

**AISI Project Annual Report (APAR) 2006/2007**

(To print these forms, set your browse margins to 0.5' for all margins, left right, top and bottom)

Section A1: Project Demographics			
School Authority:	<b>4105 - Lakeland Roman Catholic Separate School District No. 150</b>		
Project:	<b>30220 - S.T.A.R.S. (Students At Risk Succeed)</b>		
Project Scope:	300 Students, Grades K to 9, 7 Schools		
Project Description:	Target low performing K-12 students identified as at risk for not achieving grade level in the areas of reading and numeracy and utilize assessment for learning strategies to address student needs. Create an implementation plan for teachers to develop skills and knowledge that will enable them to implement AFL effectively.		
Project Purpose:	To increase the number of students achieving at the acceptable level and close the achievement gap between low performing and high performing students in reading and numeracy, specifically problem solving.		
Budget for 2006/2007:	Approved: 253,888	Working: 253,888	Actual: 253,888
Project Years:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2006/2007</li> <li>• 2007/2008</li> <li>• 2008/2009</li> </ul>	<a href="#">2006/2007 Annual Report</a>	
<b>Improvement Goals:</b> 1- To increase the % of grade 3, 6, and 9 at-risk students achieving the acceptable standard in Language Arts and Math.  2- To improve the literacy and numeracy skills of students identified as at-risk for not achieving grade level (grades k-9).  3- To increase the % of at-risk students attaining the GLA for their grade (k-9).			
Last update by: <a href="#">Maria Crudo</a> Annual Report Status: <a href="#">Closed</a>			

### Section A2. Variable Demographics

This is an opportunity to update some of the project demographics for the AISI 2006/2007 school year. Please review your original data shown below (the system will display the most current information you have in your current approved AISI project plan). Click on a number to update where applicable.

Actual Number of Students Impacted By The Project This Year	300
Estimated Number of Students Involved For Three Years	300
Estimated Number of PreSchoolers Involved	0
Estimated Number of Students (in your authority) that project could be applied to	300
Student Ages	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15
Grades	K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
Actual number of schools involved	7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption Junior Senior High School</li> <li>• Ecole Dr Bernard Brosseau School</li> <li>• Ecole Notre Dame High</li> <li>• Holy Cross Elementary School</li> <li>• Holy Family Catholic School</li> <li>• Notre Dame Elementary School</li> <li>• St. Dominic School</li> </ul>

### Section A3 : Project Type for Project **30220**

Alberta Education, school authorities, universities and other AISI users often want to undertake various analyses of AISI projects. This type of analytical work requires the capability to extract and group AISI projects accurately by various categories.

Not all categories may apply to your project. Only do the checklists for the categories that are needed to describe your project. However, you must do the following categories: **Targeted Students, Subject** and/or **Themes, Teaching Strategies** and **Types of Measures**.

Please review the project categories and contact SIB at (780) 427-3160 if you have any concerns.

Main Project Category (select only one)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Literacy and Numeracy</li> </ul>
Targeted Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aboriginal</li> <li>At-Risk (not coded)</li> </ul>
Number of Students in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>201-500</li> </ul>
Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K</li> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> <li>3</li> <li>4</li> <li>5</li> <li>6</li> <li>7</li> <li>8</li> <li>9</li> </ul>
Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zone 2/3</li> </ul>
Number of Schools in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 or more</li> </ul>
Area (Urban/Rural)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural</li> </ul>
Subject	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language Arts/Literacy</li> <li>Mathematics/Numeracy</li> </ul>
Division Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 (K-3)</li> <li>2 (4-6)</li> <li>3 (7-9)</li> </ul>
Themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment</li> <li>Special Education</li> </ul>
Teaching Strategies/Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment for Learning</li> </ul>
2000/2001 Approved Budget	
2001/2002 Approved Budget	
2002/2003 Approved Budget	
2003/2004 Approved Budget	
2004/2005 Approved Budget	

