Making a Difference: The National Writing Project's Inculcation of Leadership Over 30 Years

Linda Friedrich, Sherry Swain, Paul LeMahieu, Sela Fessehaie, Tamara Mieles
National Writing Project

INTRODUCTION

For each generation of educators, there is a small set of programs and experiences that binds many contemporaries through common experience, vision, and values. Incredibly this is done even across the divide of distant places and disparate cultural contexts. Teacher Corps and the Effective Schools Movement are two such initiatives of recent memory. It may be argued that the impacts of these efforts were best noted, not in their immediate expression, but in the influence exerted over large numbers of individuals as they matured into leaders within the profession. As distinguished educator and philanthropic leader Ed Meade put it, "An incredible number of these folks went on to become superintendents. We looked for the impact of Teacher Corps in the wrong place and at the wrong time. Its real impact was in the shared goals and visions of a significant portion of the next generation of educational leaders."

The National Writing Project (NWP), whose mission is to improve writing in America's schools, may well have made just such a contribution, particularly in realms closest to the educational process—those concerned with and directly involved in curriculum and instruction. With over 30 years of service, more than 20,000 teacher-leaders prepared, and more than 1,500,000 teachers directly touched by its programming, NWP now has a historical place amongst legacy initiatives. NWP created its legacy within the context of thirty years of educational reform movements that shared overarching national educational policy frameworks ranging from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to No Child Left Behind legislation (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). At the inception of the NWP, the nation was coming to grips with, and the NWP took on the challenge of, the poor state of writing instruction, highlighted by

the move to significantly increase access to higher education (Russell, 1990; Gray, 2000). Since then, the ebb and flow of the educational landscape has found NWP working in an environment that has shifted from almost completely ignoring writing instruction to building a body of knowledge around it (Graves, 1978; Whiteman, 1980). Simultaneously, NWP has contributed to the practice and study of the emerging field of teacher development (McDonald, Buchanan, & Sterling, 2004; Evans, 2002). The research reported here is the result of a systematic and concerted effort to assess and document the NWP legacy in these terms.

This paper describes a study that examines the professional experiences and contributions of those who participated in NWP between 1974 and 1994, the first 20 years of the project's life. Because previous research about the writing project has focused primarily on the ways in which teachers have drawn on the writing project in their classrooms—effects that can be studied in the years immediately following teachers' entry into the writing project—this paper takes an initial look at those questions that can be examined only with the benefit of time (Academy for Educational Development, 2002; Lieberman & Wood, 2004). This paper provides a preliminary analysis of teachers' acceptance of leadership positions as well as their instantiation of the vision and core beliefs of NWP in such positions. It is through their professional lives (and the lives of those whom they led and followed) that the legacy of NWP is established and manifested.

Research Focus

Viewed in this manner, NWP represents a unique form of investment in a long-term "improvement infrastructure" for American education, especially with regard to the teaching of writing. There is ample documentation (c.f., Academy for Educational Development, 2002; Stokes, Heenan, & St. John, 2002) that the local capacity that NWP engenders and supports can play a significant role in implementing policy and programmatic efforts related to writing—often strengthening and even shaping them to best educational advantage. The benefits of such an investment are appropriately investigated, not as immediate effects pursuant to an interventionist theory of action, but rather as influences that derive from the contributions of an increasingly capable and engaged cadre of teacher-leaders. This research investigates the efficacy of such an investment strategy by examining the contributions of those teacher-leaders who have been influenced by NWP and in turn have made contributions to the field. It also assesses the extent to which NWP's support was influential in shaping their work.

The study was designed and executed with the flexibility to respond to and incorporate emerging issues, themes, and questions. The following questions guided the undertaking:

- Does participation in NWP in any way sustain and retain exemplary teachers within teaching?
- How has participation in NWP contributed to individuals' development as teachers and as leaders and professional contributors in other ways?

- Does participation in NWP influence teachers to expand their sphere of influence through acceptance of other leadership positions (both formal and informal) in education?

- How do the vision and core beliefs of NWP manifest themselves in the subsequent professional activities of participants?

- What role has NWP played in guiding the pursuits of a generation of educational professionals so as to influence that and subsequent generations of educators?

Description of the National Writing Project

The National Writing Project, founded by James Gray in 1974 with a single site and 20–25 teachers, is a growing nationwide network of professional development organizations, almost 200 local "sites" of NWP. The National Writing Project aims to improve the teaching of writing at all grade levels, kindergarten through college. Local sites are housed on university campuses and co-directed by university and K–12 faculty.

Writing project sites follow the NWP model, adhering to a set of shared principles and practices for teachers' professional development, and offering core programs that are common across the network. Underpinning the model are core principles that serve as the foundation of the NWP model. Among them are the following:

- Writing can and should be taught, not just assigned, in every discipline and at every level of schooling.

- Teachers of writing must write.

- Effective professional development programs provide frequent opportunities for teachers to collectively and systematically examine research and practice.

- Teachers at every level—from kindergarten to college—are the agents of reform; universities and schools are ideal partners for investing together in that reform.

- Although there is no single right approach to teaching writing, some practices are better than others, and a research-informed community of practice is in the best position to design and develop a comprehensive writing program.

An additional principle repeated often in NWP is that teachers who are well informed and effective in their classrooms are the best teachers of other teachers. In fact, members of NWP and others often refer to it as the "teachers teaching teachers" model of professional development.

All sites follow the NWP model; in practical terms, this means sites must develop a strong set of what NWP defines as "core programs" that reflect its mission and principles. There are three major types of core programs.

- The intensive monthlong *invitational institute* produces each site's cadre of teacher-consultants (TCs). Sites seek out local teachers who demonstrate accomplished teaching, who are open to continued study, and who have potential as leaders.

- *Continuity* programs comprise a range of activities through which sites support teacher-consultants in their ongoing development as classroom teachers and as professional development leaders.

- *Inservice* programs, in the NWP lexicon, embrace a wide variety of programs that are designed and offered by the sites for the teachers in their service areas. All inservice programs are led by the sites' teacher-consultants.

NWP has a number of guiding principles that place the highest value on teacher knowledge and leadership; the creation of mutually enriching university/K–12 partnerships; a self-sustaining network infrastructure; a 30-year history of cumulative work; and a nationwide scale in terms of sites, services, and people. Although the network is already substantial, NWP continues its efforts to grow with the goal of putting a writing project site within reach of every teacher in the United States.

RESEARCH PLAN AND METHODS

In order to address the guiding questions, this research employs a mixed-methods design and is collecting a nested sample of data. The study is proceeding through three phases:

- *Phase 1*: Administered a professional history survey of all invitational institute participants between 1974 and 1994 (April–December 2004).

- *Phase 2*: Conducted in-depth, semistructured interviews with a randomly selected subsample of survey respondents, stratified by each of seven major career pathways (February–August 2006).

- *Phase 3*: Conducted case study research focused on a small, purposive subsample representing each major career pathway from the first two phases of the Legacy Study (January–June 2008).

Phase 1 Methods

The Legacy Study's first phase attempted a census survey of all individuals who had participated in an invitational institute, the centerpiece of the NWP model. A period of ten years after an individual's participation in an intensive invitational institute represented, in our view, sufficient time to ascertain how the writing project may have

influenced teacher-consultants' careers, as well as to gauge these teacher-consultants' contributions more broadly. Therefore we assembled a roster of all participants in NWP invitational institutes over the period 1974–1994. We surveyed all on the roster about general information on their career paths; the relationship between NWP participation and subsequent career decisions; and the manner in which NWP influenced their approaches to their professional responsibilities and activities (see appendix A).

Overall, 2,114 surveys out of 14,343 that were mailed out were completed from a total of 102 of the 108 qualifying sites, for an overall response rate of 16.7%. There were 266 surveys completed by teacher-consultants deemed ineligible for the dataset because they attended an invitational institute after 1994, bringing the number of cases used for analysis to 1,848.

Phase 2 Methods

The Legacy Study's second phase sought to understand qualitatively the ways in which the writing project influenced those who moved into a variety of career trajectories within and outside education, as well as their contributions more broadly.

Sampling Design and Procedures for Legacy Phase 2

Fifty-eight percent (1,085) of the survey respondents in Phase 1 expressed a willingness to participate in follow-up interviews (see appendix A). Comparing survey respondents willing to participate in interviews to respondents not willing to participate identified any patterns of bias between the two groups. Those individuals who were willing to be interviewed were slightly more likely than those not willing to be interviewed to feel that the writing project experience influenced their work. While these

differences are statistically significant, the effect sizes are very small, suggesting little reason for concern.

Early analysis of Phase 1 data was conducted with an eye to uncovering what, if any, general professional groupings the respondents formed, and resulted in the development of eight categories. A sample stratified by seven categories that reflect major career pathways was created, excluding the eighth category, "Voluntary Service" (see table 1). The interview sample over-represents categories outside the classroom in order to illuminate the nature and extent of the writing project's influence on individuals who have pursued work in these areas.

TABLE 1
Development of Interview Sample by Category

Category	Overall Survey Sample		Final Interview Sample
	Total number of Respondents	Number Willing To Participate in Phase 2	
Classroom	1175	661	25
School Level	84	51	21
School District	115	86	20
Higher Education	231	148	20
Other Education	46	27	10
Related Field	30	18	10
Other Field	5	5	4
			110

The final interview sample is made up of 110 teacher-consultants, who participated in invitational institutes as early as 1974 and come from 54 different writing project sites. The sample's gender ratio and ethnicity demographics are representative of the overall survey population. Similarly, interviewees have on average provided similar numbers of years of service to the field of education (see table 2). The one area in which interviewees differed slightly is in professional publications in education—the interview sample publishing at a rate slightly lower than the survey population as a whole. The

research team was satisfied that the Phase 2 random selection process yielded an

interview sample that is representative of the overall population.

