Teaching Sentence Writing –
A Comparison of the Effects of Two Strategies
Scaffolding versus The Fundamentals in the Sentence Writing Strategy developed by the University of Kansas

By

KAREN SALSBURY

Submitted to
The Masters in Education/Reading Faculty
Northwest Missouri State University Missouri
Department of Education/Reading
College of Education and Human Services
Maryville, MO 64468

Submitted in Fulfillment for the Requirements for
61-683 Research Paper
Spring 2012

February 28, 2012
ABSTRACT

This study was conducted in order to determine if there is a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores progress of students who participated in the Instructional Scaffolding teaching strategy, which utilizes rigor and relevance when teaching sentence writing versus the pre-test and post-test scores progress of those students who were instructed using the Learning Strategies Curriculum: Fundamentals in the Sentence Writing Strategy (Schumaker, 1998) in 7th Grade Communication Arts middle school.

Current literature and research indicates that the KU Writing Strategy has become antiquated as rigor and relevance in the classroom become more common place. The results of a t-Test performed on 23 students’ post-test scores in this study indicated no significant difference between the progress scores of participants taught using the instructional scaffolding and the KU Writing Strategy approaches to teaching sentence writing. While it is beyond the scope of this study to determine the cause, it is assumed that some of the similarities may exist at least in part due to the similarity in teacher experience as well as the learning abilities of the students. Based on the current implementation process of sentence writing instruction at this school, the review of current literature and statistical analysis, it is recommended that teachers choose one of these two instructional strategies to teach sentence writing in their seventh grade communication arts classroom.
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

The Fundamentals in the Sentence Writing Strategy, a Learning Strategies Curriculum developed by The University of Kansas and first published in 1985 (and also known as KU Writing Strategy) has been used to teach sentence writing at our middle school for the past ten or more years. Teachers interviewed could not be more accurate on the date only to say that the sixth and seventh grade teachers had been using the strategy for at least that length of time. As a new teacher to this school, the Instructional Alignment Guide developed and in place District-wide is given to teachers to use as a basis for the objectives to be met. In this Instructional Alignment Guide (IAG), which is significantly tied to the Missouri Show-Me Standards, the goals and objectives of each quarter are outlined specifically. In addition, teachers were asked to and did meet prior to the beginning of school year and developed 2-3 hard-hitting Power Standards taken from the IAG in which to focus on for each quarter. This was done and the Power Standards were approved by the administration.

Our school is in the process of implementing a brand new AVID® (Advancement Via Individual Determination) college and career readiness program utilizing rigor and relevance. Following a week-long summer training session in Chicago, these teaching activities were incorporated through an instructional scaffolding approach to teaching sentence writing. This particular scaffolding strategy is outlined specifically within Appendix A of this document. During the Professional Leadership Team (PLT) meetings, it was discovered that one 7th grade Communication Arts teachers was using the KU Writing Strategy approach, while two others, new to the district and trained in AVID had been using many of the rigor and relevance activities
building on an instructional scaffolding teaching strategy. Following a series of meetings with the principal and PLT, it was agreed upon to continue using the curriculum that had already begun this school year while ensuring that each teacher used the same Common Formative Assessments (CFA), developed by the PLT. In essence, the outcome should be the same using the same Power Standards, but the teaching strategies would remain different.

Each teacher has four different 7th grade Communication Arts classes, with one being an honors (or Challenge as termed at this school) class. For the purposes of this study we selected our honors students as the basis in which to compare the two strategies. Using the common pre-test that two of the teachers had administered, we each continued our course of study. At the end of the second quarter, we each presented a like post-test in which to determine the outcome of this study in addition to determine whether re-teaching was needed. Because this was sentence writing test, we established a rubric from which to grade alike. Sentences had to be written exactly correct, including all punctuation and capitalization, or they were counted as incorrect.

*Conceptual Underpinnings of the Study*

According to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website, in 2011 this school district had more than 18,500 students. Despite that fact, many teachers are left to design their own curriculum around the Instructional Alignment Guide which includes standards and objectives developed by the District. As long as the objectives are met, the school is not as concerned with the actual curriculum used to teach the students. Sometimes it seems a “trial and error” approach is used, but mostly the school employs highly qualified and experienced teachers who are then empowered to utilize their own teaching styles while meeting the objectives set forth by the District. New and creative teaching strategies are encouraged by
the district and preference is given to certified staff members who possess a graduate degree or above.

