

BAR07196

Title: A tale of research design in an exceptional context: Evaluating the implementation of the National Accelerated Literacy Program in the Northern Territory

Author: Claire Bartlett

Contact Details: School for Social and Policy Research
Casuarina Campus, Charles Darwin University
DARWIN NT 0909
Phone: 08 8946 6838
Fax: 08 8946 7175
Email: Claire.bartlett@cdu.edu.au

Abstract

The Northern Territory is an exceptional educational context. While it is rich in geographical and cultural assets, its report card in terms of English literacy outcomes for Indigenous students is shocking.

The National Accelerated Literacy Program (NALP) aims to improve outcomes for students, particularly for marginalized Indigenous students, by raising English literacy levels using the Accelerated Literacy methodology. By the end of 2008 it is anticipated that the Accelerated Literacy Program will be implemented in 100 Northern Territory schools, with 700 teachers and 10,000 students participating.

Charles Darwin University (CDU) has been contracted by the Northern Territory Department of Employment, Education and Training (NT DEET) to evaluate the extent to which Accelerated Literacy professional development and support impact on Accelerated Literacy teaching methods and student outcomes in the Northern Territory.

This paper describes the exceptional educational context in which the evaluation is taking place, and explores the unique issues and potentially controversial questions about program, teacher and school effectiveness that evaluators have addressed in the research design. The simplicity of the data collection instruments, and in particular, the observation instruments being used in this evaluation belies this complexity.

Introduction

When the Charles Darwin University (CDU) National Accelerated Literacy Program (NALP) research team presented the final set of data collection instruments to stakeholders, the feedback confirmed that they had finally achieved their goal of making the complex simple. However, designing reliable and valid data collection instruments, while challenging and requiring much skill, is usually an unremarkable process. What makes this tale about the design of the data collection instruments so exceptional is the context in which the research is taking place and the myriad of complex and potentially controversial questions that have emerged.

I start this tale of research design by setting the scene and providing some background information about the implementation of the program in the Northern Territory. I then briefly highlight some of the issues which make the Northern Territory an exceptional educational context.

Next I provide an orientation to this tale, by discussing the Accelerated Literacy Program implementation efforts prior to the large scale roll out in the Northern Territory. I highlight the importance of gathering evidence of student progress when evaluating implementation efforts but also argue that a multifaceted, evidence based approach to the evaluation of the implementation of the National Accelerated Literacy Program is also necessary.

All good tales need a suspenseful complication and this tale is no different. In the next section I highlight the potentially controversial questions and key issues that arise in the National Accelerated Literacy Program implementation context in the Northern Territory. The key issues relate to effective literacy teaching and school and teacher effectiveness. Finally, I resolve this tale by discussing not only how these potentially controversial questions were addressed in the research design, but why they needed to be addressed. Moreover, this discussion demonstrates how the simplicity of the data collection instruments, and in particular, the observation instruments being used in this evaluation belies the complexity of the research design.

The Northern Territory: an exceptional educational context

Welcome to the Northern Territory! It is a unique place with a unique lifestyle. Geographically, the 1,346,200 square kilometres of Northern Territory landscape is unlike any other. It is rugged, spectacular and subject to some of the harshest weather conditions in the country. The Northern Territory is also culturally diverse and about one-third of the 207 000 Territorians are Indigenous (NT DEET, 2007). The Territory's unique landscape, lifestyle and cultural richness are the stuff that tourism marketing teams can only dream of.

Welcome to the Northern Territory, where the gulf between educational outcomes for Indigenous and non-Indigenous students is shocking. According to Storry (2007), 'in 2005, 39% of all Indigenous students achieved the literacy benchmarks in Year 3 and 5, and 36% did so in Year 7' (p. 6). However, in remote communities these

already shocking statistics drop markedly. Storry (2007) reports that, 'in 2004, only 20% of indigenous students achieved the benchmark in Year 3, and 21% in Year 5 (p. 6). These statistics were starkly put into perspective today as I listened to a 15 year old student struggle to read the transition text 'At the zoo'. As the statistics show, this is the norm rather than the exception, especially in remote schools. Improving the literacy outcomes for the 80% of Indigenous students whose literacy progress is below that of their non-Indigenous counterparts is the stuff that educators in the Northern Territory are still dreaming of.

