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The following is a report prepared as a result of a Situational Analysis at Kootingal Public School from 29th November 2010 to 7th February 2011.
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1.0 School Context

Kootingal Public School is in a rural area and works closely with the local community to build a caring, collaborative and stimulating educational environment for all our students.

We have 190 students under the care of 8 teachers in multi-stage classes.

Although our numbers tend to fluctuate each year, our kindergarten numbers remain strong with an average of 30 students over the past 3 years.

12% of students and 2 teachers identify as Aboriginal. We have 3 students from non-English speaking backgrounds and have 5 special needs students who receive funding support.

We have a mixture of experienced teachers and teachers in their first few years of teaching. The teachers ensure all students have the opportunity to participate in a range of academic, cultural and sporting activities and support students to do their personal best. All teachers are encouraged to regularly assess their teaching skills, set goals and access professional development opportunities to improve pedagogy.

Our main focus continues to be on improving our literacy and numeracy results and our STLA teacher plays an important role in helping students experiencing learning difficulties.

Through our values program we endeavour to foster positive relationships between staff and students and work together to show respect, tolerance, care and consideration for one another. These values are reinforced through our peer support program together with the five keys from the ‘You Can Do It’ program. The five keys are: Being organised and ready to work, being a confident learner and prepared to take risks, getting along well with others and supporting one another to learn, being persistent and not giving up and building resilience to cope with difficult or changing situations.

Overall we encourage students to be active participants and take advantage of the many opportunities available to fulfil their potential.
2.0 Methodology

In conducting this situational analysis, the following phases were followed to draw conclusions, make recommendations and develop strategies linked to the two reforms 1 and 4 of the low SES School Communities National Partnership.

1. Planning the process
2. Collecting data
3. Analysing data
4. Communicating findings, recommendations and strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/s</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Task/s</th>
<th>Required resource</th>
<th>Staff responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29th Nov</td>
<td>Planning the process</td>
<td>• Establish a situational analysis team including representatives from key stakeholder groups:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• determine the data that needs to be collected and the tools available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• develop a timeline for the situational analysis, including tasks, required resources and allocation of personnel responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decide how the findings will be communicated to the school community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Assistant Principals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29th Nov | **Collecting data** | Collect data on:  
- Student enrolment  
- Student attendance  
- Student literacy / numeracy performance  
- staff profile  
- student engagement  
- parents / community | eDSS  
Best Start  
SMART data  
NAPLAN  
School Performance Analysis document (PL records, CLAS survey  
Recorded class data  
School suspension  
RISC records record  
Parent satisfaction survey | Principal Assistant Principals |
| 29th Nov | **Analysing data** | Scanning the data  
Drawing conclusions  
Validating the conclusions  
Explaining significance of conclusions | NP Low SES  
Info Package  
Noting patterns & themes  
Making contrasts and comparisons  
Counting  
Triangulation  
SWOT analysis | Principal Assistant Principals |
| 22\(^{nd}\) February | Communicating findings, recommendations and strategies | Communicate the findings to staff, School Council and P & C. Explain the procedure, conclusions of target areas and how these will be addressed. | Situational Analysis Report | Principal and Parent rep |
3.0 Findings

**Student enrolment**

Student enrolment has remained steady over the last 5 years averaging 196 students each year. The male/female ratio is almost equal. We do however experience a number of families moving in and out of the community caravan park throughout the year due to the difficulty of obtaining permanent accommodation in Tamworth.

Our kindergarten numbers have remained steady with an average of 30 students over the past three years. A small number of families regularly come and go from the school due to varying factors such as itinerant work opportunities and shared parenting.

**Student attendance**

Our school attendance rates for the past 5 years have remained steady with an average attendance of 94.4 and have been consistently above both state and regional levels.

**Staff profile**

We have 6 full time teachers on a class and 4 part time teachers who share 2 classes. One teacher has a full time load made up of library, STLA and RFF. The staff is made up of 3 early career teachers and 7 experienced teachers. 2/3 of the staff have been teaching for more than 10 years. Two members of staff are in their first year of teaching.

