North Vancouver School District SCHOOL PLAN for 2011-2012

School: Capilano Elementary Address: 1230 West 20th St

North Vancouver, BC V7P3B9

Phone: 604-903-3370

School/Community Context:

Capilano Elementary School's experienced staff members are fully engaged in continuously broadening their expertise in teaching methods and curriculum design. Teachers have taken on significant and on-going professional development in the last three and a half years in the process of becoming an authorized International Baccalaureate (IB) World School, offering the IB Primary Years Programme. In addition to all teachers completing required IBO training certification, we are obligated as an IB World School to uphold IBO standards and practices as well as follow the IBO rules and regulations, all of which is in addition to requirements of the North Vancouver School District, BC College of Teachers, and Ministry of Education. To ensure all requirements are upheld, the staff at Capilano are continuously involved in reflective collaborative practice and on-going professional development inclusive of:

- The training of staff members in IB instruction, assessment, and curriculum design
- Use of Wednesday early dismissal time, paired Non-Instructional Time, and Educational Leadership release time to enable same grade teachers to work collaboratively
- Involvement of teachers in school-based Collegial Conferencing projects on Inquiry-based teaching and learning and 21st Century learning
- Use of Staff Meetings and Early Dismissal Wednesdays, as well as school-based professional days to facilitate whole staff professional development

Our school, staff, and students enjoy substantial support from our active Parent Advisory Council. The funds raised at the PAC's Gala Fundraising events, held in the spring of each year, has supported many initiatives in the school, including the implementation of the IB Primary Years Programme (PYP) through the purchase of resources.

At Capilano School, staff and parents work together to provide a safe, challenging, and supportive learning environment. Students are encouraged to achieve their personal best in pursuit of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for lifelong learning and responsible citizenship. A focus on the IB Learner Profile guides students in the development of personal attributes necessary for becoming caring, reflective, and active global citizens.

<u>Capilano's Mission Statement:</u> The Capilano School Community will work together to provide learning opportunities that will enable students to develop as creative and inquiring individuals who are inspired to be lifelong learners and globally responsible citizens.

<u>Capilano's Vision Statement:</u> We provide a supportive learning environment that values diversity, promotes success and personal growth, and inspires students to become global citizens who accept responsibility for their learning.

Demographics (2010-2011 school year): Total Students: 413; Male: 222; Female: 191

| Number of stu | dents per g | rade | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grade | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| English | 66 | 74 | 62 | 58 | 43 | 50 | 30 | 30 |

| # FTE Teachers & Administrators | % Aboriginal Students | % Special Needs Students | % International Students | % ESL |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| 24.35 | 1% | 4% | > 1% | 15% |



Progress Analysis:

Significant changes have been made to the school plan for the 2011-12 school year. As a result, some of the data collected in last year's plan is not considered relevant for this revised school plan and has been discontinued. Some analyses of data for the previous year's goals is included in this section. Where data is not included, the rational for not including it is provided.

<u>Please note:</u> The FSA sections of the 2010 plan have not been commented on in terms of progress in this section because the 2011 FSA data was not assessed due to concerns about validity and reliability of the data. To spend time working through an analyses of FSA data was considered unnecessary by the members of the Capilano School Planning Council (SPC)in light of the validity issues and given that that we will no longer be using any FSA data in our school plan.

Review of School Goals - Previous Year

- 1. To Improve Literacy Proficiency in Students K to 7
- 2. To Increase Students' Numeracy Success Rates
- 3. To improve students' skills in the area of Social Responsibility

Goal 1 Objective 1.1 Reading The objective to improve the performance of "at risk" Kindergarten students identified on the Test Of Phonological Awareness (TOPA) was achieved. In Jan 2010, 68% of the kindergarten students were above the 35th percentile and 87% were above the 35th percentile in June – a 19% increase.

