

## AISI Project Annual Report (APAR) 2008/2009

### Section A1: Project Demographics

School Authority:	<b>2115 - Wetaskiwin Regional Division No. 11</b>		
Project:	<b>30155 - Learning Cycle For Improving Student Achievement</b>		
Project Scope:	4187 Students, Grades pre K to 12, 20 Schools		
Project Description:	Implement a division wide initiative that focuses on standards for student success around the four key elements of outcomes planning, high quality instructional practice, assessment and evaluation. Provide professional development support through the use of learning leaders and collaborative inquiry learning teams.		
Project Purpose:	To improve achievement of students in Mathematics in division three and move all students from good to great in English Language Arts using high yield instructional strategies and effective assessment practices.		
Budget for 2008/2009:	Approved:	Working:	Actual:
	557,727	557,727	557,727
Project Years:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2006/2007</li> <li>• 2007/2008</li> <li>• 2008/2009</li> </ul>		
	<p><u>Improvement Goals:</u></p> <p>1- 1. To increase the percentage of grade 7, 8, 9 students who achieve an acceptable standard in Mathematics</p> <p>2- 2. To increase the percentage of K to grade 12 students who achieve an acceptable standard in Language Arts</p> <p>3- 3. To increase the percentage of students who participate in grade 6, and 9 Mathematics and English Language Arts PATs</p> <p>4- 4. To build teacher lateral capacity and assessment literacy.</p>		
	<p>Last update by: <a href="#">Alfred Sakyi</a>            Final Report Status: <a href="#">Approved</a></p>		

### 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	4025
Estimated Number of Students Involved For Three	4167

Years			
Estimated Number of PreSchoolers Involved	20		
Estimated Number of Students (in your authority) that project could be applied to	4167		
Student Ages	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18		
Grades	preK , K , 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12		
Actual number of schools involved	20		
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alder Flats Elementary School</li> <li>• Buck Mountain Central School</li> <li>• C. B. McMurdo Elementary School</li> <li>• Centennial Elementary School</li> <li>• Clear Vista School</li> <li>• Ecole Queen Elizabeth Junior High School</li> <li>• Falun School</li> <li>• Griffiths-Scott Middle School</li> <li>• Gwynne School</li> <li>• Lakedell School</li> </ul> </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Millet School</li> <li>• Norwood Elementary School</li> <li>• Parkdale School</li> <li>• Pigeon Lake Regional</li> <li>• Pine Haven School</li> <li>• Pipestone School</li> <li>• Rosebrier Community School</li> <li>• Wetaskiwin Composite High School</li> <li>• Wetaskiwin Early Education Community Centre</li> <li>• Winfield Elementary School</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </table>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alder Flats Elementary School</li> <li>• Buck Mountain Central School</li> <li>• C. B. McMurdo Elementary School</li> <li>• Centennial Elementary School</li> <li>• Clear Vista School</li> <li>• Ecole Queen Elizabeth Junior High School</li> <li>• Falun School</li> <li>• Griffiths-Scott Middle School</li> <li>• Gwynne School</li> <li>• Lakedell School</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Millet School</li> <li>• Norwood Elementary School</li> <li>• Parkdale School</li> <li>• Pigeon Lake Regional</li> <li>• Pine Haven School</li> <li>• Pipestone School</li> <li>• Rosebrier Community School</li> <li>• Wetaskiwin Composite High School</li> <li>• Wetaskiwin Early Education Community Centre</li> <li>• Winfield Elementary School</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alder Flats Elementary School</li> <li>• Buck Mountain Central School</li> <li>• C. B. McMurdo Elementary School</li> <li>• Centennial Elementary School</li> <li>• Clear Vista School</li> <li>• Ecole Queen Elizabeth Junior High School</li> <li>• Falun School</li> <li>• Griffiths-Scott Middle School</li> <li>• Gwynne School</li> <li>• Lakedell School</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Millet School</li> <li>• Norwood Elementary School</li> <li>• Parkdale School</li> <li>• Pigeon Lake Regional</li> <li>• Pine Haven School</li> <li>• Pipestone School</li> <li>• Rosebrier Community School</li> <li>• Wetaskiwin Composite High School</li> <li>• Wetaskiwin Early Education Community Centre</li> <li>• Winfield Elementary School</li> </ul>		

**Section A3 : Project Type for Project 30155**

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"> <li>• All Students</li> </ul>
-------------------	--

