INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

In the last two School Reports, 2011 & 2012, the approach has been to build the report around our Business Plan. In the 2012 School Report, we essentially reviewed our Business Plan (2011-2013), indicating the issues and addressing school improvement. We also made recommendations as to what we needed to change or adapt in the Business Plan, as it was becoming dated and needed “refreshing” to keep it current. In the 2012 report we made recommendations to change the Business Plan, and during 2013 each of these recommendations was considered and endorsed by our School Board. The outcome was a revised “Business Plan 2011-2016”.

During 2013 the new Business Plan was made operational, and was used as the basis to demonstrate school improvement in our 2013 IPS Review conducted in November 2013.

It is important that the reader of this 2013 School Report, understand the relationship of our Business Plan and the Review Findings. It is also important to consider the process of the IPS School Review.

- The Review is conducted by an authority (Department of Education Services) that is completely separate from the Department of Education.
- The reviewers are typically experienced educators who contract their services.
- The review occurs in the third year of the IPS cycle.
- The reviewer’s task is to review the schools self-assessment in regard to progressing the Business Plan. The reviewers do this by focussing upon our claims AND validating the claims against the available evidence. They undertake this review process across two visits, over two and a half days, with interviews involving school leadership, the Board, students, parents and staff.
- They then prepare a report entitled “2013 Independent Review Findings”. The audience for this report is:
  - The Minister for Education
  - The Director General
  - The School
  - The Community

The Independent Review Findings address:-
  - School Context
  - School Performance – Student Learning

School Performance – Quality of the Learning Environment
School Performance – Sustainability.

The reviewer’s scope of enquiry focussed upon where the school assessed itself to be in 2013, but also explored the full IPS journey across 2011-2013.

It is our intention in the 2013 School Report, to use the Review and its findings to report against and to assess our progress as a school. From the Review Findings we will map the Business Plan forward and make any necessary recommendations for improvement. Both the “BUSINESS PLAN 2011-2016” as amended 2013 and the “2013 INDEPENDENT REVIEW FINDINGS” are published and accessible on our school website.
OUR CONTEXT AND OUR DISTICTIVENESS

A critical task for the reviews was to get an understanding of our context.

The school claims in its documentation and at interview that we have distinctive elements in our practice whole of school:

- A respectful, relationship based approach to teaching and learning.
- A consistent focus on VALUES and personal development.
- Acknowledgement and celebration of achievement,
- We take advantage of our uniqueness;
  ◦ Our physical and social environment,
  ◦ Our relatively small size, to enhance our students’ learning.
  ◦ We accommodate and assimilate change.

Other operational profile issues that we claim contribute to our distinctive practice:

- The reality of split sites.
- The attraction and retention of a high quality and stable staff.
- A 21st century facilities profile as a result of Commonwealth and State funding across both sites in 2011-2012.
- A considered and focussed strategy around transitioning Year 6 & 7 to high school.
- Signature and challenging programs across secondary specialist areas particularly Art, Design and Technology and Home Economics.

School recognised challenges:

- Our place in the changing educational market place across the greater Bunbury area.
- Challenges around the “squeeze” on resources.

In our claim, we also said that our ‘distinctiveness’ in circumstances and approach resulted in our students displaying:

- A strong school ethos,
- A caring, thoughtful values set,
- A sense of belonging and pride,
- Engagement and responding to the learning challenge.

Our claims were part of our self assessment and the reviewers interrogated them [and they affirmed our claim about our context]. The following quotes and paraphrasing are evidence from the reviewers “Findings”.

- On “respectful, relationship based approach to Teaching and Learning”.

The reviewers (RF P6) affirm the nature of the relationship ‘small school but a big family’ evidenced from discussions with students, teachers and parents.

- On our staff

“The stability allows (the school) to develop and embed long term programs of improvement and to build effective relationships with the family”. (RF P6)

- On the Values Focus

“A well established values system based on ‘Choose Respect’ has been embedded in the school……” (RF P9)

- On Split Site reality

1. Reviewers acknowledge “the cost of running and maintaining two separate campuses is significant”. (RF P6)

2. The reviewers also acknowledge that the sites have each developed modes of service aligned to both the different physical environment and the needs of the different age groups. (RF P 10 & 7)

3. Of significance in school improvement terms is the reviewers’ acknowledgement of the logistical, financial (and cultural) difficulties in building “a whole school shared ethos culture.” (RF P10)

They then RECOMMENDED:-

“The leadership team consider building stronger whole school links, promotion of whole school events, and ways of strengthening a shared culture.”