Goal 1 Objective 1.2 Reading Performance Standards were introduced as an assessment tool for this objective in the May 2008 school plan and used again in 2009 and 2010. Due to variations in teacher interpretations of Performance Standards language and given the way in which the data was gathered in previous years (as a one time assessment), we acknowledge significant levels of subjectivity in this data and will no longer be using the BC Performance Standards in the same way as they have been used in the past. In an effort to gather some data for progress analysis, we have extracted information from the March 2011 report cards for the cohort groups, where the grades are based on use of the BC Performance Standards and the BC Ministry of Education's Prescribed Learning Outcomes. Report Card grades show a more valid representation of student achievement due to the fact that it is an evaluation based on more than one assessment. However, an additional component must be considered when looking at the use of Report Card data for comparison: For Grades 4-7 the grades are reported as "Language Arts" grades, which includes all three strands of the Language Arts Curriculum (reading, writing, and oral language) in the final grade. This makes it impossible to extract a valid assessment of reading exclusively. Consideration must be given to the subjectivity of the data collected, particularly to the pervious years' data, which was based on a one-time assessment using the quick scales from the BC performance standards. Consideration must also be given to the fact that teachers differed from year to year which again affects the reliability and validity of data.

| Baseline: March 2008 - Percentage of students Fully Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in the Reading Performance Standards | GrK 77% | Gr1 76% | Gr2 67% | Gr3 67% | Gr4 64% |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| March 2011 (cohort group) | Gr 3 | Gr 4 | Gr 5 | Gr 6 | Gr 7 |
| Percentage of students Meeting and Exceeding Expectations (Grades K-3) in reading or receiving grades of C+, B, or A (grade 4-7) in Language Arts as shown on March Report Cards | 87% | 79% | 83% | 89% | 63% |

Analysis of progress in this objective, given the considerations noted above, reveal growth in all cohort groups except the Grade 7 group which shows relative stability in achievement.(Gr 3: +10%, Gr 4: +3%, Gr 5: +16%, Gr 6: +22%, Gr 7: -1%). We note a progressive increase in achievement in Grades 5 and 6.



Goal 1 Objective 1.3 Writing As in the progress report for the above reading objective 1.2, Performance Standards were introduced as an assessment tool in the May 2008 school plan and used again in 2009 and 2010. As with the reading objective, due to variations in teacher interpretations of Performance Standards language, and given the way in which the data was gathered in previous years, we acknowledge significant levels of subjectivity in this data and will no longer be using the BC Performance Standards in the same way as they have been used in the past.

| Baseline: March 2008 - Percentage of students Fully Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in the Writing Performance Standards | GrK 82% | Gr1 57% | Gr2 56% | Gr3 57% | Gr4 45% |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| March 2011 (cohort group) | Gr 3 | Gr 4 | Gr 5 | Gr 6 | Gr 7 |
| Percentage of students Meeting and Exceeding Expectations (Grades K-3) in writing or receiving grades of C+, B, or A (grade 4-7) in Language Arts as shown on March Report Cards | 81% | 79% | 83% | 89% | 63% |

Similarly, an additional difficulty arose when trying to use Report Card data from the 2011 March Report cards for progress analysis, due to the fact that the grades are reported as "Language Arts" in Grades 4-7 combining reading, writing, and oral language assessment. The March 2011 data in the chart above includes the combined assessment for these three literacy strands for the Grade 4-7 data as it was not possible to extract the writing evaluations exclusively.

Analysis of progress in this objective, given the considerations noted above, reveal growth in all cohort groups except the Grade 3 group which show relative stability in achievement.(Gr3: -1%,Gr4: +22%,Gr5: +27%,Gr6: +32%,Gr7: +18%). We note that growth is fairly consistent in Grades 4-7.

Goal 2 Objective 2.1 Numeracy The objective to improve the performance of "at risk" students identified on the North Vancouver District's Kindergarten Numeracy Assessment was achieved. In Jan 2010, 82% of the kindergarten students scored above16 and 96% scored above16 in June – a 14% increase.

