

AISI Project Annual Report (APAR) 2008/2009

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

Section A1: Project Demographics			
School Authority:	2185 - St. Paul Education Regional Division No. 1		
Project:	30082 - Increased Literacy for Primary & At-Risk Students		
Project Scope:	1300 Students, Grades K to 12, 17 Schools		
Project Description:	Focus on prevention and intervention strategies in literacy instruction using the Remediation Plus methodology that incorporates a systemic and explicit approach to instruction, multi-sensory strategies, and phonemic awareness training combined with repetition and practice. Provide structured PLC time at division and school levels for teacher collaboration.		
Project Purpose:	To increase student literacy.		
Budget for 2008/2009:	Approved:	Working:	Actual:
	163,306	163,306	163,306
Project Years:	• 2006/2007	2006/2007 Annual Report	
	• 2007/2008	2007/2008 Annual Report	
	• 2008/2009		
Improvement Goals:			
1- 1. To increase the % of kindergarten students who have mastered the grapheme and phoneme connections.			
2- 2. To increase the % of grade 1, 2 and 3 students reading at or above grade level.			
3- 3. To improve individual student reading levels for selected at-risk students (grades 1 - 12).			
4- 4. To increase teacher instructional capacity and knowledge of the reading process			
Last update by: Rene LaFrance			
Final Report Status: Created			

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	0
Estimated Number of Students Involved For Three Years	1300
Estimated Number of PreSchoolers Involved	0
Estimated Number of Students (in your authority) that project could be applied to	1500
Student Ages	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18
Grades	K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
Actual number of schools involved	17
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashmont Elementary Community School • Ashmont Secondary School • Ecole Elementaire St. Paul Elementary School • Ecole Mallaig Community School • Ecole Regionale St. Paul Regional High School • Elk Point Elementary School • F G Miller Junior Senior High School • Glen Avon Protestant School • Hairy Hill Colony School • Heinsburg Community School • New Myrnam School • Plain Lake Colony School • Racette Junior High School • St. Paul Alternate Education Centre • St. Paul Store Front Campus • Two Hills Mennonite School • Two Hills School

Section A3 : Project Type for Project 30082

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

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

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

Main Project Category (based on expected outcome)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy/Language Arts
Targeted Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At-Risk (not coded) • Mild/Moderate/Severe Disability
Subject(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language Arts/Literacy
Theme(s)	
Keywords (Teaching Strategies/PD/Programs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment for/of/as Learning • Learning Styles • One-on-one • Small Groups
Number of Students in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,001-2,500
Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K • 1 • 2 • 3 • 4 • 5 • 6 • 7 • 8 • 9 • 10 • 11 • 12
Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zone 2/3 Services
Number of Schools in Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 or more
Location of School(s) involved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural
Division Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 (K-3) • 2 (4-6) • 3 (7-9) • 4 (10-12)
School Authority Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public School Jurisdiction
Types of Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of Quality Measures • Provincial Achievement Tests

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Records • Standardized Tests
Constituency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lac La Biche-St. Paul
City or Town Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashmont • Elk Point • Heinsburg • Mallaig • Myrnam • St. Paul • Two Hills
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"> • 100,001-250,000
2007/2008 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100,001-250,000
2008/2009 Approved Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100,001-250,000
Project Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralized
PAT - English Language Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3
PAT - French Language Arts	
PAT - Mathematics	
PAT - Social Studies	
PAT - Science	
Diploma Examinations - English	
Diploma Examinations - Mathematics	
Diploma Examinations - Social Studies	
Diploma Examinations - Sciences	
Diploma Examinations-French	
Surveys	
School Records	
Standardized/Commercial Tests	
Std. Tests - General Achievement/Math/Language Arts	
Std. Tests - Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other reading tests/reading inventory
Std. Tests - Spelling	

Std. Tests - Writing	
Std. Tests - Developmental/ECS/Grade 1 Readiness	• Test of Phonemic Awareness (TOPA)

Section A4 - AISI Project Staffing Allocations

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

	FTE 2006/2007		FTE 2007/2008		FTE 2008/2009	
	AISI Funded	Funded From Other Sources*	AISI Funded	Funded From Other Sources*	AISI Funded	Funded From Other Sources*
Certificated Teachers						
Teachers						
AISI Coordinators	0.08		0.08		0.08	
Other Personnel						
Professionals (e.g., Social Worker, Liaison Worker)						
Teaching Assistants						
Administrative Support Staff						
Other						
Total FTE	0.08		0.08		0.08	

