2016

Can Best Practices in Writing Instruction and Standardized Testing Coexist?

Karen Cannavino
University of Central Florida

CAN BEST PRACTICES IN WRITING INSTRUCTION AND STANDARDIZED TESTING COEXIST?

by

KAREN BOEHL CANNAVINO
B.A. Florida State University, 1994

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric
in the College of Arts and Humanities
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2016

Major Professor: Kathleen Bell

ABSTRACT

At the high school level, teachers are tasked with a twofold agenda: they must prepare their students for college level and other post-secondary writing, and they must also make sure they perform well on the standardized writing tests that are required by the state. The stakes in standardized testing continue to rise, especially in Florida. Since the passing of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2002 (NCLB) and the implementation of the Race to the Top Assessment Program (RTTT) in 2009, teachers across the nation have experienced intense pressures related to standardized testing. Many schools' efforts to conform to testing requirements have had the unintended consequence of narrowing their focus to the content of the test. As teachers and administrators experience the pressure to meet the requirements, it has become impossible to implement any pedagogy without test results in mind.

The challenge facing high school writing teachers is formidable: how can they best choose their new approach to pedagogy, given the pressures of standardized testing, the new curriculum requirements, and the need to ensure that they equip students with the skills they will need to write in college? This thesis explores the question by analyzing the key factors that impact writing instruction in Florida high school classrooms: testing requirements, curriculum requirements, and the content of writing textbooks being used. Do these factors encourage teachers to follow the best practices in writing instruction recommended by field-based research? What knowledge can we gain from comparing these factors, which may be helpful to today's writing instructors in light of the challenges they face?

Through this research and analysis, I hope to provide insight that can inform high school writing teachers on the heart of the issue: is it possible for best practices in writing instruction and standardized testing to coexist in their classrooms?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Kathleen Bell, my advisor, has been continually patient, kind, and encouraging throughout my long journey. I am forever grateful that she didn't allow me to give up on this dream of completing a graduate degree. She was very understanding of the hurdles I had to overcome in my personal life to complete this degree. I also learned a great deal from her in the process about research, academic writing, and the world of academia from an educator's perspective. I enjoyed our talks and time spent together, and I wish her much happiness and fulfillment in her upcoming retirement.

I would also like to thank my other advisors, Dr. Elizabeth Wardle and Dr. Kevin Roozen, for their patience, support and understanding. I appreciate all the input and constructive criticism they provided throughout the process.

My family and friends have been very supportive of me throughout this endeavor. I want to thank my husband, Matt Cannavino, for his support and for not allowing me to give up. I also want to thank my mother, Janice Boehl, for her words of encouragement and for all the many hours she spent taking care of my three children so I could devote time to writing my thesis. I also wish to thank my special aunts, whose encouragement, advice and example motivated me to finish despite all the challenges: Dr. Gloria June Crawford, Rita Belcher, Dr. Ellen McElroy, Marcia Williams, and the late Dr. Laura Grounsell.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Composition as a recognized field of study can be traced back to the early 1960s, when educational reform became a national issue. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provided an unprecedented amount of money to reform the American education system, and in 1964 it was extended to include English. This call for reform and the dollars that went along with it enhanced English teachers' self-perception as professionals, and created a renewed cooperation between the MLA (Modern Language Association) and the NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English).

The idea that bureaucrats considered composition useful and worthy of funding dollars (versus Literature, which had dominated the college English curricula) resonated with some of those who taught FYC (First Year Composition). In 1962, the NCTE Executive Council formed a committee to review what was known or not known about the teaching and learning of composition. The resulting book, *Research in Written Composition*, set the precedent for the emerging field of Composition by concluding that almost all past information on the subject should be dismissed because it was not based on scientific research (North preface-16). However, it wasn't that nothing was known about composition prior to this document, as may be implied by the committee's conclusion. Rather, the body of knowledge was almost all based upon composition teachers' personal teaching experiences. Best practices in teaching composition were being shared and used among the teaching community. Teachers relied on their peers to help them decide what practices to try, and which ones were effective or ineffective. This word of mouth approach has been described as teaching from "lore" (North 23).

Therefore, the NCTE called for "genuine contributions to knowledge" (Braddock et al 5) going forward, based upon scientific research.

As a flurry of scientific based research began, spurred on by the NCTE, the academic field of Composition developed. Through the publication of *Research in Written Composition,* the NCTE disseminated information to guide future composition researchers on how to apply scientific research methods to writing situations. The NTCE defined scientific research in composition as studies which involve some actual writing and which employ scientific methods, such as controlled experimentation and textual analysis (Braddock et al 1). By identifying the different variables, how to control them, and methods to accurately report results, the authors of *Research in Written Composition* presented guidelines for methods of research that the field of Composition could use in its quest for scientific knowledge regarding writing and writing instruction.

In the mid – 1970s, the amount of research in the field dramatically increased as many universities began to offer graduate programs in Composition. These programs were a result of the credibility the field had achieved from extensive formal academic inquiry into the subject. Concurrently, as new information was gained from research, it started to spur academic reform. Composition teachers recognized a need for changes in the ways composition was being taught. In 1966 at Dartmouth College, the MLA, NCTE, and the National Association for the Teaching of English (from Great Britain) sponsored a month long conference on the teaching of English. Those present at the conference discussed current and past pedagogies, and categorized them into two main areas: those which focused on skills (correctness of grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc.), and those which focused on cultural heritage (teaching specific literary works meant to

prepare students for Literature at the university). Participants agreed that a new approach to teaching was needed: one which focused on both language and students' personal growth as writers (Dixon 1-11). They proposed a new model for teaching writing that recognized students' need for self-expression and encouraged interaction between teacher and students. The idea was to help students find their personal writing style, unconstrained by conventions. This style was termed "the writer's authentic voice" (Reynolds n.p.).

Developing the voice of the writer is a concept most likely derived from classical teachings of rhetoric. The Greek philosopher and teacher Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) is recognized for being the first to arrange what was then known about rhetoric into a cohesive body of thought. His work, *Rhetoric,* is often viewed as the foundation for teaching effective communication (Peeples 14). Aristotle's major canons of rhetoric include elocution or style, which involve "the linguistic choices the speaker [or writer] must make" (Peeples 14). In their call to bring focus back to individuals' personal writing style and voice, the Dartmouth Conference participants were in essence asking writing teachers to go back to the fundamental teachings of rhetoric, which had been missing from American writing classrooms for many years. When Harvard introduced the First Year Composition class in the 1880s, an unintended result was that over time, the teaching of writing became separated from Rhetoric in American education.

The Dartmouth Conference's conclusions reflected a trend in academic reform that was already beginning. Some writing instructors, mainly at the college level, had already expanded their focus to include instruction in rhetoric as a way to make composition classes more rigorous. The re-emergence of rhetoric into the composition curriculum is discussed in a 1965 article by

Wayne Booth, where he explains the need for instruction in the basics of rhetoric, including invention, arrangement, the study of emotional and ethical appeal, and argument analysis (Booth 11). The renewed attention to rhetorical concepts also prompted an interest in the stages of the writing process, as well as "style as an expression of personal ethos" (Bizzell, Herzberg and Reynolds n.p.). In the late 1960s and early 1970s, writing pedagogy began to focus on the voice of the writer, helping students express themselves through language. Peter Elbow, an important advocate for authentic-voice writing, wrote, "When words carry the sound of a person--whether in fiction, poetry, or an essay--they are alive. Without it they are dead" (120). Elbow also helped introduce writing process activities, such as prewriting, which became commonly used in the classroom during this period.

As writing pedagogy changed to incorporate rhetorical concepts, a focus on personal expression, and the writing process, related research began to emerge. By the 1970s and 1980s, the field of composition had accumulated a large body of research, but there was no unanimity, and no core idea or ideas that brought together the knowledge gained up to that point. Research was fragmented into several different modes of inquiry, and very little had been done in terms of comparing these various approaches to each other (North preface 1-5). In the 1987 book by Stephen North, *The Making and Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*, North describes researchers using eight different approaches to contribute knowledge to the field: Practitioners, Historians, Philosophers, Critics, Experimentalists, Clinicians, Formalists, and Ethnographers. He groups these eight approaches into three categories, based upon the overarching research question they are pursuing: Practitioners are exploring, "What do we do?" Scholars want to know, "What does it mean?", and Researchers are asking, "What happens?"

(intro 3-4). With participants in the field focused on developing their own ideas in eight different directions, North asserts that no one had taken the time to compare the body of knowledge being created to come up with common ideas that the participants in the field could agree upon together. Therefore, from the outside looking in, he demonstrates how difficult it was to synthesize all of the information being contributed and to answer simple questions about the field as a whole such as, "What exactly is the field of composition? Is there a logical hierarchy of knowledge in the field? Where is Composition research headed?" (North preface 15).

As North and others began to ask about where Composition was headed, many of those engaged in composition research began to examine how writing was traditionally taught in order to figure out how to move forward. What pedagogy, if any, was effective? What was especially ineffective? In 1978, Richard Young wrote an essay in which he described the traditional body of beliefs and practices related to teaching writing as a "paradigm." He borrowed this word from a book by Thomas Kuhn, who was a professor in the history of science. In Kuhn's 1963 book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* he discusses his theory of how major changes come about in scientific fields. Those in the same field have a shared conceptual model, or paradigm, which governs their activities and research. Results are compared against the paradigm, and new members to the field study the paradigm to gain entrance. When the scientific field reaches a point where beliefs or concepts within its paradigm are not working, the intellectual system begins to break down. As old methods are unable to solve new problems, or researchers encounter phenomena that cannot be explained by the established beliefs, the paradigm becomes unstable. Eventually, the old beliefs are replaced with new ones, resulting in a paradigm shift

(Hairston 76-77). Young concluded that the field of Composition was going through a paradigm shift at that time.

Maxine Hairston describes the traditional paradigm in Composition as pedagogy that focuses on the product, emphasizing style and form over invention and creativity. Feedback from instructors to students was primarily directed toward correctness of grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Textbooks from this time period were devoted primarily to the sentence, the paragraph, usage, and style. Invention, the rhetorical foundation for composing, was viewed as something that naturally occurs, not a skill that could be developed through a formulaic teaching method. Therefore, students were given little direction on how to actually go about writing-- there was no guidance on the invention of ideas and development of content (Young 31-32).

The new pedagogy that emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s, accelerated by the Dartmouth Conference, was more suited to the population of students that were being admitted to colleges and universities at that time. It was a more diverse population, and many of these students were coming to college without a foundation of writing skills. Composition teachers began to realize that the traditional paradigm, which focused on product (form, style, grammar, etc.) was not working, especially for the students who needed the most help. Students who were inexperienced or not able to write fluently needed guidance on coming up with the composed product itself. It became evident to those in the discipline that the current paradigm lacked a means to address invention. Invention requires a process based approach to writing, and so the new pedagogy, which focused on the composing process and theories around invention, rather than the product, became the new way to teach writing (Young 33-35).

Irene Clark and Betty Bamberg, leading researchers in writing process research, identified the traditional paradigm's lack of attention to process as a reflection of the cultural concept that good writers can produce excellent text effortlessly. A common belief was that either a person could write, or they couldn't (5). Process research began as a rejection of this cultural idea. Process researchers believed that various activities are involved in the act of writing, and that those activities are consistent among the majority of writers. Their goal was to identify those activities, then categorize and analyze them. Discovering a successive pattern of activities would result in a writing process that could be taught to others. However, in this endeavor they found that the writing process is difficult to study. There are many mental activities involved, and it is difficult to determine exactly what is going on inside a writer's brain at any given time. Process research, therefore, is not a precise science. Regardless of method, there is no way to "prove" results, and the information gathered is subject to much interpretation.

Through process research, three main points consistently surfaced among various process studies:

1. The writing process is not linear
2. Processes vary greatly among writers
3. There are similarities in the practices of experienced writers, and groups of inexperienced writers also share similarities in their writing processes

Early in the process movement, the researchers held on to another traditional paradigm belief: that writing occurs in a linear sequence (Clark and Bamberg 8). The linear process, often presented in the form of the "stage process model," describes writing as a series of tasks. For

example, the writer plans, then composes, and then revises. Later, composition researchers began to criticize this approach: "The problem with stage descriptions of writing is that they model the growth of the written product, not the inner process of the person producing it" (Flower & Hayes 367). Attempts were made to hone in on this "inner process" by observing writers thinking aloud. Different methodologies were used to analyze such data, including categorizing (Flower & Hayes 369), coding (Perl 19-25), and naturalistic studies (Berkenkotter 157-160). Although the methods varied, the results consistently refuted the stage process model. Writers, in the act of writing, seem to alternate back and forth between such mental activities as planning, translating, evaluating, reviewing, and editing. Often, these activities lead to the development of sub-plans, where the writer changes course to address a rhetorical goal that has surfaced (Berkenkotter 160-161, Flower & Hayes 372, Perl 32). It was found that there can be significant variation between each writer's individual processes (Perl 34-37). The order of activities seems to depend on how the individual writer addresses self-defined rhetorical goals, making the writing process unique to each writer and situation (Sommers 330).

With such variation of writing processes among individuals, researchers began to focus on the trends that became apparent as process research evolved, in an attempt to glean information that could be usefully applied to the classroom. These trends centered around the similarities found in experienced writers versus those found in writers that are not experienced. Some of these trends, outlined by Flower and Hayes (364-379) and Sommers (329-331), are demonstrated in the chart below:

Table 1: Writing Process Trends for Experienced Versus Inexperienced Writers

Writing Process Trends for Experienced Versus Inexperienced Writers	
Experienced Writers	**Inexperienced Writers**
Show awareness and concern for audience	Assume the audience will understand what they are communicating
Concerned about content	Overly concerned about form
Revise at all levels	Mainly revise at sentence level
Use global planning	Use local, text bound planning
Focused, specific high level goals guide composing	Abstract, undeveloped top level goals guide composing
Have a higher quality and quantity of middle range goals	Mainly focus on low level goals

As is evidenced in the chart, the significant difference between experienced and inexperienced writers is what they choose to focus on when writing. The inexperienced writers tend to focus on low level issues in their writing, such as sentence structure. In fact, they often spend the majority of their time on such problems (Perl 33). Also, inexperienced writers tend to spend a lot of time composing very few words. In addition, their editing activities are primarily form driven, with little attention to content (Perl 33). Such practices can cause the writer to get "stuck" in the writing process. Some researchers have studied this phenomenon, commonly known as "writer's block." One such study found that the students with writer's block each had unique approaches to writing. However, some of them also had very inflexible approaches which inhibited their writing. For example, one student became stuck on a certain "rule" they had been taught about writing, which was, "always grab your audience." Even though the rule was inappropriate for her rhetorical situation, the student would not let go of it. In this way, the student developed a writer's block, and could not continue composing (Rose 394). In contrast, other students had such rules in their head, but recognized when they were not appropriate and

abandoned them. These students did not develop writer's block. Out of the four students with writer's block, the researcher was able to help three of them by giving them individualized attention. Because process research focuses on the individual writer, addressing each writer's issues one-on-one was a logical next step for the researcher.

With the idea in mind that many students need help in being introduced to and guided on how write at the college level, many composition scholars concluded that "professors in all disciplines need to be enlisted in the effort" (Bizzell, Herzberg and Reynolds n.p.). This idea manifested itself in the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) movement. The WAC movement, which began in the 1970s, allowed for a focus on student writing outside of the English department. The intellectual roots of the concept came mainly from the research and theories of James Britton from the London School of Education. After the Dartmouth Conference in 1966, there was extensive communication and sharing of ideas between British and American researchers. Consequently, composition researchers in the U.S. became familiar with Britton's work, and this caused the WAC movement to catch on, especially as a way to respond to negative press about the findings of the 1976 National Assessment of Education Progress in writing. (Bazerman and Russell xiii). The typical WAC program consisted of a series of workshops for faculty of all disciplines, which encouraged them to incorporate more writing into their courses. Janet Emig, one of the leading WAC theorists in the U.S., theorized that "writing in academic settings does not merely improve writing, it improves learning, through a variety of cognitive and social processes. Students should not only learn to write but write to learn" (Bazerman and Russell xiv).

When the WAC movement waned in the mid 1980s and 1990s, Composition research moved its attention away from the individual writer and turned its attention to the "social aspects" of writing. In another paradigm shift, field participants began to voice a rejection of then established idea that there is a teachable writing process which can be applied across all types of writing situations. The simplistic, writer based view held by process theorists did not acknowledge that writing is a social activity. Therefore, social theorists proposed that a writer's purpose is to communicate with a certain audience, and to do so successfully he or she must write according to the specific expectations of that audience. This requires knowledge of the particular audience being addressed, including "social aspects," such as what is considered inappropriate word choice, stylistic conventions, and common terminology (McCarthy 233). Such discussions led to the evolution of genre theory and discourse communities, concepts which focus on the conventions and commonalities used by specific communities that communicate primarily in writing.

Researchers began to explore the role of the community in shaping discourse (Clark and Bamberg 14-15). Instead of perceiving writing as an invention of its author, some believed that "individuals perceive the world according to the shared beliefs and perceptions of the community or communities to which they belong" (Clark and Bamberg 15). A new perspective, that of intertextuality, forced writing instructors to consider "the sources and social contexts from which the writer's discourse arises" (J. Porter 35). Writing was not the unique invention of its author, but rather the result of a process whereby the writer reinvents borrowed ideas and textual formations to address the rhetorical situation at hand.

