

**New Writing Assessments:
The Challenge of Changing Teachers' Beliefs
About Students as Writers**

CSE Technical Report 422

Shelby A. Wolf
University of Colorado, Boulder

Maryl Gearhart
CRESST/University of California, Los Angeles

January 1997

National Center for Research on Evaluation,
Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST)
Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1522
(310) 206-1532

Copyright © 1997 The Regents of the University of California

The work reported herein was supported in part by the Educational Research and Development Center Program cooperative agreement R117G10027 and CFDA catalog number 84.117G as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education; the Apple Classrooms of Tomorrowsm Project, Advanced Development Group, Apple Computer, Inc.; and the California Assessment Collaborative.

The findings and opinions expressed in this report do not reflect the position or policies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the U.S. Department of Education, Apple Computer, or the California Assessment Collaborative.

NEW WRITING ASSESSMENTS: THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGING TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT STUDENTS AS WRITERS

Shelby A. Wolf

University of Colorado, Boulder

Maryl Gearhart

CRESST/University of California, Los Angeles

Abstract

New writing assessments are built on the belief that young children learning to write are engaged in making meaning. In this paper, we suggest that these new assessments will be utilized effectively by teachers and children only if teachers understand their contents and purposes and agree to endorse and embrace them. Based on findings from a two-year collaboration with the faculty of one elementary school, we examine ways that teachers' beliefs about their students as writers mediated their investment in new methods of assessing students' narrative writing. While our venture resulted in considerable growth among teachers, we encountered some resistance engendered by our hesitancy to address deep issues about the philosophic foundations that undergird teachers'—and our own—current practices.

New writing assessments are built on the belief that young children learning to write are engaged in making meaning. As Dyson (in press) has taught us, children create a written world surrounded by talk, drama, and drawing—a world that combines their “symbolic resources and social intentions,” a world that often foregrounds the micropolitics of their classroom situations including gender, race, and class. Thus as evaluations of the writing of children, new assessments capture the ways young writers express themselves to multiple audiences through a variety of genres for multiple purposes, manipulate language to achieve particular effects, and respect the abundant variety in language use and dialect across diverse groups.

In this paper, we suggest that these new assessments will be utilized effectively by teachers and children only if teachers understand their contents and purposes and agree to endorse and embrace them. When a teacher assesses a student's growth as a writer, she asks herself, “Where has this child been?”,

“Where is she now?” and “Where can I advise her to go next?” Answers to these questions require a teacher’s commitment to assessments that honor the young author’s efforts to make his or her own meaning, to validate language variety, and to stretch the child to new genres and styles as well as clarity of expression. In addition, answers to these queries require a discerning eye and a willingness to engage with children in constructive criticism about their writing. In this view, a teacher’s “assessments” become a reader’s “analytic response to text” (D. P. Wolf, 1993; Wolf, Bixby, Glenn, & Gardner, 1991; S. A. Wolf & Gearhart, 1993a, 1993b).

In the sections that follow, we examine ways that elementary teachers’ beliefs about their students as writers mediate their acceptance of and investment in new methods of assessing students’ narrative writing. Our findings emerged from a two-year collaboration with the teachers of one elementary school. While our venture resulted in considerable growth among teachers, we encountered some resistance as well, resistance engendered by our hesitancy to address deep issues about the philosophic foundations that undergird teachers’—and our own—current practices.

We begin with a description of the writing assessments we created in collaboration with the teachers of one elementary school, through a program entitled *Writing What You Read* (WWYR). Next, we explore where the teachers were prior to the onset of WWYR and then describe the overall impact of WWYR on classroom practice.¹ We then turn to two teachers who represent case examples of resistance and explore the quite varying reasons for their rejection. We conclude with remarks about what we have learned about new assessments in conflict with differing philosophies.

