Continuity

Supporting On-Site Teacher-Consultants: New York City Writing Project's Community of Learners

by Ed Osterman

New York City Writing Project
Lehman College, The City University of New York

The National Writing Project at Work monograph series documents how the National Writing Project model is implemented and developed at local sites across the country. These monographs describe NWP work, which is often shared informally or in workshops through the NWP network, and offer detailed chronological accounts for sites interested in adopting and adapting the models. The programs described are inspired by the mission and vision of NWP and illustrate the local creativity and responsiveness of individual writing project sites. Written by teams of teachers and site directors—the people who create and nurture local programs—the texts reflect different voices and points of view, and bring a rich perspective to the work described. Each National Writing Project at Work monograph provides a developmental picture of the local program from the initial idea through planning, implementation, and refinement over time. The authors retell their journeys, what they achieved, how they were challenged, and how and why they succeeded.

Continuity

Supporting On-Site Teacher-Consultants: New York City Writing Project's Community of Learners

by Ed Osterman

New York City Writing Project
Lehman College, The City University of New York

National Writing Project
Berkeley, California

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT

The mission of the National Writing Project is to improve the teaching of writing and improve learning in the nation's schools. Through its professional development model, the National Writing Project recognizes the primary importance of teacher knowledge, expertise, and leadership.

The National Writing Project believes that access to high quality educational experiences is a basic right of all learners and a cornerstone of equity. Through its extensive network of teachers, the National Writing Project seeks to promote exemplary instruction of writing in every classroom in America.

The National Writing Project values diversity—our own as well as that of our students, their families, and their communities. We recognize that our lives and practices are enriched when those with whom we interact represent diversities of race, gender, class, ethnicity, and language.

Developmental Editor: Shirley Brown
Series Editors: Joye Alberts, Shirley Brown
Consulting Editor: Amy Bauman
Copyeditor: Judith Bess
Design: Diana Nankin, 38degrees.com
Layout and page design: Karen Karten

National Writing Project
University of California
2105 Bancroft Way, #1042
Berkeley, CA 94720-1042

Telephone: 510-642-0963
Fax: 510-642-4545
Email: nwp@nwp.org
www.nwp.org

FOREWORD

How do writing project sites continue to attract and engage hard-working teachers in cocreating professional development throughout their careers? How do they sustain a presence in their local service areas, adapting to the interests of successive generations of teachers while still maintaining a sense of organizational mission? This third set in the NWP at Work monograph series focuses on the varied approaches local NWP sites take to "continuity." Each monograph offers a window into the design and structure of opportunities that provide an intellectual home for writing project teacher-consultants who lead the work at each of the nearly 200 local sites around the country.

The first two sets in the NWP at Work series highlight two of the three components of the NWP model: the summer institute and site-sponsored inservice programming in schools and districts. The present set offers illustrations of the third component: continuity. Continuity, essentially, consists of those practices that nurture ongoing professional development and provide an indispensable source for sustained leadership development at local sites. The invitational summer institute identifies, recruits, and invites teachers into the culture, offering opportunities for leadership of the site. Inservice programs disseminate learnings about the teaching of writing. And it is through continuity that each site invests over time in the continued learning of its community of teacher-consultants.

Continuity, as the name implies, extends and deepens the cultural values enacted in the invitational summer institute: learning is ongoing, and it is socially and collaboratively constructed. At NWP sites, continuity goes beyond follow-up to the summer institute and constitutes the programming that sustains the professional community of the site and builds its leadership. Sites rely on teacher-consultants and university colleagues to collaborate and reinforce the partnership that is the backbone of the site; and continuity programs allow each site to grow and respond to changing educational landscapes. Continuity, according to Sheridan Blau, director of the South Coast Writing Project, is "where knowledge is as much produced as consumed."

Continuity to Support Continued Learning

The kinds of programs sites engage in as continuity are wide-ranging and varied in intensity, drawing on local interests and needs. Such programs can include writing retreats, teacher research initiatives, and study groups on issues of concern in the service area, to name a few. While aspects of continuity described in this series involve long-range programming, teacher-consultants at writing project sites also value the less-formal and more-social occasions for learning. These might include book groups, dine-and-discuss gatherings, yearly reunion dinners, and ongoing listserv discussions that keep them involved and connected. An effective approach to continuity supports the dynamic growth of teacher-consultant knowledge by offering teachers access to colleagues and intellectual engagement in the midst of what can be the isolated act of teaching. It is, as one teacher in Oklahoma notes, a place where "you keep seeing people grow."

Continuity to Develop and Support Leadership

The monographs in this set provide a look at slices of the professional communities at a number of writing project sites. Taken together, these stories from site leaders offer a theory of action about leadership that has attracted—and continues to attract—teacher-leaders. Successful sites have found ways to respond to shifting educational priorities while preserving their core values. Not an easy task in many cases.

It will be apparent from this set of monographs that continuity is firmly linked to sustainability, so that the challenge of preparing for both normal and unanticipated site leadership transitions might be met. Continuity programs vary in form and purpose, yet they all share the goal of supporting the continued learning of teacher-consultants. This focus on learning encourages sites to take an inquiry stance toward their work: to devise new structures that support diverse and democratic leadership; to reassess the goals and mission of the site through visioning and strategic planning; to examine ideas about literacy occasioned by new technologies; and to inform thoughtful, sustained, and relevant professional development in schools.

Local Sites/National Network

Finally, the NWP itself, over its nearly 35-year history, sponsors an array of initiatives, subnetworks, and events that support continuity at local sites. These cross-site exchanges provide opportunities for teacher-leaders and directors to extend their work by identifying new resources and learning from other sites. Local continuity programs then become a way for site leaders who participate in national programs and initiatives to involve colleagues in sharing new resources and learning throughout the local community.

So the explanation for the sustainability of NWP sites over time is this notion of continuity, the means by which teachers make the local site their intellectual home and a place of continual learning. Writing project sites are like solidly built houses: they endure because they have solid foundations and adhere to a set of principles that value the collaboratively constructed knowledge of teachers from preschool through university.

With this volume of NWP at Work we invite directors, teacher-consultants, school administrators, and all education stakeholders to explore the concepts and practices of the National Writing Project's continuity programs. These programs build leadership, offer ongoing professional development that is timely and responsive to local contexts, and provide a highly effective means of sustaining a community to support current and future teacher-leaders.

SUPPORTING ON-SITE TEACHER-CONSULTANTS: NEW YORK CITY WRITING PROJECT'S COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS

by Ed Osterman

INTRODUCTION

The Friday meetings usually begin at 10 A.M. As we enter our meeting room, the chairs are typically arranged in a circle. Fourteen of us—eleven teacher-consultants, the writing project director, and our two associate directors—begin ten minutes of freewriting. Nancy Mintz, our current director, asks us to find a place to stop and then invites volunteers to read aloud all or part of the freewriting.

Freewriting is followed by a range of work-related announcements. Nancy mentions that the afternoon agenda will provide time for particular groups to convene. Those of us coordinating inservice seminars will meet to share preliminary plans; the committee in charge of our annual "Teacher-to-Teacher" conference will assemble at the same time. Others will use the time to confer with Nancy individually about particular school situations.

At this point, the writing prompt is given: Think about your week and come up with a word to describe your best day this week. Write about it. *We write; then we divide into trios. Each of us reads aloud what we wrote. Sometimes we simply want to share a success; sometimes it's a problem we've encountered during the week or a tricky situation we anticipate. The feedback can range from empathy and verbal support to advice and possible solutions from one's own experience.*

When we gather again as a whole group, we might briefly identify the issues that emerged in each trio or Joe, one of our associate directors, might ask if anyone shared a situation that needs input from the entire group. A more formal activity often follows. Usually we meet for two and a half hours before breaking for lunch.

These Friday meetings are for New York City Writing Project (NYCWP) on-site teacher-consultants who have been released by the Department of Education from teaching duties at their own schools to work full time for the writing project as teacher-consultants in other schools. Fridays are just one part of a varied continuity program, but these particular meetings have served a clear purpose since 1981: to support the transition from classroom teacher to on-site teacher-consultant and to build and maintain a safe yet academically rigorous and reflective professional community to meet the ever-changing needs of teachers and schools and, in turn, our writing project site.

Since my experience as a summer institute fellow in the NYCWP's first invitational summer institute in 1978, I have been actively involved in our site's inservice program. In the early years, after a long teaching day, I would go to other high schools to lead workshops or coordinate inservice series. Then, in 1984, I was invited to become one of NYCWP's first on-site teacher-consultants. Since that time, I have represented the writing project as an on-site teacher-consultant at various New York City public high schools ranging from traditional academic and vocational schools to small theme-based high schools. For many years, I was an associate director at our site, helping different directors shape both inservice and membership activities. In these capacities, I have been deeply involved in the Friday meetings since their inception, and I have grown enormously by being part of an ever-evolving community of learners.

This monograph will describe and analyze the particular processes and structures that NYCWP directors and on-site teacher-consultants have developed that enable us to support and learn from each other every Friday and to reflect critically upon the work we do with teachers, students, and administrators. Over time the regularity of these Friday meetings has supported the growth of the teacher-consultants who have participated as well as ensured the sustainability and continuity of our site's work. These Friday meetings have become critical to maintaining and replenishing a group of teacher-consultants who can fulfill the site's professional development goals.

While reserving one day of the work week for ongoing professional development will, no doubt, seem to be a luxury that few sites can enjoy, the principles and processes that we have employed can be adapted to any learning community. Whether a group meets online or in person, once a month or more frequently, the key is to talk and work together regularly and to keep the conversation focused on professional issues and experiences.

THE NEW YORK CITY WRITING PROJECT

The NYCWP is an early site of the National Writing Project.[1] Established in 1978, it is one of several educational projects of the Institute for Literacy Studies (ILS), a research and faculty development unit of The City University of New York located at Lehman College, our host campus within the City University system. Lehman is located in the Bronx, but the NYCWP serves all five boroughs of a culturally and economically diverse city in which residents speak more than 120 languages. Over one million children attend New York City's 1,200 schools. Each year the NYCWP serves approximately two thousand teachers from more than thirty schools. While anyone completing the summer institute is designated as a teacher-consultant, approximately nineteen from that pool comprise a staff of full- and part-time paid teacher-consultants who have been released from their regular teaching duties to work on-site in the NYCWP's partnership programs.

The NYCWP serves one of the largest school systems in the country and has established a reputation for providing high-quality professional development programs. In our twenty-seven-year history, more than four hundred classroom teachers have served as NYCWP teacher-consultants, bringing the voice of the National Writing Project to the more than ten thousand New York City teachers who have been part of our summer institutes, inservice graduate seminars, workshops, and on-site consulting. We are proud that over these many years we have developed the capacity to respond to the challenges and demands of a huge bureaucratic educational system often in the throes of restructuring.

