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ABSTRACT

The complex task of reading, understanding, analyzing, synthesizing, and subsequently writing in response to a prompt about multiple texts required by the Common Core writing standards is difficult for many students, especially struggling writers and students with learning disabilities. The majority of elementary teachers report having less than adequate preparation in writing pedagogy and identify writing as the area they feel least prepared to teach. In this multiple probe across participants study, two teachers, a special education teacher and a cooperating general education teacher in whose classroom he worked, served as teacher participants. The special education teacher implemented Self-regulated Strategy Development
(SRSD) for informational writing citing text-based evidence from two sources following practice-based professional development (PBPD) with small groups of students. Three female and five male fifth-grade African American students teacher-identified as struggling writers or receiving Special Education services for a specific learning disability (LD) participated in the study. Research questions were: To what extent can SRSD be implemented with fidelity in small groups by a special education teacher in an inclusive general education setting? To what extent does SRSD instruction in the informational genre citing text-based evidence improve the writing skills of fifth grade students with LD or those who struggle in writing in terms of (a) analytic quality, (b) evidence of strategy use, and (c) length? To what extent is SRSD considered to be a socially valid intervention for use in inclusive education settings by the participating teachers and students? A teacher survey of classroom writing practices and observations of classroom writing practices were conducted prior to the intervention to contextualize current writing practices. Student writing probes were assessed for plagiarism, academic vocabulary, number of essay elements, evidence of strategy use, and length. Fidelity was collected for writing prompt administration, PBPD, and SRSD. The teacher implemented with high fidelity and rated PBPD favorably both before and after intervention. Following intervention, student analytic quality, evidence of strategy use, and number of words written increased. Instances of plagiarism were decreased following intervention. SRSD was rated high on measures of social validity by both students and teachers.
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CHAPTER 1
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In studies conducted by the National Commission on Writing (NCOW, 2004; 2005), human resource directors in both public and private sectors identified writing skills as being in high demand in the list of responsibilities for professional and clerical workers and as a deciding factor in both initial hiring and ongoing promotion opportunities. Additionally, the NCOW estimates that 3.1 billion dollars are spent annually on remediation of writing skills in the private sector (2004) while an additional quarter of a billion are spent on these services for government employees (2005).

Writing is also of high value in classroom settings as writing is used for both attaining and displaying knowledge. Writing is a tool with broad application allowing students to demonstrate and solidify understanding as well as note connections both within and across content area learning (Graham & Hebert, 2010; Graham & Perin, 2007a, 2007b). When students write in response to new learning, both knowledge acquisition and retention of information increase (Bangert-Drowns, Hurley, & Wilkinson, 2004; Graham & Hebert, 2010). New instructional aims have brought greater focus to writing.

Informational Genre Citing Text-based Evidence

Forty-two states, the District of Columbia, four territories, and the Department of Defense Education Activity have adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and other non-participating states have opted to use similar, but locally-created standards (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). Core foci of these standards for English Language Arts (ELA) instruction include
immersion in complex, content-rich nonfiction texts, acquisition and use of academic language, and use of evidence from a variety of source texts.

Greater focus has been placed on students writing in the informational genre. Writing in the informational genre is an act of knowledge sharing that supports both the reader and writer in learning new information and reexamining conclusions by exploring concepts and relationships (USDOE, 2001). Essential drivers of the informational genre are accuracy and a purpose of increasing readers’ knowledge. Writers may acquire information from primary or secondary sources and must effectively select applicable examples, facts, and details (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010).

Following are a sample of standards for fifth grade students related to writing informational texts in response to reading multiple source texts: (a) Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas and information clearly, (b) 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, (c) Develop the topic with facts, definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples related to the topic, (d) Link ideas within and across categories of information using words, phrases, and clauses, (e) Use precise language and domain-specific vocabulary to inform about or explain the topic, (f) Provide a concluding statement or section related to the information or explanation presented, (g) Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research, (h) Apply Grade 5 Reading standards to informational texts, and (i) Conduct short research projects that use several sources to build knowledge through investigation of different aspects of a topic standards.
A specific change introduced with the CCSS is a reduced value on personal opinion essays and experiential narrative and an increased value of the use of textual evidence across all genres (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). Text-based evidence refers to evidence students draw from the source text to explain and support their response to the writing prompt. This is in contrast to information students might be expected to know without relying on text (e.g., Write an informational essay about your hometown). Throughout this paper, the writing task is referred to as the informational genre citing text-based evidence to differentiate this specific task from other types of informational essays (e.g., explain how to make a peanut butter sandwich) which do not include this additional expectation of using evidential support from a source text for the answer offered.

In accord with the shift in curriculum (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010), there has been a shift in the requirements of the associated high-stakes writing assessments. Prior assessments have included questions that required students to describe a field trip they would like to take or write an essay about the time they awoke with the ability to fly. The tests offered by Smarter Balanced, and many of the locally-created assessments aligned with the CCSS, are structured to include multiple informational source texts (and occasionally videos) grouped based on content which students are expected to synthesize (Georgia Department of Education, 2015; Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, 2016). These are followed by a demand writing task, a writing prompt that asks students to integrate and apply the knowledge gathered across multiple source texts to effectively present answers to the questions posed. In summary, students are expected to read
multiple source texts; maintain the knowledge over time and additional readings; synthesize that
knowledge across documents; consider all aspects of the prompt which may include multiple
questions; select appropriate examples to cite or summarize that demonstrate their knowledge
and do not distract from the essay; and then engage in the tasks of planning and drafting for a
given audience. Previous research indicates acquiring, assimilating, and applying knowledge
gleaned from text has been challenging for students (Gunning, 2003).

Writing Performance of Students with Learning Disabilities and Struggling Writers

These tasks provide a variety of challenges to young writers, but may prove especially
challenging to students with learning disabilities (LD) and struggling writers. Foremost is that
these tasks do not measure writing ability independent of reading ability. That is, the student’s
ability to decode and make meaning of text will moderate potential for success on the writing
tasks. The two are not assessed independently, and a student with reading difficulties or even
inadequate schema in the chosen topic will be at a disadvantage for both the reading and writing
portions of the assessment whereas a student only lacking skills in writing will be able to
perform adequately on the reading task.

Another challenge is that the identifying characteristics of the writing habits of students
with LD and struggling writers such as ineffective planning, organization, and execution are in
direct opposition to successful completion of this task (Bui, Schumaker, & Deschler, 2006;
Graham, Harris, & Mason, 2005; MacArthur & Graham, 1987). Students with LD and struggling
writers fail to use an adequate amount of time for planning prior to beginning the drafting
process (De La Paz, 1999; De La Paz & Graham, 1997; Garcia-Sanchez & Fidalgo-Redondo,
2006; Graham, 1990; Graham, Schwartz, & MacArthur, 1993; Lienemann, Graham, Leader-
Janssen, & Reid, 2006; Troia, Graham, & Harris, 1999), and then rarely consult their plan
throughout the writing process (Graham, 2006). Students with LD and struggling writers demonstrate more limited understanding of genre elements when compared to peers who are more skillful writers and this often contributes to less complex, or even less complete, essays (De La Paz, 1999; De La Paz & Graham, 1997; Graham et al., 2005; Lienemann et al., 2006; Olinghouse, Graham, & Gillespie, 2013; Troia et al., 1999). Students with LD and struggling writers encounter difficulty in execution of the writing process and maintaining self-regulation throughout the most cognitively demanding task asked of children in the school setting (De La Paz, Swanson, & Graham, 1993; Graham & Harris, 2009).

The majority of students with LD and struggling writers receive writing instruction in the regular education classroom (Graham & Harris, 2015). Thus, they are subjected to a self-reported lack of teacher preparation (Graham, Harris, Fink-Chorzempa, & MacArthur, 2003) and limited exposure to writing (Brindle, Graham, Harris, & Hebert, 2016).

**Self-Regulated Strategy Development**

Evidence-based practices are assigned that status if multiple experimental or quasi-experimental studies of high quality and rigor have been conducted and practically significant outcomes were achieved (Gersten et al., 2005; Horner et al., 2005). Use of the most effective practices improves student performance (Cook & Odom, 2013). Strategies instruction has the strongest impact on writing performance, and SRSD has the highest impact of all strategies instruction across several meta-analyses (Gillespie & Graham, 2014; Graham, McKeown, Kiuhara, & Harris, 2012; Graham & Perin, 2007a, 2007b). SRSD for writing was declared an evidence-based practice by multiple entities and is deemed effective for students in Grades 2 through 12, including students with learning and behavioral disabilities, English language learners, and students at risk of academic failure (Baker, Chard, Ketterlin-Geller, Apichatabutra,
SRSD, a multi-component, criterion-based instructional approach created to support the adoption of new learning, is an effective intervention to improve student writing (Gillespie & Graham, 2014; Graham, McKeown et al., 2012). The instructional approach is recursive, allowing teachers to repeat lessons and revisit concepts across the course of implementation based on the specific needs of the learners (Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2003). It consists of the following six, recursive, flexible stages of instruction: (a) develop background knowledge, (b) discuss it, (c) model it, (d) memorize it, (e) support it, and (f) independent performance (Harris, Graham, Brindle, & Sandmel, 2009; Harris, Graham, Mason, & Friedlander, 2008). The framework includes explicit instructional procedures to support students in self-regulation throughout the writing process while addressing deficits in initial schema, genre knowledge, and self-efficacy. SRSD also addresses motivation by developing students’ attributions both to effort in learning the strategies and to using them. Several studies have extended the external validity of the strategy across a variety of populations including students with LD (LD; Graham & Harris, 2003; Graham, Harris, & MacArthur, 1993), students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders (Ennis, Jolivette, & Boden, 2013), students with Attention Deficit Disorders (Lienemann & Reid, 2008; Reid, Hagaman, & Graham, 2014), struggling writers (Lane, Graham, Harris, & Weisenbach, 2006; McKeown, Brindle, Harris, Graham, & Collins, 2016), and also in a variety of genres including narrative (Lane et al., 2006; Mason, Harris, & Graham, 2002; McKeown et al., 2016; Saddler, 2006), expository (Mason, Snyder, Sukhram, & Kedem, 2006), and persuasive (Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2002; McKeown et al., 2017).
Implementation of SRSD provides a framework for teachers to scaffold student performance by way of gradual release of responsibility following modeled lessons and offers students a structured approach to each genre that lightens the cognitive load during the writing process (Harris & Graham, 2017). Planning strategies associated with SRSD provide foundational support to the genre that students can return to throughout the writing process refocusing them on the task at hand and the topic most recently addressed, as well as the essential components of the genre.

Theoretical Support

Over time, findings from several theories and disciplines of learning were integrated to form SRSD. These include cognitive, behavioral, affective, as well as sociocultural theory. Hayes and Flower (1980) investigated and described stages of the writing process, but reported that the process was not linear, but rather recursive in nature. Cognitive-behavioral theory and cognitive strategies instruction support the development of self-regulation through self-talk allowing students to move through the recursive process of writing in a more supported method increasing the likelihood of improved written performance, interactive learning, and explicit modeling (Harris & Graham, 2017; Harris & Pressley, 1991; Meichenbaum, 1977; Meichenbaum & Goodman, 1971). Components of SRSD that stem from cognitive-behavioral theory include establishing achievable goals, charting progress toward the goals across time, using memory strategies to recall key components of the genre (i.e., a good opening that catches the reader’s attention, effective transition words, academic vocabulary use, an ending that wraps it up right.) and self-statements directed at process (e.g. “Ok, that’s done. I’ll check it off. Now I can go back to my plan. I have a strategy.”). Motivational aspects of self-regulation are also addressed
through self-talk (e.g., “Wow, I’ve completed two parts already. Two more to go. I can do this.”) and use of graphic organizers to plot progress (e.g., rockets; Graham, 2006).

Detractors of SRSD often do not acknowledge the constructivist and sociocultural theories embedded in the instructional method. Fundamental principles of SRSD derived from constructivist and sociocultural theories of learning include scaffolding, the gradual release of responsibility from instructor to student across time; teacher modeling; teacher coaching as students move to more independent work; active engaged learning; and meaningful discussion assessing and then building on what students already know (Harris & Graham, 2017; Pressley, Harris, & Marks, 1992; Vygotsky, 1978; 2004). In SRSD, instructors begin by developing the background knowledge and discussing both the strategy and expectations of the genre or skill. Then teachers explicitly and systematically model use of the strategy from beginning to end, including student participation in the process to the degree they can be successful. Another modeling session follows where students are increasingly engaged in the strategy application. In the final stages, students practice application of the strategy with teacher support prior to being released to independent performance (Harris et al., 2002). This entire process aligns with the Vygotskian principle of social demonstration of performance by adults in social settings as a precursor to children adopting the performance for themselves and honors the concept of the zone of proximal development (Harris & Graham, 2017; Vygotsky, 1978).

Another artifact of the socio-historical tradition embedded in SRSD is the pervasive self-talk. Vygotsky (1962) outlines how the tool of language becomes the very means of self-regulatory talk with which societal norms are adopted. SRSD includes explicit demonstrations of self-talk by the teacher, encourages students to notice and record that self-talk, and then list specific phrases that support self-regulation to be used during the composing process (Graham &
Harris, 1989). SRSD provides individualized instruction throughout, using collaboration between student and teacher to create differentiated instruction for each student. The criterion-based nature of the intervention further individualizes each student’s experience as progress through the phases is determined by the student’s ability to achieve mastery within each phase.

**SRSD for Students with LD and Struggling Writers**

Students with LD and struggling writers encounter difficulty in execution of the writing process and maintaining self-regulation throughout the most cognitively demanding task asked of children in the school setting (De La Paz et al., 1993; Graham & Harris, 2009). SRSD has demonstrated positive effects when implemented to support students with LD and struggling writers in the planning and ideation, drafting, and revision processes (De La Paz, 1999; De La Paz et al., 1993; Graham & Harris, 2009; Troia et al., 1999). Through self-regulatory statements, students are encouraged to spend more time on the initial stages of planning and consult the plan regularly throughout the composing process. SRSD has demonstrated positive effects in process execution and in supporting self-regulation (De La Paz et al., 1993; Graham & Harris, 2009). SRSD supports students in initial planning and organization and encourages students to refer back to the plan by using self-regulatory statements (De La Paz & Graham, 1997). This results in both improved ideation and organization.

Students with LD and struggling writers may demonstrate an inflated sense of their proficiencies with regard to writing ability, though this wanes as the students age (Graham et al., 1993). One aspect of SRSD that supports accurate assessment of performance is self-evaluation. Students may use checklists or graphing materials to assess if all essential elements of a genre are included and if students are consistently engaging in good writing practices (i.e., use of strong openings, transition words, academic vocabulary). This provides concrete feedback on
performance as well as an opportunity to achieve success. The additional support through the
process with self-regulatory self-talk first modeled by the teacher, and eventually carried out by
the student also encourages self-evaluation (e.g., “Do I have all my parts? Did I include enough
evidence to teach my readers something new?) Students can more accurately assess writing
performance based on implementation of the strategy and an evaluation of analytic quality rather
than what may be a skewed concept of personal abilities.

In a recent meta-analysis of writing interventions for students with LD (Gillespie &
Graham, 2014), seven of the 15 studies involving strategies instruction used SRSD. The average
weighted effect size for these studies was 1.33, statistically larger than strategies instruction
studies not using SRSD. Maintenance was assessed in only two of the studies, but in both cases
students in experimental conditions outperformed those in control conditions at maintenance
testing (De La Paz & Graham, 1997; Troia & Graham, 2002). In a recent meta-analysis of
writing instruction for students in elementary grades, explicit strategies instruction, self-
regulation procedures, strategies for enhancing genre knowledge, setting clear and specific goals,
and strategies for planning and ideation all were found to produce positive effects for students
considered to be struggling writers (Graham, McKeown et al., 2012). Each of these instructional
strategies is included in the SRSD instructional approach.

SRSD has been demonstrated effective with students identified as struggling writers and
students with LD (Gillespie & Graham, 2014; Rogers & Graham, 2008). The average weighted
effect size for SRSD instruction in a recent meta-analysis was 1.17, and when moderator
analyses were run to account for variance, type of student (full range vs struggling) did not
moderate effect sizes for SRSD (Graham, McKeown et al., 2012). Previous studies of SRSD
have included students with disabilities and were included in meta-analyses as struggling writers
and in other cases struggling writers were identified by teacher nomination or performance on a pre-intervention measure never having received a disability diagnosis.

**Practice-based Professional Development**

The majority of elementary-grade teachers report insufficient educational or professional development (PD) opportunities related to writing instruction (Gilbert & Graham, 2010). Without quality PD, teachers are limited in their ability to implement evidence-based practices (Cook & Odom, 2013; Klingner, Ahwee, & Pilonieta, 2003). Many interventions are compromised when moved to school settings by inadequate delivery (Groskreutz & Higbee, 2011; Klingner et al., 2003), a concern that may be addressed through effective PD. Complex interventions require that instructors are experienced with the strategies to be comfortable differentiating instruction for all learners (Graham & Harris, 1993; Schumm, Vaughn, & Haager, 1994; Schumm et al., 1995).

PBPD is a model of PD in which teachers are engaged in practice during the PD to support their eventual practice in the classroom. PBPD focuses on content and pedagogy (Ball & Cohen, 1999). PBPD is characterized by (a) working together in teams of colleagues, (b) differentiated training reflecting the needs in participating teachers’ classrooms, (c) experts assessing content knowledge of participating teachers and addressing deficiencies, (d) experts explicitly modeling each lesson before teachers are then asked to practice each full lesson with an audience of one or more participating teachers followed by peer feedback, (e) using the same materials in PD that they will use during implementation in their respective classrooms, and (f) receiving feedback from experts in the areas of both differentiation and performance during the independent practice (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Ball & Forzani, 2009; Harris et al., 2012b;
McKeown, FitzPatrick, & Sandmel, 2014). Following, support from the PD literature for components of PBPD as enacted for SRSD is highlighted.

**Collaboration.** During PBPD, teachers work in teams of colleagues. Collective participation allows for learning to take place between professionals in the field to reap the full benefit of skills that exist within the community of learners while removing a degree of isolation often present in education (Birman, Desimone, Porter, & Garet, 2000; Brownell, Adams, & Sindelar, 2006; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Desimone, 2011; McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). Ball and Cohen (1999) outline several dispositions that should be developed in teacher education with intent of providing better instruction to students. Some of these are as follows: inquiry, reflection, professional judgment, collaboration, critique, and creation of a safe environment for risk-taking, perception. All of these dispositions are addressed as teams of colleagues work together during PBPD for SRSD.

**Differentiation.** Ball and Cohen (1999) suggest that quality PD requires teachers to be deeply invested in the knowledge, methods of understanding, and characteristics of their students. Contextualizing PD to the teacher’s classroom, allowing consideration of student characteristics and highlighting opportunities for differentiation is considered essential for improving teacher knowledge and practice (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Brownell et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Hochberg, 2010; McLeskey & Waldron, 2002; Schumm et al., 1994; Smith & Desimone, 2003). Disseminating information and outlining practices that serve diverse learners most appropriately provides teachers and administrators an opportunity to maximize instructional capacity (Hochberg, 2010; Schumm et al., 1994). Usefulness is critical. Thus, quality PD would be defined as connected to or derivative from work with students (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Smith & Desimone, 2003).
**Content knowledge.** Subject-specific PD is more effective in teacher learning outcomes (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Ball & Forzani, 2009; Birman et al., 2000; Desimone, 2009; 2011; Smith & Desimone, 2003). Quality PD should seek to address the gaps between present instruction and the required standards of the curriculum (Hochberg, 2010). It is imperative teachers demonstrate adequate knowledge of the content. For the informational genre, that would include an understanding of structure, organization, use of the genre, and related vocabulary. Additionally, teachers’ understanding of inviting introductions, strong conclusions, appropriate support from source texts, academic vocabulary, transition use, and plagiarism should be addressed. The PBPD model is flexible enough to capitalize on areas in which teachers have a wealth of knowledge and also to invest in areas of instruction where teachers’ content knowledge may need to be addressed (McKeown et al., 2014). Teachers who perceive themselves with greater knowledge and efficacy related to a content area are more likely to engage in use of evidence-based practices (Brindle et al., 2016).

**Explicit modeling and feedback.** Ball & Forzani (2009) called for practice to be the centerpiece of PD. Modeling allows teachers to view the new knowledge in context. Through modeling, practitioners may experiment with methods of achieving success while applying the newly acquired knowledge (Ball & Forzani, 2009). Active learning embraces participation in observation, either as observer or the one being observed, and debriefing with detailed feedback directed at continuous improvement (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Birman et al., 2000; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Desimone, 2009, 2011). These elements are central to PBPD.

**Use of evidence.** With increasing federal mandates to use empirical evidence to guide instruction and thus PD, Cochran-Smith and the Boston College Evidence team (2009) suggested it be included as a characteristic of PD and extend even further to suggest that school sites should
aspire to a pervasive culture of evidence. Specifically, evidence should be the centerpiece of decision-making (Klingner, 2016). The argument is that all PD rests to some degree on value judgments, so evidence, objective evaluation, and detachment should lead decision-making. When PBPD is adapted for SRSD, teachers are taught to assess student mastery of performance prior to graduation to the following lessons, and they are also introduced to the wealth of research literature supporting SRSD.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this review is two-pronged: (a) to identify the existing research base in the area of SRSD for the informational genre when implemented with students in Grades 2 to 5 and (b) to identify the existing literature base for PBPD when adapted for SRSD implementation. For the first review, the search criteria and methods for the literature review are presented. The second review was conducted to summarize and synthesize studies of PBPD for SRSD. The search criteria and methods for the second literature review are presented. Results are presented, and studies meeting inclusion criteria are summarized and synthesized. The chapter closes with a discussion of results from both searches.

**SRSD: Article Search**

An extensive search of published, peer-reviewed journal articles was conducted using the Georgia State University’s library website in July 2016 and updated May 2017 using the following databases: (a) Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), (b) PsycINFO, (c) Proquest, and (e) EBSCO. The search included the following search terms: “self-regulated strategy development” (both with and without the hyphen in this and all future terms) in correlation with each of the following terms as separate searches: writing, explanatory, and inform*. Additionally, an ancestral search of seven meta-analyses of writing was conducted.
Inclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria for this literature review included: (a) studies had to be conducted with students in Grades 2-5 in non-residential, public elementary schools; (b) studies had to include struggling writers or students with LD; (c) the writing intervention, SRSD, had to address explanatory or informational writing; (d) a report of student writing performance was included; and (e) studies had to be published in a peer-reviewed journal within the ten years preceding the search.

In this section, articles meeting inclusion criteria are summarized individually and considered as a whole. Of the 62 articles that remained, 19 were not studies (reviews, research-to-practice, etc.), two were conducted outside of the U.S., 13 were outside of Grades 2-5, three did not involve an intervention, three involved an intervention that was not SRSD (commonly the study was included because SRSD was included in the reference section), 19 used SRSD for other genres, and one (Mason, 2004) was excluded because the SRSD instruction was only associated with reading, not with the written retells. Two articles met inclusion criteria.

Articles were coded for several common quality indicators including description of participants and setting, design, fidelity, and results (Horner et al., 2005). To determine areas of similarity and difference to one another, articles were also coded for genre of instruction, who implemented the instruction, assessment type and time (e.g., pre/post), length of intervention, maintenance measures, and social validity.

SRSD for the Informational Genre

This search was limited to elementary grades. It should be noted that there is some, but little SRSD research for variations of the informational genre (e.g., informational quick writes) at
the middle school level (Benedek-Wood, Mason, Wood, Hoffman, & McGuire, 2014; Mason, Reid, & Hagaman, 2012). Results yielded two studies that employed SRSD for informational writing for students in Grades 2 through 5 (see Table 1). In depth summaries of each of the two studies follow. Then a discussion is offered.

**Mason, Davison, Hammer, Miller, and Glutting, 2013.** Mason and colleagues (2013) conducted a randomized controlled trial with 77 low-achieving Grade 4 students. Two separate studies were included. Study one was an experimental components analysis in which students were randomly assigned to SRSD for reading comprehension instruction, SRSD for reading comprehension and writing instruction for informational essays, or to a no-treatment control. In the second study, Mason, Davison, Hammer and Miller added semantic and syntactic performance analyses. Trained graduate assistants taught groups of four students randomly assigned from nine separate classrooms in 18-22 thirty-minute lessons conducted outside of the classroom. Fidelity of implementation was collected with an instructor self-report checklist and 33% of all sessions were audio recorded and evaluated using the same checklist. Instructional providers self-reported fidelity was 99% and fidelity conducted by trained GRAs listening to audiotapes was 87%. Student written retellings, untimed writing tasks probed by verbal request of a retell following the reading of a passage, were administered at pretest, posttest, and maintenance (two months following the end of instruction). Writing was scored for number of information units, holistic quality, syntactic complexity, mean length of utterance, number of total words, and number of different words. Maintenance assessments were conducted two months after instruction ended. There were no generalization measurements for writing.

Students in both treatment groups outperformed control condition in written retelling and semantic measures. Students in the reading and writing intervention for written retell obtained
higher scores than the control group for written information unit, quality scores, number of different words used, and number of total words used than control but were not significantly different from the reading strategy alone. There were no significant effects for syntactic complexity or mean length of utterance. Social validity was not reported.

The authors suggest future research address multi-structural indicators and text consistency for future assessment of grammar and syntax in written language.

**Mason, Snyder, Sukhram, & Kedem, 2006.** Mason and colleagues (2006) conducted a multiple baseline with multiple probe design across subjects with nine fourth grade low-achieving students, four students with LD and five students without disabilities, to assess the effects of SRSD writing instruction for informative writing. A member of the research team taught the reading comprehension and informational writing strategy in an average of 15 30-minute sessions. Student written retellings, untimed writing tasks probed by verbal request of a retell following the reading of a passage, were administered during baseline. Additional baseline assessments were conducted for Legs 2 and 3 participants following instruction for Leg 1, and again for Leg 3 following instruction for Leg 2. Written retells were scored for number of main ideas, holistic quality, number of information units, and number of words. Fidelity of implementation was collected with an instructor self-report checklist and 30% of all sessions were audio recorded and evaluated using the same checklist. Instructional providers self-reported fidelity was 99% and fidelity conducted by trained GRAs listening to audio tapes was 97% respectively. Maintenance probes were administered at 4-6 weeks for Legs 1 and 2. Leg 3 was administered maintenance probes at Weeks 4 and 12. Generalization measures were not reported.

Evidence of student reading comprehension improved to criterion in written retells following SRSD instruction. Written retells were longer, better organized, included a greater
number of information units, and maintained above-baseline in maintenance assessments even across the summer break for some students. Students answered six questions in oral interviews regarding treatment acceptability, and all participants reported improved reading and writing performance. The authors suggest future research consider student motivation supports, component analyses, and replication with a larger, more diverse sample.

**Summary of SRSD Literature for the Informational Genre in Upper Elementary Grades**

The literature base for implementing SRSD for writing informational essays with upper elementary students is sparse. Only two studies met inclusion criteria. Both studies included students with and without LD (Mason et al., 2006; 2013). Although the search spanned four grade levels, results included only students in Grades 4. Both were conducted outside of the classroom in small groups by members of a research team, and writing assessments were written retells of a reading passage photocopied from a science or social studies textbook (Mason et al., 2006; 2013). Maintenance probes were collected for both studies (Mason et al., 2006; 2013). Both studies resulted in improved performance. In the two articles by Mason and colleagues (2006, 2013), outlines and essays were evaluated for number of informational units included in the summary that were derived from reading the text, holistic scores, and number of total words among other measures.

**PBPD: Article Search**

An extensive search of published, peer-reviewed journal articles was conducted using Georgia State University’s library website in March 2017 using the following databases: (a) Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), (b) PsycInfo, (c) Proquest, and (e) EBSCO. The search included the following search terms: “self-regulated strategy development” (both with and without the hyphen in this and all future terms) and “practice-based professional
development.” Additional search terms were designated a priori, but these two leaned the results to ten articles and the database search was discontinued. All articles meeting inclusion criteria were subjected to an ancestral search of references. Finally, at least one author from each article meeting inclusion criteria was contacted to recommend any studies that had been conducted, but were not yet published.

**Inclusion Criteria.** As the literature for this topic was anticipated to be sparse, the inclusion criteria were purposefully not restrictive. Articles had to be concentrated on results from PBPD implemented with teachers for SRSD and be published in a peer-reviewed journal in the last ten years.

Of the ten articles that remained after duplicates were removed from search results, four had cited an article that had “practice-based professional development” in its title, and hence, the term appeared in the reference list. One mentioned that “practice-based professional development” was often used to train teachers who implement SRSD, but no further details were given. Five articles met inclusion criteria. The ten articles resulting from the search were evaluated independently by another researcher using the same inclusion criteria. Reliability of identification was 1.00.

An ancestral search of references was conducted on all articles meeting inclusion criteria. A seminal study for this content was not found with the original search (Harris et al., 2012a) and was included following the ancestral search. Finally, at least one author from each article meeting inclusion criteria was contacted regarding additional studies. These two procedures yielded five additional studies.

Articles were coded for (a) setting, (b) participants, (c) design, (d) independent variables, (e) dependent variables, (f) results, (g) social validity, and (h) fidelity of implementation.
PBPD for SRSD in Writing

Results yielded 11 studies that employed PBPD for SRSD. Nine studies are presented in alphabetical order in Table 1.2. Two additional articles met inclusion criteria, but are more appropriately suited to summarization and thus, in-depth summaries of these two articles are offered in alphabetical order followed by a discussion of the results.

McKeown et al., (2017). In this qualitative study employing grounded theory, McKeown and colleagues (2017) report the results of focus groups conducted with 14 second- and third-grade teachers following implementation during a randomized controlled trial of SRSD following PBPD (Harris et al., 2012a). Teachers reported overall favorable reviews of PBPD and the small group size during the PD. Three teachers reported hesitancy to differentiate the lessons due the nature of the research study. Twelve of fourteen teachers evaluated the lesson plans positively whereas two were concerned about the density and font. Teachers reported high student engagement with genre-specific mnemonics and a positive response to exemplar essays provided during PBPD.

