Appendix A   School Improvement Unit school types

Type	Explanation
Urban primary	Any primary school in North Coast, Metropolitan, South East regions, plus Darling Downs South West, Central Queensland, North Queensland, Far North Queensland regions if Education Queensland zone is metro or provincial, but excluding those with 1000 or more student enrolments
Very large, urban primary	Any primary school with 1000 or more student enrolments in North Coast, Metropolitan, South East regions, plus Darling Downs South West, Central Queensland, North Queensland, Far North Queensland regions if Education Queensland zone is metro or provincial
Rural primary	Any primary school in Darling Downs South West, Central Queensland, North Queensland, Far North Queensland regions, except where Education Queensland zone is metro or provincial, but excluding schools with 50 or fewer students
Very small, rural primary	Any primary school with 50 or fewer students, in Darling Downs South West, Central Queensland, North Queensland, Far North Queensland regions, except where Education Queensland zone is metro or provincial
Urban secondary	Any secondary school in North Coast, Metropolitan, South East regions, plus Darling Downs South West, Central Queensland, North Queensland, Far North Queensland regions if Education Queensland zone is metro or provincial, but excluding those with 1000 or more student enrolments
Very large, urban secondary	Any secondary school with 1000 or more student enrolments in North Coast, Metropolitan, South East regions, plus Darling Downs South West, Central Queensland, North Queensland, Far North Queensland regions if Education Queensland zone is metro or provincial
Rural secondary	Any secondary school in Darling Downs South West, Central Queensland, North Queensland, Far North Queensland regions, except where Education Queensland zone is metro or provincial
Combined	Any combined school, except when remote, plus schools of distance education
Remote	Any school, except special schools and outdoor and environmental education centres, defined as remote under Education Queensland zones definition, regardless of sector or student enrolment number
Special	Any special school, regardless of location or student enrolment number
Outdoor and environmental education centres	Any outdoor and environmental education centre, regardless of location or student enrolment number
Specific purpose	Barrett Adolescent Centre Special School, Lady Cilento Children's Hospital School and Woody Point Special School

Appendix B   Executive summary, School Improvement Unit study tour 2016

The systems visited in this field study were selected according to their profile: Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted), a recognised differential approach with many similar characteristics to the School Improvement Unit (SIU); Scotland, which emphasises schools' self-evaluation; the Netherlands with sustained results in Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA); Poland with the sustained improvement in relative gain in PISA; and Singapore based on ongoing high performance and high relative gain improvement over the past five years according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This review considers the primary features of each system, based on field work undertaken in February 2016.

Review of the English system

Recently, Ofsted has made two significant changes. Firstly, it has opted to have fewer contractors, that is, a more permanent workforce. Secondly, it has moved to a risk-based inspection approach, while still maintaining strong compliance elements of its external evaluations with high stakes outcomes. All external contractors are now employed by Ofsted. Inspections are a point-in-time review based on observations and assessment of standards. No intervention or support is provided. Ofsted is responsible for inspecting all aspects of education at all sites, including regional offices and local authorities. Regional commissioners are increasingly working in partnership with inspectors and influencing the additional funding available to support schools, particularly those that require improvement. Self-evaluation is not compulsory. There has been a move away from classroom observations to the inspection of notebooks. Most head teachers who have consistent 'requires improvement' ratings are removed from their school and not given another headship. Schools are still very hesitant to trust the inspectorate. Extensive training and quality assurance processes are in place for Her Majesty's Inspectors.

Review of the Scottish system

This system has a strong emphasis on self-evaluation undertaken each year by schools. The process is supported by the local authorities and there is clear evidence of a support and mentoring role by inspectors when the school is 'travelling well'. Partnerships with the local authorities play a key role for inspectors. Local authority scrutiny is a part of the system that is reviewed by inspectors. Lay members are involved in the inspection process, particularly with the students, families and non-educators, and they have become a part of the inspectorate workforce. Resources are allocated to authorities to support school-based quality improvement officers and attainment officers. The Curriculum for Excellence initiative has been strongly adopted by all schools and local community groups.

Review of the Dutch system

The Dutch have a highly specialised inspection workforce, with each inspector assigned to a particular sector, such as special education institutions, universities, and primary, secondary or vocational schools. The inspectorate has responsibility across all elements of education in the country, and inspects all educational institutions that receive government funding. The worst performers are named publicly, but also receive additional resources to facilitate improvement. School boards (such as Catholic Education Offices) have a key responsibility for schools' performance. The inspectorate works with these groups to achieve improvement. Standards are identified by ratings in each domain.

Review of the Polish system

There are three key functions of the Polish school improvement system: internal review, support and external evaluation. An internal review is conducted by teachers in cooperation with the head teacher. Key priorities are determined for the school in this way. The inspectorate also identifies key areas that are deficient and highlights these for consideration. An external inspection occurs over five days within the period of a fortnight, and is carried out by two inspectors. The draft report is discussed with the head teacher and staff as part of the feedback process. The final report reflects the views of the inspector and staff. 12 criteria are used and student mental and physical safety is a priority. Inspections can be conducted more frequently if the school is weak. The contributing factors for improved performance include the:

- importance of professional development of teachers
- contribution of teachers to the internal review process
- change of emphasis in the method of teaching (more problem solving and skills development).

Mathematics has become compulsory and English is mandatory from kindergarten. European Union funding has supported these initiatives. Everyone can access the nursery program for children at the age of three. Polish education acknowledges high-performing teachers through the Charter Teacher program that takes three years to achieve. Public universities are free and open to all Polish students regardless of background, but entry requirements include a rigorous external examination. Teacher quality has been strongly emphasised under the new Polish system, established in 2008.

Review of the Singaporean system

The Singaporean system is based on the School Excellence Model where there is strong school autonomy. Since 2013, Singapore has moved from the European accreditation system and its processes now have their own flavour, such as stronger recognition of culture and innovation. The tool it uses has moved to a strong teaching and learning focus, along with innovation and character development. Schools undertake an extensive biennial self-evaluation utilising a tool with enablers (three-quarters of tool) and results (one-quarter of tool) categories. A team of evaluators visits for no more than three days out of the two weeks allocated to an external review. It verifies the school findings and challenges where there is a difference. During the verification process, the team conducts in-depth data analysis, engages in discussions with the school leadership team, provides feedback and undertakes report writing. The teams are led by an evaluator who has been seconded, usually for more than three years, the superintendent, and a school leader from another school. Schools are given an assessment ranking. School leadership teams undertake intensive training on how to complete a self-evaluation. Results consist mainly of data tables that outline the current performance. Bonuses and performance pay are largely determined by the outcomes of this evaluation. An external evaluation is conducted every six years.

