

AISI Project Annual Report (APAR) 2008/2009

(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:	0021 - Holy Family Catholic Regional Division No. 37		
Project:	30218 - Students and Teachers - Making Assessment Real		
Project Scope:	2142 Students, Grades K to 12, 9 Schools		
Project Description:	Focus on formative assessment, involving students in their own assessment, and provide staff time to work in their professional learning communities at the school level in order to identify essential learning outcomes in the core subjects, plan differentiated units together, and create assessment tools and plans that work for them.		
Project Purpose:	To improve student learning and achievement and increase student involvement in assessment.		
Budget for 2008/2009:	Approved:	Working:	Actual:
	290,352	290,352	290,352
Project Years:	• 2006/2007	2006/2007 Annual Report	
	• 2007/2008	2007/2008 Annual Report	
	• 2008/2009	2008/2009 Annual Report	

Improvement Goals:

1- 1. To improve student learning/ achievement by incorporating more "assessment FOR learning" practices in the areas of Language Arts, French Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies and Science.

2- 2. In each school, students will meet or exceed intended targets for that school's identified AISI SMART goal.

3- 3. To increase student involvement in assessment.

4- 4. To increase teacher capacity to understand and use "assessment FOR learning" language, principles and practices.

Last update by: [Maria Crudo](#)
 Final Report Status: **Closed**

Section A2. Variable Demographics

This is an opportunity to update some of the project demographics for the AISI 2008/2009 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	<input type="text" value="0"/>
Estimated Number of Students Involved For Three Years	2142
Estimated Number of PreSchoolers Involved	0
Estimated Number of Students (in your authority) that project could be applied to	2142
Student Ages	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Grades	K , 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
Actual number of schools involved	9
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecole Providence School • Glenmary School • Good Shepherd School • Holy Family Cyberhigh Virtual School • Holy Family School • Rosary Roman Catholic Separate School • St. Andrew's School • St. Francis Holistic Learning Centre • St. Stephens Catholic School

Section A3 : Project Type for Project 30218

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.

Targeted Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All Students• FNMI
Subject(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All Core (LA, SS, Ma, Sc)• Language Arts/Literacy
Theme(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment• Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
Keywords (Teaching Strategies/PD/Programs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment for/of/as Learning
Number of Students in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1,001-2,500
Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• K• 1• 2• 3• 4• 5• 6• 7• 8• 9• 10• 11• 12
Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Zone 1 Services
Number of Schools in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 6 or more
Location of School(s) involved	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rural
Division Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 (K-3)• 2 (4-6)• 3 (7-9)• 4 (10-12)

School Authority Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate School Jurisdiction
Types of Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of Quality Measures • Final Teacher awarded Marks • Locally Developed/Teacher Made Tests • Observation/Checklists • Provincial Achievement Tests • Provincial Diploma Examinations • Standardized Tests • Surveys
Constituency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grande Prairie-Smoky • Lesser Slave Lake • Peace River • Dunvegan-Central Peace
City or Town Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grimshaw • High Prairie • Manning • McLennan • Peace River • Valleyview
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"> • 250,001-500,000
2007/2008 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 250,001-500,000
2008/2009 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 250,001-500,000
Project Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralized
PAT - English Language Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 • Grade 6 • Grade 9
PAT - French Language Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 6 • Grade 9
PAT - Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 • Grade 6 • Grade 9
PAT - Social Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 9
PAT - Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 6 • Grade 9
Diploma Examinations - English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Language Arts -1 • English Language Arts -2
Diploma Examinations - Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applied Math 30 • Pure Math 30
Diploma Examinations - Social Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Studies 30 • Social Studies 33
Diploma Examinations - Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology 30 • Chemistry 30 • Physics 30
Diploma Examinations-French	
Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents • Student • Teacher/Staff
School Records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual Progress Plan (IPP) Results • Success Indicators for Various Programs
Standardized/Commercial Tests	
Std. Tests - General Achievement/Math/Language Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canadian Achievement Test (CAT) • Canadian Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) • Other standardized languages arts/literacy tests
Std. Tests - Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests • Other reading tests/reading inventory
Std. Tests - Spelling	
Std. Tests - Writing	
Std. Tests - Developmental/ECS/Grade 1 Readiness	

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*
Certificated Teachers						
Teachers	0.70		1.20		1.20	1.20
AISI Coordinators	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00
Other Personnel						
Professionals (e.g., Social Worker, Liaison Worker)	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Teaching Assistants	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Administrative Support Staff	0.20		0.20		0.20	0.20
Other	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Total FTE	1.9		2.4		2.4	2.4

* 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	2008/2009		Number(*) Measured
		Target	Actual	
B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of students meeting the acceptable standard - Increase in percentage of students achieving acceptable standard in Grade 3 core subjects.	88.2	92	89.40	138

Baseline and Measure Comments:

Baseline based on 3 year average - 2003-2006 - Student who Wrote.

Comment on results (optional)

Although the original baseline was surpassed over the 3 year period, there was a decline from the first year in Cycle III from 92.90 to 92.10 to 89.40. Overall increase in Cycle III +1.20.

% of students in each school who achieve the school's literacy SMART goal objective.	70		64.84	1920
---	----	--	-------	------

Baseline and Measure Comments:

Baselines and targets will be different for each school. Each school is establishing those at the present time, based on pre-assessment results for the beginning of the school year.

Comment on results (optional)

When all eight schools are included in the measured and divided by 8 for an average, the result is 64.84%.

GSS - 70.4%

GM - 86%

HF - 74%

Ros - 63%

St. A - 36%

St. S - 89.3%

EP - 80%

Cyb - 20%

However, 5 schools surpassed their SMART goal targets. Two schools had significant impact on the result:

Good Shepherd

Overall School Goal - All students will improve reading comprehension in non-fiction by one grade level by the end of June 2009.

PLC Goals

ECS: All students will be able to follow 3-step directions by the beginning of June 2009.

Grade 1: By the end of June 2009, all grade one students will achieve at least a one grade level improvement in reading comprehension as seen in GRADE testing.

Grade 1,2 French: All Grade 1 & 2 French Immersion students will increase three levels in reading comprehension in non-fiction GB+ leveled readers by June 2009.

Grade 2: By the end of June 2009, 100% of Grade 2 students will order events of a story in the correct sequence.

Grade 3: 100% of Grade 3 students will increase their comprehension of informational passages by one grade level (Reading A-Z) by the end of May 2009.

Grade ¾ French: All Grade 3 & 4 French Immersion students will increase 3 levels in reading comprehension in non-fiction GB+ leveled readers by June 2009.

Grade 4: All Grade 4 students will maintain or improve their standard score on total test as indicated by GRADE testing in June 2009.

Grade 5 English: All Grade 5 students will improve reading comprehension by a minimum of one grade level as indicated by GRADE Tests in June 2009.

Grade 5/6 French: All Grade 6 French Immersion students will increase at least one level (using GB+) in reading comprehension by June 2009.

Grade 6: Grade six students will increase reading comprehension using vocabulary as a strategy. Between October 2008 and May

2009, students will improve by at least one stanine in vocabulary on the GRADE test.

Glenmary

80% of Glenmary's Grade 12 students will attain their grade level in reading comprehension by the end of May, 2009.

Holy Family

Div. I - By June of 2009, 82% or more of all students in Division I will be at or above grade level in Language Arts.

Div I - By June of 2009, 95% of students in Division I will be at or above grade level in math as measured by locally developed tools.

Div. II - By June 2009, 85% of Division II students will improve by a minimum of two guided reading levels.

Div. II - By June 2009, 85 % of Division II students will be at or above grade level in their writing as measured by locally developed assessment tools.

Div III - By June 2009, Grade 9 students will achieve the following percentages representing at or above grade level on their PAT's.

L.A. = 80%/Science = 80%/ S.S. = 70%/Math = 55%.

Rosary

Using Assessment for Learning practices and literacy strategies, 80% of Rosary School students will increase one year in reading level according to the GRADE reading assessment by June 13, 2009.

St. Andrews

100% of non-coded students in the 2007-2008 Grade 7 cohort will show improvement of one grade level in their reading comprehension as tested by the GRADE test by June 2009.

100% of coded students in the 2007-2008 Grade 7 cohort will show improvement of .70 of a grade level in their reading comprehension as tested by the GRADE test by June 2009.

St. Stephens

Using Assessment for Learning practices and literacy strategies, St. Stephens students will improve math scores on year end summative assessments by 20% by June 2009.

Ecole Providence

By June 2009, 80% of students will increase reading levels by at least one year as measured on the GRADE test.

Holy Family Cyberhigh

Using Assessment for Learning practices, Differentiated Instruction strategies and Critical Thinking strategies, Grade 9 and 12 students will improve their critical thinking skills by 10% in Math, L.A., S.S. and the Science by June 30, 2009 as measured by locally developed instruments.

B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of students meeting the acceptable standard - Increase in percentage of students achieving acceptable standard in Grade 12 on final blended marks.	92	95	90.50	91
--	----	----	-------	----

Baseline and Measure Comments:

Baseline based on 3 year average - 2003-2006 - Students who Wrote .

Comment on results (optional)

The original baseline was surpassed the previous 2 years but dropped this past two year from 93.40 tp 92.60 to 90.50. Overall decrease in Cycle III -1.50.

B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of students meeting the acceptable standard - Increase in percentage of students achieving acceptable standard in Grade 6 core subjects.	80	85	87.90	173
--	----	----	-------	-----

Baseline and Measure Comments:

Baseline based on 3 year average - 2004 - 2006 - Student Who Wrote.

Comment on results (optional)

The baseline was significantly surpassed all three years from 89.10 to 83.90 to 87.90. Overall increase in Cycle III +7.90.

B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of students meeting the acceptable standard - Increase in percentage of students achieving acceptable standard in Grade 9 core subjects.	70.7	76	76.50	177
--	------	----	-------	-----

Baseline and Measure Comments:
Baseline based on 3 year average - 2003 - 2006 - Students Who Wrote

Comment on results (optional)

The baseline was surpassed all three years from 76.60 to 72.10 to 76.50. Overall increase in Cycle III +5.80.

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

Section C - Qualitative Measures (From Project Plan)

Measure	Baseline	2008/2009		N*	Response Rate(%) (For surveys only)**
		Target	Actual		
% of teachers who increase use of formative assessment, in terms of total assessment practice, to 30%.	77.8	79.8	63.00	146	95

Baseline and Measure Comments
Baseline to be gathered in the fall. The drop from the baseline can be accounted for in changeover of staff and in some cases administrators did not hand out the teacher surveys until the end of June. (surveys provided in May.)

Comment on results (optional)

After our first year, we set a baseline of 77.8 based a new response in our survey - to increase formative assessment, in terms of total assessment practice, to 20%. We increased that to 30% of the total practice in year 2 and in year 3. Year 2, we had an overall percentage of teachers at 47.9% and in Year 3, an overall percentage of 63%, a significant increase.
GSS - 88%
GM - 81%
HF - 57.2%
ROS - 33.3%
St. A - 38.2%
St. S - 41.2%
EP - 66%
CYB - 100%

% of teachers who indicate growth in two or more areas on "Surveying my Landscape".	91.7	93.7	72.00	146	95
---	------	------	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments
Baseline to be gathered in the fall.

Comment on results (optional)

There was good growth in Year 1 and 2 of the project - 91.7% and 96%. Teachers indicated they realized, once they knew more about assessment, areas in which they thought they were doing a good job required more attention. This could account for the drop. They are becoming more metacognitive about their assessment practices and Year 3 is probably a more accurate representation of their understanding and growth.

GSS - 75%

GM - 84%

HF - 58%

ROS - 100%

St.A - 35%

St. S - 67%

EP - 57%

CYB - 100%

% of teachers who share learner outcomes with students.	81.4	83.4	76.00	146	95
---	------	------	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments

Baseline to be gathered in the fall.

Comment on results (optional)

Year 1 and 2, we asked % of teachers who share learner outcomes with students. Most interpreted this as "some of the time" = 81.40. Year 2, we collected -Share Learner outcomes in one unit = 71.9% - and Share learner outcomes 90% of the time = 43%. Year 3 - "share learner outcomes" = 76%

GSS - 51%

GM - 89%

HF - 21.4%

ROS -41.6%

St. A -25%

St. S - 25%

EP - 57%

CYB - 80%

Parent Satisfaction Survey Question: "How satisfied are with the school's efforts to improve students' reading skills?"	95.0	97.0	92.00	562	35
---	------	------	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments

New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #17

Parent Satisfaction Survey Question: "How satisfied are you with the methods used to grade/mark your child?"	94.0	95.0	94.00	562	35
--	------	------	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments

New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #20

Percentage of Grade 12 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "I am involved with the assessment of my work and I understand how teachers evaluate my work."	77.0	79.0	71.00	44	40
--	------	------	-------	----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #42 = evaluate my work - 77%
Schollie Survey - #43 - assessing my work - 64%

Percentage of Grade 12 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "My teachers and I discuss how I am doing and what I can do to improve my learning."	76.0	78.0	71.00	44	40
--	------	------	-------	----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #41

Percentage of Grade 12 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "Teachers post learner outcomes and use many different ways to help me learn."	95.0	96.0	72.00	44	40
--	------	------	-------	----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #46 - Outcomes - 75%
Schollie Survey - #44 - Ways to learn - 68%

Percentage of Grade 6 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "My teacher and I discuss how well I am doing and what I need to do to improve my learning."	77.0	79.0	78.00	167	95
---	------	------	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #23

Percentage of Grade 6 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "My teacher has taught me new reading strategies to use to improve my learning."	77.0	79.0	86.00	167	95
---	------	------	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #26

Percentage of Grade 6 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "My teacher puts up learner outcomes so I know what I am expected to learn."	91.0	93.0	97.00	167	95
Baseline and Measure Comments					
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.					
Comment on results (optional)					
Schollie Survey - #25					
Percentage of Grade 9 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "I am involved with the assessment of my work and I understand how teachers evaluate my work."	72.0	74.0	68.00	139	80
Baseline and Measure Comments					
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.					
Comment on results (optional)					
Schollie Survey - #42 = 75%					
Schollie Survey - #43 = 60%					
Percentage of Grade 9 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "My teachers have taught me some specific reading skills so that I know what I can do to improve my learning."	57.0	59.0	55.00	139	80
Baseline and Measure Comments					
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.					
Comment on results (optional)					
Schollie Survey - #45					
Percentage of Grade 9 students agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "Teachers post learner outcomes and use many different ways to help me learn."	91.0	92.0	70.00	139	80
Baseline and Measure Comments					
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.					
Comment on results (optional)					
Schollie Survey - #46 - Learner Outcomes - 80					
Schollie Survey - #44 - Ways to learn - 60					
Percentage of Support Staff agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "Teachers and support staff are able to better help students improve literacy skills as a result of the school's efforts on the literacy SMART goal."	96.0	97.0	93.00	75	70
Baseline and Measure Comments					
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.					
Comment on results (optional)					

Percentage of Support Staff agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "The AISI project has improved your ability to support assessment for learning initiatives in the classroom."	96.0	97.0	92.00	75	70
---	------	------	-------	----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments

New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Percentage of Teachers agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "Are you involved in school-based professional learning communities?"	83	100	92.00	147	98
--	----	-----	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments

Baseline - 1 year on the 2005-2006 Schollie Survey.

