

**INQUIRY INTO THE PROVISION OF EDUCATION TO
STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY OR SPECIAL NEEDS**

Name: Name Suppressed
Date received: 7/02/2010

Partially Confidential

Parliamentary Inquiry

Parliamentary Inquiry into the provision of education to students with a disability or special needs.

CONTENTS: The terms of reference for this inquiry are:

		Page
	Introduction	1
<u>1</u>	The nature, level and adequacy of funding for the education of children with a disability.	2
<u>2</u>	Best practice approaches in determining the allocation of funding to children with a disability, particularly whether allocation should be focused on a student's functioning capacity rather than their disability.	3
<u>3</u>	The level and adequacy of current special education places within the education system.	3
<u>4</u>	The adequacy of integrated support services for children with a disability in mainstream settings, such as school classrooms.	4
<u>5</u>	The provision of a suitable curriculum for intellectually disabled and conduct disordered students.	5
<u>6</u>	Student and family access to professional support and services, such as speech therapy, occupational therapy, physiotherapy and school counsellors.	5
<u>7</u>	The provision of adequate teaching training, both in terms of pre-services and ongoing professional training.	6
<u>8</u>	Other related matters.	6
	Career path options	6
	Proposed SLSC/T position: Role statement and definitions	6
	Industrial issues	7
	Timeline for change	7
<u>Attachment</u>	Evaluation of the role, implementation and outcomes of intervention at Semester One 2009 Please note: Please keep confidential the name of the school.	8

Introduction:

My name is _____ and I am a Special Education teacher employed by the DET. I am currently participating in the pilot School Learning Support Coordinator program. I have been a mainstream teacher K-6, Early Intervention teacher, Support Class teacher- Mild Intellectual disability, Support Teacher Learning, Itinerant Language Support Teacher and have been appointed as a Support Class teacher- Multi-categorical Class. I lecture on a casual basis at a University on Special Education for undergraduate Early Childhood and Primary teachers.

My qualifications include B.A. Dip Ed from Macquarie University with a minor in Special Education and a Master of Special Education from Newcastle University.

I am passionate about the provision of Special Education Services for children with Special Needs and I believe my experience in a range of support services gives me insight into the reality at the coal face for teachers and children in Public Schools. I truly hope that this inquiry will bring changes and improvements to Special Education Services provided for children. I am happy to be contacted to further explain any of my comments and suggestions.

1 The nature, level and adequacy of funding for the education of children with a disability.

- I. The ratio of children with ASD cluster of behaviours at my mainstream school is 1:15. The assumed ratio is 1:100. That's over 6X the national average. The nearest school is 1km down the road. Their ratio is much lower (probably 1:100) yet they have the same socio economic background. For those two schools to get the same special education funding when the needs are incongruous is grossly unfair.
- II. **Accountability for assisting students with disability.** The current proposal (SLST) takes away the *emphasis on provision of services to children with disabilities*. There needs to be some required proportion of the SLSC time to be spent on assisting with disability programs, not NAPLAN results. As a SLSC in one of the schools I have been working in I have been specifically told that it is not my role to assist with students with disabilities and to train the SLSO so that she is better equipped to support teachers and students. My main focus was specifically to improve NAPLAN writing results for 2009 (which I achieved). This year I have been given the specific task of improving NAPLAN reading comprehension scores for the school. This should be the role of the literacy committee at the school and part of the whole school budget, not using Special Education Funds. I have attached the Evaluation of the role, implementation and outcomes of intervention at School Semester One 2009 to highlight the way that Special Education funds ARE being spent in schools. The **Future Planning re Focus 1, 2 and 3: Recommendations** sections of this document highlight the need for school coordinators for literacy and the provision of basic resources in the classroom. NAPLAN, basic resources such as laminating sheets and overhead projectors should not be the focus of the Special Education teachers at the school (except the STL role- see IV below). Special Education students and their teachers ARE missing out on essential support because of the way the documentation is written and because of the emphasis on NAPLAN for funding and MySchool type comparisons. **Pease note: Please keep confidential the name of the school.**
- III. INCLUSION of children with disabilities is under threat as NAPLAN becomes the only measure of performance and perceived success. Principals and schools wanting to be noticed, promoted, and not publicly humiliated via MySchool will focus on NAPLAN not INCLUSION. Emphasis on data takes us away from people. Eg Improved self control and anger management for one student eventually improves that child's NAPLAN results, but a lot of time may need to be invested first. Learning for life, so that students with disabilities can participate in the community with purpose, also needs to be highly valued by the DET.
- IV. Support Teacher Learning (STL or STLA) role is vital and directly linked to NAPLAN. SLSC/T role requires flexibility in timetabling to trouble shoot, liaise with staff, parents, other professionals etc. It is impossible to maintain a concerted effort on literacy and numeracy and fulfil the other duties of SLSC/T. **The STL and SLSC/T should be maintained as two separate roles.**
- V. Some of the funding is tied to curriculum (NAPLAN) results in Year 3, but the STLA focus is early intervention (K,1,2). The funding is based on a fail first, then intervene strategy. This is NOT sound educational policy.
- VI. Accountability of Principals needs to be specified and quantified to ensure that they work with the LST to deploy the SLSC/T to build capacity in meeting specific needs of children and staff working with *children with disabilities*, and to ensure that IEP's are implemented.
- VII. Principals and those involved in the school plan need to be **required** to include priority areas guided by the LST. The priorities need to be included in the 3 yr school plan and allocated an appropriate budget.
- VIII. **Accountability** for Principals to deploy the SLSC/T to assist with **disability** programs in school needs to be **specified and quantified**. E.g. What proportion of the SLSC/T time should be spent on improving NAPLAN scores and what proportion should be spent on building the capacity of the school to assist children with disabilities.
- IX. Funding levels should be adjusted according to CPI and the capping should be reviewed regularly. As the incidence of disability increases, and so does the population, it is untenable that a larger number of children should share from the same limited amount of funds.

- X. The proposed SLST role has the potential to increase the school capacity to meet the growing needs of children with disabilities who are integrated into the mainstream, as long as there continues to be adequate support in the classroom. That is, the SLST cannot replace, but should be in addition to the employment of SLSO personnel. Regardless of how skilled the teacher is, schools will still have students who need a person to provide **extra assistance within the classroom**.
- XI. Sharing specialist positions between three schools simultaneously has limited the efficiency of the SLSC position. Consideration should be given to blocks of full time support. Eg Two terms.

2 Best practice approaches in determining the allocation of funding to children with a disability, particularly whether allocation should be focused on a student's functioning capacity rather than their disability.

