Finding the Common Ground:
A Comparison of Writing Expectations and Outcomes Between the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills and the Common Core State Standards

Pat Jacoby
Authentic Learning

Sheri Vasinda
Oklahoma State University

Abstract

In the Winter 2013 edition of the Texas Journal of Literacy Education, we announced that a special task force from the TALE board would be sharing the common ground among the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and the College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS). In that first edition, we began part one of our four part series by briefly discussing the history of the CCSS and the creation of the TEKS and the CCRS. Here, in part two of the series, we compare these standards by examining the writing standards of the TEKS and the CCSS.

Writing is fundamental to academic achievement, career success, and life achievements. In fact, competency in written communication is consistently listed as one of the top skills employers look for in job candidates (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2013). Writing strengthens our ability to demonstrate, support, and deepen our knowledge. In addition, our ability to communicate through writing can contribute to our understanding of relationships, the world around us, and/or our own identify.

Concerns exist about whether or not students are developing the writing skills necessary for success in college or a career. The 2011 results (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012) of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show that large portions of students are below grade-level proficiency (Zumbrunn & Krause, 2012). The NAEP report showed that only 24% of students in eighth- and twelfth-grade performed at the proficient or middle level. This level does represent a solid academic writing performance. However, 55% of eighth-graders and 52% of twelfth-graders performed at the basic or low level that indicates partial mastery of knowledge and skills that are essential for proficient work. In addition, only 3% of eighth- and twelfth-graders demonstrated superior performance and scored at the advanced level. Therefore, writing instruction and standards addressing writing instruction have become a concern as well.

What is Common in the TEKS and CCSS for Writing Standards?

With all the attention that the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) continue to garner at national literacy conferences and reflected in newly published resources, Texas teachers may wonder how the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) compare. Thus, the Texas Association for Literacy Education (TALE) board undertook an analysis of these standards as a special project for Texas educators in the current national climate of Common Core. In this article the comparison is focused on standards for writing.

We began by comparing the Writing TEKS and the CCSS side by side. We start with an overall comparison of how the standards are organized with the intent of only comparing the specific grade-level standards of the writing strands of both documents. For the most part, that is what we did, but, because writing is also tied to language, research and reading, we sometimes had to branch out to other strands. Most of our comparisons are focused on processes and skills that are described by grade level expectations and are framed in the language and organization of the TEKS. As we compared, we began to see commonalities in both sets of standards in terms of expectations for the writing process, the genre of published products, research and inquiry, and the use of technology. Within those same categories we noticed differences, as well, making this an arduous task. Due to limits of time and space, this is a general comparison as a starting point for a broad-based understanding. In this article, we briefly present and examine the student expectations for developing writing skills from the TEKS and the CCSS around the four commonalities previously mentioned. To better understand this comparison, we begin with an examination of how both sets

of standards are organized and then proceed to the comparison of writing standards.

How are the TEKS and CCSS Organized?

The organization of the English Language Arts (ELA) TEKS is well known to Texas teachers (see Table 1). The five strands from grades K-12 include: Reading, writing, oral and written conventions, research, and listening and speaking. Within each strand are Knowledge and Skills statements that give overarching descriptions about what students should understand for each sub-strand. Student expectations follow with specific skills for student performance for each grade level. With the advent of a more rigorous test, State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR), the TEKS student expectations are divided into two additional categories, Readiness Standards and Support Standards.

The CCSS are also organized into five strands (see Table 1). The first four strands, reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language, extend from K-12. From Grades 6-12, there is an additional integrated strand outlining the expectation that literacy processes and skills are integrated into content areas. This strand is called Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. Within each strand, the College and Career Readiness (CCR) anchor standards serves much the same purpose as the Texas Knowledge and Skills statement and is consistent from grades K-12 in both numbering scheme and wording. For example, Anchor Standard 2 (as seen below) articulates the broad statement for informational/explanatory writing:

> Write informative/
> explanatory texts to examine
> and convey complex ideas
> and information clearly and
> accurately through the

effective selection, organization, and analysis of content. (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices [NGA Center] & Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2010a, p.18)

Each of the ten CCR Anchor Standards in the writing strand are differentiated and further supported by specific grade-level standards that articulate end of the year expectations for students at each grade level. These specifics are tagged with lowercase letters. So in Writing Anchor Standard 2, the fifth-grade level expectation is for the student to "Provide a concluding statement or section related to the information or explanation presented" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 20) is listed as W.2.5.e: - meaning, Writing, College and Career Readiness Anchor Standard 2, grade 5, Grade level expectation e. Additionally, the ten CCR Anchor Standards are grouped into the following four sub-strands: Text Types and Purposes, Production and Distribution of Writing, Research to Build and Present Knowledge, and Range of Writing (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p.20).

