

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1				NAPLAN CASES 1/1/13 - 12/3/15			
2	Received Date	School	Allegation	Summary of Incident	Closed Date	Findings	Outcome
3	9 May 2013	s.47(3)(b) - Co	It is alleged that subject officer failed to follow guidelines for the conduct of the NAPLAN testing	<p>Informant Advises: Our A/Head of Campus had a phone call with Principal of s.47(3)(b) - Contrary to Principal was wanting to find out if our school had a printed test book for a student. A/Head of Campus was advised that Principal s.47(3)(b) had opened the test package in the presence of an Administration Officer to see if a test book for the student was in there. A/Head of Campus was advised "that they didn't look at the test". My understanding was they were able to tell A/Head of Campus that they did have a printed test book for the student.</p> <p>***Information from the deregistered WebMatter Referrerd by the Region: Principal self-reported this incident to ARD. She advised that she opened a NAPLAN Year 5 packet and in doing so broke NAPLAN Protocol. She asked her Admin Officer to be present as a witness to her action to ensure that it was above board. She stated it was a genuine error on her part and no NAPLAN material was sighted.</p> <p>Breach of NAPLAN protocol; Substantiated; Principal's Record of her Actions: •On Friday April, 26th I attempted to contact QSA, via telephone, with a query regarding NAPLAN in relation to a student who is enrolled as a student at s.47(3)(b) - Contrary to Public Interest An email was then sent. •I sent a follow up email on Thursday May 2nd. •On Friday May 3rd I received a phone call from QSA advising me to check if the student would be sitting the test at s.47(3)(b) - Contrary to Public Interest as this would determine how to mark the booklets on the days of the tests. •I asked the Admin Officer to watch as I opened a Year 5 pack to confirm I had received a booklet for the student. On seeing that I had a booklet for that student (which I did not fully remove from the pack) I slid it back into the pack, placed the pack back in the box and relocked the filing cabinet. At no stage did either I or my Admin Officer view the contents of the booklet (or any other material) except for me to confirm the name. I don't even know which test it was for. •I rang s.47(3)(b) - Contrary to Public Interest but do not recall (or record) whom I spoke to. I asked if they had received material for the student and whether he would be sitting the test with them. They confirmed that the student would be sitting it as part of mini school. In the course of the conversation I mentioned that I had checked to see if I had a booklet for the student. •I then sent an email to QSA confirming that that the student would be sitting the test at s.47(3)(b) - Contrary to Public Interest In that email I also mentioned I had opened a pack to check for a booklet. At all times it was my intention in informing QSA to be open about what I had done; not realising the error in what I had done. It was a genuine mistake on my part. •Today (May 6th) QSA rang to inform me that I had broken NAPLAN Protocol (which the s.47(3)(b) - Contrary to Public Interest had also advised them) and that I needed to take action by advising my ARD and completing a statutory declaration to send to Assistant Director of Ethical standards to ensure transparency about my actions. •I immediately rang the ARD and advised of my actions. •Today I also received a follow up email from QSA which I forwarded on to the ARD. •The NAPLAN material remains in the box locked in the filing cabinet, to which I have the only key. No one has accessed it and I did not in fact reseal the pack as this would have meant re-accessing it.</p> <p>Managerial correction or intervention</p>	26 June 2013	Substantiated	Written Caution Issued
4	14 May 2013	s.73(1) - RTI - Not relevant to scope of application			23 May 2013	Unsubstantiated	Managerial Intervention
5	13 May 2013				23 May 2013	Unfounded	No Further Action
6	15 May 2013	s.47(3)(b) - Co	Subject Officer is alleged to have inappropriately administered the NAPLAN test	Students in year 4 and 6 sat the NAPLAN test alongside the Year 5 students due to them being in a composite class.	26 June 2013	Substantiated	No Further Action
7	23 May 2013		Subject Officer is alleged to have incorrectly administered the NAPLAN assessment.	As Deputy Principal, I was checking off each student's test paper from Years 3,5 and 7 against my class rolls, checking that booklets had been filled out correctly and collecting those booklets for students that had been absent. This was done from 1pm once all tests had been completed for the day. These test booklets were then placed in our strong room for packaging and posting off on Friday afternoon. I noticed that a student in Year 7 had erased his writing task and so I alerted the Principal. The year 7 students were walking up to our hall for their PE lesson. I called the student aside and asked why he had erased the test. He replied that he didn't think it was good enough. I then asked him if he would like to have 10 minutes to re-write the test (on consultation with my Principal). Student came to my office and said he was just going to write what he had erased. I gave him 10 minutes and he was supervised by myself and the Principal. I then put his tests with the other Year 7 papers. My Principal then advised me to contact QSA to explain what had happened and await clarification of correct protocols and procedures regarding this incident. On advice from staff member at QSA, I have placed his test in a sealed envelope marked "Attention Staff Member" and have sent this email explaining the incident.	9 July 2013	Substantiated	Written Caution Issued
