

EIA Program Report for Fiscal Year 2011-12

Coversheet

EIA-Funded Program Name: Writing Improvement Network

Current Fiscal Year: 2011-12

Current EIA Appropriation: \$182,761

Name of Person Completing Survey and to whom EOC members may request additional information:

Ellen W James

Telephone Number:

803- 777-0340

E-mail:

ellenwjames@sc.edu

Question 1: History of the program: Please mark the appropriate response (choose one):

This program:

- was an original initiative of the Education Improvement Act of 1984
- was created or implemented as part of the Education Accountability Act of 1998
- has been operational for less than five years
- was funded last fiscal year by general or other funds
- is a new program implemented for the first time in the current fiscal year
- Other

Question 2: What SC laws, including provisos in the current year's general appropriation act, govern the implementation of this program? Please complete citations from the SC Code of Laws including, Title, Chapter, and Section numbers.

Code of Laws:

Title 59-18-300

None exists. WIN has line item appropriation only

Proviso(s): (If applicable. Please make references to the 2011-12 General Appropriation Act as ratified. www.XXXXX)

1A.39

Regulation(s):

None exists. WIN has line item appropriation only.

Do guidelines that have been approved by the State Board of Education, the Commission on Higher Education or other governor board exist that govern the implementation of this program?

Yes

X No

Question 3: What are the primary objective(s) or goals of this program? Please distinguish between the long-term mission of the program and the current annual objectives of the program. (The goals or objectives should be in terms that can be quantified, evaluated, and assessed.)

The Writing Improvement Network (WIN) serves as a professional development resource for South Carolina (SC) K-12 teachers. WIN uses teacher experts to provide training in the implementation of research-based best practices in teaching students to become better readers and writers and provides guidance in choosing professional development and classroom resources.

WIN's objectives are to 1) inform SC's public schools of WIN's purposes and activities; 2) become involved with other education-related agencies and projects that affect English Language Arts (ELA) instruction; 3) develop a technical assistance plan that focuses on ELA academic standards of greatest need by analyzing available data; 4) collaborate with teachers to develop instructional strategies and materials to improve ELA instruction for all students with emphasis on underperforming schools (determined by SC's annual report card); and 5) provide professional development based on current research.

Question 4: In the prior fiscal year, 2010-11, what primary program activities or processes were provided to facilitate the program's performance in reaching the objective(s) as provided in Question 3? What, if any, change in processes or activities are planned for the current year?

Examples of program processes would be: training provided, recruiting efforts made, technical assistance services, monitoring services, etc.

Answers should be specific to the process undertaken at the state level to support the objectives of the program and should be quantifiable. Please include any professional development services provided.

IF the funds are allocated directly to school districts, please indicate any data collected at the state level to monitor how the funds are expended at the local level?

Primary activities, 2010-11:

1. Reviewed and offered suggestions for revisions to Spartanburg 7's district writing plan as requested by district-level staff.
2. Provided a day-long session on learning how to use the 15-point writing rubric and associated instructional strategies for Spartanburg 7 grades 3-5 writing committee members.

3. Provided a day-long session on learning how to use the 15-point writing rubric and associated instructional strategies for Spartanburg 7 grades 6-8 writing committee members.
4. Provided a day-long session on learning how to use the 15-point writing rubric and associated instructional strategies for Spartanburg 7 grades 9-12 writing committee members.
5. Provided a half-day workshop on reading and writing instructional strategies for grades 6-8 ELA teachers in Anderson 5.
6. Provided a half-day workshop on reading and writing instructional strategies for grades 9-12 ELA teachers in Anderson 5.
7. Provided half-day ELA test data analysis workshop for grades 3-5 ELA teachers in Dillon 2.
8. Provided a half-day ELA test data analysis workshop for grades 6-8 ELA teachers in Dillon 2.
9. Provided a half-day ELA test data analysis workshop for Lexington 1 elementary, middle, and high school department chairpersons .
10. Provided a half-day ELA test data analysis workshop for statewide ELA coordinators.
11. Provided a half-day workshop on increasing the rigor of ELA classroom assessments for Darlington County district- and school-level administrators.
12. Provided a half-day workshop on increasing the rigor of ELA classroom assessments for Eau Claire High School teachers and administrators, as well as Richland 1 district-level administrators.
13. Provided a day-long session on using annotated anchor papers to score a schoolwide writing assessment for grades 6-8 ELA teachers at Gilbert Middle School.
14. Provided a day-long session on integrating reading, writing, and research instruction through a thematic unit for Berkeley County K-2 ELA teachers.
15. Provided a day-long session on integrating reading, writing, and research instruction through a thematic unit for Berkeley County 3-5 ELA teachers.
16. Provided a day-long session on integrating reading, writing, and research instruction through a thematic unit for Berkeley County 6-8 ELA teachers.
17. Provided a day-long session on integrating reading, writing, and research instruction through a thematic unit for Berkeley County 9-12 ELA teachers.
18. Provided year-long, onsite technical assistance to Scott's Branch Middle School in Clarendon District 1 in collaboration with the Palmetto Priority Schools Office at the SC Department of Education.
19. Provided year-long, onsite technical assistance to Eau Claire High School in Richland District 1 in collaboration with the Palmetto Priority Schools Office at the SC Department of Education.