This completely different perspective on process further complicated writing instruction: instead of trying to define a successful writing process and then deciding how to teach it to others, instructors began to consider the influence of the community that students were being asked to write within. Participants in the discipline began to discuss and define such communities. The idea of speech communities was already established in the field of linguistics, but the concept was too broad to apply to the study of writing within specific communities. Speech communities include all "people who use the same system of speech signals" (Bloomfield 29). This definition implies that anyone who can understand what you are saying is a part of your speech community. However, just being able to understand someone's writing does not in itself make the writing appropriate for its intended audience. Forced to narrow their focus, writing and composition researchers began discussions of genre and discourse communities. Noting that certain communities had their own accepted ways of writing, each of these could be identified as a genre, or "a distinctive category of discourse of any type, spoken or written" (Swales 33). Discourse communities were even more specific than genres. According to James Porter, a discourse community is "a group of individuals bound by a common interest who communicate through approved channels and whose discourse is regulated" (38-39). Applying these concepts to the classroom, some writing teachers began to consider the discourse communities that they belonged to, and how their membership in that community affected their teaching. In a broad sense, the idea of an academic discourse community seemed to clarify what they were trying to accomplish, especially for First Year Composition (FYC) instructors. They were charged with teaching students to write in the university, or "general things about academic language use that will help them to write during college" (Wardle "Mutt Genres" 766). Since

"FYC teachers often mistake the genres of English studies for genres-in-general" (Wardle "Mutt Genres" 769), this seemed to align with their goal.

However, approaching writing instruction from the academic discourse community perspective did not improve students' writing. Just as earlier research proved that there is no one writing process that works for everyone, researchers found that there is no one general academic discourse that could be taught to everyone. Different disciplines within the university each have their own ways of writing and acceptable conventions, and students must become familiar with the standards and characteristics of each one they are exposed to before they can write proficiently in that area of study. Gaining such familiarity takes time and practice, and each instructor is only equipped to teach his or her own community's writing conventions. As Elizabeth Wardle found in her study of genres in the university, even if the writing instructor attempts to become familiar with the genres of another academic discipline, "the activities of FYC do not provide the content needed to practice writing those genres in any meaningful way" ("Mutt Genres" 781).

Such research reveals how the complexity of writing processes has led to the inherent problems with the current writing pedagogy in American universities, where FYC courses are pervasive. Instructors must consider not only the individual's personal writing processes, but also how to best help students make their writing conform to the social constraints of the community that is their intended audience.

Well before the turn of the century, composition had become an established and respected field of study, with undergraduate and graduate degrees offered by many prestigious colleges and

universities. There is an extensive body of research that continues to evolve. Along with the NCTE and CCCC, research and university presses regularly publish scholarly work in the field. This work not only informs pedagogy at the college level, but the information is disseminated to high school writing teachers.

At the high school level, teachers are tasked with a twofold agenda: they must prepare their students for college level and other post-secondary writing, and they must also make sure they perform well on the standardized writing tests that are required by the state. The stakes in standardized testing continue to rise, especially in Florida, which is the focus of this thesis. With the passing of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2002 (NCLB) and the implementation of the Race to the Top Assessment Program (RTTT) in 2009, teachers across the nation have experienced intense pressures related to standardized testing. Many schools' efforts to conform to testing requirements have had the unintended consequence of narrowing their focus to the content of the test. As teachers and administrators experience the pressure to meet the requirements, it has become impossible to implement any pedagogy without test results in mind.

The challenge facing high school writing teachers is formidable: how can they best choose their new approach to pedagogy, given the pressures of standardized testing, the new curriculum requirements, and the need to ensure that they equip students with the skills they will need to write in college? This thesis explores the question by analyzing the key factors that impact writing instruction in Florida high school classrooms: testing requirements, curriculum requirements, and the content of writing textbooks being used. Textbooks, as an essential tool that influences and informs the curriculum, have a significant impact on classroom pedagogy.

Do these factors encourage teachers to follow the best practices in writing instruction recommended by field-based research? What knowledge can we gain from comparing these factors, which may be helpful to today's writing instructors in light of the challenges they face?

In this chapter, I have provided a background/history of the academic field of composition, from which today's best practices for writing instruction were derived. Chapter 2 will go into detail about what are considered the best practices for writing instruction today, based upon our knowledge of current research in the field of composition. Chapters 3 will discuss the current testing environment, describing the testing requirements and the implications that testing has on schools' funding and reputation, teachers' salaries, and how test results can impact students and teachers' view of themselves as learners and instructors. Chapter 4 will explore some of the textbooks being used in Florida high school classrooms and compare them with the current curriculum and testing requirements for high school writing students in the State of Florida. Chapter 5 will provide an analysis of the information in Chapters 1-4. Through this research and analysis, I hope to provide insight that can inform high school writing teachers on the heart of the issue: Is it possible for best practices in writing instruction and standardized testing to coexist in their classrooms?

CHAPTER TWO: BEST PRACTICES IN WRITING INSTRUCTION

To address the question of whether or not best practices in writing instruction can coexist with standardized testing in Florida's public high schools, we must first establish what those best practices are. According to Graham, MacArthur, and Fitzgerald, editors of *Best Practices in Writing Instruction* (2013), two ways we can gather information on best practices in writing in an educational setting are to examine the methods of those who are successful in teaching developing writers, and to review scientific studies testing specific instructional writing methods (10-12).

To explore best practices for teaching developing writers in high school, we can draw on studies of the instructional practices of effective writing teachers. A comprehensive analysis of these studies, conducted in 2007 by Graham and Perrins, examined the findings of five qualitative studies involving writing teachers in grades 4-12 "across different types of schools (private/public, suburban/inner city, and special/regular) and methodologies (qualitative observations/survey methodology)." These teachers were chosen for the studies because either their school had shown impressive results in preparing students to attend college, with 100% or almost 100% of their students going on to college, or the teachers had been recognized by their district supervisors as effective reading and writing instructors (324).

One of the five studies examined by Graham and Perrins involved a school in inner city Chicago called Providence- St. Mel, which had a 25-year track record of having 100% of its graduates attend college. The school serves predominately low income, African American students. The researchers recorded their observations of teachers, administration, and students in

the school in the spring of 2003. The researchers' observations focused on answering the question, "How does the school consistently produce high achievement in its graduates?" At the end of the observation period, they also surveyed the faculty to collect additional data (Pressley, Raphael, Gallagher, DiBella 217-219).

The second study Graham and Perrins analyzed involved a private school called Benchmark School with 35 years of experience in serving elementary and middle school students that are intelligent but underachieving, mainly due to difficulties with reading. At the time of the study, January through July 2004, the students were predominately from middle class to upper middle class families, and 7.9% of the students were minorities (African American, Asian American, and Hispanic). The school has a high level of success in teaching students to read, and almost 100% of their students go on to graduate from high school and college. The school has developed its own curriculum over time, based upon internal research and student results. Faculty at the school invented a reading comprehension curriculum that has been proven to generate "gains in reading across a wide variety of measures" (Pressley, Gaskins, Solic and Collins 283-284). Similar to the first study, the researchers' observations focused on answering the question, "How does the school consistently produce high achievement in its graduates?" The researchers gained knowledge from both informal interviews with faculty and as part of employee training, because some of the researchers were actually employed as teachers at the school during the study (Pressley, Gaskins, Solic and Collins 284-286).

The third study that Graham and Perrins analyzed involved a public elementary school, Bennett Woods Elementary School, in which the students are considered "non-disadvantaged"

(Graham and Perrins 324). Compared to other schools in the state, some of which serve children that are even more advantaged, Bennett Woods outperforms in reading and writing achievement. At the time of the study in January 2005, 65% of the students were American born and Caucasian, 10% were American born minorities (African American, Hispanic, Native American), and 25% were immigrants or had a recent international visa. Researchers focused on the question, "How does the school consistently produce high reading and writing achievement in its students?" The researcher method was to visit classrooms and observe, looking specifically for factors that would impact achievement. In addition, ten teachers participated in formal interviews with the lead researcher, where they were asked to share what they felt contributed to the school's high achievement. The principal was also interviewed, and she shared information on the school's reading and writing curriculum, how it was being implemented and significant improvements that the school had made on certain aspects of the state test since she had been principal (Pressley, Mohan, Raphael, and Fingeret 223-224).

In the final two studies that Graham and Perrins analyzed, surveys were conducted with "teachers who were nominated by district supervisors as effective instructors of reading and writing" (324). In one of the studies, the supervisors were asked by the researchers to nominate fifth grade teachers based upon a variety of factors, including standardized test scores, conversations with the teachers about their educational philosophy, direct observations and interactions, and/or positive comments from other teachers, administrators, and parents about the candidates' teaching skill. The supervisors were also asked to nominate a teacher with three or less years of teaching experience. There were two surveys conducted: an initial survey and a final questionnaire. Of the teachers nominated, 33 responded to the initial survey. For the final

questionnaire, 28 teachers from the initial survey plus an additional 34 teachers newly nominated by supervisors from the International Reading Association responded. The initial study asked the teachers two open-ended questions:

1. What are the ten most important elements in your literacy (reading/writing) instruction?
2. Are there some unique elements of instruction for weaker students?

The answers to these questions resulted in 150 teaching practices being identified, and these were all used in the final questionnaire, which asked teachers to rate how often they used each practice (Pressley, Yokoi, Rankin, Wharton-McDonald, and Mistretta 3-5).

The second survey study was similarly conducted, but the teachers surveyed were special education instructors that had been effective in teaching reading and writing to elementary students with reading disabilities. The teachers surveyed were nominated by the reading supervisor in their district. Each supervisor was asked to identify the most effective literary education among primary level special education teachers in his or her district. To garner additional participants, the researchers sent letters to the special education supervisors in areas of the country not represented in the first sample. They were asked to nominate "their most effective primary special education teacher of reading" (Rankin-Erickson and Pressley 208). Those nominating the teachers were asked to base their choice on the following criteria: student achievement, the nominated teacher's explanation of his or her of teaching philosophy and practices, direct observations and interactions with the teacher, and positive comments about the teacher's skill from parents, administrators, and other teachers. Of the 74 teachers nominated through these two methods, 33 participated in the survey. There was an initial and final

questionnaire, and the initial questionnaire in this study was the same one used for the final questionnaire in the first survey study by Pressley, Yokoi, Wharton-McDonald, and Mistretta. In addition, the researchers sent an open-ended questionnaire to the first 20 special education teachers who responded to the second survey study, and also to a random sample of 20 other special education teachers in a local district. This was done to include some data from average and/or weaker teachers. There were 28 teachers that responded to the open-ended questionnaire, and they were asked the following questions:

1. Describe the major reading problems of students with severe, moderate, and mild reading problems, roughly in order of the prevalence of the problems.
2. Identify the elements of instruction you use most consistently with readers at each level of difficulty, roughly in the order of importance of the instructional elements.

The final questionnaire used in the second survey study was similar to the first survey study's final questionnaire, with teachers being asked to categorize how often they use certain teaching practices. There were also some yes/no questions and short answer questions included (Rankin-Erickson and Pressley 209-210).

In their 2007 analysis of these studies, Graham and Perrins bring together the data to show what is known to be effective practices for teaching writing. The same or similar practices were found to be effective regardless of the students' socio-economic background, race, or where they lived. Special education students were also included, as well as students who were not in special education but had been identified as having difficulties with reading and writing. Graham and Perrins found that despite the diversity of students, teachers across all these studies engaged in similar practices when teaching writing (324). The results indicated ten best practices shared across the five studies:

- Dedicate time to writing and writing instruction, with writing occurring across the curriculum
- Involve students in various forms of writing over time
- Treat writing as a process, where students plan, draft, revise, edit and share their work
- Keep students engaged and on-task by involving them in thoughtful activities (such as planning their composition) versus activities that do not require thoughtfulness (such as completing a workbook page that can be finished quickly)
- Teach often to the whole class, in small groups, and with individual students; this includes teaching students how to plan, draft, and revise, as well as teaching more basic writing skills
- Model, explain, and provide guided assistance when teaching
- Provide just enough support so that students can make progress or carry out writing tasks and processes, but encourage students to do as much as they can on their own
- Be enthusiastic about writing and create a positive environment where students are constantly encouraged to try hard, believe that the skills and strategies they are learning will permit them to write well, and attribute success to effort and the tactics they are learning
- Set high expectations for their students, encouraging them to surpass their previous efforts or accomplishments
- Adapt writing assignments and instruction to better meet the needs of individual students (325)

Many similarities can be found in comparing these best practices to the ones developed by The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), an organization of teachers that conducts ongoing research on the teaching of reading and writing. This organization began in 1911, and has been a resource for information on the teaching of English/Language Arts education ever since. They publish a variety of books, journals, and other educational materials designed to assist and inform on the teaching of English/Language Arts. In 2008, the NCTE Executive Committee published a position statement which outlined the organization's beliefs about best practices in teaching writing. The statement has been updated a few times since 2008, most recently in March 2015, but the content has not changed. This statement is meant to provide guidance to writing instructors at all levels, including high school:

- Everyone has the capacity to write, writing can be taught, and teachers can help students become better writers through writing instruction designed to help them acquire new strategies and skills. Teachers should support students' efforts and give them time to write.
- People learn to write by writing. As students write, they experience the writing process firsthand and learn from it. Students must be given time to write both in and out of the classroom, and teachers should know how to create a community where students are comfortable writing in the same room together.
- Writing is a process. Teachers must help students understand the different stages of the process, and spend some time guiding students through them. Emphasis should not be placed only upon the final product. Teachers should provide multiple strategies for dealing with typical problems that writers face during the process of composing.

- Writing is a tool for thinking. The act of writing generates ideas, so teachers should help students realize there are many important uses for writing, such as: to solve problems, identify issues, construct questions, and to try out an idea not fully developed. Teachers should be aware of the various types of thinking people do when they compose, and be able to identify them in writing. Teachers should provide students with strategies for getting started with an idea or coming up with an idea if one doesn't occur right away.
- Writing grows out of many different purposes. Writing is not one thing; it varies according to its audience and purpose. Therefore, teachers should create opportunities for students to write in various writing situations, such as academic, aesthetic, and writing for public participation in a democratic society.
- Conventions of finished and edited texts are important to readers and therefore to writers. Readers of a public text expect it to conform to conventional rules of spelling punctuation, and grammar. They also expect the style of writing to be appropriate for the genre and social situation. Teachers must be familiar with the techniques of teaching editing and should present it as one of the last stages of the writing process- part of preparing the text for an audience to read.
- Writing and reading are related. People who read a lot have an easier time writing. In order to write a particular kind of text, it helps to have experience reading texts of that type. Teachers should provide students with access to various genres, and should be explicitly taught the features of different genres.
- Writing has a complex relationship to talk. Writers need opportunities to talk to others about what they are writing. This helps them get feedback on their ideas, practice

different ways to present what they want to say, and develop ideas through suggestions and information from others. Teachers should take advantage of the strong relationship between talking and writing by setting up and managing discussion groups, balancing talking and writing in the classroom, and setting aside time with each student to discuss their writing.

- Literate practices are embedded in complicated social relationships. It makes a difference what language the student used growing up, what culture they come from, and how language was used in that culture. Writers start in different places, and the goal is to add to their knowledge of language, not replace what they are comfortable using. Teachers should discuss with students the need to be flexible with the use of different kinds of language for different social contexts. Teachers should know how to help students master academic classroom English while maintaining their most familiar language.
- Composing occurs in different modalities and technologies. Technology today provides various ways of composing, including print, still images, video, and sound. Teachers need to understand the relationship between print and other modalities, and stay up to date on the technology their students are using to communicate and compose.

In addition to these teacher-based best practices, Graham, MacArthur and Fitzgerald arrived at a set of best practices for developing writers which incorporates both teacher-based and scientifically-based instructional writing methods (12-21):

- Create a supportive classroom where writing development can flourish
- Teach writing strategies

- Help students acquire the knowledge needed to write effectively
- Teach foundational writing skills

Regardless of the method used to arrive at the best practices, either teacher-based or scientifically-based, there are no contradictions when comparing these best practice statements to each other. Much of the same information is stated in different ways, with the NCTE's statement being the most comprehensive.

There are several underlying themes present in these statements of best practices. Two of them, context and engagement, are explained by Michael Knapp in the book, *Teaching for Meaning in High-Poverty Classrooms.* Knapp discussed how effective best practices focus on helping students understand and apply concepts; they do not focus on low-level skills such as grammar rules and punctuation. He also explains how educators of children in high-poverty areas often take the approach of focusing on low-level skills acquisition instead of what Knapp calls "teaching for meaning" (2-7). Knapp describes three ways that students can derive meaning from classroom instruction:

1. When students become "actively engaged in the attempt to make sense of things they experience in school, they are encouraged to be meaning makers" (7)

2. Students gain understanding by discovering the relationship of parts to the whole, instead of just being taught the parts out of context

3. When a context is created for whatever is being taught, students are able to make connections between what they already know and what they are learning

The three aspects of teaching for meaning can be connected back to the progression of composition research described in Chapter 1. Composition researchers, at the onset of the academic field, were turning away from skills based instruction and looking for a better approach to composition pedagogy. Knapp describes skills-based instruction as the opposite of teaching for meaning. As composition research progressed in the 1960s and 1970s, many in the field advocated an approach for developing the voice of the writer, which encouraged students' self-expression and more interaction between teachers and students. This interaction could be considered as the active engagement Knapp describes as essential to teaching for meaning.

Another theme present in the best practices outlined is the process based writing approach. Developed in the 1960s and 1970s, this pedagogy presented writing as a process, with a series of steps that could be used to teach students how to write. Teaching the writing process as an overall concept, instead of focusing on one step (such as revision), can be compared to Knapp's description of teaching the relationship of parts to the whole. When students are taught the various steps in the writing process, and how to move back and forth between these steps until they arrive at a finished product, they gain an understanding of steps of the writing process in context with each other. In this way, process and context can work together to create effective writing instruction.

Collaborative writing is also a common theme in the statements of the best practices. This approach emphasizes students sharing ideas with other students and the teacher, which complements process based instruction and encourages student engagement. According to Graham and Perrin, collaborative writing is a process-related best practice that can help students navigate through the writing process, especially in the early stages of the process (314). When writing alone, language production must come from an internal thought process. When students converse with each other, "verbal and nonverbal signals from a partner constantly stimulate and modify further thought and language production" (Yarrow and Topping 262). Other benefits of collaborative writing include increased engagement and time spent on-task, immediate and individualized help, goal specification, prevention of information processing overload, and the student in the "helper" role learns by teaching and explaining (Yarrow and Topping 262-263).

