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Background
1. A new regional planning template for the school NAPLAN plan has been developed
   a. to generate alignment between NAPLAN activity, other core improvement strategies within education, and regional models such as Zachman (Who, how, when, where, what and why)
   b. deliver consistency not conformity across schools
   c. maximize opportunity for student improvement

Activity
2. School teams are expected to review their previous 2010 plans with respect to Section B (Student Targets) and Section C (School strategies)
   a. During the review it would be appreciated if thoughts and reflections could be added to your plan in RED

3. Please post the reviewed 2010 plan on the RIS in the NAPLAN 2010 folder

4. Develop your new NAPLAN Plan 2011
   a. Sections A, B, C, and D should be completed and posted on the RIS (NAPLAN 2011 folder) by October 15.
   b. Section E is a voluntary section to be developed in response to School Improvement and personal growth strategies

5. For guidance and assistance please contact
   a. Kate Davis (3804 9602)
   b. Kate Bentley (5562 4857)
   c. Michael Forsyth (3804 9625)
Section A: Performance Reflections 2010
Principal

Student Results

General:
In year 3 reading results trended up with fewer students in the bottom 20% and more students in the top 20% than 2009. The number in the middle improved slightly on 2009. In writing, year 3 had more students in the top 20% but also more students in the bottom 20%. In spelling year 3 had more students in the top 20% but also more in the bottom 20%. In G&P there were more students in the bottom 20% with only one student in the top 20%. The Numeracy trend is up a little on last year with fewer students in the bottom 20% than the last 2 years and more students in the middle. The overall improvement although positive in terms of previous years, is still below state and national average.

In year 5 students have improved in reading in 2010 with fewer students in the bottom 20%, more in the top and more in the middle. In writing, year 5 students had fewer students in the bottom 20%, more students in the top 20% and the school mean was up slightly on 2009. In spelling, there is much work to be done with the mean trending down consistently since 2008 and the number of students in the bottom 20% increasing each year. However, the number of students in the top 20% has increased from 2009. In G&P, there were more students in the top 20% than last year, but also more students in the bottom 20% with the mean trending down. In the Numeracy strand, although there were no students in the top 20%, there are more students in the middle strand than previous years. We have begun to address the numeracy issues in term 4 of 2010, with a much stronger focus on numeracy in 2011.

In year 7, we have achieved levels similar to like schools in most strands. In reading the number of students in the bottom 20% has decreased each year but the number of students in the top 20% has decreased. The focus on reading in 2010 with PLIP should have an impact on this strand in 2011. The mean of Writing in 2010 has improved over the last 2 years, with the number of students in the bottom 20% decreasing. In spelling the number of students in the top 20% has increased while the number in the bottom 20% has decreased, with the mean improved on 2009. In G&P, the mean is comparable to like schools and the state, with a gradual increase in the number of students in the top 20%. Numeracy mean is comparable to like schools with the number of students in the bottom 20% decreased since last year and the number of students in the top 20% well up on last year.

Indigenous

Strategies

Worked well:
The process of implementing the improvement agenda as teacher’s core business is starting to show an effect. This agenda has maintained a high profile through the implementation of academic processes around data analysis that involves all staff in their year level planning meetings and driving the improvement agenda at staff meetings. The submission of week 9 data as mandatory is now successfully implemented and this data is shared with staff.
The implementation of SWPBS has had a strong positive result on student behaviour with clear and precise processes and the striving for consistency in the implementation of school processes. Data supports reduced suspensions in the 6-20 day category, with no exclusions to date this year. Better student behaviour with high expectations around the provision of a positive learning environment has contributed to a focus on the academic success of students as our ‘top of mind’ business instead of behaviour being first focus.
The implementation of URL and LL4LL, although in their infancy at NAPLAN time this year, are demonstrating improvements in key learning areas in school data, as is the new reading program PLIP. This will hopefully be reflected in the next round of NAPLAN data.
Missed the Mark
The implementation of ‘Words their Way’ as a whole school program has not shown results yet. This will be investigated and the option to do some cluster Professional development is being organised. Reading was the focus for 2010 with writing, grammar and punctuation to follow in a timely fashion, supported by the whole school foundational work on ‘best fit’ pedagogical practice.

Could be strengthened:
The decision to focus on Literacy in 2010 will be supplemented with a new whole school English plan and a whole school Maths plan in 2011. The profile of the numeracy agenda has been raised and professional development begun in First Steps in Maths and Yumi Deadly Maths in 2010. This will be intensified in 2011 with a focus on hands on activities in Maths. PLIP will be reviewed at the end of this term as it has been very effective in achieving improved reading levels, so much so that we may be able to turn our focus to writing with a decreased resource commitment to reading.

Summary
2010 has meant an improvement in NAPLAN results in terms of the rate of improvement and the achievement particularly of the year 7 cohort. Tracking the same cohort has enabled us to track the improved performance of both this year’s fives and sevens from their previous NAPLAN performance. Some signs are positive although Waterford West has much work to do towards its’ final goals and targets. The initiatives currently in place will be reviewed when appropriate for evaluating success as they are still in their infancy. The school will continue to focus on ‘best fit’ pedagogy as the primary achievement driver.
Some performance measures and targets are not relevant for every school. Cohort sizes are 2010 to 2013 students.

WATERFORD WEST TARGETS 2009 SSP: Waterford West State School (1856)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Annual target increase for state schools¹</th>
<th>Dimensions of Measure</th>
<th>Current performance (where available²)</th>
<th>Targets (Schools to complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The annual percentage increases for these measures are aligned with departmental targets.
² Current performance data may not be available for some groups.
³ Principals are to use the annual percentage increase and the current school performance information to calculate targets for the period 2010 to 2013. This completed document should be incorporated as an appendix to school planning documentation. For schools where cohort sizes are very small and where there is volatility in the data or in other contexts, using the annual percentage increase may not be applicable. In these cases further negotiation with the principal’s supervisor should be undertaken to finalise targets.

Some performance measures and targets are not relevant for every school.