



# Shared Writing Instructional Model (SWIM) Pilot Evaluation

# Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Introduction.....</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| Pilot Participants .....                                   | 3         |
| <b>Pilot Evaluation Questions .....</b>                    | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Pilot Evaluation Results.....</b>                       | <b>5</b>  |
| Acceptance .....   | 5         |
| Fidelity of Implementation.....                            | 10        |
| SWIM Implementation.....                                   | 12        |
| Pilot Outcomes.....  | 15        |
| Site Context.....  | 18        |
| <b>Conclusions and Next Steps.....</b>                     | <b>20</b> |
| Acceptance .....   | 20        |
| Fidelity.....  | 20        |
| Outcomes .....   | 21        |
| Site Context.....  | 22        |
| Next Steps.....  | 22        |
| <b>Appendix A: SWIM Intervention Design Materials.....</b> | <b>23</b> |
| SWIM Five-Step Instructional Routine.....                  | 23        |
| SWIM Pilot Implementation Plan.....                        | 24        |
| <b>Appendix B: SWIM Evaluation Instruments.....</b>        | <b>28</b> |
| SWIM Knowledge Test.....                                   | 28        |
| SWIM Data Collection.....                                  | 30        |
| <b>Appendix C: Supplemental Findings.....</b>              | <b>32</b> |
| SWIM Pilot Teacher Participation Summary .....             | 32        |
| Pilot Teacher Background Survey Results.....               | 33        |
| Week 3 SWIM Pilot Teacher Classroom Observations .....     | 34        |
| Week 6 SWIM Pilot Teacher Classroom Observations .....     | 35        |
| Week 8 SWIM Pilot Teacher Classroom Observations .....     | 36        |

# Introduction

The Shared Writing Instructional Model (SWIM) is a new approach to writing instruction designed to help students with intellectual disabilities meet challenging writing objectives aligned to grade-level content standards in grades 3-5 and improve English language arts (ELA) outcomes. The SWIM framework integrates a research-based learning map model of writing development; evidence-based practices for writing instruction for students with intellectual disabilities; and an online dashboard that teachers use while planning, delivering, and evaluating writing instruction in the context of Iowa's framework developed to support specially designed instruction (SDI) for students with disabilities.

The SWIM pilot took place in Johnston Community School District in Iowa from January 22 through March 11, 2020. The pilot was designed to implement and refine the SWIM model with a focus on the professional development and coaching components. The dashboard component of the intervention was not implemented during the pilot. The SWIM pilot professional development and coaching were designed to provide educators the knowledge and skills to deliver shared writing using the SWIM five-step instructional routine (see Appendix A). Pilot teachers received coaching to support fluency and fidelity in the implementation of the SWIM instructional sequence and to support learner engagement. The pilot professional development and coaching were specifically designed as abbreviated versions of the full intervention to allow opportunities for iteration and refinement throughout the pilot.

The SWIM pilot consisted of pre-pilot activities, a half-day professional development workshop, and individual teacher coaching. At the beginning of the pilot, teachers viewed pre-recorded webinars (approximately 90 minutes in total) with content designed to orient teachers to SWIM pilot activities and provide professional learning on shared reading and shared writing. Next, pilot teachers participated in a half-day professional development workshop that provided detailed learning on Iowa's Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) Framework, the SWIM instructional routine, and how to differentiate instruction based on student writing levels. Subsequent coaching was delivered for seven weeks in a variety of formats that included 1) virtual community of practice webinars; 2) weekly individual coaching sessions and lesson observations; and 3) district SWIM professional learning community (PLC) meetings. SWIM student assessments were introduced in the fourth week of the pilot.

## Pilot Participants

Johnston Community School District was selected as the SWIM pilot site as a result of their successful five-year participation in the State of Iowa's *Specially Designed Instruction-Literacy* OSEP funded State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). Several factors made Johnston Community School District an ideal pilot site to allow a deep exploration of the SWIM model in a supportive environment. These factors included knowledge of Iowa's SDI Framework, positive educator dispositions, a culture of continuous learning, knowledgeable and skilled paraprofessionals, and a system infrastructure to support the implementation of the SWIM pilot activities that included a supportive district administrator, teacher schedules that allowed for professional development time, and a history of literacy coaching for teachers.

Eight teachers from Johnston Community School District participated in the SWIM pilot. Seven teachers have a caseload of students in grades K-5, one teacher has students in grades 6-8<sup>1</sup>, and one teacher has students in grades K-5 and 6-8. Four of the teachers teach in self-contained classrooms with some integration in non-academic subjects (e.g., physical education, art, and recess); two teach in self-contained classrooms with integration in academic content areas, one teaches in a resource room setting, and one teaches in a separate school/facility for children with special health care needs.

The pilot participants have a range of years of experience teaching students with intellectual disabilities, ranging from less than five years to 20 or more years. Four teachers hold a bachelor’s degree, and four hold a master’s degree. Six hold Elementary Education certification, all eight hold certification in Strategist I and/or Strategist II, five hold certification in literacy/reading, three hold a certification in intellectual disabilities, one has a certification in behavioral disabilities, and one has certification in learning disabilities.

## Pilot Evaluation Questions

The pilot evaluation was designed to collect quantitative and qualitative data to address participants’ acceptance of the SWIM intervention, teachers’ fidelity implementing the SWIM intervention, teacher and student outcomes, and the influence of site context on SWIM implementation and outcomes. Table 1 shows the pilot evaluation questions and data sources for the evaluation.

Table 1  
*Pilot Evaluation Questions and Data Sources*

|            | Evaluation Question  | Data Sources   |
|------------|--|--|
| Acceptance | How do participants perceive the SWIM PD?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● PD evaluation survey</li> <li>● Participant focus group</li> </ul>  |
|            | How do participants perceive SWIM coaching?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Coaching satisfaction survey</li> <li>● Participant focus group</li> </ul>  |
|            | What are stakeholder (teachers, students, parents) reactions to the SWIM model and its impact on students? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Social validity survey</li> <li>● Participant focus group</li> <li>● Classroom observations</li> </ul>                                  |
| Fidelity   | Structural: To what extent do participants complete coaching activities as intended?                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participation in PD activities</li> <li>● Participant completion of action plans, video reflections, and student assessments</li> </ul> |

---

<sup>1</sup> This teacher was included in the pilot due to her experience as an SDI coach for teachers of grades 3-5, and because her 6<sup>th</sup> grade student was working on instructional targets in the same learning map as 5<sup>th</sup> graders.

|              | Evaluation Question  | Data Sources  |
|--------------|--|---|
|              | Engagement/educative: What evidence is there that PD and coaching contributed to teachers' learning to implement SWIM? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coaching logs</li> <li>• Coaching journal</li> <li>• Pilot teacher coaching summary</li> <li>• Participant focus group</li> </ul>            |
|              | SWIM implementation: To what extent do participants implement the SWIM intervention as intended?                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom observations</li> <li>• Review of teacher videos</li> </ul>  |
| Outcomes     | Does PD help teachers develop knowledge of the SWIM components?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWIM Knowledge pre/posttest</li> <li>• PD evaluation survey</li> </ul>   |
|              | What impact does the pilot SWIM have on teachers' design and delivery of writing instruction?                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom observations</li> <li>• Review of teacher videos</li> <li>• Participant focus group</li> </ul>                                     |
|              | What impact does the pilot SWIM have on student engagement during writing instruction?                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom observations</li> <li>• Review of teacher videos</li> <li>• Participant focus group</li> </ul>                                     |
|              | What impact does the pilot SWIM have on student mastery of writing?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom observations</li> <li>• Review of teacher videos</li> <li>• Participant focus group</li> <li>• SWIM student assessments</li> </ul> |
|              | What impact does the pilot SWIM have on student self-regulation?   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom observations</li> <li>• Review of teacher videos</li> <li>• Participant focus group</li> </ul>                                     |
| Site Context | How do site leadership teams plan for, adapt, and implement the SWIM model?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site implementation plan</li> <li>•</li> </ul>   |
|              | How does site context influence implementation fidelity and outcomes?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher background survey</li> <li>• Site implementation plan</li> </ul>   |

Seven teachers completed the professional development survey and the pre/post knowledge test, all eight teachers completed the coaching satisfaction and social validity surveys, and four teachers participated in the focus group at the end of the pilot.

## Pilot Evaluation Results

### Acceptance

Stakeholder acceptance of the SWIM pilot was evaluated by collecting formative data throughout the pilot and summative data at the end of the pilot. Quantitative data on teachers' perceptions were collected via a Professional Development (PD) Evaluation Survey, Coaching Satisfaction Survey, and Social Validity Survey. Qualitative data were collected via open-ended items on the surveys, as well as coaching logs and reflections, classroom observation protocol, and a teacher focus group conducted on March 11, 2020, with four of the pilot teachers.

## How Do Participants Perceive the SWIM PD?

Seven teachers attended the half-day PD on January 22, 2020, and completed a survey to evaluate the session. All teachers gave “good” or “excellent” ratings to the content of the PD, the activities that were conducted with the group, the presenter, and the resources that were provided. Table 2 provides additional results from the survey. Many teachers believed that more time for the PD would have been helpful.

