**Waikanae School (3056)**

**Achievement Targets and Analysis of Variance 2015.**

**

**ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR READING WRITING AND MATHEMATICS**

# READING

# Notes

# A variety of assessment tools have been selected for each target so has to more accurately gauge progress

1. The Maori Cohort contains all students enrolled as Maori at 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments.
2. The Pacific Island Cohort contains all students enrolled as Pacific Islanders at 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments.
3. The Year Group Cohorts are all the students in each year group that were judged as being Well Below or Below the National Standard in Reading on 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments.
4. Students who belong to these cohorts and who leave during the year are still included in the baseline data but not in the performance data.

# Cohort Targets

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Maori** Containing 52 Students | **Assessment Tool and Description of Target** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Running Record**: The ‘Readability’ median baseline plus 12 months progress. | 8.25 Years March 2015 | 9.75 Years March 2016 | Met |
| 2 | **STAR:** Progress that is at or above the average progress of the majority ethnic cohort (NZ European/Pakeha) as measured by scale score. |  Maori 92.2 Feb 2015 | Maori106.0 Feb 2016.  | Met |
| NZ Euro/Pakeha9.0 Feb 2015 | NZ Euro/Pakeha Feb 110.0 2016 |
| 3 | **PAT Reading Vocabulary:** Progress that is at or above the average progress of the majority ethnic cohort (NZ European/Pakeha) as measured by patv. |  Maori46.8 Feb 2015 | Maori51.7 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| NZ Euro/Pakeha48.7 Feb 2015 | NZ Euro/Pakeha54.7 Feb 2016 |
| 4 | **PAT Reading Comprehension:** Progress that is at or above the average progress of the majority ethnic cohort (NZ European/Pakeha) as measured by patc. |  Maori40.2 Feb 2015 | Maori46.7 Feb 2016 |  Not Met |
| NZ Euro/Pakeha45.3 Feb 2015 | NZ Euro/Pakeha Feb 52.3 2016 |
| 5 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % of students above whole school average December for 2014 i.e.87%  | 84% Dec 2014 | 90% Dec 2015 |  Met |
| * ***Running Records:*** **Target Met**  The Maori Target Group exceeded the 2015 Charter Target with an average of 18 months progress being made in the 12 month period
* ***STAR:*****Target Met.** 2 of the 32 students who did both assessments made 18 months accelerated progress while 15 of 32 students made 12 or more month’s progress.
* ***PAT Reading Vocabulary:*****Target Met** 10 of the 26 students who did both assessments made 18 months accelerated progress while 4 of 26 students made 12 or more month’s progress. 5 of the 26 students regressed.
* ***PAT Reading Comprehension:*****Target Not Met.** Although the target was not met 3 of the 25 students who did both assessments made 18 months accelerated progress while 9 of 25 students made 12 or more month’s progress.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.**  47 students of the 52 students were classified as being At or Above.53 students were classified as being Below Standard. The whole Maori cohort is high achieving. There is no disparity of note between Maori and the majority ethnicity
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pacific Peoples** Containing 11 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Running Record**: The ‘Readability’ median baseline plus 12 months progress (1) | 9.0 Years March 2015 | 9.25 Years March 2016 | Not Met |
| 2 | **STAR:** Progress that is at or above the average progress of the majority ethnic cohort (NZ European/Pakeha) as measured by scale score. |  Pacific Peoples102.0 Feb 2015 |  Pacific Peoples Feb 108.0 2016.  | Not Met |
| NZ Euro/Pakeha99.0 Feb 2015 | NZ Euro/Pakeha Feb 110.0 2016 |
| 3 | **PAT Reading Vocabulary:** Progress that is at or above the average progress of the majority ethnic cohort (NZ European/Pakeha) as measured by patv. |  Pacific Peoples40.7 Feb 2015 |  Pacific Peoples Feb 50.9 2016 |  Met |
| NZ Euro/Pakeha48.7 Feb 2015 | NZ Euro/Pakeha54.7 Feb 2016 |
| 4 | **PAT Reading Comprehension:** Progress that is at or above the average progress of the majority ethnic cohort (NZ European/Pakeha) as measured by patc. |  Pacific Peoples40.7 Feb 2015 |  Pacific Peoples Feb 50.0 2016 |  Met |
| NZ Euro/Pakeha45.3 Feb 2015 | NZ Euro/Pakeha Feb 52.3 2016 |
| 5 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % of students above whole school average for December 2014 i.e. 87%  | 60% Dec 2014 | 45% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***Running Records:*****Target Not Met** The Pacific Peoples Target Group did not meet the 2015 Charter Target. However students made an average of 3 months progress in the 12 month period.
