

AGENDA

School Board Meeting



Wednesday, January 30, 2013

6:00 pm

Board Chambers
33 Spectacle Lake Drive
Dartmouth, NS

Reports attached following Agenda

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
3. **AWARDS / PRESENTATIONS** (Normally awards and presentations will be limited to 5 minutes – the Chair may extend the time limit under unique circumstances.)
4. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**
5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES/BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

December 19, 2012 (Regular)
6. **CORRESPONDENCE**
7. **CHAIR'S REPORT**
8. **SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**
9. **ITEMS FOR DECISION**
 - 9.1 Report #13-01-1387 - Renumbering of Policies – Selena Henderson, Corporate Secretary

The HRSB would appreciate the support of the public and staff in creating a scent-reduced environment at all meetings. During Board meetings, cell phone ringers should be switched to vibrate or turned off. Cell phone conversations must take place outside the Board Chambers. We appreciate your cooperation. Thank you.

Halifax Regional
School Board
33 Spectacle Lake Drive
Dartmouth NS
B3B 1X7
T 902 464-2000 Ext. 2321
F 902 464-2420

10. COMMITTEE REPORTS (Committee reports will be limited to 5 minutes – the Chair may extend the time limit under unique circumstances.)

10.1 Audit Committee

10.2 Nova Scotia School Boards Association

11. INFORMATION ITEMS

11.1 Report #13-01-1385 - Succeeding in Reading – Geoff Cainen, Director, Program and Kim Matheson, Coordinator, Research, Planning & Program

11.2 Report #13-01-1384 – Outcome Measures Business Plan Update – Terri Thompson, Director, Financial Services

12. NOTICE OF MOTION

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Board Meeting – February 27, 2013

14. IN-CAMERA

14.1 Compensation Matter – Mike Christie, Director, Human Resource Services

14.2 Compensation Matter – Terri Thompson, Director, Financial Services

15. ADJOURNMENT

The HRSB would appreciate the support of the public and staff in creating a scent-reduced environment at all meetings. During Board meetings, cell phone ringers should be switched to vibrate or turned off. Cell phone conversations must take place outside the Board Chambers. We appreciate your cooperation. Thank you.

Halifax Regional
School Board
33 Spectacle Lake Drive
Dartmouth NS
B3B 1X7
T 902 464-2000 Ext. 2321
F 902 464-2420

HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD RENUMBERING OF POLICIES

- PURPOSE:** This report is for Board approval.
- BACKGROUND:** Staff has identified the need to renumber some policies and to change a heading to appropriately reflect the policy work of the different departments of the Halifax Regional School Board.
- CONTENT:** A current heading in the index of HRSB policies is Board Governance and Operations. Staff recommends that this heading change to Board Services, and Operations be considered for a separate heading with the heading Community Relations deleted. This will more accurately reflect the work of the different departments of the Board and will assist the HRSB community in locating policies.
- COST:** n/a
- FUNDING:** n/a
- TIMELINE:** Immediately upon Governing Board approval.
- APPENDICES:** Appendix 1- Current Index of HRSB Policies
Appendix 2- Revised Index of HRSB Policies
- RECOMMENDATIONS:** It is recommended that the Governing Board approve the renumbering of policies for the Halifax Regional School Board.

COMMUNICATIONS:

AUDIENCE	RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE
Governing Board	Selena Henderson, Corporate Secretary	Upon Board approval
HRSB Community (HRSB Website)	Doug Hadley, Communications	Upon Board approval.

From: For further information, please contact Selena Henderson, Corporate Secretary, by email shenderson@hrrsb.ca, or (902)464-2000, ext. 2324.

To: Halifax Regional School Board January 30, 2013

Policy Manual

INDEX

A. Board Governance and Operations

A.001	Naming School Facilities
A.002	Review of Facilities for Permanent Closure
A.005	Advisory Committees to the Board
A.006	Tobacco-Free Schools and Workplaces
A.007	Student Advisor to the Board
A.008	Harassment Policy
A.009	Disclosure of Wrongdoing
A.010	Solid Waste Management
A.011	Student Transportation
A.012	Policy Development and Review

B. School Administration

B.001	Bomb Threats
B.002	Communicable Diseases
B.003	Creating School Populations
B.004	Fire Safety
B.005	Pediculus Humanus (Head Lice)
B.008	Lunch Time
B.009	Pupil Transportation
B.010	Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect
B.012	School and Bus Cancellation
B.013	Regional Code of Conduct
B.014	School Trips
B.017	Parent Concern Protocol
B.018	Principal & Vice-Principal Appraisal
B.019	High School Attendance
B.020	Religious Education in Schools
B.021	Safe, Secure and Healthy Schools
B.022	Acceptable Use of Computers and Internet/Intranet Technology
B.023	Distribution and Display of Materials in Schools of the Halifax Regional School Board
B.024	Information Sharing Under the Youth Justice Act
B.025	School Advisory Councils
B.026	Canadian Anthem
B.027	Custody and Access Policy

