School Self-Evaluation Report

Streeton Primary School
North West Metropolitan Region

School Number:	5438
Principal:	Bronwen Lamond
School Council President:	Ash Graham
Dates of School Strategic Plan being evaluated:	2010-2013

Learning

Teamwork

Fun

Creativity

Respect

Contents

1. Context

The Streeton community is comprised of families who bring different experiences and needs to the school. As the closest primary school to Simpson Barracks, we usually have approximately 20% of our student population who are children of serving Defence members. These families are posted frequently, usually every 2 years and the impact on individual student learning can be significant. Our Defence Transition Aide provides a vital link between Streeton and our Defence families, working throughout the school to support students with their learning. Our parents are extremely supportive of our school and we have many parents who work tirelessly to support our students, though classroom programs, special events and fundraising activities.

The School Family Occupation (SFO) is .4850 continuing to indicate an upward trend.

The language background other than English (LBOTE) totals 25 students.

Enrolment numbers have changed from 255 in 2010 to 204 in 2013. The gender split continues to be weighted in favour of males.

2010

Student numbers by Year of Education at this school

Year Level	Males	Females	Total
00	21	17	38
01	22	13	35
02	23	12	35
03	23	10	33
04	17	17	34
05	31	15	46
06	19	15	34
Total	156	99	255

2013

Student numbers by Year of Education at this school

Year Level	Males	Females	Total
00	7	9	16
01	10	14	24
02	21	12	33
03	20	12	32
04	17	15	32
05	21	10	31
06	20	16	36
Total	116	88	204

In 2013 we had 10 classrooms and offered the following specialist programs: LOTE (Italian), Visual Arts and Performing Arts.

We offer a range of Literacy/Numeracy support across the school including Reading Recover in Year 1.

The staff profile continues to include a mix of experience from graduate to expert. The Substantive Leadership team is comprised of Principal, Assistant Principal and Leading Teachers. The Consultative Leadership group adds the 3 team leaders, and an Australian Education Union representative to this group.

An extensive range of play spaces are available for students including an oval, 3 adventure playgrounds, basketball/netball, down ball courts, chess/draught tables and seated quiet areas.

Context cont…

As a result of the injection of funds from the Better Schools Today (State Government) and Building Education Revolution (Federal Government), we have refurbished A wing, redeveloped the Arts precinct on the previous B wing site and refurbished the previous music room to establish a Science centre.

The Program for Students with Disabilities included 11 students in 2009 and in 2010 there were 10 students in the program. The program is inclusive and does not differentiate according to disability. Four Integration Aides support the program, each working with various children.

The school provides extensive support programs for Student Wellbeing in the belief that all students benefit from a proactive and supportive approach to improving their social competence. Since 2008 the staff at Streeton uses a 'Restorative Justice' approach in line with the student code of conduct.

The staff monitors current best practice and develop planning documents in order to deliver a high quality curriculum that meets the needs of students in the 21st century. There are three teaching teams in 2010 consisting of Prep-year 2, years3-4 and years 5-6 each led by a team leader. Teams plan collaboratively and work towards improving student outcomes by taking into account factors such as learning styles, pedagogical research and individual student progress. An advanced ICT approach has been developed throughout the school. With a continuous learning approach to training and ICT skill development, the school continues to provide quality programs with excellent hardware and software.

The school has worked actively to:-

- Enhance teaching and learning across the school through a focus on E5 and Peer Observation reinforced through professional learning and Leadership teams.

- Redevelop Literacy and Numeracy planners.

- Develop processes for student assessment/self-reflection.

- Extend the scope of existing opportunities for moderation of student work.

- Review programs for at risk students.

- Review ICT infrastructure, planning and programs.

- Build staff capacity in teaching in a flexible learning environment.

2. Methodology

Our school self-evaluation is the culmination of feedback gathered from students, staff and the community during the evaluation period.

The self-evaluation process has opened up discussion on a broad range of school activities and has resulted in thoughtful dialogue amongst staff, students and parents.

Documentation included:-
- School Level reports
- Attitude to School Surveys
- Parent Opinion Surveys
- NAPLAN data
- Annual Implementation Plans
- The 2010-2013 Strategic Plan
- School designed surveys
- Reports from focus groups (staff/parent)
- School performance against threshold standards
- Intake adjusted charts

The school leadership team has played a significant role in discussions which have informed the process of self-evaluation.
- Bronwen Lamond   Principal
- Jenny Donald   Acting Leading Teacher
- Travis Pain   Acting Leading Teacher/ICT Focus Group
- Fiona Catton   Numeracy Focus Group
- Fiona Portman   Literacy Focus Group
- Mimika Tsantis   Science Focus Group

School Council have been involved in PD and informal conversations with regard to the self-evaluation process.

Parent Members of School Council:-
- Ash Graham   President
- Karen Street   Vice President
- Jennifer Keating   Secretary
- Chris Hall   Treasurer
- Graeme Bland   Facilities
- Robert Freestone   Facilities
- Jodi Rigg   Facilities
- Robyn Thompson   Publicity and Promotions

Parent Policy Focus Group

Our students have contributed to the conversations via classrooms, student leadership and the making of the video.

Finally, a draft report was prepared and distributed to all parties.

EVALUATION OF PRACTICE

The Streeton Primary School community has much to celebrate about its achievements during 2010 through 2013. Sustained improvement in student learning from existing levels is evident over the period, along with high levels of student engagement and wellbeing. The review panel's opinion, informed by a broad range of evidence, is that Streeton Primary School is a very effective school.

Area of Focus	Literacy and Numeracy
What do we teach?	The key data sets show Streeton is performing well in English and Mathematics for the years 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013.
How do we teach?	Our annual curriculum is set out in our Scope and Sequence planning documents. This whole school scope and sequence is the overriding guide to what is covered. Our curriculum is developmentally appropriate with Yearly Planners developed by learning areas. These incorporate an overview of what needs to be taught and reinforced across the year. There is a template that all staff utilises that is consistent across the school. With Yearly Planners in place, Term Planners are then developed, again with a template that is consistent across the school. These have an in- depth breakdown of outcomes and student learning. They also have a range of meaningful tasks and activities that can be conducted by the teacher to improve student learning and engagement. The final step is weekly planning, which is done in consultation with other team members so that there is again that consistency from one class to the next. This also enables data to be collected across teams that is constant. When planning weekly sessions, they are broken into a number of parts. A whole class model with a tuning in whole class approach, followed by small group or whole class activities/y, which is either 'needs based' or 'open ended'. Within these small group/whole class sessions various students will work in a focussed teaching group where they can have their learning scaffolded through directed and explicit questioning. Within planning there are a number of factors that are considered – - Develop differentiation of curriculum with the aim of ensuring that all students make the expected growth - Ensuring whole school instructional approaches, understandings and protocols are firmly in place and closely linked to student learning outcomes
How do we know our students are learning?	With regard to student learning, NAPLAN indicators reveal strong comparative performance, with mean scores in most cases consistent with State Mean Year 3 mean scores have been particularly impressive, with the school consistently performing well beyond the level expected characteristics. The NAPLAN mean score indicators also provide clear evidence of improved student learning. Providing strong support for staff professional learning focussing improved teaching practice, consistency of practice and the sharing of best practice through peer observation and Professional Learning Teams. Analyse the collection of data from various assessment tools. Moderation within teams is an ongoing practice.
How do we provide feedback?	Ensuring a range of assessment practices and feedback mechanisms are used to: - monitor and evaluate individual student's progress - guide instructional practice - identify learning and report to students and families An assessment schedule has a range of tasks that acquires a broad range of student achievements. These Assessment Schedules and collection of data can then be used to monitor students, guide teaching and make informed judgements for formal reports. Below are a number of ways in which we provide feedback – - AusVELS teacher judgements - NAPLAN testing - Teacher Observations - Peer assessment - Student goal setting and reflection - Teacher observation of student workbooks and work samples - Assessment as, of and for learning to inform teacher practice - Parent feedback – Progress meetings - On demand testing

