Analysis of Variance Reporting

School Name:	Mount Maunganui Intermediate	School Number:	1837

Annual Aim:	To increase the number of students achieving at or above National Standards in Writing.
Target:	To make a minimum of one years progress in writing to increase the number of students who are working at the National Standard.
Baseline Data:	Our baseline data, at the end of 2016, indicated that 63.3% of students were achieving National Standard expectations. This was lower than national averages. Of particular concern, was the achievement of boys who achieved at much lower rates than our girls. 79% of girls were achieving NS expectations in Writing at the end of 2016, compared with 49% of boys.

Actions *What did we do?*	Outcomes *What happened?*	Reasons for the variance *Why did it happen?*	Evaluation *Where to next?*
1.Implementation of the PACT assessment tool in writing	1. All teachers engaged positively in PLD from outside provider regarding the implementation of the PACT tool in writing. This involved in-depth revisiting of the Literacy Learning Progressions, the NZC and using evidence of students learning to make OTJ's. Teachers used the PACT tool formatively to plan for gaps in the student's learning, within their writing programmes. It was used at the end of the year to assist staff to make NS overall teacher judgements. The PLD contributed towards an improved understanding of the progressions which was reflected in the planning and programmes in all classrooms.	Our National Standard data at the end of the school year (2017) showed significant shift in our data. 80.9% and 62.6% of girls and boys respectively, met or exceeded NS expectations in writing at the end of the school year. The school wide average was 71%, which was our best result since NS were introduced and exceed 2016 national average for year 7 and 8 . Our use of the PACT tool contributed to this shift. Although we did not use the tool to generate judgements officially in the 2017 school year, the work undertaken by staff was very valuable in terms of developing understanding of the literacy learning progressions.	Based on the positive outcomes for our data, our strategic aims for next year are as follows: To use PaCT to make overall teacher judgments mid year and end of year. To further streamline our use of data to track progress, identify pockets of excellent teaching practice share the expertise across the school. To strengthen teacher inquiry processes to focus more deeply on the progress of target students To align teaching inquiry to appraisal goals and to collect evidence of what works for our target students.
2. Accelerated Learning in Literacy	2. ALL continued as a programme across the school. PLD was held for new staff, by the literacy leader. Target groups were		To monitor the progress of target students at all "levels" of the

	identified and monitored during the ALL intervention. Teacher inquiry involved using PaCT to identify the next learning steps of target students.	This lead to more data driven, intentional teaching that met the needs of target students.	school- class teachers, Leadership team and BOT.
3. Responsive Writing - Culturally Responsive Writing - School and Community Intervention	3. Writing responders were sought within the community for all students for one term.	Formative use of the tool allowed staff to plan for a wider set of writing skills, which lead to the success of the students. In order to measure shift with accuracy, we made OTJs in the same way (ie not officially using PACT) so we could reliably compare beginning and end point data.	To continue to develop our understanding of the PACT tool and how it can inform our teaching and track the progress of all students. To learn more about culturally responsive and relational pedagogy in order to address the disparity that exists between the achievement of Maori and Non Maori students.
4. Teacher-led inquiry on target students	4. Staff undertook individual inquiries based on the achievement of their target students. In teams (3-4 teachers) inquiries were discussed regularly (at least fortnightly). Strategies that were working for target students were identified and shared amongst the staff in teams. Data was collected regularly and recorded on class tracking sheets.	The ALL programme, involving "double dipping" lessons for target students also contributed to our success. Student voice collected told us that students enjoyed and were motivated by the Responsive writing programme. This was because the purpose for writing was authentic and meaningful.	In order to address the above, we need to access the PLD Course: Poutama Pounamu. This PLD is a cascading model that will give all staff access to the CRRP strategies that make a positive difference to Maori. We are currently awaiting a response to our PLD Journal application.
5. Analysis of target student shifts in writing	5. Achievement data was analysed formatively and summatively. E asTTle data was	In 2017, we undertook a new way of tracking our data at school wide level. We "cleaned" the data, to	

6. School literacy leaders providing PLD on writing programmes

analysed to measure point shifts in both reading and writing. PACT aspects were used in between judgements to check shift against particular aspects. This data was recorded on data tracking sheets. SLT looked at trends across the school to identify pockets of successful practice.

6. Staff engaged in several staff PLD sessions, run by SLT and the literacy leader, on writing as a curriculum area. This covered formative assessment practices in writing, the sharing of quality exemplars in writing and the moderation of AsTTle scripts.

track only those students who were enrolled for the whole year. At the mid and end point data collections, we identified which students had moved from 'well below' to 'below', and from 'below' to 'at'. This was significant, accelerated progress.

OTJ Data tracking statements (for 2017 year 8 cohort, mid year OTJ prediction 2016 to mid year OTJ prediction 2017):

Overall, **39% of students who were WB at the Year 7 mid year OTJ prediction, moved to Below (and some to At) by the mid year 8 OTJ prediction.**
Of Note:
66% of Maori girls made accelerated progress
50% of Maori boys made accelerated progress
Both groups out performed their NZ European counterparts.

Overall, **46% of students who were Below at the Year 7 mid year OTJ**

Measuring the shift of individual students (names and numbers) gives us a more accurate picture of the progress we are making, by comparison to EOY NS averages. Because we are an Intermediate, we only have the students in our school for two years, so comparing percentages from one year to the next is comparing completely different groups of students. Because our entry data varies from year to year, this is not an entirely valid way of showing shift.

We need to consolidate processes for tracking to make it manageable for teachers.

prediction, moved to At (and a significant number to Above) by the mid year 8 OTJ prediction.

Of Note:

60% of Maori girls made accelerated progress

Both groups out performed their NZ European counterparts.

16% of NZ European students moved from Below to ABOVE.

This is very significant acceleration in one year at school.

AsTTle writing data statements by ethnicity. The following data shows the percentages of year 8 students who made two sub-levels or more shift in one calendar year:

European: 80% of boys and 77% of girls

Maori: 78% of boys and 76% of girls

Pacifica: 67% of boys and girls

Asian: 100% of boys and 67% of boys

		Other ethnicities: 50% of boys and 100% of girls.	

Planning for next year:

Charter Goals (2017):

Strategic Goal: To raise achievement for all students and to **accelerate the achievement of all students who are at risk of not achieving.**

Annual Goal: To decrease the disparity that exists between the achievement of Non-Maori and Maori students.

Annual Target: 50% of Maori target students to make accelerated shift (two curriculum sub-levels or more), in Mathematics. (ERO indicated in term 4 last year, that accelerating the progress of 25% of the target group, would be considered significant).