Table 2  
*Half-Day Professional Development Evaluation Survey*

| Statement  | Strongly Disagree % (N) | Disagree % (N) | Agree % (N) | Strongly Agree % (N) |
|--|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------|
| The objective(s) were clearly communicated.  | 14.3 (1)                | 0              | 14.3 (1)    | 71.4 (5)             |
| The objective(s) were met.   | 14.3 (1)                | 0              | 28.6 (2)    | 57.1 (4)             |
| The overall amount of time allocated for the PD was sufficient.  | 14.3 (1)                | 42.8 (3)       | 28.6 (2)    | 14.3 (1)             |
| The amount of time allocated for discussion and participant interaction was sufficient.                                      | 14.3 (1)                | 14.3 (1)       | 57.1 (4)    | 14.3 (1)             |
| A variety of adult learning strategies were used (e.g., introduction, illustration, practice, and reflection opportunities). | 14.3 (1)                | 0              | 42.8 (3)    | 42.8 (3)             |
| The content was important for my work with students with significant cognitive disabilities.                                 | 14.3 (1)                | 0              | 14.3 (1)    | 71.4 (5)             |
| Participating in the PD was worth my time and effort.  | 14.3 (1)                | 0              | 14.3 (1)    | 71.4 (5)             |
| Participating in the SWIM webinars before the half-day workshop supported my learning.                                       | 14.3 (1)                | 0              | 42.8 (3)    | 42.8 (3)             |
| I intend to apply what I learned in the PD to my professional practice.  | 14.3 (1)                | 0              | 28.6 (2)    | 57.1 (4)             |

Pilot teachers participating in the focus group commented on the extent to which the half-day PD prepared them for implementing SWIM. All of the teachers felt that the PD provided a good overview, but that it would have been helpful if the PD included example model lessons so that they could see how SWIM is implemented in practice. Some of the teachers felt it was difficult to get into the daily routines of implementing the SWIM sequence, but became much more comfortable over time through discussions with the coach and the other pilot teachers.

*I think I felt pretty comfortable with the entire thing at first because I'm thinking, okay, I did First Author, it's kind of similar to First Author. Okay, I've got a pretty good grip for that. But then it was just really getting into the day to day routines in the sequence. And then I think the biggest thing that helped wasn't necessarily the PD.*

*I think maybe more examples would have been helpful because I felt actually pretty comfortable with it, leaving the training. We only had kind of a broad overview. I'm like, "Okay, I'm kind of doing this already." But then when I actually sat down to do it, I'm like "aah!" I was very happy to have someone else in my building who was also doing it. So that way we could talk about ideas and what it meant to them, what it meant to me. And then as I got into it, I understood it more and more. But at the beginning it was hard understanding what each step meant and how to represent it.*

*I feel like it may have been nice to physically see the actual process in action. For [the coach] to explain it was great, but I felt the same way, like "Okay, I got this, I can do this." And then all of a sudden sit down to do it. I'm like, "I don't know what I'm doing."*

*It didn't go so well. So, I was unsure of myself at the beginning and I was like, "Get into this, let's get started." And then as we had talked, that very first Zoom that we all chatted through things, I was like, "Okay, it's not as hard as what I am making it out to be." So physically seeing that process behind it would be helpful. And less overwhelming.*

### How Do Participants Perceive SWIM Coaching?

The SWIM Coach provided one coaching session per week following a lesson observation. Coaching sessions included debriefing of lessons, discussion of next steps, and needed resources. Pilot participants completed a Coaching Satisfaction Survey at the end of the pilot. All responding participants slightly or strongly agreed that the coaching was valuable and helped them implement SWIM. Six teachers felt that the number of coaching sessions was about right, while two felt they were too many. All but one of the respondents felt that the length of coaching sessions was about right, while one felt they were too short.

Table 3  
Coaching Satisfaction Survey

| Statement  | Strongly Disagree<br>% (N) | Disagree<br>% (N) | Slightly Agree<br>% (N) | Strongly Agree<br>% (N) |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| I felt prepared for each coaching session.   | 0                          | 0                 | 25 (2)                  | 75 (6)                  |
| The coaching conversations addressed my needs and questions.                                   | 0                          | 0                 | 0                       | 100 (8)                 |
| I knew what my goals were for each coaching conversation.                                      | 0                          | 0                 | 37.5 (3)                | 62.5 (5)                |
| The coach understood my goals.   | 0                          | 0                 | 12.5 (1)                | 87.5 (7)                |
| The coach gave me new ideas about how to use SWIM strategies.                                  | 0                          | 0                 | 0                       | 100 (8)                 |
| Reflecting on my teaching videos helped me identify ways I was using the SWIM strategies well. | 0                          | 0                 | 37.5 (3)                | 62.5 (5)                |
| The PLC time spent on peer review of videos was helpful.                                       | 0                          | 0                 | 50 (4)                  | 50 (4)                  |

| Statement   | Strongly Disagree<br>% (N) | Disagree<br>% (N) | Slightly Agree<br>% (N) | Strongly Agree<br>% (N) |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| The coach helped me differentiate instruction for my student(s).    | 0                          | 0                 | 25 (2)                  | 75 (6)                  |
| Working with the coach helped me implement SWIM in my classroom.    | 0                          | 0                 | 0                       | 100 (8)                 |
| I was able to trust the coach.                                      | 0                          | 0                 | 0                       | 100 (8)                 |
| The coach's feedback helped me improve my students' writing skills. | 0                          | 0                 | 0                       | 100 (8)                 |
| Statement   | Too Few/<br>Too Short      | About Right       |                         | Too Many/<br>Too Long   |
| The number of coaching sessions was:                                | 0                          | 75 (6)            |                         | 25 (2)                  |
| The length of the coaching sessions was:                            | 12.5 (1)                   | 87.5 (7)          |                         | 0                       |

In the survey, teachers were asked to describe what worked particularly well in the SWIM coaching. The teachers felt that the coaching provided resources, new ideas, and validation as they were implementing SWIM. For example:

*Discussing what I was doing for each step, having the coach validate what I was doing, and then making suggestions for improving or enhancing my instruction.*

*I feel that [the coach]'s knowledge of the writing process for our students was great. She was able to make suggestions for us as she saw our students. She was a fresh set of eyes to look at our students and give us new ideas to work with them on or with. She was also open to discuss our struggles with us as my student is struggling between two schools so this has made his improvement slower but she helped provide ideas to support him at both of his schools.*

*The help from the coach to make the sequence fit for my student. I was really struggling with a specific step in the SWIM sequence and she helped me to put it in a different way to meet the needs of my student.*

Teachers were also asked to describe how the coaching could be improved. Two of the teachers felt that weekly coaching might not be necessary and that individual teachers and their coach should discuss and mutually decide the amount of support that is needed. Other suggestions included having the coach model the use of instructional strategies, co-teach lessons, and watch instructional videos together.

During the focus group, teachers provided additional feedback about the SWIM coaching. Overall, the teachers felt very comfortable with the coach and they appreciated the dedicated time to reflect on their instruction and discuss strategies for differentiating the SWIM instructional strategies to meet individual student needs. The pilot teachers also appreciated that the coach knew their topic and brought them many resources specific to their situation.

*The PD kind of explained the overall picture. But then, it was having those coaching conversations with [the SWIM coach] to break it down into steps. And it doesn't have to*

*be so broad. Bring it down to their level. And just those conversations about the steps. And just, "Okay this is what I did, this is what the... this is what I saw." And just those reflection pieces actually were the bigger things that meant more to me than the PD.*

*What I really appreciated was, she knew kind of what my topic was. And so the next time we met she'd bring in things to kind of help, go along with it. Or even one time, I told her, "This is the area I'm struggling with." I think it was a step four. And so she's like, "Okay, tomorrow I'm going to send you some things that might help you with this." And she did. And it was very, very helpful. So I thought that coaching was probably the best part of it because she was able to give you things and send things and offer you ideas and they were very helpful.*

*I thought it was also good just having that time each week that... That dedicated time and it's like, "Okay." And then we could talk about it, and talk about issues or ideas or just springboarding ideas too sometimes. And yeah, she would come in with some resources, "Here, let me show you this that I found." It was very helpful so I appreciated it.*

*Her resources that she provided and just her knowledge of like, "You know, we could really change it here and make it work for them" was huge. . . She was just encouraging of, "It's okay to make that modification. That's what he needs right now." So that was helpful.*

## What Are Stakeholder (Teachers, Students, Parents) Reactions to the SWIM Model and Its Impact on Students?

Participating teachers completed a social validity survey at the end of the pilot. All responding teachers agreed or strongly agreed to five of the six survey statements, indicating that they believed that SWIM is feasible, added value to their writing instruction, and that they would recommend the model to other teachers. All but one responding teacher indicated that SWIM improved their students' writing skills, while one was not sure.

Table 4  
Social Validity Survey

| Statement   | Strongly Disagree<br>% (N) | Disagree<br>% (N) | Agree<br>% (N) | Strongly Agree<br>% (N) | Not Sure |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------|
| The SWIM model improved my students' writing skills.                    | 0                          | 0                 | 62.5 (5)       | 25.0 (2)                | 12.5 (1) |
| I would recommend the SWIM model to other teachers.                     | 0                          | 0                 | 37.5 (3)       | 62.5 (5)                | 0        |
| The SWIM routine is feasible to implement in my classroom.              | 0                          | 0                 | 50.0 (4)       | 50.0 (4)                | 0        |
| The total time required to implement the SWIM procedures is manageable. | 0                          | 0                 | 62.5 (5)       | 37.5 (3)                | 0        |
| The SWIM system easily fits in with my current practices.               | 0                          | 0                 | 50.0 (4)       | 50.0 (4)                | 0        |
| I understand the procedures for the SWIM model.                         | 0                          | 0                 | 50.0 (4)       | 50.0 (4)                | 0        |

During the focus group, one teacher described the benefits of the SWIM model:

*[In previous writing instruction] they [students] didn't have a lot of that guided instruction with multiple steps. So that's what I liked different about the SWIM sequence is having those steps and breaking it down into smaller steps. So easier for them to manage and easier for them to learn.*

A few teachers also described parents' reactions to the SWIM model:

*. . . at conference time, I was able to kind of bring out some of the things that we were working on, and I kind of explained it in more detail with them in person during our conference time. And yeah, both parents were very receptive and excited about it and they're definitely on board. So yeah, it was good.*

*Mine [parents] were impressed too. It's like I had one parent that's like, "Oh, I can't believe she's doing that." It's like, yeah. So just kind of impressed with the work that she's been doing and others are just curious about the sequence. And so I just kind of explained it out and they're like, "Oh, okay, well that makes sense."*

*. . . I shared one of the [writing] pieces at conferences with my parent and she was like, "that's really cool. She did this for how long?"*

The teachers also described students' reactions to the SWIM model, which are summarized later in this report in the section on student outcomes.