2005/2006 Approved Budget	
2006/2007 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 250,001-500,000</li> </ul>
2007/2008 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 250,001-500,000</li> </ul>
2008/2009 Approved Budget	
Project Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centralized</li> </ul>
School Authority Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate School Jurisdiction</li> </ul>
Types of Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of Quality Measures</li> <li>• Provincial Achievement Tests</li> <li>• Surveys</li> <li>• Other Program Participation Measures</li> </ul>
PAT - English Language Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3</li> <li>• Grade 6</li> <li>• Grade 9</li> </ul>
PAT - French Language Arts	
PAT - Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3</li> <li>• Grade 6</li> <li>• Grade 9</li> </ul>
PAT - Social Studies	
PAT - Science	
Diploma Examinations - English	
Diploma Examinations - Mathematics	
Diploma Examinations - Social Studies	
Diploma Examinations - Sciences	
Diploma Examinations- French	
Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents</li> <li>• Student</li> <li>• Teacher/Staff</li> </ul>
School Records	
Standardized/Commercial Tests	
Std. Tests - General Achievement/Math/Language Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other standardized mathematics/numeracy tests</li> </ul>
Std. Tests - Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other reading tests/reading inventory</li> </ul>

Std. Tests - Spelling	
Std. Tests - Writing	
Std. Tests - Developmental/ECS/Grade 1 Readiness	
Constituency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bonnyville-Cold Lake</li><li>• Calgary-North Hill</li></ul>
City or Town Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bonnyville</li><li>• Cold Lake</li><li>• Waskatenau</li></ul>

Section A4 - AISI Project Staffing Allocations

Report staffing specifically assigned for the AISI project in FTEs. Use best estimates if necessary

	FTE 2006/2007		FTE 2007/2008		FTE 2008/2009	
	AISI Funded	Funded From Other Sources*	AISI Funded	Funded From Other Sources*	AISI Funded	Funded From Other Sources*
<b>Certificated Teachers</b>						
Teachers						
AISI Coordinators	1.00		1.00		1.00	
<b>Other Personnel</b>						
Professionals (e.g., Social Worker, Liaison Worker)						
Teaching Assistants						
Administrative Support Staff						
Other						
<b>Total FTE</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	

\* FTEs allocated for AISI projects that are not paid with AISI funds

If there are no FTEs please indicate with a '0'

Section B - Quantitative Measures (From Project Plan)

Measure (From project plan)	Baseline	2006/2007		Number(*) Measured
		Target	Actual	
B8-Grade level attainment/improvement % of at risk students (Gr. 4-9) achieving the acceptable standard as measured by CAA (4 schools)	19	21		
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> At - risk refers to those students not achieving grade level in mathematics. Baseline is the % of students attaining the acceptable standard in their grade level in mathematics when tested using CAA (Computer Assisted Assessment)( end of October- beginning of Nov. 2006). The results will be reported for those schools tartgeting mathematics - St. Dominic (grades 4,5,6), Dr Brosseau (grades 7, 8), Assumption (grades 7, 8, 9), and Notre Dame High (grade 9).				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>  CAA results for the end the school year were determined to be invalid due to the numerous errors found in the assessment itself. We are currently looking at other possible assessment tools for next year.				
B8-Grade level attainment/improvement % of at-risk students (Gr. 3-9) achieving grade level in reading as measured using the Jerry Johns Reading Inventory ( 5 schools)	27	29	53.00	137
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> At - risk refers to those students not achieving grade level in reading. Baseline is the % of at risk students (Gr.3-9) achieving grade level in reading when tested using Jerry Johns Reading Inventory (end of October- beginning of Nov. 2006). The results will be reported for those schools tartgeting reading - Notre Dame Elementary (grades 3, 4), Dr. Brosseau (grades 5, 6), Mackenzie (grades 3, 4, 5, 6), Assumption (grades 7, 8, 9), and Notre Dame High (grades 9).				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G3-A2-Mathematics B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of at-risk students meeting the acceptable standard in Gr. 3 Mathematics PAT ( 1 school )	25	27	11.11	9
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline was determined using the % of at-risk students achieving the acceptable standard on 2005/2006 Gr. 3 mathematics PAT at St. Dominic Elementary which is targeting mathematics.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G9-A7-English Language Arts 9 B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of at-risk students meeting the acceptable standard in the reading portion of the Gr. 9 Language Arts PAT ( 2 schools)	31	33	74.07	34
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline was determined using the % of at-risk students achieving the acceptable standard in reading on 2005/2006 Gr.9 PAT at two schools targeting reading - Assumption and Notre Dame High.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G3-A1-English Language Arts	30	32	52.94	17