Principal capability and development in Singapore

The Ministry of Education in Singapore has a leadership development stream for middle managers, deputy principals and principals. Participants are selected after taking part in a multifaceted entry program that includes interviews, tests and in-basket activities. The head of department program is an allocated 16 weeks, and the program into principalship is one semester. The program has two major parts. There are the technical aspects of leadership, and then 30 per cent is based on implementation of an initiative in a school over the period. Principals work in teams of six or seven, with a professor being a critical friend who challenges their thinking. The aim is to implement a sustainable project with no authority base, and to discover what thinking and processes sit behind this. It fosters creativity and challenge. The program is focused on self-organisation, non-linear thinking and emerging experience, discovering what learning has taken place. The program aims to foster innovation and the thinking that sits behind innovation, through design thinking. The Ministry of Education does not teach leaders to complete the tool that is used by the inspectorate, but rather they teach the skills and processes of self-evaluation. Advanced principal courses, organised by the civil service, run for two weeks.

Concluding comments

All inspection systems have similar elements of review but use different terminology. The *National School Improvement Tool* (NSIT) is consistent with the inspectorate standards of jurisdictions visited. There are different levels of emphasis, but the most common discrete priority area is staff and student safety and wellbeing. However, consideration of the relationship with the community, as a part of a review process, is less common. All systems visited give schools a rating against standards. Only the Scottish inspectorate took a coaching and support role. Each system had responsibility for all aspects of education, with a strong emphasis on independence in each system. Although self-evaluation is an option in each system when preparing for an inspection, in Scotland and Singapore it was required to be undertaken as part of a regular cycle.

Appendix C *National School Improvement Tool* domains

1. **An explicit improvement agenda**: The school leadership team and/or governing body have established and are driving a strong improvement agenda for the school, grounded in evidence from research and practice, and expressed in terms of improvements in measurable student outcomes. Explicit and clear school-wide targets for improvement have been set and communicated to parents and families, teachers and students, with accompanying timelines.

2. **Analysis and discussion of data**: A high priority is given to the school-wide analysis and discussion of systematically collected data on student outcomes, including academic, attendance and behavioural outcomes, and student wellbeing. Data analyses consider overall school performance as well as the performances of students from identified priority groups; evidence of improvement/regression over time; performances in comparison with similar schools; and, in the case of data from standardised tests, measures of growth across the years of school.

3. **A culture that promotes learning**: The school is driven by a deep belief that every student is capable of successful learning. A high priority is given to building and maintaining positive and caring relationships between staff, students and parents. There is a strong collegial culture of mutual trust and support among teachers and school leaders, and parents are treated as partners in the promotion of student learning and wellbeing. The school works to maintain a learning environment that is safe, respectful, tolerant, inclusive and that promotes intellectual rigour.

4. **Targeted use of school resources**: The school applies its resources (staff time, expertise, funds, facilities, materials) in a targeted manner to meet the learning and wellbeing needs of all students. It has school-wide policies, practices and programs in place to assist in identifying and addressing student needs. Flexible structures and processes enable the school to respond appropriately to the needs of individual learners.

5. **An expert teaching team**: The school has found ways to build a school-wide, professional team of highly able teachers, including teachers who take an active leadership role beyond the classroom. Strong procedures are in place to encourage a school-wide, shared responsibility for student learning and success, and to encourage the development of a culture of continuous professional improvement that includes classroom-based learning, mentoring and coaching arrangements.

6. **Systematic curriculum delivery**: The school has a coherent, sequenced plan for curriculum delivery that ensures consistent teaching and learning expectations and a clear reference for monitoring learning across the year levels. The plan, within which evidence-based teaching practices are embedded, and to which assessment and reporting procedures are aligned, has been developed with reference to the Australian Curriculum or other approved curriculum, and refined collaboratively to provide a shared vision for curriculum practice. This plan is shared with parents and families.

7. **Differentiated teaching and learning**: The school places a high priority on ensuring that, in their day-to-day teaching, classroom teachers identify and address the learning needs of individual students, including high-achieving students. Teachers are encouraged and supported to monitor closely the progress of individuals, identify learning difficulties and tailor classroom activities to levels of readiness and need.

8. **Effective pedagogical practices**: The school principal and other school leaders recognise that highly effective teaching is the key to improving student learning throughout the school. They take a strong leadership role, encouraging the use of research-based teaching practices in all classrooms to ensure that every student is engaged, challenged and learning successfully. All teachers understand and use effective teaching methods — including explicit instruction — to maximise student learning.

9. **School–community partnerships**: The school actively seeks ways to enhance student learning and wellbeing by partnering with parents and families, other education and training institutions, local businesses and community organisations. Parents and families are recognised as integral members of the school community and partners in their children's education. Partnerships are strategically established to address identified student needs and operate by providing access to experiences, support and intellectual and/or physical resources not available within the school. All partners are committed to the common purposes and goals of partnership activities. Procedures are in place to ensure effective communications and to monitor and evaluate the intended impacts of the school's partnerships.

Extract from Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). (2012). *National School Improvement Tool* (NSIT). Melbourne: ACER. Retrieved from https://www.acer.edu.au/files/NSIT.pdf.

Appendix D Analysis of School Improvement Unit review reports

The school review reports were primarily produced as a qualitative outcome for schools. An established and appropriate data analysis method was implemented. It was consistent with the data being used and the overall objectives of the research. The data were coded utilising NVivo 10 data analysis software. The process, including the coding framework applied to the data, is detailed below.

The coding process

Once a school review report had been compiled by the school review team, it was then forwarded to the School Improvement Unit (SIU) reports team for editing to ensure readability, consistency and accuracy of information. Basic school statistical data were also added during this quality assurance process. A data-cleansing process also occurred, where the data were converted into a standard format that could be directly uploaded into the NVivo 10 software ready for coding.

Coding was the initial stage of data analysis. Reports were analysed line by line, word by word, to identify key words or phrases that connected the reviewer's account of their experience at the school (Goulding 1999; Holton 2010). They were then broken down into distinct smaller text units.

The coding process consisted of a single stage application, which applied the coding framework to the text of the school review reports. Codes were only applied to specific areas of the review reports: the findings in each of the nine *National School Improvement Tool* (NSIT) domains became the main dataset. Their improvement strategies were also coded to enable advice on the prevalence of particular types of improvement strategies, but were not included in the main dataset as they mirrored the findings. The executive summaries of reports were ignored to avoid data duplication.

Coding involved a close examination of each clause, sentence or paragraph in the review reports in order to identify the single most appropriate conceptual category to describe what was occurring within the datum. Each review report was read closely, and codes assigned that were best representative of each piece of information (Bryant & Charmaz 2010; Creswell 2003). In this way, the data were fractured into usable units of information.