Comment on results (optional)

AISI Year End Survey - #15

Percentage of Teachers agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "Do you incorporate assessment for learning ideas or practices?"	95	100	100.00	145	98
---	----	-----	--------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments

Baseline - 1 year on the 2005-2006 Schollie Survey.

Comment on results (optional)

Used results from Survey Monkey Year End Survey. Question was missing on Schollie Survey.

Percentage of Teachers agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "How satisfied are you that the AISI project has improved the quality of your instruction and assessment skills?"	93.0	95	94.00	110	80
--	------	----	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments

New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #11

Percentage of Teachers agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "If you answered yes to the above question, has your PLC improved student learning?"	86	98	90.00	133	98
---	----	----	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments

Baseline - 1 year on 2005-2006 Schollie Survey.

Comment on results (optional)

AISI Year End Survey - #24

Percentage of Teachers agreeing with Satisfaction Survey Question: "Teachers are able to better help students improve literacy skills as a result of the school's efforts on the literacy SMART goal."	94.0	95	86.00	110	80
--	------	----	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments
New item on Satisfaction Survey. 1st year will be the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Schollie Survey - #10

Percentage of teachers who integrate a formative assessment practice in order to change or modify the instruction students require in order to achieve learner outcomes.	82.0	84	88.20	142	95
--	------	----	-------	-----	----

Baseline and Measure Comments
Baseline to be gathered in the fall.

Comment on results (optional)

GSS - 100%
GM - 88%
HF - 93.3%
ROS - 100%
St. A - 63.9%
St. S - 94.1%
EP - 66%
CYB - 100%

* 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
1. Teachers feel challenged by the assessment/evaluation process especially when it comes to "Assessment FOR Learning" principles/practices. Most recognize they need to continually improve assessment practices in order to gain more accurate evidence of student learning.	Teachers will be comfortable using the AAC's "Framework for Student Assessment" in their planning. They will become very familiar with their Programs of Studies/learner outcomes, will feel confident setting criteria and collecting evidence of learning, and will incorporate more formative assessment and individual conferencing practices into their classrooms.	Teachers will know they are comfortable using assessment for learning practices when they are using the triangulation process, collecting evidence over time so emerging trends and patterns can be identified, using assessment information to fine tune instruction and the learning environment, and involving students/parents more in the assessment process. Teachers will refine reporting systems as a result of the changes to their assessment practices. Evidence of success will be demonstrated in anecdotal records, interviews, surveys and the Reality Check Survey.

2006/2007 How well was the success indicator achieved: Well

Briefly describe the evidence of success achieved (required) for each identified success indicator.

Building on Cycle II project on DI: Although challenged by multi-ability classrooms, teachers continue to try DI practices but with more of a focus on the assessment process within the DI unit of instruction. Teachers are using assessment more often to inform instruction which is key to a DI classroom. More teachers are becoming comfortable having students working on different activities or units of learning. Many are making changes to the complexity of the learning material when faced with students who require differentiation. Teachers are more comfortable trying to tier assignments in math, writing assignments or performance assessment tasks such as projects.

GOAL-Become familiar with the green section (AAC Framework poster) with particular emphasis on becoming very familiar with the Programs of Study, identifying essential learner outcomes, aligning curriculum between grade levels, and sharing outcomes with students. (83/127)

All teachers received the AAC poster for their classrooms. The process poster was used to guide PLC work. Teachers uncovered curriculums and identified "Must Knows" (essential), "Should Knows" (important) and "Would be Nice to Knows" (Worth Being Familiar With). Teachers contributed work to the Sharing Bank. Most (105/127) looked in-depth at learner outcomes and feel confident they are focused on essential learner outcomes. Most (92/127) began posting learner outcomes in kid-friendly language and involving students in process.

Comments:

"I found this process very useful. I feel as though I am on the same page as my colleagues."

"I have become more aware of the requirements at the other grade levels. We have more consistency between the same grade classes now."

"I now know the grade 3, 4 and 5 curriculums in all subject areas. I now know how to align my teaching with the curriculum outcomes in the grades above and below me."

GOAL-Set criteria with students. (77/127)

Teachers find this easier to do with students on performance assessment tasks such as projects, writing assignments, presentations, lab write-ups. However, more difficult to do and not worth it if doing multitude of simple, lower level pen and paper tasks on daily basis. It involves redesigning whole units using Understanding by Design principles and incorporating real-life connections/meaningful learning experiences. Some teachers have set criteria with students around the presentation of a poster, chart, lab write-up, problem in math, etc. This will continue to be a major focus next year in conjunction with acquiring more exemplars. Teachers will need time to improve planning, using these principles as they move from quantity to quality. Once teachers have created such high level tasks, they will need to experiment with setting criteria with students. This is risky because involves time element. Many teachers, particularly in high stakes grades/subjects such 30 levels, struggle with how they can take the time to do this when timelines are already so tight. This involves complex

redesign and paradigm shifts. We will not move forward until this is addressed thoroughly with teachers.

Comments:

"I found it interesting when we explored (in our PLC) and discussed certain criteria."

"The students had to write a poem. They set their own criteria. They seemed to think that it made their work easier because they decided how they were going to do it."

"I am being consistent with students when establishing criteria for task and projects."

"My goal was to integrate student generated criteria for one major assignment this year."

"I set criteria with students regarding arctic animal adaptations. Setting criteria was very successful."

GOAL-Increase formative assessment practices to 20% of practice. (88/127)

Teachers completed "Surveying my Landscape" at beginning and end of year. Explicit expectation that assessments practices would begin changing to include more formative. Part of conversations at PLC's.

Majority worked hard to increase to that level. Many, especially at Div I, have surpassed that significantly.

(91/127) give students option of rewrites on exams/assignments to improve mark

(103/127) use rubrics

(90/127) involve students in peer assessment

(64/127) held at least 1 student-led interview where students had opportunity to share learning with parents

Some formative practices being developed as part of teachers' "balanced assessment program" include:

individual conferences, checks for understanding with chance to go back and correct for mastery, snapshot evaluations, variety of questions (Bloom's Taxonomy), more pre-assessment, graphing student progress, informal assessments through questioning and observation, more student involvement in setting criteria, not as much reliance on pen and paper work, more frequent/routine assessment, practice tests, checklists, rubrics, journals, peer/self-assessment, less marks for practice, tiered questions, larger projects that cover more curriculum, entrance/exit slips, partner quizzes, rewrites, more choice in assignments, redo's, warm and cool feedback, use of green/yellow/red light, more pre-activity tools to determine direction of teaching, posting outcomes, not marking assignments but providing descriptive feedback instead, simulations, portfolios, comments only, suggestions on how to improve marks, student-led interviews, oral/written feedback, developing common exams. Several set goals at beginning of year to "have my classroom become a total AFL learning environment."

Story - One grade 5 teacher did a hands-on electricity unit where students had to build and wire a house. All students knew, understood and could do the learner outcomes for the unit. There was an extremely high success rate. They presented their creations and could answer any and all questions about their projects. At the end of the unit, the teacher gave the students a test. When asked why she gave them a test, she realized that the assessment had already happened in the project and presentation. Why give the test? We have a dependency on giving tests in order to justify learning.

Comments:

"For my writing I have involved the students much more in their assessment of their own writing."

"I used an exit pass during the first part of a review for finals. It was a good strategy that led to me structuring a more succinct, focused review for the next class."

"I am providing more specific feedback to students."

"I have completely redone my unit and year plans to incorporate a backwards by design idea. I have started by asking the question "What will I collect as evidence of learning?"

"One of the most important things I learned this year - I need to "see" (observe) in order to assess."

2007/2008 How well was the success indicator achieved: Well

Briefly describe the evidence of success achieved (required) for each identified success indicator.

GOAL-Become familiar with the Blue/Pink sections of AAC Framework, continuing to develop solid summative assessment, working to increase formative assessment

Want teachers to use AAC Framework as guiding map. Most schools using-some done exceptional job.

Revisited outcomes-ensure prioritized/aligned with instruction/assessment tools. High # of 1st year/new teachers to division (30/139 = 21.5%)-struggled with "catching up". On-going process-mentorship program has to be improved

All incorporating more formative assessment but most struggling with how to report out-mark/grade-focus in the upcoming year

More individual conferencing-triangulation evident- teacher/student.

Are teachers confident in what constitutes "evidence of learning"-Are they fine tuning instruction and learning environment based on assessment evidence? 85% say yes.

Many begun involving students more in own assessments-reflection sheets, self/peer-assessment, parent feedback, individual conferences, goal setting, setting criteria, exemplars, etc.

Based on the Reality Check Survey:

83% looked in-depth at learner outcomes-focused on essential learner outcomes

72% began posting learner outcomes in kid-friendly language

81% used pre-assessment

85% integrated formative assessment practices in order to change/modify the instruction students require to achieve the learner outcomes

48% Increased formative assessment practices to 30%

73% gave students option of rewrites

81% gave frequent, specific, timely feedback to students on their learning

GOAL-Firm up work done at school-level PLC's-ensure focus on determining what constitutes "evidence of learning"

Supr of Instruction sat on most PLC's to help focus (Dufour's 4 questions).Worked with School Admin to lead PLC's effectively-huge endeavor but worth effort. PLC's focused on student learning/agendas

& minutes are kept/action plans monitored. Work to be done in some PLC's on good collaboration, focused conversation, and gathering "evidence of learning". Most in better position to lead/manage own PLC's.

Division PLC's focused on Backwards Design planning and determining what is "evidence of learning" in unit of study. What does quality summative assessment look like?

73% created assessment tools/record keeping tools that reflect individual growth/ progress

79% investigated outcomes-based report cards

86% reviewed report cards

48% reviewed mark strips/interim reports

60% reviewed parent-teacher interviews/student led interviews

82% been able to make practical connections between AFL/DI and new curriculum

80% planned/organized learning ideas/activities with colleagues to improve student learning

GSS- significant discussions regarding alignment of report card marks. Discussions on awards/honor roll. How do these practices align with the new way of thinking? Most staff well along in assessment journey-encountering contradictions between past/current reporting practice and new assessment practices. Focus on improvement/growth versus hitting mark-allowed teachers to reevaluate own assessment-making sure reporting process is representative of what is actually happening. Report card currently outcomes-based with letter system

GM-Through SAINTS house system-goal setting program implemented. Teacher advisors worked in houses on specific reading strategies. Each advisor met individually with each student to set goals in relation to reading, core subject and "behavior' goals. Few English teachers implemented student portfolios. Most putting more thought into formative/specific comments on report cards rather than just a grade. Many comments based on outcomes/evidence of learning. ELA 20-1-one used only formative comments on progress reports/reporting

terms until final report card= huge risk at senior high level. Many displayed samples of student work at PTI's

HF-Admin done extensive data analysis of student achievement. Teachers agreed on direction-all have "I Can" Statements posted in kid-friendly language. More posted exemplars. New reporting system (ECSD) implemented focused on essential Learner Outcomes-moved away from percentages/mark based reporting. Elementary report cards outcomes-based. All progress reports based on qualities of effective learners/outcomes of active, engaged learners rather than marks

Rosary-Jr High looked at data to see if any evident patterns around student learning-implemented some sped supports for 1 class-required more access to computers for writing. More assessment practices discussed at PLC's. Ideas at PLC's being used in classroom-success/failure discussed at future PLC's. All contributed to discussions to help each other find ways to improve student learning. Jr High looked at changing way report marks-decided to add outcomes to report cards next year. All report cards will be outcomes-based with letter/grade accompanying outcomes for each subject. Reading portfolios in gr 4-6 implemented. Continued tracking students who are behind

St. A-Triangulation process recognized as valuable, but time-constraints made it difficult. Looked at ways to assist teachers so can do more on regular basis. Most made progress in changing reporting/marking systems to reflect AFL. Portfolios a work in progress. Jr. High LA/some elementary did portfolios. Began to investigate outcomes-based reporting.

St. S-All gr 1-6 used marks books or electronic versions of marks books to track outcomes met. ECSD report card system implemented in gr 1-6. All reporting outcomes-based. Gr 7 & 8 will move to outcomes-based next year.100% willingly used GLA reporting measures.Student-led conferences in February=best attended PTI night ever.

EP-All participated in PLC's but timing and PLC make-up did not work well. Recommended PLC's be built into the timetable next year. Teachers became familiar with "Making Classroom Assessment Work" by Anne Davies, AAC AFL Framework, listened to AAC Conference cached videos/Rick Stiggins videos, visited AAC website, worked on literacy program supported by school library. Literacy identified as challenging area-all efforts focused on improving student literacy. Implemented ECSD elementary outcomes-based report cards-combined with student-led parent interviews-highly successful.

Cyb-Summative/formative assessment been discussed extensively as part of formation of assessment policy. Implemented many strategies/involved students more in own assessments. Agreed on need to move towards 90% quality summative assessment. An increased interaction with students on-line. All adopted formal goal-setting program with students.

2008/2009 How well was the success indicator achieved: Well

Briefly describe the evidence of success achieved (required) for each identified success indicator.

GOAL - Become familiar with the AAC Framework, beginning with the Program of Studies, and focusing emphasis on increasing formative assessment practices.

GOAL - Increase skill in data analysis, using all assessment information to adjust instruction in order to improve student learning.

GOAL - With colleagues, reevaluate all summative assessments in order to ensure quality, higher level thinking summative assessments, as part of triangulating "evidence of learning".

GOAL - Involve students and parents in the reporting system.

Teachers reported:

- 68% are familiar with the AAC's Framework and have it posted
- 88% have looked in-depth at learner outcomes and are focused on the essential learning outcomes
- 76% posted learner outcomes in kid-friendly language and involve students in the process
- 42% posted learner outcomes at least 90% of the time
- 63% increased skills in data analysis in order to improve student learning
- 53% adjusted instruction based on pre-assessment
- 83% been able to make practical connections between AFL/DI and new curriculum
- 82% planned/organized learning ideas/activities with colleagues to improve student learning
- 88% integrated formative assessment practices in order to change/modify the instruction students require to achieve the learner outcomes
- 72% increased formative assessment practices to 20% of practice
- 68% increased formative assessment practices to 30% of practice
- 68% increased formative assessment practices to 40% of practice
- 88% gave frequent, specific, timely feedback to students on their learning
- 53% gave students the option or rewrites on exams/assignments to improve work
- 88% use rubrics
- 67% involved students in peer assessment
- 82% created assessment tools/record keeping tools that reflect individual growth/progress
- 46% reviewed mark strips/interim reports
- 72% investigated outcomes-based report cards
- 86% reviewed report cards
- 72% reviewed parent-teacher interviews/student-led interviews

GSS - Teachers regularly are using the language of assessment. "Semantics drives cognition". All teachers are using portfolios to collect evidence of learning. Rubrics and student input/reflection are regularly used in the assessment process. More and more teachers are using projects and performance assessment procedures.

GM - Teachers, on a whole, are changing their assessment practices significantly. Dale Skoreyko was brought in as a keynote speaker to challenge all teachers' assumptions about assessment and the impact on the way we have traditionally done assessment in schools. (Mostly in Jr. and Sr. High) The school's assessment team of teachers and parents has worked to identify 6 key fixes from Ken O-Connor's work and redo their "Assessment Practice Standard", incorporating the 6 fixes. The real struggle has been trying to find a way to adjust the older and more traditional current technology for report cards and grade books to the newly acquired philosophy. Teachers have experimented with creating their own but it is much too time-consuming. In the meantime, the school will have to wait for the technology to be there in order to report the way the teachers would like. Teachers have separated formative from summative assessments and have clearly outlined what constitutes quality summative and what is formative and should not be marked. Although teachers would like to do a better job at triangulating their evidence of learning, there is an issue with individual conferencing with students and finding the time to do that piece well.