Welcome to the Northern Territory, where the implementation of the National Accelerated Literacy program, the most ambitious roll out of a literacy program in the Northern Territory, is nearing the end of its third year. By the end of 2008 it is anticipated that 100 schools will be implementing the program, 700 teachers will be trained to teach the methodology and 10,000 students will be participating in the program. At the time of writing this paper 65 schools in the NT were in various phases of implementation.

Evidence based literacy programs in Indigenous contexts

Literacy programs, especially reading programs that have a proven track record with students are now an essential element of reform efforts (Guskey, 2003; Victorian Department of Education and Training, 2005). The Australian Commonwealth Government's National Inquiry into the Teaching of Literacy recommends that, 'teachers be equipped with strategies based on findings from rigorous, evidence

based research that are shown to be effective in enhancing the literacy development of all children' (DEST, 2005, p. 15). Storry (2007) reports that the Accelerated Literacy teaching methodology is one of only two evidence based literacy programs that have proven successful in an Indigenous context.

Additionally, Gray (2007) notes that prior to the implementation of the Scaffolding Literacy programme (the name used for the National Accelerated Literacy Program prior to 2004), no 'scientifically validated' programs that had proven success with Indigenous students existed (p. 2). Indeed, the evaluation of the Scaffolding Literacy Programme with Indigenous Children in Schools, conducted by the Australia Council for Educational Research noted that 'The University of Canberra maintains individual records for all students and can demonstrate that, under the influence of the Scaffolding Literacy Programme, the students are making progress above and beyond that which would normally be expected' (Cresswell, 2002, p. 4). This student assessment data also provided the evidence that was integral for the evaluation of the impact of the pedagogy on student outcomes in the 21 Western Australian, 1 Queensland and 12 South Australian schools that participated in the Scaffolding Literacy Program from 1999 – 2003 (Gray and Cowey, 2005). Moreover this evidence was the springboard for the Accelerated Literacy Project which piloted the Scaffolding Literacy Program in eight schools in the Northern Territory from 2001 – 2003. To be sure, this evidence was needed to attract the \$16 million in funding required for the large scale roll out of the National Accelerated Literacy Program in the Northern Territory from 2004 – 2008.

The research focus and participant selection

While it could appear, on the surface, that the National Accelerated Literacy Program is being hailed as a panacea, the program developers are careful to point out that the program is but one part of an interdependent system, which relies on accountability at all levels. This is especially critical if such a large scale roll out is to be effective (Gray & Cowey, 2005). This interdependent system is the focus of the evaluation.

The implementation of the National Accelerated Literacy program, and the extent to which Accelerated Literacy professional development and support have impacted on Accelerated Literacy teaching methods and in turn, student outcomes will be evaluated by exploring the following primary research questions:

1. What are the key theoretical principles of Accelerated Literacy and what are the strategies used by teachers at each stage of the teaching sequence?
2. Has the NALP implementation led to the teaching of Accelerated Literacy in participating schools? That is, do observed classroom teaching strategies accord with Accelerated Literacy teaching strategies described in the Accelerated Literacy professional development and program literature?
3. What are teachers', Accelerated Literacy school coordinators', principals' and NT DEET Accelerated Literacy specialists' opinions of the effectiveness of the Accelerated Literacy teaching strategies, professional development, resources and support?
4. What degree of literacy improvement is shown by students taught using Accelerated Literacy teaching strategies and does the degree of improvement

vary according to teaching methods as observed in the classroom and as reported by teachers?