The *Writing What You Read* Professional Development Program: Integrating Narrative Curriculum and Assessment

Young authors are often encouraged to write about life experiences and the life of their individual imaginations and then to analyze the effectiveness of their written expressions. “Write what you know” is the advice often given to novice

¹ In prior reports, we have described our program in detail, reported on its impact on teachers’ understandings of narrative genre, and analyzed the role of this knowledge in teachers’ capacities to interpret and score children’s writing in meaningful ways (Baker, Gearhart, Herman, Tierney, & Whittaker, 1991; Gearhart, Herman, Novak, & Wolf, 1995; Gearhart & Wolf, 1994; Gearhart, Wolf, Burkey, & Whittaker, 1994; Herman, Gearhart, & Baker, 1993; Wolf & Gearhart, 1993a, 1993b, 1994).

writers, encouraging them to take what they know about life and put it on paper. Yet, professional writers, including numerous children’s authors, seem to suggest alternative advice—“Write what you read”—implying that writers are often inspired by what they know about literature.

Learning about literature was one key feature in the first year of the *Writing What You Read* (WWYR) professional development program. Following the participating teachers’ request to focus on narrative, we began by asking teachers to analyze literature in terms of the following narrative components: genre, theme, character, setting, plot, point of view, style, and tone. Teachers read sections of Atwell’s (1987) *In the Middle* and Lukens’ (1990) *A Critical Handbook of Children’s Literature*, as we drew on additional articles and books in the areas of children’s literature and literary criticism (e.g., Huck, Hepler, & Hickman, 1987; Lurie, 1990; Sloan, 1991; S. A. Wolf & Heath, 1992), as well as curricular materials crafted to highlight the critical features of narrative and the connections among literary texts, topics, and themes.

Learning about children as writers was a second key component of our first-year program. We provided numerous examples of young children writing their own stories as well as analyzing narratives. We discussed children’s oral insights and written work in the same way that we examined professional texts, stressing children’s developing understandings of character revelation, the symbolic use of setting, the often sequential nature of plot. We analyzed children’s beginning and more accomplished uses of language to set a tone and to create their own voice or style. We evaluated children’s awareness of audience, delineating what attempts children made to make their writing clear to others. We also stressed that indices of children’s development could not be readily equated to “grade-level expectations”—that very young writers were quite capable of more accomplished pieces than older students depending on their purpose and experience. We also emphasized that children are interested in criticism that would help them become better writers—encouraging the teachers to think of a developmental model that would scaffold children toward better writing through specific commendations and recommendations.

Teachers’ understandings of the components of narrative and their students as writers then became the motivation for integrating curricular possibilities, instructional techniques, and assessment tools. Our goal was to help teachers assess children’s narrative writing in the same way that they critically respond to

literature. Our hope was that teachers could offer their students explicit guidance, equipped now with the “tools of the literary trade”—an understanding of genre influences, the technical vocabulary, and the orchestration of the narrative components of a text—within a framework designed to strengthen young children’s writing. Together we developed two tools to support teachers in narrative assessment—a narrative feedback form to assist teacher-student conferences (Figure 1) and a narrative rubric to help teachers evaluate students’ present understandings and future possibilities (Figure 2). Year 2 focused heavily on practice and implementation of these methods.

Teachers’ Beliefs Prior to WWYR

When we began our workshops, we found that the majority of teachers assumed their students lacked knowledge necessary to competent writing. Writing in the classroom was viewed in one of two ways—as an opportunity to express and develop creative imagination (a belief that limited the teacher’s role for fear of restricting the child’s expression), or, as an opportunity to practice and master composition skills (a belief that motivated a sequential, stepping-stone curriculum). Patterns of belief were associated with grade level.

