DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 338 CS 211 345

AUTHOR Dittmer, Allan; And Others
TITLE School, University, State: Collaboration for Writing Programs.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 34p.; Panel presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (39th, St. Louis, MO, March 17-19, 1988).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Cooperation; Grants; Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Secondary Education; *State Aid; State Departments of Education; *State School District Relationship; Tutoring; Urban Education; Writing Across the Curriculum; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Laboratories; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS National Writing Project; University of Louisville KY; Writing Workshops

ABSTRACT

The subject of this panel presentation was a collaborative effort to improve writing instruction around the state of Kentucky, which resulted in the funding of several National Writing Project sites, regional workshops, and a competitive grants program to encourage middle and high school classroom teachers to develop innovative writing projects in their schools. The panel discussed the collaborative efforts of the University of Louisville, the public schools, and the State Department of Education in establishing specific writing projects in Kentucky. Presentations included in this paper are (1) introductory comments on collaboration (Marjorie Kaiser); (2) "Collaboration to Create Environments and Curriculum for Writing Instruction" (Sonia M. Cohen); (3) "An Inner City Writing Project" (Mike Miller); (4) "Training and Utilizing Peer Tutors in a High School Writing Center" (Rita Peterson); (5) comments on the collaborative efforts from the point of view of the State Department of Education (Ellen Lewis); and (6) concluding remarks (Allan Dittmer). (RS)

School, University, State: Collaboration for Writing Programs

A. Dittmer, M. Kaiser, E. Lewis,
S. Cohen, M. Miller, R. Peterson

ABSTRACT

Kentucky has a long history of collaboration between its universities and school districts, and this program will show the benefits of collaboration and what can be accomplished as a result of it. The panel presentation will consist of individuals who have been involved in a collaborative effort to improve writing instruction around the state of Kentucky. Because of this effort, the Kentucky Department of Education earmarked over three million dollars for funding National Writing Project sites, regional workshops, and a competitive grants program to encourage middle and high school classroom teachers from all over Kentucky to develop innovative writing projects in their schools. With 2 of the 3 million dollars, the grants program has funded 86 projects in 60 of Kentucky's school districts. Presenters on this panel will discuss the role of the university, the public schools, and the State Department of Education in this collaborative effort and will describe specific writing projects that have been funded.

Good afternoon and welcome to Session G-14, "School, University, State: Collaboration for Writing Programs." My name is Marjorie Kaiser, and I teach at the University of Louisville in Kentucky and direct the Louisville Writing Project, part of the network of National Writing Project sites. In a moment, I will be introducing the other presenters in our Kentucky ensemble. But first, I want to say what a pleasure it is to be here in St. Louis. As I was growing up many years ago on the other side of the Mississippi in Alton, Illinois, St. Louis loomed as large as the whole world to me. As I return here now on occasion for meetings such as this one, and to visit my family, I find, as Mark Twain did in returning to visit his birthplace in Florida, Missouri, the city has finally shrunk to a size that I can manage. It is truly a joy for all of us to be in this comfortable and hospitable river city.

Collaboration is surely the catch word of the 80's. We speak of collaborative learning in the Ken Bruffee manner; we refer to collaborative efforts in the classroom, as students compose together or simply respond to one another's writing. When 2 teachers decide to work together in the classroom, we label their activity "collaborative teaching." Indeed, some people say they are collaborating when they're simply talking with one another.

Clearly, there are many meanings attached to the term collaboration. In a recent article, Schlechty and Whitford help to clarify the term as they describe 3 types of school-university

collaboration. The first, they label cooperative, arrangements generally provided for short duration, projects which view school personnel primarily as receivers of services provided by a University. The 2nd type of collaboration the authors identify as symbiotic, or those in which there is reciprocity -- schools and a university helping meet each other's needs with some supportive organizational structures. In the 3rd type of school-university collaboration, labeled organic, both institutions define their focus so that issues are mutually owned, and schools and universities actually work together with strong institutional support to solve common problems over time.

