

THE EFFECTS OF GO 4 IT...NOW! STRATEGY INSTRUCTION ON STUDENTS'  
PARAGRAPH WRITING IN AN INCLUSIVE SECONDARY LANGUAGE ARTS  
CLASSROOM

Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Arts in the  
Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Chelsey Nicole Shidaker, B.S. & B.A.

Graduate Program in Educational Studies

The Ohio State University

2016

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Ralph Gardner III, Advisor

Dr. Moira Konrad

Copyright by  
Chelsey Nicole Shidaker  
2016

## ABSTRACT

Writing is a crucial skill that people need to successfully communicate thoughts and information. Writing proficiently is essential to function in many activities of every day life, including school, the workplace, relationships, and the community at large. In school, students are regularly asked to demonstrate their academic knowledge through written communication. The purpose of this study was to measure the effects of a strategy instruction approach, GO 4 IT...NOW!, in an inclusive secondary Language Arts classroom. Specifically, this was a descriptive study using multiple probes across participants to assess the quality of participants' writings after implementing GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction. All students demonstrated strong improvement in paragraph writing skills after the implementation of the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy. Limitations, future directions, and implications for practice are provided in the discussion.

## DEDICATION

Dedicated to my loving husband, Devin, who put up with my whining and complaining even before we were married, braved the long hours with me, and continuously supported me along the way even from afar. I love you so much!

To Alecia for befriending me the first day of graduate school and, for some reason, sticking with me the whole 4.5 years. I couldn't have survived this without you by my side, Darlin'. We finally made it! There's no one else I would rather walk up to that stage with than you.

To my dearest friends – Mandy, Janet, Ellie, and Katie – who helped me keep going even when I wanted to give up and who inspire me to be a better teacher and, further, a better person. You are the best support system I could ever have, and I am so lucky to have you as friends!

To my mom, Rhonda, and my dad, Mark, who instilled in me an impenetrable work ethic that allowed me to be ambitious by teaching full-time and completing graduate school simultaneously. There are not enough words to thank you enough. I love you!

To my brother Zach, who has been my partner in crime for the past 26 years. I always strive to be the best role model and older sister I can be. I hope you're as proud of me as I am of you!

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Ralph Gardner, for all of his guidance during this strenuous thesis-writing process. He read my manuscript more times than he probably wanted to, and I am forever indebted to him for completing this study in time to graduate. I would also like to thank my second reader and professor, Dr. Moira Konrad, for taking the time and interest to be on my thesis committee as well as allowing me to adapt one of her studies in order to investigate it in my own classroom. I still want to be like her when I grow up. I am also grateful to Gleides Lopez-Rizzi for all her help, advice, and suggestions on this big project even while she was completing her own degree. Finally, I would like to thank all my 10<sup>th</sup> grade students of the 2015-2016 school year for their hard work and extra effort they put forth to be a part of my study.

VITA

- 2011.....B.S. Secondary Language Arts Education  
B.A. English Literature  
University of Cincinnati  
Cincinnati, Ohio
- 2011.....English Teacher, RTI Coordinator  
Bridgescape East: New Beginnings Academy  
Columbus, Ohio
- 2012.....Part-Time Teacher, Long-Term Substitute  
The Ohio State School for the Blind  
Columbus, Ohio
- 2013-Present.....English Teacher  
Licking Heights High School  
Pataskala, Ohio
- 2015.....Teacher of the Year 2014-2015  
Licking Heights Education Association

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Educational Studies

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	ii
Dedication .....	iii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
Vita .....	v
List of Tables .....	viii
Chapter 1: Literature Review .....	1
Chapter 2: Method .....	16
Chapter 3: Findings .....	33
Chapter 4: Discussion .....	49
References .....	74
Appendix A: Common Core State Standards Informative Writing Rubric 9-10 .....	77
Appendix B: Skill Review: Thesis Statement Practice #1 .....	79
Appendix C: Making Connections – “Life After People” & Change .....	83
Appendix D: Procedural Integrity – Lesson Plan #5 .....	86
Appendix E: Lesson Plan #1 .....	94
Appendix F: Lesson Plan #4 .....	98
Appendix G: Vision Statement – Goals after Graduating High School .....	101
Appendix H: Examples vs. Non-Examples of Paragraphs .....	103
Appendix I: Needs – I Need to Improve my Ability To .....	107

Appendix J: Goal Paragraph Baseline #1 .....	109
Appendix K: Generalization Paragraph #1 .....	110
Appendix L: 10-Point Scoring Rubric – Quality of Writing Indicators .....	112
Appendix M: 12-Point Scoring Rubric – Content Indicators .....	114
Appendix N: Student Satisfaction of GO 4 IT...NOW! Strategy Instruction .....	116
Appendix O: Typed Student Writing Samples .....	117



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. GO 4 IT...NOW! Lesson Sequence Overview.....	22
Table 2. Pre-Baseline Lesson Sequences Overview .....	27
Table 3. Mean IOA Scores by Participants and Condition.....	34
Table 4. Expert IOA for Each Participants .....	35
Table 5. Karmen’s Performance across Writing Content and Quality .....	37
Table 6. Kelly’s Performance across Writing Content and Quality .....	38
Table 7. Weston’s Performance across Writing Content and Quality .....	39
Table 8. Michael’s Performance across Writing Content and Quality .....	40
Table 9. Allison’s Performance across Writing Content and Quality .....	41
Table 10. Latisha’s Performance across Writing Content and Quality .....	43
Table 11. Ohio Common Core Rubric Scores for Each Participant .....	46

## CHAPTER 1

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The ability to communicate effectively through written language allows individuals to convey thoughts, information, and tasks to others without being in their presence. This ability has enabled people to transfer knowledge across time and cultures. Effective written communication remains a crucial literacy skill in this modern technology-driven world (Santangelo, 2014). Because educators have a responsibility to prepare their students for success in school and beyond, educators must include teaching students to effectively communicate through writing.

Individuals that have difficulty expressing their ideas in writing are at a disadvantage, as they may be perceived as less intelligent, unfocused, and/or confused (Harris & Graham, 2011). Students with academic risk or those with disabilities may struggle to communicate clearly in written language (Konrad & Test, 2007). For example, adolescents with specific learning disabilities (SLD) frequently have poor writing skills (Sexton, Harris, & Graham, 1998). Written expression is an integral part of school curricula, particularly for students in secondary schools; however, students with academic risk and/or SLD often have difficulty developing writing skills sufficient to satisfy crucial academic benchmarks (Chalk, Hagan-Burke, & Burke, 2005).

Additionally, these students may lack the basic knowledge about how to approach writing and the process required to produce quality written products. Chalk et al. stated, “those who lack the ability to adequately demonstrate conceptual knowledge and communicate their thoughts and beliefs in writing are at a grave disadvantage” (2005, p. 85). Without important writing skills, students with academic risk and/or students with SLD are likely to continue falling further behind academically when compared to their typically developing peers, placing them at a disadvantage for high school graduation, postsecondary education, employment, and other crucial and typical life opportunities and experiences.

According to data from several national assessments, secondary students in particular are increasingly at risk of having poor writing skills. In 2007, for example, only 6% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade and 5% of 12<sup>th</sup> grade students scored at or above the proficient level in writing (Salahu-Din, Persky, & Miller, 2008). In other words, even typical students struggle with writing proficiently. When students’ writing needs are not addressed at the onset of learning how to write, their skills can fail to develop and, over time, their writing skills fall increasingly below expected standards for their age. Any special instruction used to address these skill deficits is often unsuccessful (Graham, Hebert, Sandbank, & Harris, 2016). The outcomes are even worse for students with academic risk and/or with SLD, as the likelihood of them experiencing writing difficulties is much higher than that of their typical peers (Santangelo, 2014). Furthermore, adolescents with academic risk and/or with SLD that have poor writing skills may find it difficult to remain in postsecondary settings; find employment and, once employed, struggle to get promoted; and develop age-appropriate relationships with others (Harris & Graham, 2011).

## **Students with Academic Risk**

Students are described as having academic risk when they “demonstrate poor achievement, personal problems such as social maladjustment, and overall disengagement from school” (Matheson, 2015, p. 67). This definition is rather broad and can encompass a large demographic, which has been a cause for concern for schools across the country. This is due in large part to the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2000, which has made schools increasingly more accountable for students with academic risk or students from ethnic groups that have historically underachieved. Schools are expected to provide instruction for all students, including those with SLD, those at risk for a SLD diagnosis, or struggling writers (Graham, Harris, Bartlett, Popadopoulou, & Santoro, 2016).

The high stakes created by No Child Left Behind (2002) and Every Child Succeeds Act (2015) highlights the perpetual widening of the achievement gap as students with academic risk continue to demonstrate poor performance when compared to the general student population (Marchetti, Wilson, & Dunham, 2016). For example, approximately 73% of typically developing eighth grade students scored below the proficient level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and data for 12<sup>th</sup> grade were identical with 73% of students scoring below the proficient level (Boyle & Hindman, 2015). These data are disturbing, as they indicate “difficulties in the middle years are not automatically resolved, likely because writing serves as a tool for students to process increasingly challenging ideas as the grades progress, leaving little time for remedial instruction” (Boyle & Hindman, 2015, p. 44). This lack of remediation during middle and high school years contributes to the widening of the aforementioned

achievement gap, resulting in many students failing the mandatory writing exams, resulting in these students not earning a high school diploma. Further, if these students want to go to postsecondary institutions, they must earn a GED and take remedial college writing courses prior to beginning a postsecondary degree program. These additional steps increase the cost and time needed to secure a degree. Students that fail to acquire strong writing skills face restricted opportunities for not only higher education but also for employment, as employers report they rely on writing when making decisions about who to hire and promote (Graham, et al., 2016). Therefore, it is critical that educators identify instructional strategies that can promote the development of proficient writing skills for students, especially for those with academic risk and/or with SLD.

### **Students with SLD**

According to Cortiella & Horowitz (2014), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) defines SLD as:

A disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical equations. Such term includes such conditions as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Such term does not include a learning problem that is primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage. (p. 2)

SLD is the largest category of students receiving special education services in America's schools, and approximately 2.4 million students have been identified as having a learning

disability (Cortiella & Horowitz, 2014). One of the typical areas of concern for learners with SLD is written expression (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2011). Approximately 60% of students with disabilities perform below the basic level of writing needed in secondary schools; furthermore, teachers make very few adaptations for struggling writers (Hebert, 2014). Due to these writing struggles experienced by students with SLD, particularly those in secondary education, it is imperative to provide systematic interventions as a means to close the writing achievement gap between students at risk and/or with SLD and their typically developing peers. Poor writing skills by students at risk and/or with SLD combined with minimal adaptations and a lack of effective educational interventions may precipitate these students to fall further behind with each passing year. This may result in difficulties for students at risk and/or with SLD to complete basic writing tasks such as writing a coherent paragraph. Consequently, it is essential that students at risk and/or with SLD require explicit and strategic writing instruction designed to build writing skills and close the achievement gap.

### **Writing and Students with Academic Risks and/or with SLD**

Writing is a powerful tool that not only helps students learn but also allows them to demonstrate knowledge. The task of writing gives students access to communicating and connecting with others without being physically present. It also contributes to students' self-expression, self-reflection, and personal development. Thus, when students have difficulties with writing, they are more likely to face significant barriers in educational and vocational settings as well as other interpersonal life experiences. In other words, writing is an important literacy skill that serves as a gatekeeper for an increasing number of professions (Santangelo, 2014). Some professions that increasingly

demand adequate writing skills include human resources and customer service positions. In these positions, individuals will not only be communicating with other employees in the company but also with outside individuals where effective and concise written communication is essential in sharing information and getting the job done efficiently.

Research indicates that writing deficits amongst students with academic risk and/or with SLD can lead to compositions with fewer ideas, poor organization, and lower quality when compared to compositions produced by students without academic risk and/or SLD (Anastasiou & Michail, 2013). Despite the above deficits in writing for this population of students, the Common Core State Standards require an awareness by educators (i.e., special and general education) of the increased expectations in English Language Arts (ELA) and overall content area literacy in other academic subjects such as science and social studies (Straub & Alias, 2013). According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress Standards (2011), all students should be able to write persuasively and informatively/explanatorily, with an emphasis on introducing a precise claim(s), the importance of that claim(s), counterarguments to the claim(s), and creating a logical organization of the argument that meets ELA standards. Therefore, students with academic risk and/or with SLD may require explicit and meaningful writing-based interventions to address individual writing needs and monitor growth as a means to close these writing achievement gaps for students with academic risk and with SLD when compared to their typically achieving peers.

### **Literature Review**

Intervening on written expression has played a minor role in recent attempts to reform and improve education across the country due in large part to the complex skills

that are required to perform written expression tasks (Graham, Harris, Bartlett, Popadopoulou, & Santoro, 2016). Although other factors play a role in implementing writing instruction, such as teacher preparedness and time, it becomes difficult for educators to plan and deliver effective writing instruction that meets the needs of all students with and without disabilities. However, it does not mean written expression intervention is impossible when using evidence-based practices and procedures.

Graham et al. (2016) assessed whether teachers' views on the acceptability of adaptations predicted how frequently they reported making adaptations for struggling writers since the acceptability of an adaptation influences teachers' use of it and, in turn, its efficacy. Further, this study aimed to identify the gap in literature about the adaptations teachers make for struggling writers by having teachers report how often they used 20 adaptations, ranging from teacher encouragement to giving extra time to delivering explicit skill instruction. The results showed that teachers applied only one adaptation on a daily basis – providing extra encouragement to struggling writers – and close to 9 out of 10 teachers viewed this as a suitable and effective strategy. The second most common adaptation reported was giving students extra time to complete writing assignments. Overall, teachers reported on average making a variety of adaptations for their struggling writers – 13 different adaptations monthly and almost 11 weekly or more often. Although teachers in this study reported using a wide range of adaptations for both struggling writers and students with disabilities and found that regular education teachers think it's important to adjust their writing instruction to meet the individual needs of the most vulnerable students, the study did not measure the effectiveness of the adaptation practices.



In another study aimed at struggling writers, Boyle and Hindman (2015) taught middle school students to use a novel persuasive writing strategy, DECIDE, to scaffold students' compositions of a five-paragraph persuasive essay by using a graphic organizer. The first three steps, DEC, focused on generating the basic ideas for the essay (i.e., three reasons for and against an issue, write a position thesis statement, explain which side was being taken, and choose order of ideas as they would appear in the essay). In the "I" step, INK, students wrote their ideas in the form of an essay, writing an opening paragraph that contained the thesis and three paragraphs that corresponded to each reason listed in the organizer. The D, or DRAFT, step prompted students to write the concluding paragraph (i.e., summarize the thesis, reasons for supporting, and a suggestion/recommendation for others), with the final step, E for EDIT, requiring students to edit their essays by correcting any issues (i.e., sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, etc.). The researchers concluded that students who used the scaffolding (i.e., DECIDE graphic organizer) wrote better persuasive essays than those students who were not taught the strategy, with the largest effect size on the quality of students' supporting paragraphs (i.e., the paragraphs that support the thesis statement), which is arguably the most important component of an essay. Similarly, scores from experimental students who were struggling writers were twice as large as students in the control group, and experimental struggling writers wrote, on average, 72 more words than students in the control group. Therefore, students not only wrote more sentences but also wrote more details in their essays.

Another study conducted by Flanagan and Bouck (2015) explored the use of concept mapping on written expression to support secondary struggling writers. The

researchers used concept maps, which provided a visual illustration of the main topic, subtopics, supportive details, and how each are related by connecting related ideas with lines to serve as a prewriting task that is an essential but often-neglected component of writing. This prewriting task provided students with a prompt to brainstorm, organize, and plan their ideas before writing. This study ultimately concluded that concept mapping supported students in written expression; students independently used concept mapping regardless of their degree of disability or academic challenges, which led to an immediate increase in written expression quality (i.e., increase in use of supporting details, exclusion of irrelevant details, and better organization) and a more cohesive essay. One limitation, however, was some students' lack of writing skills to complete the concept map. One student, for example, struggled to write complete sentences, making the concept map a challenge since it was to be used to create a larger composition. This was hypothesized to be due to a lack of previous instruction and/or the nature of students' individual disabilities.

Two additional studies focused on writing instruction for students with SLD. The first study sought to determine the effects of a Direct Instruction (DI) writing program, Expressive Writing, for high school students with learning disabilities (Walker, Shippen, Alberto, Houchins, & Cihak, 2005). All three participants responded "very positively," making notably remarkable gains in the number of correct word sequences, and the effects of the intervention were maintained over time as determined by generalization measures. The second study conducted by Mason, Kubina, Valasa, and Mong Cramer (2010) evaluated the effectiveness of strategy instruction in persuasive quick writing with seventh- and eighth-grade students with severe emotional and behavioral disabilities.

Using a Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) instructional model, they found positive effects for all students on the primary measure, which was the quality of written responses. Quality of written responses was scored using a 7-point holistic measure based on response elements (i.e., belief/topic sentence, three or more reasons, a counter-reason, and an ending sentence) and response organization (i.e., organized into paragraph[s] with sentences). Not only did participants' performance improve; even for those who did not demonstrate overall improvement, there was a decrease in variability. In other words, the students produced a more consistent written product. Furthermore, the effect of the intervention was maintained over time with all students reporting the instruction benefited their performances.

Santangelo (2014) provides a narrative review of contemporary research as a means to discuss why writing is so difficult for students with SLD. In her review, four important components are discussed: (1) an overview of writing skill; (2) a description of the process through which students develop writing competence; (3) the most common factors that negatively impact students' ability to engage in the three primary writing processes: planning, text production, and revising; and (4) a comprehensive description of the reasons students with LD experience significant difficulties with writing ("problem analysis") and ways in which targeted, effective instructional opportunities can be designed and assessed ("intervention planning and monitoring"). Santangelo's findings were similar to others' in regards to writing instruction – students with SLD struggle immensely with writing, especially as they get older. Thus, evidence-based practices and procedures are essential in helping students with SLD.