B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of at-risk students meeting the acceptable standard in the reading portion of the Gr.3 Language Arts PAT ( 2 schools)				
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline was determined using the % of at-risk students achieving the acceptable standard on 2005/2006 PAT at the two elementary schools targeting reading - Notre Dame Elementary and Mackenzie.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G6-A3-English Language Arts B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of at-risk students meeting the acceptable standard on the reading portion of the Gr. 6 Language Arts PAT ( 2 schools)	62	64	62.50	16
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline determined using the % of at-risk students achieving the acceptable standard on 2005/2006 Gr. 6 Language Arts PAT for the two schools targeting reading - Mackenzie and Dr. Brosseau.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G6-A4-Mathematics B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of students meeting the acceptable standard in Gr. 6 mathematics PAT ( 1 school)	45	47	33.33	6
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline determined using the % of at-risk students achieving the acceptable standard on 2005/2006 Gr. 6 Mathematics PAT at St. Dominic Elementary which is targeting mathematics.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G9-A8-Mathematics B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of students meeting the acceptable standard in Gr. 9 Mathematics PAT (2 schools)	27	29	27.59	29
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline was determined using the % of at-risk studnets achieving the acceptable standard on 2005/2006 Gr. 9 Mathematics PAT at the two schools targeting mathematics - Assumption and Notre Dame High.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				

\* Indicate the number of individuals included in the student measure or test

Section C - Qualitative Measures (From Project Plan)

Measure	Baseline	2006/2007		N*	Response Rate(%) (For surveys only)**
		Target	Actual		
% of grade 4-6 students satisfied that their teacher gives them extra help when needed.	90	91	87.00	462	99
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b> Baseline is based on the previous year's responses (2005-2006). This is a question off of the district survey with results obtained at the end of the school year (random sample). The percentage represents those students who agree or strongly agree.					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
% of grade 7-12 students satisfied that their teacher has provided them with the help and support they need to do better in school.	88	90	91.00	762	99
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b> Baseline is based on the previous year's responses (2005-2006). This is a question off of the district survey with results obtained at the end of the school year (random sample). The percentage represents those students who agree or strongly agree.					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
% of parents satisfied that their child is being challenged and encouraged to achieve their personal best.	89	91	88.00	395	98
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b> Baseline is based on the previous year's responses (2005-2006). This is a question off of the district survey with results obtained at the end of the school year (random sample). The percentage represents those parents who agree or strongly agree.					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
% of teachers satisfied with district resources and programs offered to help them develop and implement assessment for learning strategies.	88	90	95.00	109	96
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b> Baseline is based on the previous year's responses (2005-2006). This is a question off of the district survey with results obtained at the end of the school year (random sample). The percentage represents those teachers who agree or strongly agree.					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					

\* The number of surveys returned or the number of individuals included in the measure (e.g., observation, assessment, etc.)

\*\* Response rate equals the number (N) of surveys returned divided (/) by the number of surveys sent out times (x) 100.



Section D - Description of Quality Measures (From Project Plan)