The coding process was not a matter of applying a simple description or theme to the data, but was centrally concerned with converting the data theoretically (Strauss & Corbin 1998). In order to achieve this conversion, three questions based on Punch (2013, p. 184) were asked throughout the open coding process:

- What is this datum an example of?
- What does this datum stand for or represent?
- What category or property of a category does this datum indicate?

The coding framework

The genesis of the coding framework (see Table D.1) was both inductive and deductive. Firstly, the level one codes of leadership, learning, learning environments, partnerships and teaching were inductively drawn from salient literature in school improvement, specifically the work of Masters (2012). Secondly, sub-level codes, specifically the elements of improvement, improvement processes and particular issues, were developed inductively from the school review reports, before and during the coding process when new codes were required as new conceptual data were raised in subsequent school review reports.

Level one: Conceptual organisers	Level two: Elements of improvement	Level three: Improvement processes	Level four: Specific issues
Leadership	Key improvement strategies		
	Leading people	Evidencing an improvement agenda	Articulation of the improvement agenda
			Dissemination of the improvement agenda
	School funding and budgets		
	School culture	Attendance	
		Behaviour and discipline of students	
		Constructive interactions	
		Disengagement	
		Sense of belonging	
		Staff wellbeing	
		Student demographics	
		Student wellbeing	
	Utilising data	Access to data	
		Collecting and analysing data	
		Data literacy and engaging with data	
		Sources of data used	NAPLAN data
		Using and communicating data	Parents
			School leadership team
			Students
			Teachers
Learning	Inclusive strategies		
	High expectations of students		
	Individualised, flexible learning		
	Exceptional learning strategies		
	Student empowerment	Student learning goals	
		Student feedback	
	Challenging learning experiences		
Teaching	Pedagogy	Continuous improvement of teaching	Induction
			Teacher aide professional development
		Feedback on teaching performance	
		Professional learning communities	
	Curriculum	Collaborative curriculum practices	
		Assessment	Moderation
		Professional development in curriculum planning	
		Curriculum implementation	
		Evidence of a mandated curriculum	
		Curriculum addresses priority areas or is locally relevant	
Learning environments	Program support mechanisms		
	Learning resources	Human resources	
		Non-human resources	
	Shared responsibility for student success		
	Reasonable adjustments		
	Teacher aide support		
	Conducive learning environments		
Partnerships	School–community partnerships	IPS school councils	
		Parents and Citizens' Associations (P&Cs)	
	Collaborative teaching and learning	School clusters	
	Community engagement		
	Collaboration with parents		

Table D.1: Coding framework for review reports, SIU, 2015

Note: conceptual organisers based on Masters 2012.

The coding framework was also influenced by ongoing consultation and peer review with experienced education professionals. To ensure codes were rigorous, they were discussed with the Director-General, Executive Director, regional directors, selected school principals and SIU colleagues as part of targeted research conversations. The application of codes was tested as part of the peer review, a series of interim reports in Terms 1, 2 and 3 in 2015. The codes could be traced back to the data in which they were grounded (Charmaz 2006; 2014), thereby providing an audit trail.

The hierarchical relationships between codes were determined by considering the causes and consequences of what was happening within the data, interpreting concepts/activities as different aspects or dimensions of a common code, and establishing their position in a larger process (for example, leadership) or as a stimulus-response association (for example, utilising data, data literacy and engaging with data) (Punch 2013).

Clear definitions for codes were established to assist in the reliability of the coding process. Definitions for level one codes were derived directly from the literature, while further code level definitions came from a combination of the literature, the NSIT and the type of data contained within each. The definitions of level one and two codes are presented in Table D.2.

Code	Definition used to guide the coding process
Challenging learning experience	Students (non-exceptional) being challenged by the cognitive load expected of them in their learning.
Collaboration with parents	School building partnerships with parents and families.
Collaborative teaching and learning	Partnerships that include teaching or learning activities; includes activities and interactions with cluster schools and feeder schools.
Community engagement	One-way engagement model where the school engages with the community or members of the community engage with the school.
Conducive learning environments	Explicit teaching and/or embedded pedagogical frameworks.
Curriculum	The types of curriculum used and how they have been planned and implemented; includes Australian Curriculum, Curriculum into the Classroom, Queensland Curriculum (QCAR or QCARF) and Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority.
Exceptional learning strategies	The experiences of exceptional learners only; strategies to assist those students who are identified as exceptional learners; whether those exceptional students are being challenged in their learning.
High expectations of students	Excellence is expected of all students in all aspects of their learning and behaviour.
Inclusive strategies	All students are included in learning so that they are successful in their educational and social endeavours (York et al. 1992). York et al. (1992) identify the following teaching innovations as inclusive: cooperative learning, whole language, multilevel instruction, curriculum overlapping, peer tutoring, and creative problem solving.
Individualised, flexible learning	Student learning experiences are differentiated and tailored to the specific learning needs of the student.
Key improvement strategies	Items or priorities within the school improvement agenda.
Leadership	Leadership includes establishing a clear vision and direction for the school; promoting a collective sense of responsibility for improving student learning and outcomes; monitoring school performance data; encouraging reflective practices; providing hands-on instructional leadership; and managing and targeting school resources to improve outcomes for students (Masters 2012, p. 27).

Code	Definition used to guide the coding process
Leading people	All aspects in the leadership of the teaching team, collaborative practices, goal setting, communication and leading the expert teaching team.
Learning	These are student-focused strategies (what the student experiences): promoting a belief that all students can learn successfully; enhancing student motivation and engagement; setting explicit and high standards for student learning; exploring and understanding students' starting points and learning needs; and providing flexible programs and pathways to address individual needs (Masters 2012, p. 27).
Learning environments	Ensuring safe and supportive learning environments; maintaining positive and respectful relationships; creating classroom cultures in which learning is a priority for all; and celebrating student progress and success (Masters 2012, p. 28).
Learning resources	Resources for learning, both human and non-human, used within the student learning environment.
Partnerships	Partnering with parents and families to improve outcomes for students and establishing relationships with local community organisations and businesses in the interests of improved student outcomes (Masters 2012, p. 27).
Pedagogy	Pedagogy is teacher and teaching focused (what the teacher experiences); all aspects of teachers' teaching practice, including the types of pedagogical frameworks used and their implementation; includes the feedback and performance review of teachers' teaching practice.
Program support mechanisms	Additional support programs where required, for example, school-wide programs and specialist support programs.
Reasonable adjustments	Specialised support required to ensure equity in learning so that students experience positive interdependence in the classroom and that the teacher feels supported in his/her efforts to promote student success (York et al. 1992).
School–community partnerships	A dual engagement model where both partners benefit from the engagement activities; includes Parents and Citizens' Associations and playgroups.
School culture	The collective values, beliefs and principles of the school; a set of shared assumptions that guide what happens in the school, defining appropriate behaviour for staff, students and parents.
School funding and budgets	All aspects of school revenues and expenditure; funding priorities of individual schools and concerns regarding funding and resources.
Shared responsibility for student success	The whole school shares responsibility for student learning outcomes.
Student empowerment	Students are empowered in the learning process by being encouraged to take part in their own learning processes through the setting and meeting of learning goals/plans or taking action on feedback on their own learning.
Teacher aide support	All aspects in the engagement of teacher aides in the support of the learning environment.
Teaching	What the teacher does (what is taught and how it is taught); includes driving high-quality teaching practices; making decisions about what should be taught and ensuring curriculum sequencing and coherence; assessing and monitoring student learning and providing feedback to students and parents; and professional learning focused on continual improvements in teaching effectiveness (Masters 2012, p. 27).
Utilising data	All aspects in the gathering and use of data to inform practice, such as decision making by school leaders or teachers in their teaching practice; the data literacy skills required for the effective use of data in schools.