TABLE 2
Comparisons: Overall Survey Population and Interview Sample

	Overall Survey Population	Interview Sample
Ethnicity		
African American	3.8%	4.5%
Asian	2.2%	0.9%
Pacific Islander / Philipina(o)	0.2%	-
American Indian / Alaskan Native	0.4%	-
Latina(o) / Hispanic	1.2%	-
White	89.7%	92.7%
Other	1.8%	1.8%
Double Code	0.8%	-
Gender		
Female	83.3%	81.8%
Male	16.7%	18.2%
Professional Contributions		
Mean Years of Service to Education	22.7	22.5
Mean Publications in Education	6.23	5.20

Phase 2 Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection for the second phase of the Legacy Study comprised two-hour

semistructured telephone interviews conducted over three months during the spring of

2006. The interviews were guided by a common set of foci: a) current work, b) reflection

of professional history, c) an in-depth look at the influence of the writing project on one

position, d) writing project involvement and influence on the interviewee as a leader and

writer, and e) influence and contributions to individuals and the field. Specific questions

within these categories were modified slightly to reflect the interviewees' career

pathways. All interviews were audiotaped and professionally transcribed, and coded

using 69 codes organized into seven categories: 1) work and experience, 2) pathway, 3)

attributes, 4) sources of influence and effects, 5) analytic free codes, 6) environment, and

7) spheres (see appendices B and C).

For the purposes of this paper, the lead researchers focused their analysis on interviewees' descriptions of their professional work and experiences beyond the classroom (excluding the area of professional writing) and their reports of the writing project's influence on them. Conceptually, these areas provided us with a preliminary understanding of the longer-term influences of the writing project, particularly on interviewees who moved into arenas outside the classroom (see appendix D). A series of analytic memoranda, along with a series of analysis sessions guided the preliminary analysis and interpretation (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

FINDINGS

The Legacy reports come from individuals who, on average, participated in the invitational institute 21 years ago. In other words, not only do these data suggest wide-spread influence, they also suggest long-term impact. In this paper we examine the types of leadership teacher-consultants have pursued over the course of their careers. We also analyze the extent to which these teacher-consultants see their writing project experiences as influential. In particular, we explore the ways in which teacher-consultants draw on and deploy what they have learned through the writing project as they move into new contexts, take on various leadership roles, and face challenges in their day-to-day work.

Where Do Teacher-Consultants Take a Leadership Role?

The Legacy Study investigated whether writing project involvement encouraged participating teachers to remain in the field of education and to expand their spheres of influence by taking on leadership roles. An analysis of the final positions that survey respondents reported in their career histories indicated that the majority of respondents (72%) reported that they were teaching at the time of the survey or that teaching was their

last position before retirement. Thirteen percent of respondents held positions in school systems, but not as teachers. Another 14% were working in education but outside of school systems. Less than 1% worked outside of education.

A few positions with strong potential to influence the field of education underwent further analysis. As displayed in table 3, 10% played leadership roles in schools by becoming principals or other building administrators; 30% earned positions as faculty in institutions of higher education; 17% went on to become support staff in district offices; and 2% worked as state department of education staff. Twenty-three teacher-consultants (1%) eventually became superintendents, assistant superintendents, or associate superintendents.

TABLE 3
Selected Leadership Roles Teacher-Consultants Assumed After Teaching

Roles	Percent of Sample
Principals or other building administrators	10%
Support staff in districts	17%
Superintendents/Assistant/Associate Superintendents	1%
State Department of education staff	2%
Higher education faculty	30%

*The figures in this table are not mutually exclusive.

What Is the Influence of the Writing Project on Those Who Participate in It?

Legacy survey respondents rated the extent to which their involvement with the writing project influenced each position they held over the course of their careers, using a scale of 1–5 (where 1 = not at all and 5 = a very great deal). For each position, they assessed the extent to which 1) their writing project experience informed or influenced their work; 2) they applied knowledge and skills gained from writing project participation; and 3) the attitudes and values of the writing project influenced their work. The percentage of positions rated by respondents to have been greatly influenced by the

writing project (a rating of 4 or 5 on the five-point scale) are presented in table 4, which

provides a breakdown of the ratings for each aspect of writing project influence by major

position categories.

TABLE 4
Percentage of Positions Rated by Teacher-Consultants to Have Been Greatly Influenced by the NWP*

Positions	N	% Experience	% Knowledge and Skills	% Attitudes and Values
All Positions	3,293	88.3	87.8	90.2
Classroom Teacher	1,859	90.6	90.9	91.9
Higher Education	444	84.2	87.6	90.1
District/Central Office	223	91.5	90.1	92.8
School Administration	168	82.7	78.0	86.9
Other Education Positions	101	91.1	86.1	89.1
Other Fields Related to Education	78	73.1	70.5	80.8
Other Fields Not Related to Education	4	50.0	75.0	50.0

* Percentage of respondents in specified positions who gave a rating of 4 or 5

Findings indicate that the writing project influenced teacher-consultants' work to a great

extent. After they participated in an invitational institute, 88.3% of respondents felt that

their writing project experience influenced their work. Similarly, 87.8% felt they applied

writing project knowledge and skills. Overall, the respondents felt most strongly (90.2%)

that the attitudes and values of the writing project influenced their work.

The interview data corroborate the high levels of influence reported in the survey

and are consistent with earlier research about the writing project's influence (c.f.,

Academy for Educational Development 2002; Dickey et al., 2006; Lieberman & Wood,

2004). Interviewees across all professional categories indicated that their participation in

an intensive, multiweek invitational institute and ongoing involvement in their local

writing project community had a positive and significant impact on their daily work, their

writing, their engagement in the teaching profession, and their preparation for leadership.

Interviewees consistently stated that their writing project experiences[1]

- changed or enhanced their understanding of their teaching philosophy and classroom practice

- introduced them to a supportive professional learning community

- provided them with continuous opportunities for professional growth and a foundation from which to move into leadership roles outside their classrooms.[2]

Interviewees described the invitational institute as a *turning point* or a

transformational event in their teaching careers. For them, the writing project experience

was fundamentally different from anything to which they had been exposed. While they

were learning from others, *their* learning and *their* teaching were purposefully examined

and critiqued by those other colleagues. In one principal's words,

> I think [the writing project] very much was an entry into a learning community . . . . [T]o me, that was a real eye-opener that there are people like me out there that really wanted to talk about [pedagogy] and explore. That in itself—the fact that we were all willing to explore and try new things—I think led to the leadership qualities that I've gained from it. (SC_KT)

Interviewees view the *shared experiences* of the invitational institute, along with

collaborative opportunities to develop practice and leadership skills *in public* within the

writing project community following the institute, as instrumental to their pursuit and

acceptance of leadership roles. One professional developer's statement synthesizes other

interviewees' reflections on these experiences:

> I thought before the writing project that I would stay in my classroom and do my thing with my kids. And I did not see myself doing anything beyond teaching my students in my classroom as a teacher. . . . [I]n the writing project we had to . . . present to our peers. That was a part of the process. Secondly, I think, it was providing the opportunity . . . to present staff development to districts and . . . [the] encouragement to do that. So it was a combination of opportunity and

providing the skills to be able to [step outside the classroom]. (OE_RM, 107–111)

This teacher-consultant's statement highlights core aspects of the writing project's approach to inculcating leadership. Entry into the writing project community offered teacher-consultants opportunities to hone their skills as leaders.

What Leadership Roles Do Teacher-Consultants Play?

The participants in the Legacy Study, as shown by the survey data, assumed a broad array of leadership roles within education. In the interviews, they describe what their leadership looks like in classrooms, schools, districts, universities, and intermediary organizations. They bring to life the ways in which they weave writing project vision and values into their day-to-day work. In this section, we focus on the teacher-consultants' 1) leadership of professional development; 2) leadership through development of curriculum and instruction; 3) leadership in accountability and assessment; and 4) management of financial, instructional, and human resources. These interviewees amplify our understanding of the reach of writing project teacher-consultants' work across time and through the layers in the field of education.

Leadership of Professional Development

The National Writing Project model intends to prepare teachers to design and lead professional development focused on the teaching of writing. Indeed, writing project sites annually offer 2,526,335 contact hours of staff development facilitated by teacher-consultants (Inverness Research Associates, 2006). Not surprisingly, sharing deep knowledge of teaching practice is a common form of leadership taken on by the writing project teacher-consultants interviewed.[3] Of the 110 interviewees, 88[4] (80%) described leading professional development related to the teaching of writing.[5] By facilitating

professional learning opportunities for teachers at all levels of the education system, these interviewees sought to expand and improve the teaching of writing. We learn how interviewees, working as teachers, as school, district, and state administrators, and as professional developers for intermediary organizations, carry writing project principles and practices as they enact change in new contexts.

Creating a source of talent for teaching teachers. Examination of the professional development data—especially analysis of the sponsorship patterns of teacher-consultants' professional development work—suggests that writing project teacher-consultants serve as a source of talent from which schools, districts, higher-education institutions, professional associations, and teacher development and school reform organizations can select individuals with particular areas of expertise to support their efforts to improve the teaching of writing (see table 5).

TABLE 5
Sponsorship of Professional Development

Professional Development Sponsor	Number of Interviewees*
School	30
District	42
State	9
Writing project site	47
Professional associations / reform organizations**	25
University	13
Other *(e.g., publisher, individual colleague)*	5

*Many interviewees provided professional development under the auspices of more than one sponsor. Therefore, the numbers sum to more than the total number of interviewees with text coded to the professional development node.
** For example, National Council of Teachers of English, International Reading Association, Southern Regional Education Board, National Archives, and foundations.

While some interviewees worked primarily with other teachers in their own schools or presented at professional conferences, other interviewees facilitated professional learning opportunities for hundreds of other teachers. Because of the length

of these interviewees' careers, on average 22.5 years, we are able to examine their leadership of professional development over time and across multiple positions. One interviewee's career in multiple positions attending to teachers' professional growth illustrates the potential ripple effects of these teacher-consultants' capacity-building work:

- As a teacher, she led after-school inservice programs for her writing project site, co-directed her writing project site's invitational institute, and served as a regional writing coordinator, which took her into other teachers' classrooms.

- As a Kentucky state department employee, she worked first as a reading consultant to help schools improve students' reading scores and eventually supervised all regional literacy professional development.

- Now as a consultant for a national school reform organization, she leads literacy professional development for high schools in several states and builds the capacity of her fellow consultants to lead literacy-focused professional development. (OE_RM, 43, 71, 75–79)

Working as change agents: Leading professional development about teaching writing. Many interviewees articulated an explicit goal of improving the teaching of writing and viewed themselves as change agents in this process, facilitating teacher learning opportunities, developing an expanded vision for the teaching of writing, and establishing a culture that supports both student and teacher learning.

