



School Improvement Unit Report

Rosewood State High School Executive Summary



1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This report is a product of a review carried out at Rosewood State High School from 14 to 18 August 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

Location:	46 Lanefield Road, Rosewood
Education region:	Metropolitan
The school opened in:	1980
Year levels:	Year 7 to Year 12
Current school enrolment:	449
Indigenous enrolments:	10 per cent
Students with disability enrolments:	10 per cent
Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) value:	929
Year principal appointed:	2014 (August)
Number of teachers:	34
Nearby schools:	Rosewood State School, Walloon State School, Mutdapilly State School, Mt Marrow State School, Ashwell State School, Grandchester State School, St Brigid's School and a number of rural feeder primary schools
Significant community partnerships:	University of Southern Queensland, University of Queensland, Ipswich Regional Trade Training Centre (consortium partner school), Headspace, Boystown, Young Life, Busy At Work, Kambu, Rosewood Festival, Rosewood Show Society, Ipswich Hospital Foundation, Rosewood Lions (RSHS Leos Club), Royal Queensland Show and Ipswich Show Societies



Unique school programs:	University Yes I Can (University of Queensland), University of Southern Queensland Open Doors Project, Domestic Violence Action Centre (DVAC) Healthy Relationships Course, Boystown Coaching Young People for Success, Success Coach Program.
--------------------------------	--



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
 - Two deputy principals
 - Six Heads of Department (HODs)
 - Head of Special Education Services (HOSES)
 - 34 teachers
 - Business Services Manager (BSM)
 - Ten non-teaching staff
 - More than 50 students
 - Vice president of the Parents and Citizens' Association (P&C) and six parents
 - Principal of a feeder primary school
 - Division 10 Councillor, David Pahlke

1.4 Review team

Jenny Maier	Internal Review, SIU (review chair)
Mark Blackshaw	Internal Reviewer, SIU
David Aisbett	External Reviewer

1.5 Reading the report

The executive summary outlines key findings from the review. The key improvement strategies prioritise future direction for improvement. The executive summary should be read along with the findings and improvement strategies outlined in the nine domains which provide a strategic view for improvement.



2. Executive summary

2.1 Key findings

- The school leadership team have created and are driving a clear improvement agenda and purpose for the school, with learning and student outcomes at the core.

Staff, students and parents agree that there has been a significant positive shift in school culture as a result of this new direction, with many commenting on the improved behaviour of students and general tone of the school. Opportunities now present to truly engage students in learning especially at higher levels.

- There is no whole-school curriculum and assessment plan and the vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum is not assured across the school.

Individual faculties have documented term and unit plans detailing varying degrees of comprehensiveness for curriculum delivery. Faculties review their curriculum plans periodically and revise according to student interest and accessibility. However, there is no whole-school process for the systematic evaluation of curriculum and assessment.

- There is strong commitment by school staff to the wellbeing and learning for each student.

A clear, consistent approach to how staff respond to student behaviour has resulted in a more disciplined learning environment. The explicit teaching of expected student behaviour or strategies for promoting desired positive behaviours is not evident.

- The school has developed a pedagogical framework based on the explicit teaching model, which includes Tactical Teaching of Reading (TTR).

Learning intentions (We Are Learning To) and success criteria (What I'm Looking For) are embedded. The TTR approach is in the early stages of implementation.

- There is strong evidence that the principal and leadership team view reliable student data as essential components of their leadership of the school.

A whole-school data plan provides details about how and by whom data is collated however, there is no timeline for systematic collection, analysis and discussion of this data to inform and evaluate the effectiveness of teaching strategies.

- A range of student data is captured on data placemats, which teachers use to understand where students are in their learning and identify the starting points for teaching.

The information on the placemat is revised every term and some teachers adjust their teaching in response to student progress. Differentiated groupings, scaffolding or one-to-one teaching are evident, however there is little evidence of planning for and



execution of explicit differentiation strategies. Many teachers stated that they would welcome further professional development in differentiation strategies.

- The leadership team places a high priority on regular targeted professional development activities aligned to the school improvement agenda.

Professional learning is predominantly through external providers. Further opportunities exist to build capacity through in-house expertise and on-site learning.

- There is some parent involvement in the school and school connections with the local Rosewood community.

Parent involvement in the school is largely limited to attendance at school events such as parent-teacher meetings and information evenings. Connections with the Rosewood community include participation in local annual events.



2.2 Key improvement strategies

- Explore ideas and strategies to further engage students in learning and deliver outcomes in relation to the key improvement agenda.
- Develop a whole-school curriculum and assessment plan, which ensures a consistent collaborative approach to school priorities across faculties and a developmental approach to learning and higher order thinking. Systematically review and revise the curriculum and assessment plan to ensure relevance and maintain engagement of students.
- Explore possibilities and implement a whole-school approach to proactive behaviour management that incorporates a systems approach, data analysis and the explicit identification and teaching of behaviours and provide requisite professional development for all staff.
- Embed the current focus on the preferred pedagogies and provide support to teachers to deepen their understanding and skills in explicit teaching and TTR. Quality assure implementation through systematic monitoring, coaching and mentoring.
- Further develop data literacy of all teachers to ensure that they can effectively use data to evaluate teaching effectiveness and plan for explicit differentiation within their classroom.
- Develop a systematic coaching/mentoring program that ensures relevant and sustainable professional learning is available to all and align this with the performance review process and school improvement agenda.
- Foster a sense of connection and belonging with parents, carers and the local Rosewood community.