

Department for Education

External School Review

Partnerships, Schools and Preschools division

Report for Seaford Rise Primary School

Conducted in March 2019



Review details

Our education system aspires to become the best in Australia by seeking growth for every student, in every class and in every school.

The purpose of the External School Review is to support schools to raise achievement, sustain high performance and to provide quality assurance to build and sustain public confidence in government schools.

The external school review framework is referenced throughout all stages of the ESR process.

This report outlines aspects of the school's performance verified through the review process according to the framework. It does not document every aspect of the school's processes, programs and outcomes.

We acknowledge the support and cooperation provided by the staff and school community. While not all review processes, artefacts and comments are documented, they all have been considered and contributed to the development and directions of this report.

This review was conducted by Kathryn Entwistle, Review Officer, of the department's Review, Improvement and Accountability directorate and Suzie Sangster, Review Principal.

Review Process

The following processes were used to gather evidence relating to the lines of inquiry:

- Presentation from the Principal
- Class visits
- Attendance at staff meeting
- Document analysis
- Scan of Aboriginal Education Strategy implementation
- Discussions with:
 - Governing Council representatives
 - Leaders
 - Parent groups
 - School Support Officers
 - Student groups
 - Teachers

School context

Seaford Rise Primary School caters for children from Reception to Year 7. It is situated 38kms from the Adelaide CBD. The enrolment in 2019 is 456 students. Enrolments have been steady over the last 5 years. The school is classified as Category 5 on the Department for Education (DfE) Index of Educational Disadvantage. The school's ICSEA score is 975. The local Partnership is River Hub.

The school population includes 5% Aboriginal students, 9% students with a verified disability, 36% of families eligible for school card assistance, less than 1% of students of EALD background and 9 children/young people in care.

There is a disability unit on site.

The school leadership team consists of a principal in the 3rd year of his tenure at the school. The school has one acting deputy principal, special needs coordinator and a wellbeing and inclusion leader. There are 28 teachers including 4 in the early years of their career and 12 step 9 teachers. Aboriginal education teaching (AET) allocation is 0.4FTE as is Aboriginal community education officer (ACEO).

The previous ESR was undertaken in 2015 and the school's on-track evaluation directions in 2016 were:

- Direction 1** Utilise selected diagnostic assessment processes (oral language and vocabulary skills) to inform differentiation and make challenging tasks more accessible, especially for primary students.
- Direction 2** Provide on-going professional learning related to transforming tasks to support teachers across all areas of the Australian Curriculum (AC), and moderate the assessment of A-E grades.
- Direction 3** Develop a school improvement plan (SIP) for 2017 with targets and a longer-term strategic planning process.
- Direction 4** Strengthen the work of the school improvement team (SIT) and the teaching and learning PLCs by articulating the clear and focused approach to regular and cyclic self-review and systematic learning improvement.

What impact has the implementation of previous directions had on school improvement?

In evaluating the school's work in response to the 2016 directions, the panel agreed that notable improvement has been achieved.

In 2019, assessments identify students requiring intervention which has then been strategically implemented through high yield programs and greater alignment with classroom practice. The concept of differentiation as an entitlement for all students remains an area for further development and features against the second line of inquiry in this report.

Evidence was sourced to confirm the school has undertaken intentional processes to bring about improved planning using the AC. Initially, a teacher released from class duties for six months led teachers through systems that enabled familiarity with the AC. Gradually, teachers began to refer to content descriptors and then achievement standards in identifying plans and expected learning outcomes. All staff discussed the more robust planning documents that guide practice in 2019. These documents include an aspect where teachers identify how they will differentiate the learning. Statements within this section of the plan indicate further opportunity to build teachers' understanding of differentiation.

In response to the previous directions, the school leadership team developed a 2017-2018 SIP that allowed staff and the broader community to understand the school's direction and priorities. Targets were evident and teachers were able to connect their work more closely with the school's intended outcomes. This work acted as a pivotal point for the school, as it focused staff more deliberately on coherent, school-wide improvement and provided clarity regarding their practice.

To monitor the impact of the SIP, a SIT was established and included representation from all cohorts of the school. The role of this group was to evaluate the efficacy of implementations on improving learning against the school's targets. Reportedly, this group was expected to act as a conduit of communication to their teams, although evidence that this was effectively managed was limited to some cohort representatives. The line of inquiry regarding the school's new 2019 SIP and cycle of improvement allows the school to consider how they might develop collective processes that evaluate impact, and which evidence and data will inform this work.

Lines of inquiry

EFFECTIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING:

How effectively does the school use improvement planning processes to raise student achievement?