Future Visions for improvement	Building teachers' understanding and knowledge of Mathematics teaching.
	Continued commitment to implementing whole school and teacher strategies to improve student learning and strengthen teacher capacity.
	Continue to ensure a range of assessment practices and feedback mechanisms are used to:
	   - monitor and evaluate each student's progress
	   - guide instructional practice
	   - identify learning
	   - report to students and their families
	
	Further refinement in areas such as the use of assessment data to differentiate and personalise learning and continued development of the application of ICT resources.
	Use On Demand testing to guide teaching and assist in moderating students.
	Providing strong support for staff professional learning which focuses on improved teaching practice, consistency of practice and the sharing of best practice. Staff can continue to do this through peer observation and Professional Learning Teams.
	Effectively use student voice to inform and monitor the work of teachers through empowering students to more actively shape their own learning. This could be achieved through a more inquiry based learning approach, personal target and goal setting sessions.
	Further develop activities that encourage the participation and engagement of students in their learning and school life.
	Further develop home/school communication strategies that promote understanding of the school's approach to teaching and learning and further explores ways of engaging and communicating with parents.
	Continuing the good work already being implemented in English and Mathematics, use of assessment data, supporting all staff including new appointments and peer observation.
	Streeton is encouraged to pursue its thinking about building skills in giving and receiving feedback, refining the observations to more directly link with how practice might be improved, and incorporation into PDPs.
	An additional emphasis would be on continuing to embed the use of ICT resources in the curriculum, building on the good practices that are already in place.

Area of Focus	**SCIENCE**
What do we teach?	2010-2013 Streeton Primary has imbedded its Science Curriculum within its classroom teaching practice. Area teams have been responsible for planning of Science Curriculum within their Levels using Scope and Sequence planning documents. Through collaborative planning teachers have provided students with an opportunity to promote Science Understanding, Science as a Human Endeavour and Science Inquiry Skills within their classrooms.
How do we teach?	The Science Curriculum is delivered to our students to promote student engagement, Curiosity and Inquiry skills through effective team planning and explicit teacher delivery. Students are encouraged to work collaboratively, share ideas and gain deeper understandings through "hands on" science concepts and use of 21st Century Technologies. Teachers effectively plan using term and weekly planners and Scope and Sequence documents. Together, the three strands of the science curriculum provide students with understanding, knowledge and skills through which they can develop a scientific view of the world. Students are challenged to explore science, its concepts, nature and uses through clearly described inquiry processes.
How do we know our students are learning?	Student evidence of learning takes place in many forms within our Science Curriculum. Teams and Teachers are responsible for- -AusVels Teacher judgements - Teacher Observations of student work samples and assessments (Rubrics) - Student goal setting and reflection -Student understanding, engagement and curiosity as observed by the teacher.
How do we provide feedback?	Feedback to parents occurs at a minimum of 2 occasions annually. Science is reported and assessed in 2 Student Reports in Term 2 and Term 4. Parent teacher interviews are also an opportunity to discuss student achievement and understanding in the area of Science. -AusVELS teacher judgements -Teacher Observations -Peer assessment -Student goal setting and reflection -Teacher observation of student workbooks and work samples -Assessment as, of and for learning to inform teacher practice -Parent feedback – Progress meetings
Future Visions for improvement	2013-2014 Our school has implemented a Specialist Science Program. Students will be provided with a 1 Hour specialised science program fortnightly. Primary Connections Curriculum implementation as a resource. Curriculum Organiser implementation Whole School Sustainability Farm Education Area for students to utilise through "Real Life" interactions and opportunities for learning and exploration.

Area of Focus	ICT 21st Century Learning
What do we teach?	In the period of 2010-2013 Streeton Primary has continued to use ICT as a cross-curricular teaching tool. Our ICT is imbedded into a variety of teaching and learning areas. Our teaching is directed at providing our students ICT skills to- •develop new thinking and learning skills that produce creative and innovative insights •develop more productive ways of working and solving problems individually and collaboratively •create information products that demonstrate their understanding of concepts, issues, relationships and processes •express themselves in contemporary and socially relevant ways •communicate locally and globally to solve problems and to share knowledge •understand the implications of the use of ICT and their social and ethical responsibilities as users of ICT. At the beginning of each year all students from Grade 3-6, participate in a "Digital Citizenship" unit of work to provide deeper understandings of the responsibilities and risks associated with internet use.
How do we teach?	Streeton Primary pedagogy for teaching ICT is that it be integrated as a learning tool within all learning areas, and to facilitate this, specific ICT skills must be taught. This is done within classrooms, with small groups or within lab sessions which are timetabled. Shared sets of Netbooks have been used to provide opportunity for learning and development of skills. Junior and Middle School Students have had a set of shared iPads to promote 21st Century learning in preparation for 1:1 Students build ICT skills when targeted skills based on instruction occurs in daily teaching practise. As of 2013 students in years 5-6 began a 1:1 iPad program. This has enabled students to access 21st Century Learning Technologies using a 1:1 device. Students ICT understandings and engagement has developed significantly since the implementation of the program.
How do we know our students are learning?	Student evidence of learning takes place in many forms within our ICT curriculum. Teams and teachers are responsible for- -AusVels Teacher judgements - Teacher Observations of student work samples and assessments (Rubrics) - Student goal setting and reflection -Student understanding, engagement and curiosity as observed by the teacher.
How do we provide feedback?	Feedback to parents occurs at a minimum of 2 occasions annually. ICT is reported and assessed in 2 Student Reports in Term 2 and Term 4. Parent teacher interviews are also an opportunity to discuss student achievement and understanding in the area of Science. -AusVELS teacher judgements -NAPLAN testing -Teacher Observations -Peer assessment -Student goal setting and reflection -Teacher observation of student -Assessment as, of and for learning to inform teacher practice --Parent feedback – Progress meetings
Future Visions for improvement	2014 Grade 3-4 students and teachers began the implementation of a 1:1 iPad program. Continued Professional Development for staff to "up skill" in their ability to use 21st Century effectively.
Area of Focus	**The Arts**
What do we teach?	A developmentally appropriate program for all years, giving students opportunities to create and make, explore and respond to arts works. Specific skill development provides the basis for the students to express and communicate personal experiences and ideas about themselves and their world.
How do we teach?	The Arts programs, whenever possible are linked to class programs to provide added depth to student learning. Independence is encouraged as students make choices in every stage of their learning from goal setting to reflection and peer/ self-evaluation. Students use a broad range of traditional, 'new media' and multidisciplinary forms and materials. They improvise, design and make works. Learning takes place using indoor and outdoor environments, drawing from our community and external communities to develop creativity and imagination.
How do we know our students are learning?	Evidence of student learning in the Arts covers a range of styles, mostly informal due to the ephemeral nature of the program. These include teacher observations, class discussions, and skill checklists specific to certain media, work samples, rubric, Venn diagrams, mind maps, digital records, visual diaries and anecdotal records.