School Response: - To commit in 2014 operational planning to address this recommendation.

4. On Transition to High School the reviewers COMMENDED the innovation where the school provides unique opportunities to the upper primary (Year 6 & 7) in accessing facilities, curriculum, and expert teachers not normally available to primary students”.

5. On “signature and challenging programs”, the reviewers COMMEND “high quality of Design & Technology and Art programs and the opportunity they offer students.”

The Review Findings will enable us to progress and clarify and market our context.
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE - STUDENT LEARNING

Before we present the data on our School Performance it needs to be noted that the reviewers findings around how the school deals with ALL aspects of performance are very positive indeed.

The following quotes and paraphrasing clearly attest to quality process:
• “The school demonstrates integrity and honesty in the interrogation of its performance data.” P3
• “A focus on each student as an individual and a desire to support that student and his/her family in helping that student reach their potential is evident in philosophy and practice within the school.” P3

The following AFFIRMATIONS support continued implementation of strategies and initiatives or areas for improvement identified by the school.
• “Interrogation of available data regarding student performance, and the reviewing of its targets for the 2014 - 16 Business Plan.”
• “the practice of establishing the individual and group education plans (IEP’S and GEP’S) as an effective means of improving student outcomes.”
• “the appropriate curriculum offerings which focus on the learning and social needs of every student.”
• “the comprehensive analysis of data and comparison of performance in relation to national and state standards undertaken by Teachers and Board.”
• “the practice of focused fortnightly meetings for the whole staff as a key process for continuous improvement and review.”

The reviewers also made a significant recommendation viz: “in constructing the new Business Plan for 2014-16, the targets be relevant, specific, measurable and include a time frame.”

Clearly the inference the school draws from the findings is that we have a very good process around how we deal with performance of our students.

In relation to targets, we acknowledge that we chose a ‘difficult to achieve’ target set built in English and Maths in particular on our cohorts’ “average rate of improvement” against the national average growth rate.

We believed in 2011 when these targets were set, that because all students performance nationally in NAPLAN, was to be “the benchmark”, then we needed to be able to compare ourselves to that standard. We could have chosen ‘softer’ targets, by comparing our cohorts’ performances to WA averages (less than national) or “like” school averages (again less than state and national).

In retaining these chosen “big strategic, bi-annual type” targets, unless we support them with other more regular and smarter operational target sets,” we run the risk of being perceived as underperforming. The reality is we need the two types of targets and welcome the reviewers’ recommendation; in fact we discussed this with them during the review process.

So coming out of the 2013 Review the school commits to introducing, commencing in Semester 1 2014, a set of SMART operational targets.
• These targets will be centred on class rooms.
• They will be linked to specific Australian Curriculum content.
• They will be based around normal teacher judgement.
• They will be linked clearly to a STANDARD.
• They will be developed as part of our performance management process, i.e. consultation between the classroom teacher and performance manager.
• They will be of similar construction and expression for the purposes of consistency and aggregation and match the normal semesterly assessment cycle.
• We will aggregate where possible from classroom to cohort and whole of school.
• The process will start with the agreed Phase 1 Australian Curriculum Learning Areas English, Maths and Science where there are agreed standards.

It will gradually broaden to include other Learning Areas as the Curriculum Authorities reach agreement. It needs to be noted that our process will involve the introduction in both Maths and English (initially) new monitoring tools (Maths Tracker and English Tracker). It is also our intention to use Semester 1 2014 as a learning period, and then harden up the process in Semester 2. This will position the school well to engage with the new mandatory reporting requirements in Semester 1, 2015.

The whole process will be managed in consultation with the School Board.
In moving into the presentation and analysis of the data we make the following points.

1. Donnybrook cohorts’ NAPLAN performance is typically slightly lower than both national and state averages. This assertion is evidenced across past year’s performance.

2. Individual cohorts do vary in performance depending upon those variables in learning capacity that occur in every cohort. The ‘normal’ NAPLAN range we fall into is that described as “performing as expected”.

3. An interesting feature of our school performance is that our performance in WAMSE (Western Australian Monitoring Standards in Education) which measures performance in Science and Society and Environment across Years 5, 7 and 9, is that our average performance is typically at or above state averages. (WAMSE as a test regime ceased this year due to budget issues).

4. In reporting performance, we simply acknowledge that the data represents our reality. As our reviewers have attested our school interrogates all the data down to individual performance and follows through on all the learning issues.

