Ohio Deans Compact P20 Literacy Collaborative

Name of Meeting/Session: Deans Compact P20 Literacy Collaborative

Date of Meeting or Session: Thursday, September 8, 2022, 9:30 am to 2:00 pm EST

Participants in Attendance (by name, title, affiliation):

Keynote Speaker: Dr. Young-Suk Kim, Senior Associate Dean, School of Education, University of California, Irvine; and Language Literacy Learning (L3) Lab

Participants:
Aaron Bouie, Youngstown City Schools
Alex Pavlik, Marysville Exempted Village Schools
Amanda Rider, Marietta College
Amy Mullins, Bluffton University
Daria DeNoia, Ohio Education Association
Debbie Hartwig SST 9
Deborah Morbitt, Ohio State University
Earl Focht, ODE
Elizabeth Walsh-Moorman, Lake Erie College
Jenn Miller, Lake Erie College
Jennifer Bambrick, Walsh University
Jennifer Farthing, Twinsburg City School District
Jo Hannah Ward, Director, Office for Exceptional Children, ODE
Joanne Caniglia, Kent State
Katharine Delavan, Lake Erie College
Krista Maxson, ODHE
Kristen Italiano, Project PASS, Youngstown State University
Lindsay Vance, Lourdes University/Tiffin University
Lindsey Roush, Walsh University
Maggie Lehman, Lourdes University
Maria Bailey, District Literacy Support, Toledo Public Schools, OFT representative
Marla Miller, SST Region 5
Mary Heather Munger, University of Findlay
Mary K. McVey, Franciscan University
Mary Murray, Co-facilitator, P20 Literacy Collaborative
Mary Lou DiPillo, Ohio Deans Compact
Mary Ann Davis, Youngstown State University
Mary-Kate Sableski, University of Dayton
Meg Reister, Franciscan University
Michele Moore, SST Region 5
Michelle Lenarz, Walsh University
Mija Trammell, University of Akron Center for Literacy
Raven Cromwell, Marietta College
Susanna Hapgood, University of Toledo
Tammy Zilliox, Xavier University
Temitope Egbedeyi, Graduate Assistant, Kent State University
Terri Hessler, OSU
Terri Purcell, Cleveland State University
Young-Suk Kim, UC Irvine (Keynote Speaker)

UC SDI Staff: Jennifer Ottley, Director of Research and Sr. Research Associate; David Brobeck, Research Associate; Jesse Conway, Consultant; Jihye Shin, Research Associate; Deborah Telfer, Director

WFA Staff: Aimee Howley; Evaluator; Stanley Dudek, Technical Consultant; Laurel LaPorte-Grimes, Note-taker

Part 1: 9:30 am to 11:56 am EST

Agenda Item #1: Welcome & Introduction
- Dr. Jennifer Ottley welcomed and thanked all participants.
- Dr. Mary Murray informed the group that she would serve as facilitator on her own as Dr. Dottie Erb (co-facilitator) was ill. She asked participants to put their name and affiliation in the chat; Stanley shared the agenda in the chat.
- Mary reviewed the meeting outcomes and expressed her excitement in having Dr. Young-Suk Kim with us as the keynote speaker.
- She asked Jennifer and Dr. Jihye Shin to present the next agenda item.

Agenda Item #2: Literacy Instruction for Multilingual Learners Professional Learner Series (listed as Agenda Item #3 on the agenda, discussed in the order recorded here)
- Jihye and Jennifer provided an update on the Multilingual Learners Professional Learner Series modules. There are eight topics in the series. The first and second modules are live and being completed by participants. Module 3 is live and ready to launch. They discussed the content of these three modules and presented examples of slides, emphasizing the interactive nature of the modules.
- Jennifer shared preliminary pilot data on the effectiveness of the modules. There are five groups going through the series. Four groups have completed the first two modules and one group has completed only the first module. The groups are between five and 50 individuals and are a mix of people in various roles (faculty, teachers, school staff, etc.). They are progressing through the modules and learning together. Across all groups, participants are making a 30% increase in their pre/post scores for each module, regardless of group or role. UC SDI is using participant feedback to revise the modules. There will be another small cohort of participants beginning in November and there is the ability to support additional cohorts. Jennifer explained that participants must request to participate in a pilot group and that anyone interested in having a group participate should contact her.
- There was a question about whether the modules include the secondary level. Jennifer answered that the modules were focused on K-5 and there is an attempt being made to ensure it is relevant to all educators.