- I. Small schools may be more significantly affected by funding via incidence. Eg A family of children with a disability such as ASD enrol in the local small school. Funds need to be available to apply for additional funding if the incidence is higher than the assumed 1/100.
- II. Allocating the SLSC position on enrolment ratios rather than need may result in some schools not being able to access the support they need to ensure inclusion.
- III. Emphasis on NAPLAN takes the emphasis away from disabilities and providing skills for life e.g. social skills and resilience that then in turn support the academic success for all of the children in the class.
- IV. **Accountability** for Principals to deploy the SLSC to assist with **disability** programs in school needs to be **specified and quantified**. E.g. What proportion of the SLSC time should be spent on improving NAPLAN scores and what proportion should be spent on building the capacity of the school to assist children with disabilities.
- V. An enormous amount of time away from students is spent applying for funding. This application for funding relies on the willingness and ability of the parents to get a diagnosis and their fortune in getting an appointment. The referral system can easily take a year, requiring the involvement and cost of Specialist Doctors, physiotherapist, Occupational therapist, dietician, psychologist, Disability Programs Consultant, Support Teacher Integration, School Counsellor, Principal, Parent, and Class Teacher. Streamlining this would be great. Surely School Counsellors and special education teachers could identify functional need. As a qualified Special Education teacher I often have to wait for a diagnosis for a student who can clearly be identified with ASD or gross motor coordination problems but I have to wait for a diagnosis from a paraprofessional who is less qualified/done years less training than me, before funding can be applied for (including equipment and SLSO support)
- VI. Gifted and talented was seen to be included in the term *children with complex additional learning needs* at the beginning of 2009. This term needs to be much more specific so that disability funding is spent on providing services to children with **DISability**.

3 The level and adequacy of current special education places within the education system.

- I. Parents need choices. The move to Multi-categorical (MC) classes is positive, based on functional assessment.
- II. Isolated support classes (one in a mainstream school) need the provision of support such as an Assistant Principal which may be shared over three support classes in three schools. This would ensure quality education and support for the teachers as well as the students. Most Support Classes do not have an executive staff member with special education training and experience who can guide the appropriate development of Individual Learning Plans, class programs, behaviour intervention, integration and transition to High School programs.
- III. Early Intervention Support Classes (preschool special education services) are grossly inadequate. More units need to be established. Children are starting kindergarten with NO Early Intervention and then the mainstream kinder teacher is expected to include these children into the class and school.

- IV. The Early Intervention Support Classes can currently be staffed by teachers without Early Childhood qualifications and Special Education qualifications. This is against Childcare best practice which is a requirement from DADHC. Children with special needs and the preschool/childcare services they attend require appropriately trained DET staff to train and advise them. The current status quo is farcical and certainly not within the Quality Teaching framework. It reflects poorly on the DET.

4 The adequacy of integrated support services for children with a disability in mainstream settings, such as school classrooms.

- I. Itinerant language and behaviour teachers have a limited impact on school capacity building. They need to be in the school for policy development and implementation. Three students plus travel per day is not cost effective or learning efficient.
- II. Itinerant integration teachers are overstretched (caseloads of hundreds across vast geographical areas) and therefore have an extremely limited impact on the day to day provision of special education services in a school. The current pilot School Learning Support Coordinator (SLSC) program can have a much greater impact on capacity building.
- III. The student to teacher ratio for a mainstream classroom should take into account the degree of disability of a student, just as it does in a Support Class. This inequity is creating huge stress on teachers who desire to meet the needs of ALL students in their classroom. A student with High support needs actually NEEDS high levels of support. A classroom teacher can only divide his/her time for preparation of programming, making resources and directly teaching students in a finite way. Recognition of the extra time to meet the needs of children with special needs in the mainstream classroom is essential so that Teacher stress and illness are prevented and Quality Teaching to ALL students is improved.
- IV. The strengths of the current SLSC pilot program, as experienced by myself and the three other teachers in the SLSC role in my Local Management Group, are:
- **Expertise was provided to schools** that were relevant to the school, as they were able to **select** the SLSC following an Expression of Interest procedure. This ensured that the SLSC had **prior extensive experience in teaching children with disabilities, classroom teaching expertise and in some instances Special Education qualifications.**
 - **Policies and procedures** currently in place within individual schools were **reviewed and refined** to improve standards, processes and expectations. (Prior extensive disability and teaching experience needed.) This allowed the school to **improve current teaching practices** and create efficient processes that now meet **disability service standards.**
 - **SLSC's were more effective** in their ability to target programs to meet the needs of students, ensuring that students with the greatest current need were getting access to appropriate support.
 - **Disability advocacy and facilitation** of quality programs in schools occurred due to the expertise of the SLSC.
 - **Online training** provided deeper knowledge and resources which facilitated the acquisition of new knowledge and skills for school staff.
 - **Specific areas of need have been targeted** by schools to ensure better student engagement and an inclusive learning environment.
 - **Parent support.** The SLSC has been available to assist with parent support. This has been especially useful in small schools with on-class Principals or on-class AP's. E.g. Facilitating meetings with teachers, providing alternative outside programs, providing referrals to specialized people or programs, making regular contact or referring to support groups or networks.
 - **Flexible service delivery model.** The SLSC can provide direct support for the student and teacher by developing specific resources, equipping the Teacher and SLSO with new skills, knowledge and attitudes through training, consultation and team teaching. The non-classroom based aspect of the role allowed time for the development of resources specific to the child such as social stories and the collection and analysis of behaviour data.

- **Non-classroom base** allows for adequate time and flexibility for research, individualized program development, collaboration with teachers, participation in the LST and quick follow-up.
 - **Capacity building of the school.** The explicit emphasis on capacity building as part of the role description ensured that staff were prepared for change. The short, sharp intervention, and the fact that the SLSC was not a long term addition to the school, ensured that staff took the opportunity to learn from the SLSC while the SLSC was on the premises.
 - The SLSC was able to **support teachers** in the classroom and **teach them management strategies** that support **students with high needs** in the classroom.
 - **Inclusion of children with disabilities** was increased in the mainstream environment through equal access to the curriculum, implemented at whole school and classroom levels through pro-active training, in-class support and relevant accommodations.
 - Changing the role title from coordinator to teacher may diminish the effectiveness of the role across the whole school.
- V. The Local Management Group (LMG) model can help a community of schools get a range of EXPERTISE for capacity building. Rather than attaching the SLSC role to a school on a permanent basis, the SLSC could be attached to the LMG so that short sharp interventions were targeted by an expert in that field. E.g. Behaviour, language intervention, physical development, inclusion of children with disabilities, ASD. From this pool, a school could access the expert for say two terms to address clearly defined needs identified by the LST.
- VI. The LMG model would then provide a support network to assist the SLSC if there is a problem at one of the multiple schools they are at. They would be part of a LMG Support Team.

5 The provision of a suitable curriculum for intellectually disabled and conduct disordered students.

- I. The Quality Teaching framework emphasises *Why does the learning matter?* This is absolutely essential for children with a conduct disorder. Flexibility to focus on student interest and learning for life is the only way to get these children engaged in the learning process. It is essential to have a curriculum that is flexible enough to accommodate these needs.
- II. Living skills. Many teachers are writing their own curriculum for children in the K-6 age group. A clear document to guide these well meaning teachers would be very helpful and guide Quality Teaching in the special education classes.
- III. HSIE topics are often irrelevant. Flexibility to learn similar skills, knowledge and attitudes using the special interests of students is needed.
- IV. Emphasis on personal/hygiene and social skill development is necessary. Additional timetabled time is necessary.

6 Student and family access to professional support and services, such as speech therapy, occupational therapy, physiotherapy and school counsellors.

- I. Dependence on parents to transport children to assessments and therapy is a major issue. Parents must take time off work and attendance is dependent on parental commitment (often from dysfunctional families). The service would be best provided at the school.
- II. Interagency communication and skill exchange is a major issue. E.g. getting the physiotherapist to demonstrate strategies to the teacher rarely happens. For effective intervention this sharing of knowledge and practical skills is essential. The service would be best provided at the school.
- III. Money provided to parents for children with disabilities is often not spent on services for that child. Vouchers for Physiotherapy, Occupational Therapy, Speech therapy, specialist equipment (including computers and computer programs) would ensure the money was spent on serving the special needs of the children.
- IV. Physical space is needed in each school for the SLSC and therapists to hold meetings, store resources etc.