What is common?
Because we are preparing students for a future in which knowledge work is the currency for success in the information age (Drucker, 1996), both sets of standards emphasize rigor. Preparing students for successful entry into either a career or higher education is the overarching goal for both sets of standards. The ELA objectives are both organized into strands identifying basic components of traditional literacies: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Each strand identifies both broad skills and specific grade level expectations for what students are expected to know and do by the

end of each academic year. Additionally, both sets of standards are cumulative. Standards of the previous grades are expected to be mastered for success at the next grade level.

What is different?
Although both sets of standards are built on the premise of increased rigor and readiness for either higher education or the work force, both Texas and the National Governors Association developed their own standards for success. The Texas College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS) were developed in 2007 and approved in 2008 (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board [THECB], & Educational Policy Improvement Center [EPIC], 2009). Because the timeline for developing the TEKS did not allow for the CCRS to be fully integrated, the CCRS were used more extensively during the state's assessment redesign.

The development of the College and Career Readiness standards for the CCSS was begun shortly before the grade specific standards, so the CCSS are directly aligned, or anchored, to their CCR standards, thus the CCSS term "anchor standards" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 10). Throughout this and other articles that include emphasis on College and Career Readiness Standards, there is a slight difference in initialized abbreviations for each. Texas' College and Career Readiness Standards include the "S" for standards as part of its official reference and thus the initials: CCR**S**. The initials for College and Career Readiness standards for the Common Core are CCR without the "S". These minutely different initialized references are used throughout the article and give distinction to the targeted standards for both the TEKS and CCSS.

There are also differences in the strand organization. The TEKS have five strands identifying literacy components for K-12 students in Texas giving special emphasis to research as a separate strand. Because the CCRS were developed and approved around the same time as the ELA TEKS were in revision, they were not extensively examined by the TEKS writing committee and, therefore, were not directly aligned to the TEKS. Therefore, the TEKS are not completely aligned to the CCRS, which leaves some alignment gaps.

The CCSS have five strands that organize

the expectations for K-12 students giving special emphasis to a strand integrating literacy skills and processes into content areas beginning at 6th grade. This strand puts an emphasis on a shared responsibility for literacy in across disciplines because literacy skills support knowledge building in the content areas. Additionally, the CCSS are directly aligned or "anchored" to their CCR standards. The grade level expectations provide specificity to the broader learning statement outlined by the CCR anchor standards and therefore each grade level expectation is aligned to college and career readiness.

Table 1
Comparison of the Organization of the Standards

TEKS	CCSS
K-12 Strands: ● Reading ● Writing ● Oral & Written Conventions ● Research ● Listening & Speaking	K-12 Strands: ● Reading ● Writing ● Speaking & Listening ● Language 6-12 Strand: ● Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects
Knowledge and Skills Statements Student Expectations	Anchor Standards (which are the CCR) Grade Level Standards
College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS)	College and Career Readiness (CCR) Anchor Standards (used as the Knowledge and Skills Statement)

What are the Expectations for the Writing Process? Writing process (i.e., planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing) is an organic process used by experienced writers (Graves, 2003) and now widely recognized as a process to support developing writers that can be fostered in classrooms (Calkins 1994, Fletcher, 2001, Murray, 1972/2009). Zumbrunn and Krause (2012) identified the following five principles for effective writing instruction:

1) effective writing instructors realize the impact of their own writing beliefs, experiences, and classroom practices; 2) effective writing instruction encourages student motivation and engagement; 3) effective writing instruction begins with clear and deliberate planning, but is flexible; 4) effective writing instruction and practice happen every day; and 5) effective writing instruction is a scaffolded collaboration

between teachers and students. Because both the TEKS and CCSS strive to support research-based practices, both identify writing processes in Kindergarten through Twelfth-grade as a foundational component for developing effective communicators and life-long writers.

What is Common?