One consideration to address was how the graphic organizers are used to support students with specific consideration being given to whether they are distributed or whether students are responsible for creating them. Teachers reported that teaching students to condense ideas into brief notes was a challenge. McKeown and colleagues (2017) suggested more extensive discussion of notetaking during the explicit and collaborative models as well as offering positive feedback on the planning completed by students. Teachers reported modeling to be difficult and awkward, but recognized its value in student writing performance. Teachers reported a variety of strategies for using the self-evaluation tools, and McKeown and colleagues (2017) suggested fading these tools across time as students internalize genre components and the novelty factor of
the exercise decreases. Overwhelmingly, teachers reported positive student outcomes, improved confidence, and a willingness to get started when writing tasks were presented. Additionally, teachers reported that students engaged with writing more independently, and writing performance was also more independent. Teachers reported several anecdotes of generalization.

Specific areas suggested for improvement are combining SRSD writing instruction with mechanics of writing, extending the strategy to meet the needs of more talented writers, and using small groups and pairs more effectively.

**McKeown, FitzPatrick, and Sandmel, 2014.** McKeown and colleagues (2014) reviewed three studies prior studies of PBPD for SRSD (Harris, 2012b; Kiuha, 2013; McKeown, 2012) and combined those findings with a qualitative sample of teacher interviews, and anecdotal notes from hundreds of hours of practical experiences implementing PBPD with teachers across a variety of genres to compile a list of suggestions for successful implementation for all teachers, and then specifically for teachers who work with students with E/BD.

**Developing teachers’ investment.** McKeown and colleagues (2014) suggest three factors impact teacher investment in PBPD: (a) volunteerism, (b) evidence of impact, and (c) common beliefs about writing. Volunteerism, choice rather than mandated attendance, may influence teachers’ willingness to engage in PBPD (McKeown et al., 2014). McKeown and colleagues (2014) also called for researchers to offer compelling evidence to teachers to encourage fidelity in implementation of SRSD for writing with specific regard to humanizing data. Effect sizes may be convincing to researchers and policymakers, but teachers in PD when asked to assess which impacted them more consistently chose the story of one student over effect sizes representative of thousands. The authors suggested use of research, anecdotes and examples of student writing. Common beliefs such as a focus on grammar instruction or reluctance to
engage in extended modeling can impede teachers’ ability to implement with fidelity and should be addressed during PBPD.

**Logistical consideration.** McKeown and colleagues (2014) also addressed the timing and length of PBPD, gaps in instruction and group size during PD. Due to the differentiated nature of PBPD, teachers benefit when they have had time to learn the skills and talents of their students, so PBPD is often not most appropriately offered during the summer break. Teachers also reported that they would like to begin implementation shortly after PBPD, but still have time to prepare appropriately. Gaps in instruction that may occur due to academic calendars or test preparation must be addressed to insure fidelity of SRSD administration. To this end, McKeown and colleagues (2014) suggested more detailed fidelity checklists to provide additional support to teachers and to encourage review of the metascripts associated with lessons prior to implementation. Shorter writing tasks and extending SRSD instruction to meet the need of students with E/BD were addressed.

**Teacher engagement.** Several suggestions were made by McKeown and colleagues (2014) to foster teacher engagement throughout PBPD as well as during the implementation of SRSD. Teachers responded positively to requests to customize lesson components, specifically the memory aid associated with the genre and exemplar essays. McKeown and colleagues (2014) discussed how teacher modeling of the writing process embedded in SRSD was performed fully during PBPD. Modeling is an opportunity for teachers to address specific student needs that may present themselves in their classrooms. This may be related to behavior, self-regulation, use of academic vocabulary, or a myriad of other concerns. Moreover, this is unique to each classroom and each group of students. McKeown and colleagues (2014) called for leaders to be “deliberate and systematic in creating essays” (p. 22) during the explicit model performed for the students.
McKeown and colleagues (2014) also called for researchers to systematically offer instruction in implementing with fidelity during PBPD, with specific suggestions for training on using the fidelity checklist successfully and reviewing metascripts prior to classroom implementation.

**Addressing needs of students with E/BD.** McKeown and colleagues (2014) offered tailored suggestions for teachers working with students with E/BD. These included shorter writing assignments, shortening the length of the lessons, allowing students additional input during the extended explicit model such as asking students to take notes either publicly or privately. Self-statements and behavioral supports were also considered essential in meeting the needs of students with E/BD during SRSD implementation.

**Summary of PBPD for SRSD Literature**

Including the two articles previously summarized, eleven studies have evaluated PBPD for SRSD in writing (Festas et al., 2015; Harris, Graham, & Adkins, 2015; Harris et al., 2012a; 2012b; 2016; Kiuhara et al., 2013; McKeown et al., 2016; 2017; McKeown, FitzPatrick, Hendrick, & Brindle, 2015; McKeown, FitzPatrick, & Sandmel, 2014; McKeown & Patton-Terry, 2016). The studies of PBPD spanned a variety of grade levels (range = 2 to 8) with most of the studies (n = 8) addressing students in Grades 2 to 5. A special education teacher provided instruction in one study (Harris et al., 2016). PBPD for SRSD implementation was primarily conducted in the Southeastern U.S. (n = 7) and in urban settings (n = 7). PBPD for SRSD has primarily been used to address narrative (n = 5) and opinion/persuasive writing (n = 5) with some studies featuring both genres (n = 2). Only one study addressed informational writing (McKeown et al., 2016), and source texts were not used for evidence in that study. Seven studies did not include social validity measures for the PBPD, though two of those featured participants who later participated in focus groups and their comments regarding the PD were captured in a
separate article (McKeown et al., 2017). Four studies did not include reports of social validity for students. However, across the studies reports of social validity for both teachers and students were favorable, when collected. While fidelity of SRSD implementation was reported consistently across the majority of studies, fidelity of PBPD was reported in only one study (McKeown et al., 2016). SRSD implementation fidelity was moderate to high in all studies reporting fidelity and student performance in writing was meaningfully improved.

**Discussion**

Little research of SRSD in the informational genre has been conducted for elementary grades, but the studies that have been conducted demonstrate positive results for student writing performance (Mason et al., 2006; 2013). The two studies identified as SRSD implementations in the informational genre feature a summary writing task, a retell of informational text, evaluated for main ideas as the primary writing measure (Mason et al., 2006; 2013). Summary writing in response to a single source text is a very different task from what is being asked of students on assessments aligned with CCSS and the state-level variations of the standards (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). These standards emphasize engagement with multiple source texts and require students to organize information logically, support a topic with facts, employ definitions, use specific details, quotations and academic vocabulary appropriately to inform the reader in response to a prompt. Neither of the studies featured PBPD for teachers to implement SRSD in the informational genre, and classroom teachers were not the instructors. SRSD has a strong evidence base, and future studies should move toward teacher implementation of the strategy. In future research, efforts should be made to explore additional instructional providers in school
settings to determine how implementation changes when conducted by practitioners rather than researchers.

PBPD has been demonstrated effective in allowing teachers to implement SRSD for writing with moderate to high fidelity positively impacting student writing outcomes with favorable measures of social validity from both students and teachers (Festas et al., 2015; Harris et al., 2012a; 2012b; 2015; 2016; Kiuhara et al., 2013; McKeown et al., 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; McKeown & Patton-Terry, 2016). PBPD has not been used for the informational genre citing text-based evidence. However, it has been researched for employing close reading strategies for informational text and then writing in the persuasive genre (Harris et al., 2016). Additional research is needed to explore informational writing citing text-based evidence, as it is common to high stakes assessments that have meaningful consequences for both students and teachers.

In this chapter, results from a two-pronged literature review addressing both SRSD for writing in the informational genre as well as the impact of PBPD for SRSD were summarized and synthesized. Future directions were offered.

In the next chapter, the method of the proposed study is presented. Following an introductory literature review, a description of the school setting is presented. Second, the inclusion criteria for the participants and the consenting and assenting procedures are discussed. Third, measures are presented. Explicit description of both the teacher-level (PBPD) and student-level (SRSD) interventions are provided. Finally, the experimental design of the study is presented followed by results and discussion.
Table 1.1 Studies of SRSD in the informational genre for students in Grades 2 through 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4, n = 77</td>
<td>Grade 4 n = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG of 4, outside classroom</td>
<td>SG of 3 outside classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low achieving students with (n = 26) &amp; without LD (n = 51)</td>
<td>Included 4 students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban &amp; rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary outline and essay</td>
<td>Summary outline and essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in response to science &amp; social studies text</td>
<td>in response to science &amp; social studies text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventionist</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interventionist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAs</td>
<td>Member of research team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomized controlled trial with 3 conditions: reading comprehension instruction reading comprehension &amp; writing instruction no treatment control</td>
<td>Multiple probe across subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Writing Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type &amp; Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type &amp; Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student written retells using text as source</td>
<td>Written outlines and retells using text as source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzed for:</td>
<td>Analyzed for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written information units</td>
<td>Number of main ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic score</td>
<td>Holistic quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Total words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics: total words, different words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Intervention</strong></td>
<td><strong>Length of Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Averaged 15 30-minute sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22 30-minute lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fidelity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fidelity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor reported: 99%</td>
<td>Instructor reported: 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recorded fidelity: 87%</td>
<td>Audio recorded fidelity: 97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maintenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Writing Results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in both treatment groups outperformed control condition in written retelling and semantic measures.</td>
<td>All students immediately increased in number of main ideas included but two returned to baseline performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in the summary writing condition outperformed the reading condition for number of written information units at posttest.</td>
<td>Mean holistic quality of written retell, variability in quality, number of informational units, and words written all increased and remained higher than baseline at maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic measures did not differ significantly by treatment or control.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Validity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social Validity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Students, interviews, positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SG = Small Group, LD = Learning Disabilities, NR = Not Reported, GRA = Graduate Research Assistant*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Independent Variable and Dosage</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Fidelity</th>
<th>Social Validity</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festas, Oliveira, Rebelo, Damiao, Harris, and Graham (2015)</td>
<td>Teachers: 17 Students: 380 Grade 8 including 7 students in SPED</td>
<td>Schools: 6 560-991 students SES ranges of schools reported from low-medium-high to medium-high Portugal, urban</td>
<td>PBPD: 14 hrs across two days and weekly one hour meetings with researchers SRSD: opinion, 45-min sessions, 1 time per week for 3 months, WG</td>
<td>RCT; pre- and posttest</td>
<td>Teacher completed 100% of sessions Researchers observed 25% of sessions</td>
<td>PBPD: NR SRSD Teacher: Post- IRP; favorable Student: Post- CIRP; favorable</td>
<td>Implemented with moderate fidelity, 78%. Students in experimental condition improved in number of genre elements included and wrote fewer words than students in control at posttest and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Graham, and Adkins (2015)</td>
<td>Teachers: 11 Students: 51 Grade 2, low-performing, one student with LD</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>PBPD: 12–14 hrs across two days SRSD: Narrative, 20 min lessons, 3 times per week, average of 19 lessons and 6.3 hrs, SG</td>
<td>RCT; pre- and posttest</td>
<td>Teacher completed 100% of sessions Researchers observed 33% of sessions 33% recorded and rated by a blind observer</td>
<td>PBPD: NR Teacher: Post-interviews, favorable Student: Pre- and post-CIRP, favorable</td>
<td>Implemented with high fidelity, 95%. Students in experimental condition improved in genre elements and holistic quality on post- and maintenance assessments and performance generalized to a near genre of personal narrative. Teachers reported higher perceptions of students’ intrinsic motivation and effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Houston, Barkel, Atikin, Ray, Kavanagh, and Liu (2016)</td>
<td>Teachers: 14 Students: 73 Grade 5 and 6 all students with high incidence disabilities</td>
<td>District: 63,000 students 91 schools 67% FRL Schools: 8 47-90% FRL Southwestern U.S., urban</td>
<td>PBPD: 12 – 14 hrs across two days SRSD: persuasive citing text-based evidence, 21-27 40-min sessions, 3 times per week for 7 to 8 weeks, SG</td>
<td>RCT; pre- and posttest</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>PBPD: NR SRSD NR</td>
<td>Students in persuasive writing condition improved in genre elements, holistic quality, length, planning quality, number of transition words, total functional elements, total nonfunctional elements, genre/task knowledge, and writing process knowledge. Changes in reading recall and student self-efficacy for writing were not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Lane, Driscoll, Graham, Wilson, Sandmel, Brindell, and Schatschneider (2012a).</td>
<td>Teachers: 20 Students: 56 Grade 2 and 3 (with and without behavioral challenges)</td>
<td>District: 31,000 students 40 schools 8.5% FRL Schools: 3 131-740 students 12.1-32.9% FRL Tennessee, rural</td>
<td>PBPD: 12 hrs across two days SRSD: narrative or persuasive, max of 24 sessions, 3 times per week, WG</td>
<td>RCT; pre- and posttest</td>
<td>Teacher completed 100% of sessions Researchers observed 25% of sessions</td>
<td>PBPD: NR Teacher: Pre- and post- IRP; favorable Student: Pre- and post-CIRP, favorable</td>
<td>Implemented with high fidelity, greater than 85%. Students in persuasive writing condition improved in number and quality of genre elements, essay quality, and number of transition words. Students in narrative writing condition improved in number and quality of genre elements and story quality. Length did not differ between conditions. All students improved in genre elements and quality. Students without behavioral challenges outperformed those with behavioral challenges on measures of narrative quality and number of transition words in persuasive essays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LD = CIRP = Children’s Intervention Rating Profile, FRL = Free/Reduced Lunch, Learning Disabilities, NR = Not Reported, PBPD = Practice-based professional development, RCT = Randomized controlled trial, SES = Socioeconomic status, SPED = Special Education, SRSD = Self-regulated strategy development, WG = Whole group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Independent Variable and Dosage</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Fidelity</th>
<th>Social Validity</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Lane, Graham, Driscoll, Sandmel, Brindley, and Schatschneider (2012b)</td>
<td>Teachers: 20 Students: 262 Grade 2 and 3 including 14 students in SPED</td>
<td>District: 31,000 students 40 schools 8.5% FRL Schools: 3 131-740 students 12.1-32.9% FRL Tennessee, rural</td>
<td>PBPD: 12 hrs across two days SRSID: narrative or persuasive, max of 24 sessions, 3 times per week, WG</td>
<td>Essay/story elements, holistic quality, length</td>
<td>RCT, pre- and posttest</td>
<td>Teacher completed 100% of sessions Researchers observed 25% of sessions</td>
<td>PBPD: NR SRSID Teacher: Pre- and post- IRP; favorable Student: Pre- and post-CIRP; favorable</td>
<td>Implemented with high fidelity, greater than 85%. Students in persuasive writing condition improved in elements, persuasive essay quality, and number of transition words. Students in narrative writing condition improved in elements and quality of story elements. Overall narrative quality and length did not differ between conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinihata, Harris, Brindley, McKown, and Gilbert (2013, February)</td>
<td>Teachers: 17 Students: 227 Grade 4 including 14 students in SPED, 8 with LD</td>
<td>District: 78,000 students 144 schools 70% FRL Schools: 6 41.96% FRL Southeastern U.S., urban</td>
<td>PBPD: 14 hrs across two days SRSID: narrative under timed writing conditions, WG</td>
<td>Story elements, holistic quality, length</td>
<td>RCT, pre- and posttest</td>
<td>Researchers observed average of 47% of sessions across teachers</td>
<td>PBPD: NR Teacher: Post-instruction questionnaire; results NR</td>
<td>Implemented with high fidelity, 96%. Students in experimental condition improved in genre elements and holistic quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKown, Brindley, Harris, Graham, and Collins (2016)</td>
<td>Teachers: 3 Students: 53 Grade 4 including 6 students in SPED</td>
<td>District: 759 economically disadvantaged Schools: 3 210-775 students 68.95% considered economically disadvantaged Southeastern U.S., urban</td>
<td>PBPD: 14 hrs across two days SRSID: Fantastical narrative starring the author, 45-min sessions, 4 times per week, total hours range from 15 to 20, WG</td>
<td>Story elements, holistic quality, length, differentiation</td>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>PBPD: Video recorded Researchers observed 66% of sessions Additional researcher observed 44% of sessions</td>
<td>PBPD: NR SRSID Teacher: Post-interview; favorable Student: Post-interview; favorable</td>
<td>PBPD implemented with high fidelity, 100%. Implemented with high fidelity, greater than 91-100%. Students improved in narrative elements but holistic quality scores were not impacted. Students in narrative writing condition improved in elements and quality of story elements. In the embedded single-case design, struggling writers increased in genre elements included and total number of words, whereas average writers had mixed results in terms of genre elements included and a reduced number of words. All teachers adapted instruction at the whole class level, but did not use grouping adequately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LD = CIRP = Children’s Intervention Rating Profile, FRL = Free/Reduced Lunch, Learning Disabilities, NR = Not Reported, PBPD = Practice-based professional development, RCT = Randomized controlled trial, SES = Socioeconomic status, SPED = Special Education, SRSID = Self-regulated strategy development, WG = Whole group.
RCT = Randomized controlled trial, SES = Socioeconomic status, LD = Learning Disabilities, NR = Not Recorded, PL = Free/Reduced Lunch, FRL = Free/Reduced Lunch. Students previously identified as Learning Disabilities were tested in reading and writing quality. Students previously identified as LD in reading and writing quality were tested in reading and writing quality.

Students previously identified as LD were tested in reading and writing quality. Students previously identified as LD in reading and writing quality were tested in reading and writing quality. Students previously identified as LD in reading and writing quality were tested in reading and writing quality.

Students previously identified as LD in reading and writing quality were tested in reading and writing quality. Students previously identified as LD in reading and writing quality were tested in reading and writing quality.

Students previously identified as LD in reading and writing quality were tested in reading and writing quality. Students previously identified as LD in reading and writing quality were tested in reading and writing quality. Students previously identified as LD in reading and writing quality were tested in reading and writing quality.
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CHAPTER 2

PRACTICE-BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR SELF-REGULATED STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT: TEACHING STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES AND OTHER STRUGGLING WRITERS TO PEN INFORMATIONAL ESSAYS CITING TEXT-BASED EVIDENCE IN AN INCLUSIVE SETTING

Introduction

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) have made writing a focus of instruction, giving writing greater significance in the curriculum; thus, increasing the need for effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all learners. These standards emphasize engagement with a variety of texts and delve into the informational genre. Grade 5 standards require students to (a) write informative texts, (b) organize connected information in a logical order; (c) develop a topic with facts; and (e) use definitions, specific details, quotations, and domain-specific vocabulary. Additionally, students are asked to glean evidence from several source texts to support analysis, reflection, and research standards (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010).

This task is particularly challenging for students with learning disabilities (LD) and struggling writers who tend to be similar in academic deficits related to writing and writing performance (De La Paz & Graham, 1997; Garcia-Sanchez & Fidalgo-Redondo, 2006; Graham, 1990; Graham, Harris, & MacArthur, 2006; Graham, Schwartz, & MacArthur, 1993; Mason, Snyder, Sukhram, & Kedem, 2006; Mason, Davison, Hammer, Miller, & Glutting, 2013; Troia Graham, & Harris, 1999). A lack of meaningful planning, time spent planning, and practical organization are commonplace in the writing of students with LD and struggling writers (Bui, Schumaker, & Deschler, 2006; De La Paz, 1999; De La Paz & Graham, 1997; Garcia-Sanchez &
Students with LD and struggling writers also face challenges with ideation, maintaining self-regulation throughout the execution of the writing process, goal setting, and revising. This is likely because writing is complicated and requires simultaneous function of several cognitive processes to achieve success (De La Paz, Swanson, & Graham, 1993; Harris & Graham, 1996; Graham & Harris, 2003a; 2009). Still, students with LD and other struggling writers are held to the same standard for success as their peers, and schools are held accountable for the success of all students (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2002).

**Self-regulated Strategy Development**

One instructional approach to writing that has improved student performance is Self-regulated Strategy Development (SRSD; Harris, Graham, Mason, & Friedlander, 2008). SRSD is a multi-component, criterion-based, flexible instructional approach that supports learners in acquiring the skills, knowledge, and self-regulating practices necessary to become more effective writers (Gillespie & Graham, 2014; Graham, McKeown, Kiuhara, & Harris, 2012) and has been cited as an evidence-based practice for writing by multiple entities (Baker, Chard, Ketterlin-Geller, Apichatabutra, & Doabler, 2009; Graham, Harris, & McKeown, 2013; Graham & Perin, 2007b; National Center on Intensive Interventions, 2016; What Works Clearinghouse, 2012). Prior research has extended the external validity of SRSD to a variety of populations including students with LD (Graham & Harris, 2003b; Graham, Harris, & MacArthur, 1993), students with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD; Ennis, Jolivette, & Boden, 2013), students with attention deficit disorders (Lienemann & Reid, 2008; Reid, Hagaman, & Graham, 2014), struggling writers (Lane, Graham, Harris, & Weisenbach, 2006; McKeown, Brindle, Harris,
Graham, & Collins, 2016), and also to a variety of genres including narrative (Lane et al., 2006; Mason, Harris, & Graham, 2002; McKeown et al., 2016; Saddler, 2006), expository/informative (Mason et al., 2006), and persuasive (Harris et al., 2002; McKeown & Patton-Terry, 2016).

The SRSD framework includes explicit instructional procedures that support students in addressing self-regulation throughout the writing process. The strategy addresses genre knowledge, motivation, self-efficacy, and deficits in initial schema (Harris et al., 2008; Harris, Graham, Brindle, & Sandmel, 2009). SRSD is recursive, and teachers are encouraged to move throughout the stages fluidly to meet the needs of all learners (Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2003). The six stages of instruction are: (a) develop background knowledge, (b) discuss it, (c) model it, (d) memorize it, (e) support it, and (f) independent performance (Harris et al., 2008; 2009).

**Stage 1: Develop background knowledge.** The first stage of SRSD is focused on providing all learners a foundation of background knowledge common to the genre including elements and characteristics as well as genre-specific vocabulary. Students may read aloud from the genre or consider when they have encountered the genre previously. During this stage, teachers address any deficits in background knowledge that could impede student performance by assessing current understandings and misunderstandings unique to this genre. Teachers and students engage in discussion of the elements and rhetorical characteristics essential to the genre, while considering examples and nonexamples (Harris et al., 2008).

**Stage 2: Discuss it.** Stage 2 deepens the work completed in Stage 1. Teachers and students discuss how the writing strategy they are learning supports student success. They consider the uses of the genre and where they may have encountered the genre previously. Teachers and students talk about using the strategy as well as the value of creating a plan. They may discuss generalization to other tasks and settings (Harris et al., 2008).
**Stage 3. Model it.** The teacher offers the students an in-depth, explicit model of the entire writing process using the newly introduced strategy. Teachers will model all the steps of the writing processes (i.e., ideation, planning, and drafting) all while sharing his/her thought process through think alouds and self-statements to make transparent the internal dynamics of writing. During this model, the teacher may consider opportunities that allow students to successfully contribute to the process. The model is followed with special focus on self-statements, goal setting, and evaluation. Following an initial model in which the teacher is responsible for the majority of the process, drawing student participation in through carefully selected opportunities for success, an additional collaborative model is offered and students share responsibility for employing the strategy to engage with the writing process.

**Stage 4: Memorize it.** Elements of the fourth stage are included across instruction. Students are encouraged to memorize the essential genre elements and characteristics, vocabulary unique to the genre, and the genre-specific mnemonic. Students are encouraged to reflect on why memorization is important to long-term success should the teacher or visual supports be unavailable. By memorizing these pieces, students can employ the strategy automatically without spending time and cognitive effort on retrieving the knowledge. Memorization practice is integrated across lessons to support all learners (Harris et al., 2008).

**Stage 5: Support it.** Stage 5 offers students an opportunity to employ the strategy collaboratively with a peer or small group while the teacher actively monitors performance. Stage 5 is not uniform and should be tailored to the group of students as well as the setting. Students may work in groups, peer partners, or one-on-one with the teacher. During this stage, students take responsibility for using the tools they have been provided throughout the intervention (e.g., previous steps). The teacher supports the group of students in employing the
strategies on their own by providing prompts, assistance, or encouragement during difficulties. Throughout this stage, the teacher should be readily available for assistance as needed.

**Stage 6: Independent performance.** During Stage 6, students are expected to fully self-regulate for the duration of the writing process and independently employ the strategy to reach success. Generalization of the strategy is further discussed and explicit behaviors such as overt self-talk may be refined to be internal. That is, students are encouraged to move from verbalizing self-statements to reciting them silently as audible recitation of self-talk, if generalized, may have negative social consequences.

**Practice-based Professional Development for SRSD**

Teachers often report a lack of professional development (PD) addressing writing instruction (Brindle, Graham, Harris, & Hebert, 2016; Gilbert & Graham, 2010; Kiuhara, Graham, & Hawken, 2009). However, teachers who rate themselves higher on surveys of self-efficacy also report greater use of evidence-based practices (Brindle et al., 2016; Gilbert & Graham, 2010; Graham, Harris, & Santangelo, 2015) and rate themselves as more likely to differentiate writing instruction for all learners (Brindle et al., 2016). Therefore, quality PD that addresses teachers’ beliefs about their ability to be successful with writing instruction is important to teachers implementing complex evidence-based writing practices such as SRSD (Graham, Bollinger et al., 2012).

Practice-based professional development (PBPD; Ball & Cohen, 1999) has been found both effective and socially valid in implementations of SRSD for both the narrative writing and persuasive/opinion writing genres (Festas et al., 2015; Harris et al., 2012a; 2012b; 2015; 2016; Kiuhara et al., 2013; McKeown et al., 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; McKeown & Patton-Terry, 2016). PBPD is focused on pedagogy as well as content (Ball & Cohen, 1999). When adapted for
SRSD for writing, PBPD includes six basic steps: (a) teams of colleagues who share similar classroom needs work together, (b) training is differentiated to reflect needs in participating teachers’ classrooms, (c) experts assess content knowledge of participating teachers and address areas for focus, (d) experts explicitly model each lesson and then teachers practice each full lesson with an audience of participating teachers followed by peer feedback, (e) participating teachers use the same materials in PD that they will use during implementation in their respective classrooms, and (f) participating teachers receive feedback from experts in the areas of both differentiation and performance during the independent practice (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Ball & Forzani, 2009; Harris et al., 2012a, 2012b; McKeown, FitzPatrick, & Sandmel, 2014).

**The Present Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of PBPD followed by a special education teacher’s implementation of SRSD in the informational genre citing text-based evidence with fifth grade students in an inclusive education setting. A multiple probe across participants design (Gast & Ledford, 2014) was employed as the intervention does not provide opportunity for reversal. The design offers experimental control for history and maturation.

The following research questions were addressed at the teacher-level: To what extent can SRSD be implemented with fidelity in small groups by a special education teacher in an inclusive fifth grade general education setting? To what extent is SRSD considered to be a socially valid intervention for use in inclusive educational settings by the special education and cooperating classroom teacher? The following research questions were addressed at the student-level: To what extent does SRSD instruction in the informational genre citing text-based evidence improve the writing skills of fifth grade students with LD or those who struggle in writing in terms of (a) number of essay elements, (b) evidence of strategy use, and (c) length?
To what extent is SRSD considered to be a socially valid intervention for use in inclusive education settings by the participating students?

PBPD was chosen as it is effective in supporting teachers in implementing SRSD for writing with high fidelity (Festas et al., 2015; Harris et al., 2012a; 2012b; 2015; 2016; Kiuhara et al., 2013; McKeown et al., 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; McKeown & Patton-Terry, 2016). SRSD was chosen as it is an evidence-based strategy for writing (Baker et al., 2009; Graham et al., 2013; Graham & Perin, 2007b; National Center on Intensive Interventions, 2016; What Works Clearinghouse, 2012). This writing task was chosen as it was included in the school’s curriculum, and it represents the most common type of writing task asked of students in Grade 3 and above in state assessments associated with the Common Core State Standards and the similar state-level curricular variations (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010).

Both teacher-nominated struggling writers and students with LD were included in this study for the following reasons: they share many characteristics in terms of writing performance (De La Paz, 1999; De La Paz & Graham, 1997; Garcia-Sanchez & Fidalgo-Redondo, 2006; Graham, 1990; Graham et al., 1993; 2006; Lienemann et al., 2006; Mason et al., 2013; Troia et al., 1999), the strategy has been demonstrated effective in improving writing performance for both types of learners (Graham & Harris, 2003b; Mason et al., 2006; 2013; McKeown et al., 2016), teachers work with both types of learners in the general education classroom where most writing instruction takes place (Graham & Harris, 2015; McLeskey, Landers, Williamson, & Hoppey, 2012), and research should reflect realities of practice if the interventions are intended to be applied in those settings.
The small group format of instruction was chosen for many reasons. Teachers are serving students with LD and struggling writers alongside typically performing peers. Previous research in the area of reading has indicated small group instruction is more effective than whole group instruction and equally, and sometimes more, effective as one-on-one instruction (Elbaum, & Vaughn, 1999; Elbaum, Vaughn, Tejero Hughes, & Watson Moody, 2000; Lou et al., 1996; Swanson, Hoskyn, & Lee, 1999). Decentralization of instruction into smaller groups is necessary to meet the needs of all learners and may provide an environment more conducive to reflection on the individual student’s performance rather than the overall class performance which is common to elementary teachers (Fuchs, Fuchs, Mathes, & Simmons, 1997; Schumm et al., 1995). Moreover, writers develop in dynamic evolving communities that vary widely by cognitive abilities and resources, and community members are supported by one another in their learning (Graham, in press). The use of small groups facilitated by the special educator in inclusive education classrooms is commensurate with common school practices and may improve an area of concern, a lack of communication and collaboration between special education and general education teachers (Schumm et al., 1995).

Calls for future research in the area of SRSD for writing have included exploring additional genres (Asaro-Saddler & Bak, 2012; Festas et al., 2015; Harris et al., 2012b; 2015; Little et al., 2010), implementation by special educators (Harris, Graham, & Adkins, 2015; Little et al., 2010), and implementation in inclusive classrooms (Asaro-Saddler & Bak, 2012; Harris et al., 2012b; Lienemann & Reid, 2008). The proposed study makes a unique contribution to the literature as it features a writing task paired to the state-level writing assessment in the informational genre citing text-based evidence, features a special education teacher offering
instruction in small groups in an inclusive setting, and also social validity measures were included for students, the special education teacher, and the cooperating teacher.

**Method**

**Participants**

Prior to beginning the study, approvals were granted from both the university and the school. All IRB approved confidentiality procedures were followed.