In order to determine the impact of the program implementation on students' reading skills, pre and post assessment data from all participating students will be collected through the standard assessment protocols undertaken by the NT DEET Accelerated Literacy specialist bi annually. Student reading assessment data for this evaluation is in-line with existing program protocols, i.e. independent reading of standardised unseen texts (IL). Readers who demonstrate above 90% accuracy during IL assessment at year four and above will complete a Test of Reaching Comprehension (TORCH test).

Additionally, system wide student information such as Multilevel Assessment Program (MAP) reading assessment results (yrs 3, 5 and 7), student demographic information and attendance/enrolment records for all participating students will also be analysed to enable the research team to determine the extent that attendance impacts on student outcomes in Accelerated Literacy schools. Additionally, MAP data will be used to compare student literacy outcomes in Accelerated Literacy schools with those in non Accelerated Literacy schools in similar contexts.

Systematic observation of Accelerated Literacy lessons, an audit of systems and resources at the school level, standardised questionnaires and focus group interviews will provide empirically valid and reliable data from which to determine what conditions, if any, accelerated student literacy outcomes in the context of the

National Accelerated Literacy Program implementation in the Northern Territory.

What makes this evaluation unique is that it is an 'evidence' based evaluation of not only the impact of the program on student outcomes, but also the system's capacity to bring about large scale educational reform in a context of endemic failure.

Moreover, not only is it essential to ensure that a rigorous evidence base underpins data collection and analysis¹, but also that sample sizes are large enough to justify any claims that are made regarding data. Furthermore, evidence needs to be gathered in a range of contexts (Guskey, 2006, p. 5). Therefore, the evaluation targeted 10% or approximately 70 teachers in 35-40 schools for observation of teaching practices and participation in focus group interview and survey questionnaire. Subject to advice of the NT DEET Accelerated Literacy team, all schools were informed of the evaluation and invited to participate; teachers at participating schools were then invited to nominate for the observation of practices. During the site visits, two CDU researchers are spending one week in each school.

A snapshot of the literature and the issues that underpin the research design

In this section I highlight some relevant issues and complex questions that have arisen from the literature and the National Accelerated Literacy Program implementation in the Northern Territory and discuss why these need to be explored as part of the evaluation. These issues relate to: the similarities and differences between Accelerated Literacy teaching methods and conventional teaching methods,

¹ Issues of validity and reliability are addressed in the methodology section of the interim report (to be published in early 2008).

as well as school and teacher effectiveness research. I then make links between these issues and the research design to demonstrate how the data collection instruments enable us to gather evidence to answer these complex and potentially controversial questions.

Accelerated Literacy is different to conventional literacy teaching methods

The National Accelerated Literacy Program was specifically developed to accelerate the literacy progress of students, in particular, Indigenous students, who are at least two years behind national benchmarks (Gray and Cowey, 2005). According to Gray and Cowey (2005) these students are not achieving literacy success because 'conventional practice has failed' and as such, students are marginalized from the academic literate discourse of the school (p. 5). Accelerated Literacy is an 'inclusive and academically focused' teaching methodology which is underpinned by 'different presumptions about learning literate discourse' (Gray and Cowey, 2005, p. 5).

Moreover, the theory of scaffolding that underpins the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence is different to that espoused in conventional approaches to the teaching of literacy². The aim of scaffolding in the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence is to orient students to the academic literate discourse of the text in order to develop common knowledge and handover of the academic literate discourse, and ultimately, inter subjectivity with each other and the text.

² See Emmett (in press) 'Two Literacy Research Projects' for a discussion about the different pedagogical approaches.

The teaching methodology is enacted through a highly supportive, recursive teaching sequence. Each stage of the Accelerated Literacy teaching and learning sequence is staged so that 'the tutor' (Bruner, 1986) can lend their consciousness to students through the use of highly supportive and inclusive strategies. This enables students to access the academic literate discourse of narrative texts. Vygotsky's theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (Bruner, 1986; Gray, 2007) is also used as a strategy for accessing academic literate discourse within the teaching sequence, as this enables students to be supported to read age appropriate texts which may otherwise be beyond their reach³.

