



Australian Government

Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations



MONASH University



**ORAL LANGUAGE SUPPORTING EARLY LITERACY RESEARCH PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT
1 JANUARY 2010 (Adapted)**

1. Teacher Knowledge & Experience: Mid-Project Review

Area Rated	Pre-Project Rating (April 2009) 8 schools 52 Teachers	Current Rating (December 2009) 6 schools 33 Teachers
My current knowledge and experience with the oral language content (OLSEL, ICPALER,)	3.21	3.45
My current comfort level with embedding oral language into my literacy planning	3.48	3.61
My current comfort level with using oral language to improve student literacy outcomes	3.48	3.58
Rate the resources provided by the CEO contacts over the past two months	3.73	3.36
Overall, how would you rate the value of this professional learning activity for schools	4.42	4.24

N.B.: Data from teachers in three schools had yet to be received at the time of this report being prepared. As such, the results outlined can only be viewed as indicative until the complete set of teacher ratings are received.

Comments

- A broader range of strategies as exemplifiers not just the use of Big Books.
- I found the PD day very helpful.
- OLSEL PDs have been very helpful in providing ideas for our oral language program.

- We do need more resources (e.g. shared texts; time for planning and refining program).
- A progression of development would be useful. It would be good for this to be linked to assessment strategies.
- Found the PD days very beneficial.
- Good to learn about other schools and what they are doing.
- I am confident with my current knowledge, experience and usage of oral language however I know I am not fully using all ideas and content given. There is still room for improvement and for embedding oral language in a variety of ways through all activities each day. What I'm doing is good but I need to do more and add more to my repertoire.
- I believe the program to be an excellent one and I look forward to using it next year in my role of Literacy Support in the 3-4 area.
- We are teaching oral language a lot more explicitly now and are beginning to see results
- I think the OLSEL project and objectives are very valuable. In the Prep room, we see first-hand the children with poor oral language skills and how much more difficult all other tasks are as a result.
- It is like building the foundations of a house .. oral language is the foundation of so much else.
- OLSEL has enriched our English planning and has provided rich experiences for oral language activities.
- We are more aware of the importance of oral language and ensure it is explicitly embedded in all aspects of our teaching and learning.
- There have been marked gains on some of our learners. We hope to move OLSEL into Grade 3&4 next year.
- It is early days and lots more water to go under the bridge yet!!
- Data was too slow coming and there was not enough feedback and direct contact with CEO staff.
- Many tasks .. had too short a timeline to enable effective implementation.
- A lot of the planning appeared to be on the run and there were a lot of mistakes in the resource folder.
- More examples of activities and how they work would be great.
- This year has provided good foundations for future whole school involvement in quality oral language planning and implementation.
- Program and PD have been very good. However, because of a busy timetable and other school commitments, it is very hard for teachers to concentrate on just one aspect of the curriculum. I have found it hard to get the teachers more on task and to work with the booklet.
- I appreciate being part of this research and learning.
- Great information. The in-service would be better ongoing with sessions held each term to refresh/update/ensure teachers are using program to utmost benefit in classrooms. This would also build confidence in using the program/language in everyday teaching practices.
- A fantastic project that has seen wonderful progress with the children and been an excellent learning tool for teachers.

2. Support Provided to Research Schools in 2009

CEO Staff involved in supporting the OLSEL Research Initiative were surveyed to gain insight regarding the level and nature of school based support that has been provided. Six responses were received at the time of this report being written with two further responses yet to be received.

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15+
Number of School Visits to Support OLSEL Implementation	3	1	1	1

	Weekly	Fortnightly	Monthly	Term
Frequency of Visits	-	2	1	3

Nature of School Based Support

	Frequency Reported
Discussion about OLSEL Teaching Strategies	4
Assistance with Professional Learning Planning	6
Assistance provided along with existing Literacy Support Initiative	2
Assistance with Data Analysis & Interpretation	2
Assistance with Parent Information Sessions	2
Classroom Modelling of OLSEL Teaching Strategies	1
Whole Staff Information Session	2

School Staff Supported

	Frequency Reported
OLSEL Coordinator	3
Literacy Coordinator	1
Principal	1
Class Teacher	1
Professional Learning Team	3
School-Based Speech Pathologist	1

As can be seen from a review of this data, there is marked variation in the level of ongoing support being provided ranging fortnightly (n = 2) to once a term (n = 3). This will need to be considered when comparing project outcomes on a school by school basis.

HUGH McCUSKER
OLSEL Research Project Officer

