



**INTERACTIVE
EDUCATIONAL
SYSTEMS
DESIGN • INC**

33 W 87 Street NY • NY 10024 212 • 769 • 1715 631 • 691 • 2513 FAX 212 • 769 • 0909

IESD White Paper:

**Elementary Writing Programs:
How They Match the Research and the *Common Core***

November 2013

**Interactive Educational Systems Design, Inc.
Ellen R. Bialo and Jay Sivin-Kachala
33 West 87th Street, Suite 2A
New York, NY 10024
212-769-1715
iesdinc@aol.com**

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Methodology.....	1
About This White Paper.....	1
Evaluation Categories	2
<i>Common Core</i> Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features	2
Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction	3
Professional Development	5
Top-Level Ratings of Six Writing Programs	7
Conclusions	9
<i>Common Core</i> Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features	9
Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction	9
Professional Development	9
References	10
Appendix A. Findings in Detail	12
<i>Common Core</i> Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features	13
Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction	19
Professional Development	23
Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria	25
<i>Common Core</i> Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features	25
Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction	31
Professional Development	33

Introduction

Writing represents a critical part of the elementary curriculum—now more than ever. A substantial body of research and expert literature published during the last 10 years provides a solid foundation for describing principles of effective writing instruction. Additionally, the *Common Core State Standards* have raised the bar substantially with respect to writing instruction—describing types of writing students at various grades should be able to carry out.

How do leading writing programs measure up to these expectations? This white paper examines six elementary writing programs to see how they match up to requirements of the *Common Core State Standards* in writing and to research-based best practices and common writing program expectations from teachers and administrators. Programs that were reviewed include the following:

- *CraftPlus* (Maupin House)
- *Essential Guide to Writing* (Empowering Writers)
- *Strategies for Writers* (Zaner-Bloser)
- *Traits Writing* (Scholastic)
- *Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing* (Firsthand/Heinemann)
- *WriteSteps* (WriteSteps)

Methodology

IESD conducted an analysis of the *Common Core State Standards* in writing and a review of recent high-quality research related to effective writing instruction. Based on this analysis and review, IESD developed a set of 17 evaluation categories. Top-level descriptions of the categories and research support related to them are provided in the Evaluation Categories section of this report.

For each evaluation category, criteria were developed for full and partial credit at grades 2 and 5. Using these criteria, IESD evaluators examined sets of program materials and awarded ratings in each category at grades 2 and 5. For categories related to professional development, evaluators also consulted descriptions of PD services available from program websites. A combined rating was then developed for each category across grade levels.

About This White Paper

The remainder of this white paper includes the following substantive sections:

- Evaluation Categories describes the categories used in the writing program evaluation, including supporting research
- Top-Level Ratings of Six Writing Programs presents top-level results of IESD's evaluation, in table form
- Conclusions presents cross-comparison generalizations regarding the results of the evaluations
- Appendix A. Findings in Detail presents results of IESD's analysis by grade level, with explanations where programs do not fully meet the criteria
- Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria presents the criteria that were used to guide the program evaluations in each category

Evaluation Categories

This section presents the categories used in the writing program evaluation, including supporting research. It is divided into three parts:

- Common Core Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features, including student writing samples and rubrics in support of the text types specified by the *Common Core* Writing Standards
- Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction
- Professional Development

Common Core Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features

Common Core State Standards—Writing

The *Common Core State Standards* include 10 College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing that describe the writing “skills and understandings” students ought to be able to demonstrate in order to prepare for college and workforce training. Expectations are broken into broad categories related to text types and purposes, production and distribution of writing, research to build and present knowledge, and range of writing, as shown below.

Text Types and Purposes

1. Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.
2. Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.
3. Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences.

Production and Distribution of Writing

4. Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.
5. Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.
6. Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others.

Research to Build and Present Knowledge

7. Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.
8. Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.
9. Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

Range of Writing

10. Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences. (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010, p. 18)

Grade-specific standards in each of these areas spell out expectations for what students ought to be able to accomplish by the end of each grade. For more detail about the grade-specific standards, see Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria.

Student Writing Samples to Support Text Types

According to a summary of writing instruction research by Troia and Olinghouse (2013), a strong evidence base supports having students “read and analyze examples of one or more texts in order to recognize and emulate the patterns or forms in these examples in their own writing” (p. 349; see also

Evaluation Categories

Graham & Perin, 2007a, 2007b). More specifically, a study of third and fourth graders found a positive effect from having students use a model paper to “scaffold the process of generating a list of criteria for an effective story or essay” and then use a rubric to assess their own work (Andrade et al., 2008)¹. This finding supports the recommendation to have students “critiqu[e] sample pieces of writing” as part of learning to apply a rubric (p. 4).

Rubrics to Support Text Types

Another practice identified by Troia and Olinghouse (2013) as having strong supporting evidence is use of rubrics, described by Andrade et al. (2008) as “a document that articulates the expectations for an assignment by listing the criteria, or what counts, and describing levels of quality from excellent to poor” (p. 3). While rubrics are sometimes thought of primarily as assessment tools, they also help teach key characteristics of specific types of writing, provide a common framework for revision suggestions and feedback, and guide students in self-assessment (Andrade et al., 2008; Graham & Perin, 2007b; Troia & Olinghouse, 2013).

Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction

Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics Instruction

Common Core Language Anchor Standards call for students to “Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking” and “Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing” (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010, p. 25).

Research on traditional grammar instruction raises doubts about its ability to improve student writing (e.g., Graham & Perin, 2007a, 2007b; Weaver, 1996). Instead, leading experts recommend that students should be taught about grammar, usage, and mechanics in a writing-related context (Smith, Cheville, & Hillocks, 2006; Weaver, 1996). For example, Weaver suggests extensive use of examples, a focus on production of effective sentences, and discussing usage in context (pp. 26-27).