The primary teachers had a tendency to work from a readiness model and a skills view of writing (cf. Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1991; Sulzby, 1991). Because the kindergarten teachers believed that their students were not ready for writing skills, the only writing assigned were stories children dictated to their parents at home, stories that received no critical evaluation from the teachers. The first-grade teachers did not give their students opportunities for “real writing” until after January, when they thought the children were “ready to write.” There was initially no mention of young children needing to write for meaning; most first-grade writing projects were handled as exercises with prescribed story starters and fill-in-the-blank pattern books. In this context, assessment could not possibly have the function of enhancing children’s efforts with meaning making. Indeed, there was a common assumption—linked to the skills view—that children could not write and would not want to write without the teacher’s warm, uncritical acceptance to ensure a child’s interest and imagination. Thus, viewing their role as one of praise and motivation, the primary teachers did not evaluate their children’s writing: “Any attempts with the written word receive praise and encouragement.” “I want the child to truly like to write.”

Narrative Feedback Form

Name: _____
 Title: _____
 Genre: _____
 Date: _____

Convention:

Writing Process:

Communication

audience awareness
style
tone

Setting

Character

Plot

Theme

Action/Emotion
Over Time

Heart of the Story

Wolf/Gearhart 1992

Figure 1. Narrative planning and feedback form.

Narrative Rubric

	<p>Theme</p> <p>explicit ↔ implicit</p> <p>didactic ↔ revealing</p>		<p>Character</p> <p>flat ↔ round</p> <p>static ↔ dynamic</p>		<p>Setting</p> <p>backdrop ↔ essential</p> <p>simple ↔ multi-functional</p>		<p>Plot</p> <p>simple ↔ complex</p> <p>static ↔ conflict</p>		<p>Communication</p> <p>context-bound ↔ reader-considerate</p> <p>literal ↔ symbolic</p>														
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not present or not developed through other narrative elements • Meaning centered in a series of list-like statements ("I like my mom. And I like my dad. And I like my...") or in the coherence of the action itself ("He blew up the plane. Pow!") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or two flat, static characters with little relationship between characters; either objective (action speaks for itself) or first person (author as "I") point of view • Some rounding, usually in physical description; relationship between characters is action-driven; objective point of view is common 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Backdrop setting with little or no indication of time and place ("There was a little girl. She liked candy.") • Skeletal indication of time and place often held in past time ("once there was..."); little relationship to other narrative elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or two events with little or no conflict ("Once there was a cat. The cat liked milk.") • Beginning sequence of events, but occasional out-of-sync occurrences; events without problem or problem without resolution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing bound to context (You have to be there) and often dependent on drawing and talk to clarify the meaning; minimal style and tone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning statement of theme—often explicit and didactic ("The mean witch chased the children and she shouldn't have done that.") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued rounding in physical description, particularly stereotypical features ("wart on the end of her nose"); beginning rounding in feeling, often through straightforward vocabulary ("She was sad, glad, mad.") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning relationship between setting and other narrative elements (futuristic setting to accommodate aliens and spacehips); beginning symbolic functions of setting (often stereotypical images—forest as scary place) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single, linear episode with clear beginning, middle, and end. ("Once upon a time there were two friends named Frog and Toad. One sunny day when they were tree climbing, Frog got stuck. He was scared. So Toad helped him down. Toad was a good friend.") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer begins to make use of explanations and transitions ("because" and "so"); literal style centers on description ("sunny day"); tone explicit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning revelation of theme on both explicit and implicit levels through the more subtle things characters say and do ("He put his arm around the dog and held him close.") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning insights into the motivation and intention that drives the feeling and the action of main characters often through limited omniscient point of view; beginning dynamic features (of change and growth) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting becomes more essential to the development of the story in explicit ways: characters may remark on the setting or the time and place may be integral to the plot 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plot increases in complexity with more than one episode; episodes contain four critical elements of problem, emotional response, action, outcome; beginning relationship between episodes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased information and explanation for the reader (linking ideas as well as episodes); words more carefully selected to suit the narrative's purpose (particularly through increased use of detail in imagery) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning use of secondary themes, but not often tied to overarching theme; main theme increasingly revealed through discovery rather than delivery ("You can't do that to my sister!", Lou cried, moving to shield Tasha with her body.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further rounding (in feeling and motivation); dynamic features appear in the central characters and in the relationships between characters; move to omniscient point of view (getting into the minds of characters) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting may serve more than one function and the relationship between functions is more implicit and symbolic—for example, setting may be linked symbolically to character mood ("She hid in the grass, clutching the sharp, dry spikes, waiting.") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger relationship between episodes (with the resolution in one leading to a problem in the next); beginning manipulation of the sequence through foreshadowing, and subplots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some experimentation with symbolism (particularly figurative language) which shows reader considerations on both explicit and implicit levels; style shows increasing variety (alliteration, word play, rhythm...etc.) and tone is more implicit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching theme multi-layered and complex; secondary themes integrally related to primary theme or themes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round, dynamic major characters through rich description of affect, intention, and motivation; growth occurs as a result of complex interactions between characters; most characters contribute to the development of the narrative; purposeful choice of point of view 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching problem and resolution supported by multiple, episodes; rich variety of techniques (building suspense, foreshadowing, flashbacks, denouement) to manipulate sequence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Careful crafting of choices in story structure as well as vocabulary demonstrate considerable orchestration of all the available resources; judicious experimentation with variety of stylistic forms which are of the symbolic in nature and illuminate the other narrative elements

