

**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)

<b>Section A1: Project Demographics</b>			
<b>School Authority:</b>	<b>1325 - Wild Rose School Division No. 66</b>		
<b>Project:</b>	<b>30236 - Creating Enhanced Learning Environments</b>		
<b>Project Scope:</b>	5400 Students, Grades K to 12, 19 Schools		
<b>Project Description:</b>	Engage all learners through differentiated instruction and instructing with technology and enhance teacher capacity through targeted professional development, modeling mentoring and coaching.		
<b>Project Purpose:</b>	To enhance the learning of all of students K-12 using a variety of teaching strategies particularly around differentiation and ICT instruction.		
<b>Budget for 2008/2009:</b>	Approved:	Working:	Actual:
	718,980	718,980	718,980
<b>Project Years:</b>	• 2006/2007	<a href="#">2006/2007 Annual Report</a>	
	• 2007/2008	<a href="#">2007/2008 Annual Report</a>	
	• 2008/2009	<a href="#">2008/2009 Annual Report</a>	
<b>Improvement Goals:</b>			
1- To improve and enhance student achievement.			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All students use the latest technology for learning.</li> <li>2. All students receive instruction at their level.</li> <li>3. All students will have interventions when they do not learn.</li> <li>4. All students will have multiple opportunities to show evidence of learning.</li> </ol>			
To enhance the instructional and technology skills of all teachers.			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All teachers will modify and adapt instruction using Differentiated Instruction and Assessment for Learning research-based strategies.</li> <li>2. All teachers will articulate outcomes and develop criteria for assessment for their students.</li> </ol>			
To enhance our ability to operate as Professional Learning Communities.			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All schools will implement the planning for School and Student Success Process to assist in creating Powerful Learning Environments in their PLC time.</li> </ol>			
<b>Last update by: Maria Crudo</b> <b>Final Report Status: Closed</b>			

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="5320"/>
Estimated Number of Students Involved For Three Years	5400
Estimated Number of PreSchoolers Involved	0
Estimated Number of Students (in your authority) that project could be applied to	5400
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	19
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aurora Elementary School</li> <li>• Breton Elementary School</li> <li>• Breton High School</li> <li>• Caroline School</li> <li>• Condor Elementary School</li> <li>• David Thompson School</li> <li>• Drayton Christian School</li> <li>• Ecole Rocky Elementary School</li> <li>• Eldorado Elementary School</li> <li>• Evergreen Elementary School</li> <li>• Frank Maddock High School</li> <li>• Frank Maddock Outreach School</li> <li>• H W Pickup Junior High School</li> <li>• Kootenay School</li> <li>• Leslieville Elementary School</li> <li>• Lochearn Elementary School</li> <li>• Pioneer School</li> <li>• Visions West School</li> <li>• West Central High School</li> </ul>

Section A3 : Project Type for Project 30236

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>All Subjects</li> <li>Career and Technology Studies (CTS)</li> <li>Fine Arts</li> <li>French - Immersion</li> <li>Knowledge and Employability (K&amp;E)</li> <li>Life Skills (CALM)</li> <li>Physical Education</li> </ul>
Theme(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21st Century Skills/Technology Integration</li> <li>Professional Learning Communities (PLC)</li> </ul>
Keywords (Teaching Strategies/PD/Programs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment for/of/as Learning</li> <li>Differentiated Instruction</li> <li>Enrichment</li> <li>Learning Styles</li> </ul>
Number of Students in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5,001-10,000</li> </ul>
Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K</li> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> <li>3</li> <li>4</li> <li>5</li> <li>6</li> <li>7</li> <li>8</li> <li>9</li> <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>Rural</li> </ul>
Division Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 (K-3)</li> <li>2 (4-6)</li> <li>3 (7-9)</li> <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>Observation/Checklists</li> <li>Participation Rates in Provincial Achievement Tests/Diploma Exams</li> <li>Provincial Achievement Tests</li> <li>Provincial Diploma Examinations</li> <li>School Completion/Graduation Measures</li> <li>Surveys</li> </ul>
Constituency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drayton Valley-Calmar</li> <li>Rocky Mountain House</li> </ul>
City or Town Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Breton</li> <li>Caroline</li> <li>Condor</li> <li>Drayton Valley</li> <li>Leslieville</li> <li>Rocky Mountain House</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 9</li> </ul>
PAT - French Language Arts	
PAT - Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 3</li> <li>Grade 6</li> <li>Grade 9</li> </ul>
PAT - Social Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 9</li> </ul>
PAT - Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 6</li> <li>Grade 9</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applied Math 30</li> <li>Pure Math 30</li> </ul>
Diploma Examinations - Social Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social Studies 30</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social Studies 33</li> </ul>
Diploma Examinations - Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biology 30</li> <li>• Chemistry 30</li> <li>• Physics 30</li> <li>• Science 30</li> </ul>
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>• Course Completion</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	6.13		6.13		6.23	
AISI Coordinators		0.20		0.20		0.20
<b>Other Personnel</b>						
Professionals (e.g., Social Worker, Liaison Worker)						
Teaching Assistants						
Administrative Support Staff	0.25		0.25		0.25	
Other						
<b>Total FTE</b>	<b>6.38</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>6.38</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>6.48</b>	<b>0.2</b>

