). Young learners' reading and writing performance: Exploring collaborative modeling of text structure as an additional component of self-regulated strategy development. *Studies in Education Evaluation, 65*, 1-13.

Texas Education Agency (2019). *Comparison of statewide STAAR results 18-19*. Retrieved from https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/Comparison%20of%20Statewide%20STAAR%20 Results%2018-19%28prelim%29.pdf

Tracy, B., Reid, R., & Graham, S. (2009). Teaching young students strategies for planning and drafting stories: The impact of self-regulated strategy development. *The Journal of Education Research, 102*(5), 323-331.

Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). 21st century skills: Learning for life in our times. John Wiley and Sons.

Zumbrunn, S., & Bruning, R. (2013). Improving the writing and knowledge of emergent writers: The effects of self-regulated strategy development. *Reading & Writing, 26*, 91-110.

APPENDIX A

IRB Review

February 22, 2021

Type of Review:	Initial Review Submission Form
Title:	SELF-REGULATED STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT WRITING APPROACH: A SINGLE 5TH GRADE CLASSROOM
Investigator:	Mary Margaret Capraro
IRB ID:	IRB2021-0189
Reference Number:	121790
Funding:	N/A
Documents Received:	IRB Application (v1.0)

Dear Mary Margaret Capraro:

The Institution determined that the proposed activity is not research involving human subjects as defined by DHHS and FDA regulations.

Further IRB review and approval by this organization is not required because this is not human research. You have indicated that the results of the activities described in the application will not be generalized beyond a single school system and will not be published. This determination applies only to the activities described in this IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made you must immediately contact the IRB about whether these activities are research involving humans in which the organization is engaged. You will also be required to submit a new request to the IRB for a determination.

Please be aware that receiving a 'Not Human Research Determination' is not the same as IRB review and approval of the activity. IRB consent forms or templates for the activities described in the determination are not to be used and references to TAMU IRB approval must be removed from study documents.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB Administrative Office at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636.

Sincerely,
IRB Administration

APPENDIX B

Parent Letter

March 7, 2022

Dear Parents/Guardians,

      I am currently working on my doctoral degree in curriculum and instruction at Texas A&M Univeristy. I am conducting research on a writing approach, Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD). I will be teaching the six-step SRSD writing approach through 15 lessons. The goal of this study is to determine if the SRSD writing approach will improve the quality of student's writing.

      Students will write three compositions by themselves: pretest, posttest, and a maintenance. Students will learn about the elements of a persuasive composition. I will be modeling for the students how to write a persuasive composition. Then together we will be writing a persuasive composition and finally the students will work in pairs to write persuasive compositions.

      Your student's participation is this study is entirely voluntary. At this time, no action is necessary on your part. Should you choose to, you can withdraw your student at any time during the study without consequences of any kind.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns please contact me.

Thanks,
Jacklyn Davenport
jacklyncdavenport@tamu.edu

Withdrawing Consent
 I wish for my child to be withdrawn from this study.

_____

Child's Name

_____   _____

Parent/Guardian's Signature   Date

APPENDIX C

Lesson Plans

Monday, March 21, 2022: Activate Background Knowledge

SAY: Today, we are going to start our unit on persuasive writing.

DISCUSS: What is persuasive writing? Why do you think persuasive writing is important?

READ: I Wanna Iguana

DISCUSS: What do you notice the author included to make this persuasive? What should you include in a persuasive piece? Do you think he should get an iguana? Support your opinion with facts or details.

SAY: Today, you are going to complete a handwriting piece.

READ/SAY: At the top of this page is a paragraph that I am going to ask you to copy. Before doing this, I want us to read the paragraph together out loud (do so). Now I want you to hold your pencil in the air over your head. When I say start, I would like you to copy this paragraph on the lines below as quickly and neatly as possible without making any mistakes. You will do this for 60 seconds. Don't worry if you cannot copy the whole paragraph in that time. If you copy the whole paragraph and I have not said stop. Start copying it again. When I say stop, please put your pencil down and stop writing. Any questions?

Ok, start.

EXPLAIN: Tomorrow, you are going to write a persuasive piece. This piece will help me figure out what to teach. It is important for you to do your best.

Tuesday, March 22, 2022

SAY: Today, you are going to write a piece persuasive piece. This piece is going to show me what you know about persuasive writing.