Table D.2: Definitions for codes, SIU, 2015

Appendix E   Next steps after a priority support review

Within two weeks of receiving the review report	• Publish the executive summary on your school website. • Discuss the key findings and improvement strategies from the review with your leadership team, staff and school community.
Within four weeks of receiving the review report	• Discuss the draft action plan with your assistant regional director or principal supervisor. • Email the draft action plan to the School Improvement Unit at SIUMB@dete.qld.gov.au for feedback from your case manager. • Don't forget your case manager is only a phone call or email away and is happy to provide advice and support.

Three-month check-in	• Meet with your case manager, assistant regional director and school leadership team to:
	  • monitor the implementation of the action plan
	  • discuss the evidence which will be used to evaluate progress at the next check-in.
	• Following the discussion, the case manager emails feedback to the principal and assistant regional director or principal supervisor.
	• Email the final action plan (with signatures) to the School Improvement Unit.

Six-month check-in	• The case manager will meet with school staff, students and other members of the school community to gauge the school's progress against the action plan. • The option of a nine-month visit is discussed. • Following the discussion, the case manager emails feedback to the principal and assistant regional director or principal supervisor.
Nine-month check-in (optional, as needed)	• The case manager will seek further evidence of progress against the action plan. • Written feedback is provided.
12-month check-in and evaluation	• The case manager and an internal reviewer from the School Improvement Unit visit the school to evaluate the effectiveness of the school's response to its review after 12 months.

After the 12-month evaluation	• The School Improvement Unit emails an evaluation report to the principal and assistant regional director or principal supervisor.
	• The School Improvement Unit will make one of three determinations:
	  1. The School Improvement Unit will finalise its support of the school if the school, with regional support, is making positive gains.
	  2. The School Improvement Unit will identify additional targeted regional support for the school.
	  3. The School Improvement Unit will schedule the school for a second priority support review. Another program of three-monthly check-ins to follow.

List of initialisms and acronyms

ACER	Australian Council for Educational Research	MSS	Mean Scale Score
AIP	annual implementation plan	NAIDOC	National Aborigines and Islanders Day Observance Committee
AITSL	Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership	NAPLAN	National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy
APA	Annual Performance Assessment	NEA	National Education Agreement
ARD	assistant regional director	NERA	National Education Reform Agreement
ARR	apparent retention rates		
ARTIE	Achieving Results Through Indigenous Education	NMS	National Minimum Standard
		NSIT	*National School Improvement Tool*
ASoT	Art and Science of Teaching	OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
ATAR	Australian Tertiary Admission Rank	OEEC	outdoor and environmental education centre
C2C	Curriculum into the Classroom		
CARS	Comprehensive Assessment of Reading Strategies	Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills
CEC	community education counsellor	OP	Overall Position
COAG	Council of Australian Governments	P&C	Parents and Citizens' Association
		PAT-R	Progressive Achievement Tests in Reading
DET	Department of Education and Training	PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
DPP	developing performance plans		
EAL/D	English as an additional language or dialect	PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
ECEC	early childhood education and care	PLC	professional learning community
EQ	Education Queensland	PROBE	Prose Reading Observation, Behaviour and Evaluation of Comprehension
FTE	full-time equivalent		
GRG	Great Results Guarantee grant	QCAA	Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority
HOC	head of curriculum		
HOD	head of department	QCE	Queensland Certificate of Education
HOSES	head of special education services	QCIA	Queensland Certificate of Individual Achievement
IBD	International Baccalaureate Diploma	QSS	Queensland state schools
		QTU	Queensland Teachers' Union
ICP	individual curriculum plan	SAFE	SCORE, Accuracy, Fluency, Expanded Vocabulary
ICSEA	Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage		
ICT	information and communication technology	SCORE	Skim and Scan, Connect and Question, Organise Your Thinking, Read and Reflect, be the Expert
LOTE	language other than English	SDA	school/student disciplinary absence
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding		

SDS	Service Delivery Statement
SIU	School Improvement Unit
SMART	Specific Measurable Achievable Realistic Timely
SOS	School Opinion Survey
STARS	Strategies to Achieve Reading Success
STLaN	support teacher literacy and numeracy
SWD	students with disability
SWPBS	School Wide Positive Behaviour Support
TAFE	Technical and Further Education
TaLSIF	Teaching and Learning School Improvement Framework
THRASS	Teaching Handwriting, Reading and Spelling Skills
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study
U2B	upper two bands
VET	vocational education and training
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association

Endnotes

01   School improvement and reviews in Queensland schools

1. Subsequent annual reports will be able to present comparison of findings over time. These will be limited in part by the cohort of review schools varying at each time period.

2. A specific typology of schools has been developed by the SIU which combines school type, size and location. See appendix A, SIU school types, for details.

3. In its National Indigenous Reform Agreement of 2008, COAG established and funded the program in order to achieve six health, education and employment targets which would 'close the gap' in Indigenous disadvantage in Australia.

4. While the precise reviewer mix varies between review types, priority support and full school reviews proceed in an identical fashion. However, upon completion, schools receiving a priority support review continue to receive formal support from the SIU for the following year.

5. The school review process is the subject of a joint statement between the department and the Queensland Teachers' Union, see www.qtu.asn.au/files//7714/5335/5716/School_reviews.pdf

6. These data include location, education region, year school opened, year levels, current enrolment, percentage of Indigenous students, percentage of students with disability, Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) value, year principal appointed, number of teachers, nearby schools, significant community partnerships and unique school programs.

7. Owing to the nonstandard format of self-determined review reports not undertaken by the SIU, they were often not able to be analysed in the same way as other review reports. This means overall findings do not include findings from some of the more high-performing schools.