7 The provision of adequate teaching training, both in terms of pre-services and ongoing professional training.

- I. University training in special education is inadequate. I am involved in lecturing at a university to third year university students. The compulsory one semester course is only enough time to give an overview of some disabilities. If the teachers are to be equipped with adequate skills they need at least two semesters and practical observation and interaction of children with disabilities.
- II. Online training courses are great. TIME must be provided for teachers to complete the 20 hours. Relying on the good will of employees to increase their skill base is ineffective. Staff meeting time (professional development) and Professional Development Days would not require further DET expense, but would ensure the learning was happening.
- III. **The online training is CERTAINLY NOT sufficient enough to be the only thing that makes you a consultant on the issues of disability and teaching practice and meeting the needs of students with complex disabilities.**
- IV. Training (Special Education) prior to taking up specialist positions should be a minimum baseline.
- V. The training is only as good as the person who goes to it. Hence **choosing that person** is vital to the position and capacity building of other staff in the schools. Prior teaching experience and or experience including students with disabilities is vital to the position because the training is just a building block and support network, not a sturdy base from which to work.
- VI. The SLSC/T needs to have **prior extensive experience in teaching children with disabilities, classroom teaching expertise and Special Education qualifications** to adequately meet the demands of the role. It is not appropriate to have inexperienced teachers advising Classroom Teachers on adjustments and accommodations. The whole program will fail if staff perceives incompetence.

8 other related matters.

Career path options

- I. There is very limited opportunity for career path options in the SLSC/T position if it remains a Classroom teacher position. All current executive positions require extensive literacy and numeracy programming.
- II. The SLSC/T is a specialist position with additional responsibility, leadership and case management, facilitating change within the school, multiple classrooms and community of schools. But the position remains at Class Teacher level and salary?
- III. The School Learning Support teachers and Support Class teachers (e.g. I.O. and M.C.) need leadership from people with Special Education qualifications (Masters level, or a major in Special Education in undergraduate studies). This would provide a career path, acknowledge the responsibility and leadership of the coordinator whose job description is to build capacity across local management groups.
- IV. Tutors for the Online training should be given financial recognition for their involvement in training personnel across a region. Other professions get promoted for this level of responsibility, leadership and influence in creating change. I am training Principals, Assistant Principals, Consultants and teachers, and I am still paid a classroom teachers salary!

Proposed SLSC/T position: Role statement and definitions

- I. Jack of all trades, master of none. The role statement is far too broad. One person cannot have EXPERTISE in all of these areas. The proposal is self defeating.
- II. A strong network across the region and/or Local Management Group will be required to support schools in need of specific expertise.
- III. Changing a teacher's title does not make them suitable for this broad, specialist position. Staff morale, efficiency, and student outcomes will be negatively affected. Some teachers who are currently in positions such as STLA, STB, and ISTL may have lost expertise in classroom

management, behaviour or literacy and numeracy, but will now have to advise Classroom teachers. The proposal is destined to fail under these circumstances.

- IV. **Selection of SLSC/T.** Schools need to be able to **select** the SLSC/T so that school need and **expertise** is matched.
- V. **The role statement is so broad** that almost any program that the principal instructs to occur can be implemented. Eg Gifted and talented programs were interpreted as providing support for children with complex additional learning needs.
- VI. Where the Principal does not work with or actively support the LST, the SLSC can be given **conflicting roles** within a school.

Industrial issues

- I. Many teachers with experience have been employed on a non-permanent, temporary basis. Current Federation policy requires that vacancies are filled first by permanent teachers. This may lead to less skilled people taking on the SLST role. DET need to utilize the wealth of expertise we have in our temporary staff.

Timeline for change

- I. There needs to be sufficient time for consultation on the proposal, and then consultation on the implementation of the changes.
- II. Evaluation of the pilot program should be completed before the changes are implemented across the state. Plan, implement, evaluate, adapt: Quality teaching/learning cycle.
- III. Evaluation of the pilot program would be more appropriate after all of the Online training was completed.
- IV. If a minimum two year transition period was to be adopted it would allow time for teachers currently in positions which will become SLST to:
 - 1. Increase SKILL and EXPERTISE by **completing** the online training as a minimum baseline;
 - 2. Explore other options such as applying for transfer or advertised positions; and
 - 3. Train at University level – retrain or post graduate studies. eg special education, school counselling.

Attachments:

Evaluation of the role, implementation and outcomes of intervention at School
Semester One 2009 **Please note: Please keep confidential the name of the school.**

Thank you for this opportunity to contribute to the Inquiry. I am happy to speak on any of the issues I have raised.

Contribution from:

School Learning Support Coordinator
Evaluation of the role, implementation and outcomes
of intervention at
School

Semester One 2009

Please note: Keep confidential the name of the school

Mode of intervention

The Principals of PS and PS, in consultation with their Learning Support Teams, decided to trial intervention with the SLSC on a semester basis. The SLSC was appointed to PS for Semester 1 and PS for Semester 2, 2009. This report is a summary of the SLSC intervention at at the end of Semester 1.

Process of defining the role within the needs of the school

The PS School Plan was reviewed by the Principal and SLSC in relation to the given role of the School Learning Support Coordinator (see Attachment 1).

The main need within the school in relation to the SLSC role was determined to be:

1. Provide professional advice, support and mentoring to classroom teachers on how best to cater for the diverse learning needs in their classrooms to improve student outcomes in writing. Specifically, narrative writing was targeted with the aim of improving NAPLAN results.
2. Facilitate professional development within the school and the community of schools on using visuals in the classroom to support learning in general and writing in particular. This includes training teachers to create visuals using the Boardmaker program.
3. Model exemplary classroom practice when tailoring learning for students with complex additional learning needs. At this included two students with Autism Spectrum Disorder and one student with moderate to severe hearing loss.

Defining the target groups: Students and classes identified

Time allocation per target group

Students with complex additional learning needs were identified using Basic Skills and NAPLAN data as children who were achieving BELOW the minimum standard or benchmark in KLA's or were at risk of achieving below the benchmark. At risk students were defined as students who were achieving at the minimum standard for their stage level (using Basic Skills NAPLAN data) and were identified by classroom teacher assessment as requiring significant additional support to work at stage level.

As the school is very large (student population 442) the target group was further refined to those students who were sitting NAPLAN tests this year. That is, students in Year 3 and Year 5. The NAPLAN results in writing could then be used as part of the evaluation of the SLSC intervention.

With a potential 18 classes to work with, three classes from **Stage 2 and Stage 3** (6 classes total) were identified as having significant groups of children within the defined target group. (See Attachment A-1 personnel only.) These classes were then allocated 2 hours per week each of classroom intervention with the SLSC to focus on narrative writing outcomes. (6 classes x 2 hours =12 hours)

To deepen the capacity of the school to improve writing outcomes, **Stage One** teachers raised concern about the speech and language needs within their classrooms. The SLSC assessed articulation, phonemic

awareness, picture sequencing and oral story telling of students who were identified by classroom teacher assessment and observation. Clear patterns of student need emerged from the assessment results and the teachers requested support and skill development in this area. Each Stage One class were allocated one hour per week of classroom intervention with the SLSC to focus on oral language development and its relationship with writing outcomes. (5 Classes x 1 hour = 5 hours)

Three students with a **diagnosed disability** were identified by the Learning Support Team as requiring additional support. The classroom teachers also requested support and skill development to deepen their capacity to maximise inclusion in the classroom. (See Attachment A-2 personnel only.)