8	23 May 2013		Subject Officer is alleged to have incorrectly administered the NAPLAN test	I wish to advise that today a contract first year teacher, has incorrectly administered the Writing test to Year 3 first this morning instead of the Language conventions test. Although I had administered the handbook, and she had read it a few times and NAPLAN information newsletters and we had a face to face meeting yesterday to ensure everyone was clear about procedures, she said in her panic (and inexperience as she has never administered a test before) when she opened the booklet she just saw writing and started. When the Deputy went to check all was ok he noticed the students doing the writing test. As the time was almost up they completed it and remained in the classroom during the lunch break so they had no contact with any other students. Once students resumed after the break we took them out to get a drink and go to the toilet before beginning the language conventions test. I phoned QSA who advised me to let you know.	5 August 2013	Substantiated	Written Caution Issued
9	23 May 2013	s.73(1) - RTI - Not relevant to scope of application			16 October 2013	Unsubstantiated	No Further Action

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
2	Received Date	School	Allegation	Summary of Incident	Closed Date	Findings	Outcome
10	24 May 2013	s.47(3)(b) - C	It is alleged that subject officer allowed at least one year six student to complete a 2013 year 7 NAPLAN test which he subsequently marked and sent to the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA).	Subject Officer is alleged to have allowed at least one year six student do the NAPLAN test which he marked and sent to the QSA.	28 August 2013	Substantiated	Written Caution Issued
11	10 December 2013	s.73(1) - RTI - Not relevant to scope of application					
12	25 March 2014				25 March 2014	Unfounded	No Further Action
13	15 May 2014				12 June 2014	Unsubstantiated	No Further Action
14	15 May 2014	s.47(3)(b) - Co	Subject officer is alleged to have failed to follow the guidelines for the conduct of the NAPLAN testing.	Year 6/7 teacher, was not responsible for supervising the year 7 students undertaking NAPLAN writing task - due to the numbers and class formations in year 6/7 at s.47(3). She was responsible for supervising year 6 students in her classroom during NAPLAN testing period. She collected the stimulus materials from the A/Deputies office at morning tea (10:00am) stating she was taking it to the year 7 teachers classrooms. She made 55 photocopies of the writing stimulus. She locked these in her filing cabinet and went to playground duty(11:00am). On return from duty (11:30am) she provided the other year 7 teachers with the original stimulus materials to conduct the test with the year 7 students who were in another classroom. She then provided another year 6 teacher with the photocopied materials who immediately informed me what they were and did not provide any to students. A/Principal then went straight to the teacher's room to confirm if she photocopied anything and collect any copied stimulus. The teacher had already handed these out to year 6 students who were asked to complete a writing task based on that stimulus. The teacher then informed the class there was a change of plans and collected all photocopies. A/Principal has confirmed that 55 copies were made and all copies are now in A/Principal's office and accounted for. The teacher was present at all 3/5/7 NAPLAN briefing sessions. She was provided with a copy of the 2014 NAPLAN handbook for principals (blue cover) in March, which clearly details correct protocols. The stimulus materials were accessed 40 minutes prior to the test being administered and no year 3, 5 or 7 student saw the stimulus material prior to the commencement of the test or the year 6 students in the teacher's class receiving them.	12 June 2014	Substantiated	Managerial Intervention
15	16 May 2014		It is alleged that subject officer allowed the NAPLAN tests to be given out the day before the tests.	The principal allowed the tests to be given out the day before the tests. A teacher was seen calling students out to go through the tests with them.	12 June 2014	Substantiated	No Further Action