In order to teach students with SLD how to effectively produce quality paragraphs, Sexton, Harris, and Graham (1998) examined the effects of a Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) strategy for planning and writing essays, self-instruction for managing the strategy and the writing process, and adaptive attributions regarding effort and strategy usage with middle school students with LD. Prior to intervention, the participants in their study generated essays containing only two or three ideas, which usually started by stating their position, followed with a single supporting reason, and ended suddenly without a concluding statement. Overall, the quality of their essays was poor. Following intervention, researchers found that instruction changed both how and what students wrote; all of the post-instruction essays written by the participants became longer, the number of reasons supporting the premise increased (with an average of three supporting reasons), their writing was coherently ordered, and the overall quality improved (Sexton et al.). Similar results were found on the generalization writing probes administered to two of the participants. This study, however, was less successful in maintaining the gains made immediately following instruction, which reinforces the importance of using booster sessions and follow-up procedures to promote maintenance as means to sustain gains for students with LD.

Chalk, Hagan-Burke, and Burke (2005) also implemented a Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) intervention with students in a 10<sup>th</sup>-grade technical Language Arts special education resource class. This study indicated that students benefited from a SRSD approach to writing. SRSD helped them develop strategies for brainstorming, semantic webbing, setting goals, and revising. More specifically, these experimenters found that the word production and quality of students' essays increased

post-intervention. However, the majority of the growth was in word production rather than writing quality. One major limitation of this study was the way in which data were used; data collected from student essays were shared with and graphed by students as part of the intervention. This was a potential confound since those same data were used to evaluate the results of the intervention. Another limitation was the lack of ethnic diversity in the study; all participants included in the study were Caucasian, which requires caution when generalizing the results to diverse students with LD. Overall, these experimenters found that most published research regarding written expression at the time of their study focused on elementary and middle school-aged students, indicating research is needed on effective, evidence-based strategies for improving written language skills of secondary students with learning disabilities.

A promising intervention used to address writing deficits for high school students with SLD is the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy, which is SRSD instruction that engages students in writing paragraphs by teaching them to use their Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals and objectives as the content for producing a coherent paragraph (Konrad & Test, 2007). Although research on this particular strategy is limited, Konrad, Trela, and Test (2006) conducted a study to determine if the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy would lead to improved goal paragraphs as well as overall improved paragraph writing skills for students with orthopedic impairments using goals listed in these students' IEPs. These students attended classes in a self-contained setting for 70% or more of the day. This study found that when given 11 instructional sessions on how to write paragraphs based on IEP goals and objectives, the students were able to improve their ability to write

six-sentence paragraphs as well as generalize these paragraph-writing skills to other types of paragraphs. Furthermore, they maintained these skills over time (Konrad et al).

The GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction has many components. The first is used for teaching students how to write a **G**oal statement, which serves as their topic sentence of their paragraph (i.e., “To be a successful writer, I have several goals I must follow to achieve my goals”). Then, students create four (**4**) **O**bjectives, otherwise known as supporting details, which will help them meet their overall goal along the way. Next, they **I**dentify a **T**imeline in which to complete their goal and objectives to meet any deadlines set forth by the nature of the assignment. Lastly is the “**NOW**” portion of the strategy, which stands for **N**ame your topic, **O**rders the details, and **W**rap it up and restate the topic (Konrad & Trela, 2007). This is a self-regulation strategy for composing the actual paragraph in a logical order, which is helpful for both this strategy as well as most other writing tasks (Konrad & Trela). In order to assess these skills, Konrad and Test (2006) used a rubric-based scale, which was a modified version of the 8-point scale used by Wallace and Bott (1989) in their study designed to teach paragraph-writing skills to middle school students with disabilities. The scoring rubric was modified in two ways. First, Wallace and Bott awarded points for only three supporting details rather than four. Students in Konrad and Test’s and in this study learned to write four objectives as means to reach their goals; therefore, it was logical to award them points for four supporting details in their paragraphs. Second, students in this study received a point for writing a concluding sentence that restated the paragraph topic, while Wallace and Bott’s participants did not.

Despite there being a functional relationship between GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction and students' abilities to successfully address potential IEP goals and objectives as well as write coherent paragraphs, there were several limitations to this study. Students were able to generalize these paragraph-writing skills to other types of paragraphs and maintain their skills over time. However, a limitation was the small number of participants in the study, which limits these findings because there was not enough data to be considered evidence-based. Another limitation was the fact that instruction was delivered in a one-on-one format, which is not practical for teaching larger groups of students in a typical classroom setting (Konrad et al., 2006). As a result, future research is required in order to modify the study to determine the effectiveness of this strategy with groups of students, particularly in a general education setting.

In a systematic replication of the same study, Konrad and Test (2007) sought to determine the effects of GO 4 IT...NOW! on participants' abilities to write IEP goals and objectives as well as paragraph-writing skills when strategy instruction was delivered in a group instruction format, using students in middle school resource classrooms. Again, generalization of this strategy when applied to other kinds of writing was limited. The "NOW" component of the intervention was not strong due to lack of: explicit teacher modeling of applying the steps of "NOW," emphasis on self-regulation, student prompts to use the strategy, and reinforcement for students when they applied the strategy (Konrad & Test). Another limitation was the end goal of paragraph writing; because paragraph writing is not a final writing task, especially for older students, future research should examine how this intervention could be adapted to teach students to write essays by building in examples of how to apply the strategy to other types of writing, including

more lengthy writings (Konrad & Test). While there are numerous studies that examine a variety of writing interventions, these are the only two found that examine the effects of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction.

This study targets writing behavior that is necessary for students in 10<sup>th</sup> grade to fulfill Ohio's English Language Arts Common Core State Standards. Specifically, the purpose is to examine the effects of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction on writing goal paragraphs, paragraph writing skills, maintenance, and generalization of this strategy using whole group instruction with high school students in a general education inclusion classroom. The study was a systematic replication of the Konrad and Test (2007) study. This study included adaptations to the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy in order to address the instructional needs of the learners in the general education setting.

### **Research Questions**

1. Does GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction lead to improved goal paragraphs, as measured by students' scores on a paragraph content scoring rubric and a paragraph quality scoring rubric?
2. Does the overall quality of students' paragraph writing generalize as the result of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction?
3. Do students demonstrate maintenance of skills learned using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy over time?
4. What are the participants' attitudes about the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy?



## CHAPTER 2

### METHOD

#### **Participants**

A total of six participants were included in this study (i.e., four target participants and two typical peers). Four 10<sup>th</sup> grade Language Arts high-school students were targeted for participation in this investigation. The students were selected from two different inclusive classrooms. Two of the participants have IEPs – Karmen has a goal in the area of written expression, and Kelly has math and social/emotional goals. The other two target participants, Weston and Michael, were identified as students with academic risk (i.e., typical students with poor writing skills), which were determined by pre-baseline writing probes and progress monitoring data throughout the year in an English 10 classroom. In addition to the four target participants, random samples of writing from two typically developing peers (i.e., typical peers) with a history of at least average performances in Language Arts were analyzed. The experimenter is the classroom teacher in the English 10 classroom, and she implemented the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction with all students in both classes during the regular Language Arts period.

The criteria for students to participate in this study included: (a) poor paragraph writing (determined by assessment scores on written expression tasks and/or a pre-

determined written expression IEP goal to be met by the end of the academic school year); (b) ability to write complete sentences containing at least subject and a verb; (c) showed limited writing content, quality, and coherency in grade level paragraph writing prior to the intervention. Prospective participants' permanent products were examined against the Common Core State Standards Informative Writing Rubric: Grades 9-10 (Appendix A) to measure writing content and quality.

Two typically developing peers were selected as typical peers. Their writing products were compared to those produced by target participants over the course of the study. Peers were selected as typical peers based on (a) their ability to write complete sentences containing at least a subject and a verb; (b) their ability to write with accuracy, with high quality writing structure, well-supported content, and coherent content based on grade level paragraph expectations; and (c) performance attained by assessment of academic progress by the experimenter. One typical peer, Allison, was a high performing student (i.e., a student who consistently earned A's and high B's in English 10). The second typical peer, Latisha, was an average performing student (i.e., a student who consistently earned mostly C's in English 10) who met the aforementioned criteria.

### **Setting and Instruction**

Implementation occurred in a Midwestern general education Language Arts classroom in a suburban high school district. At this high school, 59% of students enrolled identified as Caucasian with a large minority population (i.e., 30.9% African American in which one-third consisted of Somali students, 7.3% Bi-Racial, 2.5% Hispanic, and 1% Asian) and over 28 languages were spoken amongst the student body. 43% of the student body was economically disadvantaged (i.e., qualified for free/reduced

lunch). The 4-year graduation rate was 92%, with a 97% graduation rate within 5 years. This district was one of 7 districts out of a total 49 in the area to earn all A's and B's on the most recent state report card, and the high school was named a School of Promise in 2014.

Classroom writing instruction for this study was aligned with Ohio's Common Core State Standards for the 9-10 grade band. The experimenter, who was also the classroom teacher, implemented the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy as whole-group instruction across both classes. An intervention specialist supervised students throughout instructional sessions in both classes. The intervention specialist was a school district employee assigned to each class to support the classroom teacher in meeting the instructional needs of students with exceptionalities.

**Current Language Arts instruction.** In the weeks prior to the onset of intervention, the experimenter used explicit teaching strategies to teach a variety of writing skills. Most of the instruction was teacher-directed whole class instruction involving the teacher modeling the targeted skill for the class, having students practice that skill with the teacher (i.e., guided practice), and lastly having the class practice the skill independently. One of the main skills targeted during that period was planning an arguable thesis statement. Students generated an arguable opinion about a topic, along with three different supporting reasons as evidence for that opinion. Repeated practice opportunities were provided covering a variety of topics (see Appendix B). Students also used several guided writing experimenter-created templates to compose analysis paragraphs about unit texts. As a culminating assessment, students composed a five-paragraph essay synthesizing unit texts. These essays followed the SEER paragraph

format (Statement – Example [evidence] – Explain [explain example as it relates to statement – Relate [relate back to statement] developed by the experimenter and a colleague (see Appendix C).

Composition instruction was differentiated to afford all students access to this writing task. First, students took a survey created by the experimenter to indicate their preference for the kind of outline they wanted – most guided to least guided – and if they wanted to receive their outlines in small chunks or all at once. The outline provided structure to help students compose their essays with appropriate prompting for each student’s writing skill level. The final product was a synthesis essay that was scored using a rubric that included but was not limited to the (a) thesis statement, (b) transition words between paragraphs, (c) SEER paragraph writing, (d) introductions, and (e) conclusions. The essay was scored on a 100-point skills-based rubric, and participants performed as follows: Karmen – 0% (she did not complete any component of the essay, including the outline); Kelly – 49%; Weston, 48%; Michael – 68.5%; Allison – 90%; and Latisha – 73.5%. The experimenter delivered instruction concurrently to participants, typical peers, and all other classroom students.

### **Experimenter**

The first author served as the experimenter. She had two bachelor’s degrees – one in Secondary English Language Arts and another in English Literature – and was in her fourth year of a master’s program in special education. She had five years’ experience in teaching students in inclusive general education settings, and she was the Language Arts teacher for all the classes containing participants in this study.

The second observer was a school district employee serving as intervention specialist assigned to the classroom. She observed 33% of the instructional sessions to measure adherence to a pre-established instructional protocol (i.e., treatment procedural integrity). Treatment integrity instructional protocol included a lesson plan used as a checklist (see Appendix D). The experimenter trained the second observer on the use of the instructional treatment integrity protocol by watching videotaped lessons of the experimenter teaching the same lessons. The second observer reached mastery when she demonstrated 90% agreement as compared with the experimenter's scoring using the same lesson plan checklist(s). This person also served as the second scorer. She independently scored at least one third of participants' permanent products and was trained by the experimenter on interrater reliability protocol. The experimenter trained her to use the 10-point quality scoring rubric by randomly selecting writing samples from other students in the class to score. The second scorer reached mastery when she and the experimenter agreed 90% of the time on the 10-point quality scoring rubric.

Additional personnel for this study included a secondary English expert (i.e., Language Arts teacher). The expert had over three years of professional fieldwork experience in teaching Language Arts. She independently scored a sample of 40 randomly selected goal paragraphs written across all conditions of the study. The experimenter trained her to apply the Ohio Common Core State Standards Informative Writing Rubric for the 9-10 grade band (see Appendix A) to a single paragraph by randomly selecting writing samples from other students in the class to score. The expert reached mastery when she and the experimenter agreed 90% of the time on the Common Core rubric.

## **Materials**

Materials were adapted from Konrad and Test (2007) to fit the needs of participants in an inclusive general education classroom (see Appendices A and C through N for intervention materials). Scripted lesson plans (Appendices E and F), student worksheet samples (Appendices B, C, and D), writing probes for both baseline and generalization (Appendices J and K), scoring rubrics (Appendices A, L, and M), an IOA lesson plan (Appendix D), and preference assessments (Appendix N) were the materials used in this study.

## **Independent Variable**

The primary independent variable was GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction. As previously stated, GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction is designed to teach participants how to write coherent, logical, high quality, and content rich paragraphs. More specifically, it teaches students how to write a **G**oal statement, which serves as the topic sentence of their paragraph. Then, students create four (**4**) **O**bjectives, otherwise known as supporting details, which will help them meet their overall goals along the way. Next, they **I**dentify a **T**imeline in which to complete their goal and objectives as means to meet any deadlines for the assignment. Lastly is the “NOW” portion of the strategy, which stands for **N**ame your topic, **O**rders the details, and **W**rap it up and restate the topic. These paragraphs were scored using the 10-point paragraph quality scoring rubric (see Appendix L) and the 12-point content scoring rubric (see Appendix M). The GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy focuses on teaching students to write paragraphs about goals and objectives (see Table 1); specifically, each paragraph includes a **G**oal, **O**bjectives, (**4** objectives), and an **I**dentified **T**imeline. Additionally, students learn to self-regulate by

checking the paragraphs to be sure that they **N**amed their topic, **O**rdered their steps, and **W**rapped it up by restating the topic.

Table 1

*GO 4 IT...NOW! Lesson Sequence Overview*

Writing Stage	Lesson(s)	Objective(s)	Activities
Develop and activate prior background knowledge	4-5	Student will be able to (a) identify strong and weak goals, (b) match objectives to goals, and (c) identify parts of a paragraph	Teacher (a) explains difference between a goal and an objective, (b) helps students identify well written and poorly written goals, (c) models process of turning poorly written goals into better ones, (d) models process of turning needs into goals, and (e) explains what a paragraph is, using examples and non-examples.
Introduce the strategy	5	Student will be able to identify the purpose of the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy and when to use it	Teacher introduces GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy and explains that student will be learning to apply the strategy for writing paragraphs about his/her goals and objectives, as well as for other types of sequential writing.
Model use of the strategy	6	Student will be able to describe how the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy is applied	Teacher models strategy use with at least one academic and one non-academic need/goal.
Memorize the strategy	7-9	Student will be able to memorize the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy	Teacher uses flash cards to help student memorize the mnemonic device.
Support strategy use	7-9	Student will be able to write a goal paragraph with assistance from the teacher	Teacher assists as student uses the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy worksheet to develop goal paragraphs based on the needs identified in pre-instruction.
Independent performance	10-14	Student will be able to (a) write a goal paragraph independently and (b) edit a goal paragraph with assistance from the teacher	Teacher instructs student to write a paragraph about a goal, using goals from previous writing activities. Student writes paragraph independently, with a verbal reminder to use strategy. When finished, student and teacher use paragraph quality scoring rubric to edit paragraph.

Materials were adapted from Konrad and Test (2007) to fit the needs of participants in an inclusive general education classroom. The pre-baseline lesson

sequence (see Table 2) was condensed into three total lessons rather than the original five. The same instruction and materials were used, but the instructional delivery was faster to account for the time allotted for each instructional period (i.e., 47 minutes). The rest of the materials followed the same sequence but with different lesson numbers based on the condensing of pre-baseline instruction. There were small edits made throughout the remaining lesson plans. For example, the student worksheet (i.e., Paragraph Examples vs. Paragraph Non-Examples) in Konrad and Test's lesson plan 8, which was this study's lesson plan 6, was modified to be more interactive, student-centered, and visual to meet participants' needs and preferred learning style. The experimenter also modified the some lesson plan scripts slightly to incorporate more opportunities for student responding. All other materials and lesson plans remained the same after the elimination of any language related to IEPs since this study was implemented in a general education classroom.

### **Dependent Variables**

The primary dependent measures were (a) writing quality of goal paragraphs and (b) content of goal paragraphs. Secondary dependent variables were (c) generalization of writing skills to other writing opportunities, (d) maintenance of writing quality, and (e) social validity measures.

**Assessing the quality of written goal paragraphs.** The writing quality of participants' goal paragraphs was measured using a 10-point scoring rubric (see Appendix L). This scoring rubric assessed whether a participant included a topic sentence, four details that supported the topic, a final restatement of the topic, logical presentation of the paragraph's information, the use of transition words, and a lack or occurrence of extraneous information in the paragraph by using a points-based



measurement technique. Although the written goal paragraphs were collected throughout the study, this scoring rubric was not used to score the permanent written products until the end of the intervention.

Each participant's permanent written products from across the various phases were randomly ordered excluding any identifiers, such as name, class time, date, etc. (see Appendix O). These handwritten permanent products were photocopied and placed in each student's archive envelope. The experimenter typed the handwritten passages for all participants (i.e., target participants and typical peers), correcting all spelling errors in the participants' writings. These typed writings were placed in each student's large envelope. The stack of participants' typed permanent products was given to a second scorer (i.e., Intervention Specialist) for scoring with the 10-point scoring rubric. She independently scored at least one third of participants' permanent products after being trained by the experimenter. The experimenter trained her to use the 10-point scoring rubric to score unmarked photocopies of students' writings. The experimenter also used the 10-point scoring rubric to score the quality of written goal paragraphs.

**Assessing the content of written goal paragraphs.** The content of participants' goal paragraphs was measured using a 12-point scoring rubric (see Appendix M). This scoring rubric assessed whether a participant's goal was based on a need identified in the statement of present level of performance, the relevance of all 4 objectives, and inclusion of a timeline to reach their objectives. This scoring rubric also used a points-based measurement technique on a scale from 0 ("There is no evidence of this skill or component, or the response is incorrect"), 1 (i.e., "Student shows an attempt; however, the response is incomplete"), to 2 ("Response is complete, makes sense, and reflects

student's understanding of process"). This scale was adapted from Konrad and Test's (2004) version, in which participants completed an IEP template.