SYSTEMATIC PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MATTERS FOR EVERYONE

Our meetings on Friday provide professional development for the professional developers. The Friday meetings, which rely on "teachers teaching teachers," are centered around three areas: 1) reflecting on the successes and challenges that on-site teacher-consultants experience as they consult and work in schools; 2) keeping current with new issues and approaches that have emerged in the fields of writing, reading, and professional development; and 3) preparing materials and workshops that enable the NYCWP to serve its membership and conduct its inservice and summer programs. To be able to protect time for this kind of learning during the work week rather than squeezing it into a Saturday is a rare thing, and NYCWP's on-site teacher-consultants cherish it. At the same time, we recognize that other sites may have to time regular meetings differently.

The regularity of these meetings has had a particular impact on our site. They have contributed to

- developing the leadership capacity of our on-site teacher-consultants
- creating and enacting the values of a democratic community by valuing diverse voices

1 For additional information on the New York City Writing Project, see *On-Site Consulting: New York City Writing Project* (Mintz and Stein 2002).

- continuing academic learning in a systemic way
- validating the power of critical reflection
- strategizing about how to handle major changes in the school system
- reinforcing quality and standards within the site.

As a result of the Friday meetings, our on-site teacher-consultants are prepared to handle a broader scope of work that includes but is not limited to writing instruction, and our site can fulfill the increasingly varied and particular requests of schools and districts.

Developing our leadership capacity is a reflection of something far more subtle and enduring than bringing particular material or practices to a school setting. It is rooted in a set of beliefs to work and live by. Director Nancy Mintz sums it up:

> I believe that all of what we do on Fridays is a gestalt. It is a way of working. It is a way of viewing. It is a way of valuing. . . . [All of these are] embedded in the work we carry with us as on-site teacher-consultants as we walk out to the world. We model them in the work that we do in schools.

Chief among these beliefs is our dedication to collaboration. In our work together on Fridays and, in fact, across all New York City Writing Project activities, we have experienced collaboration and witnessed its positive impact on both the quality of a piece of work and a person's sense of being. As a result, we do not view professional development as something we do *to* others, but as something we do *with* others. This is a belief we seek to model and promote in schools—between students, between teachers and students, and between administrators and staff.

Fridays have helped our on-site teacher-consultants fully experience what it means to live and work within a democratic community. Decisions are not made hierarchically; the group collectively determines how time should be used and how activities should be structured. Teacher-consultants share their work openly—warts and all—and read, write, and talk about challenging issues in forums that allow for all voices and perspectives to be heard equally. We are protected in doing so through the use of processes that ensure respectful response from colleagues: active listening, reflective go-arounds, tuning protocols, and text-based conversations, to name a few. Such methods can be invaluable at the team, committee, grade-level, and whole-staff meetings that occur in schools. As a result of the processes regularly used on Fridays, the NYCWP is confident about its ability to support administrators in creating a school culture that is rigorous and reflective in addressing issues of instruction and curriculum and in respecting teacher knowledge.

Our preparedness also stems from a consistent commitment to the reading of professional literature on Fridays. Our reading has not been limited to works on the teaching of writing and reading, although those are certainly essential. Just as we once learned from James Moffett, James Britton, and Peter Elbow, we now also

learn from Vito Perrone, Seymour Sarason, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Miles Horton—people who have written about school culture, race, reform, and the challenge of effecting change in any context. Such readings have enabled us to better understand and negotiate the official and unofficial cultures of schools and provided a language to describe the complexities we encounter daily in our interactions with colleagues. Moreover, our teacher-consultants repeatedly assume the stance of learners each Friday. At these meetings, we are part of an intellectual community that models what can happen in an inservice series or faculty meeting when colleagues read, write, and learn together.

Every Friday as we contemplate our work as on-site teacher-consultants and share these experiences, we have come to validate the power of critical reflection. Writing and talking openly about our work in schools—about the decisions we make and situations we encounter—challenges us to look deeply at the ways we consult and collaborate with others. Sometimes this results in a shift in practice; other times it helps us acknowledge and build upon our strengths. We have served as mentors to one another: offering advice based on experience, sharing materials that have proven successful, and helping each other to acquire the tools and develop the mind-set needed to function as responsive, efficient, and effective teacher-consultants (see appendix A). We have also grappled with an increasingly broad scope of issues that contribute to and/or limit our impact in schools: language and cultural diversity, content-area reading, and, recently, the increasing demand by districts for teacher-proof materials and preset curriculum and instructional models.

For over twenty years the New York City school system has gone through major shifts in structure and educational philosophy, which has meant reframing our work (from "writing" to "literacy"). At other times, it has meant expanding our services (helping to create or support structures and processes within a school that establish new ways for administrators and faculties to discuss curriculum, assessment, and student work.) Our regular meetings have provided a place for our directors and teacher-consultants to strategize about ways to position ourselves and to conduct our work within this ever-changing political climate in education.

Finally, through these Friday meetings, we collectively reinforce quality and standards in our work. Work is presented to the group regularly in both an informal and formal manner. This is done publicly with colleagues who face comparable challenges and provide similar kinds of professional development services. There is an inherent expectation built over time that a certain level of depth and commitment be apparent in the work, that respect for teachers and the settings in which they teach be honored, that equity and diversity be visible, and that particular principles about the teaching of writing and reading be evident.

BEGINNINGS

From its inception in 1978, the NYCWP has offered summer fellows a variety of continuity programs. There have been writing groups and retreats, as well as

periodic Saturday meetings at which teachers presented instructional approaches in writing or delved into a particular educational issue. Assuming an active role in carrying out the site's inservice program has been just one of several options that some of us pursued, often traveling after school to lead workshops in other districts. But doing this on a full-time basis—regularly representing the NYCWP to teachers and administrators around the city—seemed an impossibility.

Time changed that. In 1981, Carla Asher and Marcie Wolfe, two high school teachers who in 1978 had been fellows in the NYCWP's very first invitational summer institute, collaborated with NYCWP Directors Richard Sterling and Sondra Perl on a proposal that created a unique inservice model. As a result of the three-year federal grant the proposal secured, Carla and Marcie were released from their own schools to work during the day in other high schools. They each worked at two schools, two days apiece, every week: collaborating with teachers on lessons, demonstrating in classrooms during school hours, and coordinating an on-site after-school NYCWP graduate seminar. The idea was to bring a summer institute model into the school and to maximize its impact by having all the participants from the same faculty and an NYCWP teacher-consultant on site to support teacher experimentation. By the end of the year, Carla and Marcie had become fully immersed in the culture of each school. They demonstrated to all the NYCWP on-site teacher-consultants who would follow in subsequent years that it was both possible and powerful to adapt one's own classroom experience to support colleagues at other schools. Their success made it evident that our authenticity as practicing New York City classroom teachers who understood the realities of urban teaching could provide entry into other people's classrooms. They provided the blueprint for the rest of us to follow.

This model included the radical idea that Marcie and Carla should be at the writing project site at Lehman College every Friday. Whereas Monday through Thursday they would guide and collaborate with the teachers in their two schools, on Fridays, under the support of the site directors, they would have the opportunity to develop the skills and design the structures needed for successful inservice work. Fridays provided them with the time and space not only to prepare and plan for the upcoming week's inservice seminar or staff workshop but also to reflect upon this work with the site directors.

A MODEL OF SUSTAINED COLLABORATION: EARLY CORE PROCESSES

The model designed for that initial federal grant has remained remarkably intact: Monday through Thursday a teacher-consultant works in two schools, and on Fridays gathers with other on-site teacher-consultants at the site's office. Although some administrators have grumbled about the financial cost of this structural feature, others have understood its value as a support for the teacher-consultant. For all of us who have become on-site teacher-consultants, it has been a lifeline. Our credibility and effectiveness with teachers has stemmed partially from their trust in

our classroom experience. And yet, at some point, each of us discovers that we *are* in a different role. We are both insiders *and* outsiders. While we have an insider's classroom experience and knowledge of the school system, we are outsiders in the schools we serve. We have no community within the building (at least not at first). We cannot go to the cafeteria to blow off steam; we must keep our viewpoints about individuals or school politics to ourselves.

It is on Fridays that our community meets. It is here that we share and critically reflect upon the week's events. And because we all work in different settings and different areas of the city, the discussions are enriched by both the parallels and contrasts we discover.

Early on, Carla Asher, the NYCWP co-director then responsible for inservice, initiated certain rituals to formalize our work on Fridays. Our meetings during the 1980s and early 1990s made extensive use of four practices: "reflective go-arounds," role-playing of consultations, active listening, and presentations of instructional strategies.

Reflective Go-Arounds

The reflective go-around always begins with journal writing, as many National Writing Project activities do. We might share a highlight from the week. Often, each of us focuses on a problem: a difficult moment in a seminar, a teacher we weren't sure how to help, an administrator who put us on the spot. Time for sharing our writing is divided equally among us. As teacher-consultant Claudette Green recalls:

> When your turn in the go-around came, all of the focus was on you. There are all these people there to help you. Then when it shifted to someone else, you would do the same. . . . Each one would pitch in and help the other.

Thus, at the end of a week of consulting with teachers, facilitating inservice seminars, and presenting individual workshops, Fridays are, as some teacher-consultants view it, opportunities to "refuel" or "retool" and to learn about ways to approach the school work.

Role-Playing of Consultations

Learning how to consult with or "coach" a colleague (of any content area) about his or her teaching can be challenging. So we role-played consultations, particularly at the start of each school year and with new consultants. There is a range of possible scenarios: talking to a teacher comfortable with or eager to use writing; meeting with a jaded veteran; encountering a content-area teacher fearful of or resistant to writing. We'd play out possible conversations and identify ways to react, things to suggest, and possibilities for future directions. In the process, we created a model of consulting rooted in beliefs and values fostered by our writing project experience.

First, we respect and understand how busy (and vulnerable) the classroom teacher is. Second, we recognize that each classroom teacher brings expertise and experience to the table. Third, we acknowledge that the relationship between a teacher and a teacher-consultant must be based on trust built over time. Fourth, we realize that any instructional innovations must be shaped by the teacher and the teacher-consultant together.

Active Listening

Often, the value of active listening—as a tool for the consultant—was stressed, particularly during initial meetings with teachers (see appendix B). We reminded each other: listen hard to every teacher; don't leap into bombarding them with suggestions. The longer you listen, the greater the chance that the teacher will mention something that gives you an idea, that provides you with an entry point for building a relationship. Active listening, as developed by Eugene Gendlin (1978), is a skill we promote in our institutes and inservice series as a means of providing an initial response in writing groups. Now we began to discover its effectiveness as a consulting tool.

Presentations of Instructional Strategies

Consulting and working on-site with teachers across disciplines demanded skills many of us hadn't necessarily developed yet. During a given week, a teacher-consultant might be expected to give a workshop for the math or science department or to model for a teacher a particular way to use writing with his or her students. As a result, we were always eager to acquire new approaches or materials, especially if one of us reported success with them. These presentations were an extension of our experiences with demonstrations in the summer institute and at Saturday meetings, where we had become comfortable talking about and sharing our practice. Now, on Fridays, we had the opportunity to present new approaches to each other—some that we may not yet have thoroughly worked out in a classroom—for the purpose of shaping and refining them into workshops we could use in schools.