8. This principle has been maintained under the SIU school review regime. It is recognised that this approach limits the evidence collected by school reviews about the performance of the principal as leader and key leadership concepts.

9. Senior officers in regional or central office may request emergent reviews when significant issues, for example, a sudden decline in performance data or a major community concern, need to be addressed.

02   School improvement outcomes across Queensland state schools

10. Note that schools with higher attendance rates tend to have students from higher socioeconomic status families.

11. Although the strategies outlined were found to be effective or potentially effective practices in the 2015 review schools, schools need to consider their own local context, including their priorities and the age of students, when determining which (if any) of these approaches might address the specific attendance issues in their school.

E

References

Aina, S. (2015). Effects of school facilities on pupil's satisfaction with schooling in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies* (JETERAPS), 6(2), 146–149.

Aiston, S., Rudd, P. & O'Donnell, L. (2002). *School partnerships in action: A case study of West Sussex specialist schools*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Altrichter, H. & Kemethofer, D. (2015). Does accountability pressure through school inspections promote school improvement? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(1), 32–56.

Anderman, E. M. (2002). School effects on psychological outcomes during adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(4), 795–809.

Armstrong, P. (2015). *Effective school partnerships and collaboration for school improvement: A review of the evidence*: Research report, Department of Education, UK.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). 3238.0.55.001 – *Estimates of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians*, June 2011. Released 30 August 2013.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). 4221.0 – *Schools, Australia, 2014*. Released 19 March 2015.

Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). (2012). *National School Improvement Tool* (NSIT). Melbourne: ACER. Retrieved from https://www.acer.edu.au/files/NSIT.pdf

Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). (2012). *ACER releases results from latest international studies of student achievement*. Released 13 December 2012. Retrieved from https://www.acer.edu.au/about-us/media/article/acer-releases-results-from-latest-international-studies-of-student-achievem/

Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). (2016). *Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) Australia*. Retrieved from https://www.acer.edu.au/ozpisa/what-does-pisa-assess

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). *Australian Curriculum. Various dates: Mathematics: Overview – General capabilities. Retrieved from http://v7-5.australiancurriculum.edu.au/mathematics/general-capabilities; Literacy: Introduction. Retrieved from http://v7-5.australiancurriculum.edu.au/GeneralCapabilities/Pdf/Literacy*

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership Limited (AITSL). (2011, February). *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers*. Retrieved from www.aitsl.edu.au

Ball, S. J., Maguire, M. & Braun, A. (2012). *How schools do policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bambrick-Santoyo, P., Lemov, D. & Peiser, B. (2012). *Leverage leadership: A practical guide to building exceptional schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barber, M. (2011). *Deliverology 101: A field guide for educational leaders*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Barr, A., Gillard, J., Firth, V., Scrymgour, M., Welford, R., Lomax-Smith, J., Bartlett, D., Pike, B. & Constable, E. (2008). *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*: Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC).

Bazeley, P. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: Practical strategies*. London: Sage Publications.

Becker, P. H. (1993). Common pitfalls in published grounded theory research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 3(2), 254–260.

Bennis, W., Cherniss, C. & Goleman, D. (2003). *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bernhardt, V. (2013). *Data analysis for continuous school improvement*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Better Beginnings (online). *Research about literacy and reading*. Retrieved from http://www.better-beginnings.com.au/research/research-about-literacy-and-reading

Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. London: Granada Learning.

Black, P. J., Buoncristiani, P. & Wiliam, D. (2014). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. Cheltenham: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A. & Webster, R. (2011). The impact of support staff on pupils' 'positive approaches to learning' and their academic progress. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(3), 443–464.

Blatchford, P., Russell, A., Bassett, P. & Brown, P. (2007). The role and effects of teaching assistants in English primary schools (Years 4 to 6) 2000–2003. Results from the Class Size and Pupil–Adult Ratios (CSPAR) KS2 Project. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(1), 5–26.

Blumer, H. (1969). The methodological position of symbolic interactionism. In *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method* (pp. 1–60). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Branch, G., Hanushek, E. A. & Rivkin, S. G. (2013). School leaders matter: Measuring the impact of effective principals. *Education Next*, 13(1), 62–69.

Brand, S., Felner, R., Seitsinger, A., Burns, A. & Bolton, N. (2008). A large scale study of the assessment of the social environment of middle and secondary schools: The validity and utility of teachers' ratings of school climate, cultural pluralism, and safety problems for understanding school effects and school improvement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46(5), 507–535.

British Educational Research Association (BERA). (2014). *Research and the teaching profession: Building the capacity for a self-improving system*. Retrieved from https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/BERA-RSA-Research-Teaching-Profession-FULL-REPORT-for-web.pdf?noredirect=1

Brookhart, S. M. & Moss, C. M. (2015). How to Give Professional Feedback. *Educational Leadership*, 72(7), 24–30.

Bryan, J. & Henry, L. (2012). A model for building school–family–community partnerships: Principles and process. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 90(4), 408–420.

Bryant, A. & Charmaz, K. (Eds.). (2010). *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). London & New York: Routledge.

Caldarella, P., Shatzer, R., Gray, K., Young, K. & Young, E. (2011). The Effects of School-wide Positive Behaviour Support on Middle School Climate and Student Outcomes. *Research in Middle Level Education (RMLE) Online*, 35(4), 1–14.

Caldwell, B. & Harris, J. (2008). *Why not the best schools?* Camberwell: Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) Press.

Causton-Theoharis, J. N., Giangreco, M. F., Doyle, M. B. & Vadasy, P. F. (2007). The 'sous-chefs' of literacy instruction. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 40(1), 56–62.

R

Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation. (2015). *What works best: Evidence-based practices to help improve NSW student performance*, *2015*. Retrieved from http://www.cese.nsw.gov.au/publications-filter/what-works-best-evidence-based-practices-to-help-improve-nsw-student-performance

Chapman, C., Collins, A., Sammons, P., Armstrong, P. & Muijs, D. (2009). *The impact of federations on student outcomes*. Project Report. National College for School Leadership, Nottingham, UK.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Chick, H. & Pierce, R. (2013). The statistical literacy needed to interpret school assessment data. *Mathematics Teacher Education and Development*, 15(2), 5–26.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). The unforgiving complexity of teaching: Avoiding simplicity in the age of accountability. (Editorial). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(1), 3–6.

Cole, P. (2004). *Professional development: A great way to avoid change*, seminar series no. 140. Melbourne: IARTV.

Collins, K. & Coleman, R. (2016). *Evidence for leadership: Harnessing evidence and intelligent innovation to inform school improvement*. Paper presented at the QELi Future Leaders program.