How do we provide feedback?	Formal feedback to parents occurs twice a year with written reports. The report format for the Arts includes a description of areas covered each semester as well as personal comments regarding the student achievement. Parent feedback is also given at parent/teacher interviews held in each semester. Feedback to students occurs both formally and informally. Students are given specific feedback during Arts sessions as well as more formal rubric assessments. Peer feedback is also important.
Future Visions for improvement	Continue to find innovative ways to share the Streeton Arts program with the wider community. The Artist in Schools successful application and subsequent plans for an intensive Performing Arts program will spread into the wider community. Support classroom teachers in their professional learning in the Performing Arts areas so they feel comfortable in providing experiences for their students. Lift the rate of student involvement in external Arts initiatives such as Whittlesea Show, Montmorency Secondary College Arts Competitions etc.
Area of Focus	**L.O.T.E**
What do we teach?	**All students learn a language with a specialist teacher. They develop their knowledge and skills of communicating in the Italian language, with some understandings of historical, cultural and social aspects of this language. Students are encouraged to become culturally aware citizens.**
How do we teach?	**A modelling approach is used for teaching language, with a variety of resources such as teacher, video and audio. Liaison with local secondary schools provides opportunities for students to experience conversation, film and drama with older students.** **Where possible the Language program is aligned with class Integrated/inquiry units to add depth to student learning.**
How do we know our students are learning?	Assessment of student learning in L.O.T.E is mostly informal as Vels/AusVels assessment and reporting standards are not introduced until Level 5. Measurement of student learning includes teacher observations, peer assessments and work samples.
How do we provide feedback?	Feedback to parents is provided within two formal written reports during each year. The L.O.T.E teacher is also available at the two interview sessions scheduled over the year. Feedback to students is provided informally during L.O.T.E sessions by the teacher, other students and individual goal setting and reflection.
Future Visions for improvement	Continue to develop relationships with other schools in the area and overseas. Increase the development of ICT skills and use of devices as a means of improving students' knowledge of the connections between language and culture throughout the communication system. Develop learning experiences to relate to whole school new initiatives (Permaculture & Sustainability).

3. Evaluation of performance

Achievement	**Reading**

AusVELS Teacher Judgement

% Above expected level

	2011	2012	2013
Prep	23	40	40
1	38	46	58
2	31	40	39
3	28	36	37
4	39	39	37
5	40	33	45
6	34	48	39

% Below expected level

	2011	2012	2013
Prep	3	0	0
1	0	3	0
2	11	8	6
3	0	9	13
4	15	6	6
5	2	15	3
6	6	6	14

NAPLAN Data

% Above expected level

	2011	2012	2013
Gr 3	85	71	85
Gr 5	53	57	75

% Below expected level

	2011	2012	2013
Gr 3	3	14	4
Gr 5	12	25	0

What did we set out to achieve?	The 2014 Strategic Plan target was for the proportion of students assessed as being at or above the expected levels (VELS A, B, C) to increase across all levels with 40% of students assessed at A or B.

What did we achieve?	**Reading** Teacher judgements against VELS and AusVELS over the period 2011 to 2013 have shown continued growth across all year levels. The Strategic Plan target of 40% of students being assessed at A or B has been achieved by 2013 with years 1 and 5 cohorts exceeding the 40% target. Cohort data shows consistency and strong growth. Of concern is the increase in the percentage of students below the expected level which appear as the year levels increase, with no students below expected in years prep and 1 growing to around 6% in the grades 4-6. The 2013 Grade 6 group have been a consistent concern over the past 3 years with 15% being below expected level. However, there are identifiable reasons for this result. NAPLAN results also show extremely good results for the children in both Grade 3 and 5. In Grade 3 we have 85% (2011), 71% (2012) and 85% (2013) of students achieving above the expected level with 3% achieving below in 2011 and 2013 and 14% below expected level in 2012. The Grade 5 data has 53% of children above expected level in 2011, 57% in 2012 and 75% in 2013. These results show that the reading program at the school is effectively meeting, and exceeding, the needs of the children. Comparison of the data between Teacher Judgement and NAPLAN demonstrates that the teacher judgements are significantly lower than the NAPLAN results with the teachers being far more conservative.

What factors supported or inhibited our success?	**Reading cont…** During the course of the strategic plan period the school implemented or refined a number of strategies designed to meet the goals of the plan. Discussions with staff, students and the community during the self-evaluation process highlighted the following areas; • **Whole school non-negotiable practices** for the delivery of Literacy and Numeracy curriculum were developed, documented and adhered to. Coinciding with this was the development, by teams, of Best Practice documents detailing agreed approaches to the delivery of Literacy and Numeracy. The development of these documents contributed to our improved Literacy and Numeracy results as teachers were required to reflect critically on their current teaching practices. Lesson structures were clearly defined and time was dedicated to the various components of the Literacy and Numeracy block. Through this a thorough and consistent approach to teaching was established throughout the school. • **Regular Professional Development on AIZ strategies**, for both Literacy and Numeracy, had an impact on student achievements. Revisiting Munro's High Reliability Reading Strategies on curriculum days and during staff meetings was well received by teachers who then implemented these strategies within their classrooms. This PD encouraged teacher self-reflection and refocussed attention on the High Reliability Strategies and the importance of effectively implementing them, particularly in grades 2 to 6 to enhance comprehension through the focus on strategies. • Elements of **The Curiosity Manual** also became a feature of several curriculum days and staff meetings. A particular emphasis on the 'Learning Intention' for each lesson was highlighted in each learning area to provide a purpose for the teaching with teachers thinking about what, why and how and when to teach. • During the Strategic Plan period **teacher's knowledge and understanding of NAPLAN data** has increased. Explicit explanation of how to interpret the data, what data means and planning for teaching from the data was given to all staff, especially the NAPLAN year level staff, and staff discussion and planning was entered into. However, the NAPLAN data is inconsistent with the teacher observation data in rating children at a higher level than the teacher data. Teachers appear to be much more conservative in their rating of the children and this needs further discussion and learning. • **Peer observation** has been used across the school to develop consistent approaches and to enhance teacher learning and knowledge. Teachers would observe others at their work with targeted observation sheets that provided a basis for discussion and comment. These targeted observation session provided opportunities to ensure consistent approaches and allowed for ongoing staff learning utilising the teaching standards. • I**ntervention Programs** focusing on reading recovery and additional group assistance had great impact on the results in Literacy in grades 1-3. Children who were found to be at risk were identified and provided with targeted assistance to ensure their ongoing development. • **Team planning**, and the sharing of resources, has facilitated a consistent approach and the sharing of knowledge and the moderation of student work. This team approach is very effective in utilising each teacher's skills and knowledge and in ensuring that all children are provided with a high quality program. • **Community Literacy Activities** have engaged parents and the community in the school's literacy program. We have included the community in Story Tents, Book of the Year and Parent Helpers and have great support from the community in classroom assistance up to Grade 4. This community involvement raises the importance of Literacy, celebrates the children's growth and supports the classroom programs and the children's learning. • A focus on programs such as Ultranet dominated significant amounts of staff Professional Learning time and saw a reduction in the time allocated to PD. • The quantity and quality of the school's **Literacy Resources** has been impacted on by the recent school budgetary constraints. A need to replace take home books, big books and guided reading resources is as necessary.
Where might we focus future effort?	• Increased resourcing for Literacy. • Investigation of differentiated literacy programs to enhance the current strategies in the classrooms • Continued professional learning, especially of the AIZ strategies, and their implementation throughout the school.