ENHANCING THE MODEL: ADAPTATIONS AND ADDITIONS

As helpful as these initial processes proved to be, they don't represent a stagnant repertoire. By the mid-nineties, many changes were occurring in public schools. The standards movement was taking off. Issues of diversity and multiculturalism occupied faculty discussions, raising questions about literature choices and how to help students move smoothly between home and academic language in their writing. Reading—in both content areas and English classes—was of growing concern in middle and high schools.

As teacher-consultants worked in classrooms, we saw students who needed to acquire strategies to make sense of historical documents or learn the approaches adult readers unconsciously use to interpret fiction or nonfiction. It was no longer enough for an NYCWP teacher-consultant to have expertise in the teaching of writ-

ing. We were expected by the districts that financed our inservice program to work more broadly: to address global issues of literacy, to interact more directly with administrators, and to collaborate with instructional teams.

Now there were more calls for our work in middle and elementary schools, thus expanding and diversifying our already established team of on-site teacher-consultants for high school. We needed not only to look more critically at our practices and our values, but also to reenvision our work for a changing educational environment. We wondered, How will we serve the ever-changing needs of the school system and at the same time hold onto the values and practices we held to be true?

To serve these multiple needs Linette Moorman, the NYCWP's then co-director, elected to reshape the content and form of our Fridays. As a former on-site teacher-consultant in both elementary and middle schools, Linette knew the value of these Fridays. So, while we continued to make time on Fridays for sharing what was happening in our schools and addressing practical needs, Linette varied and deepened the meetings, layering in a new set of processes[2] and expectations for our work together: sharing in and across grade-level groups, periodic study days, professional readings about professional development, and a year-end review of practice.

Sharing in and Across Grade-Level Groups

Journal writing continued on Fridays, but as our group doubled in size to include middle and elementary teacher-consultants, we could no longer engage in formal go-arounds as a single entity. The group was too large, and its needs too varied. Sometimes we shared in small mixed groups so that we could hear and learn from our colleagues working at a different educational level. This also enabled us to see the connections and disparities in literacy instruction across levels. At other times, we needed to share a particular journal entry with those colleagues who were working at the same level as we were. What we shared in groups and how it was shared, then, varied, depending on purpose and need.

Periodic Study Days

We often set aside a series of Fridays, spread out over the academic year, for study. These study days enabled us to expand our understanding of some aspect of literacy instruction for the purpose of strengthening our work in classrooms with students and teachers. Study days often combined three key activities: readings, demonstrations of practice, and looking at student work and teacher assignments.

For example, we devoted one entire year to exploring ways to address the teaching of reading. Content-area teachers noticed students could not read textbooks;

2 Many of the ideas Linette Moorman and former NYCWP director Elaine Avidon initiated built upon their experiences at the Prospect Center and Archives in Bennington, Vermont, and the work of Cecelia Traugh, former Director of Research at the Institute for Literacy Studies (ILS). Whereas many writing project sites are closely associated with the education or English departments at their colleges, the NYCWP is just one professional development program among several housed at the ILS, a research unit at Lehman College. The ILS is home to the New York City Writing Project, the New York City Mathematics Project, Lehman College's Adult Learning Center, and various initiatives for after-school youth educators and family literacy workers. In the mid-nineties, teacher-consultants and directors from all of the ILS' projects met at monthly inquiry meetings to examine the particularities of each program's inservice model and explore the commonalities that exist across programs engaged in on-site professional development.

English teachers discovered students who had never completed a novel. As teacher-consultants, we needed to both renew and develop ways for teachers to support students in the reading and interpretation of a broad range of texts.

So we read and discussed chapters from Ellin Keene and Susan Zimmermann's *Mosaic of Thought* (1997), Constance Weaver's *Reconsidering a Balanced Approach to Reading* (1998), and *Reading for Understanding* (1999), a book coauthored by one of our colleagues, Christine Cziko. We discussed young adult fiction, even reading books students found exciting outside of school-sanctioned selections. On other occasions, individual teacher-consultants conducted demonstrations of particular processes we could use in schools (i.e., think-alouds, interactive read-alouds, interpreting documents, gallery walks).[3]

We were also able to put what we had learned to immediate, practical use. We rethought aspects of our summer institutes or designed inservice series that were heavily influenced by the study of reading that we had conducted on those Fridays. In such series, teachers reflected on their own histories/experiences as readers and identified the challenges students face as readers. Adapting some of the instructional approaches that had been demonstrated on those Fridays, we tried out a variety of ways at our different sites to use writing as a tool to support reading comprehension and encourage thoughtful response to a range of texts.

Professional Readings About Professional Development

Often, the readings introduced and discussed in the monthly Institute for Literacy Studies (ILS) Inquiry meetings (see footnote 2) found their way into our Friday teacher-consultant meetings (see appendix C). For example, whenever teacher-consultants began working with teachers at a school, even though there were always staff members eager to work with us, we knew we would also encounter resistance from various teachers and administrators. One chapter, "The Modal Process of Change," in Seymour Sarason's book *Revisiting the Culture of the School and the Problem of Change* (1996) provided a language for understanding and naming the kind of resistance one often encountered from teachers or administrators in traditional middle and high schools.

We began to realize that it was not merely one or two individuals who stood in the way of change; rather, routines, long-held rituals, and deeply established traditions and structures also impeded progress. So history and science teachers always spoke of "having to get through" an enormous curriculum as the reason why they could not incorporate more writing into their lessons; English teachers would identify the

3 **Interactive read-aloud:** Oral reading of a text in which the teacher pauses at chosen points to give students an opportunity to respond orally or in writing to a particular series of prompts and questions. Responses are briefly shared before teacher proceeds with the reading. The goal is to engage with the text and hear how readers are reacting to the content. **Gallery walk:** A display of photographs, artwork, texts, quotations, and sounds inspired by the themes and issues of a particular novel, current issue or incident, historical period or event, or major scientific study. Texts and visuals vary in content, style, and perspective in order to provoke varied responses, generate questions, and either introduce or deepen the study of a topic or work. Teachers and students walk around, read, and write, as if in a museum. **Think-aloud:** The teacher or student pauses while reading a text to state aloud what he or she is thinking, thereby making one's reading process visible. Teachers model this metacognitive activity to introduce students to the comprehension strategies adult readers unconsciously use to make sense of text. Students then practice it independently.

forty-minute instructional period as the reason why peer response groups were not possible. To effect any change in literacy instruction, then, we needed to be cognizant of these regularities and understand why they existed and were maintained. We had to be both respectful and patient, to build trust gradually over time.

We began to use the language that came out of some of these readings, so they became a natural part of our teacher-consultant conversations on Fridays. We referred to our roles as "insider/outsiders" (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1993), viewed writing project inservice series as creating a "third space" (Gutierrez, Rymes, and Larson 1995) within a school for differing viewpoints and cultures, and reminded ourselves of the need to see "what is" at the same time that we envision "what ought to be" (Horton, Kohl, and Kohl 1990).

The acquisition of such language and metaphor enhanced our understanding of the issues we encountered in the inservice work. Concurrent with these realizations, we also had to acknowledge that a similar set of regularities existed too in our own organization. We too held onto particular ways of working and needed to shift our regularities if we wanted our inservice work to remain vital and viable for teachers.

Year-End Reviews of Practice

In addition to the reports that we prepared for school administrators at the end of every school year (see appendix D), we used an adaptation of the Prospect Center's "Review of Practice" (Himley 2002) each June to reflect upon the challenges and successes connected to our work in schools. These reviews of practice provide an alternative to a traditional assessment of one's work, because the emphasis is on description and analysis of what one has done rather than on receiving a rating.

At the Prospect Center, teachers present an aspect of their work for an audience of peers. Each review of practice is framed by a question the presenter poses. Each teacher-consultant would prepare a 30- to 40-minute presentation that might focus on his or her work in one school or with one group of teachers (appendix E). The review usually mirrored a theme that Linette had selected as a lens for looking at our work in a particular year, for example, collaboration, visibility, work with new teachers (see appendix F).

Often these year-end reviews of practice were so powerful that many of us could recall the conversations and issues raised long after. One teacher-consultant chose to focus her year-end review on a study group that she had facilitated. The group, composed of veteran teachers, had been charged with developing research projects for their classes. The teacher-consultant shared the initial resistance she encountered and then presented the decisions she made and the activities she designed to move the group forward. The heart of the review, however, raised an issue all of us had faced at some point in a school: How do we remain true to our beliefs about professional development when teachers are forced to work with us on mandated projects?

Another teacher-consultant was trying to encourage vocational teachers to use writing-to-learn activities in a South Bronx vocational high school. We were impressed by how she used particular poems and pop songs as models for students to write about what they had learned and done in a computer design class. We encouraged her to expand the school's notions of literacy: to have students learn how to read technical texts proficiently and to consider Jeffrey Wilhelm's work with teenage boys (Smith and Wilhelm 2002). These year-end reviews provided an opportunity to identify achievement and analyze challenge as well as focus on a question or a slice of work important to the teacher-consultant (see appendix G).

Because these reviews of practice often raised complex issues and sometimes sensitive ones, we wanted to make sure that each presenter received a range of responses and that each listener had an equal opportunity to respond. We used the tuning protocol developed by Joseph McDonald and David Allen (Allen 1995) for the Coalition of Essential Schools, which was circulating around New York City's small schools, to structure our responses and provide for a safe and protective atmosphere. We came away with respect for each other's work and an appreciation of the delicate nature of professional development.

ESTABLISHING NEW REGULARITIES

The changes in the educational climate and the impact of our reading Sarason and Horton encouraged us to establish new regularities in three important areas: looking at student work and assignments; addressing and increasing diversity; and publicly promoting teacher knowledge and expertise. Through doing so, we acquired new skills, designed new activities, and broadened and diversified our teacher network.

Looking at Student Work and Assignments Through Different Eyes

Describing student work and its relation to the teacher's assignment constitutes a departure from the traditional ways in which most teachers respond to and evaluate writing. By introducing particular processes for looking at student work and teacher assignments, we expanded the ways we might help teachers identify the strengths and needs of student writers as well as analyze the demands of the writing tasks designed for classes.

Throughout the year, each of us brought in samples of student work from a range of disciplines, hoping that a close examination of a sample and the accompanying assignment would uncover the sources for a student's success or struggle with writing. Each time, we used a specific series of processes to focus our analysis of the work, paying careful attention to the wording and expectations of assignments as well as describing carefully what the student actually did on the paper.

Initially we drew on processes for looking closely and collaboratively at student

work developed by the Prospect Center or the Coalition of Essential Schools, but eventually we adapted these and even created a few of our own (see appendix H). This was unusual work for those of us schooled in the traditional ways of conferencing or commenting on papers, but the more we experienced it, the more comfortable we became in facilitating such practices.