Another performance indicator, in the very general sense the socio-economic indicator ICSEA (Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage) which ascribes a value of 982 to our school. (Australian average index is 1000). ICSEA which derives its data from the national census ascribes our whole of school profile as:-

| STUDENT DISTRIBUTION |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                         | BOTTOM QUARTER | MIDDLE QUARTER | TOP QUARTER    |
| SCHOOL                  | 35             | 31             | 23             |
| AUSTRALIA               | 25             | 25             | 25             |

While ICSEA is predictive in only the most general sense it does enable us to benchmark against what are called “like” schools i.e. schools who have similar socio-economic profiles.
DATA SET 1

SCHOOLS ONLINE COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE REPORT: ACHIEVEMENT 2013

Raw Achievement Data from My School ACARA website 2013. Below is the 2013 ACARA website overview compared to Like Schools Australia Wide. The blue numbers are Donnybrook’s mean score. SIM means score is similar schools and ALL is whole of Australian schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Persuasive Writing</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Grammar and Punctuation</th>
<th>Numeracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIM 404</td>
<td>ALL 419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>395 - 413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIM 489</td>
<td>ALL 502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>481 - 498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIM 526</td>
<td>ALL 541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>518 - 533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIM 568</td>
<td>ALL 580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>561 - 575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend codes:
- Above average
- Close to average
- Below average
- Substantially below

MAKING MEANING OF THE DATA

OVERVIEW OF DATA SETS 1 AND 2

These two sets of information are different in that Data Set 1 looks at raw performance data in all tested areas. Data set 2 focuses upon progress of individual cohort across 2011 to 2013, and informs our Naplan targets and it also identifies the changing composition of the cohort.

Data set 2 offers comparisons of progress of the 2014 tested cohort and the stable cohort, against like, state and national cohort performance.

Data set 2 bar graphs track the progress (in Naplan points) from one testing period to the next.

What clearly emerges from the representations above (and for comparative purposes we are looking most closely at Numeracy, Reading and Writing) is the following:

1. Our schools most consistent performance areas are READING and MATHS. Our most problematic performance is WRITING.

2. Our big “strategic’ NAPLAN targets around the “Stable cohorts average growth compared to the average growth of the national cohort” are difficult to achieve.

3. Data Set 2 however, does bring close focus to the fact that our ‘stable’ cohort (those who sat both 2011 and 2013 NAPLAN Tests) performs in growth terms well in 6 of the ‘events’ depicted, i.e., growth in terms of NAPLAN points for our stable cohort sees our cohorts compare favourably with Like, State and National Schools.

It also indicates (not in every instance) that the additions to a cohort since the last tested period can impact the average progress.

Since the 2013 NAPLAN results were made available our school has:-

With the assistance of commercial data analysis tools, completed detailed analysis of the data for planning forward purposes at the level of cohort, class and individuals.

This has resulted in detailed planning across the whole school in both English and Mathematics. It has also resulted in a new set of operational targets being framed at the classroom level. These targets are to be reviewed and reported on by semester. Alongside this the school has chosen to introduce and workshop two new monitoring tools “Maths Tracker “ and “English Tracker” to be operational by the end of Semester 1, 2014.
DONNYBROOK DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL: Progress compared to Like, State and National Schools.

In the Business Plan our targets are stated as: “The average growth of the stable cohort meets or exceeds the average national growth rate by cohort across NAPLAN tests.”
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## DATA SET 3

### Year 3 Numeracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 3 Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 3 Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 5 Numeracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 5 Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 5 Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 7 Numeracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 7 Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DATA SET 3

#### State Year 7 Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### State Year 9 Numeracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### State Year 9 Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### State Year 9 Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Making Meaning of the Data

As appears in the header, this data set is included to show and compare our performance profiles in the NAPLAN with “like” WA schools determined by our State SEI.

(Note: the concept of ‘like’ as previously explained is about similar schools on Socio-Economic grounds.) Our problem currently is we have 2 different indexes, SEI being State and ICSEA being the national index. Each deliver different school groups as ‘like schools’ and we measure slightly differently in each index.

Again the data sets clearly highlight WRITING as a major performance issues, but in all other aspects of performance we profile well.
# Data Set 4

**Science, Society and Environment**  
WA Monitoring Standards in Education (WASME) Tests

## Student Performance - WAMSE - Relative Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Science</th>
<th></th>
<th>Society &amp; Environment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Above expected** – more than one standard deviation above the predicted school mean
2. **Expected** – within one standard deviation of the predicted school mean
3. **Below expected** – more than one standard deviation below the predicted school mean

No data available or number of students is less than 6

## State Performance - Year 5 Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 20%</strong></td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle 60%</strong></td>
<td>64 %</td>
<td>56 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bottom 20%</strong></td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## State Performance - Year 5 Society & Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 20%</strong></td>
<td>45 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle 60%</strong></td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bottom 20%</strong></td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA SET 4

MAKING MEANING OF THE DATA

OVERVIEW OF DATA SET 4

Clearly WAMSE shows our students in all tests and across the 3 tested cohorts as exceeding like school performance.

