

# **Wireless Writing Project**

**School District No. 60  
(Peace River North)**

## **Research Report: Phase II**

Prepared by:  
Dr. Sharon Jeroski  
Research Director  
Horizon Research & Evaluation Inc

2192 East Kent Avenue  
Vancouver, BC V5P 4X2  
(604) 327 2448

[sharonj@wimsey.com](mailto:sharonj@wimsey.com)

15 July 2003

## Executive Summary

In February, 2002, School District 60 (Peace River North) initiated the *Wireless Writing Project (WWP)*, a classroom-based program of technology integration designed to improve grades 6 and 7 student achievement, particularly in written expression. The *WWP* was planned as an action research project where systematic, well-supported implementation of wireless technology in five classrooms would be carefully evaluated to determine its potential for improving the achievement of grades 6 and 7 students.

Project implementation featured:

- one-to-one assignment of wireless laptop computers
- a long-term systemic implementation plan
- ongoing professional development, collegial interactions and technology support
- systematic monitoring of the *WWP* impact through assessment of student work; teacher, parent, and student surveys; classroom observations; individual teacher research projects; and formal and informal interviews.

Results are extremely positive.

- Improvements in writing achievement, as measured on controlled writing assessments and in-class assessments are strong and consistent. In May 2003,

# Contents

<b>1. Background and Rationale</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Research Question	1
1.2 Context	1
1.3 Key Decisions	2
<b>2. Implementation and Data Collection</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Phase 1. January-June 2002	5
2.2 Phase II. September 2002-June 2003	5
2.3 Data Collection	7
2.4 Dependability of results	7
<b>3. Results</b>	<b>9</b>

# 1. Background and Rationale

## 1.1 Research Question

The *Wireless Writing Project*, developed by SD 60 (Peace Rive North), in collaboration with Apple Canada and Horizon Research & Evaluation, is designed to improve student writing achievement. Through action research, SD 60 systematically collected and interpreted data about student achievement, attitudes, and behaviours, and used these data to make decisions about the project. Research focused around the following key question:

*What effect does classroom and home use of wireless technology have on student writing achievement at grades 6-7?*

Specifically, what changes in achievement would occur if the district:

- provided iBooks for each student in selected grades 6 and 7 classes
- had students use the laptops at school and at home for all writing activities and assignments
- supported teachers with an ongoing inservice program integrating assessment, instruction, and the use of technology in collaboration with Apple Canada and Horizon Research & Evaluation Inc
- established and monitored common expectations about writing achievement, using the BC performance standards
- collected, interpreted, and acted on data to refine the project at key implementation points

## 1.2 Context

School District No. 60 has a history of commitment to improving student achievement. There has been continuing concern, however, that many students currently do not achieve the level of writing proficiency needed for success in an information age. In School District No. 60, as in other places in North America, a substantial proportion of students—often boys—enter high school without the writing skills, confidence, and commitment that they need to succeed. Research suggests that this deficit often becomes entrenched in early adolescence—by the time they finish elementary school (see, for example, *BC Ministry of Education, 1993; 2002; Barrs & Pidgeon, 2002; Epstein et al, 1999.*) Few late interventions have been successful for these students; however, research from other jurisdictions indicates that technology has the potential to improve student writing skills (see, for example, *Baker & Kinzer, 1998; Harris & Kington, 2002.*).

As part of a commitment to student success, School District No. 60 has developed strong expertise and interest in the use of technology as a tool for improving student achievement. The district has invested in developing knowledge and infrastructure with respect to best ICT practices.

Several conditions enabled SD 60 to undertake this initiative, including:

- district leadership—Ron Samborski, Superintendent, Carol Greenhalgh, Director of Instruction, and David Vandergugten, Principal of Technology, with the experience and expertise to support a project of this scope
- expertise and experience with technology integration
- commitment of SD 60 teachers to excellence in instruction.
- previous successful collaborations with potential partners, including Apple Canada

- Most students establish a perception of themselves as learners – competent or not – in the elementary grades; after early adolescence this perception rarely changes in positive ways.

