Creating Hopes and Dreams Through Excellence
Creating

The choice of the word "creating" is significant to our fundamental beliefs as a Catholic community. Genesis 1.1 reads, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth", and in Genesis 1.27, "God created man in His image; in the divine image He created him; male and female He created them." The inclusion of the word "creating" is a reflection that everything comes from God, and that in His great love man and woman were created. "Creating" connects us to our roots; in the same way God created life, we are creating hopes and dreams for our staff and students.

Hopes and Dreams

Every individual has established a unique set of hopes and dreams. It is these individual hopes and dreams that make us different, but we are all connected because we all possess these aspirations.

Hope is one of the three theological virtues and it allows us to believe in the promised blessings of God. Hope sustains us through the trials that arise in our lives. It is the vision of the Sudbury Catholic District School Board that individuals involved in Catholic education will feel a sense of hope in their lives and will be inspired to a life of faith.

A dream is a vivid ambition and a cherished desire. Our dreams define us as individuals and allow us to be better people. We are encouraged by God to follow our dreams, because in pursuing these aspirations we use our gifts to bring hope and beauty into the world. Every parent has dreams for his or her child, and every child has dreams for himself. At the Sudbury Catholic District School Board, we create dreams for every individual and strive to nurture those dreams.

Excellence

Every individual is capable of achieving excellence. Excellence is the act of emanating virtuous qualities and performing positive actions at every possible opportunity. Every individual has his own definition of excellence, whether it applies to academics, athletics, or character. We have achieved excellence when we live up to personal standards and are satisfied with the purity and goodness of our actions.
Sudbury Catholic Schools Priorities 2010-2011

Sudbury Catholic District School Board is proud of our Catholic faith and traditions. The Gospel values of Jesus Christ permeate every aspect of our daily school life including the curriculum, assessments, instructional approaches and teacher and student resources. In all we do, we strive to provide the best in education through teachings revealed by the gospel.

Our Catholic schools are authentic communities of faith celebrating God's love through daily prayer and witnessing to the gospel values. Our schools enter into a partnership with our parishes and our families to ensure that our children experience education embedded with religious values preparing them for their journey of faith through life.

Christ centered character formation in our schools is supported and witnessed through:

* Special Education philosophy that recognizes the dignity and rights of all students
* Cultivating diverse opportunities and programming for students success
* Outreach programs within the local community as well as the broader community
* Religion and Family Life Curricula
* Secondary School Chaplaincy Lead and Elementary Faith Leads
* Promote parish/community/school Sacred Celebrations

**Strategic Commitments:**

✦ We are called to live a culture of Catholic Faith and Community
✦ We are called to live a culture of learning for all
✦ We are called to live a culture of respectful relationships.
✦ We are called to live a culture of communication
✦ We are called to live a culture of technology
✦ We are called to live a culture of stewardship in the use of resources
Sudbury Catholic District School Board is investing in Technology to support the achievement of all its learners by:

- Providing our students with the tools and resources to develop the skills necessary to be proficient communicators and problem solvers
- Empowering our teachers to effectively integrate technology in the classroom
- Supporting and embedding the effective use of technology in our schools through committed leadership and continuous improvement
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

EQAO (primary and junior assessment)

Grade 3:
In Reading, over the past 5 years, our grade 3 students have been at or above provincial standard at 51% -56%-57%-58% and last year at 55%.
In Writing, over the past 5 years, our grade 3 students have been at or above provincial standard at 49%-53%-58%-69% and last year at 66%.
Although our overall results have shown some growth over time in reading, we seem to be somewhat stagnant.

In 2010, the profile of strengths and areas for improvement for reading showed that our grade 3 students demonstrated:
- a strength in reading for meaning at 56%
- a strength in understanding implicitly stated information and ideas (making inferences) at 60%
- a strength in making connections at 59%
- a strength in understanding form and style at 57%
- a strength in reading with fluency at 61%

It seems that our students are also at a level 2 in all these skill areas.