Commonwealth of Australia. (2016). *Closing the Gap: Prime Minister's Report 2016.* Retrieved from http://closingthegap.dpmc.gov.au/assets/pdfs/closing_the_gap_report_2016.pdf

Council of Australian Governments (COAG). (2008). *National Integrated Strategy for Closing the Gap in Indigenous Disadvantage*. Retrieved from http://www.coag.gov.au/sites/default/files/NIS_closing_the_gap.pdf

Creemers, B. P., Stoll, L., Reezigt, G. & ESI Team. (2007). Effective school improvement— Ingredients for success: The results of an international comparative study of best practice case studies. In T. Townsend (Ed.), *International handbook of school effectiveness and improvement* (pp. 825–838). Dordrecht: Springer.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Critcher, C. (2003). *Moral panics and the media*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Cuncliffe, A. L. (2008). Orientations to social constructionism: Relationally responsive social constructionism and its implications for knowledge and learning. *Management Learning*, 39(2), 123–139.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N. & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council.

Data Quality Campaign. (2014). *Teacher data literacy: It's about time*. Retrieved from http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/wp-content/uploads/files/DQC-Data%20Literacy%20Brief.pdf

DeMatthews, D. E. (2014). How to improve curriculum leadership: Integrating leadership theory and management strategies. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 87(5), 192–196.

Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD). (2009). *Signposts: Research points to how Victorian government schools have improved student performance*. Paper No. 16, May 2009. Melbourne. Retrieved from https://www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/edulibrary/public/publ/research/nws/Signposts_report.pdf

Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST). (2002). *An ethic of care: Effective programs for beginning teachers*. Canberra: AGPS.

Department of Education and Training & the Queensland Teachers' Union. (2016). *The purpose and use of data in Queensland schools*. Retrieved from http://www.qtu.asn.au/files//2014/5853/1630/Joint_statement_on_Purpose_and_use_of_Data_21March2016.pdf

Department of Education and Training (DET). *Annual Report 2014–2015*. Retrieved from http://deta.qld.gov.au/publications/annual-reports/14-15/pdfs/det-annual-report-2014-15-signature.pdf

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2014a). *Every student succeeding: State Schools Strategy 2014–2018*. Retrieved from https://oneportal.deta.qld.gov.au/EducationDelivery/Stateschooling/Documents/every-student-succeeding-state-schools-strategy-2014-2108.pdf

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2014b). *Great Results Guarantee*. Retrieved from http://education.qld.gov.au/schools/grants/resources/great-results-factsheet.pdf

Department of Education and Training (DET) Data Analytics Working Group. (2015). *Performance Insights: school attendance strategies: results of a survey of Queensland state school leaders*, December 2015, draft version 0.2.

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2015a). *FAST FACTS: Behaviour including school disciplinary absences (SDAs)*, November 2015.

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2015b). *Literacy and numeracy resources and activities*. Retrieved from http://education.qld.gov.au/literacyandnumeracy/resources.html

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2015c). *Pedagogical Framework*. Retrieved from https://learningplace.eq.edu.au/cx/resources/file/f66ebbde-9978-4bfd-e445-b0f06cf4849f/1/index.html

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2015d). *Learning and Wellbeing Framework*. Retrieved from http://deta.qld.gov.au/initiatives/learningandwellbeing/resources/learning-and-wellbeing-framework.pdf

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2015e). *Parent and Community Engagement Framework: Working together to maximise learning*. Retrieved from http://education.qld.gov.au/schools/parent-community-engagement-framework/resources/pdf/parent-community-engagement-framework.pdf

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2016a). *Every student succeeding: State Schools Strategy 2016–2020*. Retrieved from https://oneportal.deta.qld.gov.au/EducationDelivery/Stateschooling/Teachingquality/Documents/literacy-every-student-succeeding.pdf

Department of Education and Training (DET). (2016b). *Every student succeeding: State Schools Strategy 2016–2020*. Retrieved from https://oneportal.deta.qld.gov.au/EducationDelivery/Stateschooling/Successfullearners/Documents/report-card-naplan-data.doc

Dewey, J. (1915). *The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dimmock, C. & Walker, A. (2000). Developing comparative and international educational leadership and management: A cross-cultural model. *School Leadership & Management*, 20(2), 143–160.

Dinham, S. (1992). *Teacher induction: Implications of recent research for educational administrators*. Washington, DC.: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.

DuFour, R. (2004). What is a 'professional learning community'? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 6–11.

DuFour, R. & Mattos, M. (2013). How do principals really improve schools? *Educational Leadership*, 70(7), 34–40.

Earl, L. (2005). From accounting to accountability: Harnessing data for school improvement. In *Using data to support learning: Conference proceedings* (pp. 6–10). Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=research_conference_2005

Earl, L. & Fullan, M. (2003). Using data in leadership for learning. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 383–394.

Farrell, P., Alborz, A., Howes, A. & Pearson, D. (2010). The impact of teaching assistants on improving pupils' academic achievement in mainstream schools: A review of the literature. *Educational Review*, 62(4), 435–448.

Faubert, V. (2009). School evaluation: Current practices in OECD countries and a literature review. *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 42. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/218816547156

Follett, R. (2015). What does it mean to be educated? *The Age*, 16 December. Retrieved from http://www.theage.com.au/comment/what-does-it-mean-to-be-educated-20151216-glopli.html

Frontier, T. & Rickabaugh, J. (2014). *Five levers to improve learning: How to prioritize for powerful results in your school*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* Levittown, PA: Psychology Press.

Fullan, M. (2000). The return of large-scale reform. *Journal of educational change*, 1(1), 5–28.

Fullan, M. (2010). *All systems go: The change imperative for whole system reform*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Fullan, M. (2012). Transforming schools an entire system at a time. *GOVERNMENT designed for new times: a global conversation*. McKinsey & Co., No 1.

Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Fullan, M. (2016). *Coherence. The right drivers in action for schools, districts and systems*. Thousand Oaks, United States: Corwin Press. Published in association with Ontario Principals' Council.

Fullan, M. G. & Miles, B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73, 745–752.

Fullan, M., Hill, P. & Crévola, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Breakthrough*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Galton, M. & MacBeath, J. (2008). *Teachers under pressure*. London: Sage.

Garrison, W. M. (2004). Profiles of classroom practices in US public schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(3–4), 377–406.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266–275.

Gergen, K. J. (2001). Construction in contention: Toward consequential resolutions. *Theory and Psychology*, 11(3), 419–432.

Goodnow, E. J. & Wayman, J. C. (2009). *The intersection between transformational leadership and data use in schools*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of 2009 Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Anaheim, California.

Goss, P. & Hunter, J. (2015). *Targeted teaching: How better use of data can improve student learning*. Victoria: Grattan Institute.

Goss, P., Sonnemann, J., Chisholm, C. & Nelson, L. (2016). *Widening gaps: What NAPLAN tells us about student progress*. Victoria: Grattan Institute.