It is of interest that our students as cohorts, irrespective of their NAPLAN performance in the same year, have always performed well in WAMSE.

It is also of interest that when achieving at or above the WAMSE test standards all the cohorts perform well above it.

In relating performance in Science to Business Plan Targets, while we cannot relate to growth as no data exists. We can claim that in both Science and Society and Environment our cohort performance is above, even significantly above similar cohorts in like schools.

Percentage of students achieving at or above the WAMSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year 7 Science</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
<th>Year 7 Society &amp; Environment</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
<th>Year 9 Science</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
<th>Year 9 Society &amp; Environment</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Like Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of students achieving at or above the WAMSE
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE
STUDENT LEARNING

- As indicated in the preamble to this section the data represents our reality. We follow through down to individual performance and plan for Improvement.

- What has not been discussed above is how other factors impact student performance. One of these issues that we can show has impacted Year 7 performance, was attendance. This cohort had the highest proportion of at risk students due to poor attendance. This can be evidenced when we look at where poor attendees were in the lowest quartile. This impacted on our averages in a negative way.

- The second issue again impacting is a trend for students to attend the test and to choose either not to engage or minimally engage. This was evidenced anecdotally by the Year 7 writing supervisor who clearly indicated several students chose not to write. This has also been evidenced in past cohorts and when we profile cohort performance in specific tests the ‘not having a go’ clearly impacts our averages.

- A 2014 change that will impact student performance is the new WACE requirement to satisfy a literacy and numeracy standard at Level 8 or better in Year 9 NAPLAN OR sit tests in Year 10, 11, and 12 to meet the standard. This strategy, while it may not be why the change has been introduced, will see more students taking responsibility for performing in both Year 7 and Year 9 NAPLAN.

RECOMMENDATIONS AROUND CHANGES IMPACTING PERFORMANCE

- We will trial in Semester 1 2014 a set of SMART operational targets.

- Alongside this we will introduce new monitoring tools in Maths and English.

- We will report to the Board at the end of Semester 1 2014 against our new target set.

- We will move into compliance and be reporting against “agreed” standards by the end of 2014.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE
QUALITY OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

The review findings in this area sourced through discussions with all stakeholders acknowledge:

- That the school has an inclusive and quality and modern learning environment where the focus is to meet the needs of all students.

- That the physical environment of each site was seen as both different and distinctive and used and adopted to support learning.

- That split-sites created logistical and financial difficulties particularly in relation to “the building of a whole-school shared ethos and culture.”

The reviewers also made several recommendations that will provide a focus for 2014:

1. That the leadership team consider ways of “building stronger whole-school links, promotion of whole-school events and activities and ways of strengthening a shared culture.”

2. That the school look to actively support networking for its secondary staff and source more extensive mentoring and modelling opportunities for newer, less experienced staff members.

The commendations related to exemplary programs in the Arts and Design and Technology area as well as the distinctive and advantaging specialist programs offered for our Year 6 and 7 students. The reviewers further indicated and encouraged the school to focus on “what” makes Donnybrook unique and highlight the positives of the opportunities for students.

The reviewers commented on the lack of detailed satisfaction surveys of parents and students over the past two years.

We have chosen to separate the satisfaction surveys from the School Report and instead have published them on our website. The reason is that they are large documents and to do them justice they need to be in a digital, not print form. We have added on the website commentary and reportage on the substance of the two satisfaction surveys:-

- Parent Satisfaction Survey 2012
- Staff Satisfaction Survey 2013.

The surveys put our school in a really positive light but also identify a few issues for improvement. These issues are explored in the commentary.
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

QUALITY OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

We additionally constructed small surveys as an action research project around an identified issue viz. transition from the Junior Campus to the Senior Campus. We ran the survey across initially 2011-12 and then again in 2012-13. We surveyed all the Transitioning students in a “pre-transition” and a “post transition”.

The strategy was initially so we could plan for and address the concerns raised. The exercise was most successful because it enabled us to put in place a really well structured transition program starting in September with familiarization visits and moving on to planned learning activities mixing with the Senior Campus students. Parents also participated in the survey and again with the information sharing sessions, and an open door, their concerns were addressed.

The biggest impact on parents was how their children were really successful and happy with their transition.