Writing Strategies

A meta-analysis of 20 studies of elementary writing instruction found a strong positive effect from strategy instruction, in which “the teacher modeled how to use specific strategies for planning, revising, and/or editing text; students practiced applying the target strategies in at least three sessions, with the goal of using these strategies independently” (Graham, McKeown, Kihara, & Harris, 2012, p. 881)². The authors explained:

Most of the studies . . . involved teaching genre-specific strategies (e.g., how to plan and write a persuasive text), whereas the rest focused on teaching strategies that could be applied across genres (e.g., semantic webbing). . . . All of the studies produced a positive effect. (p. 886)

Writer's Workshop Model

A popular and influential approach to writing instruction has been the writer’s workshop, as developed over multiple decades by Lucy Calkins and colleagues at the Teachers College Reading and Writing Workshop. Key elements of the writer’s workshop include opportunities for students to write daily or almost daily; student selection of topics; explicit teaching of skills and strategies through mini-lessons, often including teacher demonstrations/modeling; a writing process approach; consulting with individual

¹ The comparison group generated a list of criteria for effective stories/essays, but did not analyze a model or use a rubric.

² Effect size of 1.02, considered a large effect in education research (p. 885).

Evaluation Categories

students or small groups about their writing in a workshop/conference format; and writing for an audience, including sharing of writing with other students (Calkins, 1994, 2006; Smithson, 2008).

Process Writing Approach

Substantial evidence supports a process approach to writing, which researchers have defined as including extended opportunities for writing; writing for real audiences extending beyond the teacher; personalized individual assistance and instruction; engaging in cycles of planning, writing, and reviewing; and self-reflection and/or self-evaluation (Graham, McKeown, Kiuahara, & Harris, 2012, p. 881; see also Graham, Bollinger, et al., 2012; Graham & Hebert, 2010; Graham & Perin, 2007b; Troia & Olinghouse, 2013, p. 349)³.

6 Traits/6+1 Traits Model

This influential and widely used model “empowers students and teachers to communicate about qualities of writing—ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, [and] conventions” (Culham, 2006, p. 53)⁴. Pioneered by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (now Education Northwest), the model provides a framework for instruction, assessment, and revision. A large-scale study of grade 5 students found that use of the model “significantly increased student writing scores during the year in which it was introduced to schools” (Coe et al., 2011, p. xiii)⁵.

Concise Daily Lesson Plans

Concise daily lesson plans represent an important resource for teachers in planning effective instruction. According to Stronge (2007), “Organizing time and preparing materials in advance of instruction have been noted as important aspects of effective teaching.... Both the organization of time and the preparation of materials are components of the broader practice of planning carefully for instruction” (Chapter 4; “Planning and Preparing for Instruction,” para. 1). Similarly, Cunningham (2009) writes, “Few factors are as vital to teaching success as having well-designed lessons” (Chapter 7; “Lesson Plans: Success by Design,” para. 3). Effective lesson plans integrate learning objectives, learning activities, and “strategies to check student understanding” (Milkova, 2012, para. 1; see also Stronge, 2007). Experience suggests that lesson plans should be concise in order to make them easy for teachers to apply.

Web-Based Resources

Access to program resources via the Web promotes ease of use, facilitates easy access, and allows updating of program resources over time.

Multimedia Resources for Interactive Whiteboards

Research has shown that use of multimedia resources with interactive whiteboards (IWBs) can have a positive impact on student engagement, with the potential to improve student learning (Glover et al., 2005; Higgins et al., 2007; Marzano & Haystead, 2009; Miller & Glover, 2010; Smith et al., 2005). This is more likely to happen if resources focus on key content (Marzano, 2009, pp. 80-81) and are used to

³ Based on 16 studies; moderate effect size of 0.40 (Graham, McKeown, Kiuahara, & Harris, 2012, p. 885).

⁴ In addition to the six primary traits of ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, and conventions, “presentation” was later added as a seventh “important but optional” trait (Coe et al., 2011, p. 5). This version is typically referred to as the “6+1” model.

⁵ “After controlling for baseline writing scores, the estimated average score of students in the treatment group was 0.109 standard deviations higher ($p = .023$) than the estimated average score of students in the control group” (p. xiii). The study included data from “102 teachers and 2,230 students in the treatment condition and 94 teachers and 1,931 students in the control condition” (p. xii).

Evaluation Categories

stimulate student-teacher and student-student interaction, as opposed to passive presentation of information (Lewin et al., 2008; Miller & Glover, 2010; Smith et al., 2005).

Formative Assessment

Based on a meta-analysis of research on formative writing assessment, Graham, Harris, and Hebert (2011) recommended that teachers should “use formative writing assessment to enhance students’ writing,” including feedback from teachers and peers, teaching students to assess their own writing, and monitoring students’ writing progress over time (p. 6)⁶.

Professional Development

Program Implementation Training

In order to effectively implement a new instructional program, teachers must be trained on its features and implementation. According to a summary of key research-based features of effective professional development, there is a need for both “some initial learning in training sessions as well as considerable longer-term work in which teachers incorporate the new methodologies into their actual classroom practice” (Odden, 2011, p. 27).

Professional Development Is Ongoing

Effective professional development is not a one-time event, but continues over time in order to support teachers in learning and applying new practices. A summary of current research on effective professional development explained:

[E]ffective professional development for teachers is ongoing, which involves a combination of contact hours, duration, and coherence. . . . Research shows that teacher learning and changes in teaching practice involve a recursive and continual process that takes place over time. . . . This is because teachers often need several months or even years to transition from personal concerns about a new innovation to planning, implementation, and management concerns aimed at addressing student needs. (Hunzicker, 2010, pp. 7-8)

Coaching

With the movement away from one-shot workshops toward ongoing PD that helps teachers implement new practices, *coaching* has become an increasingly popular model for supporting teachers. According to Odden (2011):

Active learning implies some degree of coaching during regular school hours to help collaborative groups use student data to hone instructional strategies, to help teachers incorporate new instructional strategies into their classroom instructional practices, and to help teachers debrief on the effectiveness of the unit after it is taught. (p. 27)

Coaches “support staff in implementing new learning with expert modeling, observation, feedback, and coaching until the new practice is mastered” (Vermont Department of Education, 2011, p. 10). While coaching is often conducted by local personnel, it can also be provided by outside consultants (Odden, 2011, p. 29).