REVIEW: what persuasive writing is and why it is important.

REVIEW: I wanna Iguana (parts that made it persuasive)

READ: the writing prompts

SAY: I need your best writing so I can see what you know and what you need help with. You have 45 minutes to work. Make sure that your final piece is on the lined paper.

Wednesday, March 23, 2022: **Lesson 1**

SAY: Today, learn a couple of tricks for writing. First, we are going to learn a strategy or trick that good writers use for everything they write.

INTRODUCE: POW

POW is a trick good writers use for many things they write.

P - Pick an Idea

O - Organize your notes (TREE; our notes do not have to be full sentences; they are a reminder of our ideas)

W- Write and say more (we use our notes to help us elaborate our ideas)

SAY: POW gives them POWer for everything they write.

REVIEW: What does the word opinion mean?

"A paper that tells the reader what you believe is called an opinion essay. When you write an opinion essay, you are trying to make your reader agree with you."

Good opinion essays are fun for you to write and fun for others to read, make sense, and can convince the reader to agree with you"

REVIEW: What does persuade mean? When do you want to persuade someone?

SAY: A powerful opinion essay has a good beginning that gets the reader's attention and the reader what you believe, gives the reader at least three reasons why you believe it, gives explanations for each reason and has a good ending. A good opinion essay is also fun for you to write and fun to read.

INTRODUCE: TREE

T- Topic sentence = tells the reader what you believe

R - reasons = 3 or more and tells the reader why you believe what you believe (What reasons would convenience the reasons)

E - Explain - explain each reason (clear and to help)

Thursday, March 24, 2022: Lesson 2- (Finishing lesson 1)

SAY: Today, we are going to continue to identify the parts of the opinion essay.

REVIEW

1. POW - What does POW stand for? When do we use it?
    a. P - Pick an idea
    b. O - Organize your notes

c. W - Write & say more

2. TREE - What does TREE stand for? When do we use it?
   a. T - topic sentence (state your opinion)
   b. R - reasons (3 or more; clear)
   c. E - explain (clear and support your reasons
   d. E - ending sentence (wrap it all up)

SAY: Yesterday, we started to identify parts of this opinion piece. Let's look over what we identified yesterday.

What was the topic sentence?

What were their reasons?

SAY: Yesterday, I mentioned linking words. Linking words are words writers use to show that a new reason is being given. Linking words can be a single word or a group of words. Every reason should have a linking word to make it clear that this is a reason.

SAY: Are there any linking words in this piece?

Circle all of the linking words.

SAY: Lastly, we need to wrap up our piece. How did this author wrap up their piece?

Double underline the ending sentence.

SAY: It is important that we learn what POW & TREE stand for. I want you on this piece of paper to show me what you remember so far.

Students will write out what each letter means.

Friday, March 25, 2022: Lesson 3

Engage:

1. Talk about what POW and TREE mean and what they stand for.
2. Review when and why we use POW.
3. Review when and why we use TREE.
4. Review what opinion writing is and the purpose of opinion writing.

REMIND: TREE is the trick for O.

SAY: Today, we are going to look at another opinion essay. We want to see if all of the parts are there as well as to see if the reasons make sense.

DISCUSS: What are the parts to a good opinion essay?

T = topic sentence - what I believe

R = reasons - three or more, why I believe

E = explain - say more about each reason

E = end - wrap it up

REMIND: Good Opinion writing is fun for you to read and for others to read, makes sense, and can convince the reader to agree with you.

Handout the opinion essay to each student (paying to go to school)

I Do:

Read the opinion essay.

We Do: (Remind that students do not need to write complete sentences on their notes page.)

1. What is the topic sentence of this opinion essay?
   a. Does it catch your attention?
   b. Does it tell what the writer believes?
2. What are the reasons mentioned?
   a. Does the explanation make the reason stronger?
   b. Will these reasons convince the reader? (Think about the audience)
3. Are there any linking words? What are they? (Words used to show that a new reason is being given)
   a. Give the students the linking word handout to put in their folder.
4. What is the ending?
   a. Does it wrap it up right?
   b. Does it bring together and summarize all of the reasons?

