

## EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

December 11, 2001

TO: Board of Trustees

FROM: A. McBeath, Superintendent of Schools

ORIGINATORS: Karen Bardy, Jenise Bidulock, Susan Burghardt-McNeill

SUBJECT: Alberta Initiative for School Improvement (A.I.S.I.) Monitoring Information:  
Year One Results

### RESOURCE

STAFF: Sandra Carl-Townsend, Cam Colville, Janet Cooper, Mary-Ellen Deising, Irene Heffel, Auriana Kowalchuk, Kathy McCabe, Anne Mulgrew, Neil Robblee, Betty Tams, Sandra Woitas

## INFORMATION

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this report is to provide monitoring information regarding the first year of implementation of the Alberta Initiative for School Improvement (A.I.S.I.) projects. A presentation will be made to board regarding the projects. Principal and teacher representatives from the projects are in attendance and are available for questions following the presentation.

### **Background**

In September 2000, Alberta Learning provided funding to all school districts in the province for the purpose of implementing school-based research projects that would identify effective strategies that promote student achievement. As a result of this invitation, schools in the district were invited to develop proposals and 101 schools were identified for involvement in A.I.S.I. projects. A.I.S.I. funding for the 2000 – 2001 school year totalled \$9.4 million. This was 2.4% of the basic instructional grant which totalled \$393.7 million. A first-year monitoring report regarding the projects has been submitted to Alberta Learning. This report provides a summary of the information submitted.

### **Preliminary Information**

Schools involved in the A.I.S.I. projects will receive funding for three years. Each year monitoring information regarding the results obtained and strategies used will be provided to Alberta Learning and to the Board of Trustees. Evaluation information regarding the effectiveness of the strategies used will be provided at the end of the third year of implementation. As the schools involved have completed only the first year of implementation, the information provided in this report is preliminary. What will be monitored over the three year period of time is the trend in improvement in results achieved and the strategies used to achieve this improvement.

### **First Year Information: Results Achieved**

A description of each project and the results achieved is provided in Appendix I. Detailed results information is provided in Appendix III. A summary of the results are provided below:

- Quantitative measures indicated substantial improvement in student achievement in the Early Literacy K-3, Balanced Literacy K-3, Middle Literacy, and Division IV Mathematics projects.
- Quantitative measures indicated mixed results in student achievement in the Division II Mathematics, Division III Mathematics, Maximizing Student Potential K–6, and Maximizing Student Potential 7-9 projects.
- Baseline information was generated for the Maximizing Student Potential 10-12 project. Growth information will be reported in the next monitoring report.

### **First Year Information: Effective Practices**

Based on the first year of implementation, the following have emerged as effective practices (Appendix II) among A.I.S.I. projects:

- a focus on curriculum and instruction
- principals as instructional leaders
- targeted teacher training in effective instructional strategies
- teacher collaboration
- ongoing monitoring of student progress
- early intervention in literacy
- alignment of best resources to instruction
- involvement of families in learning
- provision of training and coaching by subject area consultants

### **Second and Third Year of Implementation**

Monitoring information for the first year of the A.I.S.I. projects will be made available in December to all staff through the Superintendent's Memo and the district website. The second year of A.I.S.I. projects includes the implementation of a tenth project, *Blueprints for Supporting Teaching and Learning*. It is planned that in June 2003, at the end of the third year of implementation for the projects, a district evaluation of the results achieved and strategies used in the projects will be completed and provided to Alberta Learning and the Board of Trustees.

### **Extension of A.I.S.I. Funding**

Preliminary information from Alberta Learning has indicated that a fourth year of funding will be made available for school districts for the implementation of school-based research projects. Once the availability of additional funding and the exact amount of funding is officially confirmed by the province, the district will put in place a consultation process with a sample of principals, teachers, and central services staff to develop a new set of parameters for the use of this funding. These parameters will be based on provincial guidelines and will result in a recommendation to the Superintendent of Schools.

## **Issues Related To A.I.S.I. Funding**

Although the first year of implementation indicates that there are many positive results emerging in the A.I.S.I. projects, the district has identified a number of significant concerns with the initiative and will be sharing these with Alberta Learning. The use of targeted funding for projects has resulted in a district context in which some schools are receiving funding and some schools are not. In addition, the three year term set for the funding will cause problems for the schools involved when they no longer have the funds to implement current project strategies. Many of these strategies, such as full-day kindergarten and small class size at grade one, have been strongly supported by their parent communities. Consequently, the district will be meeting with Alberta Learning in the new year to encourage the province to examine how A.I.S.I. funding can be added to the district's base funding in support of our belief that the local jurisdiction, not the province, is in the best position to determine how funding should be allocated to schools.