### **1.3.2 Why Wireless iBooks?**

The District Leadership Team choose wireless technology, specifically Apple iBooks, for this initiative because:

- Wireless technology allowed the district to implement this initiative in current classrooms without the high cost of retro-fitting a networked environment.
- The iBooks were designed for student use, are robust (durable and compact) and have a transparent operating system.
- All wireless technology is built into the iBooks; the units are easily configured by non-technical staff.
- The iBook’s operating environment is completely compatible with other home and school computers.

### **1.3.3 What Implementation Timetable was Feasible?**

The District Leadership Team developed a three-year plan for implementation that would begin with 2 classrooms and culminate with iBooks in all grades 6-7 classrooms in the third year. This “slow-growing” approach was chosen because:

- Pilot testing in two classrooms would allow intensive support and trouble-shooting while the project team developed plans for wider implementation
- Through the second year—still considered to be a pilot phase—a small number of classrooms would be involved to ensure that sufficient support could be provided
- Data from the second year would provide data on which subsequent decisions about project continuation and expansion could be based

### **1.3.4 Why focus on the BC Performance Standards?**

The project team recognized the critical importance of having common expectations for writing instruction and assessment. An increasing body of research links clear, commonly held standards to increases in student achievement in a number of academic areas (see, for example, Baker, 2000; Black & William, 1998; Darling-Hammond & Falk, 1997; Marzano et al, 1993; Resnick & Harwell, 2000; Wiggins, 1993). This research suggests that clear standards contribute not only to achievement, but also to self-esteem and motivation— students who understand what is expected are more likely to feel ownership over their own progress.

Teachers and schools eligible for the project were using a variety of resources and methodologies for writing instruction. However, most of them had at least partially implemented the *BC Performance Standards for Writing* (BC Ministry of Education) and several were already using these for classroom and school assessment.

Because performance standards describe a range of expectations for student achievement, they enable teachers, students, and parents to judge whether a particular piece of student work actually meets the standard. “Any student should be able to look at a performance standard and say, ‘I understand now. I can learn how to do that’”(Tucker, 1998, p.2). Providing samples that illustrate various levels of quality, as the *BC Performance Standards* do, helps to make standards clear and concrete for teachers, students, and parents.

The *BC Performance Standards* were established as the focus for instruction, student improvement, and evaluation of results. They provide an established framework that is used throughout BC, while at the same time allowing teachers to exercise autonomy in the specific resources and methods they use. The standards also provided for self-assessment, and were the focus of feedback and discussion with students and parents.

## **2. Implementation and Data Collection**

### **2.1 Phase 1. January-June 2002**

Two class sets of iBooks were deployed in January 2002. Support for implementation included:

- regular teacher inservice, provided by John Maschak, Apple Canada, whose expertise is working with teachers to integrate technology into their classrooms, David Vandergugten, Principal of Technology Services for School District No. 60, and Sharon Jeroski of Horizon Research & Evaluation, whose expertise includes writing instruction and assessment, as well as program evaluation
- visits to classrooms to monitor implementation and to team teach
- parent informational and instructional meetings
- a direct phone number for technological support

### **2.2 Phase II. September 2002-June 2003**

Three additional class sets of iBooks were deployed, for a total of 5 classes (1 grade 5/6 class; 2 grade 6/7 classes, and 2 grade 7 classes) in September 2002, in order to provide a larger data set on which to base future decisions.

Within the project, experienced classroom teachers used student work samples, journals, regular classroom assessment tools, student attitude surveys, and provincial assessments to document the changes in student writing. Students in this project wrote their grade 7 provincial writing test (Foundational Skills Assessment) electronically.

Support for implementation was expanded and refined to incorporate findings from Phase 1, and included the following activities.