* 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	
B4-% of students meeting other criteria/standard % of Kindergarten students, involved in Remediation Plus instruction, knowing all phonemes (26/26 alphabet sounds)by year end	28	70	59.00	302
Baseline and Measure Comments: Baseline reflects % of Kindergarten students knowing all phonemes (26/26 alphabet sounds)as determined by June/06 year-end testing using Phoneme Test.				
Comment on results (optional)				
G3-A1-English Language Arts B1-% of students meeting the acceptable standard % of participating grade 3 students meeting acceptable standards on the reading component of the English Language Arts PAT (Part B).	75.6	81	82.10	280
Baseline and Measure Comments: Baseline comprised of 3 year average of 2003-2006 results for Grade 3 language arts PAT - % of students achieving acceptable standard				
Comment on results (optional)				
B8-Grade level attainment/improvement IOTA Reading Test - % of grade 1 students reading at or above a 2.0 grade level after receiving 48 lessons of Remediation Plus instruction within the classroom	83.8	90	74.00	232
Baseline and Measure Comments: Baseline established using IOTA year-end testing results for grade 1 students - % of grade 1 students reading at or above a 2.0 grade level - June, 2006.				
Comment on results (optional)				
B8-Grade level attainment/improvement IOTA reading Test - % of grade 2 students reading at or above a 3.0 grade level	76	80	78.00	293
Baseline and Measure Comments: Baseline shall be determined using IOTA year-end testing results for grade 2 students -% of grade 2 students reading at or above a 3.0 grade level - June 2007				
Comment on results (optional)				
B8-Grade level attainment/improvement IOTA Reading Test - % of selected grades 1 - 12 at-risk (reading delayed/disabled) targeted students increasing their reading level by 1.0 grade level after 24 Remediation Plus lessons	40	50	80.00	114
Baseline and Measure Comments:				

A need for this measure was identified after the first year of the project. Baseline to be determined after year 2.

Comment on results (optional)

B8-Grade level attainment/improvement IOTA Reading Test - % of selected grades 1 - 12 at-risk (reading delayed/disabled) targeted students increasing their reading level by 1.0 grade level after 48 Remediation Plus lessons	61	75	71.00	34
---	----	----	-------	----

Baseline and Measure Comments:
% of selected grades 1 - 12 at-risk (reading delayed/disabled) targeted students increasing their reading level by 1.0 grade level after 48 Remediation Plus lessons as determined by the IOTA Reading Test. First year actual will become the baseline.

Comment on results (optional)

Of 20 records of students who received the full program (85 lessons) average grade level of improvement was 1.5. The 85 lessons can be covered in 2-3 months provided that lessons are given 3-4 times weekly. Students who received all 85 lessons would typically be older students or those younger but presenting with more serious reading difficulty.

B8-Grade level attainment/improvement IOTA Reading Test_ % of grade 3 students reading at or above a 4.0 grade level at the end of grade 3.	60	70	76.00	255
--	----	----	-------	-----

Baseline and Measure Comments:
Baseline shall be determined using the IOTA year-end testing of current grade 3 students - % of grade 3 students reading at or above a 4.0 grade level- June 2007.

Comment on results (optional)

* 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		

* 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
Majority of literacy teachers use traditional paper/pencil phonics instruction and balanced literacy approaches	<p>Teachers will incorporate structured, systematic phonemic awareness training as part of their instructional practice.</p> <p>Teachers will apply "multi-sensory" instructional strategies to support varied student learning needs.</p>	<p>Teacher, grade level reading committee members and administrator anecdotal observations and comments, both written and verbal, will be gathered and analyzed to determine the impact of phonemic awareness to the teaching reading in terms of:</p> <p>Teachers will express a clear understanding of the structured, systematic phonemic awareness training process and indicate increased use of multi-sensory strategies. Data will be collected through open-ended responses on annual questionnaires and through reflective written and verbal comments (round table discussions and group sharing) at scheduled follow-up grade level meetings.</p>

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

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

Based on discussion at literacy committee meetings throughout the year primary and reading intervention teachers have a clear understanding of systematic explicit phonics instruction. Primary teachers had to make a number of in-class modifications to the multi-sensory instructional strategies in order to make them suitable for whole-group instruction. The concept of phonemic awareness and how it relates to literacy instruction will bear further discussion in literacy meetings both at the school and district level.

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

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

School 'Literacy Plans' that were developed in the first year were implemented and revised for the second year. These individual plans are developed at the school level. The revised plans, now referred to as 'school phoneme-grapheme charts', provide a clear overview of the scope and sequence for systematic phonics and spelling instruction from Kindergarten to Grade 3.

Many teachers have shared innovative ideas for implementing multi-sensory strategies to support literacy instruction in the classroom. According to reports from members of the Division literacy committee, segmenting using magnets or other manipulatives and sound-blending using stickies continue to be popular multi-sensory activities. Feedback from members of the literacy committee also indicates that ball-blending, a strategy used to develop blending skills, continues to be the most challenging multi-sensory activity to implement in a large group setting. Some teachers are reporting, however, that students who overcome their difficulty with the ball-blending activity show improvement in their ability to blend sounds in words and to read with greater fluency.

Data was collected through an informal questionnaire using open-ended responses from the literacy group, principals and school visits. Feedback is reflected throughout this report.