⁶ The recommendation to provide feedback was based on 16 comparisons ranging from grades 2-9, with a large average weighted effect size of 0.77 (pp. 17-18). The recommendation to teach student self-assessment was based on 7 comparisons ranging from grades 3-12, with a moderate average weighted effect size of 0.46 (pp. 18-19). The recommendation to monitor student progress was based on 7 comparisons of mostly weaker writers and students with special needs in elementary and middle school grades, with a small average weighted effect size of 0.24 (p. 19).

Classroom Demonstration Videos

An increasingly popular way of providing professional development support for teachers is through videos that present actual classroom instruction for teachers to analyze and use as models. Such video clips “can inspire and transform a teacher’s daily performance” (Pianta, 2011, p. 4), as well as lead to increased “understanding of the teaching-learning process, knowledge of subject-matter specific instructional strategies, and understanding of student thinking” (Santagata, 2009, pp. 38-39).

Top-Level Ratings of Six Writing Programs

The table on the following page presents results of an evaluation of six writing programs. The evaluation focused on the *Common Core* Writing Standards, related instructional features, and other aspects of writing programs of importance to teachers of writing and district and school leaders.

The evaluation was based on a detailed review of Grades 2 and 5 of each program, informed by the research and expert literature cited above. All summary scores below are based on a three-point scale representing judgments across both grade levels, where:

- = *criteria fully met*
- ◐ = *criteria partially met*
- = *criteria not met*

For a more detailed breakdown of the ratings, including evaluations at grades 2 and 5 and ratings for each of the *Common Core* Writing Standards, see Appendix A. Findings in Detail.

Top-Level Ratings of Six Writing Programs

Evaluation Category	<i>CraftPlus</i> (Maupin House)	<i>Essential Guide to Writing</i> (Empowering Writers)	<i>Strategies for Writers</i> (Zaner-Bloser)	<i>Traits Writing</i> (Scholastic)	<i>Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing</i> (Firsthand/Heinemann)	<i>WriteSteps</i> (WriteSteps)
<i>Common Core Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features</i>						
Addresses All Common Core Writing Standards	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	●
Addresses the 3 Common Core Text Types	◐	◐	●	◐	●	●
Student Samples for Text Types	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	●
Rubrics for Text Types	◐	◐	●	◐	●	●
<i>Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction</i>						
Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics Instruction	●	◐	●	●	●	●
Writing Strategies	●	●	●	●	●	●
Writer's Workshop Model	●	●	●	●	●	●
Process Writing Approach	●	◐	●	●	●	●
6 Traits/6+1 Traits Model	◐	◐	●	●	◐	●
Concise Daily Lesson Plans	●	◐	●	●	◐	●
Web-Based Resources	◐	◐	●	◐	◐	●
Multimedia Resources for Interactive Whiteboards	○	●	●	●	◐	●
Formative Assessment	●	◐	●	●	●	●
<i>Professional Development (PD)</i>						
Program Implementation Training	●	◐	◐	◐	●	●
PD Is Ongoing	●	◐	○	○	●	●
Coaching	○	●	○	○	◐	●
Classroom Demonstration Videos	●	◐	○	●	●	◐

● = criteria fully met ◐ = criteria partially met ○ = criteria not met

Conclusions

Common Core Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features

Looking across the programs, *WriteSteps* and *Strategies for Writers* were the only programs that fully addressed all of the evaluation criteria in this area.

- *WriteSteps* and *Strategies for Writers* were the only programs that fully addressed all 10 Common Core Writing Standards.
- *Strategies for Writers*, *Units of Study*, and *WriteSteps* fully addressed all 3 *Common Core* text types (argument writing, informative/explanatory writing, narratives). These three programs also provided rubrics to guide teachers and students for the *Common Core* text types.
- *Strategies for Writers* and *WriteSteps* provided student writing samples to help students learn the *Common Core* text types.
- Only *Strategies for Writers*, *Traits Writing*, and *WriteSteps* fully addressed *Common Core* requirements for technology use in student writing (Writing Standard 6).
- Only *Essential Guide to Writing*, *Strategies for Writers*, and *WriteSteps* fully addressed *Common Core* requirements for gathering, assessing, and integrating information in student writing (Writing Standard 8).
- Other *Common Core* Writing Standards were addressed by all or most of the programs.

Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction

Only *Strategies for Writers* and *WriteSteps* fully met the criteria for all 9 of these evaluation categories. *Traits Writing* fully met the criteria for all but one category (Web-based resources), where it partly met the evaluation criteria.

- *Strategies for Writers*, *Traits Writing*, and *WriteSteps* were the only programs to fully employ a 6 traits/6+1 traits model.
- Only *Strategies for Writers* and *WriteSteps* made all key program resources available on the Web.
- All 6 programs taught writing strategies and used a writer's workshop model.
- All but *Essential Guide to Writing* fully met the criteria for teaching grammar, usage, and mechanics, process writing approach, and formative assessment.
- All but *Essential Guide for Writing* and *Units of Study* provided concise daily lesson plans featuring objectives, activities, and assessments of student learning.
- All but *CraftPlus* and *Units of Study* provided substantial resources for instruction using interactive whiteboards.