JB/rl

APPENDIX I:	Project Descriptions
APPENDIX II:	Description of Effective Practices
APPENDIX III:	Detailed Results Information

## PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

For most of the A.I.S.I. projects, baseline information from the schools involved was collected in June 2000. The quantitative results in project descriptions describe the difference between baseline information and the student achievement results in June 2001.

### EARLY LITERACY, KINDERGARTEN – GRADE 3

Abbott	North Edmonton
Alex Taylor	Norwood
Beacon Heights	Parkdale
Eastwood	R. J. Scott
Glendale	Rundle
John A. McDougall	Spruce Avenue
McCauley	Strathearn
McKee	

**Project Description:** Schools implemented full day kindergarten, small class sizes at grade one, and Balanced Literacy and Reading Recovery at the grade one level. Teachers worked collaboratively in the Balanced Literacy program to learn new strategies. Teachers received coaching, resources were purchased, and extra staff were hired to allow for small grade one classes.

#### Quantitative Results:

- Percentage of grade 1 students reading at or above grade level increased by 5.8%.
- Percentage of grade 1 students writing at or above grade level increased 10.6%.
- 91% of students selected for Reading Recovery were at grade level at the completion of the course.

#### Qualitative Results:

- Increased interest and participation among students in reading and writing tasks was observed.

**Implications for Year Two:** Teachers will have a broader range of literacy strategies to implement in classrooms in the second year. Teachers in grades two and three who are not yet trained on Balanced Literacy will receive training.

### BALANCED LITERACY AND READING RECOVERY, KINDERGARTEN – GRADE 3

Belmead	Grovenor
Caernarvon	Northmount
Crawford Plains	Rideau Park
Daly Grove	Riverdale
Griesbach	Sifton

**Project Description:** Schools implemented Reading Recovery and Balanced Literacy strategies beginning at the grade one level. Through Balanced Literacy, teachers worked as collaborative

teams on effective learning strategies. Literacy resources were purchased and professional development support was offered. The schools also worked on using parents more effectively in supporting their children's learning.

**Quantitative Results:**

- Percentage of grade 1 students reading at or above grade level increased 4.1%.
- Percentage of grade 1 students writing at or above grade level increased 3.4%.
- 98% of students selected for Reading Recovery were at grade level at the completion of the course.

**Implications for Year Two:** Teachers will be practicing more in-depth literacy strategies in the Balanced Literacy and Reading Recovery programs. Teachers trained in Balanced Literacy and Reading Recovery will provide collegial assistance to others in their school who are being trained in year two. New teachers and year two teachers who have not been trained in Balanced Literacy will begin training.

**MIDDLE LITERACY, GRADE 7**

Avalon	Riverbend
Avonmore-Nellie McClung	Rosslyn
Britannia	Vernon Barford
Edith Rogers	Westmount

**Project Description:** Schools involved in the Middle Literacy Project identified staff who worked with grade seven students not reading at grade level. Teacher leaders from each school were engaged in regularly scheduled professional development in order to broaden their knowledge of literacy strategies and to receive training in a reading intervention resource, "Soar to Success". All schools on the project purchased a range of grade-level fiction and non-fiction books so that identified students had a broad range of highly motivational literature suitable for their reading levels.

**Quantitative Results:**

- Percentage of identified students achieving acceptable standard on teacher awarded marks in Language Arts increased by 17.0%.
- Percentage of identified students achieving at or above grade level on HLAT Reading increased by 14.0%.

**Implications for Year Two:** A major implication for year two is to continue to emphasize reading strategies in all subject areas. Teacher leaders will be key in assisting their staffs with teaching reading across the curriculum.

## DIVISION II MATHEMATICS, GRADES 4 – 6

Afton	Lorelei
Dovercourt	Malcolm Tweddle
Duggan	Mount Royal
Holyrood	Newton
Lendrum	Scott Robertson

**Project Description:** Schools grouped students in mathematics to meet student needs and to enable activity-based mathematics and small group instruction. Teachers were involved in an ongoing series of inservices and coaching sessions focused on effective teaching strategies in mathematics. Teacher leaders, involved in collaborative teams, shared classroom successes, developed resources, and were involved in intervisitations.