The results of our grade 3 EQAO also demonstrates that approximately 1/3 of our students are achieving at Level 2. (total students 391)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3 Reading</th>
<th>Grade 3 Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 – 11 students or 3%</td>
<td>Level 4 – 7 students or 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 – 204 students or 52%</td>
<td>Level 3 – 250 students or 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 – 112 students or 29%</td>
<td>Level 2 – 123 students or 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 – 31 students or 8%</td>
<td>Level 1 – 0 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI – 12 students or 3%</td>
<td>NEI – 0 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt – 21 students or 5%</td>
<td>Exempt – 11 students or 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade 6:
In Reading, over the past 5 years, our grade 6 students have been at or above provincial standard at 66%-68%-75%-74% and last year at 65%.
In Writing, over the past 5 years, our grade 3 students have been at or above provincial standard at 58%-58%-69%-69% and last year at 65%.
Although our overall results have shown some growth over time in reading, we seem to be somewhat stagnant.
In 2010, the profile of strengths and areas for improvement showed that our grade 6 students demonstrated:
- a strength in reading for meaning at 68%
- a strength in understanding implicitly stated information and ideas (making inferences) at 71%
- a strength in making connections at 67%
- a strength in understanding form and style at 70%
- a strength in reading with fluency at 72%

These results are higher for our grade 6 students than our grade 3 students.

It seems that our students are also at a level 2 in all these skill areas.

The results of our grade 6 EQAO also demonstrate that approximately 1/3 of our students are achieving at Level 2. (total 495 students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 6 Reading</th>
<th>Grade 6 Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 – 30 students or 6%</td>
<td>Level 4 – 31 students or 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 – 290 students or 59%</td>
<td>Level 3 – 293 students or 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 – 129 students or 26%</td>
<td>Level 2 – 149 students or 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 – 24 students or 5%</td>
<td>Level 1 – 1 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE1 – 1 student or &lt;1%</td>
<td>NEI – 0 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt – 21 students or 4%</td>
<td>Exempt – 21 students or 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of exemptions has demonstrated a need to examine how we are accommodating for our students with special needs.

### Student Questionnaire:

#### Grade 3:
- Reading outside of school: 42% read stories almost every day whereas 51% never read emails, text or instance messages
- Out of school activities: 53% read, 46% participate in sport, 43% play video games, 42% use the Internet whereas 7% never read, 75% never participate in after-school clubs and 27% never participate in art, dance or music.
- Screen Time: 61% watch up to 4 programs or more after school

#### Grade 6:
- Reading outside of school: 37% read stories almost every day whereas 18% never read emails, text or instance messages
- Out of school activities: 49% read, 52% participate in sport, 26% play video games, 57% use the Internet whereas 5% never read, 59% never participate in after-school clubs and 32% never participate in art, dance or music.
- Screen Time: 20% watch about 3 hours of TV after school but 57% say they watch about half an hour. 42% never play video games but 42% do so for about ½ hour

#### Gender:
- We have reduced the gender gap in grade 3 reading, from 22% 5 years ago to 8% last year. In writing the gap was 25% and last year it was 10%. In both areas, girls outperform the boys. In math, the gap is quite narrow at 3% where girls performance is higher than the boys.
- However, the gender gap in grade 6 is more significant. In reading it has remained around 13% in favor of girls. In writing, the gap is at 20%. However, in math, the gap is
These results indicate that we need to focus on reading/writing skills for our junior boys.

**DRA (Development Reading Assessment)**

**Primary DRA(GB+) June 2010**
The average primary (1-3) level of achievement scores have been 44% to 62% and last year at 44%

Grade 1 student results over time in achievement level have been 40% to 62% and last year at 44%. (34% in GB+ for FI students)
Grade 2 student results over time in achievement level have been 39% to 62% and last year at 42%. (47% in GB+ for FI students)
Grade 3 student results over time in achievement level have been 36% to 66% and last year at 55%. (56% in GB+ for FI students)

There are less than half our primary students who demonstrate reading comprehension at grade level as measured by DRA. Reading comprehension requires students to read for meaning (O.E. 1) using a variety of higher order skills which are reflective of the overall expectation of reading for meaning. (O.E. 1): read and demonstrate an understanding of a variety of literary, graphic, and informational texts, using a range of strategies to construct meaning

**Junior DRA:**
Our Junior student’s ability to demonstrate reading comprehension as measured by DRA, have declined over the past three years.
The average DRA scores have gone from 60% to 51% and last year at 33% of our junior students demonstrating reading comprehension at grade level.

