

Seville Road State School

Executive Summary





Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1 Review team.....	3
1.2 School context.....	4
1.3 Contributing stakeholders	5
1.4 Supporting documentary evidence.....	5
2. Executive summary.....	6
2.1 Key findings.....	6
2.2 Key improvement strategies	8



1. Introduction

This report is a product of a review carried out by a review team from the School Improvement Unit (SIU) at **Seville Road State School** from **23 to 26 April 2019**.

The report presents an evaluation of the school's performance against the nine domains of the [National School Improvement Tool](#). It also recommends improvement strategies for the school to implement in consultation with its regional office and school community.

The report's executive summary outlines key findings from the review and key improvement strategies that prioritise future directions for improvement.

Schools will publish the executive summary on the school website within two weeks of receiving the report.

The principal will meet with their Assistant Regional Director (ARD) to discuss the review findings and improvement strategies.

For more information regarding the SIU and reviews for Queensland state schools please visit the SIU [website](#).

1.1 Review team

Anthony Ryan	Internal reviewer, SIU (review chair)
Rebecca Cavanagh	Peer reviewer
David Curran	External reviewer



1.2 School context

Location:	Cnr Oates Avenue and Roscoe Street, Holland Park
Education region:	Metropolitan Region
Year opened:	1956
Year levels:	Prep to Year 6
Enrolment:	127
Indigenous enrolment percentage:	4 per cent
Students with disability enrolment percentage:	6 per cent
Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) value:	957
Year principal appointed:	Semester 2 2017
Day 8 staffing teacher full-time equivalent (FTE):	7
Significant partner schools:	Mount Gravatt State School, Lota State School
Significant community partnerships:	ParqueVista on Seville retirement village, Holland Park Child Care Centre, Holland Park Creche and Family Centre, Holland Park Library
Significant school programs:	Levelled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Read Write Inc



1.3 Contributing stakeholders

The following stakeholders contributed to the review:

School community:

- Principal, Head of Curriculum (HOC), guidance officer, Head of Special Education Services (HOSES), Special Education Program (SEP) teacher, Business Manager (BM), nine teachers, five teacher aides, two cleaners, 23 parents and 58 students.

Community and business groups:

- Holland Park Creche & Family Centre, Mount Gravatt Community Centre, Holland Park Library, ParqueVista on Seville retirement village and Holland Park Childcare Centre.

Partner schools and other educational providers:

- Principal Cavendish Road State High School and principal Mount Samson State School – formerly principal Lota State School.

Government and departmental representatives:

- State Member for Greenslopes and ARD.

1.4 Supporting documentary evidence

Annual Implementation Plan 2019	Explicit Improvement Agenda 2019
Investing for Success 2019	Strategic Plan 2015-2019
Headline Indicators (Semester 2, 2018)	School Data Profile (Semester 2, 2018)
OneSchool	School budget overview
Professional learning plan 2019	Curriculum planning documents
School improvement targets	School differentiation plan
School pedagogical framework	Professional development plans
School data plan	School newsletters and website
School Opinion Survey	Responsible Behaviour Plan for Students
School based curriculum, assessment and reporting framework	



2. Executive summary

2.1 Key findings

The leadership team and staff members are committed to improving learning outcomes for all students.

There is a strong collegial culture of mutual trust and support amongst teachers and school leaders. A high priority is given to building and maintaining positive and caring relationships between staff, students and parents.

The principal and staff members have developed and support an inclusive culture.

The school places a high priority on ensuring that classroom teachers identify and address the learning needs of all students. Teachers have a clear understanding and ownership of their responsibility for curriculum planning and delivery to the full range of students within their classroom.

Staff members value the strong focus on collaboration to set school agendas and state they feel valued as a result of this approach.

The school's documented Explicit Improvement Agenda (EIA) articulates a focus on reading, writing, mathematics, community relationships, Positive Behaviour for Learning (PBL) and performance reviews for all staff. The leadership team identifies that the EIA needs to be narrowed to focus on a key improvement agenda.

There is strong commitment from members of the teaching team to implementing the various elements of the EIA.

Some teachers would value further time and ongoing support to embed expected practices into their repertoire. The leadership team acknowledges continued monitoring of practices relating to the EIA is required to foster a stronger consistency of practice, understand issues relating to effective implementation and enable appropriate levels of support, including induction for new members of the teaching team.

There is joint understanding of, and commitment to, the importance of effective teaching practices to achieve student success.

The pedagogical framework is based on John Fleming's¹ Explicit Instruction (EI) model and was reviewed and updated in 2017 with the whole staff. Elements of other well-researched

¹ Harker Brownlow Education. (2012). John Fleming. Retrieved from <http://www.hbe.com.au/john-fleming.html>



models including Doug Fisher's² Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) and Jim Knight's³ The Big Four elements of high-impact instruction deliver an eclectic approach of which staff understanding and application vary. The implementation of the pedagogical framework varies across classrooms. Staff members indicate an awareness of the pedagogical framework. A number of staff members articulate a lack of understanding and relevance in applying the framework in their everyday work.

The leadership team identifies the development of staff into an expert and coherent teaching team as a necessary step to improve the quality of teaching.

The principal has commenced a process to gather data for the professional learning of staff. This data is informed by the Annual Performance Review (APR) process. Data gathered from walkthroughs, observations and coaching to inform professional learning for staff is an emerging practice.

There is a strong culture of purposeful collaboration within the school and with other schools.

This collaboration has supported one of the key improvement priorities of building consistency of practice in teaching reading. The school leadership team and teaching staff meet twice per term after school to review reading data and set targeted goals for student improvement in reading.

The school actively seeks ways to enhance student learning and wellbeing by partnering with parents and families.

Many parents feel that the school responds well to the identified needs of students and works well with parents and carers to support their child. Parents speak positively of the school, the support for student learning and the quality of the staff.

² Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2013). *Better learning through structured teaching: A framework for the gradual release of responsibility*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development (ASCD)

³ Knight, J. (2012). *High-impact instruction: A framework for great teaching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.



2.2 Key improvement strategies

Use school performance data to collaboratively develop a narrow EIA that identifies a key improvement area with identified targets, agreed strategies for implementation, success checks and timelines.

Collaborate with teachers to define the agreed non-negotiable practices and high-yield strategies relating to the EIA, what this looks like in their classrooms and regularly monitor implementation to promote consistency of practice.

Review the school's pedagogical framework to ensure it is reflective of agreed practices for teaching and learning, is considered in curriculum planning processes and is consistently implemented across the school.

Develop a process of data gathering from formal observation and planning conversations between teachers and the principal to inform focused coaching, mentoring and modelling opportunities between teachers as peer learners and with the principal as required.