## Fidelity of Implementation

Fidelity of implementation was evaluated in the SWIM pilot by reviewing participation in professional development activities; reviewing completion of teacher action plans, coaching logs, and weekly data collection forms; and conducting classroom observations.

### Participation

As shown in Table 5, all pilot teachers fully participated in the pre-pilot activities, the half-day PD workshop, and the community of practice PLC; however, participation in the community of practice webinars was limited. Teachers shared during the focus group that they prefer meeting in person and sometimes don't feel comfortable talking in an online environment. The SWIM Pilot Teacher Participation Summary in Appendix C summarizes participation for each pilot teacher. Two of the pilot teachers did not complete the last two weeks of the pilot due to personal circumstances.

Table 5  
*Participation in Pilot Professional Development Activities*

| Pilot Week | Pilot Activity                  | Participation  |
|------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 0          | Pre-pilot videos and activities | Honor system for teachers to complete Pre-Pilot Activities<br>All teachers self-reported completing the webinar<br>All teachers completed the remaining pre-pilot activities |
| 1          | 1/22 Half-day workshop          | Seven teachers attended in person; one worked with SWIM coach to make-up   |

| Pilot Week | Pilot Activity                     | Participation                                 |
|------------|------------------------------------|---|
| 2          | 1/27 community of practice webinar | Most teachers attended (attendance not taken) |
| 3          |                                    |   |
| 4          | 2/10 community of practice webinar | Few teachers attended (attendance not taken)  |
| 5          | 2/17 community of practice webinar | Few teachers attended (attendance not taken)  |
| 6          | 2/27 community of practice PLC     | All teachers attended                         |
| 7          |                                    |   |
| 8          |                                    |   |

### Teacher Action Plans

As shown in Table 6, teachers' completion of the weekly teacher action plans varied. Based on teacher feedback, we discovered that the design of the action plan didn't align well with the implementation of the SWIM sequence over multiple days of the week. Teachers had difficulty finding the sections of the action plan to complete. During the focus group, teachers shared that they had difficulty keeping track of what forms they needed to fill out and that having separate forms by week would have been easier.

Table 6  
*Completion of Teacher Action Plans*

| Pilot Teacher | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | Week 5 | Week 6 | Week 7 |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| P001          | x      | x      | x      | x      | x      | x      | x      |
| P002          |        |        |        | x      |        |        |        |
| P003          | x      |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| P004          | x      | x      | x      | x      |        |        | x      |
| P005          | x      |        |        | x      |        |        | x      |
| P006          | x      |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| P007          | x      |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| P008          |        |        | x      |        |        |        |        |

### Teacher Video Reflections

Pilot teachers were asked to complete three video reflections during weeks 3, 5, and 7 of the pilot. As shown in Table 7, one teacher completed three, two teachers completed two, three teachers completed one, and two did not complete any video reflections. Teachers reported not having enough time to complete the video reflections during the pilot. During the focus group, some of the teachers also reported feeling self-conscious about critiquing their own work.

Table 7

Completion of Video Reflections

| Pilot Teacher | Week 3 | Week 5 | Week 7 |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|
| P001          | x      | x      | x      |
| P002          | x      |        |        |
| P003          |        |        |        |
| P004          | x      |        | x      |
| P005          | x      | x      |        |
| P006          |        | x      |        |
| P007          | x      |        |        |
| P008          |        |        |        |

## SWIM Implementation

During the focus group, teachers commented on their ability and comfort level implementing SWIM throughout the pilot. The teachers felt it was somewhat of a struggle in the beginning but working with the coach and talking to other teachers helped greatly.

*Once I got into it and I figured out how the routine was going to work for me and how to divide it up over the course of the days and working to engage the kiddos, it didn't feel worrisome. It actually felt like aha and it became more clear for me. And then my associates have also said they have more of a better idea about what we're doing for writing. And then they were able to help the students more with the process. So it became more of a more clarifying using the steps.*

*. . . we were all kind of confused in the beginning of what the expectation was from us and what we were actually doing...Cause I think us physically seeing the process and doing it helped us tremendously and we're like, this isn't as hard as what we were thinking it was.*

*. . . I was happy to have someone to talk about it with. I mean I wish maybe we had been able to have more time to talk about what we're each doing in our own classrooms and... Because I had [the SWIM coach] who would bring up ideas like, "Oh, this person is doing this. Maybe that would work for your students too". And I, "Yeah, it's a great idea." So it would have been more helpful to have more examples or more ideas of other people doing it as well.*

*. . . I also have the struggle of, I only see him for 45 minutes, and then he goes to a different school. So it's hard. And the gen ed teacher is not the best at accommodating for him.*

The teachers pointed out that one of the difficulties in implementing the SWIM model was the fact that they could only complete one or two of the SWIM sequence steps in a single lesson. Teachers said that it took a long time to get through the sequence because they had to review prior steps or sometimes restart the sequence the next day:

*. . . for her to recall what we did the day before is very difficult. So if I only got through steps one and two on one day, which happens, I have to restart the next time. So I don't think she understood it except a couple of times we did get through all five but it was boom-boom-boom-boom, and so fast that I don't know if she even knew that we were doing a certain step sequence.*

*It's like we get it done and the next day is a new day. I have to start back over with her.*

*. . . It just took us a very long time to get through all of the steps. And so sometimes it would drag on for several days, just one step. And so it just, it's hard to see if you can move a little bit faster.*

*So I kind of have to go all the way back and okay, this is what we picked, we set our purpose that we want to answer these questions as we're doing our writing and let's keep finding our information as we've been reading. And so revisiting for him is something that has to be done so, or we're going nowhere.*

However, one teacher described being able to quickly review what was covered in the previous lesson and move on to subsequent steps in the model:

*So we'd just kind of review our steps on how we got to that certain point. So we would just kind of every day, "all right, we picked our topic, we talked about it, now we're going to do this." And just reviewing that. And some of my friends were able to finish the sentences for me as I would. We picked our, and they would, "we picked bubbles!" Okay, we have your topic. So, some of my friends could do it and get it really well. It just depends on communication, to see how they really understood.*

One of the teachers felt that her implementation was hindered by her lack of knowledge of foundational literacy skills:

*. . . having a better understanding about teaching those foundational skills to students who can't make the letter sounds and can't provide you with feedback, I think would help me with teaching more of those foundational skills that go along with reading and writing. So that's just, that's my challenge too. So it's not so much the kids' challenge, but it's how to, how to instruct them and provide the best instruction to them. So that's me that I need to figure out.*

## Implementation of SWIM Student Assessments

Starting in week 4 of the pilot, teachers were asked to complete SWIM student assessments to measure students' writing performance. An example assessment form for the K-2 transitional level is included in Appendix B. Only one teacher completed student assessments for all four weeks, one teacher completed the assessment for one week, and four teachers did not complete any student assessments. Because the SWIM assessments were introduced later in the pilot, we believe this contributed to a lack

of use and potential misunderstanding about how formative assessment goals/success criteria fit into SWIM instruction. Teachers who did use the SWIM student assessments used them in a summative manner after completing the SWIM sequence rather than as a formative assessment during the implementation of the sequence to help guide instruction.

During the focus group, teachers discussed the idea of creating a rubric around the SWIM sequence that is tailored to students’ writing levels and could be aligned to the emergent, transitional, and conventional levels in the SWIM model. The teachers also thought that the rubric should take into account previous exposure to writing instruction and the students’ physical abilities.

**Structural: To What Extent Do Participants Complete Coaching Activities as Intended?**

The pilot teachers participated in an average of 4.5 coaching sessions over the eight-week pilot, with a range of 3 to 6 coaching sessions per teacher. Some of the scheduled coaching sessions did not occur due to teacher absences. One teacher (P008) did not obtain student consent until late and did not express interest in implementing SWIM in the last two weeks of the pilot.

