



Ouruhia School Annual Report Term 1 2020

How did we go with our Student Achievement focuses in 2019?

Student Achievement Report and Analysis of Variance 2019

Annual Target: 2019/1

To increase the number of students achieving at or above the expected curriculum level for

Writing:

Student Groups: Yrs 2 - 8			
Gender	All	Boys: (6)	Girls: (7)
Ethnicity	All	Maori: (5)	Other:

Targets:

Target children (achieving below the expected curriculum level in 2018 or “at risk”) in Years 2 - 8 will make more than one year’s progress (accelerated progress) in relation to the relevant Writing Curriculum level.

Why this target?

Writing achievement has been lower than we want and has become a focus both at Ouruhia School and in our Kāhui Ako Kātote. At the end of 2018 over ¾ of our children were judged to be achieving at or above the expected curriculum level for Writing, but we have concerns about fluctuating scores and “fragile” motivation and engagement with some pupils. 47% of our Maori students, 60% of our boys and 90% of our girls achieved at expected levels. We identified **6 boys and 7 girls** causing concern from last year’s data (not all of the low achieving children, but those we chose to be part of the trial intervention groups... Total 13 children)

What did we do?

- Lead teacher worked with Ministry-funded facilitator in ALL (Accelerated Learning in Literacy)
- Reviewed assessment data with staff and determine particular learning needs of target students...Spelling? Ideas & language?
- Surveyed Student voice...what our children think/like/dislike about writing...to understand student attitude & engagement
- Planned teaching approach & reviewed resources for target children.
- Moderated Writing samples at L 2, 3 & 4 to ensure school-wide consistency
- Shared classroom practice at Admin meetings each week during Terms 2 & 3.
- Periodic monitoring of Target students through teaching observations and one-on-one discussions with teachers
- Analysed year-end data to inform progress and planning for following year

How did we resource it?

Release for our Literacy Leader for 5 days cost \$1500 from our PD Budget. The Literacy facilitator from ALL was funded from Ministry of Education PLD. The Principal released teachers when necessary to allow teaching observations and/or discussions about target children. Staff meetings for moderation of writing samples and sharing of classroom practice were held in-school, so there was no extra cost.

What did we achieve?

There were 13 children below and well-below the expected curriculum levels chosen for the Target group, with three teachers trialling a support programme in Writing. Two of these children achieved the expected levels by the end of the year, and another three made more than a year’s progress. So a total of 5 of the 13 children made significant progress during the year. The other 8 children all made some measurable progress but not the accelerated gains we had hoped for.

(Target achieved for 5 of the 13 children, with the other 8 making some progress)

Analysis:

5 of the 13 target children made significant progress during the year, of whom 2 achieved the *expected curriculum level*. This comprised of 2 boys and 3 girls, and included 1 of the 5 Maori children in the group. Of the 11 children still "Below" the *expected curriculum level* at the end of the year, eight had made some progress (1 sub-level), one had made good progress of a year or more (2 sub-levels), and two had shown excellent progress of 2 yrs + (3 sub-levels)

What do we believe made the difference?

Having a focus group of just a small number of students in each class allowed the teacher to better tailor teaching to individual needs.

Teachers sharing their successes and challenges weekly at Admin time created good collegial support, kept Writing uppermost in teachers' minds and inspired changes of practice for the teachers.

Teachers provided more variety in their programmes, which helped with enjoyment of writing. Moderation of writing samples across the school helped improve understanding of the different writing levels and what was needed to improve. This helped improve consistency and validity of assessment.

An improved tracking sheet for writing (beginning, interim and end of year) helped teachers be aware of which students were progressing and which ones were not moving.

PD focus on the LLPs (Literacy Learning Progressions) and PaCT helped clarify teacher judgments about writing levels, contributing to more valid assessments.

Where to next?

Next steps:

- Trialling approaches and strategies that appeal to boys.
- Use of Teaching As Inquiry framework for teachers to decide and record what changes they are going to make to their own practice to improve outcomes for their students. eg 'How to work with a small focus group during writing time.'
- Regular progress of target student sessions at admin meetings.
- Peer observation of teachers.
- Moderating writing samples across the school and possibly between schools
- Kātote (Kahui Ako) writing focus with Across School Teacher and Within School Teacher support

Annual Target: 2019/2

To increase the number of students achieving at or above the expected curriculum level for

Maths:

Targets:

Target children (achieving below the expected curriculum level in 2018 or “at risk”) in Years 2 - 8 will make more than one year’s progress (accelerated progress) in relation to the relevant Maths Curriculum level. Pay special attention to progress of Maori students.