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

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

Section B - Quantitative Measures (From Project Plan)

Measure (From project plan)	Baseline	2008/2009		Number(*) Measured
		Target	Actual	
G3-A2-Mathematics B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	91.3	94	93.00	358
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline is the average of the last three years. 2006 was 91.5				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G6-A4-Mathematics B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	82.5	87	87.40	350
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline is average of last three years. 2006 was 81.2				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G9-A8-Mathematics B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	65.1	75	59.60	349
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline is average of last three years. 2006 was 68.8				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G6-A6-Science B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	86.5	90	85.50	345
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline is average of last three years. 2006 was 87.4				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G9-A10-Science B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	69.4	77	78.50	353
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline is average of last three years. 2006 was 73.6				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G12--Pure Mathematics 30 B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	70.8	76	71.10	131
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b>				

Baseline is average of past three years. 2006 was 67.4.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G12-A18-Biology 30 B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	80.2	85	73.50	142
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline is average of past three years. 2006 was 75.6.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
G12-A19-Chemistry 30 B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	84.5	88	67.80	111
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline is average of past three years. 2006 was 87.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
These results are the first year of the new Diploma Examination.				
G12-A20-Physics 30 B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard	68.5	74	63.20	62
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Baseline is average of past three years. 2006 was 68.7. Certainly an increase in participation rate, which is a good thing, will affect this.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
This does not include the 2 students who wrote the old exam.				
B4-% of students meeting other criteria/standard Percentage of students meeting standard for Rutherford Scholarships.	25.3	32	52.50	440
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Based on Grades 10-11-12.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				
B4-% of students meeting other criteria/standard Percentage of students writing 4+ Diploma Exams.	39.8	43	45.30	477
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments:</b> Goal is to have more of our students writing a greater number of Diploma Exams which would indicate that our AISI initiative has enhanced student learning enough for them to register in higher level courses.				
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>				

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

Section C - Qualitative Measures (From Project Plan)

Measure	Baseline	2008/2009		N*	Response Rate(%) (For surveys only)**
		Target	Actual		
How satisfied are you with the quality of education your child is receiving at school?	80	86	83.00	314	78
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b> Target is the most recent three year roll-up.					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
Percentage of grade 10 students who find their school work interesting.	49	55	62.00	401	95
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b> Baseline is average of past three years. 2005 was 47%.					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
Percentage of grade 7 students who find their school work interesting.	58.3	64	61.00	345	86
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b> Baseline is average of last three years. 2005 was 57%.					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
Percentage of grade 7-12 students who report they use technology in most or all of their classes.	29.7	60	24.70	45	2
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>  Very low response rate resulted in a skewed result.					
Percentage of grades 3-6 students who report they use technology 3 or more times in class during a week.	25.3	50	63.80	47	5
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>  Number measured may be too small to accurately make a judgement.					
Percentage of K-2 students who report that they use computers for both learning and fun at school.	66.3	92			
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					