There were two main issues and challenges that researchers needed to address when developing the observation instruments. Firstly, in order to answer the question, *'Does effective implementation of the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence lead to improved student outcomes?'* we needed to design an instrument with variables that accurately and systematically reflected the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence Strategies. This was a challenge because we needed to determine the strategies a teacher could use at each stage of the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence and develop benchmarks to describe what these strategies could look like in practice.

This observation instrument was called the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence Strategies Observation Record (ALSSOR) and was developed after a review of the Accelerated Literacy literature, extensive consultation with the Accelerated Literacy

³ See Cowey 2005 and www.nalp.edu.au for more information about the AL methodology and teaching sequence strategies.

professional learning manager and NT DEET Accelerated Literacy specialist staff, as well as extensive testing and piloting.

Secondly, we also needed to answer the more complex question, *'Is effective literacy teaching, or effective teaching (rather than the Accelerated Literacy teaching sequence strategies) producing improved student outcomes?* The researchers developed two observation instruments to enable them to clearly distinguish between Accelerated Literacy Sequence Strategies and effective literacy teaching practices and in turn, ascertain if the teaching practices implemented by teachers during an Accelerated Literacy lesson were different or similar to other literacy approaches.

To do this, the researchers utilized an existing observation tool (Louden & Rohl, 2003) to systematically observe general effective literacy teaching practices. This was chosen because it was found to be empirically reliable and was based on an extensive review of three bodies of research: effective teachers of reading / literacy, effective teachers of literacy / early literacy and effective teachers. Furthermore, it included a range of teaching dimensions which were evident (to varying degrees) in all classrooms in the study, regardless of the teaching quality, approach or activity. In order to clearly distinguish the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence Strategies from general literacy teaching practices, the Classroom Literacy Observation Schedule (CLOS) was renamed the Teaching Practices Observation Record (TPOR).

The systematic observation of both the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence Strategies and general literacy teaching practices is crucial for this evaluation. It is

only when researchers are armed with evidence about both the strategies (what teachers do) and practices (how teachers do it) employed in the sample of Accelerated Literacy classrooms that researchers can begin to understand if the implementation of the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence Strategies has impacted student outcomes, or if it is just 'good teaching.'

Teacher and school effectiveness

Accelerated Literacy is implemented across the whole school and while most participating schools have sought out, and eagerly embraced the program there are some instances where implementation of the program has been mandated either at the departmental level or school level. As a consequence, the program may not fully supported by all staff at all levels.

Because unconventional theories about literacy learning underpin the Accelerated Literacy methodology teachers need to undergo a transformation in their thinking about teaching and learning to effectively implement the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence. Such a transformation is both pedagogical and attitudinal. The pedagogical changes have already been discussed, but attitudinal changes are implicit in this as a commitment to the implementation of Accelerated Literacy requires high expectations and accountability at all levels.

Lea (2007) highlights some of the attitudinal transformations that are required when teachers take up the Accelerated Literacy challenge and states, 'AL challenges a

range of sympathetic ethnological clichés that abound in education which assert that aboriginal kids to not learn at the same rate as others, either because of their cultural specificity or their disadvantaged starting position. Even sophisticated cognitive attributes, such as multilingualism... is proffered as a deficit...' (p. 2). Accelerated Literacy methodology challenges such deficit thinking. Indeed, it would be impossible to effectively implement the Teaching Sequence if such views existed.

To add to this complexity, school reform is a slow process and it can take teachers at least one year, and possibly two years to develop expertise implementing the Accelerated Literacy Teaching Sequence Strategies. This can be a challenging and difficult process for even the most experienced and committed practitioner and requires commitment to intensive ongoing professional learning at all school levels (NT DEET, 2007). Additionally, it can take up to three years to see any significant improvement in student outcomes across the whole school (Guskey, 2006, p. 4; NT DEET, 2007). This is not surprising, given the level of change required at all levels of the system for the program to be effectively implemented. However, such a delay in seeing 'evidence' of improved student outcomes can only further compound the fears of teachers who are not fully convinced of the program's effectiveness.