In using this conceptualization of school-university collaboration and adding in the institution of the Kentucky Department of Education to think about what has evolved in Kentucky in relation to writing programs, I suspect the working relationships among the University of Louisville, the Jefferson County Public Schools, and the State Department can be described as somewhere between symbiotic and organic. It is certainly true that the University, the schools, and the Department all have a stake in improving student writing skills and writing instruction. All 3 institutions stand to profit in numerous ways by attention to and progress in this critical area. What is lacking to keep our efforts from being characterized as fully organic is the assurance of on-going fiscal support that would sustain our work despite the fluctuations of politics in Kentucky -- and a formalized inter-institutional structure. What we have been doing has been structured and

blessed, more or less informally, by individuals and institutions of good will and professional commitment. At this precarious point in Kentucky legislative history, our thoughts are on how to build the kinds of structural bonds that will protect writing programs from the painful upheaval that occurs in our state every 4 years.

In order for you to know more about these Kentucky goings-on and how they came about, I would like to introduce our presenters in the order in which they will be sharing their material with you.

Ellen Lewis, Language Arts Consultant, Kentucky Department of Education
Sonia Cohen - Central High School, Louisville

Mike Miller, Noe Middle School, Louisville
Rita Peterson, Iroquois High School, Louisville
Allan Dittmer, Chair, Secondary Education, University of Louisville

Each of these presenters will have 10 minutes, and we would like to save 10-15 minutes at the conclusion for response and questions. I will try to time things so we don't get too far off our schedule. Please save your questions until after all the presenters have finished.

~~Bonnie~~ will take questions, moderate.

COLLABORATION TO CREATE ENVIRONMENTS AND CURRICULUM FOR WRITING INSTRUCTION

Sonia M. Cohen
Central High School
Jefferson County Public Schools
Louisville, Kentucky

When Alan first approached me with his idea for this session, my response was "collaboration? I haven't been involved in any collaborative program!" I had simply never put that label on actions that were, for me, as natural as breathing.

Since 1973 when I had been involved with Madeline Hunter at UCLA in a wonderful program called Project Linkage, I had realized the mutually enriching experience of working together with people outside my classroom walls. I missed that collaborative relationship and resultant collegiality when I began teaching in Kentucky.

In 1982 I was hired to develop a remedial reading program using computers at Central High School in Louisville. I quickly realized that the greatest potential use of the computer in English language arts was for writing. I became a fellow in the Louisville Writing Project (LWP) and over the next two years developed a course of study which emphasized process writing in conjunction with building reading skills.

I was frustrated, however, that more students were not involved with this kind of integrated instruction and that there was little or no collegiality among our department members. Traditional grammar instruction was the norm, and teachers regarded each other with suspicion.

Several teachers did become interested in the power of the word processor, however, and as a result became more interested in the power of writing in the classroom. I recruited another teacher for the LWP, and then in 1985, together with her, wrote a proposal for a Central High School Writing Institute. This semester long project was funded by a district mini-grant and enabled us to begin to break down walls among our faculty. We had fun, wrote together, learned from each other, and began to talk about transforming my classroom with its ten computers into a Writing Room for many classes to use. When the Kentucky State Department offered the Pilot Writing Grants we were ready. From September to December 1986 we identified needs, brainstormed and decided on a plan.

By this time, five of ten department members had been LWP participants and four others were interested in integrated language arts and process writing instruction. But, because time is at such a premium during the school day, collaboration was difficult, if not impossible. As a result, although teachers held similar philosophies, our students had widely different language arts experiences. We felt the need to identify some systematic approaches to ensure that all our ninth graders would have a similar foundation upon which to build.

We also knew that to provide a language rich environment we needed more than the basic literature book and grammar text. We needed to enlarge our collection of young adult novels, magazines, and writing books.

I already mentioned that we had found word processing to greatly facilitate writing instruction. With their greater flexibility for revising, editing and publishing written work, computers help students focus on the process of writing, and are certainly a motivating tool. We knew, though, that computers don't teach writing. Informed instruction in writing process does. The two together will make a difference in students' motivation and ability to write.

Thus, our proposal centered equally on creating the environment and the curriculum necessary for "Process in Thought and Action" which is the title of our grant. With funds from the grant, we met last summer to study current research in writing, select appropriate instructional materials, set up our Writing Room, and begin planning our instructional units.

A major conclusion of the 1984 National Assessment of Writing Achievement is that students at all grade levels are difficient in higher order thinking skills. The report suggests that "students need broad-based experiences in which reading and writing tasks are integrated into their work throughout the curriculum" and that "instruction in writing process needs to focus on teaching students to think more effectively as they write."