**Consenting teacher participants.** Researchers provided teacher participants with packets detailing study objectives and expectations including time commitments for intervention, PD, testing, classroom observation procedures, and teaching. A special education teacher and his cooperating teacher in whose classroom he spent weekday mornings were recruited for this study. The special education teacher served as the intervention provider embedded within the cooperating teacher’s general education classroom. These two teachers were volunteers who verbally communicated their commitment to SRSD and to teaching the complex informational genre citing text-based evidence. Researchers were available at the time of consent to answer any questions and explain that withdrawal from the study could be accomplished by request to any member of the research team. No financial incentive was made for this study.

**Consenting and assenting student participants.** After the special education teacher and his cooperating teacher were consented, researchers provided the special education teacher with a packet to be sent home outlining the study, two copies of the consent form for the parent and two copies of the assent form for the student (one to be signed and returned and one kept for personal records). Researchers were available by phone and email at the time of consent to answer questions as contact information for the researchers was included in the packet. A member of the research team reviewed the packets orally in class prior to being sent home for
parental consent and student assent. The letter offered the choice to give or not to give consent/assent; hence, students returned letters without regard to participation. Students were asked not to sign the form in school to avoid any perceived or real threat of coercion. Students returned forms to the participating teachers and a member of the research team collected them. Research personnel were available by phone and email to answer any questions from parents or teachers or assist students or parents in withdrawing from the study. All participating students returned both student assent and parent consent.

**Inclusionary/exclusionary criteria.** Criteria to be a student participant included: (a) identified by the school using state IDEA criteria as a student with LD or teacher nominated as a struggling writer in terms of writing performance, grades, or motivation; (b) ability to independently write a complete sentence as reported by the teacher; and (c) attendance of at least 85% for the prior month as reported by the teacher. Students with severe or profound intellectual disabilities, autism, or identified as English Language Learners were excluded from the study as these may impair a student’s ability to fully participate in the student-level intervention.

**Sampling.** Stratified sampling allowed for the division of the participant pool into exclusive groups that shared a commonality (Gast & Ledford, 2014). In this case, eight student participants were divided into two groups: those possessing an IEP (n = 5) and those teacher-identified as struggling writers without an IEP (n = 3). Then, from each of the two groups, students were randomly assigned to each of the three legs of the study (L1, L2, L3) assuring that each leg included at least one student possessing an IEP to justify using the special education teacher’s instructional time for this task.

**Teacher participants.** The special education teacher was a Caucasian male with four years of teaching experience and two years of teaching in the current grade assignment as well as
the current school. He worked with Grades 1, 2, and 5 during this intervention year. He attained a B.A. in History and an M.S. in Educational Psychology. He holds certifications in Special Education General Curriculum P-12; Special Education Social Studies, Science, Math, Language Arts, and Reading P-5, 4-8; and a reading endorsement. He served as the New Teacher Induction Specialist in his current teaching role and previously served as a Teach for America coach.

The special education teacher had prior experience with both writing and SRSD. He served as a journalist on the college newspaper in his undergraduate program. His master’s thesis was a multiple probe across participants study of a summary writing strategy embedded in the SRSD framework. He had served as the teacher for a revision strategy embedded in the SRSD framework in a fifth-grade inclusive classroom and scored essays that resulted from both a quasi-experimental study of the persuasive genre using SRSD (McKeown et al., 2017) and a pre-post study of the persuasive, narrative, and informational genres (McKeown & Patton-Terry, 2016).

The cooperating teacher hosted the special education teacher in her general education classroom for two hours in the morning each weekday. The cooperating teacher was an African-American female general education teacher with 13 total years of teaching experience, three years in the current grade assignment, and four in the current school. She holds a B.A. in English and an M.A. in Urban Teacher Education. She holds a professional teaching certification. She served as the literacy representative and the grade level chair.

**Student participants.** Student participants were eight fifth-grade students. SRSD instruction was delivered to students in small groups. See Table 2.1. Participating teachers provided state-level testing results in ELA as a descriptive measure of ability for students identified as meeting the above inclusion criteria, and for whom consent and assent were received. These results reflect a summative assessment from the end of the student’s prior
academic year and evaluated the knowledge and skills embedded in the state-adopted standards for that content area. Results for the state’s assessments are reported as a scaled score as well as a level. Levels include (a) Level 1 – beginning learner (b) Level 2 – developing learner, (c) Level 3 – proficient learner, (d) Level 4 – distinguished learner. See Table 2.1.

**Research Team.** There were four members of the research team. Researcher A holds an M.Ed. in Literacy, is a doctoral candidate at a research-intensive university, leverages 11 years of classroom teaching experience, and has presented more than 200 hours of PD in the PBPD format for SRSD across several genres. Researcher B holds a Ph.D. in Special Education, is a faculty member at the same university, leverages 10 years of classroom teaching experience, and has presented more than 200 hours of PD in the PBPD format for SRSD across several genres. Researcher C holds an M.Ed. in Special Education, is a doctoral fellow, leverages six years of classroom teaching experience, and has presented more than 50 hours of PD in the PBPD format for SRSD across several genres. Researcher D holds an M.Ed. in Reading, Literacy, and Language, is a doctoral student and clinical faculty member, leverages eight years of classroom teaching experience, and has received nearly 40 hours of PD in the PBPD format for SRSD across three genres.

**Setting**

This study took place during 2016-2017 academic school year in a public charter school serving approximately 800 students (K-8) in a metropolitan area in the Southeast. The school is broadly diverse with a student population composed of 70% African-American, 20% Caucasian, 5% Hispanic, 4% multi-racial, and 1% Asian or Pacific Islander. Fifty-two percent of the students are female and 58% of the students are eligible for free and/or reduced lunch.
The school is authorized as an International Baccalaureate (IB) World Programme School, accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and holds an approved charter school contract with the state’s Department of Education. Based on ratings by the Governor’s Office of Student Academic Achievement (2014), the school received a rating of five for school climate on a 1-5 scale (e.g., 5 representing an excellent school climate; Department of Education; state withheld for confidentiality). This measure was derived from the statewide accountability evaluations that assesses four dimensions of school climate: (a) safety, (b) relationships, (c) teaching and learning, and (d) institutional environment. According to the state Department of Education’s website as of 2015, 40% of the fifth-grade students and 46% of all students in this school performed proficient or better in English Language Arts (ELA; state withheld for confidentiality).

The intervention, SRSD, was conducted in a general education fifth grade all-male inclusive classroom where a special education teacher spent two hours daily providing ELA instruction to the whole class as well as to individual students assigned to receive additional support. Twenty-six males were in the ELA class, though five females from another homeroom who had IEPs received their instruction from the special educator in this setting during those hours. The school’s charter includes homogenously gendered classrooms, so while this was not an objective of the study, it served as the setting. Instruction occurred between 8:30 and 10 a.m. two to three days per week.

Instruction took place at a kidney table in a rear corner of the classroom. The special educator who served as the instructor for the study sat on one side of the table and the three students participating in the present leg of the study sat on the other. (Per the special education
teacher’s request, Leg 2 instruction was offered to an additional class member who was not a participant in the study.)

**Survey of classroom writing practices.** For descriptive purposes, the special education teacher completed the Survey of Classroom Writing Practices (Cutler & Graham, 2008) to describe writing practices regularly implemented in the classroom. Researchers provided the special education teacher with the 15-minute survey to complete during the PBPD experience (see appendix A). There are three sections to the survey: (a) 41 questions based on an 8-point Likert scale, (b) an evaluation of the existing writing program in narrative form, and (c) identification and description of any writing instruction practices related to strategies instruction or taking timed writing tests such as the Criterion-Referenced Competency Test (CRCT).

The special education teacher indicated the classroom is a rich writing environment that hosted various writing focused activities. He described his approach to writing instruction as a traditional skills approach combined with process writing and specifically mentioned pairing the state standards with components of the SRSD framework. The teacher reported using reading to support writing, encouraging students to monitor their own writing progress, and using a writing prompt to encourage student writing several times per week and using graphic organizers nearly always. Additionally, the teacher reported holding student conferences, teaching sentence construction, having students engage in planning before writing, teaching strategies for planning, overtly modeling the writing performance, using writing to support reading, and assigning writing homework weekly. The special education teacher reported that he read his own written work to the students, monitored writing progress to inform instructional goals, and create writing lessons to meet multiple instructional goals several times each month. He also reported that he taught methods of organizing text, modeled enjoyment of writing, retaught writing skills or
strategies, and had students engage in revising activities at least monthly. The special education
teacher reported that he did not engage in handwriting instruction, use writing portfolios, allow
dictation, or assign writing tasks that would require parental involvement or ask parents to listen
to student writing.

Observation of classroom writing practices. The research team conducted two 25-min
observations of the teacher’s writing instruction practices prior to the beginning of the study to
more fully understand the classroom environment and business as usual writing practices.
Additionally, results from the observation helped to determine if any components of SRSD for
writing in the informational genre were presently being used in the classroom. The observation
of classroom writing practices measure (Graham, Harris, Fink-Chorzempa, & MacArthur, 2003)
contains two sections: (a) a checklist of items observed during classroom writing instruction
including targeted items related to skills and strategies taught (nine items), common instructional
activities in process writing (12 items), instructional and assessment procedures (10 items),
alternative modes of writing (two items), and other (activities completed by the teachers or
students not listed); and (b) a checklist of items if instruction related specifically to strategies
instruction or to taking timed writing tests (seven items) was observed (see Appendix B).
Researcher A discussed all components of the instrument with Researcher D during training and
an observation was conducted prior to use of the measure to assure reliability. Training reliability
was 100%. Researcher A conducted the first observation alone and the second with Researcher D
for reliability. Researcher A observed six components of writing instruction in the first
observation and four in the second. Inter-observer agreement was calculated by dividing total
number of agreements by total number of disagreements, and reliability was 100%. 
In classroom observations, researchers noted computers were being used by some students, and at one point the teacher paused to reteach the proper way to punctuate quoted text. There was evidence on a displayed planning sheet that the students had been introduced to POW+TREE, two common mnemonic associated with SRSD for approaching the writing process and writing in the persuasive genre respectively, but no instruction directly related to that was demonstrated. At this point, the general writing strategy sometimes associated with POW was removed from the present study to mitigate possible contamination. Researchers A and D conducted a second observation prior to the onset of Leg 1. Both observers witnessed the goals of instruction being explicitly stated, demonstration of a planning strategy that involved acquiring supportive evidence from a video focused on Michelle Obama’s gardening to write an opinion essay, and the use of graphic organizers to collect information for the persuasive essay. While it was apparent a mnemonic often associated with SRSD, had been introduced, no other elements of SRSD were present. No strategies for informational writing were observed.

Teacher-level Measures

Prompt administration. Prompts were administered to students during baseline and following mastery performance of Lesson 6. Mastery was reached when students created a plan using the organizer developed to for this writing task and included a minimum of 80% of those elements in their essays (Ennis & Jolivette, 2014). This standard was assessed by the special education teacher to replicate authentic classroom practices as teachers have the authority to decide if students have mastered a skill, and researchers are not on hand in daily practice to dictate instructional decisions. Researcher A confirmed decisions. If the student met the 80% criteria, but not 100%, the special education teacher offered verbal feedback on the missed sections. Three students met the 80% criteria following Lesson 6 and received feedback
regarding their performance. The five others included 100% in their response to the probe offered for Lesson 6.

**Fidelity of prompt administration.** To assure standardization in the writing probe administration, teachers to use when administering assessments. The script offered brief, clear directions for students (see Appendix C). Writing assessment probe administration fidelity was assessed with a 14-step checklist. Researcher A observed 39% of all testing administrations across all legs and phases. Teacher fidelity to the writing probe administration script was calculated by dividing total number of steps completed by total number of steps.

**Fidelity of PD.** Quality of PD and explication of procedures for further replication studies are essential when evaluating a teacher-implemented intervention. Failure to provide proper training to those who perform the instruction may result in low student performance (Cook & Odom, 2013; Klingner, Ahwee, & Pilonieta, 2003) but if fidelity of PD is not collected, the low performance may be incorrectly attributed to the intervention (Collier-Meek, Fallon, Sanetti, & Maggin, 2013). All PBPD sessions were audio recorded. Researcher A administered PBPD lessons by checking each step of the PBPD schedule on a checklist as completed (see Appendix D). Presenter self-reported fidelity of PBPD for SRSD was calculated by the total number of steps completed divided by the total number of steps possible or planned. For Day 1 of PD, Researcher D observed 82% of all steps and for Day 2, Researcher B observed 86% of all steps. Interobserver agreement was 100%.

Additionally, the Researcher A, who modeled each lesson, checked each step of the SRSD fidelity checklist for that lesson as completed. Presenter self-reported SRSD administration fidelity during modeling was calculated by the total number of steps completed divided by the total number of steps possible or planned. Researcher D observed 33% of the
lessons. Agreement with presenter self-report scores was calculated to determine reliability (number of agreements divided by the number of possible agreements). Reliability of fidelity observations with the presenter self-report was 100%.

**Fidelity of SRSD.** In this study, all instructional sessions were audio recorded. The special educator was provided a unique checklist for each step of each lesson in both the initial materials and one was also carried and distributed by Researcher A for every observed lesson (see Appendix E). Observations were conducted across all three legs and across the span of the intervention to control for observer drift and time effects. In each leg, Researcher A observed a minimum of 33% of all instructional sessions using a unique checklist aligned with required steps in each lesson. Researcher D observed a minimum of 33% of researcher-observed lessons. Using the same checklist, the special education teacher completed a self-report for a minimum of 25% of all lessons during each leg of the study. Researcher A entered all fidelity checklist scores into a spreadsheet, and Researcher C compared 50%, 45% and 50% of the handwritten fidelity checklists to the spreadsheet of scores to evaluate reliability of entry for Legs 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Reliability of entry was 100%.

Overall, the special education teacher instructed 67 sessions from Oct 3 – May 16. The teacher checklist was collected for 34 % of the observations. Teacher agreement with observer fidelity was 83% (range = 50% to 100%). Researcher A observed 43% of all instructional sessions. Researcher D was also present for 41% of all observed sessions. IOA was 97%.

**Leg 1.** As this study uniquely featured the same teacher implementing three times successively with different students, this section includes a closer look at how fidelity of SRSD was maintained across implementations. For Leg 1, the special education teacher instructed 23 lessons from Oct 3 – Dec 9. The special education teacher completed a checklist of completed
steps as one fidelity measure. These checklists were collected for 25% of the observations, and the special education teacher self-reported agreement with researcher fidelity was 93% (range = 90% to 100%). Using the same checklists, Researcher A observed 52% of instructional sessions to determine fidelity of implementation. Researcher D was present for 50% of all observations for Leg 1. IOA was 97% (range = 90% to 100%).

**Leg 2.** The special education teacher instructed 28 lessons from Jan 9 – Mar 27. Teacher checklists were collected for 36% of the observations, and the teacher self-reported agreement with researcher fidelity was 75% (range = 50% to 92%). Researcher A observed 39% of instructional sessions to determine fidelity of implementation. Researcher D was present for 36% of all observations for Leg 2. IOA was 96% (range = 90% to 100%).

**Leg 3.** The special education teacher instructed 16 lessons from April 19 – May 16. Teacher checklists were collected for 50% of the observations, and the special education teacher self-reported agreement with researcher fidelity was 84% (range = 69% to 95%). Researcher A observed 38% of instructional sessions to determine fidelity of implementation. Researcher D was present for 33% of all observations for Leg 3. IOA was 96% (range = 90% to 100%).

**Social validity.** Both the special education teacher and the cooperating general education teacher completed the Intervention Rating Profile-15 (IRP-15; Martens, Witt, Elliott, & Darveaux, 1985). The special education teacher completed the IRP-15 both pre- and post-intervention to determine treatment acceptability, whereas the general education cooperating teacher only completed the IRP-15 at post-intervention (see Appendix F). The cooperating teacher did not complete a pre-intervention social validity survey as she was not introduced to the intervention and did not attend PBPD to control against contamination. However, she was asked to complete the IRP at post-intervention to determine her perceptions of the intervention
that had been implemented by the special education teacher in her classroom across the course of the school year. Teachers rated 15 items on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly agree, 6 = strongly disagree). Internal consistency reliability coefficients range from .88 to .98 (Martens et al., 1985; Martens & Meller, 1989; Freer & Watson, 1999).

**Student-level Measures**

**Writing assessments.** After reading two source texts on the same topic, students were asked to write an informational essay in which they had to cite evidence from the paired texts. The texts were informational texts from a common literacy website available for teachers to use freely, readworks.org (see Appendix G for a list of paired texts used for assessment purposes). Each was categorized within Earth and Space Science, Life Science, or Physical Science. To be used with a writing probe as an assessment, paired source texts had to: (a) be on the same or related topic as another text so that it could be paired; (b) fall within Lexile levels of 500-800 to be consistent with the teacher-reported reading levels of the students participating in the intervention; (c) have a Flesh-Kincaid reading level between 4.1 and 5.5; and (c) have a word count of 472 to 771.

Of the 81 source texts with Lexile levels between 500-800, 17 were discarded from the pool as their content failed to pair in any meaningful way with other texts, leaving a total of 34 sets of paired source texts. Texts collected that fell outside those parameters were used for teacher modeling or student collaborative and independent practice. Texts falling within Flesh-Kincaid reading level 6.1 to 7.5 were used for teacher modeling sessions because students would receive the greatest amount of teacher support for those texts. Texts with fewer than 472 or more than 771 words were not included to keep assessment prompts equivalent. Excluded texts were
used for student collaborative and independent work that occurred during Stages 5 and 6 of SRSD instruction.

Seventeen paired source texts were chosen as the assessment probes for the multiple probe design (see Appendix G). The average Lexile level of source texts chosen for assessment probes was 692.35 ($SD = 43.66$, range = 625 to 775), and the average Flesh-Kincaid reading level was 4.82 ($SD = 0.47$, range = 4.1 to 5.5). Assessment probes had a mean length of 602.59 words ($SD = 88.71$, range = 472 to 771). All paired source texts and writing prompts used for assessment purposes are available by request from the author.

Prior to intervention, prompts were randomly assigned to each instance of assessment. All legs of the study received the same prompt, #17, at initial testing. All other prompts were randomly assigned within each leg of the study prior to intervention. Additionally, as these prompts had not been used previously, the random assignment of assessment probes allowed some protection from performance variability across assessments, as the design would allow further investigation of student performance per probe across legs and intervention phases.

Prompts were similar to those used for the state-level standardized writing exam and matched the style of those available on the state’s Department of Education website but were crafted to include the same number of questions/directives, three, to be addressed to facilitate equality in measures. The first two directives addressed content for which evidence could be found in each of the paired source texts. As an example, after reading two source texts about threats to ocean animals, students were asked to write an essay in which they (a) explained the different threats to ocean animals, (b) what actions people can take to help, and (c) to use details and examples from the source texts to support their reasoning. The third directive was identical on all prompts.
Researcher A typed the student essays correcting spelling, capitalization, and punctuation errors to avoid bias in scoring (Graham, Harris, & Hebert, 2011). Researcher C checked 36% of the typed versions against the students’ scanned handwritten essays to determine reliability of typing. Reliability of typing was calculated as total words correct divided by total words. Typing reliability was 100%.

**Plagiarism.** After each essay was typed and evaluated for academic vocabulary, it was reviewed for instances of plagiarism. The U.S. Federal Research Misconduct Policy (2000) defines plagiarism as, “appropriation of another author’s ideas, results, processes, or words without giving appropriate credit.” While plagiarism is more heavily focused upon in secondary school and higher education, avoiding directly copying from source text was an appropriate skill for Grade 5 students to develop as Olson and Shaw (2011) found students as early as ages five and six were able to identify instances of plagiarism and identify the act as copying. In the informational genre citing text-based evidence, students use source text to support their statements. Hence, plagiarism can become a concern and may skew the student’s performance as it is likely that the adult authors of the articles would score high when the text was evaluated as a fifth grade writer’s essay. Traditional plagiarism tools commonly used at universities and available online were tried (e.g., TurnItIn’s originality check), but were not sensitive to shorter plagiarized phrases that had been pieced together to form an essay. In this case, plagiarism was defined as a minimum of four consecutive words that were meaningful and unlikely to have occurred in the student’s writing had they not been exposed to the source text. After considering methods of plagiarism detection commonly used (e.g., n-grams for approximate matching), Researchers A and B discussed the idea of plagiarism as it related to Grade 5 students and settled at four meaningful words, a subjective determination. This definition included articles and
conjunctions if they were embedded within other meaningful language, but not if they were outside of or leading up to the meaningful language. So a student who wrote, “This returns nutrients back into the environment,” would have this entire line counted as plagiarism if she failed to quote or offer language that indicated it was a citation. Conversely, a student who wrote, “Decomposers help dispose of animals and plants and that releases decomposed material into the environment.” The only portion of the line that appears sequentially in the text are three words, “into the environment.” The remainder is a summary of the text and the first two words, the preposition and article, do not contribute meaningful content. As such, this phrase does not meet the four-word threshold for plagiarism.

To indicate plagiarism, Researcher A blocked any phrases meeting the plagiarism criteria in dark red on all essays. Scorers were trained to ignore plagiarized phrases when scoring all measures, and counts of academic vocabulary were consistent with the plagiarized text being ignored for scoring purposes. Researcher C reviewed 29% of all essays for plagiarism. Reliability was calculated by dividing the number of words in agreed upon instances of plagiarism, by the total number of words in all identified instances of plagiarism. Reliability was 95%. Due to the closed total of the scoring, which does not including tallies and is further explicated in the following paragraph, in every instance \((n = 3)\), the score used for phase change was not impacted.

**Analytic quality.** The analytical quality score, a summative score of included genre elements, characteristics (i.e., an engaging introduction, use of academic vocabulary, effective transitions) and degrees of quality embedded in the analytic quality rubric was used as the phase change variable (see Appendix H). The rubric created for this task which includes essential components of the genre as well as a method of scoring the quality of the components included
was based on those used in previous studies (DeLaPaz, 1999; Graham, 1990; McKeown et al., 2015; 2016). Students earned one point if the essay could reasonably be described as the student’s own words to account for instances of extensive plagiarism. Essays were scored a zero for all elements if more than 40% of the content was plagiarized. In instances where plagiarism was included but was less than 40% of the total word count, the plagiarized content was excluded from consideration during scoring.

Students earned one point each for directly addressing each of the two prompt topics. Students earned up to two points for an engaging introduction with one point earned if it was a simple restatement of the prompt and two points earned if it was a more elaborate hook. Students earned up to two points for the topic sentence with one point earned if the topic sentence directly addressed at least one of the posed prompt topics and two points earned if both topics were addressed within the topic sentence.

Students earned up to two points for evidence for each posed topic of the prompt. One point was earned if there was a single text example or detail in support of an answer and two points were earned if there were multiple citations in support of a single answer. Students earned up to two points for explaining how their evidence was connected to their answers with one point awarded for a single instance of explanation and two points awarded for multiple instances. Scorers were encouraged to look for a word such as shows, demonstrates, or explains which explicitly connected the evidence provided to the question/directive posed in the writing prompt. Students earned up to two points for use of academic vocabulary with one point awarded for a moderate amount of academic vocabulary (i.e., three to five instances of unique use of words from the academic vocabulary word list) and two points for fluent use of academic vocabulary (i.e., more than five unique words from the vocabulary word list).
Students earned up to three points for a conclusion receiving one if it included a restatement of the topic, two if it included a restatement of the initial topic and a single instance of explanation, and three it included a restatement of the initial topic and offered multiple instances or patterns of explanation. Finally, students earned up to two points for use of transition words. Students earned one point for using at least two transition words that meaningfully moved from idea to idea and two points if three or more transition words were used in the essay. These scores were summed to make the closed total score, used for phase change decisions. The highest closed total score an essay could receive was 25. Tallies were collected for total number of evidence statements, instances of unique academic vocabulary, and use of transition words for further analysis and exploration, but were not included in the closed total.

Researchers A and B attended training to identify the different elements, characteristics, and degrees of quality embedded in the analytic quality rubric and common to the informational genre citing text-based evidence. Researchers A and B discussed different examples and came to an agreement on scoring procedures as related to the scoring rubric. Reliability in training reached 92%, surpassing the planned minimum of 80% before independent scoring began. Researcher B scored 100% of the essays \((n = 69)\). Researcher A scored an additional 33% to calculate interrater reliability (IRR). IRR was calculated using point-by-point agreement for each of the 14 items included in the closed total. IRR was 94%. Researcher A entered the scores from the scoring sheet into the database and Researcher C reviewed 33% of the original score sheets against the database for reliability of entry. Reliability of entry was 95% with nine errors resulting from a misalignment in a single column. All discovered errors were corrected.

**Academic vocabulary.** Prompts were evaluated for student use of academic vocabulary as the CCSS embed vocabulary as an objective across all grade levels (CCSS, 2010) and students
were instructed on including academic vocabulary. Cunningham (2005) called for students’
independent reading to broaden vocabulary, and this measure of academic vocabulary was
created to determine if students were able to include essential key words in their essays after
reading source texts. Prior to the beginning of the study researchers A, C, and a literacy coach
certified to instruct this grade level evaluated the assessment prompts prior to the study for
unique vocabulary that appeared in the article that an average student at this grade level would
not use without having just been exposed to the text. Researchers A, C, and the literacy coach
were directed to focus their attention on academic vocabulary that fell into Tier 2 or 3 as defined
by Beck, McKeown and Kucan (2002). Words are considered to be in Tier 2 if they were
common across content areas, had multiple meanings, and were considered an indicator of a
mature communicator (Beck et al., 2002). Words were considered to be in Tier 3 if they were
domain-specific to the topic of the source text (Beck et al., 2002) and were necessary to facilitate
understanding of the subject of the source text (Anderson & Nagy, 1991). Each party generated a
list of academic vocabulary words from each text. If a word appeared on at least two of the three
lists, it was included. By calculating total number of words that appeared in common on at least
two lists ($n = 305$) and dividing the total by the total number of words chosen by any of the three
parties for that specific assessment (total $n$ for all assessments = 376), agreement was 81%. After
each response to an assessment probe was typed, the student’s words were compared to the list
for that assessment and then highlighted by Researcher A prior to scoring for genre elements.
Researcher C reviewed 29% of these essays to evaluate accuracy of highlighting academic
vocabulary. Reliability was 95%. Due to the closed total of the scoring (not including tallies), in
every instance ($n = 3$), the closed total was not impacted.
Evidence of strategy use. The score assigned for evidence of strategy was a summative calculation of all evidence of the strategy related to the genre present in the student’s planning. Planning pages were evaluated for evidence of strategy use indicated by letters or notes associated with TONES. TONES stands for: (a) T is for Topic, (b) O stands for Outline answers to the questions posed, (c) N stands for Note citations from the text to prove your answers, (d) E stands for Explain how the evidence supports your answer, and (e) S stands for State your topic and summarize your evidence to create a strong ending. Students could score up to one point each for each letter of TONES ($n = 5$) and an additional point for notes associated with each section of the TONES planning sheet ($n = 5$) for a possible total evidence of strategy use score of 10. Researcher C received explicit guidelines on identifying the evidence of strategy use common to the informational genre citing text-based evidence in student writing samples. Researcher A scored 33% of the student essays for strategy use using the same guidelines. IRR was calculated at total number of agreements divided by total number of agreements plus total number of disagreements. IRR was 100%.

Length. Two measures of length were evaluated – total length and length after removing word counts for plagiarized sections. The number of total words written was computed by the word processing program’s word count function. IRR was not calculated on total length since it was evaluated by a machine, but was conducted on length excluding plagiarized content. Researcher A subtracted the number of words determined to be plagiarized content from the total number of words written to determine the length excluding plagiarized content. Researcher C reviewed 33% of the typed essays to confirm both word count and length excluding plagiarized content. IRR for length excluding plagiarized content was 100%.
**Social validity.** Students completed the Children’s Intervention Rating Profile (CIRP; Witt & Elliott, 1983) both pre- and post-intervention to determine treatment acceptability (see Appendix F). Students rated seven items on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = I do not agree, 6 = I agree). Internal consistency reliability coefficients range from .75 to .89.

**Research Design and Data Analysis**

A multiple probe across participants design (Gast & Ledford, 2014) was employed as the intervention cannot be reversed. This design also allows for probes to be collected at longer intervals. This may reduce the likelihood of student fatigue and compromised performance that may be associated with required reading of multiple texts followed by using textual evidence from the reading to support generation of informational essays. This design was employed to assess student performance across intervention phases. The independent variable was manipulated by introducing it to only one small group of students at a time to determine if a functional relation between the independent variable and students’ progress could be established by effect replication while non-instructed students’ performance remained at pre-intervention levels throughout baseline (Kazdin, 2011).

The variable used to determine phase change for the single case design was the analytical quality score. Means and standard deviations were calculated for each phase.

The multiple probe across participants design included two experimental conditions: baseline and intervention. Short and long-term maintenance probes were collected. The introduction of the independent variable, SRSD for writing, was staggered across small groups to control for history and maturation (Gast & Ledford, 2014).

Single case designs include continual measurement of all behaviors, conditions, or participants (Kazdin, 2011). However, multiple probe designs allow for measuring behaviors that
have a delayed response to intervention, such as writing performance (Gast & Ledford, 2014). The intervention spanned across several weeks. A delay in student response to intervention was anticipated. Additionally, each assessment required significant investment of both time and effort on the part of the student as assessments included reading multiple texts, synthesizing the information gained, and responding to a writing prompt. Hence, continual assessment would have exposed students to repeated opportunities for frustration and failure and cannot be ethically justified (McKeown, Kimball, & Ledford, 2015; Sandmel et al., 2011). Thus, students in Legs 2 and 3 received periodic baseline assessments until immediately prior to their participation in the intervention.

In studies of SRSD, student performance has been measured throughout instruction, and with rare exception, students failed to respond to intervention prior to the implementer’s modeling of the lesson (Sandmel et al., 2011; Sexton, Harris, & Graham, 1998). Though five data points per phase are suggested by What Works Clearinghouse technical documentation to assure a study meets evidence standards without reservations (Kratochwill et al., 2010), three data points may be acceptable to establish a trend (Horner et al., 2005). This decision was an effort to mitigate the demand of the writing task used for probes as students may disengage or experience performance fatigue when asked to repeatedly write for assessment purposes only (McKeown, FitzPatrick et al., 2015; Sandmel et al., 2011), and thus, could not be ethically justified. A maximum of five assessments were administered in baseline phase. If stabilization was not reached in baseline by the end of five assessments and the performance trend was not increasing, the intervention was begun as previous SRSD studies suggest more consistent performance is an outcome of the intervention (McKeown et al., 2016). Assessment probes were administered following student mastery of Lesson 6 – independent practice – as determined by
the special education teacher and confirmed by Researcher A. For Leg 1, long term maintenance probes were administered approximately six and 14 weeks following the end of the intervention implementation for the respective legs. For Leg 2 participants, long term maintenance probes were administered approximately six weeks following the end of the study. Due to constraints of the academic year, no maintenance probes could be collected from Leg 3 participants.