- A pre-project meeting was held in June 2002, where teachers received their iBooks along with instruction in the operating system and other software. They kept their iBooks over the summer.
- A 2-day Summer Institute was conducted in late August, where teachers received additional instruction and had opportunities for discussion, questions, and planning for the year. They also designed the writing assessment they would use in September to obtain baseline data, and agreed on guiding principles for the project.





## 2.3 Data Collection

The following data were collected; key data collection instruments and tables are provided in Appendices A and B:

- Impromptu Writing samples (pre/post) using the BC Performance Standards for Writing (September 2002 and May 2003)
- Teacher's in-class assessment of overall student achievement (April 2003) using the BC Performance Standards for Writing
-

subgroups of students are involved (e.g., grade 5 only, or male only, the confidence limits are substantially greater.) Student surveys were completed by over 97% of participating students; approximately 70% of parents returned completed surveys.

The 95% confidence limits (i.e., confidence that results are accurate 19 times out of 20) for data on student writing vary according to the grade and reporting category being examined, for example:

- for the reported figure of 92% of all students (120), meeting/exceeding expectations in May, the confidence limit is approximately +/- 5%—that is, we are confident that 19 times out of 20, the ‘true’ result would be between 88-97%.
- for the reported figure of 18% of all students (120) exceeding expectations in May, the 95% confidence limit is approximately +/-7%. (i.e., 19 times out of 20, the ‘true’ result will be between 11-25%.)
- results that consider subgroups (e.g., one grade, gender, class) are associated with wider confidence limits. For example, very few grade 5 students are included in the pre-post writing analysis (10); therefore the 95% confidence limit associated with the 40% who exceeded expectations is +/- 30%—still large enough to indicate that *some* students exceed expectations, but sufficiently large that we cannot be certain how many.
- on the other hand, where 100% of the students fall into the same category (e.g., grade 5 students who meet/exceed combined), there is no error term, and consequently the confidence limits are 0.

Consistency of scoring for the writing samples was ensured by extensive training and calibration sessions, and having two teachers independently rate each composition. The project leader checked each students’ scores to ensure that the two teachers did not disagree by more than 1 level; where there was such disagreement (in approximately 1% of cases), the project leader reread the paper and adjudicated the score. Consistency among markers was high. Overall, two markers, independently rating the compositions assigned *exactly* the same score in 80% of cases; a further 19% disagreed by 1 level (e.g., one marker may have assigned level 2; another level 3.)

### 3. Results

*Note: selected data tables are provided in Appendix B.*

#### 3.1 Student Writing Achievement: Pre-Post test Comparisons

The BC Performance Standards provide a provincial standard for writing at each grade, and describe 4 levels of performance:

- Not Yet Meeting Expectations
- Meeting Expectations at a Minimal to Moderate Level
- Fully Meeting Expectations
- Exceeding Expectations

The Performance Standards were used to score and compare writing samples (produced under ‘test’ conditions) from September (pre) and from May (post.) Results indicated substantial improvement.

- Student writing improved substantially between September and May, beyond what would normally be expected. In May, approximately 92% of students who wrote the posttest produced writing that met or exceeded provincial standards for their grade. This compares with 70 % in September. Further, in September, no students produced writing that exceeded provincial standards, in June, approximately 18% achieved this level.
- To provide an additional referent, in Peace River North SD, approximately 73% of students met the provincial standard for writing on the Foundation Skills Assessment (FSA) in both 2001 and 2003—that is, met or exceeded expectations; and *no* students exceeded expectations. *Note: this is offered as only a general referent—different groups of students wrote FSA and WWP, and procedures are not strictly comparable.*
- The gain, using the BC Performance Standards, averaged approximately .75 on a 4-point scale – enough to move most students a full level in terms of meeting provincial standards (e.g., from ‘not yet meeting’ to ‘meeting at a minimal to moderate level’ or from ‘fully meeting’ to ‘exceeding.’) In fact, some students moved two full levels. *Note: because the levels are very broad, it is more typical for a student to change approximately .5 level—from ‘low’ to ‘high’ within a level, or from ‘high’ at one level, to ‘low’ at another.*
- It is informative to look at FSA results for two specific schools that are participating in the WWP, and who had very different FSA profiles.