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

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

Primary phonics instruction was guided by school phoneme-grapheme plans (developed by primary teachers in a given school agreeing on a scope and sequence for instructing the 90 or so graphemes from Kindergarten across to Grade 3). Many of the multi-sensory instructional strategies (sound manipulation, segmenting, etc.) in this approach have become embedded in regular instruction practice. Through discussions with members of the Division literacy committee it appears that there is a greater understanding and application of the principles of phonemic awareness, teaching through multiple modalities, and the integration of explicit,

synthetic phonics in primary classrooms for building both decoding and encoding skills.

During the 2008-2009 school year a sub-committee of the Division Literacy group created Division materials to enhance explicit, systematic phonics instruction and phonemic awareness training in Grade 1 classrooms. Each page of the resources includes a reference to the particular skill being addressed on the page (e.g., segmenting, blending). The purpose of these resources is to provide guided practice exercises at the conclusion of a multi-sensory phonics lesson.

Upon the advisement of the Division literacy committee and with the support of school-based administrators in elementary schools we will continue to build our Division literacy framework with explicit, systematic, multi-sensory phonics as one of the foundational pieces.

<p>A variety of programs and instructional approaches are used to teach reading.</p>	<p>To establish a series of district committees focusing on the reading needs of students at various levels. District literacy committees, lead by teacher-leaders, 1) develop a common understanding of the "science of reading" and the phoneme/grapheme correspondence map; 2) instruct using a consistent grapheme/phoneme knowledge base; 3) share best practices and innovations for reading instruction; 4) identify further areas for improvement in reading instruction.</p>	<p>Teacher, grade level reading committee members and administrator anecdotal observations and comments, both written and verbal, will be gathered and analyzed to determine the impact on teacher ability to teach reading in terms of:</p> <p>Teachers will develop a literacy community to support their work in the classroom. New and experienced teachers will indicate increased confidence in literacy instruction and a better understanding of phonological processing and will have a safe forum to trouble-shoot and brainstorm with colleagues. Data will be collected through open-ended responses on annual questionnaires and through reflective written and verbal comments (round table discussions and group sharing) at scheduled follow-up meetings.</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.

Success indicator: establish a literacy community. There were 2 literacy committees: K-1 and 2-3. These 2 committees met during the year as follow-up to training sessions, to discuss strategies and implementation ideas, and to share resources. the format of these meetings included round-table sharing and open-ended discussion. At the end of the 2006-2007 school year a literacy meeting was held for all elementary school principals and a K-1 and 2-3 rep from each school. At this round-table sharing meeting each school shared literacy plans that had been developed among primary teachers at the school level. The intent of the plans is to provide individual school guidelines with respect to phoneme/grapheme units that will be taught at each level. During this meeting small inter-school groups engaged in reflective discussion and filled out an end-of-year AISI summary sheet.

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

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

During the past year the Division literacy committee combined to form 1 group for teachers from K-3 with 1 or 2 representatives from each elementary school. Division committee members indicated that they were working with 'literacy plc's' or literacy committees in each of their schools. Members of the literacy committee reported that many Kindergarten and Grade 1 teachers expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the opportunity to work collaboratively on student literacy with colleagues in Grades 2 and up. Many teachers have also indicated that it has been helpful for teachers in Grade 2 and up to have a greater understanding of the science of reading in terms of phoneme/grapheme correspondence.

Members of the Division literacy committee have identified that in addition to fostering a common understanding of reading instruction the activities of this literacy project have also encouraged teachers to engage in collegial and collaborative discussion pertaining to broad issues in literacy, specifically comprehension, fluency and reading practice. Such discussions have occurred at both the school and Division committee levels.

Data was collected through an informal questionnaire using open-ended responses from the literacy group, principals and school visits. Feedback is reflected throughout this report.

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

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

Over the course of this past AISI cycle the Division literacy committee has become an active and goal-oriented network for promoting literacy in our Division. Although the membership in the committee was originally comprised of primary teachers it has been expanded, at the request of other Division teachers, to span K-12. In the first meeting of the expanded Division literacy committee in the spring of 2009 middle and high school teachers stated that they saw a need to be implicated with the committee in order to have a broad understanding of the development of reading skill in earlier grades and to be able to share in a common language/understanding of the science of reading across all grades. The reading comprehension project for AISI Cycle 4 was designed specifically in response to the direction suggested by members of the literacy committee in AISI Cycle 3. The new Division literacy committee, with participation from teacher-leaders in various capacities/areas from each school will continue to work towards building and maintaining a common language/understanding of reading that includes but goes beyond the alphabetic code.