Moving forward into 2014 we will still use small surveys in action research mode, but we will also return to use the new Department of Education survey instruments now modernized and online.

Within our Business Plan we have a strong focus on “personal and social development”. In 2013 we committed to re-energizing our Values driven approach, the building of a strong positive culture of care around quality relationship as the basis of good learning.

Action around this intent included changing practice and a major overhaul of some of our processes. In 2013 at Bentley Street, the student diary became mandatory and is the major classroom / home communication tool.

At Bentley Street, we reviewed the “expression of our school values set” which had been criticized as being “too wordy” into a more usable form with a new expression:

- **PERSISTANCE**
- **RESPECT**
- **ORGANISATION**
- **POSITIVE**
- **STRIVE for EXCELLENCE**

These PROPS being a student-centred set of Values that our students could identify with. We didn’t just adopt the new mantra it was implemented with explicit teaching around each Value, regularly visited through our Health program and by all teachers when necessary.

We also in 2013 reviewed and reconstructed the student leadership model at the Senior Campus with a recommit-ment to the considerable investment in student leadership on both sites.

Of significance both to the ‘learning environment’ whole of school and to ‘futuring our service’ was the un-foreshadowed move to relocate the Year 6 cohort to the Junior Campus at the end of 2013 for 2014 commencement.

The rationale was economic and pragmatic based on making our shrinking resource base best meet the needs of all students AND from 2014 our school would ‘look like’ what most WA public primary and secondary schools would be in 2015. i.e. K—Year 6 on one site and Years 7—10 on the other.

Finally in this section the review found the school “…… provides a nurturing environment where the needs of each student are known and addressed.”

---
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ATTENDANCE

The attendance targets for both the primary and secondary campuses were met although with some qualifications.

In the primary section of the school the attendance rate of 92.9% was slightly in excess of the WA Public Schools 92.6% and just the 0.1% above like schools.

The secondary attendance rate of 87.4% matched that of WA Public Schools although 0.9% below that of like schools.

While that result would appear to be satisfactory and in some areas quite outstanding, there are some year groups with results that need clarification. On the positive side the Years 1, 2 and 3 cohorts were in line with WA Public Schools at 93%. In years 4 and 5 the percentage were 2 points higher as was the case with the Year 10 cohort. The Year 9 cohort were 3 percentage points above.

Attendance rates for Aboriginal students were well above WA Public Sectors and like schools.

Of most concern was the attendance rate of 84% for the Year 8 cohort which was 6% below the WA Public School figures. Analysis of individual students attendance figures reveal a brighter picture when the attendance statistics for three students are taken into account it shows that they have reduced the overall attendance rate by almost 5%. These students have left the school.

In Year 6, where the rate was 1% below expectations, most of the decline can be attributed to one student with an attendance rate of 17%.

Similarly in Year 7 a small group of students impacted negatively on the overall rate. Their combined absence lowered the average by an excess of 4%. Two of those no longer attend the school.

In the At Risk Categories, the primary section of the school the regular attendance was in line with WA Public Schools at 76.7% (compared to 77%) marginally above WA Public Schools.

Those who are indicated as being at risk is close to the WA Public School norm whilst those at moderate or extreme risk are a combined 5.6% which is below the WA Public School figure of 8%.

The Regular category for the Secondary students is nearly seven points below the schools result in 2012 and four percentage points below that of WA Public Schools. This is reflected in those who are indicated at risk of 0.7% which is 5% above the WA figure. This represents more than a quarter of the students and indicates a need for greater focus in 2014.
### PRIMARY ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Level</th>
<th>Y01</th>
<th>Y02</th>
<th>Y03</th>
<th>Y04</th>
<th>Y05</th>
<th>Y06</th>
<th>Y07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Public Schools 2013</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT BEHAVIOUR DATA

On the Bentley Street site, students are issued with incident reports for several categories on both positive and negative behaviour. These are dealt with by the Deputy Principals who investigate and initiate any actions that may follow. All details are then recorded on our Student Information Database.

The principle aim of the Incident Reports is for staff, through and with the Deputies, to gain positive outcomes from the consequences students receive. This includes resolving the conflict in the negative reports. When suspension is imposed the suspended students are required to have a re-entry interview with the Principal or Deputies and a Code of Conduct agreed to. Parents are expected to attend these interviews.

Analysis of the behaviour statistics needs to take into account subtle differences in the staff and what constitutes the need for a report; what one may see as an issue for a report may well have been dealt with in the classroom environment by another teacher. On balance though, the overall number of reports may well be a reliable indicator.
OVERALL INCIDENCE REPORTS

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BUDDY CLASS</th>
<th>LETTERS OF CONCERN</th>
<th>REPORT</th>
<th>NO FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR GROUP</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 2013 staff have consciously promoted positive reports and with the support of the Parents and Citizens Association many certificates are presented during the year at assemblies. This policy is now standard practice and well received by students.