**Generalization of writing skills to other writing opportunities.** Participants wrote paragraphs in response to typical expository essay prompts, or probes (see Appendix K), in all phases of the study. Students applied the "NOW" portion of the strategy to write a paragraph answering the prompt given. These prompts were expository, or informational, rather than goal paragraphs that were used during baseline and instructional conditions. Another high school Language Arts teacher (i.e., expert) examined the prompts to ensure they were of similar difficulty and familiarity. Each written product was delivered at the beginning of the lesson, collected immediately after the 10-min. writing time, and scored by the experimenter that same day using the 10-point scoring rubric.

**Maintenance of writing quality.** Each participant was asked to write paragraphs several weeks after completing the intervention. The first maintenance check was administered 1 school week after the last intervention lesson, and the second check was administered 4 school weeks after the last intervention lesson. The second maintenance check was a short answer portion of participants' final exam for English 10.

**Social validity measures.** Participants completed an experimenter-generated participant satisfaction survey (see Appendix N). This survey contained 8 questions that used a 5-point scale (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) for the participants to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement, with 2 opportunities for participants to explain their answers (i.e., Explain why you did/did not like using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy). Their responses on the survey were

used to measure several elements of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction: (a) if they liked the strategy and why; (b) how they understood the strategy; and (c) the importance of using the strategy in the future.

### **Experimental Design**

This study was a descriptive study using multiple probes across participants to assess the quality of participants' paragraph writing skills. There were four different conditions: baseline (i.e., no training), instructional (i.e., goal paragraph probes delivered throughout instruction), maintenance (i.e., goal paragraph prompts to respond to weeks following intervention), and generalization (i.e., expository paragraph probes delivered post-instruction). The qualitative analysis involved two high school English experts (i.e., secondary English teachers) reading and scoring 4 sets of permanent written products using a rubric. One expert is the experimenter and the other is a secondary Language Arts teacher at the same school. The second expert has been teaching Language Arts for 9 years. The experimenter trained her to apply the Ohio Common Core State Standards Informative Writing Rubric for the 9-10 grade band (see Appendix A) to a single paragraph by randomly selecting writing samples from other students in the class to score. The expert reached mastery when she and the experimenter agreed 90% of the time on the Common Core rubric. Each set of products contained participant written products from each experimental condition and was the writing of only one participant. The products in the set were randomized so they were not stacked in the sequence in which they were written. The products were all typed with all identifying markings (e.g., name, class period, date, etc.) removed from them so that only the participant's written passage was available to both experts.

## Procedures

**Pre-baseline.** Prior to collecting baseline data, all students in the experimenter’s classes received instruction in the contents of an academic goal (see Table 2). Specifically, they learned the purpose of setting goals, the meaning of present levels of performance and how they may be determined and possible writing skill areas to target in the goals and objectives section of their paragraphs. As part of the pre-intervention training, each participant identified up to 15 needs (see Appendix I) to address in formal writing. These needs later became the topics of participants’ goal paragraphs in subsequent phases of the study.

Table 2

### *Pre-Baseline Lesson Sequence Overview*

Lesson	Objective(s)	Activities
1	Students will be able to (a) describe class routine for writing unit, (b) define <i>goal</i> and state its purpose, (c) define <i>objective</i> and state its purpose, and (d) write a vision statement.	Teacher (a) describes class routine for writing unit and has students repeat routine, (b) helps students define <i>goal</i> and state its purpose, (c) helps students define <i>objective</i> and state its purpose, and (d) uses worksheet to help students write a vision statement for their lives after high school.
2	Students will be able to (a) define <i>present level of performance</i> , (b) identify academic and non-academic strengths, and (c) identify their needs.	Teacher (a) describes present level of performance and has students repeat definition, (b) explains each item on strengths worksheet and helps students select items they are good at doing, and (c) helps students select at least 13 items they need to work on using needs worksheet.
3	Students will be able to write the needs section of their present level of performance.	Students will identify additional needs not listed on previous needs worksheet and write down a minimum of 2, and transfer 15 needs onto a needs summary worksheet to be used in following lessons.

**Baseline.** During the training phase of the intervention, the experimenter used scripted lesson plans (see Appendices E and F) to deliver explicit instruction prior to introducing the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy. The experimenter also used guided notes and

worksheets (see Appendices G, H, and I) prior to implementing the intervention to help students understand the pre-requisite writing concepts necessary to be successful during intervention. Each day during baseline, students were prompted to write a goal paragraph addressing one of their needs identified during pre-baseline. A goal paragraph prompt (see Appendix J) was given over three consecutive days, with instructions to select a different goal from the previous day. Specifically, the experimenter instructed the students to, “Write a paragraph about one of your goals.” The experimenter scored the original participants’ paragraphs using the 12-point content scoring rubric on the same day each paragraph was written. When the class had a stable baseline based on the 12-point scoring rubric, the treatment intervention began. Prior to any grading of the writing, all identifying marks (e.g., student name, class time, etc.) were removed from the writing. Each participant’s writings sans identifiers were photocopied and placed in a separate large envelope containing only those writings by that participant. The experimenter typed participants’ writings with spelling errors corrected. At the end of the study, an expert scored each participant’s typed writings using the 10-point quality scoring rubric. All written products were scored using a 10-point quality scoring rubric (see Appendix L) or a 12-point content scoring rubric (see Appendix M). The 10-point scoring rubric was a qualitative measure of the writing indicators that was used to measure the content indicators given throughout the study (i.e., formative assessment), while the 12-point scoring rubric was used to score the written products at the end of the intervention (i.e., summative assessment).

**Instructional.** During the intervention phase, the experimenter used scripted lesson plans (see Appendix F) to deliver explicit instruction on the GO 4 IT...NOW!

strategy. Similar to the training phase, guided notes and worksheets (see Appendix H) were utilized to give participants practice with the strategy prior to using the strategy independently. Probes similar to the expository generalization prompts (see Appendix K) were implemented throughout this phase, which were graded instantly using a 10-point quality scoring rubric (see Appendix L) to assess students' implementation of the strategy before administering the generalization probes later in the instructional condition. Participants' permanent written products were collected throughout the intervention phase; however, these permanent written products were not scored until the end of the intervention phase. A 12-point quality scoring rubric (see Appendix M) was used to assess the participants' written products. GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction included 11 lessons, ranging from 30 min. to 45 min., that were delivered to the whole class by the experimenter. Table 1 shows an overview of the lesson sequence. All instruction took place in an inclusive general education classroom.

Each lesson followed a similar format, beginning with a review of previously learned concepts, a statement of the lesson objective(s), teacher input/modeling, student practice with feedback, and a summary of the day's lesson. Lessons encompassed all stages of the Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) model (Harris et al., 1998). The SRSD model "leads students through a recursive, six-stage process to learn to apply a writing strategy" (Konrad & Trela, 2007, p. 42). The stages are as follows: (1) Develop and activate prior background knowledge they will need in order to apply the strategy; (2) Introduce the strategy by describing its purpose and benefits to students; (3) Model the strategy with a "think aloud" process, which includes self-instructional statements; (4) Memorize the strategy so students commit the strategy steps or mnemonic to memory; (5)

Support strategy use by having students practice and apply the strategy with support from the teacher; and (6) Independent performance of the strategy is measured as students begin to use it independently and generalize skills to other writing tasks. The same scoring procedures used during baseline were used during intervention.

On each of the three consecutive days following the intervention, participants wrote a goal paragraph about a writing objective not yet addressed within 10 minutes. Students' paragraphs were scored by the experimenter two ways: (1) using the 10-point scoring rubric (see Appendix L) to assess the quality of paragraphs, and (2) using the 12-point scoring rubric (see Appendix M) to assess content of paragraphs.

**Maintenance.** Maintenance probes were administered at least one week after the last intervention session. Participants were instructed to choose any objective from their pre-instruction needs list that had not yet been addressed. Baseline procedures for scoring were used during this phase of the study.

**Generalization.** Generalization probes were administered consecutively over 3 days at the end of the instructional phase. Participants were instructed to respond to an expository prompt (i.e., Think about a career you would like to have when you finish school. Name that career and explain why you would like to have this career) using the same conditions as goal paragraph writing (i.e., 10 min. writing time). The 10-point scoring rubric (see Appendix L) was used to assess the content of the generalization probes.

### **Treatment Integrity**

A second observer observed at least 33% of the instructional sessions to account for implementation adherence to the pre-established treatment protocol. These

observations were distributed across the intervention, and procedural integrity data was collected in each instructional phase. In order to document adherence to the treatment protocol, the second observer used the corresponding lesson plan as a checklist (see Appendix D) during each observation. Each lesson plan was divided into segments, and the observer marked each segment as present (+) or not present (-). The number of present segments across all observed sessions was divided by the total number of segments and multiplied by 100 to convert it to a percentage.

### **Interrater Reliability**

To determine interrater reliability, a second scorer (i.e., Intervention Specialist) independently scored at least one third of participants' permanent products. An item-by-item analysis using the 10-point quality scoring rubric was used to determine reliability for the primary dependent variables. The number of agreements was divided by the total number of items and was multiplied by 100 to convert it to a percentage.

### **Content Validity**

Content validity of participants' paragraphs was determined by having a different general education English teacher (i.e., the expert) independently score a sample of 40 randomly selected goal paragraphs written across all conditions. The scorer was blinded to the purpose of the study and to the phase/conditions in which the paragraphs were written. All work samples were submitted without participant names to ensure confidentiality. The experimenter typewrote participants' paragraphs, with all spelling and punctuation errors corrected. Scoring was based on the Ohio Common Core State Standards Informative Writing Rubric for the 9-10 grade band (see Appendix A), which is out of 30 possible points. This rubric is designed to score essays; however, the English



teacher was asked to rate the single paragraphs as a full product (i.e., no points deducted because it was one paragraph instead of multiple paragraphs). The experimenter also scored the same 40 randomly selected goal paragraphs using the same rubric. The number of agreements on total points earned was divided by the total number of items scored and was multiplied by 100 to convert it to a percentage.

### **Social Validity**

Participants completed an experimenter-generated participant satisfaction survey (see Appendix N) at the end of the intervention. This survey contained 8 questions that used a 5-point scale (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) for the participants to indicate their attitude about the intervention with 2 opportunities for participants to explain their answers (i.e., Explain why you did/did not like using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy). The second observer administered the social validity assessment.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULTS

This chapter presents the results for the current examination beginning with interobserver agreement (IOA) and procedural integrity. Next, participants' outcomes for the primary dependent variables of writing quality and content of goal paragraphs are provided. These are followed by the presentation of outcomes of the secondary dependent variables that include generalization of writing skills to other writing opportunities along with participants' maintenance of writing quality. Moreover, the overall results by conditions are provided and are followed by social validity outcomes.

#### **Interobserver Agreement**

IOA was calculated using point-by-point agreement to determine the percent of agreement between observers during experimental conditions (i.e., baseline, instruction, generalization, and maintenance) for participants' writing. Table 3 shows mean IOA scores by participant in each condition. This investigation had a total of 19 intervention sessions in which one third of the data points by condition were randomly selected to IOA calculation (i.e., 20 randomized permanent written products were scored). The mean IOA across all conditions was 96.4%, ranging from 80% to 100%.

Table 3

*Mean IOA Scores by Participant and Condition*

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Quality</b>	<b>Probes / Generalization</b>	<b>Maintenance</b>
Karmen	100%	100%	100%	90%
Kelly	80%	-	-	-
Weston	-	100%	100%	-
Michael	100%	100%	90%	100%
Allison	90%	100%	90%	100%
Latisha	100%	-	-	100%

**Language Arts Expert IOA.** Participants' writings were measured after instruction, adopting the 30-point Ohio Common Core State Standards Informative Writing Rubric for the 9-10 grade band (see Appendix A). This 30-point rubric evaluated the (a) focus, (b) development, (c) audience, (d), cohesion, (e) language and style, and (f) conventions of participants' permanent written products across all conditions. The English teacher (i.e., the expert) independently scored a sample of 40 randomly selected goal paragraphs written across conditions using the 30-point rubric. This rubric is designed to score essays; however, the expert rated single paragraphs as a full product (i.e., no points deducted because it was one paragraph instead of multiple paragraphs). The experimenter also scored the same 40 goal paragraphs using the same rubric. The two experts' evaluations were assessed point by point to determine the IOA for each participant across all conditions. Table 4 shows mean IOA for each participant in each condition. The mean content validity across all conditions was 98.6%.

Table 4

*Expert IOA for Each Participant*

	Baseline	Intervention	Maintenance	Generalization
Karmen	91.6%	100%	100%	100%
Kelly	100%	100%	91.6%	100%
Weston	91.6%	100%	100%	100%
Michael	100%	100%	100%	100%
Allison	100%	91.6%	100%	100%
Latisha	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Procedural Integrity**

A second observer observed 36% of the instructional sessions, or for 7 sessions out of this study’s 19 sessions, to ensure implementation adherence to the pre-established treatment protocol. These observations were distributed across the intervention, and procedural integrity data was collected in each instructional phase. In order to document adherence to the treatment protocol, the second observer used a corresponding lesson plan as a checklist (see Appendix D). Each lesson plan was divided into segments, and the observer marked each segment as present (+) or not present (-). The number of present segments across all observed sessions was divided by the total number of segments and multiplied by 100 to convert it to a percentage. Procedural integrity was 100% across all experimental conditions.

**Participant Outcomes**

Participants’ writings were evaluated during baseline, instruction (content only), and maintenance using a 12-point content rubric (see Appendix M). The 12-point rubric is designed to assess content of students’ goal paragraphs, which includes (a) a topic

sentence stating the goal, (b) 4 objectives that are each a step towards reaching the goal, and (c) a concluding sentence that establishes a timeline no longer than one year.

Participants' writings during baseline, instruction (quality only), and generalization were assessed using a 10-point quality rubric (see Appendix L). The 10-point rubric was designed to assess quality of students' paragraphs, which includes (a) beginning with a topic sentence, (b) 4 supporting details that support the topic, (c) a concluding sentence that restates the topic, (d) information that is logically presented, (e) transition words used throughout the paragraph, and (f) having no extraneous information. Data obtained during the 12-point rubric is presented first followed by the data from the 10-point rubric.

**Karmen.** Table 5 shows Karmen's performance across all experimental conditions. Each box indicates the score for an individual writing sample during that condition (e.g., baseline, instructional, maintenance, and generalization). Karmen's baseline responding was stable, ranging from 2 to 3 points with a mean score of 2.7 based on the 12-point content rubric. During the instructional condition, the content of Karmen's writings was also assessed using the 12-point scoring rubric. She attained 11.3 as her mean score of correct responding, which ranged from 10 to 12. Her mean score of correct responding during the maintenance condition using the 12-point rubric was 11 and ranged from 10 to 12.

Karmen's writing during baseline, instructional, and generalization conditions was also assessed using the 10-point rubric to assess quality of writing. Her baseline responding was stable, scoring 3 points on all baseline writings. Her rubric score during instruction was 9.3 with a range from 8 to 10. The final two probes were generalization

measures, assessing participants' use of the strategy to respond to an expository prompt instead of a goal-related prompt. These paragraphs were also scored using the 10-point quality scoring rubric. Karmen scored 9 points on both generalization writings.

Table 5

*Karmen's Performance across Writing Content – 12-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Maintenance
3	12	10
3	10	10
2	12	12

*Karmen's Performance across Writing Quality – 10-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Generalization
3	10	9
3	8	9
3	10	-

**Kelly.** Table 6 shows Kelly's performance across all experimental conditions. Each box indicates the score for an individual writing sample during that condition (e.g., baseline, instructional, maintenance, and generalization). Kelly's baseline responding was stable, ranging from 2 to 3 points with a mean score of 2.3 based on the 12-point content rubric. During the instructional condition, the content of Latisha's writings was also assessed using the 12-point scoring rubric. She attained 8.3 as her mean score of correct responding, with a range from 2 to 12 with a decreasing trend. Her mean score of correct responding during the maintenance condition using the 12-point rubric was 12 with all responses earning the full 12 points.

Kelly's writing during baseline, instructional, and generalization conditions was also assessed using the 10-point rubric to assess quality of writing. Her mean rubric score

during baseline was 3, with a range from 2 to 4. Her mean rubric score during instruction was 8.3, ranging from 5 to 10. The final two probes were generalization measures, assessing participants' use of the strategy to respond to an expository prompt instead of a goal-related prompt. These paragraphs were also scored using the 10-point quality scoring rubric. The mean score of correct responding was 7.5 with a range of 5 to 10 on a decreasing trend.

Table 6

*Kelly's Performance across Writing Content – 12-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Maintenance
2	11	12
3	2	12
2	12	-

*Kelly's Performance across Writing Quality – 10-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Generalization
3	10	10
4	5	5
2	10	-

**Weston.** Table 7 shows Weston's performance across all experimental conditions. Each box indicates the score for an individual writing sample during that condition (e.g., baseline, instructional, maintenance, and generalization). Weston's baseline responding was stable, ranging from 1 to 3 points with a mean score of 1.6 based on the 12-point content rubric. During the instructional condition, the content of Weston's writings was also assessed using the 12-point scoring rubric. He attained 12 as his mean score of correct responding, with all responses earning the full 12 points. His mean score of

correct responding during the maintenance condition using the 12-point rubric was 12, with all responses earning the full 12 points.

Weston’s writing during baseline, instructional, and generalization conditions was also assessed using the 10-point rubric to assess quality of writing. His baseline responding was stable, scoring 3 points on all baseline writing opportunities. His mean rubric score during instruction was 10 with all responses earning the full 10 points. The final two probes were generalization measures, assessing participants’ use of the strategy to respond to an expository prompt instead of a goal-related prompt. These paragraphs were also scored using the 10-point quality scoring rubric. The mean score of correct responding was 9.5 with a range of 9 to 10.

Table 7

*Weston’s Performance across Writing Content – 12-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Maintenance
1	12	12
3	12	12
1	12	-

*Weston’s Performance across Writing Quality – 10-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Generalization
3	10	9
3	10	10
3	10	-

**Michael.** Table 8 shows Michael’s performance across all experimental conditions. Each box indicates the score for an individual writing sample during that condition (e.g., baseline, instructional, maintenance, and generalization). Michael’s baseline responding was stable, ranging from 2 to 3 points with a mean score of 2.3 based



on the 12-point content scoring rubric. During the instructional condition, the content of Michael’s writings was also assessed using the 12-point scoring rubric. He attained 10 as his mean score of correct responding, with a range of 6 to 12. His mean score of correct responding during the maintenance condition using the 12-point rubric was 11, with all responses earning 11 points.