The instructional units we are developing address those needs. The first unit is autobiographical, the second is literature based with "conflict" as a theme, the last is a mini-research or "I-Search" unit. We are continuing to work on these during this year. We meet at each others homes at once a month in the evening to share plans, try out new ideas, and enjoy each others company. Sometimes we get wildly off-task, but the result has been an incredible esprit de corps which has carried over in our work with our students.

We use these units and materials purchased through the grant as we teach in our own classrooms and in the Writing Room. Our Writing Room, housed in a large classroom in the center of the English wing, now has thirteen Apple computers (four with 128K, nine with 64K), three printers, large tables for writing and conferencing, our professional library, and many instructional materials.

The word processing program we chose is the Free Educational Writer (FrEd). It is Prodos based and completely compatible with AppleWriter and the more sophisticated AppleWorks and Multiscribe which require 128K computers. Because FrEd is public domain software, we can duplicate it at will. We sell students disks for fifty cents and copy FrEd for them. The text can be displayed in both 80 and 40 characters, which is essential to accomodate kids with reading and visual problems. The commands are simple to use and remember. Another teacher and I wrote a simple cue sheet containing the basic commands and prepared a three-day orientation script to acquaint all English teachers and ninth grade

students with the Writing Room, computers, and the FrEd program.

At least once a week, fifteen of the sixteen ninth grade classes come with their English teachers to the Writing Room where they draft, revise, edit, and/or publish writing that they may have begun in their class, often as an introduction to or an outgrowth of literature or language study. In addition, seven sophomore, four senior, and two learning disability classes are using the facility.

Students have many different opportunities to see their writing published. Completed work is often shared aloud and displayed in classrooms on twelve new bulletin boards provided by the school district. Students have shared their stories and plays with elementary school classes, written to the Courier Journal newspaper, State Senators and Representatives, and other public officials.

Ninth grade students are completing their writing autobiographies. When finished, each student will have produced a spirally bound booklet comprised of ten to fifteen different autobiographical sketches, narratives, poems. With grant money we hired an instructional assistant who will assemble an anthology of representative autobiographical pieces which will provide models and springboards for writing in subsequent years.

In addition, all students will have the opportunity to submit their writing for possible publication in Central's first literary magazine, "Through Our Eyes". A student editorial board, under the direction of our assistant, will make final selections and produce the magazine.

The state grant has provided teachers and students with many new learning experiences. The impact of the program, however, will not end with this year of funding. Teachers and students will continue to benefit from the instructional materials, the Writing Room, and the collaborative environment at Central High School.

"An Inner City Writing Project"

Good Morning! Thank you for coming to our session. It's been exciting for me to hear so many great ideas about writing at the college level. This was my first CCCC. It won't be my last.

The title of my presentation is "An Inner City Writing Project". Let me describe my school a little bit. Noe is a middle school with an enrollment of 850 students. We have grades 6-8. 64% of its students are white, 36% are black. 60% are on free lunches, about half of our students are one to two years behind in total reading and math. The challenge we face is not an easy one. No one has the answer for the "inner city school". I'm not going to tell you that the ideas presented today are the answer. But, I will tell you this: if we don't start finding answers soon, our society will be in big trouble. We have got to give these students a stake, a part, a place to feel they can contribute, successfully raise a family, and aspire to the same dreams you and I share!

The rest of this presentation is divided into two parts. First, I want to describe our project and second, I want to share some student work with you. The title of our Kentucky State Dept. of Education grant is, "On the Road to the Future". Our economy is in a transition from manufacturing and industry to service and information processing. The jobs my students will be competing for will take more brainpower than musclepower. We must prepare them by teaching the skills these jobs will require. These new basics are:

1) thinking
2) oral and written communication
3) problem solving in small groups
4) computer literacy

Let me share a fact about the job market in Louisville. G.E. has not had a new hire since 1976- yes- twelve years. G.E. would have been a company I could have told my students they would get on a manufacturing line.

Our writing program has three interlocking parts. They are, staff development, Writer-in-Residence, and our Student Publishing Resource Center.

Our staff development component has the overiding theme, "Invest in Teachers". I feel very strongly that an investment in the teacher pays dividends in the classroom for the student.Teachers must be encouraged and rewarded for growing professionally. I believe teachers want to. Many have never been given the chance or asked about their ideas.

Our grant set up many workshops and inservices for teachers to learn. Their main purposes were to:

1) Teach teachers the writing process. We wanted them to communicate to their students, "to write as if there is a tomorrow".

