I cautioned the audience that the results of the rating task suggested that teachers and students may indeed be closer on criteria than appears. Students may be limited in their ability to verbalize their criteria. In addition, the small number of teachers may not be representative of the general teaching population. Generally, however, the findings showed that (a) students do not necessarily agree with their teachers on criteria to use to judge writing quality and (b) teachers have difficulty in agreeing on criteria to evaluate the quality of writing. Thus students likely meet with somewhat different emphases/expectations for quality writing as they move from teacher to teacher in the course of their schooling. The dilemma is that students’ criteria influences the goals they set for quality writing and the revisions they make. Discussion generated two possible approaches to the problem of differing criteria. First, teachers in a school need to meet to cooperatively develop criteria for evaluating writing quality. Secondly, students should be included as partners in the development of these criteria. The criteria are then explicit and can be used by teachers and students as teaching/learning goals; not just as measures against which to evaluate writing.
can give. How can one find out about that learning?

At Lehman College, in a project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, we are trying out two procedures. We are getting a sample of students' written responses to two topics that force them to confront academic problems (one including quantitative data, the other entirely verbal). And we are collecting samples from the students' portfolios of writings submitted in a variety of courses other than English Composition. We are asking readers to assess both kinds of papers by engaging in an intensive analytic reading of them. On the responses to academic problems, we ask readers to take an inventory of the suitable cognitive and rhetorical activities in which the student has engaged, the readers have a scoring rubric to guide them. On the portfolios, we ask the readers to identify the kinds of writing that the student has attempted, and to note how many of some twenty affirmative statements about the quality of a writing can be made about the pieces in the portfolio.

DESIGNING LARGE-SCALE WRITING ASSESSMENTS THAT MATCH THE GOALS OF INSTRUCTION: REFLECTIONS FROM THE NATION'S REPORT CARD

Ina V.S. Mullis and Lynn B. Jenkins, Educational Testing Service

The presenters described the writing assessments conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Programs (NAEP), in which the writing abilities of American elementary-, middle-, and high-school students are evaluated based on their responses to informative, persuasive, and imaginative tasks. NAEP and other large-scale direct writing assessments have made important methodological advances in recent years, developing better prompts and better procedures for scoring responses. However, large-scale writing assessments as a whole have failed to keep pace with the best of current wisdom in writing research and instruction. The presenters discussed some of the new issues that must be addressed—in particular, the need to develop methods of evaluating students' writing performance that are congruent with the goals of instruction and providing opportunities for students to use the writing skills and strategies they have learned in the classroom.

Accordingly, ETS/NAEP has proposed an experimental writing portfolio study as part of its 1990 writing assessment, permitting an evaluation of writing that students produce on their own or for school assignments, without the time and resource constraints of the assessment situation. Working with the language arts teachers of fourth- and eighth-grade students, NAEP plans to assemble a national writing portfolio consisting of writing samples gathered from 2,000 students at each grade. Participants in the portfolio study would be selected from those students participating in the main NAEP writing assessment, making it possible to study the relationship between writing produced in and out of the assessment setting. Methods for evaluating the portfolio papers would be developed at Educational Testing Service by NAEP staff and consultants. ETS/NAEP has proposed that the writing portfolio study be refined and continued in 1992, based on findings from the experimental effort in 1990.

INFLUENCING STATE AND LOCAL POLICIES ON WRITING ASSESSMENT

Renee T. Bets, American Association for Higher Education and Central Missouri State University

Participants in this round table advised that faculty interested in responsible and ethical assessment become pro-active about their concerns with their state commissions on higher education and with their legislatures. They also recommended that NTTW become more politically active and that NTTW promote the position paper on writing assessment that has just been formally adopted by the Missouri Colloquium on Writing Assessment.

The Colloquium on Writing Assessment, a statewide organization of writing professionals from Missouri four- and two-year public institutions of higher learning, endorses the use of measures that improve instruction and empower students to become successful writers. Assessment