C. Program

C.001	Correspondence Courses
C.002	Fine Arts <i>(Currently Under Review)</i>
C.003	French Second Language
C.004	Home Schooling
C.005	Learning Resources
C.006	Special Education
C.007	Assessment, Evaluation and Communication of Student Learning
C.008	Educational Opportunity for Adults and Others
C.009	Administration of Medication
C.010	Race Relations, Cross Cultural Understanding and Human Rights in Learning
C.011	Severe Medical Conditions
C.012	Life-Threatening Allergies

D. Human Resource Services

D.002	Occupational Health and Safety
D.003	Recruitment and Selection of Principals and Vice-Principals
D.004	Recruiting and Hiring of Staff
D.005	Secondary Employment
D.006	Progressive Discipline for Board Employees <i>(Currently Under Review)</i>
D.007	Student Protection
D.008	Supervision and Appraisal for School-based Teaching Staff
D.009	Diversity Management

E. Financial Services

E.001	Purchasing
E.002	Accounting for School Based Funds
E.003	Budget and Budget Planning
E.004	Investment

F. Community Relations

F.001	Use of Board Facilities
F.002	Communications



REVISED

Policy Manual

I N D E X

A. Board Services

A.001	Naming School Facilities
A.005	Advisory Committees to the Board
A.006	Tobacco-Free Schools and Workplaces
A.007	Student Advisor to the Board
A.008	Harassment Policy
A.009	Disclosure of Wrongdoing
A.012	Policy Development and Review
A.013	Communications

B. School Administration

B.001	Bomb Threats
B.002	Communicable Diseases
B.003	Creating School Populations
B.005	Pediculus Humanus (Head Lice)
B.008	Lunch Time
B.009	Pupil Transportation
B.010	Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect
B.012	School and Bus Cancellation
B.013	Regional Code of Conduct
B.014	School Trips
B.017	Parent Concern Protocol
B.018	Principal & Vice-Principal Appraisal
B.019	High School Attendance
B.020	Religious Education in Schools
B.021	Safe, Secure and Healthy Schools
B.023	Distribution and Display of Materials in Schools of the Halifax Regional School Board
B.024	Information Sharing Under the Youth Justice Act
B.025	School Advisory Councils
B.026	Canadian Anthem
B.027	Custody and Access Policy

C. Program

C.001	Correspondence Courses
C.002	Fine Arts (<i>Currently Under Review</i>)
C.003	French Second Language
C.004	Home Schooling
C.005	Learning Resources
C.006	Special Education
C.007	Assessment, Evaluation and Communication of Student Learning
C.008	Educational Opportunity for Adults and Others
C.009	Administration of Medication
C.010	Race Relations, Cross Cultural Understanding and Human Rights in Learning
C.011	Severe Medical Conditions
C.012	Life-Threatening Allergies

D. Human Resource Services

D.002	Occupational Health and Safety
D.003	Recruitment and Selection of Principals and Vice-Principals
D.004	Recruiting and Hiring of Staff
D.005	Secondary Employment
D.006	Progressive Discipline for Board Employees (<i>Currently Under Review</i>)
D.007	Student Protection
D.008	Supervision and Appraisal for School-based Teaching Staff
D.009	Diversity Management

E. Financial Services

E.001	Purchasing
E.002	Accounting for School Based Funds
E.003	Budget and Budget Planning
E.004	Investment

F. Operations Services ~~Community Relations~~

F.001	Use of Board Facilities
F.003	Review of Facilities for Permanent Closure
F.004	Solid Waste Management
F.005	Student Transportation
F.006	Fire Safety
F.007	Acceptable Use of Computers and Internet/Intranet Technology

HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD

Early Literacy Support 2011-2012 Year End Report

- PURPOSE:** To inform the Governing Board of the progress of students supported through the Early Literacy Support model in 2011-2012.
- BUSINESS PLAN GOAL:** To continue to improve student achievement and learning for all students.
- BACKGROUND:** On April 26, 2011 the Department of Education released the “Succeeding in Reading: An Early Literacy Support Framework” document, which included the support replacement for Reading Recovery. Individual School Boards were asked to design models of support that aligned with the guiding parameters, approach and roles outlined in the framework document.
- The Halifax Regional School Board developed the Early Literacy Support model which included the Department of Education’s parameters of; focusing support at grades primary and one, basing student need on current assessment information, providing small group support within the classroom environment, using a flexible approach to instruction and ensuring on-going teacher professional learning and support.
- CONTENT:** Please see Appendix A - Early Literacy Support 2011-2012 Year End Report
- COST:** n/a
- FUNDING:** Included in the general fund
- TIMELINE:** On-going with a year-end report available in the fall
- APPENDIX:** Appendix A – Early Literacy Support 2011-2012 Year End Report
- RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended the Governing Board receive the Early Literacy Support 2011-2012 Year End Report for information.