### Quantitative Results:

- Percentage of grade 6 students meeting the acceptable standard and standard of excellence on the provincial achievement test in mathematics increased 0.6% and 3.8% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 6 students meeting the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence on teacher awarded marks in mathematics increased 0.7% and 1.8% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 4 students meeting the acceptable standard and standard of excellence on teacher awarded marks in mathematics decreased 3.0% and 10.5% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 5 students meeting the acceptable standard and standard of excellence on teacher awarded marks in mathematics decreased 0.8% and 4.4% respectively.

### Qualitative:

- Positive attitudes of students towards mathematics increased.
- Students' belief that they can be successful in mathematics increased.

**Implications for Year Two:** Teachers have started the school year planning for activity-based mathematics with appropriate resources in place. A number of teachers have been sharing their learning through district-wide inservices on problem-solving and writing in math. Plans are also in place for teachers to share the performance-based assessments developed and piloted last year.

## DIVISION III MATHEMATICS, GRADE 7 – 9

Balwin	Killarney
D. S. MacKenzie	Lawton
Dickinsfield	Ottewell
Hardisty	T. D. Baker
Highlands	Wellington
Hillcrest	Westlawn
Horse Hill	Westminster
Kenilworth	

**Project Description:** Teachers used a range of strategies such as small group instruction, team-teaching, class intervisitation, peer tutoring, electronic sharing of best practices, and levelled mathematics classes. Teacher leaders from each school attended inservices on current teaching strategies for improving student achievement in mathematics.

**Quantitative Results:**

- Percentage of grade 7 students meeting the acceptable standard and standard of excellence on teacher awarded marks in mathematics decreased 2.0% and remained the same respectively.
- Percentage of grade 8 students meeting the acceptable standard and standard of excellence on teacher awarded marks increased 0.2% and decreased 1.5% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 9 students meeting the acceptable standard and standard of excellence on teacher awarded marks increased 2.7% and 4.3% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 9 students meeting the acceptable standard and standard of excellence on provincial achievement tests increased 0.1% and 1.5% respectively.

**Qualitative:**

- Percentage of grade 7 and 8 students feeling confident in their mathematics abilities decreased 2.0%.
- Percentage of grade 9 students feeling confident in their mathematics abilities increased 3.0%

**Implications for Year Two:** Teacher leaders will be involved in peer coaching, intervisitations, increased collaboration and reflection on classroom practices.

**DIVISION IV MATHEMATICS, GRADE 10 – 12**

Amiskwaciy Academy	M. E. Lazerte
Centre High	McNally
Eastglen	Old Scona
Edmonton Christian	Queen Elizabeth
Harry Ainlay	Ross Sheppard
J. Percy Page	Strathcona
Jasper Place	Victoria
L'Academie Vimy Ridge Academy	W. P. Wagner

**Project Description:** Each school identified teacher leaders in the Pure and Applied Math programs. Teachers constructed district wide common finals based on Alberta Learning standards. Classroom visitations occurred within schools and between schools. Teachers were able to observe best practices in action. As teachers prepared to teach new units there were inservices for them in the new topics or technologies required.

**Quantitative Results:**

- Percentage of students meeting the acceptable standard and standard of excellence based on Pure Math 10 final marks increased 2.2% and 2.6% respectively. Baseline for applied math 10 was established this year. Results will be reported in year two.

Qualitative:

- Percentage of students expressing a positive attitude towards mathematics decreased 0.6%.
- Percentage of parents satisfied that schools are meeting student learning needs increased 12.2%.

**Implications For Year Two:** In the second year of the project, the major focus will be on Pure and Applied Math 20. Two teacher leaders will be identified from each school and will attend the monthly meetings to share information on effective strategies and discuss challenges and solutions. There will also be bimonthly meetings for the grade 10 teacher leaders to focus on best practices. There will be just-in-time inservicing responding to teacher requests. Sharing of best practices and intervisitation will continue. District-wide common final exams will be administered in Pure and Applied 10 and 20.

