NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT (NWP)

Goal: To improve the quality of student writing and learning, and the teaching of writing in the nation's classrooms.	**Funding History** ($ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	**Appropriation**	**Fiscal Year**	**Appropriation**
Legislation: Title X, Part K of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 8332).	1985	$0	2000	$9
	1990	$0	2001	$10
	1995	$3	2002 (Requested)	$0

Program Description

The U.S. Department of Education provides funds to the National Writing Project (NWP), a nonprofit educational organization whose mission is to improve writing and learning in our nation's schools. The NWP supports K-16 teacher professional development programs that focus on improving the teaching of writing. It also supports classroom-based research documenting the effectiveness of the NWP in improving student performance.

The NWP contracts with numerous institutions of higher education and nonprofit education providers to operate locally based professional development programs for teachers. The NWP served over 100,000 teachers and administrators at 167 sites across the country in 2000, and has served over 2 million teachers and administrators since its inception in 1974. The cost to the Federal government per teacher training hour is less than $1; almost $7 in matching funds are leveraged from each Federal dollar.

The NWP uses a teachers-teaching-teachers model of professional development. In this model, classroom teachers demonstrate to their peers their most successful practices for teaching reading and writing effectively. The core of the NWP model is the invitational summer institute, where for 5 weeks each summer, exemplary teachers meet at local sites to examine their own classroom practice, conduct research, develop their writing skills, and learn from each other. These teachers then become leaders who return to their schools and communities to provide local workshops and inservice programs for teachers, students, and parents.

The NWP has created three special focus networks, centering on urban sites, rural sites, and English-language learners. The NWP also partners with other national programs and education organizations (e.g., *America Reads*, the *Focus on Standards* project) to enhance services provided to disadvantaged children.

For more information, please visit the program Web site at: http://www.writingproject.org/

Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: SUPPORT AND PROMOTE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO IMPROVE THE WRITING SKILLS OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS.

Indicator 1.1 Teacher satisfaction: Each year, National Writing Project (NWP) teacher participants and teacher leaders will rate the program as good or excellent and will affirm that the NWP has had a positive impact on their teaching practice.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Participant Rating				**Status:** Target exceeded. **Explanation:** Participant rating: Data gathered at summer 2000 institutes showed 98 percent of new teacher participants rated the NWP program as good or excellent. The 2000 Inverness data collection found a higher percentage of good or excellent ratings than projected. In 2000, the NWP served over 100,000 teachers in 167 sites. Impact on Practice: A random sample of teachers from the summer 2000 institutes will be surveyed in 6/01 to measure impact on practice.	**Sources:** NWP Site Survey prepared by Inverness Research Associates. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* 6/01 (Impact on Practice), 10/01 (Participant Rating). *Date to be reported:* 11/01 (both). **Validation Procedure:** Inverness data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data developed; Inverness uses the NSF model for collection/verification. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data for impact on practice to be collected by Inverness in 6/01.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
1999:	95%*	91%#	75%		
2000:	**98% ***	**#**	**75%**		
2001:		#	90%		
2002:		#			
Impact on Practice					
1999:	No data available*	90% #	75%		
2000:	**Data Available by 8/15/01**	**#**	**75%**		
2001:		#			
2002:		#			
* Inverness data. # Voices in the Field survey, discontinued after 1999 and replaced by the Inverness surveys, which offer more objective, consistent methodology.					

Indicator 1.2 Improved student writing: Students taught by National Writing Project (NWP) teachers will show improved writing skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Writing Assessment			**Status:** Baseline established during pilot year. **Explanation:** Assessment in design phase during 1999, with first available data in fall 2000. Study documents a cohort of students annually using a pre-and post-assessment design. Data from first-year results show percent of students who reached 1) adequate or strong achievement for rhetorical effectiveness and 2) general or clear control of writing conventions by post-assessment. Data collected at 25 third- and fourth-grade classrooms at 25 sites in four states: Mississippi, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and California. At 17 of 25 sample sites, at least 50 percent of student population eligible for free or reduced lunch. Second-year data to be collected at 30 sites in five states (Mississippi, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, California, and Kentucky).	**Source:** Academy for Educational Development. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update*: 6/01. *Date to be reported:* 11/01. **Validation Procedure:** Data to be supplied by the Academy for Educational Development. Validation procedure to be determined. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Each year's assessment involves a new set of students, teachers, and sites. Assessment measures performance in persuasive writing, an exceptionally challenging skill for third- and fourth-graders, making targeting for a different cohort each time less certain. Sample size for the second-year assessment will increase to 30 sites (from 25).
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	No Data Available	No target set		
2000:	**3rd grade** **Rhetorical effectiveness 85%** **Conventions 66%** **4th grade** **Rhetorical effectiveness 96%** **Conventions 82%**	**Baseline established.**		
2001:		3rd grade Rhetorical effectiveness 75% Conventions 75% 4th grade Rhetorical effectiveness 75% Conventions 75%		
2002:				