You Do:

1. Add materials to the folder.

Tuesday, March 29, 2022: Lesson 4

Engage:

1. Have the students write out on a piece of paper what POW and TREE stand for.
2. Talk about what POW and TREE means and what they stand for.
3. Review when and why we use POW.
4. Review when and why we use TREE.

5. Review what opinion writing is and the purpose of opinion writing.

REMIND: Good Opinion writing is fun for you to read and for others to read, makes sense, and can convince the reader to agree with you.

SAY: Today, we are going to look at another opinion essay. We want to see if all of the parts are there.

DISCUSS: What are the parts to a good opinion essay?

> T = topic sentence - what I believe
>
> R = reasons - three or more, why I believe
>
> E = explain - say more about each reason
>
> E = end - wrap it up

Handout the opinion essay to each student

I Do:

1. Read the opinion essay.

We Do:

1. What is the topic sentence of this opinion essay?
   a. Does it catch your attention?
      i. What are ways to catch readers' attention? (Exclamation, question, fact, anecdote)
   b. Does it tell what the writer believes?
2. What are the reasons mentioned?
   a. Does the explanation make the reason stronger?
      i. Do they make sense with our topic?
   b. Will these reasons convince the reader? (Think about the audience)
      i. Who might be the reader for this essay?
      ii. Would these reasons convince them to agree with you?
         > TIP: If it doesn't make sense, correct it before you add it to the graphic organizer.

REMIND: In order to persuade a reader, the reasons need to make sense and need to be powerful to try to convince the reader to agree with you.

3. Are there any linking words? What are they? (Words used to show that a new reason is being given)

     a.   Give the students the linking word handout to put in their folder.

   4. What is the ending?

     a.   Does it wrap it up right?

     b.   Does it bring together and summarize all of the reasons?

         TIP: Make notes for a better ending.

   5. Write a new essay together from the notes we have made.

     a.   Does it make sense?

     b.   Will the reasons convince your readers?

     c.   Is it a better essay?

     d.   Does the ending wrap it up right?

You Do:

1. Have students write out POW & TREE
2. Add materials to their folder.

Wednesday, March 30, 2022: Lesson 5

Engage:

1. Have the students write out on a piece of paper what POW and TREE stand for.
2. Talk about what POW and TREE mean and what they stand for.
3. Review when and why we use POW.
4. Review when and why we use TREE.
5. Review what opinion writing is and the purpose of opinion writing.

REMIND: Good Opinion writing is fun for you to read and for others to read, makes sense, and can convince the reader to agree with you.

SAY: Today, we are going to look at another opinion essay. We want to see if all of the parts are there.

DISCUSS: What are the parts to a good opinion essay?

      T = topic sentence - what I believe

      R = reasons - three or more, why I believe

      E = explain - say more about each reason

      E = end - wrap it up

Handout the opinion essay to each student (choose their own TV shows)

I Do:

1. Read the opinion essay.

We Do:

1. What is the topic sentence of this opinion essay?

   a. Does it catch your attention?

      i. What are ways to catch readers' attention? (Exclamation, question, fact, anecdote)

   b. Does it tell what the writer believes?

2. What are the reasons mentioned?

   a. Does the explanation make the reason stronger?

      i. Do they make sense with our topic?

   b. Will these reasons convince the reader? (Think about the audience)

      i. Who might be the reader for this essay? (Parents, teacher)

      ii. Would these reasons convince them to agree with you?

            TIP: If it doesn't make sense, correct it before you add it to the graphic organizer.

REMIND: In order to persuade a reader, the reasons need to make sense and need to be powerful to try to convince the reader to agree with you.

3. Are there any linking words? What are they? (Words used to show that a new reason is being given)

   a. Give the students the linking word handout to put in their folder.

4. What is the ending?

   a. Does it wrap it up right?

   b. Does it bring together and summarize all of the reasons?

      TIP: Make notes for a better ending.

5. Write a new essay together from the notes we have made.

   a. Does it make sense?

   b. Will the reasons convince your readers?

   c. Is it a better essay?

   d. Does the ending wrap it up right?

You Do:

1. Add materials to their folder.

Friday, April 1, 2022: Lesson 6

Engage:

1. Have the students write out on a piece of paper what POW and TREE stand for.
2. Talk about what POW and TREE means and what they stand for.
3. Review when and why we use POW.
4. Review when and why we use TREE.
5. Review what opinion writing is and the purpose of opinion writing.
6. Review the rubric and why we are going to use one.