We did not survey K-2 in the third year because of time constraints.					
Percentage of teachers who rate their comfort level in using technology with their classroom instruction as either a 4 or 5 (on a scale of 1 low and 5 high).	43.8	65	62.70	166	55
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
<b>Comment on results (optional)</b>					
The percentage of teachers reporting that in the past 3-5 years the professional development and inservicing made available through the jurisdiction has been focused, systematic and contributed significantly to their ongoing professional development.	71.2	74	80.50	277	90
<b>Baseline and Measure Comments</b>					
Baseline is average over past two years: 71.2.					
<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
Technological hardware and software to support student learning has been placed in schools. ICT outcomes are stated in year plans.	Increased use of technology in instruction and increased implementation of ICT outcomes.	Teacher Survey. Student Survey. Critical data collected from Coordinators and facilitators.

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

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

Teachers and students have embraced technology as a way of assisting their instruction and students are responding positively.

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

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

We have been able to see more teachers integrating technology into their teaching. Although some of our survey numbers show a decrease, I believe this has more to do with the 'uncomfortable teachers' feeling more comfortable completing the survey, especially since it was done electronically. This survey had 165 teachers complete the survey compared to only 97 last year. The demand for in-servicing and technology continues to increase, as teachers embrace technology as part of their teaching. It has become very common for teachers to place technology goals on their professional growth plans. Students at all levels have been showing greater motivation and success when their teachers incorporate technology effectively.

- Schools are purchasing Smart boards for all of their classrooms and teachers have been building their own skills and knowledge in using this technology. More teachers have taken the SMART Master training course and facilitators are organizing and facilitating teacher in-services through the PLC time and structured PD days.
- Teachers have indicated that students "pay attention" to the SMART board as it is seen as a new novelty and they are eager to practice interactive activities. Students are also quick to trouble shoot and experiment with the different tools available and prefer interactive materials.
- Teachers have utilized the web sites that have been passed on and recommended by other teachers and the coordinators.
- Teachers indicating increased confidence with the use of technology.
- Students are required to learn and utilize Internet navigation skills.
- Some reluctant learners seem to be more motivated to complete a project using interactive tools such as Photo Story or Power Point.
- Most teachers are committed to improving and increasing their use of SMART board.
- Once Video Streaming became available, many teachers began to incorporate this into their lessons. This tool is nicely aligned with the Alberta curriculum and allows teachers to pick and choose which components of a video they would like to use.

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

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

- In services on Smart technology has increased;
- Increase in number of smart boards at the school level;

- Increase in teachers differentiating using technology;
- Sharing of lessons through the use of First Class email system.
- Unfortunately, teachers did not use online survey to report at the end of the year and we relied on coordinator and facilitator input.

Some intervention strategies in place. Our teachers are spread out along the continuum of differentiation with some having strengths in some strategies while others have strengths in subject areas. Assessment has moved towards assessment for learning. There is some alignment of curriculum.

Through collaboration teachers will increase their use of differentiation strategies, work towards common assessments, align curriculum among departments and grades so that the practice of differentiation becomes the norm in Wild Rose classrooms.

Information collected by facilitators, coordinators, principals through reflection, informal surveys.

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

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

Some of our surveys are base line this year so we cannot make a judgement. Parents have continued to view the quality of education in the top 20th percentile. High school students view school as slightly more interesting. There is a drop in teacher satisfaction with their pd but that may be due to the new initiative being put into place every three years. They become comfortable over that period and then "feel" they must change, when in fact this is only another part of the continuous improvement cycle.

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

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

- The focus was to spend time on learning outcomes, and determine which activities and projects best suited the outcomes based on DI philosophies: engaging for all students, appropriately leveled for all students, allow for some element of choice, and incorporates higher order thinking skills. Parents and students were both aware of what we were striving for.
- Teachers were involved in the PRIME (Professional Resources and Instruction for Math educators) training and resources. This includes learning about developmental phases, background and strategies and diagnostic tests for the various strands.
- Utilized the CELE coordinator for math presentations, and lessons with students using math manipulatives.
- The opportunity to be involved in the math planning sessions for the new curriculum.
- The opportunity to attend relevant PD opportunities.
- Teachers using experts within the school and school division.
- Having access to both coordinators, having them do "model" teaching
- Teachers have utilized their CELE days to attend workshops or book time with school facilitator.
- Teachers created a staff PLC group to work on incorporating technology into the classroom.
- Teachers attended a variety of relevant and useful workshops and PD sessions.
- Teachers collaborated together to build a tiered differentiated unit for Phys. Ed classes.