Agenda Item #3: Improving Literacy Partnerships as a Statewide Team (listed as Agenda Item #2 on the agenda, discussed in the order recorded here)
- Dr. David Brobeck explained that on July 19th educators gathered at the ESC of Eastern Ohio (ESCEO) to work collaboratively to align syllabi with *Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement*. Participants from Lake Erie College and Franciscan University reported on their experiences.
- Dr. Katharine Delavan from Lake Erie College reported on her experience, which included the revision of 12 credit reading core courses. She said that it was extremely helpful to have the team sit together with no distractions and that this helped them to finish the work. They were able to revise all four courses, including titles and course descriptions, allowing them to submit for approval to the college. Her biggest takeaway was that there was one book chosen for all four classes and students are excited about that.
- Dr. Megan Reister and Dr. Kathy McVey from Franciscan University discussed the benefit of meeting over the summer, saying that it was a great opportunity for them to unveil one of their deliverables from the last two years: a website with 29 strategies aligned with the science of reading (SoR). Kathy shared that as they conclude their two-year grant period, they have achieved ongoing sustainability with the tutoring program in their partnership with Steubenville City Schools, which gives pre-service teachers a chance to use systematic instruction and formative assessments. Meg shared that the website is intended to make their work available to other institutions. Challenges along the way included considering different platforms and

software; the marketing department helped them build the website and having it housed on the university website ensures stability. She discussed the content of the website, shared examples, and highlighted the website's interactive nature and ability to allow anyone to carry out a strategy with fidelity.

- Dr. Lindsey Roush from Walsh University reported that it was helpful to meet in person and focus on shared ideas related to one common goal. She shared that the grant allowed them to share resources that Walsh has in their SoR library and purchase more resources needed by their partner school. She said that teacher candidates appreciate having access to these resources and that because of these resources, teacher candidates are able to bring new SoR ideas to the schools with which they are working.
- David wrapped up by reinforcing the impact of having three different IHEs in the same room, sharing with each other. He said, "If we build a bigger pie and support each other then we can meet the goal of having literacy practices aligned with SoR being used in all Ohio classrooms."

Agenda Item #4: P20 Literacy Partnership Spotlight
- Mary Murray introduced the panel: Aaron Bouie (Youngstown City Schools), Dr. Mary Lou DiPillo (Ohio Deans Compact), Dr. Marla Miller (SST Region 5), Michele Moore (SST Region 5), and Kristen Italiano, Youngstown State University (YSU) Project Pass Director
- Mary asked panel the first questions: What was the reason for your partnership, have you sustained your partnership over time, and how have you done this?
   a. Michele answered that they (YSU & SST5) have worked with their partner, Youngstown City Schools (YCS), for a number of years and that literacy is a strong component of their ONE plan. She explained that they have funding to have an urban literacy support specialist and expressed their commitment to help YCS implement and support their ONE plan. She explained that they have a strong partnership and that several members of their team are adjunct professors at YSU. Their reading achievement plan is what really got them started.
   b. Mary Lou added that the University is located in the center of Youngstown, with all districts being within three to five miles, so it makes an ideal location for field and clinical placements. She also discussed that they have a history and foundation, due to the variety of partnerships with the city schools, including the teacher education center and early college high school on the YSU campus, which provided support for moving forward. She said that their literacy partnership began with the district's need for support in helping students to pass the 3rd grade reading test. She also said that an earlier grant (Project PASS) set the stage for their current work.
   c. Kristen then added more details about Project PASS and said that having established partnerships created a smooth transition to this partnership for literacy work. She explained that they started in the 2014-2015 year with 30 hours of fieldwork in a one-to-one setting, working with 2nd and 3rd graders, not taking away from core reading instruction time, and it was determined that this had an impact on literacy scores. They then expanded to include 4th and 5th graders to provide opportunities for more teacher candidates, and their collaboration continued toward course redesign and sharing PD, resources, and data. She discussed how each year they address sustainability, considering the needs of the district and the state, and how they can meet these needs and make the partnership mutually successful.
   d. Aaron highlighted the importance of the existing foundation of work prior to his being involved. He is focused on how they use the program in the buildings. He discussed their efforts to assess all students in one building (700-800 students) and the importance of having access to college tutors in order to complete this process, as well as the importance of having data to specifically drive instruction. He said he uses this model in conversation with building administrators across the district.
- Jennifer asked a follow-up question: Is there anything specific that Marla (SST Region 5) has been doing to improve literacy outcomes of YCS scholars.
   a. Marla answered that they have a good relationship with YCS. Literacy teams began focusing on instructional coaches at YCS and using decision rules to determine what assessments and interventions are needed for a particular child. Marla's role was to collaborate with office staff and