Visual analysis was used to analyze the data and determine if a functional relation was present (Kazdin, 2011). Kratochwill and colleagues (2010) outlined the four steps of visual analysis: (a) determining a stable pattern of performance in baseline, (b) examining data for performance patterns within phases to determine if adequate evidence exists to determine student response to intervention; (c) comparing data from adjacent phases to determine if the intervention produced a change in performance pattern related to the dependent variable; and (d) combining information across all phases of the study to determine if a minimum of three demonstrations of an effect at three different points in time exist. The six variables associated with visual analysis are an evaluation of (a) level, (b) trend, (c) variability, (d) immediacy of the effect, (e) overlap, and (f) consistency of data patterns across similar phases (Kratochwill et al., 2010). Analytical quality scores of student writing performance were plotted for each assessment. Researcher A plotted the student performance, made a determination of data stability, recommended further assessment, implementation of intervention, or completion of assessment following intervention. Researcher B evaluated the data independently for confirmation. Visual analysis was chosen as the method of analysis for phase changes as debate is ongoing over the variety of metrics that have been introduced to determine effect size in single case design. The evidence suggests metrics vary widely, are not correlated with visual analysis or one another, are calculated without meeting required assumptions, and are prone to Type I error.
(Ledford, Wolery, & Gast, 2014; Parker, Vannest, & Davis, 2011; Rakap, Snyder, & Pasia, 2014; Shadish, Hedges, & Pustejovsky, 2014; Wolery, Busick, Reichow, & Barton, 2010).

Though not used for phase change decisions, percentage of non-overlapping data points (PND; Scruggs, Mastropieri, and Casto, 1987) and percentage exceeding the median (PEM; Ma, 2006) were later calculated and reported to facilitate data interpretation. PND is a nonparametric method for estimating the effect in single case research, is commonly reported, easily understood by practitioners, and has a positive correlation with visual judgments (Parker & Vannest, 2009). PND ratios were calculated by dividing the total number of scores in intervention and maintenance that exceeded the single highest data point of each participant in baseline by the total number of scores in intervention and maintenance. PND of 90% or greater is considered highly effective (Gast & Ledford, 2014). PEM is also a nonparametric method for estimating effect in single case research and has been used in meta-analyses of single case research for effect size (Ma, 2009; Preston & Carter, 2009). PEM ratios were calculated by dividing the total number of scores in intervention and maintenance that exceeded the median score of each participant in baseline by the total number of scores in intervention and maintenance.

**Procedures**

**Teacher-level intervention procedures.** The teacher-level intervention, PBPD, was provided by Researcher A on a Friday and Saturday at a private location chosen by the participating special education teacher. Another teacher and three research team members also were present for the PD. The additional teacher conducted another study in her own classroom (FitzPatrick, 2017). She was included in this training because one of the PBPD tenets is to work with colleagues with similar needs and also, because teachers in previous studies have indicated that working with colleagues throughout the process of learning and applying the knowledge
necessary to be successful with this complex instructional approach is beneficial (Harris & Graham, 1996; Harris et al., 2008).

**Quantity and duration of PD.** The special education teacher attended a two-day, 14-hour PD session to learn to implement SRSD for writing informational essays requiring the citation of text sources (see Appendix D). Prior studies have demonstrated that 12-14 hours are sufficient for teachers to learn to implement the intervention to criterion (Festas et al., 2015; Harris et al., 2012a; 2012b; 2015; 2017; Kiuhara et al., 2013; McKeown et al., 2016; 2017).

**Session description.** On the first day, participating teachers were advised that the training was a safe environment where details of their teaching and students would be shared. The expectations of freedom of speech, privacy of information, and a lack of judgment were established. Time was spent getting to know one another, their beliefs and practices related to writing, and the academic and behavioral characteristics of students in their respective classrooms. Researcher A offered a broad overview of SRSD and showed portions of a commercially produced video published by the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (Alexandria, Virginia) titled *Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities: Using Learning Strategies* (2002) that outlined the stages of the intervention as well as the theoretical support for its implementation. Teachers and Researcher A engaged in a brief discussion of the video followed by a review of fidelity checklists and how observations would take place across the study. A brief break was then provided. Researcher A led a discussion to discern teacher content knowledge of the instructed genre. Then the discussion was refocused on the concept of text-based evidence and how the teachers might expect to see students use source text to support an assertion. Other topics included the component parts of the informational genre citing text-
based evidence, teachers’ needs in terms of writing instruction, the anticipated needs of students in their classrooms, and opportunities for differentiation.

Researcher A distributed all the materials each teacher would need to fully implement the intervention with students and allowed the participants time to review the materials. These materials included metascripts unique to each lesson; fidelity checklists unique to each lesson; all supporting materials such as organizers, posters, exemplar essays, and prompts that had not been set aside for assessment purposes that corresponded with the lessons, goal sheets, graphing synthesizers, self-statement checklists, etc. A total of six exemplar essays had been prepared by Researcher A – two each to represent a simple, an intermediate, or a more complex essay in the genre (See Appendix E). Researcher A demonstrated that the metascript offered a detailed explication of the lesson’s implementation, in-depth guidance on how to complete the lesson, but that it is not to be used as a script. Metascripts are only for PD, but also may be referred to in preparatory lesson planning. Metascripts are not used during classroom instruction, as SRSD is not a scripted intervention. Rather the trainer demonstrated how to use the fidelity checklist as a reminder of each step during instruction. The teacher was provided a small 8x11 flipchart to use at the intervention table as visual supports like posters to remind students of genre elements or key transition words are often available for students to use during SRSD instruction. However, the design of this study was so that other students in the same classroom would come to the instruction at a later date. Hence, to avoid contamination, the visual references this teacher would be using were made available in a more compact style that could quickly be brought out prior to and put away following instruction.

The participating teachers were then asked to assume the role of students in their classrooms. Researcher A explicitly modeled all steps of Stage 1 as outlined on both the
metascript and the fidelity checklist. (See Appendix E for details of these lessons). During the explicit model, Researcher A conducted the lesson for the audience of PD participants exactly as the teachers would be expected to conduct the lesson in their classroom offering examples of differentiation that might be employed in the classroom. Following the modeling of this lesson, a short discussion directed by the teachers’ questions was conducted. After all questions were addressed, the participating special education teacher modeled the lesson to his colleague, the trainer, and Researcher D who all assumed roles of students in a classroom. This role-playing by the audience of PD participants and members of the research team presented several opportunities for the special education teacher to consider ways he might differentiate for students who understand, respond, or behave in varying ways. Following his implementation of the lesson, questions and concerns were addressed.

Researcher A and other participants offered critical feedback on his performance and offered suggestions for improvement. The trainer queried the teacher about opportunities for differentiation, both cognitive and behavioral. His colleague then modeled the lesson and received peer and expert feedback on her performance. Organizing the PD in this manner afforded the participating teacher ample experience with the intervention. He encountered two full models of this lesson, one by Researcher A, and another by a colleague. Then he conducted his own implementation of the lesson with a focus on opportunities for differentiating instruction to address needs that may present themselves in a classroom setting. He then received expert and peer feedback before being asked to use these same materials to implement with students when performance is critical. Training for Lessons 2 and 3 were conducted in the same manner. Day 1 ended with reflections, comments, and questions.
To begin Day 2, questions or concerns from the first day of PD were addressed. Training for Lessons 4 and 5 were offered in the same manner as the prior lessons. The IRB approved this study for a specific time commitment for PD, 14 hours. With the participating teachers’ permission, the first day ended more than one hour after the scheduled end time, so the second day’s schedule had to be reduced by one hour. After consulting with Researcher B, Researcher A opted to cut the teacher participant model of Lesson 6 and the time set aside to create a pacing calendar, as these were deemed the least critical elements. Lesson 6 is a student independent performance. Teachers are asked to review genre parts, self-statements, and goals. Then students were asked to independently respond to a prompt. The teachers had conducted all steps of Lesson 6 aside from independent performance in previous lessons. The portion of PD set aside to create a pacing calendar allows teachers to have time allotted specifically for this instruction and to determine how this instruction could be embedded across the weekly and yearly academic calendars. Since this implementation was embedded in a research study, the demands of the study dictated much of the pacing of the intervention, and also, Researchers A and D were regularly available to answer any of the teacher’s questions regarding scheduling.

In the final afternoon together, the trainer led discussion on the schedule of lessons and received a commitment from teachers to instruct a minimum of 30 minutes a day three times each week. It was reiterated that each lesson does not necessarily correspond to one singular instructional session, that is, lessons are not necessarily one day of instruction. Additionally, it was emphasized that lessons can be returned to as necessary as SRSD is a criterion-based instructional intervention. Prior to closing, research-related considerations were discussed such as fidelity observations, audio recording procedures, available supports, classroom observations, and IRB for Human Subjects Research. The session closed with questions and comments.
Student-level intervention procedures. SRSD instruction took place at a kidney table in a rear corner of the general education classroom. The special educator sat on one side of the table and the three students participating in the present leg of the study sat on the other.

Quantity and duration of exposure. The participating special education teacher agreed to conduct a minimum of three lessons each week for a minimum duration of 30 minutes with a goal of completing instruction for each leg in approximately 15-24 sessions across five to eight weeks, estimating 7.5-12 hours of instruction per leg. There were 23 sessions spanning eight weeks of instruction (two weeks of school vacation) implemented in Leg 1 with a mean duration of 26.91 minutes ($SD = 8.27$) for a total instructional time of 10 hours, 19 minutes. There were 28 lessons spanning eight weeks of instruction (one week of school vacation) implemented in Leg 2 with a mean duration of 31.42 minutes ($SD = 11.85$) for a total instructional time of 14 hours, 40 minutes. The difference between Legs 1 and 2 in terms of total dosage can primarily be attributed to makeup instruction for absent students that occurred on separate days, to include an additional one hour and 14 minutes in Lesson 6, independent practice, when students read and responded to a prompt based after reading two texts. Leg 2 was the only leg that exceeded the anticipated number of hours necessary for the intervention. There were 16 lessons implemented in Leg 3 with a mean duration of 30.13 minutes ($SD = 10.51$) for a total instructional time of eight hours, two minutes.

Session description. The special education teacher implemented SRSD for the informational genre citing text-based evidence. This included six lessons divided across instructional sessions until mastery was attained (see Appendix E). SRSD begins with strong leadership from the teacher with students acting in a more collaborative, discussant role, so mastery of the first four lessons was considered attained when lessons were administered with
greater than 90% fidelity. As this is a criterion-based intervention, mastery for the final two lessons, where students moved into greater independence, was considered achieved when all participating students wrote essays with a minimum of 80% of essay elements (Ennis & Jolivette, 2014). Lessons were adapted for the informational genre citing text-based evidence using the same format as those used in previous SRSD administrations (Harris et al., 2002; McKeown et al., 2016).

**Memory aids.** A mnemonic is a pattern of ideas, associations, or letters often formed into a word that assists learners in remembering a series of steps. In SRSD, mnemonics are often used as a memory aid to assist students in remembering the different steps of the writing process as well as the elements and characteristics of specific genres. The genre-specific mnemonic, TONES, was used to assist students’ memory of those required for the informational genre citing text-based evidence. TONES stands for: (a) T is for Topic, (b) O stands for Outline answers to the questions posed, (c) N stands for Note citations from the text to prove your answers, (d) E stands for Explain how the evidence supports your answer, and (e) S stands for State your topic and summarize your evidence to create a strong ending. Successfully using the TONES mnemonic would foster students’ abilities to create essays that identified the topic of their response, answered all questions posed citing evidence from source texts as well as brief explanations connecting the chosen evidence with the topic, and summarized both the position and evidence for a powerful conclusion.

In the next section, there is an outline each stage of SRSD. Following that, an in-depth, step-by-step explication of the lessons associated with that stage is offered. While SRSD instruction is separated into six lessons, repeating or returning to all or parts of previous lessons is welcomed and encouraged based on teacher evaluation of student understanding throughout
the process. There are six stages of SRSD, and in this study, there were six lessons associated with the informational genre citing text-based evidence. A 1:1 ratio of stages to lessons is not necessary with SRSD instruction. Lessons were not expected to be completed within a single 30-min instructional session. That is, lessons spanned across several instructional sessions until students met performance criteria. Lessons 1 and 2 each typically lasted up to two sessions. Lessons 3 and 4 were more elaborate lessons, each including modeling the entire writing process, and lasted up to five instructional sessions. Lesson 5 included students applying the knowledge and skills they had learned from the intervention in a small group with support from the teacher and typically lasted two to four instructional sessions. Lesson 6 typically spanned two to three instructional sessions.

Stage 1: Develop background knowledge. The first stage of SRSD is focused on providing all learners a common foundational understanding of the genre, vocabulary unique to the genre, and addressing any deficits in background knowledge that could prevent students from success. This included exploration of academic vocabulary that could be derived from the source texts, engaging introductions that pull in the reader, effective use of transition words, and also, an in-depth discussion of plagiarism and strategies to avoid plagiarizing by properly citing evidence from source texts. During this stage, teachers question to assess students’ current understandings and misunderstandings unique to this genre. Misunderstandings are addressed. Teachers and students richly discuss the elements essential to the genre in depth, evaluating examples and nonexamples. Stage 1 provides access to success for all students by addressing inconsistencies in background knowledge, so all students move forward with a common understanding of the genre and its elements.
Lesson 1. The special education teacher introduced the informational genre citing text-based evidence reminding students that all good essays are fun to read, fun to write, make sense, and have all their parts. Then the special education teacher offered a variety of questions to the group to encourage an opportunity to activate prior knowledge as well as gently correct any misconceptions about the genre. Examples from this list include: What are informational essays? What is a text? What do you think text-based means? What are linking words and phrases? (See Appendix E for complete Lessons). The special education teacher then engaged in a discussion with the students as he introduced the essential elements and characteristics of the informational genre citing text-based evidence which included: (a) an engaging introduction, (b) a clear topic statement, (c) answers to each question posed by the prompt, (d) specific facts and examples from the text that support the topic/thesis, (e) an explanation of how the evidence is linked to the topic, (f) a conclusion, (g) academic language and transition words to connect ideas, and (h) correct spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. The special education teacher explained how the TONES mnemonic supported the students in including those parts. TONES stands for: (a) T is for Topic, (b) O stands for Outline answers to the questions posed, (c) N stands for Note citations from the text to prove your answers, (d) E stands for Explain how the evidence supports your answer, and (e) S stands for State your topic and summarize your evidence to create a strong ending. Following the introduction of the TONES mnemonic, the teacher addressed each letter of the mnemonic providing a common foundational understanding for all students on what represents success for each element or characteristic. The special education teacher discussed plagiarism. Students were also introduced to a poster that offered different ways evidence could be cited to prevent any appearances of plagiarism. This included using quotations as well as noting where the information originated when summarizing. At the end of Lesson 1, students
reviewed the components of good essays as well as the elements of informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic and were informed that during their next instructional meeting, they would be assessed on the TONES mnemonic and what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. Then all materials were collected.

**Stage 2: Discuss it.** Stage 2 deepens the work completed in Stage 1. Teachers and students discuss how the writing strategy they are learning supports their success. Teachers talk with the students about using the strategy as well as the value of creating a plan. The discussion may include generalization and how this could be used in other settings.

**Lesson 2.** The special education teacher began Lesson 2 by reminding students that they were learning a strategy that would support them in writing good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of all good essays as well as the elements and characteristics of informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students discussed why it was important to memorize the strategy and then reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic. The special education teacher and the students discussed the concept of making notes with special emphasis given to the timesaving and organizational benefits. The special education teacher then introduced students to an exemplar essay in the genre and had students find each of the elements or characteristics of the informational genre. Students also tried to find ways the author demonstrated using information from the source text. Special attention was brought to use of academic vocabulary as well as transition words. The special education teacher used a TONES graphic organizer (See Appendix E) to make notes similar to those the author may have used to create the exemplar essay. The special education teacher then asked the students to review the notes and see how those notes could have led to the exemplar
essay. The lesson closing was the same as with Lesson 1, students reviewed the components of all good essays as well as the elements and characteristics of informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed components of the TONES mnemonic and were informed they would be assessed on the TONES mnemonic and what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence during their next meeting. Materials were collected.

**Stage 3 (a): Model it.** Stage 3 offers the students an in-depth, explicit model of the entire writing process using the strategy. The teacher overtly models ideation, planning, and creating an essay in the instructed genre from the initial point of receiving the assigned writing prompt to the completed essay. The teacher verbalizes using think alouds and self-statements to make transparent the internal dynamics of engaging in the writing process. Then essential components of SRSD are addressed such as use of self-statements, goal setting, and monitoring performance objectives. Throughout the process, students are asked to offer input and guidance at the teacher’s discretion. This lesson was an explicit model of the entire task from beginning to end by the teacher offered so students witnessed and understood all the steps necessary to achieve an essay that successfully meets the requirement of the genre. The teacher offered the lesson with opportunities for input from the students to keep them actively engaged in the process. The teacher encouraged students to observe and be mindful of what words he was using and what specific actions he was completing.

A collaborative model followed the explicit model led by the teacher. In the collaborative model, students shared the responsibility for completing the process of reading the associated source texts, dissecting the prompt, creating an organizational plan using the TONES strategy, engaging in self-talk for a variety of purposes, and using that plan to draft the entire essay.
Students conducted a self-evaluation with model synthesizers highlighting a section of the synthesizer for each element included in the essay.

Lesson 3. Lesson 3 began with the same initial steps as Lesson 2. The teacher reminded students that they were learning a strategy that would support them in learning how to write good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of good essays as well as the elements and characteristics of informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students discussed why it was important to memorize the strategy and then reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic. The teacher displayed the TONES poster as well as the How to Cite poster.

The students were then asked to watch and listen as the teacher explicitly modeled the entire process of receiving the texts and prompt to completing a drafted essay. The teacher provided the students with opportunities for input throughout the process to keep the students engaged. The teacher explained that he would use the strategy they were learning to complete his essay. He asked students to look at the prompt as he read it aloud. He then read the associated source texts and modeled taking notes and highlighting sections that were related to the two separate content prongs of the prompt. He asked students to rate the quality and clarity of his notes. After completing the reading, the teacher created a TONES organizer. He modeled notetaking to complete the TONES organizer. After making notes and checking those notes for completeness against the list of essential genre elements and characteristics for the informational genre citing text-based evidence, the teacher began drafting his essay. He worked from his notes, section-by-section, printed clearly on the paper so students could observe, and crossed off each note on the graphic organizer as it was completed. He sometimes asked students what to do next or for input on vocabulary choice to increase their investment in the process. Following the
conclusion, the teacher checked for academic vocabulary and transition words. He asked students to identify additional opportunities to include academic vocabulary from the source texts or transitions words to support the flow of the paper.

Throughout the entire lesson, the teacher offered a verbal think aloud for his writing process that supported students in joining him on the journey of success. At times the teacher allowed the students to offer input into the process. Thinking aloud may reduce the ambiguity associated with complex writing tasks, making writing in the genre a clear and achievable skill. Also ongoing throughout the writing process was use of self-talk for a variety of purposes such as to maintain motivation, celebrate successes, determine what to do next, and cope with any negative thoughts about the challenges of writing such as frustration and fatigue. Self-statements directed toward the aim of problem definition encourage students to explicitly state the task at hand. The teacher defined the problem (e.g., “What am I being asked to do? I need to address these two topics that were mentioned in the prompt. I’ll make a note about those.”) As reading and then writing about task is cognitively taxing, self-statements were used to maintain motivation across the duration of the process. The teacher used self-statements to support motivation while reading, notetaking, and drafting his essay (e.g., “I’ve already read the first essay. Only one to go!” “I already found great evidence for the first topic. That will really teach my reader something!”). Self-statements can be used to encourage self-evaluation in using the strategy and including genre elements. The teacher used self-statements to model ongoing self-evaluation (e.g., “Let me see if I have all my parts. Did I add transition words and academic vocabulary?” “Have I checked my work?”). Self-statements can also be used to provide coping statements, stating present feelings and responding to them in a constructive way that honors the negative feeling, but offers an encouraging solution. The teacher used self-statements to cope
with challenges he faced during the writing process (e.g., “My hand is tired. This is a lot of work. At least, if I use my strategy, I know I’ll write a strong informational essay. Then my hand can have a rest!”). 

Following the creation of the drafted essay, students were introduced to a method of self-evaluation that involved graphing. Each student had a graphing sheet with six synthesizers displayed. The synthesizer illustration included: six adjusters, four knobs, and six notes that hovered above. The six adjusters were used to record the author’s use of a hook, followed by the five elements of TONES. The four knobs were used to record instances of transition words. The six notes that hovered above were used to record use of academic vocabulary. The teacher modeled using the synthesizer illustration to find each detail in the essay, underlined or circled the example in his essay, and then colored in the corresponding detail on the synthesizer. The teacher explained to students that they could go back and add anything to their essay should they notice they were missing elements after graphing was completed.

Following the instruction on using the graphing synthesizers, the special education teacher asked students to turn to the self-statements sheet in their folder where they found blank spaces for things to say to themselves (a) to get started, (b) while they work, (c) when something is hard, and (d) to check their work. The special education teacher asked students to recall how he spoke to himself during the modeled lesson. Following a brief discussion for each way of using self-statements, students were asked to write down at least two examples that they could use while they were writing independently. Students were encouraged to use the examples the special education teacher used or examples from other students if the content resonated with them. He then asked the students to keep this list in their writing folder for future use.
The final step of Lesson 3 prior to the closing was adopting goals. The special education teacher asked students to turn to Goal Sheet A provided in their writing folders. The teacher pointed out the goal that everyone would share, to use each step of TONES when writing an informational essay citing text-based evidence. The special education teacher then reviewed the other goals that were listed, I will: (a) add more academic vocabulary to my essay, (b) cite more evidence to prove my topic, (c) start every essay with an engaging hook, (d) explain why my evidence proves my answer is right, (e) use more linking/transition words to make my writing flow, and (f) write a strong ending that restates my topic and summarizes my evidence. At the bottom of the sheet were two blank spaces provided for students who had goals that were not listed. Students were asked to choose or write in one or two goals that they would use when writing their own essays.

To close the lesson, students reviewed the components of good essays as well as the elements and characteristics of informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic and were informed that during their next instructional meeting, they would be assessed on the TONES mnemonic and what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. Then all materials were collected.

Lesson 4. This lesson was a collaborative model of the entire task from beginning to end working as a team with the students so the students engaged and employed all the steps necessary to achieve an essay that met the requirement of the genre in a supportive environment sharing skills with both peers and their special education teacher to reach success. The special education teacher was asked to rely on the students as heavily as he could to transfer responsibility for performance onto the students. The teacher encouraged the students to direct the process while facilitating progress and brought emphasis to essential concerns (e.g., use of
academic vocabulary, self-statements, citing evidence). This lesson began with the same initial steps as Lessons 2 and 3. The teacher reminded students that they were learning a strategy that would support them in learning how to write good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of good essays as well as what makes good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students discussed why it was important to memorize the strategy and then reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic. The special education teacher displayed the TONES poster as well as the How to Cite poster.

The special education teacher asked students to turn to the self-statements sheet in their folder that they had filled out previously with things to say to themselves (a) to get started, (b) while they work, (c) when something is hard, and (d) to check their work. The special education teacher asked students to share their self-statements for each occasion and reviewed how self-statements allows us to be our own coach to support us in accomplishing our goals. In that way, the students were encouraged to be self-reliant with an internal locus of control, relying on themselves to provide the instruction, motivation, and direction to get them to success.

The students were then asked to be co-participants in reading the texts and responding to the prompt. The special education teacher and participating students shared responsibility for the process of reading the source texts and prompt to completing a drafted essay. The students led the use of the strategy to complete their essay. Students located the prompt and chorally read it aloud. They then read the associated source texts and took notes and highlighted sections that were related to the two separate content prongs of the prompt. After each paragraph of the reading, the teacher asked if there was anything in that paragraph they could use to prove their topic was true. Throughout this process he encouraged use of self-statements to support problem definition, motivation, self-evaluation, self-reinforcement, and coping.
After reading the source texts, students created a TONES organizer and the teacher also created one. The students and special education teacher discussed each section of the organizer and what notes would be appropriate. Students were asked for examples of self-statements throughout the process. They were asked what they could say when a section was completed, when they did not know what to do next, or when they were feeling fatigued or frustrated. After making notes and checking those notes for completeness against the list of essential genre elements for the informational genre citing text-based evidence, the group began drafting the essay. Students used their notes to verbally create a sentence and then each member of the group wrote that sentence on their respective paper. They worked from the notes, section by section and crossed off each note on the graphic organizer as it was completed. The group continued with self-statements throughout the process to maintain motivation, celebrate successes, determine what to do next, and cope with any negative thoughts about the challenges of writing. After writing the conclusion, the group checked for academic vocabulary and transition words and added additional examples when they located opportunities to do so.

Following the creation of the drafted essay, the group used the graphing synthesizer illustrations to find each detail in the essay, underlined or circled the example in their essays, and then colored in the corresponding detail on the synthesizer. When that was complete, the teacher and students turned to Goal Sheet A in their respective folders and evaluated if the essay they created had met their shared goal of using TONES to write their informational essay citing text-based evidence and also their personally chosen goals. If they did not meet their goals, students had the opportunity to add to their essay. As with the other lessons, the closing consisted of students reviewing the components of good essays as well as what makes good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic
and were informed that during their next instructional meeting, they would be assessed on the TONES mnemonic and what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. Then all materials were collected.

**Stage 4: Memorize it.** Memorization of the genre elements, vocabulary unique to the genre, and strategy are essential to long-term success when the teacher and visual supports are not available. By memorizing these things, students can employ the strategy automatically without spending time and cognitive effort on retrieving the knowledge. Stage 4 was continuously integrated within each stage as is reflected in the introduction and closing routine starting with Lesson 2. The characteristics of good writing, specific elements and characteristics of quality informational essays citing text-based evidence, and the associated mnemonic—TONES were reviewed at the opening and closing of each day’s lesson.

**Stage 5: Support it.** Stage 5 offers students an opportunity to employ the strategy collaboratively with a peer with ready access to the teacher. Stage 5 may look differently across implementations in different settings and may include small groups, peer partners, or one-on-one instruction. During this stage, students begin working with the tools they have been offered throughout the intervention. The special education teacher facilitated student success by supporting the group of students in employing the strategies on their own as a team. The special education teacher worked with the small group, fostering a collaborative writing partnership that gave students additional practice in performance and strategy application, and offered encouragement during difficulties in the planning or drafting processes. Students worked with one another to successfully complete the reading and writing tasks leaning on one another with convenient support of their teacher when needed. Teacher-initiated prompts to use the strategy
were only offered when students could not collectively determine the next step. The special education teacher was available for one-on-one consultation as needed.

Lesson 5. This lesson began with the same initial steps as Lessons 2, 3, and 4. The special education teacher reminded students that they were learning a strategy that would support them in learning how to write good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of good essays as well as the elements of informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students discussed why it was important to memorize the strategy and then reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic. The teacher displayed the TONES poster as well as the How to Cite poster.

Since students were already in a small group of three, the three students worked collectively to successfully navigate the entire process of writing an informational essay citing text-based evidence from receiving the source texts and prompt to creating notes for all the sections of the TONES organizer to completing and reviewing the completed draft for all the essential parts of the genre. Students were encouraged by the teacher and encouraged one another to engage in self-talk for a variety of purposes. Throughout the process, the special education teacher asked students what to do next if they did not move fluidly to the next step. Following essay completion, students evaluated their performance with graphing synthesizers.

As with the other lessons, the closing consisted of students reviewing the components of good essays as well as the elements of informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic and were informed that during their next instructional meeting, they would be assessed on the TONES mnemonic and the elements of a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. Then all materials were collected.
**Stage 6: Independent performance.** During Stage 6, students were expected to independently employ the strategy to reach success. The teacher was available for monitoring and support. Each student independently produced at least one informational citing text-based evidence essays using the strategy and attaining mastery, a minimum of 80% inclusion of expected genre elements, prior to moving to post-intervention assessment.

**Lesson 6.** This lesson began with the same initial steps as the other lessons. The special education teacher reminded students they were learning a strategy that would support them in learning how to write good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of all good essays as well as what makes good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students discussed why it was important to memorize the strategy and then reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic. The teacher displayed the TONES poster as well as the How to Cite poster.

The teacher asked students to turn to the self-statements sheet in their folder that they had filled out previously with things to say to themselves (a) to get started, (b) while they work, (c) when something is hard, and (d) to check their work. The teacher asked students to share their self-statements for each occasion and reviewed how self-statements allowed them to be their own coach to support them in accomplishing their goals. In that way, the students were encouraged to be self-reliant with an internal locus of control, relying on themselves to provide the instruction, motivation, and direction to get them to success.

When that was complete, the teacher and students turned to Goal Sheet A in their respective folders and reviewed their shared goal of using TONES to write their informational essay citing text-based evidence and also their personally chosen goals. The teacher then reviewed what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. He told students
they had observed him creating an essay in the genre, they had shared responsibility with him for creating an essay in the genre, they had worked in a small group to create an essay, and for the final lesson they would demonstrate that they could independently write an informational essay citing text-based evidence. Students were asked to open their folders and retrieve the self-statement list and their transition word chart. Students were then asked to write an essay independently. If students found themselves unable to move forward, the special education teacher prompted them with questions about what do next. Following the completion of essays, students evaluated their essays using the graphing synthesizers. Then they reviewed their goal sheets to determine if they had met their personal goals.

The closing for Lesson 6 was consistent with those used in the other lessons. Students reviewed the components of good essays as well as what makes good informational essays citing text-based evidence. Students reviewed the components of the TONES mnemonic and were informed that during their next instructional meeting, they would be assessed on the TONES mnemonic and what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. Then all materials were collected.