Grade 4 results over time go from 57% to 51% and last year at 37% for our student’s ability to demonstrate grade level reading comprehension. (36% for FI)
Grade 5 results over time go from 64% to 48% to 28% of our students achieving grade level reading comprehension. (20% for FI)
Grade 6 results over time are from 56% to 36% of our students achieving grade level reading comprehension. (32% for FI)

There is a significant need for our students to demonstrate reading comprehension as is reflected in overall expectation #1 in the language curriculum which states ath students must be able to read and demonstrate an understanding of a variety of literacy, graphic and informational texts, using a range of strategies to construct meaning.

**Intermediate DRA:**
In grade 7, there are 30% of our students demonstrating grade level reading comprehension. (24% for our French Immersion students)
In grade 8, there are 38% of our students demonstrating grade level reading comprehension. (13% for our French Immersion students)

DRA benchmark comprehension scores indicate a 15-25% decrease from grades 4-8 from June 2009 to June 2010.

**Early Identification assessments:**
Note: Although the data reflects healthy board averages, there are schools that have significant needs in these areas. These needs must be addressed at the school level with a focussed intervention strategy.
In grade 9-12, we measure our student’s reading ability using a reading comprehension question taken directly from the OSSLT non fiction text. It is scored using a rubric of level 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 9</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 10</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohort data indicates that grade 9 students in 2008-2009 achieved at 65% whereas the same group in grade 10 in 2009-2010 achieved at 51%. This is a decline of 15% from grade 9 to grade 10 for the same cohort group.

**OSSLT (2010)**

**First time eligible:**
Of the first time eligible students, there were 78% who were successful, 15% were not successful, 2% were absent and 5% were deferred.
Of the successful students, there were 82% girls and 69% boys. Of the not successful students, there were 18% boys and 20% girls.
Of the special education students, there were 49% who were successful and 23% who were not successful.
Of the special education students with IEP and IPRC, receiving accommodations, there were 58% successful and 37% not successful (60 students).
Academic English students: 90% successful and 7% not successful
Applied English students: 47% successful and 38% not successful
Over time: Successful 83% - 77% - 77%-75% -76%
Over time: Not successful 10% - 9% -9% -12% -14%

**Fully Participating First time Eligible:**
For the fully participating first time eligible students, there were 84% successful and 16% not successful.
Of the successful students, there were 89% females and 80% males. Of the not successful students, there were 11% girls and 20% boys.
Of the special education students, there 68% successful and 32% not succesful.
Of the special education students with IEP and IPRC, there 61% succesful and 39% not successful (57 students)
Academic English students: 93% successful and 7% unsuccesful (369 students)
Applied English students: 55% successful and 45% unsuccessful (102 students)

**OSSLT Student questionnaire**
Types of materials read outside of school: 92% said web sites, e-mail and chat, 66% magazine and 58% short novels, 32% non fiction
Types of writing outside of school: 96% emails, chat, 47% work related, 43% notes, directions, instruction, 32% letter, diaries
Student who read outside of school/homework: 31% do so one hour or less and only 18% so do more than 3 hours
Computer us at home for homework: 39% use computer once or twice a week, 24% almost every day, 11% hardly ever and 2% (8 students) don’t have a computer

**SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS FRAMEWORK:** Assessment for, as and of learning

1.1 Students and teachers share a common understanding of the learning goals and the related success criteria.
1.2 During learning, students receive on-going, descriptive feedback based on the success criteria from the teacher and from peers.
1.3 Assessment tasks are aligned with the curriculum, collaboratively developed by teachers and the resulting demonstrations of student learning analyzed to ensure consistency with success criteria.
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Board Improvement Plan for Literacy Achievement (K to 12)
Draft as of: Sunday, October 5th, 2010

SMART GOALS

**Long-term SMART goal:** Our students will demonstrate a 7% increase in primary, junior reading scores as measured through the 2011 EQAO and a 4% increase in grade 10 (intermediate) OSSLT provincial assessments, which will be achieved by focusing on cross-curricular Reading For Meaning Using Non-Fiction Texts.

EQAO Primary Reading from 55% (2010) to 62% for 2011.
- Junior – Reading from 65% (2010) to 72% for 2011.
- Intermediate OSSLT – first time 78% successful to 82% for 2011

Reading For Meaning, Overall Expectation #1(K to 12): Students will read and demonstrate an understanding of a variety of literary, graphic, and informational texts, using a range of strategies to construct meaning. Focus on specific expectations 1.4 through 1.9 (Demonstrate understanding, making inferences, extend understanding by making connections, analyse texts, respond and evaluate texts and point of view)

**Short-term SMART goal:** In January 2011, our elementary students will demonstrate an increase of 12% in achievement level as measured by the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) using a non-fiction text. Currently our grade 1 to 8 students are successful below 50%.

The two cycles of ‘Teaching-Learning Critical Pathway’ (TLCP) inquiry model will show an increase of students attaining level 3 and 4. Individual school data will also show a decrease in students attaining level 1 and 2 and in increase in level 3 and 4.