Table 8  
*Coaching Sessions*

| Pilot Teacher | Week 3 | Week 4 | Week 5 | Week 6 | Week 7 | Week 8 | Total Number of Sessions |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------------------------|
| P001          | x      | x      | x      |        | x      |        | 4                        |
| P002          | x      | x      | x      |        | x      |        | 4                        |
| P003          | x      | x      | x      |        |        |        | 3                        |
| P004          | x      | x      | x      |        | x      | x      | 5                        |
| P005          | x      | x      | x      | x      | x      | x      | 6                        |
| P006          | x      | x      | x      | x      | x      | x      | 6                        |
| P007          | x      | x      | x      | x      |        |        | 4                        |
| P008          | x      | x      | x      | x      |        |        | 4                        |

**What Evidence is There that PD and Coaching Contributed to Teachers’ Learning to Implement SWIM and to What Extent Do Participants Implement the SWIM Intervention as Intended?**

A classroom observation protocol was developed to measure teachers’ implementation of SWIM throughout the pilot. Project staff were trained to use the observation protocol (included in Appendix B) and had an opportunity to practice on teacher videos collected by teachers and the SWIM coach. Members of the evaluation team conducted on-site visits during weeks 6 (February 26-27, 2020) and 8

(March 9-10, 2020) to observe teachers during writing instruction. One or two members of the evaluation team visited each teacher and documented the implementation of each step of the SWIM sequence observed during the lesson. Observers debriefed after each lesson to compare observations. All lessons during weeks 3, 6, and 8 were also videotaped. ATLAS staff with expertise in writing instruction and the SWIM sequence reviewed each video and wrote summaries of the lesson, including the following:

- Number of students in the lesson
- Number of aides/paraprofessionals
- What steps in the SWIM sequence do the teachers reference covering in prior lessons?
- What steps in the SWIM sequence are directly observable in this lesson, and are teachers covering the steps as intended?
- What parts of the SWIM sequence did this teacher do well, and why?
- Are there any gaps in the SWIM sequence (did the teacher miss or misrepresent any parts)?
- Your overall evaluation of the lesson and what you would suggest if you were this teacher's coach

The summaries were cross-referenced with coaching logs and reflections to evaluate the extent to which coaching contributed to participants' ability to implement SWIM. Appendix C includes tables displaying the teachers' implementation of the SWIM sequence during the observed lessons in weeks 3, 6, and 8 of the pilot. These tables show variability across teachers in the SWIM steps and sub-steps that were implemented. Some teachers focused on only a few steps or sub-steps in a lesson, while others were able to move through more of the steps during a lesson. In many cases, we observed teachers implementing the SWIM steps that were the foci of prior weeks' coaching, showing evidence that coaching helped teachers implement SWIM.

## Pilot Outcomes

### Does PD Help Teachers Develop Knowledge of the SWIM Components?

Participating teachers completed a ten-item SWIM Knowledge Test before participating in the half-day PD (pre-test) and again at the end of the PD session (post-test). The Knowledge Test is included in Appendix B. The mean scores on the pretest and posttest were 5.43 (sd = 0.98) and 7.43 (sd = 0.98) respectively, showing a two-point gain.

After participating in the PD, all seven teachers rated their knowledge of each of the following as average, above average, and excellent: shared reading, shared writing, how shared reading and writing go together, SWIM Pilot Overview, and the SWIM Pilot PD. All seven teachers indicated that they would require either some degree or a minimal amount of additional support and training to implement the skills, strategies, and content learned in the PD. Teachers listed the following as areas where they would like additional support: developing lesson plans and becoming familiar with the flow of the lessons.

## What Impact Does the Pilot SWIM Have on Teachers' Design and Delivery of Writing Instruction?

When asked during the focus group to describe how SWIM impacted their writing instruction, teachers described how the pilot changed their views about the process of writing and the focus of writing (communicating ideas rather than just writing production):

*. . . it made me think differently, like the SWIM sequence made me think differently about writing. Just about the different process of writing. Some of the instruction on my end, I don't feel changed, but how I thought about it and approached it in my mind changed but, I really still get hung up on steps three and four because that's where I saw the shift. How do you, how do you plan for writing?*

*. . . before it was like, well, they're communicating an idea. Okay, but now we want to focus on how all that ties together. You can still acknowledge the other ideas, but like, well... you know, because that's one thing I did ask [the coach]. I'm like, "What do you do with those comments that they make that has nothing to do with the topic that they wanted to write about?" She's like, well, you're trying to focus in on the topic. Not yes, it's communication, but let's see what they really know what they can really tell you. So that's where I had to do a little shift.*

*Like I would just be happy if they shared a thought and so I would usually present a topic and whatever they would say, I'd be like, yay, you said something. You know? And yeah, it doesn't necessarily always relate to the specific topic, but my writing probably changed quite a bit. I guess we did more like topic writing. Like we'd write about a topic and we'd work on sentence frames and spelling and putting sounds to words... So my teaching changed a lot because we've moved more from just random topics to more themes. And that's changed a lot. And I like it a lot better with themes. There's so many different ways you can go with a theme, you can write about this and then move into this, and then move into this and we're able to spend more time developing ideas on an overall theme instead of just specific topics.*

*I had been really focused on like him producing some type of writing and then the more that I thought about it, he is kind of producing that writing when he's giving us those ideas and those articulate sentences. So for us to take that weight off of focusing on how is that letter going to look, where should it be on the line, how am I going to spell that word? Just getting more of the ideas down. It felt different and weird, but he's able to articulate an idea about something. So he's able to produce some type of writing or piece of something to be able to express his idea. And that's what we're looking for.*

The interactions with teachers through coaching and classroom observations revealed that teachers' prior knowledge of student writing levels impacted their ability to implement SWIM with fidelity. While descriptions of the three levels of writing (emergent, transitional, and conventional) were provided in the professional development, some teachers assigned writing levels that did not match their students' abilities, thus teaching outside of these students' zone of proximal development (either too low or too high). Because the PD was abbreviated, the teachers were not provided with guidance to help them

assess the writing levels of their students. In addition, some of the teachers did not have enough knowledge of how to teach foundational reading skills which are the foundation for writing.

## What Impact Does the Pilot SWIM Have on Student Engagement During Writing Instruction?

## What Impact Does the Pilot SWIM Have on Student Mastery of Writing?

Due to the short duration of the pilot, there were no formal measures of student engagement during writing instruction. Student mastery of writing was measured by the SWIM student assessments, and there is some evidence of student growth based on one teacher's use of the assessment during the last four weeks of the pilot.

During the focus group, the teachers described the impact of SWIM on their students' engagement and achievement in writing:

*I'm seeing more tying the letters and sounds to the word. And so we're starting to see them beginning to write more words that we can actually tell what the word is, if we weren't able to be right there. So seeing that process and seeing that emerge for some of our writers is really neat.*

*So I do think like the SWIM sequence did help her get out more of those thoughts. But sometimes it took 20 minutes to process those thoughts and we would get like three ideas out for her. I was never able to do the different types of writing with her because we aren't ready for that yet. But I did, you know the day that when you came, and then same with the other day, she was engaged like 20-25 minutes, which doesn't always happen. And those were like fantastic, fantastic days where we got to see more than what I've seen earlier in the year.*

*I'd say I was surprised with my kiddo because he is one that has to process through everything and it's an extended period of time to process as well, and he was able to actually articulate about the topic that we were writing about. And he was really excited and things I didn't know he knew were coming out. And so it was an interesting turn because he has never been that excited about writing, even if he picks his topic. So it was a good change of things for him to see some pictures behind what his thought process was and be able to articulate it also.*

*. . . I feel like he relaxed more when he was only having to articulate the idea and I was the one doing the heavy lifting for him.*

*I think that [students] find that the funnest part about writing is coming up with the ideas and talking about it. But when you go, okay, now we need to actually write and let's use letters. And it's like, [disappointed tone:] oh.*

One of the pilot teachers completed the SWIM student assessments for the last four weeks of the pilot and the findings (included in Appendix C) show some evidence of student growth. Student A went from achieving one out of four success criteria in week 4 to three out of four success criteria in week 8. This student also went from low engagement to moderate engagement. Student B went from achieving two

out of four success criteria in week 4 to three out of four success criteria in week 8 but was inconsistent in the level of engagement.

### What Impact Does the Pilot SWIM Have on Student Self-Regulation?

Due to the short duration of the pilot, there were no formal measures of student self-regulation during writing instruction. Student self-regulation strategies are built into each of the SWIM sequence steps; however, the abbreviated SWIMPD did not specifically focus on this aspect of implementation.

During the focus group, one pilot teacher shared that she did not see evidence of her students' self-regulation:

*I would say for the students, I did it with, they probably were not aware the different steps or know the steps that we followed.*

While we did not collect evidence regarding students' self-regulation, three teachers shared experiences of their students engaging in some metacognitive strategies related to the writing process:

*We actually, really working on the thought process and then tying it into a graphic organizer and organizing and planning for writing and then using those ideas and pairing it with core words to put those ideas into sentences.*

*"So, how are you going to write about it?" "I'm just going to put how I think it was made." So then at the beginning of the pilot, we actually found a book that was at his level to be able to articulate how to make peanut butter. And so then we wrote about it and the process and he actually did pretty good.*

*And we've gone through and we've made a list of things that we can write about different things that we know about, that we're expert in. And he still will go and say, "No, don't, don't know anything about those. I'm going to write about this.*

While not direct evidence of students engaging in specific self-regulation strategies, these potentially illustrate teachers beginning to think about strategies as being part of writing instruction. Subsequent iterations will include additional professional development on this subject and teacher ratings of student self-regulation during writing.

### Site Context

#### How Do Site Leadership Teams Plan for, Adapt, and Implement the SWIM Model?

In the SWIM Pilot, the planning and implementation of the SWIM model took place by communicating directly with the Johnston Community School District Special Education Director. Other district administrators were not involved in planning and implementation but were sent communications about the pilot.

#### How Does Site Context Influence Implementation Fidelity and Outcomes?

The SWIM Pilot Implementation Plan (in Appendix A) lists factors related to the site context that we believe impacted implementation and outcomes, based on documentation and reflection by the SWIM coach. Table 9 notes and describes these factors.