Achievement	**Writing**

AusVELS Teacher Judgement

% Above expected level

	2011	2012	2013
Prep	18	19	33
1	24	24	29
2	31	24	15
3	22	30	25
4	27	27	28
5	27	21	35
6	34	44	25

% Below expected level

	2011	2012	2013
Prep	5	0	7
1	3	3	4
2	14	5	9
3	3	9	13
4	21	6	6
5	0	18	6
6	9	10	17

NAPLAN Data

% Above expected level

	2011	2012	2013
Gr 3	79	81	89
Gr 5	65	59	57

% Below expected level

	2011	2012	2013
Gr 3	0	4	0
Gr 5	2	7	4

What did we set out to achieve?	The 2014 Strategic Plan target was for the proportion of students assessed as being at or above the expected levels (VELS A, B, C) to increase across all levels with 40% of students assessed at A or B.
What did we achieve?	The student writing data demonstrates that the school's writing program is meeting the needs of the children in both teacher judgement and NAPLAN assessments. The 2011-2013 Strategic Goal of 40% of students achieving A or B was not met according to the teacher judgement data which has 30% at this level. However, the NAPLAN data has between 57% and 89% of Grade 3s and 5s achieving above expected level, well above the strategic goal. The teacher judgement data demonstrates growth in the teaching of writing. The percentage of children achieving above the expected level demonstrates growth across most year levels and can be tracked across grade levels as children progress though the school. The NAPLAN data also demonstrates ongoing growth with well over half of the children achieving above the expected level. The number of children who are achieving below the expected level is very low. According to the teacher judgement there are regularly less than 10% of children achieving below the level. There have been occasional times when the number of children performing below the expected level has exceeded 10% but these can be followed through the years and is attributable to specific students who have needed additional support. The NAPLAN data also demonstrates a very small percentage of children achieving below the expected level, always less than 10% and in grade 3 at 0% twice in 3 years.
Where might we focus future effort?	• Increased resourcing for Literacy to enable the updating of resources and the ongoing targeted Professional Learning of teachers. • Investigation of differentiated literacy programs to enhance the current strategies utilised in the classrooms • Continued professional learning, especially of the AIZ strategies, and their implementation throughout the school.

Achievement	**Speaking and Listening**

AusVELS Teacher Judgement

% Above expected level			
	2011	2012	2013
Prep			13
1	9	27	29
2	19	8	12
3	17	33	19
4	18	33	44
5	18	18	29
6	29	31	28

% Below expected level			
	2011	2012	2013
Prep			0
1	0	3	4
2	8	3	3
3	0	6	3
4	15	6	6
5	0	15	6
6	9	8	12

What did we set out to achieve?	The 2014 Strategic Plan target was for the proportion of students assessed as being at or above the expected levels (VELS A, B, C) to increase across all levels with 40% of students assessed at A or B.
What did we achieve?	The Speaking and Listening results again demonstrate a strong program at Streeton PS. The teacher judgement data is unsupported by NAPLAN but consistently echoes the same data as the Reading and Writing results. The data demonstrates up to 44% of the students receiving an A or B (Grade 4, 2014) but is more consistently around the 25% level. The Grade 1, 2011 and Grade 2, 2012 is of concern with only 8-9% above but this is rectified in 2013 with 19% above. The number of children achieving below the expected level is consistently low with only one cohort of children having more than 10% below the expected level and this data tracks across the years. This result can be attributed to a cohort of children who required additional support.

Achievement	**Spelling**

NAPLAN Data

% Above expected level			
	2011	2012	2013
Gr 3	70	71	82
Gr 5	61	63	61

% Below expected level			
	2011	2012	2013
Gr 3	0	0	11
Gr 5	14	19	4

What did we set out to achieve?	The 2014 Strategic Plan target was for the proportion of students assessed as being at or above the expected levels (VELS A, B, C) to increase across all levels with 40% of students assessed at A or B.
What did we achieve?	NAPLAN data demonstrates consistently high performance of students in both grade levels in spelling. There are 70-80% of grade 3 students achieving above expected level and over 60% of Grade 5s above expected level. An area of concern is the consistently lower percentage of Grade 5s achieving above expected level compared to the Grade 3. The level of children performing below the expected level is of some concern. The grade 3 data has 0% of children below in 2011 and 2012 but this has increased to 11% in 2013. The Grade 5 data has 14% and 19% in 2011 and 2012 and only 4% in 2013. There is concern when there are 20% of children achieving below the expected level (Grade 5, 2012). However, this data is consistent in both Reading and Writing for this cohort of children.

Achievement	**Grammar and Punctuation**

NAPLAN Data

% Above expected level			
	2011	2012	2013
Gr 3	75	82	82
Gr 5	69	55	68

% Below expected level			
	2011	2012	2013
Gr 3	0	7	4
Gr 5	5	22	7

What did we set out to achieve?	The 2014 Strategic Plan target was for the proportion of students assessed as being at or above the expected levels (VELS A, B, C) to increase across all levels with 40% of students assessed at A or B.
What did we achieve?	The Grammar and Punctuation NAPLAN data demonstrates that there are well over the 40% of students working at level A or B as consistent with the Strategic Goal of 2011-2014. The Grade 3 data has between 75 and 82% of students exceeding expected level and the Grade 5 have 55 to 69%. There is a concern with the discrepancy between the Grade 3 and 5 results. The percentage of children achieving below the expected level is also very low with 0-7% of children achieving below expected level in all years except Grade 5 2012 where there were 22%. This is consistent with the cohort data in reading, writing and spelling and demonstrates an issue with this cohort.

Achievement	**Numeracy**

NAPLAN Data

NAPLAN Data - Below National Minimum Standard - NMS				
Year	2010	2011	2012	2013
Level 3	0%	0%	0%	0%
Level 5	0%	2.3%	3.7%	3.7%

NAPLAN Data - At National Minimum Standard - NMS				
Year	2010	2011	2012	2013
Level 3	0%	6.1%	7.1%	0%
Level 5	9.1%	9.3%	11.1%	14.8%

NAPLAN Data - Above National Minimum Standard - NMS				
Year	2010	2011	2012	2013
Level 3	100%	93.9%	92.9%	100%
Level 5	90.9%	90.7%	88.9%	85.2%

Same group of students from Year 3 to Year 5 –

Year 3 – 2009 – 4.6% at level – none below
Year 5 – 2011 – 11.6% at or below

Year 3 – 2010 – 0% at or below – all operating above
Year 5 – 2012 – 6.1% at or below

Year 3 – 2011 – 6.1% at level – none below
Year 5 – 2013 – 18.5% at or below

Year 3 – 2012 – 7.1% at level – none below
Year 5 – 2014 – N/A

What did we set out to achieve?	The Strategic Plan was for 95% of students deemed capable to achieve at or above the expected VELS level.