Professional Development

None of the programs fully addressed all of the evaluation criteria related to professional development. Overall, the two strongest programs in this area were *Units of Study* and *WriteSteps*.

- *CraftPlus*, *Units of Study*, and *WriteSteps* fully addressed the criteria for program implementation training and ongoing PD.
- Only *Essential Guide to Writing* and *WriteSteps* fully addressed the criteria for providing coaching services.
- *CraftPlus*, *Traits Writing*, and *Units of Study* fully met the criteria for classroom demonstration videos. *Essential Guide to Writing* and *WriteSteps* partly met these criteria.

References

- Andrade, H. L., Du, Y., & Wang, X. (2008). Putting rubrics to the test: The effect of a model, criteria generation, and rubric-referenced self-assessment on elementary school students' writing. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 27(2), 3-13.
- Calkins, L. M. (1994). *The art of teaching writing* (new ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Calkins, L. (2006). *A guide to the writing workshop, grades 3-5*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Coe, M., Hanita, M., Nishioka, V., Smiley, R. (2011, December). *An investigation of the impact of the 6+1 trait writing model on grade 5 student writing achievement. Final report*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Retrieved Aug. 26, 2013 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED527445.pdf>
- Culham, R. (2006, October). The trait lady speaks up. *Educational Leadership*, 53-57.
- Cunningham, G. (2009). *The new teacher's companion: Practical wisdom for succeeding in the classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Available Sept. 3, 2013 from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/109051/chapters/Lesson-Plans-and-Unit-Plans@-The-Basis-for-Instruction.aspx>
- Glover, D., Miller, D., Averis, D., & Door, V. (2005). The interactive whiteboard: A literature survey. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 14(2), 155-170.
- Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). *Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide*. (NCEE 2012-4058). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved Sept. 3, 2013 from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/writing_pg_062612.pdf.
- Graham, S., Harris, K., & Hebert, M. A. (2011). *Informing writing: The benefits of formative assessment. A Carnegie Corporation Time to Act report*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Graham, S., & Hebert, M. A. (2010). *Writing to read: Evidence for how writing can improve reading. A Carnegie Corporation Time to Act Report*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kiuahara, 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.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007b). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Higgins, S., Beauchamp, G., & Miller, D. (2007). Reviewing the literature on interactive whiteboards. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 32(3), 213-225.
- Hunzicker, J. (2010, June). *Characteristics of effective professional development: A checklist*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED510366)
- Lewin, C., Somekh, B., & Steadman, S. (2008). Embedding interactive whiteboards in teaching and learning: The process of change in pedagogic practice. *Education and Information Technologies*, 13(4), 291-303.
- Marzano, R. J. (2009, November). Teaching with interactive whiteboards. *Educational Leadership*, 67(3), 80-82.
- Marzano, R. J., & Haystead, M. (2009, July). *Final report on the evaluation of the Promethean technology*. Englewood, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory. Retrieved May 25, 2010 from http://www.prometheanworld.com/upload/pdf/Final_Report_on_ActivClassroom_%282%29.pdf
- Milkova, S. (2012). *Strategies for effective lesson planning*. University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. Retrieved Sept. 3, 2013 from http://www.crlt.umich.edu/gsis/p2_5

References

- Miller, D., & Glover, D. (2010). Interactive whiteboards: A literature survey. In M. Thomas & E. C. Schmid (Eds.), *Interactive whiteboards for education: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 1-19). New York: Information Science Reference.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Odden, A. (2011). Resources: The dollars and sense of comprehensive professional learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 32(4), 26-32.
- Pianta, R. C. (2011, November). *Teaching children well: New evidence-based approaches to teacher professional development and training*. Center for American Progress. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED535637). Retrieved Sept. 5, 2013 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535637.pdf>
- Santagata, R. (2009). Designing video-based professional development for mathematics teachers in low-performing schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(1), 38-51.
- Smith, H. J., Higgins, S., Wall, K., & Miller, J. (2005). Interactive whiteboards: Boon or bandwagon? A critical review of the literature. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21, 91-101.
- Smith, M. W., Cheville, J., & Hillocks, G. Jr. (2006). "I guess I'd better watch my English": Grammars and the teaching of the English language arts. In C. A MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 263-274). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Smithson, M. S. (2008). *Academic effects of writer's workshop* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved Aug. 31, 2013 from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/110/>
- Stronge, J. H. (2007). *Qualities of effective teachers* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved Oct. 24, 2013 from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/105156/chapters/Planning-and-Organizing-for-Instruction.aspx>
- Troia, G. A., & Olinghouse, N. G. (2013). The Common Core State Standards and evidence-based educational practices: The case of writing. *School Psychology Review*, 42(3), 343-357.
- Vermont Department of Education. (2011, April). *A guide for increasing the effectiveness of professional development in schools and districts*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED536798)
- Weaver, C. (1996). *Teaching grammar in context*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

The table below presents detailed results of an evaluation of six writing programs⁷. The evaluation focused on the *Common Core* Writing Standards, related instructional features, and other aspects of writing programs of importance to teachers of writing and district and school leaders. Each of the 10 *Common Core* Writing Standards was evaluated separately.

The evaluation was based on a detailed review of Grades 2 and 5 of each program. In each evaluation category, programs were judged at each grade level on a three-point scale where

- = *criteria fully met*
- ◐ = *criteria partially met*
- = *criteria not met*

In each evaluation category, programs were also awarded a “total” judgment using the same three-point scale, summarizing how well the program met the category evaluation criteria across both grade levels. In cases where the criteria were not fully met, a brief explanation is included.

The table is formatted in a two-page spread design, in which evaluations of three programs (*CraftPlus*, *Essential Guide to Writing*, and *Strategies for Writers*) are presented on one page, and evaluations of the other three programs (*Traits Writing*, *Units of Study*, and *WriteSteps*) for the same evaluation categories are presented on the following page.