- More teachers accessed and utilized the facilitator for assisting with creating DI lessons and units and technology integration.
- Teachers submitted monthly DI examples of what was happening in their classroom.
- The "in-house" workshops presented to staff by Greg and Carol also worked to encourage staff to use instructional strategies.
- More of our PLC time was used to work on DI/TI strategies for improving instruction.
- Teachers gained a better and deeper understanding of what DI/TI looks like in the classroom.
- Teachers using a variety of products to reach the same outcomes.
- Facilitators have become much more adept at using, utilizing, and trouble shooting the technology.
- More teachers in our school were using balanced literacy in the classroom.
- Teachers participated in the "Power of Ten" math session and the new math curriculum workshops.
- The CELE time was used for collaborative planning, which included student led conferences, learning experiences, and common assessments.
- Having the coordinator out to model lessons was seen as a success as well as the facilitator modeling new strategies and skills.
- School wide participation in designing at least one DI unit for sharing. This was helped by having full administrative support.
- Teachers are showing fairly wide acceptance that using the DI philosophy has desirable outcomes and will not over burden people into implementing it.
- Our school accessed and used several Science Alberta crates for science and math.
- Our school developed and used a shared folder for all staff to access. Quizzes, tests, learning resources and web resources were all shared. We started a drop box for teachers to electronically share assignments throughout the year.
- Our school continued to use a CELE bulletin board to highlight CELE resources, PD Opportunities and DI techniques.
- The CELE coordinators spent two full days at the school focusing on math and social studies. This was well received by staff.
- Books and resources were brought in from the CELE library to highlight DI and TI strategies.
- Our school developed school wide assessments in Language Arts and Math.
- More teachers were involved in developing and using SMART board resources.
- A portion of our PLC time was used for CELE where the facilitators had an opportunity to present a DI/TI strategy to staff.

- The opportunity for professional growth for facilitators and the accountability to school, staff, and DO kept us doing more.
- "In House" sessions which focused on core subjects or TI specific to teachers needs.
- Going to the Mini AISI conference in Red Deer allowed us to see what other facilitators, schools and districts were doing with respect to AISI. This was a great opportunity for teachers to learn from teachers.

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

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

- teachers shared strategies through PLC times and Professional Development days;
- Differentiation submissions made to first class site;
- Schools began to work towards creating common assessments and focusing on outcomes;
- I can statements posted in schools and classrooms;

\* 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)	160	36,575		
B. AISI Funding	718,980	718,980		
C. Funding from other sources	0	0		
D. Carry over AISI Funds from previous cycle	0	8,246		
<b>Total Available Funds (A+B+C)</b>	<b>719,140</b>	<b>763,801</b>		
<b>Expenses Paid or Payable:</b>				
Staffing and Benefits (includes salary, wages, benefits, outside PD services (i.e., speakers, presenters, facilitators), substitute cost, release time and contract personnel)	633,900	651,574	-2.46	
Supplies and non-staffing Services	5,000	9,743	-0.66	
Equipment	30,000	0	4.17	
Other Capital	0	0	0.00	
Other Expenses (includes travel, accommodation, meals and conference fees)	50,080	98,394	-6.72	
Other Authorities ** (group projects only)	0	0	0.00	
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>718,980</b>	<b>759,711</b>		
<b>Unexpended Funds</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>4,090</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)	45	28	17	Our front line staff are actually part of the daily Professional development for the schools. They are the facilitators who work with teachers and facilitate PLC time. They work with both students and teachers but their AISI role is entirely working with teachers. Therefore, realistically, 96% of our project is professional development.
<b>Project Management &amp; Coordination</b> (administration, data collection, reporting)	10	2	8	
<b>Front-Line Staff</b> (include staff who work directly with students eg teachers, educational assistants, counsellors)	40	68	-28	
<b>Other Costs</b> (equipment, materials)	5	2	3	
<b>Total Percentage</b>	100	100	0	
<b>Total Expenses</b>	718,980	759,711		

\* 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 school division's purpose and major goal is and always will be student achievement.