- β In school A, FSA results in 2002 were somewhat higher than for the district generally; WWP results are similar for percent meeting/exceeding expectations (90% vs 93%), but are substantially higher (22% vs. 0%) for ‘exceeds expectations.’ *Caution: these are not the same students!*
  - β In school B, where FSA results were somewhat lower than for the district generally, WWP results are substantially higher than FSA both for percent of grade 7s meeting/exceeding expectations (94% vs 68%) and for percent exceeding expectations (21% vs 0%) *Caution! WWP students are a small part of the grade 7 population in this school and may not be typical.*
- Gains vary somewhat by grade/teacher/class, although the pattern is similar across all five classes. This may reflect variations in implementation, in the dynamics of a particular class, or in their level of participation in Phase I.
  - Gains were relatively consistent across all aspects of writing (i.e., meaning, style, form, conventions.)

## 3.2 Perceptions of writing improvement

Teachers, parents, and students expressed strong beliefs that student writing has improved during the project, and further, that much of the improvement was connected to the use of iBooks.

Most grade 6 and 7 students in the WWP believe that their achievement has improved, particularly their writing skills, and see themselves as competent learners who expect to be successful. Students are enthusiastic about their writing products – their ability to produce quality work. Students describe a variety of editing strategies and practices that indicate a commitment to quality writing.

### 3.2.1 Teachers

- According to survey results, and summaries of in-class writing achievement, teachers strongly believe that student writing has improved and that the iBooks made an extensive/substantial contribution to this improvement.
- When teachers summarized in-class writing assessments, giving student achievement as of April 2003 (with a full 2 months of instruction remaining), results were dramatically improved from September 2003. By April, most teachers reported that only those students on *Individual Educational Plans* (IEPs) for writing were ‘not yet within expectations’ using the BC Performance Standards. (*Note:* IEPs are developed for students who are require modified learning outcomes and instructional support.) Further, on average, students had improved between .5 and 1 performance level. In

April, 14% were described as ‘exceeding expectations’ in April; in September, none fell into this category. These perceptions are remarkably consistent with the actual post test results described in a previous section.

- While they indicated that all aspects of student writing had improved, they saw some aspects as improving more dramatically than others. In rank order, they saw improvements in:
  - β presentation (4.8)
  - β quantity of writing (4.6)
  - β organization (4.0)
  - β conventions (i.e., sentence structure, spelling) (4.0)
  - β style (3.8)
  - β meaning (3.6)
  
- Teachers assigned high ratings to specific ways in which the iBooks contributed to improved writing, including:
  - β planning their writing (4.6)
  - β drafting their writing (4.4)
  - β editing and revising (4.4)

### **3.2.2 Parents**

- Like teachers, parents are convinced that the iBooks have dramatically improved student writing. Over 93% of parents believe that iBooks have caused at least some improvement in their children’s written expression; over 70% see that improvement as extensive or substantial.
  
- When asked about specific ways in which the iBooks contributed to student writing, parents assigned high ratings to:
  - β editing and revising (4.0)
  - β presenting their work effectively (4.3)

### **3.2.3 Students**

- Students are even more convinced than their parents that using iBooks has improved their writing. Over 50% indicated that their writing had improved ‘a lot’ this year; a further 40% said it had improved ‘quite a bit’, for an average rating of 3.4 on a 4-point scale. Results for specific aspects of their writing were as follows:
  - β meaning (3.1, 83% chose ‘3’ or ‘4’)
  - β style (3.3, 86% chose ‘3’ or ‘4’)
  - β organization (3.4, 86%)
  - β conventions (i.e., sentence structure, spelling) (3.1, 78%)