coaches in providing training on the assessments and interventions, and she modeled in classrooms how to do these. There was also a team of consultants that provided year-long trainings to provide access for all.

- Mary asked the next question: How did you work in partnership to revise core courses to align to the SoR?
    a. Mary Lou answered that when they received the grant, the Chair of Teacher Education assembled a leadership team made up of faculty, curriculum leaders, SST 5 consultants, and one of Ohio's Literacy Leads. The team met to discuss transitioning schools to the SoR and the importance of re-aligning core courses. The team was then divided into four subgroups and each subgroup took one reading course to focus on.
    b. Marla added that they had someone serve on YSU's advisory team. Two colleagues are adjunct literacy faculty at YSU, they have Project PASS students in two of the courses they teach, and they could share the training they had from the state with the students.
    c. Michele added that they made packets of materials and hands-on manipulatives aligned to the SoR for teacher candidates to have in their tool box to help with teaching phonemic awareness and phonics.
- Mary asked the next question: From your perspective, what was the most meaningful outcome of your literacy partnership related efforts?
    a. Mary Lou answered that after 28 years at the university level, this was the first time that she experienced a partnership involving local (district and university), regional (SST) and state (Ohio Literacy Lead) personnel work together to develop courses that aligned with Ohio's Plan. She explained that all of these people gave specific feedback into what content should go into courses and what candidates were missing based on what was observed in schools.
    b. Aaron shared that for him it was the flexibility of being able to take a structure designed to build capacity with future educators and to use it to meet their needs. This provided them with an opportunity to present real-life scenarios to future educators, access to candidates, and the ability to tailor make experiences to district needs.
    c. Kristen said it was beneficial to bring so many influential folks together to discuss a large problem. She felt it was most meaningful to see teacher candidates with maybe some apprehensions about going into a struggling district in an urban setting now wanting to end up back in that district as future teachers. She reflected on how she is now working with teachers in their first five years of teaching that were Project PASS students, and who are now taking on Project PASS students themselves. She felt that YSU is supporting the needs of the community through this partnership.
    d. Michele highlighted the difficulty of shifting people to the SoR, stating that people can be very entrenched. She said that it was a rough path to get there, but now there is alignment across the collaborative structures, and it is exciting to see this in action.

Agenda Item #5: Keynote Presentation: Writing Matters: The Science of Writing
- Mary introduced the keynote speaker, Dr. Young-Suk Kim, Senior Associate Dean, School of Education, University of California, Irvine, and reviewed her biography.
- Dr. Kim discussed the importance of writing, noting that this importance is not always recognized. She reviewed the learning objectives of the presentation (participants being able to describe factors that contribute to writing development and explain key ingredients of effective writing instruction).
- Dr. Kim posed the question, "Why do we care about writing?" She explained various aspects about the importance of writing: a means of expression, necessary for daily lives, essential for learning (students frequently are asked to write about something in support of their learning), and writing supports reading development. "If you really care about reading, writing helps you facilitate reading acquisition as well."
- Dr. Kim discussed how US students are doing with respect to writing achievement compared to reading achievement: 1/3 of students read proficiently while 1/4 of children can write with proficiency, indicating that writing seems to be more challenging than reading. She discussed the various stages of writing development over time (knowledge-telling, knowledge-transforming, knowledge-crafting).