COMMUNICATIONS:

AUDIENCE	RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE
Governing Board	Geoff Cainen	Jan 30, 2013
Elementary Schools	Geoff Cainen	Jan 31, 2013

- From:** Heather Syms, Coordinator EQA hsyms@hrsb.ca
Geoff Cainen, Director Program gcainen@hrsb.ca
- To:** Governing Board January 30, 2013

Early Literacy Support



2011-2012
Year End Report



General Overview of Early Literacy Support

In April 2011 the Department of Education released “Succeeding in Reading: An Early Literacy Support Framework”, which included the intervention intended to replace Reading Recovery. Individual school boards were required to use this framework to develop board level models of support. The Halifax Regional School Board (HRSB) developed the HRSB Early Literacy Support model, which was implemented in both English and French Immersion programs in the 2011-2012 school year.

During this first year of implementation the HRSB Early Literacy Support Model included the following components:

- Early literacy support was provided to English and French Immersion grade one students in the earliest stage of their literacy development.
- Once all literacy needs were met in the grade one population support was provided to grade primary students in the earliest stage of literacy development.
- Support was provided a number of ways:
 - Small group or one on one or a combination
 - In-class or outside of the classroom, or a combinationWith small group, in-class support being the preferred model.
- All decisions related to support are made at the school level through the Department of Education’s school planning team process
- The school planning team, including grades P-1 teachers, completed the selection of students for early literacy support.
- Selection of students was based on the review of current student assessment information in relation to benchmarks provided by HRSB.
- Support was provided in both English and French Immersion by trained early literacy teachers.
- Support was primarily provided to students in small groups (maximum 3 students) within the regular classroom.
- The average lesson for a group of students was 45 minutes long, 30 minutes if the support was provided to a student individually.
- Lessons consisted of a reading component, a writing component and word and oral language instruction.
- Lessons provided to grade primary students followed a different lesson structure that enabled more extensive shared and guided practice and stressed the development of oral language skills.
- Generally students received support until they reached designated reading and writing benchmarks or until the school planning team determined other support was warranted.

Support Allocation

Time for early literacy teachers to provide support to students was allocated to each school site containing English and French Immersion program grades P-2 students. Schools were given a separate allocation for English and French Immersion support.

In English program all schools with a P-3 English program student population were provided with allocation ranging from 10% in the smaller school sites to 70% in larger or higher needs schools.

In French Immersion program all schools with a P-3 French Immersion program student population (19 school sites) were provided with allocation ranging from 20% in the smaller school sites to 50% in larger or higher needs schools.

The English program allocation was allotted as follows:

English Program Early Literacy Support Allocation			
	Number of Schools	Percentage Allocation	Full Time Equivalent Total
	3	10%	0.3
	26	20%	5.2
	3	30%	0.9
	40	40%	16.0
	13	50%	6.5
	4	60%	2.4
	3	70%	2.1
Totals	92	n/a	33.4 FTE

The French Immersion program allocation was allotted as follows:

French Immersion Early Literacy Support Allocation			
	Number of Schools	Percentage Allocation	Full Time Equivalent Total
	4	20%	0.8
	4	30%	1.2
	8	40%	3.2
	3	50%	1.5
Totals	19	n/a	6.7 FTE

Early Literacy Teachers

Support was provided by 104 early literacy teachers, of which 85 teachers provided the support to English program students only, 11 teachers provided support to French Immersion program students only and 8 teachers provided support to both English and French Immersion program students. In almost all instances the allocation was paired with a lower elementary classroom assignment to create a 100% position for the early literacy teacher. There were a few early literacy teachers who were also vice principals and paired the early literacy support allocation with their administrative time to create a 100% assignment and one teacher who only worked part time. All

104 early literacy teachers had a minimum of 5 years of classroom experience and of the 104, 60 were Reading Recovery trained.

Student Selection

Students were selected for support by the school planning team which consisted of grade primary and one English and French Immersion classroom teachers, resource teacher(s), early literacy teacher(s), principal and in some schools the vice principal. Selections were based on a review of the following assessment information:

- Running Record – an instructional text level a student is able to read accurately, fluently and with comprehension
 - The texts used for this assessment in English program were from either the PM Benchmarks Assessment Resource or Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment kit
 - The texts used for this assessment in French Immersion were the texts identified by the provincial working group
 - Fluency for both English and French Immersion was scored using the HRSB Oral Reading Fluency Scale - revised October 2011
 - Comprehension was determined using the HRSB Comprehension Rubric using questions for the selected assessment resource
- Concepts About Print (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- Dated Writing sample scored using the HRSB Developmental Writing Continuum
- Letter Identification (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- Word Reading (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- Writing Vocabulary (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- Hearing and Recording Sounds (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- BURT Word Reading Test (not applicable in French Immersion)

It was recommended that students earliest in their literacy development were selected for support.