Student A is in Early Stage One and is diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder. The teacher requested assistance with social skills and language development, in particular articulation, as the student was extremely difficult to understand. Two hours per week were allocated to classroom intervention with the SLSC. (2 hours)

Student B is in Stage 2 and is diagnosed with Autism Spectrum disorder. The teacher requested support and skill development in using visual supports to increase time on task and independent working habits. In the first 2 weeks of the school year the SLSC spent a significant proportion of her time in this classroom to help establish routines and the successful use of visual supports in the classroom. As the student was in a class already targeted for SLSC support with Writing, no additional time was allocated to classroom intervention with the SLSC.

Student C is in Stage One and is diagnosed with a moderate to severe hearing loss. The Learning Support Team identified the need for student and teacher skill development to maximise inclusion in classroom activities. As the student was in a class already targeted for SLSC support with oral language development and its relationship with writing outcomes, one additional hour per week was allocated to classroom intervention with the SLSC. (1 hour)

Short term projects

During Term One an additional 1 hour and 45 mins was available for short term projects. In Term 2 this time was spent doing the mandatory Online training course on ASD. In term one the SLSC provided professional advice, support and mentoring to classroom teachers on how best to cater for the diverse learning needs in their classrooms to improve student outcomes in Mathematics, English and social skills.

Outcome and indicators, implementation

Focus 1. *Provide professional advice, support and mentoring* to classroom teachers on how best to cater for the *diverse learning needs* in their classrooms to *improve student outcomes in writing*. Specifically, narrative writing was targeted with the aim of improving NAPLAN results.

Public School Priority Area: 1. Teacher Quality

Intended Outcomes: Build teacher capacity to support school improvement and student learning.

Target: All teacher programs reflect application of Quality Teaching framework focus elements (Deep Knowledge and Understanding, Engagement and High Expectations) in lesson planning, delivery and assessment.

Public School Priority Area: 2. Literacy and Numeracy

Intended outcome: Implement professional learning programs that will increase teacher's capacity to identify and address student's literacy and maths learning needs.

Target: A 10% improvement in student outcomes in 2009 NAPLAN testing in writing bands 4,5,6 (Year 3) and bands 6,7,8 (Year 5). *The current school plan was complimented with support from the SLSC in literacy (writing) with targeting an improvement in student outcomes in 2009 NAPLAN testing in writing bands 1,2 (Year 3) and bands 3,4 (Year 5).*

community of schools

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation
		There has been no sharing of the English (writing) scope and continuum at this point. I am hoping that this will occur in Semester 2.

School Practise and structures

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation
Use Best Start and NAPLAN data to improve identification of areas needing explicit teaching.	<p>SLSC used data to identify areas needing explicit teaching:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Editing * Punctuation- capital letters (including stray capitals), full stops, direct speech * Spelling- identifying spelling errors * Narrative purpose, audience * Narrative structure- deeper knowledge and understanding of what detail to include in the orientation, complication and resolution * Description of character (Detail) * Sentence structure including compound sentences with a variety of conjunctions * Building vocabulary to include a minimum of precise verbs, adverbs, nouns and adjectives * Paragraphs * Ideas- being creative in character, setting and storyline <p>SLSC consulted with target group teachers, explained the data and the patterns it showed and used this to plan, program and assess skill development.</p>	<p>Teachers took a keen interest in the data and used the information gained to focus teaching on the areas of need.</p> <p>Teachers actively use informal and formal assessment techniques to identify areas needing explicit teaching.</p> <p>editing code initiated by SLSC and collaboratively devised and implemented. (See Attachment 2)</p> <p>Editing checklists have begun to be used in S2 and S3.</p> <p>Writing goal of the week emphasised in S1 (needs follow up in S2 and S3)</p>

<p>Text types are explicitly taught using modelled, guided and independent learning opportunities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Pre intervention samples collected from classes and marked using NAPLAN criteria. Staff trained on how to use marking scheme. Feedback to CT on trends in their class. ✓ In consultation with teachers the SLSC developed and implemented a program which used the QT framework and explicit teaching of writing in terms of structure, enriched language, purpose and application in real life. ✓ SLSC demonstrated lessons and established team teaching strategies. ✓ A marking scheme was devised by the SLSC using NAPLAN criteria. All teaching staff were trained on how to use the format. ✓ Quality writing samples from literature were studied when possible. ✓ Whole school editing code written and adopted as school policy. ✓ Posters of School Editing Code produced and disseminated to all classrooms. ✓ Writing scope and continuum based on text types devised by the SLSC in consultation with teachers. Linking quality teaching framework with outcome statements, indicators to specific text types, content and assessment strategies. ✓ Writing scope and continuum used by teachers to plan meaningful learning opportunities. ✓ Grammar taught within the context of writing. 	<p>Excerpts of quality narratives were limited by the resources available to teachers including multiple copies of books and technological issues such as reliable access to overhead projectors.</p> <p>Accelerated Literacy appears to support this outcome. Further T&D may be advantageous.</p> <p>All staff are more aware of the criteria for marking NAPLAN writing and how this criteria influences lesson content.</p> <p>The Editing code has been implemented across the school, however as new staff arrive there needs to be a system put in place to ensure that all staff understand and use the notation.</p> <p>The writing scope and continuum is not yet complete but the SLSC hopes to continue working on it. It may need further refinement to more specifically define expected minimum outcomes for each Year group within each Stage.</p> <p>Assessment rubrics may need to be modified to compliment the school scope and continuum.</p> <p>Student Outcomes in Stage One Writing have made significant improvement based on pre and post intervention testing. See Attachment 5.</p> <p>INSERT NAPLAN RESULTS HERE</p>
<p><i>In addition to School Plan:</i> Writing scope and continuum based on text types devised by</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ S1 Oral language assessments ✓ Feedback to teachers ✓ Talking and Listening 	<p>Need sight word lists to be accepted and implemented as school policy from 2010</p>

<p>the SLSC in consultation with teachers.</p> <p>Assessment rubrics need to be modified to compliment the school scope and continuum</p> <p>School Editing code devised and implemented</p> <p>Sight word lists for reading and writing defined as Oxford Word list and DIPL word lists for Stages ES1, S1, S2.</p>	<p>program devised and implemented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Linking oral language to teaching grammar and text types ✓ Modelling in classrooms ✓ Question cue cards designed and produced ✓ Team teaching of a variety of text types including description, recounts, narratives, procedure. ✓ Sight word resources made for assessment and teaching ✓ Sound and sight word visual prompts devised and used in classrooms to increase S engagement and success. 	<p>Wring Scope and Continuum increases time efficiency for CT when planning and programming meaningful programs on Text types.</p> <p>Editing code focuses S and CT on deep knowledge and understanding and increasing expectations.</p> <p>Sight word lists and visual prompts support CT and S to increase engagement and deep knowledge and understanding across the school.</p>
--	---	---