16	15 May 2014		It is alleged that subject officer failed to follow the guidelines for the conduct of the NAPLAN testing.	S/O - A new Administration Officer Complainant- Staff member When he came to open the writing stimulus, the staff member found that the packages had been opened. The packages had been split open. Upon investigation, he found that a new A02 had been given the job of counting the test materials and had opened the writing stimulus to count them. All materials had been placed into the safe and not touched until the morning of the test, when he had opened them and was horrified to find the writing task packages open. Staff member is convinced that there was no compromising of the security around the writing stimulus.	18 July 2014	Substantiated	No Further Action
17	15 May 2014	s.73(1) - RTI - Not relevant to scope of application					
	15 May 2014				26 June 2014	Unsubstantiated	No Further Action

2	A Received Date	B School	C Allegation	D Summary of Incident	E Closed Date	F Findings	G Outcome
18	15 May 2014	s.47(3)(b) - Co	It is alleged that subject officer failed to follow the guidelines for the conduct of the NAPLAN testing by unpacking the tests slightly early.	<p>Firstly, on talking with the principal, I understand that I have breached the Naplan protocols by opening the packages this morning instead of after school today.</p> <p>We have five (5) senior classes of mixed year 6 and 7 students. All the 7s will be "housed" in two rooms for the testing starting tomorrow. We wanted to organise the students testing materials into those two (2) groups to ensure a smooth beginning to each testing period. This is being done in in our administration area.</p> <p>In trying to perform the above it has come to our attention that there is some issues regarding the booklets. The attachment show three (3) scanned documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front of a blank booklet filled out for a student whose booklets are missing. 2. The printed sheet showing this student as being on the list of booklets printed for her 3. The blank booklet form to document students names to blank booklet numbers. The numbers on the booklets does not directly equate to any of the numbers on the blank booklet page (scan 3). 	24 March 2015	Substantiated	Managerial Correction
19	16 May 2014	s.47(3)	A teacher at s.47(3) is alleged to have provided assistance to a student during the conduct of the NAPLAN testing.	The allegation is that a staff member asked students to change answers in her presence. She had attended the room because another teacher had suggested that this teacher had assisted students	7 October 2014	Substantiated	Written Caution Issued
20	16 May 2014	s.47(3)(b) - Contrary	It is alleged that subject officer have sent home withdrawal forms for parents to sign	The caller's child was upset about having to sit the NAPLAN tests so the parent took her to school where the teacher said that the child needed to sit the tests. The caller was very concerned because the child who lives across the road and who is a friend of her child did not have to sit the test. According to the caller, this was because the principal of s.47(3)(b) - Contrary sent home an exemption form for the parent to sign. The caller actually saw the letter and thought that it was not right for a school to do that. I asked her to put her concerns in an email and send it to QSA.	24 March 2015	Substantiated	Managerial Correction
21	26 May 2014	s.47(3)(b) - Contrary	It is alleged the subject officer allowed the use of the NAPLAN live test materials in a television presentation.	<p>A Channel 7 report featured a brief shot of the front of the 2014 Language Conventions testbooks.</p> <p>Principal advises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I was contacted by Media Branch to host a "good news story" about NAPLAN and have the reporters at our school to film and possibly interview myself and some children. -I accepted the invitation to have Channel 10 at the school and received written advice about what I should and should not say. -Media Branch contacted me again throughout the day and we ended up hosting Channels 7, 9, 10 and the Courier Mail. -The Minister's Office approved having the media at our school and approved the NAPLAN story. -I was asked to make it a good news story (which was easy because I genuinely believe in the value of NAPLAN) and I discussed with Media Branch some of the things I could say. -I set up Year 6 classrooms, mock-up test situations and some Year 6 students to interview. All the reporters filmed and interviewed Year 6. -All children had permission. Any without written consent we contacted parents by phone and noted verbal permission. Children without permission were removed from the area. -Channel 7 reporter was very assertive. He wanted to interview some Year 7 kids. -I was aware of the requirements in the Principal's NAPLAN Handbook so I contacted media branch again and was advised that it would be okay after the test, and definitely not when the students were undertaking the test. I was advised that the children could pretend to be doing the test so we set a mock-up situation with the writing task booklets closed on the desk, names on the front covers were hidden by the child's hand and we ensured that no other test material in sight (eg stimulus pictures). All of this once done with the approval of Media Branch. -The Channel 7 reporter also spoke to our media branch. -A class teacher did a "mock-up" reading of the first paragraph from the instructions book. -I take full responsibility that I didn't notice the child's name on the pencil. -Students without permission were not allowed in the room. -We mocked-up a scene of students exiting the room after the test. -One of the school captains was interviewed and spoke very positively about NAPLAN and that he wasn't stressed etc. -The students were advised by me to speak positively and not to mention anything about the content of the test questions/topics, etc. -I coached the children in what to say. -The children spoke extremely well. -The Channel 10 reporter actually asked me what all the hype was about regarding children getting stressed and I said I don't see it at our school (I told her I thought it was all media hype.) <p>I have asked DETE Media Branch to speak to you as I was in constant communication with him throughout the day. I was working very hard to ensure that everything we did followed the rules and maintained the good image of our school and Education Queensland.</p>	12 August 2014	Substantiated	Managerial Correction
22	26 May 2014	s.47(3)(b) - Contrary	It is alleged that subject officer failed to follow the guidelines for the conduct of the NAPLAN testing.	<p>Principal advises: After further discussion with the staff involved in facilitating the mock exam photo that was published in the GC Bulletin, despite there being no identifiable features, we believe that it was the 2014 Writing Stimulus.</p> <p>The photo was taken on Tuesday 13th May after the test session. It was a mock-up of test conditions and was not taken while the students were completing their actual task. All students involved in this photo had completed the Writing Task, which had been collected and secured along with all stimulus papers prior to the media attending. At the request of the journalist, a student was given a blank piece of paper and the stimulus, and was asked to pretend he was doing the test.</p> <p>The shot was purposefully constructed to focus on the student and keep the stimulus out of focus as an additional security measure. The body of the stimulus is covered by the students arm, and the angle of the shot ensures that it is impossible to identify any textual features: including words, headings, content, instructions, genre, images, pictures etc. Any discernible features of the text are clearly omitted in the photograph.</p> <p>I can assure you that the integrity of the test has not been compromised by this photo. We take the administration of the NAPLAN test very seriously at our school, and apologise for any inconvenience and or breach this may have caused.</p>	24 March 2015	Substantiated	Managerial Correction

Released under the RTI Act 2009

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
2	Received Date	School	Allegation	Summary of Incident	Closed Date	Findings	Outcome
23	26 May 2014	s.47(3)(b) - Co	subject officer is alleged to have failed to follow the guidelines for the conduct of the NAPLAN testing by reading out to students text from the magazine while administering the Reading Test.	<p>On Tuesday I followed the script boxes for Language Conventions. I read aloud all highlighted boxes and proceeded to start on the practice questions with students until all were completed and the students understood what was required from them during the test. As we began the test I told the students if they required extra time I was able to let them have additional time and that I would only be able to read instructions if they needed help. The students did not require additional time as most were finished before the allowed time had finished. When they had finished they sat quietly and drew pictures on a blank piece of paper while they waited for their peers to finish. After play and eating time we continued with the Writing test where I explain that they would need to listen as I read through the stimulus and we proceeded according to instructions in handbook. I read out aloud all words within the stimulus page clearly. I explained to the students they would be given 10 mins to plan their writing on their blank sheet of paper, that this is where they could write down words, ideas and anything else that they thought might help them plan and organise what they will be writing about. I let them know when their planning time had finished and that they would now need to start their writing. They were then asked to open their test paper and begin writing, pointing out that I would let them know when we were getting close to our finishing time, I reminded them if they finished early they could then use their time remaining to go back and edit their writing for spelling and punctuation mistakes. I had given them an extra 5 minutes of planning time to help them get as many ideas as they could think of for their writing test according to the adjustments approved for their disability (most used visual drawings and words to help them follow their ideas). Three students were also given an extra 10 minutes at the end of the test as they had not finished writing when the timer indicated time was completed. One student had started the writing test but 20 minutes into it he refused to do anymore because he said it was too hard, I encouraged him to look back at the stimulus and also look at his planning to see if this would help him, he refuse and so was asked to close his paper and sit quietly until the other students had finished. I rewarded all students on their participation through spot prizes and an encouragement certificate at the end of testing to show both the students and their parents how well they were doing in attempting their tests. When the students had finished I walked all tests, stimulus and planning sheets over to their teachers for marking of on their administration rolls.