The instructional scaffolding teaching strategy, based on research originally done by Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934) is used within the zone of proximal development (ZPD). For the first teaching strategy, using instructional scaffolding approach, a plan was designed and implemented in which students would work within their ZPD and increase the complexity until the objective was met. In this case, the District’s first and second quarter Power Standard for seventh grade Communication Arts number two state: “students will be able to compose a variety of sentences, including complex, simple and compound.”

The second teaching strategy used was from the Fundamentals in the Sentence Writing Strategy or KU Writing Strategy that has been used in this particular middle school for at least ten years. This strategy uses the “Expression Strand” which consists of six strategies designed to enable students to write four kinds of sentences: Simple, Compound, Complex, and Compound-Complex as the first of the six strategies (Schumaker 1998). Critical Instructional Procedures include: The Describe Stage which provides background information about new concepts; The Model Stage where the objective is shown to the students; The Verbal Practice Stage in which students are asked to verbally tell about the processes and definitions; and The Guided Practice Stage in which students are asked to practice using “Learning Sheets” (Schumaker 1998) in which students work together with the instructor. Before students are asked to write anything, they are taught specific academic vocabulary-intensive terms that are defined throughout the introduction such as “subject”, “nouns”, “verbs”, “makes sense”, “infinitives” and other such terms. They are then introduced to the “PENS Strategy” (Schumaker 1998) in which they are to use the acronym of PENS to write a sentence: Pick a formula; Explore words to fit the formula;
Note the words and Search and check. Finally, students are taught another acronym, **MARK**. This is the “Search & Check Step “Mark out imposters-infinitives and prepositional phrases; Ask—“Is there a verb?”; Root out the subject; and Key in on the beginning, ending and meaning.
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**Figure 1 (Schumaker 2005)**

### Statement of the Problem

This District has specifically stated that rigor and relevance should be used within each and every classroom. KU Writing Strategies appear to have rigor, but relevance to students is not as apparent. Students get bogged down in the trying to memorize terms and thus struggle with actual sentence writing capabilities. For example, they are not sure what an “infinitive” is, even after being taught repeatedly, but more importantly they do not understand what it has to do
with writing a sentence and how to use it. Within the framework of the instructional scaffolding approach, rigor is apparent along with relevance. Students are taught using a hands-on approach which includes a variety of teaching strategies: various group activities, Reciprocal Teaching, direct instruction, media, Directed Reading-Thinking Activity, teacher-led independent activity, and several writing activities in order to provide the rigor and relevance necessary for mastery.

The Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the current KU Writing Strategies approach is sufficient to provide the rigor and relevance needed for mastery, or whether implementing Instructional Scaffolding (Appendix A) in lieu of the KU Writing Strategies is needed for mastery of sentence writing in a seventh grade Communication Arts classroom. There will be two groups used in this study. The dependent variable will be the KU Writing Strategies group taught with this traditional research-based method currently being used at this school. The independent variable will be the instructional scaffolding group being taught using a variety of research-based teaching activities.

Research Question

RQ. 1 Students will write three types of sentences: simple, complex and compound. Which teaching strategy, KU Writing Strategies or Instructional Scaffolding has the highest sentence writing scores using the range and the mean averaging calculation methods?
Null Hypothesis

The null hypothesis of this study will demonstrate that there is no significant difference between the KU Writing Strategy approach to teaching sentence writing and the Instructional Scaffolding approach.

Anticipated Benefits of the Study

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate whether the traditional KU Writing Strategies method currently used in this school to teach sentence writing strategies should be maintained, or a new, more relevant instructional scaffolding should be implemented across the Communication Arts curriculum to replace this method.

Definition of Terms

KU Writing Strategies – The Fundamentals in the Sentence Writing Strategy Learning Strategies Curriculum previously introduced and demonstrated that is vocabulary intense to teach sentence writing.

Reciprocal Teaching – A teaching method in which students work together in small groups to teach each other through what they read together.