**Results**

**Teacher-level Results**

**Fidelity of writing probe administration.** Fidelity of writing probe administration was 100% across all legs. However, some steps were optional and at times were not included. For example, the step that instructed the special education to say, “Do the best you can,” if a student asked for help would be unnecessary if no one had asked for help.
**Fidelity of PBPD for SRSD.** Fidelity of PBPD was 93% (range = 87 to 100%). For the portion of PBPD including explicit models of SRSD lessons as intended for the classroom setting, fidelity of SRSD lesson implemented by Researcher A was 100%.

**Fidelity of SRSD.** The first research question was posed to determine the extent SRSD could be implemented with fidelity in small groups by a special education teacher in an inclusive general education setting. Across all three legs, teacher fidelity of SRSD instruction was 92% (range = 78% to 100%). This indicates the intervention was implemented with high fidelity. As this study featured the same teacher implementing across multiple legs with different groups, it is meaningful to consider how fidelity of SRSD was maintained across implementations. Fidelity was 96%, 88%, and 97% across Legs 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Teacher agreement with observer fidelity was 93%, 75%, and 84%, respectively.

**Social validity for teachers.** A secondary research question was posted to determine the extent the participating teachers considered SRSD to be a socially valid intervention for use in inclusive education settings. The special education teacher’s overall approval increased from a high score of 77 at pre-intervention to a very high score of 89 at post-intervention. Following intervention, the only item not rated the maximum score was “This intervention is consistent with those I have used in classroom settings.” The cooperating teacher, that is the general education teacher in whose room the intervention was conducted, rated the intervention strongly with a score of 88. She also noted on her survey, “The parents were also happy with this intervention and its benefits.”

**Student-level Results**

Student-level writing results were related to the research question addressing the extent SRSD instruction in the informational genre citing text-based evidence improved the writing
skills of fifth grade students with LD or those who struggle in writing in terms of (a) analytic quality, (b) evidence of strategy use, and (c) length. These results are reported here in the order they were addressed in the question.

**Analytic quality of writing.** Mean analytic quality across all students at baseline was 5.14 \( (SD = 4.16) \) and increased to 14.79 \( (SD = 4.23) \) immediately following intervention (see Figure 2.1). Mean analytic quality included in essays at six-weeks maintenance was 13.8 \( (SD = 4.12) \) and at 14-weeks was 9.33 \( (SD = 0.94) \) (see Figure 2.1). PND and PEM for all participants in all legs was 100% including maintenance assessments.

Students in Leg 1 had a mean analytic quality score of 2.00 \( (SD = 1.33) \) in baseline and 12.44 \( (SD = 4.37) \) immediately following intervention. Six- and 14-week maintenance probes scored 13.67 \( (SD = 4.19) \) and 9.33 \( (SD = 0.94) \) in mean analytic quality, respectively. Students in Leg 2 had a mean analytic quality score of 6.00 \( (SD = 3.02) \) in baseline and 15.50 \( (SD = 3.82) \) immediately following intervention.

One participant’s performance called for additional explanation. Harriet had a mean analytic quality score of 1.67 in baseline \( (range = 0 - 4) \). The mean analytic quality score of her first three writing samples following intervention was 8.67 \( (range = 5-16) \), a clear improvement. However, her first two performances immediately following intervention both received analytic quality scores of 5. Then, her performance increased to 16 on the third post-intervention assessment. Additional assessments would have been desirable to determine stability of performance, but were not possible as the students began their winter break, spanning more than two weeks. This break following the end of intervention was extended further as Harriet was absent from school for several days following the winter break. By the time she was again available, it was closer to the six-week maintenance probe’s date than it was to the date she
finished the intervention and rationalizing assessment at that point as indicative of post-
treatment performance was unjustifiable. Thus, her next assessment point came at the six-
week maintenance point, and she maintained, and even improved upon, her highest performance
immediately following intervention, receiving a score of 18 for analytic quality. Because she
maintained and improved her performance, some credence is given to the third post intervention
performance, and her delayed response in terms of a change in level may be due to a need to
have had more experience with independent practice before being prepared to be fully successful
with the new skills she had acquired. That is to say, completing an essay that included a
minimum of 80% of the elements of the genre following intervention may not have been enough
independent practice for Harriet.

Students in Leg 2 had a mean analytic quality score of 14 (SD = 4.00) on maintenance
probes administered six-weeks following intervention. Students in Leg 3 had a mean analytic
quality score of 6.21 (SD = 4.73) in baseline and 16.67 (SD = 3.09) immediately following
intervention. Students in Leg 3 were unable to complete any maintenance probes as their final
writing assessment was administered three days before the academic year ended. No patterns of
performance delineated on disability status were discernible based on visual analysis. See
Figures 2.2 through 2.5 for examples of students’ writing.

Evidence of strategy use. Of the 37 essays written prior to implementation, none used
TONES or associated notes to plan essays in the informational genre. During baseline, eight
essays showed evidence of planning, five of the eight were in the initial assessment of the study
and included at least one student from each leg. The evidence of strategy use included in
planning prior to writing is described as follows: four were notes copied from the text, one was a
single sentence that addressed one prong of the prompt in the author’s own words, two were
graphic organizers described as a web, and one was the mnemonic TREE, commonly used in SRSD writing instruction for the persuasive genre, with three check marks next to the first three letters followed by a paragraph of writing that was then copied on the lined paper as a final draft.

Following intervention, 100% of essays included some evidence of strategy use for planning and 100% of participating students used the TONES organizer with associated notes scoring a perfect score, at least once following intervention. Of all essays written immediately following intervention, 92% scored a nine or ten. The mean scores for evidence of strategy use were 9.46 (SD = 1.08, range = 5 to 10) immediately following intervention and 7.8 (SD = 3.92, range = 0 to 10) and 2.33 (SD = 2.62, range = 0 to 6) on maintenance probes at administered at six and 14 weeks, respectively.

**Length.** All participants in all legs increased in mean length of essay from 94.14 (SD = 41.75) in baseline to 128.16 (SD = 23.68) following intervention. The mean of plagiarized material appearing in baseline essays was 15%, 16%, and 18% for Legs 1, 2, and 3 respectively, but dropped to 6%, 1%, and 2% immediately following intervention.

In terms of total length, students in Leg 1 wrote a mean of 63.44 words (SD = 29.68) per essay in baseline, 126.44 (SD = 12.83) following SRSD instruction, 160 (SD = 19.09) on a six-week maintenance probe, and 75.33 (SD = 8.81) on a 14-week maintenance probe. After accounting for plagiarized material, students in Leg 1 wrote a mean of 54.11 words (SD = 31.99) in baseline, 118.78 (SD = 18.40) following SRSD instruction, 145.33 (SD = 34.29) on a six-week maintenance probe, and 72.33 (SD = 7.04) on a 14-week maintenance probe.

In terms of total length, students in Leg 2 wrote a mean of 85.78 words (SD = 31.33) per essay prior to intervention, 140.00 (SD = 9.92) following SRSD instruction, and 117 (SD = 4) on a maintenance probe six weeks after instruction ended. After accounting for plagiarized material,
students in Leg 2 wrote a mean of 71.78 words \((SD = 27.27)\) per essay prior to intervention, 138.5 \((SD = 9.57)\) following SRSD instruction, and 117 \((SD = 4)\) on a maintenance probe six weeks after instruction ended.

In terms of total length, students in Leg 3 wrote a mean of 112.63 words \((SD = 41.13)\) per essay prior to intervention and 131.44 \((SD = 14.50)\) following SRSD instruction. After accounting for plagiarized material, students in Leg 3 wrote a mean of 92.63 words \((SD = 47.69)\) per essay prior to intervention and 128.33 \((SD = 15.412)\) following SRSD instruction.

**Social validity for students.** Social validity across all student participants improved from a high mean score of 39.38 \((SD = 4.82)\) prior to intervention to a slightly higher mean score of 40.13 \((SD = 3.98)\) following intervention, though the results were mixed across legs. Prior to intervention, the mean score on the CIRP for students in Leg 1 was 39 \((SD = 4.32)\) and post-intervention 41.33 \((SD = 2.36)\). Prior to intervention, the mean score on the CIRP for students in Leg 2 was 35.50 \((SD = 5.5)\) and post-intervention 38.00 \((SD = 6.00)\). Prior to intervention, the mean score on the CIRP for students in Leg 3 was 42.33 \((SD = 2.05)\) and post-intervention 40.33 \((SD = 2.87)\).

**Discussion and Future Directions**

The purpose of this study was two-fold: to determine the extent to which a special education teacher could administer SRSD instruction for the informational genre citing text-based evidence with fidelity following PBPD and also the impact the instruction had on the writing performance of fifth grade learners identified with LD and other teacher-identified struggling writers. Results indicate the teacher was capable of implementing with high fidelity, and student writing performance increased. Analytic quality scores improved, mean length
increased, and instances of plagiarism were reduced. Students also increased their planning and evidence of strategy use. Social validity was high for all participants.

**Fidelity**

Klingner and colleagues (2003) emphasized that both the quantity and quality of implementation influences students’ response to intervention. When exploring the impact of program implementation fidelity on effect sizes across several research areas, Durlak and DuPre (2008) found that across five meta-analyses, on average, effect sizes were two to three times greater when interventions were implemented judiciously with high fidelity in comparison to those with lower fidelity and stated that studies “that lack carefully collected information on implementation are flawed and incomplete” (p.340). Fidelity of PBPD was high. Due to time constraints and a commitment to abide by the number of hours approved by the IRB, Researcher A opted to remove time set aside for creating a pacing calendar and conducting teacher performance of Lesson 6, student independent performance, during PBPD. This reduced the fidelity from the anticipated 100%. It has been uncommon in the literature to report fidelity of PBPD, and simple changes to the intended PD may impact implementation. Future researchers should continue to employ the same scrutiny to fidelity of PBPD as is regularly applied to fidelity of student-level intervention. The benefits of including this measure of fidelity may extend to school settings where train the trainer sessions are modeled on research practices.

Implementation fidelity for student-level interventions is of critical concern because of the many challenges to fidelity that exist in school settings (e.g., limited time, field trips, absences). With rare exception (Festas et al., 2015; McKeown et al., 2015), SRSD for writing has been implemented with fidelity greater than 0.90. Over the course of the year, the special education teacher conducting SRSD in small groups in an inclusive general education setting
implemented SRSD with high fidelity, though Leg 2 fidelity did drop to 0.88. Across observations during that leg, the teacher failed to complete the final step on the checklist more than half of the time specifically related to reminding students that they had learned a strategy for the informational genre citing text-based evidence and announcing an upcoming test on the strategy. Recursive reminders of why the students are learning the strategy were embedded into the lessons as students benefit from instruction if they understand why they are receiving it (Brown, Campione, & Day, 1981). On 75% of the fidelity checklists filled out by the teacher during that leg, he stated that he had completed the step when observers stated he did not. Immediately following the lesson, this was mentioned to the teacher on two separate occasions, but no changes were evident in performance. The use of the term “test” is intentionally included to desensitize students to the word and associate it with an activity they pair with success to reduce the stress that often accompanies both writing and high-stakes testing in public school settings. There are many reasons this deletion may have occurred. It may be related to time constraints, the teacher’s perception that the step has no value, or the teacher’s knowledge that students will not respond to the term positively. Future researchers may interview teachers in real-time following instructional sessions to explore the various reasons teachers choose to include or abandon portions of an intervention.

**Writing**

SRSD is supported by interwoven behavioral, information processing, sociocultural, contextual, and cognitive theories (Harris et al., 2009; Pressley, Harris, & Marks, 1992). SRSD addresses metacognition, writing skills, and explicit genre-specific knowledge for the informational genre citing text-based evidence, which support increased knowledge in this academic domain and improved writing performance on this task. Improved writing performance
is also consistent with results reported previously from multiple meta-analyses (Gillespie & Graham, 2014; Graham, 2006; Graham et al., 2013; Graham, McKeown et al., 2012; Graham & Perin, 2007a, Rogers & Graham, 2008). Hence, the increase in scores of analytical quality included in informational essays citing text-based evidence is aligned with previous research. Performance was maintained at six weeks, but waned to some degree by fourteen weeks following intervention suggesting ongoing review and use of the strategy across time may be necessary to maintain or improve writing quality. This extended measure of maintenance was called for in previous research (Asaro-Saddler & Bak, 2012; Lienemann & Reid, 2008). This study extends the body of evidence for SRSD with a special educator in an inclusive setting and to this specific writing task. Future researchers may explore the use of booster sessions at the longer term maintenance interval to determine if performance can be sustained.

**Planning.** The majority of students did not engage in planning in baseline, commensurate with previous studies in the informational genre (Mason et al., 2006). This may indicate that students did not know how to use a plan to organize and support their writing, or alternatively, that the effort required to create a plan was greater than the perceived benefit. However, following instruction, every student engaged in planning. This is consistent with previous studies of students with LD and struggling writers (Garcia-Sanchez & Fidalgo-Redondo, 2006; Graham et al., 1993). Because struggling writers and students with LD, whose writing tends to be hindered by ineffectual planning and organization (Bui et al., 2006; Graham et al., 2005; MacArthur & Graham, 1987) might benefit from improved planning and the use of that plan throughout the writing process, these results are promising. Future researchers may consider measures that map the content of the plan onto the essay to see what changes are occurring between the planning and drafting processes, to consider if additional content is being added to
the initial plan or if any planned content is being left out of the final essay. This could also be extended to any highlighted material in the reading passages. That is, researchers could evaluate the relationship between what students note and highlight while reading a source text and what content they include in their drafts.

**Length.** This study included only students with LD and teacher-identified struggling writers, and all participants in all legs increased number of words per essay following SRSD instruction in the informational genre citing text-based evidence. This is aligned with prior research in the informational genre (Mason et al., 2006; 2013). An additional measure added to this study evaluated length after accounting for instances of plagiarism. Instances of plagiarism were reduced following SRSD instruction. Students improved in their ability to paraphrase content as well as cite in commonly accepted ways. Additionally, the ongoing reminders throughout the lessons of what plagiarism was and how to avoid it seemed effective. Further exploration of plagiarism in elementary grade levels are encouraged.

Prior studies of SRSD measuring essay length have had varied results with some students increasing in number of words at posttest and other decreasing in the same measure (Harris et al., 2009; Lane et al., 2011; McKeown et al., 2016). There are several reasons this is the case. Variability in number of words per essay is noteworthy. A common explanation cited is that SRSD for writing is focused on including all genre components rather than on writing for a specific length, and also, that students write less unrelated text (Harris et al., 2012a). Hence, students create higher quality essays following interventions without regard to length. Prior researchers indicated that average writers’ essay length decreased following SRSD instruction whereas struggling writers essay length increased after the intervention (McKeown et al., 2016). Length may have increased in the present study as students were required to cite directly from
the text, thereby adding the article author’s words to their own and also, because they were able to include ideas they learned in their reading.

Social Validity

Teachers. In terms of social validity, the special education teacher rated SRSD high prior to intervention and very high following intervention indicating the intervention exceeded his expectations. Additionally, at the end of the study, the cooperating teacher rated the intervention very high and also noted parental approval. One goal of this study was to determine if teachers found it socially valid for a special education teacher working in a push-in model in an inclusive educational setting with students possessing IEPs as well as those that are teacher-identified as struggling writers. It was anticipated teachers would welcome the intervention as SRSD instruction in the informational genre citing text-based evidence is aligned with the current state-level writing assessment, and this intervention was tailored to address an immediate need in public school settings. Future researchers may consider including student results from state-level assessments in studies. Future researchers may consider additional work with inclusive educators using other evidence-based practices or alternative genres for this intervention to cement the collaborative role of the special education teacher with general education teachers and students.

Students. Students rated the intervention favorably. Students in Legs 1 and 2 rated the intervention high prior to implementation and higher following. Two of the eight students in Leg 3 marked the intervention one to three points lower following intervention than they had prior to intervention contributing to a drop in scores for their leg. This may indicate the instruction did not meet or exceed those students’ expectations. Two things should be noted. First, the student ratings across this study are higher than other student ratings of SRSD for writing in other genres on the same measure in other published articles (Harris et al., 2012a). Also, the second
administration of the CIRP for Leg 3 students occurred one day prior to the end of the academic year while other students in their class watched a movie, which may have briefly tempered their enthusiasm for the writing instruction. Future researchers may evaluate opportunities of generalization as a measure of social validity for students.

**Limitations**

The design of the study offers a concentrated baseline performance prior to every leg that accounted for any content that was acquired up to the point of the intervention. As an example, one student in Leg 3 included common methods of citing text in his baseline essays, but as that was calculated as part of his current level of performance, his growth following intervention was above and beyond the skills acquired between the beginning of the study and the beginning of his leg was accounted for by the concentrated assessment of pre-intervention baseline performance. In this way, the study has a degree of protection against the influence of these occurrences.

Apart from the classroom observations, on one occasion near the end of October, the teacher had seemingly adapted materials from the intervention amidst the implementation with Leg 1 participants and was providing whole class instruction in the informational genre. Students were asked to read a nonfiction text regarding the election and respond. An organizer was provided that included phrases such as directives to restate the prompt for the introduction and to restate the topic and summarize evidence for the conclusion, nearly identical language to portions of the intervention. An additional page of the students’ packet had similar features of a poster that had been created for the intervention that encouraged students to properly cite evidence, such as “The article states that…,” “The author writes…”, and “The article says…” Written directions asked students to include evidence and use at least three quotes. Students were given a checklist that asked them to include a topic, three to four reasons, three to
four quotations, and three to four explanations. When asked about the content, the teacher stated that is how he has always instructed the genre. Researcher B discussed the core elements of SRSD with the teacher at that time.

One writing practice conducted with the whole class by the special education teacher at least three times during the year was a one-week implementation of essay writing. Students were introduced to examples of the genre on Monday, the teacher modeled his own essay with limited think alouds and no self-statements either on Tuesday or one paragraph at a time throughout the week. Students used various graphic organizers on the next day, and then they were assigned to write in the genre. There was no evidence of spiral review and this was only witnessed for two genres – persuasive and informational – across three essays early in the school year. The teacher indicated he would be teaching the informational genre again near the time of the state standardized assessments and researchers asked to be present to contextualize what was happening. As the time came near, the teacher's schedule did not allow for the review to occur.

One other demonstration of prior knowledge of common SRSD practices in student work appeared in the initial probe, completed in September, of a student in Leg 2. She wrote the letters of the mnemonic TREE (T – Topic sentence, R – Reasons, E – Explanation, E – Ending), a common memory aid associated with SRSD instruction for the persuasive genre, on the edge of her paper and checked off three parts of it. She used the rest of the planning page to write her complete informational essay prior to copying it in full on the final draft form. She did not use TREE correctly in that situation, nor did she use it again in writing any of her essays.

While these three instances may be considered limitations as the business as usual instruction encroached on some common practices associated with SRSD, it should also be noted that SRSD is far-reaching. Excluding teachers who participate in research from using any of the
same content or practices to teach while participating in a study limits their ability to do what is best for their students and is quite likely to reduce access to research sites, especially when genres taught are associated with high-stakes assessment. Based on students’ low performance in baseline and positive changes in performance following intervention, these occurrences did not impact student writing performance in any meaningful way.

The teacher in this study had some prior experience and verbally communicated how committed he was to SRSD. This may not be the typical implementation of teachers who are not volunteers and should not be generalized. Harris and Graham (2017) outline the critical importance of skillful and enthusiastic implementation, and this was achieved in this study. Prior researchers indicated it may be possible that teachers who volunteer for PD implement more quickly, with greater fidelity, and with increased duration (Johnson et al., 2013; Linek, Fleener, Fazio, Raine, & Klakamp, 2003; McKeown et al., 2015; 2016; Yamagata-Lynch, 2003). This teacher was an enthusiastic volunteer who valued SRSD instruction. If implementing with other teachers, similar results may not be typical.

The use of three rather than five data points per phase is a limitation. While five data points are encouraged (Kratochwill et al., 2010), this writing task is long in duration and cognitively demanding. The decision was an effort to mitigate these demands to prevent students from encountering fatigue or disengaging, common responses when students are asked to repeatedly write for inauthentic purposes (McKeown, Kimball et al., 2015b; Sandmel et al., 2011). The research community may need to explore the relationship of the nuanced demands of various assessment tasks and consider how the spirit of these fastidious rules often created for application with naturally occurring behaviors can be honored while also honoring the participants who have so generously offered their time and effort in the name of science.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age/Grade</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>ELA Milestone Level</th>
<th>Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>Disability/Other Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leg 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SLD – MA,R,L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SLD – MA,R,L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kacey</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SLD – MA,R,L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bea</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SLD – MA,R,L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SLD – MA,R,L; SLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pax</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. M = Male; F = Female; AA = African American; N = No, Y = Yes, SLD = Specific Learning Disability; MA = Math; R = Reading; L = English Language Arts; SLI = Speech and Language Impairment*
Figure 2.1. Analytic quality score
Do you like birds? Will we are going to talk about some people that help insects. First, we are going to talk about Erik Weisbacher. He wrote a book.

The book was about butterflies that wear shoes. He started this when he found that butterflies fast with their feet. Now we are going to talk about Mike Russell. He tries to help indoor birds. You cannot pet them in the air.

Figure 2.2. Baseline writing sample of Bea in response to the prompt, “After carefully reading both passages, explain what Erik and Mike have done to help animals, and what other people could do to be helpful to animals. Be sure to use details and examples from the text to support your reasoning.”
Do you know what the Amazon forest is? People have different concerns about the Amazon forest. We can do many different things to help the forest.

First, they cut down trees and hunt. It stuns scientists have recently discovered that the Amazon is shrinking twice as quickly as they once thought. How about storing monkeys are making mischief in New Delhi? Their trees are all most gone so they are living in the city and forest damage, we keep cutting down trees so the forest is shrinking.

Second, we can inform the workers or however that the one cutting the timber. The answer, stop solutions need to involve the very people who destroy the forest? Also the answer, stop people from destroying the rain forest is not an easy task. Some people do not care about the animals and trees. Tell the people and they will stop cutting trees and harming animals.

In conclusion, people have concerns about animals in the Amazon forest. We can help in many different ways, invest more people and help the animals in the Amazon.

Figure 2.3. Post-intervention writing sample of Bea in response to the prompt, “After carefully reading both passages, explain some of the reasons people are concerned about the animals in the Amazon and New Delhi, and what people could do to help. Be sure to use details and examples from the text to support your reasoning.”
Some kids love riding their bikes to go to their friend's house. And you should always look both ways when you cross it. It is really important for your safety. 100,000 pedestrians are hit all most each year. That is crazy. You should always walk on the sidewalk as well. That is safe. Transportation to school or work can be much lower.

- Riding a bike is safe and always use a helmet.

**Figure 2.4.** Baseline writing sample of Calvin in response to the prompt, “After carefully reading both passages, discuss why children walk or cycle around their towns and what they can do to stay safe. Be sure to use details and examples from the text to support your reasoning.”
Did you know that tigers might lose their habitats?

First off, the threats to tigers were caused by cutting trees down. In the passage, it states: "In 2010 only about 3,200 big cats were left in the wild because of habitat loss. For example, if these people keep destroying trees, tigers would die and might be extinct.

A second off people are trying to protect the cats by telling people the problem. According to the passage, "They are trying to protect the cats by teaching the public about the problem. For instance these people need to stop killing these cats so we won't have habitat loss.

Overall, tigers need to be protected so we don't lose animals. If we lose tigers we lose food because tigers would be extinct.

Figure 2.5. Post-intervention writing sample of Calvin in response to the prompt, "After carefully reading both passages, explain the different threats to big cats and some things people can do to help". Be sure to use details and examples from the text to support your reasoning."
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Teacher Survey of Classroom Writing

Practices

Please complete the following survey about your classroom writing practices. It should take you about 15 minutes to complete.

Section 1

1. Circle how often you conference with students about their writing.

Never | Several | Monthly | Several | Weekly | Several | Daily | Several
      | Times a Year | Times a Month | Times a Week | Times a Day

2. Circle how often students conference with their peers about their writing.

Never | Several | Monthly | Several | Weekly | Several | Daily | Several
      | Times a Year | Times a Month | Times a Week | Times a Day

3. Circle how often students select their own writing topics.

0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
Never | Half | The Time | Always

4. Circle how often your students engage in “planning” before writing.

Never | Several | Monthly | Several | Weekly | Several | Daily | Several
      | Times a Year | Times a Month | Times a Week | Times a Day
5. Circle how often your students “revise” their writing products.

| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |

6. Circle how often students share their writing with their peers.

| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |

7. Circle how often your students “publish” their writing. (Publish means to print or write it so that it can be shared with others.)

| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |

8. Circle how often your students help their classmates with their writing.

| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |

9. Circle how often students are allowed to complete writing assignments at their own pace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Half The Time</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Circle how often you encourage students to use “invented spellings” at any point during the writing process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Half The Time</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Circle how often you **read your own writing** to your students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Circle how often you teach **sentence construction skills**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Circle how often you teach students about ways of **organizing text** or how texts are organized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Circle how often you teach students **strategies for planning**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Circle how often you teach students **strategies for revising**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Circle how often you teach students **handwriting skills**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
17. Circle how often you teach **spelling skills**.

```
| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |
```

18. Circle how often you teach **grammar skills**.

```
| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |
```

19. Circle how often you teach **punctuation skills**.

```
| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |
```

20. Circle how often you teach **capitalization skills**.

```
| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |
```

21. Circle how often you **provide mini-lessons** on writing skills or processes students need to know at this moment—skills, vocabulary, concepts, strategies, or other things.

```
| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |
```

22. Circle how often you **overtly model** writing strategies.

```
| Never | Several Times a Year | Monthly | Several Times a Month | Weekly | Several Times a Week | Daily | Several Times a Day |
```
23. Circle how often you model the enjoyment or love of writing for students.

Never  | Several  | Monthly | Several  | Weekly | Several  | Daily  | Several  
        | Times a Year | Times a Month | Times a Week | Times a Day |

24. Circle how often you reteach writing skills or strategies that you previously taught.

Never  | Several  | Monthly | Several  | Weekly | Several  | Daily  | Several  
        | Times a Year | Times a Month | Times a Week | Times a Day |

25. Circle how often you assign writing homework to students in your class.

Never  | Several  | Monthly | Several  | Weekly | Several  | Daily  | Several  
        | Times a Year | Times a Month | Times a Week | Times a Day |

26. Circle how often your students work at writing centers.

Never  | Several  | Monthly | Several  | Weekly | Several  | Daily  | Several  
        | Times a Year | Times a Month | Times a Week | Times a Day |

27. Circle how often your writing lessons have multiple instructional goals.

Never  | Half  | The Time | Always  
        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

28. Circle how often you use a writing prompt (e.g., story starter, picture, physical object, etc.) to encourage student writing.

Never  | Several  | Monthly | Several  | Weekly | Several  | Daily  | Several  
        | Times a Year | Times a Month | Times a Week | Times a Day |
29. Circle how often your students use a **graphic organizer** (e.g., story map) when writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Half The Time</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Circle how often you **monitor the writing progress** of your students in order to make decisions about writing instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Circle how often you encourage **students to monitor their own writing progress**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Circle how often students use **rubrics** to evaluate their writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Circle how often students in your classroom use **writing portfolios** (add material to a portfolio, look at material already in it, and so forth).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Circle how often you ask students to **write at home with parental help**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several Times a Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Circle how often you ask **parents to listen** to something their child wrote at school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Times a Year</td>
<td>Times a Month</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Several Times a Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Circle how often you **communicate with parents** about their child's writing progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Times a Year</td>
<td>Times a Month</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Several Times a Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Circle how often you allow one or more students in your classroom to write by **dictating** their compositions to someone else.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Times a Year</td>
<td>Times a Month</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Several Times a Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Circle how often you allow one or more students in your classroom to use **computers** during the writing period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Times a Year</td>
<td>Times a Month</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Several Times a Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Circle how often students use **writing to support reading** (e.g., write about something they read).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Times a Year</td>
<td>Times a Month</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Several Times a Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Circle how often students use **reading to support writing** (e.g., read to inform their writing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Times a Year</td>
<td>Times a Month</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Times a Week</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Several Times a Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. Circle how often your students use writing in other content areas such as social studies, science, and math.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never Times a Year</th>
<th>Several Times a Month</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several Times a Week</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Several Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Section 2**

Please write a brief description of your writing program below.

---

Check which of the following best describes your approach to writing instruction:

- [ ] traditional skills approach combined with process writing
- [ ] process writing approach
- [ ] traditional skills approach
APPENDIX B

OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT OF CLASSROOM WRITING PRACTICES

OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM WRITING PRACTICES

1. Observer:

2. Date:

3. Classroom:

Before conducting the classroom observation, please complete items 1 – 3 above. For classroom, please write assigned code number for the class.

Directions for Section 1.

If you observe any of the behaviors or activities noted in Section 1, place a mark through that behavior or activity. The behaviors and activities are divided into the following sections:

1. Skills and Strategies Taught (9 items)
2. Common Instructional Activities in Process Writing (12 items)
3. Instructional and Assessment Procedures (10)
4. Alternative Modes of Writing (2 items)
5. Other

If you observe any activity that is not included in first four sections above, write a brief description of it.

Directions for Section 2.

If you observe any of the behaviors in Section 2, circle that activity. These activities are similar to the procedures used in the Self-Regulated Strategy Development Model.
### SECTION 1

**Teacher**
- Conferencing with Students
- Encouragement to use Invented Spellings
- Teacher Model Enjoyment of Writing
- Assigned Homework
- Teacher Assessment
- Goals of Instruction Stated

**Teacher (T+)**
- Planning Strategies
- Revising Strategies
- Sentence Construction
- Capitalization
- Punctuation
- Grammar
- Spelling
- Handwriting
- Text Organization
- Re-teaching Skills/Strategies
- Mini-Lessons
- Model Writing Strategies

**Student**
- Students Select Own Writing Topic
- Students Revising a Paper
- Students Helping Each Other
- Students Publishing a Composition
- Graphic Organizers
- Students Conferencing with Each other
- Students Planning a Paper
- Students Sharing a Paper with Peers
- Student Assessment
- Computer
- Dictation

**Environmental**
- Writing Centers
- Writing Portfolios
Section 2: Activities Included in the Self-Regulated Strategy Development Model – circle any activities that you observe and provide a brief note on what happened

Students taught a strategy for timed writing.

Students taught a strategy for planning an informational essay.

Students taught the parts of an informational essay.

Students set a goal to include all informational essay parts in their paper.

Students assess their use of informational essay parts in their paper and graph results.