What did we achieve?	**NAPLAN**

School Mean against State Mean

With regard to student learning, NAPLAN indicators reveal strong comparative performance, with mean scores consistently in the top 100% of all government primary schools. Year 3 mean scores were particularly impressive in 2013, with the school performing well beyond the level that might have been predicted. Although there are strong NAPLAN results compared to the State Mean there are however two years that showed a lower score. 2011 for Year 3 students have them operating below the State Mean and in 2012 it shows that Year 5 students were also operating below the State Mean.
In 2011, there were no students operating below NMS, only 6.1% of students operating at NMS and the remainder (93.9%) operating above NMS. This shows very healthy NAPLAN results for Year 3 students.
In 2011, there were only 2.3% of students in Year 5 below NMS and 9.3% at NMS with the rest of the students operating above NMS.
In 2012, there were no students in Year 3 operating below NMS, only 7.1% operating at the level and the remainder (92.9%) operating above.
In 2012, there 3.7% of Year 5 students were operating below the level, 11.1% operating at the level and the remainder (88.9%) operating above level.

In 2013 there were 100% of students operating above the expected level for Year 3. It is clear from this data that the school has added considerable value to student learning with high results and students operating beyond State Mean.

In 2013 there were still 3.7% of students operating below the level and 14.8% operating at the level. There was a drop in students working above the level with only 85.2% of Year 5 students operating above the level.

Although Streeton had students operating below the expected level in year 5 for all years except 2010, they still had comparable School Mean to State Mean results, with the exception of 2012 where the State Mean was higher than the School Mean. Most students were operating at or above NMS. This indicates that Streeton is still providing the appropriate environment for students to achieve.

Same group of students from Year 3 to Year 5 – See Achievement Data Above

This indicates there has been a rise in 'at' or 'below' NAPLAN results over the last 5 years.

This also indicates that the same cohorts of children are achieving lover results from years 3 to 5. This drop in achievement needs to be addressed.

All Year 5 data indicates that 2010 is the only year students were not in the 'Below NMS' category. All other years, 2011, 2012 and 2013 students appear in the 'Below NMS' category.

Although Year 5 results for Numeracy were not as strong on comparative measures as those for Year 3 there is clear evidence that the school has added substantial value to the cohort that moved from Year 3 to Year 5. This pattern is revealed in the fact that there are still over 95% of students operating at or above the level.

It is to be noted that teacher assessment of student learning contrasted to the patterns shown in the NAPLAN data. Teacher assessment had in most years when assessing against VELS and AusVELS less than 95% operating at or above the expected level. In some cases in years 3 and 5 there were as 10 to 15% of students operating below a C. This contrast between teacher and NAPLAN assessments indicates there may have been some conservatism on the part of the teachers. Suggested strategies to improve these comparisons in future could be – increased use of various assessments of student learning which would in turn mean that teachers would have more evidence upon which they can make judgements.

Year 3 Data

2009 is the only year that has below NMS (National Minimum Standard) for Year 3's. Data analysed for review (2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013) has no students below NMS with all students operating at or above NMS.

All Year 3 students from 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 are operating at or above NMS.

Year 5 Data

Each year there has been an overall decline in Numeracy results. 2009 and 2010 – 0% below NMS for each year, 2011 – 2.3% below NMS and 2012 and 2013 – 3.7% below NMS each year.

In 2013 there was a significant low in the school data with 18.5% of students operating at or below NMS as opposed to only 9.1% at the level and none below the level in 2010, an increase of 50%. What needs to be taken into account is that the School Mean and State Mean for both years is essentially the same.

Looking at the number of students below NMS or at NMS from Year 3 to Year 5 also shows a decline for each cohort.

This indicates there has been a rise in 'at' or 'below' NAPLAN results over the last 5 years.

This also indicates that the same cohorts of children are achieving lover results from years 3 to 5. This drop in achievement needs to be addressed.

All Year 5 data indicates that 2010 is the only year students were not in the 'Below NMS' category. All other years, 2011, 2012 and 2013 students appear in the 'Below NMS' category.

Although Year 5 results for Numeracy were not as strong on comparative measures as those for Year 3 there is clear evidence that the school has added substantial value to the cohort that moved from Year 3 to Year 5. This pattern is revealed in the fact that there are still over 95% of students operating at or above the level.

It is to be noted that teacher assessment of student learning contrasted to the patterns shown in the NAPLAN data. Teacher assessment had in most years when assessing against VELS and AusVELS less than 95% operating at or above the expected level. In some cases in years 3 and 5 there were as many as 10 to 15% of students operating below a C. This contrast between teacher and NAPLAN assessments indicates there may have been some conservatism on the part of the teachers. Suggested strategies to improve these comparisons in future could be – increased use of various assessments of student learning which would in turn mean that teachers would have more evidence upon which they can make judgements.

What did we achieve cont…	**VELS/AusVELS** *There appears to be a slight downward trend in student achievements in Years 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 across all years in the self-evaluation period. This is in comparison to the data collected in the same years for Prep, and Year 1 students.* The Strategic plan was for 95% of students deemed capable to achieve at or above the expected VELS level. Trend data reflecting teacher assessments against VELS Prep to 6 indicates that the goal was achieved in most to all areas for Prep to Year 2 and only some areas for Years 3, 4, 5 and 6 across Mathematics. **Prep –** Achieved in all areas over each year – VELS and AusVELS **Year 1 –** Achieved in all areas over each year – VELS and AusVELS **Year 2 –** Achieved in all areas in 2010 (VELS), 2012 (VELS) and 2013 (AusVELS) Not achieved in 2011 – Measurement, chance and data, Number, Space and Working mathematically. **Year 3 –** 2011 – Achieved in all areas in all areas in 2011 Not achieved in any of the areas in 2010, 2012 and 2013 with quite a significant low in 2010 – 8.8% of students operating below in Number, Space, Structure and Working mathematically. In 2012 there were 12.9% of students operating below the VELS level. **Year 4 –** In 2010 it was achieved in all areas except Structure with 6.5% of students operating in D. In 2011 there were some alarming figures with 15.1% of students operating below the level Measurement, chance and data, Number, Space, Working mathematically and 12.5% of students operating below the level for Structure. In 2012 6.1% were operating below the level in all areas of Mathematics with the exception of Working mathematically with 6.0% of students operating below the level. In 2013 the results still showed we did not achieve the target with 11.0% of students not meeting it for Number and 9% not achieving it for Measurement and Statistics when assessing against AusVELS. **Year 5 –** In 2011 the % of students operating at or above the level was achieved with no students operating below in any area of mathematics. 100% of all students were recorded at or above the level. In 2010 there were 8.6% of students that did not achieve this result in Measurement, chance and data and Working mathematically. In 2012 there were some significant lows. 15.2% of students were operating below the level for Measurement, chance and data and Working mathematically and 12.2% of students operating below the level for Number. In 2013 for AusVELS there were also lows with 15% of students in Number and 12% of students in Measurement and Statistics. • *Note – not given Space or Structure to look at. Data missing* **Year 6 –** In 2010 there were 7.6% of students below the expected level in Measurement, chance and data, Number, Space and 11.5% of students below the expected level in Structure and Working mathematically. In 2011 the 95% target was almost met with marginally higher results of 5.7% in Measurement, chance and data, Space and Structure. In 2012 the target was met in all areas. In 2013 for AusVELS there were further low results with 15% of students operating below the level for Number and 13% for Measurement and Statistics.