REMIND: Good Opinion writing is fun for you to read and for others to read, makes sense, and can convince the reader to agree with you.

SAY*:* Today, we are going to look back at your first opinion piece. You are going to find the parts of TREE in your essay. You will use the rubric to score yourself. Our goal is to eventually have all 8 parts of TREE in our opinion writing.

We do: (Scoring)

1. We have to count up the parts: a good opinion essay has at least 8 parts.
2. Practice scoring the piece that was missing parts (eat what they want).

SAY*:* In order to set our goal for the next piece we have to know where we are starting.

We do/You do: (Scoring)

Students will score their pre-assessment.

1. Look in your piece to see if you included a topic sentence or told what you believe.
2. Look for reasons in your piece. (Double underline and number them)
3. Look for any explanations in your piece that support your reasons.
4. Look for an ending in your piece.
5. Look for any linking words or phrases in your essay. (circle)
6. Add up your points and count how many linking words you used.
7. Discuss the rocket ship paper.
   a. This is how you are going to monitor your progress including at least the 8 parts of TREE.

You do:

1. Students will fill in the graph organizer with the parts from their paper. If they are missing a piece then add it to the organizer.

Monday, April 4, 2022: Lesson 7

Engage:

1. Have the students write out on a piece of paper what POW and TREE stand for.
2. Talk about what POW and TREE means and what they stand for.
3. Review when and why we use POW.
4. Review when and why we use TREE.
5. Review what opinion writing is and the purpose of opinion writing.
6. What did we do yesterday in writing?
   a. Have students review their goal

SAY: Today, I am going to model writing an opinion piece. You will be taking notes on what I am doing (*go over the expectations of the notes page*).

I do:

1. What am I being asked to do here?
   a. I am being asked to give my opinion to this question.
2. I know that I use POW to help with my writing.
   a. P stands for pick my idea.
   b. O stands for organizing my notes
   c. W stands for write and say more.
3. My goal this time is to include at least 6 parts of TREE.
4. First, I need to pick my topic.
   a. Well, in order to pick my topic, I need to read the prompt. (Read the prompt out loud).
   b. Brainstorm a couple of ideas (two or three) & write them down on top of the organizer.
   c. Go through each idea (two or three) and discuss the merits of each.
      i. Explain why I would eliminate one (do not feel like I have enough that I could write about)
      ii. Explain why I chose the one I did (lots of write about)

d. Create a topic sentence based on the topic.

    i. Where should I write this?

        1. Oh, I need to organize my notes. I know that if I am writing an opinion or persuasive piece, I use TREE

            a. Have students say what tree stands for

            b. Pull out organizer

                i. I will use this page to make and organize my notes. You can help me.

                ii. You will do this next time you write an opinion essay.

REMIND: Powerful opinion essays get the reader's attention and tell readers what you believe, give at least three reasons why you believe that, give explanations for each reason, use good linking words, and have an ending sentence that brings it all together. Also, good opinion essays are fun for us to write and for others to read, make sense of, and can convince the reader to agree with you.

5. I am now going to use TREE to organize my notes. This helps me plan my paper. I can write down ideas for each part. I can write down different parts on this page as I think of ideas.

    a. First, what do I believe - what do I want to tell the reader I believe?

        i. Good! I like this idea!

    b. Next, I need to figure out at least three reasons to back up what I believe.

        i. Let my mind be free to think of good ideas.

            1. Pause for a minute to show that I am thinking of ideas.

        ii. State two reasons that support what I believe.

        iii. Uh! I cannot think of anything else. I am just going to give up. I cannot do this.

            1. Jacklyn, take a couple of deep breaths. (Take deep breaths)

            2. You got this! You can come up with one more idea!

        iv. Come up with one more idea.

        v. I need to number my reasons in the order I want to put them when I go to write and say more.