Michael’s writing during instruction was also assessed using the 10-point rubric to assess quality of writing. His mean rubric score during baseline was 3.6, ranging from 3 to 4. His mean rubric score during instruction was 9 with a range of 7 to 10. The final two probes were generalization measures, assessing participants’ use of the strategy to respond to an expository prompt instead of a goal-related prompt. These paragraphs were also scored using the 10-point quality scoring rubric. The mean score of correct responding was 7 with a range of 6 to 8 on a decreasing trend.

Table 8

*Michael’s Performance across Writing Content – 12-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Maintenance
2	6	11
3	12	11
2	12	-

*Michael’s Performance across Writing Quality – 10-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Generalization
4	7	8
4	10	6
3	10	-

**Allison.** Table 9 shows Allison’s performance across all experimental conditions. Each box indicates the score for an individual writing sample during that condition (e.g.,

baseline, instructional, maintenance, and generalization). Allison showed moderate variability during baseline responding, ranging from 2 to 6 points with a mean score of 4 based on the 12-point content scoring rubric. During the instructional condition, the content of Allison’s writings was also assessed using the 12-point scoring rubric. She attained 11 as her mean score of correct responding, with a range from 10 to 12. Her mean score of correct responding during the maintenance condition using the 12-point rubric was 11.5 and ranged from 11 to 12.

Allison’s writing during baseline, instructional, and generalization conditions were also assessed using the 10-point rubric to assess quality of writing. Her mean rubric score during baseline was 8, with a range of 7 to 9. Her mean rubric score during instruction was 10, with all responses earning the full 10 points. The final two probes were generalization measures, assessing participants’ use of the strategy to respond to an expository prompt instead of a goal-related prompt. These paragraphs were also scored using the 10-point quality scoring rubric. The mean score of correct responding was 9.5, ranging from 9 to 10.

Table 9

*Allison’s Performance across Writing Content – 12-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Maintenance
2	12	12
6	10	11
4	11	-

*Allison’s Performance across Writing Quality – 10-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Generalization
7	10	10
9	10	9
8	10	-

**Latisha.** Table 10 shows Latisha's performance across all experimental conditions. Each box indicates the score for an individual writing sample during that condition (e.g., baseline, instructional, maintenance, and generalization). Latisha's baseline responding was stable, ranging from 0 to 2 points with a mean score of 1.3 based on the 12-point content rubric. During the instructional condition, the content of Latisha's writings was also assessed using the 12-point scoring rubric. She attained 11 as her mean score of correct responding, with a range from 10 to 12 with a decreasing trend. Her mean score of correct responding during the maintenance condition using the 12-point rubric was 11 and ranged from 10 to 12.

Latisha's writing during baseline, instructional, and generalization conditions was also assessed using the 10-point rubric to assess quality of writing. Her mean rubric score during baseline was 4.6, ranging from 0 to 7. She did not attempt to write a paragraph during the first baseline writing opportunity. Her mean rubric score during instruction was 10, with all responses earning the full 10 points. The final two probes were generalization measures, assessing participants' use of the strategy to respond to an expository prompt instead of a goal-related prompt. These paragraphs were also scored using the 10-point quality scoring rubric. The mean score of correct responding was 9; she was only present to complete one out of two generalization measures.

Table 10

*Latisha's Performance across Writing Content – 12-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Maintenance
0	12	12
2	11	10
2	10	-

*Latisha's Performance across Writing Quality – 10-Point Rubric*

Baseline	Instruction	Generalization
0	10	-
7	10	9
7	10	-

**Participants' Overall Outcomes**

**12-Point Rubric.** The mean score of target participants' (i.e., Karmen, Kelly, Weston, and Michael) responding during baseline conditions was 2.25, with a range of 1 to 3 and a mode of 2 and 3. The mean score of target participants' responding in the instructional condition (i.e., content) was 10.4, with a range of 2 to 12 and a mode of 12. The mean score of target participants' responding in the maintenance condition was 11.3, with a range of 10 to 12 and a mode of 12.

The mean score of typical peers' (i.e., Allison and Latisha) responding during baseline conditions was 2.6, with a range of 0 to 6 and a mode of 2. The mean score of participants' responding in the instructional condition (i.e., content) was 11, with a range of 10 to 12 and a mode of 10, 11, and 12.

The mean score of all participants' responding during baseline conditions was 2.3, with a range of 0 to 6 and a mode of 2. The mean score of all participants' responding in the instructional condition (i.e., content) was 10.6, with a range of 2 to 12 and a mode of

12. The mean score of all participants' responding in the maintenance condition was 11.4, with a range of 10 to 12 and a mode of 12. The difference from baseline to maintenance was 9.1.

**10-Point Rubric.** The mean score of target participants' (i.e., Karmen, Kelly, Weston, and Michael) during baseline conditions was 3.1, with a range of 2 to 4 and a mode of 3. The mean score of target participants' responding in the instructional condition was 9.1, ranging from 5 to 10 with a mode of 10. The mean score of target participants' responding in the generalization condition was 8.25, with a range of 5 to 10 and a mode of 9.

The mean score of typical peers' (i.e., Allison and Latisha) responding during baseline conditions was 6.3, with a range of 0 to 7 and a mode of 7. The mean score of typical peers' responding in the instructional condition (i.e., quality) was 10, with no range and a mode of 10. The mean score of typical peers' responding during the generalization condition was 9.6, with a range of 9 to 10 and a mode of 9.

The mean score of all participants' responding during baseline conditions was 4.2, with a range of 0 to 7 and a mode of 3. The mean score of all participants' responding in the instructional condition (i.e., quality) was 9.4, ranging from 5 to 10 with a mode of 10. The mean score of all participants' responding during the generalization condition was 8.5, with a range of 5 to 10 and a mode of 9.

### **Expert Assessment Writing Rubric**

Expert data was measured during instruction, adopting the 30-point Ohio Common Core State Standards Informative Writing Rubric for the 9-10 grade band (see Appendix A). This 30-point rubric evaluated the (a) focus, (b) development, (c) audience,

(d), cohesion, (e) language and style, and (f) conventions of participants' permanent written products across all conditions. The English teacher (i.e., the expert second observer) independently scored a sample of 40 randomly selected goal paragraphs written before and after strategy intervention using the 30-point rubric. This rubric is designed to score essays; however, the expert second observer rated single paragraphs as a full product (i.e., no points deducted because it was one paragraph instead of multiple paragraphs). The experimenter also scored the same 40 goal paragraphs using the same rubric.

Table 11 shows the scores given by the expert based on the 30-point rubric. During baseline, scores ranged from 8 to 15, with a mean score of 11. During the instructional condition when writing quality and content of goal paragraphs were measured, the mean score was 29.2, ranging from 27 to 30. The mean score of the maintenance condition was 29, with a range of 26 to 30. During the generalization condition, the mean score was 28.6, ranging from 27 to 30. All participants improved their paragraph writing skills when compared to baseline scores.

Table 11

*Ohio Common Core Rubric Scores for Each Participant*

	Baseline	Instructional (Quality and Content)	Maintenance	Generalization
Karmen	11	30	26	27
	8*	30	30	29
Kelly	13	27	28*	28
		30	29	29
Weston	14	30	29	30
	9*	30	30	30
Michael	14	29	28	28
			30	
Allison	11	27*	30	27
				30
Latisha	8	29	30	27
	15	30		30

*Scores are those recorded by the experimenter.*

*\*Scores that the expert scorer and experimenter did not agree upon*

**Social Validity**

Participants were administered a survey with questions assessing their attitude about the intervention as well as their attitudes toward the usability of the strategy to enhance their writing skills (see Appendix N). The survey was administered after the last maintenance data point was collected in the same classrooms where the strategy was implemented. The second observer administered the survey in the absence of the experimenter to prevent coercion and constrain. This instrument used to assess participants' social validation of intervention contained eight questions that used a 5-point scale (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree). Participants indicated their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement, and were given two opportunities to explain their answers (i.e., Explain why you did/did not like using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy).

**Participants' Attitudes.** Karmen, Allison, and Latisha scored all areas of the intervention as a 5. Karmen reported she liked to use the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy because it finally helped her “understand how to write a better paragraph.” She also enjoyed setting goals for herself and being able to express those goals through this intervention. Likewise, Allison indicated that she liked using the strategy because it allowed her to “organize [her] thoughts in a logical order” and gives students “the chance to write consistent paragraphs.” Latisha’s survey was also similar in that she reported the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy helped her write better, it was easy to follow lessons and directions, and it was “easy and quick to use in all [her] classes, not just this one.”

Similarly, Weston scored all areas as a 5. The only exception was his likability of using the strategy, which he scored a 3 (neutral), and the strategy helping him write better paragraphs, which he scored a 4 (agree). He said using the strategy “would take too long”; however, it is unclear if he was referring to the length of the intervention itself or the process of using the strategy. He indicated that the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy should be used for future classes because “it helps people right [sic],” and he was pleased with the positive progress shown by his data at the end of the study.

Interestingly, Michael scored all areas as a 5 as well, with the exception of liking to use the strategy, which he scored a 2 for disagree. He wrote that he “did not like having to use this strategy on probes because it was hard to come up with what to write about.” He was pleased with the overall increase in his paragraph writing skills because he has “never been a good writer.”

Kelly scored all areas of the intervention a 5, with the exception of liking the small-group activities involved with the study, which she rated a 1 (strongly disagree).



She reported to not enjoy group work, especially when it involved students she does not know well. Otherwise, she said she liked using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy because “it helped a lot better with outlining [her] paragraphs before writing a final version” and it should be used in future classes because “it could help so many students just like [her].”

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to measure the effects of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction in an inclusive secondary Language Arts classroom. This chapter presents a discussion of the research questions, limitations, directions for future research, and implications for practitioners.

Six 10<sup>th</sup> grade Language Arts high-school students, three students from two different inclusive classrooms, in a secondary suburban school participated in this investigation. Four participants were female and two were male, all ranging from age 15 to 17 years old. Two of the participants, Karmen and Kelly, have IEPs – one of which has a goal in the area of written expression and one that has math and social/emotional goals, respectively. Two participants, Weston and Michael, were identified as students with academic risk (i.e., typical students with poor writing skills), which were determined by pre-baseline writing probes and progress monitoring data throughout the year in an English 10 classroom. The other two participants, Allison and Latisha, were typically developing and performing peers that were selected as typical peers; particularly, academic progress led to the selection of one high performing student, Allison, (i.e., a student who consistently earned A's and high B's in English 10), and the other

typical peer was an average performing student, Latisha, (i.e., a student who consistently earned mostly C's in English 10). The experimenter is the classroom teacher in the English 10 classroom used in this investigation. She implemented the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction with the entire class during regular class time. However, data was collected on the target participants as well as a random sample of writing from two typical peers.

**Does GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction lead to improved goal paragraphs, as measured by students' scores on a paragraph content scoring rubric and a paragraph quality scoring rubric?**

Overall, all students' goal paragraphs improved as a result of using GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction using both a content scoring rubric (i.e., 12-point) and a quality scoring rubric (i.e., 10-point). This result is comparable to other studies. In particular, two other studies – one that examined the effects of Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) strategy for planning and writing essays for students with LD (Sexton, Harris, & Graham, 1998) and another that evaluated the effectiveness of strategy instruction in persuasive quick writing with seventh- and eighth-grade students with severe emotional and behavioral disabilities (Mason, Kubina, Valasa, & Mong Cramer, 2010) – found similar writing gains when using a SRSD intervention. In the study conducted by Sexton et al., researchers found that the quality of participants' written products was very poor prior to intervention. They lacked the basic structure of an effective paragraph (e.g., topic sentence, multiple supporting details/reasons, a concluding sentence). Following intervention, instruction changed both how and what students wrote. All post-instruction essays became longer, the number of reasons

supporting the topic increased to an average of three, their writing was coherently and logically ordered, and the overall quality improved. In the study conducted by Mason et al., researchers found similar results when using Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD), which is the same format as GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction, in that all participants' improved the content of their written products. Not only did all the participants demonstrate improvement with the implementation of the intervention but the effect of the intervention was also maintained over time. All six participants in the current study had low baseline scores on the 12-point rubric. The results found after intervention support results found in previous studies. That is, participants demonstrated significant improvement in the content of their written products. Four of the six participants in the current study also had low baseline scores on the 10-point rubric, and participants also demonstrated significant improvement in the quality of their written products. Furthermore, most participants maintained these paragraph-writing skills over time and generalized the skills to different writing tasks. Therefore, GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction adds another method of explicit writing instruction that shows positive outcomes on student writing performance.

Specifically related to this GO 4 IT...NOW! investigation, the 12-point content scoring rubric was used to assess the written products from the instructional condition. Participants' written products demonstrated excellent improvement in the content of most participants' responding when compared to baseline. The mean score of all participants' responding was 10.6 out of 12 total points on the paragraph content scoring rubric (see Appendix H), with a range of 2 to 12 and a mode of 12. Karmen, Weston, Allison, and Latisha immediately earned all 12 points on this paragraph content scoring rubric. Using

this same 12-point scoring rubric, Weston and Michael showed stability and a steady upward trend when compared to baseline. Similar to her performance on the 12-point scoring rubric (i.e., quality), Karmen showed slight variability on the second writing sample, earning 10 out of 12 points, but went back to earning all 12 possible points on the third and final paragraph after also earning all 12 points on the first paragraph. Allison also showed slight variability; she earned 12 points, 10 points, and 11 points, respectively. If time had permitted, the experimenter would have administered an additional prompt in the instructional condition to better assess the trend in the content of her paragraphs. Kelly showed high variability in her permanent written products; her first sample earned 11 out of 12 points, the second earned 2 out of 12 points, and the third earned all 12 points. Latisha's performance was on a decreasing trend, beginning at 12 points earned and losing one point for the second paragraph and one more point for the third paragraph. If time had permitted, the experimenter would have administered an additional prompt in the maintenance condition to better assess the trend in the content of Kelly and Latisha's paragraphs.

When using the 10-point quality scoring rubric to assess the same written products from the instructional condition, participants' written products demonstrated excellent improvement in the quality of most participants' responding when compared to baseline. The overall mean was 9.4 out of 10 total points on the paragraph quality scoring rubric (see Appendix L), with a range of 5 and a mode of 10. During baseline conditions, the target participants (i.e., Karmen, Kelly, Weston, and Michael) scored relatively low, with a range from 2 to 4, on the 10-point rubric. They consistently wrote topic sentences well but did not consistently include 4 details that supported their topic. The typical

peers, Allison and Latisha, scored high during baseline conditions, ranging from 7 to 9 with one outlier during Latisha's first baseline writing opportunity, as she did not attempt to write a paragraph during the allotted timeframe. During the instructional condition, Weston, Allison, and Latisha immediately earned all 10 points on their paragraphs based on the same quality scoring rubric and continued to earn 10 points through this condition. When using this same quality scoring rubric to analyze participants' paragraphs, the performances of Weston, Allison, Michael, and Latisha showed stability and a steady upward trend when compared to baseline. Both Karmen's and Kelly's performances show variability on their second writing samples, scoring 8 out of 10 and 5 out of 10, respectively, when compared to their first and third writing samples where both earned the full 10 points on the quality rubric. Karmen and Kelly are the two participants with a disability diagnosis. They were able to achieve a score of 10 but did so less quickly than the peers with academic risk and the typical peers. All participants ended the instructional condition earning all 10 points on the paragraph quality scoring rubric. This indicates that this explicit instruction can benefit all students but that some may develop skills more quickly than others.

Additionally, the results of the expert evaluation using the 30-point rubric (see Appendix A) also demonstrated a robust positive response to the intervention. All six of the participants showed gains in the quality and content of their writings based on the 30-point writing rubric designed to meet the Ohio Common Core Writing standards. The second expert did not know the sequence or the experimental condition under which the paragraphs were written. After the experimenter scored the same writings following the expert's analysis, the data indicated that the expert's scores were more conservative (i.e.,

slightly higher) on the products in which the scores were not identical. The experimenter scored the area of Development lower than the expert did on all four disagreements (see Table 11) by a range of 1 to 2 points. Yet, the scoring showed a clear improvement of the student writings in both content and quality after intervention using the data from both the expert and the experimenter.

The participants with IEPs, Karmen (e.g., SLD, with goal in area of written expression) and Kelly (e.g., math and social/emotional goals), made clinically significant gains but at different rates. Karmen, for example, made immediate gains in both quality and content of her paragraphs, and she sustained these gains across instructional conditions. Her gains were large in comparison to baseline conditions. The first two writing products in this condition earned 3 points out of the possible 12 and the final earned 2 points out of 12 on the 12-point content scoring rubric. On the 10-point quality scoring rubric, she earned 3 points out of the possible 10 on all three writing opportunities. Kelly, on the other hand, made an immediate gain in both content and quality but did not maintain these gains for her second written product; instead, her scores dropped to 4 points out of 10 during baseline and 5 points out of 10 during instruction. Her third and final probe during baseline fell to 2 points out of the possible 10, while her third and final probe during instruction rose to earn all 10 quality points. This variation in Kelly's results might be attributed to her diagnosis in that she had a social/emotional-related problem the day in which this probe was administered. This meant she had to make up this probe the following day, which could have been influenced by a number of factors, such as the events of the previous day, the time of day of her class period (i.e., the last period of the day), or her diagnosis. The fact that Karmen

quickly learned and maintained the writing skills and Kelly's performance was more variable indicates that teachers should closely monitor students' performances, allowing the data to guide instructional decisions rather than labels.

The participants with academic risk, Weston and Michael, demonstrated similar gains to that of Karmen and Kelly in which Weston made immediate gains while Michael did not. Weston scored perfectly across the instructional condition, which was a striking difference from his baseline responding on the 12-point rubric – 1, 3, 1, respectively – and on the 10-point rubric – all 3's. During the instructional condition, Michael's progress occurred at a slower rate in both areas of content and quality. For example, when assessing content using the 12-point scoring rubric, he earned 6 out of 12 possible points on his first written product; however, he earned all 12 points on the following two written products. When assessing writing quality using the 10-point scoring rubric, his score was similar in that he earned 7 out of 10 possible points on the first written product but earned all 10 on the following two written products. Even though Michael's progress was not immediately clear like Weston's and occurred at a slower rate than Weston's, both participants demonstrated significant increases during the instructional condition when compared to baseline responding.