In 2009 one teacher attained accreditation with the institute.

In 2010 our targets were improving students’ capacity to write effectively for a wide range of purposes. Teachers will need additional support to work with the more able students to improve their writing results.

Our second target was to improve students’ maths results. To assist teachers a new program was implemented to ensure the teaching of Maths was more comprehensive and consistent from K-6. All staff underwent training on the new program.
It became obvious from our annual think tank that we needed to change our time tabling to allow more time to be spent teaching maths in 2011. More professional development funds will be allocated to maths.

‘Focus on Reading’ was the major professional development undertaken by all staff members in 2010 and will continue into 2011. New staff will be trained in module 1 and will complete modules 2 and 3 with the remainder of staff throughout the year.

**Parents/community**

In an online survey we sought the opinions of parents about the school, the whole survey can be viewed in the annual report but a snap shot suggests that the parents believe that the staff provide a learning environment that engages their children (72.7% strongly agree, 27.3% agree)

The school has high expectations for its students (45.5% strongly agree, 45.5% agree, 9.1% neither agreed or disagreed)

The school delivers on what it plans (27.3% strongly agree, 72.7 % agree)

The school communicates well with parents (54.5% strongly agree, 36.4% agree and 9.1% strongly disagreed.

The teachers at the school are very encouraging when it comes to learning (72.7% strongly agree, 27.3% agree)

**Student engagement**

In an online survey students indicated that generally they were happy in class however a couple of areas to work on include. 11% of students felt that teachers did not always deal with students who misbehave. 50% of students indicated that at times other students disrupt their learning. 10% of students indicated that they don’t feel the teacher encourages them in their learning.
Student performance – Best Start

Term 1
- 61% of students were at level 0 (beginning kindergarten level) in reading and comprehension.
- 38% of students were at level 0 in phonics.
- 50% of students in phonemic awareness and concepts about print.
- 27% of students were at level 0 in aspects of speaking.
- 88% of students were at level 0 in writing.

Term 4
- 11% of students did not make end of kindergarten benchmark (level 3) in reading, phonics, phonemic awareness and concepts about print.
- 61% of students did not make the benchmark in comprehension.
- 55% of students did not make the benchmark in writing.
- 22% of students did not make the benchmark in aspects of speaking.

Student performance – Year 3
- In reading 16% of students were in the bottom two bands compared to 14% in the state. 51% of students were in the middle two bands compared to 39% of the state. This indicates that we are underrepresented in the proficient bands with only 33% of our students achieving in the top bands compared with 48% of the state.
- In writing students made up 3% in the bottom two bands which compared favourably with the state 6%. 64% of our students achieved in the middle two bands compared to state of 38%. We were again over represented in the middle two bands and underrepresented in the proficient bands with 32% of students compared to 56% of the state.
- In spelling 19% of students were in the bottom two bands compared to 13% of the state. 61% achieved in the middle two bands compared to 42% of the state. 19% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared to 46% in the state. This data
indicated again that we had too many students in the middle bands and too few students in the proficient bands.

- In grammar and punctuation 16% of students were in the bottom two bands compared to 15% of the state. 62% achieved in the middle two bands compared to 32% of the state. 23% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared to 54% in the state. This data indicated again that we had too many students in the middle bands and too few students in the proficient bands.

- In numeracy 22% of students were represented in the bottom 2 bands compared to 15% of state. 67% of students were in the middle two bands compared with 46% of state. 9% of students were in the proficient bands compared to 38% of state.

- In Data and measurement 29% of students were in the bottom two bands compared to 17% of state. 55% of students were in the middle bands compared with 51% of state. In the proficient bands 16% compared with 32% of state.

- In patterns and algebra 19% of students were in the bottom two bands compared with state 14%. 58% of students were in the middle bands compared with 45% of state. 23% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared with 40% of state.

**Student performance Year 5**

- **Reading**- 21% of students were in the bottom two bands compared with 20% in the state. 57% of students were in the middle bands compared with 46% of state. 22% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared to 33% in the state.