- Students answered a series of questions about *how* the iBooks helped their writing, and reported strongly positive results for virtually all the stages of writing (in rank order of results):
  - β editing and revising (3.6, 91%)
  - β planning (3.5, 92% chose ‘3’ or ‘4’)
  - β finding information (3.5, 90%)
  - β drafting (3.3, 91%)

### 3.3 Reported Use of Writing Strategies

Students were asked about their use of various writing strategies in a survey that was administered in September 2002, and repeated in June 2003. Results indicated:

- **Before writing.** Students reported little change in their use of traditional prewriting strategies, and indicated that they were less likely to make mental pictures or images before writing. Results were generally consistent across grade levels.
- **While writing.** Overall, students reported little change in their use of strategies while writing, with one exception: they were more likely to report changing their ideas about their topic or plan as they wrote (increase of 11%).
- **After writing.** Students generally reported higher use of editing and revising strategies in June than they had in September, however, the gains were small and most often not statistically significant. When the percent of students who chose ‘often’ or ‘most of the time’ were compared, the greatest gains were for: “Take out parts you don’t like” (increase of 10%) and “Move sentences or paragraphs” (increase of 9%.) Girls also reported a substantial increase in “Check for errors and make corrections” (increase of 13%); boys did not.
- The one area where male students showed greater gains was “Think about the person or people who will be reading your work.” While results for girls were relatively stable, there was an increase of 8-10% of boys who reported thinking about their audience ‘often’ or ‘most of the time’ as they planned, drafted, and edited their writing.
- One disappointing finding emerged in the strategy survey: in June, fewer students reported working with their family members to check or improve their writing, except at grade 5. In Phase I, this question received a much more positive result in June than in December (project initiation.) This result is at odds with information from other parent and survey students, and requires close attention as the project expands.







- Most parents also reported that their children helped other family members computers, 50% ‘extensively’ or ‘substantially.’

### **3.5.3 Students**

- Students reported a high degree of confidence in using computers, with an average rating of 3.6 on a four-point scale, and 94% choosing ‘quite a bit’ or ‘a lot.’
- Over 68% also indicated they are able to help others who are having trouble with their computers ‘quite a bit’ or ‘a lot’ (average rating 3.2)

## **3.6 Accessing Information**

### **3.6.1 Teachers**

- Teachers were also enthusiastic about the way in which the iBooks had helped students to access information, assigning an average rating of 4.8.

### **3.6.2 Parents**

- Parents were not asked about the impact of the iBooks on accessing information; however, they did provide information about the extent to which children accessed the Internet for school work and leisure combined, and reported relatively low usage, with over 1/3 indicating that their children did not use the Internet at all at home (*note: 75% of parents reported having Internet access in their homes.*)

### **3.6.3 Students**

-

### **3.7.1 Teachers**

- Teachers believe that students are taking increased responsibility for their own and others' learning; often, those who previously contributed negatively to the classroom

- They reported a even stronger change in their attitudes toward writing, with nearly half indicating their attitude had improved ‘a lot’ and over 85% choosing ‘quite a bit’

- β results were similarly varied when teachers were asked about students with attention problems, although more positive (average 3.8)
- β for students with motivation (4.0) or organizational problems (3.8), as described in an earlier section, results were strongly positive, but varied from one teacher to another
  
- β When teachers responded to open-ended questions, they often commented on students who typically have difficulties, for example:
  - β “The greatest success was giving low income students a chance to use technology that they would otherwise be unable to even view.”
  - β “The greatest success was opportunities for low achieving/behaviour students.”

•

### 3.9 Hardware and Software: Satisfaction and Use

Teachers, parents and students also responded to questions about the dependability of the hardware (iBooks) and the utility of various software and applications.