Subject(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language Arts/Literacy</li> <li>• Mathematics/Numeracy</li> </ul>
Theme(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment</li> </ul>
Keywords (Teaching Strategies/PD/Programs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment for/of/as Learning</li> <li>• Collaboration/Cooperative Learning</li> <li>• Learning Styles</li> <li>• Mentorship (Students)</li> </ul>
Number of Students in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2,501-5,000</li> </ul>
Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• preK</li> <li>• K</li> <li>• 1</li> <li>• 2</li> <li>• 3</li> <li>• 4</li> <li>• 5</li> <li>• 6</li> <li>• 7</li> <li>• 8</li> <li>• 9</li> <li>• 10</li> <li>• 11</li> <li>• 12</li> </ul>
Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zone 4 Services</li> </ul>
Number of Schools in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 or more</li> </ul>
Location of School(s) involved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban</li> <li>• Rural</li> </ul>
Division Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• preK</li> <li>• 1 (K-3)</li> <li>• 2 (4-6)</li> <li>• 3 (7-9)</li> <li>• 4 (10-12)</li> </ul>

School Authority Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public School Jurisdiction</li> </ul>
Types of Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of Quality Measures</li> <li>• Final Teacher awarded Marks</li> <li>• Locally Developed/Teacher Made Tests</li> <li>• Observation/Checklists</li> <li>• Participation Rates in Provincial Achievement Tests/Diploma Exams</li> <li>• Provincial Achievement Tests</li> <li>• Provincial Diploma Examinations</li> <li>• Surveys</li> </ul>
Constituency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drayton Valley-Calmar</li> <li>• Wetaskiwin-Camrose</li> </ul>
City or Town Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alder Flats</li> <li>• Buck Lake</li> <li>• Falun</li> <li>• Gwynne</li> <li>• Millet</li> <li>• Westeros</li> <li>• Wetaskiwin</li> <li>• Winfield</li> </ul>
2000/2001 Approved Budget	
2001/2002 Approved Budget	
2002/2003 Approved Budget	
2003/2004 Approved Budget	
2004/2005 Approved Budget	
2005/2006 Approved Budget	
2006/2007 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 500,001-1,000,000</li> </ul>
2007/2008 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 500,001-1,000,000</li> </ul>
2008/2009 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 500,001-1,000,000</li> </ul>

Project Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centralized</li> </ul>
PAT - English Language Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3</li> <li>• Grade 6</li> <li>• Grade 9</li> </ul>
PAT - French Language Arts	
PAT - Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 9</li> </ul>
PAT - Social Studies	
PAT - Science	
Diploma Examinations - English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Language Arts -1</li> <li>• English Language Arts -2</li> </ul>
Diploma Examinations - Mathematics	
Diploma Examinations - Social Studies	
Diploma Examinations - Sciences	
Diploma Examinations-French	
Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents</li> <li>• Student</li> <li>• Teacher/Staff</li> </ul>
School Records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success Indicators for Various Programs</li> </ul>
Standardized/Commercial Tests	
Std. Tests - General Achievement/Math/Language Arts	

Std. Tests - Reading	
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*
<b>Certificated Teachers</b>						
Teachers	4.00		1.54		1.07	0.00

AISI Coordinators	0.80		0.80		0.60	0.00
<b>Other Personnel</b>						
Professionals (e.g., Social Worker, Liaison Worker)						
Teaching Assistants						
Administrative Support Staff						
Other						
<b>Total FTE</b>	4.8		2.34		1.67	0

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

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

Measure (From project plan)	Baseline	2008/2009		Number(*) Measured
		Target	Actual	
G12--English Language Arts 30-1 B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard Grade 12 students who achieve the acceptable standard on the L.A.30-1 DIP.	88.2	91	91.50	142

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the English Language Arts scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

G12--English Language Arts 30-2 B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard Grade 12 students who achieve the acceptable standard on the L.A.30-2 DIP.	92.5	95	85.30	102
--	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the English Language Arts scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

G3-A1-English Language Arts B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard Grade 3 students who achieve the acceptable standard on the Grade 3 L.A. PAT.	91.1	94	90.50	257
---	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the English Language Arts scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

G3-A1-English Language Arts B3-Participation rate (in %) Grade 3 students who participated in Grade 3 L.A. PAT.	87.5	94	87.00	296
---	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the English Language Arts scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

G6-A3-English Language Arts B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard grade 6 students who achieve the acceptable standard on the Grade 6 L.A. PAT.	85.9	90	90.10	263
---	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the English Language Arts scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

G6-A3-English Language Arts B3-Participation rate (in %) Grade 6 students who participated in Grade 6 L.A. PAT.	81.6	90	83.10	316
---	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the English Language Arts scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

B4-% of students meeting other criteria/standard Grade 7 math students in an AISI schools who achieve an acceptable standard at year end report card.	92.1	95	91.00	276
--	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline will be established using 2005/06 school year composite average of the Mathematics scores for all schools. Acceptable standard will be 60% or higher.