Classroom practise

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation
<p>Catering for a range of ability by planning, programming and re-organising groups within the class.</p>	<p>Lesson differentiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Visuals to promote on task behaviour ✓ Individualised editing of written work. Visual prompts. ✓ Clear lesson outcome statements communicated to all students. ✓ Pictures and words to scaffold sentence and text type structure. 	<p>Understanding of adjustments and accommodations is limited amongst the staff and needs to be addressed in staff development.</p> <p>Student engagement has increased as the visual prompts have given clear direction and support for independent learning.</p>
<p>Improved student engagement is evident in student work samples</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Clicker 5 program introduced to assist students with fine motor and emotional difficulties to physically participate with success. It enables the student to focus on the text type rather than the physical formation of letters. ✓ Links with the English KLA across other KLA's such as HSIE and Science were documented in the class program. That is, meaningful exposure to, and practise of, text types. 	<p>Teachers and School Learning Support Officer need training in how to use the Clicker 5 program to support writing and other KLA's in the classroom.</p> <p>The Clicker Paint program would expand the potential use of the Clicker program to enhance student engagement across KLA's.</p> <p>The SLSC only introduced Clicker 5 to 2 students, one of whom has begun to use it successfully in the classroom.</p> <p>Higher Teacher expectations and follow up of writing outcomes were evident in</p>

		<p>lessons across KLA's.</p> <p>Conferencing and editing skills, within the context of writing have begun to be implemented in many classrooms.</p> <p>Student engagement and self motivation was noticeably increased when students understood the application of the writing task to the real world.</p>
--	--	--

Future planning re Focus 1: Recommendations

1. Purchase quality samples of text types which are in an accessible format for whole class and small group instruction. This may include Big Books, multiple copies of books, and software to use on the Smartboards. See Macmillan pack for suggestions and PM software (CD ROM) from www.thomsonlearning.com.au or www.nelsonprimary.com.au
2. Purchase enough (one per class) overhead projectors or computer projectors with trolleys and screens so that each class has reliable access to technology which will enhance learning outcomes.
3. Teachers need to be trained in legal requirements to provide and document Adjustments and Accommodations for students with additional learning needs.
4. School scope and continuum be completed, refined and shared with other schools in the school community if relevant to those schools.
5. Assessment rubrics be reviewed and adapted if necessary to mirror the School Scope and Continuum. Explore the use of the assessment rubrics for student conferencing and lesson planning as a method of increasing student engagement and conveying high expectations.
6. Question cue cards kits made for ES1 and implemented as a whole school strategy to improve oral language and writing skills. The cost involves card, coloured ink and laminating pouches, library bag. Money could be accessed from the Curriculum: Literacy funds from the school global budget as these resources would be accessioned to the library and used for many years.
7. A school literacy team be established to select and purchase resources and provide a continuing focus on writing across the curriculum.
8. Sight word lists to be accepted and implemented as school policy from 2010.
9. Teachers and School Learning Support Officers need training in how to use the Clicker 5 program to support writing and other KLA's in the classroom. Future SLSC or current STLA could be given time to develop resources and train students, staff and parents if applicable in the use of Clicker and Clicker Paint.
10. The **Clicker Paint** program would expand the potential use of the Clicker 5 program to enhance student engagement across KLA's. Purchase of the program and site licences through Spectronics.

Focus 2. Facilitate *professional development* within the school and across the community of schools on using *visuals in the classroom to support learning in general and writing* in particular. This included training teachers to create visuals using the Boardmaker program.

Public School Priority Area: 3. Information Technology

Intended outcome: Implement training and support that moves staff pedagogy to seamlessly provide programmed learning experiences.

Target: Staff are able to identify learning opportunities where technology can be integrated and program relevant and meaningful learning experiences.

community of schools

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation/Outcome
Develop teacher capacity in the use of ICT to improve learning and teaching.	<p>✓T&D involving PS, PS and PS on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why and how to use Visuals in the classroom for increased engagement and social skills (PDHPE) • How to create boards with the Boardmaker computer program • How to use visuals to promote oral language, and scaffold writing of sentences and different text types, and directly link its use to quality teaching. 	<p>Hundreds of ready-made boards, created by the SLSC, have been loaded onto the school servers at</p> <p>Teachers have accessed these resources and used them in their classrooms to increase Deep Knowledge and Understanding, Engagement and High Expectations.</p> <p>Some teachers have created boards of their own to assist with classroom management, communicating expectations and writing scaffolds.</p>
Increased teacher capacity to support student learning	<p>✓Professional Learning Opportunities were provided in response to staff needs based on student assessment and staff skills:</p> <p>✓Overview of Colourful Semantics and Visualising and Verbalising for talking, writing and comprehension, using visual supports to teach grammar, sequencing and storytelling. Presented to some ES1 and S1 teachers across the community of schools.</p>	<p>Teacher requested training which has not yet been addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Cued Articulation and common articulation difficulties- teaching strategies. Pronunciation is very poor across the school at and this is evident in writing eg jrink for drink S2 ✗ Phonemic Awareness training ✗ Clicker 5- how to use, best classroom practice ✗ Social stories to develop social skills. When they are used, how to use them, how to write them ✗ Using visuals to promote independent learning- self regulation.

School Practise and structures

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation
<p>Develop teacher capacity in the use of ICT to improve learning and teaching.</p>	<p>✓ Link technology with current syllabus and the quality teaching framework by introducing Clicker 5 and other word processing programs to the classroom. E.g. Alphasmart.</p> <p>✓ Boardmaker program used to create visuals which support increased engagement and social skills (PDHPE)</p> <p>✓ Writing Scope and Continuum has included the use of technology to support writing.</p>	<p>Staff training needed in Clicker 5</p> <p>Stage One, Two and Three student writing outcomes were greatly improved with the use of Boardmaker produced visual supports.</p> <p>Best practice needs to be developed across the school as teachers experiment with the integration of technology to support writing.</p>
<p>Increased teacher capacity to support student learning</p>	<p>✓ Scaffolding modelled to tailor learning for students with complex additional learning needs. E.g. word banks, sound cue cards, have-a-go spelling, editing checklists, question cue cards, social stories.</p> <p>✓ QT framework used to model programming and assessment.</p> <p>✓ Lesson modelling and team teaching with SLSC.</p> <p>Collaborative planning.</p> <p>✓ Specialist educational advice and assistance to the Learning Support team and classroom teacher were provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting the use of visuals to increase engagement, differentiation and high expectations. <p>✓ Task boards introduced and used with Student B to increase time on task and task completion.</p> <p>✓ SLSC facilitated sharing lesson successes, ideas, and resources across stage and school.</p> <p>✓ Fine motor handwriting assistance for children with dyspraxia, ASD, muscle tone and motor planning difficulties in the form of the provision of pencil grips, the introduction of Clicker 5 computer program and renewed Teacher focus on posture.</p> <p>✓ Assessment checklists and methods of assessment for talking</p>	<p>Communicating high expectations to students within lessons has been modelled but not particularly adopted by Teachers in S2 and S3. Stating intended outcomes of a lesson to students – including this as their title or within their workbooks- is an aspect of the Quality teaching framework: What do I want them to achieve and how well do I expect them to do it? How will I communicate this to the student?</p> <p>An increase in the use of scaffolding to support learning across KLA's is evident. E.g. class and lesson schedules, writing scaffolds.</p> <p>Student engagement and production of quality written work has increased in some classrooms.</p> <p>Teacher acknowledgement of work by other colleagues has built self esteem and motivated others to try new resources and strategies.</p> <p>Stage One oral and written work indicates an improved student ability to use better vocabulary and more complex sentence</p>

	and listening devised to correlate with Curriculum Outcomes and indicators.	structures. See Attachment 5.
--	---	-------------------------------