Wolff/Gearhart/Quellmalz/Whitaker 1992

Figure 2. Narrative rubric.

At higher grade levels, we found a juxtaposition between the teachers' concerns with creative voice and with skill. Teachers might assign narratives on specific topics (usually associated with heroes and holidays) guided by explicit criteria, or they might provide time for opportunities to "just write": "I want children to express themselves in a way that does justice to what they imagine and think, to find the words." "I want children to see relationships between their thoughts and words." Still, the teachers did not understand ways of helping children enhance these relationships. They were not particularly explicit in their analyses of narrative, and, not wanting to stifle creativity, they tended to avoid giving advice on content, focusing their assessment feedback mostly on convention or genre-general characteristics such as the importance of a clear "beginning, middle, and end." Upper-grade teachers represented a departure from a focus on the child's expressive imagination toward detailed, assignment-specific expectations. A good story had a "beginning, middle, and end/conclusion; stays to the point; lots of detail; at least two paragraphs; complete sentences; [no] run-on sentences; [no] rambling; proper punctuation; neat; completed all parts of the assignment." With assessment criteria like these, upper-grade teachers conveyed a traditional view of students not as makers of meaning, but as compliant learners.

The Impact of WWYR

Year 1 represented the more intensive focus on children as writers, and its impact was evident by the end of the year. We were heartened that many teachers reported a shift in focus away from skill mastery toward the making of meaning through narrative ("I don't [just] correct the convention. I have begun to ask questions to get them to think of ways to improve writing"). Kindergarten teachers expressed interest in facilitating more opportunities for "letting them tell stories." Teachers at all grade levels reported really reading and listening to their children's stories ("I've enjoyed children's writing") and building instruction on children's spontaneous interests and understandings of literature ("I'm now beginning to have the students look for and share their favorite phrases from the literature we read and tell us why it appeals to them"). Many teachers were beginning to recognize students as authors, a change that had potential to support assessment as a reader's response.

However, that potential was limited by complaints that WWYR may be “too sophisticated,” and the apparent source of those complaints was the belief that students could not analyze narrative in the ways we were recommending: “We still have a problem with [Theme] in class; they tend to think every theme is friendship.” “Trying to explain Plot to my kids is often difficult.” “Some miss the point completely.” Kindergarten teachers and some primary teachers were particularly likely to distance themselves from the relevance of our program, and they wished for a focus just on their grade levels.