Another theme demonstrated in the best practices is that of teaching genre. The concept of genre teaches students "how different forms of composition help writers build the world and act in the world in different ways" (Collin 215). In his article, "How Rhetorical Theories of Genre Address Common Core Writing Standards, " Ross Collin describes how teaching a rhetorical understanding of genre can help students meet the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which guides the curriculum for Florida teachers, and at the same time understand how different contexts call for different forms and writing style (216-217). Even students that write well can face challenges later if they are not able to transfer their writing skills to different settings (Graham, MacArthur and Fitzgerald 48-49). For example, writing teachers must explicitly teach their students how to write in various formats or situations that they may encounter in college or at work, such as a lab report for science class, a history report, or a

business memorandum. Incorporating the concept of genre into a writing pedagogy provides a framework for teaching various forms of writing (Collin 221).

While teaching genre specifically focuses on what types of writing to teach, there is another best practice prevalent in the standards outlined in this chapter that can be applied to any writing classroom, regardless of the content being presented at the time. This best practice is called scaffolding, and it was noted by the researchers in several of the studies Graham and Perrins used for their 2007 analysis. In their observations of Providence St-Mel School, Pressley, Raphael, Gallagher, and Di Bella describe scaffolding as a best practice that contributes to the success of the school. Scaffolding is a process by which teachers systematically check in with individual students to determine who needs help with the task at hand. If a child does need assistance, the teacher provides just enough help so that the student can make progress on his or her own, and then they allow the student to continue on with the task. If the student is having a lot of difficulty, the teacher may even change the assignment a little, customizing it for that particular student (or for the class, if many students are having similar trouble) so they can move on and accomplish the task. This teaching method creates student confidence and encourages self-regulation (224-225).

The following chart is provided as a visual resource, which includes the best practices discussed and the common themes they share:

Table 2: Common Themes in Best Practices in Teaching Writing

Common Themes in Best Practices in Teaching Writing					
Context	**Process**	**Collaboration**	**Engagement**	**Genre**	**Scaffolding**
Encourage students to believe the skills and strategies they are learning will permit them to write well	Help students learn to write by writing; they experience the writing process firsthand and learn from it	Create a community where students are comfortable writing in the same room together	Keep students engaged with activities that require thoughtfulness	Help students master academic classroom English, not as a replacement for their familiar language but as an addition to their knowledge	Adapt writing instruction and assignments to meet the needs of individual students
Encourage students to attribute success to effort and tactics they are learning	Help students understand the different stages of the writing process	Teach often to the whole class, in small groups, and with individual students	Dedicate time to writing instruction	Provide students with access to various genres, and explicitly teach the features of different genres	Encourage students to do as much as they can on their own
Provide multiple strategies for dealing with typical problems that writers face	Treat writing as a process, have students plan, draft, revise, edit	Provide students with opportunities to talk to others about what they are writing	Create a positive classroom environment	Create opportunities for students to write in various situations, such as academic, aesthetic, etc.	Set time aside with each student to discuss their writing
Practice writing across the curriculum	Provide strategies for getting started with an idea	Have students share their work with each other	Set high expectations for students	Teach how the style of writing must be appropriate for the genre and social situation	Provide just enough support so students can make progress
	Teach editing and present it as the last stage of the writing process	Set up and manage discussion groups	Encourage students to try hard	Involve students in various forms of writing over time	Model, explain, provide guided assistance

Common Themes in Best Practices in Teaching Writing					
Context	**Process**	**Collaboration**	**Engagement**	**Genre**	**Scaffolding**
	Don't emphasize only the final product	Balance talking and writing in the classroom	Present writing as a tool for thinking	Help students realize there are many important uses for writing	
				Teach how writing varies according to its audience and purpose	

In the next chapter, I will discuss in detail the writing requirements outlined in the Florida's adaptation of the CCSS, the Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) and the Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS), and how well (or not) the standardized testing designed to support these standards aligns with the best practices in teaching writing.

CHAPTER THREE: STANDARDIZED TESTING FOR WRITING IN FLORIDA

In 2002, President Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which set in place federally mandated requirements that impacted every public school in the United States. The Act implemented a system that measures student progress through standardized testing and holds states and schools accountable for the test results. When President Obama took office in 2009, he continued with President Bush's plan to improve school performance through standardized testing by implementing the Race to the Top Assessment Program (RTTT), which provided states with funding to develop standardized testing. Through this program, the U.S. Department of Education awarded two Comprehensive Assessment System grants the following year, each to a consortium of states that applied together for the grants (U.S. Dept. of Ed "RTTT").

To be eligible for the RTTT grant, Florida joined a consortium of states called the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC). PARCC was awarded $185.8 million, and $700 million of that went to Florida. With this grant money, Florida began making significant changes to their curriculum and to their standardized tests. In 2010, the Florida State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). This list of educational standards was approved by the National Governor's Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers in 2010. The purpose of CCSS is to ensure that students will graduate high school with the skills and knowledge they need to perform in today's global market (FDOE). In order to evaluate schools on how students are meeting these new standards, the Florida Department of Education began to develop new standardized testing based upon

CCSS to replace the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) that was being used at the time (Jordan).

Florida had a standardized testing program in place long before the NCLB and RTTT program. When the Educational Accountability Act of 1968 was passed, the Florida legislature approved and funded a statewide assessment program, which was implemented in the 1970-71 school year. The main goals of the program were to provide each school district with a way to objectively evaluate the effectiveness of their educational programs, provide relevant data that could be used to compare the districts to each other, and to create an assessment program that would be compatible with the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) periodically reviews the format of whatever tests are currently being administered, and the tests are changed over time to stay current with the FDOE's stated educational objectives for each subject area. These objectives are developed using input from committees in each Florida school district.

Although standardized testing was already a common practice in Florida schools, the influx of federal funding brought by national initiatives such as NCLB and RTTT created a high stakes testing environment. In Florida and around the country, there is an intensity and focus on standardized testing results, in which school funding, reputation, and in some cases individual teachers and administrators' job security depends on the outcome of the tests.

Many schools' efforts to adapt to the high stakes testing environment have had the unintended consequence of narrowing educators' focus to the content of the test. As teachers and administrators experience pressure to meet the requirements, it has become impossible to implement any pedagogy without test results in mind.

In some instances, reaction to this pressure has had disastrous results. In 2013, thirty five Atlanta Public Schools educators and administrators were indicted by a grand jury after a state review determined that cheating on standardized tests had occurred in more than half the district's elementary and middle schools. During at least a four year period, the schools' superintendent at the time, Beverly Hall, presided over a system where threats and intimidation influenced teachers to alter tests, change answers, and falsely certify the test results (Carter 2013).

Although the tests create some level of pressure for every teacher, it varies from school to school. The Atlanta school scandal reflects an extreme amount of pressure for teachers. However, there are other situations where the teachers may not be as affected by the testing environment. One research study on the effects the high stakes testing environment has had on writing instruction indicates that teachers in high income schools "have more latitude to teach writing in less prescriptive ways because their students continue to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)" (McCarthey 464). These teachers feel that they have the freedom to choose a more personal pedagogy to teach a broader, more inclusive curriculum that will benefit students' learning as well as provide preparation for the test. However, in low income schools most teachers do not feel they have as much choice in relation to the pedagogy they implement. They feel that they "have less power to resist the law and are monitored to a greater degree than teachers in high income schools" because the majority of their students are not making AYP or performing well on the tests (McCarthey 464). The level of testing related pressure a teacher feels can directly translate into the pedagogy he or she chooses to implement. Common choices

when pressure is high are to have students practice the test, to teach only what is on the test, or to teach for the test.

After 10+ years of the high stakes standardized testing environment in Florida, significant changes have been made to the tests themselves, as well as to what is being tested. Between 2007 and 2010, the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, also known as the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), were approved. This list of educational standards was created by private organizations in Washington, D.C. and mainly funded by private entities such as the Gates Foundation. Despite having no background in education at all, Bill Gates and other like-minded billionaires across the country have had significant influence over the country's most recent version of education reform, CCSS. This involvement is tied economically to the millions of dollars schools spend on testing activities, related textbooks, and test development. Unfortunately, the result is that the educational reform taking place through CCSS will ultimately benefit the profit margin of corporations rather than benefitting students on an individual learning level (McGroarty and Robbins 1).

The federal Department of Education maintains that individual states have the option to participate or not in the CCSS initiative. However, since states were required to compete for RTTT funding, non-participation meant not sharing in the $4.35 billion of federal funding dollars that went along with it. Presented at a time of economic crisis in the country, it would have been difficult for any state to decline to participate. In order to receive the money, states had to go along with CCSS and the high-stakes testing environment it perpetuates. Participation resulted in the states relinquishing their control over curriculum, testing, and test results accountability at the state level (McGroarty and Robbins 6-8).

The loss of state control over curriculum, assessment, and instructional materials is a major factor negatively affecting public view of CCSS. Common Core has become exceedingly unpopular across the country with many parents, students, and teachers. A movement has gained momentum for students to opt-out of testing, which causes significant problems for schools trying to comply with a program that relies almost entirely on testing results to operate (Martinez n.p.). Most likely in response to negative press about Common Core, Governor Rick Scott decided to publicly break ties with the PARCC consortium in 2013. This break did not mean that Florida would not implement CCSS, but that they would choose their own vendor to create the standardized tests instead of being restricted to the tests chosen by PARCC (Hamilton n.p.).

Another measure Scott used to deflect the unpopularity of Common Core was to rename the academic standards. In 2014, Florida's adaptation of the CCSS was named the Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) and the Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS). The MAFS and LAFS were approved by the Florida State Board of Education on February 18, 2014 and fully implemented in the 2014-2015 school year (FDOE). The Florida version of CCSS also added back into the curriculum some items that were missing from CCSS, such as the teaching of cursive writing. Not teaching cursive had been a prominent criticism of CCSS since its adoption (Pawlowski n.p.).

Florida schools are evaluated on how students are meeting the MAFS and LAFS through new standardized tests that replaced the FCAT in the 2014-15 school year: the Florida Standards Assessments (FSA). The LAFS related to high school writing are outlined in Appendix B and Appendix C. In order to understand how LAFS has impacted the current writing curriculum and the accompanying standardized test, we can look back to the structure and content of the former

FCAT writing test for comparison. The FCAT was administered to students annually from 1998 to 2014, and was revised several times over the years. In 2000, a writing section called FCAT Writing was added to the test, which measured student writing achievement in grades 4, 8, and 10. The test required students to write responses to a specific topic given within a certain period of time. In 2006, FCAT Writing was renamed FCAT Writing+, and a multiple-choice section was added to the test. Writing scores were calculated by combining the writing and multiple choice scores to come up with a cumulative score. In the 2008-2009 school year, the multiple-choice section was removed from the writing assessment, and the test named was changed back to FCAT Writing (FCAT Writing).

The final version of the FCAT Grade 10 Writing test evaluated a student's ability to write on demand. Students were assigned a topic and given 45 minutes to write either an exploratory or a persuasive essay about the topic. The student was expected to exhibit good grammar and usage, organized and focused ideas, and to support those ideas with good reasoning, examples, details, and facts. Students' response to the writing prompt was evaluated through a rubric (see Appendix A) which outlined essay requirements for each score level based upon a three level Model of Cognitive Complexity, which was derived from Dr. Norman Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Model of Cognitive Complexity. This three level DOK, which Florida used for its assessment tests between 2004 and 2013, provided a framework for evaluating students' depth of knowledge. The purpose of this was to tie Florida's Sunshine State Standards and curriculum directly to the FCAT assessment (FCR-STEM "Content Complexity Florida Standards" 2). The FCAT Grade 10 Writing test was scored 1-6, with 6 being the highest score. Writing scores were used as part of each school's grading system, so students' passing scores

helped their school receive an overall performance grade, A-F. These school grades affect school funding and usually teachers' pay ("School Grades FAQs" n p).

Students' FCAT writing scores evaluated their achievement towards the Sunshine State Standards, which were in place prior to the adoption of LAFS and MAFS. First developed in 1996 by the Florida Board of Education, these Standards described what students should know or what skills they should have at the end of every grade level from first to twelfth grade. There were standards for eight different subject areas, and writing was included under the English Language Arts subject area. By subject area, the standards were subdivided into "benchmarks," which more specifically outlined what students were expected to learn. See Appendix A for the FCAT grade 10 writing test rubric, which provides the expectations for high school writing that were based upon the Sunshine State Standards.

The new FSA writing test, first implemented in the 2014-15 school year, is based upon the Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS). Please see Appendix B for the 11-12th grade writing related LAFS, and Appendix C for the 9-10th grade writing related LAFS. Because these new standards are intended to be more rigorous than the previous Sunshine State Standards, they are based upon four levels of content complexity instead of the three level model previously used. The Florida Center for Research in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics defines the content complexity levels: "Content complexity relates to the cognitive demands inferred from the language of a content standard. In essence, content complexity considers factors such as prior knowledge, processing of concepts and skills, sophistication, number of parts, and application of content structure required to meet an expectation or to attain an

outcome. Because of its reliance on prior knowledge, content complexity does bear some relation to grade level" (FCR-STEM "What is Content Complexity" n.p.).

By implementing a four level model, the intent was that this more detailed model will allow test makers to tie assessment questions more closely to the particular standard being assessed (FCR-STEM "Content Complexity Florida Standards 2-3). However, the format of the new FSA writing assessment has not significantly changed from the former FCAT version. Both the FCAT and FSA ask students to write on demand about an assigned topic, although the FSA includes a text for the students to read and use to support or validate the claim or controlling idea they are presenting in their essays. Because the writing assessment requires students to perform a task (writing) rather than presenting them with a series of questions, the connection between the assessment and the standards being assessed is discernable not in the assessment content, but in the writing requirements used to evaluate the students' responses. For the FSA writing assessment, the four levels of writing requirements are as follows (FCR-STEM "Content Complexity Florida Standards 6-7):

Level 1 (Recall) requires the student to write or recite simple facts. This writing or recitation does not include complex synthesis or analysis but is restricted to basic ideas. The students are engaged in listing ideas or words as in brainstorming activity prior to written composition, are engaged in a simple spelling or vocabulary assignment or are asked to write simple sentences. Students are expected to write and speak using Standard English conventions. This includes using appropriate grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.

Some examples that represent but do not constitute all of Level 1 performance are:

- Use punctuation marks correctly
- Identify Standard English grammatical structure and refer to resources for correction
- Recall information from experiences or gather information from provided sources to answer a question
- Use correct grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling to construct simple sentences

Level 2 (Basic Application of Concepts & Skills) tasks require some mental processing. At this level students are engaged in tasks such as first draft writing for a limited number of purposes and audiences. At Level 2 students are beginning to connect ideas using a simple organizational structure. For example, students may be engaged in note-taking, outlining, or simple summaries. Text may be limited to one paragraph. Students demonstrate a basic understanding and appropriate use of such reference materials as a dictionary, thesaurus, or web site.

Some examples that represent but do not constitute all of Level 2 performance are:

- Construct compound sentences
- Use simple organizational strategies to structure written work
- Write summaries that contain the main idea of the reading selection and pertinent details
- Outline a text, illustrating its key ideas
- Use correct grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling to produce a paragraph about an experience or activity

Level 3 (Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning) tasks require higher-level mental processing. Students are engaged in developing compositions that include multiple paragraphs. These compositions may include complex sentence structure and may demonstrate some synthesis and analysis. Students show awareness of their audience and purpose through focus, organization, and the use of compositional elements. The use of appropriate compositional elements includes such things as addressing chronological order in a narrative or including

supporting facts and details in an informational report. At this stage students are engaged in editing or revising to improve the quality of the composition.

Some examples that represent but do not constitute all of Level 3 performance are:

- Support ideas with details and examples
- Use transitional words or sentences to tie ideas together in an essay or story
- Edit writing to produce a logical progression of ideas associated with a theme
- Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant evidence
- Write opinion pieces on topics or texts, supporting a point of view with reasons and information

Level 4 (Extended Thinking & Complex Reasoning) tasks may incorporate a multi-paragraph composition that demonstrates synthesis and analysis of complex ideas or themes. Such tasks will require extended time and effort with evidence of a deep awareness of purpose and audience. For example, informational papers include hypotheses and supporting evidence. Students are expected to create compositions that demonstrate a distinct voice and that stimulate the reader or listener to consider new perspectives on the addressed ideas and themes.

Some examples that represent but do not constitute all of Level 4 performance are:

- Write an analysis of two selections, identifying the common theme and generating a purpose that is appropriate for both
- Use voice appropriate to the purpose and audience of an essay
- Conduct research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question), drawing on several sources and generating additional related, focused questions that allow for multiple avenues of exploration
- Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas, concepts, and information through the selection, organization, and analysis of relevant content
- Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, using search terms effectively; assess the credibility and accuracy of each source; and quote or paraphrase the data and conclusions of others while avoiding plagiarism and following a standard format for citation

These writing requirements are also present in the FSA writing rubrics (found in Appendices D and E). In comparing these rubrics to the FCAT writing rubric (Appendix A), we can see the additional requirements imposed in the FSA assessment, which indicate a more thorough evaluation of students' writing ability:

Table 3: Comparison of Writing Requirements for FCAT Writing and FSA Writing Exams

Writing requirement	FCAT	FSA Argumentation	FSA Exploratory
Writing is focused	X	X	X
No loosely related ideas	X	X	X
Effective organizational structure	X	X	X
Shows logical progression of ideas	X	X	X
Effective use of transitional devices	X	X	X
Little to no errors in conventions of mechanics, punctuation, spelling, capitalization	X	X	X
Varied/complex sentence structure	X	X	X
Adequate word choice	X	X	X
Supporting ideas are developed	X	X	X
Sense of completeness	X	X	X
Supporting ideas are detailed	X	X	X
Demonstrates a mature command of language	X	X	X
Shows insight	X		X
Supporting ideas are relevant	X	X	X
Supporting ideas are concrete/convincing	X	X	X
Writer shows involvement with/understanding of the subject	X	X	X
Use of creative writing strategies	X	n/a	n/a
Freshness of expression/effective expression of ideas	X	X	X
Appropriate word usage	X	X	X
Writing is appropriate for the intended audience		X	X
Writing fulfills the requested task		X	X
Writer's claim/controlling idea is clearly stated		X	X
Clearly addresses alternate or opposing claims		X	X
Satisfying introduction and conclusion		X	X

Writing requirement	FCAT	FSA Argumentation	FSA Exploratory
Writer uses appropriate style and tone		X	X
Effective use of sources/text	n/a	X	X
Precise reference to sources/text used	n/a	X	X

As indicated in the chart above, there are some aspects of students' writing that were not evaluated in the former FCAT writing assessment. One main difference in the FSA assessment is the addition of a text related to the writing prompt. With FSA writing, students in 9th and 10th grade are given 120 minutes to read a text and respond in writing with an argumentative, informative, or explanatory essay. This format allows the for the evaluation of additional writing skills that cannot be evaluated with the FCAT format of having students write an exploratory or persuasive essay in 45 minutes using their own internal knowledge to support their controlling idea or claim. These skills include effective uses of sources or text, and precise references to the sources or text.