Current Situation	Desired Change	Success Indicators
Feeling of academic hopelessness among students at risk for failure.	Students at-risk for failure know what success looks like and that it is within their reach.	Student portfolios and conferences documenting increasing levels of success and efficacy.
<p><b>2006/2007</b> How well was the success indicator achieved: Well</p> <p><b>Briefly describe the evidence of success achieved (required) for each identified success indicator.</b></p> <p>For many at-risk students school is game in a foreign language with rules they can neither read nor understand. By beginning the process of implementing assessment for learning, we are providing these students with a blueprint to success. During the first year of the project, teachers worked on sharing outcomes with students in language that they could understand. Sharing outcomes prepares students for what is coming up in the class. Already feeling hopeless, at-risk students are provided with a vision of what is to come.</p> <p>An essential step that follows the sharing of outcomes is constructing criteria together with the students. Co-constructing criteria with students is an empowering procedure since it provides them the opportunity for input. If students know the criteria of an assignment before they hand it in, it takes the mystery out of the learning. Students compare their assignments to the criteria to see their own strengths and weaknesses. In conferences with students, many stated that they had a good idea about what their mark would be prior to handing an assignment in. They felt that knowing what they needed to do in order to be successful prior to handing in an assignment, took the surprise out of the learning. They added that the teachers were not trying to trick them, but be there to support them with their learning.</p> <p>Criteria does not always stand alone. Using exemplars during the process of setting criteria is an effective way of allowing students to see what is expected in an assignment and using the exemplars to support the criteria provides students with an example of each level of success. By seeing various levels of success, at-risk students do not get the feeling of overwhelmed hopelessness at aiming for an unknown level during their first attempt. Instead, during conversations, they stated that they were provided with feedback from both their teacher and their peers about what they did well and areas for improvement. This provided them with a feeling that they were able to be successful.</p> <p>Finally, many teachers provided students with a second chance or they did not count their first attempts. For example in math, some teachers might collect homework to assess student understanding while others might give a quiz for the same purpose. These would not be used for marks, but to inform instruction. If students did not understand the concept, then they were provided with another opportunity to learn the concept. Students felt that they were provided with the chance to learn at their own pace. In language arts, some teachers allowed students to produce several written assignments and then choose the one that they would hand in to be marked. Students responded positively to this because they could learn from their mistakes.</p> <p>At this point in the project, teachers were not using portfolios to a great extent.</p>		

\* N/A means the quality measure did not apply to the current year.

**Section E - Budget Estimates and Reported 'Actuals'**  
**(From Project Plan)**

Budget Area	2006/2007			Explain any variance of (+/-) 25% or more on "Total Expenses"
	Approved Budget	Actual	(*)% Variance	
A. Unexpended AISI Funds (at beginning of year)				
B. AISI Funding	253,888	253,888		
C. Funding from other sources	0	0		
D. Carry over AISI Funds from previous cycle	0	2,332		
<b>Total Available Funds (A+B+C)</b>	<b>253,888</b>	<b>256,220</b>		
<b>Expenses Paid or Payable:</b>				
Staffing and Benefits (includes salary, wages, benefits, outside PD services (i.e., speakers, presenters, facilitators), substitute cost, release time and contract personnel)	227,470	153,945	28.96	Schools were allocated funds to use for substitute teacher costs which were not used to the extent as projected. Since it was the first year, teachers were working within their own classes building their own capacity. We project that in the second and third years more schools will access these funds to use for internal coverage for peer coaching.
Supplies and non-staffing Services	5,000	7,066	-0.81	
Equipment	0	0	0.00	
Other Capital	0	0	0.00	
Other Expenses (includes travel, accommodation, meals and conference fees)	21,418	64,345	-16.91	
Other Authorities ** (group projects only)	0	0	0.00	
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>253,888</b>	<b>225,356</b>		
<b>Unexpended Funds</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30,864</b>		

\* System will automatically calculate the variance as a percentage of Total Expenses.

\*\* This applies to school authorities who have combined their AISI funds to create a group project.

**Section F - Project Expense Percentages (From Project Plan)**

Expense Area	2006/2007(%)			Explain any positive or negative percentage point variance of 10% or greater for PD and Admin
	Approved Estimate	* Year End Actual	** % Variance (Approved Estimate minus Y/E Actual)	
<b>Professional Development</b> (include all costs associated with PD - eg substitute coverage, conference, workshops, speakers` fees, release time on total cost of PD from all budget, categories)	93	92	1	
<b>Project Management &amp; Coordination</b> (administration, data collection, reporting)	5	5	0	
<b>Front-Line Staff</b> (include staff who work directly with students eg teachers, educational assistants, counsellors)	0	0	0	
<b>Other Costs</b> (equipment, materials)	2	3	-1	
<b>Total Percentage</b>	100	100	0	
<b>Total Expenses</b>	253,888	225,356		

\* If the actuals are not available, then a reasonable estimate of the actual is acceptable.

