

Promoting Environmental Conservation and Enhancing English Standard through Writing Study Reports

1. Attainment of objectives

(A) Students' improvement in writing and presentation skills

- a) To assess if Form 2 students have made improvement in their presentation skills, the oral marks of the First Term Test of all Form 3 students (The F.2 students of last year are in F.3 now.), the Yearly Examination (after the project) and the oral marks of the First Term Test (before the project) of all Form 2 students are compared.

Oral marks	2A	2B	2C	2D	2E	Mean score of the 5 classes
First Term Test (15/16) Full marks: 60 (before the project)	38	37	34.1	32.9	35.4	35.48
Yearly Exam (15/16) Full marks: 60 (after the project)	38.5	39.2	33.1	32.1	35	35.58
	3A	3B	3C	3D	3E	Mean score of the 5 classes
First Term Test (16/17) Full marks: 60 (after the project)	36.5	37.4	35.5	33.1	36.5	35.8

According to the oral marks obtained in 2015 – 16, more able classes (2A and 2B) made much progress in their oral performance and they managed to obtain higher marks after the project. However, the less able classes (2C – 2D) did not make much progress in their oral performance as shown by their class scores. The mean score of the 5 classes conducted after the project increased though it was not very big.

In 2016 – 2017, the F.2 students were re-shuffled into five classes so it is much fair to consider the mean score of the 5 classes instead of studying the performance of individual classes. It can be seen that the mean score of the 5 classes in the oral test was much higher than those of the First Term Test and the Yearly Exam conducted in 2015 – 2016 though it was not to a great extent.

- b) To assess if Form two students have made improvement in their writing skills, the writing marks of the First Term Test of all Form 3 students (The F.2 students of last

year are in F.3 now.), the Yearly Examination (after the project) and the writing marks of the First Term Test (before the project) of all Form 2 students are compared.

Writing marks	2A	2B	2C	2D	2E	Mean score of the 5 classes
Half-yearly Exam (15/16) Full marks: 100 (before the project)	55.8	55.7	53.9	46.3	48.3	52
Yearly Exam (15/16) Full marks: 100 (after the project)	54.4	54.7	50.5	47.9	47	51
	3A	3B	3C	3D	3E	Mean score of the 5 classes
First Term Test (16/17) Full marks: 100 (after the project)	54.9	55.7	54.3	46.9	51.9	52.7

The mean writing score of the F.3 students (The Form 2 students last year are in Form 3 now.) for the First Term Test was higher than those of the Half-yearly Exam and the Yearly Exam conducted in 2015 – 2016. This showed that students did make some improvement in their writing skills.

The less able students (for example, 3C and 3D) made more progress comparing their mean writing scores got in the above assessments. The reason was that this project gave them chances to write and read more reference materials.

**(B) Evaluation Form**

After the project, a survey was administered to study students' responses towards the trip, workshops and tutors.

	Part I Trip to the Hong Kong Wetland Park
1	75% of students enjoyed the trip to the Hong Kong Wetland Park.
2	83% of students have gained a better understanding of the Hong Kong Wetland Park through information collection.
3	71% of students claimed that trip had aroused their interest in environmental issues.
	Part II Workshops

1	79% of students agreed the presentation of the tutors was clear.
2	68% of students supported that the learning materials had familiarized themselves with the components of a study report.
3	75% of students agreed that they had learnt the skills to give oral and written presentations.

In general, Form 2 students had positive responses towards the trip, workshops and tutors.

2. Project impact on learning effectiveness, professional development and school development

(A) Enhancing students' abilities and broadening their horizons

Learning should go beyond the English language context, collaboration with the Geography Department allowed students to use and learn English in a purposeful context. Writing study reports, students learnt the components of a study report and with what they learnt on the trip to the Hong Kong Wetland Park, they integrated the Geography knowledge into the project.

To all F.2 students, the scale of the projects was quite big considering the amount of data collection and the survey done. Students were given the chances to break through their limits.

Through writing and presenting the study reports, students were given chances to formulate their own ideas and share them in class. During the workshops conducted on Saturdays and weekdays, students had more communication with the Native English-speaking tutors and their classmates through group work and discussion.

(B) Enhancing teachers' professional development

The speaking and writing assessment rubrics which were derived through discussion and meetings between the panels of English and Geography teachers were used in the project. It was agreed that the speaking and writing assessment rubrics could be used in the future.

Working along with the Native English-speaking teachers in the workshops, our school English and Geography teachers had exposure to more interactive teaching methods. School teachers were given opportunities to learn from each other.

It was agreed that similar trips could be organized in the future with some

modification to the learning materials that were used in this project.