Student Groups: Yrs 2-8

Gender	All	Boys: (11)	Girls: (11)
Ethnicity	All	Maori: (5)	Other:

Why this target?

Traditionally Maths achievement has been lower than Reading at Ouruhia. Some gains had been made while our school focused on Maths with ALiM (Accelerated Learning in Maths) in 2015 and 2016, but these gains were not maintained in 2018 (some of which may have been due to turnover of students). At the end of 2018 about ¾ of our children were judged to be achieving at or above the expected curriculum level for Maths, but we have concerns about fluctuating scores and “fragile” motivation and engagement with some pupils. 42% of our Maori students, 63% of our boys and 78% of our girls achieved at expected levels. We identified 11 boys and 11 girls causing concern from last year’s data (Total 22 children in Target group.)

What did we do?

- Reviewed assessment data with staff and determined particular learning needs of target students. Tested GLOSS/JAM and PAT
- Planned teaching approach (focused teaching as inquiry), groupings, & review resources for target children. Decided whether to use an ALiM-like focus for a target group, as we did in 2015 and 2016, or explore and use problem-solving approach with focus on student-talk to enhance engagement and thinking (TAI – how does problem solving and encouraging “student speak” affect student engagement and learning?)
- Use Maths resource folder to monitor students provide consistency of record keeping/teaching across school
- Periodic monitoring of Target students through one-on-one discussions with teachers
- Three teachers attended workshops with former Maths adviser
- Explored and used rich tasks and multi-ability groupings with focus on student-talk to enhance engagement and thinking
- Regular testing and goal-setting for basic facts.
- Re-tested GLOSS/JAM and PAT at end of year to gauge progress
- Analysed year-end data to inform progress and planning for following year

How did we resource it?

In previous years, extra staffing was provided by the Ministry of Education (ALiM) contract. In 2019 we didn’t have access to this resource and tried to use collaborative staffing arrangements across classes (and using the teaching principal) to provide extra targeted assistance. Teacher workshops off-site had a minimal cost of \$400.

What did we achieve?

There were 22 children “at risk”, below and well-below the *expected curriculum level* at the start of the year. Four achieved the expected curriculum level by the end of the year, and another three made more than a year’s progress (two sub-levels in asTTle). So a total of 7 of the 22 children made significant progress during the year. Nine of the other children made some measurable progress, but we did not make the accelerated gains we had hoped for.

(Target achieved for 7 of the 22 children, with another 9 making some progress)

Analysis:

Only a third of the target children showed significant progress during the year...for the others, they effectively fell further behind. Nine of the other children made some progress, but they needed to make *accelerated* progress (more than a normal year’s progress in a year) to “catch up”.

The 7 children who made significant progress comprised of 3 girls and 4 boys. Two of the Maori children in the target group made accelerated progress.

The main focus at Ouruhia during the year was Written Language, due largely to the Ministry funded PLD provided, so limited attention was given to Maths in 2019.

As in previous years, we found it very difficult to provide extra targeted assistance to our at-risk learners in Maths, as we had done in previous years when ALiM resourcing was provided. The Principal was able to work with some of these children (mainly in Terms 2&3), but it was not as regular as previous years when we were funded for it. When the Principal had other commitments, the target Maths groups didn't happen. As a result, the accelerated progress was not as great as hoped for, albeit that the improvement for boys and Māori was better in 2019 than in 2018. To make accelerated progress, there needs to be some **extra** targeted assistance i.e. **in addition to** what the teacher can do in the normal class programme. Research has shown that these children improve when participating in their normal class Maths time **as well as** getting an extra targeted boost at another time during the day...this is very hard for teachers to manage. Which other curriculum area or activity is sacrificed?

What do we believe made the difference?

Teachers made some gains by using Teaching as Inquiry with a Maths and mixed-ability grouping focus. Some teachers worked collegially with their groups. Teachers are motivated to improve their Maths programmes, and are using good planning and assessment tools. An improved tracking sheet for Maths (beginning, interim and end of year) helped teachers be aware of which students were progressing and which ones were not moving.

Where to next?

Next steps:

- Regular monitoring of specific, small, achievable Maths steps (using our updated **teaching resource folder**) to help fine-tune the individualised teaching needed for “at risk” children.
- Continued exploration by teachers of using a problem-solving approach which focuses heavily on “**student speak**”... i.e. children having to plan and **explain and justify their thinking**...
- Provide extra **accelerated Maths support** for targeted individuals on top of, not instead of, normal class programmes. (Where possible, within the constraints of our staffing and budget.)