The typical peers, Allison (e.g., high-performing student) and Latisha, (e.g., average-performing student), followed a similar pattern of the four previous participants. Allison, for example, showed immediate gains that ranged from 10 to 12 on the 12-point scoring rubric, with an initial writing content score of 12, while her writing quality as assessed by the 10-point rubric earned 10 points across all three opportunities. Her content baseline responding (i.e., 12-point scoring guide) was slightly higher than other



participants', scoring 2, 6, and 4 respectively, but her scores in the instructional condition demonstrate the significant and consistent gains she made when compared to baseline. Her quality baseline responding (i.e., 10-point scoring rubric) was very high, scoring 7, 9, and 8, respectively, and her scores in the instructional condition rose to 10 for all three writing opportunities. Even with high baseline responding, she made small gains and earned all points on the 10-point quality scoring rubric. Latisha's responding was slightly different. Her first baseline response using both the 12-point and 10-point scoring rubrics earned 0 points because she did not write anything during the 10-min. timeframe, so there was nothing to score. When measuring content with the 12-point scoring rubric during baseline, she scored 0, 2, 2, respectively. When measuring quality with the 10-point scoring rubric during baseline, she scored 0, 7, 7, respectively. With the exception of the first written product, Latisha's paragraphs scored much higher in quality than that of content, and this trend continued into the instructional phase when she earned all 10 points on all three probes during the instructional condition. Although her written products scored perfectly for writing quality using the 10-point rubric, her writing content (e.g. 12-point rubric) showed a downward trend starting at 12 and decreasing to 10. While she still made significant content gains during the instructional condition when compared to the baseline condition (e.g. 0, 2, 2 respectively), her content scores decreased rather than increased like the other participants.

Overall, all participants made significant gains, with 3 participants (Karmen, Weston, and Allison) demonstrating immediate and sustained improvement, while the other three (Kelly, Michael, and Latisha) demonstrated gains at a slower rate that were not always sustained throughout the instructional condition. Overall, these gains amongst

all participants are consistent with findings by Konrad and Test (2006, 2007); when given instructional sessions on how to write paragraphs based on goals and objectives, students were able to improve their ability to write six-sentence paragraphs about potential goals.

Four of the six participants ended the instructional condition earning all 12 points on the content rubric. The other two participants' paragraphs earned at least a 10, which computes to 83.3% when converted to a percentage. All six participants ended the instructional condition earning all 10 points on the quality rubric, with only 3 out of 18 total writing opportunities across participants scoring less than 10 points. When measuring quality and content of goal paragraphs using scoring rubrics, all participants demonstrated improved goal paragraphs when using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy by the end of the instructional condition. For example, below is an example of Weston's baseline responding:

Being able to spell words well is good because it shows employers that you are good at writing and spelling words. This also can affect any email or letter to a company asking for an interview or doing research on it. Not being able to spell words can mess up your job because if you don't know how to spell a word people could mess up the order or what part they need. If someone can't read the instructions clearly and mess up the order that could come back at you and people will not want you to write anything for them to read. Not being able to spell words correctly can really hurt you when it comes to the type of job you have.

This was Weston's very first response. Using the 12-point content rubric, he earned 1 point out of a possible 2 for showing an attempt to state a goal based on a need identified

in the statement of present level of performance. All other categories on the 12-point scoring rubric earned a 0, resulting in an overall score of 1 out of 12. On the 10-point quality scoring guide, he earned 1 point out of a possible 2 for attempting to write a topic sentence and 1 point for one out of four supporting details (e.g., the second sentence of the paragraph) being related to the topic. All other categories of the 10-point scoring rubric earned a 0, resulting in a score of 3 out of 10. By the end of the instructional condition, however, Weston was composing written products that scored perfectly both on the 12-point content scoring rubric and the 10-point quality scoring rubric, as seen below:

I will be able to listen to what teachers say within one year by following the steps below. First, I will put all my papers away. Second, I will not sit by any friends or distractions. Next, I will put my phone and ear buds away so I don't use them. Finally, I will sit close to the teacher so I can hear better and so I can ask questions if I need help. I will be able to complete my goal of listening to what teachers say by the end of the year by following the steps above.

Using the appropriate scoring rubrics to assess quality and content, Weston's writing improved significantly when comparing a baseline sample to an instructional sample. Using the instructional condition sample, he has a clear topic sentence that lists his goal, he has four objectives that are observable and measurable, and a concluding sentence that restates the goal and includes a timeline that does not exceed one year. Additionally, his writing is logically presented, uses transition words throughout, and does not include any

extraneous information. This comparison demonstrates a clear improvement between baseline and instructional conditions in both content and quality.

Another example of improvement is the difference in Karmen's writing samples. Below is an example of baseline responding:

Writing better is one of my biggest goals. I want to be able to read my own handwriting. I want to write an essay and actually have the teacher be able to read what I wrote. It's not good not being able to read your own handwriting. Almost everything involves writing or reading, and you can't go on in life not being able to do any of those things.

This was Karmen's second baseline response, earning a total 3 points out of a possible 12 on the 12-point content scoring rubric. She earned 2 points for a clear topic sentence that states her goal and 1 point for the first supporting detail supporting the topic, although she arguably misinterpreted what writing better meant here. Regardless, her first supporting detail technically supports the topic sentence, while the following sentences do not. She does not include a conclusion sentence, which results in a 0, with a total score of 3 on the 12-point scoring rubric. When using the 10-point quality scoring rubric to score the same paragraph, she earned 2 points for writing a clear topic sentence and 1 point for the third sentence. All other areas of the rubric earned a 0, earning a total of 3 points out of a 10 possible points. By the end of the instructional condition, however, she was producing paragraphs similar to the one below:

I will research at least three colleges I want to attend. First, I will find out what major I want to by making a list of what interests me. Second, I will research colleges with those majors and make a list of them. Third, I will

narrow down my college choices to three and circle the three I am most interested in. Fourth, I will take a campus tour and find out which college best fits my needs. My goal is to research at least three colleges by the end of my senior year next year by doing these steps.

This written product earned full points on both quality and content scoring rubrics. She has a clear topic sentence that indicates her goal, all supporting details relate to the topic, there are transition words used to move between ideas, there is a conclusion sentence that restates the topic and indicates a timeline no longer than one year, and there is no extraneous information. Like Weston's, this comparison demonstrates a clear improvement between baseline and instructional conditions. All other participants, with the exception of the few outlier performances, produced samples similar to the ones above. The GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy proved to be effective in improving the students' ability to write paragraphs that aligned with the district and state standards in both areas of content and quality.

**Does the overall quality of students' paragraph writing generalize as the result of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction?**

All six participants demonstrated generalization of the improved writing skills based on the expert assessments using the 30-point rubric (see Appendix A). The participants also demonstrated generalization of writing skills on the 12-point content rubric. These two sets of data provide evidence that after instruction in the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy, participants were able to write high quality paragraphs without instructional prompts. The ability of the participants to demonstrate generality of writing skills enhances the effectiveness of this strategy. Teachers must use their instructional

time efficiently and utilize instructional strategies that promote generalization of skills by students, which are more beneficial.

Four of the six participants' writings showed excellent quality during untrained opportunities following instruction in the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy when analyzing their permanent written products using the 10-point scoring rubric (see Appendix L). The mean score of all participants' responding was 8.5 out of 10 total points, with a range of 5 to 10 and a mode of 9. The probes in this condition were administered during the instructional condition at the beginning of a class session. Participants wrote a generalization paragraph to later be scored with the 10-point scoring rubric, which was immediately followed by them writing a goal paragraph that would later be scored with both the 10-point and 12-point scoring rubrics. In this condition, participants were instructed to respond to an expository prompt (i.e., Think about a career you would like to have when you finish school. Name that career and explain why you would like to have this career) using the same conditions as goal paragraph writing (i.e., 10-min. writing time).

Correct responding in the generalization condition was consistently high for Karmen, Weston, Allison, and Latisha with no variability in their responding, which ranged from 9 to 10 out of 10 possible points for both generalization probes. On the other hand, Michael and Kelly showed a decreasing trend with high variability in this condition. Michael's responding for the first probe earned 8 out of 10 total points, which was an increase when compared to the instructional written products he produced both during baseline and during the instructional condition (e.g., the paragraph produced immediately following the generalization probe). His responding for the second probe

decreased to 6 points, which was significantly lower than his score on the instructional goal paragraphs; he earned full points on the quality and content rubrics which were written directly after this generalization probe. Similar to Michael's responding, Kelly also showed a decreasing trend; however, she began this condition with a response earning all 10 points on the scoring rubric. Her second written product earned 5 total points, showing a significant decrease from the first probe. When compared to the instructional samples she wrote directly after this second generalization probe, however, the results were consistently low for all three samples (which differs from Michael's responding). The second generalization probe was the last short response question on participants' final exam. It is possible that Michael and Kelly were either running out of time, leading to a rushed written response, or they were mentally exhausted after completing the rest of the final exam first. Had the school year not ended, the experimenter would have administered another generalization probe to better assess the trend in their performances. In the future, Michael and Kelly may need more explicit training in order to generalize their paragraph writing skills to untrained opportunities.

When compared to previous literature, generalization findings were limited mostly due to the absence of a generalization condition. However, there were a couple studies that can be used for comparison. One study that was most striking was one conducted by Sexton, Harris, and Graham (1998) in which they examined the effects of SRSD strategy for planning and writing essays with middle school students with LD. Two of the six participants were notably successful in generalizing the skills used during intervention to write their own essay following intervention, which is much lower than the generalization results of the participants using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy. Another

study conducted by Konrad, Trela, and Test (2006) found that all four participants were able to generalize the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy to daily generalization paragraphs when assessed by the 10-point scoring rubric. During the maintenance checks, which occurred at different times due to the experimental design, the first participant had a generalization mean of 7.33, the second had a generalization mean of 9.8, the third had a generalization mean of 7.33, and the fourth did not have any generalization data due to the constraints of the school calendar. To compare, Karmen had a generalization mean of 9, Kelly had a generalization mean of 7.5, Weston had a generalization mean of 9.5, Michael had a generalization mean of 7, Allison had a generalization mean of 9.5, and Latisha had a generalization mean of 9. The students in the current investigation had a higher rate of generalizing their paragraph-writing skills to untrained opportunities; however, Konrad, Trela, and Test administered daily generalization probes, whereas the current investigation administered two probes, weeks apart, at the end of the study. Even with the differences between the studies, all participants were able to generalize the skills to untrained opportunities with at least 70% accuracy. Using a typical public school grading scale, participants in both studies were scoring at least in the average range, whereas they were scoring in the below average or failing range prior to intervention.

**Does GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction sustain improvement of paragraph writing skills over time?**

Overall, all participants sustained improvement of paragraph writing skills over time after receiving and practicing GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction. The permanent written products were scored using the 12-point content rubric (see Appendix M), with the first maintenance check occurring one week after the last intervention session; the



second occurred four weeks after the last intervention session and was a short answer question on the participants' final exam for their English 10 course. The mean score of all participants' responding was 11.4, with a range of 10 to 12 and a mode of 12.

All participants' responses ranged from 10 to 12. Weston and Kelly earned 12 points on both maintenance probes, with Weston's mean baseline score of 1.6 and Kelly's mean baseline score of 2.3. Michael earned 11 on both maintenance probes after a mean baseline score of 2.3. Karmen's first response in this condition earned 10 points but increased to 12 points on the second probe, demonstrating an increasing trend. Two participants' responses demonstrated a slight decreasing trend: Allison's first response earned 12 points but decreased to 11 points on the second probe, while Latisha's first response earned 12 points but decreased to 10 points on the second probe. Although both participants' responses remained significantly higher than baseline and were consistent with their performance in the instructional condition, the experimenter would have preferred to administer an additional maintenance probe to better assess the trend in their maintenance data; however, the school year ended before this could happen. Even with the small decrease in two participants' data, all participants demonstrated maintenance of the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy when compared to baseline and instructional responding.

Universally, participants improved many skills during this study. One of the first improvements was including a clear topic sentence at the start of their paragraphs. Prior to intervention, participants attempted to write a topic sentence but it wasn't always coherent and clear. For example, one of Kelly's baseline responses began as follows: "Keeping an organized book bag and notebook." While she did select a clear goal, she did not write a complete sentence or indicate that this was a goal. By the end of the

instructional condition, her paragraphs began similarly to the topic sentence that follows: “My goal is to be able to name multiplication facts quickly.” From this topic sentence, she communicated what the specific goal was and communicated it in a complete sentence. Another skill participants’ improved upon was generating four clear supporting details that related to and supported the topic sentence. This skill was not acquired as easily as writing topic sentences; however, with copious amounts of practice, revisions, and teacher feedback, most participants were able to successfully communicate four clear supporting details by the end of the study. For example, when writing a goal paragraph about learning how to fill out a résumé during baseline, Latisha’s details were as follows:

It is very important on getting a job while in college so that you can have money toward your college funds. Also so that if college doesn’t work out then I could still have an income to at least pay bills or anything. Also it helps your job that you’re interviewing for, what your previous experiences were, how you handle situations. If you just quit and not give a notice, it lets them know if you qualify or are responsible enough to handle a job like that.

These supporting details discuss why a résumé is important to have, but it does not provide supports for how she’s going to learn how to fill out a résumé. Some of the sentences are incoherent, the paragraph lacks transitions words to help readers follow the sequence of ideas, and many of the ideas are irrelevant. By the end of the study, Latisha was producing supporting details that related to her topic sentence. When writing a goal paragraph about keeping an organized book bag and notebook, for example, her details were as follows:

First, I will buy a planner/organizer. Next, I will write down my homework and reminders each day. Then, I will have each teacher initial next to each subject at the end of every class at least 3 times a week. Finally, I will keep track of all papers by getting a folder for each class and labeling them so I know what each one is for.

These supporting details are much more specific; they support the topic, they are observable and measurable, and they are sequenced using logical transition words. The addition of relevant supporting details made Latisha's paragraph more coherent and demonstrate a clear improvement in providing supporting details to a paragraph. A third and final skill that improved almost immediately was the addition of transition words throughout the paragraphs. Prior to intervention, Allison was the only participant that used transition words in her paragraphs. During the instructional sessions, however, students quickly began adding transition words consistently to make their paragraphs more organized and coherent. They maintained this throughout all conditions of the study following the instructional sessions at the start of implementing the intervention. Even though the participants maintained these skills after instruction, there is a need to continue to provide opportunities for them to practice these skills and receive reinforcement for using them. The fact that all of the participants' paragraphs during maintenance were of higher quality and content than during baseline indicates that this strategy has potential across various types of learners (e.g., learners with disabilities, learners with academic risk, and typical learners). This is important information for teachers working in inclusive classrooms.

### **What are the participants' attitudes about the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy?**

To assess participants' attitudes about the GO 4 IT...NOW strategy, participants completed an experimenter-generated participant satisfaction survey (see Appendix N). This survey contained 8 questions that used a 5-point scale (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) for the participants to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement with 2 opportunities for participants to explain their answers (i.e., Explain why you did/did not like using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy). Only the 8 scaled questions were scored, giving the survey a total of 40 possible points.

Overall, students gave the intervention an average score of 38.3 out of 40 total points. Participants had mainly positive comments regarding the study, and three out of six participants scored the intervention with a full 40 points. Three participants indicated that the strategy finally helped them write a better, more logical paragraph, and two participants mentioned the strategy should be used in other classes because it is a quick and easy strategy to use. One student mentioned she enjoyed setting goals for herself and being able to express those goals to her teacher (i.e., the experimenter) throughout the intervention. On the other hand, there were a couple negative comments regarding the study. One student indicated that the strategy would take too long, but it is unclear if he was referring to the length of the intervention itself or the process of using the strategy. Another student indicated he did not like using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy on the generalization probes, which were the expository prompts, because he had difficulty coming up with enough to write about in order to follow a strategy. A third student indicated she did not like the few opportunities for group work during the instructional condition.

## **Limitations**

Although GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction was effective in supporting 10<sup>th</sup> grade students' planning and writing paragraphs, there were limitations. One such limitation was the accessibility (i.e., a connection to the probe as means to generate ideas to organize into a paragraph) to every probe by every student during both instructional and generalization conditions. Students probably scored more consistently using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy when they had more knowledge and/or interest in the topic indicated in the expository prompt. This is considered a limitation because a student would not be able to generate logical reasons to support their topic sentence as required by the strategy if he or she has little background information or little interest in the topic.

Another limitation was the time in which this study was conducted. Both classes in which the intervention was implemented took place in the afternoon – one right after lunch and the other the last period of the day. Furthermore, approximately half of the study took place in the midst of statewide standardized testing as well as being implemented in the last two months of the school year. Due to these factors, participants' attention spans and motivation may have been negatively impacted. This is considered a limitation because distractions tend to increase near the end of the school day, which impedes a student's ability to maintain focus on writing and therefore impact the paragraph they are able to write within the 10-minute time limit. It is also considered a limitation because a lack of motivation may cause a student to not feel the need to put his or her best effort forth and, as a result, negatively impact their paragraphs. Further, this study occurred during the last months of the school year, which is always a difficult time to maintain students' academic focus.

A third limitation in this study was student attendance. The experimenter implemented the study to the entire class, making it challenging to keep track of the copious amounts of worksheets, probes, and student absences between the two classes. It was very difficult to help absent students get caught up with missed work, especially since there were strict procedures and scripts to follow for each lesson. At times, it was not possible and the experimenter had to record no data for a particular prompt. Several students on IEPs with writing goals (but were not selected as participants for this study based on their baseline data) missed explicit writing instruction for multiple sessions, which affected their success during the intervention. It was not possible to include these students as target participants because of their frequent absences. This is a limitation because target students cannot participate in crucial intervention if they do not regularly and consistently attend school.

Another limitation was the generalization opportunities. In this study, these opportunities were only assessed using expository prompts that were based on student preference (i.e., “If you could have any pet, what would you choose and why?”). To better assess generalization, these opportunities could be extended to other materials and academic disciplines. For example, students could use the strategy to answer a short answer response in any content-specific class. In Social Studies, for example, students could use the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy to explain one of the causes of World War II and why it was important. Both the 12-point content scoring rubric and/or the 10-point quality scoring rubric could be used to assess their response and could even be modified to match the teacher’s expectations for a short answer response.