Students taught to use self-statements.

Students taught how to write for the Georgia State or District writing tests.
Hi everyone.

I am going to ask you to plan and write an informational essay. You will write an informational essay about a specific topic. I will pass out a packet of papers in a minute that has some information for you to read and another packet with a writing prompt. There are also 2 sheets of lined paper in that packet (pass out the writing prompt and lined paper).

Does everyone have a pencil to write with? (pass out pencils to those who need them).

Ok, now please put your pencil down while I tell you what you are going to write your informational essay about. Please look at this sheet (hold up the prompt sheet so that each child can see it) I gave you. This page tells you about the topic of your informational essay.

I want you to read the prompt on this page silently to yourself as I read it aloud. Read the prompt aloud. (See attached prompt)

You may repeat the prompt as many times as necessary. Note: Prompts must not be discussed or vocabulary words defined.

You will plan and write your informational essay after you’ve read the text.

REMEMBER TO WRITE ONLY ON THIS TOPIC.

Before you start to write your informational essay, spend some time thinking about the topic and planning your essay. You can write your notes on the text you are reading and make your plans on the writing topic page we just read together (hold the prompt sheet up for students to see). If you need additional space to write your notes or plans, please do this on the first page of the lined pages that are stapled together.

When you write your informational essay, please write it on the lined sheets of paper in your packet (show them the lined paper). If it’s easier for you to remove those pages, we can staple them back in later. You may tear them out if that’s easier for you. You will receive no other paper. Write neatly. Do not skip lines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th><strong>Express your thoughts clearly and make your essay interesting to the reader.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Remember you plan and write your essay after you’ve had time to read the text. I cannot help you as you write your essay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10  | **Do you have any questions?**  
|     | Answer questions on testing only. If students ask questions as they work, just say, “**I cannot help you. Just do your best.”** |
| 11  | **When students are ready to start, say:**  
|     | When you finish writing your essay, put your pencil down on your paper and sit quietly (if a student finishes and is unable to sit quietly, go up to him and quietly tell him/her he may draw something on the back of his paper – only do this if necessary).  
|     | Now, you may begin reading, planning and writing. (start timer) |
| 12  | **If a student asks how to spell a word or for any other type of help, say:** **Do the best you can.**  
|     | (Note any instances a teacher deviates from this) |
| 13  | **When the students are finished. “Now turn to the final page in your packet. On that page, there are 3 questions. Right now we will answer the first two. “How much do you know about this topic?” Circle the number that agrees with how much you know – 5 for a lot, 4 for quite a bit, 3 for some, 2 for a little and 1 for nothing. Go ahead and complete the other two questions.” If children need support in this step, that is fine.** |
| 14  | **Upon conclusion of the administration, say, “I will now collect your essay and the material I gave you.”** |
## APPENDIX D
### PBPD Fidelity Form
#### Day One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-10:15</td>
<td>8:30-10:15 Introduction to SRSD training –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Safe environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Self-Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRSD Video –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview of SRSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- View video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Brief Discussion of SRSD &amp; Video Fidelity Checklists &amp; Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct Pre-Intervention Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Administer Genre Knowledge Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Survey of Classroom Writing Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching Efficacy Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:15</td>
<td>10:15-11:15 Lesson 1: Develop Background Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trainer models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher participants model with a partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher Demographic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-12:15</td>
<td>11:15-12:15 Lesson 2: Discuss It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trainer model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher participants model with a partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-2:15</td>
<td>12:15-2:15 Lesson 3a: Model It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trainer model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher participants model with a partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-3:15</td>
<td>2:15-3:15 Lesson 3b: Collaborative model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trainer model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher participants model with a partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-3:30</td>
<td>3:15-3:30 WRAP-UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflections/Comments/Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conduct pre-interview with Teacher 1 (time permitting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Day Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30 – 9 am    | Questions from Day 1?  –  
|                | • Previous Lesson(s)  
|                | • Homework            |
| 9 – 10:45 am   | Lesson 4  
|                | □ Trainer model  
|                | □ Teacher participants model with a partner |
| 10:45 – 12:00 am | Lesson 5  
|                | □ Trainer model  
|                | □ Teacher participants model with a partner |
| 12-12:45pm     | **Lunch** |
| 12:45 – 1:15   | Lesson 6  
|                | □ Trainer model  
|                | □ Teacher participants model with a partner |
| 1:15-2:15      | □ Review calendar, pacing, schedule  
|                | □ Pacing calendar  
|                | □ Lessons are not a day  
|                | □ Lessons can be repeated  
|                | □ Commit to minimum of 30 min a day 3x/week  
|                | □ Work with team to create a pacing calendar for the team, including important testing days and test prep days. Be realistic. Determine where in the day(s) writing will be taught, which days of the week, and when there are going to be likely interferences. |
| 2:15-3:15      | □ Review research-related considerations – fidelity observations, recording, etc.  
|                | □ Fidelity  
|                | □ Fidelity checklists  
|                | □ Support available  
|                | □ Classroom observations (for fidelity)  
|                | □ Purpose of checklists  
|                | □ IRB – Human Subjects Research  
|                | □ Baseline and Post-Intervention Assessments  
|                | □ Teacher surveys  
|                | □ Teachers determine their own instructional schedule |
| 3:15 – 3:30 pm | **WRAP-UP**  
|                | □ Reflections/Comments/Questions  
|                | □ Conduct pre-interview with Teacher 2 (time permitting) |
### APPENDIX E

**Fidelity Checklists, Lessons, Support Materials**

**Informational genre citing text-based evidence: TONES**

**Lesson One: Developing Background Knowledge and Introducing the TONES Strategy**

Instructor: ___________________  Completed by: ___________________  Date: ______________

Time Started: _______________  Time Stopped: _______________  Total time: ______________ min.

1= step done, 0 = step not done/completely, 7= not scored; A= taught to all, whole class; SG=small group; I = Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.1 Remind students about learning strategies to write good essays.</th>
<th>1…2…3…4…5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1: Introduce Informational genre citing text-based evidence and What Makes Good Writing</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good essays:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Are fun to read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Are fun to write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Make sense and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Have all their parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.2 Introduce informational genre citing text-based evidence. Ask. Discuss. Clarify misunderstandings.</th>
<th>1…2…3…4…5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What are informational essays?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What does it mean “to inform” while writing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What is text?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What is a fact?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What is a definition?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What is evidence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What are supporting details?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What is an ending? What should go into the ending?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What do you think text-based means?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What is an informational essay citing text-based evidences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Why do we need to know how to write this way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ When would we use it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What are linking words and phrases?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ What parts should be in a good informative essay?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Step 2: Discuss good informational essay citing text-based evidences</th>
<th>1…2…3…4…5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Has an engaging introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Has a clear topic statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Uses specific facts and examples from the text (s) to support the focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Describe and discuss the TONES mnemonic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce TONES Strategy to help you plan and write better informational essay citing text-based evidences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss what each letter stands for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong> = Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong> = Outline answers to the questions posed while informing your reader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> = Note citations (evidence) from the text to prove your answers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> = Explain how the evidence supports your answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong> = State your topic and summarize evidence to create a strong ending.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.2 T</strong> in TONES – Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine questions to be answered from the writing prompt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong beginnings engage the reader while providing information about the topic (may include a hook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic combines all of the points in the prompt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A strong topic gives a glimpse of the evidence that will prove the topic is true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.3 O</strong> in TONES – Outline answers to the questions posed while informing your reader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a clear answer to each question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t just provide evidence, but first clearly states the answer to the question often restating parts of the prompt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.4 N</strong> in TONES – Note citations from the text to prove your answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find examples and evidence in each reading to support your answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss how students might mark things they could use as evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite each text when you use its evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call student attention to Good/Better/Best, How To Cite Evidence Poster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.5 E</strong> in TONES – Explain how the evidence supports your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect the evidence from the text to your topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.6 S</strong> in TONES – State your topic again and summarize to create a strong ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 4: Check for Understanding
- 4.1 What makes good essays? (They are fun to read, fun to write, make sense, and have all their parts.)
- 4.2 What important parts should your informational essay citing text-based evidence include?

Good informational essay citing text-based evidences
- Has an engaging introduction
- Has a clear topic statement
- Answers all the questions asked while informing/educating your reader
- Uses specific facts and examples from the text (s) to support the topic and explains your thinking
- Has a conclusion
- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

Step 5: Practice Memorizing TONES

Students may:
- Write out the TONES strategy on scratch paper and state each step
- Quiz each other in partners or small groups
- Respond chorally to the teacher
- Use TONES cue cards to quiz each other

You may also use the Memorization Handout for additional ideas

Wrap up lesson
- Announce test, ungraded
- Remind students they have learned the strategy for writing a strong informational essay citing text-based evidences, TONES
- Discuss purpose of learning and memorizing
- Collect folders

Meeting Individual Needs
Determine if some students need more help with this lesson

Informational Essays using Text-based Evidence: TONES

Lesson One: Developing Background Knowledge and Introducing the TONES Strategy
Lesson Overview:

- Introduce informational genre citing text-based evidence
- Introduce genre parts
- Introduce mnemonic TONES
- Discuss and define key terms: strategy, writing prompt, essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials

- TONES flash cards (optional)
- Student folders

Build Background Knowledge

Step 1: Introduce informational genre citing text-based evidence and what makes good writing.

1.1 Remind students we are learning strategies for writing that will help them plan and write a good essay.

Good essays:
- are fun to read
- fun to write
- make sense, and
- have all their parts

1.2 We are learning a new type of essay, a genre called informational writing citing text-based evidences.

What are informational essays? (answers may include: writing that gives information, has facts).

What does it mean to inform while writing? (answers may include: giving facts, giving information, teaching).

What is text? (answers may include: books, writing, articles, print, words)
What is a fact? (answers may include: something that is true, something that can be proven).
What is a definition? (answers may include: what a word means, explanation).
What is evidence? (answers may include: proof, showing that something happened)
What are supporting details? (answers may include: proof of what you’re saying, information that helps readers understand, ideas that make the my points more clear).
What is an ending? (answers may include: when it stops, how you finish the paper, a conclusion).
What should go into an ending? (answers may include: your big idea, a summary, restating the important points).

What do you think text-based means? (answers may include: coming from text, found in a book).

What do you think an informational essay citing text-based evidence might be? (answers may include: writing that gives information, has facts, proves it with citations from text, arguments).

Why do we need to know how to write this way? (answers may include: to prove things to people, to teach others, to support our ideas with evidence).

When would we use it? (answers may include: on the Georgia State writing exams, for our college papers, if we become a researcher 😊).

What are linking words or phrases? (answers may include: words that move the reader through the essay, words that connect one idea to another).

What is academic language? (answers may include: hard words, words specific to what you are reading, words that make you look like an expert, etc.).

What parts should be in a good informative essay? (answers may include: facts, evidence, introduction, conclusion, etc.).

Step 2: Discuss Good informational essays citing text-based evidence (genre parts)

NOTE: May use the Good informational essay citing text-based evidence Handout.

2.1 Discuss and identify what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.

Good informational essay citing text-based evidences have all the important parts. A good informational essay citing text-based evidence:

☐ Has an engaging introduction
☐ Has a clear topic statement
☐ Informs/educates the audience
☐ Answers all the questions asked
☐ Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the focus
☐ Explains your thinking
☐ Has a strong conclusion
☐ Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
☐ Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

Note to teachers: It may be useful to make a poster or otherwise
Step 3: Describe and Discuss the TONES mnemonic

3.1 Today we will learn a strategy, TONES. TONES will help you plan and write good informational essays citing text-based evidence.

Note to teachers: This can be done several ways: Write each part on the board or overhead as you discuss it, make a poster (poster included) or overhead and uncover each part as you discuss it, give each student a copy of the chart, or another technique you are comfortable with.

Discuss with students each part of TONES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline answers to the questions posed to inform your audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Note citations from the text to prove your answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Explain how the evidence supports your answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>State your topic and summarize evidence to create a strong ending.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 The T in TONES stands for topic. Explain to students that a good informational essay citing text-based evidence begins with an engaging topic that directly addresses what the prompt asked them to write about. Sometimes the prompt will ask just one question, sometimes two or three or four. But a good topic will combine all of the questions broadly so the author can discuss them in detail later.

The beginning of your essay which includes the topic may begin with a hook. A hook is just an exciting way to start your essay and is the very first line. It makes your reader want to know more. It could be a question, a quote or just a fun fact. We’ll talk more about hooks when we write our class essays.

3.3 Discuss with students: The O in TONES stands for outline answers to the questions posed to inform your audience. Explain to students that a good informational essay citing text-based evidence answers all of the questions posed and informs or educates the reader about the topic. Note that this is a direct statement to the reader that answers the question or makes it clear that the answer is immediately following and
may include some restating from the prompt.

3.4 The N in TONES stands for note citations from the text to prove your answers. Explain to students in addition to grabbing the reader with a good topic and clearly answering all parts of the prompt, we need to provide additional information including details and examples that come right out of the text to help the reader understand each idea. Tell students when they are citing their supporting details and examples, they can ask themselves: Do these citations strongly support my ideas? Will they help the reader understand the topic I am writing about?

What would be a good way for me to make a note if I thought something was interesting? Discuss highlighting or underlining during reading to accent key ideas that could be used in their essays.

Quickly explain to students that there are several ways to cite text. You want to introduce it now, but you will explain more later and even show them how to do it.

Refer to poster (Good, Better, Best).

- **Good** – referring to facts and data (630 cats, in 1912, academic vocabulary, etc.)
- **Better** – Quoting exactly what the author said. (“Four score and twenty years ago…”)
- **Best** – Using the information the author gave you to create a thought with your own words

3.5 The E in TONES stands for Explain how the evidence supports your answer. Explain to students that in addition to finding the evidence that supports their idea, they need to use their own words to explain why that evidence was selected. Connect the evidence to the topic statement. Explain why those thoughts are significant.

For instance, they might directly tell the reader, “The evidence I chose to share with you, _____, really demonstrated how (restate the topic).” This shows the reader that the author chose the examples purposefully and didn’t just get lucky by copying something from the article.

3.6 Discuss with students: The S in TONES stands for state your topic again and summarize to create a strong ending. Explain to students in addition to grabbing the reader with a good start, providing answers to all the questions, and citing details from the text to support those ideas, we need to have a good ending that ties the whole essay together and tells how important this subject is. In the ending, students should restate their topic clearly but using slightly different words, briefly mention the evidence they used to support their topic, and examine the importance and implications of the topic. Tell students when they are
writing the end, they can ask themselves: Does my ending make clear why this topic is so important? Does the final statement wrap up the essay? Does the ending make sense for my purpose?

Finally, at the end of every essay, you should check to be sure that you have included all of the important parts.

Remind students that the prompts do not tell you all of the important parts that should be in an essay. It is important that you think about all of the important parts and include any the prompt leaves out.

Step 4: Check for Understanding – Genre parts

4.1 What makes a good essay?

Good essays:
- Are fun to read
- Are fun to write
- Make sense and
- Have all their parts

4.2 Ask students: What important parts should your informational essay citing text-based evidence include?
- Has an engaging introduction
- Has a clear topic statement
- Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader
- Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the focus
- Explains your thinking
- Has a conclusion
- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

Note to teacher: You may want to post these questions in the room.

Step 5: Practice memorizing TONES

May use the Memorization Handout.

5.1 You can have students:
- Write out the TONES strategy on scratch paper and state each step
- Quiz each other in partners or small groups
- Respond chorally to the teacher
- Use TONES flash cards to quiz each other

Wrap-Up

1. Announce test next session! Tell students they will not be graded. They will be asked to demonstrate how well they know the steps of TONES, how to use the strategy for writing an informational essay citing text-based evidence, what makes a good essay, and the parts of good informational essays.
2. Tell students they learned a strategy for writing better informational essays citing text-based evidence. During the next lesson, they will continue practicing the TONES strategy.
3. Discuss the purpose of why they are learning it and why they have to memorize it.

Determine if some of your students need more help with this lesson and
T O N E S

T o p i c

O utline answers to the questions
to inform and educate your audience.

N o t e citations from the text
to prove your answers.

E xplain how the evidence
supports your answer.

S tate your topic again and summarize evidence
to create a strong ending.
All good essays:
  o are fun to read
  o fun to write
  o make sense, and
  o have all their parts

What are the important parts of an informational essay citing text-based evidence?

☐ Has an engaging introduction
☐ Has a clear topic statement
☐ Answers all the questions asked
☐ Informs/educates the reader
☐ Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the focus
☐ Explains your thinking
☐ Has a conclusion
☐ Uses academic language & transitions to connect ideas
### The TONES Strategy Cue Cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td>Outline answers to the questions posed to inform your audience</td>
<td>Note citations from the text to prove your answers</td>
<td>Explain how the evidence supports your answer</td>
<td>State your topic again and summarize evidence to create a strong ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONES</td>
<td>TONES</td>
<td>TONES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T - Topic</td>
<td>T - Topic</td>
<td>T - Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O - Outline answers to the questions posed to inform or educate your audience</td>
<td>O - Outline answers to the questions posed to inform or educate your audience</td>
<td>O - Outline answers to the questions posed to inform or educate your audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N - Note citations from the text to prove your answers</td>
<td>N - Note citations from the text to prove your answers</td>
<td>N - Note citations from the text to prove your answers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Explain how the evidence supports your answer</td>
<td>E - Explain how the evidence supports your answer</td>
<td>E - Explain how the evidence supports your answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S – State your topic again and summarize evidence to create a strong ending</td>
<td>S – State your topic again and summarize evidence to create a strong ending</td>
<td>S – State your topic again and summarize evidence to create a strong ending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good -- Refer to facts or details; include vocabulary from the article

As the first article stated, the pufferfish has spines and a stomach that unfolds.

Better -- Use the author’s exact words

In “Who Wants a Spiny Snack?”, the author suggested that when the pufferfish “is threatened, it swells up suddenly like a big balloon.”

Best -- Use their idea, but your words.

In my reading, I noticed that the pufferfish protects itself from predators by swelling much bigger than normal and scaring off animals that try to eat it.

How to Cite Your Evidence

I noticed the text pointed out . . .
   The author mentioned. . .
   I read that. . .
In the second article, I learned. . .
The article about _____ stated . . .
### Addition
- furthermore
- moreover
- too
- also
- in the second place
- even more
- next
- further
- last, lastly
- finally
- besides
- and, or, nor
- first
- second, secondly, etc.
- again
- in addition,

### Time
- immediately
- after
- later, earlier
- always
- when
- next
- soon
- whenever
- meanwhile
- sometimes
- in the meantime
- during
- afterwards
- now, until now
- following
- once
- then
- at length
- simultaneously
- this time
- subsequently

### Exemplification or Illustration
- to demonstrate
- specifically
- for instance
- as an illustration
- for example
- e.g., (for example)

### Comparison
- in the same way
- by the same token
- similarly
- in like manner
- likewise
- in similar fashion

### Clarification
- that is to say
- in other words
- to explain
- i.e., (that is)
- to clarify
- to rephrase it
- to put it another way

### Cause
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• since</td>
<td>• on account of</td>
<td>• for that reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• therefore</td>
<td>• accordingly</td>
<td>• hence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consequently</td>
<td>• thus</td>
<td>• as a result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• in order that</td>
<td>• to that end, to this end</td>
<td>• for this purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• so that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• almost</td>
<td>• never</td>
<td>• perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• nearly</td>
<td>• always</td>
<td>• maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• probably</td>
<td>• frequently</td>
<td>• although</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• indeed</td>
<td>• of course</td>
<td>• yes, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to repeat</td>
<td>• doubtedly</td>
<td>• undoubtedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• by all means</td>
<td>• certainly</td>
<td>• in fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• in fact</td>
<td>• without doubt</td>
<td>• surely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• to summarize</td>
<td>• in brief</td>
<td>• in short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• in sum</td>
<td>• to sum up</td>
<td>• in summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• in conclusion</td>
<td>• to conclude</td>
<td>• finally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Informational essay citing text-based evidence: TONES

**Lesson Two: Reviewing TONES, Finding TONES in an essay**

Instructor ___________________ Completed by: ______________ Date: __________

Time Started: _________ Time Stopped: ___________ Total time: __________ min.

1= step done, 0 = step not done/completely, 7= not scored; A= taught to all, whole class; SG=small group; I = Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Self-Eval.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activate prior knowledge**

- □ Tell students they will continue working with the TONES strategy to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence

**What makes a good essay?**

*Good essays:*

- *are fun to read*
- *fun to write*
- *make sense, and*
- *have all their parts*

**Ask students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence**

- □ Has an engaging introduction (hook)
- □ Has a clear topic statement
- □ Informs/educates the audience
- □ Answers all the questions asked
- □ Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the topic
- □ Explains your thinking
- □ Has a strong conclusion
- □ Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
- □ Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

**Ask students why it is important to memorize the strategies**

- 1…2…3…4…5
- NA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5    | Test and Review the steps of TONES  
|      | You can have students:  
|      | Write out TONES on scratch paper. Quiz each other in partners or small groups.  
|      | Respond chorally to the teacher  
|      | Use flashcards to quiz each other | 1…2…3…4…5 |
| 6    | Step 1: Discuss making notes  
|      | Explain concept of notes  
|      | Examples of when to make notes  
|      | Good writers make notes before writing  
|      | Notes are faster than whole sentences  
|      | Ask students how notes can help their writing | NA |
| 7    | Step 2: Find TONES in an essay  
| 7.1  | Introduce TONES graphic organizer  
|      | Teacher models taking TONES notes on graphic organizer based on sample student essay | NA |
| 8    | 2.2  
|      | T – Topic  
|      | Students identify the topic in the sample essay  
|      | Do they see a hook?  
|      | Take notes about the topic sentence used by the writer | NA |
| 9    | 2.3  
|      | O – Outline answers to the questions posed while informing/educating the reader  
|      | Students identify questions asked in the prompt and answered in the sample essay  
<p>|      | Record notes about the answers to each | NA |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Will this inform the reader about a topic?
- Have students notice how the citations and examples were presented.

- N – Note citations from the text to prove your answers
- Do you see any academic language?
- Students identify examples and details from the text that support the answers
- Record notes about the citations.

- E – Explain how the evidence supports your answer
- Students identify where the author explained why he chose the citations he chose and how they support his points
- Record notes about the reasons for choosing these citations
- Do the students notice any linking words?

- S – State the prompt again and summarize to create a strong ending
- Students identify the conclusion in the example essay
- Record notes about the conclusion

- Ask students if the notes
  - Do the notes make sense?
  - Keep the reader interested?
  - Inform the reader about the topic, ideas and details?
  - Provide examples from the text?
  - Provide a strong conclusion?

- Practice Memorizing TONES
Students may:
- Write out the TONES strategy on scratch paper and state each step
- Quiz each other in partners or small groups
- Respond chorally to the teacher
- Use TONES cue cards to quiz each other

You may also use the Memorization Handout for additional ideas

| 15 | Announce test, ungraded | 1…2…3…4…5 |
|    | Remind students they have learned strategies for writing good informational essays citing text-based evidence | NA |
|    | Why is it necessary to memorize the strategy? |   |
|    | Does anyone need additional support? |   |
|    | Put materials in writing folder |   |
|    | Collect folders |   |

1=Fell Well Short of Expectations, 2=Fell Short of Expectations, 3=Met Expectations, 4=Exceeded Expectations, 5=Greatly Exceeded Expectations
Lesson Two: Reviewing TONES, Finding TONES in an essay

Lesson Overview:
1. Review writing informational essays citing text-based evidence
2. Students will review the steps of TONES
3. Identification of TONES parts in essay example
4. Students will be familiar with the following term: making notes.

Materials

| • Mnemonic chart          | • Flash cards (if desired) |
| • Paper example (****)   | • Pencils                  |
| • TONES graphic organizer | • Student folders          |

Activate Prior Learning

- Good writing
- TONES – Informational essays citing text-based evidence
- Memorizing each step

Remind students we are learning a strategy for writing that will help them plan and write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. Today we will learn more about the strategy, TONES. The TONES strategy will help you plan and write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.

Review: What makes a good essay?

Remind students

Good essays:
- are fun to read
- fun to write
- make sense, and
- have all their parts

Informational essays citing text-based evidence:

Ask the students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence
Memorize. Ask the students why it is important that they memorize each step of these strategies. Answers should include: (I won’t have a paper with the steps on it when I take the test; it will help me remember what to do; it will help me pass the test, I won’t always have a poster when I need to write an essay, and so on).

### Review and Test TONES

1.1 Practice TONES

1.2 Practice reviewing what each letter in TONES stands for and why it is important. Direct students to the poster. Help as needed.

*Options for practice – have students:*

1. Write out mnemonic on scratch paper and say what each letter means.
2. Quiz each other in partners or small groups.
3. Respond chorally to the teacher
4. Use flashcards to quiz each other

### Step 1: Discuss Making Notes

Describe and discuss the concept of notes. We make short notes to remind us of what we want to write. Notes are faster than writing whole sentences. We can change our notes later, too.

- *Discuss examples of when and why someone would make notes. Examples include:* teachers use notes when they create webs on the board, parents use notes when they write things on a calendar or when they make a grocery list. Have students generate some examples of when they might make notes on their own.

- *Explain to students that good writers plan and make notes before writing.*
Since we know what has to be in a great informational essay, we’ll just jot a quick note for all the parts so ours are always complete. Discuss with students that notes are short phrases to help us remember what we want to write. We can change our notes later to add or change details or events in our essay. Tell students the notes are written like CAVEMAN/TEXT TALK. Write an example of CAVEMAN/TEXT TALK.

- Discuss with students that making notes is faster than writing whole sentences.

- Ask students how making notes before they write will help them when they need to write a essay (Answers should include: they will help me remember my ideas, they will help me write faster, they will help me be sure I have all my parts).

Step 2: Find TONES in an essay and teacher modeling of making notes on a graphic organizer

Tell students you will read and help them examine an informational essay citing text-based evidence. While you are reading, they will look to see if the writer followed all of the steps. Remind students of the steps:

- T = Topic
- O = Outline answers to the questions posed while informing your reader
- N = Note citations (evidence) from the text to prove your answers
- E = Explain how the evidence supports your answer
- S = State your topic and summarize evidence to create a strong ending.

2.1 (Leave out the TONES chart)

Introduce the TONES graphic organizer. Put graphic organizer on board or chart. You will show students how to make notes for each part of TONES on the organizer. Explain this is how writers plan before writing an essay.

Give students a copy of the prompt and informational essay citing text-based evidence (The Food Chain and Who Wants a Spiny Snack? OR Habitat: Zoos and Frozen Home). Ask students to read along silently while you read the prompt and the paper out loud.

2.2 Topic. Have students identify the topic. Write notes for the topic and the topic sentence in the graphic organizer on the board or chart, having students help you. Explain you need just a few words for notes. Is there
a hook? If not, students may suggest one.

2.3 Outline answers to the questions posed and inform or educate the reader. Have students identify the questions in the prompt and the answers the writer gave to each question. Write notes for the answers to each question. Bring attention to instances in which the author informed or educated the reader. Re-emphasize that these are just notes.

2.4 Note citations from the text to prove your answers. Have students identify the supporting details or examples the writer chose from the text to present for each idea. Do they make sense? Do they have any other examples from the text that could work or would be better? Do they notice anything about how the author cited the information? Students can suggest how you should write the notes. Emphasize that notes are not full sentences.

2.4 Explain how the evidence supports your answer. Have students note how the author explains the examples or details from the text. Can they identify any academic language? How does the author prove his point using those citations?

2.5. State the prompt again and summarize to create a strong ending. Have students identify the ending. Does the author bring attention back to the main points? Does the author tell why this topic is important and give a nod to the evidence he/she used? Does the conclusion wrap this essay up right? Do you notice any linking words throughout the essay that make it easier to navigate?

2.6 Ask students if the notes they wrote make sense. Emphasize that in order to capture your reader’s attention, keep them interested, and inform them about the topic, the ideas, citations, details, and examples need to make sense.

Wrap Up

- Practice memorizing the TONES mnemonic.

You can have students:
1. Write out TONES on scratch paper.
2. Quiz each other in partners or small groups.
3. Respond chorally to the teacher
4. Use flashcards to quiz each other
- Announce test next session! Tell students they will not be graded. They will be asked to demonstrate how well they know the steps of TONES. Remember, TONES helps us remember the steps to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. We also will be tested on what makes a good essay and the important parts of a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.

- Tell students they learned a strategy for writing better informational essays citing text-based evidence. During the next lesson, they will continue practicing the TONES strategy.

- Discuss the purpose of why they are learning it and why they have to memorize it.

- Determine if some of your students need more help with this lesson and plan for individualized instruction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note citations (evidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain how the evidence supports your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State topic again and briefly summarize your evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Simple Exemplar Essay
Food Chains and Adaptations

What does the food chain have to do with adaptations? The food chain is a list of what animals eat, but some animals’ protect themselves from getting eaten.

The food chain is a list of what animals eat. I read that it starts with a plant called a producer. Then, another animal eats the producer. Another bigger animal eats that producer. The author said when animals die, worms eat him up. The food chain goes from plants, to plant eating animals, then carnivores, and decomposers. That’s how the food chain works.

Getting eaten is no fun, so some animals don’t want to be part of the food chain. They protect themselves. I read that the pufferfish defends himself and stays alive. He gets real big. The author said that his “stomach becomes almost one hundred times larger.” That makes the pufferfish huge! Then he’s not so easy to eat. This shows how the pufferfish tries to protect himself from getting eaten.

The food chain is a cycle that tells what animals eat each other, but the pufferfish protects himself. He does not want to be part of it. His stomach help him stay safe.
Intermediate Exemplar Essay

Food Chains and Adaptations

Do adaptations have anything to do with the food chain? The food chain is a list of what animals eat, from the tiny worms to big lions, but some animals’ bodies protect them from getting eaten.

The food chain is a cycle. It starts with a plant called a producer. The article used grass as an example. Then, another animal eats the producer. That’s an herbivore because they are eating the plants. Then that herbivore gets eaten by another bigger animal. That animal is a carnivore because it is eating other animals. That keeps happening until the biggest animal and then when he dies, little decomposers like worms eat him up and poop him out as rich soil. The food chain goes from plants, to plant eating animals, then carnivores, and decomposers. That’s how the food chain works.