During Year 2, we focused our workshops intensively on methods of assessment. Perhaps because we had far less time to share and celebrate students’ writing, the pattern of impact on teachers’ beliefs was little different from the first year. Again we found some teachers delighted with their students’ writing (“I was just so impressed with what they had come with [portfolios from the prior year] and how much better their writing had gotten”) and surprised by their students’ positive attitudes toward writing (“We talked about what was our favorite part of the year, and . . . a great many students said *writing* was! . . . [I]t wasn’t as much of a chore for them as I thought it was!”). In this context, more teachers expressed awareness that children can handle explicit feedback (“and then children want to fix it right away, and they go away happy and wanting to change, they’re very eager to go back and write . . .”). Indeed, at this point, some teachers were actively confronting ways that their prior assessment practices had emphasized incompetence, rather than competence: “I need to be able to see a lot more positive things from the students and not always think about the best student and evaluate from top down.”

But the pattern of mixed impact persisted, as some teachers continued to raise concerns about their students’ capacities as writers: “Weaving a good story is beyond them.” “They don’t have a clue on what revision is all about.” “There isn’t that much that [third graders] accomplish in a year’s time that you could measure.” Reflecting deep beliefs in either a “skills” view or a “creative writing” view, there were two counters to the WWYR approach to assessment.

On the one hand, the teachers invested in skills either rejected WWYR for its irrelevance or suggested revisions of WWYR assessments that fit a “scope and sequence” analysis of writing growth. Thus the following quote illustrates a primary teacher’s worries about time lost to teaching writing skills.

Spending so much time and attention to the rubric and the feedback form . . . I actually did less writing than I normally would have done. . . . [Now] they don't even know how to write a sentence.

In her view, the purpose of a “writing” program is to provide students opportunities to practice composing grammatical sentences, and therefore WWYR is limited in its relevance. The next quote illustrates a revisionist position grounded in a deep commitment to a skills view of writing development:

I think that [WWYR should have] some type of structure so that . . . in first grade . . . you would lay out what the narrative should contain—a simple plot, a simple scene, no more than two characters, and then, the next year, you would take one of those and develop it further, maybe the third year you'd put dialogue in, so you're following the sequence down the line.

On the other hand, the teachers invested in “creative writing” felt that WWYR's analytic emphasis violated their understandings of whole language, writing process approaches. Our substantive focus on narrative content was viewed as inconsistent with a child-centered classroom. When some teachers planned a narrative assignment or had specific criticisms of children's writing, they felt guilty about restraining the freedom of the child.

When I read Graves [1983] and Atwell [1987] . . . they say . . . when we assign a topic to the children, we're still making them dependent upon us as writers. [On the other hand,] you cannot draw from an empty well. If you don't give the child something to draw from, then all they do is pull from their own limited experience. And yet, there has to be time when what's important to them is what they're writing about rather than the assigned topic. . . . So do we have two *different* writing [methods]? . . . It is overwhelming.

This teacher is ambivalent, worried that constructive assessment may silence children's voices.

Case Examples

We have selected two cases that represent patterns of resistance to WWYR founded on beliefs about students as writers. Neither case is typical of our sixteen teachers. Indeed, as we report elsewhere (Gearhart et al., 1994), there were teachers whose knowledge, beliefs, and practice were deeply and positively impacted by their involvement with WWYR. The cases below, however, serve to highlight two persistent philosophical orientations that would not be moved in the

face of new assessments. Although both teachers, Bert and Peter, gave a polite nod to our program, their firmly-held beliefs were not swayed by the methods we used.

Bert

An experienced teacher new to the primary level, Bert tended to follow the lead of his grade-level colleague in planning narrative units and utilizing methods of narrative assessment. Less knowledgeable about narrative than his partner, Bert was able to make minor use of some of the WWYR materials we distributed, such as “the [guide]book . . . that’s helpful,” but, for the most part, the materials seemed overwhelming to him: “There seems to be so much coming at you, you really have limited time to touch base with resource materials.”

Bert’s comments about writing assessment in early workshops led us to believe that he did not see children as capable authors (“I used to ask older kids things. But with the primary grade I don’t”), but we noted changes in Year 2 in his understandings of the developmental nature of children’s writing. He learned that children were capable of handling theme, particularly if it was explicitly discussed in class. Thus, with regard to the *Frog and Toad* unit he and his colleague designed (Lobel, 1971, 1979), Bert said, “The kids understood the theme of friendship. It was something that they could easily write down and identify with.”