The FSA assessments also include a deeper evaluation of students' writing versus the previous FCAT assessment. This is demonstrated in the requirements for additional skills related to organization, content, and genre. Related to organization, the FSA rubrics reference the requirement of a satisfying introduction and conclusion. The FSA evaluation also looks for specific content to be present, such as the writer's claim or controlling idea, and statements which specifically address an alternate or opposing idea. The FCAT rubric, being less specific, may imply that these elements should be included, but they are not overtly stated as a requirement for a particular score.

Other writing requirements missing from the FCAT rubric that are included in the FSA assessment rubrics are related to the concept of genre. For example, the FSA requires that the writing be appropriate for the intended audience, and that the style and tone of the writing are appropriate. These requirements ensure that students write their essay within the genre of academic discourse, in a style and tone appropriate for the audience: FSA evaluators.

Along with the changes in the way the FSA writing assessment evaluates students, there are other changes that make the test different from its predecessor. Starting in the 2016-2017 school year, the FSA writing assessment for 8th through 10th grade will be computer based instead of on paper (FCR-STEM "FSA Test Design" 13-15). Another difference between the FCAT writing test and the new FSA writing assessment is that the FCAT was administered for only fourth, eighth and tenth grades, and the FSA writing test is administered every year from fourth through eleventh grade (O'Connor n.p.). In addition, within the FSA ELA exam, there is a "Language and Editing" section, which assesses students' mastery of standard conventions of English. Items in this section focus on grammar and usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, which are skills that are also addressed in the rubric for the FSA writing exams. Computer versions of the FSA may include technology-enhanced items (TEI) which address these skills. For example, students may be asked to click a highlighted word or phrase, and be asked to correct and error in the sentence. Or, the student may click a phrase and be asked to replace the highlighted word by typing the correct word into a text box (FCR-STEM "FSA Test Design" 12-16).

As it pertains to writing pedagogy in the classroom, the FSA represents a more thorough assessment of students' writing ability versus the former FCAT writing test. To obtain a high

score on the FSA, students must meet more requirements, and those requirements are much more detailed. To successfully prepare students for the test, we can assume that teachers will need to spend more time on writing instruction, and that their pedagogy must help students meet the LAFS for writing. Will this new assessment promote an increase in teachers feeling that they have to focus on the test itself, or will it steer them towards an approach that incorporates writing skills into more of their overall language arts instruction? If we refer back to the Common Themes in Best Practices in Teaching Writing chart on page 29, it is apparent that many of the items in this chart can be used to help students perform well on the FSA writing exam. For example, students must write an essay that is organized, focused, and has appropriate support for the claims being made. This is best accomplished through writing process activities, especially planning or prewriting. In a timed testing environment like the FSA, students may feel pressure to just freewrite if they were not explicitly taught to follow a composing process.

Another requirement for the FSA is that students must use "Academic and domain-specific vocabulary clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose" (Appendices D and E). To meet this requirement, students must understand the concept of genre. Many of the best practices outlined in the chart on page 29 are related to genre, and can be used to help students be successful on the FSA writing exam.

The page 29 chart also lists as a best practice to "present writing as a tool for thinking." Because the new FSA writing exam incorporates a text that students must read and respond to, this best practice has become essential: in order to use the text to answer the essay question, citing specific examples and details, students must think about a subject they may have known

little about before the exam. In order to respond, they are compelled to form new ideas and express them in writing, thus using writing as a tool for thinking.

Although this chapter outlines in detail the format and requirements of the new FSA writing exam, there is limited information on the results from the first year of testing, the 2014-15 school year. Preliminary information was released in September 2015, but this data is not specific to writing, as it is based on overall English Language Arts (ELA) scores. The ELA score is a composite score for the five ELA exam sections: Key Ideas and Details, Craft and Structure, Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, Language and Editing, and Text-Based Writing (Understanding FSA Reports 8). The state reported results divided student performance into four quartiles, showing how students scored, by district and by school, compared to students in other districts or schools. The percentages reported showed who scored in the top, bottom, and middle two quartiles. Educators were able to use this information to compare their results to other districts and schools, but it did not tell them if their students passed the tests (Postal "Preliminary FSA Test-Score" n.p.). In February 2016, just weeks before testing for the next school year begins, the FDOE released school grades based upon the new FSA test results. In addition to making the school grade requirements easier for this year, the new grade calculations omitted the "learning gains" category that normally factors into school grades, because gains are assessed by comparing test scores from one year to the following year; therefore gains could not be determined from only one year of scores. Therefore, the school grades were quite closely aligned with the previous year's grades, and many schools improved their grades. However, there is still no specific information available regarding "passing" scores on the test. The initial information using percentages to compare students' scores by district and school is all that is

available, and many educators find this data unhelpful (Postal "Florida School Grades Released" n.p.).

Once the scoring criteria has been more specifically established and there are multiple years of test results to compare, writing teachers will have a better idea of how (or if) the new assessment requires that they make changes or adjustments to their pedagogy.

In the next chapter, I will explore some of the textbooks used in Florida high school classrooms. These materials will provide some insight into the pedagogy being used and how closely it follows best practices in writing instruction, the current writing assessment, and the LAFS being assessed.

CHAPTER FOUR: FLORIDA HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS

In previous chapters, I illustrated how the FSA writing exam requirements are more detailed than the previous FCAT writing exam, and thus have a more specific connection back to the LAFS for writing. Although the exam's one essay response cannot evaluate every aspect of writing, there is a direct correlation between the FSA requirements and many of the LAFS for writing. I also compared the requirements of the FSA writing exam to best practices in teaching writing, and uncovered several categories of best practices that can effectively support the test requirements. Therefore, we should be able to answer "yes" to our research question, "Is it possible for standardized testing and best practices in teaching writing to coexist in Florida classrooms?" However, does having a standardized test that so closely aligns with the LAFS create the best possible outcome for students? In some cases, it may not be, as it could create a tendency for teachers to only focus on the standards required to score well on the essay-- in other words, "teaching to the test." As discussed in Chapter 3, in recent years the federal government's initiatives such as Race to the Top have influenced state education departments to put increased emphasis on standardized test scores. This has created an environment where there is more pressure for teachers to focus only on test content, ignoring other aspects of the curriculum (Roach 36). Has this pressure negatively affected writing instruction in Florida classrooms? If writing teachers are only focusing on the content of the FSA, which consists of writing two types of essays, this makes for a very narrow and limited curriculum.

Because every teacher and school is different, we cannot know for certain what pedagogy is being applied in all classrooms. However, we can gain insight from the textbooks being used

by Florida teachers. Research has shown that textbooks have a significant influence on pedagogy, and that they also affect topics presented in the classroom, homework assignments, and other decisions teachers make related to what is being taught (Polikoff, Zhou, and Campbell 10). Teachers use textbooks and other instructional materials in various ways, with some closely following the text and others taking a more flexible approach. Regardless of the degree to which the content is followed, they are an integral part of instructional interaction between teachers and students. According to an article on this subject published by the Brown Center on Education Policy at Brookings, 70 to 98 percent of teachers use textbooks at least weekly (Chingos, Whitehurst and Institution Brookings 3). With classroom instruction being framed by the materials used, textbooks have been shown to impact student achievement (measured by test scores) even more than teacher quality (Chingos, Whitehurst and Institution Bookings 4-5). Despite this impact, textbook content and selection receives much less attention from education policymakers compared to teacher effectiveness and state standards. Most of their focus is on factors removed from teacher and student interactions, such as academic standards, teacher evaluation systems, and school accountability policies. Chingos, Whitehurst and Institution Bookings provide a comparison for this: "It's as if the medical profession worried about the administration of hospitals and patient insurance but paid no attention to the treatment that doctors give their patients" (1).

This lack of attention to materials could affect the success of new initiatives intended to improve education, such as the implementation of Common Core State Standards, or Florida's version of this, the MAFS and LAFS. Many textbook publishers have developed materials that they claim align with the new standards, but consistent method for validating these claims does

not exist. Because high quality materials are essential to the success of the standards, education policy makers would do well to devote some attention to instructional materials (Chingos, Whitehurst and Institution Bookings 1-2). However, in doing so they would find that information is sparse and cumbersome to obtain. In Florida, getting a list of textbooks approved by the state is relatively easy, but if you want to know which books each district has chosen to use, the only way to obtain that information is to call each one and ask them directly.

As part of my research, I have chosen to conduct a content analysis of some textbooks adopted for use in Florida high schools. Analyzing textbook content is not only a way to gain insight into classroom pedagogy, but it is also a means to evaluate a text's effectiveness. According to an article published by the National Council on Measurement in Education, there are two ways to evaluate a textbook for effectiveness:

1. An evaluation that connects the use of the textbook to student achievement
2. An evaluation of the textbook's content (evaluation strategies vary)

The first option produces more generalizable results, and cannot be used to compare instruction, curriculum materials, standards, and assessments. I have chosen the content method because it has been used effectively to make comparisons between these factors, all of which are relevant to answering the research question at hand (Polikoff, Zhou, and Campbell 10-11). A key tool in analyzing content is creating a uniform language to describe it. Using the same verbiage to describe content allows for consistent description across materials (A. Porter 3-4). Therefore, I have chosen to use the best practices in writing instruction that I outlined in Chapter 2 as my basis for describing the content.

For English Language Arts instruction, Seminole County uses the Springboard® Florida English Language Arts textbook series published by The College Board. I chose to look at what this county is using because their initial FSA results showed that they performed well overall compared to other counties in the state. Of the sixty seven counties in Florida, Seminole County was one of ten that had 30% or more of its students' scores in the top quartile. The remaining fifty seven counties scored less than 30% in the top quartile (McKenzie n.p.). Between 2010 and 2014, all of the high schools in Seminole County received a grade of either "A" or "B" from the state, and in 2014 only one high school scored a "B" and all others received an "A," indicating that this county's high schools have consistently performed well on state standardized tests ("SCPS Summary of School Grades 2010-2014" n.p.). In the newly released results for 2015, the first year in which school grades were based upon the FSA, all of Seminole's high schools received an "A" (Postal "Florida School Grades Released" n.p.). Based upon this information, if we were evaluating their textbooks based upon student achievement, we could assume that these books are effective. However, there are too many other factors involved that prevent us from coming to this conclusion just based upon test scores, such as variance in how the textbooks are used in the classroom.

The College Board, publisher of the Springboard® texts, is a non-profit organization that helps students nationwide prepare for college through its programs and assessments, including the SAT® and Advanced Placement Program® (Hart n.p.). According to a letter written by Gaston Caperton, College Board President, the Springboard® program was developed to "challenge and engage all students so that they meet or exceed state standards" (Matos-Elefonte and Li n.p.). Florida high schools have been using the Springboard® program since at least

2005. In fact, they were the focus of the College Board's initial research results for the Springboard® program, published in 2010. As part of the study, researchers identified 106 Florida high schools representing 12 school districts and determined that the schools using Springboard® showed a greater percentage of participation in taking Advanced Placement Program® courses and exams versus schools using a different textbook program. However, results also showed that for white students and those that chose "other" as their ethnic category in the study, students in non-Springboard® schools scored higher on their Advanced Placement® exams than their Springboard® counterparts. The researchers attributed this result to the dramatic increase in participation overall (Matos-Elefonte and Li 2-4).

Florida schools' participation in the College Board's research for the Springboard® program has been ongoing. In the most recent version of the Language Arts Springboard® texts, nine Florida school districts are recognized in the textbooks on the "Research and Planning Advisors" page, listed among 26 other school districts around the country. The Florida districts named include Broward County, Collier County, Hillsborough County, Lee County, Orange County, Palm Beach County, Polk County, Seminole County and Volusia County (College Board iv).

Although it is clear that the Springboard® program is very popular in Florida, with significant cooperation between Florida schools and the College Board, it is far from the only option available to Florida educators. The Florida Department of Education's Office of Instructional Materials outlines very clear policies and procedures for choosing textbooks and other instructional materials approved for use in Florida classrooms. Items are usually approved for five years at a time. The approval process includes review by two subject area reviewers

appointed by the Commissioner of Education, and a third reviewer appointed by a school district superintendent. Reviewers at the district level are usually individuals with a graduate degree in the content area or someone who has been recognized as Teacher of the Year. All reviewers are trained to use an online evaluation system that serves as part of the evaluation process. Once a year, the state accepts digital submissions from publishers for subject areas under review, and these submissions are sometimes followed by a publisher – led virtual presentation. The reviewers evaluate the submissions and make recommendations through a formal online evaluation process (FDOE Dept. of Instructional Materials 4-6).

From the list of approved texts that the FDOE Department of Instructional Materials disseminates, I have chosen a text for comparison with the Springboard® textbook series: *The Language of Composition: Reading, Writing, Rhetoric* by Renée Shea, Lawrence Scanlon and Robin Aufses. This text is listed as an approved material for Advanced Placement English Language and Composition classes. The publisher is Bedford St. Martin's, and the description of the book on their website states that it was written by a team of both high school and college educators, with a goal of helping students learn "the skills they need to read, write, and think at the college level" ("The Best Book for AP Language Just Got Better" n.d).

For the content analysis, I will discuss the elements of these textbooks and compare them with the best practices outlined in Chapter 2. The best practices were organized into the following categories: context, process, collaboration, engagement, genre, and scaffolding. Starting with the 9th grade Springboard® text, I will review each textbook and outline its content according to these best practice categories:

Table 4: Best Practices in Springboard® Florida English Language Arts Grade 9-10

Best Practices in Springboard® English Language Arts Grades 9-10						
Grade	**Context**	**Process**	**Collaboration**	**Engagement**	**Genre**	**Scaffolding**
9	**Discuss with students the skills and knowledge needed to do well on the Embedded Assessment** Learning Targets tell students what they will be learning **Have students keep their work so they can look back and see their academic growth over time**	**Quickwrite activities** Have students keep a journal while they read their chosen novel to help generate ides for writing **Freewrite activities** Students are asked to organize their writing: begin with a thesis, include direct quotes to support your claim, include transitions and conclusion **Have students write and revise open-ended interview questions**	**Have students respond to the visual prompt and share responses with a partner or small group** Have some students share their Quickwrite with the class **Have students use the graphic organizer to annotate and critique each other's writing** Have students work in groups to conduct a close reading **Have students each interview a classmate they don't know well** Discuss in groups "Two Versions of One Narrative" **Have students discuss in groups the student essay excerpts** Peer editing activities **Students are asked to work**	**Have students think about and discuss the theme of the unit** Provides group discussion guidelines **Have students create a timeline** Conduct a close reading activity as a class **Come up with interview questions as a class** Have students role play in pairs to practice asking interview questions **Have students predict the focus and tone of the reading based upon the title** Give students envelopes with follow up questions	**Academic vocabulary and literary terms: definitions are discussed and added to a "word wall"** Discussion of writer's voice and tone, and how diction, syntax, and imagery influence it **Discussion of how diction and connotations affect a writer's tone** Introduce the concept of a transcript and have students write one **Discuss the difference between prose and poetry** Introduction of an interview narrative **Discuss the author's shift**	**Use the group discussion to assess students' skills and determine how much direct instruction is needed** Assess students' understanding of parallel structure lesson by having them write sentences on the board **"Assess" and "Adapt" instructions for the teacher** Quickwrite activities help teachers pre-assess student's knowledge of the concept being presented

Best Practices in Springboard® English Language Arts Grades 9-10						
Grade	**Context**	**Process**	**Collaboration**	**Engagement**	**Genre**	**Scaffolding**
		Have students draft and revise their interview report and use a checklist to make sure they parallel structure and direct/indirect quotations **Have students use the "web organizer" tool (prewriting)** Introduce RAFT tool-used to generate ideas for writing Planning, prewriting, drafting, annotation of drafts, revising and editing activities **Writing prompts ask students to employ the Language and the**	**together in discussion groups before writing** Shared reading activities generate group discussion of concepts being presented	they created and ask them to rearrange them into a logical order **Encourage students to be thoughtful and detailed about their writing** Have students cite the different claims in a persuasive reading and cite evidence that the writer uses to support the claims **Some assignments and lessons incorporate the use of websites, films, and other non-textual elements** Have students perform a scene in Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet"	**from first to second person** SOAPSTone strategy helps students analyze the speaker, his/her purpose, and the target audience **Language and the Writer's Craft sections discuss grammar and usage, how authors use language to create specific effects** Introduction of texts that build an argument **SMELL strategy helps students analyze a persuasive speech or essay** Introduction of an editorial	

Best Practices in Springboard® English Language Arts Grades 9-10						
Grade	**Context**	**Process**	**Collaboration**	**Engagement**	**Genre**	**Scaffolding**
		Writer's Craft information			**Discussion of informal versus formal writing**	
10	**Discuss with students the skills and knowledge needed to do well on the Embedded Assessment** Learning Targets tell students what they will be learning **Students are encouraged to reflect on their learning and set goals for future work**	**Have students complete a mapping activity to identify elements from a story and how they set up the story's theme and conclusion** Quickwrite activities **Have students reread an essay, searching for textual evidence that support the conclusions** Discuss how SOAPStone can be used as a planning tool to help writers	**Student discussion in small groups: think/pair /share activities** Place students in small groups and invite them to think about and discuss the unit theme **Establish rules for group discussions as a class** Present five images and ask students to share their reactions to them in groups **Have students complete grammar exercises in pairs** Organize group discussions about the reading	**Have students think about and discuss the theme of the unit** Establish rules for group discussions as a class **Have students mark the text (close reading technique), identifying words or phrases that help them predict what the unit is about** Ask students to keep a Reader/Writer notebook in which they record new words, reflections, note about texts, etc (close reading technique)	**Students read a variety of genres, such as poetry, short stories, essays, novel excerpts, biography, memoir, interview** Have students compare and contrast how a central idea is expressed in an academic text and a literary nonfiction text **Discuss what academic voice is, using the text as a model** Discuss how writers use	**Add information as needed to help students understand the task at hand** Check students' work to make sure they are using formal or informal voice appropriately, review this concept if needed **Assess students' ability to apply and incorporate voice, and if you need to reinforce the concept, ask them to consider the speakers' voices in the**

Best Practices in Springboard® English Language Arts Grades 9-10						
Grade	**Context**	**Process**	**Collaboration**	**Engagement**	**Genre**	**Scaffolding**
		consider context **Embedded Assessment instructions walk the student through the writing processs: planning/ prewriting, drafting/ revising, editing/ publishing** Students are given five parts of a writing prompt to identify as steps in the prewriting process	**Have students complete drafts and submit work for peer review** Students are assigned an essay in which they will collaborate with their peers to write	**Ask students to identify stylistic choices an author makes** Have students analyze a painting by completing a graphic organizer **Have students mark the text as a close reading technique**	language to express voice **SOAPstone chart**	**stories they read**

As shown in Table 4, the Springboard® texts encourage teachers to use all areas of best practices in teaching writing. In addition to this alignment with best practices, the Teacher's Edition specifically references activities and content back to specific LAFS, so the teacher can see what standards are being covered.

