

Conseil scolaire francophone
de la Colombie-Britannique

Literacy Plan

2008-2009

Submitted on July 15, 2008

Alain Laberge, Director of Educational Services

Words for speaking, writing and hearing... for each one of us!



Literacy: Definition

Literacy can take several forms and therefore have different definitions. Thus we will speak of functional literacy, which can be defined as follows:

Skills required to be able to use writing and reading in everyday life and at work.

It is interesting to note that Statistics Canada uses the same description of literacy as being a key factor in determining *a person's chances of success, both from the standpoint of career and quality of life. Strong literacy skills are closely linked with the likelihood of having a good job.* (<http://www.statcan.ca/francais>).

In fact, functional literacy is much more important than level of education for explaining labour force participation (<http://www.statcan.ca/francais/research/11F0019MIF/11F0019MIF2006275.pdf>)

Areas of Literacy

The approach favoured by the CSF for its learners is literacy development encompassing three distinct areas of literacy:

Reading

Writing

Oral communication

These areas, while they are different, should be regarded as a whole and not be treated separately so as to focus on one area to the detriment of the others; nor should they be adapted for individual learners in order to diminish or minimize their scope. In addition, the ubiquitous concepts of language development must not be forgotten, including socialization, basic literacy training, and information and communication technologies in education, which underlie and provide an integral support for literacy.

Literacy and the Pédagogie 2010 (Education 2010) Project

In 2006, the Conseil scolaire francophone undertook an innovative educational project in order to meet the requirements of the district's strategic orientations. The project was given the name of *Pédagogie 2010* (Education 2010) and has the primary objective of providing quality education for all learners, in a minority Francophone education context; at the same time, it aims to improve the academic achievement of all students.

Pédagogie 2010 is intended to be an educational project based on three components, designed as an inclusive as well as a complementary approach: education technology, culture and community, and education.

Education Technology Component

The education technology component plays a paramount role in supporting learners and providing training for teachers. When the *Pédagogie 2010* project was launched, the CSF was convinced of the importance, and indeed the need to equip each learner as well as each teacher with a laptop computer. In the 21st century, it was inconceivable to limit education to traditional approaches and to overlook a paradigm that engages the learner in far more constructive and innovative ways.

For that matter, the educational tools used on a daily basis are all directly associated with the use of laptop computers.

Culture and Community Component

This component aims to foster the development of cultural identity among the province's Francophone learners through literacy, and to enable them to achieve their full potential.

It is important to note that studies on literacy show that children develop literacy behaviours at a much earlier time than Kindergarten, hence the importance of working with our partners in education to give a greater chance of success to the next generation. *The institutional and social challenges of Francophone communities can be summarized as the challenge of establishing for themselves a "community life" in the French language that can provide basic socialization contributing to the development of identity* (Allard and Landry 1996. "Vitalité ethnolinguistique : une perspective dans l'étude de la francophonie canadienne" [Ethnolinguistic vitality: a perspective on the study of the Canadian Francophonie].)

Educational Component

The educational component supports the implementation, within the context of the *Pédagogie 2010* Project, of four tools for acquiring functional literacy:

-  12 reading strategies
-  Phonological awareness
-  Vocabulary acquisition
-  Francization

Teachers and administrators have all had the opportunity to take workshops and specific training in the four tools, and they will have the chance to expand their knowledge when Level 2 workshops are offered this year.

During the coming year, we also plan to launch the fifth and last tool designed for *Pédagogie 2010*: writing.

It should be noted that these workshops take into account the various aspects pertaining to special needs children.

Progress Update

Literacy
Plan
(caps?)

Before describing our results and making comparisons with percentages and earlier data, it should be explained that we have changed the indicators of success that were used in writing the first literacy plan, submitted in October 2007. There was no unanimous agreement concerning the indicators of success directly associated with the FSA tests. Therefore, the working group decided, by consensus, to use as a basis for comparison elements from the various curriculum organizers pertaining to comprehension found in the Ministry of Education's learning taxonomy:

READING COMPREHENSION SKILLS

Identifying	Comprehension	Vocabulary	Producing inferences	Demonstrating critical thinking
-------------	---------------	------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

WRITING SKILLS

Summarizing

NUMERACY SKILLS

Number	Patterns and Relations	Shape and Space	Statistics and Probability
--------	------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------

Therefore, understandably, the results used last year cannot be used for comparative purposes in this document.

Progress Indicators Used

In addition to the curriculum organizers from the taxonomy, we will also use the data provided by each school, still in relation to the organizers that were mentioned, as well as analysis of various district tests: phonological awareness, ESL and Francization. Furthermore, we collect similar data to the indicators of success, obtained from surveys conducted among teachers to determine the success level of the four tools in the classroom.

Results and Analysis of Data

Phonological Awareness

“Phonological awareness designates the ability to separate words into sounds, which makes it possible to manipulate, add or remove syllables, and even to understand rhymes.”

(Daniel Baril <http://www.petitmonde.com/iDoc/Article.asp?id=28846>)

Used more specifically in Kindergarten and Grade 1, phonological awareness is one of the four tools that the CSF supports. We can compare student progress through the initial test and the end-of-year test. via le test initial et le test de fin d’année.

Date	Identifying rhymes	Counting syllables	Associating initial sounds	Overall average
October 2006	61%	78%	48%	62%
May 2007	74%	89%	72%	78%
September 2007	73%	84%	72%	76%
May 2008	92%	95%	92%	93%

Based on these results, we can make the following observations:

- 🌐 Consistent progress from the first year that this method was used (62% to 78 %)
- 🌐 A slight decrease (usually) in achievement occurred during the summer (between May 2007 and September 2007)
- 🌐 After two years of using this method, the results were convincing, with a general average of 93 %.