For an explanation of the evaluation criteria for each category, see Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria.

⁷ This study was commissioned by *WriteSteps*. Program evaluations were carried out independently by IESD.

Common Core Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features

Evaluation Category	CraftPlus (Maupin House)				Essential Guide to Writing (Empowering Writers)				Strategies for Writers (Zaner-Bloser)			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Common Core Writing Standard 1. Text Type: Arguments	●	●	●	At grade 2, no evidence of focus on transitions that link opinions/assertions to reasons.	●	●	●	Little to no guidance at grade 2 for introducing the topic, linking words, and conclusions.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Standard 2. Text Type: Informative/ Explanatory Texts	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Very limited guidance/practice with introductions and conclusions at grade 2. Transitions to link information not addressed at grade 5.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Writing Standard 3. Text Type: Narratives	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Transitions to communicate sequence not addressed at grade 5.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Student Samples for Text Types	●	●	○	Student samples lacking at grade 5. Grade 2 student sample of an argument was not used as a model of opinion writing.	●	●	●	No samples of student writing found for informative/expository text at grade 2.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Rubrics for Text Types	●	●	●	Opinion/persuasive writing did not have a dedicated rubric at grade 5.	●	○	●	No rubrics found for opinion writing at either grade. No rubrics found for informative/ explanatory writing at grade 2. Grade 2 rubric for narrative not provided to students.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>Traits Writing (Scholastic)</i>				<i>Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing (Firsthand/Heinemann)</i>				<i>WriteSteps (WriteSteps)</i>			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Common Core Writing Standard 1. Text Type: Arguments	●	●	●	Persuasive writing taught only as extensions/ variations at grade 2.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Standard 2. Text Type: Informative/ Explanatory Texts	●	●	●	Introduction of a topic not taught in grade 2. In grade 5, linking ideas and providing conclusions not taught in context of expository writing.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Writing Standard 3. Text Type: Narratives	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Student Samples for Text Types	●	●	●	At grade 2, no samples as models for opinion writing. Grade 5 samples for opinion writing mix text types & do not focus on key text type elements. Grade 5 expository samples do not model all text type criteria from CC standard.	●	●	●	Grade 2 student samples were mostly not shared with students for them to analyze.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Rubrics for Text Types	●	●	●	At grade 2, there is only one generic scoring guide for teachers and one for students, not specific to any text type.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>CraftPlus</i> (Maupin House)				<i>Essential Guide to Writing</i> (Empowering Writers)				<i>Strategies for Writers</i> (Zaner-Bloser)			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Common Core Writing Standard 4. Appropriate Development, Organization, & Style	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)
Common Core Writing Standard 5. Planning and Revision Process	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	●	Writing as a process not addressed for informational/expository writing or opinion writing.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Writing Standard 6. Use of Technology	◐	◐	◐	Use of technology is optional, not part of the program’s planned experiences for students.	◐	○	◐	Use of digital tools to produce and publish writing not found for grade 2. Use of technology limited to typing at grade 5.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Writing Standard 7. Research Projects	◐	●	○	While limited research is a part of some lessons in grade 5, it does not meet the criterion of “addressing multiple aspects of a topic.”	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Writing Standard 8. Gathering, Assessing, and Integrating Information	◐	●	◐	Limited gathering of evidence from sources in grade 5, with no requirement to provide a list of sources.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>Traits Writing (Scholastic)</i>				<i>Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing (Firsthand/Heinemann)</i>				<i>WriteSteps (WriteSteps)</i>			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Common Core Writing Standard 4. Appropriate Development, Organization, & Style	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)
Common Core Writing Standard 5. Planning and Revision Process	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Writing Standard 6. Use of Technology	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	●	At grade 2, use of technology is optional, not part of the program’s planned experiences for students.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Writing Standard 7. Research Projects	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Common Core Writing Standard 8. Gathering, Assessing, and Integrating Information	◐	◐	●	At grade 2, there is writing based on observation, but not writing based on information collected from texts.	◐	●	◐	No evidence of students being prompted to provide a list of sources at grade 5.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>CraftPlus</i> (Maupin House)				<i>Essential Guide to Writing</i> (Empowering Writers)				<i>Strategies for Writers</i> (Zaner-Bloser)			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Common Core Writing Standard 9. Drawing Evidence from Texts	●	NA	●	No evidence found that students in grade 5 draw evidence from informational texts. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)
Common Core Writing Standard 10. Range of Writing	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	At grade 5, some science writing tasks, but no tasks in other disciplines. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>Traits Writing (Scholastic)</i>				<i>Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing (Firsthand/Heinemann)</i>				<i>WriteSteps (WriteSteps)</i>			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Common Core Writing Standard 9. Drawing Evidence from Texts	○	NA	○	At grade 5, students do no writing in which they draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)
Common Core Writing Standard 10. Range of Writing	◐	NA	◐	At grade 5, some ELA writing tasks, but no tasks in other disciplines. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)	●	NA	●	Criteria fully met at grade 5. (Not applicable for grade 2.)

Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction

Evaluation Category	<i>CraftPlus</i> (Maupin House)				<i>Essential Guide to Writing</i> (Empowering Writers)				<i>Strategies for Writers</i> (Zaner-Bloser)			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics Instruction	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	●	◐	Not much emphasis on teaching mechanics at grade 5.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Writing Strategies	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Writer's Workshop Model	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Process Writing Approach	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	◐	Most elements of a process approach are addressed, but students are not guided to self-reflect or self-evaluate.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
6 Traits/6+1 Traits Model	◐	◐	◐	Support for elements, but no use of the 6 traits framework.	◐	◐	◐	Support for elements, but no use of the 6 traits framework.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Concise Daily Lesson Plans	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	●	While daily lesson plans provided, assessment of student learning not directly addressed in most grade 2 lessons.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Web-Based Resources	◐	◐	◐	Limited availability of resources on CD only (not Web).	◐	◐	◐	While a few resources are provided on the website, key program resources are available only on CD, not on the Web.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>Traits Writing (Scholastic)</i>				<i>Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing (Firsthand/Heinemann)</i>				<i>WriteSteps (WriteSteps)</i>			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics Instruction	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Writing Strategies	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Writer's Workshop Model	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Process Writing Approach	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
6 Traits/6+1 Traits Model	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	◐	Support for elements, but no use of the 6 traits framework.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Concise Daily Lesson Plans	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	◐	Lesson plans not concise.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Web-Based Resources	◐	◐	◐	Some essential materials not available online.	◐	◐	◐	Availability of resources on CD only (not Web)	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>CraftPlus</i> (Maupin House)				<i>Essential Guide to Writing</i> (Empowering Writers)				<i>Strategies for Writers</i> (Zaner-Bloser)			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Multimedia Resources for Interactive Whiteboards	○	○	○	No evidence of resources provided for use with IWB.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Formative Assessment	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	◐	At grade 2, students are not taught to assess their own writing. At grade 5, formative assessment is not frequently incorporated into the lessons, and there is no evidence of teachers being guided to monitor student progress over time.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>Traits Writing (Scholastic)</i>				<i>Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing (Firsthand/Heinemann)</i>				<i>WriteSteps (WriteSteps)</i>			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Multimedia Resources for Interactive Whiteboards	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	◐	Some resources provided that could be used with IWB, but no guidance given on how to use with IWB.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Formative Assessment	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.

Professional Development

Evaluation Category	<i>CraftPlus</i> (Maupin House)				<i>Essential Guide to Writing</i> (Empowering Writers)				<i>Strategies for Writers</i> (Zaner-Bloser)			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Program Implementation Training	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	◐	Based on website information, training is not automatically provided to clients, but is provided through offsite topic-based workshops teachers can register to attend—which are not widely available across the US.	◐	◐	◐	No training supporting implementation of <i>Strategies for Writers</i> described. However, the publisher provides other PD services that <i>could</i> be customized to support this program.
Professional Development Is Ongoing	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	◐	Customized ongoing PD is available but not provided or promoted as the standard PD support.	○	○	○	No evidence found of ongoing PD services to support program implementation.
Coaching	○	○	○	No evidence found of coaching services.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	○	○	○	No evidence found of coaching services.
Classroom Demonstration Videos	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	◐	◐	◐	Classroom demonstration videos were supplied, but there was no evidence of supporting features/resources to guide teachers’ thinking and reflection.	○	○	○	No evidence found of classroom demonstration videos.

Appendix A. Findings in Detail

Evaluation Category	<i>Traits Writing (Scholastic)</i>				<i>Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing (Firsthand/Heinemann)</i>				<i>WriteSteps (WriteSteps)</i>			
	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation	Total	Gr. 2	Gr. 5	Explanation
Program Implementation Training	●	●	●	No training supporting implementation of <i>Traits Writing</i> described at Scholastic site. However, program author Ruth Culham (Culham Writing Company) independently provides workshops about key topics embodied in the program.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Professional Development Is Ongoing	○	○	○	No evidence found of ongoing PD.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.
Coaching	○	○	○	No evidence found of coaching services.	●	●	●	“Home-grown institutes” meet some of the criteria for coaching, but ongoing coaching as such not supported.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met
Classroom Demonstration Videos	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Criteria fully met.	●	●	●	Relatively few classroom videos provided.

Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria

Common Core Writing Standards and Related Instructional Features

<i>Evaluation Category</i>	<i>Grade 2 Criteria</i>	<i>Grade 5 Criteria</i>
<p>Common Core Writing Standard 1. Text Type: Arguments</p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Write opinion pieces in which [students] introduce the topic or book they are writing about, state an opinion, supply reasons that support the opinion, use linking words (e.g., <i>because, and, also</i>) to connect opinion and reasons, and provide a concluding statement or section.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, text type must be taught in at least 2 assignments, with guidance addressing all items in the standard. Partially meets criteria if guidance addresses some but not all items.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Write opinion pieces on topics or texts, supporting a point of view with reasons and information.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Introduce a topic or text clearly, state an opinion, and create an organizational structure in which ideas are logically grouped to support the writer’s purpose. b. Provide logically ordered reasons that are supported by facts and details. c. Link opinion and reasons using words, phrases, and clauses (e.g., <i>consequently, specifically</i>). d. Provide a concluding statement or section related to the opinion presented.” <p><i>To fully meet criteria, text type must be taught in at least 2 assignments, with guidance addressing all items in the standard. Partially meets criteria if guidance addresses some but not all items.</i></p>

Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria

<i>Evaluation Category</i>	<i>Grade 2 Criteria</i>	<i>Grade 5 Criteria</i>
<p>Common Core Standard 2. Text Type: Informative/ Explanatory Texts</p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Write informative/explanatory texts in which [students] introduce a topic, use facts and definitions to develop points, and provide a concluding statement or section.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, text type must be taught in at least 2 assignments, with guidance addressing all items in the standard. Partially meets criteria if guidance addresses some but not all items.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas and information clearly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Introduce a topic clearly, provide a general observation and focus, and group related information logically; include formatting (e.g., headings), illustrations, and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension. b. Develop the topic with facts, definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples related to the topic. c. Link ideas within and across categories of information using words, phrases, and clauses (e.g., <i>in contrast, especially</i>). d. Use precise language and domain-specific vocabulary to inform about or explain the topic. e. Provide a concluding statement or section related to the information or explanation presented.” <p><i>To fully meet criteria, text type must be taught in at least 2 assignments, with guidance addressing all items in the standard. Partially meets criteria if guidance addresses some but not all items.</i></p>

Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Category	Grade 2 Criteria	Grade 5 Criteria
<p>Common Core Writing Standard 3. Text Type: Narratives</p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Write narratives in which [students] recount a well-elaborated event or short sequence of events, include details to describe actions, thoughts, and feelings, use temporal words to signal event order, and provide a sense of closure.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, text type must be taught in at least 2 assignments, with guidance addressing all items in the standard. Partially meets criteria if guidance addresses some but not all items.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, descriptive details, and clear event sequences.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Orient the reader by establishing a situation and introducing a narrator and/or characters; organize an event sequence that unfolds naturally. b. Use narrative techniques, such as dialogue, description, and pacing, to develop experiences and events or show the responses of characters to situations. c. Use a variety of transitional words, phrases, and clauses to manage the sequence of events. d. Use concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely. e. Provide a conclusion that follows from the narrated experiences or events.” <p><i>To fully meet criteria, text type must be taught in at least 2 assignments, with guidance addressing all items in the standard. Partially meets criteria if guidance addresses some but not all items.</i></p>
<p>Student Samples for Text Types</p>	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, the program must provide grade-specific samples of student writing for each of the 3 Common Core text types, illustrating characteristics of that text type as described in the Common Core Writing Standards. The samples must be presented as models to students, who should be guided to analyze and emulate features of the models.</i></p> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if some samples are provided to students as models, but they are not provided for each text type or are not consistently shared with students as models.</i></p>	<p>Same as grade 2.</p>

Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Category	Grade 2 Criteria	Grade 5 Criteria
Rubrics for Text Types	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, the program must provide rubrics that are specific to each of the 3 Common Core text types. Rubrics must be shared with students as a guide to their own writing and revision, and teachers must be guided to use the rubrics to assess student writing.</i></p> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if rubrics are provided, but (a) they are not text type-specific or (b) there is guidance to use them for student instruction or assessment, but not both.</i></p>	<p><i>Same as grade 2.</i></p>
Common Core Writing Standard 4. Appropriate Development, Organization, & Style	<p><i>Writing Standard 4 does not apply until grade 3.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.” (Grade-specific expectations for writing types are defined in #1–3 above.)</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, guidance must be provided to develop writing that is appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</i></p>
Common Core Writing Standard 5. Planning and Revision Process	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “With guidance and support from adults and peers, focus on a topic and strengthen writing as needed by revising and editing.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, lessons or guidance must be provided to students on a writing process that includes a topic focus, a first draft, and a revision/editing phase. Partially meets criteria if program provides lessons/guidance for some but not all of the 3 Common Core text types.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, lessons or guidance must be provided to students on a writing process that includes planning, a first draft, and a second draft, at a minimum. Partially meets criteria if program provides lessons/guidance for some but not all of the 3 Common Core text types.</i></p>

Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Category	Grade 2 Criteria	Grade 5 Criteria
<p>Common Core Writing Standard 6. Use of Technology</p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “With guidance and support from adults, use a variety of digital tools to produce and publish writing, including in collaboration with peers.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, at least 2 planned writing experiences (individual or collaborative) must use wordprocessing or other software to produce a final piece of writing. Partially meets criteria if only 1 experience or if only mentioned as an option.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “With some guidance and support from adults, use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish a minimum of two pages of writing (using the keyboard) as well as to interact and collaborate with others.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, students must use wordprocessing or other software to produce a final piece of writing, <u>and</u> must use technology to share, collaborate, and/or provide or get feedback on writing. Partially meets criteria if only 1 of these or if use of technology is only mentioned as an option.</i></p>
<p>Common Core Writing Standard 7. Research Projects</p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Participate in shared research and writing projects (e.g., read a number of books on a single topic to produce a report; record science observations).”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, students are guided through the process of collecting information and turning it into a written product, <u>and</u> complete at least 2 shorter projects or 1 unit-length (multi-week) project involving multiple sources, either individually or collaboratively. Partially meets criteria if guidance is lacking and/or if there is only 1 shorter project.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Conduct short research projects that use several sources to build knowledge through investigation of different aspects of a topic.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, students are guided through the process of collecting information and turning it into a written product. They also complete at least 2 shorter projects or 1 unit-length (multi-week) project involving multiple sources <u>and</u> addressing multiple aspects of a topic. Partially meets criteria if guidance is lacking and/or if there is only 1 shorter project.</i></p>
<p>Common Core Writing Standard 8. Gathering, Assessing, and Integrating Information</p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Recall information from experiences or gather information from provided sources to answer a question.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, students review provided sources to answer a question, then share the answer. Partially meets criteria if students answer questions based on experiences only, not from provided sources.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; summarize or paraphrase information in notes and finished work, and provide a list of sources.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, students summarize/paraphrase information from print/digital sources in notes <u>and</u> in a finished work, and provide a list of sources. Partially meets criteria if students summarize/paraphrase information from print/digital sources in a finished work, but don’t meet one or both of the other criteria.</i></p>

Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria

<i>Evaluation Category</i>	<i>Grade 2 Criteria</i>	<i>Grade 5 Criteria</i>
<p>Common Core Writing Standard 9. Drawing Evidence from Texts</p>	<p><i>Writing Standard 9 does not apply until grade 4.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Apply <i>grade 5 Reading standards</i> to literature (e.g., ‘Compare and contrast two or more characters, settings, or events in a story or a drama, drawing on specific details in the text [e.g., how characters interact]’). b. Apply <i>grade 5 Reading standards</i> to informational texts (e.g., ‘Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text, identifying which reasons and evidence supports which point[s]’).” <p><i>To fully meet criteria, students complete at least 2 projects involving analysis, reflection, and/or research based on evidence from literary texts, and 2 projects based on evidence from informational texts. Partially meets criteria if students do only one or the other.</i></p>
<p>Common Core Writing Standard 10. Range of Writing</p>	<p><i>Writing Standard 10 does not apply until grade 3.</i></p>	<p><u>Text of standard:</u> “Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences.”</p> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, students complete both short-term writing lessons/activities and multi-day writing projects related to at least 2 disciplines (e.g., ELA, science, social studies), typical of tasks students might be assigned as part of subject-area instruction. Partly meets criteria if students do this in only 1 subject area.</i></p>

