Multi-Genre Project

The artist formerly known as the Junior Paper…

My Family

My Passions

My Inspiration

Old Junior Paper vs. The First Revision

Multi-Genre Project

Comparison

OLD

- Read Novel (2 weeks) from an "approved list".

- Research Link (4 weeks off Library Database).

- Write traditional 6-paragraph essay.

Less Old

- Choose topic of interest (requirements: American).

- Research in phases.

- Writing in conjunction with research.

- Choice in product.

Junior Paper Due Dates

Day	M (2/2)	T (2/3)	W (2/4)	Th (2/5)	F (2/6)
Due	Works Cited	Research Packet	"Incomplete" Outline	Nothing	"Complete" Outline
Work-on	• Type MC and SC's • Include 10 pieces of Evidence • Document Title (Research Packet)	• Work on "Incomplete Outline" • Include MC and 4 SC's • At least 2 pieces of evidence / SC • Should have missing evidence	• Find additional resources to "fill holes" in outline. • Must find 2 additional sources (**annotate**) • Complete outline	• Continue filling out outline. -- OR – • Begin "Rough Draft"	• Vocabulary Test #8 • Speech Role Out
Next Assignment Due	Research Packet	"Incomplete" Outline	"Completed" Outline	"Completed" Outline	"Rough Draft" Due Wed (2/11)

Example of Multi-Genre Week

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Library Day	Research Day	Research Day	Library Day	Peer Review Day
15 minutes free reading	Time to read articles/ draft / free reading / write / etc.	Time to read articles/ draft / free reading / write / etc.	15 minutes free reading	15 minutes free reading
Research in library databases			Research / type draft (revising NTBK draft)	Writing Groups (using a questioning system)

Comparison

Old

- Research without writing.
- Because of the condensed time frame, very little time to revise work (1 opportunity; elective).
- Writers not given the time to work on craft

Less Old

- Research and writing woven together.
- Minimum of 3 drafts per product.
- Seated in tables, given time to write, although not always used well.

My big issues…old

- Very little student choice (chose 1 of 10 novels – teacher created list, chose topic from novel).

- Forced product – Schaffer model – long 6-10 pages.

– Usually very similar to other group members.

- Graded on a rubric where I found my comments to be a validation for a grade rather than nurturing my student's ability to express themselves.

- Boring to teach. I didn't do much.

	A Superior	B Strong	C Adequate	D/F Needs Improvement
Introduction **10%**	• Creative opening engages the reader • Strong novel summarization clearly affixed towards MC • Clearly expresses personal credibility through detailed, summarized research • Strong transition into main thesis • Articulate, clearly focused main claim, provides direction of paper	• Creative opening is less engaging but connects to MC • Novel summarization aligned to MC • Expresses personal credibility but research isn't clearly defined • Solid transition into main thesis • Solid, focused main claim, provides direction of paper	• Creative opening is adequate but simplistic • Novel summarization is too broad or narrow in focus towards MC • Expresses personal credibility but research lacks direction • Transition to MC attempted • Logical, but simplistic main claim, shows basic organization	• Unconvincing, illogical creative opening • Novel summarization lacks connection to MC • Credibility and research lacks clarity • Lacks transition to MC • Unclear main claim, lacks organization/ direction of paper
Body Paragraphs **40%**	• SCs strongly support the MC • 2-3 powerful pieces of evidence per paragraph • Accurate documentation of sources • Insightful explanation, shows strong analysis • Well-organized with logical transitions between ideas and paragraphs • Accurate and credibility-building Lead-ins • Strong clincher	• SCs effectively support the MC • 2-3 solid pieces of evidence per paragraph • Accurate documentation of sources • Solid explanation, shows good analysis • Well-organized with logical transitions between ideas and paragraphs • Accurate credibility-building Lead-ins • Sufficient clincher	• SCs logically support the MC • Adequate pieces of evidence, meeting minimum number required (2) • Accurate documentation of sources • Average explanation, analysis not as well-developed • Adequate organization with transitions between ideas • Lead-ins seek to build credibility but aren't always successful • Contains clincher	• SCs confusing & unclear in support of MC • Pieces of evidence present, but illogical or unclear • Lacks documentation, may be plagiarized • Weak explanation, restates evidence, preaches, judges, etc. • Lacks transitions • Lead-ins lack credibility • Lacks clincher sentence
Conclusion **20%**	• Powerful restatement of MC • Strong, concise summary of major arguments • Shows insightful awareness of historical significance • Includes a relevant and possible plea for reader action • Relates to introductory attention getter	• Effective restatement of MC • Solid summary of major arguments • Shows awareness of historical significance • Includes a relevant plea for reader action • Relates to introductory attention getter, with less effectiveness than an A	• Simplistic restatement of MC • Basic summary of major arguments • Simplistic awareness of historical significance • Includes a plea for reader action but may be unreasonable • May not clearly relate to introductory attention getter	• Unclear restatement of MC • Underdeveloped summary of major arguments • Lacks a plea for reader action or the plea does not reflect the essay • Abruptly ends with no clear closure to paper
Research **20%**	• Research that is thorough & insightful • Uses reliable & academic sources • Uses a variety of sources throughout the paper • Exceeds the minimum number of sources required (>5) • Correctly formatted parenthetical line citation correspond to works cited • Works Cited is in correct MLA format	• Research is accurate, but less thorough or insightful than an A paper • Uses reliable & academic sources • Incorporates a variety of sources • Meets or exceeds the minimum number of sources required (5) • Correctly formatted parenthetical line citation correspond to works cited • Works Cited is in correct MLA format with some minor admissions	• Research is accurate, but general or simplistic • Uses minimum number (5) of reliable, academic sources • Contains minimal source evidence; relies on one or two sources • Research reflects some topical insight • Slight formatting errors may exist in parenthetical line citation and correspondence to works cited • Works Cited is in correct MLA format with 1 or 2 major mistakes	• Contains some unreliable or inaccurate historical evidence • Contains fewer than minimum required sources (<5) • Research reflects little insight into topic • Parenthetical line citation does not correspond with works cited or may be missing altogether • Works Cited is missing, lacking sources, or does not MLA format consistently
Conventions **10%**	• Smooth & seamless organization • Sophisticated, appropriate word choice • Well-crafted, varied sentences • Infrequent errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling • Proper MLA formatting	• Logical organization • Effective word choice • Strong, varied sentences • Minimum of errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling • Proper MLA formatting	• Basic organizational plan • Appropriate but not dynamic word choice • Some sentence variety • Some errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, but do not detract from meaning • Proper MLA formatting	• Weak organization or lacks organization • Simplistic, inappropriate word choice • Lack of variety or clarity in sentences • Frequent errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling that may interfere with meaning • MLA format attempted