Primary Activities, 2011-12:

1. Provided a half-day session on reading and writing strategies using informational texts at the summer conference for recipients of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) through the SC Department of Education. (July 2011)

2. Provided a 2-day summer institute for ELA teachers from Eau Claire, C. A. Johnson, and Lower Richland High Schools in Richland District 1. (July 2011)
3. Provided a day-long session on technical writing to non-ELA teachers and administrators at the Darlington County Technology Center. (August 2011)
4. Provided a day-long session on initiating and maintaining portfolio writing assessments for Berkeley County 6-8 and 9-12 ELA teachers. (August 2011)
5. Provided a half-day informational session on the ELA Common Core State Standards for grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12 ELA teachers in Anderson District 1. (September 2011)
6. Provide a half-day session on incorporating social studies in the ELA classroom for K-5 teachers in Berkeley County. (February 2012)
7. Provide onsite technical assistance to McBee Elementary K-6 teachers in Chesterfield County. (August 2011 – January 2012)
8. Provide year-long, onsite technical assistance to ELA teachers at Eau Claire, C. A. Johnson, and Lower Richland High Schools in Richland District 1. (September 2011-April 2012)
9. Provide monthly after-school extended-response scoring sessions for ELA teachers from Eau Claire High School, C. A. Johnson High School, and Lower Richland High School in Richland District 1. (October 2011-April 2012)
10. Revise existing (and develop new) ELA HSAP benchmark items for Richland District 1. (November 2011-March 2012)
11. Provide professional development services to additional schools and districts, as requested.
12. Provide professional development services to schools and districts for the SC Department of Education, as requested.
13. Provide PRAXIS 1 tutoring to individual University of South Carolina students, as requested.
14. Present a session entitled *The Role of Evaluation in Informing Program Functioning and Public Perception* at the American Evaluation Association conference in Anaheim, California, November 4, 2011.

Question 5: In the prior fiscal year, 2010-11, and using the most recent data available, what were the direct products and services (outputs) delivered by this Program?

Examples of program outputs would be: number of teachers attending professional development seminars, number of and passage rates on AP exams, number of students served in the program, improvements in student achievement, retention and graduation.

WIN consultants conducted 18 workshops (including two 8-day intensive workshops) in 2010-2011 related to PASS Writing, scoring, student assessment, or targeted professional development based on school and student needs. Approximately 500 teachers and 50

administrators representing nine school districts were served through school-based and teacher-targeted initiatives.

Specifically, seven half-day workshops were offered to 260 teachers and related personnel in six schools/school districts. Nine full-day workshops were provided to 270 teachers and administrators across four counties, and 12 teachers in two schools participated in more intensive services that spanned eight days.

As a service to the University of South Carolina, WIN provided one-on-one tutoring to several College of Education students who had to re-take the PRAXIS 1 test to qualify for student-teaching.

Question 6: What are the outcomes or results of this program?

Outcome can be both quantitative and qualitative and should address the program's objectives. Please use the most recent data available:

Examples of outcomes would be: results of surveys, student achievement results, increases in participation, reduction in achievement gaps, loans awarded, textbooks purchased, etc.

WIN realized the following outcomes during 2010-11: 1) provided useful, relevant, and practical information to 550 teachers and related personnel in nine school districts regarding teaching ELA aligned with South Carolina standards, 2) collaborated with the South Carolina Department of Education and school districts to enhance ELA instruction and assessment, and 3) used participant feedback, participant observation, and information from stakeholders to reexamine and redefine technical assistance and consultation services. Outcomes such as impact on student achievement are difficult to ascertain based on intensity of WIN services resulting from strained professional development budgets of schools and the occurrence of multiple interventions in high-needs school districts. In 2010-2011, WIN sought to provide higher intensity technical assistance to schools. Technical assistance and consultation with one school district (Richland 1) resulted in a continuation of services to one high school and expansion of services to two additional high schools for 2011-12.

End-of-workshop evaluations were collected from participants in 15 WIN workshops that occurred in 2010-11. Seven evaluation surveys based on the goals and objectives of individual workshops were used to collect data.