Literacy Benchmarks

Reading and writing benchmarks for both English and French Immersion grade primary and one Early Literacy Support were established. These benchmarks were used by school planning teams to inform decisions in relation to student support.

Ending Support

The goal of the model of support is to ensure all students are able to achieve year end benchmarks for reading and writing. The school planning team determines when a child is no longer in need of additional support from the early literacy teacher. The assessments identified for determining if a student requires support are re-administered to inform decisions in relation to further student support. It was recommended support not be discontinued unless a student met the appropriate benchmarks or alternate support could be put in place for a student.

Data Collection

Early literacy teachers were asked to submit entry, exit and year end assessment results for all students who received early literacy support. This data was compiled at a board level and analyzed to inform decisions in relation to continued implementation of the support model.

Summary of Results

The following information is a summary of the student results from data collected during the first year of Early Literacy Support implementation (2011-2012).

General Summary of Students Supported (September to June)

The total grade one population for 2011-2012 was 3444 students

- 48% female
- 52% male

From this total grade one population 1069 students (both English and French Immersion programs) were supported through Early Literacy Support

- 397 female (37%)
- 672 male (63%)

Of the 1069 students supported

- 846 students were in English program
- 223 students were in French Immersion program

English Program Results

In relation to meeting/not meeting year-end benchmarks:

Of the 846 English program grade one students supported 40 were unavailable for year-end assessment (moved, etc.).

806 students who participated in year-end assessment

- 289 (36%) females
- 517 (64%) males

Of the 806 students who participated in year-end assessment

- 454 (56%) **met** year-end benchmarks
 - 185 (41%) females
 - 269 (59%) males
- 352 (44%) **did not meet** year-end benchmarks
 - 104 (30%) females
 - 248 (70%) males

In relation to growth in reading level:

Of the 806 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 641 (80%) students began their support reading in the limited category (reading level 0-6).

Of the 641 students who began their support reading in the limited category

- 309 (48%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 15+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 145 (23%) students were approaching year-end benchmarks (reading at level 11 to 14) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 112 (17%) students were reading in the developing category (reading at level 7 to 10) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 75 (12%) students remained in the limited category (reading at level 0-6) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 806 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 133 (17%) students began their support reading in the developing category (reading level 7-10).

Of the 133 students who began their support in the developing category

- 116 (87%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 15+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 17 (13%) students were approaching year-end benchmarks (reading at level 11 to 14) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 806 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 28 (3%) students began their support reading in the approaching category (reading level 11-14).

Of the 28 who began their support reading in the approaching category:

- 27 (96%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 15+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 1 (4%) student remained in the approaching year-end benchmarks category (reading at level 11 to 14) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 806 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 4 students began their support reading in the meeting year end benchmark category (reading level 15+).

Although these students met the benchmarks for reading they were provided support because their writing levels did not meet expectations. They remained in the meeting benchmarks category for reading at the end of the year.

There was no statistically significant difference between males and females in relation to growth in reading level. The method of instruction for both boys and girls created the same results for both genders.

In relation to how support was provided:

Small Groups versus Individual Support

Of the 806 students who received support:

- 654 (81%) received support in a small group
- 58 (7%) received individual support
- 94 (12%) received support in a combination of individual and small group

Progress of Students in Relation to Small Group versus Individual Support

Type of Support (N = 806)	Total N	Meets Reading Benchmark		Meets Reading Level 15 YE		Approaching YE		Developing YE		Limited YE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small Group	654	387	59.2%	389	59.5%	134	20.5%	87	13.3%	44	6.7%
Individual	58	25	43.1%	25	43.1%	9	15.5%	9	15.5%	15	25.9%
Combination	94	42	44.7%	42	44.7%	20	21.3%	16	17.0%	16	17.0%

Although the percentage meeting expectations are higher for Small Group support, we cannot conclude that Type of Support made a difference in the program outcomes. Rather, students may have been placed in Individual support for example because of concentration difficulties, behavioural concerns, etc. that could have had a larger impact on student reading success.

In Class versus Out of Class Support

Of the 806 students who received support:

- 300 (37%) received support in class
- 263 (31%) received support out of class
- 243 (30%) received support in a combination of in class and out of class

Of the 300 students who received support in class, 195 (65.0%) met year end reading benchmarks.

Of the 263 students who received support out of class, 123 (46.8%) met year end reading benchmarks.