- Dr. Kim led participants through a brief writing exercise with the prompt: Tell us about your summer. Participants reported back on the process they employed for writing. Dr. Kim stated that writing is a production task: in reading you are given the text; in writing you have to create the text yourself. First you think of ideas, then you translate the ideas into a linguistic representation, then you transcribe the written product, and finally you review and revise. She led participants through a reflection on the skills necessary for each of these processes.
- Dr. Kim discussed how theory, teaching, and assessment are tightly related. Factors that influence writing development include the environment, a child's characteristics, and the interaction between the two. She presented a visual representation of how individual student characteristics (e.g., attention control, memory capacity, language skills, behavior control, etc.) are embedded within families, which differ in multiple ways; research shows this matters and influences children's literacy development. Families are then embedded within schools and community, and there is variability in terms of resources, which also influences students' learning. Schools and community are further embedded within the system level where there is also variability. Reading and writing skills are the consequence of these multiples layers of factors, because development occurs between the interactions of environment and the individual child.
- Dr. Kim briefly discussed a variety of theoretical models of writing.
    a. The Hayes and Flower (H&F) Model is highly influential. This is a cognitive model of writing focused on the process of writing, planning, idea generation, and revision. H&F worked with adults, so they did not identify the transcription process, as this is typically automatized for adults.
    b. The Knowledge Telling and Transforming Model is focused on text generation and the ideation phase.
    c. Researchers looking at children's writing created the Simple View of Writing, similar to the Simple View of Reading. This model places importance on spelling and text generation.
    d. The Not-so-simple View of Writing adds in working memory as having an important role to play in coordinating multiple pieces, as well as the category of self-regulation.
    e. Graham (2018) builds upon previous models, but adds the social aspect of writing; writing occurs within a community.
    f. The Direct and Indirect Effects Model of Writing (DIEW) was the focus of Dr. Kim's presentation and was discussed in greater depth (see remaining bullet points).
- Dr. Kim focused on the Direct and Indirect Effects Model of Writing (DIEW), because it builds upon previous models, expanding and integrating a variety of aspects.
    a. A detailed graphic targeted at an academic audience was presented, representing how the various aspects of writing are related to each other. Reading comprehension and written composition are discourse-level, as opposed to lexical-level, literacy, and transcription skills. Lexical-level literacy and transcription skills build upon orthography, phonology, and morphology. Language acquisition is different from discourse language/oral composition, which are supported by higher order cognition and regulation, as well as foundational oral language.
    b. A more "educator friendly" graphic was presented, representing the same information. In this graphic, the two pillars (lexical literacy and handwriting/keyboarding; oral discourse/oral composition) are necessary to support the roof (written composition and reading comprehension). If one of the pillars is missing, the roof collapses. Text-writing and reading fluency act as a bridge between the two pillars. The knowledge and skills represented in this graphic map onto the writing process.
        ▪ Hierarchical Relations: The mapping of component skills to the writing process is hierarchical, meaning that written composition is a high-order skill supported by multiple levels of low-order skills. Low-order skills are necessary, are the foundation of high-order skills, and have a cascading upstream effect. Difficulty in low-order skills causes a chain of influence. Also, this specifies direct and indirect effects. This model is different from the Not-so-simple View of Writing, where there is no structural relationship between component skills. The hierarchical structure is supported by a large body of literature and can account for variability among studies, where some studies show that

certain skills are important in writing, while other studies will show that different skills are important. This can be accounted for due to the presence of both direct and indirect effects: not everything is directly related to writing quality; indirect influences (like working memory) will be important because they are relevant to other aspects which will directly impact written quality.

- Interactive Relations: Skills are hypothesized to develop interactively mediated by experiences (e.g., socio-emotion toward writing and writing skills). If you have challenges with writing skills then you will think you're not good at writing, you will distance yourself from writing, and you will be more likely to continue to think you're not good at writing.