Finally, the experimenter typed and corrected all student mechanical errors on the paragraphs before giving the writings to the expert in Language Arts to assess using the 30-point rubric. This was done to prevent the expert from identifying individuals' writing. However, this resulted in inflated scores across all experimental conditions on this measure since all participants received all 5 of the mechanical related points on the rubric.

### **Future Directions**

This study was done with 10<sup>th</sup> graders in a general education high school classroom. Future research should examine the effects of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction on a larger sample of students with a similar demographic and setting. Additionally, it would be interesting to see the effects of the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy on a longer type of writing prompt, such as a three-paragraph or five-paragraph essay that isn't expository (i.e., narrative or persuasive). While implementing this strategy to complete a narrative writing task could potentially be difficult, it might be more effective applying this strategy to a persuasive writing unit, which is typically the most difficult for students to master. Furthermore, it would be interesting to implement this strategy with younger struggling writers across all classes with a follow-up assessment later in their school career to assess their growth as a writer after using this strategy for an extended period of time.

### **Implications for Practice**

In order for practitioners to implement GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction, teachers may want to choose a different time of the school year in which to execute the intervention, such as the beginning of the year before any major writing unit takes place

or as an introduction to a writing unit. Students may be able to focus and have more ideas to write about if they are not exhausted by state testing and are not distracted by the promise of the school year's end. Teachers may also want to write their own instructional and generalization probes based on students' interests or give students choices in which to write about. This would allow students to have increased interest in each writing prompt and, further, ideally be able to consistently compose high quality paragraphs with little variability across conditions. Although teachers cannot control student attendance, teachers may want to devise a clear plan for handling student absences prior to implementing the intervention, particularly if the teacher is implementing the intervention to an entire class. This could decrease the frustration of the teacher as well as still provide missing students with crucial, explicit writing instruction.

Additionally, teachers could use this strategy throughout the school year and across disciplines for better results. If this strategy is used throughout the school year with the implementation beginning near the start of the school year, teachers can provide remedial instruction for any skills not retained during the summer months and students are given the opportunity to master paragraph-writing skills. This strategy can be extended to assist students in producing longer compositions, such as multi-paragraph essays that are a requirement of Ohio's Common Core State Standards. Furthermore, this strategy could be adapted and then embedded into the curriculum to program for mastery automatically across grade levels. This would provide a common strategy for all teachers to teach and, when necessary, re-teach paragraph writing to ensure an effective, evidence-based strategy is being used across classrooms and grade levels.



Perhaps the most important implication for practice is the easiness and cost effectiveness of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction. Every lesson is taught using an explicit scripted lesson plan that would require minimal adaptation based on students' needs in a given classroom. The scripts are easy to follow and include student-friendly language, student worksheets, programming for student responding, scoring rubrics, etc. These lessons last no longer than 40 minutes during pre-baseline and the instructional condition and no more than 10 minutes during baseline, generalization, and maintenance conditions. The scoring rubrics are provided to further support teachers' implementation of this intervention and could be used as a student's self-monitoring checklist as they master the skill and begin writing independently. These implications for practice will allow any teacher in any setting to implement this seamless intervention with ease.

### **Summary**

The purpose of this study was to measure the effects of a strategy instruction approach, GO 4 IT...NOW!, in an inclusive secondary Language Arts classroom. This was a descriptive study using multiple probes across participants to assess the quality of participants' writings after implementing GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction. Specifically, it sought to measure (a) the effectiveness of the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy on both quality and content of paragraph-writing, (b) the extent to which the strategy was generalized to other writing opportunities, (c) the extent to which participants maintained the skills learned from the strategy, and (d) the participants' attitudes about the strategy. By using scripted lesson plans, student-friendly worksheets, repeated writing practice opportunities, scoring rubrics, IOA checks, and preference assessments, the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy was easy to implement to an entire class at once, regardless of skill

level. The scoring rubrics were easy to use and allowed the experimenter to score writing products quickly and efficiently in order to monitor student progress throughout the study. It was essential to use the data to make instructional decisions for all students, regardless of their label. Overall, all students demonstrated strong improvement in paragraph writing skills after the implementation of the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy.

## REFERENCES

- Anastasiou, D. & Michail, D. (2013). Exploring discordance between self-efficacy and writing performance among low-literate adult students. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, (11)1, 53-87.
- Boyle, J.R. & Hindman, A.H. (2015). Scaffolding the persuasive writing of middle school students. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, (10)3, 43-59.
- Chalk, J.C., Hagan-Burke, S., Burke, M.D. (2005). The effects of self-regulated strategy development on the writing process for high school students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, (28), 75-87.
- Cortiella, C., & Horowitz, S. (2014). The state of learning disabilities: Facts, trends and emerging issues (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: National Center for Learning Disabilities.
- Flanagan, S.M. & Bouck, E.C. (2015). Mapping out the details: Supporting struggling writers' written expression with concept mapping. *Preventing School Failure*, (59)4, 244-252.
- Graham, S., Harris, K.R., Bartlett, B.J., Popadopolou, E., & Santoro, J. (2016). Acceptability of adaptations for struggling writers: A national survey with primary-grade teachers. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, (39)1, 5-16.
- Graham, S., Hebert, M., Sandbank, M.P., & Harris, K.R. (2016). Assessing the writing achievement of young struggling writers: Application of generalizability theory. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, (39)2, 72-82.
- Harris, K.R., & Graham, S. (2011). "An adjective is a word hanging down from a noun": Learning to write and students with learning disabilities. *The International Dyslexia Association*, (63), 65-79.
- Harris, K.R., Schmidt, T., & Graham, S. (1998). Every child can write: Strategies for composition and self-regulation in the writing process. In K.R. Harris, S. Graham, & D. Deschler (Eds.), *Teaching every child every day: Learning in diverse schools and classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

- Hebert, M. (2014). The nuances of writing instruction for students with learning disabilities: An introduction to the special issue. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, (12)1, 1-4.
- Konrad, M., & Test, D.W. (2007). Effects of GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy instruction on the written IEP goal articulation and paragraph-writing skills of middle school students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, (28)5, 277-291.
- Konrad, M., & Test, D.W. (2004). Teaching middle-school students with disabilities to use an IEP Template. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 27, 101-124.
- Konrad, M., & Trela, K. (2007). GO 4 IT...NOW!: Extending writing strategies to support all students. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, (39)4, 42-51.
- Konrad, M., Trela, K., & Test, D.W. (2006). Using IEP goals and objectives to teach paragraph writing to high school students with physical and cognitive disabilities. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, (41)2, 111-124.
- Marchetti, R., Wilson, R.H., & Dunham, M. (2016). Academic achievement and extracurricular school activities of at-risk high school students. *Educational Research Quarterly*, (39)4, 3-20.
- Mason, L.H., Kubina, Jr., R.M., Valasa, L.L., & Mong Cramer, A. (2010). Evaluating effective writing instruction for adolescent students in an emotional and behavior support setting. *Behavioral Disorders*, (35)2, 140-156.
- Matheson, I. A. (2015). Self-regulatory efficacy and mindset of at-risk students: An exploratory study. *Exceptionality Education International*, (25)1, 67-90.
- Salahu-Din, D., Persky, H., & Miller, J. (2008). *The Nation's Report Card: Writing 2007 (NCES 2008-468)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Santangelo, T. (2014). Why is writing so difficult for students with learning disabilities? A narrative review to inform the design of effective instruction. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, (12)1, 5-20.
- Sexton, M., Harris, K.R., & Graham, S. (1998). Self-regulated strategy development and the writing process: Effects on essay writing and attributions. *Exceptional Children*, (64)3, 295-311.
- Snyder, E.P. (2002). Teaching students with combined behavioral disorders and mental retardation to lead their own IEP meetings. *Behavioral Disorders*, 27, 340-357.

Straub, C. & Alias, A. (2013). Next generation writing at the secondary level for students with learning disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, (46)1, 16-24.

Walker, B., Shippen, M.E., Alberto, P., Houchins, D.E., & Cihak, D.F. (2005). Using the *Expressive Writing* program to improve the writing skills of high school students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, (20)3, 175-183.

## Appendix A

### Common Core State Standards Informative Writing Rubric: Grades 9-10

<b>INFORMATIVE</b>					
<b>Description</b>	<b>5 Exceptional</b>	<b>4 Skilled</b>	<b>3 Proficient</b>	<b>2 Developing</b>	<b>1 Inadequate</b>
<p><b>Focus:</b> The text focuses on a topic to inform a reader with ideas, concepts, information, etc.</p>	<p>The text clearly focuses on a compelling topic that informs the reader with ideas, concepts, information, etc.</p>	<p>The text focuses on an interesting topic that informs the reader with ideas, concepts, information, etc.</p>	<p>The text focuses on a topic to inform a reader with ideas, concepts, information, etc.</p>	<p>The text has an unclear topic with some ideas, concepts, information, etc.</p>	<p>The text has an unidentifiable topic with minimal ideas, concepts, information, etc.</p>
<p><b>Development:</b> The text presents relevant facts, definitions, concrete details, quotations, and examples. The conclusion ties to and supports the information/explanation.</p>	<p>The text provides significant facts, definitions, concrete details, and quotations that fully develop and explain the topic. The conclusion provides insight to the implications, explains the significance of the topic, and projects to the future, etc.</p>	<p>The text provides effective facts, definitions, concrete details, quotations, and examples that sufficiently develop and explain the topic. The conclusion provides the implications, significance of and future relevance of the topic, etc.</p>	<p>The text provides relevant facts, definitions, concrete details, quotations, and examples that develop and explain the topic. The conclusion ties to and supports the information/explanation.</p>	<p>The text provides facts, definitions, details, quotations, and examples that attempt to develop and explain the topic. The conclusion merely restates the development.</p>	<p>The text contains limited facts and examples related to the topic. The text may fail to offer a conclusion.</p>
<p><b>Audience:</b> The author anticipates the audience's background knowledge of the topic.</p>	<p>The text consistently addresses the audience's knowledge level and concerns about the topic. The text addresses the specific needs of the audience.</p>	<p>The text anticipates the audience's knowledge level and concerns about the topic. The text addresses the specific needs of the audience.</p>	<p>The text considers the audience's knowledge level and concerns about the claim. The text addresses the needs of the audience.</p>	<p>The text illustrates an inconsistent awareness of the audience's knowledge level and needs.</p>	<p>The text lacks an awareness of the audience's knowledge level and needs.</p>

<p><b>Cohesion:</b> The text uses appropriate and varied transitions to link the major sections of the text, creates cohesion, and clarifies the relationships among complex ideas and concepts.</p>	<p>The text strategically uses words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of text. The text explains the relationships between the topic and the examples and/or facts.</p>	<p>The text skillfully uses words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of the text. The text identifies the relationship between the topic and the examples and/or facts.</p>	<p>The text uses words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of the text. The text connects the topic and the examples and/or facts.</p>	<p>The text contains limited words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of the text. The text attempts to connect the topic and the examples and/or facts.</p>	<p>The text contains few, if any, words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of the text. The text does not connect the topic and the examples and/or facts.</p>
<p><b>Language &amp; Style:</b> The text presents a formal, objective tone and uses precise language and topic-specific vocabulary to manage the complexity of the topic.</p>	<p>The text presents an engaging, formal, and objective tone and uses sophisticated language and topic-specific vocabulary to manage the complexity of the topic.</p>	<p>The text presents an appropriate formal, objective tone and uses relevant language and topic-specific vocabulary to manage the complexity of the topic.</p>	<p>The text presents a formal, objective tone and uses precise language and topic-specific vocabulary to manage the complexity of the topic.</p>	<p>The text illustrates a limited awareness of formal tone and awareness of topic-specific vocabulary.</p>	<p>The text illustrates a limited or inconsistent tone and awareness of topic-specific vocabulary.</p>
<p><b>Conventions:</b> The text demonstrates standard English conventions of usage and mechanics along with discipline-specific requirements (i.e. MLA, APA, etc.).</p>	<p>The text intentionally uses standard English conventions of usage and mechanics along with discipline-specific requirements (i.e. MLA, APA, etc.).</p>	<p>The text uses standard English conventions of usage and mechanics along with discipline-specific requirements (i.e. MLA, APA, etc.).</p>	<p>The text demonstrates standard English conventions of usage and mechanics along with discipline-specific requirements (i.e. MLA, APA, etc.).</p>	<p>The text demonstrates some accuracy in standard English conventions of usage and mechanics.</p>	<p>The text contains multiple inaccuracies in Standard English conventions of usage and mechanics.</p>

## Appendix B

### Skill Review: Thesis Statement Practice #1 English 10 – Mrs. Shidaker

Thesis statements must:

- State the \_\_\_\_\_
- Give your \_\_\_\_\_
- Include \_\_\_\_\_
- Be \_\_\_\_\_

Typically, a thesis statement is found at the \_\_\_\_\_ of the \_\_\_\_\_ paragraph

The purpose of a thesis statement is to:

- Provide \_\_\_\_\_ with a \_\_\_\_\_ with which to write the paper
- Provide the \_\_\_\_\_ with an \_\_\_\_\_ as to what the paper will \_\_\_\_\_

**DIRECTIONS:** In the activities that follow, construct a thesis statement for each of the topic questions. For each question,

1. Write a **declaration**, or your opinion on the topic
2. Write **3 reasons** to support your declaration
3. Put your thesis together by **ordering your 3 reasons in order of importance**
  - a. **Strongest reason** should go LAST
  - b. **Weakest reason** should go in the MIDDLE
  - c. The **remaining reason** should go FIRST

<b>Topic Question</b>	<b>Should high school students have a curfew?</b>
<b>Opinion on the Topic</b>	High school students should have an enforced curfew.
<b>Three Reasons to Support your Opinion</b>	<u>2</u> a. Students need their rest for school. <u>3</u> b. Being behind the wheel of a vehicle during the early morning hours increases their chances of accidents. <u>1</u> c. Students are less likely to get into trouble if they are home.



**PUT YOUR REASONS IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE**  
 → Strongest reason LAST → Weakest reason in the MIDDLE → Remaining reasons FIRST

<b>Thesis Statement</b>	High school students should have an enforced curfew because students are less likely to get into trouble if they are home, they need their rest for school, and it decreases the chance of getting into early morning accidents.
-------------------------	--

<b>Topic Question</b>	<b>Should students be allowed to use their cell phones throughout the school day?</b>
-----------------------	---

<b>Opinion on the Topic</b>	
-----------------------------	--

<b>Three Reasons to Support your Opinion</b>	<p>_____ a.</p> <p>_____ b.</p> <p>_____ c.</p>
--	---

**PUT YOUR REASONS IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE USING THE LINES ABOVE**  
 → Strongest reason LAST → Weakest reason in the MIDDLE → Remaining reasons FIRST

<b>Thesis Statement</b>	
-------------------------	--

<b>Topic Question</b>	<b>Should parents have access to their child's social media accounts like Instagram, Snapchat, and Twitter?</b>
<b>Opinion on the Topic</b>	
<b>Three Reasons to Support your Opinion</b>	<p>_____ a.</p> <p>_____ b.</p> <p>_____ c.</p>
<p><b>PUT YOUR REASONS IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE USING THE LINES ABOVE</b></p> <p>→ Strongest reason <u>LAST</u> → Weakest reason in the <u>MIDDLE</u> → Remaining reasons <u>FIRST</u></p>	
<b>Thesis Statement</b>	

<b>Topic Question</b>	<b>Should students have to attend school all year long?</b>
<b>Opinion on the Topic</b>	
<b>Three Reasons to Support your Opinion</b>	<p>_____ a.</p> <p>_____ b.</p> <p>_____ c.</p>
<p><b>PUT YOUR REASONS IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE USING THE LINES ABOVE</b></p> <p>→ Strongest reason <u>LAST</u> → Weakest reason in the <u>MIDDLE</u> → Remaining reasons <u>FIRST</u></p>	

<b>Thesis Statement</b>	
-------------------------	--

<b>Topic Question</b>	<b>Should students be allowed to leave campus at lunchtime?</b>
-----------------------	---

<b>Opinion on the Topic</b>	
-----------------------------	--

<b>Three Reasons to Support your Opinion</b>	<p>_____ a.</p> <p>_____ b.</p> <p>_____ c.</p>
--	---

**PUT YOUR REASONS IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE USING THE LINES ABOVE**  
 → Strongest reason LAST → Weakest reason in the MIDDLE → Remaining reasons FIRST

<b>Thesis Statement</b>	
-------------------------	--

## Appendix C

*The teacher modeled the first paragraph, and the second was guided practice. For homework, students composed a paragraph to take a specific side using a different reason. The same prompting was provided for this homework, but later lessons used less prompting as students mastered this skill.*

### Making Connections: “Life After People” & Change English 10 –Mrs. Shidaker

---

Now that we’ve discussed the article “Life After People” and watched a documentary with the same title, it’s your turn to make judgments about change. Use the guided template below to create your response.

### Focus Prompt: How is change both good and bad?

**PARAGRAPH #1** – Using the article “Life After People” (pages 51-54), how is change good? Use the template below to respond in one paragraph.

I \_\_\_\_\_ the topic of \_\_\_\_\_ is good because  
Opinion word Topic

\_\_\_\_\_ Clear and relevant reason  
\_\_\_\_\_

For example, in Dolores Vasquez’s article, “Life After People,” she writes, “\_\_\_\_\_”

\_\_\_\_\_ Quote the article in a short and complete sentence.  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_” (p. \_\_\_\_\_, lines \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_).

This quote proves that \_\_\_\_\_ is good because \_\_\_\_\_  
Topic

*Explain **IN DETAIL** how your quote proves your clear and relevant reason. Write at **LEAST 3 complete sentences** in this section. You can discuss the text but **SHOULD NOT** have additional citations.*

You **must** argue how the quote supports your REASON from above.  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**PARAGRAPH #2 – Using the documentary “Life After People: The Bodies Left Behind,” how is change bad? Use the template below to respond in one paragraph.**

On the other hand, I also \_\_\_\_\_ the topic of \_\_\_\_\_  
Opinion word Topic  
is bad because \_\_\_\_\_  
Clear and relevant reason

For example, in the documentary, “Life After People: The Bodies Left Behind,” they discuss \_\_\_\_\_

Give a specific example from the documentary in a clear and complete sentence.