**Comment on results (optional)**

B4-% of students meeting other criteria/standard Grade 8 math students in an AISI schools who achieve an acceptable standard at year end report card.	93.9	96	92.00	288
--	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline will be established using 2005/06 school year composite average of the Mathematics scores for all schools. Acceptable standard will be 60% or higher.

**Comment on results (optional)**

B4-% of students meeting other criteria/standard Grade 9 math students in an AISI schools who achieve an acceptable standard at year end report card.	88.1	92	87.00	277
--	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline will be established using 2005/06 school year composite average of the Mathematics scores for all schools. Acceptable standard will be 60% or higher.

**Comment on results (optional)**

G9-A7-English Language Arts 9 B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard Grade 9 students who achieve the acceptable standard on the Grade 9 L.A. PAT.	89.1	94	89.10	248
--	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the English Language Arts scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

New data suggest baseline was 88.7%

G9-A8-Mathematics B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard Grade 9 students who achieve the acceptable standard on the Grade 9 math PAT.	67	75	76.40	240
---	----	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the Mathematics scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

G9-A7-English Language Arts 9 B3-Participation rate (in %) Grade 9 students who participated in Grade 9 L.A. PAT.	82.6	90	83.80	297
---	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the Mathematics scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

G9-A8-Mathematics B3-Participation rate (in %) Grade 9 students who participated in the Grade 9 math PAT.	83.3	87	82.10	292
---	------	----	-------	-----

**Baseline and Measure Comments:**

The baseline was established using a three year (2002/03 to 2004/05 school year) composite average of the Mathematics scores for all schools.

**Comment on results (optional)**

New data suggests baseline was 80.1%

\* 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		
Percentage of parents satisfied with the overall quality of basic education.	81.3	90	81.20	214	89

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline was established using a three year average (2004 to 2006) calculated using all parent data across all grades from the Accountability Pillar Survey Measures.

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of students satisfied with the overall quality of basic education.	85.2	92	87.90	804	91.4
---	------	----	-------	-----	------

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline was established using a three year average (2004 to 2006) calculated using combined (grade 4,7,10) student data from the Accountability Pillar Survey Measures.

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of students that repeatedly have the opportunity to use exemplars or samples of student work prior to receiving an assessment task or assignment.	86	100	92.20	1296	87.3
--	----	-----	-------	------	------

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a student monitoring 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of students that report they received a 0% on an assessment task or test.	23	0	12.00	1296	87.3
--	----	---	-------	------	------

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a student monitoring 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of students that report they repeatedly have an opportunity to practice before any marks are recorded.	84	100	92.00	1296	87.3
---	----	-----	-------	------	------

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a student monitoring 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of students that report they repeatedly have an opportunity to redo an assessment task or test	72	100	84.00	1296	87.3
---	----	-----	-------	------	------

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a student monitoring 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of students that report they repeatedly rewrite learner outcomes into "I" statements.	48	100	88.00	1296	87.3
--	----	-----	-------	------	------

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a student monitoring 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of students that report they repeatedly use rubrics or other criteria by which their work will be judged.	70	100	89.00	1296	87.3
--	----	-----	-------	------	------

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a student monitoring 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of students who report that they receive frequent descriptive feedback from their teachers.	77	100	91.00	1296	87.3
--	----	-----	-------	------	------

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a student monitoring 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of teachers that indicate they never give a 0% on an assessment task or test.	77	95	89.00	174	84
--	----	----	-------	-----	----

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a teacher 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of teachers that indicate they repeatedly use rubrics or other criteria by which students work will be judged.	59	95	93.00	174	84
---	----	----	-------	-----	----

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a teacher 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of teachers that report they repeatedly give descriptive feedback to students.	77	95	99.00	174	84
---	----	----	-------	-----	----

**Baseline and Measure Comments**

The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a teacher 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%

**Comment on results (optional)**

Percentage of teachers who indicate they repeatedly allow students to improve before any marks are recorded.	85	95	99.00	174	84
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a teacher 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
Percentage of teachers who indicate they repeatedly give students an opportunity to redo an assessment task or test.	62	90	91.00	174	84
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a teacher 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
Percentage of teachers who report they repeatedly have students rewrite learner outcomes into "I" statements.	23	100	59.00	174	84
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a teacher 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
Percentage of teachers who report they repeatedly use student exemplars or samples of student work before assigning and assessment task or assignment.	53	98	90.00	174	84
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
The baseline will be established in September 2006 using a teacher 4 point likert survey and the composite average of scores for all grade 3 to 12 schools. Although we do not have our baseline data collected we anticipate a end result of 100%					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					