Gottfried, M. A. (2011). The detrimental effects of missing school: Evidence from urban siblings. *American Journal of Education*, 117(2), 147–182.

Goulding, C. (1999). *Grounded theory: Some reflections on paradigm, procedures and misconceptions*. Working paper series, WP006/99. Wolverhampton: University of Wolverhampton. Retrieved from http://www.ssnpstudents.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Grounded-theory.pdf

Graffeo, M., Polonio, L. & Bonini, N. (2015). Individual differences in competent consumer choice: The role of cognitive reflection and numeracy skills. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6 (844). Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00844

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Pragmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences. *In The landscape of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.). London: Sage Publications.

Gurr, D. (2007). Diversity and progress in school accountability systems in Australia. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 6(3), 165–186.

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329–352.

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(2), 95–110.

Hancock, K. J., Shepherd, C. C. J., Lawrence, D. & Zubrick, S. R. (2013). *Student attendance and educational outcomes: Everyday counts*. Report for the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Canberra.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 6(2), 151–182.

Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A., Shirley, D. & Canadian Teachers' Federation. (2012). *The far side of educational reform*. Ottawa: Canadian Teachers' Federation.

Hargreaves, A. & Shirley, D. (2012). *The global fourth way: The quest for educational excellence*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Harild, G. & Sharratt, L. (2015). From good to great: Recalculating the route to career readiness through a pathways lens. *Principal Leadership*, 54–57. Retrieved from http://www.lynsharratt.com/pdf/PRI-K0415_54-57.pdf

Harris, A. (2012). Leading system-wide improvement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 15(3), 395–401.

Harris, L., Davidson, C. & Aprile, K. (2015). Understanding teacher aides' definitions of reading: Implications for classroom practice. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 42(5), 627–644.

Hattie, J. (2005). *What is the nature of evidence that makes a difference to learning?* Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=research_conference_2005

Hattie, J. (2013). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Hayes, D., Mills, M., Christie, P. & Lingard, B. (2006). *Teachers and schooling making a difference*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Helleve, I. (2010). Theoretical foundations of teachers' professional development. In J. O. Lindberg and A. D. Olofsson (Eds.), *Online learning communities and teacher professional development: Methods for improved education* (pp. 1–19). Hersey, PA: ICI Global.

Hill, R., Dunford, J., Parish, N., Rea, S. & Sandals, L. (2012). *The growth of academy chains: Implications for leaders and leadership*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Holton, J. A. (2010). The coding process and its challenges. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 265–289). London: Sage Publications.

Hoy, A. W. & Hoy, W. K. (2003). *Instructional leadership: A learning-centered guide*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hunzicker, J. (2010). *Characteristics of effective professional development: A checklist*. Online Submission. Department of Teacher Education, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED510366.pdf

Hunzicker, J. (2011). Effective professional development for teachers: A checklist. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(2), 177–179.

Hutchings, M., Greenwood, C., Hollingworth, S., Mansaray, A., Rose, A., Minty, S. & Glass, K. (2012). *Evaluation of the City Challenge programme*. Research Report. Department of Education, London.

Jensen, B. (2010). *What teachers want: Better teacher management*. Melbourne: Grattan Institute.

Jensen, B. (2012). *Catching up: Learning from the best school systems in East Asia*. Grattan Institute. Retrieved from http://grattan.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/129_report_learning_from_the_best_main.pdf

Johnson, S. M., Berg, J. H. & Donaldson, M. L. (2005). *Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature on teacher retention*. Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from http://assets.aarp.org/www.aarp.org_/articles/NRTA/Harvard_report.pdf

Karmel, T., Misko, J., Blomberg, D., Bednarz, A. & Atkinson, G. (2014). *Improving labour market outcomes through education and training*. Issues paper no. 9 produced for the Closing the Gap Clearinghouse. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare & Australian Institute of Family Studies, Australian Government. Retrieved from http://www.aihw.gov.au/uploadedFiles/ClosingTheGap/Content/Our_publications/2014/ctgc-ip9.pdf

Kearney, S. (2014). Teacher attrition, retention and mobility: Where does Australia stand? *Education and Society*, 32(2), 5–24.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). *Critical constructivism*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Knapp, M. S. & Feldman, S. B. (2012). Managing the intersection of internal and external accountability: Challenge for urban school leadership in the United States. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(5), 666–694.

Lamb, S., Rumberger, R., Jesson, D. & Teese, R. (2004). *School performance in Australia: results from analyses of school effectiveness*. Report for the Victorian Department of Premier and Cabinet. Centre for Post-compulsory Education and Lifelong Learning, The University of Melbourne. Retrieved from http://www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/edulibrary/public/govrel/reports/schoolperformance-rpt.pdf

Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2006). *A handbook for teacher research: From design to implementation*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

Leithwood, K. (2011). *Characteristics of high performing school districts in Ontario*. Toronto: OISE/University of Toronto.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201–227.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S. & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning: A review of research for the Learning from Leadership Project*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Lindsay, G., Muijs, D., Harris, A., Chapman, C., Arweck, E. & Goodall, J. (2007). *School federations pilot study 2003–2007*, Research Report DCSF-RR015. Warwick: University of Warwick. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/files/161/4157439.pdf

Macqueen, S. (2012). Academic outcomes from between-class achievement grouping: The Australian primary context. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 59–73.

Malterud, K. (2001). Qualitative research: Standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The Lancet*, 358(9280), 483–488.

Marsh, J. A. & Farrell, C. C. (2015). How leaders can support teachers with data-driven decision making: A framework for understanding capacity building. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(2), 269–289.

Marzano, R. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 14–19.

Masters, G. (2009). *A shared challenge: improving literacy, numeracy and science learning in Queensland primary schools*. Camberwell: Australian Council for Educational Research. Retrieved from http://education.qld.gov.au/mastersreview/pdfs/final-report-masters.pdf

Masters, G. (2012). *Measuring and rewarding school improvement*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

Masters, Geoff, N. (2014). *Is school reform working?* Research Development Occasional Paper. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research. Retrieved from http://rd.acer.edu.au/article/is-school-reform-working

Masters, G. (2015). A 21st century curriculum. *Teacher Magazine*. Retrieved from https://www.teachermagazine.com.au/geoff-masters/article/a-21st-century-curriculum

Matters, G. (2006). Using data to support learning in schools: Students, teachers, systems. *Australian Education Review*, No. 49. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=aer

McKenzie, P., Weldon, P. R., Rowley, G., Murphy, M. & McMillan, J. (2014). *Staff in Australia's Schools [SiAS] 2013: Main report on the survey*. Australian Council for Educational Research, commissioned by the Department of Education Canberra. Retrieved from https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/sias_2013_main_report.pdf

McKinsey (2007). *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top*. September 2007. Retrieved from http://mckinseyonsociety.com/downloads/reports/Education/Worlds_School_Systems_Final.pdf

McNamara, G. & O'Hara, J. (2005). Internal review and self-evaluation—the chosen route to school improvement in Ireland? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 31(4), 267–282.