HF - Elementary teachers are using Edmonton Catholic Schools' outcomes-based report cards in conjunction with student-led interviews. They have begun to use portfolios. Most teachers use a variety of assessments including rubrics, checklists, anecdotal records and some performance assessment tasks. Several increased the use of comments only on some assignments and projects for feedback. Many are posting learner outcomes regularly. Most are increasing the use of individual conferencing as part of the triangulation process.

ROS - There has been much more open discussion about assessment at PLC's, in particular, the Jr. High PLC. They have discussed no zero's and late/missing assignments and how to deal with them. More teachers are co-constructing criteria with students and using many different assessment strategies within their classrooms. More discussions are now focused on how to report marks and how that is going to have to change in order to mesh with the way we are now assessing students. Jr. High teachers changed their interview system and held student/parent/teacher interviews in which all teachers of a student met with the student and parents together in

a "case conference" style. Reaction was mostly favorable, positive and productive.

St. A - Teachers have participated in "data carousels" and begun using the information from various data sources to determine underlying issues. Teachers are creating long term strategies and programs to address areas of concern identified in the data analysis. Teachers are finding purpose in the programs they are implementing. Teachers are experimenting with new forms of assessment and revising assessment practices. They are realizing the need for revising assessment activities and practices by reevaluating the quantity and quality of both formative and summative assessments. Teachers are struggling with addressing the needs of multiple levels of learners in a classroom.

St. S - In the K-2 PLC, teachers developed a checklist to align K-2 outcomes and skills. They broke down concepts so each teacher knows exactly what needs to be learned in each grade level. In the 3-5 PLC, the teachers built performance assessments in Math. In L.A., the teachers are sharing what students have learned previously and are discussing/planning to allow for greater ease of transition from grade to grade. In the 6-9 PLC, teachers completed assessments for each grade level in L.A. and Math. They began work on developing a CTS course in Jr. High on "School Survival Strategies". They began a book study on "Summarization" strategies. They analyzed the GRADE test results and looked for trends. Based on the trends, they are developing strategies to improve the weak areas.

EP - Elementary teachers have moved to the Edmonton Catholic outcomes-based report cards and are using them in conjunction with student-led interviews. It has been a drastic change for the teachers and parents as they moved from a percentage-based report card that was quite archaic.

CYB - The majority of the Sr. High classes have grade books made up of 90% summative and 10% formative assessment. The school is working towards 100% summative. Teachers are working to make sure assessments line up with curriculum outcomes. 75% of teachers "Strongly Agree" they have planned and organized learning ideas/activities with colleagues to improve student learning.

2. Most students are not actively and metacognitively involved in the assessment process. They are unable to assess their own learning, reflect on their own learning or set goals for themselves.

When students are trained in self-assessment, reflection and goal setting, they better understand the purpose of their learning and what they need to do to improve. Their teachers can see the gaps between what they have taught and what the students have learned.

Learning is enhanced when students see their strengths, understand what they need to work on, and are able to set personal goals. By collecting students' self-assessments, teachers enrich the depth and variety of their data collection about student learning. Students will be able to articulate the learner outcomes, assess and reflect on their own learning, and set realistic goals for them in order to improve their learning.

2006/2007 How well was the success indicator achieved: Well

Briefly describe the evidence of success achieved (required) for each identified success indicator.

GOAL-To involve students in self-assessment, with focus on incorporating more reflection tools.

(102/127) involve students in self-assessment

(74/127) began using portfolios with students

Teachers are using more AFL strategies such as entrance and exit cards, journals, 2 Stars and a Wish, KWL ideas. It is challenging to get younger students to do this and takes much practice for them to get good at it. Students with learning disabilities can experience metacognition strategies as a challenge and require more structure to help them. Sometimes teachers try it a couple of times and it does not go as well as they would like so they abandon idea. Leaders have to keep encouraging teachers to keep at it. This takes a skill set on part of teachers and on part of students. Teachers have to model over and over so students know what good reflection looks like. One of the areas we have worked more on is giving students very specific, timely feedback (warm and cool feedback) so they can use it to improve learning and in reflections. For example, "I did this, and this improved." "I had not included this. When I added it, my mark was better."

Comments

"Students complete specific outcomes checklist at end of each unit so that students are indicating what they know and don't know."

"The rubric was constantly referred to in this assignment. The students were more reflective and answers were more indicative of performance. Previously, when I used rubrics, I did not provide the structure needed and did

not refer it enough before, during and after. Therefore, it was less successful. This was more successful."
"They liked knowing exactly what finished product was supposed to look like. They now take much less time to do paragraph assignment."

"We made writers checklist and students knew what was expected. We had exemplars. They had a chance to edit as they self-assessed before I marked work."

"I give pre-assessments to my Kindergarten and gr 1 students so they know exactly where they are. Then they know exactly what they need to do to get there. It places the responsibility for their learning on them."

GOAL-Students will set realistic goals and work towards them.

(89/127) did active goal-setting with students and revisited goals regularly throughout year to reflect on growth.

Three schools instigated formal goal-setting programs, meeting with every student 2 - 4 times per year as part of reporting system. (Glenmary, Good Shepherd and Holy Family)

Teachers commented they needed to do more on-going follow-up to goal setting sessions in order to keep students focused on goals they had set. As well, it helped teachers make these living documents.

Comments

"We chart progress on a graph."

"Students had control of decisions. It led to more creative thinking."

GOAL-Students will begin to articulate learner outcomes in own words, reflecting their understanding.

Teachers have just begun to experiment with wording and ways to involve students more in understanding learner outcomes. Teachers sometimes struggle with "big ideas" and try to post too many little outcomes. As well, there were several teachers who said they put them up but never did anything with them until end of unit and then wondered why students were not making use of them. They realized they had to consciously refer to them and bring them alive for students. High school English teachers felt particularly challenged with language of their Program of Studies. How do you make it understandable for students when it is difficult for high school teachers to "get it". Many teachers chose to post one set of outcomes for a unit rather than daily ones. Junior and Senior high teachers began putting them on assignments and on tests so that students would constantly refer to them. When Supervisor of Instruction visited classrooms, many students even at gr 1 level could articulate what outcome(s) they were working on. Div I teachers got very creative with non-readers and used pictures for outcomes. The question "What makes a good.." was often used when referring to an outcome.

Comments

"We did printing lesson in gr 1 and posted the exemplars (1,2,3,4,5). All wanted to get a 5 and worked to get 5. A few never achieved the 5's but all did well."

"I had students create own rubrics and provided them with glossary of terms to use in rubrics. Rates of completion went up compared to previous assignments (before 55-60%, now 90%)"

"When posting learner outcomes, for higher end students, it made them feel confident in what they already knew and gave them something to aim for."

"Have used essential learning outcomes to drive program, particularly in Science. Consistently use rubrics to evaluate work, and have students help create criteria for which they will be assessed."

"We have "We Can" Wall in class. Wrote our math outcomes on blank whiteboard. As we learn them, students change the colors on them. We can see which ones we still need to learn."

GOAL-Try individual conferencing at least 1 time, as part of triangulation process for assessment. (94/127)

3 schools held individual conferencing with students several times per year as part of goal setting program. Many teachers took advantage of sub coverage to create more triangulation for specific performance assessment tasks i.e. position papers, major writing assignments, etc. They conferenced with students about task after having given comments and no marks. Others made conscientious effort to do more individual conferencing within classroom setting. One online teacher in Cyberhigh does exit cards as a way to conference with students.

Story - A grade 6 teacher does many project-based learning activities. Quality of projects was not improving

and she was frustrated. She began to incorporate more individual conferencing throughout project as part of criteria for project i.e. must do 2 conferences with the teacher and one with friend. The teacher finds problem areas are caught much sooner and students get redirection before they get too far along. Standards improved. As well, teacher incorporates checklists as checkpoints along the way.

Teacher Comments:

"I use entrance and exit passes in a variety of formats."

"My goal was to refine student conferencing in English."

"They like 1-on-1 time with me where no one else gets my attention."

"Students made judgments about their own success and their own shortcomings. Next time I would have students make their own assessment plan."

"After some students met with the teacher and did their goal setting, they seemed to have a better understanding of where they were going and what they needed to do to get to that goal."

2007/2008 How well was the success indicator achieved: Well

Briefly describe the evidence of success achieved (required) for each identified success indicator.

GOAL - To involve students in self-assessment, with focus on incorporating more reflection tools.

Teachers realized just how much effort was required to get students to do accurate self-assessment, where they are more metacognitive in their learning. In particular, younger children and learning disabled students find this a challenge and must have scaffolded practice to acquire the skill set. Good discussions at PLC's have helped teachers experiment and figure out ways that work for their students.

66% know students can describe how to improve their own learning

47% held one student-led interview

78% involved students in self-assessment

74% involved students in peer assessment

60% Set criteria with students

51% maintained student portfolios

GOAL - To incorporate individual conferencing as part of the triangulation process for assessment.

Some schools set up schedules and brought in subs so that teachers could do individual conferencing or goal-setting with students. Most teachers figured out ways to incorporate conferencing as part of an on-going assessment process. For example, they might talk with 4-5 students/day in short, but focused conversations, about one assessment i.e. test. One junior high math teacher did individual conferencing with each student after every test. During that conversation, if it was felt the student truly understood the mathematical concept/operation but made an error, the mark was changed to reflect the student's true understanding. The students felt this process was very fair. More teachers were understanding the importance of triangulation in order to create a fair, balanced assessment program.

64% did individual conferencing with students on their learning as part of the triangulation process for assessment

49% did active goal-setting with students

GSS - Again, the goal setting program done throughout the school was significant. Students were aware of what they needed by having criteria/rubrics presented prior to the assignment. This was significant to students becoming more metacognitive in their learning. Students were able to meet and exceed standards when given the opportunity for feedback, redo's, quality versus quantity work, and exemplars.

GM - All teachers posted I CAN statements (student-friendly) in classrooms and referred to them regularly. The English and S.S. departments conferenced with students. Some teachers offered re-writes for tests (i.e. SS

9).

HF - Students in all grades were able to indicate the outcomes on which they were working. They were able to dialogue about their learning and why they were studying a particular concept. Students were provided opportunity to self assess and peer assess.

Rosary - In interviews with students, they said they appreciated knowing what they are supposed to learn. Students also liked having rubrics so they could judge what they have and have not accomplished before handing in their assignments. Students liked to help set criteria as they saw it as having a part in how they were being marked.

St. Andrews - This continued to be an ongoing process. Many teachers in the humanities field had student writing portfolios, where students had input and made choices about what determined their mark. Some teachers provided assessment and reflection tools (checklists, exit cards) to involve students in the process. In most classes, students could articulate learner outcomes.

St. Stephens - Three teachers reported they have used the goal setting section of the ECSD report card (outcomes-based report card which all elementary classes are doing). An increased number of teachers reported using and holding individual conferences with students (2 in Sept, 6 in June). There was an increased number of teachers using portfolios (3 in Sept, 7 in June). 100% of teachers shared student-friendly learning outcomes at some point during the year.

EP - Two teachers incorporated student-led conferences with their outcomes-based report cards. They had a significant increase in the number of parents attending. A few teachers did individual conferencing on a regular basis with their students. One teacher did a very thorough system of involving students in their own assessment. In April, he gave each student all the outcomes they had learned over the year in all subjects. The students were able to try to demonstrate that they had improved or mastered an outcome and were given the opportunity to show that new learning and have their marks changed to show that improvement.

Cyberhigh - The staff identified vocabulary used by students when interacting with a teacher was reflective of students acquiring the assessment semantics which, in turn, drives their cognition. As well, students often made references to established goals.

2008/2009 How well was the success indicator achieved: Well

Briefly describe the evidence of success achieved (required) for each identified success indicator.

GOAL - Students will begin to articulate learner outcomes in their own words, reflecting their understanding.

GOAL - Students will be involved in self-assessment, with focus on using more reflection tools.

GOAL - Students will set realistic goals and work towards them.

GOAL - Students will take part in individual conferencing with teachers as part of the triangulation process for assessment.

GOAL - Students will participate in student-led interviews, using their portfolios to demonstrate their learning and growth over time.

55% know students can articulate learner outcomes and describe how to improve their own learning

84% involved students in self-assessment

51% set criteria with students

58% began using portfolios with students

41% did active goal-setting with students and revisited goals regularly throughout the year to reflect on growth.

68% tried individual conferencing at least one time, as part of the triangulation process for assessment.

73% allow "product" assignments to differ based on readiness, learning needs, interests and/or multiple

intelligences/learning styles

51% held one student-led interview

GSS - "I can statements" are being used to guide students to success indicators. Portfolios are being used by every teacher extensively in order to demonstrate growth. Individual conferencing is occurring where students set goals at each reporting period. Students are reflecting on their learning through journals in the majority of classes.

GM - Because Glenmary has done extensive work with teachers and students on goal setting, self-assessment, report cards and grade books, students get very specific feedback on their learning and are part of the process. Teachers have worked to develop formative assessment practices where high school students are content to receive a + or - or = sign on their quiz or assignment. They then work with a partner to determine where they need to change answers in order to improve. They understand the difference between the "practice" and the "game". Students are able to articulate what they need to practice more in order to be better prepared for the game.

HF - Most teachers share learner outcomes with their students regularly and discuss expectations around the outcomes. Students often have a checklist to keep track of outcomes as they are learning them and teachers use this as a reflection piece. Some teachers are using self-assessments. All teachers use rubrics for many learning situations. i.e. projects, performance assessment tasks. All elementary students participate in student-led interviews. One teacher is using "Personal Best" where students choose their best writing piece and reflect on why it is their best. They then share this with parents at interviews as part of their portfolios.

ROS - Students' views on how they are being assessed is changing. They now have an expectation to be involved in the process. They see they have a role in their own education and are taking more ownership of their work. When they co-construct criteria, they better understand how to self-assess. Students have a much better idea as to which outcomes are being focused on in a given class.

St. A - Work has been done in the area co-constructed criteria, particularly for projects. Students understand and benefit from "I can statements". Students have begun using information from pre-assessment to understand their learning paths.

St. S - Jr. High teachers have begun to use exit and entrance cards. Some have set up portfolios of students' work and they refer to these regularly when conferencing with students and parents. Teachers have been taking the time to conference with students in all grades. By starting the class referring to the learner outcomes, the students are better able to focus on what is important. Teachers have begun to do more informal assessments through conferencing which allows them to get a more accurate picture of where their students are before they try the summative assessment.

EP - 3/6 teachers have their students do self-assessments regarding individual projects and overall learning for the day/week. Students set goals and have conversations with teachers and each other with regards to meeting those goals.

CYB - Incorporating more self-assessments, open book quizzes to encourage corrections based on self checking and self discovery, self-assessments using rubrics as assessment guide. Cyberhigh uses the Elluminate program as a chat room which makes it easy to post outcomes for the lesson. Teachers are using the strategy of having students keep a running record of difficult questions. Then, together with the teacher and other students, they come up with strategies that would help them answer the question. Students have become more adept at knowing they need help with and how to address their own learning needs.