\*\* The system will automatically calculate the % Variance (Y/E Actual Less Approved Estimate.)

**Note:** Point form is preferred. Due to each section being limited to 7,000 characters, it is suggested that you cut and paste the information from a Word document.

### Section G1 - Summarize and Analyze Student Outcomes

#### **Using the evidence that you have collected (Qualitative, Quantitative and Description of Quality Measures in Section B, C & D).**

Provide a summary and explanation of overall student outcomes by explaining the extent to which student learning targets were achieved. (Point form is preferred.)

#### **2006/2007**

At the start up of this school year, each school identified either math or reading as their area of focus for this project. In order to measure student progress in these two areas, we chose to use PAT results for both as well as Computer Adapted Assessment (CAA) for math and Jerry Johns Informal Reading Inventory (JJ) for reading.

#### Reading

The results for our at-risk students were as follows:

- o Jerry Johns - Target: 29% at grade level
- o Actual - 53% at grade level
- o Student results as measured by the Jerry Johns indicate that we met our targets.
- o AFL strategies when linked with research proven strategies for teaching comprehension have a positive impact on student learning.
- o Schools who identified reading improvement as their target for the AISI project had the additional support of the Literacy Coordinator.
- o The Literacy and AISI coordinator worked closely together to provide support for teachers in the area of reading.
- o The Literacy coordinator was able to work with teachers to help them see how AFL strategies could be used in reading.
- o Students have expressed their preference for AFL strategies by asking teachers what the criteria for success is, by requesting exemplars when needed, and by wanting teachers to provide them with feedback they can use to help them learn.
  
- o Gr. 3 PAT - Target: 32% at grade level
- o Actual - 53% at grade level
- o Gr. 6 PAT - Target 64% at grade level
- o Actual - 63% at grade level
- o Gr. 9 PAT - Target 33% at grade level
- o Actual - 74% at grade level

#### Math

The results for our at-risk students were as follows:

- o CAA - Target: 21% at grade level
- o Actual - N/A

At the beginning of the 2006/2007 school year, those schools targeting mathematics as their area for improvement wanted to find a measurement tool that reflect the Albert Program of Studies. After careful deliberation on the part of math teachers CAA was identified as the assessment as it was touted

as a tool that could be used to accurately assess the grade level at which students were performing in math in relation to Alberta Program of studies. At the beginning of the school year all students were assessed using this tool with no apparent difficulties. Unfortunately the end of the year assessment using CAA has been fraught with difficulties that call into question not only the validity of the results, but also the reliability of the assessment itself.

The primary concern identified by students and teachers using this tool are the numerous errors that the end of year assessment contained. For example, one of our administrators wrote 2 of the grade level assessments herself and discovered that in many instances the multiple choice answers did not have the correct response or the answers were all the same but the student was only credited as correct if they choose a certain letter. This experience for students was frustrating at best and at worst damaged already low levels of self-esteem. As a result, we are unable to report any valid results from the CAA and will identify a new measurement tool for next year or rely simply on the results of the PATs.

Gr. 3 PAT - Target: 27% at grade level  
Actual - 11% at grade level

Gr. 6 PAT - Target 47% at grade level  
Actual - 33% at grade level

Gr. 9 PAT - Target 29% at grade level  
Actual - 27.59% at grade level

Success in the area of math did not reap the same results as were evident in reading. At the grades 3 and 6 level, only one school focused on math. While these teachers were provided with support from an outside math consultant and the AISI Coordinator, their results fell short of the anticipated target. Both of the grade 3 and one of the grade 6 teachers were new teachers. They received intense support throughout the year in various areas, but perhaps there were too many initiatives to go deeply into math and assessment for learning.

Math was an area that teachers struggled in when applying assessment for learning strategies. In many cases, after learning a new strategy, teachers would go back to their classes and play with the strategy in their writing classes before working with it in math. Throughout the one elementary school, the math focus was on putting learner outcomes into student-friendly language and pre-and-post testing. Although teachers were in the midst of developing a deeper understanding of the math curriculum, teaching strategies did not go deep due to an underlying philosophy that math facts need to be practiced in isolation. Considerable instructional time was spent on lower-level activities such as practicing basic facts.