Goal 2 Objective 2.2 Numeracy As in the progress report for the above reading and writing objectives (Reading 1.2 and Writing 1.3), Performance Standards were introduced as an assessment tool in the May 2008 school plan and used again in 2009 and 2010. As with the previous objectives, due to variations in teacher interpretations of Performance Standards language and given the way in which the data was gathered in previous years we acknowledge significant levels of subjectivity in this data and will no longer be using the BC Performance Standards in the same way as they have been used in the past. In the chart below we have use Report Card data from the 2011 March Report cards for progress analysis. It is likely that the use of Report Card grades shows a more valid representation of student achievement due to the fact that it is an evaluation based on more than one assessment. Again, teacher bias must be considered as teachers change from year to year.

| Baseline: March 2008 Percentage of students Fully Meeting and Exceeding Expectations in the Numeracy Performance Standards | K | Gr1 | Gr2 | Gr3 | Gr4 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 86% | 81% | 81% | 76% | 82% |
| March 2011 (cohort group) Percentage of students Meeting and Exceeding Expectations (Grades K-3) in numeracy or receiving grades of C+, B, or A (grade 4-7) in numeracy as shown on March Report Cards | Gr 3 | Gr 4 | Gr 5 | Gr 6 | Gr 7 |
| | 78% | 95% | 68% | 100% | 77% |

Analysis of progress in this objective, given the considerations noted above, reveals inconsistency in growth (Gr 3: -8%, Gr 4: + 14%, Gr 5: -13%, Gr 6: +24%, Gr 7: -5%). This may be due to the more "global" assessment that was done to establish baseline with the use of the Performance Standards. It could also have to do with the curriculum content that was covered at the time leading up to the assessment/grading period for the March 2011 report cards (ie: relative ease or difficulty of learning outcomes assessed).



Goal 3 Objective 3.1 Social Responsibility Performance Standards were also used for as source of data for this objective in previous years. Again, due to the subjectivity of the data in the way in which Performance Standards were used, and since this is no longer a goal in our school plan we did not feel it would be possible to gather data that would give a reasonable comparison for progress analysis. We have experienced improvements in social responsibility in Capilano students over the past few years, which may be attributed to the implementation of the International Baccalaureate (IB) Learner Profile attributes as an integral component of daily learning.

Opportunities for Further Development:

The intention of the school plan from this time forward is to make it very specific with a focus on targeted groups of students, in particular areas, who would benefit most from additional learning support. We endeavour to include measures that are less subjective so that progress can be tracked with greater reliability and validity over time. Our goal is to generate a school plan that is streamlined and focused to allow for better use of our resources to support student progress. Implications from the pervious school plans and this progress analysis informed our decisions for the development of the 2011-12 school plan goals and objectives and key performance measures. We recognize the need to continue to address the needs of learners in the area of literacy early in their school experience. We also recognize the importance of supporting students as they transition from primary to intermediate grades in both literacy and numeracy. Tracking of the specific target groups over time will continue to be a priority in determining future goals and objectives.

School Goals for 2011-2012:

Based on the review of Report Card data and other school-based assessments, the goals set out in the Capilano School Plan for 2011-12 are:

- 1. To improve literacy proficiency of students identified as "at risk" or not yet meeting grade level expectations in Grades Kindergarten, 1, 2 and 6.
- 2. To improve numeracy proficiency of students in Kindergarten who are identified as "at risk" by the Kindergarten Numeracy Assessment and students in Grades 4-7 who receive C- on term report cards.
- 3. To improve students' performance in the IB Primary Years Programme



School Goal #1: To improve literacy proficiency of students identified as "at risk" or not yet meeting grade level expectations in Grades Kindergarten, 1, 2, 6 and 7.

Goal Rationale:

Research has shown time and again that early intervention is one of the key factors in future academic achievement, particularly for students who are not meeting grade-level or age-specified expectations for reading. We acknowledge that students identified as "at risk" or below expectations for their age/grade would benefit in the long term from additional learning support. As a result, it was determined that we would continue to identify and provide additional learning support for students in the early primary grades. Additionally, we recognize the importance of having the ability to communicate ideas effectively in writing, and therefore have included an objective to address needs at the upper intermediate grades, providing additional support to students who are identified as "Not Yet Meeting Expectations" (using the *Impromptu Writing* rubric from the BC Performance Standards) in writing.