          1. Discuss with the students what order would be most effective or logical for the reader.

            a. Who is my reader?

c. I need to remember my trick, TREE. The next step in TREE is to make notes to explain each of my reasons.

    i. Add an explanation to each reason

        1. Man, I am tired and my brain and hand are tired. I have done soooooo much writing today.

        2. Jacklyn, it is ok to take a minute break to rest your brain and hand. (After a minute) You only have one more explanation to add and your ending. You got this!

d. What do I need to do next? I need to wrap it upright.

    i. When I wrap up an opinion essay, I need to bring it all together and summarize all of the reasons.

    ii. Have the students help complete this step.

e. Now I can look back at my notes and see if I can add more notes to my paper.

    i. Have students help add more notes

        1. Add an extra explanation

        2. Clarify one reason

f. I can also decide on good linking words I want to use for each reason.

    i. Let's look at our folder and pick out three linking works.

    ii. Add them to the graphic organizer.

g. Lastly, I need to make sure that I have completed all the steps of TREE.

    i. Do I have a topic sentence, which tells what I believe?

    ii. Do I have three or more reasons which support my opinion?

    iii. Do I have explanations that make sense with the reason?

    iv. Do I have linking words?

    v. Do I have an ending that wraps it up by bringing it together and summarizes my reasons?

h. Will my reader be persuaded?

(We will complete the W in POW tomorrow.)

You do:

1. Have students write out POW & TREE with a description.

2. Add materials to their folder.

Tuesday, April 5, 2022: Lesson 8

Engage:

1. Have the students write out on a piece of paper what POW and TREE stand for.

2. Talk about what POW and TREE means and what they stand for.

3. Review when and why we use POW.

4. Review when and why we use TREE.

5. Review what opinion writing is and the purpose of opinion writing.

6. What did we do yesterday in writing?

    a. Ms. Davenport model using TREE.

SAY: Today, I am going to take the notes I made yesterday to write and say more.

I do:

1. First, I am going to reread my notes from yesterday.

    a. *Have the students help you read through your notes.*

    b. Will my reader be persuaded?

2. I know that after O in POW is the W which means I need to write it out and say more.

    a. How do I start?

    b. First, I start with my topic sentence, so I need to look back at my notes.

        i. Wait, before I write my topic sentence, I want to hook my reader.

        ii. In order to do that, I need to add a sentence to get their attention.

        iii. I can use a question, anecdote, quote, or a fact.

        iv. *Have students help generate a hook*

    c. What do I need to do next?

        i. Model looking back at my notes.

    d. Next, I need to write my first reason.

        i. Find the one I wrote a 1 next to.

            1. Write out the reason with the transition word.

            2. Write out the explanation with the reason.

82

e. I now need to add my second reason.

    i. Write out the reason with the transition word.

        1. Modify the reason

    ii. Write out the explanation with the reason.

f. I need to add my last reason.

    i. Write out the reason with the transition word.

    ii. Write out the explanation with the reason.

        1. Add an explanation

g. Lastly, I need to add my ending.

    i. Write out my ending.

h. Do I have all of the parts of TREE?

    i. Do I have a topic sentence, which tells what I believe?

    ii. Do I have three or more reasons which support my opinion?

    iii. Do I have explanations that make sense with the reason?

    iv. Do I have linking words?

    v. Do I have an ending that wraps it up by bringing it together and summarizes my reasons?

i. Good work. I have finished my piece. It'll be fun to share my opinion essay with my readers and see if I can persuade them.

You do:

1. Add materials to their folder.

Wednesday, April 6, 2022: Lesson 9

Engage:

1. Have the students write out on a piece of paper what POW and TREE stand for.
2. Talk about what POW and TREE means and what they stand for.
3. Review when and why we use POW.
4. Review when and why we use TREE.
5. Review what opinion writing is and the purpose of opinion writing.
6. What did we do yesterday in writing?

SAY: Today, we are going to create some self-talk statements we can use before, during, and after writing.

I do: (Self-talk/Self-statements)

1. Discuss: what are some things you are really good at?
2. Discuss: What do you say to yourself when you are doing something you really like to do or are good at something?
3. Discuss: What do you think self-talk is?
4. Self-talk is when you talk to ourselves to help us remember what we are doing (e.g. steps to TREE) or to help when we are feeling strong emotion (e.g. frustrated, angry, scared).
5. Discuss: When could you use self-talk statements?
6. Discuss: How coil self-talk statements help you?
7. Today, we are going to create some self-talk statements: at least one we can use before we write, at least one we can use while we are writing, and at least one we can use after we write.
8. Model self-talk a situation for each.
   a. Before
      i. How do I start?
   b. During
      i. Tired - Jacklyn, it is ok to take a minute break to rest your brain and hand. (After a minute) You only have one more explanation to add and your ending. You got this!
      ii. Frustrated - Man, I am tired and my brain and hand are tired. I have done soooooo much writing today.
         1. Jacklyn, it is ok to take a minute break to rest your brain and hand. (After a minute) You only have one more explanation to add and your ending. You got this!
   c. After
      i. Good work. I have finished my piece. It'll be fun to share my opinion essay with my readers and see if I can persuade them.