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

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

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

Current Situation	Desired Change	Success Indicators
The culture in most schools	Inquiries and tasks that	· Increased numbers of classroom teachers that are confident in

<p>about student achievement is:          -Tasks and assignments are knowledge acquisition mainly          -Memorization and repetition of information is the major indicator of understanding          -Tasks and assignments demand a clearly-defined approach to externally generated criteria          -Originate with and only meet minimum expectations of the Program of Studies          -Set out one right way, or one right solution</p> <p>*Adapted from Galileo school review process for school AISI inquiry projects</p>	<p>increasingly:          -Lead students to acquire, create and apply knowledge across subject disciplines          -Challenge students to use methods of inquiry central to one or more disciplines          -Emanate from question, problems or explorations that have meaning to the students          -Provide opportunities for students to create something that contributes to the world's knowledge          -Demand a variety of roles and perspectives</p>	<p>terms of the authenticity of inquiries and tasks they establish for students· Increased numbers of students that participate in the development of authentic inquiries and tasks · Increased number of students who show self confidence by the quality of the work they produce· Increased variety in the ways in which students are given the opportunity to participate in their learning experience.· Increased numbers of students making meaningful, purposeful links between learning and their personal experience.</p> <p>*The above data will be gathered through visitation/interviews by the AISI coordinator and Learning Leaders. Other evidence of student success will be collection of products, observation of process, conversations and anecdotal notes</p>
--	--	--

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

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

The success indicators for changing the culture of student achievement in WRPS Schools would be describe as " Well".

Classroom teachers are becoming more confident in terms of creating authentic, multi-level formative and summative assessment tasks. However this is the main focus of year two of this cycle. Teachers have reported that 79% (from 59% to 79% an increase of 20%) of teachers in WRPS use rubrics and other assessment criteria with students on an ongoing basis. Students' have reported 77% of them (from 70% to 77% an increase of 7%) use rubrics and other assessment criteria with students on an ongoing basis. There has been a 20% (from 54% to 74%) increase reported by teachers that they use student exemplars, while 88% of students believe teachers use exemplars (from 86% to 88% an increase of 2%). We have found a 19% (from 35% to 54%) jump in teachers giving students a choice to do different assignments, 71% (this is a reported 6% increase from 65% to 71%) of students feel they have a choice of tasks assigned for the same outcome or assessment task. We noted that 95% (from 40% to 95% an increase of 55%) of teachers have reported they re-teach for understanding but only 87 % (from 81% to 87% an increase of 6%)of students feel their teachers re-taught the outcome.

We know for instruction to be effective, student learning must occur in sufficient time. In year two of our AISI project teachers will continue to use Assessment FOR Learning short-cycle assessment strategies. Teachers will collect evidence of students successfully achieving the learner outcomes. When student assessment evidence clearly shows students are not learning the outcomes, teachers must adjust how they are teaching: that is, change the type of instructional practices so students can alter how they are trying to learn. Our strategy for 2007 - 2008 school year will focus on the nine high yield instructional strategies. These strategies come from 30 years of accumulated research based on thousands of comparisons, from K - 12 classrooms, across a variety of subject areas. The nine high yield strategies provide highly consistent answers to the question of what types of instructional strategies work best to improve student achievement. Teachers can use these strategies to guide classroom practice in such a way as to maximize and enhance student achievement.

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

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

Teachers continue to collaborate to ensure all students benefit from creation of authentic, multi-level formative and summative assessment tasks. In year 2 of our project we continue to focus on Assessment For Learning. This is a process or attitude about teaching and learning using "short - cycle" assessment strategy. In September of 2007 we added 4 of the 9 High Yield Instructional Strategies Robert Marzano documented in his

Meta-Analysis which come from 30 years of accumulated research based on thousands of comparisons, from K - 12 classrooms, across a variety of subject areas. Teachers can use these strategies to guide classroom practice in such a way as to maximize and enhance student achievement. Even though classroom instruction and formative assessment are different, both of these activities are focused on the same outcome: improved student learning and that is why we teach.

Teachers have reported that 90% (from 79% to 90% an additional increase of 21%) of teachers in WRPS use rubrics and other assessment criteria with students on an ongoing basis. 87% of students have reported they (from 77% to 87% an additional increase of 10%) use rubrics and other assessment criteria on an ongoing basis. This indicates that students are participating in the creation of authentic assessment tasks.