At school meetings and in our inservice series, we began to encourage teachers of all content areas to present samples of assignments and student work for their colleagues to examine; we served as facilitators to guide participants through such collective "looking." We realized that these processes enabled teams of teachers to reflect together on the work their students were producing for the purpose of improving instruction and curriculum.

Addressing and Increasing Diversity

As the teacher population of New York City's public schools became more diverse, we realized that we had to address the issue of diversity not only in our inservice seminars but also within our own organization. As always we began with reading and writing. Discussions built around "Teaching in Our Underwear: The Liabilities of Whiteness in the Multiracial Classroom," a provocative article written by Maryann Dickar (2000), one of our inservice participants, and Lisa Delpit's "Skills and Other Dilemmas of a Progressive Black Educator" (1986), led to hard talk about privilege and the realization that writing project workshops and inservice series had to make room for voices that were diverse and even dissenting. By doing so, we would be able to look at the texts we read and the situations we encountered in schools from a multitude of perspectives, some of which had been underrepresented in our work. This would challenge some of our long-held beliefs and practices but also open up possibilities for new approaches to our work with teachers and students.

As stated earlier, coinciding with this were the local and national concerns about literacy. What did that mean to us? Once we began to wrestle with the concept of literacy, issues of race, class, and language became prominent in the conversation. Over time these discussions, along with the reading and the writing we did around them, had an impact on the inservice activities we designed as well as the ways in which we worked with colleagues in our school.

The courage to "push" these difficult issues or, at the very least, to raise them within the context of an inservice series was possible only after years of Friday talk and study. And how far one could go with them in the schools was always determined by the teacher-consultant's relationships with staff and administration and his or her sense of the school culture. One happy result of the opening up of these issues was that, at several locations, our inservice series became more populated by the staff members of color. The writing project inservice series became a place they wanted to be.

We also began to actively recruit more teachers of color to join our on-site teacher-consultant group and to identify teachers of color to cofacilitate workshops and inservice series with us. Without Fridays, we might have come to these realizations in time; with Fridays, we were able to approach and address these issues thoughtfully, consistently, and in a timely way.

Publicly Promoting Teacher Knowledge and Expertise

For years, we believed teacher word-of-mouth was enough to guarantee the continued success of our various inservice seminars and summer institutes. As calls for accountability increased and more outside organizations began to compete for teachers' time, however, we sought to enhance the visibility of our thriving inservice program. We created two forums specifically designed to highlight our work with teachers in schools: the Administrators Breakfast and the Teacher-to-Teacher Conference.

The Administrators Breakfast is held at Lehman College one Friday morning each year, and we invite principals and key assistant principals from each of the schools where an on-site teacher-consultant is based. The breakfast is meant to recognize the administrators' support and to demonstrate how our work in their schools addresses instructional or curricular goals. Often, these meetings are structured around one topic (such as standards, assessment, essay writing), and three or four concurrent workshops are featured. In the workshops, which run across grade levels, a teacher-consultant and the teacher he or she works with show how we approach a specific need or develop a particular skill (see appendix I).

We reach an even broader and more diverse audience through our Teacher-to-Teacher Conference, which is advertised widely in schools and is held on a Saturday at Lehman. About twenty former fellows and inservice participants reflecting varied grade levels and content areas demonstrate aspects of exemplary practice in eighty-minute workshops. It is the first time many of them have presented their work publicly outside of a summer institute or their own school. As a result, more of these teachers become interested in doing inservice work, and the pool of potential workshop presenters expands.

What's also crucial to note is that our group of on-site teacher-consultants plays an essential role in the success of both endeavors. We collaborate on the planning and coordination of each event and recruit and coach many of the teachers through the design and preparation of workshops. In the process, we strengthen our site's local profile and reaffirm the National Writing Project's belief in the value of the classroom teacher's knowledge and expertise.

DRAWING ON THE PAST AND LOOKING TOWARD THE FUTURE

In fall 2003, dramatic changes occurred in New York City's educational system: for the first time in history, the mayor took control of the public school system, dis-

banding the board of education and replacing it with a New York City Department of Education led by entirely new leadership teams. After years of developing a citywide reputation for excellence, we had to fight to maintain our status in a system that now prized large-scale, expensive professional development models that dispensed "teacher-proof" materials. In some ways, it felt as though we were starting over.

As the shifts in expectations for instruction, curriculum, leadership, and accountability have continued, the NYCWP leadership and its corps of on-site teacher-consultants still strive on Fridays to serve both our intellectual and our practical needs. The structures are in place to detect, evaluate, and prepare for change. We still allot regular time for writing about and sharing issues that emerge in our daily work with teachers; we still present for each other and make time for study. But the current educational environment has also necessitated that we address basic site needs, such as designing promotional materials (see appendix J) that will help new regional administrators understand how the NYCWP works in schools, what our work is, and why we work differently from other organizations that have very delineated plans of action and packaged units of study.

Nancy Mintz, our current director, has preserved the processes and structures that have served us so well while at the same time incorporating new pursuits and ideas into our Fridays: formalized distributed leadership; book groups; and a focus on NWP initiatives.

Formalizing Distributed Leadership

The focus and format of Fridays has been the result of collaborative decision making; leadership has always been shared informally between directors and teacher-consultants. In order to ensure that leadership addressed the intellectual interests of the group, Nancy invited us to form committees to determine what our Fridays should look like. These committees became responsible for planning and structuring the reading, writing, and learning we did together. By rotating responsibilities across the group, different teacher-consultants tackled a range of leadership tasks (see appendix K): facilitating Friday book group and article discussions; creating publicity materials; planning and coordinating our annual Teacher-to-Teacher Conference; designing and arranging membership activities such as writing marathons; and coordinating or cofacilitating NWP initiatives.

Book Groups

Though we had always made time to read and discuss professional articles on pertinent issues, a committee proposed we form book groups. These book groups operate in varied ways. Sometimes the entire teacher-consultant group agrees to read the same text. For example, all of us read *The Skin That We Speak* (Delpit and Dowdy 2003), a compilation of essays reflecting our ongoing interest in language and English language learner issues. On another occasion, we selected three titles—Sheridan Blau's *The Literature Workshop* (2003), Carol Jago's *Cohesive Writing*

(2002), and Jabari Mahiri's *What They Don't Learn in School* (2004)—and formed three smaller book groups that met concurrently for an hour on three Fridays to discuss their respective choices.

Each group divided up its reading and decided on ways to respond to the content and facilitate the discussions. As a culminating activity, each group presented its book to the rest of us, often by designing an activity that enabled those of us who had not read the book to engage with some its ideas. As usual, these book group presentations have a practical impact, since they can be used or adapted for classrooms, inservice seminars, or faculty workshops.

National Writing Project Initiatives

In recent years, Fridays have provided time for the on-site teacher-consultants to learn more about the NWP initiatives in which particular NYCWP teacher-consultants participate: the National Reading Initiative (NRI), New-Teacher Initiative (NTI), English Language Learners (ELL) Network, and Technology Initiative (TI).[4] Because the work the on-site teacher-consultants do in schools is so integral to the NYCWP's inservice program and, as a result, so crucial to attracting new teachers to our network, it's important that we be aware of the benefits of our site's participation in NWP initiatives.

For example, through our involvement in NRI, one of us spearheads a study group of social studies teachers that is currently exploring what it means to read as historians. On some Fridays we have received updates on the study group's emerging discoveries and challenges. On other Fridays we have been introduced to online forums such as blogging that technology liaison Paul Allison has promoted with teachers who have participated in the TI-funded offerings (advanced summer seminars, inservice series, study groups).

The benefits of these national initiatives have extended beyond our immediate group. The various initiatives have generated continuity activities that have not only attracted participation from NYCWP members who were previously less involved or whom we hadn't seen in a while, but also created leadership roles that build on the special skills or interests of other members. A diverse group of summer fellows and teacher-consultants have stepped forward to coordinate these activities.

CHALLENGES FOR SUSTAINED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

While our on-site teacher-consultants have grown enormously in their ability to reflect upon and approach the professional development issues they face in schools, there is a concern about the gap in knowledge that exists between this group of teacher-consultants and two other key groups at our site: teacher-consultants who work part-time on-site in schools during the school day but do not attend Friday meetings, and other writing project members who continue to coordinate seminars

4 The NWP Technology Initiative provides opportunities for writing project sites to better understand the impact of new digital tools and information/communication technology on the teaching of writing.

or conduct workshops but cannot attend Friday meetings since they are regular full-time classroom teachers.

In addition, when one of our on-site teacher-consultants leaves his or her full-time association with the site, it becomes difficult to find a replacement possessing such expertise (see appendix L). Of course, over time, ideas are passed on from one teacher-consultant to another through their collaboration on a workshop series, institute, or special initiative (see appendix M). But nothing quite replaces the experience of the weekly reflections and studies conducted on Fridays.

The issue, then, is clear: Once a site becomes committed to broadening and deepening the kinds of professional development services it offers and, thus, raises the expectations for its teacher-consultants, the community needs to be maintained at different levels. In the increasingly competitive world of school-based professional development—a world in which a plethora of organizations and public school systems have begun to create consultant roles for their teachers—National Writing Project sites may be in danger of losing the active involvement of their most experienced and talented members. In such an environment, a site must design structures to support the continued growth of all or most of its teacher-consultants if it is to continue to flourish.

There need to be multiple and regular opportunities for teacher-consultants to deepen their knowledge of instruction, engage in continual dialogue about the issues facing teachers and schools, and develop their skills as consultants. When this happens, their commitment to the site is strengthened, and their readiness to represent both the site and the National Writing Project in professional development forums is enhanced. Our Friday meetings provide a structure for continuity and support, ensuring a steady flow of teacher-consultants ready to assume the demands of full-time on-site work (see appendix N). Other sites may discover different solutions.

Developing a thriving corps of on-site teacher-consultants is one challenge. Maintaining and replenishing that group is quite another task.

FINAL THOUGHTS

It has been more than twenty years since the original NYCWP directors invited several classroom teachers to form the nucleus of what eventually became a thriving community of on-site teacher-consultants. Since that time, my colleagues and I have enjoyed the pleasures and met the challenges of working with teachers of all disciplines and backgrounds in many different settings throughout our vast city. We survived the tricky transition from being classroom teachers to full-time teacher-consultants and have done so in a public school system with an ever-changing leadership and mission. We have endured, not only because we have been supported by the NYCWP community, but also because we have intimately and extensively contributed to the spirit and life of that community. In the process, we have dis-

covered our own strengths, enriched the organization we love, and reinvigorated the teachers and students in the schools we serve.

REFERENCES

Allen, D. 1995. *The Tuning Protocol: A Process for Reflection*. Providence, RI: Coalition of Essential Schools.

Blau, S. 2003. *The Literature Workshop: Teaching Texts and Their Readers. Portsmouth*, NH: Heinemann.

Delpit, L. 1986. "Skills and Other Dilemmas of a Progressive Black Educator." *Harvard Educational Review* 56 (4): 379–385.