2) We wanted teachers to realize that "writing is thinking written down".

3) We wanted to give teachers a chance to get together with each other and share ideas. I'm convinced that good things happen when teachers get together. This conference is evidence of that fact.

4) We wanted teachers to visit other schools and learn how they approached the teaching of writing.

5) We wanted to train teachers in the technology we have in our own building that is not being used.

We also wanted to build a library of resource materials where a teacher could go and get a good idea or check out a book about writing. Finally, we wanted to take a look at ourselves. We wanted to identify the strengths and weaknesses in our curriculum. We wanted to continue building new programs that meet the needs of students who need help and challenge those who are bored. We're doing this with: 1) Holistic Writing Samples, 2) Attitude Inventory, 3) Case studies

The second major component of our grant is our Writers-in-Residence. Teachers and students love this part. We found professional writers with a good track record in classroom situations and invited them into our school for 1-2 week residences. Teachers learned new ways to make writing come alive. Students are seeing first-hand, the joy these writers share about their work. We had professional poets, playwrights, dramatists, fiction writers and creativity experts. Aleda Shirley, the winner of the New York Best First Book of Poetry Award has worked with us.

The final component is our Student Publishing Resource Center. We have one room in our school devoted to the publishing of student work. Class books, individual books, fiction and non-fiction works, and plays are all being produced. Students love reading other students writing. The books we

publish are being used all over our building as supplementary reading materials. We are literally creating our language arts curriculum. We want want to expand this in the future. My dream is to develop a marketable unit of student books to earn money for our publishing center.

The core of Noe's publishing house is a Macintosh Plus with a Laserwriter Plus. This Desktop Publishing System quickly gives our student writing a professional look. There is magic in this translation of student work to professional quality printed materials. Graphic capabilities give these books even more flair. This magic is also motivational. The word is out. Get yourself published. The amount and variety of writing at Noe is astonishing to me.

A major outgrowth of our Student Publishing Resource Center is our Academic Olympics.It consists of six events in which students compete. These events were designed by teachers at Noe and each has writing as an integral part. You have the 1988 guidelines and a bock from last years events.

Submitted by Mike Miller July 6, 1988.

"Training and Utilizing Peer Tutors in a High School Writing Center"

Rita Peterson

The Iroquois Writing Center Program began operation in September 1984 with equipment funded by a grant from Xerox Corporation and the National Urban League. Since its beginning, the Writing Center has expanded from a program serving primarily ninth grade English classes to one that serves all grade and subject areas and includes a peer tutoring component.

Our program is based on the assumptions that writing can be taught by helping students gain control over the basic stages of the process, and that writing is best taught in a non-threatening environment where both students and teachers write.

Any grade or subject area teacher wishing to use the Writing Center facility is invited to attend one of several inservice programs offered throughout the year. Each inservice presentation reviews current research regarding writing instruction, displays writing assignment models, and allows participants to experience the discovery of writing, by writing.

A large portion of this year's inservice was devoted to familiarizing teachers with the newest component of our program: peer tutors. Ninth and tenth grade students were instructed, during a four-week summer institute funded by a Kentucky State Writing Grant, to serve as peer readers and responders to student writing. This energetic group of young people provides a vital link between our Center's commitment to writing instruction and the teachers and students we serve.

The idea of training students as tutors grew out of the identified needs of our student writers and the teachers who sent or sometimes came to the Center with entire classes of students. These students fell into several categories: those who didn't know how or where to begin; those who had a start but couldn't focus or develop their writing; those who wanted us to "fix" or "clean up" their drafts, so that they could turn it in and be done with them; and finally, a few students who recognized the value and need for reader response. Furthermore, teachers wanted proof that the Writing Center did indeed assist them and their students and that this renewed emphasis on writing instruction wasn't the latest educational fad, or one more thing for them to do.

Convinced that a peer tutoring component would expand the scope of the Center's efforts, we applied for and received funding for our project through Kentucky's generous grant program. The principles underlying our training program are adapted from Reigstad and McAndrews, Training Tutors for Writing Conferences. (see appendix)

Students were selected for participation in the summer program based on the following: past academic performance and attendance records; their written responses to an application/questionnaire; their interpersonal skills; and teacher recommendation.