* 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	2008/2009			Explain any variance of (+/-) 25% or more on "Total Expenses"
	Approved Budget	Actual	(*)% Variance	
A. Unexpended AISI Funds (at beginning of year)	5,195	19,194		
B. AISI Funding	290,352	290,352		
C. Funding from other sources	200	0		
D. Carry over AISI Funds from previous cycle	0	0		
Total Available Funds (A+B+C)	295,747	309,546		
Expenses Paid or Payable:				
Staffing and Benefits (includes salary, wages, benefits, outside PD services (i.e., speakers, presenters, facilitators), substitute cost, release time and contract personnel)	288,746	259,114	9.57	
Supplies and non-staffing Services	8,000	33,249	-8.15	
Equipment	0	2,837	-0.92	
Other Capital	0	0	0.00	
Other Expenses (includes travel, accommodation, meals and conference fees)	13,000	14,346	-0.43	
Other Authorities ** (group projects only)	0	0	0.00	
Total Expenses	309,746	309,546		
Unexpended Funds	-13,999	0		

* 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	2008/2009(%)			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)	

Professional Development (include all costs associated with PD - eg substitute coverage, conference, workshops, speakers` fees, release time on total cost of PD from all budget, categories)	42	36	6	
Project Management & Coordination (administration, data collection, reporting)	10	14	-4	
Front-Line Staff (include staff who work directly with students eg teachers, educational assistants, counsellors)	43	38	5	
Other Costs (equipment, materials)	5	12	-7	
Total Percentage	100	100	0	
Total Expenses	309,746	309,546		

* 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

From B

Every grade increased achievement. Most schools pleased with results but some recognize there is more concentrated work to do in certain subjects. Deputy Superintendent in charge of School Improvement has requested that action plans with interim measures be developed by schools that have "red" areas in Accountability Pillars. Plans will be approved by Central Office and monitored.

Gr 3 Acceptable on PAT's (Students who wrote)

Up 4.7 from Baseline

Gr 6 Acceptable on PAT's (Students who wrote)

Up 9.1 from Baseline

Gr 9 Acceptable on PAT's (Students who wrote)

Up 5.9 from Baseline

Gr 12 Acceptable on PAT's (Students who wrote)

Up 1.4 from Baseline

Schools have done concentrated data analysis of PAT's and DE's, then developed plans with strategies to correct problem areas. This kind of focused effort on all the teachers in dept or division leads to improved results.

From C

%age of teachers who integrate formative assessment practice in order to change or modify instruction students require in order to achieve learner outcomes.

Although many teachers, particularly at elementary level, indicate they revise instructional plans based on what on-going assessment says, this continues to be most challenging area of all. Unless teachers have set up programs to be flexible enough to stop and address concerns as arise, flexible enough to offer enrichment to students who already know materials, and/or provide multiple choices within content, process and products, this does not happen on widespread basis. Teachers are struggling with quality of planning/programming. Many recognize low level assignments they have traditionally used "cover" curriculum but students do not necessarily learn. As teachers feel ready, we introduce them to Understanding by Design principles of planning. This has to be major focus over next two years. New SS/ Math are going to force issue. Teachers beginning to embrace change. We see more teachers using Guided Reading, Self-selected reading, tiered assignments/test, learning centers, project-based learning, performance assessment tasks, etc. All these strategies allow teachers to be flexible enough to allow assessment to drive instruction. Every time teachers experience success with such practices, they recognize importance of giving students time to practice before "playing the game". They are learning not to mark while they are learning something. The balance is in ensuring that specific, timely and accurate feedback is given that promotes learning that, in turn, enables a student to "play successfully in the game". Senior high teachers have great concerns around figuring out ways to "cover the curriculum". We need to allow them time to work collaboratively with other teachers to plan high quality performance assessment tasks that have multiple hits on the curriculum.

%age of teachers who increase formative assessment, in terms of total assessment practice, to 30%.

See discussion in Section D #1.

%age of teachers who indicate growth in 2 or more areas on "Surveying my Landscape".

Over 90% of teachers indicated growth.. When interviewed about specifics, most said they had improved in:

- o a. understanding and articulating in advance of teaching learner goals;
- o b. informing students regularly about goals in terms they can understand;
- o d. understanding relationship between assessment and student motivation and use assessment to build confidence; and
- o f. providing frequent, descriptive feedback.

Very directed PLC work resulted in many improvements. Combining small scale P.D., followed by PLC work time, allows teachers opportunity to "create" and try new strategies. Having follow-up PLC time allows for reflection needed to maximize teacher learning. Teachers say, "We need more time to master one strategy."

%age of teachers who share learner outcomes consistently with students.

Over 90% of gr 6, 9 & 12 students agreed that teachers post learner outcomes and use many different ways to

help them learn. Indications are students are beginning to feel they know what the target is for a unit of learning. Teachers' conscientious efforts to post learner outcomes in kid-friendly language, refer to them regularly during the learning, and reflect on them at the end of learning process is evident in students' responses.

Parents continue to be happy with schools' efforts.

Support Staff and Teachers agree AISI project has improved quality of instruction and assessment skills, and helped them to help students improve literacy skills.

From D

#1-Very good success with first measure. Teachers becoming comfortable using parts of AAC "Framework" in planning. Most teachers are now very familiar with Programs of Studies/learner outcomes. Many are experimenting with setting criteria and most are trying formative ways to collect evidence of learning. Large percentage of teachers have made a conscientious effort to use triangulation in gathering of evidence. We need to promote idea of collecting evidence over time, looking at emerging trends and patterns. This should drive instructional decisions. Teachers often struggle with how to set up a system that facilitates this way of operating. This will be focus for Year 2 of project. Without exception, teachers are saying we need to re-evaluate reporting systems because they no longer "match" our practice. 2 elementary schools have outcomes-based report cards. 3 more elementary schools are moving to same next year. In Year 3, all elementary schools and 5 junior high schools will move to it as well.

#2 - Training students to be more reflective and metacognitive takes extensive training. More success will happen when teachers across grades/divisions agree on specific skills students need to become more proficient in this area. Students will then be able to build more skills each year. Teachers are at beginning stages. Many students are beginning to articulate learner outcomes, know their learning styles/multiple intelligences, and can set reasonable goals for improving learning. Motivation continues to be challenge. How do we get students to want to improve their learning and take ownership of learning? Teachers who have really good relationships with students, use variety of DI strategies to engage students, give students choices, provide structured systems to support learning, do individual conferences with goal setting, and have high expectations/standards - more successful in motivating students to be reflective and metacognitive. These teachers practiced this kind of reflection on regular basis. It is about consistency. This area will improve as more teachers embrace formative assessment and triangulation process. We have used Anne Davies materials to support teacher learning and drive P.D. As we go through the "Knowing What Count" series, teachers are learning more things to try in this area.

2007/2008

Section B

Accountability Pillar

♣ 7/8 schools show school improvement. Individual schools report the following:

GSS

PAT's

♣ Gr 3-All at/above in LA/Math.

♣ Gr 6-ELA exceptional in Acc and Exc. Results inconsistent- up & down. French results-a concern.

GM

DE's-

♣ FrLA always 100% above Acc and Exc.

♣ Math shown steady improvement.

♣ Biology & Chemistry at/above Acc.

♣ Exc continues to be low.

PAT's

- ♣ Exc up in most subjects.
- ♣ ELA made vg progress- above in Acc- almost equal in Exc.
- ♣ Math=big concern- excellence results are down.

HF

PAT's

- ♣ Gr 3-solid-100% in LA /Math Acc levels. Significantly high Exc results in Math.
 - ♣ Gr 6-3/4 above Acc. Steady improvement overall.
 - ♣ Gr 9-Science v g improvement in Acc/Exc.
- Significant concerns particularly in Math/S.S.
- ♣ Exc is concern throughout except in Math 3.

Ros

PAT's

- ♣ Gr 3-Results very unexpected. Class underperformed on exam although over in Acc in LA and Exc in Math.
- ♣ Gr 6-3/4 subject achieved 100% Acc & very high Exc All subjects over Acc.
- ♣ Gr 9-All 4 over Acc and 2/4 over in Exc. Math tends to be overall weakest area in 6 & 9.

St. A

DE's

- ♣ School and Exam marks are on par.
- ♣ Consistent overall improvement in 7/9 DE's.
- ♣ English/SS excellent results.
- ♣ Most participation rates up.
- ♣ 6/9 DE's at the 100% for Acc.
- ♣ Exc rates are generally low.

PAT's

- ♣ Gr 3 100% over Acc/Exc.
- ♣ Gr 6-Math only subject to have gone up over Prov.
- ♣ Gr 9-¾ subjects are over Acc. Math over Exc level. Science=concern.

St. St

PAT's

- ♣ Gr 3-LA went down-Math went up. However, steady gains over last several years. This year a "blip".
- ♣ Gr 6-Math over Acc and other 3 very close to Province. 3/4 over in Exc=drastic improvement.
- ♣ Gr 9-Although all below the Acc levels, all 4 went up significantly-making steady improvement yearly. All went up in Exc .
- ♣ School has shown steady improvement at all levels.

EP

PAT's

- ♣ Gr 3-Significant improvement in Acc/Exc levels. 100% Acc in LA /Math.
- ♣ Gr 6-Good improvement in all scores at Acc level. We are having difficulty moving students into the excellence range.
- ♣ Gr 9-Results much the same as previous years except LA dropped drastically in Acc. Again difficulty in moving students to the excellence range.
- ♣ Absenteeism problem at all levels.
- ♣ Numbers low

♣ Math/Science school weak overall in school.

Cyb

DE's

♣ steady improvement in Sr. High SS/English.

♣ 4/6 DE's 100% Acc.

PAT's

♣ All Gr 9 PAT's gone up steadily.

♣ 3/4 over Acc.

♣ Exc is generally very low.

Section C - Parents quite satisfied. Students generally negative in responses. Support Staff not feeling part of process. Teachers satisfied with own progress. Disconnect needs to be addressed, more so in some schools than others.

Each school has Reality Check surveys, Accountability Pillar and their quantitative results. As part of data analysis (100/121), most schools now doing data carousels as part of school improvement efforts. School Improvement Teams create action plans based on findings. New for most schools-having positive impacts in most cases.

% teachers who increase use of formative assessment, in terms of total assessment practice, to 20 %/ 30%/ 40%

20%	-	74/121	(61%)
30%	-	58/121	(48%)
40%	-	48/121	(40%)

Teachers on a journey. Some appear to be using some formative assessment practices but some struggling with not marking/grading formative assessment. Some confusion with this question. Some see it as what % of grades should be formative-what % summative. This is not what this question refers to-refers to increasing amount of formative assessment practices used in classroom.

% teachers indicate growth in 2+ areas on "Surveying my Landscape"

96% indicate growth=true indicator of growth.

All do pre-assessment at beginning of year & set couple of target areas they wish to work on during year.

At end, assess whether improved in at least two areas & indicate evidence of their learning.

% teachers who share LO with students-1 unit/ 90% of time.

1 unit-72%

90% of time-43%

Most administrators insist teachers display & refer to LO regularly.

Some reward teachers for doing so.

Many put LO on assignments/tests. Students aware of outcome working towards.

1 larger school did very little in this area. Once they come on board, result should improve. School level administrators need to encourage/insist on this practice consistently-is key to involving students in own assessment. Teachers who use this practice consistently state students are much more metacognitive in their learning and goal focused.

"When I give more emphasis in each subject on the Learner Outcomes, students can articulate them and know if they have achieved them."

% teachers who integrate formative practice to change/modify instruction students require in order to achieve LO.

85%=true indicator of teacher growth.

If teachers allow assessment to drive instruction where assessment equals instruction-making significant changes to assessment practices.

Section D

On Surveying My Landscape, teachers indicated growth in more than 2 areas. The 2 areas most often identified are:

- I understand and can articulate in advance of teaching the learner goals my students are to achieve.
- I consistently use classroom assessment information to revise instruction.

Professional Learning Communities=vehicles through which teachers work to improve student learning/incorporate practices which enable students to become more metacognitive in own learning. For teachers to discuss assessment practices/develop school practices that are consistent with the AAC framework, they need time to meet/collaborate. District has struggled with issue-best way to implement/run PLC's? What works best in each school?

Historically-all over the place. Supr of Instruction sat on most PLC's to assist in getting more focus/productivity. Agreed this was a key focus for school improvement. Opportunity to model leadership for administrators. Result=PLC's running more smoothly in 7/8 schools. 1 school struggling with teachers willing to work together collegially/timing of PLC's.>now built into the timetable.

Most PLC's agree not enough time to get into meat of work teachers need to & want to do. Teachers requested:

- initial start up day beginning of year for each PLC - to get organized for the year, do data analysis, fine tune SMART goal, develop measures
- Meeting times built into the timetable.
- Time to work in PLC's on Staff Meeting/P.D. Days-frustrated with those days being planned down to the minute>NEED TIME TO WORK
- Division PLC's particularly around new cu

2008/2009

Section B Analysis

Gr 3 Acc-overall increase of 1.2

Gr 6 Acc-overall increase of 7.9

Gr 9 Acc-overall increase of 5.8

Gr 12 Acc-small increases for the last two years and a decrease this past year - overall drop of 1.5

SMART goal-Not Met-5/8 schools met target

Gr 12 continues to be our challenge-3 small high schools-drop in bigger school significantly impact results-school indicates standards required to be in 30 level higher stream course needs to be increased-accepting students into challenging 30 level courses who do not have a strong enough foundation (i.e. 50%) sets them up for failure-either work ethic has to improve significantly or standards for the course need to increase-participation rate significantly above provincial average-coded students do very well-action plans to address issues/concerns on the Accountability Pillar.

Section C Analysis

Significant growth- teachers who increased formative assessment to 30% of total assessment practice-from 47.9% to 63%

All teachers use formative assessment and improved use of AFL principles-more using wide array of strategies-more effort to triangulate data-planning using simple backwards design to ensure the enduring understanding-recognizing difference between "coaching" and "judging"-not marking formative-ensuring better quality summative that require higher level thinking and demonstrate learning to audience-more conversations between learner and teacher-using feedback loop-giving specific, timely feedback-having students explain learning to teacher and/or peer-scaffolding to greater extent-key in DI classroom-especially for many of students in our

Division.

Surveying my Landscape Survey-indicated growth in 2 or more areas-good growth in Year 1 and 2-91.7% and 96%- dropped this year-once teachers knew more about assessment, realized areas in which they thought they were doing good job required more attention-could account for drop-becoming more metacognitive about assessment practices-Year 3 is probably a more accurate self-assessment.

88% gave frequent, specific, timely feedback

55% confident students could articulate learner outcomes and describe how to improve learning

58% maintained portfolios on student work (mostly elementary)

82% created assessment tools and record keeping tools that reflect individual growth and progress

87% adjusted instruction based on pre-assessment or on-going formative assessment

76% post/share outcomes-practice is inconsistent-some do it all the time and some rarely-consistent expectations and communication a must.

Gr 6 Students-said teachers posting outcomes, talk about their learning and show them how they can improve-indicate they were learning new reading strategies to improve learning-results appear to reflect satisfaction.

Most teachers are engaged in PLC's and doing some worthwhile work-feel they are making a difference in quality of instruction and assessment.