Nevertheless, Bert’s emphasis on “simpler” and “basic” curriculum for primary children did not change, as he conveys in his reflections on the irrelevance of the WWYR rubric.

As we practice grading other papers, you know, I scratch my head and say, “I’m kinda glad I’m in the [primary] grade ’cause it’s pretty basic and it’s pretty simple . . .” So I keep it kinda simple and don’t feel like I need to, you know, refer to the rubric so much. (Bert, final interview, 1993)

With this rationale, he departed from his colleague by providing his students with a simpler version of the WWYR assessment materials. When his students planned their stories, they used a form that included four components (Theme, Plot, Character, Setting) but omitted the Communication circle in the center of the form.

When I'm talking with first graders, and they're beginning to write for the first time in January or February . . . it just seemed to be a simpler approach, for what I was trying to do with kids who were writing for the first time.

Comparing the remaining four components to the children's familiar game of four-square, Bert felt that the communication circle in the form was too complex for his students. By removing the communication circle—which encompassed the necessary writing tools of style, tone, and audience awareness—he virtually eliminated attention to language. He felt strongly that while first graders could write a brief plot, with two characters in a limited setting with a minimal theme, they could not manipulate language for particular effects.

Overall Bert's attitude represents his determination to simplify materials for younger children. He had little faith in his students' abilities to become accomplished writers.

Peter

Peter was an upper grade teacher who joined the faculty and the WWYR project in the second year. Peter's resistance to WWYR derived from multiple sources—his limited understandings of narrative, his commitment to “creative” writing, and his beliefs in his students' limited capacities.

Uncomfortable with the analytical WWYR workshop conversations, he commented that the workshops were the most “intellectual” experiences he had ever had concerning text. His own difficulties with the material were linked to his beliefs that his students had comparable difficulties. Peter felt, for example, that the subtle devices of motivation and intention were unavailable to his children.

These stories that I'm reading [to the students] are not just telling of events, but there is a plot to it, and there is a theme to it, and I think kids don't really do that, at least not the ones that I have worked with.

His kids, he felt, saw writing as an assignment to finish rather than a meaning to be communicated: “They didn't quite grasp theme.” “They just wanted to write it and finish it and turn it in and get it graded and be done.” We heard much from Peter about what his students could not do.

Perhaps because he viewed the “technical” aspects of writing to be beyond his students' capacities, Peter was resistant to the critical stance that we asked teachers to take in their assessments of students' writing, believing that a teacher

should not tamper with a child's personal writing process. He believed that many children cannot handle specific feedback.

Last year, I had this one girl. She just—the blood would just drain out of her face. It was really painful for me, 'cause she was one of the most rambling writers I ever encountered and she needed a lot of help. But she couldn't handle . . . the criticism. So, for me, it was more of an issue of helping her with that issue alone, rather than even with the writing.

A recent convert to a particularly open-ended view of writers' workshop, Peter was most concerned with enhancing his students' creativity. He labeled himself a "writing process" teacher, and felt that a major part of the process was "allowing [children] to write whatever they feel like writing, and then guiding each individual child along, in terms of where they are with their writing." But Peter's guidance was limited both by his lack of knowledge about narrative and his strong aversion to giving any assessment feedback at all. Because Peter focused on the negative aspect of criticism, he could not see the role of constructive criticism in helping to build a student's confidence.

Peter's differentiation of creativity from criticism represents a novice approach to writer's workshop. The purpose of any kind of conferencing, whether with the teacher or with peers, is to hold a conversation about the effectiveness of the writing—to compliment and question different choices, to encourage an expansion of the writer's vision. By avoiding attention to criticism, Peter set up an atmosphere for "anything goes"—an atmosphere that may serve to make children feel more comfortable for a while, but one that will not support a writer's growth in developing new styles, genres, and audiences in the future.