Students selected were paid to participate in a four-week summer program where they developed their own skills by writing continuously, interacting in writer's groups, and with partners. They experienced first hand the kinds of problems beginning and

mature writers encounter. They read current articles about writing development, role-played and critiqued video-taped conferencing sessions (using what we fondly refer to as our generic checklist--see appendix), and finally talked with several professional writers who freely discussed their own development and who unanimously encouraged our tutors to "keep on writing!"

Following the summer institute, sixteen students were selected to remain in the program and work in the Writing Center. These students will recieve elective credit for their efforts at the conclusion of the school year. In addition, these students are scheduled into the same homeroom where they learn about the classes and assignments that are scheduled in the Center, and discuss current problems or concerns. Frequently, students will volunteer to talk about a particularly challenging interaction.

We begin homeroom at seven-fifty. (Our tutors have suggested that they might arrive even earlier, if we serve them breakfast. Food is definitely a priority item with adolescents and it was a great motivator this summer.) Once the peer tutors are familiar with a teacher's writing assignment and expectations, they work with students clarifying the task, listening, reading, questioning, recognizing potential and moving the writer toward revision and discovery.

A record keeping system is slowly evolving. Currently, we ask students to respond to student writing using a prioritized list of concerns that stress--focus, appropriate voice and tone, organization, and development over punctuation, spelling and usage.

The checklist and conferencing notes are filed in student folders and tutors are instructed to review files before the next conference begins. Tutors follow up a conference by responding in learning logs to open-ended questions that allow for reflection. This provides students the opportunity to talk and write about what happens during a conference, and allows the program coordinators to know more about the processes of these empowered student writers. Over the past few months the tutors have grown to rely less on the checklist and more on their own abilities to foster ownership.

A follow-up summer session is in the planning stage for the summer of `88. This will allow for review of the training, policies and program procedures. Veteran tutors will be paired to work with new tutors in the fall. In addition, by surveying the tutors and other students who frequent the Center, the coordinators hope to learn more about the kinds of responses that are the most helpful to developing student writers.

It would be grand to report that the skepticism of all teachers regarding the Writing Center and the use of peer tutors has disappeared, but it hasn't. What can be said is that the program is gaining credibility as a location within the school where students recieve help and where teachers can collaborate with other teachers about writing instruction. Our effectiveness in this regard is evident in the number of teachers who bring or send students to the Writing Center. During the current school year, we have worked with students in the areas of English, science, chemistry, social studies, distributive education, Chapter I reading, special education, and math.

In conclusion, the State Writing Grants offered us the opportunity to expand the services of our Writing Center. Having the physical space and the staff to serve students every period of the day, as well as before and after school, provides us the opportunity to demonstrate and document our commitment to writing as a means to learn in all subject areas.

APPENDIX

PEER TUTORING MODEL

FOUR PRINCIPALS UNDERLYING MODEL:

1) Establish and maintain rapport with the student writer.

The tutor can establish rapport by first getting acquainted with the writer, making him/her feel comfortable, non-threatened by the session. Opening the session with a positive comment about the paper helps build the writer's confidence, and lays the groundwork for interaction.

2) The writer does the work.

The tutor is a reader and responder to the student's writing, not an editor or rewriter. By assuming role of collaborator, who monitors and guides the forming draft through questioning and listening, the tutor can elicit more substantive changes in the writing draft (Karliner, 1979). According to a study by Beaumont (1978), the most effective tutor roles are those of "interested reader/listener" and "partner in writing," roles which limit evaluation of the writing.

3) High-order concerns come before low-order concerns.

Because of limited time in the tutoring session, time must be spent where it will yield the greatest improvement. The four priority concerns (HOC's) include: 1) thesis or focus, 2) appropriate voice or tone, 3) effective organization and structure, and 4) adequate development.

After dealing with HOC's, tutors move to LOC's, concerns that deal with units of sentence length or smaller. The first LOC addresses problems with awkward or incorrect structure, sentence length, and sentence variety. The remaining LOCs deal with problems in punctuation, spelling, and usage.

Tutors help students without a draft begin writing by giving them strategies to overcome writer's block, e.g. freewriting, clustering, dialoging about the topic.

4) Tutors do not have to be experts.

Although tutors are preferably above-average writers who relate well to people, if properly trained their level of expertise they bring to a writing conference should be sufficient. Improvement, not perfection, is the goal.

* Adapted from Training Tutors for Writing Conferences by Thomas J. Reigstad and Donald A. McAndrew. Published 1984 by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and NCTE.