The TEKS and the CCSS articulate a shared understanding that all writers must develop, organize, and strengthen their writing skills by utilizing the broad components of the writing process so that a clear and structured message is conveyed to the reader. The basic elements of planning, drafting, revising, editing, and published are outlined in both sets of standards. Additionally, there is agreement that writing processes are foundational for quality writing instruction and it is important that writing assignments have authentic purposes.

Another commonality is that both sets of standards address written conventions in a separate strand and both of those strands connect written conventions to language skills. The TEKS place conventions in the Written and Oral Language strand. The CCSS place them in the Language strand.

What is Different?

The knowledge and skills statement for the TEKS comprehensively encompass writing process as the following: "Students use elements of the writing process (planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing) to compose text." (University of Texas System [UTS]/Texas Education Agency [TEA], 2009, p. 32). Student expectations further

detail specific requirements for each part of the process meaning there is a separate TEKS for each identified part of the writing process from planning to publishing.

The CCSS integrate writing process expectations across four anchor standards with additional emphasis on the use of technology to support collaboration and publishing. Anchor Standard 5 clusters the expectations for "planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p 18). In addition, Anchor Standard 4 emphasizes coherency for developing and organizing a piece with the audience and purpose in mind.

In the Anchor Standard 10, there is an additional emphasis on time frames of writing described as the concept of "Range". Range includes the expectation that students write for a variety of purposes across disciplines to demonstrate understanding and content knowledge as well as composing high quality literary pieces. Range also includes the ability to write extended pieces that go through multiple revisions to shorter pieces to be completed in a single sitting or shorter time frame and high quality first drafts. Range includes writing for a variety of purposes across disciplines with careful consideration of audience, purpose, and task. The CCSS lists "range of writing" as an expectation in grades 3-12 (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p 18). Table 2 displays this comparison of the TEKS comprehensive knowledge and skills statement and the way CCSS integrated the process across four anchor standards.

Table 2
Comparison of Writing Process TEKS Knowledge and Skills Statement and CCSS CCR Anchor Standards

TEKS	CCSS
TEKS Writing Process Knowledge and Skills Statement: Students use elements of the writing process (planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing) to compose text.	CCSS: (Anchor Standard 4) Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task and purpose.
	CCSS: (Anchor Standard 5) Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.
	CCSS: (Anchor Standard 6) Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others.
	CCSS: (Anchor Standard 10) Write routinely over extended time frames and shorter time frames for a range of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences.

What are the Expectations for Genre?
Genre refers to the structure, form, technique, or content used to categorize texts (Harris & Hodges, 1995). Students become knowledgeable about genre through both reading and writing (Donovan & Smolkin, 2002). Understanding structures of genre can support students' understanding of a text even when they may not have background knowledge on the content or context because they can rely on "textual schema" (Anderson, Pichert, & Shirey, 1983). This understanding helps students not only set a purpose for writing but also includes decisions about genres and forms (Tompkins, 2009). Selecting an appropriate genre gives form for conveying the intended message to the audience, therefore understanding genre supports both knowledge building and communication.

What is Common?
Traditionally writing has focused on two main genres: narrative and expository. Therefore, it is not surprising that both the

TEKS and the CCSS address these two genres (see Table 3). Because both sets of standards are based on preparing students for college and careers, it is noteworthy that the strongest commonality between the two sets of standards is the emphasis on expository writing. Although CCSS uses the term informative/explanatory writing, there are grade-level expectations for expository writing from K - 12 in both the TEKS and CCSS. Because expository writing is often accompanied by research, both sets of standards emphasize research skills as well.

Additionally, each set of standards expects K-12 students to write texts that resemble storytelling or a narrative structure. Both sets of standards are in agreement on the importance of literary narratives, and, in both, there are student expectations for narrative text structure and the genres within it. The TEKS and CCSS both refer to real and imagined narratives.

What is Different?

While similar in structure and expectations, the standards use different terminology to describe the same text structure (see Table 3). For narrative structure, the TEKS use the wording "literary text" (UTS/TEA, 2009, p. 32) while the CCSS uses the wording "narratives" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p.18). The TEKS separate "personal" writing in Grades 3-8 (UTS/TEA, 2009, p. 32), while the CCRS address this by requiring students to "recall information from experiences" in Grades K-5 (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p 19-21). In the TEKS, writing expectations for expository structure are referred to as "expository and procedural texts" (UTS/TEA, 2009, p. 33) and the CCSS use "informative/explanatory texts" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 18). We find these to be differences in terminology, not in actual structure or application.