Changes…

- All student reading became free-choice (although this still needs some tweaking).

- All vocabulary tests were abolished (and for this I don't apologize for – although I need to develop vocabulary building).

- Students chose a topic of their choosing (topics varied from the Civil Rights Movement, Theory of Everything, GMO's, Monsato, Ocean Pollution, etc.)

- Students wrote in 4 different areas: Informative, Argumentative, Functional, and Creative.

Changes…

- Within each category, choice was given as to final product.
- Mentor Texts were provided and students were required to find their own
-

Functional: **Choose 1**

- Personal Letter
- Business Letter
- Pamphlet
- Advertisement for Product
- Infographic
- Eulogy
- -OR- student choice (w/ teacher approval)

Issues that need to be addressed…

- Mentor Texts (mostly were chosen by myself).I chose them based on my interests. Some were over students' heads or outside their interests although choice was given.

- Fun. Students wrote plugged in. It was not a communal process. Students often sat with their friends rather than people who could help.

- Continuity. Students saw writing each piece as a singular process rather as an integrated process.

Issues that need to be addressed…

- Grouping strategies. Some groups are effective, nurturing the entire writing process. Others, not so much.

- Peer Review. Need to continue to work and put a greater emphasis on training students to help their classmates.

- Grading. Because the only assignment scored was MLA, it took on a focus, and thus a life of its own. This was not supposed to happen. Created a class of MLA rather than researching and writing.

Grouping…

- Langer, in a 2001 study, argued that students should be grouped by proximity, and the environment is a fundamental part of what gets learned.

- Van den Bossche, Segers, and Kirshner (2006) found that creating diverse groups may entail considering more alternatives and richer argumentation creating more creative solutions to problems.

- Van den Bossche also suggested that group members must feel safe and supported to take the risks involved in learning.

Grouping Brainstorm

- You've walked into a classroom where you have decided to group students in 3-4 person tables (a collection of desks placed together).

- Consider the following questions:

+ How do you group students?

+ How do you promote "team building" among group members?

+ How do you teach/support students' abilities to respond to each other's writing in genres they may not be comfortable in?

Quick Write

- Take 6 minutes and brainstorm ways of grouping students.

- Use past classes you have taught as your guide.

+ How would/did you group these students?

+ Was it successful?

+ How did you know it was successful or that it was not successful?

Share

Now lets try them out…

- In groups, we are going to do the beginning brainstorm process and discuss the ideas of our topics.

- Take 6 minutes and brainstorm possible topics:

    + Criteria – must be "American" having to do with the United States of America

- Make your list, bubble chart, artistic rendering, or whatever as long as you can.

Group Work

- Identify your best (2-3) topics.

- Bring them to your group. Talk about the positives and negatives of each.

- Brainstorm ways of researching each, possible focus areas – ways of taking your research, argument, purpose, etc.

- Write it all down. When you struggle with ideas, this will be important.

Questions

- Anybody have any???

A final word on reading…

- I switched from reading whole class novels to free choice reading. These numbers were self-reported and compiled during first trimester, which is 13 weeks (Aug – November):

+ Novels read previous calendar year: 121 (3.45 ps)

+ Novels read during trimester: 183 (5.08 ps)

A final word on reading and the impact on generating writing…

- I pulled 4 students using their diagnostic writing (both pre and post) to see if it impacted their writing (generating). The prompt was to "Write an argument about school." They were given 25 minutes.

- These students were not chosen at random, but rather as a cross-section of my class. I chose 2 boys and 2 girls, a variety of ethnicities, and 1 high-achieving student and 1 under-achieving student per gender.

- Results:

- Avg. words Pre: 184.5 / Avg. paragraphs Pre: 1
- Avg. words Post: 294.8 / Avg. paragraphs Post: 3

Sources…

ॐ

- Langer, J. A. (2001). Beating the Odds: Teaching Middle and High School Students to Read and Write Well. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 837-880.

- Van den Bossche, P., Segers, M., & Kirschner P. A. (2006). Social and Cognitive Factors Driving Teamwork in Collaborative Learning Environments: Team Learning Beliefs and Behaviors. *Small Group Research*, 37(5), 490-521.