Two Teaching More, Using Less to Teach workshops were conducted in Anderson 5. More than 95% of participants in both workshops indicated that the workshops were probably or definitely worth their time. Participants in these workshops were asked to provide a one-word description of the workshop. Respondents from one workshop used 100% positive words while approximately 65% of the words used to describe the other workshop were positive. Finally, participants responded to eight survey items about their overall impressions of the workshop. More than 90% of participants "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" with the statements. Figure 1 contains the survey items and Tables 1-6 provide detailed results from the closed-ended items on the evaluation surveys.

Four *Reading, Researching, and Thinking Like a Writer* workshops were provided in Berkeley County. These workshops used a 10-item Likert scale survey to gauge participants' learning of specific techniques such as using ELA indicators, informational texts, and thematic units that were taught in these sessions. Participants in two of the sessions "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" with the statements 97% and 93% of the time. More than half of the participants in the other two sessions indicated that they "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" as well. Tables 7-10 provide detailed results from the closed-ended items (available in Figure 2) from these two workshops.

An intensive, eight-day workshop, entitled *Success in Reading and Writing: Gaining Insights, Building Skills, and Making a Match*, was conducted in Richland 1 at Eau Claire High School. This workshop used a 15 item Likert-scale survey to evaluate participants' level of understanding of the topics taught, such as the use of literary texts and figurative language in writing instruction. Approximately 89% of the participants "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" with the statements on the survey, indicating a high level of understanding of the topics discussed. Figure 3 details the 15 survey items. Table 11 provides the detailed results for this eight-day workshop.

Together, Spartanburg and Darlington school districts offered five *Scoring Workshops* to teachers in all grade levels (one for grades 3-5, two for grades 6-8, and two for grades 9-12). A retrospective pre-post survey was used that asked teachers to rate their level of preparation both before and after the workshop. This was used to measure participants' average gain in learning from the workshop. The average gain in learning for the five workshops ranged from 0 to 0.3 points on a four-point Likert scale (4 indicates Strong Agreement and 1 is Strong Disagreement). Figure 4 shares the items for the pre-post survey and Tables 12-16 show the results from the five workshops.

A similar pre-post design was used for the *Strategies for Developing Higher Cognitive Level Multiple Choice Tests* with teachers at Eau Claire High School and with district- and school-level administrators in Darlington County. The average gain for the Eau Claire High School workshop was 0.2 points on the four point Likert scale. The average gain for the Darlington County workshop was 0.5. Figure 5, Table 17 and Figure 6, Table 18 share detailed information about these items and responses.

Two PASS Writing workshops were offered to grades 3-5 and 6-8 teachers in Dillon 2. A retrospective pre-post survey with four Likert scale items was given for teachers to rate their level of preparation. Grades 3-5 teachers reported an average gain of 0.6 points on the 4-point Likert scale, while grades 6-8 teachers had a 0.7 point change in knowledge. Teachers were also asked to report if they thought there was a change in the domain that students demonstrated their strongest and weakest performance, based on the new information they received about writing domains in the workshops. Approximately 71% of the grades 3-5 teachers changed their students' strongest domain and 43% changed their students' weakest domain. The grades 6-8 teachers were slightly less likely to change their students' strongest domain, but the same percentage as elementary teachers (43%) changed their students' weakest domain at the end of the training. Figure 7, Tables 19-24 share detailed information about these items and responses.

Question 7: Program Evaluations

What was the date of the last external or internal evaluation of this program?

2009-10

Has an evaluation ever been Provided?

Yes

No

If an evaluation was provided, what were the results and primary recommendations of the most recent evaluation?

Due to reductions in funding, WIN was unable to pay for its Year 2 External Evaluation. Therefore, the information provided below is based on WIN's Year 1 External Evaluation (2009-10).

Professional development provided by WIN is content specific, focusing on improvement explicitly related to ELA standards with supplemental impacts on other content areas. WIN consultants work to assist teachers and administrators in effectively interpreting standards and provide examples of student mastery of ELA concepts. WIN consultants use active learning techniques in the professional development process that seek to engage and include teachers in the development of strategies and methods to understand and improve student learning. While these are strong aspects of WIN professional development and technical assistance, the current intensity and length of engagement of WIN professional development activities are often not enough to significantly impact teacher functioning and student achievement. At this point, impact on student outcomes is hard to discern based on the limited intensity of WIN services and the prevalence of other professional development and technical assistance at many of the high needs schools and districts served.

WIN consultants are interested in and have attempted to provide professional development with more intensity particularly to Below Average and At-Risk districts and schools; however, budget cuts and funding constraints have limited schools' ability to afford this type of professional development. In addition, WIN's budget does not allow it to provide intensive services at a significantly reduced rate to be affordable for these districts and schools. On average, schools/districts provided approximately \$2,000 for a customized series of WIN workshops during 2009-2010 that consisted of between one and three workshops. Costs per district ranged from \$550 to \$3,000 based on the intensity of services. The actual costs to WIN to plan and implement a high-quality, one-day customized professional development workshop are between \$1,500 and \$2,500. WIN often provides more services and technical assistance than it is compensated for based on the amount it charges schools and districts for professional development. For example, WIN received only 15% of the costs required to plan and implement the services for the Writers' Edge Project, a collaboration with Benedict College.