Differences in the Specificity of Sub-genres

Because this article frames the comparisons based on the organization of the TEKS, on first glance at Table 3, it appears that the CCSS neglect some genres and forms of writing, such as poetry and letter writing. While there are not specific student expectations outlined for writing poetry and other literary genres and forms, they are addressed in Appendix A of the ELA CCSS. Appendix A explains that the narrative strand includes additional forms of narrative writing including, but not limited to, creative fiction, memoirs, poetry, autobiographies, and science procedures (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010c, pp.23-24).

While the TEKS identify multimedia presentations as an additional form within expository writing starting at 6th grade (UTS/TEA, 2009, p. 41), the CCSS integrate multimedia expectations within the genre of informational writing starting at 4th grade with the expectation that students will "introduce a topic clearly and group related information in paragraphs and sections; include formatting (e.g. headings), illustrations, and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 20). Additionally, multimedia presentations are addressed again in the Speaking and Listening strand from Grades 6-12. So, while it might appear that CCSS neglects some aspects that the TEKS address specifically, it may be more accurate to say that the expectations for sub-genres are addressed in different ways with the CCSS leaving sub-genres to teacher discretion (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010c). Table 3 represents the articulation of specific grade level expectations for writing pieces in specific genres from Kindergarten through CCRS or CCR.

Additional Emphases in the CCSS on Argument Writing

The TEKS refer to persuasive writing in grades 2-12, while the CCSS expects "opinion" writing in K-5 transitioning to "argument" writing, which requires some evidence to support a "claim", in grades 6-12. The CCSS differentiate the genre of argument (with counter argument) and opinion (persuasive) writing. Appendix A of the CCSS defines and describes the three emphasized types, or genres, of writing: argument, informational/explanatory, and narrative. Argument is initially defined in the first paragraph. Next, the informational/explanatory writing is defined with a paragraph followed by two paragraphs comparing and contrasting informational writing and argument. The narrative writing is defined with a paragraph and a small paragraph describing blended genre finishes the definitions. What is telling of the emphasis on argument in the CCSS is the inclusion of a page-long essay,

or argument, entitled "The Special Place of Argument in the Standards". This section includes evidence to support argument as a critical literacy of examining multiple perspectives on a topic or issue not primarily to persuade the reader, but with the emphasis on critical thinking and decision making, determining validity of both thinking and resources, supporting thinking with evidence, and anticipating counter-claims. In terms of the difference between persuasive writing and logical argument, logical argument is based more on the quality of the argument, reasonableness, and its support through credible evidence rather than the credibility of the writer or emotional appeal as in opinion writing. Argument is considered central to being prepared for both college and career (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010c, pp. 23-25).

Additional Emphasis on the Relationship between Reading and Writing in the CCSS

Additionally, the CCSS highlight the related integrated nature of reading and writing processes in Anchor Standard 9 which states, "Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research" beginning in grade 4 (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 21). For example when composing a narrative text, 4th graders learning to deeply describe a character through thoughts and actions using text evidence in reading would be expected to use those same skills to develop a character in their narrative compositions. High school students composing an informational text would apply reading processes evaluating the validity of an argument and relevance and sufficiency of text support for the claim to their own argumentative writing.

Table 3

Comparison of the TEKS and CCSS Specific Grade-Level Expectations for Writing Genres

Genres and Sub-genres		Grade Levels K- 12 and CCRS/CCR													
LITERARY															
Literary Narrative (Real or Imagined)		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
	CCSS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Poetry		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
	CCSS														

Script		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS										x	x	x	x	
	CCSS														
Personal Narrative		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS				x	x	x	x	x	x					
	CCSS														

EXPOSITORY

Informative		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	CCSS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Analytical (Essay Response to Literature)		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS										x	x	x	x	x
	CCSS					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Letter, Procedural or Work-related		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	CCSS														
Response to Literary or Expository Texts		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	CCSS					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Multimedia Presentation		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS							x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
	CCSS					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Persuasive (Opinion)		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
	CCSS	x	x	x	x	x	x								

Argument (Counter-Argument)		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS							x	x	x	x	x	x		x
	CCSS						x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x

Research		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
	CCSS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

What are the expectations for Research and Inquiry?