Of the 243 students who received support in a combination of in class and pull out, 136 (56.0%) met year end reading benchmarks.

Progress of Students in Relation to In Class versus Out of Class Support Overall

Location of Support (N = 806)	Total N	Meets Reading Benchmark		Meets Reading Level 15 YE		Approaching YE		Developing YE		Limited YE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Out of Class	263	123	46.8%	124	47.1%	61	23.2%	49	18.6%	29	11.0%
Combination	243	136	56.0%	136	56.0%	54	22.2%	29	11.9%	24	9.9%
In Class	300	195	65.0%	196	65.3%	48	16.0%	34	11.3%	22	7.3%

Students receiving the **In Class** support location experienced a higher degree of success in meeting Year End Reading Benchmarks and Level 15 (Accuracy) compared to students receiving the Combination or Out of Class location.

Progress of Students in Relation to In Class versus Out of Class Support by Entry Level

Location of Support (N = 806)	Total N	Limited at Entry		Developing at Entry		Approaching at Entry		Meeting at Entry	
		N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE
Out of Class	263	221	38.9%	37	86.5%	4	100%	1	100%
Combination	243	200	50.0%	32	81.3%	11	90.1%	n/a	n/a
In Class	300	220	55.0%	64	90.6%	13	100%	3	100%

For students who began receiving early literacy support in the Limited category (0-6), more students in the Combination and In Class Locations met the year end reading level 15 than those in the Out of Class Location.

French Immersion Program Results

In relation to meeting/not meeting year-end benchmarks

Of the 223 French Immersion program grade one students supported 23 were unavailable for year-end assessment (moved, etc.).

Of the 200 students who participated in year-end assessment

- 84 (42%) females
- 116 (58%) males

Of the 200 students who participated in year-end assessment

- 123 (61%) **met** year-end benchmarks
 - 54 (44%) females
 - 69 (56%) males
- 77 (39%) **did not meet** year-end benchmarks
 - 30 (39%) females
 - 47 (61%) males

In relation to growth in reading level:

Of the 200 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 169 (85%) students began their support reading in the limited category (reading level 0-4).

Of the 169 students who began their support reading in the limited category

- 93 (55%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 9+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 30 (18%) students were approaching year-end benchmarks (reading at level 7 to 8) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 31 (18%) students were reading in the developing category (reading at level 5 to 6) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 15 (9%) students remained in the limited category (reading at level 0-4) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 200 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 19 (10%) students began their support reading in the developing category (reading level 5-6).

Of the 19 students who began their support reading in the developing category

- 18 (95%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 9+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 1 (5%) students were approaching year-end benchmarks (reading at level 7 to 8) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 200 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 10 (6%) students began their support reading in the approaching category (reading level 7-8).

Of the 10 students who began their support reading in the approaching category

- 10 (100%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 9+) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 200 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 2 (1%) students began their support reading in the meeting year end benchmark category (reading level 9+). Although these students met the benchmarks for reading they were provided support because their writing levels did not meet expectations. They remained in the meeting benchmarks category for reading at the end of the year.

There was no statistically significant difference between males and females in relation to growth in reading level. The method of instruction for both boys and girls created the same results for both genders.

In relation to how support was provided:

Small Group versus Individual Support

Of the 200 students who received support:

- 178 (89%) received support in a small group
- 3 (2%) received individual support
- 19 (10%) received support in a combination of individual and small group

Progress of Students in Relation to Small Group versus Individual Support

Type of Support (N = 200)	Total N	Meets Reading Benchmark		Meets Reading Level 9 YE		Approaching YE		Developing YE		Limited YE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small Group	178	111	62.4%	111	62.4%	29	16.3%	30	16.9%	8	4.5%
Individual	3	2	66.7%	2	66.7%	n/a	n/a	1	33.3%	n/a	n/a
Combination	19	10	52.6%	10	52.6%	2	10.5%	n/a	n/a	7	36.8%

Although the numbers meeting expectations are higher for Small Group support than Combination, we cannot conclude that Type of Support made a difference in the program outcomes. Rather, students may have been placed in Combination support because of concentration difficulties, behavioural concerns, etc. that could have had a larger impact on student reading success.

In Class versus Out of Class Support

Of the 200 students who received support:

- 109 (55%) received support in class
- 38 (19%) received support out of class
- 53 (27%) received support in a combination of in class and out of class

Progress of Students in Relation to In Class versus Out of Class Support Overall

Location of Support (N = 200)	Total N	Meets Reading Benchmark		Meets Reading Level 9 YE		Approaching YE		Developing YE		Limited YE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Out of Class	38	23	60.5%	23	60.5%	6	15.8%	4	10.5%	5	13.2%
Combination	53	30	56.6%	30	56.6%	7	13.2%	12	22.6%	4	7.5%
In Class	109	70	64.2%	70	64.2%	18	16.5%	15	13.8%	6	5.5%

Students receiving the In Class support location experienced a similar degree of success in meeting Year End Reading Benchmarks and Level 11 (Accuracy) as students receiving the Combination or Out of Class location.

