

MUNROE JR. HIGH - HISTORICAL SCAN – Exhibit 1

This data reflects responses from a sample of Munroe teachers. The statements below represent “raw data” – the statements are unedited.

Prior ← Sept. '06

1. Describe this school prior to the implementation of the reform process?

- self-contained SpE classroom in basement beside band room
- pull-out RT program
- para support in classroom – student specific
- paras W/D students to work with them out of the room
- students in class during whole group instruction and out for 1:4/1:5 work
- teachers sent students who were struggling academically to RT
- paras worked with students in halls/stairwells
- language in halls from student was foul and abusive
- non-structured time resulted in foul and abusive language use by student
- culture of school was a “street culture” – kids made the rules
- CT’s had to ignore language problems (swearing) as there were bigger issues
- no structure for lunch hours – students in halls
- less than ½ - maybe ¼ student engaged in instruction during class – estimate
- took about 20 minutes out of a 45 minutes class period to move student from class to class, out of the hall, and settled for instruction; class disruptions resulted in about 15 minutes of instructional time
- students had to be herded into classes from the hallway
- admin had clipboard with student body timetables to know where students needed to be
- response system reactive
- lots of lates, chasing students
- approximately 20% chronic attendance issues
- 80 % of the band kids from French Immersion with 20% of bands kids from English
- disrupted learning process
- students pushed each other in halls, into lockers – lots of physical confrontations
- school operating in a reactive mode
- divisional clinical staff and others indicated that they did not feel safe in the school; CT’s in the school did not feel safe
- much destruction of property - broken windows, fire starting
- students didn’t value “good students” – they were made fun of
- many students drew others out – pack mentality
- several incidents of conflict after school in the school yard
- gang colours an issue
- us and them mentality, kids vs. CT’s
- no time to be proactive due to the #'s of issues – always reactive
- never a time when there were no students referred to the office
- no field trips for students in the English program
- differentiation between French Immersion L & B & English L & B
- CT’s worked alone, no teaming, no collaboration
- gang development
- CT’s just surviving – getting through the day
- staff room place to unload
- CT’s stressed; uncomfortable approaching students
- team meetings were about listing all students and their problems
- could tell which kids were in French Immersion and those in English
- CT’s felt that students were the problem vs. their instruction
- white board in staff room listed student suspensions almost always full – badge of honour for CT’s – vacation from school, relief for CT’s

2. What is different now?

- students excited about being in school – want to be here
- physical/aggressive behaviour is the exception vs. the norm
- student engagement very close to 100%
- have some chronic attendance issues (less than 5%)
- less disparity between French Immersion and English; French Immersion students feel safer
- change in beliefs of CT's – CT's want to teach here; staff attendance good
- team approach by staff
- CT's have ownership of all students
- CT's feel that they can help all students to learn by improving their practices
- CT's use staff room to problem solve vs. complain
- white board in staff room listing student suspension has not been used in 2 years
- level team meetings (grade 7, 8, 9) focus on instruction vs. problem students – on changing instruction proactively to support students
- can't differentiated between students in French Immersion and English
- CT's feel comfortable approaching students
- CT's not stressed
- 60% of band kids in French Immersion and 40% in English
- professional conversations occur frequently – education-based
- no paras in the school
- PBS in place – more proactive strategies in place
- culture of...how do we help students make better choices vs. how best to punish them
- address needs of whole child – L & B – academic and social
- additional SW time in school
- 22 of 24 staff (most) trained in mediation
- sense of family on the staff – lots of teaming and collaborating
- culture of peace
- staff understand and accept Appropriate Education Legislation
- staff writing AEP's and using adaptations and modifications and DI
- fewer transitions during the day
- halls virtually empty – no clipboard - it is the expectation
- students feel that their needs are being met
- small group instruction (flexible) at level of students
- intern support
- student working in class and in alternate spaces
- CT's feel and are accountable for learning
- multiple trials to meet outcomes
- CT's committed to establishing relationships with students
- Outcome-based instruction
- CT's engaged in learning process
- RT's co-teaching in classrooms
- RT is an adult leader to support learning in the classroom – instructional coach
- students see CT's as educational leaders and trust them to support their L & B
- sense of shared leadership
- member of UNESCO Associated Schools network
- culture of school changed to one of the mutual respect
- acceptance that behaviour is related to lack of academic achievement
- students work at their own level (on a continuum)
- behaviour management proactive vs. reactive; few reactive issues
- student needs being met in the regular classrooms
- students know they can access admin. and counselor for mediation
- whole class SS instruction by SW and counsellor
- new students get "accultured" quickly
- 7 habits of effective teens taught to all students
- SW working with families and supporting parents – assists in helping parents
- developed respect agreement
- differentiated assessment