The panel was provided comprehensive evidence regarding the school's recent work in developing the 2019 SIP.

Despite the constraint of time, it is evident that the leaders designed a consultative process that ensured collective ownership of the improvement imperatives. Staff meeting time was dedicated to allow staff to review and consider data sets provided by the leaders and to collaboratively develop agreement regarding the priorities. The panel notes the school's decision to include writing and oral language as priorities that are clearly respondent to contextual data. Challenges of practice have been identified to inform the school's work towards the goals and all staff members with whom the panel spoke were able to articulate the school's priorities. Whilst success criteria have been documented to support the school to review and evaluate progress towards goals and the impact of implementations, at the time of the review, systems and

forums to monitor development are yet to be established. Once these are operational, the panel agrees they will need to be informed by evidence and the analysis of relevant data. An emergent and responsive approach to self-review will support the school in future improvement.

Direction 1 Effectively evaluate the impact of implementations and actions by establishing ongoing systems of self-review, informed by data and evidence.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND STUDENT LEARNING

How effectively are teachers using the Australian Curriculum to support and improve student learning?

Planning against the AC is a relatively new practice at the school, given that previously the International Baccalaureate was the agreed, school-wide framework. Consequently, this introduction has needed to be strategically led and teachers scaffolded to respond to new expectations. Initially, a teacher was released from class for six months to lead this implementation. After securing staff familiarisation with the AC, teachers accessed group and individual professional learning opportunities to develop their knowledge of effective planning. The introduction of time dedicated to collaborative planning has supported teachers' work in this area.

Some staff made clear that a consistent planning document is a relatively new implementation and the panel acknowledges this initiative. Documents sourced by the panel confirmed teachers plan against content descriptors and achievement standards. However limited reference to the AC general capabilities was evident and this remains an area for further development. Some plans include reference to learning intentions and success criteria; innovative concepts the school has introduced in 2019 to develop greater student agency.

An aspect of practice often referred to by teachers, and included in planning documents, was differentiation. Teachers clearly appreciate the significance of this concept in addressing the needs of all learners. Whilst data has been used to identify students at risk of not meeting the Standard of Educational Achievement (SEA), the panel saw limited evidence of differentiated teaching operating in class. Discussion with staff made apparent the varied levels of understanding of differentiation, and signified an opportunity for the school to develop a more consistent and informed approach to meeting all learners' needs.

Direction 2 Meet the needs of each learner by deepening teachers' understanding of differentiation in practice and their ability to design and deliver teaching that is tailored to maximise all students' potential.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND STUDENT LEARNING

How effectively are teachers using evidence-based pedagogical practices that engage and challenge all learners?

In an intent to deliver contemporary teaching and learning opportunities across the school, staff have been provided, and participated in, significant professional learning. The panel heard leaders and teachers discuss a range of external providers who have worked with the school. Concepts explored have included inquiry-based learning, approaches to numeracy, teaching strategies including 'tell to ask' and 'wait time', small group learning, transforming tasks, dispositions to learning and strategies that bring about student agency. Reportedly, teachers have been allowed flexibility to experiment with and trial any of the aforementioned concepts. Some staff discussed the positive difference this has had upon their practice.

Class visits made evident that students access diverse pedagogical approaches, some of which require them to think at deeper levels and apply their knowledge. In some classes students have identified a robust

learning goal and discuss strategies they will employ to work towards this. In other classes, students are provided worksheets that require limited cognitive processing, while in other classes, disproportionate amounts of time are focused on teacher talk and closed questioning techniques.

In order for students to become agile and intuitive thinkers, and to move through year levels with greater learning certainty, the school is now well placed to collectively review and agree upon which pedagogical approaches will be implemented across the school.

Direction 3 Ensure pedagogical coherence and seamless transition points for learners by establishing agreed, high yield practice that will be implemented consistently across the school.

EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

To what extent are the school's professional learning and performance and development processes effective in building teacher capacity?

Across the school, systems and forums operate to build teacher capacity and progress school initiatives. Professional learning teams (PLTs), year level teams, performance and development processes (PDP) and data meetings operate systematically. Teachers with whom the panel spoke appreciated the time dedicated to engage in these opportunities and to work with others. The capacity of some teachers to lead has been increased, as opportunities to convene PLTs has broadened across the staff.

The panel observed four PLTs during the review: literacy, numeracy, wellbeing and ICT, which were convened for an hour each. Utilisation of this time included completing an online survey, teachers engaging in a process of moderation, consideration of purchasing resources, discussion of a teaching task and accessing data. When discussing PLTs, teachers reported that they provide a forum for sharing their cohort's work and listening to what other teams are doing. Year level teams are described as providing opportunities to share ideas, discuss individual students or to organise special events. The panel agrees the concept of *professional learning*, whilst evident in some PLTs, could be more robust and focused.