At the grade 9 level, results were just shy of the target. Both schools received support from the AISI coordinator and teachers were provided with the opportunity to attend math conferences outside of the district. In addition, teachers at this level teaching math have extensive training in math, a thorough understanding of their curriculum as well as the opportunity to spend their time focusing on one subject area. Many instructional changes were seen in math classes including more students dialoguing about math, questioning strategies that held all students accountable, and feedback on assignments.

## [Section G2 - Effective Practices \(Processes\)](#)

Select a category (1-5) and describe **one** effective practice that resulted from this project. If you have additional effective practices to share, please complete the appropriate category below. Leave any box blank if you do not wish to share an effective practice in a particular category.

## 1. Instructional Strategy

### 2006/2007

The first year of Cycle 3 focusing on Assessment for Learning saw teachers using a variety of exciting strategies. While these strategies have been research proven to have a positive impact on student learning, perhaps the most exciting thing to happen in our district in relation to this project is the buy-in of students due to the implementation of many instructional strategies, especially setting criteria. When teachers set criteria with students, they are clearer about what is expected of them. For example, in one class I heard a child ask his teacher if she was going to do the same thing she had done for biographies with the new unit on letter writing (set criteria). When using this strategy, teachers brainstorm with students what success looks like in relation to a particular project or topic. For example, teachers might ask, "What counts in writing a formal letter?" Students then brainstorm what they think is important. The teacher would then provide students with various exemplars to look at for purpose of developing a sense of clarity of "what counts". Students would then continue adding to their list of brainstormed ideas. Once all the ideas are exhausted the class works to categorize ideas thus creating a list of criteria and indicators.

In setting criteria in another class the teacher identified things students needed to do in order to create a successful project. The students then worked with the teacher to create a list of indicators for each category. Part way through the project students were given time to revisit the criteria and assess how they were doing in relation to it. This was done using peer feedback whereby each student looked at the work of 3 other students and gave them feedback in the form of two stars and wish. All feedback focused on the criteria established at the beginning the project. The result of this was that almost every student got 100% with lowest mark being 74%.

## 2. Professional Development

### 2006/2007

Professional development for this AISI project is based on the belief that schools need to be actively involved in change that focuses on increasing student achievement through the use of research proven best practices. For us, this meant using locally developed PD sessions as a catalyst for developing teacher leadership capacity within all the schools. It also meant shifting the responsibility for project implementation from the district level to the school level. According to Rick Dufour (2001), "[When] professional development moves from the workshop to the workplace, [e]mphasis shifts from finding the right speaker to creating opportunities for staff to work together, engage in collective inquiry and learn from one another..." The process that follows an example of such a shift.

A core group made up of teachers, administrators and special education teachers from all our schools attend 6 full day seminars led by the AISI coordinator. These sessions server several purposes. Firstly, approximately half of each day is devoted to learning about effective assessment for learning strategies. The second purpose is to provide a venue for teachers from across to come together to meet for a common purpose, to share new ideas and to learn from one another. The third purpose is to allow time for school teams to meet together in order to create a plan for ensuring change at the grassroots level. Finally, these sessions are designed to increase the leadership capacity of teachers, administrators and

special education teachers so that they become the impetus for change.

After attending each of these sessions, it becomes the responsibility of the school teams to try the new ideas in their classes and to share what they've learned with their colleagues. The sharing of ideas at the school level is done in many different ways including during PLC's, at staff meetings, through peer observations and modelling, at school based PD sessions, at learning lunches, etc. Regardless of the method of sharing, the school teams are the ones driving the change process at the school level.

In order to support the team members, the AISI coordinator follows up all seminars with classroom visits. During these visits, she looks for evidence of the strategies they learned about at the seminars. All teachers are provided with written, descriptive feedback that focuses on all the great AFL strategies the teacher is trying along with one area they may want to think in the form of "two stars and an I wonder.". These visits use what research tells us about the importance of providing learners with ongoing feedback in order to improve performance.