Delpit, L., and J. K. Dowdy, eds. 2003. *The Skin That We Speak: Thoughts on Language and Culture in the Classroom*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Dickar, M. 2000. "Teaching in Our Underwear: The Liabilities of Whiteness in the Multiracial Classroom." *In Freirean Pedagogy, Praxis, and Possibilities: Projects for the New Millennium*, edited by S. Steiner, H. M. Krank, P. McLaren, and R. Bahruth. New York: Farmer Press.

Gendlin, E. 1978. *Focusing*. New York: Everest House.

Gutierrez, K., B. Rymes, and J. Larson. 1995. "Script, Counterscript, and the Underlife in the Classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education." *Harvard Educational Review*.

Himley, M., ed. 2002. *Prospect Descriptive Processes: The Child, the Art of Teaching, and the Classroom and School.* A monograph. North Bennington, VT: The Prospect Center.

Horton, M., with H. Kohl and J. Kohl. 1990. "Islands of Decency." Chap. 11 in *The Long Haul*. New York: Doubleday.

Jago, C. 2002. *Cohesive Writing: Why Concept Is Not Enough*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Keene, E.O., and S. Zimmermann. 1997. *Mosaic of Thought.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Lytle, S., and Cochran-Smith, M. 1993. *Inside/Outside: Teacher Research and Knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Mahiri, J. 2004. *What They Don't Learn in School: Literacy in the Lives of Urban Youth.* New York: Peter Lang.

Mintz, N., and A.L. Stein. 2002. *On-Site Consulting: New York City Writing Project*. Models of Inservice, National Writing Project at Work series. Berkeley, CA: National Writing Project.

Sarason, S.B. 1996. *Revisiting the Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schoenbach, R., C. Greenleaf, C. Cziko, and L. Hurwitz. 1999. *Reading for Understanding*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, M.W., and J. Wilhelm. 2002. *Reading Don't Fix No Chevys*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Weaver, C., ed. 1998. *Reconsidering a Balanced Approach to Reading*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: CONSULTING AND WORKING WITH CLASSROOM TEACHERS: TIPS FOR TEACHER-CONSULTANTS

Note: When a colleague joins our on-site teacher-consultant group and will soon consult full time with teachers in other schools, he or she always has questions about how to begin or what to do. Based on their own experiences, our on-site teacher-consultants identified the following points as useful guides.

- In general, listen more than tell.
- Don't offer to demonstrate in a class that you haven't first observed.
- After visiting someone's classroom or observing a lesson, always be positive first. Share your own classroom experiences and admit your own vulnerabilities.
- After observing a particularly weak lesson (especially when you're not sure the teacher thought it was weak), invite the teacher to talk. You might open the conversation by asking, "So, what did you think about how the lesson went?" If there was obvious trouble, you can say something sympathetic like, "Wow, that's a challenging class."
- If you see the same problem over and over in a teacher's class, just address it head-on: "What are you doing about [your need for a lesson plan/the six boys who sit and talk in the back, etc.]?"
- Count or time things/events for the teacher while you're watching to be able to give him or her some data. For example, you can note the number of teacher–student interactions, student–student interactions, how many students responded to a question, how long the do-now took, etc.
- Write a letter to the teacher about what you've noticed. The letter should just document—not judge—and should note several things that are working as well as provide suggestions. (Suggestions can be phrased as questions: "Have you thought about . . .?")
- If you notice a particular issue over and over in observing teachers (such as classroom management problems), use a journal prompt on the topic in the inservice seminar to invite teachers to write about the issue and discuss it together.

Prepared by Katherine Schulten

APPENDIX B: ACTIVE LISTENING

Note: The following is one of the first NYCWP handouts designed for summer institutes and inservice seminars. Though initially it was used as a guide for responding to drafts of writing, on-site teacher-consultants also use active listening in their consultations with teachers.

Purpose

Writing is a process of discovering and constructing meaning. Active listening is a process that encourages writers and speakers to discover and construct more of what they mean.

As teachers, we frequently assume that we understand students' intentions in writing. We also often assume that any corrections or additions we make on students' drafts are necessarily the ones they should make. However, if we are to enable our students to become better writers, they need to retain ownership of their texts. One way to ensure this is to provide students with the opportunity to engage in the process of active listening by reflecting and "saying back" to students what it is we hear in their writing.

Writers need to know what they have communicated before they can benefit from reactions or judgments. Active listening allows them to know they've been understood. Sometimes writers may not be sure what they want to communicate. Listening helps them to clarify their intended meaning and to extend and strengthen their discourse. In active listening, listeners set aside their own personal preoccupations and become, in effect, mirrors for the other person.

The Practice of Listening: A Protocol

Once writers have shared their drafts aloud, listeners respond in a variety of ways:

- **Listeners take a moment to pause and to allow the writer's/speaker's words to take hold.**
- **Listeners "say back" what they hear by repeating exact words, by expressing the gist of what was said, or by summarizing in their own words what they heard. "What I heard you say . . ."**
- **Listeners phrase declarative sentences in a questioning tone. Listeners do not interview the writer or speaker.**
- **Sometimes listeners focus on the underlying sense of a draft and reflect that back to the writer. If listeners are confused, they need to ask the writer to reread or restate either the whole piece or a section they have missed.**

Listening is interactive. Listening responses are invitations to writers and speakers to move the discourse forward. As writers develop and clarify their meaning, listeners continue to reflect back the sense of what is being said. Writers will let the listeners

know if they've understood or captured the meaning accurately. Writers may nod affirmatively, or say "Yes, and . . ." and then develop more of what they mean. Or they may look puzzled and confused and say, "No, that's not it . . ." Either way, listeners are helping writers to clarify and develop meaning. A sequence of active listening ends when the writers know what they want to do next with the piece of writing.

References

Gendlin, E. 1978. *Focusing*. New York: Everest House.

Perl, S. 1980. "Understanding Composing." *College Composition and Communication* 31 (4).

Prepared by: Elaine Avidon, Jerry Megna, and Sondra Perl © New York City Writing Project.

APPENDIX C: SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF READINGS

The following texts have shaped the thinking of our teacher-consultant group in three areas: (a) professional development work; (b) language and literacy; and (c) the teaching of writing and reading.

1. Professional Development

Allen, D. 1995. *The Tuning Protocol: A Process for Reflection*. Providence, RI: Coalition of Essential Schools.

Blythe, T., D. Allen, and B. Schieffelin Powell. 1999. *Looking Together at Student Work.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., and S. Lytle. 1993. *Inside/Outside: Teacher Research and Knowledge.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Delpit, L. 1986. "Skills and Other Dilemmas of a Progressive Black Educator." *Harvard Educational Review* 56 (4): 379–385

Dickar, M. 2000. "Teaching in Our Underwear: The Liabilities of Whiteness in the Multiracial Classroom." In S. Steiner, H. M. Krank, P. McLaren, and R. Bahruth (Eds.), *Freirean Pedagogy, Praxis and Possibilities: Projects for the New Millennium.* New York: Farmer Press.

Edwards, C., L. Gandini, and J. Nimmo. 1994. "Promoting Collaborative Learning in the Early Childhood Classroom." In L. Katz. *Reflections on the Reggio Emilia Approach*. St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.

Freire, P. 1970. "Chapter 3: Dialogics." *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Fullan, M., and A. Hargreaves. 1996. *What's Worth Fighting for in Your School?* New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Gutierrez, K., B. Rymes, and J. Larson. 1995. "Script, Counterscript, and the Underlife in the Classroom: James Brown versus *Brown v. Board of Education*." *Harvard Educational Review*.

Himley, M., ed. 2002. *Prospect Descriptive Processes: The Child, the Art of Teaching, and the Classroom and School.* A monograph. North Bennington, VT: The Prospect Center.

Himley, M. 1997. "Talking Power." *Political Moments in the Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Horton, M. with H. Kohl and J. Kohl. 1990. "Islands of Decency." *The Long Haul*. New York: Doubleday.

Horton, M., and P. Freire. 1990. "Ideas." *We Make the Road by Walking*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

King Jr., M. L. 1964. "Letter from a Birmingham Jail." *Why We Can't Wait*. New York: Harper Collins.

Lipman, P. 1998. "Teachers Beliefs About African American Students." *Race, Class, and Power in School Restructuring.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lipman, P. 1997. "Restructuring in Context: A Case Study of Teacher Participation and the Dynamics of Ideology, Race, and Power." *American Education Research Journal* 34 (1): 3–37.

Lopez, B. 1990. *The Rediscovery of North America*. New York: Vintage Press.

McDonald, J. 1991. *Exhibitions: Facing Outward, Pointing Inward*. Providence, RI: Coalition of Essential Schools.

McDonald, J., N. Mohr, A. Dichter, and E.C. McDonald. 2003. *The Power of Protocols: An Educator's Guide to Better Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

McIntosh, P. 1990. "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." *Independent School* (winter).

Meier, D. 1995. *The Power of Their Ideas*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mintz, N. 2000. *Collaborative Conversations for Literacy: Professional Development in a Middle School Classroom*. Bronx, New York: Institute for Literacy Studies.

Moses, R., with C. Cobb. 2001. *Radical Equations: Math Literacy and Civil Rights*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Perrone, V. 1998. *Teacher With a Heart*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Perrone, V. 1991. "Toward Larger Purposes." *A Letter to Teachers: Reflections on Schooling and the Art of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sarason, S. 1996. "Programmatic and Behavioral Regularities" and "The Modal Process of Change" in *Revisiting The Culture of School and the Problem of Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

2. Language and Literacy

Christensen, L. 2000. "Teaching Standard English: Whose Standard?" *Reading, Writing, and Rising Up*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Delpit, L. 1995. *Other People's Children*. New York: The New Press.

Delpit, L., and J. Kilgour Dowdy. 2002. *The Skin We Speak*. New York: The New Press.

Fisher, D., C. Rothenberg, and N. Frey. 2007. *Language Learners in the English Classroom*. Urbana, Ill: NCTE.

Fishman, A. 1987. "Literacy and Cultural Context: A Lesson from the Amish." *Language Arts* 64 (8): 842–854.

Freeman, Y., and D. Freeman. with S. Mercuri. 2002. *Closing the Achievement Gap*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Krashen, S. 2003. *Explorations in Language Acquisition and Use*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ladson-Billings, G. 1994. *The Dreamkeepers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, C. 2001. "Is October Brown Chinese? A Cultural Modeling Activity System for Underachieving Students." *American Educational Research Journa*l 38 (1): 97–141.

Mahiri, J. 2004. *What They Don't Learn in School: Literacy in the Lives of Urban Youth*. New York: Peter Lang.

Marshal, P. 1983. "How Language Means." *The New York Times Book Review*.

Rodriguez, R. 1982. *Hunger of Memory.* New York: Bantam Books.

Rose, M. 1989. *Lives on the Boundary*. New York: Penguin Books.

Rose, M. 2004. *The Mind at Work.* New York: Penguin Books.