This example from the documentary proves that \_\_\_\_\_ is bad because  
Topic

*Explain **IN DETAIL** how your example proves your clear and relevant reason. Write at **LEAST 3 complete sentences** in this section. You can discuss the text but **SHOULD NOT** have additional citations.*

You **must** argue how the example supports your REASON from above.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix D

### Procedural Integrity: Lesson Plan #5

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Period: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Observe the researcher teaching this lesson to the class. The lesson plan below is divided into segments. Each segment that is **present** will receive a **plus sign ( + )** next to it; each segment that is **not present** will receive a **minus sign ( - )**.

#### Probe Paragraphs Script

##### First, be sure that...

\_\_\_\_\_ The GO 4 IT...NOW! poster is not hanging and no instructional materials are visible to students

\_\_\_\_\_ Students have paper and pencils/pens to write with; if not, they are provided by the researcher

\_\_\_\_\_ Researcher has a timer

##### Procedures:

1. Researcher gives each student a piece of lined paper with the prompt on it.
2. Researcher says, ***“Write your name and the date at the top, using the lines provided.”*** Make sure students do this. While students are doing this, make a sheet for any student who is absent.
3. Researcher projects the day’s prompt up on the board and reads the topic aloud.
4. Researcher says, ***“I want you to write a paragraph about a topic that I will give you. I cannot help you with this, so do the best you can. If you are not sure how to spell a word, make your best guess. You will have 10 minutes to write.”***
5. Researcher instructs the students to begin and set the timer for 10 minutes.
6. After 10 minutes the researcher says, ***“Please put your pencils down.”***
7. Researcher has one student collect the students’ writing samples and then thanks the students for their hard work.
8. Researcher checks to be sure names and dates are on all papers.
9. Researcher files the students’ work in the probes folder.

10. Researcher begins the day's lesson (if applicable).

**Statement of Objective/Purpose (5 minutes)**

***“Remember to copy today’s objectives in your learning logs.”***

[Point to the day’s objective and ask a volunteer to read it aloud. Remind them to copy the date as well.]

***“Today you are going to begin the most important part of our unit. Does anyone remember from the last lesson what we said is the most important part of our unit?”***

[Solicit, “goals.”]

Response

***“That’s right, goals are the most important part.”***

**Input/Practice (35 minutes)**

***“Who can remember how we decide on what goals to set?”***

[Solicit response like, “Goals must come from your needs.”]

Response

***“That’s right. You only set goals based on what you need to work on.”***

***“So, right now, I’m going to pass out the list of needs you wrote the other day.”***

[Distribute students’ needs summary sheets.]

***“What you’re going to do today is take at least one of your needs and turn it into a goal sentence. Remember each sentence must have a subject that tells what the sentence is about. In these sentences, the subject is your goal. Sentences must also have verbs. In these sentences the main verb is the verb ‘is.’ But these sentences also have other verbs. These other verbs tell what you should be able to DO if you complete your goal. I am going to give you a list of good verbs that can be used for writing goals. The verb is the action in the sentence. It tells what you will be doing.”***

[Hand out the Verbs for Goal Setting worksheet.]

***“Take a look at these verbs and listen to some examples.”***



[As you read these examples, emphasize the underlined verbs so students recognize them in the sentences.]

***“In reading, you could increase the number of sight words you read to 100 and answer who, what, where questions about what you read. In writing, you could spell words that contain the prefixes and suffixes. In math, you could name your multiplication facts. In study skills, you could record all your assignments in your daily planner. In transition skills, you could complete job applications. Do you see how using these verbs helps make sure your goals are clear?”***

***“This sheet also has some verbs at the bottom of the page that you don’t want to use because they are too hard to measure and don’t really give us a clear idea about what you will be doing. For example, if I said my goal is to understand the book, how would my teacher be able to measure this?”***

***“The second page of this handout has some examples of goals and objectives. Let’s go through these right now. Turn to the second page of the packet.”***

[Be sure students do this. Then read the goals and objectives aloud to the students, pointing out how the objectives are steps toward reaching the goals. Tell students they may use some of these ideas in their own goals but shouldn’t just copy them because then it is not individualized. Emphasize that these goals individualized based on each of the needs.]

***“What you’re going to do now is take one of your needs and turn it into a goal. You’ve seen lots of examples. You saw some during our last lesson, and now you’ve got five more. So, you should be ready to try this. It’s not easy, but I’ll help you if you need it.”***

***“You are going to start each goal sentence with the phrase ‘My goal is to be able to.’ So, if one of my needs says, ‘I need to be able to add and subtract fractions,’ my goal will be ‘My goal is to be able to add and subtract fractions.’ Remember to begin your goal sentence with ‘My goal is to be able to.’ I’m going to say it one more time, then I’m going to ask you to repeat it. ‘My goal is to be able to.’ Everyone, how do you begin your goal statement?”***

[Have students say, “My goal is to be able to.” Repeat until it seems that all students are able to say it.]

Response

[Distribute the goals worksheet.]

***“Now, look at your needs sheet and point to the first one; this is the one you will write a goal for. It doesn’t matter if you’ve already checked it off because the ones we’re doing today are just for practice.”***

[Assist students with this.]

***“Now you are going to try to write an annual, or yearly, goal based on that need. You will write it on the blank after ‘My goal is to be able to.’ I will assist you.”***

[Some students will need **a lot** of help with this. Circulate and provide individual assistance. You may want to encourage students to look at the samples. Once students have an acceptable goal, put your signature or a stamp or sticker on the page and instruct them to write another goal with another need, if time permits. Make sure that students do not check off any more boxes on the needs summary sheet.]

### **Closing (5 minutes)**

***“I hope you are satisfied with the goals you set. Those should be pretty solid. You’ve learned a lot over the past few lessons, and I don’t want you to forget these things, so write down at least two new things you’ve learned in your learning log.”***

[Supervise as students do this.]

***“Are there any questions or concerns about what we did today?”***

[Answer questions.]

***“Please put everything back in your folder except for your needs summary sheet.”***

[Hold this up so students know which one you’re talking about.]

***“I will be collecting this sheet.”***

[Collect students’ needs summary sheets and put them back in the file. Then, instruct students to put away materials and transition students according to class routine.]

**Procedural Integrity: Lesson Plan #5**

Completed by: Elle Stonecash Period: 6 Date: 4/12/16

Observe the researcher teaching this lesson to the class. The lesson plan below is divided into segments. Each segment that is **present** will receive a **plus sign (+)** next to it; each segment that is **not present** will receive a **minus sign (-)**.

**Probe Paragraphs Script****First, be sure that...**

- + ✓ The GO 4 IT...NOW! poster is not hanging and no instructional materials are visible to students
- + ✓ Students have paper and pencils/pens to write with; if not, they are provided by the researcher
- ✓ Researcher has a timer

**Procedures:**

- + 1. Researcher gives each student a piece of lined paper with the prompt on it.
- + 2. Researcher says, *"Write your name and the date at the top, using the lines provided."* Make sure students do this. While students are doing this, make a sheet for any student who is absent.
- + 3. Researcher project the day's prompt up on the board and reads the topic aloud.
- + 4. Researcher says, *"I want you to write a paragraph about a topic that I will give you. I cannot help you with this, so do the best you can. If you are not sure how to spell a word, make your best guess. You will have 10 minutes to write."*
- + 5. Researcher instructs the students to begin and set the timer for 10 minutes.
- + 6. After 10 minutes the researcher says, *"Please put your pencils down."*
- + 7. Researcher has one student collect the students' writing samples and then thanks the students for their hard work.
- + 8. Researcher checks to be sure names and dates are on all papers.
- + 9. Researcher files the students' work in the probes folder.
- + 10. Researcher begin the day's lesson (if applicable).

**Statement of Objective/Purpose (5 minutes)**

+ *“Remember to copy today’s objectives in your learning logs.”*

[Point to the day’s objective and ask a volunteer to read it aloud. Remind them to copy the date as well.]

+ *“Today you are going to begin the most important part of our unit. Does anyone remember from the last lesson what we said is the most important part of our unit?”*

[Solicit, “goals.”]

Response

+ *“That’s right, goals are the most important part.”*

**Input/Practice (35 minutes)**

+ *“Who can remember how we decide on what goals to set?”*

[Solicit response like, “Goals must come from your needs.”]

Response

+ *“That’s right. You only set goals based on what you need to work on.”*

+ *“So, right now, I’m going to pass out the list of needs you wrote the other day.”*

[Distribute students’ needs summary sheets.]

+ *“What you’re going to do today is take at least one of your needs and turn it into a goal sentence. Remember each sentence must have a subject that tells what the sentence is about. In these sentences, the subject is your goal. Sentences must also have verbs. In these sentences the main verb is the verb ‘is.’ But these sentences also have other verbs. These other verbs tell what you should be able to DO if you complete your goal. I am going to give you a list of good verbs that can be used for writing goals. The verb is the action in the sentence. It tells what you will be doing.”*

+ [Hand out the Verbs for Goal Setting worksheet.]

*“Take a look at these verbs and listen to some examples.”*

+ [As you read these examples, emphasize the underlined verbs so students recognize them in the sentences.]

+ “In reading, you could increase the number of sight words you read to 100 and answer who, what, where questions about what you read. In writing, you could spell words that contain the prefixes and suffixes. In math, you could name your multiplication facts. In study skills, you could record all your assignments in your daily planner. In transition skills, you could complete job applications. Do you see how using these verbs helps make sure your goals are clear?”

+ “This sheet also has some verbs at the bottom of the page that you don’t want to use because they are too hard to measure and don’t really give us a clear idea about what you will be doing. For example, if I said my goal is to understand the book, how would my teacher be able to measure this?”

+ “The second page of this handout has some examples of goals and objectives. Let’s go through these right now. Turn to the second page of the packet.”

+ [Be sure students do this. Then read the goals and objectives aloud to the students, pointing out how the objectives are steps toward reaching the goals. Tell students they may use some of these ideas in their own goals but shouldn’t just copy them because then it is not individualized. Emphasize that these goals individualized based on each of the needs.]

+ “What you’re going to do now is take one of your needs and turn it into a goal. You’ve seen lots of examples. You saw some during our last lesson, and now you’ve got five more. So, you should be ready to try this. It’s not easy, but I’ll help you if you need it.”

+ “You are going to start each goal sentence with the phrase ‘My goal is to be able to.’ So, if one of my needs says, ‘I need to be able to add and subtract fractions,’ my goal will be ‘My goal is to be able to add and subtract fractions.’ Remember to begin your goal sentence with ‘My goal is to be able to.’ I’m going to say it one more time, then I’m going to ask you to repeat it. ‘My goal is to be able to.’ Everyone, how do you begin your goal statement?”

+ [Have students say, “My goal is to be able to.” Repeat until it seems that all students are able to say it.]

+ Response

[Distribute the goals worksheet.]

+ “Now, look at your needs sheet and point to the first one; this is the one you will write a goal for. It doesn’t matter if you’ve already checked it off because the ones we’re doing today are just for practice.”

+ [Assist students with this.]

+ “Now you are going to try to write an annual, or yearly, goal based on that need. You will write it on the blank after ‘My goal is to be able to.’ I will assist you.”

+ [Some students will need **a lot** of help with this. Circulate and provide individual assistance. You may want to encourage students to look at the samples. Once students have an acceptable goal, put your signature or a stamp or sticker on the page and instruct them to write another goal with another need, if time permits. Make sure that students do not check off any more boxes on the needs summary sheet.]

+ **Closing (5 minutes)**

+ *“I hope you are satisfied with the goals you set. Those should be pretty solid. You’ve learned a lot over the past few lessons, and I don’t want you to forget these things, so write down at least two new things you’ve learned in your learning log.”*

+ [Supervise as students do this.]

+ *“Are there any questions or concerns about what we did today?”*

+ [Answer questions.]

+ *“Please put everything back in your folder except for your needs summary sheet.”*

+ [Hold this up so students know which one you’re talking about.]

+ *“I will be collecting this sheet.”*

+ [Collect students’ needs summary sheets and put them back in the file. Then, instruct students to put away materials and transition students according to class routine.]

## Appendix E

### Lesson Plan #1

#### Teacher Preparation

- Write objective on the board, overhead, or chart paper (see below).
- Make sure you have all materials (listed below).

#### Materials

- Crate to store materials
- Students' folders
- Students' learning logs (in folder)
- Vision statement form, one for each student

#### Objectives

- SWBAT describe the class routine for the writing unit.
- SWBAT define *goal* and state its purpose.
- SWBAT define *objective* and state its purpose.
- SWBAT write a vision statement.

#### Opening (3 minutes)

*“Today we are going to begin our unit on writing goals. Over the next few weeks, you will be learning how to write your own goals related to writing paragraphs. But before we start learning about good paragraph writing, we need to get organized so our lessons will run smoothly.”*

*“Our lessons over the next several weeks are going to follow a specific routine, so you will always know what to expect. Here’s what will happen: First, when you come into the room each day, I will expect you to go straight to this crate (point to crate) and take out your folder. You can see that I did that for you today and placed them on your desks. Starting tomorrow, \_\_\_\_\_ (a student’s name), what should you do when you come into the room, before you sit down?”* [Solicit response like, “Go to the crate and take out my folder and Learning Log and then go sit at my desk.”]  
*“Good.”*

#### Statement of Objective/Purpose (5 minutes)

*“Each day, you will need to copy the day’s objectives into your Learning Log.”* [Point to the day’s objective and ask for a volunteer to read it aloud. Explain that ‘SWBAT’ means ‘students will be able to.’ Explain the meaning of the objective and instruct students to copy it into their Learning Logs. Tell them they should copy the date as well.]

*“The first objective for today is one we’ve already met. The second objective is what we are going to work on now.”*

### **Defining Key Terms (10 minutes)**

*“Before you can start writing your goals, you need to learn some background. All of us learn in different ways or at different paces. It might mean that you need certain accommodations, like graphic organizers to help you organize information or extra time on bigger assignments, to help you keep up and be successful in class. You need to learn and know how keep track of what you need and how you’re going to get it so you can be as independent as possible both during and after high school.”*

*“In order to write goals for yourselves, you must understand your present level of performance. This must include your strengths [write ‘strengths’ on the board], or the things you are good at, and your needs [write ‘needs’ on the board], or the things you need to work on.”* [Give students a minute to write these words down on their worksheet. Circulate to make sure they’re writing in the right spot.] *On 3, I want everyone to respond. What two things must be included to understand your present level of performance? 1-2-3.”* [Students chorally respond with “strengths” and “needs.”] *“That’s right – strengths and needs must be included to understand present level of performance.”*

*“Goals and objectives help us write about our strengths and needs. Sometimes people get the two words mixed up, but they mean different things. How might we define goal?”* [Call on 1-3 students whose hands are raised to generate ideas before writing a definition on the board.] *“These are great ideas! Let’s summarize a goal as an aim or desired result. Write this on your worksheet.”* [Give students a minute to write this definition down on their worksheet.] *Now, how might we define objective?”* [Call on 1-3 students whose hands are raised to generate ideas before writing a definition on the board.] *“Great thinking! Let’s summarize an objective as steps toward reaching a goal. Write this on your worksheet.”* [Give students a minute to write this definition down on their worksheet.]

### **Input/Practice (25 minutes)**

#### **Vision Statement**

*“A vision is like a dream or a big goal. Today you are going write a vision statement for your life. I am going to hand out a form for you to write on. When I give it to you, write your name on it, but do not write anything else until I give you directions.”* [Distribute the vision statement forms.] *“As you can see the vision statement addresses four areas: live, learn, work, and play. Here is what each of these areas mean.* [Project definitions for students to use a reference. Spend 3-5 minutes reading and generating ideas for each to help students brainstorm.]

*“On the first blank you will write where you plan to live after high school. It needs to be realistic, so don’t say ‘in a mansion’ because it is very unlikely that you will be able*



***to afford to buy a mansion right after you graduate from high school. What are some realistic examples of where you might live after high school?*** [Engage students in a very short discussion about options. Write some of the examples on the board next to ‘live.’ Some examples include ‘with my parents,’ ‘in a dorm,’ ‘in an apartment with a roommate,’ ‘with my uncle.’] ***Go ahead now and write down your ideas for where and with whom you want to live when you graduate.*** [Supervise as students do this. Answer students’ questions. Assist them as they fill in these blanks. Share good examples with the class. If there are common problems, like the goals are too broad, too narrow, or unrealistic, stop the students and review the concepts again.]

***“On the next blank, you will write how you plan to continue to learn after high school. When you finish high school you need to continue to learn. Some options for learning after high school include community college, on-the-job training, or four-year college.”*** [Write ‘community college,’ ‘on-the-job training,’ and ‘four-year college’ on the board or overhead next to the word ‘learn.’] ***Again, be realistic. Go ahead now and write down your ideas for how you will continue to learn after you graduate.”*** [Supervise as students do this. Answer students’ questions. Assist them as they fill in these blanks. Share good examples with the class. If there are common problems, like the goals are too broad, too narrow, or unrealistic, stop the students and review the concepts again.]

***“Then on the third blank, you will write what kind of job you hope to get after high school.” Let’s use the word ‘work’ to describe this area. The word work refers to your job, career, or occupation.”*** [Write the words ‘job,’ ‘career,’ and ‘occupation’ next to the word ‘work’ on the board or overhead.] ***“Many of you plan to be famous athletes or musicians. This is doable but not necessarily realistic, so the goal here is to be completely realistic with the kind of job you hope to have. Go ahead now and write down the realistic job you hope to get after high school.”*** [Supervise as students do this. Answer students’ questions. Assist them as they fill in these blanks. Share good examples with the class. If there are common problems, like the goals are too broad, too narrow, or unrealistic, stop the students and review the concepts again.]

***“The last area we need to address is one that lots of people don’t think about. It’s the area of fun. Sometimes when people finish high school, they lose their connections with friends or activities, and we want to be sure that you are still finding opportunities for fun, opportunities that are safe, healthy, and enjoyable to you. So, let’s use the word ‘play’ to describe this area. Let’s think of some healthy and safe examples of how you might have fun after high school.”*** [Have a very short discussion with students about recreation and leisure options. Write some of the examples on the board. Some examples might include, ‘join a gym,’ ‘play on a softball team,’ ‘go to church on Sundays,’ ‘go to scrapbooking parties with my sister,’ etc.] ***“Go ahead and write how you will have fun after high school.”*** [Supervise as students do this. Answer students’ questions. Assist them as they fill in these blanks. Share good examples with the class. If there are common problems, like the goals are too broad, too narrow, or unrealistic, stop the students and review the concepts again.]