Following is a portrait of the students (homogeneous target group) who will begin Grade 1 in September 2006:

Date	Identifying rhymes	Counting syllables	Associating initial sounds	Counting sounds	Comparing the length of sounds	Representing sounds by letters	Average
October 2006	78%	84%	74%	55%	62%	54%	68%
May 2007	90%	92%	88%	67%	83%	81%	84%
September 2007	73%	84%	72%	43%	57%	37%	61%
May 2008	92%	95%	92%	66%	77%	82%	84 %

Based on these results, we can make the following observations:

- 🌐 Consistent progress from the first year that this method was used (68% to 84%)
- 🌐 A significant decrease in achievement occurred during the summer (between May 2007 and September 2007). We note that as students become older, their socialization and (external) stimulation occurs increasingly in English.
- 🌐 After two years of using this method, the results improved considerably, except for two categories that lower the average by a lot: counting sounds and comparing the length of sounds.

Reading Tests for Grades 3, 6 and 9

In May 2008, a district-wide reading test was given to most of the students in Grades 3, 6 and 9. The way in which the test was administered was, by and large, different from the FSA tests in that the students were identified only at the local level, whereas the district received information and data based on the group as a whole.

Once again, as a basis for comparison, we used the same indicators of success as for the FSA tests. The results for each of the groups are presented below. It was observed that the difficulties encountered for each level are, in fact, similar to those in the FSA tests.

Grade 3

Amalgamated results	Reading		Writing	
	# of students	%	# of students	%
Meet expectations	291	80	239	69
Do not meet expectations	74	20	110	31

Grade 6

Amalgamated results	Reading		Writing	
	# of students	%	# of students	%
Meet expectations	284	86	228	71
Do not meet expectations	45	14	93	29

Grade 9

Amalgamated results	Reading		Writing	
	# of students	%	# of students	%
Meet expectations	121	84	92	70
Do not meet expectations	23	16	39	30

In spite of the convincing results on a general level, it is important to analyze the difficulties encountered by most students. For the purposes of comprehension, it should be noted that the percentages indicated in the columns are not performance indicators, but rather an analysis of the questions that were generally missed by more than half of the students. Here are the findings of this analysis:

Grade 3

Identification	Comprehension	Vocabulary	Inference	Critical thinking
80%	66%	61%	41%	56 %

Grade 6

Identification	Comprehension	Vocabulary	Inference	Critical thinking
80%	72%	71%	60%	49 %

Grade 9

Identification	Comprehension	Vocabulary	Inference	Critical thinking
76%	69%	71%	55%	63%

We can therefore assert that students have significant difficulty with the following two skills:

- Inference
- Critical thinking

FSA Test Results

For the time being, we cannot add the results of the analyses done by the province, given that they have not yet been published. We expect to update the results in September.

Results for Aboriginal Students

Our Aboriginal student population is fairly limited (294 throughout the district, representing about 7% of our total student population), and thus the number of students writing the tests is not very representative:

21 students in Grade 4

20 students in Grade 7

On the other hand, the FSA comparative results (the only comparative assessment available) indicate that our Aboriginal results are comparable to the provincial results, and even exceed them.

Grade 4	Aboriginal students in the CSF		Aboriginals students throughout province*	
	Meet expectations	Do not meet expectations	Meet expectations	Do not meet expectations
Comprehension	53%	47%	57%	29%
Writing	76%	24%	52%	31%
Numeracy	67%	33%	51%	37%

Grade 7	Aboriginal students in the CSF		Aboriginal students throughout province*	
	Meet expectations	Do not meet expectations	Meet expectations	Do not meet expectations
Comprehension	75%	25%	49%	36%
Writing	80%	20%	56%	28%
Numeracy	65%	35%	47%	39%

*A percentage of students do not appear in the data.

In 2008-2009, we are going to put forward our Aboriginal education enhancement agreement, which will contain very specific literacy objectives.

District Priorities for 2007-2010

District priorities are based on the 4 underlying principles of literacy found in the recommendations of the Ministry in its document *Read Now BC*.

The CSF is therefore emphasizing:

- The importance of preschool-aged children being ready to begin school with a sufficiently high knowledge level
- Increasing the number of students who can read at a satisfactory level
- Increasing literacy skills of adults so that they can enter and succeed in the job market.
- Increasing the number of Aboriginal students with a satisfactory reading level.

District Priority for 2008-2009

The Conseil scolaire francophone de la Colombie-Britannique gives priority to the same four long-term objectives and three short-term objectives that were undertaken last year, given that they still represent a challenge at the present time and that work has already begun to meet these objectives. It must also be taken into account that the preceding plan was adopted barely 9 months ago and is still being addressed in our daily activities.

Long-term Objectives

- Develop formative achievement tests that include identification and progress of special needs students, support for learners and teachers and, finally, diagnosis.
- Establish a continuum of knowledge and skills
- Build a provincial network of educational “leaders” with the goal of improving students’ achievement and literacy level
- Increase literacy activities in the family setting and for early childhood

Short-term Objectives

- Improve student achievement in the area of literacy (reading and writing)
- Implement learning tools for literacy, supported by information and communication technologies in education
- Develop and implement different teaching models for secondary students, in order to continue to increase success rates
- Increase the number of students who obtain their Dogwood Diploma