STUDENT'S NAME_____ I.____

TUTOR'S NAME_____ II.____

DATE_____ III.____

IV.____

PEER TUTOR INTERACTION GUIDESHEET

(NON-FICTION/RESEARCH)

I. FOCUS

1) What is the topic?

2) What is said about the topic? State the slant or focus of this topic:

3) How is the information in the paper related to the topic?

4) Note any unrelated information:

5) Write out suggestions for making the topic and focus clearer:

II. VOICE/TONE

6) Is the language appropriate to the purpose of the paper? Explain.

7) Is the language appropriate to the audience of the paper? Explain.

8) Write out suggestions for making the language consistent throughout the paper:

9) Describe the tone of voice in the paper: (serious, humorous, informative, critical, etc.)

10) Is the tone of voice consistent throughout the paper?

Identify places where the tone is not consistent and write out suggestions for correcting this:

III. ORGANIZATION

11) How is the information organized in such a way that the reader can follow the ideas easily?

12) Outline the paper's organization:

I7. DEVELOPMENT

13) What specific illustrations/examples/reasons are used to make clear the ideas developed in the paper?

14) Wnat unanswered questions are omitted which should be answered about this topic? List below:

S. Kirtley and R. Peterson, Iroquois H.S., Jeff. County, KY., Summer 1987.

NAME OF WRITER_____ I._____

NAME OF TUTOR_____ II._____

DATE_____ III._____

IV._____

PEER TUTOR INTERACTION GUIDESHEET

(PERSONAL EXPERIENCE NARRATIVE/FICTION)

I. POINT OF VIEW/FOCUS

1) Decribe the narrator/story teller of this narrative:

2) Who is the point of view character?

3) Does the writer keep this point of view consistently throughout the story?

If not, note any problems with the viewpoint:

4) Describe the effect the story has on you:

List some words or phrases which help create this effect:

II. TONE OF VOICE/LANGUAGE

5) What is the narrator's tone of voice in the story?

List below some words or phrases which illustrate the narrator's attitude in the story:

6) Explain how the language of the narrator appropriate to the character the story is told through?

7) Explain how the language is appropriate for the implied audience/reader.

8) Comment on any language that is unclear or misunderstood by the reader:

III. ORGANIZATION

9) How is this story organized?

a) chronological order (in the present or past)

b) present-past-present (flashback/memory)

10) Describe below any problems you have following the plot or story line and make suggestions for improvement:

IV. DEVELOPMENT

11) How has the writer used **showing** instead of **telling**?

a) dialogue to reveal character

b) specific language

c) sensory detailed description

d) description of scenes that **move** instead of **sit still**

11) Comment on any of the above which need attention:

12) Comment on the following characteristics of writer's style that may need attention:

a) wordiness

b) unnecessary repetition

c) using **passive voice** when **active voice** is more appropriate

S. Kirtley and R. Peterson, Iroquois H.S., Jeff. County, KY., Summer 1987.

In 1985, a special session of the Kentucky General Assembly passed legislation establishing a $3,000,000 Statewide Writing Program in Kentucky for the 1986-87 and 1987-88 school years. The focus of the program is to improve students' writing abilities and to provide staff development for teachers in effective methods of teaching writing.

Getting this piece of legislation passed was a result of successful collaboration between a variety of Kentucky educators. At the time, our governor and state superintendent of public instruction were former classroom teachers who supported the writing program along with other education reform measures. The state Secretary of Education was the Dean of the School of Education at the University of Louisville. He was a strong proponent of legislation for a writing program due to his first-hand knowledge of the success of the Louisville Writing Project, which began in 1982. The Kentucky Council of Teachers of English/Language Arts, whose membership includes both classroom teachers and college professors, lobbied hard for the writing program. Personnel at the Kentucky Department of Education prepared for the program by asking the directors of the Louisville Writing Project to conduct a week-long state writing institute for public school and university teachers. Most of the university professors who attended this institute are now directing writing projects at their own universities. Many teachers who attended have become involved in the one or more elements of the program. Collaboration was the key to establishing the program, and collaboration has been a part of its implementation.

The legislation provided for an advisory committee to be formed to guide the program. Four classroom teachers, a public school principal, three university professors, and a representative from the community make up the committee.

The Writing Program includes five major elements, each of which I will describe.