Factors underlying the number of incident reports:

- In year 8 there were considerably more negative reports than other years. Almost half of these were generated by the students who also had unsatisfactory attendance ratios.
- Year 10 also has a high number of negative reports entered on the system.
- As shown on Table 1 many of these have to do with their academic program rather than disruptive behaviour. Almost one hundred letters of concern were sent. In general secondary teachers are more inclined to use this as a strategy than the primary teachers who mostly use personal contact.

Suspension of a student occurs when there is physical or verbal abuse of staff and or students. Often this is for a single day and in most cases the issue does not re-occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR GROUP</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DAYS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 x 7 days (3 suspensions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 x 1 day and 1 x 2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1 x 1 day, 1 x 2 days, 1 x 9 days (2 suspensions) 1 x 30 days (9 suspensions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 x 1 days and 1 x 5 days (3 suspensions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 x .5 days, 2 x 1 days, 1 x 2 days and 1 x 3 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that one student alone received 42 days suspension of the total school suspensions of 68 days.

Overall the behaviour of students in general reflects quite well in most year groups. It is recognised that there are some areas where modification of behaviour needs to occur. Staff have this as a focus area for 2014.
FINANCIAL REPORT

This Financial data is an overview of the 2013 school year, our third year of managing a one-line budget in the Independent Public Schools initiative.

At the end of 2012, the school Administration, in collaboration with the School Board made a decision to no longer manage our own Relief Salary Allocation pool. To continue to manage this would put the school in an undesirable financial position.

The school underwent a full Financial Audit in August and as a result the rating awarded was EXCELLENT. A level only achieved by approximately 4% of schools

ONE-LINE BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Allocation</th>
<th>Adjusted Allocation</th>
<th>Expended YTD</th>
<th>Balance YTD</th>
<th>% Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total School Salary Allocation</td>
<td>$4,884,848.00</td>
<td>$5,222,316.00</td>
<td>$5,165,306.00</td>
<td>$57,010.00</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief Salary Allocation (RFSA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Salary Allocation (SFSA)</td>
<td>$4,884,848.00</td>
<td>$5,222,316.00</td>
<td>$5,165,306.00</td>
<td>$57,010.00</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total One-Line Salary Balance v’s Expenditure

School Flexible Salary Allocation

[Graph showing School Flexible Salary Allocation]
Our Financial Planning continues to support our School Priorities in Curriculum Improvement, Learning Environment and Futuring Our Service. Our year 6 and 7 primary students receive learning experiences in our Design and Technology, Visual Arts and Food Technology centres delivered by our specialist secondary teachers. This focus gives our upper primary students a distinctive learning experience.

Displayed below is a summary of our Voluntary Contributions collection rate along with the outstanding amounts from our Creditors and Debtors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Voluntary contributions collection rate</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Voluntary contributions collection rate</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Creditors as at 31 December</td>
<td>$2442</td>
<td>$7454</td>
<td>$3769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Debtors as at 31 December</td>
<td>$6886</td>
<td>$7147</td>
<td>$7032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The School Board endorse our One-Line and School budgets and planning processes annually.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 2013

EV CHALLENGE

2013 saw Donnybrook DHS re-enter the Electrical Vehicle Challenge after an absence of one year, caused by a lack of numbers in the Year 10 cohort, and the results were outstanding. The team members took out both first and second place in the A Division for the lower secondary school category. The team also took out its third consecutive award for Design Engineering as well as the perpetual award for the top performing school.

Each year the students in the programme work on modifying two previously used cars and design and build a new car. In 2013 the new car outperformed the cars from the past and but for two flat tyres would almost certainly have taken first place giving the school all of the major placings.

The competition and judging takes place at the RAC test track in Perth and the winner is the car that travels the greatest distance in one hour with a maximum batter capacity of 432 watts.

First place: Drivers Haley Cook, Mitchell Knoll, Brody Cook and support crew Matt Blackman.

Second place: Drivers Jackson Chalker, Muhsen Kazemi and Zane Gamble Design Engineering Award: Matt Goff, Ethan Smith and Brenton Christian.

A great deal of recognition goes to Mr Rob Doherty who has been involved with the program for many years. His dedication and guidance was greatly appreciated and a major factor in the schools continued dominance of their division.