The connection to the FSA is also very transparent in the text. In each of the five units in the text, lesson content and activities build up to the completion of an "Embedded Assessment."

In most cases, the Embedded Assessment allows the student to practice writing an essay similar to what they would see on the FSA, which asks them to write either an argumentative essay or an informative/exploratory essay. To illustrate this, please see outline below of Embedded Assessment assignments in the ninth grade text:

Table 5: Springboard® English Language Arts Grade 9 Embedded Assessments

Springboard® English Language Arts Grade 9 Embedded Assessments		
Unit	Assessment 1	Assessment 2
1	Write an interview narrative	Write an argumentative essay
2	Write an original narrative from real or imagined events	Write a style analysis essay, making a claim and supporting it
3	With your student group, present to the class your research on the historical context of the novel, "To Kill A Mockingbird" with multimedia support	Write a literary analysis essay on a passage in the novel, "To Kill A Mockingbird"
4	Write and compile an original poetry anthology	Research a professional poet and write an essay analyzing his or her work
5	Perform a scene from Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet"	Write an argumentative essay

In the example above, seven of the ten assignments could be considered practice essays for the FSA writing exam. Students are also exposed to Scoring Guides, which mimic the FSA writing exam rubrics. In Unit 1 of the grade 9 Teacher Edition, it recommends that the teacher "lead a discussion evaluating each sample [of a student essay] according to the Scoring Guide descriptions" (51). In this way, the text helps students become familiar with the format of the FSA writing exam and how their essay responses will be evaluated. In the "To the Teacher"

section of the text, the College Board explains how their "research based pedagogy" helps students perform on the standards-based assessments (xiii), which is clearly the overarching goal of the text.

The Grade 10 Springboard® text is basically the same format as Grades 9, 11 and 12. However, in comparison to Grade 9, there is more focus on analyzing information, as shown in the table below of the Grade 10 assessments. Although this text is still very FSA focused, the Grade 10 assignments do require more group collaboration and more presentations in front of the class versus the Grade 9 book; these activities are not directly related to the FSA exam.

One example of an FSA testing strategy presented in the Grade 10 text is having the students "deconstruct" a writing prompt. As preparation for one of the Embedded Assessments that calls for students to write an essay, the text presents five parts of every writing prompt that can be used to deconstruct the prompt: subject, speaker, type of essay, task, and hints (48). This strategy can help students recognize elements of their essay they need to include which are present in the FSA writing exam rubrics, such as having their response "consistently focused within the purpose, audience, and task" (Appendix D).

Table 6: Springboard® English Language Arts Grade 10 Embedded Assessments

Springboard® English Language Arts Grade 10 Embedded Assessments		
Unit	Assessment 1	Assessment 2
1	Write a reflective essay explaining your cultural identity	Collaborate with your peers to write a synthesis essay
2	Write a narrative about an incident that conveys a cultural perspective	Write an argumentative essay
3	Research Nigerian tribal culture with your student	Write an analytical essay

Springboard® English Language Arts Grade 10 Embedded Assessments		
Unit	Assessment 1	Assessment 2
	group and create a presentation that reflects your research	
4	Research, analyze, and present an oral interpretation of a monologue	Write an analytical essay
5	Deliver a group presentation to present a solution to an environmental conflict your group has researched	Transform your presentation from Assessment 1 into a documentary film that convinces the audience of your argument

The Grade 11 and Senior English Springboard® texts are basically the same format as Grades 9 and 10. However, compared to Grades 9 and 10, the literary and informational texts in Grade 11 and Senior English are more complex and the activities require students to use a deeper level of analysis. While the majority of the Embedded Assessments are still essay focused, there is opportunity in the Senior English textbook's content to emphasize other concepts, such as understanding literary criticism. Students are also asked to self-reflect on their writing processes.

Table 7: Springboard® English Language Arts Grade 11 Embedded Assessments

Springboard® English Language Arts Grade 11 Embedded Assessments		
Unit	Assessment 1	Assessment 2
1	Write an essay defining your interpretation of what it means to be American	Write an argumentative essay
2	Work with a group to write and perform an original dramatic script	Write and present an original persuasive speech (argumentative)

Springboard® English Language Arts Grade 11 Embedded Assessments		
Unit	Assessment 1	Assessment 2
3	As a group, write and present an informational article about an issue and then individually write an editorial piece that reflects your point of view	Write a satirical piece critiquing some aspect of our society
4	Write an informative/exploratory essay	Create a multi-genre research project that expresses your perspective on a person, event, or movement
5	Work in a group to create a multi-media research presentation on a topic	Write an analytical essay

Table 8: Springboard® English Language Arts Senior English Embedded Assessments

Springboard® English Language Arts Senior English Embedded Assessments		
Unit	Assessment 1	Assessment 2
1	Write an argumentative essay	Write a reflective essay that illustrates an event
2	Work with a partner to write a script that transforms a scene in a play, then write a reflection analyzing your writing process and product	Write an analytical essay
3	Write an argumentative essay	As a group, write your interpretation of a scene from Shakespeare's *Othello* using a critical perspective you have studied and perform the scene
4	Write an argumentative essay, including an annotated bibliography of	Create a documentary text in a media channel in which you transform

Springboard® English Language Arts Senior English Embedded Assessments		
Unit	Assessment 1	Assessment 2
	at least five sources used to support your argument	researched information into an argument
5	Work in a group to present a novel or play to your audience and collaboratively prepare an analysis of the literary work through multiple critical perspectives	none

As a comparison to the format and content the College Board uses in its Springboard® series, I chose another text on the FDOE's approved list: *The Language of Composition: Reading, Writing, Rhetoric* by Renée Shea, Lawrence Scanlon, and Robin Aufses. Rather than focusing on specific LAFS or on preparing students for the FSA, this goal of this text is to prepare students to "read, analyze, and write with the same level of skill and sophistication of thought as they would in a first-year composition class in college" (vii). The first three chapters of the text introduce the three concepts in the title: reading (close reading), writing (in the form of synthesizing sources to present an argument), and rhetoric. The following chapters, four through thirteen, each present students with a thematic focus and question about the theme, which "invites students to enter the chapter's conversation and begin thinking critically about the chapter's theme (ix). This text incorporates best practices in teaching writing, but with less emphasis on collaborative activities than is seen in the Springboard© series of texts. However, the format of most of the book, Chapters 4-13, asks students to "enter into the conversation" about each chapter's topic. Although the activities in these chapters give the student to opportunity to individually reflect and respond to the readings, it is implied that there should be

class discussions about the topics being presented. During such discussions, and instructor could engage in collaborative best practices such as setting up discussion groups, having students share work with each other, and balancing talking and writing in the classroom. The chart below illustrates some of the pedagogy presented in the text as it relates to the best practices outlined in Chapter 2 Table 2:

Table 9: Best Practices in The Language of Composition: Reading Writing Rhetoric

Best Practices in The Language of Composition: Reading Writing Rhetoric					
Context	**Process**	**Collaboration**	**Engagement**	**Genre**	**Scaffolding**
The value of studying rhetoric is conveyed through examples of both effective and ineffective uses of rhetorical strategies	**The text discusses how writers use different types of information: anecdotes, facts, quantitative data, expert testimony as a process for building an argument**	**The text provides questions to be used in class discussions**	**Students are asked to use annotation, dialectical journals, and graphic organizers as techniques for close reading and text analysis**	**The text presents various genres and explicitly teaches the features of different genres (speeches, letters, cartoons, excerpts from literature, narration, poetry, etc.)**	
The text shows how answering questions about diction and syntax will help the student	The text presents a student essay in draft form and revised form, and students are asked to compare the two versions and answer		Questions on Rhetoric and Style provide a thought provoking activity	Examples of student responses provide a framework for what a good essay should look like	

Best Practices in The Language of Composition: Reading Writing Rhetoric					
Context	**Process**	**Collaboration**	**Engagement**	**Genre**	**Scaffolding**
analyze style	questions about them				
Interviews with authors/professional writers provide insight into how they deal with typical problems writers face, strategies used	Text asks students to analyze an essay's organization and development		**Each chapter (4-13) invites students to "enter a conversation" about a topic, about which they will read, discuss, write, and express their thoughts and viewpoints**	Grammar lessons throughout the chapters introduce rhetorical and stylistic strategies within the genres being presented	

Another best practice area that is not specifically addressed in the text is scaffolding. This best practice is something that could be present in the classroom, even if teachers are not explicitly directed to do so by their chosen textbook. The chart below describes many of the assignments and activities provided in the text. In performing many of these activities, there is opportunity for teachers to use scaffolding techniques such as discussing writing individually with students, providing guided assistance, and providing just enough support so students can make progress.

Table 10: Assignments in The Language of Composition: Reading Writing Rhetoric

Assignments in The Language of Composition: Reading Writing Rhetoric					
Chapter	Assignment 1	Assignment 2	Assignment 3	Assignment 4	Assignment 5
1	Write an explanation of how effective Einstein's use of rhetoric is in terms of subject, speaker, audience, context, purpose, and appeals to ethos, logos, pathos	Analyzed a political cartoon in terms of the rhetorical triangle and ethos, logos, pathos	Read an essay and discuss the patterns of development the author uses	Read texts in four different genres about the same event and discuss the purpose of each in terms speaker, audience, and subject; discuss the effectiveness of each text	
2	Use one of three close reading techniques to analyze an excerpt from a book	Find an ad that is appealing or provoking and analyze the visual text	Use one of three close reading techniques to analyze a political speech and answer questions about diction and syntax	Write an essay analyzing the rhetorical strategies used in a political speech	
3	Read an excerpt from a non-fiction book and answer questions about how the author uses different types of information to support his argument	Choose a columnist in a publication and analyze their style over at least four columns by examining the types of sources he or she uses			
4-13	Questions for Discussion/Questions on Rhetoric and Style	Exploring the Text questions that require close reading of the texts Seven sets of questions that	Suggestions for Writing provide multiple essay topics to choose from: an evaluation of a text,	Entering the Conversation essay topics, argumentative and exploratory	Grammatical exercises

Assignments in The Language of Composition: Reading Writing Rhetoric					
Chapter	Assignment 1	Assignment 2	Assignment 3	Assignment 4	Assignment 5
		address content, style analysis	argumentative essays, expository essay topics		

In comparing the Springboard© series to The Language of Composition, both present teachers with the opportunity to use best practices in teaching writing. However, the texts differ in their emphasis on the skills required for the FSA writing exam. Throughout the majority of the ninth through twelfth grade texts, Springboard®'s format specifically steers the content towards practicing the types of essays required for the FSA. The Language of Composition text takes an approach that provides many opportunities to write the argumentative and exploratory/informative essays the FSA requires, but it presents these opportunities as a way for students to express their views on a meaningful topic that is being presented. Each chapter goes into significant depth on the topic at hand, inviting students to "enter the conversation" on the subject. This format encourages students to write to learn and to construct their own meanings about the topic at hand, which are concepts they will encounter in college writing classes (Wardle "Easing the Transitions" 4-5).

Both *The Language of Composition: Reading, Writing, Rhetoric* and the College Board's Springboard© series allow for teachers to use best practices in teaching writing. However, since writing teachers cannot ignore the goal of preparing students for the writing assessments, their use of these texts and their choice of pedagogy will be influenced by the testing requirements. For example, they may follow the text's lessons for part of the year, and as the test time gets

closer they may abandon the lesson formats and focus class time on test preparation. With the Springboard© series, this interruption may not be necessary, because the units are formatted as a progression towards "Embedded Assessments," which mostly mirror the standardized testing format. If teachers are using a text that is less test oriented but encompasses best practices, such as *The Language of Composition: Reading, Writing, Rhetoric*, are they spending extra time teaching to the test, or are they confident that the students will learn what they need to know without it being explicitly taught or practiced? How much time are they spending on activities and instruction not related to testing? More research should be done in these areas, because if there are high school teachers that do not teach to the test and still have students that perform well on the assessments, their methods and results could encourage others to do the same. An example of further research in this area could include a teacher survey that asks how much time is spent on each topic, as well as the amount of time spent on each cognitive demand and how closely they follow the textbook's lesson plans (Roach, Niebling, and Kurz 164).

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

In attempting to answer the research question at hand, "Can Best Practices in Writing Instruction and Standardized Testing Coexist?" my goal was to provide information that can help guide teachers as they face the challenge of adapting their pedagogy to meet the new, more defined and rigorous requirements posed by the recent changes to standardized testing. In Florida's high stakes testing environment, it has become impossible to implement any pedagogy without test results in mind. As discussed in Chapter 1, the challenge facing high school writing teachers is formidable: how can they best choose their approach to pedagogy given the pressures of standardized testing, the new curriculum requirements, and the need to ensure that they equip students with the skills they will need to write in college? In this thesis, I have explored the question by analyzing the key factors that impact writing instruction in Florida high school classrooms: the testing requirements, the content of writing textbooks being used, and the requirement to teach students the Language Arts Florida Standards (Florida's version CCSS). Do these factors encourage teachers to follow the best practices in writing instruction recommended by field-based research? My findings provide an analysis of what I have discovered through the research process.

Politics and Standardized Testing

In analyzing how standardized testing affects teachers and students at the school and classroom level, I found that it is important to recognize the impact of the political environment has on testing, including major decisions about how testing results are used. Education reform has been going on in the United States since the early 1980s, culminating in the 2002 No Child

Left Behind Act. With NCLB, "education reform shifted from a liberal left-of-center focus on school integration and civil rights to one concerned with setting national standards and building accountability systems" (Roach 36). Over time and with an increase in federal and state funding to schools that is contingent upon standardized test results, we now have a high stakes testing environment in which politics and education are irreversibly intertwined.

There is debate about whether the increase in accountability (measured mainly by testing) is a good thing or not. Procon.org, a non-profit organization that researches and presents controversial issues online in an unbiased format, summarized the controversy as follows:

"Proponents say that standardized tests are a fair and objective measure of student achievement, that they ensure teachers and schools are accountable to taxpayers, and that the most relevant constituents -- parents and students -- approve of testing. Opponents say the tests are neither fair nor objective, that their use promotes a narrow curriculum and drill-like 'teaching to the test,' and that excessive testing undermines America's ability to produce innovators and critical thinkers" (n.p.). No matter which side of the issue you support, standardized testing is most likely here to stay, and there are many stakeholders relying on test results: politicians, school administrators, test makers, teachers, parents, and students. The recent transition in Florida from the FCAT to the FAS is a good example of how politics is intertwined in the education reform process, and how all stakeholders are affected.

When the first year of FSA results were finally released in September 2015, the results did not indicate what the "cut score," or the score at which a student passes or fails the exam, was for each test. Instead, school districts were given percentages that could be used to compare

districts and schools to each other. To date, the cut scores still have not been released, and there seems to be some political angst about what the cut scores should be. The Florida Board of Education recommended that the cut scores align with the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP). Through NCLB, the NAEP is directed to conduct its own testing nationwide every two years, in order to create a "report card" for the nation on student academic achievement. States are not required to participate, but they are not eligible for Title 1 grants if they do not participate. Appendix F illustrates how the NAEP ranks Florida students in writing compared to the rest of the nation. The data for writing is sparse, because testing in this subject is considered "additional," and will be tested "to the extent that time and money allow" (NAEP n.p.). Because NCLB gives states the flexibility to choose how they measure student performance and how they calculate students' Adequate Yearly Progress, the NAEP is likely the only entity that has an accurate way to compare student progress across states. Any other comparison, such as comparing the Florida's FSA results to NAEP data, would be a complex undertaking. There is significant variation in test type, difficulty, established proficiency levels, passing scores, and other factors that make it difficult to compare test results to each other (Azin and Resendez 76). Therefore, the motivation behind the Florida Board of Education's request to align FSA cut scores with the NAEP's cut scores is unclear.

At the same time as the Florida Board of Education was making cut score recommendations, school superintendents were requesting that cut scores be set low or even not be counted, since it was the first year of a new test. Taking into account the recommendations from school superintendents and the Florida Board of Education, Commissioner Pam Stewart submitted her proposal for lower cut scores than the board recommended in September 2015.