- Dynamic Relations: Differential contributions are hypothesized due to development and measurement.
    1. Development: In the beginning phase (e.g., primary grades or upper elementary) writing products are heavily constrained by transcription skills, but as children develop those skills, the other pieces play a more important role (e.g., language, reasoning, etc.).
    2. Measurement: There are multiple approaches to writing composition. Holistic scoring looks at multiple factors and then assigns a single score. It is also possible to score looking at a single aspect (e.g., productivity, fluency, writing conventions, ideation, etc.). If you look at writing quality vs writing productivity vs correctness in writing, studies show that these are not a single thing, rather they are dissociable things, and the skills that contribute to each of them might differ.
    3. A graphic on Dynamic Relations by Measurement indicates that writing quality predictors are all statistically significant; with respect to writing productivity, handwriting matters a lot, but corrections in spelling skills matter more. It is important to pay attention to what we mean by written composition and the outcomes we use for different purposes.
    4. In measurement, it is important to note that the skills relevant to various genres can differ, and students can be better at certain ones; also, when writing is based on source reading, reading skills matter more. It is important to think about these variables in relation to writing outcomes.
    5. Question: What are your thoughts on analytic vs. holistic evaluation of writing? Dr. Kim said it depends on the goal. Holistic evaluation gives you just one score; analysis tells you how students do on a variety of things. Analytic evaluation can be more informative for instruction.
    6. Question in chat: Have you found a direct or indirect relationship with reading comprehension? Dr. Kim said yes, and there is other research on this, but she is not talking about it here.
- The DIEW theoretical model is directly related to assessment. When looking at WHAT to assess, you can look at any of the skills on the educator friendly graphic and, depending on your goal, all of these skills could be assessed.
- When considering HOW to asses, the hierarchical relations hypothesis has implications, depending on your goal. In a summative assessment you would care about the outcome (written composition), but if you care about formative assessment then you can be systematic. The dynamic relations hypothesis also has implications for how to assess. It is important to be aware of each aspect that we're looking at when we are evaluating, and which skills they are tapping into. When you interpret a student's score, be sure that it captures all the pieces you intend. Also, including multiple genres and multiple tasks could be important to gain an accurate picture, recognizing that this could be a practical challenge.

- Implications for teaching include thinking about when to teach. It is important to start early because foundational skills develop earlier. Also, higher order cognitive skills develop before schooling starts. It is important not to wait to begin writing instruction until children develop transcription skills.
- Implications also include thinking about what to teach, including a multicomponent, coherent approach, since if any one component does not develop adequately it will present a problem for writing composition. Evidence shows that instruction in the following has a positive effect on writing: lexical literacy, spelling, handwriting/word processing, sentence combining, text structure, and self-regulation. It is also important to teach different genres, source-based and non-source-based writing, and when teaching source-based writing, the text is important. Research also shows that traditional grammar instruction and sentence diagramming have a negative effect on writing outcomes. There was a question asking asking for clarification and confirmation that this is indeed the case. Dr. Kim reiterated that yes, it is the case that teaching sentence diagramming has a negative effect on writing outcomes. However, evidence also shows that teaching the writing process itself is effective, and the more opportunities students have to write, the better. It is also beneficial to have prewriting activities and feedback (adults, peers, or self), and teaching reading and writing together benefits both reading and writing outcomes. Additionally, because higher-order thinking skills develop along with language skills, they should be taught all the way along.
- Dr. Kim asked if there were any questions and Dr. Hapgood thanked her for paying attention to writing, saying that it is crucially important to be thinking about it from the youngest ages. She highlighted the importance of reading aloud to children so that their stories will be rich as they begin to write them.
- Dr. Kim commented that asking participants to write with their non-dominant hand in the earlier writing assignment was intended to put them into the mindset of a writing learner, where the rich ideas were lost because with the non-dominant hand participants had to focus more on handwriting and spelling. This was a demonstration of why it matters to have instruction in those skills.

Part 2, 12:26 pm to 1:43 pm

Agenda Item #6: Keynote Summary: Writing Matters: The Science of Writing
- Dr. Kim asked participants to think about any key takeaways. She asked them to think about several questions: What is a place for writing in your current organization? What is the current practice? Does writing receive attention? Mary Murray suggested going into small groups for further reflection and then coming back for discussion.
- Participants were divided into break-out rooms.

Agenda Item #7: Small Group Discussion
- The following questions for the break-out rooms were posted in the chat:
  a. What is one idea in particular that resonated with you during Dr. Kim's presentation?
  b. What are one or two specific strategies you can try in your context to improve writing instruction for all learners?
  c. What broader structures, support, or resources would you need to improve your writing instruction?

  (Note-taker was in Group 3: Participants in room were Joanne Caniglia (Kent State), Temi (a graduate assistant at Kent State and part of their project), Lindsay Vance (Lourdes Univ), and Amanda Rider (Marietta College). There was some general discussion about how participants were impressed with the different initiatives that reported out in the first part of the meeting. Also, Joanne mentioned how she was constantly thinking about how this relates to math and reading. Lindsay said that they are in the beginning stages of grant implementation; they have worked on revising their core courses and are in the beginning stages of establishing partnerships. The note-taker assisted this group by taking notes on the discussion so they could focus on the conversation.)