Discussion

While teachers grew demonstrably in their competencies with narrative assessment, their growth was most typically marked by only partial alignment with a fundamental tenet of WWYR—that children are eager to "make meaning" through narrative and will make use of the insights of a thoughtful reader. Not every teacher was ready and able to embrace a developmental approach that veered from a sequential step-by-step vision. Teachers might be charmed by their students' writing, excited by their students' growth, and eager for more involvement and opportunities for response to children's work, but otherwise daunted by our requests for substantive critique. Even as they commented on

growth and shared with pride examples of their students' stories, they complained about what their students could not understand and accomplish. We regard this attitude of complaint and negativity as a failing of our in-service methods. Teachers held beliefs that we did not attempt to unsettle directly.

One unexamined belief was that writing is a set of skills that can be charted hierarchically, and that should be taught and assessed sequentially. Skills are discrete and dichotomous in nature—a child has either mastered them (e.g., writing a complete sentence) or not, and if not, it is the teacher's job to ensure mastery. This belief provided a basis for rejecting WWYR's views of narrative (as beyond most students' level of maturity) and of pedagogy (as presuming a voice that the child does not yet possess).

A second unexamined belief was that writing should provide students an opportunity to develop a creative voice. We had not recognized that teachers might perceive constructive criticism as a way of silencing children. Even though we were convinced, we had not persuaded some teachers that criticism is a way of expanding children's voices and helping them to find new genres and styles in which to express themselves. To be sure, creativity is vital in writing, but there is little creativity without dialogue, without communication, without collaboration, and assessment is critical. As Bakhtin's work demonstrates, "Meaning is always a function of at least two consciousnesses. Thus, texts are always shared" (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 151). To share a text does not mean to look at it and put a smiley face or a quick compliment at the top of the page ("Good work!"). To share a text means to value the work with substantive attention, to ask questions, to push the metaphors, to guide the writing.

In hindsight, we recognize that we were much like some of the teachers in our study, equally guilty in our failure to offer sound criticism. We were so eager to have the teachers feel comfortable with new assessments that we failed to question their long-held beliefs about what children could not do and what children could not tolerate. When we shared examples of children's writing with the intention of countering teachers' focus on children's limited competence, we left unchallenged the teachers' belief that the writing we displayed was from exceptionally gifted children. Nor did we question specific practices—such as designating the home as the context for kindergartners' dictated stories and reserving the classroom for the teaching of skills—and as a result, teachers felt validated in continuing such practices.

To counter teachers' beliefs that students lack both skill and voice, as well as to improve our own in-service practices with new assessments, we would make three changes. First, we would create a primary focus to allow us to share what is known about the development of very young writers and to address squarely the tendencies of primary teachers to see WWYR as irrelevant to their students. Second, for teachers of all grade levels, we would ask teachers to develop cases of their students as writers. Teachers could share their students' writing and tell stories about their students as young authors. Videotapes of children's engagement with their work, with peers, with parents, and with teachers could provide memorable images of children's eagerness to compose, to share their work with others, and to respond to critique. Third, we would model effective conferencing, either directly with children in their classrooms or through videotapes of teachers holding productive assessment conferences. These models would serve to demonstrate the validating and growth-nurturing powers of criticism, as opposed to a more negative view.

In our criticisms of our work—often the product of extended discussions between ourselves as well as insights from our teachers in final interviews and follow-up conversations—we have come to discover that there are no crystal ball secrets for the future success of new assessments. In Lloyd Alexander's (1992) humorous tale, *The Fortune Tellers*, a young man asks if he will have a long life. The old seer gazes into his crystal and replies, "The longest. . . . Only one thing might cut it short: an early demise." Will it be the case that new assessments are destined to be short-lived? Certainly, such a prediction is not unnecessarily dire considering the early death of the California Learning Assessment System (McDonnell, 1996). However, we are hopeful that the lessons learned here and elsewhere will serve to help those who are attempting to "build assessments toward which [we] want educators to teach" (Resnick & Resnick, 1992, p. 59). Life, as the fortune-teller intimates, is what you make it—"You shall wed your true love if you find her and she agrees." To secure such agreement in our work to develop and implement new assessments, we must make our conversations with teachers open to criticism as well as collaboration.