She later asserted that this was her "final" recommendation (Solochek n.p.). In the midst of this conflict, there are those most affected by the decision: the schools, teachers, and students, who depend on the cut scores as a means of measuring performance and progress in teachers, students, and as a school overall. Most likely due to the conflict between Stewart and the Florida Board of Education, cut scores have not been released to date. However, the state did release school grades in February 2016, as required by law, and the requirements to earn an "A" were lowered, resulting in higher marks overall for Florida schools (Postal "Florida School Grades Released" n.p.). These higher marks have translated into FSA "success" for most stakeholders: politicians, school and governmental officials, teachers. This success can be defined as positive reputation for schools and teachers who earned higher grades for their schools and more funding based upon testing results. However, is this really a success for students, who are the most important stakeholders? When education reform is not governed by those who research and practice in the field of composition, but by politicians and governmental officials who perpetuate misunderstandings about what writing is and how students learn to write (Wardle "Easing the Transitions" 3-4), we arrive at a definition for success that is not shared by everyone.

Public resistance to standardized testing is growing, and much of it is in the form of social media conversations. Social media is an easy outlet for parents, teachers and students (both supporters and those that oppose) to raise the issues and have their voices heard. Some of the conversation focuses on the Common Core curriculum changes, which many people associate with schools' increased focus on standardized testing. Using the hash tag sign along with "commoncore," an analysis of Twitter postings over a six - month period revealed that angst

over Common Core spurred a continuing online debate that encompasses "a range of politically charged education issues" (Supovitz 21).

The study of Common Core social media conversation indicates that using social media to voice opinions is an effective way to be heard. If educators and parents proactively voice their concerns and opinions using social media platforms, politicians and key decision makers will hopefully respond in a way that could affect change or address their concerns. Being involved in the schools and in the community (in person and online) is perhaps the best way to ensure learning in the classroom.

Influence of Materials

In Chapter 4, I analyzed some of the textbooks being used in Florida high school classrooms. Both *The Language of Composition: Reading, Writing, Rhetoric* and the College Board's Springboard© series allow for teachers to use best practices in teaching writing. However, since writing teachers cannot ignore the goal of preparing students for the writing assessments, their use of these texts and their choice of pedagogy will be influenced by the testing requirements.

Using a text like Springboard© that so closely aligns with testing requirements is an asset towards the goal of preparing students to write the argumentative and informative/exploratory essays required for the FSA writing exams. Having the testing requirements so integrated in the curriculum saves teachers valuable time and should reduce the need to interrupt the flow of lessons to concentrate on test preparation. Teachers must prioritize test preparation because

good test scores result in personal job security, success for their school (as measured by a good rating from the state), and a higher level of funding for the school.

But in addition to the goal of test preparation, writing teachers have an expectation to equip students with skills that will prepare students to write in college and beyond. According to Dr. Elizabeth Wardle, current chair and former director of the writing program at the University of Central Florida, many students come to college with misconceptions about writing. Students are taught these misconceptions "because teachers are so often forced to design assignments and curricula that actually undermine students' ability to learn accurate and useful concepts about writing" (Wardle "Easing the Transitions" 3). As a result of the writing curriculum and assignments in high schools becoming more test-focused and narrow, misconceptions about writing are conveyed, implicitly or explicitly. For example, the textbook may cover writing process concepts such as prewriting and revision. However, teachers are required to assess students based upon their ability to write a timed essay, where there is little time to plan and revise their writing. This conveys a contradictory message about the importance of allowing for a recursive writing process. There are many more examples of how putting so much classroom emphasis on one way to write-- a timed essay-- causes students to form inaccurate ideas about what good writing looks like, but the end result is that when students become college writers, they often find themselves confused or disoriented by the concepts about writing that college writing faculty present to them (Wardle "Easing the Transitions" 2-5). Wardle outlined some of the concepts commonly shared by writing faculty, insiders in the field of composition, in *Crosspol*, a journal that promotes the exchange of ideas between high school and college writing teachers:

- Writing is a knowledge-making activity
- Writing expresses and shares meaning that is also constructed and reconstructed by the readers
- Writing mediates activity
- Failure can be an important part of writing development (4).

While it is not impossible to convey these concepts to high school students, and there are textbooks and materials available that support these ideas, the high stakes testing environment that writing teachers must work in can undermine the effort.

Use of Best Practices

High school writing teachers face a formidable task: they must help students learn to write better among the pressures of standardized testing and within the time frame they are given. It is not impossible to succeed, but teachers must believe in and implement best practices and avoid the temptation to "teach to the test." An example of someone that has had success in this is Serena Mari Garcia, a writing instructor in Texas, where there is also a high stakes testing environment. In an article where she describes how she uses best practices to create "rhetorical spaces" for her students that combat the testing culture, Garcia describes how her perspective as both a high school and college writing instructor motivates her to focus on designing pedagogy that results in "transferable communication and writing skills" (42). This pedagogy supports best practices in teaching writing, and she is very confident in her approach, even though she works within an assessment culture that makes many of her peers anxious and sometimes results in negative feedback from administrators. Garcia's description of her pedagogy includes many of the best practices described in Chapter 2. Here are a few examples, one from each best practice category (38-43):

- Provides multiple strategies for dealing with typical problems writers face
- Treats writing as a process
- Helps students learn to write by writing
- Creates a "rhetorical space" where students are comfortable writing together
- Presents writing as a tool for thinking
- Involves students in various forms of writing over time
- Models, explains, provides guided assistance, including student/teacher conferences about major assignments

This example of a successful teacher using best practices at work in a high stakes testing environment should emphasize the result of my inquiry into the research question, "Can best practices in teaching writing and standardized testing coexist?" As a parent of a Florida high school student, I have been relieved to find a positive answer to this question. However, just because this is possible doesn't mean it is happening in every Florida classroom. Every classroom contains its own set of circumstances, and just as results vary, methods of instruction inevitably vary as well. My hope is that the research and inquiry I have completed will result in providing educators with information that can inform future decisions about pedagogy and selection of materials.

APPENDIX A:
FCAT GRADE 10 WRITING RUBRIC

FCAT Grade 10 Writing Rubric	
Score	**Requirements**
6 Points	The writing is focused and purposeful, and it reflects insight into the writing situation. The organizational pattern provides for a logical progression of ideas. Effective use of transitional devices contributes to a sense of completeness. The development of the support is substantial, specific, relevant, and concrete. The writer shows a commitment to and involvement with the subject and may use creative writing strategies. The writing demonstrates a mature command of language with freshness of expression. Sentence structure is varied, and few, if any, conventional errors occur in mechanics, usage, punctuation, and spelling.
5 Points	The writing is focused on the topic, and its organizational pattern provides for a logical progression of ideas. Effective use of transitional devices contributes to a sense of completeness. The support is developed through ample use of specific details and examples. The writing demonstrates a mature command of language, and there is variation in sentence structure. The response generally follows the conventions of mechanics, usage, punctuation, and spelling.
4 Points	The writing is focused on the topic and includes few, if any, loosely related ideas. An organizational pattern is apparent, and it is strengthened by the use of transitional devices. The support is consistently developed, but it may lack specificity. Word choice is adequate, and variation in the sentence structure is demonstrated. The response generally follows the conventions of mechanics, usage, punctuation, and spelling.
3 Points	The writing is focused on the topic but may contain ideas that are loosely connected to the topic. An organizational pattern is demonstrated, but the response may lack a logical progression of ideas. Development of support is uneven. Word choice is adequate, and some variation in sentence structure is demonstrated. The response generally follows the conventions of mechanics, usage, punctuation, and spelling.
2 Points	The writing addresses the topic but may lose focus by including extraneous or loosely related ideas. The organizational pattern usually includes a beginning, middle, and ending, but these elements may be brief. The development of the support may be erratic and nonspecific, and ideas may be repeated. Word choice may be limited, predictable or vague. Errors may occur in the basic conventions of sentence structure, mechanics, usage, and punctuation, but commonly used words are usually spelled correctly.

FCAT Grade 10 Writing Rubric	
Score	**Requirements**
1 Point	The writing addresses the topic but may lose focus by including extraneous or loosely related ideas. The response may have an organizational pattern, but it may lack a sense of completeness or closure. There is little, if any, development of the supporting ideas, and the support may consist of generalizations or fragmentary lists. Limited or inappropriate word choice may obscure meaning. Frequent and blatant errors may occur in the basic conventions of sentence structure, mechanics, usage, punctuation, and commonly used words may be misspelled.
Unscorable	The paper is unscorable because • The response is not related to what the prompt requested the student to do • The response is simply a rewording of the prompt • The response is a copy of a published work • The student refused to write • The response is illegible • The response is written in a foreign language • The response is incomprehensible (words are arranged in such a way that no meaning is conveyed) • The response contains an insufficient amount of writing to determine if the student was attempting to address the prompt • The writing folder is blank

APPENDIX B:
LANGUAGE ARTS FLORIDA STANDARDS FOR 11TH AND 12TH GRADE

Language Arts Florida Standards, 11-12

Reading Standards omitted in this chart. Source: CPALMS - www.cpalms.org

Benchmark#	Description	Idea/Standard	Body Of Knowledge/ Strand/Level
LAFS.1112.L.1.1	Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking. a. Apply the understanding that usage is a matter of convention, can change over time, and is sometimes contested. b. Resolve issues of complex or contested usage, consulting references (e.g., *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage, Garner's Modern American Usage*) as needed.	Conventions of Standard English	Language Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.L.1.2	Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing. a. Observe hyphenation conventions. b. Spell correctly.	Conventions of Standard English	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

LAFS.1112.L.2.3	Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening. a. Vary syntax for effect, consulting references (e.g., Tufte's Artful Sentences) for guidance as needed; apply an understanding of syntax to the study of complex texts when reading.	Knowledge of Language	Language Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.L.3.4	Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases based on *grades 11–12 reading and content*, choosing flexibly from a range of strategies. a. Use context (e.g., the overall meaning of a sentence, paragraph, or text; a word's position or function in a sentence) as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase. b. Identify and correctly use patterns of word changes that indicate different meanings or parts of speech (e.g., conceive, conception, conceivable).	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

	c. Consult general and specialized reference materials (e.g., dictionaries, glossaries, thesauruses), both print and digital, to find the pronunciation of a word or determine or clarify its precise meaning, its part of speech, its etymology, or its standard usage. d. Verify the preliminary determination of the meaning of a word or phrase (e.g., by checking the inferred meaning in context or in a dictionary).		
LAFS.1112.L.3.5	Demonstrate understanding of figurative language, word relationships, and nuances in word meanings. a. Interpret figures of speech (e.g., hyperbole, paradox) in context and analyze their role in the text. b. Analyze nuances in the meaning of words with similar denotations.	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

LAFS.1112.L.3.6	Acquire and use accurately general academic and domain-specific words and phrases, sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level; demonstrate independence in gathering vocabulary knowledge when considering a word or phrase important to comprehension or expression.	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.1112.SL.1.1	Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 11–12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively. a. Come to discussions prepared, having read and researched material under study; explicitly draw on that preparation by referring to evidence from texts and other research on the topic or issue to stimulate a thoughtful, well-reasoned exchange of ideas.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	b. Work with peers to promote civil, democratic discussions and decision-making, set clear goals and deadlines, and establish individual roles as needed. c. Propel conversations by posing and responding to questions that probe reasoning and evidence; ensure a hearing for a full range of positions on a topic or issue; clarify, verify, or challenge ideas and conclusions; and promote divergent and creative perspectives. d. Respond thoughtfully to diverse perspectives; synthesize comments, claims, and evidence made on all sides of an issue; resolve contradictions when possible; and determine what additional information or research is required to deepen the investigation or complete the task.		
LAFS.1112.SL.1.2	Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse formats and media (e.g., visually, quantitatively, orally) in order to make informed decisions and solve problems, evaluating the credibility and accuracy of each source and noting any discrepancies among the data.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

LAFS.1112.SL.1.3	Evaluate a speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric, assessing the stance, premises, links among ideas, word choice, points of emphasis, and tone used.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.SL.2.4	Present information, findings, and supporting evidence, conveying a clear and distinct perspective, such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning, alternative or opposing perspectives are addressed, and the organization, development, substance, and style are appropriate to purpose, audience, and a range of formal and informal tasks.	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.SL.2.5	Make strategic use of digital media (e.g., textual, graphical, audio, visual, and interactive elements) in presentations to enhance understanding of findings, reasoning, and evidence and to add interest.	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.SL.2.6	Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and tasks, demonstrating a command of formal English when indicated or appropriate.	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.1112.W.1.1	Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

		a. Introduce precise, knowledgeable claim(s), establish the significance of the claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence. b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, supplying the most relevant evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases. c. Use words, phrases, and clauses as well as varied syntax to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims. d. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and		

	supports the argument presented.		
LAFS.1112.W.1.2	Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content. a. Introduce a topic; organize complex ideas, concepts, and information so that each new element builds on that which precedes it to create a unified whole; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension. b. Develop the topic thoroughly by selecting the most significant and relevant facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic. c. Use appropriate and varied transitions and syntax to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

	among complex ideas and concepts. d. Use precise language, domain-specific vocabulary, and techniques such as metaphor, simile, and analogy to manage the complexity of the topic. e. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. f. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the information or explanation presented (e.g., articulating implications or the significance of the topic).		
LAFS.1112.W.1.3	Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

		a. Engage and orient the reader by setting out a problem, situation, or observation and its significance, establishing one or multiple point(s) of view, and introducing a narrator and/or characters; create a smooth progression of experiences or events. b. Use narrative techniques, such as dialogue, pacing, description, reflection, and multiple plot lines, to develop experiences, events, and/or characters. c. Use a variety of techniques to sequence events so that they build on one another to create a coherent whole and build toward a particular tone and outcome (e.g., a sense of mystery, suspense, growth, or resolution). d. Use precise words and phrases, telling details, and sensory language to convey a vivid picture of the experiences, events, setting, and/or characters. e. Provide a conclusion that follows from and reflects on what is experienced, observed, or resolved over the course of the narrative.		

LAFS.1112.W.2.4	Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. (Grade-specific expectations for writing types are defined in standards 1–3 above.)	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.W.2.5	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.W.2.6	Use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products in response to ongoing feedback, including new arguments or information.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.1112.W.3.7	Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

LAFS.1112.W.3.8	Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess the strengths and limitations of each source in terms of the task, purpose, and audience; integrate information into the text selectively to maintain the flow of ideas, avoiding plagiarism and overreliance on any one source and following a standard format for citation.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.1112.W.3.9	Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research. a. Apply grades 11–12 Reading standards to literature (e.g., "Demonstrate knowledge of eighteenth-, nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century foundational works of American literature, including how two or more texts from the same period treat similar themes or topics").	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	b. Apply grades 11–12 Reading standards to literary nonfiction (e.g., "Delineate and evaluate the reasoning in seminal U.S. texts, including the application of constitutional principles and use of legal reasoning [e.g., in U.S. Supreme Court Case majority opinions and dissents] and the premises, purposes, and arguments in works of public advocacy [e.g., The Federalist, presidential addresses]").		
LAFS.1112.W.4.10	Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.	Range of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.1112.WHST.1.1	Write arguments focused on *discipline-specific content.* a. Introduce precise, knowledgeable claim(s), establish the significance of the claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences the claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

	b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, supplying the most relevant data and evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both claim(s) and counterclaims in a discipline-appropriate form that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases. c. Use words, phrases, and clauses as well as varied syntax to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims. d. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from or supports the argument presented.		
LAFS.1112.WHST.1.2	Write informative/explanatory texts, including the narration of historical events, scientific procedures/ experiments, or technical processes.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

		a. Introduce a topic and organize complex ideas, concepts, and information so that each new element builds on that which precedes it to create a unified whole; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension. b. Develop the topic thoroughly by selecting the most significant and relevant facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic. c. Use varied transitions and sentence structures to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships among complex ideas and concepts. d. Use precise language, domain-specific vocabulary and techniques such as metaphor, simile, and analogy to manage the complexity of the topic; convey a knowledgeable stance in a style that responds to the discipline and context as well as to the expertise of likely readers.		

	e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the information or explanation provided (e.g., articulating implications or the significance of the topic).		
LAFS.1112.WHST.2.4	Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.WHST.2.5	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.WHST.2.6	Use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products in response to ongoing feedback, including new arguments or information.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.1112.WHST.3.7	Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating understanding of the	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

	subject under investigation.		
LAFS.1112.WHST.3.8	Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess the strengths and limitations of each source in terms of the specific task, purpose, and audience; integrate information into the text selectively to maintain the flow of ideas, avoiding plagiarism and overreliance on any one source and following a standard format for citation.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.WHST.3.9	Draw evidence from informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.WHST.4.10	Write routinely over extended time frames (time for reflection and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of discipline-specific	Range of Writing	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	tasks, purposes, and audiences.		