Instructional Scaffolding – A teaching method where much like a building scaffold, a basis for instruction is introduced, and as the students learn, scaffolding is taken away and replaced with newer scaffolding to meet the needs of the student within their ZPD.

Zone of Proximal Development or ZPD – Established by the Russian Psychologist, Lev Vygotsky, ZPD refers to the distance between what a child can do with assistance and what he can do without assistance. A child’s ZPD is constantly changing as he or she masters
increasingly challenging tasks. ZPD is helpful because it reminds teachers where learning should take place and how a child’s mind can be stretched to reach higher level learning goals. This is the basis for Instructional scaffolding.

**Common Formative Assessment** – Common in this instance refers to all teachers on our PLT use the same assessment. “Formative assessment is a process used by teachers and students during instruction that provides feedback to adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve students' achievement of intended instructional outcomes.” (Popham 2008)

**Planning Leadership Team or PLT** – This is the school district’s term for core curriculum teams. Because there are three and four teachers in each building for each core curriculums, Science, Math, Social Studies and Communication Arts, each core meets as a team to establish norms, teaching strategies and formative assessments used to meet the objectives established by the district. These teams meet on an almost daily basis.

**Instructional Alignment Guide** – This is the district’s complete set of goals and objectives that correspond directly to the Missouri Show-Me Standards for learning.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The best way to teach grammar in the public schools has had a lengthy debate for hundreds of years. Specifically teaching the all-important way to write clear, grammatically correct and effective sentences to children has become a very hot topic in the last decade as literacy remains at the fore-front of the education community. The new Common Core State Standards (C.C.S.S.) for Missouri (N.G.A.C.B.P. 2010) now indicate that all core teachers, including science, social studies and math must also teach English Language Arts within their curriculum framework. Literacy has top billing. This has many teachers of these subjects scrambling with exactly how to do this. Several teachers at my school have even gone so far as to say that they, themselves are not good sentence writers. This makes them unsure as to how to teach literacy while teaching their own full curriculum of goals and objectives.

Effective sentence writing can be very challenging to teach; however, it must be taught. Teachers continue to struggle to find effective ways to teach. Many teachers only find pattern practice, grammar tasks and specific writing tasks such as fill-in-the-blank worksheets. While these tasks have value by providing important practice such as changing verb tense, moving adverbs or changing subjects, they do not provide a good way to personalize the writing activities to make them relevant to students. The question then becomes whether or not these tasks serve any purpose beyond grammar manipulation. “In other words, it seems that we should be asking ourselves if our attempts at teaching composition skills really teach composition or whether we are simply providing written practice in grammar…The ability to write a clear, concise, logical and convincing paragraph or essay involves more than just the ability to be able to write a grammatical sentence…” (Mashori, Lal 2011).
As students begin to acquire mastery of sentence writing, these will next naturally be incorporated into paragraphs and then onto the writing process. Before students can truly be literate, they must first be able to write in a structured form. This will make their natural progression from struggling readers to good readers to great readers an easily identifiable journey. Incorporating great writing strategies into teaching methodology will strengthen students’ mastery quicker and provide a basis for life-long successful learning and literacy.

Using great teaching strategies for sentence writing can help to ensure students success. The Fundamentals in Sentence Writing Strategy (KU Writing Strategy) Learning Strategies Curriculum (Schumaker 1998) has been designed to assist students on their path to learning how to write sentences. The first 1985 version of the KU Writing Strategy was field-tested in several classrooms at three schools, which include: Summit Middle School in Columbia, South Carolina; Irvine Intermediate School in Garden Grove, California; and Summit School in West Dundee, Illinois. There was then a second version developed and field-tested at the same schools following feedback. Since that time, the feedback requested was for an easier version, which is the current 1998 version. The complete instructional method outlined in the Learning Strategies Curriculum must be followed exactly as presented in order to be effective.

Research indicates that by using the KU Writing Strategies, sentence writing capabilities increased on average from 18% complicated sentence writing to 65% that each student made gains on pertinent measures only after instruction began for each strategy. In addition, research has indicated that on the Woodcok Johnson Psychoeducational Battery, the students’ mean grade equivalent score increased from 2.1 grade level equivalent to 2.7 following instruction. The student demonstrated that high school students with learning disabilities could learn using this Sentence Writing Strategy within a resource room program. There was a caution issued on the
second study listed that these results were achieved using the program exactly as it is presented in the instructor’s manual and student materials (Edge 2009).

