Title and a brief description of L4All K-12 Regional Project

In June 2012, TARO L4All Regional PLC boards engaged in an activity where they identified Learning for All 2011 Draft Version key elements in their Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and Well Being (BIPSA).

With alignment established, boards looked for evidence of that practice in their schools. These schools were considered as candidates for the teacher-lead project. The following criterion was followed:

- Teacher led projects that align with priorities and on-going and/or new initiatives at a board/school level
- Evidence based inquiries or action research
- Minimum one elementary and one secondary project requested (lead boards had representation from both panels)
- Artifacts suggested included:
  1. Samples of student work and/or student voice
  2. Evidence/data collection of teacher self-assessment
  3. Evidence/data collection of project assessment
  4. Evidence/data collection of student achievement and well being
- Engagement of internal/external partners such as community partners
TARO L4All Regional PLC boards were also given an option to initiate a teacher-lead project. This teacher-lead project would meet the same above criterion to establish/strengthen alignment between Learning for All 2011 Draft Version key elements and their Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and Well Being (BIPSA).

A Teacher-Led Project template was created which included all the suggested criteria.

Each board completed and submitted this template which generated the carousel rotation map for the November 6th agenda.

### A brief description of 2011-12 and 2012-13 Teacher-Led L4All K-12 Projects

- **Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board**
  - Elementary: Use of Student Response System to Inform Planning
  - Secondary: Use of Student Response System to Enhance Student Engagement
- **Halton Catholic District School Board**
  - Elementary: Use of School Team to Develop Tiered Approach to Student Intervention
  - Secondary: Tiered Intervention(s) through a Team Approach through an ASD Lens
- **Peel District School Board**
  - Elementary: Use of Student Profiles in a Multidisciplinary Team
  - Secondary: Student Re-Engagement
- **Upper Grand District School Board**
  - Elementary: Use of Technology to improve Student Engagement for the LD Intermediate Learner
- **Toronto Catholic District School Board**
  - Elementary: Use of Student Profile in Math Instruction
- **Toronto District School Board**
  - Elementary: Use of Tiered Approach in supporting Students with Academic /Behavioural Needs
  - Secondary: Use of Multiple Intelligence Profile in Assessment
- **Halton District School Board**
  - Elementary: School Based Collaborative Inquiry Process to Enhance Practice and Outcomes

### A brief description of L4All K-12 professional learning activities

TARO Region L4All PLC Lead Boards recommended that the L4All Teacher-led projects presented on November 6th 2013 be shared locally within their own schools, Family of Schools, and SEAC.
These professional learning opportunities can serve as evidence of the actualization of the L4All principles in practice. The sharing of these authentic experiences can enhance the professional learning opportunities for all. All November 6th 2013 Teacher-led Projects templates are posted with contact information should other boards be interested in pursuing it further.

**Assessment**

In June 2012, using Student Response System technology, initial data was collected from the TARO region on the implementation of key L4All elements in their school board. The inquiry included the following key elements:
- Universal Design of Learning
- Differentiated Instruction
- The Tiered Approach
- Assessment for Learning
- Assessment as Learning
- Assessment of Learning
- Class Profile
- Student Profile
- Transitions

Respondents were clustered by board and asked to provide one response per board. Separate responses were provided for elementary and secondary panels. Boards were anonymous. Respondents were asked to indicate their board’s level of implementation in each area above using the following rating scale:
- Awareness
- Beginning Implementation
- Partial Implementation
- Full Implementation.

This data collection was repeated at the November 6th 2013 session. The results provide an indication of the level of implementation of each identified L4ALL element at each point in time. Comparing the results for each question at each administration point provides an indication of changes in levels of implementation over the 17 month period. It is important to note that the number of respondents is small and that the respondents were different for each administration. As such, the results provide only an overall picture of L4ALL implementation at the elementary and secondary level. Please see the attached artifacts for the 4 reports.

In general, implementation levels in the elementary panel in each key element increased over the 17 month period. The greatest shifts occurred from awareness to beginning implementation and from beginning implementation to partial implementation.

In the elementary panel, results indicated that most boards have moved beyond the awareness stage in all of the L4ALL key areas. Results indicate that most boards fall in the beginning or partial implementation levels in each of the key areas. In June 2012 results indicated that none of the key elements of L4ALL
were at the “Full Implementation” level. In November 2013, results showed full implementation in the following areas: differentiated instruction (20%), the tiered approach (20%), assessment for learning (30%), assessment as learning (30%), assessment of learning (55%), use of the class profile (5%), student profile (31%) and student transitions (35%).

At the secondary level, implementation levels of each key element were also examined. Results indicated that 25% to 55% of boards remain at the awareness level in several key areas of L4ALL. Results also indicate that approximately 50% of boards fall in the beginning or partial implementation levels in each of the key areas. The areas of differentiated instruction, assessment of learning, student profile and transitions showed movement to the full implementation level. Overall, there is greater variation in implementation of the key elements of L4ALL across the secondary panel within the TARO boards.

Clearly, the results indicate that boards need to continue with additional work in all of the key elements of Learning for All in order to reach the full implementation level.

TARO L4All Regional PLC boards were also given an option to initiate a teacher-lead project. This teacher-lead project would meet the same above criterion to establish/strengthen alignment between Learning for All 2011 Draft Version key elements and their Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and Well Being (BIPSA).

A Teacher-Led Project template was created which included all the suggested criteria.

Each board completed and submitted this template which generated the carousel rotation map for the November 6th agenda.

**Additional Comments**

Within the structure of a three part lesson:

1. Simon Sinek’s TED video The Golden Circle highlighted the importance of the “Why” when examining our work.
2. The carousel format of the November 6, 2013 session modeled a professional learning approach that each board could emulate within their own community.
3. The use of technology (SRS/Twitter) was utilized to model 21st century engagement strategies.