We do:

1. Brainstorm self-talk statements for each group.

    a. Write on anchor charts to hang later.

You do:

1. Create your self-statements and write them down.

2. Share your statements with a partner.

3. Write out POW and TREE and add a description.

4. Add materials to their folder

Thursday, April 7, 2022: Lesson 10

SAY: Today we are going to write an opinion piece together using TREE.

Engage:

1. What does TREE stand for?

    a. T = topic sentence - what I believe

    b. R = reasons - three or more, why I believe

    c. E = explain - say more about each reason

    d. E = end - wrap it up

We do:

1. What is the first step when I am writing an opinion composition?

    a. Read and understand the prompt.

    b. PROMPT: Should students be allowed to bring their devices to school?

2. Read and discuss the prompt.

3. Review our goal for this opinion piece.

4. What do we need to do next?

    a. P - pick our idea (YES or NO)

    b. Decide as a class each idea and possible reason

    c. Discuss that we need to pick an idea that can be backed up with solid reasons.

5. After we have picked an idea, what should we do?

    a. Graphic Organizer - TREE (use lined paper)

    b. Write out our topic sentence.

        i. Students will write it out on paper as well.

6. What is the next step?

    a. Reasons

       b.   Write out three reasons that support our topic sentence.

7.   After we add our three reasons, what do we need to add next?

       a.   Explanations

       b.   We need to add explanations if we did not already do so when you wrote out our reasons.

       c.   Remind students that each reason should have an explanation.

8.   What else do we need to add with our reasons and explanations?

       a.   Linking Words

           i.   Why do author's use linking words?

          ii.   What resource do we have to help us with linking words?

                1.   Linking Word Chart on our folders

9.   Lastly, what do we need to add?

       a.   Ending - wrap it up

       b.   We need to bring together and summarize all of the reasons.

           i.   What did we believe?

          ii.   What were our reasons again?

10. Do we have all of the parts?

11. Self-talk statement: We completed our outline/notes!

12. Tomorrow, we are going to write and say more.

You Do:

1.   Have students write out POW & TREE with definition.

2.   Add materials to their folder.

Friday, April 8, 2022: Lesson 11

SAY: Today we are going to continue with our opinion piece by completing POW. We are going to take our notes and write and say more.

We do:

1.   Look at your self-talk statements for during writing.

REMIND: A good opinion essay has at least 8 parts, uses linking words, and makes sense. It is fun to read and write.

2.   What is the first thing we need to write for our opinion piece?

a. Hook

b. Create a hook

3. Once our hook is created, what do I need to add next?

    a. Topic sentence

    b. Read the topic sentence and see if there is anything that we want/need to change.

    c. Write it on our paper.

4. What is the next step?

    a. Reason #1

    b. Which reason did we say we wanted to use first?

        i. Do we still want to use it first?

        ii. Don't forget our linking word.

        iii. Write out in a sentence.

    c. Add the explanation with reason #1

5. After we added our first reason, what do we need to add next?

    a. Reason #2

    b. Which reason did we say we wanted to use second?

        i. Do we still want to use it there?

        ii. Don't forget our linking word.

        iii. Write out in a sentence.

    c. Add the explanation with reason #2

6. We need to add our last reason.

    a. Reason #3

    b. Which reason did we say we wanted to use third?

        i. Do we still want to use it there?

        ii. Don't forget our linking word.

        iii. Write out in a sentence.

    c. Add the explanation with reason #3

7. Lastly, what do we need to add?

    a. Ending - wrap it up

    b. We need to bring together and summarize all of the reasons.

        i. What did we believe?

    ii. What were our reasons again?