#### 3.9.1 Teachers

- At monthly meetings, which in the first year of the project focused largely on troubleshooting, teachers by February 2003 had few/no problems to report. They frequently reported that technology was working seamlessly in their classrooms –no down time, no instances of activities interrupted or cancelled because of hardware problems. Because the technology works and is serviced quickly and smoothly, it is becoming transparent.
- Teachers indicated strong satisfaction with the reliability of the iBooks, and often mentioned (in open-ended responses), satisfaction with the level of technology support, both in terms of quality and timeliness that is available.
- Of the programs and features they were asked about, teachers indicated that most had been effective in helping student development. For example:
  - β Teachers rated the word processing program very positively, in terms of helping students, (4.8)
  - β Powerpoint received the second highest ratings among the software (4.6)
  - β *Inspiration*, software that students use to generate, develop and organize their ideas was also seen as very helpful (4.2)
- Teachers were also positive about the effect of using the Internet (3.8)

#### 3.9.2 Parents

- Parents were asked a slightly different set of questions about software and hardware. Rather than being asked for their impression of the impact or utility of various programs and applications, they were simply asked to indicate the extent of their children's use. Most indicated that their children spent extensive time using their iBooks at home (average rating 3.8; 64% chose '4' or '5.')
- Most reported high usage of several specific tools, both for school and leisure. Word processing tools, including editing features, received extremely high ratings.
  - β editing tools (average rating, 4.2; 83% chose '4' or '5' on 5-point scale)
  - β word processing (3.9; 72%)
  - β *Inspiration* (3.6; 49%)

- β *Powerpoint* (3.5; 50%)
- β *iMovie* or *iPhoto* (2.9; 38%)

### 3.9.3 Students

- Most students reported a high degree of satisfaction with their iBooks with 86% percent choosing the top two ratings, and an average rating of 3.1 on the 4-point scale. Only 2 students described their iBooks as ‘not at all’ reliable.
- Students rated a variety of software and application, in terms of how helpful these had been for improving their work. They were extremely positive about most of them, reported below in rank order.
  - β editing tools (average rating 3.7 on 4-point scale; 95% chose ‘3’ or ‘4’)
  - β word processing (3.6, 96%)
  - β features for organizing work (e.g., file folders) (3.6, 91%)
  - β *Powerpoint* (3.3, 82%)
  - β *Inspiration* (2.9, 73%)
  - β *iMovie* or *iPhoto* (2.6, 52%)

## 3.10. Use of the BC Performance Standards

The BC Performance Standards for Writing were an important feature of implementation. These provincial standards were used to assess student writing, to guide instruction, and to prompt self-assessment and goal setting. Teachers, students, and parents had access to both electronic and paper forms of the Performance Standards.

### 3.10.1 Teachers

- All teachers felt that the BC Performance Standards had helped student writing development; some were extremely positive, others, less so (average rating 3.8.)

### 3.10.2 Parents

- Parents were not asked to make judgments about the value or impact of the performance standards. Rather, they were asked to report on how frequently their children used these standards at home. The results were very positive, and somewhat surprising, with 71 % reporting that their children used the standards ‘somewhat’ or more, and 37% reporting extensive or substantial use (average rating 3.1 on the 5-point scale.) This is particularly encouraging, as any use of the standards is necessarily connected to self-assessment and striving to improve writing. For example, it is possible to use word processing tools, and even Powerpoint or Inspiration for pleasure/leisure; the Performance Standards have no possible application for leisure – they are strictly an academic tool, used to focus on and improve the quality of a student’s writing.

### 3.10.3 Students

- Students also reported an encouraging level of use for the BC Performance Standards for Writing, with over 75% reporting that the standards had helped their writing ‘quite a bit’ or ‘a lot’ (average rating of 3.1 on 4-point scale.)