Evaluations from the more intensive professional development workshops such as Clarendon 1 (Scott's Branch) and Lexington School District 5 are more positive than those from shorter term

professional development and likely demonstrate the rapport developed with professional development facilitators and the commitment gained from more frequent interactions and integration of material over a period of time. In addition, evaluations from The Writers' Edge Summer Institute demonstrated that significant changes occurred in teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes during the insensitive professional development process. The design and intent of the Writers' Edge Project was aligned with high-quality professional development; however, lack of follow through by participating teachers during the academic year following the institute appears to have compromised classroom and student impact (Saunders, 2010).

Based on information gleaned from workshop evaluations as well as teacher dispositions during technical assistance, WIN consultants have redesigned some of their professional development strategies for 2010–2011. In professional development designed for teachers in Grades 3-8 for Dillon School District 2, which occurred in August 2010, WIN consultants analyzed district-level PASS Extended Response and Multiple Choice Writing Scores. The consultants developed a workshop to assist classroom teachers in understanding and using these data to inform their instruction. The evaluation form used to determine pre- and post-workshop perceptions allows WIN consultants and others to understand changes in beliefs, perceptions, and knowledge as a result of workshop participation. If WIN continues to use this type of data-driven approach in a more substantial and sustained professional development process, significant student achievement results may be realized.

Can you provide a URL link, electronic version, or hard copy of this evaluation to the EOC?

Yes (hard copy)

No

If yes, please provide URL link here.

If no, why not?

Due to reductions in funding, WIN can no longer afford to pay the monthly Website hosting fee or to pay the Webmaster. Therefore, WIN has eliminated its Web site. A hard copy of the Year 1 External Evaluation (2009-10) was provided last year.

Question 8:

While EIA revenues increased in 2010-11 over the prior fiscal year and no mid-year cuts were made to any EIA programs, programs and agencies continue to implement conservative budget practices.

Please describe how the program and/or organization would absorb or offset potential EIA reductions totaling 5%, and 10% in the current fiscal year, Fiscal Year 2011-12?

WIN's July 2011 appropriation was \$182,761. The following items were budgeted based on this original amount: 94.4% (salaries and fringe for the WIN director, administrative assistant, and WIN's early childhood/elementary specialist; \$1,500 (consultant fee for technical assistance with data calculations for this report); and the remaining, \$8,735 budgeted for general office operating expenditures.

With its appropriation reduction of 15%, WIN changed its hiring and payment policies for all part-time consultants. Effective July 1, 2011, staff formerly hired as part-time consultants (to assist with projects on an as-needed basis) are now hired as independent consultants, eliminating the need for WIN to pay a portion of their state and federal withholding taxes and state retirement contributions. WIN submits an invoice for services provided to schools/districts as a convenience to these consultants; however, the schools/districts pay the consultants directly. Schools/districts also provide each consultant with Form 1099 for income tax purposes. These independent consultants do not receive reimbursements for any travel expenses. Full-time staff members also do not receive travel reimbursements.

WIN has reduced general office operating expenses by 15% and ceased operation of its website, eliminating the need to pay for a web-hosting site (\$25 monthly) and a web master (\$100 monthly). WIN has postponed indefinitely upgrading any existing technology and has eliminated the purchase of any new technology. Additionally, WIN no longer purchases professional texts and materials for use with teachers and students in professional development projects.

In 2005, WIN's appropriation was \$288,444. Since 2006, WIN's appropriation has been reduced by 36.6%, \$105,683.

WIN increased its fees with each of the previous reductions. If additional reductions are imposed, WIN will again have to increase its fees. Monies collected from increased fees will be used to supplement any salary reductions taken by WIN's director, early childhood/elementary specialist, and administrative assistant.

Question 9:

If no additional EIA revenues were appropriated to this program in Fiscal Year 2012-13 above the current year's appropriation level, how would the objectives, activities and priorities of this program change?

Please be specific to address the impact to students, teachers or schools. Are there regulatory or statutory changes that you would recommend to the legislature that would assist this program/organization in meeting its objectives?