 8. Do we have all of the parts?

 9. Self-talk statement: We completed our opinion composition!

You Do:

 1. Add materials to their folder.

April 11, 2022: Lesson 12

SAY: Today, you're going to work with a partner to write your own opinion piece.

Engage:

 1. What are self-talk statements? What can you use today to help with writing out your piece?

 2. What is your goal? How many parts are you going to include?

I do:

Go over the expectations for working with a partner.

We do:

 1. Discuss the two prompts the students can choose from.

   a. Should students have homework?

   b. Which animal makes the best pet?

 2. Students will get into pairs.

 3. Students will work through the POW process.

   a. I will pull four students to my table to work with them through the process.

 4. I will check in with each group throughout the time given.

You do:

 1. Students will complete a piece with a partner.

 2. Students will write out POW & TREE with definitions.

 3. Put materials in their folder.

April 12, 2022: Lesson 13

SAY: Today, you're going to work with a different partner to add explanations to a graphic organizer.

SAY: We are going to practice together first what good explanations are.

SAY: What should good explanations do?

We do:

1. Together add explanations to a graphic organizer that has the reasons filled in.
2. Discuss the expectations of what they are to accomplish today.
3. Students will get into pairs.
4. Students will work on the task.
   a. I will pull four students to my table to work with them through the process.
   b. I will pick the students based on how they do with the previous lesson.
5. I will check in with each group throughout the time given.

You do:

1. Students will write out POW & TREE with definitions.
2. Put materials in their folder.

April 14, 2022: Lesson 14

SAY: Today, you're going to work with a different partner to write a new opinion composition.

I do:

1. Go over the expectations for working with a partner.
2. Discuss what I noticed about the last compositions they wrote.
   a. What did they do well?
   b. What could they improve upon?

We do:

1. Discuss the two prompts the students can choose from.
   a. What is the best time of the year?
   b. Which sport is the best?
2. Discuss the expectations of what they are to accomplish today.
3. Students will get into pairs.
4. Students will work on a persuasive composition today.
   a. I will pull four students to my table to work with them through the process.
   b. I will pick the students based on how they do with the previous lesson.
5. I will check in with each group throughout the time given.

You do:

1. Put materials in their folder.

April 18, 2022: Lesson 15

SAY: Today, you're going to work with a different partner to add explanations to a graphic organizer.

SAY: We are going to practice together first what good explanations are.

SAY: What should good explanations do?

We do:

1. Together add explanations to a graphic organizer that has the reasons filled in.
2. Discuss the expectations of what they are to accomplish today.
3. Students will get into pairs.
4. Students will work on the task.
    a. I will pull four students to my table to work with them through the process.
    b. I will pick the students based on how they do with the previous lesson.
5. I will check in with each group throughout the time given.

You do:

1. Put materials in their folder.

April 19, 2022: Posttest

SAY: Today, you are going to write one a persuasive piece to show what you have learned.

REVIEW: what persuasive writing is and why it is important.

READ: the writing prompts

SAY: I need your best writing so I can see what you know and what you need help with. You have 45 minutes to work. Make sure that your final piece is on the lined paper.

May 26, 2022: Maintenance Test

SAY: Today, you are going to write one last persuasive piece.

REVIEW: what persuasive writing is and why it is important.

READ: the writing prompts

SAY: I need your best writing so I can see what you know and what you need help with. You have 45 minutes to work. Make sure that your final piece is on the lined paper.

Practice-Based Professional Development - Self-Regulated Strategy Development Opinion Writing: Day 1

Time	Objective	Presenter	Teacher
8:00 - 8:15	Intro and Icebreaker Teachers will get to know the presenter.	Introduce myself	Engage in the ice breaker activity
8:30 - 9:30	Share views on writing and teaching writing Discuss students' writing abilities Through this discussion, the presenter will learn about the current writing happening, the teachers' beliefs, and where students' current writing ability falls.	Facilitate first the discussion about views on writing and teaching writing (add to chart paper) Facilitate a discussion on where students' current writing abilities are (add to chart paper)	Engage in the discussion about their writing beliefs, how they currently teach writing and where their current students' writing levels would fall
9:30 - 10:30	Understand the theoretical basis for SRSD and observe classroom examples	Facilitate the learning of the theoretical basis of SRSD Facilitate the observation of the classroom examples and the discussion afterwards about what teachers saw	Actively listen to the theoretical framework (take notes) Observe the classroom examples and engage in the discussion about what was noticed in the examples
10:30 - 10:45	Break	Prep for the next part (Handout the SRSD materials - lesson plan)	Break
10:45 - 12:15	Read through the lesson plans handed out Model and Practice Stage 1 - Activate Background Knowledge	Model Stage 1 - Activate Background Knowledge Facilitate a discussion about what the	Read through the lesson plans, especially stage 1 Engaged in the modeling of stage one