Some animals don’t want to be part of the food chain, so they protect themselves. The pufferfish defends himself and stays alive. When a big fish swims over to eat him, he sucks in a bunch of water and gets real big. I read that his “stomach becomes almost one hundred times larger.” That makes the pufferfish huge! He has spines too. Then he’s not so easy to eat. By becoming big, the pufferfish doesn’t get eaten.

The food chain is a cycle that tells what animals eat each other, but the pufferfish protects himself because he does not want to be part of it. His stomach and spines help him protect himself from becoming prey.
Advanced Exemplar Essay

The Food Chain and How the Pufferfish Skips Out on It

You may have been bitten by a dog, but it’s unlikely any animal has ever really tried to eat you before. However, that’s a real problem for most of the animals on Earth. The food chain is simply an explanation of what animals eat, from the smallest like bugs to the largest like lions, but some animals, like the pufferfish, have secret weapons to avoid becoming a part of the food chain.

The food chain can be explained as a cycle. “All food chains begin with a producer.” That’s a plant because they can use the sun to make their food, so they don’t have to eat anyone else. An example could be grass or a pear tree or even a cactus. The second step in the cycle is when an herbivore eats the producer. That makes them a primary consumer. Primary means first, and they are the first animals that eat the producer. Zebras eat plants, so that’s an example of the second step in the food chain. And what eats zebras? That’s right! Lions. That’s the third step of the food chain, but it makes the lions and their carnivore friends secondary consumers because they eat the animals that ate the producers. See how that works? This chain continues until the top of the food chain – like humans. No one eats us. However, the article suggests that when we die, if we’re buried, decomposers, the bacteria and little animals like worms and snails in the soil, might eat our rotting bodies. EWWWW! Then, as the author says, we can “return nutrients back into the environment.” That’s the final step in the food chain. I’ve shown you how plants, plant eaters, primary consumers, secondary consumers, and even decomposers create a food chain.

Even though the food chain has a place for most animals, some animals, like the pufferfish try to skip out on their turn in getting eaten by using adaptations. The pufferfish has two adaptations that help him stay alive. The first is his stomach. When a bigger animal on the food chain swims along and wants to eat him, he swallows a lot of water, and his folded up stomach gets huge! The article says, “its stomach becomes almost one hundred times larger.” That makes the pufferfish get really large. The second adaptation is spines. Those spines poke out all over his body. Then he’s not so easy to eat. The predator just swims on by.

The food chain is a cycle of life, but many animals like the pufferfish have adaptations that help them avoid becoming a part of it. The pufferfish’s big stomach and spines help him protect himself from carnivores that live in the ocean with him.
How do zoos choose which animals live together? An ecosystem is the place a group of animals and plants live together in the wild, and zoos use those groups to plan their habitats.

An ecosystem is a place where all sorts of different plants and animals grow together. According to the article, it is “an environment in which animals and plants depend on one another to live.” That shows what an ecosystem is.

Zoos put animals from the same habitat together because it’s easier. For instance, the zoo can build one big aviary. They can put all the birds together in there. The article says that, “Birds are kept in aviaries.” This shows that sharing the same home is easier than if every animal had a space.

Animals live in ecosystems in the wild. This helps zoos decide the best way to make homes for their animals. They keep it the way nature made it.
Intermediate Exemplar Essay

Zoos Try to Use Ecosystems

Can a penguin be at home in Atlanta? An ecosystem is the surroundings where a group of animals and plants live together, and zoos use natural ecosystems to plan their habitats.

An ecosystem is a place where all sorts of different plants and animals grow together. According to the article, it is “an environment in which animals and plants depend on one another to live.” I read that in the iceberg ecosystem plankton are plants that get eaten by krill. Then some birds eat the krill. This shows you that all of those animals live together in the ecosystem and “depend on one another to live.”

Zoos put animals from the same habitat together because it’s easier to organize that way. For instance, if the zoo builds one big aviary, they can put all the birds together in there. The article says that, “Birds are kept in aviaries.” Then they put the African animals like elephants, zebras and lions together, but away from the birds, so they won’t bother them. The birds and the African animals show that sharing the same habitat is easier than if they didn’t share the same place.

Ecosystems help zoos decide the best way to make homes for their animals. By grouping them together, they keep it the way nature made it and they can control their habitats better.
Advanced Exemplar Essay

Zoos Create Habitats Inspired by Natural Ecosystems

Can a penguin used to living in the freezing temperatures of Antarctica really ever be at home in a zoo in hot, hot Atlanta? Most zoos try to match their habitats to the ecosystems, the surroundings where a group of animals and plants live together, to try to help them feel at home as they can be. I’ll explain how ecosystems work with food chains and then I’ll explain how zoos use natural ecosystems to plan habitats.

First, an ecosystem is a place where all sorts of different plants and animals grow together in the wild. According to the article, it is “an environment in which animals and plants depend on one another to live.” I read that in the iceberg ecosystem, plankton are plants that use the sun to make their own food. Then other animals like krill and silverfish eat those plankton. Then some birds such as petrel “fly between icebergs” to eat up all the krill. That’s a small food chain that exists right there in the iceberg ecosystem and that shows how animals and plants in an ecosystem “depend on one another to live.”

Since nature put those animals together, zoos try to keep animals from the same habitat together because it’s easier to organize that way and allows zookeepers to control their surroundings better. The article says that, “Birds are kept in aviaries.” If the zoo builds one big aviary, they can put all the birds together in there, control the temperature and keep them from flying away. The same zoo may also put the African animals like elephants, zebras and lions together, but away from the birds, so they won’t bother them. The birds and the African animals show that sharing the habitat with friends from your ecosystem is easier than if they didn’t share the same place.

Zoos are smart to create habitats inspired by natural ecosystems. It helps them decide the best way to make homes for all their animals, from birds to lions. By grouping them together in the same groups as they are found in the wild, they keep it the way nature made it. That allows zookeepers to control their habitats better.
**Lesson Three: Review TONES, Teacher Models, Self-Statements, Goal Setting**

Instructor _______________ Completed by: __________________ Date: ______________

Time Started: ______________ Time Stopped: ______________ Total time: ____________ min.

1= step done, 0 = step not done/completely, 7= not scored; A= taught to all, whole class; SG=small group; I = Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Self Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        |       | **Activate prior knowledge**  
| □       |       | Tell students they will continue  
|         |       | working with the TONES strategy to  
|         |       | write a good informational essay citing  
|         |       | text-based evidence  
|         |       | 1...2...3...4...5  
|         |       | NA |
| 2        |       | **Good essays:**  
|          |       | o are fun to read  
|          |       | o fun to write  
|          |       | o make sense, and  
|          |       | o have all their parts  
|          |       | 1...2...3...4...5  
|          |       | NA |
| 3        |       | **Ask students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence**  
| □       |       | Has an engaging introduction  
| □       |       | Has a clear topic statement  
| □       |       | Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader  
| □       |       | Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the topic  
| □       |       | Explains your thinking  
| □       |       | Has a conclusion  
| □       |       | Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas  
| □       |       | Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation  
|          |       | 1...2...3...4...5  
|          |       | NA |
| 4        |       | **Ask students why it is important to memorize the strategies**  
|          |       | 1...2...3...4...5  
|          |       | NA |
| 5        |       | **Test and Review the steps of TONES**  
|          |       | You can have students:  
|          |       | □ Write out TONES on scratch paper.  
|          |       | □ Quiz each other in partners or small groups.  
|          |       | 1...2...3...4...5  
<p>|          |       | NA |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Step 1: Model PLANNING an essay with TONES using self-statements.</strong></td>
<td>1…2...3...4...5 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | **1.1**  
|   | - Explain to students you will use TONES to plan and write an informational essay citing text-based evidence | |
| 7 | **1.2**  
|   | - Read aloud the practice prompt  
|   | - Read the associated texts (chorally or aloud)  
|   | - Lead highlighting/underlining/note-taking  
|   | - Use self-statements to determine the topic | 1…2...3...4...5 NA |
| 8 | **1.3**  
|   | - Display TONES chart  
|   | - Explain you will use the strategy to help you write the essay. You will use TONES to help organize and plan your essay | 1…2...3...4...5 NA |
| 9 | **1.4**  
|   | - Display TONES graphic organizer (or make your own)  
|   | - Tell students you will use this graphic organizer to plan and organize your notes for the informational essay citing text-based evidence | 1…2...3...4...5 NA |
| 10 | **1.5**  
|   | - Review parts of TONES in the graphic organizer  
|   | - Review your writing goals for an informational essay citing text-based evidence  
|   | - Has an engaging introduction  
|   | - Has a clear topic statement  
|   | - Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader  
<p>|   | - Uses specific facts and examples from the | 1…2...3...4...5 NA |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: Model making notes using TONES</th>
<th>1...2...3...4...5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ What is the topic I should write about?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Reread the prompt and use self-statements to determine what is the best way to respond.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Choose a topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Make notes about the topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Talk out loud to think of and write notes to address all of the questions/all parts of the prompt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Good! I like this idea! Now I better figure out the answers to all of the questions in the prompt. <em>Let my mind be free. How can I answer these?</em>”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ “What did the text say about this?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ “What ideas did I get from what we read?” “What can I teach my reader?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Use text talk to make the notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Use coping statements at least twice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ “What do I need to do next?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Read through relevant parts of the text and talk out loud to choose which pieces of the text are the best evidence for your answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Use coping statements for the effort of going back to find the supporting evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Congratulate yourself when you find the right citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Model making notes for the citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Discuss academic vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑ Model adding academic vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15 | 2.5 | “How can I explain why I chose these citations to prove my points?”
- Model making notes for connecting your chosen citations with the answers to your questions “I chose this evidence because it proves... Or These examples clearly demonstrate that...”
- Model adding more notes
- Model deleting a note (if appropriate)
- Use coping self-statements
- “For each one of those citations, I want to really explain to the reader how that proves my answer. I need to make a clear connection so they really understand me.”
| 16 | 2.6 | “Now I need to think of a strong ending.”
- Use self-statements to get excited about ending your essay with a strong conclusion.
- Model restating your topic and summarizing your points.
- Model pulling out key pieces of evidence to make the conclusion interesting
| 17 | 2.7 | “After generating notes for all the parts tell students you can look back at the notes to see if anything should be added
- Model stopping and checking the notes for all the parts of a good essay and a good informational essay citing text-based evidence, insuring all parts of TONES are complete
- Discuss transition/linking words
- Model adding transition words
- Check your notes to be sure you’ve included all parts of the TONES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Step 3: Model WRITING a paper using TONES</strong>&lt;br&gt;3.1</td>
<td>□ Display TONES charts  □ Tell students you will use the notes to write an essay  □ Tell students why using notes will make it easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>□ Model the entire process of writing an informational essay citing text-based evidence using the notes  □ Print clearly (or type) so students can follow along  □ Cross off every note on the graphic organizer after it is used in the essay. Be explicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>□ Use think alouds while writing to talk through each decision and action  □ Model adding transition words  □ Model using self-statements: “Does my essay make sense? Do I have all my parts? Will the reader be convinced by the evidence?”  □ Model frustration, tiredness and use self-statements to focus again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>□ Model writing the conclusion  □ Model stopping to check for all the parts in the essay  □ Praise your use of the strategy, your effort, and completing the task “Good work. I’m done. It’ll be fun to share my paper with others.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Step 4: Introduce Graphing Sheet / Graph the essay</strong>&lt;br&gt;4.1</td>
<td>□ Show students the graphing sheet  □ Ask if essay had all its parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>□ Graph a section for each answer to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions in the prompt</td>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>Step 5: Self-Statements: To Think of Good Ideas, While You Work, &amp; To Check Your Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tell students they will write down things they can say to themselves to help them plan and write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pass out self-statements list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask students to remember things you said to get started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask students to write down at least 2 self-statements to get started: What is it I have to do? I have to write an essay using TONES. A good informational essay citing text-based evidence proves the author’s points with evidence and makes sense.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask students to remember things you said while you worked: try to get some statements about remembering the parts, self-evaluation statements, and creativity statements, like “let my mind be free, good ideas will come!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask students to write down at least 2 self-statements to say while you work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask students to remember things you when something was hard: I can do this! I did this with my teacher or I can do this. I have a strategy – TONES!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask students to write down at least 2 self-statements to say when something is hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask students to remember things you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1…2…3…4…5 NA
said to check your work: *Did I remember all my parts? Does my essay make sense? Have I used STRONG evidence? This is great! I have really proved my points.*
- Ask students to write down at least 2 self-statements to check your work.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.6</strong></td>
<td>Tell students you don’t always need to say these things out loud.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **29** | **Step 6: Review Goal Setting** 6.1 | - Ask students why making goals is important  
- Pass out Goal Sheets | 1...2...3...4...5 NA |

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.2</strong></td>
<td>- Ask students to select 1-3 goals for themselves</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3</strong></td>
<td>- If you want, ask students to write in a class goal</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **32** | **Wrap up lesson**  
**Practice Memorizing TONES**  
**Students may:** | - Write out the TONES strategies on scratch paper and state each step  
- Quiz each other in partners or small groups  
- Respond chorally to the teacher  
- Use TONES cue cards to quiz each other  
You may also use the Memorization Handout for additional ideas | 1...2...3...4...5 NA |

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **33** |   | - Announce test, ungraded  
- Remind students they have learned a strategy for writing good informational essays citing text-based evidence  
- Put materials in writing folder  
- Collect folders | 1...2...3...4...5 NA |

1 Well Short of Expectations, 2=Fell Short of Expectations, 3=Met Expectations, 4=Exceeded Expectations, 5=Greatly Exceeded Expectations
Lesson Three: Review TONES, Teacher Models, Self-Statements, Goal Setting

Lesson Overview:
1. Students will review and practice TONES
2. The teacher will model planning and writing an essay using TONES
3. The students will rehearse the strategy using the cue cards
4. Students will set individual goals for writing and use self-statements.
5. Students will be familiar with the following term: *self-statements, goal setting*

Materials

| Mnemonic chart | Flash cards (if desired) |
| Practice prompt | Pencils |
| TONES graphic organizer (or make your own) | Student folders |
| Paper with document camera (or computer with display) to write an essay students can watch | Blank graphing sheets |

Activate Prior Learning

- Good Writing
- TONES – Informational essays citing text-based evidence
- Memorizing each step

*Remind students we are learning a strategy for writing that will help them plan and write a good essay. Today we will learn more about the strategy, TONES. The TONES strategy will help you plan and write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.*

Review good essays

*What makes a good essay?*

Remind students

*Good essays:*

- are fun to read
- fun to write
- make sense, and
- have all their parts

Informational essays citing text-based evidence.

Ask the students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.

Answers should include:
- Has an engaging introduction
- Has a clear topic statement
- Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader
- Uses specific facts and examples from the text (s) to support the topic
- Explains your thinking
- Has a conclusion
- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

Memorize. Ask the students why it is important that they memorize each step of the strategy (Answers should include: I won’t have a paper with the steps on it when I take the test; it will help me remember what to do; it will help me pass the test, and so on).

Review and Test TONES

R.1 Practice TONES
R.2 Practice reviewing what each letter in TONES stands for and why it is important. Help as needed.

Options for practice – have students:
1. Write out mnemonic on scratch paper and say what each letter means.
2. Quiz each other in partners or small groups.
3. Respond chorally to the teacher
4. Use flashcards to quiz each other

Step 1: Model planning an essay with TONES using self-statements

1.1. Say, “I am going to show you how to use TONES to plan and write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. You might be able to help me! When I write, I talk myself through the writing process; normally I do this in my head, but today I will talk aloud so you can hear how I talk myself through the planning and writing process. For example, when I look at my writing prompt (show students the prompt), I might think in my head, what
is it I have to do? I know! I have to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. I need to make sure I understand the text I have to read, the writing prompt, include answers to all the questions, use citations from the passage to prove my answers are right, include transition words, sum it up with a strong conclusion, and have it all make sense and be fun to read and write. Woooweee, that is a lot to handle. But I can do it because I have a strategy.”

1.2 Read aloud the practice prompt.

Then have all parties read the texts (choral, aloud, your choice). Have students point out areas to highlight, underline, or make note of drawing attention to important points only.

Use problem definition, planning, self-evaluation, self-reinforcement, and coping statements as you work. Use statements that your students are likely to state when they read and write. Model things you might say to yourself when you want to think of a good idea. For example, “I have to let my mind be free.” “Take my time. A good idea will come to me.” “Think of good, clear ideas.” You can also start with a negative statement and model how a coping statement can help you get back on track. For example, “I can’t think of how to respond! Ok, if I just take my time, a good idea will come to me.”

1.3 Display TONES charts. Explain that you are going to write an informational essay citing text-based evidence today. You need a strategy; ask students to tell you the strategy -- TONES. You will use TONES to help you organize and plan your informational essay citing text-based evidence.

1.4 Show students a blank graphic organizer on the board or a chart. State, “I will use this page to make and organize my notes. You can help me.” Tell students they will do this too next time they write a paper.

1.5 Briefly review the parts of TONES in the graphic organizer. Review your writing goals: To write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. Remind students that an informational essay citing text-based evidence:

- Has an engaging introduction
- Has a clear topic statement
- Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader
- Uses specific facts and examples from the text (s) to support the focus
- Explains your thinking
- Has a conclusion
- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation
Step 2: Model reading the text(s) and making notes using TONES. State, “This helps me plan my paper. I can write down ideas for each part. I can write ideas down in different parts of this page as I think of ideas.” Students can help you throughout the next steps. Read aloud or chorally read both texts.

2.1 First, begin with a strong topic. “What will be the topic I will write about?” (Talk out loud and fill in notes for topic).

2.2 Second state, “Good! I like this idea! Now I better figure out the answers to all of the questions in the prompt. Let my mind be free. How can I answer these?” “What did the text say about this?” “What ideas did I get from what we read?” “What can I teach my reader?” (Talk out loud and write notes for each question/prompt, not in full sentences. Use coping statements at least twice). Remind students to generate their answers not from their own opinions, but from the information they can support by using text citations.

2.3 Third, state, “Those are great answers! Now I need to find evidence in the text to prove my answers are correct. I’m a careful reader. What good points agree with my already good answers?” (Talk out loud and write notes, finding at least one example/detail from the text to support each answer you originally chose. Use self-statements to talk yourself through the careful rereading and selection of citations.)

Also, be sure examples of academic vocabulary are included in your plan. Point out all the ones already included. Ask students if they have further suggestions.

As an extension, you may have students search for any information that is an alternative to what they believe and provide it as a counterpoint. For instance, students may say, “While the evidence I have provided demonstrates that ______, there is also some evidence in the article that suggests ______.”

2.4 Fourth, state, “For each one of those citations, I want to really explain to the reader how that proves my answer. I need to make a clear connection so they really understand me.” (Talk out loud and write notes for each citation linking it back to your original answers. Use self-statements to make connections strong connections to show how the text evidence proves your answers.) I chose this evidence because it proves....These examples clearly demonstrate that...

2.5 Finally, state, “What do I need to do next? I need to have a strong conclusion that states my main topic again and summarizes my points and explains the importance” (Talk out loud and write notes for a strong ending.)

2.6 After generating notes for all the parts state, “Now I can look back at my notes and see if I can add more notes for my paper.” Model adding more notes (e.g., an extra detail, or adding something to make more sense, a very
specific vocabulary word). Use coping statements.

Next, state, “I can also decide on good transition words I want to use in the paper.” Write them on the graphic organizer. Model adding the transition words.

Finally, model stopping and checking the notes for all parts.

Step 3: Model writing a paper using TONES

3.1 Keep the TONES chart out or write on board. State, “Now I can write an informational essay citing text-based evidence using my notes and think of more good ideas.” My notes will help me stay organized and make sure that I have all of my parts.

3.2 Model the entire process of writing an informational essay citing text-based evidence using the practice prompt. Print clearly on the board or chart so students can follow along.

3.3 Talk yourself through writing the paper. The students can help. Start by stating, “How shall I start? I need to have a strong introduction. I need a topic sentence.” Then pause and think. Look at the notes and consider out loud how you can make that tiny note into a long complete sentence. Say out loud and then write out the sentence. Model selecting and using transition words. Continue writing the informational essay citing text-based evidence until you are finished. At least 2 times ask, “Does my essay make sense? Do I have all my parts? Will the reader be convinced by the evidence?” Use coping statements.

Model being very tired. Shake your hand, roll your neck in frustration. Then use self statements to get yourself motivated again and back on task.

3.4 Model writing the conclusion and stopping and checking the paper for all of its parts. When the paper is finished, state, “Good work. I’m done. It’ll be fun to share my paper with others.”

Step 4: Introduce Graphing Sheet / Graph the Paper

4.1 Show the graphing sheet on the board, and pass out the graphing sheets to each student. Have students write their names on their sheet.

4.2 Ask students if the paper had all its parts. Review and look for answers to the questions in the prompt, details/examples from the text used to prove that those answers were correct, a strong conclusion, and
transition words.

Show the students how each section on the graph gets colored in for each part that was written.

**Step 5: Self-Statements: To Think of Good Ideas, While You Work, and To Check Your Work**

5.1 Tell students they will write down things they can say to themselves (called self-statements) to help them through planning and writing. If students have trouble developing their own statements, let them “borrow” one of yours or get help from each other. Discuss why each self-statement matters and how it helps.

5.2 Pass out the Self-Statement List. Ask students if they can remember some of the things you said to yourself to get started. Have students put 1-2 self-statements they would like to use when they write on their self-statement sheet. For example, “What is it I have to do? I have to write an essay using TONES. A good informational essay citing text-based evidence proves the author’s points with evidence and makes sense.”

5.3 Ask students if they can remember some of the things you said to yourself while you worked (try to get some statements about remembering the parts, self-evaluation statements, and creativity statements, like “let my mind be free, good ideas will come!”). Have students add 1-2 statements of their own to say while I work.

5.4 Ask students if they can remember some of the things you said to yourself when something was hard. Have students write 1-2 statements they can say when something is hard; these statements should help them stick with it and keep working. (Examples may include: *I can do this! I did this with my teacher or I can do this. I have a strategy – TONES!*).

5.5 Ask students if they can remember some of the things you said to yourself to check your work. Have students add 1-2 statements of their own to say to check my work when you’re finished such as, “Did I remember all my parts? Does my essay make sense? Have I used STRONG evidence? This is great! I have really proved my points.”

5.6 Tell students that we don’t always have to state these things out loud. Once we learn them we can think these things in our heads or whisper it to ourselves.

**Step 6: Review Goal Setting**

There are two different goal sheets, which can be used. Goal sheet A has initial goals, while the goal B contains advanced goals. You may want to use different
goal sheets for different students or start with the initial goals and move students towards the advanced goals.

6.1 Ask students why making goals is important. (Answers can include: they help us, so we know what to work towards, to help us do something better, to help us do something new, etc.) Pass out goal sheets. (If all students receive the same goal sheet, read through the goals with the students.)

6.2 Have each student look over the goal sheet and select 1 to 3 goals to work on in addition to using each part of TONES each time they write. Help students select appropriate goals as needed.

6.3 Teachers can instruct students to write in class goals to align with other writing instruction (grammar, spelling, sentence structure, etc.) or individual goals that specific students may need to address. For instance, if they did not have all of the parts, one goal should be to include all of the important parts.

Wrap Up Lesson

- Practice memorizing the TONES mnemonic

You can have students:
1. Write out TONES on scratch paper.
2. Quiz each other in partners or small groups.
3. Respond chorally to the teacher
4. Use flashcards to quiz each other

- Announce test next session! Tell students they will not be graded. They will be asked to demonstrate how well they know the steps of TONES. Remember, TONES helps us remember the steps to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. We also will be tested on what makes a good essay and the important parts of a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.

- Tell students they learned a strategy for writing better informational essays citing text-based evidence. During the next lesson, they will continue practicing the TONES strategies.

- Discuss the purpose of why they are learning it and why they have to memorize it.
- Determine if some of your students need more help with this lesson and plan for individualized instruction.
My Self-Statements

Things to say to myself to get started:

Things to say to myself while I work:

Things to say to myself when something is hard:

Things to say to myself to check my work:
Goal Sheet A

Name___________________

I will use each step of TONES when I write.

In addition, my goals are (pick 1, 2, or 3):

☐ I will add more academic vocabulary to my essay.

☐ I will cite more evidence to prove my topic.

☐ I will start every essay with an engaging hook.

☐ I will explain why my evidence proves my answer is right.

☐ I will use more linking/transition words to make my writing flow.

☐ I will write a strong ending that restates my topic and summarizes my evidence.

☐ ________________________________

☐ ________________________________
Goal Sheet B

Name___________________

I will use each step of TONES when I write.

In addition, my goals are (pick 2 or 3):

- I will use my notes to make sure my essay is very clear and easy to follow.
- I will elaborate on things evidence by adding details and examples.
- I will use quotes from the articles.
- I will put points from the article into my own words.
- I will use a variety of types of sentences like long, short, questions, exclamations, and so on.
- I will check my story for proper spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and word choice.

- ___________________________________________________
Graph My Writing
## Informational Essay Citing Text-based Evidence: TONES

### Lesson Four: Review TONES, Collaborative Writing

Instructor _______________  Completed by: ___________________  Date: ____________

Time Started: __________  Time Stopped: _______________  Total time: ____________ min.

1= step done, 0 = step not done/completely, 7= not scored; A= taught to all, whole class; SG=small group; I = Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Activate prior learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tell students they will continue working with the strategies to write a good essay</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Good essays:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o are fun to read</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o fun to write</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o make sense, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o have all their parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ask students what makes a good informational essay with text-based evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Has an engaging introduction</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Has a clear topic statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Explains your thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Has a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ask students why it is important to memorize the strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Test and Review the steps of TONES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You may have students:</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Write TONES on scratch paper and say what each letter means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Quiz each other in partners or small groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Respond chorally to the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use flashcards to quiz each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Step 1: Review self-statements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 2: Collaborative Planning, Teacher Leads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2 Ask students to name some things to say to get started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3 Ask students to name some things to say while working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4 Ask students to name some things to say when something is hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5 Ask students to name some things to say to remind you to check your work&lt;br&gt;Remind students that self-statements don’t have to be stated aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Step 2: Collaborative Planning, Teacher Leads 2.1&lt;br&gt;TONES chart, transition word chart, and self-statements list out&lt;br&gt;Model self-talk throughout this process.&lt;br&gt;Display TONES charts&lt;br&gt;Pass out student folders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2 Write or display prompt&lt;br&gt;Read aloud, chorally read, or assign reading of associated texts&lt;br&gt;Let students lead the writing process and initiate using TONES to get started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.3 How do we get started?&lt;br&gt;Refer students to self-statements to get started&lt;br&gt;Decide as a group what topic to write about&lt;br&gt;Write topic on the TONES graphic organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4 What do we do next?&lt;br&gt;Allow students to guide the next steps&lt;br&gt;Record notes on the graphic organizer&lt;br&gt;T = Topic&lt;br&gt;O = Outline answers to the questions posed&lt;br&gt;N = Note citations from the text to prove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Review goals for writing informational essays citing text-based evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Has an engaging introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Has a clear focus/thesis statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Explains your thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Has a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>After all notes have been generated, look back to see if the class wants to add more parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Insure transition words are included in the notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>With students, examine parts of TONES to be sure they are all there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Step 3: Collaborative Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>After notes are completed, ask students what to do next</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Refer students to self-statements of what to say while working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Remind them of the important parts of an informational essay with text-based evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Has an introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Has a clear topic statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Answers all the questions asked while educating/informing the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Uses specific facts and examples from the text (s) to support the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Explains your thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Has a conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 19 | 3.2 | All students to talk you through writing the essay |
|    |     | Refer to the notes and cross off each note as it is used in the writing |
|    |     | Have students generate sentences using the TONES notes you just created |
|    |     | 1…2...3...4...5 |
|    |     | NA |

| 20 | 3.3 | Use self-statements |
|    |     | 1…2...3...4...5 |
|    |     | NA |

| 21 | 3.4 | Ask students to |
|    |     | add transition words as you write each part |
|    |     | add interesting vocabulary |
|    |     | 1…2...3...4...5 |
|    |     | NA |

| 22 | Step 4: Introduce Graphing Sheet / Graph the essay |
|    | 4.1 | Show students the graphing sheet |
|    |     | Ask if essay had all its parts |
|    |     | 1…2...3...4...5 |
|    |     | NA |

| 23 | 4.2 | Graph a section for each answer to the questions in the prompt |
|    |     | Graph a section for each detail/example from the text used to prove that those answers were correct |
|    |     | Graph a section for a strong conclusion |
|    |     | Graph transition words |
|    |     | 1…2...3...4...5 |
|    |     | NA |

<p>| 24 | Step 5: Review goal setting |
|    | 5.1 | Ask why it is important |
|    |     | Pass out goal sheets |
|    | 5.2 | Have students review the goals that they have chosen |
|    |     | Have students confirm their goal selection |
|    |     | 1…2...3...4...5 |
|    |     | NA |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25</th>
<th>5.3</th>
<th>Teachers can have students write in a class goal</th>
<th>1…2…3…4…5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Step 6: Introduce Transfer</td>
<td>6.1 Ask students if they can think of other times/places/assignments they could and TONES Explain they can use TONES for any kind writing that asks them to use examples or evidence from text they’ve read</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wrap up lesson</td>
<td>Practice Memorizing TONES</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students may:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Write out the TONES strategy on scratch paper and state each step  □ Quiz each other in partners or small groups  □ Respond chorally to the teacher  □ Use TONES cue cards to quiz each other  □ You may also use the Memorization Handout for additional ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>□ Announce test, ungraded  □ Remind students they have learned strategies for good writing text-based evidence essays  □ Put materials in writing folder  □ Collect folders</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Fell Well Short of Expectations, 2=Fell Short of Expectations, 3=Met Expectations, 4=Exceeded Expectations, 5=Greatly Exceeded Expectations
Lesson Overview:

- Students will review and practice TONES.
- Students will engage in collaborative practice, planning and writing an essay using TONES.
- Students will graph the collaboratively written essay.

Materials

- Mnemonic chart
- Essay example
- Practice prompt
- TONES graphic organizer
- Transition word chart
- Self-statements sheet
- Flash cards (if desired)
- Pencils
- Scratch paper
- Student folders
- Graphing sheet

Activate Prior Learning

- Good Writing
- TONES – Informational essays with text-based evidence
- Memorizing each step

Remind students we are learning a strategy for writing that will help them plan and write a good essay. Today we will learn more about the strategy, TONES. The TONES strategy will help you plan and write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.

Review good essays.