PDP meeting plans include reference to peer and line manager observations. These have been conducted in 2018 and will continue this year. Documentation provided and discussion forums made apparent that observations have tended to focus on suggested adjustments to students' tasks, rather than pedagogical implementation and how the teacher might grow their practice.

Given the two previous directions regarding the development of authentic differentiated practice and the establishment of school-wide pedagogy, the panel agrees that systems that currently operate can provide a more targeted and intentional approach to building teachers' capacity to respond to school expectations. PLTs and observations strategically designed to progress school agreements will ensure coherent and effective implementation across the school.

Direction 4 Bring about greater consistency in pedagogy and planning by ensuring existing systems that build teacher capacity are focused on school agreements and expectations.

Outcomes of the External School Review 2019

The panel would like to acknowledge the undertakings that have raised the profile of Seaford Rise Primary School in the last few years. Evidence sourced indicated the improvement in a culture of respect, pride and high expectations. Consultation with the parent community and listening to concerns or opinions has been appreciated. Staff and families report the improvement in behaviour exhibited by students at the school and attribute this to an aspirational culture and consistent expectations.

The intent to introduce high yield pedagogy and planning practices is evident, as is the raised profile of data to inform growth. The panel agrees the school is well placed to respond to the following directions.

The principal will work with the education director to implement the following directions:

- Direction 1 Effectively evaluate the impact of implementations and actions by establishing ongoing systems of self-review, informed by data and evidence.
- Direction 2 Meet the needs of each learner by deepening teachers' understanding of differentiation in practice and their ability to design and deliver teaching that is tailored to maximise all students' potential.
- Direction 3 Ensure pedagogical coherence and seamless transition points for learners by establishing agreed, high yield practice that will be implemented consistently across the school.
- Direction 4 Bring about greater consistency in pedagogy and planning by ensuring existing systems that build teacher capacity are focused on school agreements and expectations.

Based on the school's current performance, Seaford Rise Primary School will be externally reviewed again in 2022.



Tony Lunniss
DIRECTOR
REVIEW, IMPROVEMENT AND
ACCOUNTABILITY



Kathryn Bruggemann
ACTING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
PARTNERSHIPS, SCHOOLS AND
PRESCHOOLS



Andrew Messenger
PRINCIPAL
SEAFORD RISE PRIMARY SCHOOL



Governing Council Chairperson

Appendix 1

School performance overview

The external school review process includes an analysis of school performance as measured against the Department for Education Standard of Educational Achievement (SEA).

Reading

In the early years, reading progress is monitored against Running Records. In 2018, 75% of year 1 and 79% of year 2 students demonstrated the expected achievement against the SEA. This result represents an improvement from the historic baseline average, for both year 1 and year 2.

In 2018 the reading results, as measured by NAPLAN, indicate that 77% of year 3 students, 69% of year 5 students and 58% of year 7 students demonstrated the expected achievement under the SEA. For year 3, this result represents little or no change, for year 5, an improvement and for year 7, a decline, from the historic baseline average.

For 2018 year 3, 5 and 7 NAPLAN reading, the school is achieving within the results of similar students across government schools.

In 2018, 38% of year 3, 22% of year 5 and 5% of year 7 students achieved in the top 2 NAPLAN reading bands. For year 3, this result represents an improvement from the historic baseline average.

For those students who achieved in the top 2 NAPLAN proficiency bands in reading, 50% or 7 of 14 students from year 3 remain in the upper bands at year 5 in 2018 and 100% or 1 of 1 student from year 3 remains in the upper bands at year 7 in 2018.

Numeracy

In 2018 the numeracy results, as measured by NAPLAN, indicate that 71% of year 3 students, 56% of year 5 students and 47% of year 7 students demonstrated the expected achievement against the SEA. For year 3 this result represents an improvement, for year 5, little or no change and for year 7, a decline, from the historic baseline average.

For 2018 year 3 NAPLAN numeracy, the school is achieving within and for year 5 and 7, below, the results of similar groups of students across government schools.

In 2018, 19% of year 3, 7% of year 5 and 0% of year 7 students achieved in the top 2 NAPLAN numeracy bands. For year 3 this result represents an improvement from the historic baseline average.

For those students who achieved in the top 2 NAPLAN proficiency bands in numeracy, 67% or 4 of 6 students from year 3 remain in the upper bands at year 5 in 2018 and no students from year 3 remain in the upper bands at year 7 in 2018.