The processes of questioning, exploration, and inquiry are central to the writing process. Writers discover what they know about a subject through the process of writing. They also explore their purposes and goals for a piece of writing, and engage in the questioning processes of inquiry (Emig, 1971; Murray, 2009/1972). Elbow (1973) asserts that people write their way into knowing. Therefore, it would be difficult to write a valid informational piece or effective argument without research. Even narrative writers conduct research for real and imagined stories. Because of living in the information age with knowledge and facts at our fingertips, conducting research leads to a critical reading stance, too, as we evaluate resources in terms of credibility (Flanigan & Metzger, 2007). Both sets of standards outline expectations for research, but they are not all found within the writing strand.

What is common?

The process of collecting information based on questions is a focus of both sets of standards from K-12. From the asking of questions to gathering and evaluating resources, research is part of writing. Additionally each set of standards expects the production of written texts to share the findings of research. Expectations for younger students are to work on class

research projects with guidance and support. In both sets of standards, third grade is where individual projects are first expected (see Table 4).

Both sets of standards also expect students to use multiple resources to gather data and emphasize "relevant" sources and information in the knowledge and skills statement or anchor standards. The use of online or digital resources starts in third grade in both standards. In the upper grades, there is emphasis on learning to paraphrase and avoiding plagiarism as well as expectations to use "authoritative" resources and correct citation formats (UTS/TEA, 2009, p. 57; NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 18).

What is different?
As the CCSS have a special place for argument, the TEKS have a special place for research. Texas demonstrates its significant emphasis on research by positioning it in a separate research strand. To be comprehensive in this comparison, we have included the research strand of the TEKS in this examination of writing expectations. Though both sets of standards have similar goals for conducting research to gather information and present findings, there is a noticeable difference in orientation. The TEKS appear to be more process based, and the CCSS seem to be more information based.

In the TEKS research strand, students are expected to "know how to locate a range of relevant sources and evaluate, synthesize, and present ideas and information" (UTS/TEA, 2009, p. 55). The expectations for this strand are supported by four Knowledge and Skills Statements that highlight research as a process. From Grades K-12, students are expected to ask open-ended questions that they can pursue,

initially as a class and individually by third grade. By first grade and with support, students clarify questions, evaluate resources and organize information to create a synthesis and present to intended audience. There is also emphasis in the early grades for gathering information from "natural and personal" sources such as interviewing local experts and making observations in the natural world (UTS/TEA, 2009, p. 57).

In Grades 5-12, students set the purpose for either written or oral products that present their research according to their audience. The emphasis on research as a process and the focus synthesis building culminate with presenting ideas and information in a variety of formats options (UTS/TEA, 2009, pp. 56-60). Table 4 is organized around the TEKS Knowledge and Skills Statements for the research strand and shows the grade levels at which they are addressed in each set of standards as well as alignment to college and career standards. Although there are K/1-12 grade-level standards in the TEKS for each of the research processes listed, the Texas CCRS do not explicitly state a goal for synthesizing information and organizing and presenting ideas.

The research expectations for the CCSS are part of the writing strand and are grouped in the sub-strand of "Research to Build and Present Knowledge" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 18). There are three CCR anchor standards within this sub-strand. The cumulative nature of the standards is exemplified here through Anchor Standard 7, "Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation." (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 18). In third grade students are expected to conduct research projects to "build knowledge around a topic" (NGA Center & CCSSO,

2010a, p. 21). Credibility and validity of sources are emphasized by 6th grade and avoiding plagiarism and correct citation formats are emphasized at high school levels. (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, pp. 42-44). CCSS emphasizes the importance of text evidence to support a written thesis through the application of grade level reading standards to writing beginning in Grade 4 and continuing through Grade 12 articulated in Anchor Standard 9, "Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and resources." (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 21).

When gathering resources in Grades K-2, students are to "recall information from experiences or gather information from provided sources" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 19). The emphasis remains on information from personal experiences through Grade 5 and the inclusion of print and digital resources beginning at Grade 3. The use of multiple resources begins at Grade 6 as do the expectations for evaluating trustworthiness and continues to Grade 12. Because the CCSS are anchored to their CCR standards, there is alignment of research expectations through college and career readiness as shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Comparison of the Grade-Level Expectations for Research and Inquiry

Grade-Level Expectations		Grade Levels K- 12 and CCRS/CCR													
Research plan		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/ CCR
	TEKS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	CCSS					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Gathering Sources		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/ CCR
	TEKS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	CCSS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Synthesizing Information		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/ CCR
	TEKS		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
	CCSS					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Organizing and Presenting Ideas		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/ CCR
	TEKS		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
	CCSS	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

What are the expectations for use of technology?

