**Registry of Efficacy and Effectiveness Studies**

**Study Title:**
Evaluation of National Writing Project's College, Career, and Community Writer's Program (C3WP) Scale-up Grant

**Registry ID: 14340.1v1**

---

**Version History**

**The first version of this entry was published on October 14, 2022 3:03:08 PM EDT**
Currently viewing this version.

---

## Section I: General Study Information

**PI name:** Nicole Arshan
**PI affiliation:** SRI International

**Co-PI name:** Christina J. Park
**Co-PI affiliation:** SRI International

**Primary Funding Source(s):**
Department of Education, Office of Elementary & Secondary Education

**Award Number(s):**
Investing in Innovation Scale-up grant #U411A160004

**IRB Name:**
SRI International

**IRB Approval Date:**
2018-02-15

**IRB Approval Number:**
50132

**Other Registration Name:**
National Evaluation of i3

**Other Registration Date:**
2018-05-15

**Other Registration Number:**
Scale10

**Study Start Date:**
2017-01-01

**Study End Date:**
2022-06-30

**Intervention Start Date:**
2018-07-02

**Timing of entry:**
Prior to implementation of the intervention

**Brief Abstract:**
The National Writing Project (NWP) developed the College, Career, and Community Writers Program (C3WP) to improve students' argument writing through intensive teacher PD, instructional resources, and formative assessment. Based in part on evidence of impacts on student achievement, NWP received a federal Investing in Innovation Fund (i3) Scale-up grant in 2016. As part of this grant, SRI International (SRI) conducted a replication study of C3WP in new contexts. The study was originally designed to study the impacts of C3WP in grades 7-10 in 2018-19 and 2019-20 and grades 4-5 in 2019-20. Because of the Covid 19 pandemic, the evaluation team was unable to collect student writing data in spring 2020. The most significant change, therefore, was changing our confirmatory impact analyses to only one-year programmatic impacts of C3WP on grades 7-9 in 2018-19.

**Keywords:**
randomized control trial; writing; professional development; argument; formative assessment; replication; scale; implementation at scale

**Comments:**
The team preregistered this study with the National Evaluation of i3 (NEi3). To provide a public, uneditable link to the preregistration, we are uploading (1) proposal (actual PDF from the link you shared below), (2) design document submitted to NEi3, and (3) a date-stamped email from NEi3 registering the study. As a study team, we consider the preregistration with NEi3 as our preregistration.

*Section II starts on the next page.*

## Section II: Description of Study

**Type of Intervention:**
Curriculum/Product, formative assessment, Practice, Professional Development

**Topic Area of Intervention:**
Reading and Writing

**Number of intervention arms:**
1

**Target school level:**
7, 8, 9

**Target school type:**
Rural

**Location of Implementation:**
*United States*: United States : Midwest, United States : South, United States : West

**Further description of location:**
Alabama (two sites), California, Idaho, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin

**Brief Description of Intervention Condition:**
C3WP is a skills-based program designed to provide students with instruction that supports their ability to craft reasoned arguments. Over the course of a year, students learn a sequenced set of skills to write an argument supported by evidence from nonfiction sources. The program emphasizes a conversational approach to argument: Students must first familiarize themselves with multiple viewpoints and position themselves within the conversation by forming a claim supported by evidence (Burke, 1941; Graff & Birkenstein, 2006; Harris, 2006). A loftier goal is for students to apply the skills they learn in a civic argument of their choosing.

C3WP has three interwoven components designed to support classroom implementation: intensive PD, instructional resources, and formative assessment. When implemented in a repeating sequence, these three elements are called a "cycle of instruction." A C3WP cycle of instruction is an iterative process that involves four steps. First, teachers engage in PD to learn how to implement an instructional resource. Next, they implement the instructional resource in their classrooms, resulting in student writing. Third, the teachers use the students' writing to assess student progress, and finally they select the next instructional resource based on students' needs. Step 4 starts the next cycle of instruction.

**Brief Description of Comparison Condition:**
If randomized into the business-as-usual group, districts (prior to randomization) committed to continuing typical instructional practice and PD programming (as if they had not heard of C3WP); not seeking out similar PD (i.e., with a focus on argument writing); and waiting until after the study to use any C3WP tools, materials, or strategies. Control districts received an incentive of $2,500 each year of the study and were offered C3WP during the year following the experiment (the 2020–21 school year).

**Comparison condition:**
Business-as-usual

**Comments:**

-

---

## Section III: Research Questions

**Confirmatory research questions:**

**Question 1:**

What is the impact of 1 year of C3WP on grade 7–9 students' argument writing quality and conventions?

