

EBP PHASE 2 SUMMARY REPORT 2014-2015

RIVERSIDE SCHOOL BOARD

Project 1: Data collection, analysis and reporting to schools

Goals and Activities

This project furthers the Riverside practice of providing school teams with key data on the end-of-cycle and end of year evaluations held in May/June 2014. These data practices have been in place in the elementary sector for seven years and in the secondary sector for three years. Consultants meet with school teams in September to receive detailed reports, and discuss final evaluation results in light of selected targets and indicators which are part of the school board PA and school MESAs. School teams developed insights into various areas of success and challenge, and developed accordingly school-specific action plans to meet the identified needs.

Funded by Riverside - Measure 30105 (0.5 day x 50 teachers)

Project 2: Support for Elementary Mathematics

Goals and Activities

1) Harold Napper Data Teams

- a. **Cycle 2:** Under the guidance of the Education Consultant, teams of teachers analyzed student results (previous year's end of cycle exam, end of term results) to identify issues of concern and develop a plan of action to address those issues. The cycle 2 team at Harold Napper met 5 times from December to May for half a day each time. A joint meeting was also held with the remainder of the cycle team for a standardization and common correcting session to further learning across the entire cycle. This was the second year of this data team.
- b. **Cycle 3:** Teams of teachers analyzed student results (previous year's end of cycle exam, end of term results) to identify issues of concern and develop a plan of action for addressing those issues. The cycle 3 team at Harold Napper met 5 times from Dec.-April, for half a day each time.

- 2) **St. Jude Data Team:** Under the guidance of the Education Consultant, Cycle 2 and 3 teachers analyzed student results (previous year's end of cycle exam, end of term results) to identify issues of concern and develop a plan of action for address to address these issues. The data team at St. Jude met 7 times from Dec.-April, for half a day each time.

Outcomes

1) Harold Napper Data Teams

- a. **Cycle 2:** Teachers identified a gap in success rates between students in the English program and students in the immersion program as the targeted area of concern. Throughout the meetings, strategies for common planning and assessment were discussed. Currently all teachers in the school are released for common cycle meetings, but these take place separately for each program. The

teachers agreed, and a request was made to the administrator, to schedule team meetings by grade level rather than by cycle for next year to facilitate common understandings and collaborative work. Teachers have also decided to adopt the same supplemental material (workbook) in both the English and Immersion programs for next year.

In conjunction with other professional development taking place at the school, all teachers chose common assessments for C1 for each term, by grade level. The members of the data team decided to hold a standardization session for one of the situational problems that had been chosen for grade 3 and one in grade 4. They developed an evaluation folder, which contained documents needed to assess math tasks, and provided copies to each teacher at this session. A sample folder for the other 2 cycles will be produced and presented to the rest of the staff at the final staff meeting. At the standardization session, teachers discussed the use of the observable elements grids for situational problems, as well as the use of the competency rubric.

- b. **Cycle 3:** At this cycle, the area of greatest concern to teachers was the student success rate on the mastery of concepts and processes booklet. Initial meetings were spent exploring possible reasons for student's low success rates and discussion what, if any, tools are used to assess mastery during the year.

Teachers agreed to create small, frequent assessments to “check up” on students’ mastery of concepts taught. Once a month, students were presented with 5 mastery questions – modelled after, or taken directly from, previous year’s MELS exams. The questions consisted of:

- 1 oral question (mental math, representation of numbers, vocabulary)
- 2 questions related to concepts that had been taught earlier in the year
- 1 question related to the concepts currently being taught.

At each subsequent meeting, teachers corrected their students’ work and compared success rates. Teachers did not consider the success rate on a question by question basis. They compared students’ success based on a pass/fail of the group of 5 questions, insisting that this best represented the MELS end of cycle exam. In future, I will suggest that teachers assess individual concepts (instead of several at once) in order to bring teachers to think more critically about the errors they are seeing in their students’ work and how to address those errors.

- 2) **St. Jude Data Team:** The greatest area of concern to teachers was the students’ success rate on the mastery of concepts and processes booklet. Initial meetings were spent exploring possible reasons for student’s low success rates and discussion what, if any, tools are used to assess mastery during the year.

Teachers agreed to create small, frequent assessments to “check up” on students’ mastery of concepts taught. Together, teachers designed 2 multiple choice or short answer questions related to the content they were currently teaching. At the following meeting, they brought back their students’ answers and we sorted them by error type. Teachers discussed the common errors made by students and shared strategies for addressing those errors.

In initial meetings, teachers were not teaching the same content at the same time, so each teacher created questions based on the current content in her class. As time passed, teachers began to plan together more frequently, enabling them to use the same questions (by cycle).

Teachers felt that it would be beneficial to have a common plan in place for teaching math next year. The final two meetings were spent developing a common curriculum map for grade 4 and grade 5/6 so that next year, from the beginning of the year, teachers will be able to confer, share teaching material, develop common assessments and track student progress together.

Project 3: Support for Secondary Mathematics

Goals and Activities

There were three secondary Math data teams: a Secondary IV Cultural, Social & Technical (CST) Math team which had representatives from all four secondary schools, and two Secondary III Math teams (one from Heritage Regional High School and one from Centennial Regional High School).

Outcomes

- 1) **Secondary IV CST Math:** This team met on two separate days for a full day each. The team was composed of 12 teachers (from all four schools) and the Math Educational Consultant. This was the second year of the Secondary IV CST math data team.

The first meeting involved analyzing data from the June 2014 Uniform Exam, sharing observations, revisiting the strategies that were shared, selected and implemented from the previous year of data team meetings, digging into student sample work from the Uniform Exam, identifying student learning problems, and finding teaching implications. The teachers consulted best practices and strategies from research and planned out their annual goal (learning problem, strategies and formative assessment to measure success and progress).