This presents a catch 22 scenario as, according to Guskey (2006), teachers need to see some evidence of student success or improvement within the first few months of implementation of a new program or strategy in order to maintain the commitment needed to sustain such change. Teachers who are not fully convinced of the effectiveness of Accelerated Literacy methodology, and who see little evidence of

student progress in the first few months, can easily throw their hands up in despair and relegate the program to the scrap heap, already littered with many other ill fated programs that 'do not work'. In the face of perceived 'failure', ethnological clichés may also resurface and breed more deficit thinking.

However, this deficit thinking is damaging and dangerous as it removes school and teacher accountability from the picture. According to Hill (2001), 'schools and teachers can and do make a difference, and that consistent, high-quality classroom teaching can deliver dramatic improvements in student learning...it is not so much what students bring with them but what they experience on a day-to-day basis in classrooms that really matters' (pp. 7-8). Moreover, Hill's (2001) claims are supported by research which found that individual teachers had a greatest impact on student performance than schools. The impact of a school on student performance is between 7 and 20% and the variation of teachers in individual classes is between 38 and 55% (p. 6).

Throughout this paper I have emphasized the interrelated nature of the roll out of the National Accelerated Literacy Program and it is important to re-iterate the need for accountability and commitment at all levels of the system, not just the teacher level. Although effective teaching is at the heart of reform efforts (Gray, 2007; Guskey, 2006, Lea, 2007) effective teaching alone cannot be relied upon to bring about the level of change required for large scale system wide program implementation. Hawley and Valli (1999) highlight the impact of school conditions on teacher effectiveness and suggest:

‘Improving teacher capabilities without changing the conditions that influence the opportunities to use these capabilities is often counter-productive. These conditions include time and opportunities to try new practices, adequate funding, technical assistance and sustained follow through. Thus, unless professional development is designed as part of a larger change process, it is not likely to be effective’ (p. 15).

In Accelerated Literacy schools where the program implementation, and in turn, professional learning is not fully supported at all levels (teacher, school and departmental) this change process is likely to be extremely difficult, if not impossible. One reason for this is that teachers developing Accelerated Literacy expertise require intensive, ongoing, in school support. In small, remote schools it can be a challenge to provide the time, funding and adequate expertise required to facilitate the necessary conditions for effective professional learning described by Hawley and Valli (1999).

To address this issue, the Northern Territory Department of Employment and Education have recruited a team of Accelerated Literacy specialists to provide Accelerated Literacy professional development training and to support the implementation of the program at the school level. Accelerated Literacy schools are visited by the NT DEET Accelerated Literacy Specialist for approximately one week per term⁴. Anecdotally, the in school professional support provided by this team has been lauded by an overwhelming majority of teachers in schools visited by the research team. However, this type of support is resource intensive and difficult to sustain as the program expands.

⁴ See Bartlett, C. (in press) ‘Sustaining professional development in Northern Territory schools’ for more information.

Effective school leadership is crucial for the effective implementation of professional development and in turn, effective teacher practice and student outcomes (Hill, 2001; Hill and Crevola 1997; Meiers and Ingvarson, 2005; Victorian Education Department, 2005). In cases where the program has been mandated, and where it is not uncommon for a school to have two or three principals in a year, there is the potential for the program to be viewed as an unwanted inheritance. This further compounds the already challenging implementation context as the conditions to facilitate ongoing, in school professional development are less likely to be evident in schools where leaders are not fully supportive of the program.

This raises a myriad of potentially controversial questions about teacher effectiveness, the impact of school leadership and departmental level support, as well as accountability, on the effective implementation of the National Accelerated Literacy Program. For example, to what extent do teacher attitudes, expectations and commitment impact on teacher capacity to implement the program effectively? To what extent does a positive school culture where high expectations and accountability are the norm impact on effective implementation of the program? What school level conditions lead to improved student outcomes? Why is Accelerated Literacy methodology being implemented effectively in some contexts and not in others? To what extent does system wide and school level professional learning and support impact on teacher's capacity to implement the program?