We live in a digital age with access to myriad resources. Our current generation of students was born into a knowledge-based society (Drucker, 1999; Davenport, 2005) and never knew a time before the Internet. Students can gather information with online resources and collaborate with peers around the corner or around the world using a

variety of technology applications and formats such as wikis, sharable documents, and blogs to create and share content. Writers can take advantage of the ease of revision and editing within word processing software that includes cut and paste features, spelling and grammar tools as well as online dictionaries, thesauruses and originality checkers, which checks on plagiarism.

Technology also affords the opportunity to produce multimedia texts in a variety of digital formats for presentations or otherwise. Multimedia refers to the integration of several media into one work (Harris & Hodges, 1995). This may include the integration of music, video, photographs, and images with or without text to convey a message. Digital and Web 2.0 tools provide opportunities to expand audience reach of both expression and content creation through multimedia presentations. Multimedia presentations are commonplace in both school and the workforce and are considered a skill for the 21st century as evident by both sets of standards. We compare and contrast technology expectations in two ways: technology as a research and process tool and technology as a creation tool for multimedia presentations.

What is common?
Technology for Research. Because the use of digital tools is part of popular culture, higher education, and the workforce, it makes sense that both the TEKS and CCSS include the use of digital tools for resource gathering and production of writing products. The research strand of the TEKS emphasizes gathering data from online searches and electronic resources from Grades 3-8. From Grades 9-12, the TEKS do not make specific reference to online or electronic resources, but we infer that this continues to include online sources through the end of high school. The CCSS sets the

expectations that both print and digital resources will be utilized from Grades 3-8 explicitly. Both sets of standards emphasize "authoritative" sources in high school. As mentioned earlier in the research comparison, credibility and originality are emphasized by both standards. The use of online sources has made the teaching of credibility another critical aspect of literacy.

Technology for Creation. Additionally, both sets of standards expect students to create multimedia presentations. They both introduce multimedia incrementally beginning with one medium and adding in more with increasing grade levels (See Tables 6 and 7). There are multimedia expectations specifically embedded in the expectations for expository writing.

What is different?
Technology for Research. In terms of tool use, the TEKS specify the use of electronic spelling resources explicitly in Grades 3-6 in the Written and Oral Language strand. From that point on, students are expected to spell correctly using "various resources" for proofreading. Because reference is made specifically to online and electronic resources in those earlier grades, we interpret "various resources" to include online options.

In the CCSS there is no explicit reference to digital resources to aide in spelling. In the Language strand, the expectations state that students are to consult reference materials to check and correct spelling, but there is no reference to digital tools specifically. The use of digital tools for writing process is articulated in Anchor Standard 6 stating, "Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 18). Starting in Kindergarten, students are expected to use

digital tools and collaborate with peers with guidance from adults and culminate in Grade 12 with "Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and present the relationships between information and ideas efficiently as well as to interact and collaborate with others" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 46). Within the grade specific expectations for Anchor Standards 6, keyboarding skills begin in Grade 3 and culminate in Grade 6 with a keyboard fluency expectation of at least three pages in a single session. Because the TEKS do not specify these within the Writing or Research strand, these integrated technology skills are not included in Table 5. However, the TEKS do address keyboarding and collaboration in the technology TEKS that were implemented during the 2012-2013 school year.

Technology for Creation. The TEKS identifies multimedia a sub-genre of expository and procedural texts. The Texas Knowledge and Skills Statement for expository writing states that students will "write expository and procedural or work-related texts to communicate ideas and information to specific audiences for specific purposes." The expectations for multimedia as a sub-genre begin in Grade 6 with the expectation to, "produce a multimedia presentation involving text and graphics using available technology." At the culmination of high school, that multimedia expectation has expanded to, "produce a multimedia presentation (e.g., documentary, class newspaper, docudrama, infomercial, visual or textual parodies, theatrical production) with graphics, images, and sound that appeals to a specific audience and synthesizes information from multiple points of view" (UTS/TEA, 2009, p. 37). This exit expectation includes additional sub-genres, audience consideration, and creating synthesis from a variety of

viewpoints. Table 6 includes the Texas Knowledge and Skills Statement for expository and procedural texts and details the corresponding Grade 6 -12 expectations.