Agenda Item #8: Small Group Share-Outs & Keynote Speaker Takeaways
- Jennifer Ottley read the following two responses that were entered into the chat prior to break-out rooms, after which each group reported back:
    a. Jennifer Bambrick, "I liked the way you organized the 'Factors that Influence Writing Development' slide. Many of my students are curious about how few of our students are proficient writers and how we got here. I always mention the differences I noticed in our curriculum when our state eliminated the writing assessment."
    b. Lindsey Roush, "The summary of teaching writing was a great visual to show all of the details of each part on one document. This is something I will share with my teacher candidates."
- Dr. Kim added that in the small group discussion, she realized she should have said more explicitly: In the figure, written composition and reading composition are together and supported by the same pieces; reading and writing difficulties tend to co-occur at high rates.
- Mija Trammell reported back for her group: The question in the chat about the sentence diagramming and negative correlation resonated with their group. They had a question about whether it was the "skill and drill" nature of instruction or grammar instruction overall. Dr. Kim answered that the thing to consider in teaching sentence diagramming/traditional grammar is the goal of this instruction. Many times sentence diagramming becomes the goal instead of helping students understand how sentences are composed and how this represents meaning in order to support their writing. So if a teacher just teaches sentence diagramming and it ends there, then it will not be effective instruction for writing. Effective instruction would be: How did the author use this sentence? Could they have used this verb or another verb? Could they have said it this way? Why did they do that? What role did this sentence structure/grammar instruction play? Grammar instruction must be in service of writing comprehension and expression. Mija reported that their group talked about how having them switching hands in the writing exercise lent itself to having empathy for students that are learning handwriting, that they appreciated the visuals in the presentation, and also that it would be good to have more writing by stretching it across content areas. Other ideas included taking the idea of the read aloud to a write aloud and using that as a model for students before they attempt their own writing; the idea that teaching teachers to teach writing in 'a one and done' is not realistic; and that teachers need support as they go, as well as support in assessing writing because it is not as straightforward as assessing math. "We want to honor what kids give us and draw them out and not just focus on *you got it right* or *you got it wrong*." She also said it would be helpful for teachers to have packets for each week for what they should be expecting from their students, and what they can be doing with them.
- Jennifer Bambrick reported back for her group: She shared some ideas that resonated, including: thinking about the stages of writing and how long it takes to reach where they want to be, the comment she shared about the factors that impact writing, how sometimes we're not thinking about how writing can tie everything together, how even for our smartest students maybe their writing looks weak, and thinking about expectations for student writing and reflecting on how it has not had enough attention.
- Michelle Lenarz reported back for her group: They felt that there needs to be more focus on writing instruction, and they liked the diagrams in the presentation to remind them of the component skills needed to be a good writer. They talked about a dyslexic grandchild using the text-to-speech function to get comfortable with writing. They liked the exercise of writing with the non-dominant hand to demonstrate the loss of connection to telling the story because they were attending to handwriting rather than meaning. Other things mentioned included: for struggling secondary students gathering background knowledge takes so much time that they produce little composition, different writing evaluations being used for different purposes, suggested improving writing instruction across all content areas, the importance of the opportunity for both narrative and informative writing, the need for students to have good examples of writing in various content areas, using graphic organizer for scaffolding tools for student writing, the need for supports and resources for more technology such as speech-to-text. They also discussed schools having higher expectations for meaningful writing opportunities at the secondary levels, the importance of focusing on writing science and how this is different from creative writing, and how a grandchild was having difficulty with the language needed to decipher word problems.