93% focused learning around best practice for teaching/learning of AFL

90% engaged in classroom initiatives to improve student learning

95% focused learning around students' learning needs

91% increased understanding of AFL

75% worked actively with team of teachers to improve results on literacy SMART goal

82% planned and organized learning ideas/activities with colleagues to improve student learning.

83% were able to make practical connections between AFL/DI and new curriculum

83% ensure respectful assignments for all learners-zones of proximal development

85% vary pace of learning

88% integrate formative assessment practices in order to change/modify instruction

Section D Analysis

Section I Analysis

Teachers know their P of S well

Are able to connect students to learner outcomes/big ideas in meaningful ways

Some struggle with identifying enduring understandings and using Backwards Design planning-benefit from working in PLC's with other teachers

NRLC-SS/Math PLC's for new curriculum-provides opportunity for teachers to plan/collaborate together-Teachers appreciate

More confident in ability to rely on professional judgment

Base decisions about instruction on quality, on-going formative assessment-are beginning to trust they "know" their students enough to make some calls on marks-very challenging area for teachers to admit-had given away professional judgment to marks, particularly in upper elementary and secondary-realized they had come to rely on mark book to justify grades on report cards-realize summative assessment is a confirmation of what they already know-when is not confirming what they already know-then have to make a call about whether student redoes the summative assessment or whether formative assessment is contradicting the results

Kindergarten/Gr 1 teachers have always used that professional judgment piece as part of assessment process-others are learning to take back their professional judgment

Teachers paying more attention to the recent, most consistent evidence of learning-taking leap to realign marks in grade books based on evidence and outcomes-most anxious to move to technological SIS and report card system next year

Asking for outcomes-based reporting so as we move towards new Division-wide report cards next year, will be good buy-in/support because teachers and students are ready

Section 2 Analysis

Challenge=finding ways to involve students and parents more in assessment process Individual conferencing-key piece of the triangulation process-challenge for some teachers-often a management piece-teachers need to look to others teachers who do it well to figure out what might work for self-must build it in-requires teachers to determine expendable pieces-boils down to quality planning.

Creating a DI classroom means creating enabling learning opportunities for all students to meet the outcomes of P of S to best of abilities-need to demonstrate what they know, understand and can do-involving students in assessment and decision-making processes, students learn to be more metacognitive-recognize what to do to improve their learning

Use of portfolios and reflection opportunities works well-many teachers find this most helpful-process forces teacher to pay attention to student involvement-requires having conversations with students about what to put in portfolio-what pieces would show growth over time-requires students explaining their learning to parents-combined with student-led interviews, outcomes-based reporting and portfolios ensure students and parents are more involved in meaningful ways.

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

2007/2008

Because of the diversity in our classrooms, we often see huge ability spans that made it extremely difficult for a teacher to differentiate more than the 3 groups most teachers can handle. Often classrooms had 6 groups and it was too challenging to have students reading in their zone of proximal development during Guided Reading or doing Math at that many different levels. After attending a workshop with Rebecca Dufour and having the opportunity to sit and plan with her, the Supervisor of Instruction brought back the idea of flexible groupings. The idea was all classes involved would be scheduled for guided reading and/or math at the same time. This allowed for teachers, working together in a very effective PLC, to assess students' ability and/or skill levels and stream them into appropriate levelled classes. Often, another teacher (Resource Room teacher, principal, V-P) or a T.A. was included in order to create more and smaller manageable classes. T.A.'s were always planned for and were never given more than 1 group that was manageable.

The first school to try this idea was Holy Family School. 3 classes in Div. II (4/5/6) gave all students the same

writing prompt. Then they took the students' writing in and assessed them as a group. They divided them into 4 teaching groups (the 3 original teachers and a learning support teacher). They were divided according to the skills they needed to further develop - voice, organization, juicy words and grammar/punctuation. The students were of very mixed abilities in their groups and for 3 weeks, the teacher worked with that group, for a set time each day, on that very specific skill. At the end of the 3 weeks, another writing prompt was given to check for improvement. Interviews with students and teachers indicated it was a huge success and they would do it again but with some alterations.

The 2nd school to try flexible groupings was St. Stephens and they tried it in Math. They took students from grade 4-7 and grouped them by ability on the first big idea in math - number sense. No student dropped down more than 2 levels and several went up. In the first 2 months, 29 students moved in and out of groups - some because they were in the wrong group and some because they were catching up and filling in gaps so were able to move up. They were careful not to pigeon hole teachers in their grades. Only one student was upset about his placement. Very grudgingly, he agreed to give it a try for one month. If after that month, he was not happy, he would move up. At the end of the month, he wanted to stay where he was. He was experiencing amazing success and filling in years of gaps in his learning. (He was actually several years behind his original class.) He eventually moved up and his marks on his report card were excellent. PAT's have shown the improvements, particularly in the excellence category at the grade 6 level.

Based on those two stories, St. Stephens has begun flexible groupings in L.A. from grades 2-6. Holy Family has begun flexible groupings in guided reading in Div. I. St. Andrews has begun flexible groupings in Div. I for LA. They held a big Survivor party kick-off and students were very excited about the big change. They continually adjusted things to make it work better for their students. Students easily moved in and out of groups. Teachers had 2 or 3 groups in their classroom to differentiate for, a much more manageable classroom than before. The teachers were still differentiating and used sound assessment for learning principles but they were have to be much more specific in their assessments in order to justify students moving up. It was a fluid operation and, as they continued adapting and modifying their flexible groupings, they were sure to put students first in the planning. Students were becoming more metacognitive about what they needed to learn in order to fill in gaps or move up. When asked about their learning, they could tell you where they were operating and what they needed to improve in order to move on.

2008/2009

2. Professional Development

2006/2007

Professional Learning Communities - have been used as a vehicle for teacher learning for a few years but never in a very formal way. In our Cycle II project, we focused on developing strong division grade/subject PLC's but never focused on the school level PLC's. In the last two years, we have encouraged schools but not mandated that they have PLC's in operation. They have been all over the map - weekly, monthly, with substitutes, without substitutes, on P.D. days or not at all. Everyone had a different idea of how they should operate and few principals were taking leadership roles in what was happening in them. Last year, principals became more involved but organized everything. We recognized that teachers needed to get down to action and that administrators were controlling what was happening in PLC's and the direction they were going, so much so that teachers were feeling like they had no control over what was happening. In May, Wayne Hulley was brought in for two district leadership days. He worked with leaders on how PLC's should operate - looking at DuFour's 4 questions. He reiterated research about student learning and school improvement, all of which had been heard several times before. He stressed that work in PLC's needed to be focused on student learning and teachers had to work together collaboratively towards agreed upon goals under an umbrella school goal. Every

school brought their leadership team to the training. Leadership Teams were given the opportunity to plan together in order to refurbish their PLC's for the upcoming year. They have come up with varied solutions and ideas that fit the needs of their individual school communities. Some very creative timetabling will happen next year and teachers will be given more autonomy in their PLC's to make decisions around student learning. They will take ownership for improving their schools and having their students reach the school's SMART goal. Several teams have attended Solution Tree team workshops on PLC's. More training and direction from Central Office has occurred. PLC's have grown considerably this past year but still have a long way to grow yet.

(116/127) focused their learning around current best practices for teaching and learning of "Assessment for Learning".

(119/127) examined their assumptions about teaching and learning.

(113/127) shared their learning with members of the school community (division and school).

(110/127) focused most of my learning around students' learning needs.

(108/127) networked with colleagues at the school.

(102/127) engaged in research that explores effective practice around "AFL: and "DI".

(121/127) increased their understanding of "AFL"

Comments from teachers on ideas for improvement and benefits of PLC's -

"more teacher led PLCs as opposed to administration led"

"have more teacher involvement in planning what we will do in PLC's"

"less activities that involve paperwork in PLC's"

"would like more preps in common with teachers in my area"

"lots of benefits of working in PLC's and would like the opportunity to make it our own now"

"Meeting with my colleagues forces me to think about and challenge some of my assumptions about teaching and learning."

"opened up more communication between Grade levels"

"creates consistency between grade levels"

"helped me focus on areas that I now know need more focus"

"with my partner - making sure we are assessing students fairly and similarly"

"develops improved relationships with some school staff"

"sharing of information regarding different students"

"look at what works and doesn't work"

"feel as though I am on the same page as my colleagues"

"time to share ideas for school wide improvement"

"appreciated the time to look over PAT's"

"created an overall general format for note-taking that we all use"

"changed report cards to match AFL philosophy"

"increases collaboration"

"meets the needs of students that have chronic problems with organization, behaviour and learning"

"the opportunity to learn new skills from a staff member with expertise in that area"

"design programs based on needs and utilize cross grade grouping"

"implement a pyramid of intervention"

"do data research (carousel activity) because it is useful"

"Conversations will evolve with regard to authentic learning."

"opportunity to discuss issues with the other teachers in my division (there is very little time to do this.)"

"We have to get results so we have to look deep within ourselves."

Success Story-Most of our schools are looking at the question, "What do you do when students don't learn it?" They have put in a variety of programs to address this (Alternate Day Rooms, Learning Support Teams, EDGE classes, Learning Support Teacher, Before and After School Tutorials) and are recognizing the importance of

system approaches. We cannot leave it to individual teachers to try to solve bigger challenges. We recognize there needs to be school-wide approaches for those students who fall through the cracks and we need to set up systems to assist teachers. All these programs are sustainable and not funded by AISI.

Success Story-Majority of elementary teachers are doing parts or all of 4 Blocks/ Balanced Literacy approaches in LA. Schools had literacy SMART goals and, although there was some disorganization in approaching those goals within a school, teachers have done some great work in the classroom. Beginning to see results on PAT's. Leaders and teachers recognize we need more coordinated approaches within a building.

Success Story-A junior high student was having great difficulty with attitude and academics. All the student's teachers got together in PLC and came up with plan to change this. They began to work together with student and parents. They allowed re-do's so student would feel success on assignments and marks. They graphed the marks in color to visibly show improvement. They gave more choice in assignments/projects. Marks started to go up and student began to change attitude especially towards teachers. The student began trying harder, has now turned around, does top quality work and is a successful student. The student said, "They cared about me getting good marks. I guess if they care, I should, too."

2007/2008

Accountability Pillar - Teachers have indicated over the last 3 years, by the increase in percentages, PD opportunities made available through the jurisdiction have:

1. been focused on the priorities of the jurisdiction (87-90-91-94) %age
2. effectively addressed your PD needs (76-86-82-92) %age
3. significantly contributed to your on-going PD. (78-85-88-91) %age

Division PLC's - were requested more often in order for teachers to work together to plan for new curriculum. AISI had been working through the new Math curriculum and was tying PD and PLC work into division PLC's. Focus was on Backward Design, establishing quality summative assessments, putting learner outcomes into student-friendly language, and planning formative activities.

Librarian Initiative - Again, librarians are an important support for teachers, especially with the implementation of the new inquiry-based SS curriculum. Librarians were being asked to do things to support teachers and students. They were levelling books for guided reading and self-selected reading. They were purchasing MP3 players to support special education students in the reading of textbooks. They had not been included in much of the AISI work, other than attending the occasional speaker. The first session for librarians was held called "Supporting Inquiry-based Curriculum" workshop and was delivered by Betty-Lou Ayers. They formed a division PLC and next year will be working closely with the Supervisor of Instruction to improve their skill set and their libraries.

Good Shepherd School - did a focused approach to learning the AAC Framework. They created a comprehensive P.D. plan where teachers were in-serviced in short snippets on each section of the framework. After each in-service, they moved into their PLC's to work on a directed task around their literacy SMART goal around non-fiction reading and assessment. The process included assessing all students' reading levels, putting together orders of levelled fiction and non-fiction books to support curriculum, and determining what constitutes evidence of learning. As well, they implemented a goal setting program and offered subs for teachers so they could do individual conferencing. It was a very comprehensive and structured process. Teachers had ownership and each PLC did quite different things, but they were all the same page at the end of it. It was a good way to ensure everyone got that important grounding in the AAC model.

2008/2009

Ecole Providence - Whole School Focus on Literacy

This school is a small school with a large First Nations population. Half the students in the schools are coded as Severe Emotional/Behaviour and/or Learning Disabled. Prior to this past year, most of the students in the schools were reading below grade level and many significantly below grade level. They decided that everyone on staff needed to become reading teachers. That allowed the whole staff to become more focused on one and the same thing. Some difficult decisions had to be made. For example, the teachers chose not to attend new math curriculum workshops because they had determined, nothing would make a difference until they got these students reading. Everyone, including their School Improvement Team of parents and community members, began to work towards their Literacy Goal. It stated - "80% of students will be reading at or above grade level as measured by the GRADE test in June 2009.

Their training to do this focus was given by Dawn Reithaug. She did four literacy workshops with all the staff, including support staff and the librarian. Using her research all were trained on the 3 Tiers of Reading Intervention. Then they began to implement the plan throughout the school. First, they tested every student but were not able to do that until nearer the middle of the year. Every student was part of the Tier 1 regular classroom L.A. program. This included levelled guided reading, word wall and self-selected reading. Tier 2 was an extra 45 minutes/day for students who were behind 1-2 years in their reading. They went to a trained person for remedial work in the specific areas they required. Tier 3 was delivered by a trained special education teacher who worked intensively with these students who were over 2 year behind in reading. They received an extra hour of instruction over and above their regular L.A./per day.

In addition, the librarian did extensive work to support the teachers' work. The library was weeded out and quality books were purchased. The librarian worked with the FNMI Coordinator and Supervisor of Instruction to create a levelled book system that provided teachers with quality levelled books to sign out for their classrooms. All classrooms would have access to 500 levelled books at a time, a combination of 50% fiction and 50% non-fiction. Books in the library would be purchased to support curriculum and FNMI culture.

The leadership of the Principal was key. She allowed teachers to make difficult decisions about P.D. She provided the resources needed to purchase many more books for the schools. She coordinated and trained students for a Peer Tutoring program. She demanded that teachers become reading teachers. Her overall goal became everyone's goal. That was to ensure all students, parents, visitors, and staff knew this school was about reading,

Because they got the program off the ground midway through the year, the results are from a 6 month period. 50% of students achieved at least one grade level in reading.

66.4% of students were reading at or above grade level by June 2009.

ECS - 100%

Grade 1 - 86 %

Grade 2 - 75%

Grade 3 - 50%

Grade 4 - 50%

Grade 5 - 57%

Grade 6 - 50%

Grade 7 - 30% (small group)

Grade 8 - 100%

Although they still have a long way to go, they are making consistent gains and students are feeling very good about their reading. Teachers recognize that focussed, clear programming can make a difference. The Principal has the support of all the staff and parents. It is certain results will be even more dramatic if they continue at this

pace. When a whole school community becomes this focused, results are much more significant.