<p>Assessment educational purpose is to sort and sift students into those who would progress to a higher education. A large portion of reading achievement is determined by the students' ability to decode sight words and answer reading comprehension questions. Students who are not successful in reading are often channelled into non-academic programs even though they have the intellectual capacity to be successful in academic programming.</p>	<p>Improve the teachers' diagnostic ability to identify grapheme-phoneme relationships that individual students have not mastered and to be able to use specific instructional strategies to improve student knowledge of graphemes and phonemes. Teachers will have a better conceptual understanding of the phoneme-grapheme framework and through daily auditory and visual reviews will be able to assess areas of need to improve phoneme-grapheme knowledge as opposed to providing additional 'reading practice'.</p>	<p>Teacher, assessment committee members and administrator anecdotal observations and comments, both written and verbal, will be gathered and analyzed to determine the impact on teacher assessment in terms of: Assessment that is planned and purposeful. Assessment that is planned, purposeful and integrated in daily lessons. Reading lessons include a variety of diagnostic assessments that are balanced and include oral, performance, and written tasks. Students know what they have done well, what they have done poorly, and what they need to do work on.</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 Division Assessment Committee membership had changed drastically from the previous year. One Division trainer remained from the previous year. Three more trainers were selected and trained. The trainers were able to develop and deliver five training sessions. Awareness of assessment for learning has been established. Principals and Assistant Principals attended an AAC session on assessment. Teachers met in grade groups and developed common assessment tools.
- Literacy instruction practice includes daily review of the phoneme-grapheme units and regular supervised reading of word lists and controlled texts in keeping with responsive teaching practices.
- The linkage between primary literacy practices and assessment for learning is one that can continue to be explored and developed.

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

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

The Division Assessment Committee membership was relatively stable over the past year. The committee met four times and the Division Trainers continued their professional development through the Alberta Assessment Consortia's (AAC) regional training sessions. The trainers worked with several schools and schools also accessed AAC staff directly. The schools each had the opportunity to send one member of their staff to the Annual AAC Fall Conference. 13 staff members attended the conference and we have 20 people registered for next year's conference. Our division survey asked teachers if they believed they had a good understanding of assessment for learning, 89% believed they had a good understanding. Schools set up professional learning communities on assessment, establish assessment library and created and share presentations about assessment for learning. Staffs are seeing the interrelationship between assessment for learning, differentiated instruction and multiple intelligences and are working on all three.

We have established a good base of understanding and teachers are asking to work together on assessment practices. Schools are also working on an outcomes based report cards. The challenge is to apply this new knowledge and change teaching practice. Having school administrator as learning leaders who are able to recognize individual students achievement levels or where they are functioning according to curriculum outcomes is very helpful during classroom visits and while talking with students. In this way administrators are able to provide coaching support to teachers. Administrators being involved in professional discussion about assessment will make for greater impact in the implementation of assessment for learning.

A number of older students recognized that their reading difficulties stem from specific weaknesses in areas of memory, recognizing sounds and/or processing them. The student's identified how certain parts of the lessons have helped them build capacity in those areas.

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

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

The Division continues to work towards improving overall practice in the area of assessment. With this goal in mind the Division trainers have shifted their presentations to include more time on assessing/understanding reading difficulty when working with individuals or small groups of students. While the importance of providing opportunities for emergent and struggling readers to develop automaticity and fluency when reading continues to be underscored both the preventative and remedial approaches to reading/reading difficulty have been expanded to include more discussion of other reasons for reading difficulty as well as how we can be responsive to these needs. A set of beliefs that has emerged through this past cycle, consistent with assessment for learning principles, is that the purpose of assessment in the context of phonics instruction is to inform practice and guide further instructional decisions until with the goal of helping all students achieve automaticity and fluency with the alphabetic code.

* 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)		54,910		
B. AISI Funding	163,306	163,306		
C. Funding from other sources	0	0		
D. Carry over AISI Funds from previous cycle	0	0		
Total Available Funds (A+B+C)	163,306	218,216		
Expenses Paid or Payable:				
Staffing and Benefits (includes salary, wages, benefits, outside PD services (i.e., speakers, presenters, facilitators), substitute cost, release time and contract personnel)	109,884	56,547	34.05	-Division trainers were trained in the first year thus PD costs in years 2 and 3 were minimal (subs and lunches for staff taking the training)
Supplies and non-staffing Services	42,400	148,274	-67.58	created Division resource to support base resource and also supplemented with additional print materials across all grades
Equipment	0	0	0.00	
Other Capital	0	0	0.00	
Other Expenses (includes travel, accommodation, meals and conference fees)	4,370	13,395	-5.76	
Other Authorities ** (group projects only)	0	0	0.00	
Total Expenses	156,654	218,216		
Unexpended Funds	6,652	0		

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

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

Section F - Project Expense Percentages (From Project Plan)