## 3.11 Impact on Teaching

Teachers involved in Phase II report strong satisfaction with the impact of the project on their students and classrooms, and cite few problems associated with technology integration. Classroom observations confirm that in some project classrooms, the teacher has been able to take a more facilitative role, rather than directing all student learning. This, in turn, has increased students’ engagement and responsibility for their own learning and achievement

### 3.11.1 Changes in teaching practice

- Teachers reported a very high level of change in their teaching practices. This is one of the most exciting results of this project, as the practices they report changing/increasing, are those which research suggests make the biggest difference to student achievement and motivation (see, for example, Black & Wiliam, . For example:
  - β providing students with more choice and responsibility (4.4)
  - β providing feedback to students (3.8)
  - β engaging students in self-assessment (3.8)
- Teachers also indicated that they had changed the way they planned and organized for instruction, for example:



- β changed planning (4.0)
  - β changed managing student activities and behaviours (4.0)
  - β changed organization of classroom (4.0)
  - β changed designing and marking assignments (3.8)
- In interviews, teachers noted that student collaboration had increased; they share their work and the results of their research. Teachers also noted that use of the Internet has increased classroom efficiency, for example, students are able to consult reference materials or conduct research using approved sites, without leaving their desks. Some teachers have incorporated websites within their worksheets in content areas such as science.
  - One teacher commented:
    - β “I am more aware of my teaching practices. I am more willing to use the performance standards and they drive my teaching of writing.”

### **3.11.2 Issues and Challenges**

- Overall, teachers reported few issues and challenges. Those mentioned included:
  - β trying to keep up with the students’ knowledge
  - β monitoring Internet and chat line use
  - β issues around sharing with another class
  - β increased marking (because of increase in quantity and quality of student writing)
  - β occasional technology problems (ensuring all iBooks are working all the time)
  - β some students (1-2) who are not benefiting
  - β learning to teach from a computer screen and a projector

### **3.12 Impact on Parental Involvement**

Preliminary data from the pilot study in 2001-2002 indicated that iBooks had the potential to increase parents’ involvement in their children’s writing activities and assignments. Parents and students were asked about this involvement on the 2003 surveys.

- Approximately one-half (47%) of the parents surveyed indicated that they looked at their children’s work on the iBook ‘extensively’ or ‘a great deal’; 17% said they looked at their children’s work ‘a little’ or ‘not at all.’





## 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The *Wireless Writing Project* has demonstrated that technology can be effectively integrated to improve student performance and attitudes, classroom learning environments, and parent satisfaction with schools. Analysis of survey and achievement data also help to identify some key issues and provide guidance for ways to further enhance the impact of technology integration as the program expands.

### 4.1 Student Writing Achievement

#### **Students who participated in the WWP improved their writing**

Improvements in writing achievement, as measured on controlled writing assessments and in-class assessments are strong and consistent. In May 2003, 92% of students produced writing samples that met expectations on the BC Performance Standards compared with 70% on the pretest (a gain of 22%); further, students whose writing exceeded expectations increased from 0% in September to 18% in May. Wireless technology has the potential to improve achievement, particularly in writing, for grades 6-7 students in ways that bode well for their success in high school.

**Recommendation:** Expand the Intermediate project to Phase III, as initially planned, to provide similar experiences to all grades 6 and 7 students, with one-to-one deployment. See Figure 1 for this plan.

#### **Improvements appeared consistently for all subgroups**

Students at all grade levels, both boys and girls, showed similar improvement during Phase II. Girls scores were higher both at the beginning and end of Phase II. Overall, grade 5 students showed the strongest gains; however, they were a very small number, and all from one classroom; it is inappropriate to generalize beyond the specific students who participated.

Teachers had mixed views about whether some groups of students benefited more than others. They all agreed that both boys and girls benefited similarly, along with high achieving students and First Nations students. They also saw strong benefits for students who have problems with organization and work habits. Some saw the WWP as strongly benefiting low achieving students and those with behaviour or attention problems; others did not.