There has been an additional 6% (from 74% to 80%) increase reported by teachers that they use student exemplars, while 90% of students believe teachers use exemplars (from 88% to 90% an increase of 2%). Students continue to indicate self confidence when given the opportunity to participate in a meaningful learning experience. The data demonstrates 79% of our students understand the learner outcomes. The data also shows that 97% of students feel that they receive good descriptive feedback from their teachers and 86% of students feel they know what is expected of them before the teacher moves on to a new learner outcome. In year 3 of our AISI Cycle we will continue to focus on Assessment For Learning. This is a process or attitude about teaching and learning using "short - cycle" assessment strategy. And we will look at the remaining 5 High Yield Strategies. Teachers can continue to build their tool box with strategies to guide classroom practice in such a way as to maximize and enhance student achievement. Even though classroom instruction and formative assessment are different, both of these activities are focused on the same outcome: improved student learning and that is why we teach.

We are continuing this process with a couple of changes.

1. Teachers will collaborate with colleagues who teach the same grade and/or subjects.
2. We will spend more time on practical implementation tools, the development of rubrics, formative assessment tasks, summative assessments, look at evaluation methods etc.
3. The Learning Leaders from each school will facilitate all our division professional development sessions in 2008 -2009.

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

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

After three years of working with teachers, students, and parents on the Initiation Phase of the Learning Cycle we believe we are armed with various teaching and learning strategies to begin making significant differences on student achievement. The Learning Cycle is a process followed by teachers intended to shift teacher and student behaviors creating a culture where capacity building = skill development = clarity = ownership (Fullan). In WRPS, teachers have spent the last three years focused on improving instructional practice (Marzano's High Yield Strategies) to actively involve students in the mastery of their learning. We have also been focused on implementing assessment strategies (Assessment FOR Learning) to inform instruction and instill student self responsibility. Armed with various strategies teachers are ready to take on some next steps, which we will call the Implementation Phase of the Learning Cycle.

Teachers will continue to collaborate to ensure all students benefit from creation of authentic, multi-level formative and summative assessment tasks. The Learning Cycle process is challenging us to look at our behaviors and our attitude/beliefs about teaching and learning. Teachers are using these strategies to guide classroom practice in such a way as to maximize and enhance student achievement.

Looking at our data, teachers and our students have reported their sophistication and understanding of what it means to use good assessment practice in the classroom have improvement in all 14 areas measured.

<p>The culture in most schools about assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Most assessment is done only at the end of a task or a study</li> <li>-Most assessment is summative</li> <li>-The teacher is the only one to assess student work</li> <li>-Assessment often lacks authenticity and relevance to the disciplines at the heart of the study</li> <li>-Tasks and assignments require students to complete a series of teacher-constructed activities using limited resources</li> <li>-Understanding is gauged mainly by students' presenting evidence of learning to the teacher for grading</li> <li>-Students are not genuinely engaged in exploring topic, questions, issues or ideas</li> </ul>	<p>Inquiries and tasks that provide opportunities for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Meaningful and timely formative assessment</li> <li>-Assessment that feeds back into student and teacher next steps</li> <li>-A wide range of methods and alternatives</li> <li>-Meaningful peer and self assessment</li> <li>-Student input into inquiry criteria</li> <li>-Students to set goals and revise strategies based on feedback</li> <li>-Adults outside the school to provide meaningful feedback</li> <li>-Become increasingly engaged in, and excited by, what they are learning</li> <li>-Spend significant amounts of time doing field work, labs, interviews, studio work, construction, etc.</li> <li>-Communicate what they are learning with a variety of audiences through exhibitions and presentations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Increased numbers of classroom teachers moving to designing authentic, multi-faceted and meaningful assessment</li> <li>· Increased numbers of students experience learning opportunities that are deepened and strengthened by the feedback they receive from teachers</li> <li>· Increased numbers of students demonstrating their ability to reflect on their own learning, set goals and modify their own strategies and approaches to learning</li> <li>· Increased student engagement and enthusiasm for learning</li> </ul> <p>*The above data will be gathered through visitation/interviews by the AISI coordinator and Learning Leaders. Other evidence of student success will be collection of products, observation of process, conversations and anecdotal notes</p>
---	---	---

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

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

The success indicators for changing the assessment culture of WRPS Schools would be describe as "Very Well".

