



# Woodside Primary School 2017 Annual Report to the School Community



Government  
of South Australia

Department for Education  
and Child Development

Woodside Primary School Number: 495

Partnership: Torrens Valley

Name of School Principal:

Steve Hicks

Name of Governing Council Chair:

Murray Guy

Date of Endorsement:

19/03/2018

## Improvement Planning and Outcomes

Our 2017 SIP contained specific strategies that every teacher was expected to engage with.

In Maths expectations were:-

- All teachers will scan for misconceptions appropriate to their year level and respond with interventions.
- All teachers will conduct at least one problem solving lesson per week including questions that are meaningful and unfamiliar
- All staff will use numeracy (& literacy) data to inform their teaching practice.
- All teachers will work with the STEM coach to develop STEM units of work that require students to apply their skills in new ways using collaboration, problem-solving and interdisciplinary thinking.
- All teachers will trial the use of at least one of the 'new' technologies to support learning (ie. 3D printing, robotics or coding)

Outcomes:- Misconception tests were carried out at each year level using the Tierney Kennedy resources. To ensure consistency and continuity, which tests and when they are to be administered will be included in our new numeracy plan. Every teacher attended multiple training sessions on how to successfully implement problem solving sessions and did so on a regular basis. Teachers gathered, analysed and reviewed data on a regular basis and altered their teaching practice in response to that data. Integrated STEM units (eg. 'What Floats Your Boat' and 'Survival on Everest' with the UPs; 'Zootopia' with the MPs and recently 'Code my Town' with the JPs) were all highly successful with high levels of engagement and achievement recorded.

Comparison to set targets:-

SEA target for Year 3 was 73%; Actual was 93% Higher Band Target for Year 3 was 24%, Actual was 38%:- Exceeded.  
SEA target for Year 5 was 75%; Actual was 78% Higher Band Target for Year 5 was 42%, Actual was 17%:- At and lower.  
SEA target for Year 7 was 74%; Actual was 96% Higher Band Target for Year 7 was 13%, Actual was 30%:- Exceeded.  
Higher band retention target for Year 3 - 5 was 50%, Actual was 36% :- Lower.  
Higher band retention target for Year 3 - 7 was 43%, Actual was 100% :- Exceeded.  
Higher band retention target for Year 5 - 7 was 75%, Actual was 175% :- Exceeded.

In Literacy, expectations were:-

- At least 4 times in the year all Year 3-7 teachers will assess reading comprehension using the WPS assessment tool and then respond with interventions using appropriate Sheena Cameron strategies.
- All R-7 teachers will collect and assess 4 samples of writing across 2 genres in the year. These will be kept in individual portfolios for moderation and to assess growth. R-2 teachers will assess 'recount' in T1&3 and 'procedural' writing in T2&4.
- Year 3-7 teachers will assess 'narrative' in T1&3 and 'persuasive' writing in T2&4. Appropriate '7 Steps to Writing' & 'Sheena Cameron' strategies will then be selected for targeted intervention.

Outcomes:- All teachers used the scanning tools in both reading comprehension and writing to gather baseline data, conducted intervention strategies then re-tested to show growth.

Comparison to set targets:-

Running Record target for Year 2 was 74%; Actual was 85%: Exceeded  
SEA target for Year 3 was 97%; Actual was 100% Higher Band Target for Year 3 was 27%, Actual was 45%:- Exceeded.  
SEA target for Year 5 was 78%; Actual was 81% Higher Band Target for Year 5 was 58%, Actual was 42%:- At and lower.  
SEA target for Year 7 was 74%; Actual was 87% Higher Band Target for Year 7 was 22%, Actual was 39%:- Exceeded.  
Higher band retention target for Year 3 - 5 was 80%, Actual was 62% :- Lower.  
Higher band retention target for Year 3 - 7 was 53%, Actual was 60% :- Exceeded.  
Higher band retention target for Year 5 - 7 was 67%, Actual was 75% :- Exceeded.



## NAPLAN Progress

The data below represents the growth of students from 2015 to 2017 in the NAPLAN test relative to students with the same original score, presented in quartiles.

### Reading

NAPLAN progression	Year 3-5	Year 5-7	State (average)
Upper progress group	25%	33%	25%
Middle progress group	38%	52%	50%
Lower progress group	38%	14%	25%

Data Source: DECD special extract from Student DataWarehouse, July 2017.

\*NOTE: Reporting of data not provided when less than six students in the respective cohort. Due to rounding of percentages, data may not add up to 100%.

### Numeracy

NAPLAN progression	Year 5-7	Year 3-5	State (average)
Upper progress group	33%	13%	25%
Middle progress group	48%	47%	50%
Lower progress group	19%	41%	25%

Data Source: DECD special extract from Student DataWarehouse, July 2017.

\*NOTE: Reporting of data not provided when less than six students in the respective cohort. Due to rounding of percentages, data may not add up to 100%.

## NAPLAN Upper Two Bands Achievement

This measure shows the number of non-exempt students enrolled at the time of NAPLAN testing who have demonstrated achievement in the relevant NAPLAN higher bands.