(C) Inducing collaboration with other schools

During a sharing session conducted by Po Leung Kuk Schools in October 2015, this QEF project was shared by us with English teachers working at some other Po Leung Kuk schools. We would like to encourage more Po Leung Kuk teachers to apply for the Quality Education Fund and use our project design as a reference.

3. Cost-effectiveness – a self-evaluation against clear indicators and measures

Time Enterprises Company helped run the project and \$89,000 was needed. The amount of money received from Quality Education Fund was \$76,500. As the Moral and Civic Education (MCE) Department of the school would collaborate in the project, the remaining \$12,500 would be obtained from the MCE Department. There were no breakdown items.

4. Deliverables and modes of dissemination; responses to dissemination

**Dissemination Value of Project Deliverables**

Item description (e.g. type, title, quantity, etc.)	Evaluation of the quality and dissemination value of the item	Dissemination activities conducted (e.g. mode, date, etc.) and responses	Is it worthwhile and feasible for the item to be widely disseminated by the QEF? If yes, please suggest the mode(s) of dissemination.
Handbooks titled 'Environmental Conservation and Enhancing English Standard through Writing Study Reports'	The handbook includes some sample study reports conducted by those who had visited the Hong Kong Wetland Park. There are a number of reflection exercises for students to work on.	Distributed to 165 students and 7 teachers in the first workshop and had been used throughout the project. Our school teachers would adjust the materials and use them in the future.	If other schools would like to organize a field trip and teach students to write study reports, they could consider the handbooks we used.

The writing and speaking assessment rubrics derived by the English teachers.	They helped teachers assess students' writing and presentation skills.	The assessment rubrics were shared with the 5 classes of Form 2 students in the tenth workshop. With the assessment rubrics, students gained a clear idea of the aspects they had to pay attention to.	The assessment rubrics could be shared with teachers who are going to ask students to write study reports or projects.
--	--	--	--

The project was conducted successfully with positive feedback by students and teachers. It was agreed among the English, Geography and Moral and Civic Education Departments that we would conduct a similar trip and workshops a few years later. Time was needed to further modify the workshop materials by the English and Geography teachers.

#### 5. Activity List

Month	Content/ Activity	Attendees
2016		
22 Jan (Friday)	Introduction talk giving details of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- field trip to the Hong Kong Wetland Park and the workshops on writing and presenting study reports</li> <li>- reasons for organising this activity</li> <li>- areas of interest</li> <li>- basic assessment criteria (speaking and writing)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 classes of Form 2 students</li> <li>- 9 teachers (2 Geography teachers, 6 English teachers and a teaching assistant)</li> </ul>
27 Feb 12 Mar 19 Mar	6 workshops held on Saturday from 9:00 am – 12 noon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 classes of F.2 students</li> <li>- 5 NETs</li> <li>- 5 English teachers</li> <li>- 2 Geography teachers</li> <li>- 1 teaching assistant</li> </ul>
21 Apr (Thu) (2:00pm – 5:00pm)	An educational trip to the Hong Kong Wetland Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 classes of F.2 students</li> <li>- 5 NETs</li> <li>- 3 English teachers</li> <li>- 1 Geography teacher</li> <li>- 1 teaching assistant</li> </ul>
March - May	6 workshops conducted during the English or Geography lessons for each class <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 workshops on complying information and reporting progress</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 classes of F.2 students</li> <li>- 1 NET in charge of all the workshops</li> <li>- 5 English teachers</li> </ul>

	- 2 presentation workshops	- 1 Geography teacher
June	Collection of evaluation surveys	- 5 classes of F.2 students
October – November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Morning assemblies notifying students of the sharing of the study reports on the school webpage.</li> <li>- A selected list of students' PowerPoint Presentations and projects were uploaded to the school website/ School Profile/ Moral and Civic Education/ Activities 2016 - 2017</li> <li>- Self-reflection exercises on students' PowerPoint Presentations and Projects</li> </ul>	- F.1 – F.5 students

6. Difficulties encountered and solutions adopted

To organise the workshops on weekdays, arrangements of lessons were necessary. As one tutor was responsible for the workshops and double lessons must be used, special attention was needed to avoid time clash.

Some groups were not motivated enough to start collecting information at home earlier. Tutors and teachers had to remind and encourage them to do their tasks properly.

Lack of resources.

The amount of money needed for carrying out the project was \$89,000 but the amount applied from Quality Education Fund (QEF) was only \$76,500. There was a lack of funding. When writing the proposal, I didn't know how expensive the whole project cost. I just estimated the amount myself. Luckily, part of the budget of the Moral and Civic Education Department could be used to make up the difference. Next time when I am to write the proposal, I will take inflation into account and plan more thoroughly.