In year one of the AISI project the collaborative process has generated the following data. One teacher from each school, called a Learning Leader, has coordinated release time for all teachers to collaborate together and produce student friendly outcomes. The collaborative process has generated the following data. In the first year of this project 19% more teachers (from 68% to 87%) reported they are now using student friendly learner outcomes from the program of studies in their daily routine. While 69% of students (this is a reported 6% increase from 65% to 71%) reported they had the opportunity to rewrite the learner outcomes in language they can understand individually. It was reported that 28% more (from 23% to 51%) teachers are now sharing these outcomes with their students in a variety of ways. Students are demonstrating a comfort level and understanding what learner outcomes are and the purpose for them.

When the Project Coordinator visited schools he asked students, "What is it you are learning?" Students quickly identify what it is they are expected to know and be able to do by referring to the posted learner outcome. WRPS teachers are sharing these materials they are producing through scheduled collaborative

release time that each teacher receives. The Learning Leaders are trained to help all teachers at their sites use and download materials on to our School Division's DocuShare System (assistive technology filing system). Division teachers are able to post materials they create into folders labeled; formative assessment tools, lesson plans (using ubd format), rubrics, grade/subject student friendly learning outcome, and summative assessment tools. All of these materials are available to all teachers as a reusable word document throughout the school division. This should greatly improve the use of common assessment tools within WRPS schools.

As teachers embrace the Assessment FOR Learning short-cycle assessment strategies, students clearly demonstrate an understanding of what they do and do not know, can and can not do. WRPS data shows that teachers (from 77% to 94% an increase of 17%) and the students (from 77% to 89% an increase of 12%) continue giving descriptive feedback on criteria for what it is we will accept as evidence that students have successfully reached the targeted learner outcome. Teachers are getting better at using formative assessment strategies in sufficient time where student-learning evidence is available quickly enough to enable teachers to adjust ongoing instruction and students to alter how they are trying to learn. We found where teachers are using such rapid-turnaround assessments during a class period or in the midst of an instructional unit, students are tracking their progress and alter how they are learning much quicker and with better understanding.

Students demonstrate their ability to reflect on their own learning in a variety of ways.

One of our rural elementary schools experienced students talking about their learning by letting the teacher know when they understood the learner outcomes posted on the wall. Students told the teacher if they were ready for the summative evaluation. The teacher on the other hand did not test the students until the students told her they were ready. The students showed ownership for their learning and when they were able to demonstrate to the teacher they could successfully meet the learner outcomes they confidently took the test.

At another elementary school in a classroom where the entire class has some form of a learning delay or learning difficulty students demonstrated where they are at in their learning like this. As observed by an adult, students were engaged in the formative assessment by using a rubric and exemplars posted on the wall to monitor where they are at in their learning. One student pointed to the exemplar posted on the wall and told the adult, "Here is where I'm at, but I want to get to this point." as he pointed to a different spot on the wall. The great part is he told the adult how and what he needed to do in order for him to be confident and able to get there.

At one of our high schools we observed students who are changing courses where the previous teacher practiced formative assessment strategies and the incoming new teacher may not or choose not to use assessment for learning strategies. Students are demanding that the teacher list the outcomes indicating the knowledge and skill required of them for that day or the unit. These same students have requested to know what the criterion is on which they will be evaluated.

Students and teachers are beginning throughout our school division to see noticeably the advantage of clear, shared learner outcomes, and the importance of developing with students the criteria by which we will judge student achievement. In fact students reported a 7% (from 88% to 95%) increase in teachers re-teaching the outcomes and students reported a 6% (from 81% to 87%) increase their ability to describe what comes next in the lessons. Also the data shows a 10% (from 77% to 87%) increase in students knowing how they are to be graded and that their mark(s) are based on the outcomes they have been studying.

Increase student engagement and enthusiasm is noted by teacher observations and conversations with students. Here is an example from one of our schools, "We have found that most students look for the "I can" statements on a daily basis, and are quick to remind the teacher when they have not yet been placed on the whiteboard. Some students even like to guess what the "I can" statement will be as it is being written." Teachers in this school found that when used as part of instruction, student friendly outcomes help the student focus on the lesson.

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

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

As we move into year 3 of our project and reflect back on year 2 we can see that the collaboration by teachers with help of the Learning Leaders is building teacher confidence in designing meaningful multi-faceted assessments as students continue to experience learning opportunities that deepen and strengthen our students' ability to reflect on their own learning.