### **MAXIMIZING STUDENT POTENTIAL, KINDERGARTEN – GRADE 6**

Belvedere  
Brightview  
Earl Buxton  
Fulton Place  
Glenora  
Greenview  
J. A. Fife  
Julia Kiniski

Kildare  
King Edward  
Lee Ridge  
Lauderdale  
Virginia Park  
Windsor Park  
Woodcroft

**Project Description:** These schools identified students who were at risk of not achieving the acceptable standard or the standard of excellence. Students who could, but are not, achieving the acceptable standard have been termed “at-risk” students. Students who could, but are not, achieving the standard of excellence have been termed “at-promise” students. The schools used strategies such as goal setting, small learning groups, peer tutoring, and increased parental involvement.

Quantitative Results:

- Percentage of at-risk students reading and writing at or above grade level increased 8.0% and decreased 6.0% respectively.
- Percentage of at-risk students achieving the acceptable standard on teacher awarded marks in language arts and mathematics increased 11.1% and 10.0% respectively.
- Percentage of at-promise students achieving the standard of excellence on teacher awarded marks in language arts and mathematics increased 2.0% and decreased 6.0% respectively.

Qualitative Results:

- Percentage of students demonstrating respect and responsibility increased as indicated by school anecdotal information.
- Percentage of students demonstrating positive behaviour increased as indicated by school behaviour records.

**Implications for Year Two:** Many of the schools involved will be aligning these projects with their instructional focus. Best strategies for student success will continue to be a focus of the project.



## MAXIMIZING STUDENT POTENTIAL, GRADE 7 – 9

Alberta School for the Deaf  
Crestwood  
Donnan  
Laurier Heights  
McKernan

Sherbrooke  
Ritchie  
S. Bruce Smith  
Talmud Torah  
The Academy at King Edward

**Project Description:** Each school put into place instructional strategies to enhance the academic achievement for students identified as working below potential. These strategies included counselling, flexible groupings of students, teacher collaboration teams, interschool sharing of strategies, and a focus on research-based strategies. Each project school designated a staff member who coordinated opportunities for staff collaboration regarding identified students.

### Quantitative Results:

- Percentage of grade 7 students achieving the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in language arts increased 1.7% and 6.9% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 7 students achieving the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in mathematics decreased 0.2% and increased 2.6% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 8 students achieving the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in language arts increased 1.8% and decreased 2.1% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 8 students achieving the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in mathematics decreased 2.1% and increased 0.7% respectively.
- Percentage of grade 9 students achieving the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence based on provincial achievement tests in language arts decreased 0.7% and 4.0% respectively.

### Qualitative Results:

- Identified students showed increased confidence, motivation, and interest as measured by teacher leader anecdotal information.

**Implications for Year Two:** Teachers will employ the strategies learned and piloted last year. Re-alignment of resources to meet student needs and school goals has been implemented. Continued tracking of the most successful strategies will be a focus for year two.

## MAXIMIZING STUDENT POTENTIAL, GRADE 10 – 12

Jasper Place  
Learning Store on Whyte

Queen Elizabeth  
Tevie Miller

**Project Description:** The four sites had unique projects for their schools. Tevie Miller integrated their six high school students into the King Edward Academy satellite classes at Victoria School. Queen Elizabeth worked with the at-risk 16 level students and provided ongoing professional development and training for their teachers in dealing with the unique needs of these students. Jasper Place began a Career Directions course for all grade ten students. The

Learning Store has focused on strategies to retain the students at greatest risk of not completing school.

**Quantitative Results:**

- 88.9% of Jasper Place grade 10 students have completed a portfolio.
- 57.1%, 42.8% and 64.3% of Queen Elizabeth students successfully completed Social Studies 16, English 16 and Science 16 respectively.
- 57.5% of Learning Store students successfully completed courses.

**Qualitative Results:**

- Parental surveys of Tevie Miller parents indicated that parents are satisfied with the integration of their children into Victoria School academic classes.

**Implications for Year Two:** The second year of the project will expand into grade eleven courses for the students at Jasper Place and Queen Elizabeth. The project at the Learning Store has expanded to include additional sites. The Tevie Miller project continues with a new group of six high school students.

## DESCRIPTION OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

The following preliminary information identifies effective strategies that were found to be common in a number of the nine projects.