Classroom practise

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation
Develop teacher capacity in the use of ICT to improve learning and teaching.	<p>✓ Boardmaker accessed and used effectively by teachers and SLSO to promote language, engagement, classroom management and social skills.</p> <p>✓ Clicker 5 site licences were purchased and students and teachers have begun to learn how to use the program and directly link its use to quality teaching.</p>	<p>Adjustments and accommodations should be documented and include the use of Clicker 5 and visual timetables, task boards and prompts including those made using Boardmaker.</p> <p>Boardmaker was used more by teachers when they had easy access to the disc after school hours.</p> <p>The SLSO was trained in how to make boards using Boardmaker but her inability to access files stored on the school server restricted her capacity to broaden her understanding and develop some initiative in the provision of suitable visual support for teachers and students.</p> <p>The way the children hold their pencils is beginning to improve for those students with pencil grips provided.</p>

Future planning re Focus 2: Recommendations

1. Purchase Boardmaker 6 which is compatible with VISTA operating system and Windows XP so that teachers can utilise the resource on their personal laptops.

Cost: \$169 Contact Spectronics PH 07 3808 6833 FAX 07 3808 6108

will provide RMA number from Spectronics. Complete the purchase order and send to Spectronics with the old Boardmaker disc with the school registration number for the current disc. Uninstall Version 5. May need disc so do this before sending it away and then install V6. All previously made files can be imported into new Boardmaker 6.

2. Purchase Clicker Paint with site licences to go with Clicker 5, making learning activities more interactive and extending the practical application of Clicker 5. Available from Spectronics as above.

Cost: incl site licence

3. Training and Development.

- × Visualising and verbalising to improve spoken and written language, and comprehension.
- × Cued Articulation and common articulation difficulties- teaching strategies
- × Phonemic Awareness training

- × Clicker 5- how to use, best classroom practice
 - × Social stories to develop social skills. When they are used, how to use them, how to write them
 - × Using visuals to promote independent learning- self regulation.
4. School purchases in bulk crossover pencil grips and then sell to parents at cost. Available from Educational Experience. Cost \$2.20 each if purchased on pack of 20.
 5. The school budget and school plan takes into account the wisdom of laminating resources which will stay in the school for many years. A process be established within the school to ensure that resources which are made using school ink, card, paper and laminating sheets be accessioned to the library and borrowed by teachers. Students with additional needs benefit greatly from visual supports. The school needs to retain valuable resources so that the school builds its capacity to meet the needs of these students. Currently, teachers are spending a lot of precious time making visual aids from resources in their homes. When the teachers leave the school, the resources go with them. If the school provided the resources and the SLSO was employed to make them, the resource could be kept at the school and used each year for the students who they were made to support.
 6. The SLSO needs to be included in all T&D re Boardmaker and Clicker 5 so that she is confident to use it independently from the teacher, to make and adjust resources to meet the needs of students.
 7. The SLSO needs to have a password so that she can access and add to Boardmaker and Clicker resources on the school server.
 8. The LST and Teachers be encouraged to consider utilising SLSO time with the production of visual resources. This could include design, printing, laminating and cutting.
 9. Clicker 5 could be used in Stage One and ES1 to promote engagement and literacy skills for all students.
 10. Boardmaker disc continue to be accessible to all staff in the staff room.
 11. Best practice needs to be developed across the school as teachers experiment with the integration of technology to support writing.
 12. Communicating high expectations to students within lessons has been modelled but not particularly adopted by Teachers in S2 and S3. Stating intended outcomes of a lesson to students – including this as their title or within their workbooks- is an aspect of the Quality teaching framework: What do I want them to achieve and how well do I expect them to do it? How will I communicate this to the student?
 13. Adjustments and accommodations should be documented and include the use of Clicker 5 and visual timetables, task boards and prompts including those made using Boardmaker. Teachers need training on the legal requirements and to gain an understanding of documentation and practical implication of adjustments and accommodations.

Focus 3. Model *exemplary classroom practice* when tailoring learning for students with ***complex additional learning needs***. At this included two students with Autism Spectrum Disorder and one student with moderate to severe hearing loss.

Wallsend community of schools

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation
<p>Networks established between schools in the Wallsend community which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate professional development with the schools and across the local community of schools • Provide specialist educational advice and assistance to the Learning Support teams • Help coordinate relevant interagency support 	<p>✓SLSC's met informally approximately once per month after school hours to share resources and ideas to address needs within the Wallsend Cluster.</p> <p>Classroom visits within and to other schools to observe range of grouping strategies within a class to cater for differing ability.</p>	<p>ESL resources given to ESL teacher at</p> <p>Oral Language and Writing programs, analysis of data and teaching ideas shared.</p> <p>Behaviour strategies discussed but unable to be implemented at due to the defined role of the SLSC within the school.</p> <p>Inter school visits did not occur. This may occur in semester 2 as the SLSC becomes aware of expertise at PS.</p>

School Practise and structures

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation

Classroom practise

Indicator	Strategy/implementation	Evaluation
<p>Class lesson plans include Lesson Differentiation in order to address the range of student ability.</p>	<p>✓The SLSC identified classrooms and teachers with QT Lesson differentiation in place and coordinated classroom visits.</p> <p>✓Articulation focus on class and small group lessons in ES1 for Student A and three peers with articulation difficulties.</p> <p>✓Visuals to support sentence construction, recall and comprehension introduced to ES1 class and teacher.</p> <p>✓How to draw sequences to express ideas, create a story, entertain provided to all ES1 and S1 teachers.</p> <p>✓Picture sequencing resources shared with ES1 to allow for differentiation in writing activities.</p> <p>✓Social stories developed for specific students and classes-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Packing away before my work is finished. 	<p>Teachers in Stage One used RFF time to visit identified classrooms to observe grouping strategies in Maths and Literacy. Teachers experimented and implemented changes to classroom structures and programs to better meet the need of groups with differing ability.</p> <p>Target students acquired new speech sounds: l, w, sh, k, s, z, f, v. CT learnt cued articulation for these sounds and is beginning to learn how to cue students to achieve maintenance and generalisation. Sounds to do: g, p, b</p> <p>Vocabulary, sentence structure and word recall were improving in the ES1 classroom using the Question Cue cards. Unfortunately the school had</p>