It was clear that the majority of our teachers in Kentucky needed to learn much more about effective methods of teaching writing. Due to the success of the Louisville Writing Project, we embraced the assumptions of the National Writing Project and established sites at other state universities in Kentucky. Each university adds its own funds to a yearly grant of $20,000 from the Writing Program. In addition to the Louisville Writing Project, four state universities conducted projects in 1986, and two others joined the network in 1987. All seven will conduct a project this summer. Three of these projects have classroom teachers serving as assistant directors and one other has as its co-director a former classroom teacher who is chairperson of the local school board. The projects have been enormously successful in working with excellent teachers who have left the projects

professionally enriched and have provided the strong leadership necessary to effect change in their schools, districts, and throughout the state.

In order to reach some teachers in each of the 178 public school districts i Kentucky, the advisory committee decided to conduct regional writing workshops. Two language arts teachers form each school district were invited to attend. The workshops were held for three days in the fall of 1986 and two follow-up days the next spring. Fifteen writing project teachers were selected to conduct these workshops which were designed to give teachers some basic knowledge about teaching writing as a process. Rita, Sonia, and Mike served as leaders of three of the workshops. Marjorie developed an outline of the workshops and worked with the leaders as they planned their programs. The workshops inspired many of the participants to learn more about the teaching of writing. Some of the teachers were later accepted to writing projects and others developed writing programs for their schools.

Knowing that a strong state mandate was necessary to support the effective teaching we were talking about in the projects and workshops, the advisory committee revised the state Program of Studies to reflect a greater emphasis on what current research tells us about the effective teaching of writing. Whereas the old program required the teaching of isolated grammar units and mentioned writing only incidentally, our new program requires that teachers teach writing as a process. As with the other parts of the writing program, university professors, public school teachers, and state department personnel collaborated to produce the document.

The most extensive element of the Writing Program is the Pilot Writing Projects grant program. Over two million of the three million dollars has been sent directly to public school districts for grant projects which enhance students' fluency and effectiveness in writing and develop teacher knowledge and implementation of effective teaching of writing. 86 projects are now operating in one-third of Kentucky's school districts. Each project is designed to address the unique needs of the students and teachers involved. The three teachers on this panel will be describing their projects to you. Collaboration between the schools and universities has been particularly evident in many of the grant projects. The team of readers who selected which proposals to fund was made up of university and public school teachers. University professors helped some teachers to write their proposals; other projects have asked professors to serve as consultants for inservice presentations. Universities are helping some of the districts to conduct parts of the project evaluations. Because we are requiring that all projects conduct a pre- and

post-project writing assessment, we are also providing teachers with training in holistic scoring and conducting a writing assessment. A director of the Louisville Writing Project and nine writing project teachers are leading the training sessions.

Many of the grant projects address writing across the curriculum, and the National Writing Project sites are open to teachers of all content areas. At the end of this month, we will bring together representatives from all major state professional education organizations to learn about writing across the curriculum and to develop recommendations for more extensive implementation of writing in all classrooms. Our speakers will be from universities and public schools as will our participants.

Last fall we were delighted to learn that the Council of State Governments had selected our Writing Program as one of the eight innovative programs they honor each year. A policy analyst from the Council is in the final stages of writing a monograph about the Writing Program which will be sent to top policy makers in all fifty states. If you are interested in learning more about the program and, perhaps, beginning a program like this in your own state, you might want to make your legislators and state department of education personnel aware that this monograph is forthcoming.

As you can see, collaboration between the universities, schools, and the state department of education is the heart of the program. All of these groups work together sharing their special expertise as we help Kentucky's students become effective communicators of important ideas.

When I wrote the proposal for this program session, I wrote in, as primary presenters, the classroom teachers I knew who were the key players in this collaborative effort between the University, Public Schools, and the State Department of Education. In fact, I couldn't imagine a program on collaboration that didn't include classroom teachers. I understand that at this convention particularly, it is more the exception than the rule to include classroom teachers on the program, but clearly these presentations today would be strong support for changing that tradition.

There is an awful lot of talking these days about the professionalization of teaching . . . of raising not only the standards by which teachers are chosen and educated, but improving the conditions in which teachers work. It is difficult to imagine either one of those things happening without some clearly articulated shared vision between schools and universities. By its very nature, a shared vision assumes cooperation or collaboration of some sort.