Using the KU Strategy, there is a set of steps and key formulas that help students to recognize and write different types of sentences. The teaching used here is systematic and sequenced in such a way so that students who may have learning disabilities will have ample opportunity to practice identifying and writing different types of sentences. This learning strategy does not cover every sentence variation neither does it cover all the grammatical terms that other language courses might cover.

A learning strategy is an individual’s approach to complete a task or an individual’s way of organizing a set of skills in order to learn or accomplish a task (Freeman 2004). By using the KU Writing Strategy, teachers are incorporating a specific strategy to help students achieve these learning goals. Instructional scaffolding is a teaching strategy that incorporates many different types of learning strategies into a relevant learning facilitator approach. The approach differs from KU Writing Strategy in many ways. While KU is a structure that must be followed exactly, Instructional scaffolding can be adapted to meet the needs of students individually each day as the teacher uses different assessment strategies on a daily basis to monitor progress. In addition, the material presented within the KU Writing Strategy can be dull and uninteresting; while the instructional scaffolding strategy is considered more relevant to the students as they develop their own sentences and utilize these within a framework story or other activity.

Instructional scaffolding uses the following method. First the instructor models the new or difficult task. Second, the class then works together to perform the same or like task. Third, the students work with a partner or in groups to do the same or like task, and finally, the student
does the work independently. Teachers use a variety of scaffolds at different times to help students master the content. Some of these ways include direct instruction, writing, advance organizers, examples, explanations, handouts, prompts, stories and literature, and visual and auditory aids. Each of these fall into two main categories of scaffolds which include materialization and private speech.

In the work of Lev Vygotsky’s (1896-1934) zone of proximal development (ZPD), it was found that children become independent performers when taught within this zone. “Abilities that are fully developed exist at the level of independent performance. Those skills that are on the edge of emergence and that can be enhanced by varying degrees of assistance are located within the ZPD.” (Bodrove & Leong 1998). Scaffolding can offer “varying degrees of assistance,” thus providing a great opportunity of success for students.

Interviews with first year teachers and master teachers all agreed that offering personalized scaffolding was one of four characteristics of differentiation and meeting individualized student needs. Students drew on a “rich mental database of examples, metaphors, and enrichment ideas.” (Carolan & Guinn 2007). Each step of instructional scaffolding of the writing sentences process is intended to be a temporary tool. By beginning with simple sentences, adding vivid verbs and descriptive adjectives, figurative language piece by piece, students can see how their writing becomes more interesting. In the beginning, the teacher provides maximum assistance for writing by demonstrating its use and modeling well-written sentences that holds the reader’s interest.

The teacher then provides opportunities for the students to write descriptive, complex and compound sentences as a whole. Next, students partner up with 2-4 peers to build their
sentences together, working as a team. They will share out their sentences. Finally, students will be asked to build their own sentences and incorporate them into some type of writing such as a short-short story, paragraph, or mini-report. Increased awareness of the importance of specific word choice and detail in students’ writing has been recorded and observed by these authors (Carolan & Guinn 2007).

Because written language is far more complex than spoken language in terms of organization and sentence structure, scaffolding is an opportune strategy for teaching writing. Specifically, teaching sentence structure and descriptive, expressive language can be successfully learned by first modeling then allowing students to take an active role in learning how to write effectively. Sentence expanding was discovered as one of the most effective methods of introducing and reinforcing different structures of sentences. Increasing vocabulary by adding descriptive words on a step-by-step basis allowed the students to discover basic sentence structure and how to enhance their own sentences.

There are many benefits to instructional scaffolding in that it challenges students to deeper learning and discovery, engages them in meaningful discussions, and motivates them. The ultimate goal, of course, and one that this strategy has been proven to be highly successful is that it increases the likelihood that students will meet their instructional objectives. Scaffolds can be recycled to use at a later date; however, planning and implementing them the first time can be time consuming and demanding. It is important to select appropriate activities that scaffold and match the learning objective (Yellin 2008).