Wild Rose used many quantitative measures in 2006-2007. Of the 9 measures for PAT's and DE's, results increased in 5 of the 9 subjects. Wild Rose teachers were successful in raising both the Rutherford eligibility and the 4+ Diploma Exam completions for this last year.

The Creating Enhanced Learning Environments initiative is creating technologically rich classrooms where teachers are addressing the needs of their student population with differentiated instruction strategies. The work these teachers are participating in will pay dividends over the long term.

With regard to our own surveys, this year was a baseline year with our coordinators gathering data. Year 2 and 3 of the initiative will see the effect of it on our students.

Student outcomes and student learning is being affected over the long term. This initiative is changing the fundamental way teachers operate in their classrooms.

#### **2007/2008**

Wild Rose Public Schools has two goals: Increase in Math and Science results and an Increase in Participation Rates for Diploma exams.

Wild Rose was only up in 3 measures this year. That is not good enough and the entire division focus is to create learning environments that allow for student success. Therefore, we will continue to strive to use the strategies in our AISI initiative to create environments that will lead to success in all our measures.

#### **2008/2009**

Wild Rose increased in 6 qualitative areas this year. Most importantly, we increased in diploma exam participation which will only continue to rise as we continue to focus on excellence. In the qualitative area, we continue to make gains in areas of student engagement and in teacher efficacy.

### 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**

There has been a better addressing of individual student learning styles. It is not just audio or visual, it is kinesthetic (use of manipulatives.) Teachers are cognizant of the role that hands on activities and interactive activities play in the learning of their students.

With regard to the Technology component of our initiative, teachers have broadened their repertoire of technological tools to assist them in instruction and their students' learning. For instance, SMART notebook lessons, digital storytelling, and electronic visual organizers.

**2007/2008**

See attachment

**2008/2009**

Teachers are increasing their use of instructional technology and are differentiating their instruction to meet the needs of our learners.

## 2. Professional Development

**2006/2007**

Teachers have access to 2 fte release days during the year at their discretion to use to meet the goals of our initiative. For example they would attend workshops provided by our two coordinators; they would work with the in-school facilitators; they would attend outside conferences and workshops that supported our goals.

**2007/2008**

Our professional development is more aligned between the teachers' classrooms, the schools, the division and the province.

**2008/2009**

This year, our teachers are extremely happy with the professional learning experiences they are offered. This is the result of the previous two years' work. Teachers are using embedded PLC time to address school and division goals.

## 3. Student Assessment

**2006/2007****2007/2008**

Teachers have started to look at the relationship between Differentiated Instruction strategies and Assessment for Learning. This is a major achievement as teachers now are beginning to see AISI as not individual "projects" with something new being added to their plate but rather a seamless integration of cycles.

**2008/2009**

The division hired a District Administrator of Assessment and Student Achievement. Their duties included data analysis of PAT and Diploma results for schools. This resulted in school plans addressing those needs. AISI then piggybacked on this and principals used AISI facilitators and the two coordinators to meet school needs. This is a two-year seconded position.

## 4. Project Management

**2006/2007**

This initiative is organized to make use of the the leadership capacity in our division. The use of facilitators in each school, who are provided with release time to work on the initiative's goals, is a strength.

**2007/2008**

In school facilitators are pleased with their roles and their input into the initiative.

**2008/2009**

The continued use of in school facilitators resulted in job-embedded professional learning being part of the way Wild Rose Public Schools does business.

## 5. Parental Involvement

### 2006/2007

Wild Rose coordinators developed a parent brochure that outlined the main tenets of our Creating Enhanced Learning Environments with a focus on Differentiated Instruction and Technology Integration. (Attached.)

We had parent and student representation on a Steering Committee that gave feedback to year one. It became more than feedback, it had to be an opportunity for sharing the initiative.