References

- Alexander, L. (1992). *The fortune-tellers*. New York: Dutton Children's Books.
- Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: Writing, reading, and learning with adolescents*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook-Heinemann.
- Baker, E. L., Gearhart, M., Herman, J. L., Tierney, R., & Whittaker, A. K. (1991). Stevens Creek portfolio project: Writing assessment in the technology classroom. *Portfolio News*, 2(3), 7-9.
- Clark, K., & Holquist, M. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dyson, A. H. (in press). Children out of bounds: The power of case studies in expanding visions of literacy development. In J. Flood, S. B. Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *A handbook for literacy educators: Research on teaching the communicative and visual arts*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gearhart, M., Herman, J. L., Novak, J. R., & Wolf, S. A. (1995). Toward the instructional utility of large-scale writing assessments: Validation of a new narrative rubric. *Assessing Writing*, 2, 207-242.
- Gearhart, M., & Wolf, S. A. (1994). Engaging teachers in assessment of their students' writing: The role of subject matter knowledge. *Assessing Writing*, 1, 67-90.
- Gearhart, M., Wolf, S. A., Burkey, B., & Whittaker A. K. (1994). *Engaging teachers in assessment of their students' narrative writing: Impact on teachers' knowledge and practice* (CSE Tech. Rep. No. 377). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Goldenberg, C., & Gallimore, R. (1991). Local knowledge, research knowledge, and educational change: A case study of early Spanish reading improvement. *Educational Researcher*, 20(8), 2-14.
- Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Herman, J. L., Gearhart, M., & Baker, E. L. (1993). Assessing writing portfolios: Issues in the validity and meaning of scores. *Educational Assessment*, 1(3), 201-224.
- Huck, C., Hepler, S., & Hickman, J. (1987). *Children's literature in the elementary school*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Lobel, A. (1971). *Frog and toad together*. New York: Scholastic.
- Lobel, A. (1979). *Days with frog and toad*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Lukens, R. (1990). *A critical handbook of children's literature*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Lurie, A. (1990). *Don't tell the grown-ups: Subversive children's literature*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- McDonnell, L. M. (1996). *The politics of state testing: Implementing new student assessments (Deliverable to CRESST/OERI)*. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Resnick, L. B., & Resnick, D. P. (1992). Assessing the thinking curriculum: New tools for educational reform. In B. R. Gifford & M. C. O'Connor (Eds.), *Changing assessments: Alternative views of aptitude, achievement and instruction* (pp. 37-75). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sloan, G. D. (1991). *The child as critic: Teaching literature in elementary and middle schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sulzby, E. (1991). The development of the young child and the emergence of literacy. In J. Flood, J. M. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (pp. 272-285). New York: Macmillan.
- Wolf, D. P. (1993). Assessment as an episode of learning. In R. Bennett & W. Ward (Eds.), *Construction versus choice in cognitive measurement* (pp. 213-240). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wolf, D. P., Bixby, J., Glenn, J., & Gardner, H. (1991). To use their minds well: Investigating new forms of student assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 17, 31-74.
- Wolf, S. A., & Gearhart, M. (1993a). *Writing What You Read: Assessment as a learning event* (CSE Tech. Rep. No. 358). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation.
- Wolf, S. A., & Gearhart, M. (1993b). *Writing What You Read: A Guidebook for the assessment of children's narratives* (CSE Resource Paper No. 10). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation.
- Wolf, S. A., & Gearhart, M. (1994). *Writing What You Read: A framework for narrative assessment*. *Language Arts*, 71, 425-445.
- Wolf, S. A., & Heath, S. B. (1992). *The braid of literature: Children's worlds of reading*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.