Within our Learning Cycle we continue to focus on assessment and instruction, and most importantly on our teacher /student relationships in the classrooms. Assessment is fundamentally transforming the way we teach. Many of us have come to realize that Instruction and Formative Assessment are not the same. Assessment For Learning is a process or attitude about teaching and learning using "short - cycle" assessment strategy. Instruction refers to the set of teacher-determined activities carried out in an effort to get students to accomplish a curricular outcome. In September of 2007 we added 4 of the 9 High Yield Instructional Strategies Robert Marzano documented in his Meta-Analysis which come from 30 years of accumulated research based on thousands of comparisons, from K - 12 classrooms, across a variety of subject areas. Teachers can use these strategies to guide classroom assessment practice in such a way as to maximize and enhance student achievement. Even though classroom instruction and formative assessment are different, both of these activities are focused on the same outcome: improved student learning and that is why we teach.

In year 2 of this project 7% more teachers (from 87% to 94%) reported they are now using student friendly learner outcomes from the program of studies in their daily routine. While 79% of students (this is an additional 10% increase from 69% to 79%) reported they had the opportunity to rewrite the learner outcomes in language they can understand individually. It was reported that in the second year 9% more (from 51% to 60%) teachers are now sharing these outcomes with their students in a variety of ways. Students are demonstrating their ability to reflect on their learning and seem to be able to modify their own strategies and approaches to learning.

As teachers become more confident using and embedding Assessment FOR Learning short-cycle assessment strategies, along with the high yield instructional strategies students are clearly demonstrating an understanding of what they do and do not know, can and can not do. Our data continues to indicate improvement in student engagement and enthusiasm. Some of the indicators are: 89% of students feel they continue receiving good descriptive feedback and criteria for what it is teachers will accept as evidence that students have successfully reached the targeted learner outcome. 83% of students feel confident that they are ready to move onto new content or learner outcomes when the teacher does so. 96% of students believe their teachers do a good job re-teaching outcomes in a different way using good instructional strategies to do so. And 90% of students feel their summative assessment or grade is based on the learner outcomes studied in the lesson or unit of study.

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

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

Again after three years of working with teachers, students, and parents on the Initiation Phase of the Learning Cycle we believe we are armed with various teaching and learning strategies to begin making significant differences on student assessment.

The Learning Cycle process allows us to implement assessment strategies to inform instruction and instill student self responsibility. And the Learning cycle directs us to applying the right instructional strategies to actively involve students in the mastery of their learning; most importantly the Learning Cycle redefines teacher /student relationships in our classrooms.

As teachers become more confident using short-cycle assessments, along with the appropriate high yield instructional strategies we see that our data demonstrates students are clearly demonstrating an understanding

of what they do and do not know, can and can not do.

We believe our project has allowed teachers to begin designing authentic, multi-faceted and meaningful assessments that are increasing student ownership through good assessment practices. Our student's data (see Section C) supports these findings.

\* 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)	4,050	124,826		
B. AISI Funding	557,727	557,727		
C. Funding from other sources	0	0		
D. Carry over AISI Funds from previous cycle	0	0		
Total Available Funds (A+B+C)	561,777	682,553		
<b>Expenses Paid or Payable:</b>				
Staffing and Benefits (includes salary, wages, benefits, outside PD services (i.e., speakers, presenters,	582,917	510,764	10.57	

facilitators), substitute cost, release time and contract personnel)				
Supplies and non-staffing Services	23,000	43,036	-2.94	
Equipment	0	0	0.00	
Other Capital	0	0	0.00	
Other Expenses (includes travel, accommodation, meals and conference fees)	76,636	78,338	-0.25	
Other Authorities ** (group projects only)	0	0	0.00	
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>682,553</b>	<b>632,138</b>		
<b>Unexpended Funds</b>	<b>-120,776</b>	<b>50,415</b>		

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

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

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

Expense Area	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)	
<b>Professional Development</b> (include all costs associated with PD - eg substitute coverage, conference, workshops, speakers` fees, release time on total cost of PD from all budget, categories)	89	85	4	
<b>Project Management &amp; Coordination</b> (administration, data	9	9	0	

collection, reporting)				
<b>Front-Line Staff</b> (include staff who work directly with students eg teachers, educational assistants, counsellors)	0	0	0	
<b>Other Costs</b> (equipment, materials)	2	6	-4	
<b>Total Percentage</b>	100	100	0	
<b>Total Expenses</b>	682,553	632,138		

\* 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**

Our AISI Project in year one of this cycle focused on Assessment for Learning strategies. In year one we needed to focus on students and what it is they were or were not learning, rather than what teachers were teaching. The message we sent out to students, teachers, and parents was the following information in the form of a poster.

It's all about Learning not Teaching

To focus on learning is to focus on strategies for students.