In January 2011 and in May 2011, our grade 9 and 10 English students will demonstrate an increase of 7% as measured by the ‘Reading Comprehension Task’. Currently our grade 9 students are successful at 57% in the first semester and 59% in the second semester. Our grade 10 students are successful at 39% in first semester and 70% in second semester.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETED EVIDENCE BASED STRATEGIES</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL LEARNING</th>
<th>MONITORING AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SMART GOALS</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEVEMENTARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. TLCP:</strong> Teaching and Learning Critical Pathway (Elementary) and Learning Cycles (secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the goal should take place throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on non-fiction texts and reading with meaning strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- In elementary classes, monthly running record data and achievement is to be collected and analyzed by school staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Literacy during the pathway process with a significant focus on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- In elementary, DRA administration must be completed beginning in Dec and finished by Jan 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOR 4 TO 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In elementary, the first TLCP will focus on the goal. A report will be prepared by the school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Read/Aloud and Think Aloud</td>
<td>Catholic Graduate Expectations</td>
<td>- School-based focus area with TLCP is to be reading for meaning using non-fiction texts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shared Reading</td>
<td>EQAO Anchors and Scoring Guides</td>
<td>-System wide professional learning in the focus areas during hubs and networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOR K TO 3</strong></td>
<td>Ministry Resources: Ontario Curriculum K – 12 Education for All Guides to Effective Instruction</td>
<td>-School based job-embedded PD to address TLCP and learning cycle needs provided by consultants, literacy coaches and principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Guided Reading</td>
<td>Web Resources: <a href="http://www.curriculum.org">www.curriculum.org</a> <a href="http://www.eworkshop.on.ca">www.eworkshop.on.ca</a> <a href="http://www.edugaines.ca">www.edugaines.ca</a> <a href="http://resources.elearningontari">http://resources.elearningontari</a> o.ca/</td>
<td>-Academic services to support literacy coaches in the administration of DRA and in the focus area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Independent Reading</td>
<td>LNS Resources: Web cast: Effective Instruction in Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>-Academic services to work directly with schools throughout their TLCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video on Demand: Shared Reading; Continuing the Conversation</td>
<td>-Academic services to work directly with struggling schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>-School in the Middle (SIM) to participate in professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Improvement Plan</td>
<td>In elementary, ‘Reading Comp Task’ must be administered at the end of each semester, the data collected and analyzed by staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- By end of October School Improvement Team to embed these strategies into the School Improvement Plan, as determined by needs assessment and data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Principal to forward SIP to academic superintendent</td>
<td>-The goal must be evaluated at every reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-SIT and Principal to develop ‘data analysis template’ and submit to superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Superintendent to discuss and monitor goal through school visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>During TLCP/Learning Cycles</strong></td>
<td>-Principal and staff will monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers to deconstruct curriculum expectations and create learning goals that are clearly articulated in their planning and to their students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs/Resources:</td>
<td>Professional Resources:</td>
<td>Non-Fiction Resources:</td>
<td>People Resources:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Literacy Place</td>
<td>Reading with Meaning – Debbie Miller</td>
<td>Skywriter</td>
<td>LST, Resource Teachers, Secondary Literacy Leads, Literacy Coaches, Itinerate Resource Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Létératie en Action</td>
<td>Nonfiction Matters Reading, Writing, and Research in Grades 3-8 – Stephanie Harvey</td>
<td>Zenith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Vol Littératie</td>
<td>7 Keys to Comprehension – Susan Zimmermann &amp; Chryse Hutchins</td>
<td>Let’s Talk About It</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB+</td>
<td>-CASI and Evaluation Rapide De Lecture</td>
<td>Bold Print</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Reading and Viewing Stepping Out Teacher Resource Book</td>
<td>Power Magazine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Principals and superintendents to focus on this area through Community Use of Schools (COS)</td>
<td>Petit Curieux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>7 Keys to Comprehension – Susan Zimmermann &amp; Chryse Hutchins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Principals and superintendents to focus on this area through Community Use of Schools (COS)</td>
<td>Reading and Viewing Stepping Out Teacher Resource Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>Reading and Viewing Stepping Out Teacher Resource Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td>Reading with Meaning – Debbie Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Principals to monitor DRA administration by all teachers</td>
<td>Nonfiction Matters Reading, Writing, and Research in Grades 3-8 – Stephanie Harvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>7 Keys to Comprehension – Susan Zimmermann &amp; Chryse Hutchins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Teachers to administer, collect and analyze the DRA and reading comprehension task data</td>
<td>-Principals to analyze DRA data with their teachers as written in the ‘data analysis plan’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Principal to analyze DRA data with their teachers as written in the ‘data analysis plan’</td>
<td>-CASI and Evaluation Rapide De Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year long</td>
<td>-Reading and Viewing Stepping Out Teacher Resource Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Subject teachers are to teach reading with meaning using non-fiction texts with a focus on expectation 1.4 to 1.9</td>
<td>-Reading and Viewing Stepping Out Teacher Resource Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Principal to monitor teacher use and understanding of learning goals and success criteria through discussion and observation</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Academic services to prepare data reports for presentation to academic superintendent</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher use and understanding of learning goals and success criteria through discussion and observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Principal to monitor the collection of TLCP and learning cycle data and to provide a report to the superintendent</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Principal to monitor the needs of the students and teachers and provide or seek support on a regular basis</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-School staff to develop learning cycle/pathway that incorporates the comprehensive literacy approach with a focus on read aloud/think aloud and shared reading in secondary and guided reading in</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and evaluate through their SIP, PLC meeting and staff meeting</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-All data collected will be reported upon and presented to senior administration which will guide the BIP</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-System improvement team to monitor and evaluate during the year</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-EQAO 2011 data will be examined in August and analyzed for progress in the focus area</td>
<td>-Principals to monitor teacher’s need for training in DRA and access support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Elementary

- **School staff** to create a data analysis that demonstrates the analysis of reading data throughout the year

- **School staff** to participate in hubs and network or curriculum councils and PLCs with a focus on the SMART goal

- **Program leads** to monitor through department and professional learning community meetings (PLC)

- **Superintendents** to monitor during COS meetings and to analyze the data at the senior administration table.

