research team to formulate its hypothesis that assessment strategies that emphasize a collaborative rather than a hierarchical writer-reader connection. Next, we described the kinds of assessment interactions which may create this constructive learning climate. The teacher/reader is asked to communicate her/his reading process of the student text and how this process leads to the final grade. Simple "I" statements are used throughout the responding process. The strategy is designed to emphasize reading process as learning process on the part of the teacher, rather than prior mastery of material by the teacher against which the students' efforts are measured.

We discussed the ways in which this process has changed the way we assess formal work. Assessing journals and essays in a reactive, non-judgmental way helped us to begin to listen to student beliefs, to identify the world view of each student, and to discover how the teacher can speak to it in an atmosphere of dignity and mutual respect.

We continued with a description of an experiment with formulating a writing assignment in a physics course, showing how we had assessed the work. Since we were teaching in a fairly structured situation with a great deal of material to cover, we were unable to devote a great deal of class time to the writing project. Our major communication with the students was through written response to the developing stages of the project's freewriting, topic definition, drafts, and final copies. We showed the group the kinds of interventions we made, all "I" comments, all reader reactions showing the student how a reader might or might not be able to follow the reasoning or description in various passages. We noted that it was time consuming, but that we felt most students had developed a far deeper understanding of the chosen physics topic than would normally be the case.

There were some questions throughout the presentation, particularly about the research on women's learning experiences. At the end, there was time for discussion of assessment in various disciplines. Some of the participants noted the importance of affective and interactive writing for mature women students. There was also interest in writing assessment in the sciences.

MULTIPLE INDICATORS OF ASSESSMENT: TOWARD A COLLABORATION OF TEACHING AND TESTING

A. Frederic Cheney, Maine Department of Education and Cultural Services

The session began with an explanation of my role as language arts consultant to the Maine Educational Assessment, a direct assessment of writing administered to all 4th, 8th, and 11th graders in the state. The objectives measured by the Maine Educational Assessment are as follows:

I. The writer comprehends and manages the writing process.
   A. The writer will demonstrate the ability to generate writing and apply strategies to refine that writing.
   B. The writer will demonstrate the ability to organize and present information in such a way that the writing fulfills its purpose and makes sense to its intended audience.

II. The writer makes an individual response.
   A. The writer's voice is evident.
   B. The writer will demonstrate interest and involvement with the task.

III. The writer will aid the reader by conforming to the conventions of standard American English: punctuation, usage, capitalization, spelling, legibility, and format.

I then presented the Analytic Scoring Guide used to score the Maine tests. Papers are rated from 1-6 in each of six analytic traits—topic development, organization, details, sentences, wording, and mechanics; the guide, also, defines the criteria for each rating. Because papers get two readings, the raw scores range from 12-72. Next came an overview of objectives, scoring formats, and rhetorical modes tested in other
states, and a brief discussion of the implications of each.

I then shifted to a discussion of the limitations of such broad objectives in assessing programs with more specific objectives. Workshop participants suggested several areas which are usual components of curricula, but are not addressed in large scale testing. I presented three examples of my collaboration with teachers to assist them in testing their teaching. These examples included an analytic scoring guide, portfolio assessments, and a posttest to measure long term learning.

The process guidelines for designing assessments are as follows:

1. Understand the objectives of the large-scale test and add to them according to your own needs;
2. become familiar with the full range of testing formats and options;
3. determine objectives and select formats;
4. train testers, gather data;
5. publicize the objectives and the assessment.

Finally, I reviewed questions to consider during development:

1. To what degree will the assessment be content specific?
2. What modes will be tested?
3. How many modes will be tested?
4. Will all modes be scored the same way?
5. What would be the benefits/liabilities?
6. What should be the method: holistic, analytic, primary trait?
7. What combinations, modifications are possible?
8. Will the assessment provide individual student data? Program data? Both?
9. How much process writing will be retained?
10. What is the balance of multidraft to impromptu writing?
11. Is security an issue?
12. Do you want year-to-year comparisons?
13. Can you get them?

CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING HIGH SCHOOL LANGUAGE- SKILL PREPARATION

Anne K. Bourjaily, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, Ohio

The mission of Cuyahoga Community College is to provide high quality, accessible, and affordable educational opportunities and services that promote individual development and improve the overall quality of life in a multicultural community. Consequently, Cuyahoga is committed to collaborative efforts with secondary school systems and baccalaureate institutions for the advancement of educational excellence and improvement of student access and success in higher education. One such institutional partnership, established in 1983 among the Cleveland, East Cleveland, and Lakewood Public Schools with the College is the Urban Initiatives Action Program for Language Education (UIP). The program fosters the concept that the broad intellectual skills essential to effective work in all fields of college study are language based—reading, writing, speaking, listening, reasoning, and studying.

The goal of the UIP is the achievement of a command of basic and higher-order language by all students. The program attempts to reduce language deficiencies and develop reasoning and communication skills through the Foundations for Learning Language curriculum, which has been implemented in each of the Collaborative districts. As part of the Foundations program, students participated in a pre- and postprogram expository essay assessment. Teachers received training in holistic assessment and scored all essays holistically. The scores provided a basis for measuring improvement and progress in writing skills. Each paper was assessed independently on a six-point scale by two readers, with the total score determined by adding the two scores together. For papers having a span of two or more points between readers, a third reader read and scored the paper.