</p> <p>On Wednesday I followed the guidelines in the handbook and administered the practise test questions to my year 5 students. I read aloud the stimulus and practice questions while I followed the outline in the administration handbook for teachers. After we had finished the practice questions I read out guidelines for the test. I let them know they would need to read each piece of reading stimulus and then they would need to answers the questions as we had done in the language test on Tuesday. The students began the test by looking at the first stimulus and this is where I read the highlighted box in the handbook but then went onto to read question 1 (I think I still had the practice page open because I remember seeing the read aloud before I read out the first question). Staff member walked into the room to see me at this point and asked me a question about if I had read the question to the student's and I replied yes but not the answers out aloud. I then informed the student's I had made a mistake and that I could not read anymore to them and they needed to continue with their test in silence. Staff member stayed on to remain in the room for a period after this incident occurred and the test was administered in the correct sequence of requirements. Towards the end of the test as I saw students finishing I reminded them if they finished early they would need to go back over their tests to see if they wanted to make any changes and when they felt they had done everything they could they would need to close their test and they could draw quietly on a piece of paper with their pencil provided until everyone had finished. When the students had finished I walked all tests, reading stimulus over to their teachers for marking of on their administration rolls.</p>	30 June 2014	Substantiated	Managerial Correction
24	29 May 2014	s.47(3)(b) - Co	It is alleged that the subject officer failed to follow the guidelines for the conduct of the NAPLAN testing by doing an assessment of the NAPLAN test results.	<p>Teacher s.47(3)(b) - Co advises:</p> <p>On Tuesday 13th May, acting deputy principal instructed me to call four parents to inform them that their children had not put pencil to paper during the NAPLAN writing test. In good faith, I followed this very clear instruction, however I hold a genuine belief now that this may have transgressed the national protocols for test administration.</p> <p>As a result of making the telephone calls, one of the parents had said she may keep her child home from school the next day so he didn't have to do any more of the tests.</p> <p>Under the protocols, 8.9.4 states that Under no circumstances should test administrators mark any test books or provide results to teachers, parents and/or students.</p> <p>On Friday 16th May, I was taken off my class (another teacher relieved me) and I had to go to the office for a meeting with the principal and the acting deputy principal.</p> <p>The principal had a list of my students in front of him with certain children highlighted. He stated to me that they had looked over the NAPLAN writing task, and how individual children had performed. He stated that they could see already that a lot of children in my class would come out at a band 2 and that they also noted quite a few had written a narrative. He also stated to me that it was very concerning that I had the only four children in the school that didn't write anything. He also stated that I have had these children for 14 weeks now, and he wanted me to go away and think about what I was going to do to move these children forward for the rest of the year, and in readiness for NAPLAN in year 5.</p> <p>I had to make an appointment with the Literacy Coach to discuss these matters.</p> <p>I asked him if I was the only one that he was having these conversations with and he said no, he would be speaking to everyone in years 3, 5 and 7 and I just happened to be first in line. He said they didn't want to wait until the results came out in October.</p> <p>I have drawn the potential breach of protocol to the principal's attention in writing. This is a good faith reporting of what I believe to be a breach.</p>	8 July 2014	Substantiated	Managerial Correction
25	16 October 2014	s.73(1) - RTI - Not relevant to scope of application			4 December 2014	Unsubstantiated	No Further Action
26	24 November 2014	s.73(1) - RTI - Not relevant to scope of application			24 March 2015	Unsubstantiated	No Further Action

Released under the RTI Act by DET