Scribner, S. 1984. "Literacy in Three Metaphors." *American Journal of Education* (November).

Smitherman, G., and V. Villanueva, eds. 2003. *Language Diversity and the Classroom: From Intention to Practice.* NCTE/CCCC and Southern Illinois University Press.

Turnbull, E., and B. Farr. 2005. *Language and Learning: What Teachers Need to Know*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Wong Fillmore, L., and C. E. Snow. 2000. "What Teachers Need to Know About Language" (U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement: ERIC)

3. Writing and Reading

Allen, J. 1995. *It's Never Too Late*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann.

Atwell, N. 1998. *In the Middle.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann.

Bean, J. C. 2001. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blau, S. 2003. *The Literature Workshop: Teaching Texts and Their Readers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Christensen, L. 2000. *Reading, Writing, and Rising Up*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Elbow, P. 1998. *Writing with Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. 1997. "High Stakes and Low Stakes in Assigning and Responding to Writing." *In New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jago, C. 2002. *Cohesive Writing: Why Concept Is Not Enough*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Krashen, S. 1997. "The Case for Late Intervention: Once a Good Reader, Always a Good Reader." In *Reconsidering a Balanced Approach to Reading*, edited by C. Weaver. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Keene, E. O., and S. Zimmermann. 1997. *Mosaic of Thought*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Mayher, J., N. Lester, and G. Pradl. 1983. *Learning to Write / Writing to Learn*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton Cook.

McCann, T., L. Johannessen, E. Kahn, P. Smagorinsky, and M. Smith, eds. 2005. *Reflective Teaching Reflective Learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Moffett, J., and B. J. Wagner. 1992. *Student-Centered Language Arts*, K–12. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Perl, S. 1980. "Understanding Composing." *College Composition and Communication* 31 (4).

Perl, S. 1994. "A Writer's Ways of Knowing: Guidelines for Composing." In *Presence of Mind Writing and the Domain Beyond the Cognitive.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann

Rosenblatt, L. 1983. *Literature as Exploration*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Schoenbach, R., C. Greenleaf, C. Cziko, and L. Hurwitz. 1999. *Reading for Understanding*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, M.W., and J. Wilhelm. 2002. *Reading Don't Fix No Chevys*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Stahl, S.A., and C. Shanahan. 2004. "Learning to Think Like a Historian: Disciplinary Knowledge Through Critical Analysis of Multiple Documents." In *Adolescent Literacy Research and Practice,* edited by T. L. Jetton and J. A. Dole. New York: The Guilford Press.

Vacca, R., and J. Vacca. 1998. *Content Area Reading: Literacy and Learning Across the Curriculum*. New York: Addison Wesley.

Weaver, C., ed. 1998. *Reconsidering a Balanced Approach to Reading*. Urbana, IL: NCTE

Wilhelm, J. 2001. "Getting Kids into the Reading Game: You Gotta Know the Rules." *Voices in the Middle* 8 (4).

APPENDIX D: SAMPLE END-OF-YEAR ADMINISTRATOR'S LETTER/ REPORT

Note: Though teacher-consultants meet periodically with principals during the year, each of us writes an extensive report in letter form in June. Though there are formal evaluations from inservice participants, New York City Writing Project (NYCWP) directors believe it is essential that each principal and district superintendent responsible for our funding and release time be informed of the progress of our work with teachers during the school day. We share drafts of these reports in response groups, paying particular attention to voice, language, and the way in which difficult issues are raised.

This heavily edited excerpt of an administrator's letter captures the basic structure many of our on-site teacher-consultants use to reflect and report on their work in June. Letters are often several pages in length with an appendix listing all of the inservice participants that year. A revised version of this letter is sent to district administrators.

June 20, 2003
Mr./Ms. X, Principal
XXX School

Dear Mr./Ms. X,

I am writing to report on the work of the New York City Writing Project (NYCWP) at XXX this year. As you know, I was on site three days a week, largely serving teachers at your school and XXX, the other school on campus.

There were three predominant strands to my work this year. Each term I coordinated an after-school inservice series open to all teachers from all the schools in this building. I coached seminar participants and other interested teachers by doing demonstration lessons in their classrooms of particular literacy practices as well as team-teaching and collaborating on projects. Finally, I also contributed to the broader, schoolwide work that supports staff and administration by providing curriculum resources and serving on teaching teams and committees to help move the school's instructional agenda forward.

It has been a pleasure to resume and deepen the work I began last year. **[The rest of this paragraph describes some of the work from the previous year and establishes one or two goals the teacher-consultant had for this year.]**

Inservice seminars

Whatever the focus of an NYCWP inservice series, we always have two goals in mind. First, we want participating teachers to experience firsthand the power of writing and reading and begin to explore the multiple uses for writing as a thinking tool in the classroom. Second, we strive to create a professional community

wherein teachers read and write together, engage in discussions that connect theory to practice, and support one another as they bring new pedagogical approaches into their classrooms.

I co-led the fall inservice series, "Implementing Literacy-Rich Classrooms," with XXX, an NYCWP teacher-consultant and a literacy teacher at XXX. **[The rest of this paragraph describes the main goals and major activities of the inservice series.]**

I want to share two highlights from this seminar. **[This paragraph highlights the work of several teachers in the seminar.]**

The spring inservice series, "Reading Writing Connections: Working with Multiple Texts," focused on reading. [The rest of this paragraph describes the goals and major activities of the inservice series.]

I want to share some highlights from this seminar. **[This paragraph highlights the work of several teachers in the seminar.]**

Coaching, modeling, and consulting with teachers

The heart of my work continues to be the consulting and planning I do with teachers and the modeling, team-teaching, and direct work with students that occurs in classrooms. As you know, I always try to adapt the focus of this work to the specific needs of each teacher. Sometimes I help them plan or refine projects they already have in mind, suggesting texts or ways of using writing that enrich or even transform a unit. In other instances, we create lessons and assignments together and team-teach. Often I demonstrate a particular instructional approach or work directly with students. The goal is always to support and guide the teacher. As I look back on this year, I am gratified by much of the work staff members and I accomplished together.

[The next two paragraphs describe collaborations with specific teachers in the school.]

Schoolwide work

In an effort to fully support the staff and the goals of the school, I have also worked on a broader scale. I attended committee and staff meetings when I was in the building. In the fall, you suggested that I work more intensively with one of the school's two teaching teams. You will also recall that I joined the staff at its fall retreat where I conducted an all-morning literacy workshop that demonstrated how to introduce and support the study of a historical topic through a series of writing, reading, and discussion activities.

[A paragraph describes the work done with two of the school's teaching teams.]

[Another paragraph identifies the workshops that the teacher-consultant coordinated during the year.]

Looking Ahead

This completes my second year at XXX. As I look back over the year, I notice certain trends that have emerged. **[The rest of this paragraph identifies accomplishments in literacy teaching across the school.]**

Upon reflection on the year's work, I have identified some goals to consider for the future. **[The rest of this paragraph identifies three or four needs/concerns.]**

[A final brief paragraph acknowledges administrative support.]

Sincerely,

XXX

NYCWP Teacher-Consultant

APPENDIX E: SAMPLE END-OF-YEAR REVIEW
Adapted From The Prospect Center's Review Practice

Note: This a heavily edited excerpt of an end-of-year review. Usually the New York City Writing Project (NYCWP) director provides written instructions for the preparation of these reviews (see Appendix D). Teacher-consultants prepare their reviews in writing, and some of us write them more formally than others. The end-of-year review is presented orally for colleagues, so the quality of the writing is not an issue. Teacher-consultants often add in many anecdotal details during their oral presentation that do not appear in their written notes. The teacher-consultant may distribute and refer to samples of his or her work in schools during the presentation. Ideally, we present our year-end reviews for the entire Friday group. Sometimes, owing to time constraints, two reviews are held concurrently, and each teacher-consultant presents for a smaller group of peers.

End-of-Year Review: Study Groups At Xxx

1. Framing question

What might I have done differently to make these study groups more productive, and what should I consider regarding the focus, structure, and context for study groups in the future?

2. Background and context

The teacher-consultant provides an overview of the history of his or her work at this site and identifies some of the faculty and administrative concerns that led to the decision to promote study groups in this year.

3. Description and analysis of three study group experiences

The teacher-consultant: 1) describes what happened in each group, 2) shares what worked, and 3) identifies challenges and concerns.

Experience 1: Fall inservice series: "Study Groups: Inquiry into Teaching."

Since we hoped to get a few independent study groups off the ground in the spring, we offered an inservice series that introduced the concept and modeled the experience of study groups. The inservice series provided a way for both veteran and inexperienced teachers to read, write, and discuss aspects of teaching as well as share instructional approaches.

Description of inservice series: In this section of the review the presenting teacher-consultant describes the inservice series and focuses on the five weeks in the series in which inservice participants worked in small study groups based on their interests. Materials are distributed.

Reflection on the inservice series: In this section of the review the presenting

teacher-consultant reflects on what worked and what didn't work about this experience.

Experience 2: Study group for English teachers

The teacher-consultant also helped form a study group for four English teachers (from different schools in the building) who wanted to meet to support each other's teaching. These teachers had met in the NYCWP inservice series. The study group met during two free periods in the spring.

Description of the study group: In this section of the review the presenting teacher-consultant describes the study group. Each week a different teacher presented (a unit he or she was planning or teaching; samples of student work) and shared resources. The teacher-consultant facilitated the group meetings. Materials are distributed.

Reflection on the study group: In this section of the review the presenting teacher-consultant reflects on what worked for the four teachers and then identifies the challenges.

Experience 3: Study group on finding literature for the classroom

In all four schools in the building, teachers across disciplines have talked about the lack of a broad range of appropriate literature to enrich curriculum and engage students. As a result, we initiated an after-school study group for teachers to identify, read, and discuss literature for potential classroom use. The group met for ten weeks and comprised eight teachers: art, English, foreign language, and science. The teacher-consultant coordinated.

Description of the study group: In this section of the review the presenting teacher-consultant describes the study group. Over the ten weeks, teachers looked at myth and folk tale as genre and read a range of works from different cultures, believing such works could be adapted for use in all four disciplines. Participants determined how to structure the two hours each week.

Reflection on the study group: In this section of the review the presenting teacher-consultant reflects on what worked for the eight teachers and then identifies the challenges.

4. Final reflection by teacher-consultant

1. Study groups have the potential to build in-house leadership and establish a culture of collaborative learning, but most teachers have never participated in them and are not sure of what they might be or what is entailed to make them work.

2. Such groups require careful facilitation, regular attendance, and an ongoing commitment from participants.

3. A successful study group needs to have a specific focus. Such groups seem to work best when 1) they are made up of teachers from one school or content area or 2) there is something in particular that people want and need to learn in a specific amount of time.

4. How do you select a focus, and what happens if teachers want to participate in the group but don't share a particular need/interest?