Instructional scaffolds promote learning through positive feedback and shared responsibility. They provide support, challenge and engaging activities for students to become
successful in their academic writing career. As student understanding increases through practice, they gain confidence in their writing ability.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A posttest-posttest research design was used for the findings in this study. Alpha level was set at 0.25 to determine significance from the \( t \)-Test. After using each teaching strategy, KU Writing Strategy and instructional scaffolding, the post test scores of each of the two groups of students will be compared. The independent variable will consist of students who are learning from the instructional scaffolding strategy. The dependent variable will consist of students being taught using the KU Instructional Writing Strategies. Scores will be calculated based on percentage of correctly written sentences on a like posttest given to each group of students. Sentences must be written 100% accurately, including appropriate punctuation and capitalization in order to be counted correct.

Study Group

The study group consists of two 7\(^{th} \) grade Communication Arts groups. The school district is located directly adjacent to the inner city, but is considered a safe suburban neighborhood and is considered to be in a low socio-economic area of the metropolitan area. There were 23 students tested in each group to provide consistency. There are approximately six hundred forty students enrolled in this school. The demographic profile of the student population is 56% White, 19% African American, 13% Hispanic, 9% Asian, and 2% other. Student population consists of 51% males and 49% female (Wolfram|Alpha knowledgebase, 2012).
Data Collection, Instrumentation and Method

Data was collected from the PowerSchool application and directly from graded tests. It was then placed in an Excel spreadsheet without any identifying characteristic for individual students. Then, ultimately the data was copied into A Statistical Program (ASP) version 3.95 for manipulation of the t-Test statistical data.

FINDINGS

Using the data found in Table 1, no significant t value was found for the between the two teaching strategies post test scores. The title of Table 1 below is “t-Test Analysis Result Between Class A and Class B Final Formative Assessment”. Table 1 below shows the mean of Class A sentence writing assessment scores to be 86.43. It will also show that the mean of the Class B sentence writing assessment scores as 87.83. This table demonstrates the difference in the mean as well as the p-value.

Table 1
*t-Test Analysis Results Between Class A and Class B Final Formative Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean X-Y</th>
<th>t-Test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>86.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>87.83</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Significant when p = < 0.25.

As you can see, table 1 identifies very close mean for class A and class B falling at 86.43 and 87.83 respectively. Table 1 also identified a p-value of .71 with a standard deviation of 3.74.

Forty-six middle school seventh grade Communication Arts students were chosen at random to conduct a study on whether using Learning Strategies Curriculum for sentence writing
developed by the University of Kansas currently being used in this school produced better learning results than an instructional scaffolding strategy. There were 23 students in each class. The null hypothesis stated there was no significant difference in sentence writing formative assessment scores between the two teaching strategies. Scores were calculated using the percent correct method. The p-value calculated to 0.71 which is significantly above the alpha level of 0.25, therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected, but rather accepted. This suggests there is not a difference in sentence writing assessment scores using KU Writing Strategies versus instructional scaffolding.

The chart below shows the distribution of sentence writing formative assessment scores in relationship to percentage of pre-test and post-test scores to each of the different teaching strategies.

Figure 2 Class A and B Pre-test and Post-test Results
This chart shows the significant progress made from the pre-test to the post-test using each teaching strategy. It also shows that there is no significant difference between post-test scores for students within either class.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study show that there is no significant difference in the two teaching strategies. Research would indicate that this would be the case. Sources cited for the Learning Strategies Curriculum Sentence Writing (Schmidt, 1983) claim that this particular instructional strategy can help to significantly raise assessment scores when incorporated into the classroom over time. Sources cited for using instructional scaffolding have reported major gains in student achievement as well (Cudd et. al. 1994).

The null hypothesis of this study states that there is “no significant difference between the KU Writing Strategy approach to teaching sentence writing and the Instructional scaffolding approach.” The p-value was calculated as 0.71, which is significantly above the alpha level of 0.25, therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted as stated.