- Dr. Kim commented on last two speakers: With respect to writing and math, people recognize the connection between reading and math—co-occurrence between reading disability and math disability. There is a substantial relationship between writing and math and there is a growing body of work currently looking at this relationship. She loved the idea of universal writing instruction across content areas, saying that this will likely take some convincing.
- Lindsay Vance reported back for her group: They talked about how the visual representations helped them see the direct and indirect skills. They also talked about standardized testing, and how they wish the test would do a better job at communicating the complex task of writing and how it is assessed by the state—a lot of teachers assume that students come to them with the skillset to do high-level writing and that is not the case. They also discussed the visuals being helpful in addressing the difficulties in identifying what piece is missing with individual students. They discussed trying to add writing into the instruction of math, and they liked the summer writing exercise as a reflection piece, as well as potentially a good way to introduce students to writing instruction in content reading/writing classes. Additionally, they were interested in more specific subject area writing instruction, thinking that maybe some very specific content area modules could be helpful here.
- Dr. Kim said that students are expected to have foundational reading and writing skills by grade 3, but really many students do not have this. In secondary schools this is especially expected, but it is not the case, and teachers are not equipped to work on these skills. Having usable materials readily available is critical. She also said that the standardized testing question is very interesting. There is not much support for teachers from the state, and it is important to have more information about how to support students to do well on the writing portions of these tests.
- Jihye Shin reported back for her group: They had similar feedback to previous groups. They really appreciated the comprehensive model and seeing how skills contribute to writing composition and how there can be underlying issues to students' performance and achievements. They also discussed: how assistive technology can be really beneficial for students and for receiving feedback; how we tend to look at the end project for assessment, but that is not necessarily always a good representation of students' abilities, so it is really helpful to see the component skills to help inform teaching in a meaningful way. They also had questions for Dr. Kim: Is there a reliable writing assessment tool? What criteria can we focus on in assessing writing? Is there a rubric? What are some of the things we should be looking at when assessing students' writing?
- Dr. Kim said she would love to hear feedback from participants on the comprehensiveness of the visual representations. With respect to the question on assessment, it depends on your goal and how you're going to use it. There are normed assessments available, but each tool tends to have only one genre not multiple genres. For example, Wyatt is focused on opinion writing. Also, some are easier to follow than others. She says that they use a specific tool with their own way of scoring and also following their protocol. However, they spent hundreds of hours with many research assistants to reach a high enough reliability, and she has no idea how they used their protocol to achieve reliability. The key is establishing reliability—if this is not high enough then the score will depend on which grader you get, which is not acceptable. But establishing reliability requires a large amount of training, and typically what is done is teachers are asked to score according to a rubric, but teachers interpret the rubric differently. In their study they did a series of training and discovered that it requires many hours of training to achieve reliability. Standardized assessments—not sure if they report reliability among the raters—supposed to have more than two per piece but sometimes they assign a single reader if they do not have sufficient resources.
- Maggie Lehman reported back for her group: They were thinking about assessment, how depending on what district you're in you may be taught how to write differently. Dr. Kim was in this group and mentioned that she had noticed differences in her own children's writing instruction, in that the specific teacher had a large impact on how writing instruction was done. Also there is variability across districts. They were also talking about what prompts the transition from stage to stage. Dr. Kim said that this is ideally through systematic instruction, but it is also related to background and reading exposure to different texts, so this varies from individual to individual. Also, some students need support in terms of handwriting, and this can delay writing. Reading and writing difficulties are very highly related.

- Dr. Kim added that with respect to her children, she had noticed much more variation in writing instruction than reading instruction; it was kind of the luck of the draw, some years there was writing instruction but other years there was not, depending on the teacher they got. With respect to writing development, we would ideally develop this as a result of high quality instruction, but our own reading experience does matter.
- Lindsey Roush reported back for her group: Three of their group members were at the higher ed level. They talked about the importance of making sure we're including writing in more of the courses in the classroom. Teacher candidates need to be providing writing activities in their lesson plans when they are in the field. They do not have a lot of time, but it would be beneficial to include writing. They were also talking about how writing can be incorporated into math and science classes and how math anxiety can prevent students from working the proper way, because working memory is taken over by anxiety. They discussed how it has been shown to be beneficial to provide students with a chance to have five minutes to write about anything they feel anxious about prior to an assessment.
- Dr. Kim said that she really appreciated the opportunity to present to this group and all the ideas that were shared out. "It's great that there is a group of people dedicated to this topic. What else could we ask for?"

Agenda Item #9: Facilitator Wrap-up
- Mary Murray wrapped up the meeting. She thanked the participants, shared the remaining meeting schedule with a reminder that the next meeting is Dec 8, 2002, and reminded participants to fill out the evaluation (the link was shared in the chat and will also be emailed to participants).

Meeting adjourned at 1:43 pm.