	<p>Accepting change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ How to lose <p>SLSC modelled how to introduce a social story to the class in role play and using booklets and posters. How to rehearse new social skills and phrases with the class/student.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ SLSC provided advice on positioning and pencil grip to assist with Fine Motor skills including writing and cutting. ✓ Here, hidden, in my head visual to aid comprehension strategies created by SLSC and shared with select staff. ✓ Now, next, last schedule made for classroom use for Student B by SLSC. ✓ SLSC taught Student B to use Clicker 5: Independently open, save, re-open to continue work in his folder. Clicker template set up for easy access. 	<p>insufficient coloured ink and laminating sheets for the CT to be equipped with a resource pack for her class, so these teaching strategies are unable to be continued at this point. The files are on the school server ready to be made when resources and funds become available.</p> <p>How to draw sequences have just been introduced, so no evaluation is possible. Hopefully engagement in fine motor activities will increase, as will the ability to communicate ideas and create a variety of text types using illustrations to support writing.</p> <p>Student behaviour improved, accepting change and losing without tantrums or melt downs. Select teachers learnt how to make social stories, and how to introduce and teach social skills more effectively.</p> <p>Fine Motor skills improved, legible work increased, cutting became more accurate and student engagement improved.</p> <p>Visual prompts made for children with special needs helped the children focus on the learning strategy and set tasks, increasing engagement, knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Student B can use Clicker 5 to complete writing tasks across the curriculum. He has gone from writing one sentence to completing an information report including paragraphs, illustrations, technical language and learning punctuation such as the correct use of commas and colons.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Staff Professional Learning demonstrates a continuing focus on improving teaching using the Quality Teaching Framework.</p>	<p>✓Talking and Listening program and writing text types programs in S1, S2 and S3 all modelled the Quality Teaching Framework. ✓SLSC modelled QT in lesson preparation, implementation and evaluation of student outcomes.</p>	<p>QT Framework:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What do I want the children to learn? There is a high level of understanding and sharing of expertise amongst the staff in most Stage groups. 2. Why does the learning matter? Staff are beginning to incorporate meaning beyond the classroom as a means of giving real purpose to learning and to assist student motivation. 3. What do I want the students to do or produce? (deep knowledge and understanding, engagement) This has improved with the use of visual resources, computer technology, scaffolding learning activities and assessment. 4. How well do I want them to do it? High expectations communicated to the students and followed up. This is increasing with new strategies such as displaying the Writing Target for the Week, using the editing checklists, studying examples of quality writing products and developing marking Rubrics which are linked to Scope and Continuum.
--	--	--

Future planning re Focus 3: Recommendations

1. ES1 articulation group need further support to achieve adequate communication skills. Other ES1 teachers report similar difficulties in their classes. Cued articulation training could be a focus of staff T&D in Term 3, presented by the SLSC. The book, Cued Articulation, by Jean Passy should be purchased as a reference for teachers. Available from ACER for about \$15. Short term assistance could be a focus of the STLA or future SLSC.
2. Vocabulary, sentence structure and word recall were improving in the ES1 classroom using the Question Cue cards. Unfortunately the school had insufficient coloured ink and laminating sheets for the CT to be equipped with a resource pack for her class, so these teaching strategies are unable to be continued at this point. The files are on the school server ready to be made when resources and funds become available.
3. Behaviour intervention be a target at _____ for identified students and classes. Specific social skills (determined by need) such as winning and losing, turn taking and understanding how to play a

variety of games in the classroom and playground, appropriate ways to interact with boys and girls in Stage 3. Teachers need support in this area, including new ways to teach children with complex additional learning needs such as emotional disorder, ASD, moderate intellectual disorder. E.g. ES1 Student A, Year 2 student F, Year 3 Student B & D, Year 5 student E, This intervention would be in addition to the existing and beneficial social skills program in the school. One of the current SLSC's for [redacted] Cluster is a BD teacher and would be able to assist with intervention.

4. Year 5 or 6 Buddy program be initiated to incorporate social skills and peer tutoring. This program helps to create a supportive social network in the playground and helps Year 5/6 and ES1 students develop social skills for play, group learning and work. This is well developed in schools such as [redacted] PS, [redacted] PS.
5. Formal networking meetings be included in the SLSC role. Create meeting agenda, meeting time and place. Minutes to be recorded and provided to SLSC supervisor. This could be linked with the Local Management Group meetings so that the SLSC resource is effectively and efficiently utilised across the LMG.
6. Inter school visits be pursued to further teacher professional development. This may occur in Semester 2 as the SLSC becomes aware of expertise at [redacted] PS and can promote a professional exchange of expertise with Glendore staff.
7. Continued emphasis on the Quality teaching Framework, particularly:
Why does the learning matter? Incorporating **meaning** beyond the classroom as a means of giving real **purpose** to learning, and to assist student motivation.
How well do I want them to do it? **Communicating high expectations** to the students and following up consistently. This is increasing with new strategies such as displaying the Writing Target for the Week, using the editing checklists, studying examples of quality writing products and developing marking Rubrics which are linked to Scope and Continuum.

Conclusion

Evidence indicates that the capacity of [redacted] Public School to improve student outcomes in writing, use visuals in the classroom to support learning and tailor learning for students with additional needs has improved during Semester One with the additional support of the SLSC.

Report written by:

Date: 23.6.09

Attachment 1

Role of the

School Learning Support Coordinator

As specialist teachers the SLSCs will, through the learning support team, assist classroom teachers to respond to students with complex additional learning needs* from diverse cultural, linguistic and socio-economic backgrounds.

1. Provide professional advice, support and mentoring to classroom teachers on:
 - How best to cater for the diverse learning needs in their classrooms and
 - How to effectively work in partnership with families to maximise learning opportunities for students at school and at home.
2. Model exemplary classroom practice when tailoring learning for students with complex additional learning needs, including those who are:
 - Starting school
 - Moving from primary to secondary, and
 - Moving to post school destinations.
3. Facilitate professional development within their school and across schools in their local community of schools.
4. Provide specialist educational advice and assistance to Learning Support Teams in their school.
5. Help coordinate within schools relevant interagency support from government and non-government services.

*Complex additional learning needs. Student learning needs may be complicated by the support required by the **student** and/or the skills and support needed by the **teacher** and those in the wider **community**. The students may or may not have a diagnosed disability. They may be achieving BELOW the minimum standard or benchmark in KLA's.

Attachment 2

Public School

Editing Code

NEW PARAGRAPH. School convention will be to leave a line and not indent.

[] Paragraph beginning and ending.

= Leave a line

// Leave a space between the words

○ Omitted punctuation: e.g. capitals, full stops, comma, speech marks, apostrophes. Eg glendore

∅ Punctuation not required.

∧ Omitted words eg I went ∧ the shops.

Omitted title.

correct spelling
Spelling error

They

eg Thay were my scissors.

Grammar. Incorrect usage. Need to change the word in the sentence. Eg We ^{were} was outside.

? Does not make sense. Need to re-word the sentence.



* More expressive word needed. Eg The big dog ran after the ^{*decaying} ∧ bone. *vicious

{ } or ~~striketrough~~ Leave out. Words not needed. Eg The little boy {he} was scared.

Attachment 3
Editing checklist

Name:

My editing checklist

CODE	Date:			
	Editor			
<input type="text"/>	<u>Title</u>			
<input type="radio"/>	● ? ! Full stop at the end of EVERY sentence			
<input type="radio"/>	CAPITAL letter at the beginning of EVERY sentence			
?	Do all of the sentences make sense? 			
*	Have I used INTERESTING words?			
<u>underline</u>	Spelling errors identified			
<small>correct spelling</small>	Spelling corrected			
<u>underline</u>				
[]	Paragraphs []			
<input type="radio"/>	CAPITALS in the wrong place 			

Curriculum planning and programming, assessing and reporting to parents K-12 Policy 2006

3.1.5 *Students for whom accommodations and/or learning adjustments have been made*

- **Accommodations** are changes to an environment that will allow students with additional needs to participate fully in the same learning, working towards the same syllabus outcomes and content, as all other students of the same age/stage. **Accommodations** could include sign language, Braille/large print, a reader or scribe, access to technology, personal carer support, modifications to equipment, furniture and learning spaces. They could also include: Augmentative communication system, sign language, Special provisions such as extended time allocated to complete work or do assessments/exams; provide a copy rather than expect student to copy from the board, access to additional teacher or School Learning Support Officer.
- **Learning adjustments** are measures or actions taken in relation to teaching, learning and assessing that enable a student to access and participate in achieving syllabus outcomes and content different from those for the age/stage group and that meet the student's personalised learning needs in a personalised learning program.
Where a student requires learning adjustments to be made they are planned and developed in consultation with parents and carers and may also be supported through accommodations.