Other Aspects of Writing Curriculum and Instruction

<i>Evaluation Category</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>
Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics Instruction	<p><i>To fully meet criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Students are expected to create writing products that adhere to appropriate standards of grammar, usage, mechanics, and spelling for their age.</i> <i>b. Students are taught appropriate skills related to grammar, usage, and mechanics in a way that helps them apply those standards to their own writing.</i> <p><i>Partly meets criteria if (a) is met, but (b) is not met, or (b) is addressed in a non-writing context.</i></p>
Writing Strategies	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, students are consistently taught strategies for carrying out assigned writing tasks (e.g., planning and revising a specific type of text) and reminded of these strategies as appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if students are sometimes taught such strategies but this is not a consistent feature of instruction (e.g., students are sometimes told expectations but not given strategies on how to carry them out).</i></p>
Writer’s Workshop Model	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, must include all of the following elements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Frequent opportunities for students to write—daily or almost daily</i> <i>b. Student selection of topics</i> <i>c. Explicit teaching of skills and strategies through mini-lessons, often including teacher demonstrations/modeling</i> <i>d. A writing process approach</i> <i>e. Consulting with individual students or small groups about their writing in a workshop/conference format</i> <i>f. Writing for an audience, including sharing of writing with other students</i> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if it includes a, c, d, and e, but not b and/or f.</i></p>
Process Writing Approach	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, must include all of the following elements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Extended opportunities for writing</i> <i>b. Writing for real audiences extending beyond the teacher</i> <i>c. Personalized individual assistance and instruction</i> <i>d. Engaging in cycles of planning, writing, and reviewing</i> <i>e. Self-reflection and/or self-evaluation</i> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if it includes a and d, but not one or more of the others.</i></p>

Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Category	Evaluation Criteria
6 Traits/6+1 Traits Model	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, rubrics/evaluation criteria for student writing must incorporate the 6 traits/6+1 traits model, and students must be taught the model <u>as a framework</u> for evaluating and revising their own work. The model must be integrated with process writing instruction, and students must be provided with guidance/strategies on how to revise writing to improve each of the traits.</i></p> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if rubrics/evaluation criteria reflect the traits, but they are not taught or used as a framework.</i></p>
Concise Daily Lesson Plans	<p><i>“A successful lesson plan addresses and integrates these three key components:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Objectives for student learning</i> <i>• Teaching/learning activities</i> <i>• Strategies to check student understanding” (Milkova, 2012, para. 1; see also Stronge, 2007)</i> <p><i>To fully meet criteria, daily lesson plans must be provided that include clear objectives, description of activities, and regular assessment of student learning. Lesson plans must be concise for teacher convenience (i.e., no longer than 4 pages). Partially meets criteria if lesson plans are provided but lack some of these characteristics.</i></p>
Web-Based Resources	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, teachers and/or students must be able to access all resources on the Web that are needed to implement the program.</i></p> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if teachers can access planning and presentation resources on the Web, but some resources are not accessible on the Web. Also partially meets criteria if resources are available on CD but not on the Web.</i></p>
Multimedia Resources for Interactive Whiteboards	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, the program provides ample resources for use with interactive whiteboards. Resources focus on key content and are engaging (i.e., likely to stimulate student-teacher and student-student interaction). Partially meets criteria if resources are provided but fall short in one or more areas.</i></p>
Formative Assessment	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, students receive feedback on their writing from peers and/or teachers; students are taught to assess their own writing; and teachers are guided to monitor students’ progress in writing across multiple assessments. Partially meets criteria if feedback is provided, but one or both of the other conditions are not met (i.e., self-assessment, monitoring across multiple assessments).</i></p>

Professional Development

<i>Evaluation Category</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>
Program Implementation Training	<i>To fully meet criteria, the program vendor provides training for teachers in program features and resources and program implementation. Partially meets criteria if training covers some but not all of these areas or if it is provided only for a limited number of personnel.</i>
Professional Development Is Ongoing	<i>To fully meet criteria, the program vendor provides substantial ongoing follow-up training for teachers. Partially meets criteria if only 1-2 follow-up sessions are provided/recommended.</i>
Coaching	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, the program vendor provides coaching services, which are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Job-embedded (i.e., takes place during the regular school day and school calendar)</i> • <i>Ongoing</i> • <i>Conducted with individual teachers or instructionally meaningful groups of teachers (e.g., grade-level or subject-area groups)</i> • <i>Focused on teachers' own implementation of the program with their students (e.g., involving analysis of data from participants' own students; observations and feedback on classroom lessons taught by participants; review of participants' lesson plans; collective/collaborative planning; "debriefing" on participants' experience teaching with the program)</i> • <i>Conducted in real time (on-site, online, or both)</i> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if some but not all of these are supported.</i></p>
Classroom Demonstration Videos	<p><i>To fully meet criteria, the program vendor provides a substantial body of classroom videos demonstrating real instruction, with supporting features/resources to guide teachers' thinking and reflection. These could include key questions, annotations, advance organizers, and/or prompting to teachers to reflect on what they saw—provided either as part of the video or in supporting materials.</i></p> <p><i>Partially meets criteria if fewer than 9 videos are provided, or videos are provided but without supporting features/resources to guide teachers' thinking and reflection.</i></p>