### **Course of Study**

***“Now that you have established a vision for yourself, we need to determine which high school course of study might be good for you. It might seem like graduating high school is a long time from now, but if you have thought about these different options early, it will help you, your family, and your teachers make good decisions for your future. At our school, you have several options. We’re going to talk about each one, and then you’re going to pick the one that you think is best for you.”*** [Read each of the options. Then give some examples of who might choose different options.] ***“What questions do you have about these different options?”*** [Answer students’ questions.]

***“Right now, I want you to circle which course of study you think is most appropriate for you: Career Prep, College/University Prep, or Occupational Prep. This is just the beginning. What you circle may not be your final decision. You will work with your family, teachers, and guidance counselor to make the final decision, but right now we want you to begin thinking about it.”*** [Assist students as they do this.]

### **Closing (4 minutes)**

***“Remember today you learned the difference between goals and objectives and wrote your vision statement for your future after high school. Tomorrow you will get a chance to start identifying your strengths, but first we need to put away our materials from today. Listen carefully while I give you directions for clean up. Put your learning logs and worksheets in your folders. [Hold up one as an example.] Now, raise your hand if you can tell me where these should go.”*** [Call on a student and solicit a response like, “In the crate.”] ***“When I call your row, I want you to quietly walk over to the crate and place your folder in it.”*** [Release each row using the first student’s name and have them turn in their materials.]

## Appendix F

### Lesson Plan #4

#### **Teacher Preparation**

- Write objective on the board, overhead, or chart paper.
- Make sure you have all materials (listed below).

#### **Materials**

- Students' learning logs (in crate)
- "Strong and Weak Goals" handouts, one for each student
- Digital copy of the "Strong and Weak Goals" handout (for modeling)
- Expo marker
- "Strong and Weak Goals" answer key
- Goals-Objectives matching activity, one for each student
- Scissors for each student
- Glue for each student

#### **Objective**

1. SWBAT identify strong and weak goals.
2. SWBAT match objectives to goals.

#### **Opening/Statement of Objective/Purpose (5 minutes)**

*"Remember to copy today's objectives in your learning log."* [Point to the day's objective and read it aloud to the students. Remind students to copy the date as well.]

*"Today you are going to learn about what some people would say is the most important part: setting goals."*

*"Can anyone remember what we said the difference is between a goal and an objective?"* [Solicit responses and guide students to something like, "A goal is bigger than an objective. A goal takes longer to accomplish. The objectives are the steps toward reaching to goal."]

#### **Input/Practice (30 minutes)**

##### **Strong Goal-Weak Goal (35 minutes)**

*"So, if the objectives are the steps toward reaching a goal, what do we need to write first, a goal or an objective?"* [Solicit response like, "We need to set a goal first."]

*"That's right, we need to set a goal before we can set the objectives. The goal is like the destination on a trip, and the objectives are how we're going to reach the destination."*

*We can't know how we're going to get there if we don't know where we're going. So, we can't set objectives before we set goals."*

*"You are going to set several goals over our next few lessons. But first, how do we decide what goals to set? What are your goals based on?" [Take responses from students.] "Your goals must be based directly on your needs. Let me say that again: your goals must come directly from your needs. Remember in the last lesson you wrote a list of your needs. You identified what you think you need to work on. In the next few days, you will be picking some of those needs and turning them into goals. It sounds pretty simple, doesn't it? And it is simple in a way. But it is also very difficult. The reason it's difficult is because when you set a goal, it must be something that you can clearly measure or test. So, we're going to look at some examples of goals and objectives, some that are good and some that are bad, so you have an idea of how to do this."* [Distribute Strong and Weak Goals handouts.]

*"On this page I'm handing out, there are some good goals and some not-so-good goals. We're going to see if we can identify which ones are good and bad and try to fix the ones that are bad. Put your name at the top of the page, and let's get started."* [Read the directions aloud to the student.]

*"I am going to do some of this activity with you. Please follow along with me as I do it on the board so that when it's your turn to practice, you know exactly what you're doing."*

[Read #1 to the students.] *"I will increase my reading comprehension level to a fifth grade level. Is it clear what this goal means? Is this something I could get a score on and show progress on a graph?"* [Solicit, "Yes, this is a clear goal."] *"Yes, this goal is clear. It's a complete sentence. It's something I can measure. Please check off the box next to 'strong.'"* [Model this on the board.]

*"Now let's move on to #2."* [Read #2 to the students.] *"I will improve my writing skills. This goal is not very clear, is it? We can't be sure what the student means by 'improve writing skills.' Does that mean be able to write sentences? Does it mean spell better? Does it mean work on punctuation skills? So, this goal is a weak goal. Please check off the box next to 'weak.'"* [Model this on the board.] *"It is weak because it is not very clear."* [Write on board, "it is not very clear."] *"Now since it is a weak goal, we need to try to rewrite it to make it stronger. Does anyone have a suggestion for how to make this a better goal?"* [Call on a student. Write on the board a strong goal that is related to writing skills and instruct students to copy it on their sheets. You may use one of the examples on the "key" or you may use one provided by a student as long as it is clear, measurable, and a complete sentence.]

*"Now let's move on to #3."* [Read #3 to the students.] *"I will decrease the number of times I am tardy to class to one time per month. Is it clear what this goal means? Is this something I could get a score on and show progress on a graph?"* [Solicit, "Yes, this is

a clear goal.”] **“Yes, this goal is clear. It’s a complete sentence. It’s something I can measure. So, please check off the box next to ‘strong.’”** [Model this on the board.]

**“Now that we’ve done 3 together, it’s your turn to try. Either by yourself or with a partner, try numbers 4 through 7 just like we did up here. What 3 elements must a goal have to be strong?”** [Call on different students. Solicit: It’s clear. It’s a complete sentence. It can be measured.] [Write these on the board for reference.] **“Yes! Strong goals are clear, written in a complete sentence, and can be measured. I will give you 10 minutes to work.”**

[Monitor students’ progress as they are working. Answer students’ questions. Provide corrective feedback and positive feedback.]

**“Okay, now let’s check our work! Who would like to walk us through #4?”** [Call on volunteer to teach their answer to class. Provide corrective feedback as necessary, and ask other students for comparisons or differences in answers.]

[Repeat above process for numbers 5-7, having different students teach the class for each question.]

**“Great work today! You are all making great progress on understanding goals!”**

#### **Closing (5 minutes)**

**“I hope you have a good idea about goals and objectives because in our next session, you are going to actually start writing your goals and objectives. Quickly, raise your hand if you can tell us the difference between a goal and an objective.”** [Solicit response like, “An objective is a step toward a goal.”] **“Yes! An objective is a step toward a goal. Now, raise your hand if you can tell me the 3 elements of a strong goal?”** [Provide 1-minute think time. Call on various students to say it must be clear, written in a complete sentence, and measurable.] **“Well done! Please put everything back in your folder.”** [Instruct student to put away materials and transition student according to class routine.]

Appendix G

**Vision Statement: Goals after Graduating High School**

**After high school, I plan to...**

**Live**

---

---

**Learn**

---

---

**Work**

---

---

**Play**

---

---

**In order to achieve this vision, the best high school course of study for me is (*circle one*):**

Career Prep

(going to C-Tec junior & senior year)

College/University Prep

(taking general and/or honors/AP courses at LHHS)

Occupational Prep

(preparing for & getting a job in a similar field in which you want to work / CBI program)

**Writing Goals: Vision Statement**  
**English 10 – Mrs. Shidaker**

---

**After high school, I plan to...**

Live at my mom and stepdad's house<sup>in Ohio</sup> ^ till I can move to WV on my dad's farm.

---

Learn on the job training on a race track down the street from my  
mom.

---

Work horse trainer

---

Play Video games

---

**In order to achieve this vision, the best high school course of study for  
me is (circle one):**

Career Prep  
(going to C-Tec junior & senior year)

College/University Prep  
(taking general and/or honors/AP courses at LHHS)

**Occupational Prep**  
(preparing for & getting a job in a similar field in which you want to work / CBI program)

## Appendix H

### Examples and Non-Examples of Paragraphs

#### PARAGRAPH 1:

There are several things you need to do to be a good student. First, you need to go to school every day, unless you are very sick. You should also pay attention in class and write down important ideas and homework assignments. In addition, you should do all assignments and turn them in on time. Finally, it is very important to ask for help when you need it. A student who does all these things will be successful in school.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?       Yes       No

#### PARAGRAPH 2:

I would like to be a truck driver when I graduate from high school. Truck drivers make a lot of money. My dad is a truck driver. Trucks are cool! Last night, my dad got back from one of his truck driving trips. He was tired, even though he got to take a nap in the bed in his truck.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?       Yes       No

#### PARAGRAPH 3:

My aunt Suzanne is my favorite relative. She is my dad's sister. My dad has three sisters: JoAnn, MaryAnn, and Suzanne. I wonder why my grandparents put "Ann" at the end of all their names. They are nice aunts. I like them all, but I don't tell them Suzanne is my favorite.



1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?       Yes       No

**PARAGRAPH 4:**

The United States of America has three branches of government. First, the legislative branch, or Congress, makes the laws. Second, the executive branch, headed by the President, enforces the laws. Finally, the judicial branch interprets the laws. This three-branch system of government has been very effective for many years.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?       Yes       No

**PARAGRAPH 5:**

High-school students should be allowed to attend parent/teacher conferences for several reasons. First, the person being discussed (the student) should be able to hear what is being said about them. Next, students should have some say in determining their goals and objectives for being successful in each of their classes. In addition, high-school students will be out on their own soon, so they should learn how to participate in adult meetings. Finally, students should learn how to appropriately build relationships with adults that hold different roles in their lives, such as parents and teachers. These are among the many reasons students should attend their own parent/teacher conferences.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?       Yes       No

## Examples and Non-Examples of Paragraphs

### PARAGRAPH 1:

There are several things you need to do to be a good student. First, you need to go to school every day, unless you are very sick. You should also pay attention in class and write down important ideas and homework assignments. In addition, you should do all assignments and turn them in on time. Finally, it is very important to ask for help when you need it. A student who does all these things will be successful in school.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?  Yes  No

### PARAGRAPH 2:

I would like to be a truck driver when I graduate from high school. Truck drivers make a lot of money. My dad is a truck driver. Trucks are cool! Last night, my dad got back from one of his truck driving trips. He was tired, even though he got to take a nap in the bed in his truck.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?  Yes  No  
*not about one topic*

### PARAGRAPH 3:

My aunt Suzanne is my favorite relative. She is my dad's sister. My dad has three sisters: JoAnn, MaryAnn, and Suzanne. I wonder why my grandparents put "Ann" at the end of all their names. They are nice aunts. I like them all, but I don't tell them Suzanne is my favorite.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?  Yes  No

**PARAGRAPH 4:**

The United States of America has three branches of government. First the legislative branch, or Congress, makes the laws. Second the executive branch, headed by the President, enforces the laws. Finally, the judicial branch interprets the laws. This three-branch system of government has been very effective for many years.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?     Yes     No

**PARAGRAPH 5:**

High-school students should be allowed to attend parent/teacher conferences for several reasons. First, the person being discussed (the student) should be able to hear what is being said about them. Next, students should have some say in determining their goals and objectives for being successful in each of their classes. In addition, high-school students will be out on their own soon, so they should learn how to participate in adult meetings. Finally, students should learn how to appropriately build relationships with adults that hold different roles in their lives, such as parents and teachers. These are among the many reasons students should attend their own IEP meetings.

1. Underline the topic sentence.
2. Put a check above each supporting detail that supports the topic sentence.
3. Is this a paragraph (check one)?     Yes     No

## Appendix I

### NEEDS: I NEED TO IMPROVE MY ABILITY TO...

#### READING

sound out new words  
read aloud without making too many mistakes  
correctly answer questions about what I read  
identify the main idea of a reading passage  
read silently for a long period of time  
answer questions about what someone else reads to me

#### WRITING

spell words well  
write and edit paragraphs  
write and edit essays  
use elaboration to make my writing more interesting  
use a computer to type essays and check spelling  
write silently for a long period of time

#### MATH

add and subtract whole numbers without a calculator  
multiply and divide whole numbers without a calculator  
add and subtract fractions  
multiply and divide fractions  
solve word problems on my own  
name my multiplication facts quickly

#### STUDY SKILLS/ORGANIZATION

complete and turn in my homework  
keep an organized book bag and notebook  
come prepared and on time to class  
take notes during class  
create study guides or flashcards to study for tests

#### SOCIAL SKILLS/BEHAVIOR

make at least one new friend  
stay on task during class  
ask for help from a peer or teacher when I need it  
follow one-step directions  
follow multi-step directions  
join a school sport or club  
participate in my next IEP meeting

#### TRANSITION SKILLS

research at least three careers that I might want to have  
research at least three colleges I might want to attend  
research the requirements for getting a driver's license  
plan and prepare an entire meal by myself  
wash, dry, and fold laundry by myself  
complete important forms (job applications, tax forms, etc.)



**Goal Paragraph: Baseline #1**

Use the space below to write a paragraph describing a goal from your needs summary. You may use the needs summary sheet that you developed, but I cannot provide any other help so do the best you can. If you are not sure how to spell a word, make your best guess. You will have 10 minutes to write.

I need to work on taking notes, because if I take notes I can study. If I study the notes I take I can maybe pass my test. It would bring my grade up from studying. It's hard to memorize a subject but if you take notes the subject doesn't seem as hard. Studying notes can improve a lot of skills. Taking notes might be boring, but it can help improve grades.



**Probe Paragraph #4**

Use the lined space below to write a paragraph about the topic below. I cannot help you with this, so do the best you can. If you are not sure how to spell a word, make your best guess. You will have 10 minutes to write.

**Topic: Think of a pet you would like to have if you could have any pet. Name that pet and explain why you would like to have it.**

I would like to have a ~~dog~~ horse as my pet. <sup>First, is because</sup> horses are smart energetic animals. Second, is because their good therapeutic companions. Third, I want feel lonely after a long day of school work. Lastly, when you ~~run~~ <sup>run</sup> throw a field of flowers it feels like your flying. I would like to have horse as my pet because of these reasons.



## Appendix L

### 10-Point Scoring Rubric: Quality of Writing Indicators

Each item is worth one point, unless otherwise specified.

<b>Administration:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Student writes topic sentence (2 points)								
Detail #1 supports topic								
Detail #2 supports topic								
Detail #3 supports topic								
Detail #4 supports topic								
Final sentence restates topic								
Paragraph information is logically presented								
Paragraph uses transition words								
There is no extraneous information								
<b>Total:</b>								

**10-Point Scoring Guide: Quality of Writing Indicators**

Each item is worth one point, unless otherwise specified.

<b>Administration:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Student writes topic sentence (2 points)	2	2	2					
Detail #1 supports topic	1	1	1					
Detail #2 supports topic	1	0	1					
Detail #3 supports topic	1	0	1					
Detail #4 supports topic	1	1	1					
Final sentence restates topic	1	1	1					
Paragraph information is logically presented	1	1	1					
Paragraph uses transition words	1	1	1					
There is no extraneous information	1	1	1					
<b>Total:</b>	10	8	10					

## Appendix M

### 12-Point Scoring Rubric: Content Indicators

**0 = There is no evidence of this skill or component, or the response is incorrect.**

**1 = Student shows an attempt; however, the response is incomplete.**

**2 = Response is complete, makes sense, and reflects student's understanding of process.**

<b>Administration:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Goal</b>								
Student's goal is based on a need identified in the statement of present level of performance.								
<b>Objectives</b>								
Objective #1 is a step toward reaching the goal.								
Objective #2 is a step toward reaching the goal.								
Objective #3 is a step toward reaching the goal.								
Objective #4 is a step toward reaching the goal.								
<b>Timeline</b>								
The timeline established is no longer than one year.								
<b>Total :</b>								

12-Point Scoring Guide: Content Indicators

- 0 = There is no evidence of this skill or component, or the response is incorrect.  
 1 = Student shows an attempt; however, the response is incomplete.  
 2 = Response is complete, makes sense, and reflects student's understanding of process.

Administration:	4/4		4/6		4/6		4	5	6	7	8
Goal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Student's goal is based on a need identified in the statement of present level of performance.	2	2	1								
Objectives											
Objective #1 is a step toward reaching the goal.	1	1	1								
Objective #2 is a step toward reaching the goal.	0	0	0								
Objective #3 is a step toward reaching the goal.	0	0	0								
Objective #4 is a step toward reaching the goal.	0	0	0								
Timeline											
The timeline established is no longer than one year.	0	0	0								
<b>Total :</b>	3	3	2								

**Appendix N**  
**Student Satisfaction of GO 4 IT...NOW! Strategy instruction**

Survey Statements: Please respond to the following statements indicating your agreement or disagreement with each statement listed below by checking the appropriate box to the right of the corresponding statement.	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1. I liked using the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy.					
2. Explain why/why not.					
3. I understand how to use the GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy.					
4. This strategy helped me write better paragraphs.					
5. The teacher's lessons were easy to understand and follow.					
6. I liked the small-group activities.					
7. The GO 4 IT...NOW! strategy should be used for future classes.					
8. Explain why/why not.					
9. Writing better paragraphs is important.					
10. It is important to learn how to write goals and objectives.					

**Appendix O**  
**Typed Student Writing Samples**

**B4**

If I could have any pet in the world it would be a monkey hands down. My monkey's name would be Goof because monkeys are goofy. I would like a monkey because they are so cute. Monkeys are funny to watch because they are so unpredictable about what they will do. I don't know about all monkeys but I know at least some have photographic memories. When monkeys are babies they are so tiny and adorable. I love when monkeys play because they jump around and climb like crazy. If I could have one as a pet and play with it every day that would be amazing.

My goal is to be able to name multiplication facts quickly. First, I will go to my math teacher and ask for help on multiplication facts. Second, I will ask for a worksheet to take home and study. Next, I will correctly name five multiplication facts quickly under ten to fifteen seconds. Finally, I will practice naming multiplication facts every single night for ten to twenty minutes. I will reach my goal of being able to name my multiplication facts quickly in the time of one year or less.

I will be able to make at least one new friend by following the steps below. First, I will sit at a table with people I don't know. Second, I will talk to everyone and be nice to them. Next, I will get to know them and also tell them about myself. Finally, I will sit with them every day and talk to them about random stuff throughout their day. I will be able to follow the steps above to complete my goal of making at least one new friend within in a year.