1

See Stage One Language Assessment Overview 11.2.09 for more detail

Oral assessment trends 11.2.09	Intervention	Outcomes June 09*
<u>Letter sound vs letter name</u> confusion, making spelling (sounding out) and reading (blending sounds to make a word) more difficult	✓ sound drill ✓ spelling chunking and sounding out strategies demonstrated to teachers in team teaching setting	✓ Increased accuracy and approximation in spelling eg frida (Friday)
<u>Articulation of sounds and words</u> omission of initial sounds final consonant deletion voicing quiet sounds fronting lisp	✓ Developmental graph of sound production explained and distributed to S1 teachers ✓ Incidental teaching during team teaching sessions	*NEED T&D in Cued articulation ✓ T awareness raised of developmentally appropriate articulation errors *Inaccurate articulation continues to effect spelling e.g. voicing – pud for put, sgool for school, consonant deletion and vowel distortion e.g. mucki for monkey
<u>Phonemic awareness</u> Difficulties with auditory identification of beginning sounds and blending of single sounds	✓ SLSC advice to CT to revise spelling program to developmentally appropriate level. That is, CVC and digraphs before consonant blends.	*Need T&D for CT, SLSO and Parents *Need school scope and continuum to guide developmental focus in spelling and reading. SLSC has begun this process which needs to be refined and adopted as school policy.
<u>Vocab limited</u> Overuse of general terms Pronoun referents confused	✓ Question cue cards ✓ Visualising and Verbalising introduced ✓ Sequencing pictures in narratives and storytelling included in oral language program	✓ Words becoming more precise and varied ✓ More detailed description as below ✓ Description of character beginning to include personality traits and more variety of emotion ✓ Structure, content and grammar varied according to text type *Pronoun confusion only introduced in one class at this stage.
<u>Lack of detailed description of a picture</u> not using sentences limited to what/who, action, where, mood basic rather than specific vocab	✓ Talking and Listening program modified ✓ Visualising and verbalising program explained and demonstrated while team teaching using question cue cards ✓ Collaboration in programming, lesson preparation and delivery. ✓ Description targeted as a text	✓ Inclusion of more detail: when, colour, size, number, shape, interpretation (why) ✓ Children talking in sentences and writing sentences which are usually grammatically correct (word order)

	type	
<u>Difficulties Sequencing</u> identifying cause and effect, answering why, ideas not linked from one picture to the next, incorrect sequence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Sequencing pictures ✓ Sequencing related events in recount and procedure ✓ Sequencing story re-telling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Links between one picture and the next made by all but one student in reference group ✓ Correct sequence by all but one student ✓ Use of time referents e.g. suddenly, after the accident... ✓ Cause and effect clearly identified ✓ Ability to answer why or include causal relationship spontaneously
<u>Voice projection inappropriate</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ incidental teaching ✓ specific praise modelled ✓ teachers given suggestions on teaching strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Teacher praise beginning to become more specific * Many students still use inappropriate projection
<u>Attention span</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Stop, look, listen, think do strategy reinforced with visual prompt ✓ Positioning in chairs improved using footstools. ✓ Teachers made aware of possible need to refer to Occupational Therapist and/or physiotherapist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Scaffolding has assisted children to be more engaged in the talking and writing process * OT and Physio assessment of some children's ability to sit still on the floor and in a chair may need to be further investigated. E.g. core strength, dura disc cushions
<u>Story writing</u> request by teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Alphabet cards with word banks introduced ✓ Writing goal of the week introduced ✓ Editing code and checklists ✓ Scaffolding using question cue cards for sentences and text type structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Most children are achieving basic to sound lesson and curriculum outcomes. ✓ All comments above are relevant ✓ Student engagement and success significantly higher
<u>Handwriting</u> request from teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Sitting posture improved with SLSC advice ✓ Cross-over pencil grips introduced to some students ✓ Some shorter students were given foot stools or smaller tables and chairs ✓ Emphasis on common letter production errors as identified in Stage 2 and 3 assessments eg a/u, b/l closing the gap to create a closed letter, stray capitals, letter size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Handwriting for some students has improved, particularly those targeted with pencil grips. ✓ This remains an ongoing issue which will need continued emphasis by all teachers across all stages to communicate and consistently expect high levels of accuracy when writing.

*Outcomes June 09 as determined from across Stage 1 Writing task- sequencing 3 pictures and writing a story to compliment those pictures.

Attachment 6
Writing results

Attachment 7

**Resources that Michelle has made in consultation with many GREAT Glendorians:
What and where to find it.**

Text types

description program STG1	Common\ Units of Work\English\STG1\writing\description\writing text types description
description scaffold	Common\ Units of Work\English\STG1\writing\description\description scaffold
character description	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\character description
narrative scaffold	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\narrative scaffold
narrative more complex scaffold	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\narrative more complex scaffold
	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\narrative more complex scaffold p2
Writing target of the week kit contents	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing target of the week kit contents
This week we are week learning...poster	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\week learning large
writing target of the week	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\writing target
Writing goal: spelling	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\goal spelling
Writing goal: sentence making sense	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\sentence making sense
Writing goal: paragraph	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\goal paragraph
Writing goal: interesting words	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\goal interesting words
Writing goal: full stop	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\goal full stop
Writing goal: capital letter pronoun	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\goal capital letter pronoun
Writing goal: capital letter	Common\Boardmaker files\writing text types\goal capital letter
	see also Talking and Listening resources
Narrative program Stg 1	
Narrative Program Stg 2 &3	
Scope and sequence writing generic	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing scope and sequence\WRITING
Scope and sequence Narrative	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing scope and sequence\NARRATIVE
Scope and sequence Exposition	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing scope and sequence\EXPOSITION
Scope and sequence Description	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing scope and sequence\DESCRIPTION
Scope and sequence	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing scope and

Recount	sequence\RECOUNT
Scope and sequence Explanation	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing scope and sequence\EXPLANATION
Scope and sequence Information Report	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing scope and sequence\INFORMATION REPORT
Scope and sequence Procedure	Common\ Units of Work\English\Writing scope and sequence\PROCEDURE

Also of interest
Marking rubrics

Sight words

Oxford and DIPL student word lists and assessment sheets ES1 and S1	Common\ Units of Work\English\Sightwords
---	--

Editing

Student editing code checklists	Common\ Units of Work\English\editing checklist writing
PS editing code	Common\ Units of Work\English\editing code Glendore

Talking and listening

Question cue cards resource pack contents	Common\ Units of Work\English\Question cue cards resource pack
Talking and listening program for ES1 and S1	Common\ Units of Work\English\STG1\Talking and listening\stage one talking and listening
Question cue cards	Common\Boardmaker files\questions
Person, animal or thing game	Common\Boardmaker files\questions\Game person animal thing
ordinals	Common\Boardmaker files\language\first next next last