The school has operated with a budget of around $2000 and has received some valuable sponsorship over the years. In 2013 valuable sponsorship was provided by LGA Glass, Autopro Donnybrook and Marindi Fabrication, Bunbury.

BENDIGO BANK CAMP

Once again in 2013 the local branch of the Bendigo Bank provided generous sponsorship for a year 7 camp for the five schools in the district. Students from Donnybrook DHS, Balingup Primary School, Boyanup Primary School, Kirup Primary School and St Mary’s Primary School enjoyed a number of activities in Perth for a week. Among the many activities enjoyed by the students were ice skating, rock climbing, Sci Tech, archery and visits to Kings Park, Sizzler and AQWA. All students appreciated the Bendigo Bank’s commitment to the youth of the district.
INTERNATIONAL MODEL SOLAR CAR CHALLENGE

The annual International Model Solar Car Challenge was held in Perth at the University of WA on Friday 25 October 2013. The school submitted three cars in the competition and all passed the scrutineering and time trials to qualify for the finals. Only thirty two cars from around the state qualify for the final which made Donnybrooks feat of qualifying three cars quite an accomplishment.

Our fastest car was “The Dons” which came fifteenth in the state which was designed, built and raced by Abbas Kazemi, Hamsa Ghulam and Jack Tucker. “Bullet Proof” came sixteenth and was the work of Connor Baxter, Jess Burgess and Jack Jordan. Twenty first place was the result for the car raced by Brodie Cook, Joshua Farr and Ivarne Bowman.

All three teams achieved great results and were a credit to themselves, their school and the Donnybrook community. The overall performance was also a credit to Mr Strother who is now looking for an even greater achievement in 2014.

ART

The art programme continued to flourish during 2013 as the school enjoyed the second year of the new state of the art facilities. The school was fortunate to have two very capable Art teachers involved who provide a wide range of skills and expertise.

Year six students experienced a semester of Art and were very enthusiastic. The year seven cohort were able to have a full year art programme and were able to produce some outstanding works. Students in Years eight, nine and ten were exposed to a wide range of experiences and in all year groups enthusiasm was a feature and some outstanding works were produced for the annual Art Exhibition. This again was held in Term four and received high commendation from the community.

Three students had their work chosen for the Visions Art Exhibition 2013 held at the Bunbury Art Gallery: Georgia Rutter (Year 8) had her Surrealist Inspired Horseshoe Sculpture chosen; Darcy Kavanagh (Year 8) had her Leopard Shoe selected in the same category while Year 9 student Sune Van Zyl had her Deforestation sculpture selected

CERTIFICATE 1 in HOSPITALITY and TOURISM

A great result was achieved in this Tafe Accredited course in 2013. All students were able to meet the requirements of the course and receive their certificate. The class became quite competent baristas after honing their skills on the staff members on a regular basis. Staff was also very supportive of the class as customers at their Bentley Street Café on a regular basis throughout the year. Students learnt to make other beverages, a range of soups, various finger foods, hors d’ouvres and several sweets. Additionally the students became well versed in customer service through their regular provision of food and provision to staff.

While it is not envisaged that many of the students will go on to careers in the Hospitality industry the course has given them skills they can use in their personal lives as well as the skill and confidence to seek casual or part time employment in the field whilst studying. The success of this programme owes a great deal to the expertise and enthusiasm of Mrs Robertson. Mrs Marshall and home economics assistant Mrs Kelly.

AUTOMOTIVE

The school again received valuable support from two gentlemen involved in the Men in Sheds programme by providing an Automotive course for mainly year 10 students. This occurred during the Grow programme on Friday afternoons. The course ran for ten weeks to allow as many students as possible to be involved. Students learnt a lot about engines, assembling and disassembling motors, general maintenance and the preparation for and carrying out the spray painting of trailers. Special thanks to Charlie Pizzino and Charles Smillie who have now provided this opportunities for several years.
STRUCTURED WORKPLACE LEARNING (VET)

The VET programme for 2013 again saw the Year 10 VET class being offered Structured Work-based Learning (SWBL) for 1 day per week and the entire Year 10 cohort being offered Certificate 1 in Hospitality and Tourism (a nationally recognized certification).

The Year 10 VET classes structured work-based placement range covered areas such as Childcare, Bakery, Building, Retail, Equestrian, Forestry and various forms of Engineering and Mechanical Industrial environments.

Of the 14 students engaged in the programme 4 students have gained either a traineeship or apprenticeship in the areas of Baker, Heavy Mechanical and Plumbing. The majority of the remaining students have continued their educational journey at Manea College in Bunbury in some form of vocational programme that they became aware of due to the SWBL programme here at Donnybrook District High School.