- Senior Admin to share BIP with Board/community and to provide updates
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2010-2011 Board Improvement Plan For Numeracy Student Achievement K-12

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Draft as of: Sunday, October 5th, 2010

BIP Needs Assessment for Numeracy Goal
September 2010

Student Achievement Data:

Grade 3 EQAO:
63% of participating students achieved Level 3 or 4 in 2010.
34% of participating students achieved Level 2 in 2010.
2% of participating students achieved Level 1 in 2010.
0% of participating students achieved NE1 in 2010.

Over the past 5 years, the percentage of all Grade 3 students achieving level 2 has remained steady at 35%, with minor fluctuations.

Between 2005-2006 and 2008-2009, the average percentage of students who responded “yes” to “I like math” (60%) was approximately 7% higher than the percentage of students who responded “yes” to “I am good at math” (53%).
In 2009-2010, 53% of students responded “most of the time” to “I am good at math” and 51% responded “most of the time” to “I like math”.

The 2009-2010 Preliminary Profile of Strengths and Areas for Improvement indicates that in all areas, our students are achieving between 60% and 67%. No single area stands out.

Grade 6 EQAO:
51% of participating students achieved Level 3 or 4 in 2010.
42% of participating students achieved Level 2 in 2010.
7% of participating students achieved Level 1 in 2010.
0% of participating students achieved NE1 in 2010.

Over the past 5 years, the percentage of all Grade 6 students achieving Level 2 has increased from 35% to 40%, while the percentage of all Grade 6
students achieving Level 3 or 4 has decreased from 55% to 48%.

Over the past 5 years, the average percentage of students who responded "yes" to "I like math" (46%) was 4% lower than the percentage of students who responded "yes" to "I am good at math" (50%). These percentages are lower than the responses given by Grade 3 students to the same questions. The more significant decrease is the response to "I like math."

The 2009-2010 Preliminary Profile of Strengths and Areas for Improvement indicates that in all areas, our students are achieving between 52% and 59%. No single area stands out.

**Grade 9 EQAO (Academic):**
74% of participating students achieved Level 3 or 4 in 2010.
18% of participating students achieved Level 2 in 2010.
8% of participating students achieved Level 1 in 2010.
<1% of participating students achieved NE1 in 2010.

Over the past 5 years, the percentage of all Grade 9 Academic students achieving Level 2 has increased from 13% to 18%, while the percentage of all Grade 9 Academic students achieving Level 3 or 4 has decreased from 78% to 74%.

In 2010, the percentage of students who responded “yes” to “I like math” (56%) was 9% higher than the percentage of students who responded “yes” to “I am good at math” (47%). These percentages are similar to the responses given by Grade 3 students and higher than the Grade 6 students to the same questions.

The 2009-2010 Preliminary Profile of Strengths and Areas for Improvement in the Winter Assessment indicates that in all areas, our students are achieving between 66% and 75%. Applications stands out as an area of need at 66%.

The 2009-2010 Preliminary Profile of Strengths and Areas for Improvement in the Spring Assessment indicates that in all areas, our students are achieving between 70% and 88%. Linear Relations stands out at 88%.

**Grade 9 EQAO (Applied):**
42% of participating students achieved Level 3 or 4 in 2010.
34% of participating students achieved Level 2 in 2010.
14% of participating students achieved Level 1 in 2010.
7% of participating students achieved NE1 in 2010.

In 3 of the last 5 years, the percentage of all Grade 9 Applied students achieving Level 2 has been 34%, while the percentage of all Grade 9 Applied
students achieving Level 3 or 4 has shown an overall drop from 45% to 42%.

In 2010, the percentage of students who responded “yes” to “I like math” (35%) was 2% higher than the percentage of students who responded “yes” to “I am good at math” (33%). These percentages are lower than the responses given by Grade 3 and Grade 6 students to the same questions.

The 2009-2010 Preliminary Profile of Strengths and Areas for Improvement in the Winter Assessment indicates that in all areas, our students are achieving between 14% and 36%. Linear Relations stands out at 36%.