If WIN's funding for FY 2012-13 remains the same as its funding for FY 2011-12, WIN can function, minimally, as described in the previous two sections. During FY 2010-11, WIN explored possibilities for offering its services through video-streaming and Webinars, and through video recording workshops onto CDs/DVDs. As a result of this exploration, the director learned that many sites/services require a paid subscription, costs that are prohibitive given WIN's reduced funding. While there are some free video-streaming and webinar-hosting services, WIN often lacks the technological resources to take advantage of them. And in many cases, USC's IT Department restricts access to sites/services for which WIN has compatible technology. Even if these financial and/or technological obstacles can be resolved, WIN must determine if fees can be charged for video-streaming sessions and Webinars and if workshop CDs/DVDs can be sold to compensate for reduced appropriations. WIN's full-time staff and independent consultants have developed thematic instructional units that align both to the South Carolina ELA Standards and to the new Common Core State Standards. The director contacted the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) to determine if the organization would be interested in publishing these materials and offering them for sale to its members (with WIN receiving a percentage of the sales). While NCTE was interested in reviewing the materials, NCTE was not interested in forming a partnership. However, NCTE did encourage WIN to submit a proposal to present at its national conference, which would provide an opportunity for WIN consultants to present a workshop using the thematic units. Although WIN consultants regularly presented at NCTE in years past, consultants can no longer afford to attend any conferences due to decreased funding. Because WIN cannot afford to pay to have its instructional materials published, the director is trying to find a publisher who is willing to produce the materials at no charge to WIN. If WIN is successful in finding a "free" publisher and selling these materials, all proceeds will be used to compensate for reduced appropriations.

If you want to provide supporting documents or evaluation reports, either reference a website below or email the report directly to mbarton@eoc.sc.gov.

Questions 10 and 11 Apply only to programs NOT administered by the South Carolina State Department of Education.

Question 10: Fiscal Year 2012-13

The total amount of EIA funds requested for this program for the next fiscal year will be:

- The same as appropriated in the current fiscal year's appropriation**
- An increase over the current fiscal year's appropriation**
- A decrease over the current fiscal year's appropriation**

If you indicated an increase or decrease in funding for the next fiscal year, what is the total amount requested for this program for the next fiscal year?

NA

If you indicated an increase or decrease, please describe the reasons for the increase or decrease. How will the increase or decrease impact the objective of the program?

Question 11: Fiscal Years 2010-11 and 2011-12

Please fill in the attached charts to reflect the budget for this program in the prior fiscal year (2010-11) and the budget for this program in the current fiscal year (2011-12).

If the program was not funded in the prior fiscal year, please fill out information for the current fiscal year only.

Funding Source	Prior FY Actual	Current FY Estimated
EIA	215,013	182,761
General Fund		
Lottery		
Fees		
Other Sources		
Grant		
Contributions, Foundation		
Other (Specify)		
Carry Forward from Prior Yr		
TOTAL	215,013	182,761

Other: Please specify here.

Expenditures	Prior FY Actual	Current FY
Personal Service	158,431	138,683
Contractual Services	7,106	6,446
Supplies and Materials	8,487	2,600
Fixed Charges	1,900	2,300
Travel	354	500
Equipment		
Employer Contributions	38,471	32,232
Allocations to		
Other: Please explain		
Balance Remaining	264	
TOTAL	215,013	182,761
#FTES	3	3

Other: Please explain here.

Supporting Documents:

**Figures 1-7
Tables 1-24**

**South Carolina Writing Improvement Network
Workshop Evaluation Results**

Figure 1
Items from the Teaching More, Using Less to Teach Workshops

Items	Responses			
1. The workshop met its intended goals as outlined in the opening few minutes of the session(s).	Strongly Agree	Generally Agree	Generally Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. The workshop was relevant to my needs.				
3. The workshop content was focused and effectively presented.				
4. The workshop materials were well organized.				
5. The workshop materials were professional looking and relevant.				
6. The presenter was well prepared.				
7. The presenter was knowledgeable.				
8. The presenter was engaging.				

Table 1
Anderson 5 Teaching More, Using Less to Teach Workshop (Grades 6-8)

Item #	n	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	23	3.61	0	1	7	15
2	23	3.65	0	3	2	18
3	23	3.78	0	0	5	18
4	23	3.74	1	1	1	20
5	23	3.83	1	0	1	21
6	22	3.86	1	0	0	21
7	22	3.77	1	0	2	19
8	19	3.95	0	0	1	18
Percent		3.77	2.2%	2.8%	10.7%	84.3%

Table 2
One-Word Description of Anderson 5 Teaching More, Using Less to Teach Workshop (Grades 6-8)

Type of Word	Number	Percent
Positive (e.g., informative, enriching)	19	100.0%
Negative	0	0.0%

n=19 (those who provided comment)

Table 3
Overall Rating of Anderson 5 Teaching More, Using Less to Teach Workshop (Grades 6-8)

Overall Rating	Number	Percent
Not Worth My Time	1	4.3%
Probably Worth My Time	7	30.4%
Definitely Worth My Time	15	65.2%