	Teachers will have an understanding of activating background knowledge and practice with teaching stage 1.	teacher saw during the modeling Provide feedback to the teachers as they practice stage 1	as a student Engage in the discussion of what they saw happening in stage one Teach stage 1 to a fellow participant and engage as a student for another participant
12:15 - 1:15	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break
1:15 - 2:45	Review Stage 1 and read through stage 2 lesson plans Model and Practice Stage 2 - Discuss it Teachers will have an understanding of discuss it and practice with teaching stage 2.	Facilitate a discussion about stage 1 (focus points and tips) Model Stage 2 - Discuss it Facilitate a discussion about stage 2 Provide feedback to the teacher as they practice stage 2	Engage in the discussion about stage 1 and read through stage 2 lesson plans Engage in the modeling of stage 2 as a student Engage in the discussion of what they saw happening in the modeling of stage 2 Teach stage 2 to a fellow participant and engage as a student for another participant
2:45 - 3	Break	Prep for the next part	Break
3:00 - 3:30	Reflect on what was learned today about SRSD, stage 1, and stage 2	Facilitate a discussion about what was learned today (SRSD and Stages 1 & 2)	Engage in the discussion about what was learned on day 1

Practice-Based Professional Development - Self-Regulated Strategy Development Opinion Writing: Day 2

Time	Objective	Presenter	Teacher
8:00 - 8:15	Welcome & Review what we learned yesterday	Facilitate a discussion about what was learned yesterday	Engage in the conversation about what was learned yesterday
8:15 - 10	Read through the lesson plans handed out for Stage 3 Model and Practice Stage 3 - Model It Teachers will have an understanding of modeling a persuasive composition and practice with teaching stage 3.	Model Stage 3 - Model It Facilitate a discussion about what the teacher saw during the modeling Provide feedback to the teachers as they practice stage 3	Read through the lesson plans for stage 3 Engaged in the modeling of stage three as a student Engage in the discussion of what they saw happening in stage three Teach stage 3 to a fellow participant and engage as a student for another participant
10:00 - 10:15	Break	Prep for the next part	Break
10:15 - 12:15	Discuss stage 4 Read through the lesson plans for stage 5 Model and Practice Stage 5 - Support it Discuss ways the teacher could modify stage 5 for their students Teachers will have an understanding of support it and practice with teaching stage 5.	Facilitate a discussion about stage 4 Model Stage 5 - Support It Facilitate a discussion about what the teacher saw during the modeling Provide feedback to the teachers as they practice stage 5	Read through the lesson plans, especially stage 4 & 5 Engaged in the modeling of stage five as a student Engage in the discussion of what they saw happening in stage five Teach a part of stage

			5 to a fellow participant and engage as a student for another participant
12:15 - 1:15	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break
1:15 - 2:15	Review Stage 4 and 5 Read through stage 6 lesson plans Model and Practice Stage 6 - Independent Practice Teachers will have an understanding of independent practice it and practice with teaching stage 6.	Facilitate a discussion about stages 4 and 5 Model Stage 6 - Independent Practice Facilitate a discussion about what they saw in stage 6 Provide feedback to the teacher as they practice stage 6	Engage in the discussion about stage 4 and 5 Engage in the modeling of stage 6 as a student Engage in the discussion of what they saw happening in the modeling of stage 6 Teach stage 6 to a fellow participant and engage as a student for another participant
2:15 - 2:30	Break	Prep for the next part	Break
2:30 - 3:30	Reflect on what was learned today Discussions about how they are going to implement Answer and remaining questions	Facilitate a discussion about what was learned today, how they are going to implement into the classroom, and answer any remaining questions	Engage in the discussion about what was learned and how teachers are going to implement SRSD into the classroom Ask any important questions remaining