Expense Area	2008/2009(%)			Explain any positive or negative percentage point variance of 10% or greater for PD and Admin
	Approved Estimate	* Year End Actual	** % Variance (Approved Estimate minus Y/E Actual)	
Professional Development (include all costs associated with PD - eg substitute coverage, conference, workshops, speakers' fees, release time on total cost of PD from all budget, categories)	73	29	44	Division trainers were trained in the first year therefore PD costs over years 2 and 3 were minimal (subs and lunches)
Project Management & Coordination (administration, data collection, reporting)	0	4	-4	
Front-Line Staff (include staff who work directly with students eg teachers, educational assistants, counsellors)	6	0	6	
Other Costs (equipment, materials)	21	67	-46	
Total Percentage	100	100	0	
Total Expenses	156,654	218,216		

* 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

Kindergarten (alphabet sound-letter connections). There was a substantial increase in the percentage of kindergarten students who had mastered 100% of the alphabet sounds (out of order, lower case). This increase was due in part to the fact that this skill set was not a previous standardized expectation at the kindergarten level. Some kindergarten teachers were also able to go on to early sound-blending activities with their students.

Grade 1 (% students reading at 2.0 level on IOTA). There was a small negative variance between the baseline data and data for 2006-2007. In some cases, classroom teachers cited concerns with regard to attendance, moving schools, etc. Teachers also noted that some students need more time to develop emerging literacy skills at this level. At the year-end literacy meeting when the literacy plans were shared it was felt that student achievement would show improvement with school literacy plans in place for the 2007-2008 year.

Grade 2 and 3 (%students reading at 3.0 or 4.0 level on IOTA). Baselines were established with the 2006-2007 data.

Grade 3 PATS: showed a small improvement 0.9% but did not meet target. Teacher-leaders and participants in the literacy committees have said that they anticipate an overall improvement in Grade 3 PAT scores once systematic, explicit phonics instruction with phonemic awareness training and multi-sensory strategies have been consistently in place over a 3 year period. It is also anticipated that school literacy committees and plans, which have increased collegial interaction on the topic of primary literacy, will also have an overall positive effect on student achievement.

At-risk students: We have established a baseline for students who have completed at least 48 lessons which looks promising. Many reading intervention teachers reported difficulty with timetabling in order to get in a substantial amount of remedial lessons. Thus it might be more feasible to look at achievement after 24 lessons. There is also a need to create better data collection sheets to analyze the data for at-risk students in different programs.

Teacher instructional capacity and knowledge of the reading process: This has been an overall area of growth across the district with other complimentary literacy initiatives being introduced at the district level. The work of the district literacy committee and the literacy PLC's at each of the school will continue through the 2007-2008 year. Training of new staff has already been completed. School support visits are being planned and a second training is under development for late-hired staff.

2007/2008

The target of having 60% of Kindergarten students being able to provide the sound of each of the 26 lower case letters of the alphabet was met. Further, the results for Grade 1 appear to indicate that gains made by having students develop alphabet phoneme-grapheme knowledge in kindergarten were maintained and carried over into Grade 1.

Grade 1 (% students reading at 2.0 level on IOTA). The target of 80% was met and exceeded and this result was consistent with comments made by members of the literacy committee that they believed that student achievement would show further improvement in the second full year of implementation with school literacy plans in place.

Grade 2 and 3 (%students reading at 3.0 or 4.0 level on IOTA). Targets derived from baselines established in

the previous year have been met and exceeded. Many teachers are also reporting correlated gains in spelling.

At-risk students: Approximately 218 students from Grades 1-12 received remedial intervention in individual or small pull-out groups. Of these students, among those who completed exactly 24 lessons of approximately 45 minutes/lesson, 40% showed gains of at least 1 full grade level. Of 113 students who completed from 24 to 48 lessons, 49% showed gains of at least 1 full grade level. Of 35 students who completed 48 lessons 69% showed gains of at least 1 full grade level. Since the inception of the project, of approximately 8 high school students with significant reading difficulties who completed the whole program of 85 lessons, 6 of them showed gains of a minimum of 1 grade level in their reading achievement. Self-reports from these students also indicate that these students feel more confident in school, that they believe that they are performing better across all subject areas, and that they enjoy reading and read more often. Parental reports for these students also indicate a high level of satisfaction with their children's improved reading achievement.

The overall data appears to suggest that about 89% of the students who received any amount of R+ instruction improved their reading achievement at least marginally. Further, classroom teachers have reported that students at all levels who receive pull-out intervention are showing marked improvement in reading and that taken together with a number of related District literacy initiatives, students are reading more and appear to be enjoying reading.

Grade three achievement exams were 6.6% above our target and our overall division achievement results were slightly above provincial average. This is the first time we have been above the provincial average!

2008/2009

Cause for celebration is noted in student achievement as measured in Part B of the Grade 3 English Language Arts with an improvement from a baseline of 75.8 to a score of 82.1 in the spring of 2009. Improvement was also noted in the AP 3-year rolling averages for ELA 3 (73.9-75.4-77.3). Further study of this achievement data confirms that this improvement is likely attributable to specific improvements in reading skill. During the same period (2005-2009) there was also an improvement of 1% at the Standard of Excellence (ELA 3) although this measure was not specifically included in the project proposal. Participation rates in ELA 3 over this period have improved slightly (93.6% for the authority as compared to 90.6% for the province). Finally, the 3-year rolling average for ELA 3 (October 2009) shows 77.3% of Division students meeting the acceptable standard as compared to 80.6% provincially representing an overall closing of the gap between the performance of Division ELA 3 students and other ELA 3 students in the province.