The second meeting involved each school team sharing their goals school strategies, challenges and progress. Each school brought sample student work (within the 50-65% range) from a common assessment and analyzed this student work. Teachers identified new student learning problems and researched new solutions and teaching implications. They refined their school goals and received professional development on two topics: feedback and formative assessment. The teachers developed and shared resources on the topic of probability and the Educational Consultant presented the upcoming changes to the math program.

The teachers found that a third meeting was not necessary. Consequently, the Educational Consultant followed up on progress after this with the school mathematics coordinator.

This data team should be continued in 2015-2016 in consideration of results obtained on the June 2015 Uniform Examination and in light of the upcoming changes to the CST Math program.

2. **Secondary III Math Team of Heritage RHS:** This team met five times. There were 6 teachers involved in this team. Release was not required on all days.

Since the teachers were previously familiar with school results from the June 2014 RSB summative exam, the focus work of the team was on improving student success using the means of school-based common assessments and classroom formative assessment.

At each of the four first meetings, the teachers used the SWART (Student Work Artifacts Recording Tool) to analyze student work, tally the evidence, make inferences, think of possible causes and select teaching implications that will remediate the student learning problems identified. The meetings began with a discussion on progress of implementing the strategies and measurement of success for the students identified in the 50-65% range in each class. The last meeting was used to discuss teaching alignment in preparation for review at the end of the year.

The teachers became quite familiar with the process. A couple of the teachers assumed lead of the data process and should be able to continue the process independently next year. Administrative support was present at all data team meetings, and was an important positive quality of the project.

3) Secondary III Math Team at Centennial RHS: This team met twice; there were two teachers on this team. Release was required on one date only.

Since the teachers were previously familiar with school results from the June 2014 RSB summative assessment, the focus of the team was on student success using the means of school-based common assessments and classroom formative assessment. At each meeting, the teachers used the SWART (Student Work Artifacts Recording Tool) to analyze student work, tally the evidence, make inferences, think of possible causes and select teaching implications that will remediate the student learning problems identified. The meetings began with a discussion on progress of implementing the strategies and measurement of success for the students identified in the 50-65% range in each class.

This school continues to need support with the implementation of data teams and would also need participation from all math teachers at that grade level.

Project 4: Support for Elementary Français langue seconde de base

Goals and Activities

With the guidance of the Education Consultant, six sessions occurred at St-Johns school with the 3 FLS de base elementary teachers. Since the teachers were all teaching different grades, the decision was made to focus on a specific competency. The student success data demonstrated that reading was the area required for focus.

Outcomes

The preliminary goal of this data team was to examine common student learning data and identify areas of weakness, devise strategies to support this areas, apply interventions and measure the impact of these strategies. After examining the available data, selecting success in reading as the focus, and having further discussions on this topic, it became apparent that the teachers required support in terms of the strategies used to develop the reading competency in the FLS de base classroom. Given that two of the three teachers had no prior experience in FLS de base elementary, it was concluded that teachers required professional development on two topics: strategies for the introduction of authentic children's literature and strategies for developing student's understanding of what they read. Thus, meetings thereafter focused on professional development in these areas, followed by practical application of these new strategies in their classroom. Each subsequent meeting began with a reflective sharing of their practical application of the new strategies, discussion of outcomes, and determination of the next step. As the teachers began to observe and record the impact on authentic literature on student learning, it was increasingly integrated into their teaching. The Education Consultant organised an interlibrary loan in order that teachers had a vast selection of literature to provide their students, and use as teaching resources. The Consultant also spoke to the school librarian to further develop the collection of French picture books for older students. Finally, as another way to model best practices for teachers, the consultant taught in the classroom with the students, with the teacher as observer/learner. Overall, this year was most effectively used to build teacher understanding of the FLS de base program and specific best practices in relation to teaching reading. Should the teacher team remain the same next year, it would be timely to introduce the concepts related to common assessments, data collection and analysis strategies.

.

Project 4: Support for Secondary IV History & Citizenship Education

Goals and Activities

Teachers of Secondary IV HCE met for one day and under the guidance of the Education Consultant reviewed the HCE Uniform results of June 2014.

Outcomes

Each school conducted a prediction and analysis exercise on the student success rates per each exam question. Results were discussed in terms of student understandings and challenges. Schools were asked to identify one or two student learning problems and areas for further study. Schools made particular requests for data set and additional resources. It is anticipated that the data team approach will be further developed next year with all teachers of this course: a data team/school is desirable.

Overall reflection/observation

The various subject-specific teams in place focused on the collection of reliable evidence of student learning in order that they could engage in a collaborative inquiry process, and determine strategies to improve student success. Whereas each teacher team came with a variety of different experiences (professionally and in terms of data team knowledge), many beneficial and desired outcomes were achieved overall, to varying degrees:

- Building assessment literacy
- Collection of various forms of evidence of student learning (data overview)
- Identification of needs and priorities
- Cause-effect analysis (examine instruction, curriculum, resources and the school situation)
- Identification, monitoring and revision of research-based strategies
- Development of an action plan
- Monitoring of impacts on student success
- Review and revision of the school MESA in light of the inquiry and outcomes

Overall, each project was an effective means of furthering teacher understanding and building collaborative practices.

All projects referenced evidence-based practice inquiry models, as defined by three main sources: 'Data-Wise' by K. Parker Boudett, "Using data to Improve Learning for All – A Model for Collaborative Inquiry" by N. Love and 'Data Teams' by the Douglas Reeves Leadership and Learning Centre.

Submitted by Lisa Rae

Assistant Director Riverside School Board

June 25, 2015