### **A Focus on Curriculum and Instruction**

Teachers developed a much greater depth of understanding of curriculum expectations, and standards for student work associated with grade level standards. Teacher training programs emphasized direct instruction and guided practice in the curriculum areas of reading, writing, numeracy and problem solving. Many schools further aligned curriculum and assessment in the curriculum areas of focus. In all projects, the most success was seen when teachers had a strong understanding of curriculum outcomes and standards for high quality student work.

### **Principals as Instructional Leaders**

Principals co-ordinated the organization and implementation of the project, staff involvement and assignment, resource alignment, budget planning, and review of data and monitoring of student results. Principals with their teacher leader(s) and leadership teams hosted site coaching visits. Teacher leaders became an integral part of the professional development teams in project schools. School teams worked closely with coaches, consultants, and project managers, with a goal of setting high expectations for all staff and students. Principals worked together with teachers to implement best strategies, and to look at student work in relation to standards.

### **Targeted Teacher Training in Effective Instructional Strategies**

Professional development was tied to the curricular focus area (e.g. mathematics or literacy) and keyed to student learning results. Teacher training focused on best practices. Teacher leaders were involved in intensive ongoing project professional development with frequent opportunities for practicing and coaching. Effectiveness of professional development was measured by growth in student learning and growth in teacher confidence. Teacher leaders shared their expertise with school staff and developed professional development plans with staff.

### **Teacher Collaboration**

School teams built expertise and changed and refined practices. Many schools built in time for teacher collaboration and peer coaching. Best practices in assessment and standard setting were shared. Staffs in each project were part of a network of schools that shared experiences and expertise. Teachers worked together to identify student needs, improve instruction, and assess student progress. Inter-school visitations were followed up by debriefings and communication of learning with school colleagues. Teachers worked together on the development of materials and activities that had the potential to improve instruction.

There was a team approach to improving the practice of teaching through “open door” classroom observation and rich reflective dialogue. Collaboration resulted in a high degree of professional confidence and sharing of best practices among teachers in the projects.

### **Ongoing Monitoring of Student Progress**

Teams were involved in sharing best assessment strategies among teachers in the projects. Sharing the results of student work and analyzing that work in relation to standards, and the creation of a wide variety of common assessment tools and strategies for school and district use, resulted in the establishment of common standards for student work. A mutual understanding and application of curriculum standards aligned teacher's classroom assessments with one another.

Schools in the projects established clear, measurable goals including multiple measures of performance for students. Student performance data was examined regularly at the school level in addition to large-scale assessment. Based on data, instruction was examined and modified.

### **Early Intervention in Literacy**

Early literacy intervention for students at risk greatly increased their success in school. For all students, and especially students at risk, intervention that assisted students with the development of skills in reading at grade level had the highest degree of success. Early intervention took many forms: full day kindergarten, Reading Recovery, and middle literacy in junior high.

### **Alignment of Best Resources to Instruction**

Having resources readily available to teachers greatly assisted them in improving student learning. For example, having levelled books in the Middle Literacy project and having math manipulative materials purchased and organized for upper elementary and junior high classrooms greatly assisted instruction. Schools selected resources based on research and aligned those resources to the best practices being used in the classroom.

### **Involvement of Families in Learning**

In all projects, the involvement of families in supporting learning in the focus area achieved results for students. Families were involved in learning behaviour support, assisting students with guided practice in the focus area, and goal setting.

### **Subject Area Consultants Provide Training and Coaching**

In several of the projects, subject area consultants designed training, made available best practices in instruction and assessment, provided coaching and feedback to teachers, and coordinated the design of common assessment materials. Consultants provided processes for teacher leaders to use with other staff at the school. Consultants provided leadership and modeled collaborative teamwork with other consultants and teacher leaders.

**DETAILED RESULTS INFORMATION****EARLY LITERACY, KINDERGARTEN – GRADE 3**

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of grade 1 students at or above grade level on HLATs in reading	74.3	80.1	5.8
Percent of grade 1 students at or above grade level on HLATs in writing	69.5	80.1	10.6
Percent of students at grade level at completion of Reading Recovery	NA	91.0	N/A

**BALANCED LITERACY AND READING RECOVERY, KINDERGARTEN – GRADE 3**

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of grade 1 students at or above grade level on HLATs in reading	90.6	94.7	4.1
Percent of grade 1 students at or above grade level on HLATs in writing	84.6	88.0	3.4
Percent of students at grade level at completion of Reading Recovery course	NA	98.0	N/A