3. Student Assessment

2006/2007

Assessment Portfolios - Teachers in most schools were encouraged, individually or as a PLC group, to build an assessment portfolio to show student learning and their own learning. Anything to do with assessment was considered appropriate to place in the portfolio. At PLC's, teachers would bring student work to discuss or share something they had developed. Current Best Practices were often discussed. Teachers were encouraged to reflect on the effectiveness of the strategy and what could be done to improve it in terms of student learning. Not all schools did this although all schools put the work they did on learner outcomes and prioritizing/alignment into the portfolios to go into the Sharing Bank and/or AISI library. Items that were brought to the table for discussion and reflection included: prioritized learner outcomes for all core subjects at every grade level, rubrics, tests, checklists, assessment tools, criteria checklists, reflection journals, entrance and exit passes, exemplars, pictures of exemplars, self-evaluations, peer evaluations, self-reflections, student/teacher conferencing, goal setting ideas, quick checks, observation checklists, parent reflection/goal setting sheets, graphing of reading skills, examples of bulletin board displays which were used by students to monitor their own learning, literacy strategies handbook developed by a teacher, pre-assessment ideas i.e. thumbs up, guided reading assessments, inventories, progress reports, report cards, response logs, predictions before reading, 2 Stars and a Wish, KWL charts, Venn diagrams, redo's, retests, changes to unit plans (UbD). The variety was incredible and the conversation was very rich. Teachers that put some time and effort into this activity benefited the most and have moved the farthest in their assessment thinking. Next year, we will try to encourage more schools to insist on this adult professional learning strategy. The Principals will be provided with "protocols for learning conversations" to help them have these kinds of discussions around student samples. These conversations will be modelled for leaders so they feel comfortable using them in a PLC discussion/reflection.

107/127 reported increased engagement in professional conversations and collaborations at the school.
112/127 worked actively with a team of teachers to improve results on their literacy SMART goal.

Creating Exemplars - Teachers have been encouraged to use "No Excuses Lists" in every class. They are collecting actual products or pictures of exemplars at the various levels of achievement (4-3-2-1). They are recognizing the importance of tying strong exemplar discussion into the conversation about the essential learner outcomes for a unit. In this way, students know exactly what to aim for. Several have sent their pictures into the Sharing Bank for others to use. We have encourage schools to purchase more digital cameras so teachers can take pictures and post them with the outcomes at the beginning of a unit next year.

Pre-assessment - This was an on-going topic of conversation in our professional learning communities, with administrators, and on School Improvement Teams. We kept asking the question, "How will you know you have arrived if you don't know where you came from?" We talked about establishing baselines when goal setting. We talked about planning with the end in mind. We debated the purposes of pre-assessment. Some still felt it should be marked and then the students would do the post-assessment and get another mark or the best mark of the two. Sometimes a student would be exempted from doing the post-test based on the high scores on the pre-assessment. In our project, our goal is to have teachers pre-assess before every unit and then adjust instruction to meet the learning needs of students. If a student does very well, instruction should become more complex and challenging for that student. They should not take a holiday. If students already have a large knowledge base around a unit, the teacher can modify the unit. It will not take as much time therefore allowing additional time to another unit that requires more intense work. Assessment must drive instruction. Decisions around instruction and learning can be made based on pre-assessment. Teachers are beginning to utilize pre-assessment to a much greater degree and for the right reasons.

(107/127) pre-assess students to determine level of understanding

(97/127) ensure respectful assignments for all learners by aiming to have students working in their "zones of proximal development"

2007/2008

2008/2009

Student-led interviews in high school

A senior high ELA teacher hosted her first ever student-led parent/teacher conference. Along with the teacher assistant and students, they set up the library to create a soft, reflective mood. Music was playing quietly in the background. Snacks and drinks were served. A power point that the students had created about their learning in the classroom was running on a laptop and, before they left, parents had the opportunity to view the presentation while enjoying the food and drink. There were three stations set up, two in small, adjoining rooms, so that three students with their parents could meet in privacy simultaneously. The teacher and teacher assistant circulated and had opportunity at the end of each interview to meet with the student and their parent(s).

Prior to the interview evening, report cards had been handed out. Students had conferenced with the teacher beforehand to determine which pieces of work from their binders they were going to discuss with their parents. Each student had a portfolio of written work demonstrating drafts, feedback and final productions. During the individual conference, the students and teachers discussed a "Guide Sheet" (Pink Sheet) to be used in the interview. In class, they practiced what they were going to say and do with their parents based on the work they selected to discuss. They actually role played what they would do. They also determined what their goal for the whole course was and what they would need to do to achieve it. This was recorded on the Course Goal sheet (purple Sheet) which was part of the package and to be signed by the parents on the evening.

On the evening, the parents were given the corresponding "Guide Sheet" (Blue Sheet) which included instructions that said, "As your son or daughter leads you through their ELA 20-1 binder, they will tell you about the work they have done so far, their accomplishments, their challenges and their goals for their achievement in English." As well, the sheet included the following:

General Outcomes from the Program of Studies and specific instructions under each of those. i.e. GO1 Exploring Thoughts, Ideas, Feelings and Experiences - You will hear the student read at least two entries from their Writer's Journal.

Corresponding evidence of learning, feedback and discussion points.

Student's Goal for the Course - Your son/daughter will tell you what their goal is for the whole course and what they will need to achieve it.

Evaluation Form of the Student-Led Interview - for Students

Evaluation Form of the Student-Led Interview - for Parents

Course Goal Sheet

Most students, when interviewed, found the process to be better than they thought it would be. They indicated they had trouble with English and often discussions about their marks would result in angry words with their parents. They were surprised that this was better even though they were not initially keen on doing these interviews. What they discovered is they could talk calmly about their learning and not get into a fight with their parent(s). Only one student did not like the process. This student was very shy and found it too challenging to do; however, it is likely this is a student for whom this may be beneficial as it forces the student to participate in an area that is difficult and needs work.

Parents, in particular, enjoyed the process. They appreciated their children taking ownership for their learning and verbalizing what they needed to work on in order to improve. Two stated that, in a normal interview, a

parent would not get that detail. They were all especially appreciative of the fact this teacher takes into account the students learning styles, interests and abilities and meshes it with the outcomes of the program. She builds on the students strengths to so the student uses his/her own voice and has some freedom within the process. Parents appreciated the students' diagnostic self-evaluation and the fact students were setting relevant goals for the rest of the course.

The teacher indicated doing interviews this way was an intensive amount of preparation but worth the effort. There are two interviews/year and she will do one English class this way each time. There was 100% turnout of parents which never happens in high school. The percentage is usually around 40% so this method definitely works. The teacher felt it was due to the student's buy-in and parents felt obligated to attend for their child. The issue for high school teachers still remains - How do you do this with every class? There is not enough time in interviews to do that if you teach 4 classes of 25 students.

4. Project Management

2006/2007

2007/2008

2008/2009

5. Parental Involvement

2006/2007

2007/2008

2008/2009

Section G3 - Project Summary and Reflections

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

2006/2007

Leadership Training - School leaders had little or no training on school improvement, assessment for learning, professional learning communities and/or literacy. Central Office staff worked together to ensure administrators had the knowledge, skills and understandings to "lead" their teachers in professional learning communities and through this improvement process. Several workshops, guest speakers, administration meeting training sessions and modelling in PLC's was done to achieve this. Now we are at a place where all Principals can lead their staffs the way they should. They have more confidence to do that and recognize leadership has to come from within the building. We have created guidelines for "Walkthroughs" so that Principals know what to look for in a classroom in terms of AFL and DI.

School Improvement Teams - have been formed in most schools. Staff and, in particular, administrators are taking full responsibility for AISI and School Improvement instead of relying on the AISI Coordinator. Staff is beginning to take ownership for school improvement, as well. - revamping special education, timetabling, PLC's, reporting, awards, uncovering curriculum, creating common exams, establishing baselines, determining P.D. that will support improved student learning. Four schools have formed a "Learning Support Team" and integrated discussion about at-risk students as part of every staff meeting.

Refined Understanding of PLC's - SI Teams and some teachers have a better understanding of what is supposed to happen in a true PLC. They are looking more critically at the set-up and organization of PLC's which were previously very loosely structured and not always focused on student learning. We have done extensive P.D as mentioned. We have created better timetables that will allow for true PLC work and collaborative planning. Some are building PLC times into the timetable. It is the hope that all schools will do that so teachers do not have to plan for subs. We are celebrating the schools that are doing good PLC work and talking about what they are doing that leads to improved student learning. PLC's are vital as a vehicle for school improvement. Our FNMI Coordinator, Curriculum Coordinator and AISI Coordinator sat on most PLC's last year and so did the school administrators. Although this is excellent and has been good training for Central Office people and the administrators, it is very time-consuming and our expense cheques have been huge. It is very worthwhile but takes much time away from office work and we are spending too much time on the road. As administrators and school leaders become more skilled in their work, we will be able to "back off" more. We are looking at doing more VC.

Whole School Focus - Administrators and teachers are beginning to recognize the need to have a "whole school focus". i.e. every teacher being trained on 4 Blocks or Balanced literacy. We have two schools who have done very good work in this area and we are able to use them as a model in our discussions with other schools by telling their success stories.

Success Story-St. Stephens School in Valleyview has very high Aboriginal and Special Education population. Math marks in PAT's have been historically low so, as part of AISI project for last few years, focused on literacy in math and revamping instructional practices in math classes. Teachers have reorganized programs with more spiralling back, to hit essential learnings several times a year. They have focused on learner outcomes. They have integrated special education services to better support at-risk students. They have done extensive PD with teachers and TA's. They have purchased kits and supplies to better support classrooms. Upon analysis of the previous year's tests, realized students were weak in patterning. Every teacher found ways to incorporate the patterning into their subjects (PE, Cree, French, Art, and Music). As result of whole school focus, grade 3 & 6 PAT's have risen dramatically over last few years. There has been significant growth in excellence rates at gr 3 level (+8.0 over Province) and in acceptable rates at gr 6 level (+9.8 over Province). Next year, they are, again planning some innovative timetabling to further address issues at junior high level and in LA.

KEY CONCEPT - Whole school initiatives bring everyone on board and, with everyone working towards the same goal and acquiring skills they need, success is more likely.

Integrating Mentorship with AISI - This allows AISI to ensure all new teachers are brought up to speed on our projects. We send out packages to them beforehand. We host the orientation meetings and visit their classrooms regularly. Because of those connections, the AISI Coordinator gets to know new teachers well and is able to hook them up with teachers from others schools who teach the same grade or discipline. This saves them work because they make connections and can borrow/share others' plans with them.

2007/2008

1. What is working well?

GSS

-Provided narrow, clear, systematic planning approach specifically targeting intervention strategies (Pyramid of Intervention). Helped identify what students were learning, occurrences of learning, instructional strategies that worked.

-Integration of planned PD/PLC's allowed staff to grow in knowledge of assessment-provided supported implementation of new techniques

GM

-Core Subject Dept PLC's worked:

-All completed (English still part way) prioritizing Outcomes

-All developed student friendly I CAN statements

-All started developing unit assessment plans.

-New teacher mentorship Reading Comprehension SMART Goal successful through: Admin/Peer support of DI strategies

-Reading Specialist support of Reading Comprehension assessment strategies;

-Staff carousel sharing;

-Educational Consultant, Irene Heffel, worked with 1st year teachers-DI and pre/during/post Reading comprehension strategies

-PE Dept. V huge poster made for gym-criteria for students; dress, behaviour, attitude, effort-all classes use

HF

-Administrative team took ownership of project

- PLCs; V held weekly and monthly

-Built leadership capacity through support team.

-Flexible grouping-Div I and II-very successful. Students combined for reading in primary division and LA/math in Div II-provided opportunity for students to learn with other students at the same level

-Students pre-assessed using common assessment tool, grouped according to instructional level, then periodically re-assessed to determine need for programming

-Students excited about learning -able to see own progress as moved through flexible groups

-Div I used multi-sensory spelling techniques, computer assisted learning groups, small group phonics work to support student learning

ROS

-PLC's worked much better-were more organized/planned. Presentations by school Literacy Specialist, gave all teachers ideas to use, not only in LA, but in other core, too. Work supported AISI SMART goal on literacy

- Making plan at beginning of year made it easier for teachers to plan for PLC days

- Agendas/minutes used more effectively to keep everyone on track during PLC's.

-School Computer Technician came to PLC's to give technology tip-something could use in class

STA

-AISI Lead teachers planned for PLC's, PD, speakers to support AISI project

-Flexible groupings in Div I worked well

-PLC's worked on outcomes/curriculum

-Daily reading with all elementary/ jr. high students effective. Every teacher reads for 15 minutes in pm from novel of own choosing. Students enjoyed it -saw different sides to math/science teachers

-Report card discussions around outcomes-based report cards were very challenging and pushed people out of their comfort zones.

STS

-AFL a priority. School PD days focused

-Focus on AFL during admin walkabouts.

-AFL mentioned in weekly newsletters-followed up with daily walkabouts

-Evidence of success-AFL seen in classes during daily walkabouts and heard in conversations with staff

-Seeing outcomes posted, teachers engaged in individual conversations with students, students working on quality summative assessments was common place

-School implemented new outcomes-based report cards (ESCD)-transformed a few teachers

EP

-In PLC's teachers and Librarian created system in library for signing out bags of levelled books. All elementary and librarian worked with Supr of Instruction and FNMI Coor to design/create system to support literacy SMART goal

-Elementary went to outcomes-based reporting (ECSD Report Card) and student-led interviews. Both very successful. Purchased stamps = "Excellent, Proficient, Basic and Insufficient" for each teacher>used them on assignments to get students and parents understanding that some things are proficient when student gets 8/1 - some things Insufficient when get 8/10. Teachers set criteria/standard and students knew what had to get to acquire a certain evaluation stamp.

CYB

-Openly talked about AISI project-regular discussions-teachers began to get clearer idea how formative could be used in class-more comfortable looking at goal of 100% formative assessment-attainable School's assessment policy developed. Managed to incorporate 90% summative and 10% formative for calculating marks-movement away from marking formative. Staff began to understand formative assessment outcomes could also be summative.

CO level

-Worked to build leadership capacity with Principals/VP's so could lead PLC's effectively. Very good progress in most schools

-Requested leadership training in division-New Superintendent worked to bring 2 year training program for identified leaders-called "Leading Every Day"= joint effort between #10 and NRLC. 18 candidates from #37 will be involved next year

-Data analysis became standard in all schools. School administrators realized importance of being action researchers, looking at data-making solid decisions based on what data tells you

-One Teacher at a Time; V motto for AISI. It was the conversation with one person at a time, the visit to one class at a time, the sending of materials to one teacher at a time, the tapping on the shoulder for a teacher to attend a workshop ; V that brought teachers into the good work of this project. It was about the personal touch. Practices observed around balanced assessment programs:

Posting outcomes

Triangulation model with conferencing

Specific, descriptive feedback

Re-writes, re-do; is

Checklists/running records/Anecdotal

Self-assessment/reflection

Student-peer-parent-teacher assessment

Outcomes-based report cards

Co-constructing criteria

Refining progress reports

Exemplars

Portfolios

Student-led conferences

Created No Excuses lists

DI strategies - Projects, product choices, variety of assessment tools for learning styles, tiered learning centers

Quotes

"worked with PLC group-come up with common marking grid"

"Only best work is assessed."

"I discuss the difference between formative and summative assessment with my students to help them understand when/how to ask for rewrites, assistance, etc ; KIf possible, wait until students are finished learning and are ready for a summative. At times, it no longer becomes necessary for formal summative assessment as they have already demonstrated a completion of their learning in that area.;"

-Developed unit in S.S. on establishing communities in AB in 1800's. I incorporated variety of pre, formative &

summative assessments. These ranged from quizzes to creating a heritage commercial."

-Students are now aware that not everything gets a mark. A checkmark for completing practice is as good as a mark."