Objective 1.1: (Reading - Kindergarten): To improve the performance of "at risk" students identified on the Test of Phonological Awareness

Strategies/Structures:

- Administer the Test of Phonological Awareness (TOPA) to all Kindergarten students in January 2012 and identify the students scoring below the 35th percentile; Learning Assistance Centre (LAC) and Kindergarten teachers then collaborate to provide additional learning support for those students, from January through until June; Students who had scored below the 35th percentile are then re-tested in June 2012
- Use of interventions in Kindergarten as outlined in *Firm Foundations*; Use of literacy resource materials

Home support for phonological awareness

Evidence: (Quantitative)

| Key Performance Measure: TOPA – Test of Phonological Awareness | Baseline % students above the 35th percentile | Target % students above the 35th percentile | Actual % students above the 35th percentile |
|--|--|---|--|
| 2010 80 Kindergarten students assessed Jan –32% below (26 students; 8 ESL); 68% above the 35 percentile June - 13% below (11 students; 6 ESL); 87% above the 35 percentile | 2010 January 68 % | 2010 100% | 2010 June 87% |
| 2011 58 Kindergarten students assessed Jan - 18% below (11 students; 3 are ESL); 82 % above the 35 percentile | 2011 January 82 % | 2011 100% | 2011 June |



June -

Objective 1.2 (Reading – Grade 1 and 2): To improve the performance of students identified by the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) test as "Well Below" and "Below" Benchmark.

Strategies/Structures:

- Use the DIBELS test to assess students in Grade 1 in September 2011 who:
 - o at the end of Kindergarten were still below the 35th percentile on the TOPA (June assessment)
 - are referred by teacher as performing at the "approaching expectations" level for reading during the fall reporting period (receiving performance scale rating of "approaching expectations" for reading on Term 1 report card)

- Students who score "Below" or "Well Below" benchmark on the DIBELS receive additional learning support through LAC for the rest of their Grade 1 year and are then retested, using the DIBELS, at the beginning (Sept/Oct) of Grade 2
- Other Grade 2 students, not previously identified, may be referred for DIBELS testing, by classroom teacher, in September of their Grade 2 year
- All Grade 2 students identified as "Below" or "Well Below" benchmark on the DIBELS in Grade 2 will receive additional learning support through LAC for their Grade 2 year
- Use of classroom-based guided reading groups and in-class reading instruction

Evidence: (Quantitative)

| Key Performance Measure: | Basel "Below" o Below" ber | r "Well | Target At or above Benchmark | |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|
| 2010-11 | le 1 Assessed: 74) | Grade 2 tudents Assessed: 19) | | |
| Fall DIBELS results | # | % | # | % |
| Well Below Benchmark "intensive Support" Score: 0-96 for Gr 1 Score 0-108 for Gr 2 | 22 (4 are ESL) | 29% | 4 | 5% |
| Below Benchmark "strategic support" Score: 97-112 Gr 1 Score 109-140 Gr 2 | 3 | 4% | 3 | 1.5% |



Objective 1.3 (writing): To improve the writing proficiency of students in Grade 6 and 7 who are identified as "Not Yet Meeting Expectations" (*Impromptu Write* – BC Performance Standards) in 2011-12 school year.

Strategies/Structures:

- All grade 6 and 7 students complete an impromptu write in September of 2011
- Grade 6 and 7 teachers collaboratively assesses the impromptu write using the BC Performance Standards rubric for Impromptu Writing for Grades 6 and 7
- Provide additional support for students "not yet meeting expectations" through small group instruction and "writers' workshop" approach
- All students participate in a second impromptu write in May 2011 to re-assess for progress analysis

Evidence: (Qualitative)

| Key Performance Measure: | Baseline | Target | Actual |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|
| BC Performance Standards Impromptu Write rubric Grade 6 | Not Yet Meeting Expectations | Meeting Expectations | |
| BC Performance Standards Impromptu Write rubric Grade 7 | Not Yet Meeting Expectations | Meeting Expectations | |

School Goal 2: To improve numeracy proficiency of students in Kindergarten who are identified as "at risk" (NVSD Kindergarten Numeracy Assessment) and students in Grades 4-7 who receive a grade of C- on term report cards.