Interviewees used professional development to change the teaching of writing in their schools and districts over time. For example, all seven elementary school principals in the interview sample identified improving the teaching of writing schoolwide as a

central goal. They explained that their writing project experience enhanced their vision of high-quality writing instruction. One Colorado principal noted, "First [teachers] have to take time to get children to love writing . . . before they can teach the technical part" (SC_JB, 160-168). An urban California principal felt that his experience with the writing project gave him knowledge of "[what] the writing process is from start to finish, and what is entailed in each phase of the writing." This in turn helped him support teachers in developing their approach to teaching writing (SC_SV, 236-250).

A rural Indiana principal's experience typifies the approaches that these principals used to promote their faculties' professional growth. When she first became the principal at her current school, state writing assessment scores were very low. Teachers wanted to teach writing skills but asserted that they did not know how. In response, this principal facilitated professional development, adapting what she knew from teaching writing to middle school students as well as from leading Indiana Writing Project and state workshops. She quickly moved away from leading professional development herself. Instead, she worked to create a school culture in which teachers understood that "We all have something we can teach somebody else in our building. . . . We don't need [outside] experts because we are the experts." Over time, teachers taught more and more writing and students' performance improved (SC_MFC, 80, 118). These principals show the importance of having deep pedagogical content knowledge as well as expertise in building professional communities for their work as instructional leaders.[6]

Professional development was key for many district administrators who moved into and out of schools and classrooms throughout their districts, promoting the teaching of writing, reaching dozens if not hundreds of teachers. These administrators employed a

wide array of professional development tools: asking teachers to allow them to model lessons in the teachers' classrooms, sharing their own writing with teachers and students, facilitating book groups in which teachers read and responded to professional literature together, establishing writing communities among teachers in schools, creating opportunities for teachers to talk with one another about their practice, and engaging teacher-leaders in the process of making change. One district interviewee makes explicit an underlying goal that integrates these strategies:

> I believe that we are a community of learners, and that's what the writing project to me purported. That's what I tried to build in our system—first in my classroom, then in the community of learners with a group of teachers, and then in a group of administrators. (DI_LW, 203)

These examples bring to light writing project teacher-consultants' work in multiple domains—especially in schools and districts—to strengthen the teaching of writing and to build a culture of teaching that encourages ongoing learning and growth.

Enacting writing project principles. Core writing project values are woven throughout interviewees' accounts of their professional development practice. Interviewees consistently provided evidence of enacting three core principles:

- Teachers are the best teachers of teachers (teachers teaching teachers).

- Professional development ought to provide opportunities to examine research and practice.

- Teachers of writing must write.

At the heart of virtually every interviewee's professional development work sits a deep respect for teachers. These interviewees invite participating teachers to bring their own ideas and expertise to the table. An administrator in a district where teacher morale is "incredibly low," and most administrators disregard teachers' expertise, explained how

her own values and approaches to staff development have been influenced by the writing project.

> Staff development should rest on a combination of teacher practice and theory, both respecting people's intellect and their experience in the classroom. . . . Knowledge isn't just constructed from the people who are giving the workshops but [from] the people who are attending [them] as well. (DI_SW, 212)

The interviewees demonstrate the writing project principle of teachers teaching teachers.[7] Interviewees who moved into administrative roles typically created opportunities for teachers to share with each other rather than leading professional development themselves. One Kentucky principal, for example, worked hard to schedule time for "embedded professional development" in which teachers visited each other's classrooms and then discussed what they observed, offering both praise and constructive criticism (SC_MM, 334-338). Likewise, district administrators hired teachers, often writing project teacher-consultants, to lead professional development. When leading professional development themselves, administrators established environments in which participating teachers co-constructed knowledge. The reflections of a county office of education coordinator illustrate many administrators' teacher advocacy stance:

> I'm very tired of teachers having things done to them. . . . [When we led professional development,] we weren't telling them how to do it. We were sharing with them all the strategies and information we had, but they were talking collectively among themselves. . . . They were the authority for their own classroom. They knew their kids, they knew what they needed. (OE_BG, 426, 432)

Many interviewees described how, when leading professional development, they *provided opportunities to examine research and practice*. For example, in spring 2006, a Pennsylvania principal provided funding from her professional development budget for a study group focused on Lucy Calkins' (1994) *The Art of Teaching Writing*. As teachers

began trying new practices they read about in their classrooms, they returned to the group

with samples of their students' writing. In this way, they supported each other in

improving their teaching (SC_EC, 124-128). This principal's approach contrasts with the

current policy emphasis on purchasing literacy programs accompanied by external

experts who lead scripted professional development.

Interviewees also consistently offered teachers opportunities to write during

professional development, thus putting into practice the writing project principle *teachers*

of writing must write. In fact, 16 interviewees (14%) facilitated professional development

in which teachers' writing was the primary focus, while others integrated writing into all

of their work. For example, a state department professional developer asked teachers to

write in the writers' notebooks that she gave them. She invited teachers to take five

minutes before a break to write questions about the activities they had just participated in

or the most important word they heard. By using writers' notebooks in this way, she

modeled why they are important and how to seamlessly integrate them into teaching

(OE_SA, 134, 315).

Most interviewees' professional development descriptions were consistent with

writing project values. However, many descriptions were brief and illustrated only one or

two principles. A handful of interviewees described aspects of their professional

development leadership in ways that seem contrary to writing project principles. In

almost every instance, however, the same individuals talked about other parts of their

staff development practice that reflect writing project values.

Navigating challenging contexts. One way to understand the extent to which

people have embraced a set of principles is to examine what happens when they are faced

with situations that call for working in ways that contradict their beliefs.[8] Some

interviewees, particularly those who worked in district roles or for publishing companies,

led professional development prescribed by others and negotiated their beliefs in the face

of mandates. For example, one district interviewee incorporated writing into scripted

workshops mandated by her district in order to better support teachers' learning (DI_MG,

416 – 420). Another interviewee, who had been invited by a publishing company to

design a three-day workshop on writing process, expressed her dismay when she learned

that the company transformed her workshop design into a script that all trainers would

use.

> We've become corporatized [*sic*]. We're connected to writing materials. . . . If
> you have to have writing materials . . . they're fabulous, because they were
> written by teachers. . . . But writing process has to come out of your love of the
> written word, and . . . your awe of the learning process. It can't come out of one
> transparency after another being laid on an overhead machine. (OE_SS, 451)

When she facilitates the workshop, she does not follow the script and is willing to risk

getting fired by the company in order to remain true to her professional judgment.[9] These

examples illustrate how writing project teacher-consultants negotiate situations in which

they do not have full authority to carry out professional development in ways that are

consistent with their attitudes and values. In such situations, interviewees typically seek

to make learning experiences as rich as possible for participating teachers rather than

fully following the script.

Leadership Through Development of Curriculum and Instruction

Writing project participants exhibit leadership by creating curriculum as well as

influencing, implementing, or supervising curriculum and instructional policy. Interview

data reveal that 58 of the 110 interviewees (53%) had experiences with curriculum

development or policy, some at the school or district level, some in their universities, some at a state, regional, or national level, and some with publishers (see table 6).

TABLE 6
Sponsorship of Curriculum Development

Curriculum Development Sponsor	Number of Interviewees*
School	26
District	14
State	7
Regional	1
National	5
Professional associations / reform organization**	2
University	5
Other *(e.g., publisher, television)*	4

*Some interviewees developed curriculum under the auspices of more than one sponsor. Therefore, the numbers sum to more than the total number of interviewees with text coded to the curriculum node.
** For example, National Council of Teachers of English, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Center on Education and the Economy, Southern Regional Education Board, and National Archives.

Upon close examination of the data, it becomes clear that leadership in local curriculum projects is considered a career milestone, even among those interviewees who are no longer in the classroom or who serve as school administrators. Several interviewees noted that their efforts marked the first time a written curriculum, curriculum guides, or curriculum mapping had been developed in their schools. Interviewees on university campuses provided detailed descriptions of course and degree development analogous to those of their K–12 colleagues. Particularly at the local school and district levels, interviewees reported a number of curriculum "firsts" for which they were, at least in part, responsible. One elementary principal identified one of these firsts: "For the first time our district tackled developing good, clear curriculum documents." She then described her work to integrate and embed the expected genres at various grade levels, producing a grade-level writing curriculum for her district (CR_CE, 115, 123).

Incorporating writing project values into curriculum. Interviewees describe how they weave writing project beliefs and practices into the curricula they develop as well as the curriculum development processes they lead. For example, an Indiana district administrator's insistence on establishing a revision benchmark at each grade level reflects a widely held principle that writing is recursive in nature (DI_LW, 210). And, just as the writing project engages teachers in examining student writing, another district administrator insisted on using students' work as guides for instructional direction (DI_PG, 173).

Interviewees serving as school-level administrators have not only helped to design curriculum; they are charged with oversight of implementation. As in professional development, these school administrators also focused the curriculum development efforts on the teaching of writing:

> Writing project helped me to be . . . more confident when I had to explain something . . . or a certain philosophy that we used in curriculum. (SC_JM, 370)

> I pushed the teaching of writing during the entire time that I was principal and assistant principal. (SC_SV, 86)

> My school is now doing . . . more writing than when I came. Writing is nothing but teaching thinking. (SC_MF-C, 80, 82)

> One interviewee, working for a regional education reform organization and

facilitating groups of teachers and administrators in developing critical competencies for transitioning into high school, enumerated how the writing project influenced her curriculum work:

- Untying the curriculum from textbooks, so that the curriculum is not the text

- Having students write every day, writing to learn, writing to demonstrate learning, writing for authentic purposes

- Allowing and encouraging students to use their own voices when writing

- Engaging students in real-world type experiences

- Eschewing the trend toward developing materials to drive instruction, but rather developing materials for the purpose of supporting authentic writing experiences

- Teaching teachers a process for planning instruction, often relying on evidence found in student work as well as standards or benchmarks for guidance

- Writing as process: frequent writing, different types of writing, real audiences and purposes; helping students become better at writing through frequent revision.
  (OE_RM, 87)

Her listing summarizes a number of features common to curricula developed by the interviewees. Essentially what the interviewees brought to curriculum development was a commitment to building the same sense of authorship for students that they experienced within the writing project. As one school administrator stated, "That experience . . . as a student in a writing project helped me to realize how wonderful it is to be able to produce writing, and so I knew from that how powerful it could be for students. And it always was" (SC_SP, 176).