* ***STAR:*****Target Not Met.** Although the target was not met 3 of 6 students who did both assessments made 12 or more month’s progress or more.
* ***PAT Reading Vocabulary:*****Target Not Met** Although the target was not met 3 of 6 students who did both assessments made 18 or more month’s progress, 2 made some progress and 1 student made no progress.
* ***PAT Reading Comprehension:*****Target Met.** 1 of the 6 students who did both assessments made 18 months accelerated progress while 3 of 6 students made 12 or more month’s progress**.**
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** There was a drop from the base line of **15%.**45%of all Pacific Peoples reached the target. 5 students were classified as being At or Above. 4 students were classified as being Below Standard and 2 students were classified as being Well Below. There is a major disparity between Pacific Peoples and other ethnicities. It is worth noting that several of the students in this cohort at ELLs and are recent immigrants to NZ for a third world education system.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 2**Containing 5 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Running Record:** The ‘Readability’ Average baseline plus 18 months progress (1.5) | 6.0 Years March 2015 | 7.75 Years March 2016 | Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 1005 Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***Running Records:*****Target Met**  All five students moved from below to either At or Above
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 100% of the students reached the Target. 3l students in this cohort have moved from Below Standard to At and 2 students have moved to Above the Standard
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 3**Containing 3 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Running Record:** The ‘Readability’ Average baseline plus 18 months progress (1.5) | 6.75 Years March 2015 | 7.5 Years March 2016 | Not Met |
| 2 | **STAR** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (41.4 Points) | 36.3 Feb 2015 | 55.8 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 33% Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***Running Records:*****Target Not Met**  None of the 3 students moved to either At or Above
* ***STAR:*****Target Not Met**
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 33% of the students reached the Target. 1 of the three student moved from Below to At
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 4**Containing 3 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Running Record**: The ‘Readability’ Average baseline plus 18 months progress (1.5) | 6.5 Years March 2015 | 7.25Years March 2016 | Not Met |
| 2 | **STAR:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (24.3 Points) | 54.4 Feb 2015 | 97.4 Feb 2016 | Met |
| 3 | **PAT Reading Vocab:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (12.75 patv) | 18.9 Feb 2015 | 21.6 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 4 | **PAT Reading Com:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (10.5 patc) | 19.25 Feb 2015 | 13.8 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 5 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 33% Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***Running Records:*****Target Not Met**  One of the 3 students moved to At.
* ***STAR:*****Target Met** 2 of the 3 students in this cohort did not sit the 2016 assessment with one student making excellent progress
* ***PAT Reading Vocabulary:*****Target Not Met** 2 of the 3 students in this cohort did not sit the 2015 assessment while 3out of 3 sat the 2016 assessment. One student made 12 months progress.
* ***PAT Reading Comprehension:*****Target Not Met.** Only 1 of the 3 student’s start both assessments and this student went backwards.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 33% of the students reached the Target. 1 student has moved from Below Standard to At the Standard. 2 students remain Well Below
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 5**Containing 3 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Running Record**: The ‘Readability’ Average baseline plus 18 months progress (1.5) | 7.5Years March 2015 | 8.5 Years March 2016 | Not Met |
| 2 | **STAR:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (17.11 Points) | 72.1 Feb 2015 | 85.8 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 3 | **PAT Reading Vocab:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (11.7 patv) | 15.3 Feb 2015 | 22.8 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 4 | **PAT Reading Com:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (13.8 patc) | 12.1 Feb 2015 | 17.3 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 5 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 0%Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***Running Records:*****Target Not Met**  None of the 3 students moved to either At or Above