Goal Rationale: Noting there was room for improvement in progress associated with numeracy goals of the past school plan, it was agreed to keep the numeracy as a goal, narrowing the focus to improve support for students who most need it: Early intervention and learning support for students in Kindergarten and additional learning support for students in grades 4-7 who are lacking in basic math skills and problem solving strategies.

Objective 2.1: (Numeracy - Kindergarten): To increase the percentage of kindergarten students who meet the expectations for numeracy readiness by end of the school year as measured by the NVSD Kindergarten Numeracy Assessment.

Strategies/Structures:

- Assess all Kindergarten students, using the North Vancouver Numeracy Assessment Package, in late January or early February 2012 and identify those students who score 16 or below ("at risk" defined as a score of 16/20 or below in January and 18/20 or below in June)
- Provide each Kindergarten teacher with *Mathematics Intervention Handbook: Kindergarten/Grade 1* to facilitate in-class support for "at risk" students
- Provide intervention through LAC, and/or facilitate home support to "at risk" students and reassess them in June 2012 to assess progress; Results examined by the School Based Resource Team for decisions on programming /class placements and further support in Grade 1

Evidence: (Quantitative)

| Key Performance Measure: | Baseline | Target | Actual |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| NVSD Kindergarten Numeracy Assessment | % of students who scored | % of students who scored | % of students who scored |
| | above 16 | above 16 | above 16 |
| 2010 | | | |
| 83 Kindergarten students assessed | | | |
| January: # BELOW 16 = 18% (16 students); 82% above 16 | | | |
| June: # BELOW 16 = 4% (4 students); 96% above 16 2011 | 2010 January 82 % | 2010 100% | 2010 June 96% |
| 64 Kindergarten students assessed January: #BELOW 16 = 20% (13); 80% above 16 June: #BELOW 16 = (%) % above 16 | 2011 January 80 % | 2011 100% | 2011 June |

Objective 2.2 (Numeracy – Grades 4-7) To identify and provide additional learning support for students in Grades 4-7 who receive a letter grade of C- in Mathematics on term report cards.

Strategies/Structures:

- Students in Grades 4-7 identified for additional support either through Term 1 report card grades (those who receive a grade of C- in mathematics or by teacher request/ with teacher consultation) or recommended for further assessment by classroom teacher; *Criterion Test of Basic Skills* used to further assess learning needs of those students identified
- Support (small group instruction, in-class and/or LAC support) given to those students in the areas of need as revealed by the *Criterion Test of Basic Skills*, teacher observations/reports; continue to provide support as needed throughout grades 4, 5, and 6 ("as needed" meaning for those continuing to receive C- on report card for mathematics or by teacher request/ with teacher consultation)
- Refer to results of NVSD Grade 6 Math Assessment for further assessment of learning needs/identification of students needing support; Continue with learning support throughout Grade 7 for students who did not pass (less than 50%) the Grade 6 Numeracy Assessment and for those continuing to receive a grade of C- on report cards, with teacher consultation, for Mathematics

| Key Performance Measure: | Term Report Card Grades- Mathematics |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | |

| 2011-12 | # s with | # students with C- letter grade in Mathematics Target # students with C- letter grade in Mathematics | | | # students with C- letter grade in | | # st with grad | ctua adent a C- le de in thema | ts etter |
|---------|-------------|--|---|---|--|---|----------------------|--|-------------|
| Term: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Grade 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 6 | | | | | | | | | |

Other Evidence:

Criterion Test of Basic Skills

NVSD Grade 6 Math Assessment

students with LESS than 50% (Spring 2011):

students with LESS than 50% (Spring 2012):

School Goal 3:

To improve students' performance in the IB Primary Years Programme.

Goal Rationale:

As an authorized IB World School we have a number of standards and practices that we need to uphold as well as specific elements of the Primary Years Program that must be incorporated into instruction. The Learner Profile is one of the core components of the IB Programmes, the thread that connects the Primary and Middle Years and Diploma Programmes. It is through the development of these attributes that students develop what IBO defines as "international-mindedness". Of these, one that most closely related to both academic achievement and aspects of social responsibility is the attribute of being reflective.