The result of this professional development model has been unprecedented growth in teacher expertise in the area of assessment for learning across the district.

### 3. Student Assessment

#### **2006/2007**

As the assessment for learning is the primary focus of this project, involving students in the assessment process has been integral. Teachers this year began their assessment journey by looking at the importance of sharing learner outcomes with students. By sharing outcomes with student in student friendly language and checking for understanding throughout the lesson, teachers ensured that students knew the destination they were journeying towards in their learning voyage.

Once sharing outcomes with students became second nature to teachers, they began investigating the importance of using exemplars to help students develop an understanding of what success look like. While it was tempting to only share exemplary exemplars, teachers quickly realized that showing students with exemplars at a variety of levels worked as a catalyst for beginning conversations around what students needed to do be successful. Looking at exemplars at a variety of levels helped students identify the differences between work of high quality and low quality. Armed with the knowledge of what separated the exceptional from the mediocre, students were able to apply the criteria to their own work for the purposes of improvement.

Using exemplars to set the criteria for success with students provided them with a road map for improvement that helped them in a wide variety of ways. Students used the criteria to provide both themselves and their peers with feedback. Providing feedback in relation to criteria ensured that students knew what they were doing well and what they needed to work on. Armed with this knowledge and a clear understanding of expectations for success students were able to apply to their learning.

If improving student learning is to be the goal of all AISI projects, and it certainly is with this one, the proof of its impact should come directly from students. In listening to students in our schools, what we're hearing is the sound of students' voices asking for teachers to provide them with exemplars and to work together to identify the criteria for success. Students have quickly realized the impact both of these assessment strategies can have on their success.

#### 4. Project Management

##### 2006/2007

For this AISI cycle, project management was put primarily in the hands of the schools with the AISI coordinator playing a supporting role. This meant that after participating in AISI workshops, school teams were responsible for ensuring the ongoing growth in knowledge and expertise of the rest of the teachers in their schools. School teams took on the role project managers at the school level by developing school based implementation plans and working together to ensure their effective execution. The result of putting the project in the hands of individual schools has been the exponential growth of teacher expertise in the area of assessment for learning.

#### 5. Parental Involvement

##### 2006/2007

### Section G3 - Project Summary and Reflections

#### 1. WHAT is working well in your AISI project? (Point form preferred)

##### 2006/2007

- o Professional development provided by the school teams as well as sharing ideas during PLC's has been the impetus for the majority of teachers beginning the assessment for learning journey.
- o Teachers have begun using rubrics, sharing exemplars, and posting learner outcomes. Teachers have found these strategies very effective in ensuring that students have a clear understanding of expectations and what success looks like.
- o Teachers are moving away from teacher directed approaches to ones that afford students greater control over their learning. The use of things such as group work, peer assessment and discussions focusing on learning and improvement have resulted in an increased focus on the needs of student within the classroom.
- o Providing teachers with opportunities to collaborate with peers has resulted in everyone becoming more adept at using AFL.
- o Peer observations and conferencing afterwards has been a vehicle for promoting growth and change.
- o Allowing schools to take on the responsibility for the AISI project as increased buy-in and created a sense of urgency in all schools.
- o Leadership at the school level allows teachers within the school to try things and develop an understanding of.
- o Presenting strategies during regular meetings helped ensure everyone was on the same page.
- o Observations and walk-throughs kept principals informed about teacher progress in the area of AFL. When principals noticed teachers who were lagging behind or resisting they were able to give them a gentle nudge towards trying new things.
- o All teachers grew in the area of AFL.
- o Teacher liked that they didn't have work alone and that they were part of a team not only at the school level but also at the district level. They liked the support they received from the various members of the teams.
- o While the AISI project focused on math and reading, it has carried over into a wide variety of other subjects.
- o Students are beginning to push for change as they demand that teachers begin to, or continue to, use strategies that help increase their level or success.
- o In reviewing teacher openness and willingness to use AFL best practices, one school found that the

majority of staff (85-90%) have tried new things in their classes. This school has seen a definite increase in the number of teachers willing to jump into assessment for learning with both feet.