The NWP basic assumption that writing is as fundamental to learning in science, mathematics, and history as it is to learning in English and the language arts is reflected in the work of these interviewees. In the elementary-school domain, work by interviewees includes across-the-curriculum efforts in reading/writing integration, science, math, social studies, and physical education, as well as efforts to curtail the influence of scripted elementary programs that preempt writing. For example, the director

of a community literacy center, who participated in a district vision-building process

explained,

> Back to the old reading thing, some of the big textbook publishers and the
> programs, some schools are really slighting their writing time for their
> younger students by using scripted reading programs that also include
> phonics and spelling instruction but not so much writing. And we were
> able I think to do some work to stop the influence of those and to keep a
> balanced approach to literacy, and also an approach that honors teachers'
> strengths rather than assuming that teachers cannot make good
> instructional decisions in their classroom but need scripts to read out loud.
> OE_JI, 305)

Interviewees in higher education have influenced curriculum and policies in areas

such as teacher mentoring, practitioner research in teacher education, and classical

rhetoric for entering freshmen. One interviewee, who is also a writing project director,

described his influence and the influence of the writing project site on a master's degree

in the teaching of writing and literature at his university:

> There [are] two writing courses, which is very unusual for a master's
> degree in . . . teaching . . ., especially in an English department. There's a
> linguistics course, two literature courses and . . . theory of composition.
> The four courses that I've designed for that program—the summer
> institute, the inservice program, the theories of composition and the . . .
> research in composition—I did that [designed those courses] for the
> project, and then it became part of the master's degree and it fit in
> beautifully. (HE_DG, 116)

Working outside the formal education structure, other interviewees have made

contributions to curriculum through their work with national organizations to develop

religious curriculum, create curriculum for the National Park Service and the National

Archives, and design websites with specialized content for other organizations.

Leading collaborative curriculum development. Perhaps as noteworthy as the

curriculum content is the interviewees' commitment to collaborative curriculum

development. While many respondents used the pronoun "we" to describe their

curriculum development experiences, seven explicitly described guiding the collaborative

teams, using a shared decision-making process, and feeling mutual pride in the resulting

curriculum products. A district administrator in Michigan reported that when she pulled

people together to write curriculum, she also brought in the union representative to assure

teachers that the curriculum writing endeavor was a sound idea. Her teams successfully

revised curriculum to meet state standards (DI_SS, 101-102). She described the multiyear

process:

> We had no curriculum in place . . . all we had [were] the national
> standards. . . . So I started pulling people together to do just that, to
> identify curriculum . . . we came up with a format that we thought would
> work for us . . . . I actually had curriculum teams . . . across the district K–
> 12 . . . we spent like 2–3 years just writing our curriculum. I really loved
> this approach, which is . . . start with what you currently have. . . . And
> that fit perfectly with what I'd learned from the writing project. You take
> the learner where they are and you move them to where you want them to
> be. (DI_SS, 101)

Other interviewees initiated partnerships between their schools and local writing

project sites to accomplish the development tasks. The interviewees who described their

approaches to designing curriculum illustrated how they have integrated the collaborative

structures they experienced in the writing project into their curriculum development

responsibilities.

Leadership in Accountability

Virtually all interviewees who worked with accountability systems also led

professional development, developed curriculum, or both. Of the 110 interviewees, 39

(35%) talked about policy/accountability, spanning education at national, regional, state,

district, and school levels (see table 7.)

TABLE 7
Work with Assessment and Accountability Systems

Policy Context	Number of Interviewees*
School	9
District	13
State	14
Regional (multistate)	2
National	1
Writing Project	1
Professional associations/reform organization	1
University	3
Other (e.g., publisher, television)	1

*Some interviewees influenced accountability under more than one level. Therefore, the numbers sum to more than the total number of interviewees with text coded to the accountability node.

Incorporating writing project principles and practices into assessment. As teacher-leaders moved into the realm of accountability, they took with them the writing project principles and practices they had internalized and enacted in their classrooms, in professional development, and in curriculum projects. These principles included the premise that the best teachers of writing are themselves writers and therefore more effective evaluators of writing, and the commitment to safeguarding student-centered educational practices within current accountability contexts.

Authenticity. Teacher-leaders in positions to influence writing assessment systems have created opportunities for other teachers to gain an authentic understanding of writing-on-demand assessments. First, interviewees engaged teachers in developing prompts or writing responses to sample prompts, so that deep understanding of the mental and rhetorical tasks required by various prompts could be understood by those charged with teaching students. At the state level, teachers reported collaborating with other teachers to design and submit prompts for their state assessment. For example, in Louisiana,

We wrote the assessment instruments over and over . . . . one of the things that helped the most, for us to take the prompts that we thought were perhaps the best, and for each one of us to write on that prompt . . . sometimes . . . the testing company would veto our choice . . . . they gave us the opportunity to go back and reconstruct and come up with another one. . . . [t]hose [prompt] options were derived from a tremendous amount of discussion and from trying the prompts ourselves. (OE_EA, 109)

Second, and more prevalent, was the practice of teaching classroom teachers how to score student writing, thereby facilitating their deep understanding of the criteria on which their students' writing would be evaluated. A Pennsylvania teacher, without specified duties related to assessment and without the opportunity to influence state or local assessment, found her own way of imparting this kind of teacher knowledge. She sponsored a districtwide writing contest and solicited district teachers to score the writing samples using a relevant rubric. When asked about the strongest influence the contest had on her district, she answered,

Well, I think the scoring sessions were the strongest influence, because teachers really learned the rubric. We had established anchor papers. And we really took them through the process, so that they were better able to evaluate their own classroom assessments, and to give kids feedback that really would help them improve, rather than just a grade. (DI_PG, 229-233)

Third, interviewees invited teachers from all disciplines to write to sample prompts, so that they would gain a deep understanding of the kinds of tasks required of their students. For example, a district administrator from Michigan copied the 80-page sample ACT booklet, divided the faculty into interdisciplinary teams and asked them to take the assessment. Afterward teachers discussed the various skills that were tapped as they wrote to the prompts. They then began designing the instruction that would teach students to use those skills. The teacher-leader explained how the interdisciplinary approach to assessment helps teachers prepare students for the ACT. She further

explained that this also promotes cross-disciplinary skills outside the assessment situation:

> In my English class, when I'm having them study something in particular, they'll be able to use a scatter plot or any kind of graph that's out there in their writing . . . the kids are learning about graphs, not just in their math classes, but they're seeing the relevance in other classes. (DI_SS, 78)

By creating opportunities for teachers to learn about assessment through creating and responding to prompts as well as by scoring student writing, the work highlighted here expresses writing project teacher-consultants' commitment to building learning communities.

Writing project teacher-consultants' contributions to assessment. The writing project advocates responsiveness to context, attentiveness to local culture and values, and astute awareness of state and national mandates. The project encourages teacher-leaders to investigate far-reaching state and national policies around assessment and to respond with well-informed judgment. In the following discussion, responses of interviewees working in the state or local accountability spheres are explored.

Interviewees' accountability work ranged from serving on assessment committees to designing prompts and field-testing rubrics and scoring systems in the language arts (as well as other subject areas). For example, one interviewee cited the development of a district history assessment as her most significant work. Recognizing that the state history assessment asked only factual questions, this interviewee set out to "create an assessment which would get at . . . historical thinking," ultimately creating a "writing-based and document-based assessment" that required students to use documents, photographs, and knowledge gained from history classes to write an essay (DI_SW, 62, 126).

Writing project teacher-consultants from one state developed a comprehensive writing assessment in the late 1980s. Working together, the director of the writing project state network and the director of testing for the state agreed on a development process that placed teacher-consultants at the helm of the state's new writing assessment. The former state writing project network director recalled the plan:

> I suggested that we get the best 20 teachers. . . . I just knew it would be a great assessment if teachers developed it, because they would bring their experience . . . . they could field-test it right in their own classrooms and they could field-test it in the classrooms of other teachers, and they could write materials for it, and they could score . . . . [the] eight different kinds of writing . . . . (OE_MS, 310)

This assessment program became widely known as a model writing assessment around the country and is still being utilized in classrooms and reform efforts even though it is no longer in use as the official state writing assessment (OE_MS, 322).[10] While this example is not typical in terms of impact, it is one of several major assessment systems to which writing project teacher-consultants contributed. It also typifies the commitment of interviewees to carrying writing project beliefs and practices into the accountability systems of their state and local education agencies when given that opportunity.

Negotiating mandates: The No Child Left Behind challenge. Nine interviewees, all identified as school or district-level leaders, discussed No Child Left Behind (NCLB) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the accountability node. Most pointed out disconnects between NCLB or AYP policies and effective practices, describing how the mandates call upon their expertise and leadership skills to enact accommodations.

Interviewees who must work within the NCLB testing climate find niches where

teachers can incorporate effective practices, negotiating mandates without compromising

beliefs. One strategy is to boost language arts instruction, "pushing the composition issue

quite a bit" (DI_LW, 75). A district-level interviewee reported that she has a twofold

assignment, first as a district support person for NCLB, and second as a state external

entity for program improvement districts. In the latter position, her responsibilities are to

support underperforming districts during their improvement process (DI_SR, 14-22). Still

another interviewee working at the district level reported her approach to test preparation,

which she organizes in response to the high-stakes assessments:

> Just before the writing test . . . I would orchestrate instruction . . . to get . .
> . everybody . . . energized to engage in a very artificial writing experience,
> so as to get the very best results. And I hate to think of writing in terms of
> doing this, but . . . it is a reality of education today that we . . . teach
> students to write for a test, and that so much hinges on the outcomes of
> these tests. (DI_JS, 252)

Other examples include writing project teachers across the state of Michigan who

developed lessons and exercises for students, which they shared over their websites

(DI_SS, 131-139) and a principal who, after studying her school's test scores, hired

writing and math specialists for the school (SC_JE, 42-46).

In contrast, another principal demonstrated that there is support for the mandates

when she articulated her conviction that NCLB provides benefits for learners:

> I have to say frankly I think the accountability part of NCLB, the notion of
> accountability for teachers is extremely. . . . as a profession, we have not
> been accountable for what we've done. We were by ourselves in our
> classrooms with the door closed and basically given a curriculum to
> follow. Whether we did it or not was not often checked, and there was a
> sense of "this is my idea, don't you dare use it." I really feel like the
> change that has happened with NCLB has made us more accountable and
> it has forced us into being a team like we should be, and . . . I see [NCLB]
> as a catalyst for having created some neat things in my school, one of
> which is a much stronger sense of ownership as a team for what we do
> here, and that's been really significant. (SC_MFC, 172)

These examples illustrate that writing project teacher-consultants follow different pathways to navigating the maze of federal mandates and accountability issues they face.