APPENDIX C:
LANGUAGE ARTS FLORIDA STANDARDS FOR 9TH AND 10TH GRADE

Language Arts Florida Standards, 9-10

Reading Standards omitted in this chart. Source: CPALMS - www.cpalms.org

Benchmark#	Description	Idea/Standard	Body Of Knowledge/ Strand/Level
LAFS.910.L.1.1	Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking. a. Use parallel structure. b. Use various types of phrases (noun, verb, adjectival, adverbial, participial, prepositional, absolute) and clauses (independent, dependent; noun, relative, adverbial) to convey specific meanings and add variety and interest to writing or presentations.	Conventions of Standard English	Language Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.L.1.2	Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing. a. Use a semicolon, with or without a conjunctive adverb, to link two or more closely related independent clauses. b. Use a colon to introduce a list or quotation. c. Spell correctly.	Conventions of Standard English	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

LAFS.910.L.2.3	Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening. a. Write and edit work so that it conforms to the guidelines in a style manual (e.g., *MLA Handbook, Turabian's Manual for Writers*) appropriate for the discipline and writing type.	Knowledge of Language	Language Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.L.3.4	Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases based on *grades 9–10 reading and content*, choosing flexibly from a range of strategies. a. Use context (e.g., the overall meaning of a sentence, paragraph, or text; a word's position or function in a sentence) as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase. b. Identify and correctly use patterns of word changes that indicate different meanings or parts of speech (e.g., *analyze, analysis, analytical; advocate, advocacy*).	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

	c. Consult general and specialized reference materials (e.g., dictionaries, glossaries, thesauruses), both print and digital, to find the pronunciation of a word or determine or clarify its precise meaning, its part of speech, or its etymology. d. Verify the preliminary determination of the meaning of a word or phrase (e.g., by checking the inferred meaning in context or in a dictionary).		
LAFS.910.L.3.5	Demonstrate understanding of figurative language, word relationships, and nuances in word meanings. a. Interpret figures of speech (e.g., euphemism, oxymoron) in context and analyze their role in the text. b. Analyze nuances in the meaning of words with similar denotations.	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.L.3.6	Acquire and use accurately general academic and domain-specific words and phrases, sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level; demonstrate independence in gathering vocabulary knowledge when considering a word or phrase important to	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

	comprehension or expression.		
LAFS.910.SL.1.1	Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 9–10 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively. a. Come to discussions prepared, having read and researched material under study; explicitly draw on that preparation by referring to evidence from texts and other research on the topic or issue to stimulate a thoughtful, well-reasoned exchange of ideas. b. Work with peers to set rules for collegial discussions and decision-making (e.g., informal consensus, taking votes on key issues, presentation of alternate views), clear goals and deadlines, and individual roles as needed.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	c. Propel conversations by posing and responding to questions that relate the current discussion to broader themes or larger ideas; actively incorporate others into the discussion; and clarify, verify, or challenge ideas and conclusions. d. Respond thoughtfully to diverse perspectives, summarize points of agreement and disagreement, and, when warranted, qualify or justify their own views and understanding and make new connections in light of the evidence and reasoning presented.		
LAFS.910.SL.1.2	Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively, orally) evaluating the credibility and accuracy of each source.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.SL.1.3	Evaluate a speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric, identifying any fallacious reasoning or exaggerated or distorted evidence.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.SL.2.4	Present information, findings, and supporting evidence clearly, concisely, and logically such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning and the organization, development, substance, and style are appropriate	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	to purpose, audience, and task.		
LAFS.910.SL.2.5	Make strategic use of digital media (e.g., textual, graphical, audio, visual, and interactive elements) in presentations to enhance understanding of findings, reasoning, and evidence and to add interest.	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.SL.2.6	Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate.	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.910.W.1.1	Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. a. Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

	b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly, supplying evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level and concerns. c. Use words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims. d. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the argument presented.		
LAFS.910.W.1.2	Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

		a. Introduce a topic; organize complex ideas, concepts, and information to make important connections and distinctions; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension. b. Develop the topic with well-chosen, relevant, and sufficient facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic. c. Use appropriate and varied transitions to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships among complex ideas and concepts. d. Use precise language and domain-specific vocabulary to manage the complexity of the topic. e. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing.		

	f. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the information or explanation presented (e.g., articulating implications or the significance of the topic).		
LAFS.910.W.1.3	Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences. a. Engage and orient the reader by setting out a problem, situation, or observation, establishing one or multiple point(s) of view, and introducing a narrator and/or characters; create a smooth progression of experiences or events. b. Use narrative techniques, such as dialogue, pacing, description, reflection, and multiple plot lines, to develop experiences, events, and/or characters. c. Use a variety of techniques to sequence events so that they build on one another to create a coherent whole. d. Use precise words and phrases, telling details, and sensory language to convey a vivid picture of	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	the experiences, events, setting, and/or characters. e. Provide a conclusion that follows from and reflects on what is experienced, observed, or resolved over the course of the narrative.		
LAFS.910.W.2.4	Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. (Grade-specific expectations for writing types are defined in standards 1–3 above.)	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.W.2.5	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.W.2.6	Use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products, taking advantage of technology's capacity to link to other information and to display information flexibly and dynamically.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

LAFS.910.W.3.7	Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.W.3.8	Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess the usefulness of each source in answering the research question; integrate information into the text selectively to maintain the flow of ideas, avoiding plagiarism and following a standard format for citation.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.W.3.9	Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research. a. Apply grades 9–10 Reading standards to literature (e.g., "Analyze how an author draws on and transforms source material in a specific work [e.g., how Shakespeare treats a theme or topic from Ovid or the Bible or how a later author draws on a play by Shakespeare]").	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	b. Apply grades 9–10 Reading standards to literary nonfiction (e.g., "Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning").		
LAFS.910.W.4.10	Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.	Range of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.WHST.1.1	Write arguments focused on *discipline-specific content.* a. Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among the claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence. b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly, supplying data and evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both claim(s) and counterclaims in a discipline-appropriate form and in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level and concerns.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

	c. Use words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims. d. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from or supports the argument presented.		
LAFS.910.WHST.1.2	Write informative/explanatory texts, including the narration of historical events, scientific procedures/ experiments, or technical processes. a. Introduce a topic and organize ideas, concepts, and information to make important connections and distinctions; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

	b. Develop the topic with well-chosen, relevant, and sufficient facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic. c. Use varied transitions and sentence structures to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships among ideas and concepts. d. Use precise language and domain-specific vocabulary to manage the complexity of the topic and convey a style appropriate to the discipline and context as well as to the expertise of likely readers. e. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. f. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the information or explanation presented (e.g., articulating implications or the significance of the topic).		

LAFS.910.WHST.2.4	Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.WHST.2.5	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.WHST.2.6	Use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products, taking advantage of technology's capacity to link to other information and to display information flexibly and dynamically.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.910.WHST.3.7	Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning

LAFS.910.WHST.3.8	Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess the usefulness of each source in answering the research question; integrate information into the text selectively to maintain the flow of ideas, avoiding plagiarism and following a standard format for citation.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.WHST.3.9	Draw evidence from informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.WHST.4.10	Write routinely over extended time frames (time for reflection and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences.	Range of Writing	Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.K12.L.1.1	Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.	Conventions of Standard English	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.L.1.2	Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing.	Conventions of Standard English	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

LAFS.K12.L.2.3	Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening.	Knowledge of Language	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.L.3.4	Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases by using context clues, analyzing meaningful word parts, and consulting general and specialized reference materials, as appropriate.	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.L.3.5	Demonstrate understanding of word relationships and nuances in word meanings.	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.L.3.6	Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level; demonstrate independence in gathering vocabulary knowledge when encountering an unknown term important to comprehension or expression.	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	Language Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.SL.1.1	Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

LAFS.K12.SL.1.2	Integrate and evaluate information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.SL.1.3	Evaluate a speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric.	Comprehension and Collaboration	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.SL.2.4	Present information, findings, and supporting evidence such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning and the organization, development, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.SL.2.5	Make strategic use of digital media and visual displays of data to express information and enhance understanding of presentations.	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.SL.2.6	Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and communicative tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate.	Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas	Standards for Speaking and Listening/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.W.1.1	Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.W.1.2	Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

LAFS.K12.W.1.3	Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences.	Text Types and Purposes	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.K12.W.2.4	Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.K12.W.2.5	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.W.2.6	Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others.	Production and Distribution of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.W.3.7	Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.W.3.8	Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.K12.W.3.9	Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.	Research to Build and Present Knowledge	Writing Standards/Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	LAFS.K12.W.4.10	Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.	Range of Writing	Writing Standards/Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

APPENDIX D: FSA ARGUMENTATION WRITING RUBRIC

Grades 6-10 Argumentation Text-Based Writing Rubric (Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below)			
Score	**Purpose, Focus and Organization (4-point rubric)**	**Evidence and Elaboration (4-point rubric)**	**Conventions of Standard English (2-point rubric begins at score point 2)**
4	The response is fully sustained and consistently focused within the purpose, audience, and task; and it has a clear claim and effective organizational structure creating coherence and completeness. The response includes most of the following: • Strongly maintained claim with little or no loosely related material • Clearly addressed alternate or opposing claims* • Skillful use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas • Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end with a satisfying introduction and conclusion Appropriate style and tone established and maintained	The response provides thorough, convincing, and credible support, citing evidence for the writer's claim that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details. The response includes most of the following: • Smoothly integrated, thorough, and relevant evidence, including precise references to sources • Effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques to support the claim, demonstrating an understanding of the topic and text • Clear and effective expression of ideas, using precise language • Academic and domain-specific vocabulary clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose	

Grades 6-10 Argumentation Text-Based Writing Rubric (Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below)			
Score	**Purpose, Focus and Organization (4-point rubric)**	**Evidence and Elaboration (4-point rubric)**	**Conventions of Standard English (2-point rubric begins at score point 2)**
		Varied sentence structure, demonstrating language facility	
3	The response is adequately sustained and generally focused within the purpose, audience, and task; and it has a clear claim and evident organizational structure with a sense of completeness. The response includes most of the following: • Maintained claim, though some loosely related material may be present • Alternate or opposing claims included but may not be completely addressed* • Adequate use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas • Adequate progression of ideas from	The response provides adequate support, citing evidence for the writer's claim that includes the use of sources, facts, and details. The response includes most of the following: • Generally integrated and relevant evidence from sources, though references may be general or imprecise • Adequate use of some elaborative techniques • Adequate expression of ideas, employing a mix of precise and general language • Domain-specific vocabulary generally appropriate for the audience and purpose Some variation in sentence structure	

Grades 6-10 Argumentation Text-Based Writing Rubric (Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below)			
Score	**Purpose, Focus and Organization (4-point rubric)**	**Evidence and Elaboration (4-point rubric)**	**Conventions of Standard English (2-point rubric begins at score point 2)**
	beginning to end with a sufficient introduction and conclusion Appropriate style and tone established		
2	The response is somewhat sustained within the purpose, audience, and task but may include loosely related or extraneous material; and it may have a claim with an inconsistent organizational structure. The response may include the following: • Focused claim but insufficiently sustained or unclear • Insufficiently addressed alternate or opposing claims* • Inconsistent use of transitional strategies with little variety Uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end with an inadequate introduction or conclusion	The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the writer's claim that includes partial use of sources, facts, and details. The response may include the following: • Weakly integrated evidence from sources; erratic or irrelevant references or citations • Repetitive or ineffective use of elaborative techniques • Imprecise or simplistic expression of ideas • Some use of inappropriate domain-specific vocabulary Most sentences limited to simple constructions	The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. The response may include the following: • Some minor errors in usage but no patterns of errors Adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, sentence formation, and spelling

Grades 6-10 Argumentation Text-Based Writing Rubric (Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below)			
Score	**Purpose, Focus and Organization (4-point rubric)**	**Evidence and Elaboration (4-point rubric)**	**Conventions of Standard English (2-point rubric begins at score point 2)**
1	The response is related to the topic but may demonstrate little or no awareness of the purpose, audience, and task; and it may have no discernible claim and little or no discernible organizational structure. The response may include the following: • Absent, confusing, or ambiguous claim • Missing alternate or opposing claims* • Few or no transitional strategies • Frequent extraneous ideas that impede understanding Too brief to demonstrate knowledge of focus or organization	The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer's claim, including little if any use of sources, facts, and details. The response may include the following: • Minimal, absent, erroneous, or irrelevant evidence or citations from the source material • Expression of ideas that is vague, unclear, or confusing • Limited and often inappropriate language or domain-specific vocabulary Sentences limited to simple constructions	The response demonstrates a partial command of basic conventions. The response may include the following: • Various errors in usage Inconsistent use of correct punctuation, capitalization, sentence formation, and spelling
0			The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions, with frequent and severe errors often obscuring meaning.

APPENDIX E: FSA EXPLORATORY WRITING RUBRIC

Grades 6-10 Informative/Exploratory Text-Based Writing Rubric (Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below)			
Score	**Purpose, Focus and Organization (4-point rubric)**	**Evidence and Elaboration (4-point rubric)**	**Conventions of Standard English (2-point rubric begins at score point 2)**
4	The response is fully sustained and consistently focused within the purpose, audience, and task; and it has a clear controlling idea and effective organizational structure creating coherence and completeness. The response includes most of the following: • Strongly maintained controlling idea with little or no loosely related material • Skillful use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas • Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end with a satisfying introduction and conclusion Appropriate style and objective tone established and maintained	The response provides thorough and convincing support, citing evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes the effective use of sources, facts, and details. The response includes most of the following: • Smoothly integrated, thorough, and relevant evidence, including precise references to sources • Effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques (including but not limited to definitions, quotations, and examples), demonstrating an understanding of the topic and text • Clear and effective expression of ideas, using precise language • Academic and domain-specific vocabulary clearly appropriate for the audience and purpose Varied sentence structure, demonstrating language facility	
3	The response is adequately sustained and generally focused within the purpose, audience, and	The response provides adequate support, citing evidence for the controlling idea or	

Grades 6-10 Informative/Exploratory Text-Based Writing Rubric (Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below)			
Score	**Purpose, Focus and Organization (4-point rubric)**	**Evidence and Elaboration (4-point rubric)**	**Conventions of Standard English (2-point rubric begins at score point 2)**
	task; and it has a clear controlling idea and evident organizational structure with a sense of completeness. The response includes most of the following: • Maintained controlling idea, though some loosely related material may be present • Adequate use of a variety of transitional strategies to clarify the relationships between and among ideas • Adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end with a sufficient introduction and conclusion Appropriate style and objective tone established	main idea that includes the use of sources, facts, and details. The response includes most of the following: • Generally integrated and relevant evidence from sources, though references may be general or imprecise • Adequate use of some elaborative techniques • Adequate expression of ideas, employing a mix of precise and general language • Domain-specific vocabulary generally appropriate for the audience and purpose Some variation in sentence structure	
2	The response is somewhat sustained within the purpose, audience, and task but may include loosely related or extraneous material; and it may have a controlling idea with an inconsistent	The response provides uneven, cursory support/evidence for the controlling idea or main idea that includes partial use of sources, facts, and details. The response may include the following: • Weakly integrated	The response demonstrates an adequate command of basic conventions. The response may include the following: • Some minor

Grades 6-10 Informative/Exploratory Text-Based Writing Rubric (Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below)			
Score	**Purpose, Focus and Organization (4-point rubric)**	**Evidence and Elaboration (4-point rubric)**	**Conventions of Standard English (2-point rubric begins at score point 2)**
	organizational structure. The response may include the following: • Focused controlling idea but insufficiently sustained or unclear • Inconsistent use of transitional strategies with little variety Uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end with an inadequate introduction or conclusion	evidence from sources; erratic or irrelevant references or citations • Repetitive or ineffective use of elaborative techniques • Imprecise or simplistic expression of ideas • Some use of inappropriate domain-specific vocabulary Most sentences limited to simple constructions	errors in usage but no patterns of errors Adequate use of punctuation, capitalization, sentence formation, and spelling
1	The response is related to the topic but may demonstrate little or no awareness of the purpose, audience, and task; and it may have little or no controlling idea or discernible organizational structure. The response may include the following: • Confusing or ambiguous ideas • Few or no transitional strategies • Frequent extraneous ideas that impede understanding	The response provides minimal support/evidence for the controlling idea or main idea, including little if any use of sources, facts, and details. The response may include the following: • Minimal, absent, erroneous, or irrelevant evidence or citations from the source material • Expression of ideas that is vague, unclear, or confusing • Limited and often inappropriate language or domain- specific vocabulary	The response demonstrates a partial command of basic conventions. The response may include the following: • Various errors in usage Inconsistent use of correct punctuation, capitalization, sentence formation, and spelling

Grades 6-10 Informative/Exploratory Text-Based Writing Rubric (Score points within each domain include most of the characteristics below)			
Score	**Purpose, Focus and Organization (4-point rubric)**	**Evidence and Elaboration (4-point rubric)**	**Conventions of Standard English (2-point rubric begins at score point 2)**
	Too brief to demonstrate knowledge of focus or organization	Sentences limited to simple constructions	
0			The response demonstrates a lack of command of conventions, with frequent and severe errors often obscuring meaning.