Meiers, M. (2008). The Digest edition 2008/2: Using data to improve student learning. *The Digest*, NSW Institute of Teachers. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/digest/5

Mestry, R., Moonsammy-Koopasammy, I. & Schmidt, M. (2013). The instructional leadership role of primary school principals. *Education as Change*, 17(sup1), S49–S64.

Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. (2008). *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. Retrieved fromhttp://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf

Morrissey, T., Hutchison, L. & Winsler, A. (2014). Family income, school attendance, and academic achievement in elementary school. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(3), 741–753.

Mulford, B., Edmunds, B., Kendall, L., Kendall, D. & Bishop, P. (2008). Successful school principalship, evaluation and accountability. *Leading and Managing*, 14(2), 19–44.

Nathan, L. (2015). The art of the school-community partnership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(8), 57–62.

Noble, T., McGrath, H., Roffey, S. & Rowling, L. (2008). *A scoping study on student wellbeing*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment & Workplace Relations.

O'Day, J. A. (2002). Complexity, accountability, and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 293–329.

OECD. (2011). What can parents do to help their children succeed in school? *PISA In Focus*, 2011(10). Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/pisa/49012097.pdf

Omotere, T. (2013). *Influence of school environment on the academic performance of secondary school students in lagos state*. Published online by EgoBooster Books, www.omotere.tk.

O'Neill, O. (2013). Intelligent accountability in education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(1), 4–16.

Page, R. (2003). *Hope is not a strategy: The 6 keys to winning the complex sale*. New York: McGraw Hill Professional.

Pont, B., Nusche, D. & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving school leadership: Volume 1: Policy and practice*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Punch, K. (2013). *Introduction to research methods in education*. London: Sage.

Queensland Health. (2014). *The health of Queenslanders 2014*. Fifth report of the Chief Health Officer Queensland. Queensland Government, Brisbane. Retrieved from https://www.health.qld.gov.au/publications/research-reports/reports/cho-report/cho-full-report.pdf

Radford, J., Blatchford, P. & Webster, R. (2011). Opening up and closing down: How teachers and TAs manage turn-taking, topic and repair in mathematics lessons. *Learning and Instruction*, 21(5), 625–635.

Rea, S., Sandals, L., Parish, N., Hill, R. & Gu, Q. (2015). *Leadership of great pedagogy in teaching school alliances*. Final report. Teaching schools R&D network national themes project 2012–14. Research report, Spring 2015. Nottingham: National College for Teaching and Leadership. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/406285/Leadership_of_great_pedagogy_in_teaching_school_alliances_final_report.pdf

Reece, P. & Blackall, D. (2007). Making news today: Literacy for citizenship. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years*, 15(3), 46–54.

Reiser, R. A. & Demsey, J. V. (2007). *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A. & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.

Roffey, S. (2012). Pupil wellbeing—teacher wellbeing: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational and Child Psychology*, 29(4), 8–17.

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M., Spilt, J. L. & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher–student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(4), 493–529.

Sari, M. (2012). Sense of school belonging among elementary school students. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 41(1), 1–11.

Seashore Louis, K., Dretzke, B. & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(3), 315–336.

Sharratt, L. & Fullan, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Realization: The change imperative for deepening district-wide reform*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Sharratt, L. & Fullan, M. (2012). *Putting FACES on the data: What great leaders do!* Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Shirley, D. & Hargreaves, A. (2006). Data-driven to distraction. *Education Week*, 26(6), 32–33.

Smith, L. (2015). I, Inspire. *The Queensland Principal: Journal of the Queensland Association of State School Principals*, 42(2), 23–29.

Sparks, D. (1997). A new vision for staff development. *Principal*, 77(1), 20–22.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sun, J. & Leithwood, K. (2015). Direction-setting school leadership practices: A meta-analytical review of evidence about their influence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(4), 499–523.

Teddlie, C. & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The international handbook of school effectiveness research*. Levittown, PA: Psychology Press.

Thessin, R. A. (2016). Identify the best evidence for school and student improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 97(4), 69–73.

Timperley, H. (2015). *Professional conversations and improvement-focused feedback: A review of the research literature and the impact on practice and student outcomes*. Melbourne: Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL).

Thomson, S., De Bortoli, L. & Buckley, S. (2013). *PISA in brief: Highlights from the full Australian report: PISA 2012: How Australia measures up*. Melbourne: ACER.

Thomson, S., Hillman, K., Wernert, N., Schmid, M., Buckley, S. & Munene, A. (2012). *Highlights from TIMSS & PIRLS 2011 from Australia's perspective*. Camberwell: ACER. Retrieved from https://www.acer.edu.au/files/TIMSS-PIRLS_Australian-Highlights.pdf

Tomlinson, C. A. & Strickland, C. A. (2005). *Differentiation in practice: A resource guide for differentiating curriculum, grades 9–12*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tozer, L. & Holmes, M. (2005). *Moving on from Count Me In Too: Evidence-based teaching and learning in numeracy in the early and middle years of schooling*. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2005/16

Tyler, R. W. (2013). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vescio, V., Ross, D. & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80–91.

Voogt, J., Laferrière, T., Breuleux, A., Itow, R. C., Hickey, D. T. & McKenney, S. (2015). Collaborative design as a form of professional development. *Instructional Science*, 43(2), 259–282.

Wahlstrom, K. L., Seashore Louis, K., Leithwood, K. & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning. The Informed Educator Series. *Educational Research Service*. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning-Executive-Summary.pdf

Wallace Foundation. (2013). The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning. *Perspective*, January. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/effective-principal-leadership/Documents/The-School-Principal-as-Leader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and-Learning-2nd-Ed.pdf

Wellbeing Australia. (2012). Survey: *Factors affecting school wellbeing: First analysis*. Sydney: Wellbeing Australia Network. Retrieved from http://wellbeingaustralia.com.au/wba/survey_factors_affecting_school_wellbeing_first_analysis/

York, J., Giangreco, M. F., Vandercook, T. & Macdonald, C. (1992). Integrating support personnel in the inclusive classroom. In S. Stainback & W. Stainback (Eds.). *Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms: Facilitating learning for all students*. (pp.101–116). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Young, M. (2015). What is learning and why does it matter? *European Journal of Education*, 50(1), 17–20.

Mail address

Department of Education and Training
PO Box 15033
City East Qld 4002

Street address

30 Mary Street
Brisbane Qld 4000

General enquiries

13 QGOV (13 74 68)