Management of Financial, Instructional, and Human Resources

Of the 110 interviewees, 63 (57%) reported information relevant to resource policy and management. Of these 63 respondents, 41 (65%) described how their work in this arena was influenced by writing project beliefs or experiences. In this paper we focus on this smaller set, which exemplifies how education leaders drew on their writing project principles and values in the area of resource management (see table 8.)

TABLE 8
Management of Financial, Instructional, and Human Resources

Activity	Number of Interviewees*
Raising or implementing grants; allocating or managing funds	25
Managing instructional resources: policies and implementation	39
Managing human resources: hiring, selecting, evaluating	10

*Some interviewees worked in more than one area of resource management. Therefore, the numbers sum to more than the total number of interviewees with text coded to the accountability node.

Fund raising. Accomplishments of 25 (23%) of the interviewees included raising funds or writing or implementing grants. Of those, five helped to secure funds to establish their local writing project sites or their writing project state networks. One respondent in a higher education context received a multimillion dollar grant from the Southeast Education Regional Laboratory for the purpose of promoting the outreach efforts of NWP sites. Yet another interviewee organizes the dissemination of information to Congress in order to sustain federal funding for the NWP. Most interviewees, however, wrote grants for their schools, including two respondents who mentored others into grant writing (an example of teachers-teaching-teachers).

Overall, respondents were successful in securing funds from multiple sources (humanities councils, Goals 2000, Title I, GEAR UP, and private foundations) to carry out programs and projects in keeping with writing project values. A school principal in Kentucky raised millions of dollars for the schools where he worked, adding that the writing project experience enriched his grant writing (SC_MM, 128). Yet another respondent received a multiyear award to work with teams of volunteer teachers and principals, influencing some 60 educators over a three-year period while targeting at-risk fourth through twelfth grade students. She described the atmosphere in the workshops in this way: "Everybody there was a great teacher who wanted to be even greater. . . . much like the writing project" (OE_BG, 708). Two respondents reported award totals in the millions of dollars for endeavors that upheld writing project principles and practices—specifically, 5 to 7 million dollars for their organizations.

Resource allocation and budget management. Interviewees often allocate funds to support endeavors in sync with writing project principles and practices. A Pennsylvania teacher-consultant who served on an advisory grant-making board for a private national foundation enacted the writing project principle of respect for teacher expertise by providing financial support for a practitioner-initiated inquiry series, "I was on the first group to make . . . dollars available to teachers to conduct research within their own school communities. I think that work was very significant because this was a major research organization who decided to give money to teachers to fund their work." Explaining the significance of the support for teacher inquiry, this teacher-consultant went on to say that the foundation "provided a lot of support to teachers . . . from under-funded schools [in] communities that were marginalized . . . [I]t was a significant

contribution to promoting teacher research in the field, and having people begin to think differently about who can conduct research and what deserves to be funded" (DI_DW, 271). Others have made funds available for at-risk student programs, young writers programs, family literacy programs, and writing centers.

Notable, but not typical, is the example of writing project practices applied to budgeting. A respondent in the northwest described in some detail how she translated writing process into a budgeting process when she became financial manager for her district, bringing in groups to brainstorm, draft, and revise the district budget. Just as writing process is a transparent and reflective process for composing, this interviewee built a transparent and collaborative budget process. And just as writing project leaders demonstrate their creativity in the realm of professional development, curriculum and assessment, they also demonstrate creativity in their budgetary decisions.

Instructional resources. Interviewees have also been responsible for instructional policies and their implementation, including such tasks as selection of professional development offerings sponsored by the school or district, introduction of writing project strategies into local curriculum plans, and infusing writing across the disciplines and into the early grades. In keeping with the NWP belief in peer leadership, one interviewee met with writing project teachers in the district to consider a districtwide writing initiative. Another district administrator showed her commitment to writing when she "laid down the law that a student arts fair had to require a writing component for each project" (DI_PG, 317). Still another launched a policy to require that teachers visit in the classrooms of other accomplished writing teachers, elucidating for the principal the most important thing she had learned in the writing project:

You cannot teach that dance that has to happen in the classroom for independent learning and goal-setting and each child making his own decisions. That kind of teaching doesn't happen as long as the teacher is standing up front and directing traffic. We've got to have teachers visiting classrooms [to see how the dance is done]. (DI_GL, 75)

A number of interviewees view local writing project sites as resources for improving instruction in their schools and districts. Fifteen of those who discussed policy/resource (24%) explicitly stated that they either called on the local writing project site for services or actively recommended writing project programs for teachers. One respondent specifically stated that, as principal, she contacted the local writing project site for a writing specialist nomination when hiring for a new position. Others have convinced boards of education to contract with the local writing project site. Similarly, the six interviewees who have served as writing project site directors actively seek to partner with local schools.

Human resources. As managers of human resources, interviewees have unique opportunities to enact writing project principles indirectly through their hiring and selection practices. While only ten interviewees (9%) explicitly talked about their hiring duties, eight of these referred to the writing project's influence in the hiring/selection process. Two looked specifically for teacher-consultants; several explained that often the candidates who meet their criteria are writing project teachers; and others described asking interview questions that include reference to critical friends groups, inquiry, and process teaching. Eight respondents (7%) reported conducting teacher or staff evaluations among their duties. Here again, writing project practices can be seen in pre- and post-observation interviews, written narratives of observations, walk-through observations

combined with consultations, and evidence of writing instruction in both language arts and subject-area classrooms.

Thus the data illustrate that writing project leaders who have moved beyond the classroom to positions of greater authority carry writing project principles and practices with them as they design and redesign the various schools, districts, and organizations that help to shape the educational experiences of our nation's students. Some interviewees reported that after they left their "transformed schools," subsequent administrators reversed the reforms, returning the schools to their former structures. Nevertheless, in assuming the role of change agent, these interviewees have accepted the challenge of transforming school climate drawing upon writing project principles and core beliefs.

DISCUSSION

The Legacy Study makes visible how teacher-consultants enact writing project principles as they work in a variety of roles across the embedded contexts of the education landscape. These teacher-leaders repeatedly and consistently infused writing project attitudes, values, and practices into their work. They have done and continue to do so in policy conditions that range from supportive to challenging.

They translate the principle of *teachers teaching teachers* into building and nurturing collaborative communities. Here, teachers share their expertise and continue to grow professionally, and draw on and synthesize their knowledge to create curricula, instructional practices, and assessment tools. In addition, those interviewees with significant personnel and budgetary authority manage resources in ways that improve the conditions for teacher and student learning.

They emphasize the importance of writing. Teachers and administrators advocate for a focus on teaching writing at the school, state, and district levels. All seek to engage teachers in writing as they facilitate staff, curriculum, and assessment development. They identify approaches to using writing to support learning in all content areas. In their day-to-day actions, they demonstrate their belief that *writing can and should be taught*.

They strive to make all their work meaningful and authentic, incorporating the idea that *teachers of writing must write*. They engage those around them in direct experiences with writing, assessment, and the like. They act as *agents of reform* as they move throughout the system. They are not passive recipients or even mere respondents to waves of change. In the words of Mary Ann Smith, "The NWP model, as opposed to the traditional model of teacher as passenger, demands that teachers get behind the wheel and make informed decisions about where to go, and how to get there. More than ever, the National Writing Project is a model that asks teachers . . . to initiate change, to take the lead in improving the profession" (Smith, 1996). The Legacy Study participants take seriously this vision: they accept responsibility for making change as teachers and carry this mission into all other arenas in which they work.

These early analyses begin to demonstrate the value of time and the value of watching people travel along their career pathways. We see what parts of their writing project experiences and learning they draw on and deploy in new situations. We also begin to see the broad reach of these individuals' work.

As we look toward the next phases of the Legacy Study, we plan to look more directly at the influence these teacher-consultants' leadership activities had on the next

generation of educators and students. In addition, these early analyses have raised a number of questions that we hope to pursue:

- In what ways, if at all, do these teacher-leaders find writing to be professionally and personally sustaining?

- In what ways, if at all, does the writing project influence people's decisions about the direction of their careers?

- What are the particular contributions, both within the classroom and in a range of other leadership roles, of those individuals who chose to remain in education for the duration of their careers?

- How do teacher-leaders maintain their core values and commitments while they negotiate a policy context that sometimes challenges these? What are the nuances of this situation?

The National Writing Project has endured for more than 30 years through multiple waves of policy changes and reform efforts. As such, NWP appears to provide a lasting infrastructure for improving the teaching of writing and inculcating leadership among teachers. NWP offers those teachers new roles, helps them develop as leaders, and provides an established professional community where they can return for ongoing support, learning, and renewal. Writing project sites bring together teacher-consultants to share and deepen their knowledge of writing and the teaching of writing. In turn, these teacher-consultants individually and collectively create and disseminate knowledge and expertise throughout the field of education.

In this way, writing project sites serve as repositories of talent. Collectively these individuals are available to schools, districts, state departments of education, institutions

of higher education, and other educational organizations to provide leadership around the teaching of writing and the use of writing to learn. These individuals are deeply rooted in the education system and are available to be called upon for leadership across time and space. Their leadership involves building the capacity of sites and individuals to provide leadership and education through professional development, creating and sharing knowledge, and developing policies and intellectual resources (e.g., curricula and assessment systems), as well as through allocating and managing resources. Because these leaders remain true to their core values and vision, they are able make educational policies and practices work for the benefit of students and teachers, even when such initiatives may at first appear misguided.

The work of these long-time teacher-consultants represents the things leaders do: they influence structures, nurture and help others perform, distribute and develop resources related to writing and the teaching of writing, and ensure high-quality implementation of policies. Accepting this as leadership, NWP offers a different vision of leadership—one that emanates from the classroom as well as from positions of formal authority. It holds out the possibility of leadership that is rooted in deep knowledge of teaching and learning, is exercised collaboratively, and is sustained across time and place.

REFERENCES

Academy for Educational Development. (2002). *National Writing Project Final Evaluation Report.* New York: Author.