### 2007/2008

### 2008/2009

Wild Rose held Town Hall meetings in two geographic areas. These meetings had opportunities for input to AISI and ideas from these meetings went towards designing the 2009-2012 AISI initiative. School Council meetings feature visits by our two coordinators.

## Section G3 - Project Summary and Reflections

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

#### 2006/2007

- Much more buy in and acceptance from the teachers;
- Much more practical use of technology integration;
- Technology is being used in instruction in more meaningful ways; it is beginning to reach its potential;
- Our delivery model is working well where we have teacher facilitators working directly with teachers in each school setting.

#### 2007/2008

- Teachers are seeing the value of adopting technology, if they hadn't before. Computer labs are beginning to get more meaningful usage, teachers are using the technology in more effective ways.
- Teachers are making Differentiated Instruction part of their daily routine. The support from in-school facilitators is important in making this happen.

#### 2008/2009

There are some great exemplars in the DI submissions. Again, some of the work that facilitators did on Silver's work (task rotation based on both MI and Marzano's work) was exemplary. The gelling of the Technology Instruction and Differentiated Instruction and how most of the facilitators saw this as one direction, integrating technology as a key factor in differentiating but with the instructional piece as being the focus not the technology. Getting into schools to work with teachers and students, building student exemplars, and sharing this with teachers in the division. Developing the leadership capacity and the connection within and among schools developed great networking opportunities. Built on the foundations of the first two years. There was great flexibility and there was release time for teachers to work on meaningful professional learning opportunities. The technology was engaging for both teachers and students.

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

**2006/2007**

- Because our division believes in creating leadership capacity, this initiative is being led by new personnel. Unfortunately, the fact that both coordinator positions did not start until the beginning of the school year resulted in a slower start to the initiative;
- Therefore our in-school facilitators had a lack of understanding of how to drive the initiative forward in the beginning.

**2007/2008**

- One of the biggest issues with the technology, is still access. Teachers can get very excited about something, but then sometimes do not have the resources to implement it.

## Summary of School Facilitator Evaluations

- My own personal road block. I need to find better ways of promoting the strategies I wish to get across
- I need to be more proactive next year about visiting classrooms to see lessons.
- Trying to fit everything in tended to "add more" rather than exchange ideas
- We did not celebrate the successes as we had planned to.
- We chose too many outcomes to focus on
- Technology available but difficult to access in our school
- Teachers are hesitant to openly share ideas
- CELE time was not built in to my schedule in order to observe other classes
- Always needing more time to implement new learning (practice with SMART Board, computer software, and math planning.
- Our school continues to experience difficulties accessing the computer lab
- The amount of time the teachers had available to book the SMART board, (once every two weeks)
- Substitute shortage
- Do not have enough resources or money
- Too much curriculum to cover, teachers will not take CELE days
- No projector in computer lab
- Lack of space for group work, classes sizes are too big
- Not enough students know how to type (computer)
- The resistance in using CELE days comes from being absent from school, finding a sub, creating sub plans
- Some teachers are still resentful of the ESTA/CEM projects but more are buying in to the DI/TI projects
- Sharing a computer lab with another school makes it difficult to access computer time when you need it
- Making technology a regular part of kindergarten
- The two days, while great, were not enough. I would have liked more time to explore web sites, develop projects, assignments, and assessment
- DI is a very broad topic and it is difficult to implement a lot of changes at once
- As a facilitator my biggest road block was to get staff to book my time, either to collaborate or to have me work with students
- No time was given for CELE information to be discussed at staff meetings or PLC times.
- Not enough access to technology
- CELE is seen as such a big area (differentiated instruction and technology integration)
- Time to implement the DI
- Having resources for intervention of "at risk" students
- Lack of classroom projectors
- Workshops need to be distributed throughout the division
- Lack of SMART boards up and running in our school
- Some teachers have not bought into the philosophy of differentiated instruction
- Some teachers did not demonstrate a willingness for facilitators to come in and team teach
- Other commitments by teachers caused teachers not to take advantage of their CELE time
- Taking the goal that was set for this initiative, and coming up with a set plan of how we were going to achieve it
- The roadblocks continue to be from the concern about time, effort and pay off in terms of how much teachers

will invest in trying new learning strategies

- Available time: so often the lack of time with the teacher's schedule's or the DI/TI Coordinators schedules made for insurmountable obstacles
- Sometimes a particular DI/TI interest or need exists but not among enough staff to warrant a special session

### **2008/2009**

Getting parents involved was an area that was not really focussed on.