Table 9

*General Site Context that Impacted SWIM Pilot Implementation and Outcomes*

| Context Factor   | Description  |
|--|--|
| Planning time for instruction  | Not all teachers had a planning period. SWIM requires more planning time (materials, lessons over time) than typical writing instruction.  |
| Time for writing instruction   | Teachers had limited time for writing instruction, and mostly implemented SWIM during “SDI time” or IEP goal instruction (sometimes only 15 minutes).  |
| Service delivery model   | Teachers in self-contained settings had more time to teach writing compared to teachers whose students were served in less restrictive environments.   |
| Student attendance   | Some pilot students were not able to attend school due to medical or health concerns. At one of the pilot sites (a residential care facility), students were not able to attend school if a certain percentage of the general population of students missed school due to illness. This is due to the primary medical needs of this facility’s students.   |
| Curriculum and instruction   | There was not a strong match between the instructional approach and materials needed for students to access and make progress in the Iowa Core. Teachers relied heavily on paper/pencil and did not have a curriculum nor curriculum support.  |
| Participation in SDI grant   | Some teachers participated in the SDI grant, while others did not. Non-participants were limited in their knowledge of how to apply shared reading language strategies to elicit student responses during SWIM instruction.  |
| Language systems and communication supports  | Students who were context-dependent communicators had no language systems or communication supports to build receptive language understanding (knowing what the teacher is asking), idea generation, or expressive communication (saying what they want to say).   |
| Availability of Knowledgeable and skilled paraprofessionals                                  | Students who were supported by paraprofessionals who understood student language systems and communication supports were more engaged and able to communicate and generate ideas during SWIM.  |
| Alignment to Iowa Early Literacy Alternate Assessment, DLM writing assessments and IEP goals | There was alignment between the Iowa Early Literacy Alternate Assessment and DLM writing assessments; however, teachers did not indicate they were comparing or using SWIM assessments, DLM, or Iowa Early Literacy Alternate Assessment results to design or drive instruction. Teachers also indicated that IEP goals were written for skills not aligned to the standards/essential elements or the SWIM writing process. |
| Leadership   | There was no direct communication with district leadership, only with the Special Education Director.  |

The pilot teacher focus group provided additional evidence regarding the impact of the SDI grant as well as the alignment between SWIM and students’ IEP goals. During the focus group, pilot teachers discussed the extent to which participating in the SDI grant facilitated their implementation of SWIM:

*Well I think [P004] and I ate, slept, everything SDI the last three years. So I guess going into this I felt pretty confident. I understood more the background and I think that was an advantage of being a part of that. Where I could see all the pieces aligning. But some of our teachers have just started the SDI process and digging into the framework. So I*

*could see where that would be a little bit more complex for them to see how it all ties together. If you don't have the background on the SDI framework.*

*I think having the SDI is just a better practice of just reviewing and looking at data and just knowing by [inaudible]. Just kind of that cycle of learning. But I think you probably could do it without having in-depth knowledge about SDI. But then when you talk about SWIM and you relate it to the SDI, we're like, "Oh yeah. Yeah."*

Teachers also mentioned that there was a lack of alignment between SWIM and their students' current writing goals in their IEP. One teacher stated,

*You know, right now mine aren't really very connected. All my students have writing goals but they aren't really connected to my DLM assessments. They're not really connected to my SWIM sequence. So I think in the future I'd like to find a way to tie it more to that. Right now their writing goals are more on letter formation and things like that, as opposed to forming ideas and writing about topics. And so I think, especially as they get to be better writers too, you can move more towards something that matches this a little bit better.*

## Conclusions and Next Steps

Based on the results of the SWIM pilot evaluation, we have initial evidence regarding stakeholder acceptance of the intervention, the extent to which teachers can implement SWIM as intended, and teacher and student outcomes. The evaluation also revealed site context factors that either support or potentially hinder SWIM's implementation and outcomes. The following section presents the major findings and lessons learned in each area of the evaluation, and how these are being addressed in the next phase of SWIM implementation.

### Acceptance

Pilot teachers were unanimous in their belief that SWIM is a worthwhile intervention and has promise for improving students' writing instruction and achievement. There is some early indication that parents and students also have positive reactions to SWIM. The pilot teachers felt that the initial professional development provided a good overview but could be improved by adding more time and including model lessons so that teachers can observe the SWIM sequence in action. The pilot teachers felt that the coaching was very valuable in helping them implement SWIM. To improve the coaching, teachers suggested that each teacher discuss and mutually decide the amount of support that is needed and that the coach offered to model the use of instructional strategies, co-teach lessons, and/or watch instructional videos with teachers.

### Fidelity

Despite pilot teachers' acceptance of SWIM and their willingness to participate, some components of the pilot intervention were not completed by all teachers. Participation in the online community of practice webinars was limited, and many teachers did not complete the teacher action plans, video reflections, and student formative assessments. Five pilot teachers participated in all scheduled coaching sessions. Two pilot teachers did not participate in all scheduled coaching sessions due to

medical and family leave and one pilot teacher did not participate in all scheduled coaching sessions due to student absenteeism.

The online community of practice webinars were held during contract hours and many teachers were not able to attend due to other responsibilities such as IEPs or building meetings. Teachers completed some but not all sections of the teacher action plans, such as the video reflection sections. Many teachers indicated that they did not have time to complete all of the activities. The SWIM formative assessments were not introduced until the fourth week of the pilot which contributed to a lack of completion and lack of understanding of how to incorporate these into their SWIM lessons.

Overall, throughout the pilot teachers made substantial progress in their implementation of SWIM and provided valuable feedback on the SWIM sequence and how it can be improved to better serve teachers and students. The most salient findings from the evaluation regarding teachers' fidelity of implementation include the following:

- Teachers cannot get through the entire sequence in one lesson and often must re-start at the beginning.
- Steps 1 & 2 of the SWIM sequence (Choose a Topic and Communicate about the Topic and Purpose) took up most of the teachers' writing instruction. These steps were substantially different from teachers' prior writing instruction. Once the teachers became comfortable with these steps they were successful in implementing them.
- The most challenging step for teachers was Step 3: Plan for Writing. The majority of the teachers did not know how to teach informative and explanatory writing (e.g., text structures).

## Outcomes

The pilot evaluation provides evidence that teachers gained knowledge about the SWIM intervention. There was a significant increase in the average score on the SWIM knowledge test from pretest to posttest, showing that teachers gained knowledge about the SWIM intervention as a result of the half-day professional development.

The SWIM pilot also showed an impact on teachers' design and delivery of writing instruction. While prior writing instruction was primarily skill-based, we observed teachers focusing more on Iowa Core Standards and DLM Essential Elements and the writing process. In addition, teachers made a shift from focusing on writing production to working with their students on idea generation. Teachers also started to focus more on topics or themes rather than capturing any ideas their students generated. Finally, we saw teachers incorporating more technology into their writing instruction, moving away from pen/pencil to using adapted keyboards and digital graphic organizers. Throughout the pilot, teachers came to understand that it is not necessary to implement the SWIM sequence in lockstep; rather they can have the freedom to adapt it according to their comfort level as well as their students' individual writing goals and learning needs. As a result, the pilot teachers reported greater enjoyment in teaching writing and are looking forward to teaching different types of writing.

Based on teachers' self-report, there is some evidence that SWIM had an impact on students' engagement and self-regulation in writing instruction. They also described better and more sustained student engagement but noted that many of their students still struggle in writing production. One of

the most important outcomes was that students felt that their ideas matter and that others can help them share their ideas.

## Site Context

Several factors impacted the implementation of the SWIM pilot. Factors facilitating implementation included a supportive district administrator, teacher schedules that allowed for professional development time, a history of literacy coaching for teachers, and the teachers' mindset of continuous student improvement. The most salient factors hindering implementation included a lack of time for instructional planning, teachers' varying levels of understanding of shared reading strategies to support shared writing, and teachers' familiarity with language systems and communication supports.

## Next Steps

In response to the evaluation findings, the following changes are being considered:

### SWIM Sequence Revisions

Current work is focusing on evaluating how to revise the SWIM sequence descriptions. Revisions may include alignment of purpose statements, descriptions and implementation strategies to student behaviors, and integration of SWIM assessments within the SWIM sequence. We hope that the revisions to the SWIM sequence along with the revised professional learning will support teachers in becoming writers themselves. We also anticipate that the revisions, along with tailored and individualized year-long coaching support, will enable teachers to move through the entire SWIM sequence with fluency and fidelity. We will also revise the SWIM professional development plan, instruments, and resources with input from the PAC.

### SWIM Differentiated Professional Learning and Coaching

The pilot study illustrated the need for personalized coaching support for individual student participants that must be also differentiated for the type of student writer that is participating. Coaching will most likely be individualized based on teacher input and needs, and teacher reflection on student needs. A menu of supports might include options such as modeling of instructional strategies, co-teaching lessons, and viewing instructional videos with teachers. Coaching could be provided through a variety of formats including coach office hours, district PLC on SWIM lesson implementation, classroom observations and implementation support, community of practice meetings, and the online dashboard. Depending on site selection, site context, and resources, SWIM Coaching may include a collaborative coaching model, whereby the SWIM Coach supports district coaches in learning and coaching SWIM to district teachers.

In the next phase of SWIM, the most salient site context factors (time for instructional planning, teachers' understanding of shared reading strategies to support shared writing, and teachers' familiarity with language systems and communication supports) will be incorporated as much as possible into professional learning and coaching activities so that they are explicitly addressed and supported. In addition, AEA personnel (Speech and Language Pathologist, Assistive Technology) will be brought into coaching sessions to specifically address language systems and communication supports.