Year 3 results for students receiving remediation are also promising, at least 1.0 grade level for 80% of students receiving at least 24 lessons and an average of 1.5 grade levels of improvement across 20 records of students who received the complete remediation program of 85 lessons.

Upon initially collecting the data for cycle 3 year 3 in the spring of 2009 a slight depression was noted across all quantitative measures for students K-3. As these scores represent a single year it is difficult to see whether they are representative of a larger trend or not. Based on the positive results in student achievement seen across year 1 and 2 as well as the positive results in student achievement for ELA 3 part B and promising results for students receiving remediation we will continue to support systematic, explicit, multi-sensory phonics instruction as both a preventative tool in primary classrooms and a remedial tool for struggling readers found to be having difficulty specifically with the alphabetic code or phonemic awareness/phonological processing skills.

Section G2 - Effective Practices (Processes)

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

1. Instructional Strategy

2006/2007

The literacy plans that were developed in each of the elementary schools show excellent promise for improving student reading achievement and are supported by research on literacy.

2007/2008

Teacher instructional capacity and knowledge of the reading process: This continues to be an overall area of growth across the district along with a number of complimentary literacy initiatives being introduced at the district level. During the 2008-2009 school year, the Division literacy committee will also endeavour to create a bank of early literacy pen/paper activities similar to those in the R+ workbooks that integrate phonemic awareness, segmenting and blending skills.

2008/2009

- provision of effective one-on-one or small group remediation for students identified as struggling readers provided in addition to (not in lieu) of regular language arts classroom instruction
- effective and engaging multi-sensory instructional practices (rice tray, finger spelling, sound manipulation, magnets) to support systematic, explicit phonics instruction and phonemic awareness primary classrooms; kinesthetic-tactile in particular becoming more commonly provided in classrooms.
- integration of sound-manipulation activities with Smart Board technology
- integration of R+ (base program for this project) with other approaches using a systematic, explicit phonics approach (e.g., Joe and Joan)
- integration of multi-sensory phonics and phonemic awareness activities in centres in ECS classrooms

2. Professional Development

2006/2007

The train the trainer system has been very successful with four Division trainers now available to continue to offer training sessions and support for classroom and reading intervention teachers. An off shoot of the Train the Trainer sessions was the establishment of a Literacy Committee. The teachers saw the need for follow-up from the Train the Trainer sessions and established a Literacy Committee to address this. This committee was led by teacher-leaders and provided additional support and networking opportunities.

2007/2008

A powerpoint presentation featuring pictures and comments from Division staff, students and parents was created as part of a presentation at the annual AISI conference. This powerpoint presentation which has been incorporated into the R+ training sessions highlights the dedication and innovation of the teachers and assistants who are implementing the program and its' strategies and also features positive feedback from parents and students who receive the instruction. Many comments have indicated that it is an inspiring presentation. The training sessions for new staff continue as well as the Division and school professional learning communities.

2008/2009

- Division train the trainer model has provided a sustainable resource to provide initial training and continuing support for this approach
- establishment of school-level literacy PLCs (K-3)
- Division literacy committee as a network support and coordinate literacy initiatives in the division

3. Student Assessment

2006/2007

2007/2008

2008/2009

- benchmark data collected by primary teachers annually
- use of phoneme testing, Stanford test to assess reading and plan responsive instruction
- opportunities for observation and checklisting (assessment for learning) during whole/small group activities
- integration of data collected for AISI 3 with reading achievement data from Accelerated Reader (Grades 2-6)
- screening of grade 1 students to identify students at risk of reading difficulty
- general recognition of the importance of a variety of reading assessment tools to assess reading and be responsive to the needs of both emergent and struggling readers
- identified need to balance baseline and screening testing with ongoing diagnostic assessment to support phonics instruction

4. Project Management

2006/2007

2007/2008

Managed collaboratively through the Division R+ trainers, a central coordinator, the Division literacy committee, school-based literacy committees, and some related work by the ECS and special education committees.

2008/2009

- expressed desire to screen more students for possible intervention
- identified need for greater coordination among teachers who have designed/implemented a similar approach for use with primary French students
- representation from each school on the Division literacy committee deemed helpful

5. Parental Involvement

2006/2007

Plans are underway to develop AISI posters for the 2007-2008 school year which will highlight the unique aspects of all three of the projects, including the literacy project. Once developed these can be posted in the schools around the time of mid-year parent-teacher interviews.