Progress of Students in Relations to In Class Versus Out of Class Support by Entry Level

Location of Support (N = 200)	Total N	Limited at Entry		Developing at Entry		Approaching at Entry		Meeting at Entry	
		N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE
Out of Class	38	29	51.7%	6	83.3%	1	100%	2	100%
Combination	53	47	51.1%	5	100%	1	100%	n/a	n/a
In Class	109	93	58.1%	8	100%	8	100%	n/a	n/a

Students receiving the In Class support location experienced similar progress in reading as students receiving the Combination or Out of Class support location.

Early Learning Opportunities Results

Of the 70 students who participated in the Early Learning Opportunities program and are currently registered in HRSB, 33 students (47%) received Early Literacy Support.

- 11 **met** year end reading benchmarks
- 20 **did not meet** year end reading benchmarks
- 2 students moved before the year end assessment

Board Response to the Data

- Professional development for early literacy teachers will focus on strengthening instructional skills and supporting accelerated student progress
- French Immersion Early Literacy Support will begin at grade two in the first half of the school year
- Continue to support the development of classroom teacher practice so teachers can further develop students' skills, in particular in the area of oral language development
- Continue to support decision making at the school level; particularly focusing on supporting administrators in their role as instructional leaders
- Participate in the provincial development of a new Atlantic Collection of French books focusing on appropriate gradient levels for French Immersion
- Share the data internally, using the results as a starting point for discussion and further investigation with board partners and school based administrators
- Examine ways to better support the varied needs of all learners and to strengthen programs offered prior to early literacy support intervention.

Public
Private

Report No. 13-01-1384
Date: January 7, 2013

HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD

Outcome Measures - Business Plan Update

- PURPOSE:** To provide the Board with the Outcome Measures – Business Plan Update for the targets associated with the 2011-12 school year.
- BACKGROUND:** The Approved 2012-13 Business Plan included Outcome Measures that were tied to the Board’s goals. Each outcome includes a measure, target and time frame to facilitate performance reporting within the business plan.
- The reporting years for the 2012-13 Business Plan Outcome Measures varied: some were for the 2011-12 school year, and a number were for the 2012-13 school year.
- As the Business Plan is tied to the fiscal year end, the results associated with the 2011-12 school year were not available to be included in the final 2012-13 Business Plan document. Rather than wait until the 2013-14 Business Plan, the attached report includes the results for this school year. As well, Department of Education staff have requested an update for this time period.
- CONTENT:** The attached report identifies all outcome measures included in the 2012-13 Business Plan. It highlights those outcome measures with a target and reporting year of the 2011-12 school year. Results for outcome measures with target and reporting years beyond 2011-12 will be included in future reports to the Board.
- COST:** N/A
- FUNDING:** N/A
- TIMELINE:** N/A
- APPENDICES:** Outcome Measures Update – 2011-12 School Year.
- RECOMMENDATIONS:** It is recommended that the Board receive the Outcome Measures Business Plan Update report for information.

COMMUNICATIONS:

AUDIENCE	RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE
General Public and schools via web site	Doug Hadley	Upon receipt by the Board
Department of Education	Terri Thompson	Upon receipt by the Board

From: For further information please contact Terri Thompson, Director of Financial Services, at 464-2000 extension 2241 or e-mail at tthompson@hrsb.ca.

To: Senior Staff – January 14, 2013
Board – January 30, 2013

Filename: ktucker/Outcome Measures Update – 13-01-1384

**HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
OUTCOME MEASURES - BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE**

OUTCOME MEASURES

School boards develop outcome measures against which performance can be measured. Each outcome includes a measure, target and time frame to facilitate performance reporting within this business plan.

The business plan template defines the following:

Outcome: A brief statement that explains the intended outcome(s) or result(s) to be achieved. In preparing outcome statements, think about what you are intending to change with your goals/priorities. The outcomes chosen should be attributable or influenced by your activities/outputs. As such, outcome statements should be short or medium term focused. Longer term or societal outcomes are the ultimate results of many programs/activities within the Board but are typically outside of the scope of control of the board and are not recommended for school board business plans.

Measure: A measure describes what the board will look to for an indication of effectiveness of a program or service. To be meaningful, measures information is obtained regularly (e.g. annually) and is normally expressed in percentages, ratios or numbers in relation to a total. For each outcome, identify the best quantitative or qualitative measure(s) that will provide objective evidence about the state of the chosen outcome. How will you know you are achieving your objectives? More than one measure may be required to gauge each outcome.