* ***STAR:*****Target Not Met** 3 of 3 students sat both assessments. Although the 18 month accelerated progress target was not met 1of the 3 students made in excess of 18 months progress while 1 other student made 12 months progress.
* ***PAT Reading Vocabulary:*****Target Not Met** 3 of 3 students sat both assessments with 2 students making in excess of 18 months progress. 1 of 3 students went backwards dramatically thus ensuring the target was not met
* ***PAT Reading Comprehension:* Target Not Met.** Interestingly all 3 students completed both assessments with 1 student making the targeted 18 months progress, another made 12 months progress while 1 student regressed.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** None of the students reached the Target. 1 student remains Below the Standard and 2 remain Well Below the Standard
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 6**Containing 2 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Running Record**: The ‘Readability’ Average baseline plus 18 months progress (1.5) | 8.755 Years March 2015 | 8.75 Years March 2016 | Not Met |
| 2 | **STAR:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress ( 13.35 Points) | 100.7 Feb 2015 | 97.95 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 3 | **PAT Reading Vocab:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (9.45 patv) | 32.6 Feb 2015 | 29.9 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 4 | **PAT Reading Com:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (12.3 patc) | 32.4 Feb 2015 | 44.4 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 5 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 0% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***Running Records:*****Target Not Met**  None of the 2 students moved to either At or Above
* ***STAR:*****Target Not Met.** 1 of the 2 students in this cohort did not sit the 2016 assessment. The other one student made excellent progress in excess of the 18 month accelerated target
* ***PAT Reading Vocabulary:*****Target Not Met** 1 of the 2 students in this cohort did not sit the 2015 assessment. The other one student made 9 month progress in 12 months.
* ***PAT Reading Comprehension:*****Target Not Met** 1 of the 2 students in this cohort did not sit the 2015 assessment. The other one student made pleasing progress of 12 months.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** None of the students reached the Target. Both students remain Well Below Standard
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 7**Containing 9 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Running Record**: The ‘Readability’ Average baseline plus 18 months progress (1.5) | 10.5 Years March 2015 | 11.25 Years March 2016 | Not Met |
| 2 | **STAR**: Average baseline plus 18 months progress (10.15 Points) | 106.1 Feb 2015 | 108.4 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 3 | **PAT Reading Vocab:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (7.65 patv) | 44.6 Feb 2015 | 46.5 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 4 | **PAT Reading Com:** Average baseline plus 18 months progress (10.8 patc) | 41.2 Feb 2015 | 48. 6 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| 5 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 22% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***Running Records:*****Target Not Met**  One of the 6 students assessed moved to At.
* ***STAR:*****Target Not Met.** 8 of 9 students sat both assessments. Although the 18 month accelerated progress target was not met 3 of the 8 students made in excess of 18 months progress while a further 3 students made 12 months progress.
* ***PAT Reading Vocabulary:*****Target Not Met.** 8 of 9 students sat both assessments. Although the 18 month accelerated progress target was not met 3 of the 8 students made in excess of 18 months progress while another student made 12 months progress. One student regressed by a massive margin.
* ***PAT Reading Comprehension:*****Target Not Met** 8 of 9 students sat both assessments. Although the 18 month accelerated progress target was not met 2 of the 8 students made in excess of 18 months progress while a further 2 students made 12 months progress.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 22% of the students reached the Target. 2 students have moved from Below Standard to At the Standard. 7 students remain Below the Standard
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 8**Containing 9 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 22% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 22% of the students reached the Target. 2 students have moved from Below Standard to At the Standard % remained at Below Standard and 2 at Well Below Standard.
 |