-finally realized I don't have to correct everything in a story. Co-constructing criteria with the students beforehand has allowed this to happen."

-It will take time to fully develop a balanced assessment program."

2008/2009

Principals were assigned the role of AISI lead teachers in year 3. This enables them to become instructional learning leaders. They are held accountable and must take the lead on everything to do with school improvement i.e. P.D. Days, budgets, PLC's, etc. They have more "clout" than our past AISI Lead teachers and, when the leader in a school makes school improvement his/her focus, the staff is supported in that initiative.

When a school has a strong instructional focus and a good SMART goal that is measured regularly, there are increased chances of meeting targets. Ecole Providence had a very specific literacy SMART goal. Everything aligned to that goal - PLC work, P.D., budget, etc. Results were very evident.

"We are much more consistent with knowing each other's expectations re: student achievement, teaching strategies, and parent communication."

"I appreciate the opportunity to discuss professional development issues with colleagues and a chance to focus on one topic (assessment) in depth."

Most PLC's are working very well and focused on student learning/achievement. School administrators are able to oversee the PLC's effectively. Holy Family School did a particularly impressive job of data analysis and revisited goals and data every PLC to ensure they were on the right track.

"Discussion around pedagogy has increased not only in PLC's but also in the staffroom."

"The sharing of promising practices amongst my colleagues has increased significantly. We are learning from each other and, in turn, are able to pass this on to our students. The sharing of rubrics, checklists and self-assessments are all a positive outcome from PLC's."

"Discussions during PLC's have led to me trying new things in my class. I've used some of the literacy strategies presented in other content areas."

"It is wonderful to have feedback from colleagues in my division. Both my students and myself benefit from their expertise and experiences. It makes me feel less isolated."

We have worked closely with the NRLC to embed new Math curriculum P.D. into PLC's and within school buildings. Teachers prefer this as it reduces travel time and lessons are modelled in their classrooms with their students. PLC's have been created with support from the NRLC so we are confident teachers are on the right track with this new curriculum. Several teachers have stepped forward to become leaders in their PLCs. They lead work around creating performance assessment tasks, quality tests and record-keeping tools.

The train-the-trainer or leadership training model works well for us. Asking teachers to take the lead in numerous areas - Assessment, Mentorship of new teachers, S.S., and Math allows teachers to step forward and take on leadership roles. This builds wonderful capacity and takes the pressure off a few doing all the work. We now have many leaders capable of leading in their specific areas and in general. Three years ago, we could not have said this.

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

2006/2007

P.D. continues to be a challenge. We struggle with the amount of time teachers are being pulled from classes, the travel distances especially on poor road conditions, and the overwhelming choice that is out there. Teachers are having trouble choosing and, as a result, are shutting down and just not doing it. We saw that with the new S.S. curriculum. We tried to tie AISI, FNMI and Curriculum together so that teachers would get multiple hits in the P.D.; however, the new curriculum is such a drastic change for many that the number of days required to come to a good understanding has caused many teachers to shut down. Teachers are overwhelmed. We are trying video conferencing. The AISI Coordinator is doing way more travelling instead of having teachers drive to a central location. We are modeling lessons within schools and doing more work/P.D. through PLC's. The AISI Coordinator requested a Zone meeting to be organized by the NRLC to create a Comprehensive P.D. Plan for this area but it has been poorly implemented and has not meet our needs.

Parental Involvement & Celebrations - continues to challenge schools. Although the AISI Coordinator does workshops in classrooms and for School Councils, and set up displays at Parent-Teacher Interviews, teachers need to involve parents more, especially in terms of celebrations. We have done a sketchy job in celebrating the good successes. We do not need to do huge celebrations but we do need to find a way to build it into this project at the school level. With new outcomes-based report cards beginning to come in, we need to ensure parents understand this new way of operating. This will be one important way to involve parents more.

Newsletters - This was a challenging year due to personal and central office circumstances. Next year, the AISI Coordinator needs to ensure more frequent newsletters go out to schools. There is a need to do more celebratory newsletters with pictures of staff doing great things.

There is only one AISI Coordinator. We need another person in this role in order to do a really thorough job. It is often isolating work and it would be great to have someone with whom to work.

2007/2008

GSS

"X Had so many people at different stages of their learning, understanding and practice of assessment due to different levels of experience, attitudes and skills. As a result, allowing differentiation and adult learning models into PD was required.

GM

"X Coordinating PLC's sharing and collaboration time throughout the year was challenging.

"X Organizing PLC time within and outside of the instructional day was challenging.

"X Strategies have to be more user-friendly for staff implementation.

"X Reality check survey was done the last day of the year and teachers were upset about doing it. Only half the teachers did it. Because the staff is so large, it really skewed some results.

HF

"X In Div. I, the challenge was the management of the many groups that were formed due to the wide range of learning abilities. How to manage this was a consistent dialogue at the weekly PLC meetings.

"X Junior high PLCs struggled due to the constant turnover of junior high staff. Basics like classroom management tended to be the focus rather than instruction.

ROS

"X Still had some resistance in the Junior High area, but it was very minor. STA

"X Were not been able to build PLC time into the timetable for high school.

"X High turnover of staff continually presents a challenge each year to 'catch them up'.

STS

"X One challenge teachers faced was getting first year teachers up to speed in the area of assessment during year two of the project. The mentors played a positive role but sometimes the first year teachers looked swamped or lost during AFL discussions because the rest of the staff was using language that was foreign to them or had just been introduced to them.

"X A second challenge was to keep PD outside the school focused but not limited to AFL workshops. Good support was there for PD but when teachers took part in PD, they often would not have the time or would not make the time to implement it in the classroom. Also, teachers wanted time, and rightly so, to explore issues outside of AFL. This put pressure on the budget and sometimes led to PD overload as teachers never had the opportunity to master a PD event.

EP

"X PLC's were not working well. The timing of Monday mornings was not good. They needed to be built into the timetable. School administration needed to take ownership of PLC's. Central Office can support but they will not work until the school takes ownership of them. As well, the teachers needed to decide they were willing to work together for the benefit of students. They cannot refuse to work together.

CYB

"X It was difficult to find the time to follow-up on goals and to look at effectively reaching different types of learners with some lessons.

"X One issue was teachers were struggling with the changing technology and finding a common medium that could be accessible to all students.

"X Teachers needed confidence in knowing that what they were doing fit under AISI goals. Some of this work could cause teachers to second-guess what they might be doing in the classroom or make them think that changes they implemented were not "good enough" yet and still needed improvement.

"X The SMART goal was to increase/improve critical thinking for students. Teachers felt this goal was lost in the process and they were not sure they accomplished that goal. This indicated measurements were not in place to assess the goal accurately.

"X Teachers needed to establish more quality summative assessment in calculating marks.

CO

"NRLC sponsored Anne Davies for a big name Assessment PD. It was not well received and actually hurt some of our efforts.

"AISI Coordinator (Supr. of Instruction) wore too many hats. Although there was good integration of mentorship and new teachers to the division and PD, another of the mandates, AISI required at least one full-time person to work in classrooms with teachers. There was not time to do that effectively.

"Challenge was the transient nature of teachers in northern AB. We had significant increases in number of new/1st year teachers. Several worked in PAT/DE subjects/grades. 3 were not renewed & taught at the PAT levels. The evidence was obvious-greatly affected results in those schools. Because these teachers were in "survival mode", priority was to learn curriculums/classroom management. They did not have time for other learning such as DI/AFL. New teachers have to be brought on board with initiatives. 30/139 (21.5%) teachers were new, resulting in Supr. of Instruction's time/energy to mentor. School administrators spent much time mentoring/doing catch up". District SpEd personnel spent much time assisting new teachers as this was a huge learning curve for most of them" Number of new teachers and lack of systemic support for them- Need to refine mentorship program

"Program Implementation/Planning -Administrators need training on the change process and how to implement a plan i.e. new curriculum, an AISI project. A workshop that provides a planning model would be beneficial i.e. Jillian Koellen.

"Some schools have not encouraged teachers to take on the role of AISI Lead Teachers and Assessment Specialists - important to build leadership capacity. School Improvement Teams can serve some of those functions but have to have one or the other in place.

2008/2009

Gr 12 Students- have some concerns about not being involved in assessment of their work-do not understand how they are evaluated-some indicate not all teachers discuss how they can improve their learning-individual conferencing is piece of triangulation process needed-72% indicated teacher posts outcomes-68% said teachers use many different ways to help them learn-question=Are we differentiating instruction in high school enough to make a difference in student engagement?

Gr 9 Students-many indicated they are dissatisfied with their learning-do not understand how their teachers evaluate them-feel they have not been taught specific reading skills to improve their literacy-do not know what to do to improve their learning-said 80% of their teachers post outcomes but do not use many different ways to help them learn-interviews from "Listen to What the Kids Say" and Cycle IV student forum will ask for input from students about how to better engage this age group in their learning.

Parent Satisfaction-was down slightly across Division-Administration has targeted this as an area school level administrators require training-has more to do with communication with parents-reevaluating our communication methods-next year, Principals and Vice-Principals will have P.D. on how to develop a Communication Plan and engage parents in meaningful ways in the schools.

Three of our schools went with Edmonton Catholic's outcomes-based report cards. However, they failed to do a really good job educating parents about outcomes-based report cards and new assessment philosophies. Communicating to parents on outcomes-based reporting is a must as this is a huge paradigm shift for parents. Parents only know the systems that were used when they went to school. They still want to see marks and have honor roll. If we want to make such drastic changes, we must educate parents first and we must do it well.

Some teachers and parents not making the connection between our AISI projects - DI and AFL. There are still a few who cannot seem to understand that we are on a journey to create differentiated classrooms where students are engaged and learning to the best of their abilities. Part of that classroom is the whole assessment piece and students must be active in their own assessment. They see everything as separate entities. With improved communications through "Power School" our new student information system we are looking to improve our communications with parents. In addition any one-on one conversations with these people is important so they see the connections.

Some teachers still require work on quality planning, including the development of quality summative assessments. They need to narrow summative assessments to 3-5 quality pieces/unit and get away from marking all the little pieces of paper.

Although we have made some good progress, there is a need to help our Principals develop more skills in order to lead this school improvement work. We are going to develop a leadership training program whereby all school administrators' work on plans that require them to do some quality planning, communicating, leading and reflection.

Most principals have done some work on data analysis but require more training and time to do it well.

Teachers are all saying the same thing - TIME - they need time to do the planning, to develop the quality assessment pieces, to do the data analysis, to conference with students, etc. We need to trust that teachers, with a little guidance, will make very good use of their time in PLCs and on P.D. days. It is time to let them do the work.

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

2006/2007

Division grade/subject level meetings - In our Cycle II project, we held two per year. In this project, we left that as an option. Teachers are now requesting that once again. They want to choose a unit from one subject and anyone who wants to work on that unit comes to central office to develop and assessment plan. We are trying to tie into new curriculum areas - S.S. and Math and include FNMI.

Assessment Specialists - We began a train-the-trainer model in Cycle II under the leadership of three jurisdiction assessment specialists trained through the AAC. Most schools have chosen to move away from actual specialists, requiring all their teachers to become assessment specialists. AISI Lead Teachers have sometimes taken on the role and so have administrators. This is a very good thing.

AISI Lead Teacher Training - The AISI Coordinator needs to hold at least two training sessions per year and meet individually with them; however, we need to do some leadership training next year. Most of them will attend the Anne Davies Leadership series and we plan to do a session where we introduce 5 book/video studies they could use with their staffs.

2007/2008

GSS

- ♣ Integrate goal setting programs into student portfolios and student-led interviews.

GM

- ♣ Give teachers time to work - Most PD days will be given to teachers to work on their assessments.
- ♣ Have rewritten our Department SMART Goals I.e. Social Studies SMART goal 3 times (refining it) in five years.

HF

- ♣ Focus on improving Jr. high programming and results

ROS

- ♣ Focus on using data analysis to make decisions

STA

- ♣ Data analysis
- ♣ Target specific teachers who need more support

ST

- ♣ Target jr high math/LA

EP

- ♣ Increase focus and PD on Literacy
- ♣ Build in PLC's into timetable

CYB

- ♣ Continue work on critical thinking SMART goal

CO

- ♣ Create more Division PLCs where teachers plan for new math curriculum - important so can model backwards design and the importance of creating quality summative assessments. Keep asking "What is the evidence of learning?" Allows Supr. of Instruction to keep teachers focused on what is important in planning for

a DI classroom where students are involved in their own assessment.

- ♣ Revisit DI (ultimate goal is to create a DI classroom) in the form of mini-workshops
- ♣ Host a planning meeting once a year in April with all administrators/School Improvement Teams/AISI Lead to evaluate, look at the data, plan, etc. Bring in Phil McCrae and Jim Parsons to lead us.
- ♣ Set up planning workshop for administrators (Jillian Koellen)
- ♣ Next year, because of our increasing teacher turnover, we are implementing a more formal Mentorship Program where Mentors are trained to be on-site or off-site mentors. We will draw from retired teachers, too. Protégées will undergo a series of workshops to train them in areas of need around: Special Education, Planning, Assessment and Classroom Management -topics they have identified as target areas. Further areas to be looked at will include FNMI and DI.
- ♣ AISI would, once again, like to have time with administrators at Principals' meetings for mini training sessions around assessment. In the past, this allowed opportunities to give the Principals quick and easy P.D. that they could take back and deliver to staffs at meetings (half hour, 15 minutes). This was an effective "train-the-trainer" kind of model that allowed Principals to show leadership with their staffs on AISI topics. It was a good training process and worked well for us so we need to revisit doing that again

central Office is working on PD for increasing PAT math scores.

2008/2009

Principals will receive formal training over a 3 year period to give them the leadership skills they need to be instructional leaders in school improvement.

Vice-Principals will take the lead on the report card initiative and the choosing of a new student information system. This will give them the opportunity for leadership but within a very structured framework with support.

Ideally every teacher would have someone to work with to do planning, bounce ideas off, compare lessons and discuss student learning. There is still a need to create some more partnerships for those who do not have that someone with whom to work.

"We developed novel study groups on the basis of reading ability so that students are reading and working with students close to their own ability level, and allowing them to feel more confident in their reading skills."

Our Sharing Bank is very limited and not working well because no one has the time to monitor it well. This needs to be reviewed.

We will continue to do a better job at the school level and division level on data analysis.

One skill administrators need is the ability to have the "hard conversations" with some teachers. We have been doing this work on DI and AFL for six years. It is time for teachers to step up and do what is expected. Principals, in particular, need to ensure all their teachers are on board.

Protocols or Focused Conversations are useful tools in many situations. Principals will be asked to incorporate a few of them each year into PLC's.

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

2006/2007

Literacy Week Celebrations - A few schools held incredible literacy week celebrations with author visits, book sales, camp read-a-lots, parent workshops, learning fairs, etc.

Good Shepherd is a blue school. Because this school had all blue on its accountability pillar, they held a "Blue

Day". Everyone wore blue and all the students got a blue balloon. They did it on an awards day so it was very good public relations with parents and the media.

Photostory - The AISI Coordinator created a Photostory that celebrated the good work done in PLC's. It had pictures of teachers from all schools working in their PLC's. Principals took it and shared it with their staffs.

Inukshuks - The AISI Coordinator made stained glass inukshuks (ties into Anne Davies use of inukshuks in her book, "Making Classroom Assessment Work"), thanking all AISI Lead teachers and Assessment Specialists for their hard work and dedication to the project.