2007/2008

A number of teachers and administrators have stated that this literacy project appears to have stimulated increased communication with parents on the subject of literacy. In response to this observation, members of the Division literacy committee have created a parent brochure explaining the project and expanding on the principles of R+. A number of copies will be printed professionally and distributed and an electronic photocopyable version will also be circulated.

2008/2009

- daily instructional routines established to have parents follow progress in alphabetic code
- signed consent and regular progress reports sent home for students receiving remediation
- R+ brochure created in 2007-2008
- in some cases information was shared at Meet-the-Teacher night, through school newsletters, etc.

Section G3 - Project Summary and Reflections

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

2006/2007

- ☐ Reading instruction has become more consistent; K-3 teachers can now use the same terminology when talking among themselves and when teaching students; new teachers (Division 1) find it helpful to have a set of standards to refer to across the grade levels; adequate training is available for teachers and support staff
- ☐ Building learning communities for reading instruction; sharing sessions and follow-up meetings; having an 'expert' on staff; teachers are 'buying in'; schools have developed scope and sequence charts to guide reading instruction from Kindergarten through to Grade 3
- ☐ Positive benefits to student learning; students are gaining an understanding of basic phonemes and how to use these phonemes to read and spell words
- ☐ Positive learning experiences; students enjoyed many of the unique reading instruction strategies, particularly the folders and sticky notes. They also responded well to the segmenting activities and the finger spelling.
- ☐ Benefits for struggling readers; remediation has worked very well for at-risk students on a pull-out basis; all students get the basic instruction and those who need more have access to additional assistance through a variety of small-group pull-out

2007/2008

A number of qualitative and quantitative indicators appear to show that taken together with other Division initiatives for literacy (e.g., Accelerated Reader) this literacy project has produced gains in student reading achievement, students' affect towards reading, a common language and understanding of reading among teachers, and increased communication with parents of primary students on the topic of literacy.

Teachers have indicated that along with related Division literacy initiatives, the project has caused them to review their instructional practices related to literacy and that, in general, many students are reading more and enjoying reading. Further, teachers report a greater level of comfort in condensing and modifying activities and strategies from the R+ program for effective implementation in the regular classroom.

A number of elementary principals have become actively engaged with their staffs in this project and these individuals have indicated satisfaction with their level of involvement. Some administrators have also noted that this literacy project appears to have enhanced parent-teacher communications with respect to comprehensive literacy development. Parent comments collected for the powerpoint presentation indicated a high level of satisfaction.

All the qualitative information is gathered from literacy committees, principals and from visits by the coordinator.

2008/2009

- development of scope and sequence plans for graphemes
- integration of base resource for AISI 3 (R+) with other resources designed for the same research base in

- systematic, explicit, or multi-sensory phonics instruction
 - pull-out remediation for students identified as struggling readers
 - same/common language for understanding alphabetic code/phonemic awareness
 - teacher leader(s) in every school
 - great results, excellent success, team is more organized
 - staff has become more comfortable with this approach
 - noted increase in decoding skills and fluency
 - involving parents of emergent readers in this approach
 - children enjoy the instructional activities and the approach is a good tool for teaching sounds and rules of the English language
 - good carry over into spelling success
 - students are actively identifying graphemes/phonemes and successfully incorporating them into their written work
 - ECS students experience success in learning the letter sounds
 - this approach works well in combination with Accelerated Reader program
 - approach is responsive to varied student learning styles
 - teachers became more comfortable and knowledgeable about phonics and phonemic awareness strategies.
- Continuation from grade to grade was a huge positive

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

2006/2007

- Lessons had to be adapted for whole group instruction
- Need to achieve a balance between instruction in alphabetic principle/phonological processing with other
- components of the language arts curriculum (or other programs and initiatives)
- Some concerns about the quality of the materials in the Early Language Curriculum (Kindergarten and Grade 1)
- Students at-risk would benefit from more time for intensive intervention; size of group for small-group
- intervention needs to be monitored
- Some challenges with combined classes, new students moving in or students who are frequently absent
- Some concerns expressed about the accuracy of the word identification scores for predicting overall reading
- comprehension

2007/2008

Although most teachers indicate that they are more comfortable and familiar with the instructional strategies and activities in R+, they indicate that extensive modifications have been necessary in order for these strategies to be effectively implemented in a whole-class setting. With reference to both whole-class and remedial implementation, time factors and scheduling continue to be challenging.

Staff turn-over requires that on-going training be provided in order to maintain high levels of common understanding and commitment to the project. In some instances, implementation fidelity has been affected by the individual choices of teachers.

In a number of instances student attendance or factors of student motivation may also negatively impact reading gains achieved as a result of R+ instruction.