	No. of students who sat the test <sup>^</sup>		No. of students achieving in the upper two bands		% of students achieving in the upper two bands <sup>**</sup>	
	Reading	Numeracy	Reading	Numeracy	Reading	Numeracy
Year 3 2017	29	29	13	11	45%	38%
Year 3 2015-17 Average	32.7	32.7	18.3	13.7	56%	42%
Year 5 2017	36	36	15	6	42%	17%
Year 5 2015-17 Average	32.0	32.0	15.7	5.0	49%	16%
Year 7 2017	23	23	9	7	39%	30%
Year 7 2015-17 Average	19.7	19.7	5.7	5.3	29%	27%

Data Source: DECD special extract from NAPLAN SA TAA data holdings, July 2017.

<sup>^</sup>includes absent and withdrawn students.

\*Reporting of data not provided when less than six students in the respective cohort.

\*\*Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

## Attendance Comment

Attendance levels are high right across the school and comparable with previous 4 years. Our total of 94.1% is just below the DECD target of 95%.

Our approach to attendance is primarily a proactive one, where we aim to create a safe, engaging learning environment where students want to attend.

If not for an extremely wet, cold Adelaide Hills winter where illness was commonplace, these results would have been even higher.

## Behaviour Management Comment

In our parent opinion survey 172 parents responded to the statement:- "The classroom and school in general provides a safe and supportive learning environment".

71 responded with Strongly Agree; 100 responded with Agree; 0 were neutral; 1 responded with Disagree and 0 responded with Strongly disagree.

Our behaviour management data backs up this response. In 2017 there were no students suspended from Woodside Primary School.

There were a small number of students who were given time-outs for classroom or yard mis-demeanours.

## Client Opinion Summary

179 parents responded to the statement:- "My child is happy at school." Only 2 disagreed.

175 parents responded to the statement:- "My child is engaged in their learning." Only 2 disagreed.

179 parents responded to the statement:- "I feel welcome at this school. 0 disagreed. 95 strongly agreed.

175 parents responded to the statement:- "I am confident that the school is concerned about my child's learning and well-being." 1 strongly disagreed and 1 was unsure.

177 parents responded to the statement:- "The school keeps up with current learning programmes and teaching methods." 143 either strongly agreed or agreed; 19 were neutral; 3 disagreed and 12 were unsure.

The responses above strongly indicate that the general culture of the school and the teaching and learning programmes are highly regarded.

The following two questions about communication indicate there is still strong support for our approach but it is an area for further exploration as it is not as positive as the responses above.

175 parents responded to the statement "I am kept informed about the learning programmes in the school. 77% either agreed or strongly agreed; 17% were neutral; 8% disagreed; 0% strongly disagreed and 2% were unsure.

179 parents responded to the statement "I receive timely and helpful information about my child's progress and achievement." 68% either agreed or strongly agreed; 20% were neutral; 8% disagreed; 2% strongly disagreed and 2% were unsure.

We also asked parents about 4 of the new curriculum initiatives we had introduced in 2017. Below are the percentages of the level of engagement in each of these.

STEM(R-7): Strongly agree 36%; Agree 53% Neutral 8% Disagree 2% Strongly disagree 1%

Enterprise(Year 4-7): Strongly agree 47%; Agree 41% Neutral 11% Disagree 1% Strongly disagree 0%

Spanish (R-2): Strongly agree 13%; Agree 26% Neutral 17% Disagree 36% Strongly disagree 9%

Spanish (3-7): Strongly agree 5%; Agree 16% Neutral 13% Disagree 42% Strongly disagree 24%

Problem Solving in Maths(R-7): Strongly agree 29%; Agree 59% Neutral 10% Disagree 1% Strongly disagree 1%

These results clearly show a high level of satisfaction in 3 of these new initiatives. Spanish scored better in the face to face lessons with the R-2s than the online lessons with the Year 3-7s. Further investigation is obviously required to ascertain exactly what the issue is here.

## Teacher Qualifications and Workforce Composition

All teachers at this school are qualified and registered with the SA Teachers Registration Board.

Qualification Level	Number of Qualifications
Bachelor Degrees or Diplomas	28
Post Graduate Qualifications	7

Data Source: DECD HR Management Reporting System, extracted Term 3 2017.

Please note: Staff who have more than 1 qualification will be counted more than once in the above qualification table. Therefore the total number of staff by qualification type may be more than the total number of teaching staff.

### Workforce Composition including Indigenous staff

	Teaching Staff		Non-Teaching Staff	
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
Full-Time Equivalents	0.0	13.9	0.0	7.5
Persons	0	16	0	11

Data Source: DECD HR Management Reporting System, extracted Term 3 2017.

## Financial Statement

Funding Source	Amount
Grants: State	\$2,335,490
Grants: Commonwealth	\$0
Parent Contributions	\$66,506
Fund Raising	\$6,769
Other	\$0

Data Source: Data Source: Education Department School Administration System (EDSAS).