The CCSS treat multimedia as a literary device to strengthen the understanding of presentations as well as a tool for collaboration, not a genre of its own. From Grades 4-12, multimedia components should be included "when useful to aiding comprehension" and is reflected in this way in Table 5. Multimedia is also included in a way more similar to the TEKS in the Speaking and Listening strand. Rather than treat multimedia as a sub-genre, as with the multimedia use within informational writing, it is used a literary device for strengthening the understanding of a presentation. Anchor Standard 5 states, "Make strategic use of digital media and visual displays of data to express information and enhance understanding of presentations" (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 22). The CCSS stresses the "strategic" use of multimedia for both presentations and informational writing, which is a difference of orientation. Table 7 illustrates the specific grade-level expectations for this anchor standards starting with Grade 5. The expectations for multimedia prior to Grade 5 are adding drawings and visuals, and then creating auditory recordings starting of stories or poems at Grade 2 (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010a, p. 23).

Table 5

Comparison of the Grade-Level Expectations for Use of Technology in Writing, Conventions, and Research

Strands and Grade-Level Expectations		Grade Levels K- 12 and CCRS/CCR													
Writing															
Write Expository and Procedural Texts		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS							x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
	CCSS					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Oral and Written Conventions: Spelling		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS				x	x	x	x							
	CCSS														
Research: Gathering Sources		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	CCRS/CCR
	TEKS				x	x	x	x	x	x					
	CCSS				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Table 6

Grade-Level Expectations of the TEKS for Multimedia Presentations

Grades 6-7	Grade 8	Eng. I - Eng. II	Eng. III - Eng. IV
TEKS Knowledge and Skills Statement for Writing/Expository and Procedural Texts: Students write expository and procedural or work-related texts to communicate ideas and information to specific audiences for specific purposes. Students are expected to:			
(D) produce a multimedia presentation involving text and graphics using available technology.	(D) produce a multimedia presentation involving text, graphics, images, and sound using available technology.	(D) produce a multimedia presentation (e.g., documentary, class newspaper, docudrama, infomercial, visual or textual parodies, theatrical production) with graphics, images, and sound that conveys a distinctive point of view and appeals to a specific audience.	(D) produce a multimedia presentation (e.g., documentary, class newspaper, docudrama, infomercial, visual or textual parodies, theatrical production) with graphics, images, and sound that appeals to a specific audience and synthesizes information from multiple points of view.

Table 7
Grade-Level Expectations of the CCSS for Multimedia Presentations

Anchor Standard 5 in the Speaking and Listening (SL) Strand:
Make Strategic use of digital media and visual displays of data to express information and enhance understanding of presentations.

Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grades 9-12
SL.5 Include multimedia components (e.g. graphics, sounds) and visual displays in presentations when appropriate to enhance the development of main ideas or themes.	SL.6 Include multimedia components (e.g. graphics, images, music, sounds) and visual displays in presentations to clarify information.	SL.7 Include multimedia components and visual displays in presentations to clarify claims and findings and emphasize salient points.	SL.8 Integrate multimedia components (e.g. graphics, images, music, sounds) and visual displays in presentations to clarify information, strengthen claims and evidence, and add interest.	SL.9-12 Make strategic use of digital media (e.g., textual, graphical, audio, visual, and interactive elements) in presentations to enhance understanding of findings, reasoning, and evidence and to add interest.

Conclusion: What Unites Us?

Teachers across the nation continue to grapple with the increasing rigor of the standards movement framed around College and Career Readiness Standards whether they are their state standards or the CCSS. And, like it or not, their implementation continues to be a messy, controversial, political process at both the state and national levels. As literacy conversations at national conferences focus on CCSS, our goal was to provide Texas teachers and interested others with a better understanding of how the two sets of standards compare and provide some foundational knowledge for their organization and orientation. Both of these sets of writing standards emphasize the importance of writing processes and deep understanding of genres. The importance of technology is also acknowledged. Texas places a special emphasis on research in the writing while CCSS places a special emphasis on argumentative writing. Both of these emphases point to the increasing importance of informational genres.