Preps

In 2010, 2011 and 2012 no students in Prep were operating outside Level C and B. Some data showed all students were operating in C – 2012 Measurement, chance and data, 2012 Space and 2012 Working mathematically. This showed that from 2010 to 2013 no students were operating as an A and very few were operating as a B.

No students assessed at level A and very few students assessed at level B – with the exception of number in 2010 with 33.3% of students operating at B – the rest however are still in C.

Although there were far more than 95% of students operating at or above the level the School Mean compared to the State Mean was lower. This indicates that although Streeton had more than 95% achieving at or above the expected level there were not enough students in the 'above' the expected level in B or A.

Year 1's

In 2010, 2011 and 2012 there are very few students being assessed below the level. In some areas they have been, but in all cases that there are a percentage of students assessed at Level D, it is only 1 student in the cohort. The rest are operating at or above the level. As per the Prep data there are none to very few students operating as an A.

In 2010 Working mathematically there were 2 students operating at A, In 2010 and 2011 there were 3 students operating at A in Number and in 2010 there was 1 student operating as A for Space. There were no students operating as an A for most of 2011 and all of 2012. There were also very few B's.

Although there are the majority of students operating in Level C and B there are a few that have been marked in A for some areas of Mathematics. In 2010 and 2011, 3 students in both years were marked at Level A for Number, in 2010, 1 student was marked at Level A for Space and in 2010, 2 students were marked at Level A for Working mathematically. With these exceptions no other students are operating at A.

As per Preps, although there were far more than 95% of students operating at or above the level the School Mean compared to the State Mean was lower. This indicates that although Streeton had more than 95% achieving at or above the expected level there were not enough students in the 'above' the expected level in B or A.

Year 2's

There is a slightly wider spread in Year 2's data with several more students being assessed above their level. In all years and dimensions there are students recorded in B and A with the exception of 2012 Chance and data, 2012 Space and 2012 Working mathematically. In these years and domains there were no students operating above a B.

In very few cases were there students operating below a C and if they were, there were only 8.3% or less. In some of the data over the years, Year 2 students were operating at or above their level with no students operating below. There were also no students operating below a D or E level in any of the year's data.

As per Preps and Year 1's, although there were far more than 95% of students operating at or above the level the School Mean compared to the State Mean was lower. This indicates that although Streeton had more than 95% achieving at or above the expected level there were not enough students in the 'above' the expected level in B or A. In 2010 across most domains there was however more students assessed at level A which in turn brought the School Mean almost in line with the State Mean. This was the best year for comparative data from the School Mean to the State Mean.

Year 3's

Judgements remain consistent over the period. The school mean remains consistent with the state mean and is either at or above state mean. There was a wide spread in almost all areas for all years of students operating in C, B and A. There were very few operating below a C. The only year that recorded E was 2010 with 1 student recorded in Measurement, Chance and Data, 1 student in Number, 1 student in Space and 1 student in Working Mathematically. The only area that seems to have lesser results with more students operating below the level (in D) was in Structure.

Year 4's

For Year 4, 2011 has the broadest range of students placed from level B through to E. Although it has a broad range of results there are no or few A's being assessed. This therefore brings the overall school result down, especially when there are E's recorded in almost all areas. This would account for the school mean being lower than the state mean. There were up to 15% of students operating below the level in all areas with the exception of Structure. 2013 also showed a number of students operating below the level with 11%, 9% and 9% assessed for Number, Measurement and Statistics.

Year 5's

Although in Year 5 there was a greater spread of students across the AusVELS and VELS levels it was a little concerning that there were as many as 12% and 15% operating below the expected level in 2012 (VELS) and 2013 (AusVELS). This places Streeton below State for both of those years in all areas. Although there were higher numbers of students operating below the level than other areas there are more students operating above the level with B's and A's being recorded.

	Year 6's Year 6 results were very impressive in 2012 for VELS and 2013 for AusVELS. Comparative performance revealed strong results with regard to student learning. The mean scores for school to state showed the Year 6 students were operating above the State Mean in all areas. Although there was a wider spread of students from A to D this was by far their best year for results with less than 5% operating below the expected level and up to 20% operating at an A and up to 30% operating at a B.
What factors supported or inhibited our success?	*There also appears to be a trend in student achievements in Prep, Year 1 and Year 2 in that they are not marking in levels above B. There are very few – almost none in B and even fewer to none in A.* Some of the reasons data may not have been as high as we might have liked it to be and in relation to our projected outcomes is due to a number of factors such as – • Individual students – These students may have been removed/withdrawn from the NAPLAN assessment but have been assessed against VELS / AusVELS – this includes students with learning difficulties. • Another factor is a cohort of children. • Teacher judgement plays a significant part in data results. Expectation is high. Although it is consistent from year to year it is high i.e. teachers mark students fairly low and have not placed many students in level B and A for VELS/AusVELS. Are teachers setting their own standards higher when assessing against VELS/AusVELS? • What testing takes place beyond the expected level to monitor students that are operating at a higher level? • When you look at the 2006 – 2009 self-evaluation period there is a cohort of children that performed low (Year 3 – 2009). This cohort had a significant number of special needs children with a range of academic, social and behavioural areas. This would have an impact on the data for the Year 4's in 2010, the Year 5's in 2011 and the Year 6's in 2012. These students were closely monitored in the following years and the data shows that that there is some improvement; particularly by the time they make it to Year 6 where there are very positive results. There was a significant increase in the results in 2012 with the School Mean higher than the State Mean with almost 50% of students operating above the level as a B or A in all domains. This indicates much work was done with these students across the years to support their learning and improve results. It shows that there was a commitment to improvement and strengthening of student learning by the teachers. It was important that this cohort of students was identified in 2009 and then closely monitored, which in turn showed increased performance each year thereafter, with the most significant improvement in Year 6. • For each student to achieve at least one year's growth in learning (as measured by AusVELS) during each school year. This may not be the case for some individuals, therefore impacting on data.
Where might we focus future effort?	Ensuring all Streeton students will continue to: - be confident and curious learners - make great progress regardless of their starting point - achieve high standards in numeracy Targets - To progressively increase the percentages of Year 3 and 5 students assessed in the top two NAP Bands for their year level when measured from a 2014 baseline. - To improve the correlation between teacher (AusVELS) and NAPLAN assessments. - For each student to achieve at least one year's growth in learning (as measured by AusVELS) during each school year. Improvement Strategies for Mathematics - Building teachers' understanding of Mathematics teaching - Ensuring whole school instructional approaches, understandings and protocols are firmly in place and closely linked to student learning outcomes

- Ensuring a range of assessment practices and feedback mechanisms are used to: monitor and evaluate each student's progress; guide instructional practice; identify learning and report to students and families
- Providing strong support for staff professional learning which focuses on improved teaching practice, consistency of practice and the sharing of best practice through peer observation and Professional Learning Teams.
- Use of assessment data, supporting all staff including new appointments.
- Observation practice. Building skills in giving and receiving feedback, refining the observations to more directly link with how practice might be improved, and incorporation into PDPs.
- Continue to embed the use of ICT resources in the Mathematics curriculum. Continue to build on the good practices that are already in place.