Listen to What the Kids Say - The AISI Coordinator, along with a principal and a teacher, will share findings of 5 years of student research at the AAC Conference and with administrators.

When the Saints Go Marching In - Many are interested to hear successful high school stories. The AISI Coordinator and 5 teachers from Glenmary will be presenting their story at the AAC Conference, as well as writing it up for a chapter in Anne Davies fourth book

2007/2008

GSS

- ♣ Displays during Education Week and at PTI evenings

GM

- ♣ Shared at PLC's - (engaging classroom activities; student exemplars)
- ♣ Shared at Staff Meetings - (twice within the year)

HF

- ♣ Watched a PowerPoint that showcased AISI activities.
- ♣ Discuss and congratulate one another at PLC Meetings.

ROS

- ♣ Successes have been shared between colleagues at PLC meetings.
- ♣ Interviewing students to see what their reactions are to the changes and sharing with staff.

STA

- ♣ hold a sub party for teachers once a year
- ♣ show AISI video

STS

- ♣ Celebrate in small but regular ways throughout the school year.
- ♣ Started year with staff breakfast to celebrate all we accomplished in 2007-2008.
- ♣ Purchased teacher friendly gifts to pass out when we saw AFL in action during walkabouts
- ♣ Celebrated staff at monthly staff meetings who are implementing and having success with AFL practices.

EP

- ♣ Literacy Week celebrations

CYB

- ♣ Shared some general information on what we have been doing in the classroom, and part of staff meetings have been given to sharing information.
- ♣ PLC discussions online
- ♣ Excellent discussion in staff meetings

CO

- ♣ Board presentation - Photostory
- ♣ Photostory shared with all schools
- ♣ -Bouquets to staff on a regular basis
- ♣ Ask teachers to present at workshops, conferences, PLC's to show what they are doing
- ♣ Teachers presented at the AAC Conference with Supr. of Instruction - Listen to What the Kids Say and When the Saints go Marching In
- ♣ AAC adopted the calendar from Listen to What the Kids Say - gave one to each teacher

2008/2009

"Listen to What the Kids Say" - Over the last four years, the AISI Coordinator interviewed students about what they liked in classes and what they did not. They talked about what teachers do to make their learning interesting and engaging. 10 Major themes emerged:

1. Let's get to know each other. (Know your students.)
2. Make my learning interesting and engaging. (Differentiated Instruction)
3. Don't mark me while I'm learning something. (Assessment for Learning)
4. Let me have a say in my learning. (Goal Setting/Portfolios/Student-led Interviews)
5. Allow me a variety of ways to show my learning. (More DI/Flexible Grouping)
6. Teach to my needs. (Instructional Level)
7. Be fair. (Assessment for Learning)
8. Challenge me. (Tiered Instruction - "Zone of Proximal Development")
9. Make me laugh. Make learning fun. (Engagement and real life connections)
10. Celebrate how well we have done. (Evidence of successful learning)

These were shared with staff in the form of a desktop calendar. Each month one of the themes is celebrated along with a picture of some students demonstrating that theme. On the back side of the calendar page are a few questions for teachers, where they have the opportunity to reflect on that theme within their own practice. A 20 minute video will be created to share with staff and board members at the Cycle IV kick-off in September.

Most schools celebrate student learning during Education Week and tie their school improvement work in AISI into that week.

All elementary schools do at least one student-led interview per year. These are great opportunities for students and teachers to celebrate learning.

"We have planned literacy and math nights for families to participate in."

Each year a Photostory has been created for Principals to use with their staffs and School Councils celebrating the work in AISI.

This continues to be a challenging area for schools. Parents and students need to be included in the planning and actual celebrations.

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

2006/2007

Elementary Teachers - Many are overwhelmed with the new curriculum coming in and feeling unable to cope with all the initiatives (FNMI, Special Education, AISI, etc). AISI has backed off in terms of assessment for learning because we recognize all the new curriculum builds on it. We have encouraged principals to let

teachers do practical work in PLC's that supports new curriculum. Let them work together to develop unit plans, to develop tests, to build rubrics, etc. Allow them to determine what they need to help students learn.

PLC's - Teachers are demanding that administrators not "plan" every minute of PLC's. They want time to explore, try new things, build test banks, create assignments, reflect, etc. Principals have to trust that teachers know what they need. If administrators are trained and sitting on the PLC's as active members, they can ensure good things are happening. Many administrators find it difficult to "let go". Many teachers find it difficult to take ownership of their PLC's.

Storytelling - Telling stories of success is a great way to share good ideas. The AISI Coordinator has made it a point to tell those stories over and over or to get others to tell their stories. When people repeatedly hear a message that way, they often adopt the good idea. This worked particularly well with establishing School Improvement Teams, improving the operations of PLC's, improving leadership training, trying new timetables and developing whole school focus.

2007/2008

GSS

- ♣ Huge growth in some classes who focused on leveled reading.

GM

- ♣ Teachers greatly desired the PLC time to the extent they planned their meeting times outside the school day even though administration provided the opportunity to use instructional day (sub coverage). Teachers did not want to lose valuable instructional class time - i.e. monthly AM 7:00 - 8:30 AM meetings before school; supper meetings 5:00 - 7:00 PM. In the end, this was taxing and wearing on the teachers' energies.

- ♣ Very successful results with ELA Jr. High grade 7 & 9 building of Unit Assessment plans (day long PD with Irene Heffel); ELA 30-1 & 30-2 had similar success with their Unit Assessment planning day.

- ♣ Math, Science and Social Departments collaboration in developing Reading language tools for students i.e. posting of classroom wall charts with student friendly science, math, and social terms. Depts. did a very good job of this. Also, department collaboration between grades (7 through 12) regarding use of common language on student summative assessments (i.e. unit exams, comprehensive exams) was successful.

HF

- ♣ Much greater sense of "family" within each of the elementary divisions as a result of flexible grouping. Relationships have been developed that transcend, to a greater extent, the grade-specific boundaries that traditionally occur.

- ♣ Students are becoming more metacognitive about what they need to do in reading/writing.

ROS

- ♣ Jr high teachers have decided to change the report cards for next year. They want to introduce learner outcomes and change the marking system to allow for more formative assessment.

STA

- ♣ Flexible groupings in Div. I very successful. Teachers and students really liked it and the data suggests positive results.

STS

- ♣ There was a change of thinking among staff. Definitely, the flexible groupings made it easier for teachers to create differentiated classrooms. The staff will be forever grateful to our AISI coordinator for suggesting this as an effective strategy to move our learners forward. It has been successful in the mind of teachers and our initial PAT results and Grade results are bearing out the successes from this program for the students as well.

- ♣ Students are beginning to be exposed to more self assessment, not the way it used to be so much (answer keys), but with rubrics and exemplars.
- ♣ A new report card system was not on the St. Stephen's vision at the start of this project. However, it has been warmly received by teachers and the parents.

EP

- ♣ Literacy focus is truly working. The leveled books bags help teachers who are new and do not have many of their own library books for their classrooms. Students are excited to take books out and read. Many of the FNMI books are popular.

CYB

- ♣ It seems all teachers are enthusiastically embracing the AISI goals as the project goes on. As teachers understand how formative and summative assessment can truly benefit students, teachers are motivated to push towards improving student achievement.

CO

- ♣ -Positive - The power of individual conversations was a motivator and lead to turnarounds on staffs. Never underestimate the power of focused, encouraging but challenging conversation.
- ♣ There seemed to be a disconnect between DI and AFL in some schools or with some teachers. AISI will have to revisit our goals - to create a differentiated classroom that incorporates AFL principles. More mini workshops, videos, and chats with teachers will need to be done.

- AISI Rubric - is used as a reflection tool for schools to assess how the AISI project is going in their school. All schools rated themselves a combination of 2,3 and 4. Some were 3 & 4. They improved overall from last year.

2008/2009

We did not expect our high schools to buy in so readily to new assessment practices. They never really bought in to Differentiated Instruction the way the other levels did. Assessment has certainly been the hook for high school teachers. They are doing some very good work and are so open to new ideas.

Division II teachers, as with all elementary teachers, have to become "experts" in every subject. However, because of the level and complexity of learning at these grade levels, it becomes a real challenge to become adept at everything. These teachers are faced with new curriculum, AISI and, in this Division, challenging special education issues. The teachers sometimes feel overwhelmed and then become quite protective of their time and energy for what seems to them as "one more thing on their plate". It is important to recognize their reality and try to meld all this into one workable and doable focus.

[Section G4 - Sustainability \(Optional in Year 1 and 2 - Required in final year\)](#)

[How will this project be sustained?](#)

2006/2007

The Supervisor of Instruction oversees AISI, Mentorship and P.D. The nature of the work has become integrated throughout Central Office. Now FNMI, Curriculum and Special Services are focused on school improvement and improved student learning. Even with the death of our Supervisor of Curriculum, we were able to continue integrating the initiatives. The FNMI Coordinator and Supervisor of Curriculum sat on several PLC's along with the Supervisor of Instruction. The Supervisor of Special Services has undertaken the

purchasing of literacy testing materials. Under the new organization, the Deputy Superintendent in charge of School Improvement, who also oversees curriculum, will try to visit as many PLC's as possible next year. All five administrators at central office will be part of the School Improvement meetings once again. This was a new initiative this past year, where Central Office administrators met with school administrators and/or School Improvement Teams and discussed their improvement plans two times per year. At the administration table, we have agreed our focus will be school improvement. We are all involved in the process and Board of Trustees is committed to the process, as well.

We did much P.D. over the last several years to ensure PLC's were operating with clear focus and they way in which they should. We have empowered Principals and their administration staff to take the lead in their respective schools. Most schools have "School Improvement Teams" and/or Learning Support Teams. By the end of Year 2 of this Cycle III project, it is our goal for all schools to have them in operation and working very effectively to make differences in student learning.

In Cycle II, we operated in a top down fashion. We have reversed that in Cycle III and the schools are taking more responsibility for this work. It has created increased autonomy for schools. They appreciate having the ability to determine specific direction for their own schools. In many ways, it is as if we are operating eight different AISI projects. Each school is working on "Assessment for Learning" but they each have their own literacy SMART goal under the school improvement umbrella. All teachers have had some training in data analysis and writing SMART goals. Principals and AISI Lead Teachers in most schools are now confident to "lead" their staffs on this journey. They have developed plans for their AISI budgets, P.D., staffing, PLC's, and leadership training.

If funding for AISI was pulled next year, the following would continue to operate: Leadership training, School Improvement Teams, PLC's, P.D. to support school improvement, learning support initiatives, and the positions at Central Office. New curriculum is, also, driving teacher growth in differentiated instruction and assessment for learning. It is not going away. The principles we are advocating - differentiated instruction, assessment for learning, professional learning communities, and improved literacy are built in to every initiative in this province.

2007/2008

"We need to continue to build capacity at Central office so that all central office staff are seen as instructional leaders. We get credibility when we do workshops, sit on PLC's once in a while, visit classrooms and talk with teachers about instruction and student learning.

"PLC's are now built into each school and would not disappear tomorrow if funding from AISI was pulled.

"Data analysis is part of every school's yearly routine now. School leaders recognize the need for action research and that decisions need to be based on data. What is the data telling you? How do you know what you are doing is making a difference? Are you willing to stop doing something that has been ingrained into your system if the data tells you it is not making a difference?

"Our Cycle II project was a top down project. This project has been a bottom up project. There is a balance somewhere between those two and we are looking to find it.

" The last paragraph from last year's APAR report still applies.

If funding for AISI was pulled next year, the following would continue to operate: leadership training, school improvement teams, PLC's, PD to support school improvement, learning support initiatives, and the positions at Central Office. New curriculum is driving teacher growth in differentiated instruction and assessment for learning. It is not going away. The principles we are advocating- differentiated instruction, assessment for learning, PLC's, and improved literacy are built into every initiative in this province.;"

2008/2009

Grade books are changing to match formative and summative record keeping. Teachers are asking for new report cards. Next year, Division-wide report cards will be created by teachers and the way we report student learning and calculate grades will be a much more accurate reflection of our assessment philosophy.

"I am using more anecdotal notes in combination with grade and looking at progress over time. When doing report cards, I am going back and spending more time re-examining work looking for strengths, weaknesses, and improvements before making decisions about grades."

PLC's are now built in to most schools' timetables and/or P.D. days. They have become part of the culture at the division and school level. The NRLC has changed the way they do things and has, upon recommendations from our Division, created new curriculum P.D. that is PLC-based work. Most teachers indicate this has been the most effective P.D. they have ever experienced.

"I appreciate having the opportunity to work with other teachers to come to understand this new math curriculum. I am the only Grade ___ teacher in my school so it is nice to be able to work with teachers from other schools."

"It offers a chance to explore ideas with colleagues. This year we have cross curricular PLC's. This offered a chance to see things from a different point of view."

"This has greatly helped make it easier for me to implement and have success with my students in my classroom. I find it really helps me to focus on and feel confident about what I'm doing in my classroom. We share so many good practices."

AB Assessment Consortia Support - 1) We have 4 Division AAC Assessment Specialists who continue to do train-the-trainer activities with people in the schools. This AAC initiative will continue in some way and teachers and students will continue to be the beneficiaries. 2) AAC Conference - Every year we fill our spots. Originally, AISI supported attendance financially and now teachers choose to go on their own P.D expenses because they value the conference and what they learn there. It has become part of several teachers' individual growth plans. Two teachers who have regularly attended the AAC Conference stated:

"I am trying to balance the number and nature of pieces of assessment that I use in my classes. Formative assessment allows me to increase the amount of meaningful feedback that I provide my students so that results in areas of summative testing are significantly improving."

"I have worked at providing feedback which is timely and provide a summary of areas in which students can improve on their marked assignments. I have worked at identifying the gaps that exist in student understanding, both at an individual level and at the whole class level. Then remediation has been provided, through reviews and individual or group tutorials, to enable students to make up the gaps in their understandings. I have used test analysis to evaluate how students are doing in their critical thinking."

When Principals become one of the instructional leaders in the school, they return to the work they were intended to do. Principals are now leading the school improvement efforts. They are being supported in their own learning to lead. They are being held accountable by the Superintendent's office to lead their school's efforts and improve student learning.

[Section G5 - Project Status \(for 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 only\)](#)

Year: 2006/2007

[Please check one of the following boxes:](#)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuing
<input type="checkbox"/> Completed
<input type="checkbox"/> Discontinued If so, please explain WHY
Year: 2007/2008
Please check one of the following boxes:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuing
<input type="checkbox"/> Completed
<input type="checkbox"/> 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
Guideline Sheet.doc	0021_30218_1.doc	2009-12-06 22:51:36	Successful	N
AISI Project RUBRIC.doc	0021_30218_2.doc	2009-12-06 22:53:17	Successful	N
Commitment to AISI Cycle III Project Yr 3.doc	0021_30218_3.doc	2009-12-06 22:53:47	Successful	N
Assessment Planning Template 3.doc	0021_30218_4.doc	2009-12-06 22:55:12	Successful	N
Grading_Practices - AJ.doc	0021_30218_5.doc	2009-12-06 22:55:43	Successful	N
Professional Judgment.doc	0021_30218_6.doc	2009-12-06 23:01:13	Successful	N

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)