2008/2009

- identified need to continue building to address comprehension and writing (NB - comprehension addressed in AISI Cycle 4)

- recognition that IOTA scores used in AISI Cycle 3 are word identification scores and not reading comprehension scores and identified need to develop/use a variety of reading assessment tools
- on-going need to balance principles of explicit, systematic, multi-sensory phonics instruction with instruction in a whole class Language Arts context and development of a broad range of literacy skills
- recognition of the on-going need for vocabulary development for many students
- recognition of the importance of achieving consistency for rules for alphabetic in every day reading and writing activities
- time
- pull-outs can disrupt flow of whole-class instruction
- base resource for AISI 3 not initially designed for whole class instruction thus required extensive modification for implementation

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

2006/2007

- Modification of materials and strategies for whole-class instruction: files and alphabet sticky notes created for each student; modifications to the segmenting magnets; turn-taking for the ball blending activity; integrating with the Grade 3 spelling program; integrating with the Joe and Joan readers
- Coordinating with other classes and achieving balance in overall language arts program
- Adjustments to timetabling, programming, staffing, professional development, etc. to support literacy project

2007/2008

Adjustments implemented over the course of the previous year have been implemented and refined, for example schools are continuing to adjust their timetabling, in a remedial setting the R+ program gets the best results when it is done individually or in a group of two. The time between sessions has an effect on the results; better results are attained if the lessons are given on a daily basis as opposed to being spread out with extensive time between lessons.

2008/2009

- whole class modifications to base resource
- development of Division resources for Grade 1
- recognized need to build greater understanding of reading across all teachers (not just Language Arts teachers)
- recognized need to continue to build assessment for learning practice and to integrate such principles with reading instruction
- pacing of lessons often needed to be adjusted

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

2006/2007

- Qualitative data for annual reporting collected from school teams
- Sharing individual student success stories with parents
- Student-led conferences in parent/teacher interviews
- Students demonstrating R+ tasks and related student work
- Through monthly PLC meeting or grade-level team meetings
- Staff and division meetings
- Communication between classroom and intervention teachers

2007/2008

- R+ brochure for parents
- R+ powerpoint presentation shared with Board members, administrative council, Division literacy committee, at annual AISI conference, and during R+ training sessions
- showcase session at the annual AISI conference
- additional in-depth case study of three high-school students

2008/2009

- quantitative measures shared and discussed with Division literacy committee and administrators
- rewards to celebrate student success in reading (reading parties, books, treats, etc.)
- success stories shared at PLC meetings and other division events
- results shared with parents
- students receive certificate of completion upon completing 85 lessons
- writing samples and anecdotes shared in school newsletter
- school council

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

2006/2007

- Required teachers to begin to work as a team and focus on curriculum
- Great sharing and teamwork (or PLC's)
- Good conversation among teachers at different grade levels
- Great results for pull-out students
- Coordinated inter-school committee for Early Language workbooks
- Decoding/spelling skills have improved; continued room for improvement in comprehension levels

2007/2008

- R+ lead-teachers were invited to present at the 2008 Teachers' Convention
- a small number of parents and educators from neighbouring jurisdictions as well as community members from St. Paul have participated in the training sessions
- a number of Grade 3 teachers have reported positive gains in spelling achievement
- in general, it appears that teachers have developed a greater understanding of how reading accuracy and fluency are positively correlated with reading comprehension and this has led to increased collegial discussion regarding strategies for improving reading comprehension

REFLECTION:the activities of this project have underscored the need to continue to address other facets of literacy, in particular, reading comprehension and pre-school literacy experiences

2008/2009

All of the following may be attributable to AISI Cycle 3 in combination with the implementation of Accelerated Reader across the division in 2007:

- noted increase in students demonstrating enjoyment of/interest in reading
- noted increase in reading levels
- increased confidence in the students (noted by parents at home)
- increased participation in reading out loud (noted by classroom teachers)
- students are beginning to develop a culture of reading, taking books to all classess, asking to read, reading when they've finished work, reading in library and hallways
- students with a preference for visual or auditory learning did not appreciate the kinesthetic approach as much
- controlled reading activities deemed boring and repetitive by some students

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

How will this project be sustained?

2006/2007

2007/2008

Division R+ trainers will continue to have the opportunity to provide annual training for new staff. It is also expected that a bank of photocopiable paper and pencil activities similar to those in the R+ workbooks will continue to support the literacy instruction of Kindergarten and Grade 1 teachers. This activities will be developed by a sub-committee of the Division literacy committee during the 2008-2009 school year.

2008/2009

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

Year: 2006/2007
Please check one of the following boxes:
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Continuing
<input type="radio"/> Completed
<input type="radio"/> Discontinued If so, please explain WHY
Year: 2007/2008
Please check one of the following boxes:
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Continuing
<input type="radio"/> Completed
<input type="radio"/> Discontinued If so, please explain WHY

Section H. Attachments (Optional)

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

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

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

<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	The school authority has the documentation and systems that support the reported information.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Parents are involved and aware of the progress and results of the project.
<input type="checkbox"/>	_____ Superintendent/CEO Name (electronic signature)