The 2009-2010 Preliminary Profile of Strengths and Areas for Improvement in the Spring Assessment indicates that in all areas, our students are achieving between 41% and 52%. Linear Relations stands out at 48%. Knowledge and Understanding stands out at 52%.

If only 50% of our students surveyed believe that they are good at math or that they like math, then we need to find a way to build their confidence and capacity.

PRIME Data:

Data analysis indicates that there was overall growth in all grade levels in both the Number and Operation assessments. The largest amount of growth occurred in Grades 1, 2, 4 and 6. However, there was a general decrease in growth over the year as the grade level increased from Grade 1 to 8.

The percentage of students not meeting targets in Operation was significantly higher in the fall collection than the percentage of the same students not meeting targets in number.

In each of the PRIME tools used, approximately 50% of the questions require students to communicate their mathematical thinking in words. Clear communication from students will help teachers to interpret their math thinking and problem-solving strategies on a daily basis, which will help to inform assessment for, as and of learning.

Report Card Data:

Term 3 Report Card Data indicates that from Grades 1 to 8, the percentage of students achieving Level 3 or 4 in each strand decreases over time. At each Grade level from Grade 1 to 7, Number Sense and Numeration is one of the two weakest strands. In Grade 8, only 71% of students achieved the target. The average over Grades 1 to 8 is 74% of students meeting the target in NSN. Grade 3 students had the highest percentage meeting the target, with 81%, while Grades 6, 7 and 8 had the lowest percentage, with 71% each. (Note that our 2009-2010 EQAO profile indicates that 62% of Grade 3 students and 53% of Grade 6 students demonstrated strength in NSN.)

Our 1-8 Report Card data suggests that our students achieve more success in classroom-based assessments, than on EQAO. Would students achieve more success if they had improved communication skills, which would enable an outside evaluator to interpret their
mathematical thinking?

Perceptual Data

Observed Outcome (from the Small and Northern Boards Numeracy Report Back Form)

5. Schools are beginning to focus on the importance of building math communication.

Evidence of Outcome

- This item was introduced initially as part of the math-focused classroom (accessible numeracy learning environment), which 58% of Teachers and 33% of Principals surveyed selected in their top 3 areas of interest/need in the September surveys.
- Most classrooms used Math Word Walls and some were implementing strategy walls, based on observations during job-embedded learning opportunities during the school year.
- One school embarked on a Math Communication Pathway, and as a result of their presentation at our TLCP Network, several other schools are considering math pathways next year.
- 71% of Teachers indicated “Very Comfortable (23%)” or “Somewhat Comfortable (48%)” for this item on the year end survey. 27% of teachers selected “Becoming Comfortable” and only 1% indicated “Not Comfortable at All”.

At this point, qualitative data gathered in 2009-2010 from Grades 3 to 6 teachers indicates that they are poised to implement effective math communication strategies more deeply in their classrooms.

School Effectiveness Framework: Assessment for, as and of learning

1.5 A variety of valid and reliable assessment data is used by students and teachers to continually monitor learning, to inform instruction and assessment and to determine next steps.

1.6 Assessment of learning provides evidence for evaluating the quality of student learning at or near the end of a period of learning.

1.7 Ongoing communication is in place to allow students, teachers and parents to effectively monitor student learning.
SMART GOALS

**Long-Term SMART Goal:** Our students will demonstrate a 7% increase in primary, junior and intermediate mathematics scores as measured by the 2011 EQAO assessment, which will be achieved by focusing on **communication of mathematical thinking** orally, visually and in writing, using mathematical vocabulary and a variety of appropriate representations and observing mathematical conventions.

Currently:
- Grade 3: 61%
- Grade 6: 48%
- Grade 9 Applied: 42%
- Grade 9 Academic: 74%

**Short-Term SMART Goal:** Our grade 6 students will demonstrate a 7% increase in their ability to communicate effectively as measured by a team-developed task through a Teaching-Learning Critical Pathway (TLCP) model between Jan and April 2011.