**Recommendation:** Continue to provide *all* students with opportunities to participate fully in the WWP.

## 4.2 Technology skills

### **Students' technology skills have improved.**

According to teachers, parents, and students themselves, student facility with technology – both hardware and software—has improved dramatically. Most students are confident and flexible, able to ‘trouble shoot’ and help others at home or school. Teachers also report strong improvement in their technology skills and confidence.

**Recommendation:** Continue to provide opportunities for students to develop and apply these skills in a wide range of contexts. Consider building on these skills by focusing increasing attention on critical thinking, on collaboration, and on information management and use.

## 4.3 Support for the project

### **Teachers, parents, and students support continuation of the WWP**

Teachers, parents, and students are all extremely enthusiastic about the use of iBooks, and their impact on student achievement, motivation, and attitude. They believe tha3 Support for the proj

prewriting strategies (e.g., creating mental pictures) than they had at the beginning of Phase II.

On the other hand, students reported higher use of editing and revising strategies as the project developed, and boys were more likely to think about their audience after participating in the WWP.

Generally, grade 5 students showed the strongest improvements in use of writing strategies; this may be partially accounted Wyisnts in use of writing







## References

- Baker, E. L. (2000) *Assessing standards and assessment: Closing the achievement gap*. Paper, annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Baker, E.L. & Kinzer, C.K. (1998). Effects of technology on process writing: Are they all good? In T. Shanahan and F.V. Rodriguez-Brown (eds.), *National Reading Conference Yearbook 47*. Chicago, IL: NRC.
- Barrs, M. & Pidgeon, S. (eds.) (2002). *Boys and writing*. London, UK: Centre for Language in Primary Education.
- Black, P. & William, D. (1998). Inside the Black Box. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80 (2): 139.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Falk, B. (1997). Using Standards and Assessments to Support Student Learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*. November, 1997, p.190.
- Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V., & Maw, J. (eds.) (1999). *Failing Boys? Issues in Gender and Achievement*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, S. & Kington, A. (2002). Redefining the classroom: Innovative pedagogical practices in primary and secondary schools in England. Symposium paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Lisbon, September 13, 2002. *National Foundation for Educational Research*. <<http://www.nfer.ac.uk>>
- McNabb, M.L. (1999). *Technology Connections for School Improvement: Teacher's Guide*. Naperville, IL: NCREL. <<http://www.ncrel.org/tplan/tplanB.htm>>
- Marzano, R.J., Pickering, D., & McTighe, J. (1993). *Assessing student outcomes*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ministry of Education. (1993). *The 1993 Communication Assessment*. Victoria, BC: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2000-2002). *BC performance standards: Writing*. Victoria, British Columbia.  
<[http://www.gov.bc.ca/bced/classroom\\_assessment/perf\\_stands/](http://www.gov.bc.ca/bced/classroom_assessment/perf_stands/)>

Ministry of Education. (2002). *FSA Results*. Victoria, BC: Ministry of Education.  
<<http://www.gov.bc.ca/bced/>>

NCREL (adapted from manuscript prepared by Honey, M., Culp, K.M., & Spielvogel, R. at the Center for Children and Technology, Educational Development Corporation) (1999). *Critical Issue: Using Technology to Improve Student Achievement*. Naperville, IL: NCREL.  
<<http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/methods/technlgy/te800.htm>>

Resnick, Lauren B. & Harwell, Michael. (2000) *Instructional variation and student achievement in a standards-based education district. CSE Technical Report 522*. Los Angeles: National Centre for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST)/UCLA. <<http://www.cse.ucla.edu>>

Tucker, M. (Spring 1998). *The state of standards: Powerful tool or symbolic gesture?* The Newsletter on Standards-Based Reform. National Centre for Education and the Economy. <<http://www.ncee.org>>

Wiggins, G. (1993). *Standards NOT standardization*. Geneseo, NY: Greater Insights Productions.