APPENDIX F: SUMMARY OF NAEP RESULTS FOR FLORIDA

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

This report was generated using the State Profiles. http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/

Summary of NAEP results for **Florida**

Assessment			Average Scale Score				Achievement Level					
			State		National public		at or above Basic		at or above Proficient		at Advanced	
Subject	Grade	Year	Avg.	SE	Avg.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE
Mathematics	4	2015	243	(1.0)	240	(0.3)	85	(1.0)	42	(1.8)	7	(0.7)
		2013	242	(0.8)	241	(0.2)	84	(0.9)	41	(1.3)	6	(0.7)
		2011	240	(0.8)	240	(0.2)	84	(1.1)	37	(1.3)	5	(0.5)
		2009	242	(1.0)	239	(0.2)	86	(1.2)	40	(1.5)	5	(0.8)
		2007	242	(0.8)	239	(0.2)	86	(0.8)	40	(1.4)	6	(0.6)
		2005	239	(0.7)	237	(0.2)	82	(0.6)	37	(1.1)	5	(0.7)
		2003	234	(1.1)	234	(0.2)	76	(1.4)	31	(1.3)	4	(0.5)
		1996[1]	216	(1.2)	222	(1.0)	55	(1.7)	15	(1.1)	1	(0.2)
		1992[1]	214	(1.5)	219	(0.8)	52	(1.7)	13	(1.4)	1	(0.3)
	8	2015	275	(1.4)	281	(0.3)	64	(1.7)	26	(1.2)	5	(0.5)
		2013	281	(0.8)	284	(0.2)	70	(1.1)	31	(1.1)	7	(0.6)

Summary of NAEP results for **Florida**

Assessment			Average Scale Score				Achievement Level					
			State		National public		at or above Basic		at or above Proficient		at Advanced	
Subject	Grade	Year	Avg.	SE	Avg.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE
		2011	278	(0.8)	283	(0.2)	68	(0.9)	28	(1.0)	6	(0.5)
		2009	279	(1.1)	282	(0.3)	70	(1.1)	29	(1.4)	6	(0.6)
		2007	277	(1.3)	280	(0.3)	68	(1.4)	27	(1.4)	5	(0.7)
		2005	274	(1.1)	278	(0.2)	65	(1.3)	26	(1.2)	5	(0.7)
		2003	271	(1.5)	276	(0.3)	62	(1.8)	23	(1.5)	4	(0.6)
		1996[1]	264	(1.8)	271	(1.2)	54	(2.1)	17	(1.3)	2	(0.4)
		1992[1]	260	(1.5)	267	(1.0)	49	(1.9)	15	(1.2)	1	(0.3)
		1990[1]	255	(1.2)	262	(1.4)	43	(1.4)	12	(0.9)	1	(0.3)
	12	2013	149	(1.3)	152	(0.5)	60	(1.7)	19	(1.5)	1	(0.4)
		2009	148	(1.4)	152	(0.8)	59	(1.8)	19	(1.6)	1	(0.2)
Reading	4	2015	227	(1.0)	221	(0.4)	75	(1.2)	39	(1.5)	8	(0.9)
		2013	227	(1.1)	221	(0.3)	75	(1.2)	39	(1.5)	9	(0.8)

Summary of NAEP results for **Florida**

Assessment			Average Scale Score				Achievement Level					
			State		National public		at or above Basic		at or above Proficient		at Advanced	
Subject	Grade	Year	Avg.	SE	Avg.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE
		2011	225	(1.1)	220	(0.3)	71	(1.4)	35	(1.4)	8	(0.7)
		2009	226	(1.0)	220	(0.3)	73	(1.2)	36	(1.5)	8	(0.9)
		2007	224	(0.8)	220	(0.3)	70	(1.0)	34	(1.0)	8	(0.6)
		2005	219	(0.9)	217	(0.2)	65	(1.0)	30	(1.2)	7	(0.7)
		2003	218	(1.1)	216	(0.3)	63	(1.4)	32	(1.4)	8	(0.8)
		2002	214	(1.4)	217	(0.5)	60	(1.6)	27	(1.3)	5	(0.6)
		1998	206	(1.4)	213	(1.2)	53	(1.6)	22	(1.2)	4	(0.5)
		1998[1]	207	(1.5)	215	(0.8)	54	(1.6)	23	(1.2)	5	(0.7)
		1994[1]	205	(1.7)	212	(1.1)	50	(1.8)	23	(1.5)	5	(0.6)
		1992[1]	208	(1.2)	215	(1.0)	53	(1.6)	21	(1.1)	3	(0.4)
	8	2015	263	(1.0)	264	(0.2)	75	(1.1)	30	(1.4)	2	(0.4)
		2013	266	(1.1)	266	(0.2)	77	(1.2)	33	(1.5)	3	(0.5)
		2011	262	(1.0)	264	(0.2)	73	(1.4)	30	(1.4)	2	(0.4)

Summary of NAEP results for **Florida**

Assessment			Average Scale Score				Achievement Level					
			State		National public		at or above Basic		at or above Proficient		at Advanced	
Subject	Grade	Year	Avg.	SE	Avg.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE
		2009	264	(1.2)	262	(0.3)	76	(1.3)	32	(1.4)	2	(0.4)
		2007	260	(1.2)	261	(0.2)	71	(1.3)	28	(1.3)	2	(0.4)
		2005	256	(1.2)	260	(0.2)	66	(1.4)	25	(1.1)	2	(0.3)
		2003	257	(1.3)	261	(0.2)	68	(1.5)	27	(1.3)	2	(0.6)
		2002	261	(1.6)	263	(0.5)	72	(1.9)	29	(2.0)	2	(0.5)
		1998	255	(1.4)	261	(0.8)	67	(1.8)	23	(1.7)	1	(0.2)
		1998[1]	253	(1.7)	261	(0.8)	65	(2.0)	23	(1.6)	1	(0.3)
	12	2013	286	(1.2)	287	(0.6)	72	(1.4)	36	(1.5)	5	(0.7)
		2009	283	(1.6)	287	(0.8)	70	(1.6)	32	(1.7)	4	(0.6)
Science	4	2009	151	(1.1)	149	(0.3)	75	(1.3)	32	(1.6)	#	(†)
	8	2011	148	(1.1)	151	(0.2)	62	(1.4)	28	(1.4)	1	(0.3)

Summary of NAEP results for **Florida**

Assessment			Average Scale Score				Achievement Level					
			State		National public		at or above Basic		at or above Proficient		at Advanced	
Subject	Grade	Year	Avg.	SE	Avg.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE	Pct.	SE
Writing	4	2009	146	(1.0)	149	(0.3)	57	(1.6)	25	(1.2)	1	(0.2)
		2002	158	(1.4)	153	(0.5)	86	(0.9)	33	(1.7)	4	(0.5)
	8	2007	158	(1.3)	154	(0.3)	88	(0.9)	36	(1.5)	3	(0.7)
		2002	154	(1.6)	152	(0.6)	84	(1.2)	32	(1.7)	3	(0.5)
		1998	142	(1.2)	148	(0.6)	78	(1.1)	19	(1.8)	1	(0.2)

[1]Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
Rounds to zero.
† Not applicable.
Note: Standard Errors (SE) are shown in parentheses.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Azin, Mariam, and Miriam G. Resendez. "Measuring Student Progress: Changes and Challenges Under No Child Left Behind." *New Directions for Evaluation* 117 (2008): 71-84. *Education Source.* Web. 16 Feb. 2016.

Bazerman, Charles and David R. Russell, eds. *Landmark Essays on Writing Across the Curriculum.* Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1994. Print.

Berkenkotter, Carol. "Decisions and Revisions: The Planning Strategies of a Publishing Writer." *College Composition and Communication* 34.2 (1983): 156-167. Print.

"The Best Book for AP Language Just Got Better." *highschool.bfwpub.com.* n.d. Bedford St. Martin's. Web. 23 January 2016.

Bizzell, Patricia, Bruce Herzberg, and Nedra Reynolds. *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing.* Boston, MA: Bedford, 2000. *MLA International Bibliography.* Web. 3 May 2015.

Booth, Wayne C. "The Revival of Rhetoric." *PMLA* 80.2 (1965): 8-12. Print.

Braddock, R, Lloyd-Jones, R & Schoer, L. *Research in Written Composition under the Supervision and with the Assistance of the NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition.* Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963. Print.

Carter, Chelsea. "Grand Jury Indicts 35 in Georgia School Cheating Scandal." *www.cnn.com*. Cable News Network, 29 March 2013. Web. 22 November 2015.

Chingos, Matthew M., Grover J. Whitehurst, and Institution Brookings. "Choosing Blindly: Instructional Materials, Teacher Effectiveness, and the Common Core." *Brookings Institution* (2012): ERIC. Web 5 March 2016.

Clark, Irene L., and Betty Bamberg. Concepts in Composition Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.

The College Board. *SpringBoard Florida: English Language Arts Grade 9 Teacher Edition*. New York: The College Board, 2014. Print.

The College Board. *SpringBoard Florida: English Language Arts Grade 10 Teacher Edition*. New York: The College Board, 2014. Print.

The College Board. *SpringBoard Florida: English Language Arts Grade 11 Teacher Edition*. New York: The College Board, 2014. Print.

The College Board. *SpringBoard Florida: English Language Arts Grade 12 Teacher Edition*. New York: The College Board, 2014. Print.

Collin, Ross. "How Rhetorical Theories of Genre Address Common Core Writing Standards." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 57.3 (2013): 215-222. *ERIC*. Web. 22 Aug. 2015.

"Common Core State Standards Initiative: Preparing America's Students for College and Career." *www.corestandards.org*. National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012. Web 5 October 2013.

Dixon, John. *Growth through English: A Report Based on the Dartmouth Seminar 1966.* Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967. Print.

Elbow, Peter. “A Method for Teaching Writing.” *College English* 30.2 (1968): 115-125. Print.

“FCAT Writing.” *fldoe.org*. Florida Department of Education, n.d. Web. 5 October 2013.

Florida Department of Education Office of Instructional Materials. “2015 Policies and Procedures for the Florida Instructional Materials Adoption.” *www.fldoe.org.* Florida Department of Education 2015. Web. 23 January 2016.

Florida Center for Research in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics. “Content Complexity Florida Standards.” www.*CPALMS.org.* The Florida State University, 11 July 2014. Web 8 December 2015.

Florida Center for Research in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics. “Florida Standards Assessments Test Design Summary And Blueprint: English Language Arts” www.*CPALMS.org.* The Florida State University, n.d. Web 3 January 2016.

Florida Center for Research in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics. “What is Content Complexity?” www.*CPALMS.org.* The Florida State University, n.d. Web 8 December 2015.

Florida Department of Education. “Countdown to Common Core.” *Fldoe.com.* Florida Department of Education, n.d. Web 6 Aug 2013.

Florida Department of Education. “2012 FCAT Writing Grade 10 Persuasive Calibration Scoring Guide.” *Fldoe.com.* Florida Department of Education, 2011. Web 6 Aug 2013.

Florida Department of Education. “Frequently Asked Questions about PARCC Assessments.” *Fldoe.com.* Florida Department of Education, n.d.. Web 6 Aug 2013.

Flower, Linda and John R. Hayes. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 32.4 (1981): 365-387.

"Frequently Asked Questions about PARCC Assessments." *parcconline.org*. Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, n.d. Web. 13 August 2013.

Garcia, Serena Mari. "College and Career Ready: Aligning Local Organizations to End the Please-the-Teacher Syndrome." *Crosspol* 1.1 (2014): 37-46. Web. 20 February 2016.

Graham, Steve, Charles A. MacArthur, and Jill Fitzgerald. *Best Practices in Writing Instruction.* New York: The Guilford Press, 2013. Print.

Graham, Steve, and Dolores Perin. "What We Know, What We Still Need To Know: Teaching Adolescents To Write." *Scientific Studies of Reading* 11.4 (2007): 313-335. *ERIC*. Web. 13 June 2015.

Hairston, Maxine. "The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 33.1 (1982): 76-88. Print.

Hamilton, Amelia. "Governor Rick Scott Withdraws Florida from Common Core Test." *www.freedomworks.org*. Freedom Works, 23 September 2013. Web. 4 April 2016.

Hart, Beth, et al. "Common Core State Standards Alignment: Advanced Placement®." *collegeboard.org/research*. The College Board, 2011. Web. 22 January 2016.

"History of Statewide Assessment Program." *fldoe.org*. Florida Department of Education, n.d. Web. 5 October 2013.

Jordan, Gina. "Why States are Designing Two Tests for Common Core Standards." *stateimpact.npr.org*. National Public Radio, 8 January 2013, n.pag. Web. 6 August 2013.

Knapp, Michael, et al. *Teaching for Meaning in High-Poverty Classrooms.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1995. Print.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970. Print.

Martinez, Remso. "School Threatened by Feds over Massive Number of Common Core Opt-Outs." *www.freedomworks.org.* Freedom Works, 3 August 2015. Web. 4 April 2016.

Matos-Elefonte, Haifa and Jun Li. "Can Springboard® Improve AP® Enrollment and Performance? Phase 1: Five-Year Trend Analysis." *springboardprogram.collegeboard.org.* The College Board, January 2010. Web 23 January 2016.

McCarthey, Sarah J. "The Impact of No Child Left Behind on Teachers' Writing Instruction." *Written Communication.* 25.4 (2008): 462-505. *ERIC.* Web. 6 Aug 2013.

McCarthy, Lucille Parkinson. "A Stranger in Strange Lands: A College Student Writing Across the Curriculum." *Research in the Teaching of English* 21.3 (1987): 233-265.

McGroarty, Emmett and Jane Robbins. "Controlling Education from the Top: Why Common Core Is Bad for America." *A Pioneer Institute and American Principles Project White Paper.* 87 (2012): 1-85. www.pioneerinstitute.org. Web. 4 April 2016.

McKenzie, Amanda. "Here are the 215 FSA Test Results in Every Florida School District." *Baynews9.com*. Bright House Networks, 30 September 2015. Web. 22 January 2016.

National Council of Teachers of English, and Project National Writing. "Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing." *National Writing Project* (2011): *ERIC*. Web. 13 June 2015.

National Governors Association & Council of Chief State School Officers. "Common Core State Standards for English language arts & literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*." www.statestandards.org,* 2015. Web. 8 August 2015.

North, Stephen M. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field.* Upper Montclair: Boynton/Cook, 1987. Print.

O'Connor, John. "Meet Florida's New Statewide Test." *stateimpact.npr.org*. National Public Radio, 24 November 2014. Web. 3 January 2016.

Pawlowski, A. "Cursive Comeback? After Outcry, Handwriting Lessons Return to Some Schools." *www.today.com*. Today Parents, 8 September 2015. Web. 4 April 2016.

Peeples, Tim. *Professional Writing and Rhetoric: Readings from the Field.* n.p.: New York: Longman, 2003. Print.

Perl, Sondra. "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers." *Research in the Teaching of English 13.4* (1979): 17-41. Print.

Polikoff, Morgan S., Nan Zhou, and Shauna E. Campbell. "Methodological Choices in the Content Analysis of Textbooks for Measuring Alignment with Standards." *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 3 (2015): 10. *Academic OneFile.* Web. 17 Jan. 2016.

Porter, Andrew C. “Measuring the Content of Instruction: Uses in Research and Practice.” *Educational Researcher* 2002: 3. *JSTOR Journals.* Web 6 March 2016.

Porter, James E. “Intertextuality and the Discourse Community.” *Rhetoric Review* 5.1 (1986): 34-47. Print.

Postal, Leslie. “Florida School Grades for 2015 Released, Still Facing Criticism.” *The Orlando Sentinel*, 12 February 2016. Web. 13 February 2016.

Postal, Leslie. “Preliminary FSA Test- Score Data Released.” *The Orlando Sentinel,* 30 September 2015. Web. 16 January 2016.

Pressley, Michael, Irene W. Gaskins, Katie Solic, and Stephanie Collins. "A Portrait Of Benchmark School: How A School Produces High Achievement In Students Who Previously Failed." *Journal Of Educational Psychology* 98.2 (2006): 282-306. *PsycARTICLES*. Web. 16 Aug. 2015.

Pressley, Michael, Lindsey Mohan, Lisa M. Raphael, and Lauren Fingeret. "How Does Bennett Woods Elementary School Produce Such High Reading And Writing Achievement?." *Journal Of Educational Psychology* 99.2 (2007): 221-240. *ERIC*. Web. 16 Aug. 2015.

Pressley, Michael, Lisa Raphael, J. David Gallagher, and Jeanette DiBella. "Providence-St. Mel School: How A School That Works For African American Students Works." *Journal Of Educational Psychology* 96.2 (2004): 216-235. *ERIC*. Web. 16 Aug. 2015.

Pressley, Michael, Linda Yokoi, Joan Rankin, Ruth Wharton-McDonald, and Jennifer Mistretta-Hampston. "A Survey Of The Instructional Practices Of Grade-5 Teachers Nominated As

Effective In Promoting Literacy. Reading Research Report No. 85." (1997): *ERIC*. Web. 16 Aug. 2015.

ProCon.org. "Is the Use of Standardized Tests Improving Education in America?" *www.procon.org.* 3 April 2015. Web. 16 February 2016.

Rankin-Erickson, Joan L., and Michael Pressley. "A Survey Of Instructional Practices Of Special Education Teachers Nominated As Effective Teachers Of Literacy." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice (Lawrence Erlbaum)* 15.4 (2000): 206-225. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 16 Aug. 2015.

Reynolds, Nedra, Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing.* 6th ed. Boston, MA: Bedford, 2003. *Macmillianhighered.com.* Web. 31 January 2015.

Roach, Andrew T., Bradley C. Niebling, and Alexander Kurz. "Evaluating the Alignment among Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessments: Implications and Applications for Research and Practice." *Psychology in the Schools* 45.2 (2008): 158-176. *Professional Development Collection*. Web 7 March 2016.

Roach, Ronald. "Teaching to the Test: Concerns about The Use of Standardized Tests Persist in American Education." *Diverse Issues in Higher Education* 3 (2014): 32. *Academic OneFile.* Web. 30 January 2106.

"School Grades Frequently Asked Questions." *afloridapromise.org.* Foundation for Florida's Future, n.d. Web 9 January 2016.

"Seminole County Public Schools Summary of School Grades (2010-2014)." *scps.k12.fl.us.org.* Seminole County Public Schools, 18 February 2015. Web. 22 January 2016.

Shea, Renée H., Lawrence Scanlon, and Robin Dissin Aufses. *The Language of Composition: Reading, Writing, Rhetoric.* Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008. Print.

Solochek, Jeffrey S. "Commissioner's FSA Cut Scores Recommendations are Final, Spokeswoman Says." *www.tampabay.com.* Tampa Bay Times, 11 November 2015. Web. 16 February 2016.

Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." *The Norton Book of Composition Studies.* Ed. Susan Miller. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2009. 323-332. Print.

Supovitz, Jonathan. "Twitter Gets Favorited in the Education Debate." *Phi Delta Kappan* 97.1 (2015): 20-24. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 4 April 2016.

Swales, John M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.

"Understanding FSA Reports." *fldoe.org*. Florida Department of Education, 2015. Web. 16 January 2016.

U.S. Department of Education. "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001," *www.ed.*gov. U.S. Department of Education, 19 Sept 2011. Web. 20 July 2013.

U.S. Department of Education. "Race to the Top Assessment Program," *www.ed.gov.* U.S. Department of Education, 12 August 2014. Web. 12 April 2014.

Wardle, Elizabeth. "Easing the Transitions: Finding Ways to Work in Solidarity across the High School/College Divide." *Crosspol* 1.1 (2014): 1-8. Web. 20 February 2016.

Wardle, Elizabeth. "'Mutt Genres' and the Goal of FYC: Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the University?" *College Composition and Communication* 60.4 (2009) 765-789. Print.

Writing Study Group of the NCTE Executive Committee. *NCTE Beliefs about the Teaching of Writing*. National Council of Teachers of English National Council of Teachers of English, November 2004. Web. June 13 2015.

Yarrow, F. and KJ Topping. "Collaborative Writing: The Effects of Metacognitive Prompting and Structured Peer Interaction." *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 71 (2001): 261-282. Print.

Young, Richard E. "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention." *Research on Composing: Points of Departure*. Ed. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1978. 29-47. Print.