5. Facilitation is key. How many people on a faculty can or want to facilitate, and how can facilitation be supported?

5. Repeat of framing question

What might I have done differently to make these study groups more productive, and what should I consider to regarding the focus, structure and context for study groups in the future?

6. Group response

Two rounds of response: 1) positives or things we notice, 2) questions or suggestions.

APPENDIX F: NEW YORK CITY WRITING PROJECT YEAR-END REVIEWS, JUNE 1999

Last year our year-end reviews centered around the concepts of increased visibility and building capacity. Though we have spent time this year tightening up and refining our inservice seminars, we have not had the time to focus on our consulting work. Therefore, our year-end reviews this year offer us the opportunity to reflect on and assess how the consulting we do moves the work of the project forward in schools.

To prepare for this year's review, consider the range of activities that comprise your consulting work in schools: one-on-one consultations with individual teachers; work in classrooms; work with new teachers; coordination of curriculum development and New York State assessments; collaborations with other professional development groups in the building; facilitation of teams and study groups; helping teachers prepare presentations, etc. Your presentation will focus on your consulting work at *one* site. Since consulting represents such a key element of our work and has presented some difficulties for us this year, we encourage you to use this review as a way for each of us to look both individually and collectively at our practice in this area. This will enable us to grow as individuals and as a National Writing Project site.

As a group, we will determine the format for these presentations. We expect that each person will have forty minutes to present followed by twenty minutes of questions and response. Together we will develop a protocol for responding. Each presentation will need to be framed by a focus question that the consultant will design in collaboration with Ed, Linda, or Linette.

To prepare for your review, you may want to assemble a portfolio of artifacts/documents that reflect your consulting work: meeting notes; samples of student work; publications; curriculum units; your responses to and/or revisions of committee work, school-based or districtwide literacy policies, and initiatives. Please be selective if you assemble a portfolio.

We want to make these reviews more intimate this year. Therefore, each review group will consist of five people. The consultant who is presenting will invite two colleagues to participate, from either the writing project or the Institute for Literacy Studies. The other members of each review team will be two of the following people: Linette, Linda, Ed, or Marcie, depending on time availability.

Reviews are tentatively scheduled for the following Fridays: May 28, June 4, June 11. As needed, we will use Thursdays, June 3 and June 10 as well. At the Institute's annual year-end retreat, June 16–17, we will consider how these reviews can inform our work for the upcoming school year. We will also take time in June (at the retreat or soon thereafter) to have a forum at which each of us will acknowledge two

colleagues, either for the support we received from them this year or for an aspect of their work (heralded or not) that has been important to us.

Prepared by Linette Moorman, Director, NYCWP
Ed Osterman, Linda Vereline, Associate Directors, NYCWP

Suggestions for Preparing for Year-End Reviews, June 1998

Last year we did a broad review. It gave us a chance to reflect on our work and to have some support from our colleagues about our work. This year, as part of our focus on the impact of our work in schools, we will look at how we use our time in the school to advance our purpose/intentions.

To prepare for your review, it may be helpful to do the following: You might want to go through your journals and begin by listing all of the ways you use your time in the school: meeting with individual teachers; working in classrooms; supporting publications of student work and other ways of making the site's work visible in the school; organizing study groups; meeting with any subgroup (new teacher group, etc.); participating in cabinet meetings; coaching teachers for presentations; and networking with other staff development groups/people in the building and with other resource people in the school (librarians, computer people).

As you review your materials, keep track of what you notice about the content and structures of your work in schools and what you notice about your documentation of this work in terms of this focus issue: building capacity and/or increasing the visibility of your work in the school.

Describe your year in terms of this focus. Consider these points in your description:

- Describe contexts where the work of the writing project is visible in your school or where you are beginning to recognize some kind of impact on students, teachers, or department or school;
- Describe people and structures that have supported this aspect of your work or made it possible as well as people and structures which have made it more difficult;
- Tell a story about this aspect of your work;
- Assess your strengths in doing this aspect of your work;
- Name your questions and concerns in doing this aspect of your work.

Since all of us will focus on building capacity and increasing visibility, the reviews will give each of us an individual chance to describe this aspect of our work and at the same time place it in a broader context. Collectively and individually, we will name where we are and what concerns we have.

Prepared by Linette Moorman, Director, NYCWP

APPENDIX G: SAMPLE FRAMING QUESTIONS FOR END-OF-YEAR REVIEWS

Note: Here are some sample questions that NYCWP teacher-consultants have used to frame the end-of-year reviews of their work. Often, teacher-consultants meet with current and former NYCWP directors to discuss the end-of-year review and to formulate framing questions.

1. Where has my on-site work—in its difference from the New York City Writing Project inservice model—held true to the spirit of the writing project and where has it become disconnected? (Barbara 1998)

2. What have been the characteristics of my work with first-year teachers, and what might I do differently next year to better support and prepare them for teaching? (Ed 2001)

3. How do I support the growth of teachers in a vocational high school and have a positive impact on student writing across the curriculum? (Amanda 2004)

4. How do I position myself in collaborations where coaching holds very different meanings for me and our organization than it does for my collaborators (and their organizations)? How do we navigate/work alongside other organizations or individuals when the basic values are so different? (Julie 2004)

5. How can we create productive and meaningful professional development in situations in which both the participants and the content we teach are mandated? In what ways do you see my work as helping a reluctant study group find meaningful "ways in" to a mandated project? (Katherine 2005)

APPENDIX H: A PROTOCOL FOR LOOKING AT STUDENT WORK: ADAPTED FROM THE PROSPECT CENTER'S DESCRIPTIVE PROCESSES

Our Goal

This protocol is designed to help everybody in the group participate in a manner that is supportive of the presenter and conducive to helpful feedback. It is also crucial that we remain respectful of the student and his/her work as we use this protocol for response.

1. The teacher/presenter asks a framing question to guide our looking and responding.

2. The teacher/presenter provides a context for the work.

3. The teacher/presenter reads aloud the assignment. Participants ask clarifying questions about the assignment before looking at the student work.

4. The student work is read aloud or displayed.

5. Rounds of Response*

   Round 1: First Impressions

   In one or two sentences, share a first thought or impression about the work.

   Round 2: Description

   Describe one thing you notice in the paper. The goal here is not to evaluate or judge in any way; simply describe one feature we would all agree is there on the page.

   Round 3: What the Student Can Do

   Identify one thing the student can do, something you think the student does well.

   Round 4: Signs of Struggle

   Identify a sign of struggle. What is one area where the student seems to need help? Try to be as specific as possible here.

   Round 5: Suggestions

   What might this teacher do to help move this student's work forward? Offer one suggestion, strategy, or possibility for the teacher to consider.

6. The teacher/presenter reflects on what he or she has heard.

*Note: Facilitator might summarize comments heard following each round of response.

APPENDIX I: BREAKFAST MEETING AGENDA

Note: Each pair of small-group leaders listed in the agenda below consists of an on-site teacher-consultant and a teacher he or she works with in a school.

New York City Writing Project
Administrators Breakfast Meeting
Thursday, March 14, 2002

AGENDA

8:30 – 9:10	Breakfast	
9:10 – 9:30	Welcome and framing statements	Marcie Wolfe, Executive Director Institute for Literacy Studies
	Review of morning's activities	Linette Moorman, Director New York City Writing Project
9:30 – 11:00	Small groups	Small-Group Leaders:
		Joe Bellacero/Cora Hiebinger
		Debi Freeman/Ayette Cabrera
		Nancy Mintz/Josefina Ortiz
		Laura Schwartzberg
11:00–11:15	Discussion and reflection	

APPENDIX J: NEW YORK CITY WRITING PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET

HOW DO THE CONSULTING AND OUR WORK IN SCHOOLS EVOLVE?

Step 1: INITIAL CONSULTATIONS

A. How do consultations emerge? From where do the teachers come?

- Participation in an NYCWP inservice series or study group
- Targeting by principal or assistant principal
- Self-selection
- New teacher groups
- Interest generated by a teacher-consultant's workshop

B. What is the content of the consultations? How does a teacher-consultant decide how to work with a teacher if we do not have a preplanned script?

Any of the following can be the starting point of the discussion:

- Writing and reading issues that the teacher has targeted from observing student needs
- Teacher or school interest in developing writing-to-learn approaches
- Regents or city/state assessments needs
- Region's needs/goals
- Project that the teacher has in mind
- Teacher interest in implementing some approaches he or she experienced in an NYCWP inservice series or workshop
- Teacher interest in knowing how to best implement the curriculum

C. How does the teacher-consultant work in these initial consultations?

He or she

- Questions the teacher about how he or she already uses reading and writing in the classroom and asks what the teacher has noticed about the student work
- Inquires about the ways reading/writing are used in the teacher's discipline
- Questions the teacher about the reading/writing students need to master for Regents and/or other state assessments
- Asks the teacher what he/she is doing well and where he/she needs help
- Listens for the issues/questions that sometimes underlie teacher stories/expressed needs

- Lays out the possibilities for the teacher: Where can we begin? What is possible?

A relationship between a teacher-consultant and a teacher is built over time: through trust, through a mutual understanding of and knowledge of urban classrooms and students, and through the teacher-consultant "having walked that walk."

Step 2: HOW A PLAN OF ACTION DEVELOPS

The sequence usually occurs in following manner:

a. Observing the classroom: to see how a teacher works; classroom set-up; interaction with students. It is here where the teacher-consultant frequently sees places for writing.

b. Collaborating on the design of a lesson or unit

c. Modeling an approach in the classroom and/or team-teaching

d. Developing material for a lesson or unit

e. Reflecting: Discussing how lessons and assignments played out; revising this work; and looking ahead to the next steps.

f. Looking at student work together

g. Publishing and displaying student work: class magazines, bulletin boards, or online.

Step 3: WHAT ARE THE POSSIBILITIES FOR SCHOOLWIDE WORK?

The teacher-consultant may be asked by a principal / assistant principal to work more broadly or the teacher-consultant may initiate any of the following:

- Department or staff meetings: Demonstrations of balanced literacy approaches; Regents-related work; writing-to-learn approaches; writing as process/craft.

- Lunch and Learns: Workshops/demonstrations of the above.

- Team meetings: (a) facilitating curriculum planning and materials design; (b) designing protocols for curriculum-sharing and looking at student work; (c) facilitating discussions; and (d) supporting team leaders.

- Documentation: Teacher-consultant may take notes at meetings to provide team/staff with documentation of conversations; collaborate with teachers on designing displays of student work.

- Staff development workshops: Topics based on (a) stated needs of principal/assistant principal; (b) plans made by a professional development committee; or (c) an instructional or curriculum need the teacher-consultant has identified that others may not have noticed.

- Oral readings and celebrations: Teacher-consultant may organize schoolwide celebrations of student work.

APPENDIX K: SAMPLE FRIDAY MEETING AGENDAS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM TEACHER-CONSULTANTS IN LEADERSHIP ROLES

Sample #1:

Note: The following email communication was sent to on-site teacher-consultants regarding a Friday book group meeting. The prompts were designed by Debi Freeman, one of the two teacher-consultants who volunteered to take responsibility for how the group would work with the book.