## Appendix A: SWIM Intervention Design Materials

### SWIM Five-Step Instructional Routine

| Step | SWIM Sequence                           | Purpose(s)  |
|------|---|---|
| 1    | Choose a Topic and Purpose              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choose a topic and a purpose for the text</li> <li>• Activate student background knowledge about the topic</li> <li>• Set a goal for writing that matches the purpose</li> </ul>   |
| 2    | Communicate About the Topic and Purpose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organize information about the topic</li> <li>• Elaborate on the purpose for the text</li> </ul>   |
| 3    | Plan for Writing                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set goals for the amount and quality of information in the text</li> <li>• Select strategies for writing to meet the purpose</li> <li>• Select strategies for translating communication into writing</li> <li>• Set-up tools for writing (e.g., writing tools, graphic organizers, reference materials)</li> </ul> |
| 4    | Write with a Purpose                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct a text with guidance and support</li> <li>• Minimize distractions and maximize relevance</li> <li>• Teacher guides the process of translating thoughts/ideas into written communication</li> </ul>   |
| 5    | Reviewing for Purpose                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read the writing product together</li> <li>• Evaluate how the purpose was met</li> </ul>   |

## SWIM Pilot Implementation Plan

Multiple activities and supports will be in place to meet the SWIM pilot outcomes. These include 1) SWIM pre-pilot activities, 2) SWIM pilot activities, and 3) SWIM post-pilot activities. These activities and supports are reflected and documented in the SWIM Implementation Timeline table.

### SWIM Pre-Pilot Activities

#### *SWIM Communications with Iowa Department of Education*

Communications regarding SWIM project and SWIM pilot implementation provided to Iowa Department of Education (IDOE) Special Education Director.

Actions: SWIM Pre-Pilot activities began with initial communications to IDOE. SWIM Research Project Manager developed and led IDOE communications using a variety of methods. These included emails ZOOM and SWIM Project Advisory Committee meetings. General communications were designed to provide updates and seeking input for future SWIM implementation.

### SWIM Internal Project Coordination Activities

Develop a variety of coordination efforts to include technology platforms, grant planning tools, and organizational meeting structures to document SWIM communications and activities.

Actions: A SWIM email account, project calendar, and project management Excel spreadsheet were developed by SWIM Project Coordinator to track deliverables and services aligned to SWIM goals and objectives. The SWIM Project Coordinator also led bi-monthly SWIM Staff Cross-Team meetings to coordinate the integration of multiple SWIM project staff efforts that contribute to the overall SWIM project.

### Recruit and Secure Johnston CSD for Pilot Participation

SWIM Project Staff meet with Johnston Community School District (CSD) staff to recruit and determine interest, ability to participate, lay the groundwork for pilot activities and provide opportunity to learn SWIM pilot interventions and activities. Johnston CSD participation in SWIM pilot participation secured through Johnston Special Education Director.

Actions: SWIM Project Principle Investigator and SWIM Research Project Manager led recruitment efforts of 16 SWIM teachers and 30 students. An introductory meeting was a scheduled to provide an overview of the SWIM model and components, develop a communication plan, provide information on the guidelines for the selection of SWIM Pilot teachers, SWIM pilot professional development topics and anticipated coaching support. The meeting resulted in Johnston CSD Special Education Director agreeing to participate in the SWIM pilot, provide coordination and support for identification of possible SWIM teacher participants and students, forwarding SWIM communications to building administrators, securing meeting spaces for district professional learning communities (PLCs) and attendance during professional development and securing official agreement with Johnston District Central Administration. It

was determined that email, ZOOM virtual meetings and in-person contact would be used for SWIM district communications and pilot coaching activities.

### SWIM Internal Review Board (IRB) Process

SWIM Pilot research proposal submitted to Kansas University Research for Institutional Review Board (IRB). SWIM Project Staff work with Johnston District Special Education Director to recruit SWIM pilot teachers and secure teacher and parent consent for pilot participation.

Actions: Kansas University Research Office approved SWIM Pilot application with SWIM Principle Investigator and SWIM Project Coordinator leading efforts for IRB approval. SWIM Research Project Manager led SWIM pilot teacher recruitment and secured informed consent for pilot participation by working directly with SWIM pilot teachers to secure parent informed consent for research. Eight teachers and parents of fifteen students agreed to participate in the SWIM pilot.

### SWIM Pilot Onboarding Activities

SWIM pilot teachers complete pre-pilot teacher activities.

Actions: SWIM Research Project Manager, SWIM Project Coordinator and SWIM Evaluators led the development of the pre-pilot teacher activities. Prior to the start of the pilot, teachers completed a teacher background knowledge survey, a SWIM knowledge pre-test survey, and a series of five short webinars that provided information on the SWIM model and components, SWIM professional development and coaching activities, and other instructional methodologies that support SWIM instruction (e.g., how shared reading supports shared writing).

### SWIM Pilot Activities

#### SWIM Professional Development

SWIM professional development and coaching content collaboratively designed and developed with SWIM project staff. SWIM professional development to provide educators the knowledge and skills to teach shared writing through the *SWIM Instructional Sequence*. SWIM coaching practices provide instructional leadership and develop positive relationships so that teachers can implement the *SWIM Instructional Sequence* with fidelity and fluency.

Actions: SWIM Research Project Manager led the development and delivered SWIM professional development in a one-half day learning session. Professional learning outcomes were integrated into Iowa's Specially Designed Instruction Framework and SWIM interventional components 1) Diagnose: SWIM learning map neighborhoods and types of writing and writers, 2) Design: SWIM sequence steps and evidenced-based practices differentiated to types of writers, and 3) Deliver: SWIM assessment components. SWIM professional development activities included development of a SWIM Instructional Routine based on a student profile and action planning to begin the process of implementing SWIM instructional routines. Teachers completed a post-PD SWIM knowledge test as an ending activity of the professional development. Following the professional development SWIM pilot teachers were asked to create and update a weekly SWIM teacher action plan, provided daily shared writing instruction to SWIM pilot students,

videotaped and self-reflected on SWIM lessons and participated in SWIM PLC for purposes of SWIM lesson peer review.

## SWIM Coaching

Develop SWIM coaching model to align to Iowa's SDI Framework.

Actions: The SWIM Coaching model will follow Jim Knight's model of Identify, Learn, and Improve as the coaching practices aligns to Iowa's Specially Designed Instruction Framework components: 1) Observe: Diagnose for Instructional Design, 2) Learn: Design for Instructional Delivery, and 3) Improve: Deliver for Learner Engagement. The SWIM Research Project Manager scheduled and provided SWIM Pilot Teachers weekly coaching visits following the first week of professional development. Coaching activities were delivered both virtually and in-person to support lesson planning, lesson observations, "SWIM office check ins" and SWIM professional learning community activities.

## SWIM Grant Evaluator Activities

SWIM grant evaluators collect observational data during professional development and SWIM instruction, access student Individualized Education Plans and collect artifacts from the intervention. Additional grant evaluation activities include teacher background survey, PD evaluation survey and SWIM knowledge test (pre and post).

Actions: SWIM Grant Evaluators in collaboration with SWIM Research Project Manager led onsite observations and gathered SWIM intervention artifacts of teacher action plans that included written self-reflection on lessons, ratings of student mastery, coaching logs, and recordings of coaching conversations. All observations were video recorded, and two SWIM project staff were assigned to observe each lesson.

## Post-Pilot Evaluation Activities

SWIM Teachers complete follow up surveys and participate in a focus group. SWIM Researchers provide a brief summary of pilot findings to inform the findings and next phase of the project.

Actions: Upon completion of the pilot, SWIM teachers, led by SWIM grant evaluators completed a coaching satisfaction survey, a social validity survey and participated in a focus group. These activities were designed for SWIM teachers to provide evidence of the extent to which intended pilot outcomes were met. A brief summary of pilot findings will be provided to Johnston CSD and the Iowa Department of Education upon completion of the Pilot Evaluation Report.

## SWIM Implementation Timeline Table

| Date                      | Contacts  | Activities   |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| April 18, 2019            | Johnston Community School District (CSD) Special Education Director and SDI Coaches | SWIM Kick Off Meeting with Johnston CSD Administration and Teacher Leaders   |
| October 14, 2019          | Johnston CSD Special Education Director   | Plan for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWIM Communications for District Administrators</li> <li>• One-half day professional development</li> <li>• District SWIM teacher PLC</li> </ul> |
| October 16, 2019          | Johnston CSD Special Education Director and potential SWIM Pilot Teachers           | Introduction to SWIM PD Facilitator/Coach  |
| January 15, 2020          | Johnston CSD Special Education Director   | Finalize January 22 <sup>nd</sup> one-half day PD and discussion related to pilot teacher honorariums  |
| January 22, 2020          | Johnston CSD Special Education Director and SWIM Pilot teachers                     | SWIM PD 1/2 day Morning and Afternoon Sessions   |
| January 27, 2020          | SWIM Pilot Teacher<br><br>All SWIM Pilot Teachers                                   | SWIM PD make up for Absent Teacher<br><br>SWIM Pilot Teachers Virtual Community of Practice Coaching Webinar   |
| February 3–March 10, 2020 | All SWIM Pilot Teachers   | Bi-Weekly Coaching Visits  |
| February 10, 2020         | All SWIM Pilot Teachers   | SWIM Pilot Teacher Virtual Community of Practice Coaching Webinar  |
| February 17, 2020         | All SWIM Pilot Teachers   | SWIM Pilot Teacher Virtual Community of Practice Coaching Webinar  |
| February 24–28, 2020      | All SWIM Pilot Teachers   | SWIM Pilot Onsite Observations   |
| February 27, 2020         | All SWIM Pilot Teachers   | SWIM District Pilot Teacher PLC  |
| March 9–10, 2020          | All SWIM Pilot Teachers   | SWIM Pilot Onsite Observations   |
| March 11, 2020            | All SWIM Pilot Teachers   | SWIM Pilot Teacher Focus Group   |