Whether teaching in Texas guided by the TEKS or in other states guided by their own standards or by the CCSS, the bottom line is preparing our students for a future in which expectations continue to increase. The CCSS have provided a context for national conversations on rigor in which Texas teachers can participate. We continue to refine our teaching based upon the increasing rigor of standards, new research on teaching and learning, and collaboration with peers. Our students need to be able to compete and collaborate in a knowledge-based economy in which strong writing skills and a critical stance are essential in both higher education and in the workplace. We need to equip them to navigate in a world in which being literate in a variety of ways is expected. They will need a compass more than a map as the terrain they will travel will be different from the one in which we currently know, therefore focusing on writing processes and critical thinking is essential.

Pat Jacoby is an independent literacy consultant and well-known expert in secondary literacy. She served on the TEKS revision committee for the 2010 revisions and was asked by the TALE TEKS/CCSS task force to serve on this project. You may contact her at patjacoby@authenticlearning.com.

Sheri Vasinda has served as secretary of TALE and also serves on the editorial board. She is a former Texas public school teacher and currently an Assistant Professor of Literacy at Oklahoma State University serving on this special task force. You may contact her at sheri.vasinda@okstate.edu.

References

Anderson, R. C., Pichert, J. W., & Shirey, L. L. (1983). Effects of the reader's schema at different points in time. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 75*(2), 271-279.

Calkins, L. (1994). *The art of teaching writing.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Culham, R. (2005). *6+1 Traits of writing: The complete guide for the primary grades.* New York City, NY: Scholastic.

Davenport, T. H. (2005). *Thinking for a living: How to get better performance and results from knowledge workers.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Donovan, C. A., & Smolkin, L. B. (2002). Children's genre knowledge: An examination of K-5 students' performance on multiple tasks providing differing levels of scaffolding. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(4), 428-465.

Drucker, P.F. (1996). *Landmarks of tomorrow: A report on the new "Post-modern" world.* Edison, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Drucker, P.F. (1999). *Management challenges of the 21st Century.* New York City, NY: Harper Business.

Graves, D. (2003). *Writing: Teachers and children at work.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gray, J. (2000). Teachers at the center: A memoir of the early years of the National Writing Project. *The Quarterly*, *22*(4), 17-23.

Fletcher, R. & Portalupi, J. (2001). *Writing Workshop: The Essential Guide.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Harris, T. L. & Hodges, R. E. (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Murray, D. (2009). *The essential Don Murray: Lessons from America's greatest writing teacher.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

National Association of Colleges and Employers (2013). *The job outlook for the class of 2014. Retrieved from* http://www.naceweb.org/uploadedFiles/Pages/MyNACE/grab_and_go/students/job-outlook-2014-student-version.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics (2012). *The Nation's report card: Writing 2011.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pubs/main2011/2012470.asp

National Commission on Writing for America's Families, Schools, and Colleges (2004). *Writing: A ticket to work...or a ticket out: A survey of business leaders.* New York City, NY: The College Board.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School
        Officers. (2010a). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy
        in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Retrieved from
        http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/ELA_Standards.pdf.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School
        Officers. (2010b). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy
        in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects- Common Core State Standards
        initiative: Standards-setting considerations.* Retrieved from
        http://www.corestandards.org/assets/Considerations.pdf

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School
        Officers. (2010c). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy
        in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects-Appendix A: Research
        supporting key elements of the standards and glossary of key terms*. Retrieved from
        http://www.corestandards.org/assets/Appendix_A.pdf

Texas Education Agency. (2012b, April). TEKS and instructional materials working document.
        Retrieved from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=6148

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, & Educational Policy Improvement Center.
        (2009). Texas College and Career Readiness Standards. Austin, TX. Retrieved from
        http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/collegereadiness/crs.pdf

Tompkins, G. E. (2009). *Literacy for the 21st Century: A balanced approach* (5th ed.). Upper
        Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education/Merrill/Prentice Hall.

University of Texas System/Texas Education Agency. (2009). *English language arts and
        reading Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills: Vertical alignment Kindergarten through
        English IV.* Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency. Retrieved
        from http://englishspanishteks.net/files/standards/TEKS/ELAR_TEKS_K-12.pdf

Zumbrunn, S. & Krause, K. (2012). Conversations with leaders: Principles of effective writing
        instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 65*(5), 346-353.