Calkins, L. (1994). *The Art of Teaching Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Dickey, K., Hirabayashi J., Murray, A., St. John, M., & Stokes L. with assistance from Senauke, L. (2006). *Client Satisfaction and Program Impact: Results from a Satisfaction Survey and Follow-up Survey of Participants at 2005 Invitational Institutes.* Inverness, CA: Inverness Research Associates.

Evans, L. (2002). "What is Teacher Development?" *Oxford Review of Education*, 28, 1, pp. 123–137.

Graves, D. (1978). *Papers on Research About Learning - Balance the Basics: Let Them Write.* A Report to the Ford Foundation. New York: Ford Foundation.

Gray, J. (2000). *Teachers at the Center: A Memoir of the Early Years of the National Writing Project.* Berkeley, CA: National Writing Project.

Guthrie, J.W., & Springer, M.G. (2004). "A Nation at Risk Revisited: Did 'Wrong' Reasoning Result in 'Right' Results? At What Cost?" *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79, 1, pp. 7–35.

Inverness Research Associates. (2006). National Writing Project Comparative Summary of Key Statistics: Programs and Program Hours. Inverness, CA: Author.

Lieberman, A., & Wood, D. (2004). *Inside the National Writing Project: Connecting Network Learning and Classroom Teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press.

McDonald, J. P., Buchanan, J., & Sterling, R. (2004). "The National Writing Project: Scaling Up and Down." In S. Bodilly & T. Glennan (Eds.), *Scaling Up Reform Interventions*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Russell, D.R. (1990). "Writing Across the Curriculum in Historical Perspectives: Toward a Social Interpretation." *College English*, 52, 1, pp. 52–73.

Smith, M.A. (1996). "The National Writing Project After 22 Years." Phi Delta Kappan 77, 10, pp. 688 ff. Available at *www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/570*.

Stokes, L., Heenan, B., & St. John, M. (2002). *Teachers Inquiring Into Standards, Teaching and Learning: Lessons Learned from the National Writing Project's Focus on Standards Project.* Inverness, CA: Inverness Research Associates.

Whiteman, M.R. (1980). "What We Can Learn from Writing Research." *Theory into Practice*, 19, 3, pp. 150–156.

NOTES

1 Influence data were analyzed bin by bin. At least two researchers read each bin noting broad patterns of influence cited by interviewees.

2 Future reports will present a full analysis of interviewees' perspectives on the ways in which the writing project influenced them as teachers and engaged them in a supportive professional community.

3 The analyses included in the professional development section are based on all of the data coded to the Professional Development node. Some data in this node are also coded to other nodes analyzed for this paper: influence/writing project, policy / curriculum and instruction, policy/accountability, and policy/resource.

4 Although 88 transcripts had text coded to the professional development node, in 11 transcripts the references included only a single paragraph that provided limited information beyond a simple mention that the interviewee had facilitated workshops or another form of professional development.

5 Specifically, interviewees facilitated staff development focused on teaching of writing processes (26 interviewees or 23%), using writing as a tool for learning content across the disciplines (32 interviewees or 29%), and assessing writing (26 interviewees or 23%). (These categories are not mutually exclusive.) Interviewees also offered other content related to the teaching of writing: writing workshop, motivating students to write, peer response to writing, journals, writers' notebooks, and giving choice and control to student writers. Some interviewees ventured beyond a focus in writing to areas such as inquiry, reflection on practice, preparing for National Board Certification, English language learners, differentiated instruction, Teacher Expectations Student Achievement, Madeline Hunter, whole language, balanced literacy, brain-based research, cognitive coaching, middle school advisory, adult education, history, textbook sales, cross-age tutoring, writing center, the arts, and working with principals.

6 School administrators not only reported drawing on the expertise of teachers in their buildings. At times, they also call on other writing project teacher-consultants or other external partners whose values are compatible with theirs. These examples do, however, illustrate these administrators' deep belief in teachers' capacity.

7 Our analysis of the professional development data raised questions about whether teacher-consultants who accepted administrative or higher education positions facilitated learning opportunities for their peers who worked in the same position (e.g., principal to principal). After a careful rereading of the professional development data, we identified only 6 examples (from 68 eligible interviewees): 1) a retired principal who mentors new principals in his former school district; 2) an administrator who mentions creating learning community among other administrators; 3) a professor who facilitated writing across the curriculum professional development for other university faculty; 4) a university writing center director who created a two-week invitational institute for other writing center directors; 5) a literacy consultant who builds the literacy knowledge base of other consultants for her reform organization; and 6) a retired teacher who now works for a seminary and teaches others about writing. Because we did not ask an explicit question of all nonteaching interviewees about working peer-to-peer, we cannot draw any conclusions about whether this type of peer-to-peer professional development was limited to these six individuals or whether it was a more common instantiation of the "teachers teaching teachers" principle. It is also possible that additional peer-to-peer work was coded to other nodes.

8 The Legacy 2 interviews did not allow us to fully explore the complexity of working within a policy context where mandates may conflict with informants' deeply held principles. To understand more fully how writing project teacher-consultants in a variety of roles learn to walk the line, this issue is a central question explored in the Legacy 3 case study work. This phase of the study will hopefully allow for a more nuanced understanding of this issue than would a series of two-hour broad-brush interviews.

9 This example is not typical of the five interviewees who worked for textbook companies. All five seemed to have some latitude for designing the activities that they led. However, most activities focused on selling textbooks and getting teachers to use ancillary materials sold by textbook companies. Teacher-consultants doing this work described often having only 20 minutes for a presentation.

10 Two informants explained that the materials were sold to The New Standards Project at the University of Pittsburgh.. They reported that the assessment was also adopted by the Department of Defense Dependent Schools, where it remained in use at the time the interviews were conducted. (OE_MS, 322; OE_FC, 453)

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Legacy Study Phase 1 Methodology and Phase 2 Sampling Design and Procedures

Legacy Study Phase 1 Methodology

Given the centrality of the summer institute in the NWP model, and acknowledging the need to allow sufficient time to elapse after a teacher-consultant attends a summer institute before seeking to ascertain how the writing project may have influenced the teacher-consultant's career (or to gauge the contributions of the teacher-consultant more broadly), the study attempted a census survey of all teacher-consultants who had participated in a summer institute at least ten years prior to the date of the research. The survey was implemented in 2004; therefore eligibility for inclusion in the survey was based on whether or not a teacher-consultant participated in a summer institute prior to 1995.

All qualifying sites (i.e., those that existed prior to 1995) were approached to solicit contact information for all participants in the invitational summer institute offered by those sites. Of the 108 sites that were eligible to be part of the survey, 102 (94%) provided contact information, and another two sites chose to contact their teacher-consultants directly on the researchers' behalf. The research team was able to obtain contact information for and directly mail the survey to 14,343 teacher-consultants.

Response Rates

The first wave of the survey yielded 1,156 completed surveys. The mailing list was pared down by removing the records with incorrect contact information as well as those of people who had responded (if they could be identified).

Using the cleansed mailing list, 12,422 surveys were mailed out in a second wave. This yielded

an additional 958 responses, bringing the total number of surveys completed to 2,114. There

were 266 surveys completed by teacher-consultants who were deemed to be ineligible to be part

of the dataset because they attended a summer institute after 1994. Surveys from respondents

that met the eligibility requirement of having participated in a summer institute prior to 1995

were coded and digitized, bringing the number of cases used for analysis to 1,848.

Sampling Design and Procedures for Legacy Study Phase 2

In anticipation of Phase 2 of the Legacy Study, survey respondents were given space on

the survey form to provide their contact information if they were willing to participate in in-

depth interviews regarding their careers and the role that the NWP might have played in shaping

them. Fifty-eight percent (1,085) of the respondents expressed a willingness to participate in

these follow-up interviews.

The steps taken by the research team to build the interview sample are outlined here,

then followed by detailed descriptions of the various steps:

1. Comparison of survey respondents willing to participate in interviews to respondents not willing to participate to identify any patterns of bias between the two groups

2. Formulation of categories based on professional role of respondents in their last reported position

3. Determination of sample size

4. Sample selection (through random selection) and validation.

Comparison of Respondents Willing to Interview and Not Willing to Interview

The initial step in shaping the sampling strategy was to compare the respondents who

were willing to participate in Phase 2 interviews with those who were not. An examination of

frequency tables for the two groups revealed that they are comparable on important indicators.

Variables used for comparison are presented in table 1.

TABLE 1
Comparisons on selected variables

Variable	Willing to participate in Phase 2	Not willing to participate in Phase 2
Mean number of years since participating in summer institute	21	21
Mean number years of service to education	22.7	22.7
Mean of total number of publications	8.44	3.14

The data in the table above indicate that the number of years since the teacher-consultants participated in a summer institute is similar between the two groups, and that the number of years that respondents had worked in education is similar for both groups. The main difference found between the two groups is that respondents willing to participate in Phase 2 interviews are twice as likely to have published as those not willing to participate in Phase 2.

The two groups were also compared on the extent to which the writing project influenced their work based on the experience, knowledge and skills, and attitudes and values they gained through involvement with the National Writing Project.

Results from the analysis indicated that respondents willing to participate in Phase 2 interviews were slightly more likely to feel that NWP experience influenced their work (M=4.54, SD=.893) than those not willing to participate in Phase 2 (M=4.33, SD=.890), $t(698)$=3.21, p=.001. The results for whether knowledge/skills gained from NWP and attitudes/values of NWP influenced their work were similar. Respondents willing to participate in Phase 2 were more likely to indicate knowledge/skills gained from NWP influenced their work (M=4.53, SD=.855), than those not willing to participate in Phase 2 (M=4.32, SD=.867), $t(699)$=3.09, p=.002. Finally, respondents willing to participate in Phase 2 were more likely to indicate that attitudes/values of

NWP influenced their work (*M*=4.61, *SD*=.762) than respondents who were not willing to participate in Phase 2 interviews (*M*=4.42, *SD*=.829), *t*(697)=3.23, *p*=.001.

All of the results are statistically significant and they all suggest that those who were willing to participate in Phase 2 report slightly greater influence of the writing project upon their work. However, the effect sizes are very small (Cohen's *d* = .24 for all three), suggesting little reason for concern about the differences.

Development of Interview Categories

Analysis of Phase 1 data was conducted with an eye to uncovering what, if any, general professional groupings the respondents formed. This analysis led to the development of the eight categories that are listed below. The researchers made the decision to create a sample stratified by seven out of the eight categories (all except Voluntary Service).