## 2. WHAT did not work well? (Point form preferred)

### 2006/2007

- o While the majority of teachers have tried many AFL strategies, some have been slow to dive into the more complex AFL strategies.
- o Finding adequate time for the AISI teams to share what they know with the rest of their staffs.
- o The time to be able to get the information out to all staff. It's impossible to get a full-days worth of PD out in a limited amount of time.
- o Some schools aren't as far along as they'd hoped to be. For them it feelings like things are moving slowly and its taking a long time to feel comfortable in new things.
- o Varying levels of understanding and confidence make some people more or less comfortable sharing with their peers
- o Feeling that it was too much information to handle all at once
- o Difficult for some to see the links between various other initiatives that are happening in the district - feeling overwhelmed.
- o Teams struggle because they didn't all have a clear vision of what they were doing.
- o Difficult to cater PD sessions to various needs of the participants.
- o Hard to juggle multiple initiatives. Some teachers were involved in multiple projects and found the time demand overwhelming.

## 3. Outline the project adjustments (if applicable). (Point form preferred)

### 2006/2007

- o Some minor adjustments to the project have been made this year. For example, on one AISI team a teacher who resigned from the team due to personal reasons had to be replaced by another.
- o At another school, the principal brought on an extra team member when he learned that one of the members was moving in the summer.
- o A school developed a planning template focusing on how AFL fits into planning. This plan evolved as teachers learned new ideas and began incorporating them.

One major adjustment to the project next year will be the hiring of a new AISI coordinator who will bring her own unique perspective to the project.

## 4. Specify how you shared and celebrated your AISI project and findings. (Point form preferred)

### 2006/2007

- o At all AISI sessions, participants were given the opportunity to share many of the exciting things they tried in their schools. At last AISI session teams shared successes and highlights of the year.
- o Principals frequently celebrated the successes of their teachers by highlighting many of things they were doing to improve student learning.
- o Parents were kept apprised of AISI successes through parent meetings, parent/teacher interviews, academic meetings and school tours for new parents, etc.

- o Shared new practices tried at board meetings in which the media was present
- o Findings displayed in staff rooms
- o Project was shared through school newsletter and parent council meetings.
- o Principals shared what was happening during Open House and School Concerts. This was an opportunity to speak to a large, captive audience.

5. Explain the unanticipated results/effects? (if applicable) (Point form preferred)

**2006/2007**

- o The cultivation of leadership qualities in teachers on AISI team. There has been a genuine willingness on the part of these teachers to take on the role of teacher leader, which has helped ensure a successful start to this project
- o The understanding/skills improved of teachers improved as a result of descriptive feedback
- o The growth in teacher knowledge is greater than anticipated.
- o One school was surprised that all but one person agreed to continue with AISI teams next year.
- o An increase in positive attitude towards trying new things.
- o The fact that AFL spilled over into other subject areas.
- o The integration of AFL with technology. Teachers could see how technology fit in with AFL and were going beyond what they had imagined possible

Section G4 - Sustainability (Optional in Year 1 and 2 - Required in final year)

How will this project be sustained?

**2006/2007**

Section G5 - Project Status (for 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 only)

<b>Year: 2006/2007</b>
Please check one of the following boxes:
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Continuing
<input type="radio"/> Completed
<input type="radio"/> Discontinued If so, please explain WHY

Section H. Attachments (Optional)

\*Please attach additional supporting documents in this section that provides significant information about your project. Since your attachment may be posted on the Internet any names should be excluded unless you have permission to publicly release the names.

File Sent	File Received	Sent Date	Received Status	Copyrighted Document
-----------	---------------	-----------	-----------------	----------------------

## Section I. Superintendent/CEO Certification and Electronic 'Signature' Approval

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The information provided in this AISI Project Annual Report is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, accurate, reliable and valid. I believe that all AISI requirements have been met.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The school authority has the documentation and systems that support the reported information.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Parents are involved and aware of the progress and results of the project.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____ Superintendent/CEO Name (electronic signature)