In order to gather data to answer these questions about teacher and school effectiveness, all teachers in the school being visited will be invited to participate in a

one hour focus group interview. The focus group interview will explore teacher attitudes and opinions of Accelerated Literacy teaching methods, professional development and support. Survey questionnaires will be completed by teachers after the focus group interview. These explore individual responses to standardised items that may or may not also arise during the focus group. In the cases of observed teachers, the questionnaire data will be linked to the observation data and student outcomes data. All teachers and Accelerated Literacy school based coordinators in schools not visited by the research team will complete an online survey questionnaire. In addition, principals and the NT DEET Accelerated Literacy team will be invited to participate in a profession specific focus group interview and complete the survey questionnaire during this time.

Conclusion: summing up the remarkable context

These complex issues and the potentially controversial questions are not new to either Indigenous education in the Northern Territory, or mainstream literacy education for that matter. Furthermore, the current reform climate has placed the spotlight on teacher and school effectiveness, along with the importance of scientifically validated literacy programs. Never has there been a time when teachers and schools have been more accountable.

The purpose of highlighting the exceptional circumstances in which the evaluation of the National Accelerated Literacy Program is being implemented in the Northern Territory is not to attribute blame or to paint a deficit view of efforts to improve


English literacy for Indigenous students, but to highlight the reality of the challenging situation that confronts students, parents, teachers, schools and departmental bureaucrats on a daily basis.

The evaluation of the National Accelerated Literacy Program must focus on providing evidence of student outcomes as that is what bureaucrats want, and after all, if there is no evidence of improved student outcomes, then why implement the program on a large scale? However, not only is it necessary to prove or disprove the validity of the program, it is also necessary to evaluate all parts of the system. It is only then that improving can occur. Moreover, doing so prevents the program as being viewed as a panacea for entrenched failure. It also enables us to understand the impact of each part of this complex, and interdependent system so we can understand not only if the program 'works' but also why, when and how it 'works'. It is only when the complexity of these sometimes confronting issues is understood that questions can be asked and answers can be provided. The evaluation of the implementation of the National Accelerated Literacy Program in the Northern Territory was designed to address these issues and answer these questions. The research design belies this complexity.

Appendix – Example Data Collection Instruments

Example Accelerated Literacy Sequence Strategies Observation Record:

Example of observation instrument



nalp
National Accelerated Literacy Program
www.nalp.edu.au


Low Order Literate Orientation (focus on language and content)			
• Did the teacher clearly explain the lesson purpose or lesson goal?	0	1	2
• Did the teacher clearly explain the learning goal for low order?	0	1	2

High Order Literate Orientation (focus on wording of the text)			
• Did the teacher ensure all students could see the book / text?	0	1	2
• Did the teacher examine the wording of the text to demonstrate the author's writing techniques?	0	1	2

The National Accelerated Literacy Program is jointly funded by the Australian Government through the Department of Education, Science and Training, and the Northern Territory Government through the Department of Employment, Education and Training, and supported by Charles Darwin University.

Example Teacher Practice Observation Record:

Example of observation instrument



nalp
National Accelerated Literacy Program
www.nalp.edu.au

Key: 0 = Never 1= Sometimes 2 = Always		1	2	3
Orchestration	Awareness The teacher has a high level of awareness of literacy activities and participation by children			
	Structure The environment is predictable and orderly			
	Flexibility The teacher responds to learning opportunities that arise in the flow of literacy lessons			
	Pace The teacher provides strong forward momentum in literacy lessons			

The National Accelerated Literacy Program is jointly funded by the Australian Government through the Department of Education, Science and Training, and the Northern Territory Government through the Department of Employment, Education and Training, and supported by Charles Darwin University.


Example teacher focus group interview questions:

Example focus group interview questions:

- How is professional development organised for your school? Do you have an opportunity to attend this?
- What do you like best about the PD sessions that you attend?
- Think back to when you are in your school working with students. What things help you to do this well? What things make this difficult?