- Classroom Teacher
- School Administration
- District-Level Administration
- Higher Education

- Other Education Field
- Related Field
- Other Field (out of education)
- Voluntary Service

Sample Size

The initial size of the interview sample was 129 survey respondents. As table 2 illustrates, the sample size was set for 20 teacher-consultants from the larger categories (Classroom, School Administration, District Level, and Higher Education) and 10 from the smaller categories (Other Education and Related Field). With only 5 respondents categorized into Other Field, the research team decided to attempt to interview all 5. Therefore, only 6 categories required selection. A cushion of approximately 20% was built into the sampling size to allow for attrition for any number of reasons.

TABLE 2.
Initial sample size

Category	Overall survey sample		Interview sample	
	Total number of respondents	**Number willing to participate in Phase 2**	**Target number of interviewees**	**Number sampled (with cushion for attrition)**
Classroom	1175	661	20	25
School Level	84	51	20	25
School District	115	86	20	25
Higher Education	231	148	20	25
Other Education	46	27	10	12
Related Field	30	18	10	12
Other Field	5	5	5	5
				129

Sampling Procedure

The roster of potential interviewees was selected using random sampling stratified by the professional categories. Respondents' final reported position was used to determine assignment to the categories.

Based on the results of efforts to recruit interviewees from the sample, 16 more prospective interviewees were randomly selected: 5 for the Classroom category, 5 for the Higher Education category, 3 for the School Level category, and 3 for the Other Education category. Further review of the interview sample prompted an additional selection of 6 invitees based on targeted positions across all jobs ever held by individuals in an effort to capture positions that were deemed slightly underrepresented but important to include in the interview pool. A total of 110 teacher-consultants were eventually interviewed for Phase 2 of the Legacy Study.

Description of Interview Sample and Comparison with Survey Population

The final interview sample is made up of 110 teacher-consultants that participated in a summer institute as far back as 1974 from 54 different Writing Project sites. The sample's

gender ratio (81.8% female and 18.2% male) reflects that of the overall sample (83.3% female

and 16.7% male).

The sample's ethnic demographics are representative of those of the overall survey

population. The demographic information for both groups is presented in table 3.

TABLE 3
Comparisons: Overall survey population and interview sample

	Overall survey population	Interview sample
Ethnicity		
African American	3.8%	4.5%
Asian	2.2%	0.9%
Pacific Islander / Philipina(o)	0.2%	-
American Indian / Alaskan Native	0.4%	-
Latina(o) / Hispanic	1.2%	-
White	89.7%	92.7%
Other	1.8%	1.8%
Double Code	0.8%	-
Gender		
Female	83.3%	81.8%
Male	16.7%	18.2%
Professional Contributions		
Mean Years of Service to Education	22.7	22.5
Mean Publications in Education	6.23	5.20

As a group, the interviewees have over 2400 years of service to education. That amounts

to an average of 22.5 years for each of the interviewees (compared to 22.7 years for the overall

survey population).

The final interview sample has professionally published in the field of education at a rate

(mean = 5.20) that is slightly lower than that of the survey population as a whole (mean = 6.23).

The research team was satisfied that the Phase 2 random selection process yielded an

interview sample that is representative of the overall population.

Appendix B. Legacy Phase 2: Qualitative Methods

Data Collection

Data collection for the second phase of the Legacy Study comprised telephone interviews conducted over three months during the spring of 2006. Seven forms of the interview protocol were developed to reflect the different career pathways of the interviewees. Although some of the specific questions varied from protocol to protocol, all protocols included the following: a) current work, b) reflection on professional history, c) an in-depth look at the influence of the writing project on one position, d) writing project involvement and influence on the interviewee as a leader and writer, and e) influence and contributions to individuals and the field.

Each interviewee participated in a two-hour semistructured telephone interview that was audiotaped and later transcribed. In addition, the interviewers took notes, which they later summarized, in the form of a contact summary sheet (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The interviewer listened to the audio recording of the interview and corrected the transcript for accuracy using standard notation. In some cases, summaries were prepared after transcripts were reviewed. All participants who requested a copy of their transcript were given an opportunity to review it for accuracy and expression during the fall of 2006. Eighty-five interviewees opted to do so.

All interviewers were experienced teacher-consultants selected from several writing project sites around the country. Before their first interview, individuals participated in interview training sessions. Following the first set of interviews they met again for a daylong meeting in which they discussed revisions to the protocols as well as interview challenges they were experiencing. They also received feedback from lead researchers, who had read sample transcripts, on their interviewing techniques.

Development of Coding Dictionary

The starting point for data analysis was the collection of brainstormed categories during the daylong meeting with the interviewers on what they were learning from the interviews and what central ideas they thought would be important to capture. This list was collapsed into a smaller group of categories that were then checked against the interviewers' contact summary memos. Additional categories (or codes) were also derived using the research questions guiding the interviews, the researchers' contact summary memos, and a preliminary coding scheme developed by the NWP Research Unit during a teacher-leadership pilot that addressed similar issues.

Once a preliminary list of codes was generated, lead NWP researchers developed code definitions through reviewing the contact summary memos. They then began applying code definitions to interview transcripts to further refine the codes. Lead researchers went through several cycles with transcripts from different pathways, and continually added, eliminated, collapsed, or modified codes. Coding disagreements were discussed until consensus was reached. This process resulted in a coding dictionary (see appendix C) with the following seven broad categories, each containing multiple descriptive and analytic codes: 1) work and experience, 2) pathway, 3) attributes, 4) sources of influence and effects, 5) analytic free codes, 6) environment, and 7) spheres. The descriptions of these categories and a list of derived codes are presented below in the coding discussion. Complete definitions, as well as anchor definitions, are available upon request.

Training for Coding and Coding

During a weeklong conference in July 2006, the interviewers were trained to apply these codes independently and to make their annotations by hand on hard copies of the transcripts. As

part of their training, interviewers were sent a packet before the meeting, which included 1) a copy of the coding dictionary with explicit definitions of the codes, 2) sample passages drawn from interviews that helped define the boundaries of each code, and 3) guidelines for coding. These items were reviewed during a full day of training on the first day of the conference. Through the week, the interview team periodically recalibrated their coding using sample passages. In addition, lead researchers read coded transcripts from each coder and provided feedback on accuracy of coding.

Data Entry and Subsequent Analysis

Following the conference, the manually coded data were entered into NVivo 2 software, which was used to compile and organize the coded interview transcripts for analysis. Analytic memoranda were written by three lead NWP researchers to help organize and guide this preliminary analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To receive feedback and as a check on their interpretations, they shared their findings at several analysis meetings. This iterative process occurred over several months.

REFERENCE

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Appendix C: Legacy Coding Dictionary

LEGACY CODING DICTIONARY
Interview Coding Meeting
July 7, 2006

Introduction

The Legacy Coding Dictionary has been divided into seven distinct sections that reflect the major questions guiding this research. Within each section is a range of codes and subcodes that we will use to categorize the content of each interview. In all cases, we will be asking you to take what the interviewee says at face value. The actual codes range from those that identify the interviewees' descriptions of their work and involvement in the writing project to those that require you to exercise a higher degree of inference, such as noting expressions about an interviewee's "sense of efficacy," "connections between writing and teaching of writing," and so on.

In addition to the codes that we will assign, NWP staff will code all of the interview content by question and for administrative purposes (e.g., requests for transcripts and results, willingness to be contacted for additional research, and address updates). The program into which we will enter the data – NVivo 7 – also has the capacity to search all interviews for specific terms (e.g., NCLB).
[NB: we ultimately used NVivo 2 because NVivo 7 had so many bugs that it compromised the database.]

Most passages within the interviews will receive more than one code; in some cases it will not be unusual to apply five to eight codes to the same passage. In fact we have designed the coding dictionary to make use of the fact that most text will receive multiple codes. We refer to this practice as "double coding." In certain cases, some text will not be coded at all (e.g., interviewer's introduction, administrative information, some survey updates). Below we briefly describe each section of the coding dictionary and how it relates to other sections.

Structure of the Coding Dictionary

<u>Work and Experience</u>
The purpose of this section is to capture interviewees' full *descriptions* of their work. Because the primary purpose of the Legacy Study is to explore writing project folks' work and contributions in arenas outside the K–12 classroom, we have defined fairly broad codes for this section. For example, all descriptions of teaching will be coded to a single broad category of Teaching. Some subcodes are predefined in the dictionary; for other codes, notably Teaching and Professional Development, we will decide on what constructs we wish to subcode for as we become clearer about the analyses we plan to conduct. With the exception of Writing Project Involvement and its subcodes, these broad categories will be subcoded at a later date.

The codes for the Work & Experience section are:
- Writing Life (WL)
    - *Publication (WL/PUB)*
    - *Use (WL/USE)*
    - *Collaboration on writing (WL/COLLAB)*
    - *Approach to own processes (WL/PROCESS)*
    - *Edit (WL/EDIT)*
- Teaching (TEACH)
- Advising (ADVISE)
- Professional Development (PD)
- Writing Project Involvement (WP)
    - *Entry (WP/ENTRY)*
    - *Continuing involvement (WP/CONT)*
    - *Lack of involvement (WP/LACK)*
    - *Director/Co-director (WP/DIR)*
    - *Other site leadership positions/roles (WP/ROLE)*
    - *Calling upon writing project (WP/CALL)*
    - *Writing project history (WP/HIST*)
- Policy and Administrative Work (POL)
    - *Curriculum and instruction (POL/C&I)*
    - *Accountability (POL/ACCOUNT)*
    - *Resources and resource management (POL/RESOURCE)*
- Public Engagement (ENGAGE)
- Consulting (CONSULT)
- Research and Evaluation (R&E)
- Reflective Practice (RP)
- Involvement in and Leadership of Professional Activities (ACTIVE)

Pathway
The purpose of this section is to explore the interviewee's explicit statements about how her career has evolved over time AND the reasons behind career transitions, decisions to stay the course, and pursuit of additional education.

The codes for the Pathway section are:
- Transition (PATH/TRAN)
- Remain (PATH/REMAIN)
- Pursuit of additional education (PATH/ED)

Attributes
The purpose of these codes is to explore interviewees' statements about important intangible ideas that shape and inform their work and their lives. For example, the codes in this section capture how the interviewee characterizes his identity as a writer, a leader, or a teacher. They explore the knowledge upon which interviewees draw, their attitudes and values toward all areas of work, their sense of confidence and efficacy, as well as their internal struggles. These codes are inward-looking and tied to the interviewees' sense of the world.

