School Performance Data 2010

Literacy and Numeracy results for 2010 are taken from the NAPLAN tests in May, the Kimberley Literacy Assessment (Kimlit) conducted in Term 1 and the Mathematical Assessment Interviews conducted in Term 1 & 2. In some cases NAPLAN 2009 results are included for the purpose of comparison.

**LITERACY RESULTS**

Kimlit Reading: Primary B (Grades 1&2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test: PMBchMk</th>
<th>PreTest</th>
<th>Mean: 1.18</th>
<th>SD: 0.64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PostTest</td>
<td>Mean: 0.00</td>
<td>SD: 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Primary B at the commencement of 2010, five students were reading Reading Benchmark Level 2, nine students were reading at Level 1 and six students were reading not reading at all.

**Year 3, 5 & 7 NapNuLit data**

**Writing Results 2009**

*Writing Scores for Year 3 students relative to School Percentiles in 2009*

*Writing Scores for Year 5 students relative to School Percentiles in 2009*
Year three reading results indicate that two students are performing at Band level 3 which is just above the National Minimum Standard, 5 students are performing at the National Minimum standard and 9 students are performing at below the National Minimum standard.
In Grade 3 Three students were reading at Benchmark Level 7, one student at Level 4, two at Level 2, six at Level 1 and eight students who could not read at all under test conditions.
Year 5 reading results show 100% of the students are performing below the minimum National Standard. This year level results indicate that students are at high risk of not moving forward at an acceptable rate. This score is below the lowest level of achievement students need to have to be able to make progress and move forward with their learning.
Year 7 reading results indicate two students are performing at the minimum national standard and three students are performing below the national minimum standard.
These results show that the students at in Year 7 are achieving at a much lower standard acceptable for students at this end of the school. Only one student is reading above Benchmark level 5.
WRITING

Writing Results 2010 using the Education and Assessment Reporting System (EARS) and Kimlit data

Grade 1 and 2

KimLit data as at Pretesting 2010

Writing Vocabulary
Clay Dictation Test

Calendar Year: 2010
Class: Margaret English

Test: ClayDictn

PreTest
Mean: 3.29
SD: 2.47

PostTest
Mean: 0.00
SD: 0.00
The Year Three writing report shows that at the time of testing 100% of the students were in the high risk category of performance. Two students were at the lower end of the National Minimum Standard while 14 students were at the lower end of the below National Minimum Standard.
Results show that these students have a reasonable ability to hear sounds in words. Only two students performed at lower than 10 sounds. This ability was not reflected in the results of the NAPLAN testing.
The year 5 writing results show that at the time of testing 100% of the students were performing at below the National Minimum Standard. These students were unable to complete any writing tasks unaided.
These results indicate that many of the students in this area have some knowledge of words but this was not reflected in the NAPLAN test results. Once again this indicates that these students cannot write when asked to complete a written task totally independently.
The results of the Year 7 test results shows that 100% of the students who presented for the writing tests were performing at well below the National Minimum Standard.
Students at this level have limited knowledge of words but cannot use this to write a simple sentence unassisted.
Numeracy

NapNuLit data

Year 3, 5, & 7 2009 Numeracy

NUMERACY Scores for Year 3 students relative to School Percentiles in 2009

NUMERACY Scores for Year 5 students relative to School Percentiles in 2009
Given the very small cohort in the school doing the test in 2009 we would like to compare the results in 2010 & 2011 to help us look at positive and negative trends in our data that we can incorporate into our plan in 2012.
In 2010 we participated as a project school in the Bridging the Numeracy Gap – Maths (Extending Mathematical Understanding – EMU). Data was collected from the Mathematics Assessment Interview (MAI) for Years 1-7.

Below are the results collected in March and November.

**Counting**

At the beginning of 2010 our results show most children in Yr 1-3 are growth point 2 but a large percentage are in growth point 0 for counting.
At the end of 2010 our results clearly show that the vast majority of children improved by at least two growth points with some obtaining three.

Areas of concern: We have analyzed the at risk children and planned to focus on their movement forward in growth points next year. There will also be focus on the children in Years 1-4 that remain on growth point 0 in counting.
Place Value

At the beginning of 2010 our results in Place Value show most children in Yr 1-3 are growth point 1 but a large percentage are in growth point 0.
At the end of 2010 our results show that the majority of students from years 1-7 are only on growth point 2 for Place Value.

All children in Years 1-3 have moved a growth point.
At the beginning of 2010 our results in Addition and Subtraction show most children in Yr 1-3 are growth point 0 but a large percentage are in growth point 1.
At the end of 2010 our results show lots of movement in Years 1-3 in Addition and Subtraction. Most children have moved 2 growth points.

Areas of concern: All upper students are at risk and work needs to be done with these children to move them forward on the growth points.
At the beginning of 2010 our results in Multiplication and Division show most children in Yr 1-3 are split between growth points 0 and 1 with the remainder in growth point 2.
At the end of 2010 good movement has been shown in this area for Year 3s. However there has not been significant improvement in Multiplication and Division for the other grades.