Also for schools who continued to change facilitators it was hard to build any continuity, although when there were dynamic people in place a lot could happen even within a year.

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

#### **2006/2007**

- Instead of hoping schools would come forward with identified needs, the coordinators moved into the schools and brought information and choices into the schools;
- We identified the need to combine the strengths of the coordinators and provide combined workshops with both a technology integration and instruction strategy focus;
- We did a needs assessment survey to determine teacher needs and focus areas for our professional development week during the last week of August 2007;

#### **2007/2008**

- Less pull out for the facilitators;
- Geographic meetings to keep travel time for facilitators to a minimum;

#### **2008/2009**

We had more concrete expectations for facilitators. Their roles were more defined by the third year.

Teachers shared more relevant examples of differentiated instruction in year three. Teachers began to see the connection of AISI with their school and division goals and their daily work in their classroom.

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

#### **2006/2007**

- We had an end of year working celebration for our facilitators to highlight successes that had occurred throughout Year 1;
- Created the parent brochure;
- Had an AISI Advisory Meeting that included teachers, administrators, parents, and students. We will include the same students on the committee over the next two years.

#### **2007/2008**

- end of year working celebration;
- Participated in Zone IV AISI MINI-Showcase; most valuable activity;
- Use CELE conference on our First Class email system - allows for sharing of best practices;

#### **2008/2009**

Continued to use the CELE conference on First Class; all DI resources were shared among present and past AISI facilitators;

Web pages were catalogued and stored for availability;

We hosted a year end celebration for all facilitators and shared;

Facilitators had the opportunity to attend an international conference in Florida as part of the wrap up activities.

Shared successes at AISI IX.

Our facilitators shared successes with each other.

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

##### **2006/2007**

- Increased demand for more technology hardware and software;
- Some schools are providing their own funds to cover such costs;
- Increased awareness of the usefulness of some of the instructional tools;
- Teachers are accessing information and sharing with other staff members.

##### **2007/2008**

- cannot keep up with the installation of hardware (SMART boards etc);
- lag between teacher learning and implementation due to not all classrooms having technology;

##### **2008/2009**

Continued need for technology hardware to meet the needs of teachers. Installation is not keeping up with demand.

The continued recalcitrance of the high schools in general while the primary grades are moving forward.

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

How will this project be sustained?

##### **2006/2007**

The teaching strategies and technological instructional skills teachers are developing are not meant for a finite initiative. As Creating Enhanced Learning Environments is an initiative, Wild Rose will create such environments over the next two years so that the basic classroom and what occurs in it will be part of the culture of our school division for years to come. Teachers will not stop using what they have learned and practiced over these three years when this cycle is completed. Already teachers have expressed the feeling that these strategies and this technological knowledge is something that they cannot stop using.

##### **2007/2008**

Sustainability is in the priorities of the school division. Support for technology and instruction will always be there whether there is provincial funding or not. AISI allows for schools and teachers to take that first step and practice the "action research" necessary for successful implementation.

##### **2008/2009**

Student learning is at the centre of what we do. Therefore, differentiating instruction and using technology in our instruction must continue. The division supports this by creating a .5 technology instruction position outside of AISI beginning in the 2009-2010 school year.

Our structure in AISI still includes the school based facilitator, assisting and coaching teachers in their instruction for the next three years.

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

<b>Year: 2006/2007</b>
------------------------

Please check one of the following boxes:
<input type="radio"/> Continuing
<input type="radio"/> Completed
<input type="radio"/> Discontinued If so, please explain WHY
<b>Year: 2007/2008</b>
Please check one of the following boxes:
<input type="radio"/> Continuing
<input type="radio"/> Completed
<input type="radio"/> Discontinued If so, please explain WHY

Section H. Attachments (Optional)

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

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

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

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