The codes for the Attributes section are:
- Knowledge/Content (KNOW)
- Attitudes and Values (AV)
- Identity (ID)
  - *Writer (ID/WRITER)*
  - *Leader/Teacher Leader (ID/LEAD)*
  - *Teacher (ID/TEACH)*
- Confidence and Sense of Efficacy (CONFIDENCE)
- Internal Challenges (CHL)

Sources of Influence and Effects
These codes begin to address the ideas of influence and impact. These codes are closely tied to the questions that guide the overall study. It is here that we explore the questions "What types of influence did the writing project have on interviewees?" and "What contributions have those involved in the writing project made to the field?"

These codes focus on the sources of influence on the interviewee; changes that the interviewee has made in her thinking, work, and personal life; and the effects or impacts of her work on other individuals or parts of the education system more broadly. The Sources of Influence code will nearly always be double-coded with one of the codes in Work and Experience, Pathway, Attributes, or the Analytic Free Codes. So when a state curriculum director explains that he has worked to integrate writing into all content areas because of his involvement with the writing project, we would add two codes: Policy (POL) and Influence/Writing Project (INFL/WP).

The codes for the Influence and Effects section are:
- Sources of Influence on Interviewee (INFL)
  - *Writing Project (INFL/WP)*
  - *Other (INFL/OTHER)*
- Changes Made by Interviewee (CHANGE)
- Effects of Interviewee's Work (EFFECT)

Analytic Free Codes
This section of the coding dictionary provides an important home for larger analytic ideas that seem important to this research. Some of these ideas emerged from our reading of your interview summaries, others stem from the pilot teacher leadership studies, and still others speak to NWP questions that extend beyond the questions specifically posed by this study.

The codes for the Analytic Free Codes section are:
- Relationship Between Writing and Teaching of Writing (WRITE-TEACH)
- Relationship Between Teaching and Leading (TEACH-LEAD)
- Systemic Reform (REFORM)
- Equity / Social Justice (EQUITY)
- Advance Teacher Knowledge and Voice (ADVANCE)
- Cultivate and Sustain Teacher Leadership (CULTIVATE)
- Awards (AWARD)
- Golden Lines (GOLD)

Environment
These codes characterize that nature of the environment in which the interviewee works. It has two major codes: Professional Community, which describes how the interviewee interacts with professional colleagues; and Context—Negative or Positive—which captures the interviewee's sense of how the policy, administration, and people (including professional colleagues) in the environment affect her work.

The codes for the Environment section are:
- Professional Community or Network (PROFCOM)
- Context (CXT)
  - *Positive (CXT/POS)*
  - *Negative (CXT/NEG)*

Sphere

In each of the sections described above, we have attempted to create coding definitions that span all levels and sectors of the formal educational policy system. The research will take into account the spheres in which actions and contributions occur. Therefore, almost all text will receive one or more sphere codes. This will allow us to explore questions such as "What similarities and differences do we see in the ways in which K–12 and higher education teachers enact writing project values in their classrooms?" Further, it allows us to explore these questions without reproducing every level of the education system as a subcode for each code.

The codes for the Sphere section are:
People
- Student (SPH/STU)
- Parent(s)/Family/Community (SPH/FAM)
- Other Teachers (SPH/OT)
- Other Professional Colleagues (SPH/OPC)
- Preservice and New Teachers (SPH/NEWT)
- Other Individuals (SPH/INDV)

Layers of education system
- Classroom (SPH/CLASS)
- School (SPH/SCH)
- District (SPH/DIST).
- State (SPH/STATE)
- Federal/National (SPH/FED)

Intermediary Ed Organizations / Higher Ed
- Higher Education (SPH/HE)
- Adult Education (SPH/ADULTED)
- Writing Project – Local (SPH/WPSITE)
- Writing Project – National (SPH/NWP)
- Professional Organizations (SPH/PROFORG)
- Foundation (SPH/FOUNDATION)
- Field of Education (SPH/FIELD).
- Other (SPH/OTHER)

CODING GUIDELINES
Interview Coding Meeting
July 5, 2006

General principles

- *Code for face value.* Please be as literal and low-inference as possible when you assign codes. Stay as close to the interviewee's words as possible rather than searching for deeper meaning. There must be explicit evidence to support the code. Always ask yourself, "What is the evidence for this code?" Check yourself against definitions and against short passages. If you find yourself saying, "I know this code applies because the interviewee's experience sounds similar to mine," you are probably *not* coding for face value.

- *Judge not*. Closely related to coding for face value is the idea of not judging what the interviewee says. Sometimes interviewees will use different language to describe their experience than what we are used to hearing. At other times you may find yourself disbelieving the interviewee's statements. For example, if the interviewee reports learning a practice from the writing project and you find yourself saying, "There is no way that he could have learned THAT from the writing project!", you may just need to take a deep breath and code for Influence/Writing Project. You are coding the interviewee's perspective, *not* your perceptions about whether he is correct.

- *Be agreeable.* We seek to code reliably. In other words, we want to assign the same codes to the same types of text both within and across categories. We have established a variety of procedures to ensure that we are all coding in the same way. We will work very hard with everyone to make certain that we are all in agreement. However, if this doesn't work we may need to ask someone to take on a different piece of meaningful work.

Read Closely and Judiciously

- *See the forest, not only the trees.* We aim to code the central ideas within a passage, not every word or every detail. We recommend reading through a passage before you start writing down codes, so that you understand its central areas of focus. If you find yourself coding every time you see a key word or phrase, you may be over-coding.

- *Complex ideas sometimes call for multiple codes*. Many of the ideas articulated by the interviewees are complex and not easily captured within a single code. We have sought to create a coding system that allows us to search for complex information through the NVivo software's search mechanisms. In some cases, you may assign 5 to 7 codes for a passage.

- *Multilayered descriptions may be captured by one big code.* In some cases, a long description may have only one or two codes. A rich and detailed description of a classroom or of a professional development partnership may receive one primary code plus sphere codes.

Some Notes on the Design of our Coding Dictionary

- *Use sphere codes to designate the level at which work occurs.* We have sought to create codes that work for any employment category or part of the educational system. Ask yourself, "Can my challenge be overcome by assigning one or more sphere codes?"

- *Codes range from fairly descriptive to more analytic*. Although you are coding for face value, the actual codes range from trying to collect the interviewees' descriptions of their work, their involvement in the writing project, and what has influenced them to more analytic codes related to ideas such as "sense of efficacy," "connections between writing life and teaching," and so on.

- *Lists of examples are illustrative, not comprehensive.* Several of the code definitions include examples. The purpose of these examples is to provide concrete pictures of abstractions. If you think to yourself, "This isn't included on the list of examples, I shouldn't code it," please reread the entire definition. We aren't omniscient, so we couldn't come up with comprehensive lists. Besides, if we could, we wouldn't have had the opportunity to talk to all of these fabulous people!

- *Advice on length of passages, how much context to include*. The length of passages coded will vary greatly depending on the code's definition, the interviewee's manner of speaking, whether the question itself needs to be coded in order to provide context for the interviewee's response, and so on. We have tried to illustrate this variation in the long training passages.

- *Sections of the interview that you may not need to code*. Three parts of the transcripts may not need to be coded: 1) the introduction to the interview where you are gaining consent and providing background; 2) updates or modifications to the interviewee's professional history survey, unless these spark more substantive conversation; and 3) the administrative questions at the conclusion of the interview. These sections will be captured through question coding that the Research Unit staff will do following the coding conference.

Tips for using your coding dictionary and training materials

- Keep the short list of codes at your finger tips—it can be helpful for remembering codes quickly.
- Annotate and mark up your coding dictionary and sample training packages as we go through training.
- Refer back to your coding dictionary and your notes whenever necessary during coding.
- Look over your sample code packets (both the short and the long training passages) to see examples of how the code has been applied to the text.
- Make two passes through each interview. One pass focuses on SPHERE codes and one focuses on SUBSTANTIVE codes.

Applying Codes

- When coding a passage, include all of a paragraph or section that is relevant. In addition, if the same program/concern/etc. is further addressed at a later point in the narrative, code that as well.
- Many passages will receive more than one code (we'll refer to this as double-coding).
- Many passages will not receive any codes.
- If you have trouble applying a particular code, try to narrow the choices to a small number of related codes.

Marking Text

- Use brackets to mark passages; also note where a code begins and ends.
- Write the code abbreviation next to the bracket.
- Use the same color pen to mark the passage and the code abbreviation.
- Use a different color pen if you applying more than one code to a part of a passage with a different beginning and ending.
- Place SPHERE codes on left and SUBSTANTIVE codes on right.

Resolving Questions

- Bring the passage and your question to Linda, Sherry or Tamara

ROOM RULES

- Please be quiet while coding. If you need to have a conversation or have a question, please step out into the hallway.
- Feel free to ask questions of Linda, Sherry, or Tamara.

Appendix D. Rationale for Work and Experience Data Analyzed

In our preliminary examination of the interview data we found that the most frequently named areas of work *outside of the classroom* included professional development, creation of curriculum and instruction, support for writing assessment, and management of human, financial, and intellectual resources (see table 4)**.** Our initial analysis also revealed several issues which we intend to revisit in the future. For example, our analysis of the Research and Evaluation node, and the Engage node, revealed some inconsistencies with the application of the code's definition. Also, our analysis of the Consult node revealed that most of the work captured under this code related to professional development. In fact, about 62% of the text within the Consult node was coded to the Professional Development node. Therefore, we elected to further analyze these particular data sets after we have an opportunity to review the coding patterns.

TABLE 4
Work and experience categories analyzed

Selected areas of work	Number of interviewees
Professional Development	88
Policy/Resource and Resource Management	80
Policy/Curriculum & Instruction	64
Policy/Accountability	43
Engage	42
Research and Evaluation	40
Consult	22

Based on our preliminary understanding of the data, we decided to focus on interviewees' descriptions of their professional work and experiences outside the classroom (excluding the area of professional writing) and their reports of the writing project's influence on them. For this paper, we intentionally focused on their descriptions of their formal and informal roles within the areas of work they most often named (i.e., professional development and policy and

administrative roles), and the ways in which they integrated writing project vision and values into their day-to-day work. We also concentrated our efforts on capturing their reports of *longer-term* influences of the writing project.