Teacher-Consultant Meeting

Subject: Friday's book group discussion of *Reflective Teaching, Reflective Learning*

December 7, 2006

Hi all,

Here's what I am thinking about for this Friday.

We agreed to read the foreword, preface, and introduction to *Reflective Teaching, Reflective Learning*. I thought a good way to begin thinking about how we want to read this book and the ideas in these early pieces might be to focus on two or three passages from any of these sections that connect in some way to your teaching—past, current, or soon-to-come. We'll take about twenty minutes to write about the passages we selected. Choose from these questions or find your own way in:

- How do the idea(s) connect to your work?
- Of what are you reminded?
- What does it affirm/contradict?
- How does it speak to what you value/believe/worry about?
- What questions does this raise for you?

Then we'll share this writing in small groups as a lead into what we are interested in reading next. We'll share in the whole group and decide if we will be reading the same chapter(s) or different ones for our next book group meeting.

Does this sound ok?

See you Friday,
Debi

Sample #2:

Note: The following Friday meeting agendas were prepared by associate directors Felicia George and Joe Bellacero. You will note writing prompts vary as do the range of activities. These are sent via email in advance of the meeting.

Teacher-Consultant Meeting

Friday, October 10, 2003, Agenda

A.M.

1. Writing and sharing:

Prompt: How has entry gone for you? What relationships are you beginning to form in the school(s)? Where are the potential relationships? Where are the places that are challenging?

2. Sharing in small groups:

Small groups will decide on how to conduct sharing and responses. Be sure to have one or two note-takers.

3. Whole group:

Reporting back. (Notes from small groups to follow.)

4. Business

P.M.

Small-Group Meeting

- Planning Groups: Study Groups/Inservice Workshop Series
- Individual/work in pairs: Professional Development Day Workshops

Teacher-Consultant Meeting

Friday, March 16, 2007, Agenda

A.M.

1. Free write

2. Introduction to my.nycwp.net—Gina Moss

3. Inquiry on year's theme: Success

- Reflection on the word success

- Sharing our "success" stories in trios
- Discussion: What might each of us include in our collection of work around the idea of "success"?

4. Business/Announcements:

- NCTE/NWP Annual Meeting in New York: Discussing needs
- Teacher-to-Teacher Conference: Report by conference committee on jobs needed
- 2007 Summer Update: Possibility of Summer Youth Program

P.M.

Small-Group Meetings

- Teacher-to-Teacher Conference Committee
- Planning Groups: Study Groups / Inservice Workshop Series

APPENDIX L: JOB DESCRIPTION

Position: On-site teacher-consultant for the New York City Writing Project (NYCWP) Staff Development Program in schools

Roles and Responsibilities:

An on-site teacher-consultant will establish staff development programs for teachers of all subject areas and grade levels in a variety of settings—comprehensive, alternative and small schools—in any of the boroughs of New York City. This program is designed to build a community of teachers in or across schools who will collaborate to explore the use of writing as a tool for thinking, learning, and personal reflection. The teacher-consultant will help teachers examine how writing is taught, used, and assessed in schools.

The responsibilities of the teacher-consultant include but are not limited to the following:

1) Identify and actively recruit a group of teachers from a variety of disciplines who will participate in the program.

2) Co-coordinate a thirty-hour graduate seminar (each semester or over the year, depending on contracted arrangements with district), which entails weekly planning, the design and preparation of materials, and the necessary preparations for teaching.

3) Meet regularly with participating teachers during the school day to discuss ways to integrate writing and writing-to-learn approaches in different curriculum areas and to gain greater understanding of the programs, requirements, and expectations of the school and district.

4) Provide classroom support for participating teachers such as lesson planning, acting as a resource for materials, team teaching, conducting demonstration lessons, facilitating reflective conversations, and professional dialogue.

5) Make presentations at department and faculty meetings and on designated staff development days and/or coach classroom teachers to present at conferences or on staff development days.

6) Meet regularly with administrators to keep them informed about the progress of the program and issues that affect the impact of our work in a school.

7) Maintain careful records and documentation of the graduate seminars and the daily work in schools.

8) Facilitate study groups and/or serve on school- or district-based literacy or school reform committees, should the need or request arise.

9) Prepare reports about the graduate seminars and the school-day work for administrators on various levels.

10) Meet weekly at the Institute for Literacy Studies (ILS) at Lehman College to

- participate in further professional development
- collaborate with colleagues on the work of the professional development program in schools
- prepare materials utilizing the resources of the ILS and the NYCWP at Lehman College
- reflect and assess the progress of the work on an on going basis.

Requirements:

1) New York State certification or a valid New York City license for teaching in elementary, middle, or high schools.

2) Extensive classroom experience.

3) Prior participation in NYCWP programs and commitment to its principles.

4) Demonstrated leadership abilities; ability to establish positive rapport with administrators, colleagues, students, and parents; ability to work collaboratively with teachers.

5) Excellent attendance record.

APPENDIX M: LIST OF ADDITIONAL INSERVICE OPPORTUNITIES PROVIDED BY THE NEW YORK CITY WRITING PROJECT

Compiled by Ed Osterman, November 2007

Note: The heart of the NYCWP's inservice model features a) an on-site teacher-consultant who works during the day with teachers and b) an inservice series held on-site for which participating teachers can receive tuition-free graduate credit. Sometimes a limited number of stipends are available to participants who no longer need graduate credit. This is the model we prefer and continue to propose to schools and districts. However, we do provide other services as noted in the following list.

1. **Workshop series, graduate-level seminars, or study groups:** Schools and/or districts purchase a graduate-level seminar, workshop, or study group series for locations where there is no NYCWP on-site teacher-consultant. These are developed in collaboration with schools and districts to address a particular need or interest (writing to support learning; developing research projects; rubrics and assessment; looking at student work) or target a particular teaching population (industrial arts teachers). They are coordinated by NYCWP teacher-consultants.*

2. **Independent workshops:** Schools and/or districts contact the NYCWP to coordinate an individual workshop on a specific topic or for a particular occasion. These can be one-hour to half-day or full-day workshops. The workshop will be designed and conducted by a teacher-consultant or consultants.

3. **Administrative work:** Districts have requested a series of workshops or study groups for administrators. Such workshops may run for three to six sessions and are planned to accommodate the busy schedules of administrators from several schools. These workshops intend to provide administrators with a broader understanding of writing and reading approaches in both language arts and content-area classrooms. Sometimes workshops are designed to support the work that we are already doing in several of a district's schools, and are geared to help administrators clarify their literacy goals and establish structures for faculty that promote dialogue and reflection on literacy practices. Such workshops are often coordinated by the NYCWP director or associate director alongside a teacher-consultant. In such instances, we seek teacher-consultants who are current or former administrators.

4. **Teacher-to-Teacher Conference:** This yearly event is described in detail in the body of this monograph. Though the conference is advertised throughout the city and no one pays to attend, it should be noted that during the semester in which the conference is held, all inservice participants are required to attend. The conference runs four hours, so attendance at the conference is equivalent to two sessions of the inservice series. Some of the workshop presenters at the conference are current or former inservice participants as well as summer institute fellows.

5. **District-funded summer seminars:** Sometimes districts with whom the NYCWP has year-long inservice contracts agree to fund two-week summer seminars that are open only to teachers of those specific districts. These may occur right after the end of the school year or prior to the September opening of schools. In recent years, such seminars have included "Content-Area Writing" and "Reading-Writing Connections." Each seminar is coordinated by a pair of teacher-consultants; often this provides the opportunity for one of our on-site teacher-consultants to collaborate (and guide) a less experienced teacher-consultant. *

*__Note:__ In each of these instances, we select from our entire pool of teacher-consultants, not merely from those who have been released from their own teaching duties to work on-site in other schools.

APPENDIX N: NEW YORK CITY WRITING PROJECT CHART OF STRATEGIES AND PROCESSES USED TO SUPPORT THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF ON-SITE TEACHER-CONSULTANTS

Compiled by Ed Osterman, December 2006*

1. Supporting the current work we do in schools

- Journal writing with prompts
- Weekly go-arounds within and across grade level groups
- Active listening
- Using protocols and processes to look at student work and teacher assignments
- Looking at our on-site work through yearly themes (collaboration, entry, impact)
- Role-playing consultations
- Presentations of classroom instructional approaches (including gallery walks; interactive read-alouds; using Nicenet conference boards)

2. Refreshing our professional skills and knowledge through study

- Book groups on topics of professional interest
- Periodic Study Days (on topics such as literacy, cultural and language diversity, adolescent reading, reading in content areas, essay writing) **
- Using varied processes for text-based discussions of readings (reflection on a word; selecting quotes; wall talk; creating found poems; mapping; creating visual metaphors; text rendering; writing of personal stories; freewriting, read alouds; cut up poems; "speed" discussions)
- Presentations and/or reports on progress of a site's participation in NWP initiatives (new teacher; reading initiative; technology)

** **Note:** Study includes the reading/discussion of professional articles, presentations, and writing.

3. Addressing the site's immediate and practical needs

- Designing and preparing for NYCWP's annual Teacher-to-Teacher Conference**
- Designing or revising publicity materials**
- Writing and preparing reports/materials for school districts, NWP, grants, New York City Department of Education RFPs**

** **Note:** These activities often involve reaffirming or rethinking our beliefs, writing, reading, and work with teachers so they also serve to refresh our professional knowledge as well.

4. Reflecting on the issues and accomplishments of our inservice work

- Writing, revising, and responding in groups to superintendent and principal letters
- Developing and presenting year-end Reviews of Practice
- Using protocols to respond to Reviews of Practice (including tuning protocol, processes adapted from The Prospect Center and Archives)

*__Note:__ Thanks to Elizabeth Radin Simons for her helpful identification and organization of the strategies and processes described in this text

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

ED OSTERMAN

Teacher-Consultant, New York City Writing Project at Lehman College

Ed Osterman worked for over thirty years in New York City public schools as a high school English teacher and as a literacy consultant with teachers across the curriculum. He has been associate director and a founding member of the New York City Writing Project (NYCWP), the largest program of the Institute for Literacy Studies at Lehman College (CUNY). He served for ten years as editor of the NYCWP newsletter and has presented at local, regional, and national conferences.

As an on-site teacher-consultant for the NYCWP, Osterman has worked with teachers at a range of large and small high schools in the Bronx and Queens, New York. At the Campus Magnet High Schools, Osterman collaborated for five years with a team of consultants from several professional development organizations on a school restructuring initiative, *Students at the Center*, funded by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund.

He currently works as an on-site teacher-consultant and literacy coach at Bronx International High School at the Morris High School Campus in the Bronx, a position he has held since the school's inception in fall 2001.

National Writing Project
University of California
2105 Bancroft Way #1042
Berkeley, CA 94720-1042

Tel. 510-642-0963
Fax. 510-642-4545
nwp@nwp.org
www.nwp.org