## Appendix B: SWIM Evaluation Instruments

### SWIM Knowledge Test

1. Marks, scribbles, and/or the random selection of letters that beginning writers often demonstrate is called:
  - a. Conventional writing
  - b. Emergent writing
  - c. Transitional writing
2. Which students are eligible to participate in the SWIM Project?
  - a. Students with intellectual disabilities who participate in Iowa's General Assessment (ISASP)
  - b. Students with intellectual disabilities who participate in Iowa's Alternate Assessments
  - c. Students with learning and behavior disabilities who participate in Iowa's General Assessment (ISASP)
  - d. Both a & b
3. In which step of the SWIM sequence does the student evaluate how the purpose was met?
  - a. Communicate About the Topic and Purpose
  - b. Reviewing for Purpose
  - c. Write with a Purpose
4. Which step of the SWIM sequence focuses on setting a writing goal?
  - a. Choose a Topic and Purpose
  - b. Plan for Writing
  - c. Reviewing for Purpose
5. Which of the following is a skill covered in the Writing with a Purpose step of the SWIM Sequence?
  - a. Activate student background knowledge
  - b. Elaborate on the purpose for the text
  - c. Minimize distractions and maximize relevance
6. Which of the following best represents conventional writing?
  - a. Using letters and words to meaningfully communicate with others
  - b. Copying words from a word bank
  - c. Using organizational structures to produce a coherent text
7. Which of the following best represents transitional writing?
  - a. Initially creating word strings including random letters and using sentence frames to produce sentences when composing a written text

- b. Introducing the topic; providing facts, details, ideas, and other information related to it; and developing points about the topic.
  - c. Describing an event or personal experience using words or illustrations and tactile information depicting them.
8. Which of the Iowa Core Standards/Essential Elements categories are represented in the SWIM Sequence?
- a. Production and Distribution of Writing
  - b. Text Type and Purposes
  - c. Research to Build and Present Knowledge
  - d. Range of Writing
  - e. Both b and c
9. SWIM assessments include:
- a. Formative assessment
  - b. Writing characteristics
  - c. Writing process
  - d. All of the above
10. Mentor texts used in writing instruction can best be used to:
- a. Teach the alphabet
  - b. Take the place of shared writing
  - c. Test student comprehension
  - d. Provide students engaging examples of different types of writing

# SWIM Data Collection

Writing Level: Transitional

Grade Band: K-2

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

| Formative Assessment Questions                 |  |  |   |         |
|--|--|--|---|---------|
| Information Gathering:                         |  |  |   |         |
| Informative and Explanatory Writing:           |  |  |   |         |
| Iowa Core Standards/<br>Essential Elements     | Instructional Goal(s)  | Student Learning Goal(s)   | Student Success Criteria  | Met Y/N |
| ELA W.8<br>Information Gathering               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use speech or other communication system to tell about a personal experience.</li> <li>Answer simple questions about the topic.</li> <li>Use letters to write words and about the topic, including one fact or detail.</li> </ul> | Without help, (name of student) will <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>tell about something they know or has happened.</li> <li>share what they think about something.</li> <li>answer who and what questions using information in a book (pictures, graphs, and objects).</li> </ul> | Without help, I can tell <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>one or more things about it.</li> <li>one or more things that happened.</li> <li>what I think about it.</li> <li>some of the letters that go in the words.</li> </ul> [tell = drawing, dictating, or writing*; it = topic or event]       |         |
| ELA W.2<br>Informative and Explanatory Writing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use drawing, dictating, or writing to compose a message about the topic with one fact.</li> <li>Use letters to write words about the topic, including one fact or detail that is meaningful and relevant to the topic.</li> </ul> | Without help, (name of student) will <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>draw, tell, or write words about the topic, including some correct letters.</li> <li>give more information about the topic.</li> </ul>   | Without help, I can tell/write <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>one or more things about it.</li> <li>one or more things that happened.</li> <li>what I think about it.</li> <li>some of the letters that go in the words.</li> </ul> [tell = drawing, dictating, or writing*; it = topic or event] |         |

**SWIM Characteristics of Writing Process and Product Data Collection**

| <b>Skill/Evaluation</b>   | <b>Date:</b>   | <b>Date:</b>   | <b>Date:</b>   | <b>Date:</b>   | <b>Date:</b>   |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Writing Process</b>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student engagement during shared writing  | <input type="radio"/> High<br><input type="radio"/> Medium<br><input type="radio"/> Low  |
| Student used self-regulation strategies during writing.   | <input type="radio"/> Independently<br><input type="radio"/> With support<br><input type="radio"/> Did not use   | <input type="radio"/> Independently<br><input type="radio"/> With support<br><input type="radio"/> Did not use   | <input type="radio"/> Independently<br><input type="radio"/> With support<br><input type="radio"/> Did not use   | <input type="radio"/> Independently<br><input type="radio"/> With support<br><input type="radio"/> Did not use   | <input type="radio"/> Independently<br><input type="radio"/> With support<br><input type="radio"/> Did not use   |
| Student accessed a tool for writing.  | <input type="radio"/> Independently<br><input type="radio"/> With support  |
| <b>Writing Product</b>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Characteristics of writing product (Choose the highest level that reflects the student's writing product) | <input type="radio"/> Writes paragraph-length text<br><input type="radio"/> Writes sentences or complete ideas<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words or phrases<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words using letters to reflect some of the sounds<br><input type="radio"/> Writes letters<br><input type="radio"/> Scribbles or randomly selects letters | <input type="radio"/> Writes paragraph-length text<br><input type="radio"/> Writes sentences or complete ideas<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words or phrases<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words using letters to reflect some of the sounds<br><input type="radio"/> Writes letters<br><input type="radio"/> Scribbles or randomly selects letters | <input type="radio"/> Writes paragraph-length text<br><input type="radio"/> Writes sentences or complete ideas<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words or phrases<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words using letters to reflect some of the sounds<br><input type="radio"/> Writes letters<br><input type="radio"/> Scribbles or randomly selects letters | <input type="radio"/> Writes paragraph-length text<br><input type="radio"/> Writes sentences or complete ideas<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words or phrases<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words using letters to reflect some of the sounds<br><input type="radio"/> Writes letters<br><input type="radio"/> Scribbles or randomly selects letters | <input type="radio"/> Writes paragraph-length text<br><input type="radio"/> Writes sentences or complete ideas<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words or phrases<br><input type="radio"/> Writes words using letters to reflect some of the sounds<br><input type="radio"/> Writes letters<br><input type="radio"/> Scribbles or randomly selects letters |

**Description of Student AAC and Writing Tools:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C: Supplemental Findings

### SWIM Pilot Teacher Participation Summary

| Pilot Teacher | Half-day PD | Community of Practice PLC | Action Plans (Out of 7) | Video Reflections (Out of 3) | Student Assessments (Out of 4) | Coaching Sessions (Out of 6) |
|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 001           | Y           | Y                         | 7                       | 3                            | 1                              | 4                            |
| 002           | Y           | Y                         | 1                       | 1                            | 0                              | 4                            |
| 003           | Y           | Y                         | 1                       | 0                            | 0                              | 3                            |
| 004           | Y           | Y                         | 5                       | 2                            | 2                              | 5                            |
| 005           | Y           | Y                         | 3                       | 2                            | 4                              | 6                            |
| 006           | N*          | Y                         | 1                       | 1                            | 1                              | 6                            |
| 007           | Y           | Y                         | 1                       | 1                            | 0                              | 4                            |
| 008           | Y           | Y                         | 1                       | 0                            | 0                              | 4                            |

\*Attended make-up session with SWIM coach.

## Pilot Teacher Background Survey Results

| Question   | Response Option  | Number of Teachers |
|--|--|--------------------|
| On average, how much time do you devote to writing instruction for your students with intellectual disabilities?   | • Less than 30 minutes per day   | 3                  |
|  | • Between 30-60 minutes per day  | 4                  |
| In choosing materials for writing instruction, which curricular materials do you use? (Select all that apply)      | • Adapted general curriculum materials (modified by self or other teacher)                     | 3                  |
|  | • Specially designed materials for special education (packaged curriculum developed by others) | 5                  |
|  | • Other (teacher creates materials or purchases online)  | 4                  |
| Which of the following do you use for writing assessment (Select all that apply)                                   | • Teacher-made assessments   | 4                  |
|  | • Modified or adapted general education assessments  | 2                  |
|  | • Observational checklists/data sheets   | 5                  |
|  | • Other (developmental writing scales, teacher-made rubrics)                                   | 1                  |
|  | • Don't use writing assessments  | 1                  |
| When accounting for student writing progress, how frequently do you collect and evaluate progress monitoring data? | • Weekly   | 4                  |
|  | • Bi-weekly  | 2                  |
|  | • Other (N/A)  | 1                  |

| Which of the following will be a major emphasis, minor emphasis, or no emphasis in your classroom instruction for all students this academic year? | Major Emphasis | Minor Emphasis | No Emphasis | Unsure or Unfamiliar |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Big paper writing  | 0              | 3              | 4           | 0                    |
| Writer's workshop  | 1              | 3              | 3           | 0                    |
| Peer conferencing  | 0              | 1              | 5           | 1                    |
| Journaling   | 0              | 2              | 5           | 0                    |
| Author's chair   | 4              | 1              | 1           | 1                    |
| PowerPoint books   | 1              | 3              | 2           | 1                    |
| Artifact/experience books  | 3              | 3              | 0           | 1                    |
| Predictable chart writing  | 3              | 3              | 1           | 0                    |
| Dictating a story  | 1              | 1              | 5           | 0                    |
| Generating messages using a communication device   | 3              | 3              | 1           | 0                    |
| Copying words from a book or written text  | 0              | 2              | 5           | 0                    |
| Writing a letter, card, or email   | 0              | 4              | 2           | 0                    |
| Tracing letters  | 0              | 3              | 4           | 0                    |
| Identifying the correct punctuation to use in pre-written sentences  | 3              | 0              | 4           | 0                    |