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE IN ICT AND SCIENCE
(2 Proposed Priority Areas for the way forward)

ICT
Throughout the period of 2010-2013, ICT at Streeton Primary School has undergone significant growth and change with students in Grades 5 & 6 being introduced to a 1:1 iPad program in Term 2, of 2013, with each classroom participating in the program having an Apple TV. This program has provided our students with a deeper understanding and skill base to effectively use 21st Century technologies to facilitate their learning and understanding across all areas of the curriculum.
Our school had an uptake of approximately 95% of the student population participating in the program. Due to the success of the program in our Senior School we have now introduced the 1:1 program into our Grade 3 and 4 classrooms at the beginning of 2014. The implementation of this program continues to be successful.
Prior to the implementation of the 1:1 program in our Senior and Middle schools our ICT program consisted of "Area Sets" of 12 Netbooks to be timetabled and shared at approximately 1:2 ratio. The Junior School also had access to a set of 12 ipads which were, and continue to be used in the Junior School. Our school has a computer lab which consists of 25 Personal Desktop Computers. This learning space continues to be utilised by our Junior School and on occasions our Middle and Senior School students.
Our school teacher judgement data indicates that between the periods of 2010-2012, approximately 90% of students were working at standard "C" in ICT across the school student population. This data indicated that very few students were working below or above the standard. Our data changed considerably following the introduction of the 1:1 program at the beginning of 2013 within our Senior School students with 90% of this cohort working above standard. Students working in Grade 5 and 6 were assessed at working considerably higher than expected standard due to the presentation of work samples, demonstrated understandings of diverse ICT areas, range of Apps being used effectively and the advanced ICT skill base displayed by the vast majority of our students.

Science
At Streeton Primary School we believe that it is important to develop a scientific mindset with questioning and problem solving in order to enhance a child's cognitive growth, logic, and reasoning.
We believe that Science:
- engages a child's natural curiosity
- provides practical tools for understanding everyday life
- advances critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity in learners

From 2008 to 2012 Science was primarily taught by the classroom teacher. This was enhanced by relevant incursions by science professionals.

Streeton PS has created partnerships with local secondary school science teachers to demonstrate key ideas in developing science concepts.
In this way we have been able to share knowledge to develop and explore science knowledge.

Teachers utilise a range of science resources currently available at Streeton P.S. including ICT resources in science and classrooms-iPads, Smart-boards/projectors.

In 2014, Streeton PS introduced Science as specialist program with a dedicated specialist teacher.

Engagement	Engagement refers to the extent to which students feel connected to and engaged in their learning and with the broader school community. Engagement spans students' motivation to learn, as well as their active involvement in learning. Engagement also refers to students engagement as they make critical transitions through school and beyond into further education and work.
What did we set out to achieve?	To provide a student centred, stimulating learning environment which engages students in their learning.
What did we achieve?	In 2013 student Attitudes to School Survey measure scores were extremely positive with scores much higher than the State Mean for all areas (Student Relationships, Wellbeing and Teaching and Learning) for Year 5. In 2013 student Attitudes to School Survey measure scores were also extremely high for Year 6 students. Although they were not as high as the Year 5 results they were still much higher in most cases than the State Mean. For those that were not 'much' higher were still significantly higher. This still indicates the students are extremely engaged and there is much to celebrate. Student perceptions were positive and much higher than the state median. There was strong evidence of high levels of student engagement and connectedness to school, with the scores measuring in the top % of Victorian Government schools. In no instance was there a score lower than the State Mean. This indicates students were very positive about the school, identifying an extensive range of benefits they had gained as a result of their school experiences. This indicates a high level of quality teaching, positive relationships with students and teachers and a calm and stimulating learning environment. This would also indicate high levels of student cognitive, emotional and behavioural engagement.
What factors supported or inhibited our success?	Learning environment incorporates the use of ICT in daily practice. Teachers demonstrate a commitment to differentiated learning. Focus on Real Life experiences. High student attendance levels. **Inhibiting Factors** Physical layout of some classes. Variation in teacher practice.
Where might we focus future effort?	The following needs to be considered for inclusion in the new School Strategic Plan. Goal/Target - All Streeton Primary School students will continue to be highly motivated and engaged in their learning across all areas of the curriculum. - In addition the school will investigate developing its own survey of student perceptions. There may be a need to develop a survey for students younger that Years 5 and 6. This will establish attitudes to school for areas from Prep to Year 4. - Establish targets based on results from the appropriate measures in the 2014 student Attitudes to School Survey, which were also extremely positive and had all students operating well above the State Mean in Years 5 and 6 for all areas. Key Improvement Strategies - Continue to encourage a strong student voice to inform and monitor the work of teachers through empowering students to more actively shape their own learning. Continue to develop programs and activities that continue to build on and encourage the participation and engagement of students in their learning and school life.

PARENT SURVEY (Placed on E-News for 1 week – available to all parents)

How often do you meet in person with teachers at your child's school?

	Responses %	No. of Parents
Almost Never	0.00%	0
Once or Twice Per Year	30.23%	13
Every Few Months	20.93%	9
Monthly	23.26%	10
Weekly or More	25.58%	11
TOTAL		**43**

How involved have you been with a parent group(s) at your child's school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not at all involved	20.93%	9
A little involved	18.60%	8
Somewhat involved	16.28%	7
Quite involved	23.26%	10
Extremely involved	20.93%	9
TOTAL		**43**

In the past year, how often have you discussed your child's school with other parents from the school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Almost never	2.38%	1
Once or Twice	11.90%	5
Every few months	7.14%	3
Monthly	40.48%	17
Weekly or more	38.10%	16
TOTAL		**42**

In the past year, how often have you helped out at your child's school?

	Responses %	No. of Parents
Not at all involved	9.30%	4
A little involved	30.23%	13
Somewhat involved	18.60%	8
Quite involved	32.56%	14
Extremely involved	9.30%	4
TOTAL		**43**

How involved have you been in fundraising efforts at your child's school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Almost never	13.95%	6
Once or Twice	13.95%	6
Every few months	11.63%	5
Monthly	30.23%	13
Weekly or more	30.23%	13
TOTAL		**42**

In the past year, how often have you visited your child's school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Almost never	2.33%	1
Once or Twice	0.00%	0
Every few months	4.65%	2
Monthly	6.98%	3
Weekly or more	86.05%	37
TOTAL		**43**

PARENT SURVEY cont…

To what extent do you think that children enjoy going to your child's school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not at all	0.00%	0
A little bit	6.67%	3
Somewhat	22.22%	10
Quite a bit	55.56%	25
A tremendous amount	15.56%	7
TOTAL		**45**

How much does the school value diversity of children's backgrounds?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not at all	0.00%	0
A little bit	11.36%	5
Somewhat	36.38%	16
Quite a bit	45.45%	20
A tremendous amount	6.82%	3
TOTAL		**44**

Overall, how much respect do you think the children at your child's school have for the staff?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Almost no respect	0.00%	0
A little bit of respect	0.00%	0
Some respect	11.11%	5
Quite a bit of respect	60.00%	27
A tremendous amount of respect	28.89%	13
TOTAL		**45**

To what extent do you think that children enjoy going to your child's school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not at all	0.00%	0
A little bit	6.67%	3
Somewhat	22.22%	10
Quite a bit	55.56%	25
A tremendous amount	15.56%	7
TOTAL		**45**

PARENT SURVEY cont...