Table 4

Anderson 5 Teaching More, Using Less to Teach Workshop (Grades 9-12)

Item #	n	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	30	3.8	0	0	6	24
2	30	3.8	0	1	4	25
3	30	3.9	0	0	4	26
4	30	3.8	0	0	7	23
5	30	3.9	0	0	2	28
6	30	3.9	0	0	2	28
7	30	4.0	0	0	1	29
8	30	3.8	0	0	6	24
Percent		3.9	0.0%	0.4%	13.3%	86.3%

Table 5

One-Word Description of Anderson 5 Teaching More, Using Less to Teach Workshop (Grades 9-12)

Type of Word	Number	Percent
Positive (e.g., helpful, interesting)	11	64.7%
Negative (e.g., long, too time consuming)	5	29.4%
Neutral (e.g., confused)	1	5.9%

N=17 (those who provided comment)

Table 6

Overall Rating of Anderson 5 Teaching More, Using Less to Teach (Grades 9-12)

Overall Rating	Number	Percent
Not Worth My Time	0	0.0%
Probably Worth My Time	7	24.1%
Definitely Worth My Time	22	75.9%

Figure 2

Items from the Reading, Researching, and Thinking Like a Writer Workshops

Items	Responses			
1. As a result of the “hands on, interactive” presentation of this workshop, I am confident that I will be able to use this thematic instructional unit with my students.	Strongly Agree	Generally Agree	Generally Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. I have a better understanding of how to incorporate multiple ELA indicators into my regular instruction.				
3. I have a better understanding of how to incorporate informational texts into my regular instruction.				
4. I have a better understanding of how to incorporate ELA research indicators into my regular instruction.				
5. I have a better understanding of how to integrate ELA and social studies indicators into my regular instruction.				
6. The presenter was able to offer additional suggestions and strategies to help me modify my instructional activities.				
7. Participating in the activities as a “student” gave me a better understanding of how to use the thematic unit.				
8. Discussing the activities and materials provided opportunities to ask questions and to clarify my thinking.				
9. Having both a hard copy and an electronic version (i.e., flash drive) of the thematic unit will make it easier for me to use these materials.				
10. Having one of the WIN consultants model instructional strategies with my students would be beneficial for me.				

Table 7

Berkeley Reading, Researching, and Thinking Like a Writer Workshop (Grades K-2)

Item #	n	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	63	2.7	5	20	25	13
2	63	2.4	15	19	19	10
3	63	2.5	10	20	22	11
4	63	2.4	11	21	23	8
5	63	2.4	10	25	21	7
6	63	2.4	16	16	22	9
7	63	2.4	14	18	20	11
8	62	2.5	12	18	21	11
9	63	2.9	4	14	28	17
10	63	2.4	12	21	20	10
Percent		2.5	17.3%	30.5%	35.1%	17.0%

Table 8**Berkeley Reading, Researching, and Thinking Like a Writer Workshop (Grades 3-5)**

Item #	n	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	62	3.1	2	10	27	23
2	63	2.9	3	18	23	19
3	63	2.9	3	18	27	15
4	64	2.9	3	17	27	17
5	63	3.0	2	11	34	16
6	63	2.8	6	14	28	15
7	64	2.7	10	18	16	20
8	63	2.9	3	18	26	16
9	64	3.6	1	4	15	44
10	64	2.5	11	26	15	12
Percent		2.9	7.0%	24.3%	37.6%	31.1%

Table 9**Berkeley Reading, Researching, and Thinking Like a Writer Workshop (Grades 6-8)**

Item #	n	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	14	3.9	0	0	1	13
2	14	3.9	0	0	2	12
3	14	3.9	0	0	1	13
4	14	3.6	0	0	6	8
5	14	3.4	0	2	5	7
6	14	3.8	0	1	1	12
7	14	3.9	0	1	0	13
8	14	4.0	0	0	0	14
9	14	4.0	0	0	0	14
10	14	4.0	0	0	0	14
Percent		3.84	0.0%	2.9%	11.4%	85.7%

Table10**Berkeley Reading, Researching, and Thinking Like a Writer Workshop (Grades 9-12)**

Item #	n	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	20	3.7	0	1	6	13
2	20	3.7	0	1	8	11
3	20	3.8	0	0	5	15
4	20	3.3	0	4	9	7
5	20	3.2	1	3	11	5
6	20	3.7	0	1	4	15
7	20	3.8	0	0	4	16
8	20	3.9	0	0	2	18
9	20	3.9	0	1	2	17
10	19	3.7	0	3	5	11
Percent		3.7	0.5%	7.0%	28.1%	64.3%