Example survey questionnaire:

Example of questionnaire



National Accelerated Literacy Program
www.nalp.edu.au

Accelerated Literacy Professional Development and ongoing support has provided me with the skills and knowledge to:	SA	A	N	D	SD
understand the theory behind AL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
confidently plan each stage of the AL teaching sequence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
understand the purpose of each stage of the AL sequence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
confidently teach each stage of the AL teaching sequence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
identify and explain a range of literary techniques used by authors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
scaffold students' learning through highly supportive interaction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
manage my students through the use of inclusive strategies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
understand AL assessment procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
manage student assessment data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The National Accelerated Literacy Program is jointly funded by the Australian Government through the Department of Education, Science and Training, and the Northern Territory Government through the Department of Employment, Education and Training, and supported by Charles Darwin University.

Example audit questions:

Example audit questions:

- Whole school approach with AL prioritised (single literacy focus)
- Literacy / Numeracy plan and the Action plan for school improvement
- A minimum of one and a half hours a day allocated to literacy teaching using AL by each classroom teacher.

Bibliography

Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Commonwealth Department of Education. (2005). *National inquiry into the teaching of reading: report and recommendations*. Canberra: Commonwealth Government Department of Education, Science and Training.

Cowey, W. (2005). ACTA background paper: a brief description of the National Accelerated Literacy Program. *TESOL in Context* 15(2).

Department of Education and Training. (2005). *Professional learning in effective schools: The seven principles of highly effective learning*. Melbourne: Office of School Education.

Gray, B. (2007). *Accelerating the literacy development of Indigenous students*. Darwin, NT: Charles Darwin University.

Gray, B. and Cowey, W. (2005). *Key Elements of Scaffolding Literacy: Pedagogy and Teacher Support*. Reading Online

<http://www.canberra.edu.au/centres/schools-community/literacy-research>

Gray, B. and Cowey, W. (2005). *The Scaffolding Literacy in Indigenous Schools Project, 1999-2003*. Reading Online

<http://www.canberra.edu.au/centres/schools-community/literacy-research>

Guskey, T. (2006). A conversation with Thomas R. Guskey. *The evaluation exchange*, XI(4), (12-13). Reading Online

<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/content/eval/issue32/winter2005-2006.pdf>

Guskey, T. R. (2003). The characteristics of effective professional development: A synthesis of lists. Paper presented at the 84th annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 21-23.

Hawley, W. & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In Darling-Hammond, L. & Sykes, G. (eds). *Teaching as the learning profession: handbook of teaching and policy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hill, P. (2001). *Teaching and school effectiveness: perspectives on education*.

Department of Education and Training. Victoria: State Government of Victoria.

Lea, T. (2007, November 3). Accelerated literacy path tackles profound issues, and it works. *The weekend Australian*. Reading Online

<http://www.cdu.edu.au/sspr/documents/tessaaustralian05.11.07.pdf>

Louden, W. and Rohl, M. (2003). *Classroom Literacy Observation Schedule*. Western Australia: Edith Cowan University.

Louden, W., Rohl, M., Barratt-Pugh, C., Brown, C., Cairney, T., Elderfield, J., House, H., Meiers, M., Rivalland, J., Rowe, K. (2005). In teacher's hands: Effective literacy teaching practices in the early years of schooling. Western Australia: Edith Cowan University.

Meiers, M., & Ingvarson, L., (2005). [Investigating the links between teacher professional development and student learning outcomes](#). Commonwealth Department of Education Australian Council for Educational Research. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Northern Territory Department of Employment Education and Training. (2007). Department of Employment Education and Training Participation and Service Model 2007 for NT schools. Department of Employment, Education and Training: Northern Territory Government.

Northern Territory Department of Employment Education and Training (2007). (2007). Teaching in the Northern Territory. Reading Online <http://www.teaching.nt.gov.au/>.

Storry, K. (2007). What is working in good schools in remote indigenous communities? St Leonards, NSW: The Centre for Independent Studies.