# Student Success Plan **School Annual Report**

**School: Sir Charles Tupper Elementary School Year: 2018-19**

**Principal: Patricia Woodbury Student Enrollment: 198 (without Pre-Primary)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal: To improve student achievement in writing with a focus on organization and conventions.** | | | |
| **Student Evidence**  *(performance measure(s))* | **Where did you begin?**  *(baseline year and results)* | **Where do you want to be?**  *(target)* | **Where are you now?**  *(progress)* |
| **RWM6 (Writing Organization)** | **2017-18**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 15%  Level 3: 68%  Level 4: 18%  Levels 3+4: 85% | Improvement from baseline | **2018-19**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 0%  Level 3: 83%  Level 4: 17%  Levels 3+4: 100% |
| **RWM6 (Writing Conventions)** | **2017-18**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 15%  Level 3: 71%  Level 4: 15%  Levels 3+4: 85% | Improvement from baseline | **2018-2019**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 11%  Level 3: 68%  Level 4: 21%  Levels 3+4: 89% |
| **Gr. 3 to (2015-16) to Gr. 6 (2018-19) Writing Conventions** | **2015-16**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 33%  Level 3: 50%  Level 4: 17%  Levels 3+4: 67% | Improvement from baseline | **2018-19**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 13%  Level 3: 67%  Level 4: 21%  Levels 3+4: 88% |
| **Gr. 3 to (2015-16) to Gr. 6 (2018-19) Writing Organization** | **2015-16**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 29%  Level 3: 50%  Level 4: 21%  Levels 3+4: 71% | Improvement from baseline | **2018-19**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 0%  Level 3: 83%  Level 4: 17%  Levels 3+4: 100% |
| **Classroom Assessment Data - Writing Organization**  **(Sentences Make Sense)**  1 - Limited Understanding  2 - Basic Understanding  3 - Good Understanding  4 - Thorough Understanding | **2018-2019**  **Gr. 4**  Level 1+2: 20.7%  Level 3+4: 79.3%  **Gr. 5**  Level 1+2: 6.1%  Level 3+4: 93.9%  **Gr. 6**  Level 1+2: 3.7%  Level 3+4: 96.3% | Improvement from baseline | **Baseline year - data will be collected in November, 2019** |
| **Classroom Assessment Data - Conventions**  **(Spelling, Capitalization, and Punctuation)**  1 - Limited Understanding  2 - Basic Understanding  3 - Good Understanding  4 - Thorough Understanding | **2018-2019**  **Gr. 4**  Level 1+2: 10.3%  Level 3+4: 89.7%  **Gr. 5**  Level 1+2: 6.3%  Level 3+4: 93.7%  **Gr. 6**  Level 1+2: 11.1%  Level 3+4: 88.9% | Improvement from baseline | **Baseline year - data will be collected in November, 2019** |
| **What did you do this year to support this goal?** *(assessment for learning, instruction and learning team focus, and PD)* | | | |
| Assessment for Learning:   * Teachers used the writer’s workshop model daily, with an emphasis on conferencing with students. Using the students' writing and information gleaned from their conversations with students, teachers prepared lessons to foster individual growth. * Teachers met as learning teams to examine student writing samples in the context of the writing continuum provided by HRCE. * Students are learning to independently self-assess their writing using tools such as checklists and rubrics (e.g. for high frequency words, punctuation, capitalization), and to reread their work for meaning prior to sharing. * Some teachers keep a portfolio of dated writing samples for each student and use highlighters to follow their progress along the writing continuum. * Some teachers use Google Apps for Education (GAFE) to communicate with each student throughout the stages of their writing, and to do online conferencing with instant feedback.   Instruction/Learning Team Focus:   * Continued use of the writing workshop model. * Support systems are in place to support student writing (for example: class word wall, individual word walls, personal spelling dictionaries and a writing rubric checklist for each child). “Editing checklists” and personal word walls have been effective strategies for supporting students in taking ownership of their writing. * Focus on helping students to understand that writing is often meant to be shared; practice with peer editing. * Explicit teaching of writing organization and conventions, using lots of modeling and providing examples for the students. * Learning team focus on giving effective feedback and teaching students to give and receive feedback/suggestions from the teacher and/or the group they are conferencing with. * Organizational materials (e.g. graphic organizers) are provided to students. * Use of “Writers Workshop” rubric to assess student writing has been an effective self and peer assessment tool, and has helped students to be more careful about rereading their pieces. Reviewing this rubric daily before writing time has made the students more aware of their need to use conventions in their writing.     