## Week 3 SWIM Pilot Teacher Classroom Observations

| SWIM Sequence Steps   |   | Pilot Teacher |       |     |      |      |      |      |
|---|---|---------------|-------|-----|------|------|------|------|
|   |   | 001           | 002   | 003 | 004  | 005  | 006  | 007  |
| Step 1:<br>Chose a Topic<br>and Purpose                     | a. Choose a topic and purpose for the text  | C3-4          | P, C4 |     | C3-4 | C3-5 | C4-5 |      |
|   | b. Activate student background knowledge about the topic  |               | C4    |     |      | C4   | C4-5 |      |
|   | c. Set a goal for writing that matches the purposes   |               |       |     |      | C4   |      |      |
|   | d. Determine what the reader will want to know  |               |       |     |      | C4   |      |      |
|   | e. Introduce student learning goal & success criteria for Steps 1-2                                 |               |       |     |      | C4   |      |      |
| Step 2:<br>Communicate<br>about the<br>Topic and<br>Purpose | a. Organize information about the topic   |               | C4    |     | C3   | C4-5 | C4   | P    |
|   | b. Use graphic organizers and other visuals to show the connections                                 | C3-4          | C4    |     |      | C4-5 |      | P    |
|   | c. Make lists, take notes, sort information, outline information                                    |               | C4    |     |      | C4-5 |      |      |
|   | d. Elaborate on the purpose for the text  |               |       |     |      | C4-5 |      |      |
|   | e. Describe the <i>Organizational Structures</i> of informative and explanatory writing             |               |       |     |      | C4-5 |      |      |
| Step 3:<br>Plan for<br>Writing                              | a. Set goals for the amount and quality of information in the text.                                 | C4            |       |     | C3-4 |      |      | C4-5 |
|   | b. Select strategies to meet the purpose  |               |       | C4  | C3   | C4   |      |      |
|   | c. Arrange the information according to the purpose of writing using the appropriate text structure |               |       |     |      |      |      |      |
|   | d. Select strategies for translating communication into writing                                     |               |       | C4  | C5   |      |      | C5   |
|   | e. Set-up tools for writing   |               |       |     | C5   |      |      |      |
| Step 4:<br>Write with a<br>Purpose                          | a. Construct a text with guidance and support   | C5            | C3,C5 | C5  |      |      |      | C3   |
|   | b. Focus on text production- spelling, conventions, etc.  |               |       |     |      |      |      | C3   |
|   | c. Minimize distractions and maximize relevance.  |               |       |     |      |      |      |      |
|   | d. Provide guidance for relevant information about the topic  |               |       |     |      |      |      |      |
| Step 5:<br>Reviewing for<br>Purpose                         | a. Read the writing product together  |               |       | C4  |      |      |      |      |
|   | b. Provide feedback and suggestions for improvement   |               |       |     |      |      |      |      |
|   | c. Evaluate how the purpose was met   |               |       |     |      |      |      |      |
|   | d. Determine if text includes the appropriate writing elements                                      |               |       |     |      |      |      |      |
|   | e. Determine if student met student learning goal & success criteria for Steps 3-5                  |               |       |     | C5   |      |      |      |

Notes. Dark blue shading indicates evidence of implementation as intended and light blue shading indicates some evidence of implementation with areas for improvement. Gray shading indicates teacher was absent or did not have a video. P = step was referenced as happening in a prior lesson. C3-8 = Step was focus of coaching for that week.

## Week 6 SWIM Pilot Teacher Classroom Observations

| SWIM Sequence Steps   |   | Pilot Teacher |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|---|---|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
|   |   | 001           | 002 | 003 | 004 | 005 | 006   | 007 |
| Step 1:<br>Chose a Topic<br>and Purpose                     | a. Choose a topic and purpose for the text  |               |     | P   | P   | P   | P, C7 | P   |
|   | b. Activate student background knowledge about the topic  |               |     |     | P   | P   | C7    |     |
|   | c. Set a goal for writing that matches the purposes   |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | d. Determine what the reader will want to know  |               |     |     |     |     | C7    |     |
|   | e. Introduce student learning goal & success criteria for Steps 1-2                                 |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
| Step 2:<br>Communicate<br>about the<br>Topic and<br>Purpose | a. Organize information about the topic   | C7            |     |     |     | P   | C7    | P   |
|   | b. Use graphic organizers and other visuals to show the connections                                 |               |     |     |     |     |       | P   |
|   | c. Make lists, take notes, sort information, outline information                                    |               | C7  |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | d. Elaborate on the purpose for the text  |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | e. Describe the <i>Organizational Structures</i> of informative and explanatory writing             |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
| Step 3:<br>Plan for<br>Writing                              | a. Set goals for the amount and quality of information in the text.                                 |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | b. Select strategies to meet the purpose  |               |     |     | P   | C7  |       | P   |
|   | c. Arrange the information according to the purpose of writing using the appropriate text structure |               |     |     | P   |     |       |     |
|   | d. Select strategies for translating communication into writing                                     |               |     |     | P   | C7  |       |     |
|   | e. Set-up tools for writing   |               |     |     | P   | C7  |       |     |
| Step 4:<br>Write with a<br>Purpose                          | a. Construct a text with guidance and support   |               | C7  |     | C7  | C6  |       | P   |
|   | b. Focus on text production- spelling, conventions, etc.  |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | c. Minimize distractions and maximize relevance.  |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | d. Provide guidance for relevant information about the topic  |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
| Step 5:<br>Reviewing for<br>Purpose                         | a. Read the writing product together  |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | b. Provide feedback and suggestions for improvement   |               | C7  |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | c. Evaluate how the purpose was met   |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | d. Determine if text includes the appropriate writing elements                                      |               |     |     |     |     |       |     |
|   | e. Determine if student met student learning goal & success criteria for Steps 3-5                  |               |     |     | C7  |     |       |     |

*Notes.* Dark blue shading indicates evidence of implementation as intended and light blue shading indicates some evidence of implementation with areas for improvement. P = step was referenced as happening in a prior lesson. C3-8 = Step was focus of coaching for that week.

## Week 8 SWIM Pilot Teacher Classroom Observations

| SWIM Sequence Steps   |   | Pilot Teacher |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|---|---|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|
|   |   | 001           | 002 | 003 | 004 | 005   | 006 | 007 |
| Step 1:<br>Chose a Topic<br>and Purpose                     | a. Choose a topic and purpose for the text  |               |     |     |     | P, C8 | C8  |     |
|   | b. Activate student background knowledge about the topic  |               |     |     |     | C8    | C8  |     |
|   | c. Set a goal for writing that matches the purposes   |               |     |     |     | C8    |     |     |
|   | d. Determine what the reader will want to know  |               |     |     |     | C8    | C8  |     |
|   | e. Introduce student learning goal & success criteria for Steps 1-2                                 |               |     |     |     | C8    |     |     |
| Step 2:<br>Communicate<br>about the<br>Topic and<br>Purpose | a. Organize information about the topic   |               |     |     |     |       | C8  |     |
|   | b. Use graphic organizers and other visuals to show the connections                                 |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|   | c. Make lists, take notes, sort information, outline information                                    |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|   | d. Elaborate on the purpose for the text  |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|   | e. Describe the <i>Organizational Structures</i> of informative and explanatory writing             |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
| Step 3:<br>Plan for<br>Writing                              | a. Set goals for the amount and quality of information in the text.                                 |               |     |     |     | C8    |     |     |
|   | b. Select strategies to meet the purpose  |               |     |     |     | C8    |     |     |
|   | c. Arrange the information according to the purpose of writing using the appropriate text structure |               |     |     | C8  |       |     |     |
|   | d. Select strategies for translating communication into writing                                     |               |     |     | C8  |       |     |     |
|   | e. Set-up tools for writing   |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
| Step 4:<br>Write with a<br>Purpose                          | a. Construct a text with guidance and support   |               |     |     |     | C8    |     |     |
|   | b. Focus on text production- spelling, conventions, etc.  |               |     |     |     | C8    |     |     |
|   | c. Minimize distractions and maximize relevance.  |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|   | d. Provide guidance for relevant information about the topic  |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
| Step 5:<br>Reviewing for<br>Purpose                         | a. Read the writing product together  |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|   | b. Provide feedback and suggestions for improvement   |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|   | c. Evaluate how the purpose was met   |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|   | d. Determine if text includes the appropriate writing elements                                      |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |
|   | e. Determine if student met student learning goal & success criteria for Steps 3-5                  |               |     |     |     |       |     |     |

Notes. Dark blue shading indicates evidence of implementation as intended and light blue shading indicates some evidence of implementation with areas for improvement. Gray shading indicates teacher was absent or did not have a video. P = step was referenced as happening in a prior lesson. C3-8 = Step was focus of coaching for that week.