MEAD STREET AWARDS 2013

Year 5 MA — Allrounder Award  
Jay Hennessey

Year 5 MA — Allrounder Award  
Megan Taaffe

Year 5 MA — Allrounder Award  
Zac Trigwell

Year 5 MA — Allrounder Award  
Sophie Pemberton-Ovens

Year 4/5 GL — Merit Award  
Sevina Jones

Year 4/5 GL - Merit Award  
Marcie Roberts

Year 4/5 GL - Merit Award  
Tom Graham

Year 4 - Academic Award  
Scott Tuia

Year 4 - Academic Award  
Molly McInnes

Trumpet Award  
Hayley Stewart

Woodwind Award  
Rory O’Doherty
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE—SUSTAINABILITY

In drawing the 2013 School Report to closure, I make the following points:

1. This year we adopted a different approach to the representation in the Report of the “Requirements” as outlined by DOE. We chose to use the 2013 “Independent Review Findings” as the window on our School Performance. This approach may well finish up aligned to the 3 year cycle of School Review, and if so, that makes sense. The advantage of the Review process in informing the report is that, in itself the review process is external oversight of our self-assessment of our Business Plan.

2. I believe that the nature of a “School Report” will change due to the new technologies and digital ease of access to information. In this report, we have used references to data and other complete documents (e.g. Business Plans, Satisfaction Surveys, etc.) published elsewhere on our website. The report therefore needs to be seen as a “pointer” as to where the school is at and the other documents are the amplification. Going this way is also more efficient in that we get away from “massive documents”.

3. In ‘sustainability’ terms, the reviewers leave us with the clear impression that:

- We have ‘evidence based self-review practices’ in place and very effective.
- We have some work to do in “Business Planning” terms for the next cycle 2014—2016, but our approach to treat the Business Plan as an organic and evolving plan, allows this planning to be part of a “continuing” rather than a “point in time” exercise. The school will plan forward, make recommendations to the Board and modify the Business Plan as we reach agreements.
- We have good governance practice in place with some need for change around:-
  * induction and training of board members;
  * self-evaluation of our Boards’ effectiveness.
- We need to take up the reviewers suggestion to make marketing of our own uniqueness and distinctiveness more our practice in a planned way.

The concluding comment by the reviewers clearly expresses the view that ‘sustainability of the school’s performance is achievable’. We have all the elements in place and effective, and the focus on improvement will realize the desired outcome over time.
YEAR 10 2013 AWARDS

MASONIC LODGE DUX
Elisha Gray

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—RUNNER UP DUX
Matthew Goff

ENGLISH
Elisha Gray

MATHEMATICS
Mitchell Knoll

SOCIETY AND ENVIRONMENT
Elisha Gray

SCIENCE
Haley Cook

ART
Laura Ryan

PHOTOGRAPHY
Rhys Jones

DESIGN AND TECHNOLOGY
Ethan Smith

ICT
Elisha Gray

TOURISM & HOSPITALITY CERTIFICATE 1
Casey Ballantyne

SENIOR CITIZENS COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD
Brenton Christian

CHOOSE RESPECT CITIZENSHIP AWARD
Joel Parker

PRINCIPAL’S LEADERSHIP & TEAMWORK AWARD
Laura Ryan

LIONS SPORTS STAR OF THE YEAR
Laura Ryan
Isaac Freeman

RECREATIONAL PHYSICAL EDUCATION
Joel Parker

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AWARD
Shaun Towers

PUGSLEY / CWA AWARD
Matthew Goff

MAX WALKER AWARD
Haley Cook

2013 AWARDS

YEAR 9 ACADEMIC AWARD
Jacob McGruddy
Abby Dale

YEAR 9 MERITORIOUS AWARD
Casey Proctor
Sharni Mifflin
Morgan Bailey

MUSIC
Tyrone O’Doherty

YEAR 8 ACADEMIC AWARD
Shannon Moulton
Anna Foster

YEAR 8 MERITORIOUS AWARD
Connor Alford
Shaylee Green
Georgia Rutter

YEAR 7 ACADEMIC AWARD
Lachlan Connor
Ashley Williams

YEAR 7 MERITORIOUS AWARD
Courtney Babich
Rachel Fernley
Hannah Asplin
Laurel Hewson

YEAR 6 ACADEMIC AWARD
Erin McGruddy
Henry Delbridge

YEAR 6 MERITORIOUS AWARD
Jordan Murphy
Cate Foster
Alyssa Asplin
Harry Smith