Literacy Goal (continued)  Professional Development:   * PD session: Chapter 10, “Fill Your Toolbox” from *Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Teaching and Learning* (Hollie), with a view to developing a common “toolbox” of culturally responsive instructional strategies that can be used in small group instruction to scaffold students’ writing development. * All staff attended HRCE October Workshop presented by Sharroky Hollie. * Teachers met in PLC groupings to look at samples of student writing and to plan instruction for small groups (ongoing). * Group planning for instruction using assistive technology (i.e. speech to text; Google translate; language functions on the Chromebooks, etc.) * Teachers read and discussed: Advancing Formative Assessment In Every Classroom (Moss & Brookhart) - Chapter 3 *(Shifting from Correcting to Informing: Feedback That Feeds Forward)* (Linked to SSP PD strategy: Teachers will provide students with effective and timely descriptive feedback, showing them what they are doing well and what they can do to improve when writing.) * PD Session using *Writing Strategies Book, by Jennifer Serravallo*, (focus on *Organization and Structure*, *Conventions).* * Reviewed EECD *Lessons Learned* documents. * Teachers had the opportunity to choose from a number of teacher-led sessions at the May 17th PD session (for example, on strategies used to engage students in the writing process, and on integrating curriculum through activities such as “Figure-It-Out-Friday” | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal: To improve student achievement in mathematical problem solving.** | | | |
| **Student Evidence**  *(performance measure(s))* | **Where did you begin?**  *(baseline year and results)* | **Where do you want to be?**  *(target)* | **Where are you now?**  *(progress)* |
| **RWM6 (Math)** | **2017-18**  Level 1: 3%  Level 2: 9%  Level 3: 50%  Level 4: 38%  Levels 3+4: 88% | Improvement from baseline. | **2018-19**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 7%  Level 3: 50%  Level 4: 43%  Levels 3+4: 93% |
| **M4 to M6 (Math)** | **2016-17**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 12%  Level 3: 64%  Level 4: 24%  Levels 3+4: 88% | Improvement from baseline. | **2018-19**  Level 1: 0%  Level 2: 8%  Level 3: 56%  Level 4: 36%  Levels 3+4: 92% |
| **Classroom Assessment Data - Problem Solving**  **(*Understanding the Problem*)**  1 - Limited  2 - Developing  3 - Competent  4 - In-Depth | **Level 3+4**  Primary: 96%  Gr. 1: 87.5%  Gr. 2: 81.8%  Gr. 3: 88%  Gr. 4: 89.3%  Gr. 5: 84.4%  Gr. 6: 84.6% | Improvement from baseline | **Baseline year - data will be collected in November, 2019** |
| **(continued next page…)**  **Classroom Assessment Data - Problem Solving**  **(*Communication*)**  1 - Limited  2 - Developing  3 - Competent  4 - In-Depth | **Level 3+4**  Primary: 91.7%  Gr. 1: 84.4%  Gr. 2: 86.4%  Gr. 3: 72%  Gr. 4: 60.7%  Gr. 5: 84.4%  Gr. 6: 92.3% | Improvement from baseline | **Baseline year - data will be collected in November, 2019** |
| **What did you do this year to support this goal?** *(assessment for learning, instruction and learning team focus, and PD)* | | | |
| Assessment for Learning:   * Ongoing assessment took place as students shared and discussed their thinking in groups, as well as during independent practice time. * Teachers have made a consistent effort to ensure that they provide students with effective and timely feedback in math. * Teachers tracked conversations, making greater use of note-taking when conferencing.     Instruction/Learning Team Focus:   * Increased focus on constructivist model, providing hands-on experiences and exploration. * Explicit teaching of mathematical language to communicate mathematical understanding. * Teachers encouraged students to take risks with their math learning, and helped them to understand that, as one teacher reflected, “math problem solving is a challenge/puzzle with more than one route to the answer and often more than one correct answer.” * Explicitly teaching students to listen to how their peers arrived at their answers, with an emphasis on the process and not just on getting the correct answer. * Modeling, giving many examples and completing problems together as a class…including explaining how students solved problems. * Providing students with a “tool box”, such as common math language used to figure out an operation, three-read strategy, and problem-solving strategies such as removing extra information, focusing first on “what we do know”, etc. * Teachers found that using Marian Small’s "Open Ended Questions" helped their students with math confidence and to be creative math thinkers.       Math Goal (continued) - Professional Development:     * Many teachers attended the Marion Small conference in the fall and have incorporated her open-ended approach to teaching into their daily lessons. We have shared activities/questions from Marion Small’s Open Questions at staff meetings, and have purchased her books for all grade levels in all strands. * PD session: Chapter 10, “Fill Your Toolbox” from *Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Teaching and Learning* (Hollie), with a view to developing a common “toolbox” of culturally responsive instructional strategies that can be used in small group instruction to scaffold students’ problem solving development. * All staff attended HRCE October Workshop presented by Sharroky Hollie. * Teachers read and discussed: Advancing Formative Assessment In Every Classroom (Moss & Brookhart) - Chapter 3 *(Shifting from Correcting to Informing: Feedback That Feeds Forward)* (Linked to SSP PD strategy: Teachers will provide students with effective and timely descriptive feedback, showing them what they are doing well and what they can do to improve when solving mathematical problems. * Teachers have spent time learning more about providing descriptive feedback, using the book, Becoming the Math Teacher You Wish You Had(Tracy Johnston Zager). * Our HRCE Math specialist provided support on how to provide effective support to students. | | | |
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