Figure 3

Items from the Success in Reading and Writing Workshop

Items	Responses
As a result of this workshop, I have a better understand of how to demonstrate for students...	
1. comparing/contrasting ideas within and across literary texts to make inferences.	Strongly Disagree Generally Disagree Generally Agree Strongly Agree
2. analyzing the impact of point of view on literary texts.	
3. interpreting devices of figurative language.	
4. analyzing the relationship among character, plot, conflict, and theme in a given literary text.	
5. analyzing the effect of author’s craft on the meaning of literary texts.	
6. creating responses to literary texts through a variety of methods.	
7. using context clues to determine the meaning of technical terms and other unfamiliar words.	
8. analyzing the meaning of words using Greek and Latin roots and affixes.	
9. interpreting euphemisms and connotations of words to understand the meaning of a given text.	
10. organizing written works using prewriting techniques, discussions, graphic organizers, models, and outlines.	
11. using complete sentences in a variety of types.	
12. using grammatical conventions of written Standard American English.	
13. revising writing to improve clarity, tone, voice, content, and the development of ideas.	
14. editing written pieces for correct use of Standard American English.	
15. writing for a variety of purposes and audiences.	

Table 11

Eau Claire High School Success in Reading and Writing Workshop (Grades 9-12)

Item #	n	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	6	3.3	0	0	4	2
2	6	3.0	0	0	6	0
3	6	2.8	0	1	5	0
4	6	2.7	1	0	5	0
5	6	3.2	0	0	5	1
6	6	2.8	1	0	4	1
7	6	3.2	0	0	5	1
8	6	2.8	0	2	3	1
9	6	2.5	1	1	4	0
10	6	3.2	0	0	5	1
11	6	3.0	0	0	6	0
12	6	2.8	0	1	5	0
13	6	2.8	1	0	4	1
14	6	3.3	0	0	4	2
15	6	3.0	0	1	4	1
Percent		3.0	4.4%	6.7%	76.7%	12.2%

Figure 4
Items from the Scoring Workshops

Items	Pre-Post Responses			
	Strongly Agree	Generally Agree	Generally Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The 2008 writing standards and indicators are incorporated into the 15-point rubric.				
2. I am confident in my understanding of the State’s expectations for student performance on statewide assessment.				
3. I am confident in my understanding of how to use the Conventions Matrix.				
4. I am confident in my understanding of how to use the 15-point rubric score student writing.				
5. Student writing should always be graded or assessed.				
6. Student writing should always be graded or assessed using the 15-point rubric.				
7. Student writing should always be graded or assessed in all four domains.				
8. Student writing should always be graded or assessed for conventions.				
9. Scored student writing should always include feedback that uses the language of the rubric.				
10. Scored student writing should be used to inform instruction.				
11. Students should understand the language of the 15-point rubric.				
12. Computer-generated scoring of student writing provides accurate information that can be used to inform instruction.				

Note: Items 5, 7, 8, and 12 measure changes in teachers’ understanding of “incorrect” instructional and assessment practices. For example, *after* the workshop, teachers should understand that student writing *does not* always have to be graded or assessed.

Table 12
Darlington Scoring Workshop (Grades 6-8)

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	3.3	3.7	0.4
2	3.1	3.7	0.6
3	2.9	3.6	0.7
4	3.3	3.7	0.4
5	1.8	1.6	-0.2
6	2.0	2.0	0.0
7	1.8	1.7	-0.1
8	2.0	1.8	-0.2
9	3.1	3.6	0.5
10	3.6	3.9	0.3
11	3.7	4.0	0.3
12	2.6	1.8	-0.8
Total	2.8	2.9	0.2

Table 13
Darlington Scoring Workshop (Grades 9-12)

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	3.1	3.6	0.5
2	3.4	3.7	0.3
3	3.1	3.5	0.4
4	3.3	3.8	0.5
5	2.3	2.7	0.4
6	2.0	2.5	0.5
7	2.2	2.5	0.3
8	2.4	2.6	0.2
9	3.2	3.6	0.4
10	3.6	3.9	0.3
11	3.6	3.9	0.3
12	2.4	2.3	-0.1
Total	2.9	3.2	0.3

Table 14
Spartanburg Scoring Workshop (Grades 3-5)

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	3.8	4.0	0.2
2	3.0	3.5	0.5
3	2.7	3.4	0.7
4	2.8	3.5	0.7
5	2.3	2.4	0.1
6	2.5	2.4	-0.1
7	2.2	2.3	0.1
8	2.2	2.2	0.0
9	3.7	3.8	0.1
10	4.0	4.0	0.0
11	3.9	3.9	0.0
12	2.3	1.0	-1.3
Total	2.9	3.0	0.1

Table 15
Spartanburg Scoring Workshop (Grades 6-8)