**MIDDLE LITERACY, GRADE 7**

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of identified students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in grade 7 Language Arts	71.0	88.0	17.0
Percent of identified grade 7 students at or above grade level on HLATs in reading	69.0	83.0	14.0

**DIVISION II MATHEMATICS, GRADES 4 - 6**

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on Provincial Achievement Test in grade 6 Mathematics	86.1	86.7	0.6
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on Provincial Achievement Test in grade 6 Mathematics	14.5	18.3	3.8
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in Grade 6 Mathematics	88.9	89.6	0.7
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in grade 6 Mathematics	34.2	36.0	1.8
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in Grade 4 Mathematics	92.5	89.5	-3.0

Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teachers awarded marks Grade 4 in Mathematics	41.0	30.5	-10.5
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in Grade 5 Mathematics	88.7	87.9	-0.8
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks grade 5 in Mathematics	36.9	32.5	-4.4

### **DIVISION III MATHEMATICS, GRADES 7 - 9**

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in grade 7 Mathematics	85.6	83.6	-2.0
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in grade 7 Mathematics	29.8	29.8	0.0
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in grade 8 Mathematics	79.4	79.6	0.2
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in grade 8 Mathematics	25.5	24.0	-1.5
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in grade 9 Mathematics	75.6	78.3	2.7
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in grade 9 Mathematics	22.3	26.6	4.3
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on Provincial Achievement Test in grade 9 Mathematics	69.6	69.7	0.1
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on Provincial Achievement Test in grade 9 Mathematics	13.3	14.8	1.5
Percent of grade 7 students feeling confident in their Math ability	68.0	66.0	-2.0
Percent of grade 8 students feeling confident in their Math ability	61.0	59.0	-2.0
Percent of grade 9 students feeling confident in their Math ability	52.0	55.0	3.0

### **DIVISION IV MATHEMATICS, GRADES 10 -112**

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on Pure Math 10 final marks	80.8	83.0	2.2
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on Pure Math 10 final marks.	23.0	25.6	2.6
Percent of students expressing a positive attitude toward Mathematics	58.0	57.4	-0.6
Percent of parents satisfied that schools are meeting students learning needs.	56.0	68.2	12.2

**MAXIMIZING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, KINDERGARTEN – GRADE 6**

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of identified at risk students reading at grade level on HLATs	70.0	78.0	8.0
Percent of identified at risk students writing at grade level on HLATs	78.0	72.0	-6.0
Percent of identified at risk students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in 1-6 Language Arts	80.0	91.0	11.1
Percent of identified at risk students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in 1-6 Mathematics	83.0	93.0	10.0
Percent of identified at promise students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in 1-6 Language Arts	40.0	42.0	2.0
Percent of identified at promise students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in 1-6 Mathematics	55.0	49.0	-6.0

**MAXIMIZING STUDENT POTENTIAL, GRADES 7-9**

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in grade 7 Language Arts	87.9	89.6	1.7
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in grade 7 Language Arts	34.0	40.9	6.9
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in grade 7 Mathematics	92.0	91.8	-0.2
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in grade 7 Mathematics	42.5	45.1	2.6
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in grade 8 Language Arts	86.9	88.7	1.8
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks grade 8 in Language Arts	39.5	37.4	-2.1
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on teacher awarded marks in grade 8 Mathematics	86.7	84.6	-2.1
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on teacher awarded marks in grade 8 Mathematics	38.1	38.8	0.7
Percent of students at acceptable standard based on Provincial Achievement Test in Grade 9 English Language Arts	93.0	92.3	-0.7
Percent of students at standard of excellence based on Provincial Achievement Test in Grade 9 English Language Arts	26.5	22.5	-4.0

## MAXIMIZING STUDENT POTENTIAL, GRADES 10 - 12

The following measures are collected from the individual projects.

MEASURE	BASELINE	2001 RESULT	DIFFERENCE
Percent of grade 10 Jasper Place students who have completed a portfolio	NA	88.9	N/A
Percent of Queen Elizabeth students who successfully completed Social Studies 16	NA	57.1	N/A
Percent of Queen Elizabeth students who successfully completed English 16	NA	42.8	N/A
Percent of Queen Elizabeth students who successfully completed Science 16	NA	64.3	N/A
Percent of Learning Store on Whyte students who completed courses	NA	57.5	N/A