What makes a good essay?
Remind students

Good essays:

- are fun to read
- fun to write
- make sense, and
- have all their parts

Informational essays with text-based evidence.
Ask the students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence

Answers should include:
- Has an engaging introduction
- Has a clear topic statement
- Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader
- Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the topic
- Explains your thinking
- Has a conclusion
- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

Memorize. Ask the students why it is important that they memorize each step of these strategies (Answers should include: I won’t have a paper with the steps on it when I take the test; it will help me remember what to do; it will help me pass the test, and so on).

Review and Test TONES

- Practice TONES
- Practice reviewing what each letter in TONES stands for and why it is important. Help as needed.

Options for practice – have students:
1. Write out mnemonic on scratch paper and say what each letter means.
2. Quiz each other in partners or small groups.
3. Respond chorally to the teacher
4. Use flashcards to quiz each other

Step 1: Review Self-Statements

Tell students they will write down things they can say to themselves (called self-statements) to help them through planning and writing. If students have trouble developing their own statements, let them “borrow” one of yours or get help from each other. Discuss why each self-statement matters and how it helps.

1.1 Pass out the Self-Statement List. Discuss why we use self-statements.

1.2 Ask students if they can remember some of the things you said to yourself to get started. Have students put 1-2 self-statements they would like to use when they write on their self-statement sheet. For example, “What is it I have to do? I have to write an essay using TONES. A good informational essay...
citing text-based evidence proves the author’s points with evidence and makes sense.”

1.3 Ask students if they can remember some of the things you said to yourself **while you worked** (try to get some statements about remembering the parts, self-evaluation statements, and creativity statements, like “let my mind be free, good ideas will come!”). Have students add 1-2 statements of their own to say **while I work**.

1.4 Ask students if they can remember some of the things you said to yourself **when something was hard**. Have students write 1-2 statements they can say **when something is hard**: these statements should help them stick with it and keep working. (Examples may include: *I can do this! I did this with my teacher or I can do this. I have a strategy – TONES!*).

1.5 Ask students if they can remember some of the things you said to yourself **to check your work**. Have students add 1-2 statements of their own to say **to check my work** when you’re finished such as, “Did I remember all my parts? Does my essay make sense? Have I used STRONG evidence? This is great! I have really proved my points.”

Tell students that we don’t always have to state these things out loud. Once we learn them we can think these things in our heads or whisper it to ourselves.

**Step 2: Collaborative planning**

2.1 Pass out student folders, if not already out. Ask students to get out their TONES reminder chart, transition word chart, and self-statements list. Put graphic organizer on board with TONES down the left side.

2.2 Write the prompt on the board. Let students lead the writing process as much as possible. Help students as needed. This is a collaborative process, together you will write a group essay.

2.3 How do we start? Refer students to their self-statements to get started. This is along the same line as **What is it I have to do? I have to write an informational essay with text-based evidence using TONES.** After reading the texts associated with the prompt, decide as a group what topic you will write about.

2.4 What do we do next? We will use TONES to help us organize and plan our paper. State, “We will use this organizer on the board to make and organize our notes.”

2.5 Review your goals for writing an informational essay with text-based evidence with the students. A good informational essays with text-based evidence
Has an engaging introduction
Has a clear focus/thesis statement
Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader
Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the focus
Explains your thinking
Has a conclusion
Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

2.6 After students have generated notes for all of essay parts, look back at the notes and see if you can add more parts (e.g., more details, stronger vocabulary, additional supporting evidence). Make sure there are notes for good transition words.

2.7 With the students, examine the parts of TONES in the notes. Are they all there?

Step 3: Collaborative Writing

3.1 What do we do now? Remind students they now have to write their essay. They can also add more ideas as they write. Refer students to their self-statements to say while they work. State, “What is it we have to do here? We have to write a good informational essay with text-based evidence. Good essays are fun to read, fun to write, make sense, and have all their important parts.” Ask students to tell you what the important parts are: has a strong introduction with a clear topic (thesis), answers all the question in the prompt while informing and educating the reader, uses facts and examples from the text(s) to support those answers, provides the reader a strong conclusion that explains why the topic is important, uses precise language and linking words to connect ideas, has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation.

3.2 Allow students to talk you through writing the essay. Allow students to help as appropriate with transforming the notes into an essay. Refer to the notes as you model adding details and making sure your essay has all of its parts. Say, “How shall we start writing? Where can we look for an idea? (our notes)” Then look at your notes and point out that you already made notes on what ideas you want to include in your essay. “Here are our notes on what we want to include in our essay, now we need to expand our idea and really grab our reader’s attention.” Ask students how you take a note and expand it into an interesting sentence. State what you will write and then write the sentences. Students can help.

3.3 Use self-statements and cross off the parts on the TONES Notes planning sheet as you write. For example, “Wow, that was easy. Now that we have
written my first answer and supporting details, what should we do?” (cross it off to show myself that part is done) or “What can we say to ourselves now that we have written the first idea and supporting citation? This is easy! We have all my parts right here.” “I think I’m going to change this part and make it better.” “How can I add more detail here?” “How can I make this example more interesting?” “Wow, I’m really teaching my reader something new!” “We’re almost done!” Encourage students to guide you through writing the answers, supporting citations and then connecting the text citation to the answer chosen. Continue crossing off each part as you add it to the essay or make changes to improve your essay. Continue to use self-statements to show students how you keep yourself motivated and encourage yourself.

3.4 Ask students to help you add transition words as you write each part and find ways to use interesting vocabulary.

**Step 4: Review Graphing Sheet / Graph the Collaboratively Written Paper**

4.1 Draw a graphing icon on the board, and pass out the graphing sheets. Have students write their names on their sheet.

Ask students if the paper had all the parts. Review the topic, answers to each question from the prompt that inform/educate the audience, details/examples from the text used to prove that those answers are correct, a strong conclusion, transition words.

4.2 Show the students how each section on the graph gets colored in for each part that was written. Also, color a section for each text citation using a detail or fact or for each transition word that was used in the essay.

**Step 5: Review Goal Setting**

There are two different goal sheets, which can be used. Goal sheet A has initial goals, while the goal B contains advanced goals. You may want to use different goal sheets for different students or start with the initial goals and move students towards the advanced goals.

5.1 Ask students why making goals is important. (Answers can include: they help us, so we know what to work towards, to help us do something better, to help us do something new, etc.). Pass out goal sheets. (If all students receive the same goal sheet, read through the goals with the students.)

5.2 Have each student look over the goal sheet and select 1 to 3 more goals to work on in addition to using each part of TONES each time they write. Help students select appropriate goals as needed.

5.3 Teachers can instruct students to write in class goals to align with other
writing instruction (grammar, spelling, sentence structure, etc.) or individual goals that specific students may need to address. For instance, if they did not have all of the parts, one goal should be to include all of the important parts.

**Step 6: Introduce Transfer**

6.1 Ask students if they can think of other times/places/assignments they could use TONES. Explain they can use the writing process with any writing. Explain they can use TONES for any kind of informational writing that includes text-based evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrap Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o  Ask students to practice memorizing TONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o  Announce test next session! Tell students they will not be graded. They will be asked to demonstrate how well they know the steps of TONES. Remember, TONES helps us remember the steps to write a good informational essay with text-based evidence. We also will be tested on what makes a good essay and the important parts of a good informational essay with text-based evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o  Tell students they learned a strategy for writing better informational essays with text-based evidence. During the next lesson, they will continue practicing the TONES strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o  Discuss why they are learning TONES and why they have to memorize it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o  Determine if some of your students need more help with this lesson and plan for individualized instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lesson Five: Review TONES; Paired or Small Group Collaborative Practice

Instructor __________________ Completed by: __________________ Date: ______________

Time Started: ______________ Time Stopped: ______________ Total time: ______________ min.

1= step done, 0 = step not done/completely, 7= not scored; A= taught to all, whole class; SG=small group; I = Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Activate prior knowledge</th>
<th>Self Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Tell students they will continue working with the TONES strategy to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Good essays:</th>
<th>Self Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        |       | o are fun to read  
            o fun to write  
            o make sense, and  
            o have all their parts | 1…2…3…4…5 NA |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ask students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence</th>
<th>Self Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3        |       | □ Has an engaging introduction  
            □ Has a clear topic statement  
            □ Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader  
            □ Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the focus  
            □ Explains your thinking  
            □ Has a conclusion  
            □ Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas  
            □ Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation | 1…2…3…4…5 NA |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ask students why it is important to memorize the strategies</th>
<th>Self Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Complete | Group | Test and Review the steps of TONES  
You can have students:  
□ Write out TONES on scratch paper.  
□ Quiz each other in partners or small | Self Eval |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Group Collaborative Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Divide students into pairs or small groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Write or display prompt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pull out TONES chart, transition word chart, self-statements list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ask students how to start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Refer them to self-statement chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- After read aloud, choral reading, or partner reading, decide in pairs/groups what topic to write about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What do we do next?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Insure all pairs/groups are using TONES to organize and plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review goals for writing informational essay citing text-based evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has an engaging introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has a clear topic statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uses specific facts and examples from the text (s) to support the focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explains your thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ask students to generate notes for all the essay parts (in pairs/groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Check to make sure notes are complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review notes to see if more should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11   | 1.6      | - Examine the parts of TONES in the notes  
|      |          | - Have students underline or circle parts on their plan as you name them OR  
|      |          | - Have students point parts out to a neighbor or partner OR  
|      |          | - Have students respond orally  
| 12   | **Step 2: Collaborative Writing**  
|      | 2.1      | - What do I do now?  
|      |          | - Write the essay  
|      |          | - Review important parts of the genre  
|      |          | - Has an engaging introduction  
|      |          | - Has a clear topic statement  
|      |          | - Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader  
|      |          | - Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the focus  
|      |          | - Explains your thinking  
|      |          | - Has a conclusion  
|      |          | - Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas  
|      |          | - Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation  
| 13   | 2.2      | - Guide students through writing the essay in pairs or small groups using their notes  
| 14   | **Step 3: Graph the essay**  
|      | 3.1      | - Use graphing sheets  
| 15   | 3.2      | - Ask students if the essay had all its parts  
|      |          | - Ask them to color in the sections on the graph  
| 16   | **Wrap up lesson** |
### Practice Memorizing TONES

**Students may:**
- Write out the TONES strategy on scratch paper and state each step
- Quiz each other in partners or small groups
- Respond chorally to the teacher
- Use TONES cue cards to quiz each other

You may also use the Memorization Handout for additional ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>Announce test, ungraded</th>
<th>1…2…3…4…5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Remind students they have learned strategies for writing good informational essays citing text-based evidence</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Put materials in writing folder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Collect folders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Fell Well Short of Expectations, 2=Fell Short of Expectations, 3=Met Expectations, 4=Exceeded Expectations, 5=Greatly Exceeded Expectations
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Lesson Five: Review TONES; Paired or Small Group Collaborative Practice

Lesson Overview:
- Students will review and practice TONES.
- Students will engage in collaborative practice, planning and writing an essay using TONES.

Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mnemonic chart</th>
<th>Pencils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice prompt</td>
<td>Scratch paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONES graphic organizer</td>
<td>Student folders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition word chart</td>
<td>Rocket graphing sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-statements sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activate Prior Learning

- Good Writing
- TONES – Informational essays citing text-based evidence
- Memorizing each step

Remind students we are learning strategies for writing that will help them plan and write a good essay. Today we will learn more about the strategy, TONES. The TONES strategy will help you plan and write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.

Review good essays

What makes a good essay?

Remind students

Good essays:

- are fun to read
- fun to write
- make sense, and
- have all their parts

Informational essays citing text-based evidence.

Ask the students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence
Memorize. Ask the students why it is important that they memorize each step of these strategies (Answers should include: I won’t have a paper with the steps on it when I take the test; it will help me remember what to do; it will help me pass the test, and so on).

Review and Test TONES

- Practice TONES
  - Practice reviewing what each letter in TONES stands for and why it is important. Help as needed.

Options for practice – have students:
1. Write out mnemonic on scratch paper and say what each letter means.
2. Quiz each other in partners or small groups.
3. Respond chorally to the teacher
4. Use flashcards to quiz each other

Step 1: Collaborative Planning

1.1 Divide students into purposefully selected pairs or small collaborative groups. Pass out student folders, if not already out. Ask students to get out their TONES reminder chart, transition word chart, and self-statements list. Put graphic organizer on board with TONES down the left side. Write the prompt on the board. This continues to be a collaborative process, but students need to take more of the lead now.

1.2 How do we start? Refer students to their self-statements to get started. This is along the same line as “What is it we have to do? We have to write an informational essay citing text-based evidence using TONES.” After reading the texts associated with the prompt, decide in pairs or in a group what topic you will write about.

1.3 What do we do next? We will use TONES to help us organize and plan our paper. State, “We will use this organizer on the board to make and organize
1.4 Be sure students review your goals for writing an informational essay citing text-based evidence with the students. Good informational essays citing text-based evidence has a strong introduction with a clear topic, answers all the question in the prompt while informing/educating the reader, uses facts and examples from the text(s) to support those answers, provides the reader a strong conclusion that explains why the topic is important, uses precise language and linking words to connect ideas, has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation.

1.5 What next? Prompt students to generate notes for all of the informational essay citing text-based evidence parts, and then look back at the notes and see if more parts should be added (e.g., more details). Make sure there are notes for good transition words. Make sure there are notes for academic language.

1.6 What is the next step? Prompt the student pairs or groups to examine the parts of TONES in the notes. Are they all there?

Step 2: Collaborative Writing

2.1 What do we do now? Remind students they now have to write their essay. They can also add more ideas as they write. Refer students to their self-statements to say while they work. State, “What is it I have to do here? I have to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. Good essays are fun to read, fun to write, make sense, and have all their important parts.” Ask students to tell you what the important parts are: has a strong introduction with a clear topic, answers all the question in the prompt while informing/educating the reader, uses facts and examples from the text(s) to support those answers, provides the reader a strong conclusion that explains why the topic is important, uses precise language and linking words to connect ideas, has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation.

2.2 To the degree necessary, guide the students through writing the essay. Allow students to transform the notes into an essay. Remind them to cross off the parts on the TONES Notes planning sheet as you write.

Step 3: Graph the Collaboratively Written Paper

3.1 What now? Have students assesses their writing using the graphing sheets. Prompt students to check if the paper had all the parts. Review the topic, answers to each question from the prompt, details/examples from the text used to prove that those answers are correct, a strong conclusion, transition
You may also have students graph other things that are important to you – strong vocabulary, etc.

3.2 Prompt as needed to have students to color in a section for each part that was written.

Also, color a section for each text citation using a detail or fact or for each transition word that was used in the essay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrap Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Ask students to practice memorizing TONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Announce test next session! Tell students they will not be graded. They will be asked to demonstrate how well they know the steps of TONES. Remember, TONES helps us remember the steps to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. We also will be tested on what makes a good essay and the important parts of a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Tell students they learned a strategy for writing better informational essays citing text-based evidence. During the next lesson, they will continue practicing the TONES strategy.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Discuss why they are learning TONES and why they have to memorize it.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Determine if some of your students need more help with this lesson and plan for individualized instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Informational essay citing text-based evidence: TONES

**Lesson Six: Review TONES, Independent Writing**

*THIS LESSON IS REPEATED AS NECESSARY FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS TO MOVE FROM SUPPORTED WRITING TO INDEPENDENT WRITING*

Instructor ___________________  Completed by____________  Date: __________

Time Started: ___________  Time Stopped: ___________  Total time: ______________ min.

1= step done, 0 = step not done/completely, 7= not scored; A= taught to all, whole class; SG=small group; I = Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Self Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activate prior knowledge**

☐ Tell students they will continue working with the TONES strategy to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence

**Good essays:**

- are fun to read
- fun to write
- make sense, and
- have all their parts

**Ask students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence**

- Has an engaging introduction
- Has a clear topic statement
- Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader
- Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the topic
- Explains your thinking
- Has a conclusion
- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation
| 4 | Ask students why it is important to memorize the strategies | 1…2...3...4...5
| NA |
| 5 | Test and Review the steps of TONES
You can have students:
- Write out TONES on scratch paper.
- Quiz each other in partners or small groups.
- Respond chorally to the teacher
- Use flashcards to quiz each other | 1…2...3...4...5
| NA |
| 4 | Step 1: Review self-statements
- Review self-statement list
- What are they used for? | 1…2...3...4...5
| NA |
| 5 | 1.2
- Ask students to name some things to say to get started: “What is it I have to do? I have to write an essay using TONES. A good informational essay citing text-based evidence proves a strong point by citing facts and examples from text.” | 1…2...3...4...5
| NA |
| 6 | 1.3
- Ask students to name some things to say while working: For example, statements about remembering the parts, self-evaluation statements, and creativity statements, like “let my mind be free, good ideas will come!” | 1…2...3...4...5
| NA |
| 7 | 1.4
- Ask students to name some things to say when something is hard: I can do this! I did this with my teacher or I can do this. I have a strategy – TONES! | 1…2...3...4...5
| NA |
| 8 | 1.5
- Ask students to name some things to say | 1…2...3...4...5
<p>| NA |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: Review Goals</th>
<th>1...2...3...4...5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Ask students why making goals is important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Ask students to get out their goal sheets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: What makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence?</th>
<th>1...2...3...4...5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Has an engaging introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Has a clear topic statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Explains your thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Has a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4: Introduce Independent Writing</th>
<th>1...2...3...4...5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Pass out student folders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Ask students to get out self statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Step 5: Practice Independent Writing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | 5.1 | - Ask students what they needed to do (if graphic organizer was faded, they should write TONES down the side of the paper)
- Circulate to confirm every student has a graphic organizer set up | NA |
|16 | 5.2 | - Wait to see if students continue
- If some students do not, prompt them by asking what they should do next (Use TONES to write notes to plan their essay; use self-statements to get started) | 1…2…3…4…5 |
|17 | 5.3 | - Wait to see if students continue. If some students do not, prompt them to write an essay as needed
- Let students write independently as much as possible | NA |
<p>|18 | 5.4 | - When students complete the writing, wait to see if students read over their papers to check their work | NA |
|19 | <strong>Step 6: Review goal for writing better papers</strong> |   | 1…2…3…4…5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Prompt students to draw/retrieve graphing sheet</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Ask students if their paper had all its parts. Encourage them to check for their parts. Review the parts to check for if necessary.</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Have students graph their essay</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Congratulate the students on their hard work. Remind them of their writing goals for next time.</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>Wrap up lesson</strong></td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Practice Memorizing TONES</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Students may:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Write out the TONES strategy on scratch paper and state each step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quiz each other in partners or small groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respond chorally to the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use TONES cue cards to quiz each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You may also use the Memorization Handout for additional ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Announce test, ungraded</td>
<td>1…2…3…4…5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remind students they have learned strategies for writing good informational essays citing text-based evidence</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Put materials in writing folder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect folders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Fell Well Short of Expectations, 2=Fell Short of Expectations, 3=Met Expectations, 4=Exceeded Expectations, 5=Greatly Exceeded Expectations
Informational essay citing text-based evidence: TONES

Lesson Six: Review TONES, Independent Writing

THIS LESSON IS REPEATED AS NECESSARY FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS TO MOVE FROM SUPPORTED WRITING TO INDEPENDENT WRITING

Lesson Overview:
- Students will review and practice TONES
- The students will independently plan and write an essay using TONES
  - Students will graph their performance

Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mnemonic chart</th>
<th>Pencils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice prompt</td>
<td>Scratch paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-statements sheet</td>
<td>Student folders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphing sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activate Prior Learning

1. Good Writing
2. TONES – Informational essays citing text-based evidence
3. Memorizing each step

Remind students we are learning strategies for writing that will help them plan and write a good essay. Today we will learn more about the strategy, TONES. The TONES strategy will help you plan and write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.

Review good essays

What makes a good essay?

Remind students

Good essays:
- are fun to read
- fun to write
- make sense, and
- have all their parts
Informational essays citing text-based evidence.

Ask the students what makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence
Answers should include:
- Has an introduction
- Has a clear focus/thesis statement
- Informs/educates the audience
- Answers all the questions asked
- Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the focus and explains your thinking
- Has a strong conclusion
- Uses precise language and linking words to connect ideas
- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

Memorize. Ask the students why it is important that they memorize each step of these strategies. (Answers should include: I won’t have a paper with the steps on it when I take the test; it will help me remember what to do; it will help me pass the test, and so on).

Review and Test TONES

R.1 Practice TONES
R.2 Practice reviewing what each letter in TONES stands for and why it is important. Help as needed.

Options for practice – have students:
1. Write out mnemonic on scratch paper and say what each letter means.
2. Quiz each other in partners or small groups.
3. Respond chorally to the teacher
4. Use flashcards to quiz each other
Step 1: Review Self-Statements

1.1 Ask students to get out the Self-Statement List. Have students review things they can say to themselves (called self-statements) to help them through planning and writing. If students have trouble developing their own statements, let them “borrow” one of yours or get help from each other.

1.2 Ask students to name some of the things they can say to get started. For example, “What is it I have to do? I have to write an essay using TONES. A good informational essay citing text-based evidence proves a strong point by citing facts and examples from text.”

1.3 Ask students to name some of the things to say while they work (try to get some statements about remembering the parts, self-evaluation statements, and creativity statements, like “let my mind be free, good ideas will come!”).

1.4 Ask students to name some of the things to say when something is hard. These statements should help them stick with it and keep working. (Examples may include: I can do this! I did this with my teacher or I can do this. I have a strategy – TONES!)

1.5 Ask students to name some of the things to say to check their work. For example, “Did I remember all my parts? Does my essay make sense? Did I teach my reader something? This is great! I really proved my point in this essay!”

Step 2: Review Goals

2.1 Ask students why making goals is important. (Answers can include: they help us, so we know what to work towards, to help us do something better, to help us do something new, etc.) Ask students to get out their goal sheets.

2.2 Have each student review their goal sheet and add any other goals to work on each time they write.

2.3 Teachers can instruct students to write in class goals to align with other writing instruction (grammar, spelling, sentence structure, etc.) or individual goals that specific students may need to address. For instance, if they did not have all of the parts, one goal should be to include all of the important parts.
Step 3: What makes a good informational essay citing text-based evidence

a. Review with students their goals for writing an informational essay citing text-based evidence.

State, “A good informational essay citing text-based evidence:

- Has an engaging introduction
- Has a clear topic statement
- Answers all the questions asked while informing the reader
- Uses specific facts and examples from the text(s) to support the topic
- Explains your thinking
- Has a conclusion
- Uses academic language and linking words to connect ideas
- Has correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation

Step 4: Introduce Independent Writing

4.1 Pass out student folders. Ask the students to get out their transition word chart and their self-statements list. Give students a blank graphic organizer. Write or display the writing prompt on the board.

4.2 Explain to students they have seen you write an essay, they have helped to write an essay as a class X number of times, and they wrote an essay with a peer or peer group. So, now they are going to write an essay on their own.

Step 5: Practice Independent Writing

5.1 Ask students what they should do first. THEY MUST WRITE TONES along the side ON THE WRITING PROMPT OR NOTEBOOK PAPER – HELP THEM TO DO SO IF THEY HAVE DIFFICULTY. Circulate around the room. If all of the class is having trouble with any step, you can pull the whole class together to review and help. Otherwise, assist individuals or small groups as needed.

5.2 Wait and see if students continue. If some students do not, ask these students what they need to do next. Prompt and help only as necessary. They need to use TONES to make notes for each part. When they are done writing notes, remind them they can think of more ideas as they write. Encourage students to use self-statements when you think they are needed. It is okay if students aren't using self-statements out loud.

5.3 Wait and see if students continue. If some students do not, ask these
students what they should do next. Prompt students to write their essay, as needed. Let students work independently as much as possible, but help them if needed so they have a complete, quality informational essay citing text-based evidence. The goal is for these students to become more independent with practice. Struggling writers may need extra help here. You can work with them individually, in small groups, or have them work with a peer as necessary and possible.

5.4 Once students complete their writing, wait and see if students read their paper to check if the story makes sense and has all the important parts, and if they make any changes to parts of their story (e.g., adding details or more ideas). Encourage or help students do this if they don't do it on their own.

**Step 6: Graph the Independently Written Paper**

6.1 If students do not proceed to graph their papers, prompt them to do so.

6.2 Ask students if their paper had all the parts. Ask students if the paper had all the parts - a topic, answers to each question from the prompt, details/examples from the text used to prove that those answers are correct, a strong conclusion, transition words.

Circulate and help students to verify the number of parts they have. Or, you may pair students off to share and count their parts together. If a student is missing a part(s), they may add them now if time allows (i.e., they can revise).

6.3 Congratulate students on their hard work and remind them of their goals for next time.

**Wrap Up**

- Ask students to practice memorizing TONES
- Announce test next session! Tell students they will not be graded. They will be asked to demonstrate how well they know the steps of TONES. Remember, TONES helps us remember the steps to write a good informational essay citing text-based evidence. We also will be tested on what makes a good essay and the important parts of a good informational essay citing text-based evidence.
- Tell students they learned a strategy for writing better informational
essays citing text-based evidence. During the next lesson, they will continue practicing the TONES strategy.

- Discuss why they are learning the TONEs strategy and why they have to memorize it.

- Determine if some of your students need more help with this lesson and plan for individualized instruction.

- **REPEAT THIS LESSON UNTIL STUDENTS CAN WRITE INDEPENDENTLY. SELECT FROM REMAINING PROMPTS IN PROMPT BANK***
APPENDIX F
Social Validity Measures

Teacher Social Validity Survey: Adapted from Intervention Rating Profile-15

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information that will aid in the selection of future classroom interventions. These interventions will be used by teachers of children with identified needs. Please circle the number which best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is an acceptable writing intervention for children in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers would find this intervention appropriate for children with similar needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This intervention will prove effective in improving the child’s writing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would suggest the use of this intervention to other teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing performance of these students warrants use of this intervention.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers would find this intervention suitable for the needs of these students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to use this writing strategy in most classroom settings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of this intervention will produce no negative consequences for the student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This intervention would be appropriate for a variety of children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This intervention is consistent with those I have used in classroom settings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intervention is a fair way to teach student informational writing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This intervention is reasonable for the academic needs of these students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the procedures used in this intervention.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This intervention is a good way to handle the students’ writing needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, this intervention is beneficial for the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I totally agree</th>
<th>I mostly agree</th>
<th>I agree a little</th>
<th>I disagree a little</th>
<th>I mostly disagree</th>
<th>I do not agree at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The writing strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(POW+TONES) will be fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think when we do the writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy (POW+TONES), my teacher will demand too much work from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the writing strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(POW+TONES) will help me read informational articles better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the writing strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(POW+TONES) will help me write about what I read better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are probably other ways to learn to write that are better than this one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the writing strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(POW+TONES) could help other kids, too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will like learning the writing strategy (POW+TONES).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the writing strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(POW+TONES) will help me do better in other classes too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  

## APPENDIX G

### Writing Probe Assessment List of Texts and Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles of Paired Texts Used for Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After carefully reading both passages, explain the different threats to big cats and some things people can do to help.

Be sure to use details and examples from the text to support your reasoning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much do you know about this topic?</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you enjoy this topic?</td>
<td>Loved it</td>
<td>Liked it</td>
<td>It was okay</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate your essay</td>
<td>Awesome</td>
<td>Pretty Good</td>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>Not the best</td>
<td>Maybe next time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX H
### Analytic Quality Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. OWN WORDS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay can reasonably be described as the student’s own words (proper citations of significant portions, but key phrases lifted w/o attribution are reasonable).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, continue with Item #2. If No, continue scoring and score as P / #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. ON TOPIC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does response explicitly address prompt topic 1?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does response explicitly address prompt topic 2?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Intro</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A hook is any lead that might be thought to interest the reader. It must be separate from the topic itself and must start the essay. The first line must be included for the statement/question to be considered a hook. Absent = 0, Restates prompt as ? = 1, More elaborate = 2</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The topic sentence(s) must be responsive to the prompt and must be in the first (or only) paragraph 0 if it is absent or does not address the either topic posed in the prompt. 1 if it explicitly/directly addresses one of the posed topics in the prompt. (Identical words to prompt or close synonyms) 2 Both parts of the prompt are explicitly/directly addressed.</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A topic can be elaborated by referring to evidence, examples, or details that will be discussed in the body. The elaborations can be in more than one sentence if it is still clearly in the introductory chunk.</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Evidence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence must support the explicitly stated topic/answer to the prompt. It can give an example or add details from the text. (Evidence related to an answer may not be scored if no answer is explicitly offered as there is no way to support an unmade claim.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count the number of distinct evidence statements (statements do not have to be complete sentences) Tally: ____________________ #</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tally: __________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. PROMPT PRONG ONE, if explicitly answered, score below:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVIDENCE: For no cited text examples/details or copied text, score 0. For single text examples/details in support of an answer, score 1 For multiple citations in support of a single answer, score 2</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were common methods of denoting citation used in support of answer 1? (Quotation marks, the author stated, I read, etc.) 0-none, 1-one type, 2-multiple variations</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. PROMPT PRONG TWO, if explicitly answered, score below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were common methods of denoting citation used in support of answer 1? (Quotation marks, the author stated, I read, etc.) 0-none, 1-one type, 2-multiple variations</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVIDENCE: For no cited text examples/details or copied text, score 0. For single text examples/details in support of an answer, score 1. For multiple citations in support of a single answer, score 2.</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were common methods of denoting citation properly used in support of answer 1? (Quotation marks, the author stated, I read, etc.) 0-none, 1-one type, 2-multiple variations</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. EXPLANATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The explanation allows students to justify their choice of textual evidence to support their prompt. No explanation is scored 0. A single instance of explanation is scored as 1. Multiple instances/patterns of explanation are scored as 2.</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key words (shows, demonstrates, explains, or some variation thereof, explicitly connects chosen evidence to prompt answer)</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Vocabulary (Unique Words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic vocabulary (unique words)</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A conclusion explicitly refers to the position. Earns 2 points if it summarizes at least 2 instances of the evidence, examples, or details. 0 = No conclusion 1 = Restates initial topic 2 = Restates initial topic and a single instance of explanation 3 = Restates and multiple instances/patterns of explanation</td>
<td>0 – 1 – 2 - 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transition Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Words</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count the number of transition words Tally: __________________________</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Words</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1 point) – Uses at least 2 transition words (2 points) – Uses at least 3 transition words</td>
<td>0 – 1 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>