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	3.7	4.0	0.3
2	3.3	4.0	0.7
3	3.0	3.7	0.7
4	3.2	4.0	0.8
5	2.3	2.0	-0.3
6	2.7	2.6	-0.1
7	1.6	1.6	0.0
8	1.6	1.7	0.1
9	3.6	4.0	0.4
10	3.9	4.0	0.1
11	4.0	4.0	0.0
12	2.7	1.8	-0.9
Total	3.0	3.1	0.2

Table 16
Spartanburg Scoring Workshop (Grades 9-12)

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	3.4	4.0	0.6
2	3.1	3.9	0.8
3	2.5	3.0	0.5
4	3.1	3.9	0.8
5	1.9	2.3	0.4
6	2.4	3.0	0.6
7	1.8	1.6	-0.2
8	1.8	1.6	-0.2
9	3.5	4.0	0.5
10	3.9	4.0	0.1
11	4.0	4.0	0.0
12	2.2	1.8	-0.4
Total	2.8	3.1	0.3

Figure 5

Items from the Strategies for Developing Higher Cognitive Level Multiple Choice Tests Workshop

Items	Responses			
1. I am confident in my understanding of the 2008 ELA standards and indicators.	Strongly Agree	Generally Agree	Generally Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. I am confident in my understanding of how to align my instructional plans to the rigor specified in the 2008 ELA standards and indicators.				
3. I am confident in my understanding of how to align my classroom assessments to the rigor specified in the 2008 ELA standards and indicators.				
4. I am confident in my understanding of how to revise my instructional plans and classroom assessments so that they align to the rigor specified in the 2008 ELA standards and indicators.				

Table 17

Eau Claire High School Developing Higher Cognitive Level Multiple Choice Tests Workshop

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	3.5	3.7	0.2
2	3.0	3.3	0.3
3	2.8	2.8	0.0
4	3.0	3.2	0.2
Total	3.1	3.2	0.2

Figure 6

Items from the Strategies for Developing Higher Cognitive Level Multiple Choice Tests Workshop

Items	Responses			
1. I am confident that ELA teachers at my school understand the 2008 ELA standards and indicators.	Strongly Agree	Generally Agree	Generally Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. I am confident that ELA teachers at my school understand how to align their instructional plans to the rigor specified in the 2008 ELA standards and indicators.				
3. I am confident that ELA teachers at my school understand how to align their classroom assessments to the rigor specified in the 2008 ELA standards and indicators.				
4. I am confident that ELA teachers at my school understand how to revise their instructional plans and classroom assessments so that they align to the rigor specified in the 2008 ELA standards and indicators.				

Table 18

Darlington Developing Higher Cognitive Level Multiple Choice Tests Workshop

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	2.9	2.3	-0.6
2	2.4	1.9	-0.5
3	2.2	1.8	-0.4
4	2.2	1.8	-0.4
Total	2.4	2.0	-0.5

Figure 7
Items from the PASS Writing Workshops

Items	Responses			
1. The multiple-choice writing questions are aligned to the 15-point rubric.	Strongly Agree	Generally Agree	Generally Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. I am confident in my understanding of how the State determines a student's Writing Performance Level.				
3. I am confident in my understanding of how to interpret PASS Writing scores.				
4. I am confident in my understanding of how to use test data to inform my instruction.				
5. I am confident in my understanding of how to use the Conventions Matrix.				
6. I am confident in my understanding of the 15-point rubric.				
7. Students should understand the language of the 15-point rubric.				

Table 19
Dillon 2 PASS Writing Workshop (Grades 3-5)

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	3.6	3.8	0.2
2	3.0	3.7	0.7
3	3.2	3.8	0.6
4	3.0	3.8	0.8
5	3.1	3.8	0.7
6	3.2	3.8	0.6
7	3.6	3.9	0.3
Total	3.2	3.8	0.6

Table 20
Dillon 2 PASS Writing Workshop (Grades 3-5)

	Number	Percent
Change	10	71.4%
No change	3	21.4%
No response	1	7.2%

Table 21
Dillon 2 PASS Writing Workshop (Grades 3-5)

	Number	Percent
Change	6	42.9%
No change	7	50.0%
No response	1	7.1%

Table 22
Dillon 2 PASS Writing Workshop (Grades 6-8)

Item #	Average Pre Score	Average Post Score	Average Gain
1	3.4	4.0	0.6
2	3.2	3.7	0.5
3	2.8	3.8	1.0
4	3.1	3.8	0.7
5	2.7	3.7	1.0
6	3.0	4.0	1.0
7	3.5	3.8	0.3
Total	3.1	3.8	0.7

Table 23
Dillon 2 PASS Writing Workshop (Grades 6-8)

	Number	Percent
Change	3	21.4%
No change	8	57.1%
No response	3	21.4%

Table 24
Dillon 2 PASS Writing Workshop (Grades 6-8)

	Number	Percent
Change	6	42.9%
No change	5	35.7%
No response	3	21.4%