Baseline Data and Year: For each target, establish baseline data against which achievements for the reporting year will be compared. The baseline year is normally the first year in which data was reported for the outcome. Include the year and what the data was for that year.

Targets: For each measure, establish a target for what the school board wishes to achieve in concrete terms. The targets may be specific numerical standards, movement in a desired direction or a qualitative statement of preferred achievements over the period indicated (reporting period). Targets should be a stretch for the school board but they must also be realistic. Can you be accountable for the results? Are they influenced by the Board's activities/outputs? Generally, the target would not change prior to the reporting year; however, it is recognized that there may be special circumstances which warrant some adjustments from time to time prior to the reporting period. These adjustments should be explained in a footnote.

Reporting Year: Some targets may be achievable within one year and can be reported in the following year. However, other targets can be set two, three or even four years out. For each target, indicate the time frame within which the Board will report. Each year, new outcomes may be added, and others that have been reported on may be dropped.

Performance: In the reporting year's Business Plan, the board needs to report on what it had achieved in relation to the targets established. If the target was not met, explain why this is the case.

**HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
OUTCOME MEASURES - BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE**

Goal 1: To improve student achievement and learning for all students.

Outcome	Measure	Baseline Data & Year	Target & Reporting Year	Performance
Increased literacy levels for Grade 1 students	% of students in the Early Literacy Intervention Program whose levels of literacy have increased	Program is being introduced in the 2011-12 school year so that data from that year will become baseline data Baseline data is pending.	Target and reporting year will be developed once baseline data is obtained and analysed	Pending
	% of students in the Early Literacy Intervention Program who have maintained success in subsequent grades	Program is being introduced in the 2011-12 school year so that data from that year will become baseline data Baseline data is pending.	Target and reporting year will be developed once baseline data is obtained and analysed	Pending
The gap between high school class marks and the Nova Scotia Exams (NSE) is narrowed	Average difference between class marks and NSE marks	Baseline data will be the June 2009 results The average difference between high school Mathematics 12 class marks and the NSE in January 2009 is 23%. The average difference between high school Advanced Mathematics 12 class marks and the NSE in January 2009 is 21%. The average difference between high school Mathematics 12 class marks and the NSE in June 2009 is 19%. The average difference between high school Advanced Mathematics 12 class marks and the NSE in June 2009 is 18%.	The target will be to narrow the gap by 10% in the 2012-13 school year	Pending

**HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
OUTCOME MEASURES - BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE**

Outcome	Measure	Baseline Data & Year	Target & Reporting Year	Performance
High school students graduate within 3 years of entering high school	% of students graduating after 3 years of high school	Baseline data is the results from June 2011. The total number of students graduating is 3864. Of that number, 3421 or 88.5% graduated within three years.	The target will be to increase the June 2013 percentage by 5% from the June 2011 results	Pending
Grade 2 students showed improved literacy progress	# of grade 2 students in level 14 to 18 (as % of total assessed students)	Baseline data will be the 2009-2010 results In 2009, 2130 (78%) students (English Program) read accurately and fluently at levels 14-18. In 2009, 323 (62%) students (French Immersion Program) read accurately and fluently at levels 11-16.	The target will be to increase the # of Grade 2 students (as % of total assessed students) in level 14-18 by 2% by 2011-2012	Target Not Achieved: In 2011, 2323 (78%) students in English Program read accurately and fluently at levels 14-18. Since 2009, the number of students reading accurately and fluently at levels 14-18 has increased; however, the overall percentage of students reading accurately and fluently at levels 14-18 remains unchanged. In 2011, 388(63%) students in French Immersion Program read accurately and fluently at levels 11-16. Since 2009 the number of students reading accurately and fluently at 11-16 has increased and the overall percentage of students reading accurately and fluently at levels 11-16 has increased by 1%.

**HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
OUTCOME MEASURES - BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE**

Outcome	Measure	Baseline Data & Year	Target & Reporting Year	Performance
	# of students in level 0 to 10 (as % of total assessed students)	<p>Baseline data will be the 2009-2010 results</p> <p>In 2009, 470 (17%) students (English Program) read accurately and fluently at levels 0-10.</p> <p>In 2009, 163 (31%) students (French Immersion Program) read accurately and fluently at levels 0-7.</p>	<p>The target will be to reduce the # of students (as % of total assessed students) in level 0 to 10 by 2% by 2011-2012</p>	<p>Target Not Achieved:</p> <p>In 2011, 517 (17%) students in English Program read accurately and fluently at levels 0-10. Since 2009, the number of students reading accurately and fluently at Levels 0-10 has increased; however, the overall percentage of students reading accurately and fluently at Levels 0-10 remains unchanged.</p> <p>Target Not Achieved:</p> <p>In 2011, 194 (32%) students in French Immersion Program read accurately and fluently at levels 0-7. Since 2009, the number of students reading accurately and fluently at Levels 0-7 has increased and the overall percentage of students reading accurately and fluently at Levels 0-7 has increased by 1%.</p>
Increased student achievement of high school students	# of high schools offering Credit Recovery	<p>Baseline data will be the 2009-2010 results</p> <p>In 2009-2010, 10 high schools offered Credit Recovery.</p>	<p>The target will be to have all 15 high schools offering Credit Recovery by 2012-2013</p>	<p>Target Achieved:</p> <p>As of September 2012, all 15 high schools are offering Credit Recovery.</p>

**HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
OUTCOME MEASURES - BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE**

Outcome	Measure	Baseline Data & Year	Target & Reporting Year	Performance
	% of students taking Credit Recovery courses who were successful	Baseline data will be the 2009-2010 results The percentage of students taking Credit Recovery courses who were successful was 92.4%.	The target will be to increase the % of students taking Credit Recovery courses who were successful by 2% by 2011-2012	Target Not Achieved: The percentage of students taking Credit Recovery courses who were successful in 2011-2012 was 87.5%
Improved attendance at high schools participating in the Attendance Pilot	Overall % of absences in each high school	Baseline data will be data from the 2010-2011 school year The average absentee rate in the high schools participating in the pilot was 9%.	Target will be to decrease overall absenteeism by 10% by 2012-2013	Pending

**HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
OUTCOME MEASURES - BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE**

Goal 2: To achieve system-wide equity for students.

Outcome	Measure	Baseline Data & Year	Target & Reporting Year	Performance
Ability to use reliable data to address equity issues for all students	<p># of students of Aboriginal or African Descent who self-identify in high schools using the iNSchool student information system</p> <p># of students who self-identify in any category in all schools</p>	<p>Baseline data will be the data from 2010-11 school year</p> <p>The total number of high school students who self-identified by June 2011 was 249. Of those who chose to self-identify, 68 were Aboriginal and 181 were of African Descent.</p> <p>Baseline data will be the data from 2011-2012 school year</p> <p>The total number of students in all school who self-identified in all categories by June 2012 was 15,330. Of those who chose to identify, 770 were Aboriginal and 2026 were of African Descent.</p>	<p>The target will be to increase this number by 20% by 2012-13.</p> <p>The target will be to increase this number by 20% by 2012-13.</p>	<p>Target Achieved:</p> <p>June 2012 - The total number of high school students who self-identified as Aboriginal or African Descent by June 2012 was 795. Of those who chose to self-identify, 199 were Aboriginal and 596 were of African Descent.</p> <p>Pending</p>
Improved student achievement	% of students who attended the Early Learning Opportunities Program who do not require the Early Literacy Intervention Program in Grade 1	<p>Baseline data will be developed in the 2011-12 school year</p> <p>53% of students who attended the Early Learning Opportunities Program do not require the Early Literacy Intervention Program in Grade 1</p>	The target will be developed following analysis of the baseline data and reported in 2012-13	Pending

**HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
OUTCOME MEASURES - BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE**

Goal 3: To continue to improve school safety.

Outcome	Measure	Baseline Data & Year	Target & Reporting Year	Performance
Reduced incidences of bullying in schools	# of incidences of bullying in schools resulting in out-of-school suspensions.	Baseline data will be data from the 2010-11 school year There were 136 Out-of-School suspensions related to bullying.	The target is to reduce incidences of bullying by 10% by 2012-13	Pending
Fewer workplace injuries and less work time lost due to workplace injuries	# of workplace injuries	Baseline data will be data from the 2009-10 school year There were 69 workplace injuries (14 teacher, 55 WCB).	The target will be to reduce the number of workplace injuries by 5% by 2012-13	Pending
	# of weeks of lost time due to workplace injuries	Baseline data will be data from the 2009-10 school year There were 614.8 weeks of lost time due to workplace injuries (155.3 teacher, 459.5 WCB).	The target will be to reduce work time lost due to workplace injuries by 10% by 2012-13	Pending
Less consumption of energy	Gigajoules of heating and electricity consumption	Baseline data will be data from the 2010-11 fiscal year Heat: Oil 314,009 GJ Natural Gas 11,592 GJ Total Heat 325,601 GJ Electricity 142,546 GJ Total 468,147 GJ	The target will be to reduce gigajoule consumption in each category by 10% in 2011-12	Target Not Achieved: Heat: Oil 283,178 GJ Nat Gas 21,790 GJ Total Heat 304,968 GJ -6.3% Electricity 130,702 GJ -8.3% Total 435,670 GJ -6.9% Note: A number of facilities were converted from oil heat to natural gas during both the baseline and performance period.