How motivating are the classroom lessons at your child's school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not at all motivating	2.22%	1
Slightly motivating	11.11%	5
Somewhat motivating	26.67%	12
Quite Motivating	44.44%	20
Extremely motivating	15.56%	7
TOTAL		**45**

Overall, how much respect do you think the teachers at your child's school have for the children?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Almost no respect	0.00%	0
A little bit of respect	6.67%	3
Some respect	24.44%	11
Quite a bit of respect	35.56%	16
A tremendous amount of respect	33.33%	15
TOTAL		**45**

How well do the activities offered at your child's school match his or her interests?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not well at all	4.08%	2
Mildly well	12.24%	6
Fairly well	24.49%	12
Quite well	48.98%	24
Extremely well	10.20%	5
TOTAL		**49**

How well do administrators at your child's school create a school environment that helps a child learn?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not well at all	8.89%	4
Mildly well	15.56%	7
Fairly well	31.11%	14
Quite well	33.33%	15
Extremely well	11.11%	5
TOTAL		**45**

How fair or unfair is the school's system of evaluating children?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Very unfair	4.44%	2
Somewhat unfair	6.67%	3
Slightly unfair	2.22%	1
Neither fair or unfair	22.22%	10
Slightly fair	8.89%	4
Somewhat fair	20.00%	9
Very fair	35.56%	16
TOTAL		**45**

PARENT SURVEY cont…

How well do the teaching styles of your child's teachers match
your child's learning style?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not well at all	2.04%	1
Mildly well	12.24%	6
Fairly well	26.53%	13
Quite well	36.73%	18
Extremely well	22.45%	11
TOTAL		49

How much of a sense of belonging does your child feel at his or her school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
No belonging at all	0.00%	0
A little bit of belonging	8.16%	4
Some belonging	18.37%	9
Quite a bit of belonging	40.82%	20
A tremendous amount of belonging	32.65%	16
TOTAL		49

How well do you feel your child's school is preparing him or her
for his or her next academic year?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not well at all	10.42%	5
Mildly well	16.67%	8
20.83%	20.83%	10
Quite well	31.25%	15
Extremely well	20.83%	10
TOTAL		48

How well do the school's ways of evaluating learning work for your child?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not well at all	8.16%	4
Mildly well	12.24%	6
Fairly well	24.49%	12
Quite well	46.94%	23
Extremely well	8.16%	4
TOTAL		49

At your child's school, how well does the overall approach to
discipline work for your child?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not well at all	2.04%	1
Mildly well	2.04%	1
Fairly well	28.57%	14
Quite well	51.02%	25
Extremely well	16.33%	8
TOTAL		49

How comfortable is your child in asking for help from school adults?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not comfortable at all	0.00%	0
Mildly comfortable	22.45%	11
Somewhat comfortable	12.24%	6
Quite comfortable	53.06%	26
Extremely comfortable	12.24%	6
TOTAL		49

Given your child's cultural background, how good a fit is his or her school?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Not good at all	2.04%	1
Mildly good	0.00%	0
Fairly good	20.41%	10
Quite good	38.78%	19
Extremely good	38.78%	19
TOTAL		49

STUDENT SURVEY (Grades 3-6)

My teachers expect me to do my best.

	Responses %	No. of Parents
Always	90.00%	72
Most of the time	8.75%	7
Sometimes	1.25%	1
Never	0.00%	0
TOTAL		**80**

My teachers provide me with useful feedback about my school work?

	Responses	No. of Parents
Always	62.03%	49
Most of the time	34.18%	27
Sometimes	3.80%	3
Never	0.00%	0
TOTAL		**79**

Teachers at my school treat students fairly

	Responses	No. of Parents
Always	80.00%	64
Most of the time	16.25%	13
Sometimes	3.75%	3
Never	0.00%	0
TOTAL		**80**

My school is preparing me for the 21st Century in ICT and Sustainability

	Responses %	No. of Parents
Yes	88.75%	71
Most of the time	7.50%	6
A little bit	1.25%	1
Not at all	2.50%	2
TOTAL		**80**

I feel safe at school

	Responses	No. of Parents
Always	67.09%	53
Most of the time	29.11%	23
Sometimes	2.53%	2
Never	1.27%	1
TOTAL		**80**

I can talk to my teachers about my concerns

	Responses	No. of Parents
Always	42.50%	34
Most of the time	51.25%	41
Sometimes	6.25%	5
Never	0.00%	0
TOTAL		**80**

Student behaviour is well managed at my school

	Responses	No. of Parents
Always	43.75%	35
Most of the time	51.25%	41
A little bit	5.00%	4
Never	0.00%	0
TOTAL		**80**

I like being at school

	Responses	No. of Parents
Always	45.00%	36
Most of the time	46.25%	37
A little bit	5.00%	4
No not at all	3.75%	3
TOTAL		**80**

Wellbeing	Students' health, safety and wellbeing are essential to learning and development. An inclusive, safe, orderly and stimulating environment for learning is critical to achieving and sustaining students' positive learning experiences.
What did we set out to achieve?	
What did we achieve?	Developed an environment fostering high expectations for all students. Re-configure the majority of our learning spaces to facilitate best practice/bright, light filled, flexible, latest ICT infrastructure. Provide an orderly environment with no/minimal interruptions to learning safety.
What factors supported or inhibited our success?	**Factors Supporting our Success** Injection of State and Federal government funding to develop learning spaces. Staff with a passion for change/best practice. Staff optimising opportunities presented via professional reading/professional development. Identifying risks to student safety. Promote inclusion and value diversity in our community. Student discipline processes are fair and consistently applied. Regular review of policies and procedures (Bullying, Cyber Safety Complaints) **Factors Inhibiting our Success** Some variation in implementation Very large site to maintain (OHS) Refurbishment of remaining classrooms
Where might we focus future effort?	Making our school different/continued development of the Permaculture Farm, Leader in ICT. Continue to foster/promote best practice Continue the work with O.H.S.

Productivity	Productivity refers to the effective allocation and use of resources, supported by evidence and adapted to the unique contexts of each school. Successful productivity outcomes exist when a school uses its resources - people, time, space, funding, facilities, community expertise, professional learning, class structures, timetables, individual learning plans and facilities – to the best possible effect and in the best possible combination to support improved student outcomes and achieve its goals and targets.
What did we set out to achieve?	-Transform learning spaces -Review best practice -Improve student achievement levels in literacy and numeracy -Offer an inclusive program for all students -Build community
What did we achieve?	-Re-develop A wing, Specialist facilities and the hall with Better Schools today and Building Education Revolution money -Participate in AIZ Professional Development as offered by Northern Region -Partner with other schools to facilitate change 1:1 ipad Program, Integration/Learning for Life -Reflect on change of practice to enhance programs. ICT, Disability, Engagement, special programs (café/challenge based learning), school sustainability project -Small class sizes/flexible learning opportunities -Tracking of student achievement levels early work with SPA, use of on-demand testing
What factors supported or inhibited our success?	-Dedicated staff -Professional learning opportunities at low or no cost because of Northern Region – AIZ -Professional learning/shared staff expertise (in school between schools) -Peer observation/theories of action -Learning opportunities provided by the network: AP mini network Leaders in the making Shared best practice -Support provided by the project manager throughout the building process -Locally raised funds dedicated to special need – sustainability, literature, grounds
Where might we focus future effort?	-Sustainability of class structure -Re-focus on distributive leadership -Focus on research based practices (pedagogy and assessment practice) -Challenge to provide breadth of curriculum in a small school