When two instructional strategies that are based on researched are placed side by side in a study the first response would be that their results would be similar; however, given the broad differences in the strategies it would next indicate that results would be significantly different. In addition, because of the diverse styles of the teachers and the differences in the students, this, too would indicate the appearance of a strong discrepancy in scores. Within the instructional scaffolding strategy, there were several more modern teaching activities, while the KU Writing Strategies uses a more traditional “diagraming sentences” approach. Students were taught the “terms” and asked to identify each of these terms once they write a sentence. With the
instructional scaffolding approach, there were graphic organizers, reciprocal teaching, group participation and hands-on activities.

Using different instructional strategies then become subjective. While the KU Writing Strategies is a formal, individually purchased curriculum, the instructional scaffolding strategy was individually developed and designed by the teacher to meet the needs of the students. This strategy used activities pulled at no cost from the Internet and several resources already available to the teacher. In figure 2 (shown above), it is clear that both classes of students showed a significant increase in knowledge when tested over identifying the different types of sentences and how to write them.

Following the goals and objectives set forth by the school and the state to facilitate learning is the key to student achievement. From this research, the recommendation then is for consistent, clearly stated objectives along with a complete plan and implementation of that plan to teach sentence writing to seventh grade communication arts students. Experienced teachers can either use the attached (Appendix A) scaffolded strategy, or incorporate an existing curriculum, KU Writing Strategy and achieve similar results.
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APPENDIX A

Instructional scaffolding strategy used for this comparison:

Timeline Table with Action Steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Time-line</th>
<th>Support/Resources</th>
<th>Evaluation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Permission from building principal</td>
<td>9/29/11</td>
<td>Building principal and discussion with C.A. team</td>
<td>Since we don’t currently have a formal program of study already adopted, no documentation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sentence writing pre-assessment</td>
<td>10/10/11</td>
<td>Prepare sentence writing assessment</td>
<td>Sentence writing assessment Assign quantifiable numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PowerPoint Sentence writing and fixing fragments-Cornell Notetaking</td>
<td>10/11/11</td>
<td>Modeling and Direct Instruction -- HRW PowerPoint Composition Notebooks</td>
<td>Review students’ composition notebook notes for accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Read “Owl Moon” by Jane Yolen to students</td>
<td>10/12/11</td>
<td>Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) -- <em>Owl Moon</em> by Jane Yolen</td>
<td>Read-think-aloud with the students, listing descriptive words...assess understanding orally during class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Counting Sentences’ Words Lesson Plan group activity</td>
<td>10/13/11</td>
<td>Group activity – students worked as a “table” of 4-5 each <a href="http://writingfix.com">http://writingfix.com</a> Owl-Moon3 Overhead and worksheets</td>
<td>Oral discussion regarding which paragraphs were more interesting and why. Groups “share out” their opinions and compare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Scaffolding sentence writing exercise</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>Teacher-led independent activity - Blank sheet of notebook paper</td>
<td>Turn in papers for a grade to assess students’ current sentence writing abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <em>Rikki Tikki Tavi</em> by Rudyard Kipling vivid verb search</td>
<td>11/2/11</td>
<td>Group Activity—students work in groups to pick out as many vivid verbs as they can find in this short story</td>
<td>How many vivid verbs did the students find?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fiction short story 4-step writing activity</td>
<td>11/9/11-11/15/11</td>
<td>Individual activity—Using a prepared rubric and 4-step writing process, students will write their own fictional short story and complete all 4 steps</td>
<td>Were sentence structures more sophisticated than their early writing? Using the rubric, grade short stories and review their sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students practice writing a variety of sentences for review</td>
<td>11/28/11</td>
<td>Independent activity -- Composition notebooks and whiteboard</td>
<td>Review composition notebooks for accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Show-Me Sentences</td>
<td>11/29/11</td>
<td>Group-activity – &quot;Telling&quot; sentence, then students write a &quot;Showing&quot; sentence with vivid verbs and adjectives that create an image in the reader's mind.</td>
<td>Each sentence must have no less than 15 words, and have a minimum of 3 descriptive words in them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Post-test Assessment</td>
<td>11/30/11</td>
<td>Use the initial pre-test as a post-test of sentence writing</td>
<td>Students will be graded based on point structure. Students should also include at least 20% more verbs and adjectives than in their pre-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>