The strategy is - "Assessment For Learning"

Assessment For Learning strategies that support learning are:

- Clear, shared learner outcomes
- Criteria developed with and by the learners
- Students coached in how to apply criteria in self and peer assessment
- Planned opportunities for checking and decisions about next steps
- Improvement time, in class
- Student presentation of learning and evidence

Application of the Assessment For Learning process is "Formative Assessment"

What is formative assessment and why is it so important? For an assessment to be formative, teacher and students need to have the evidence of student learning in sufficient time to adjust - that is form - ongoing

instruction and learning. When teachers do this, it is a "short - cycle" assessment strategy, in which student learning evidence is available quickly enough to enable teachers to adjust how they're teaching and students to alter how they're trying to learn. Such rapid-turnaround assessments yield results during a class period or in the midst of a multiweek instructional unit. If the results don't get back in time for teachers to adjust instruction for the students being assessed then it is not formative assessment.

In year one of the AISI project the collaborative process has generated the following data. One teacher from each school, called a Learning Leader, has coordinated release time for all teachers to collaborate together and produce student friendly outcomes. The collaborative process has generated the following data. In the first year of this project 19% more teachers (from 68% to 87%) reported they are now using student friendly learner outcomes from the program of studies in their daily routine. While 69% of students (this is a reported 6% increase from 65% to 71%) reported they had the opportunity to rewrite the learner outcomes in language they can understand individually. It was reported that 28% more (from 23% to 51%) teachers are now sharing these outcomes with their students in a variety of ways. Students are demonstrating a comfort level and understanding what learner outcomes are and the purpose for them.

When the Project Coordinator visited schools he asked students, "What is it you are learning?" Students quickly identify what it is they are expected to know and be able to do by referring to the posted learner outcome. WRPS teachers are sharing these materials they are producing through scheduled collaborative release time that each teacher receives. The Learning Leaders are trained to help all teachers at their sites use and download materials on to our School Division's DocuShare System (assistive technology filing system). Division teachers are able to post materials they create into folders labeled; formative assessment tools, lesson plans (using uhd format), rubrics, grade/subject student friendly learning outcome, and summative assessment tools. All of these materials are available to all teachers as a reusable word document throughout the school division. This should greatly improve the use of common assessment tools within WRPS schools.

As teachers embrace the Assessment FOR Learning short-cycle assessment strategies, students clearly demonstrate an understanding of what they do and do not know, can and can not do. WRPS data shows that teachers (from 77% to 94% an increase of 17%) and the students (from 77% to 89% an increase of 12%) continue giving descriptive feedback on criteria for what it is we will accept as evidence that students have successfully reached the targeted learner outcome. Teachers are getting better at using formative assessment strategies in sufficient time where student-learning evidence is available quickly enough to enable teachers to adjust ongoing instruction and students to alter how they are trying to learn. We found where teachers are using such rapid-turnaround assessments during a class period or in the midst of an instructional unit, students are tracking their progress and alter how they are learning much quicker and with better understanding.

Students demonstrate their ability to reflect on their own learning in a variety of ways.

One of our rural elementary schools experienced students talking about their learning by letting the teacher know when they understood the learner outcomes posted on the wall. Students told the teacher if they were ready for the summative evaluation. The teacher on the other hand did not test the students until the students told her they were ready. The students showed ownership for their learning and when they were able to demonstrate to the teacher they could successfully meet the learner outcomes they confidently took the test.

Students and teachers are beginning throughout our school division to see noticeably the advantage of clear, shared learner outcomes, and the importance of developing with students the criteria by which we will judge student achievement. In fact students reported a 7% (from 88% to 95%) increase in teachers re-teaching the outcomes and students reported a 6% (from 81% to 87%) increase their ability to describe what comes next in the lessons. Also the data shows a 10% (from 77% to 87%) increase in students knowing how they are to be graded and that their mark(s) are based on the outcomes they have been studying.

The quantitative results indicate noticeable gains in nine of the thirteen measures over the baseline. These

results do indicate that the school division quantitative results are moving in a positive direction and are at or above the provincial results. The lack of achieving some of the target measures is not too unsettling. In any change process we can expect a lag in year one. A bright spot is our divisional math results. Grade seven and grade eight student school awarded summative final marks are up. The percentage of grade seven students who have met the acceptable standard is up 4% that is 96% of all grade seven students achieving an acceptable standard at year end. The percentage of grade eight students who have met the acceptable standard is also up 4% to 98% of all grade eight students achieving an acceptable standard at year end. It is expected that the accomplishment of the quantitative target measures will continue upward.

### **2007/2008**

Over the last two years we have looked at classroom assessment and 4 of the 9 High Yield Strategies. The research is clear; classroom assessment can fundamentally transform the way we teach. Good instructional practice can improve student learning. Many of us have come to realize that Instruction and F