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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This report is a product of a review carried out at Magnetic Island State School from 23 to 25 March 2015. It provides 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 consider in consultation with its regional office and school community.

The review and report were completed by a review team from the School Improvement Unit (SIU). For more information about the SIU and the new reviews for Queensland state schools please visit the Department of Education and Training (DET) website.

1.2 School context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>10 - 16 Mandalay Avenue, Nelly Bay 4819</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education region:</td>
<td>Northern Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school opened in:</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year levels:</td>
<td>Prep to Year 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrolment:</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous enrolments:</td>
<td>6.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disability enrolments:</td>
<td>5.3 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) value:</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year principal appointed:</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers:</td>
<td>7 classroom and 6 specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby schools:</td>
<td>Belgian Gardens SS, Railway Estate SS, Townsville State High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant community partnerships:</td>
<td>Rotary Club, PCYC, Sealink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique school programs:</td>
<td>Peer support, 123 Magic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Review methodology

The review was conducted by a team of three reviewers.

The review consisted of:

- a pre-review audit of the school’s performance data and other school information
- consultation with the school’s assistant regional director
- a school visit of three days
- interviews with staff, students, parents and community representatives, including:
  - Principal and Head of Curriculum (HOC)
  - Support Teacher, Literacy and Numeracy (STLaN)
  - Guidance Officer
  - 10 teachers and specialist teachers
  - Six teacher aides
  - Five non-teaching staff
  - Tuckshop convenor
  - Parents and Citizens Association (P&C) (Treasurer)
  - Two high school principals
  - 12 students
  - Police Citizens and Youth Club (PCYC) coordinator
  - Kindergarten provider
  - Six parents

1.4 Review team

Michelle D’Netto Internal Reviewer, SIU (Chair)
Mike Townsend Peer Reviewer
David Curran External Reviewer
2. Executive summary

2.1 Key findings

- The school has a clear improvement agenda and pedagogical framework
  
  School leaders have articulated a clear improvement agenda: Guided reading, explicit planning using data, pedagogical framework and coaching practices. The pedagogical framework is based on Archer’s model of explicit instruction\(^1\).

- There is a focus on planning for consistency in curriculum delivery
  
  There is a consistent approach to planning the English curriculum through the use of common planning templates. There are consistent expectations for units of work, assessment and the analysis and application of data.

- Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) has been introduced to the school
  
  PB4L has been implemented and the school is a Tier 1 school. Artefacts reflective of the program are evidenced across the school. The language and consistency of processes are yet to be embedded in all classrooms.

- Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) for learning are not fully utilised
  
  The school has a computer laboratory but there is inconsistent use of this facility. Several of the computers will need replacement and the funds allocated to this area do not reflect this need.

  ICTs are not fully embedded in the daily operations and delivery of the curriculum.

- School leaders recognise the importance of instructional leadership
  
  A model of classroom observation with feedback is used in classrooms. Teachers are open to receiving feedback on their practice.

- There is a lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities for the leadership team
  
  There is a lack of clarity around the roles and responsibilities of the newly formed leadership team.

- There is some school-wide planning for differentiation
  
  School leaders encourage teachers to tailor their teaching to student needs and readiness. Class teachers develop differentiation through their classroom lesson

---

\(^1\) Archer, AL and Hughes, CA 2011, *Explicit Instruction: Effective and Efficient Teaching*, Guilford Press, New York, USA.
plans using the Maker Model\textsuperscript{2}, with attention to above, at, below and well below standard.

\textsuperscript{2} Maker, C.J. (1982). \textit{Curriculum development for the gifted}. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
2.2 Key improvement strategies

- Refine the current explicit improvement agenda to enable a sharp, narrow and deep focus with achievable, measurable targets and timelines.

- Implement processes to ensure that the curriculum plan and the documented pedagogical framework are the reference against which flexible delivery is designed and implemented.

- Continue to embed P4BL across the school, using every avenue to communicate high expectations, common language and successes.

- Review the roles and responsibilities of the school leaders and support team, based on their expertise to ensure that all members are instructional leaders. These roles and responsibilities should be clearly communicated to all staff.

- Further develop staff capacity through coaching and feedback to ensure the effective implementation of the explicit instruction model.

- Develop strong and strategic partnerships that will support the improved outcomes of students in their early years and transition to high school.