Objective 1.1: To improve students' development of the IB Learner Profile attribute "reflective"

Strategies/Structures:

- Teacher, student (self and peer) and parent assessment development of the attribute "reflective" – regularly, with specific goal setting (SMART goals)
- Use of formative assessment strategies (Assessment FOR and AS learning) to engage reflective thinking
- Journal Writes and goal setting on the attribute of being "reflective"
- Structuring for open communication in "community circle" or class meetings
- Support for student "action" initiatives (especially identifying a need or problem, coming up with solutions, taking action)
- Student involvement in generating learning criteria and assessment rubrics, and classroom essential agreements
- Use of Capilano's behaviour "Think Sheets", based on the Learner Profile attributes incorporated into our Code of Conduct, that also include a reflection on the IB PYP "action cycle", in problem solving (continuous cycle – interconnected triangle of think, reflect, act)

| Key Performance Measure: | Baseline | Target | Actual |
|--|----------|--------|--------|
| Student (self and peer), Teacher, and Parent formative | | | |
| assessments | | | |

Evidence: (Qualitative)

Qualitative Baseline:

 To be determined through student, parent, and teacher formative assessments in September 2011



Qualitative Target:

- Students' demonstration of an understanding of the importance and value of reflection (both for self and relationships with others; metacognition as well as "taking personal inventory")
- Samples of students' reflections that reveal their ability to accurately identify learning progress, successes, struggles, and needs
- Demonstration of students' abilities to set "SMART" goals related to reflections
- Demonstrations of students' abilities to reflect on problems/problematic situations and generate solutions and problem-solving strategies

| \cap | 12 | lita | tive | Λ | cti | ıal | ı |
|--------|-----|------|------|---|-----|-----|---|
| w | IHI | 117 | nve: | А | CH | ıaı | |

- Click here to type qualitative ACTUAL comments



Connections:

Connections to Family of School's School Plans and/or District Achievement Plan:

Connections to Family of Schools' (FOS) School Plans:

Members of the Capilano School Planning Council attended the FOS School Plan session on Wednesday February 9th 2011 where school plans were shared and discussed.

Following that session Capilano's SPC met and reviewed FOS school plans and the following connections and considerations were made in the revisions of the plan:

- -Two goals were common amongst the FOS plans: one goal for literacy and the other in the area of numeracy
- -Inclusion of an IB Programme goal (specifically relating to the IB Learner Profile) to connect with Carson/Balmoral IB goal was considered
- -Decision made to have more specific targeting of "at risk" or "Not Yet Meeting Expectations" student groups in each of the goal areas
- -Continued inclusion literacy focus in the early primary years as common with other FOS plans
- -Sources of data and measurement tools aligned with those used in FOS (TOPA, BC Performance Standards, report card grades, impromptu writing assessments)
- A focus on the numeracy skills of Kindergarten and intermediate students (Grade 4-7) as done in other FOS plans

Connections to District Achievement Plan:

North Vancouver School District's *Achievement Contract* was reviewed by Capilano's SPC and links were made purposefully to areas of *early literacy* and *reading success in school*. In consideration of the District Review Recommendations, BC Performance standards will continue to be used as a key performance measure. The Capilano School Plan goals were established to reflect the needs of our own school population while still giving consideration to those of the District, specifically the following District goal: *"To improve the success rates of students who are not yet meeting expectations for reading, writing, listening and/or speaking as measured by performance standards."*

Strategies/Structures selected reflect those also listed in the District's plan, specifically use of the TOPA at Kindergarten and the K-Math assessments and multi-year tracking of literacy-learning needs of students receiving interventions in Kindergarten.



School Planning Council Approval of Proposed School Plan:

Date: Thursday May 5th

| | Name | Signature |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Chairperson (Principal) | Jennifer Wilson | |
| Vice Principal (Teacher) | Johneen Harris | |
| Parent | Lori Nobes | Original Document signed by SPC Members |
| Parent | Emma Tymm-Nash | |
| Parent | Mary Charleson | |
| Student (Gr 10, 11, 12 schools only) | N/A | |

Board Approval of School Plan:

Approved by:

Mark Jefferson, Assistant Superintendent June 12, 2011