In selected schools, our students will demonstrate improvement as measured by the Teaching Learning Critical Pathway in Numeracy in Feb-Mar 2011.

Our grade 7, 8 and 9 students will demonstrate an increase in their ability to communicate effectively as measured by a team-developed task and used 3 times during term 2 (February and May) with a focus on math communication in the context of proportional reasoning.

Qualitative measurement: All grade 6 teachers will complete a math communication matrix entitled “Evidence of Math Talk Learning Community: Action Trajectory for Teacher and Student”. This will be collected at two checkpoints.

Grade 7, 8 and 9 teachers and students will complete a pre and post survey regarding math communication.

Grade 3, 4, 5 and 6 teachers will complete a pre (October) and post (May) survey regarding math communication.

This data will provide us with a sense of where teachers and students believe they are in the continuum of effective math communication.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TARGETED EVIDENCE – BASED STRATEGIES</strong></th>
<th><strong>RESOURCES</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROFESSIONAL LEARNING</strong></th>
<th><strong>MONITORING and RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SMART GOALS</strong></th>
<th><strong>EVALUATION CYCLE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The 3-Part Problem-Solving Math Lesson:  
Part 1: Getting Started/Minds On  
Part 2: Working On It/Action  
Part 3: Reflecting and Connecting/Consolidation, Homework and Practice | MOE RESOURCES  
A Guide to Effective Instruction in Mathematics, K-6, Volume 2 - Problem-Solving and Communication  
TIPS4RM (7-12)  
Think Literacy (7-9)  
CLIPS  
What Works? Research Into Practice  
Student Interaction in the Math Classroom: Stealing Ideas or Building Understanding  
Learning Mathematics vs. Following “Rules”: The Value of Student-Generated Methods  
Learning Blocks for Literacy and Numeracy  
Capacity-Building Series:  
Communication in the Mathematics Classroom  
Differentiating Mathematics Instruction  
Math Talk Learning Communities Research Synopsis | -Gr 3 to 6: Numeracy Facilitator job-embedded support  
-Grade 6 Teaching Learning Critical Pathway Network in Numeracy  
-K to 12: Board and school based professional learning opportunities  
-Elementary: Co-Planning and Co-Teaching through the Collaborative Inquiry in Mathematics (CIL-M)  
-Gr 7 -9: Math PD Plan through the achievement team focus on numeracy  
-Gr 7 -11: Blended Learning Math Pilot | -School Improvement Team to embed these strategies in the SIP, as determined by needs assessment and data analysis  
-Principal and senior admin to monitor the level of math communication using the “Evidence of Math-Talk-Learning Community: Action Trajectory for Teacher and Student”, three times during the school year (October 29, January 14, June 10)  
-Schools and senior admin to gather and analyze evidence from TLCP reports from Math TLCPs conducted Feb - May 2011  
-Consultants/Superintendents to monitor the “Blended Learning Math Pilot Qualitative Data Report” January 30 and June 15  
-Teachers to use the 3 part-problem solving math lesson in every day practice. Principal to monitor and provide support as required  
-Teachers to administer PRIME questions and assess for evidence of communication  
-Principal to monitor evidence of math talk and communication in the classroom  
-Superintendents to monitor and check-in during Community of school meetings and to report to senior admin. | September EQAO analysis: Grade 3 Grade 6 Grade 9  
PRIME data analysis in September to create a baseline for classroom-based supports.  
SIP is developed in Sept/Oct, based on EQAO and school data by the School Improvement Teams and submitted to School Superintendent  
School Superintendent to review and provide descriptive feedback, based on success criteria  
Evidence of Math-Talk-Learning Community: Action Trajectory for Teacher and Student conducted three times in the year  
Collect and analyze the Pathway data from Feb to May 2011  
Collect and analyze PRIME question data |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growing Mathematical Ideas in Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Questions: Great Ways to Differentiate Mathematics Instruction (K-8, 9-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Led Conferencing Using Showcase Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Reading Kits (topic-based) available from the Numeracy Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>