**Exploratory research questions:**

**Question 1:**

What is the impact of 1 year of C3WP on secondary teachers' writing practices?

**Comments:**

-

---

## Section IV-A: Study Design (Selection)

**Study Design:**

Randomized Trial (RT)

**Comments:**

-

---

## Section IV-B: Study Design (Input)

***Study Design: Input***

**Unit of random assignment of intervention:**

District

**Assignment within sites or blocks:**

Yes

**Define the sites or blocks:**

Pairs of districts

**Probability of assignment to treatment the same across sites or blocks:**

Yes

**Probability of assignment to treatment:**

.5

**Unit outcome data measured:**

Student

**Intermediate clusters between unit of random assignment and unit of measurement:**

**Comments:**

Local Writing Project sites (the local implementation partners) were directed to recruit one or more pairs of study

districts of similar size, prior achievement, and demographics, with the understanding that one district in each pair would be assigned to treatment, and the other to control. Such blocked randomization has several benefits. First, local Writing Project sites can control how many districts they serve in a year. Second, blocked randomization provides better balance across treatment conditions (accounting for prior achievement, local policy, etc.) than randomization without regard to blocks. To be eligible to participate, study districts had to have a majority of rural schools according to the guidelines issued by the i3 grant funding the project (i.e., having a federal locale code 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43). NWP required that pairs of schools needed to (rules for pairs for similarity). Local Writing Projects made individual decisions about the number of pairs they had the capacity to recruit and serve. In some sites serving more than two pairs, randomization blocks contained four, instead of two, districts.

***Design Classification***

**Based on the responses above, this study has been classified as:**
RT: Multisite (Blocked) Cluster Randomized Trial

---

## Section V: Sample Characteristics

**Approximate number of students per district:** 1000

**Approximate number of districts in the comparision condition within each block (Pairs of districts):** 1

**Approximate number of districts in the intervention condition within each block (Pairs of districts):** 1

**Number of blocks (Pairs of districts):** 22

No No Yes - rural, high-needs districts Yes - non-rural, non-high-needs disticts No Yes - One local Writing Project site recruited two Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) districts. Leaders within the BIE districts expressed concern both the the randomized design and the lack of flexibiity to adapt the definition of "argument" from C3WP's CCSS-aligned materials. The evaluators recommended the local Writing Project site serve these two DIE districts outside the RCT study. These BIE districts were therefore not randomized, nor did the evaluation team collect data in them.
**Comments:**
Despite excluding the BIE schools from the RCT study (in accordance with district leadership preferences), the study sample is 3.2% American Indian/Alaskan Native students, including one district that enrolled a majority of American Indian/Alaskan Native students.

---

## Section VI: Outcomes (Input)

### Confirmatory question 1: Outcome Measure 1

**Outcome domain:** Student Achievement - Literacy
**Minimum detectable effect size:** .16
**Outcome measure:** Analytic Writing Continuum for Source-Based Argument (AWC-SBA)
**Scale of outcome measure:** Continuous
**Normed or state test:** No
**Test-retest reliability:**
**Internal consistency:**
**Inter-rater reliability:** In the CRWP Validation study, these reliability estimates ranged from 89%–92% on each attribute (Gallagher, Arshan, & Woodworth, 2016)
**Same outcome measure in treatment and comparison groups:** Yes

---

## Section VII: Analysis Plan

**Baseline data collected prior to start of intervention:**
Yes

**Description of baseline data:**
AWC-SBA

**Covariates you plan to include in the model:**
Grade, Student Pretest

**Covariates you plan to include in the model:**

**Analytic model:**
See "Impacts on student source-based argument writing" on pdf p.47 of the attached proposal

**Plan to handle cases with missing outcome data:**
Delete all cases with missing data on any outcome measure

**Comments:**
-

---

## Section VIII: Additional Information

**Links:**

-
---

**Files:**
File Name: C3WP Scale Up EIR Proposal.pdf
Description: Funded Proposal

File Name: NEi3 Registration of C3WP Scale Up Evaluation aka Scale10.msg
Description: Email from NEi3 Confirming pre-registry, including memo describing study

File Name: SCALE10-DesignSummary-02-06-2018.docx
Description: Design Summary accepted by NEi3 as Pre-registration

File Name: SCALE10_Contrast_Tool_02.06.2018.xlsm
Description: Contrast tool, with detailed description of planned impact analyses

**Comments:**
-

---