- **Writing** – 9% of students were in the bottom two bands compared with 13% in the state. 87% of students were in the middle bands compared with 59% of the state. 4% of students were in the proficient bands compared with 27% in the state.

- **Spelling**- 13% of students were in the bottom two bands compared with 16% in the state. 74% of students were in the middle bands compared with 49% of state. 13% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared to 36% in the state.

- **Grammar and punctuation**- 18% of students were in the bottom two bands compared with 17% in the state. 56% of students were in the middle bands compared with 38% of state. 26% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared to 45% in the state.
• Numeracy - 17% of students were in the bottom two bands compared to 16% of the state. 70% of students were in the middle bands compared with 52% of state. 13% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared with 32% in the state.

• Data and measurement 21% of students were in the bottom two bands compared to 20% of the state. 56% of students were in the middle bands compared with 53% of state. 22% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared with 27% in the state.

• Patterns and algebra - 17% of students were in the bottom two bands compared to 17% of the state. 73% of students were in the middle bands compared with 47% of state. 9% of students achieved in the proficient bands compared with 36% in the state.

• Follow up by the STLA teacher on individual students indicated that half of the students in bands 1-3 did not attempt all questions. When interviewed regarding this the majority said they ran out of time because they read too slowly.
## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Strategies to be implemented</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There was a severe problem in Year 3 with girls under performing (compared to the boys) in reading, spelling, grammar and punctuation and writing.</td>
<td>Ensure the girls experiencing difficulty in Stage 1 are identified early using Best Start and school assessment data and referred to STLA program for additional support.</td>
<td>• Look at school assessment data, Best Start and Reading Recovery to identify girls in Stage 1 who are experiencing learning difficulties. The Learning Support Group to monitor the number of girls in the STLA program each term.&lt;br&gt;• Research teaching and learning strategies specific to girls and implement key findings (Gender grouping)&lt;br&gt;• All teachers to incorporate learning intention and reflection into each literacy lesson.&lt;br&gt;• Provide in class support in ICT and continue to use ICT effectively to improve the engagement and learning opportunities for girls.&lt;br&gt;• Provide consistent practice at reading aloud to an adult for low achieving girls to improve fluency.</td>
<td>R1 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NAPLAN data for Years 3 and 5 indicated 66% of students achieved in the middle two bands in literacy compared with the state at 43%.</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of students in Years 3 and 5 achieving in the proficient bands until they are in line with state averages in reading and writing.</td>
<td>• HAT to work in classrooms to demonstrate strategies to assist teachers to use higher order skills to improve the reading and writing results for more able students.&lt;br&gt;• Ensure teachers are proficient at analysis of NAPLAN data and incorporate teaching strategies from SMART data into programs and classroom practice.&lt;br&gt;• Provide consistent practice at reading aloud to an adult for low achieving students to improve fluency.&lt;br&gt;• Deconstruct and practice of past NAPLAN literacy questions and tasks to familiarise students with language and time allowance.</td>
<td>R1 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Best Start data indicates that 61% of students did not meet level 3 (expected benchmark level for Kindergarten) in comprehension and 55% of students did not meet the benchmark for writing.

| Target fluency in reading through consistent practice, and a greater focus on comprehension and writing skills. | • Kindergarten teachers to train in L3.  
• Train all new and existing staff in “Focus on Reading” and ensure strategies are being implemented.  
• HAT to support teachers in the classroom in implementing “Focus on Reading” strategies.  
• Structure guided reading groups to ensure there is a clear focus for every lesson.  
• Writing samples from K-6 to be collected and analysed at stage meetings to ensure consistency and growth. |  | R1  
R1  
R1 & 4  
R4  
R4 |

### 4. Data indicates that the average percentage of on-task behaviour was 60%.

| Increase student on-task behaviour to an average of 65%. | • Implement individual Literacy learning goals for all students.  
• To work towards having Smartboards operational in all classrooms.  
• Provide in class support in ICT and continue to use ICT effectively to improve the engagement and learning opportunities for students. |  | R4  
R4 |