Nevertheless, most educators would agree that unless the structure of schools and the conditions of teaching are dramatically improved, one likely consequence of higher standards for teachers entering the profession is enrollment decline in teacher preparation programs. Yet universities have no legitimate right to intervene in the restructuring

of schools, and school personnel have no legitimate right to set university standards. In the long run, though, the conditions characterizing school cultures and the teaching occupation affect a university's ability to attract teacher education students, just as the quality of teacher education graduates affects the school's capacity for effectiveness. In other words, our future successes are very much intertwined and depend in large part on our ability to work together cooperatively . . . collaboratively.

In the relatively short time I have been at the University of Louisville, a year-and-a-half to be exact, I have become aware of the long history of collaboration between the University and the schools it serves. Perhaps the most dramatic and wrenching period of collaboration occurred during the period when the city and county school district merged, creating the eighth largest school district in the country, currently with over 90,000 students. At about the same time the merger was taking place, the federal courts ordered the system to desegregate. These were emotionally charged times in Louisville, but with the help and support of a broad constituency, including colleagues at the University of Louisville, the effort succeeded.

Last summer, I experienced my first direct encounter with school/university collaboration teaching a writing institute in Boone County, Kentucky near Cincinnati with three very talented teachers as colleagues. I continue to be impressed with the pool of extremely gifted and dedicated

teachers the University has access to, a pool that continues to expand through such efforts as the Louisville Writing Project and the "teachers teaching teachers" model it is based on.

There are a number of other significant collaborative efforts currently going on that I would like to mention briefly.

1. The Coalition of Essential Schools project based on Ted Sizer's model of school reform.
2. The Professional Development Schools Planning Project and the induction process for new teachers being conducted under the auspices of the JCPS/Gheens Academy and the University of Louisville.
3. The New Kid in School project which involves university and school people in developing and evaluating uses of computers in classrooms.
4. The Louisville Writing Project which is in its 7th year of successful operation and which in that time has spawned 6 other state-wide projects.
5. A variety of Teacher/Researcher projects all based in specific schools.
6. And the state-wide writing incentive grants program you heard about today.

This past year, a group of University faculty developed a competitive grant proposal that was funded by the Kentucky Council on Higher Education to establish a Center for the

Collaborative Advancement of the Teaching Profession. A variety of activities will take place as a result of the resources provided by this grant, but one which is specifically related to the program today, is the establishment of a companion institute to the Louisville Writing Project called the Writing to Learn Institute, designed for K-12 teachers of Science, Math and Social Studies. Ellen Lewis, who represented the state on the program today, was released one-half time from her duties with the Kentucky State Department of Education to assist with the development of the program and Marjorie Kaiser's teaching load and mine were reduced to work on developing the institute. Center funds allowed Marjorie and me to visit the National Writing Project Research Center at Berkeley, California this Fall to discuss our ideas about the Writing to Learn Institute with the staff of the National Writing Project. A former Writing Project participant and current middle school teacher has been hired to serve as co-director of the summer institute and the teacher participants in the institute will receive a stipend and 6 hours of graduate credit for their participation. And some of the expenses to help support the teacher participant's travel to this convention were provided out of Center funds.

It would be less than truthful for me to say there are no problems with collaboration. In fact, there are and here are just a few that we have already encountered and some

we've worked through: often individuals are brought together with differing personalities or working styles or philosophies . . . often physical barriers like distances between locations, or non-physical barriers like a willingness to trust others or share what has always been one's exclusive province, or turf issues get in the way ... there is no shortage of self-promoters in the field of education, and individuals who place their personal success and recognition ahead of working cooperatively with others can undermine the achievement of commonly agreed upon goals . . . new roles emerge which threaten people's security, and sometimes just the idea of change can be sufficiently threatening to throw up barriers to collaboration. And, as we in Kentucky are currently experiencing, a new governor with a new educational agenda and budget priorities can lop off programs, even ones that have proven successful, and replace them with untried but politically safe ones. This kind of disruption can bring an abrupt halt to collaborative efforts and destroy valuable networks that have been painstakingly built. In Kentucky where, by law, government turns over every four years, it is difficult to plan for and achieve long term goals.

Collaboration is never easy, just as marriage is never easy. There are compromises, adjustments, and negotiations that must take place in both, but they become easier as a base of successful collaborative activities are developed and built on. Not only is my professional life enriched by

the collaborative contacts I have had with my public school teacher counterparts, the students in our respective classes benefit in the long run and that alone makes these efforts worthwhile.

0118 DD2