# Executive Summary

# Reading Achievement

**Running Record:**

* The Maori Target Group exceeded the 2015 Charter Target with an average of 18 months progress being made in the 12 month period
* The Pacific Peoples Target Group did not meet the 2015 Charter Target. However students made an average of 3 months progress in the 12 month period
* The Year Group Target Groups all made progress with the five students in the Year 2 Target Group making in excess of 21 months progress in the 12 month period. All cohorts made some progress except Year 6. (Containing 2 students).7 of the 24 students moved from Below to either At or Above

**PATs and STAR;**

* The Maori Cohort is progressing and achieving at or about the rates and levels of the majority cohort of NZ European/Pakeha.
* The Pacific Peoples Cohort is making some good progress but is still well behind other ethnic cohorts in levels of achievement.
* Many individual students in the Year Group cohorts have made accelerated progress. This being 18 months progress in a 12 month period. This is really good news! See individual targets for a breakdown of these numbers

**OTJ Targets:** There has been a pleasing shift in performance for this cohort with **11 students (32%)** moving from Below the National Standard to At the National Standard. At 1 December 2014 all 34 of these students were rated as being either Below or Well Below the National Standard.

**WRITING TARGETS**

# Notes

1. The Maori Cohort contains all students enrolled as Maori at 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments.
2. The Pacific Island Cohort contains all students enrolled as Pacific Islanders at 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments.
3. The Year Group Cohorts are all the students in each year group that were judged as being Well Below or Below the National Standard in Writing on 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments
4. Students who belong to these cohorts and who leave during the year are still included in the baseline data but not in the performance data.

# Cohort Targets

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Maori** Containing 52 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **e-asTTle:** Average e-asTTle score plus 8 months progress (32 aWs) | 1445 aWs April 2015 | 1542 aWs Oct 2015 | Met |
| 2 | **Writing Exemplars :**Median Curric level plus 8 months progress (1 sublevels) | 2B April 2015 | 2A Oct 2015 | Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above Whole School Average 79% Dec 2014  | 72 % Dec 2014 | 79% Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***E-asTTle Writing:*****Target Met**. 24 of the 29 students reached the target and progressed by 32 e-asTTle points or more
* ***Writing Exemplars:*****Target Met**. 33 of the 52 students reached the target made the desired progress of 1 sub level. 16 students made 2 or more sub levels of progress.15 students made no measureable progress. 2 students regressed.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 79% of all Maori Students reached the target. 41 students were classified as being At or Above. 11students were classified as being Below Standard and 1 Student was classified as being Well Below
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pacific Peoples** Containing 11 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **e-asTTle:** Average e-asTTle score plus 8 months progress (32 aWs) | 1389 aWs April 2015 | 1468 aWs Oct 2015 | Met |
| 2 | **Writing Exemplars :**Median Curric level plus 8 months progress (1 sublevels) | 2P April 2015 |  2A Oct 2015 | Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above Whole School Average79% Dec 2014  | 52 % Dec 2014 | 36% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***E-asTTle Writing:*****Target Met**. 7 of the 9 students reached the target and progressed by 32 e-asTTle points or more.
* ***Writing Exemplars:*****Target Met**. 6 of the11students reached the target made the desired progress of 1 sub level. 1 student regressed.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 36%of all Pacific Peoples Students reached the target. 4 students were classified as being At or Above. 7 students were classified as being Below Standard and 1 student was classified as being Well Below.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 2** Containing 5 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Writing Exemplars :**Median Curric level plus 8 months progress (1 sublevels) | 1P April 2015 | 1P Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | OTJs: End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 60 % Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***Writing Exemplars:*****Target Not Met**. 2 of the 5 students reached the target made the desired progress of 1 sub level. This being from 1b to 1p or 1p to 1a. 3 students made no progress
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 60% of the students reached the Target. 3 students have moved from Below Standard to At the Standard
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 3**Containing 7Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **Writing Exemplars :**Median Curric level plus 8 months progress (1 sublevels) | 1P April 2015 | 1P Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 14% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***Writing Exemplars:*****Target Not Met**. None of the 7students reached the target and made the desired progress of 1 sub level. This being from 1b to 1p or 1p to 1a. 1 student made progress of 2 sub levels form a 1b to a 1a. 1 student made no progress. 1 student regressed and went from a 1p to a 1a.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 1of the7 students reached the Target and six students remain Below or Well Below the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 4**Containing 8Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **e-asTTle:** Base average e-asTTle score for cohort plus 8 months progress (26 aWs) | 1248 aWs April 2015 | 1375 aWs Oct 2015 | Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 25% Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***E-asTTle Writing:*****Target Met**. 5 of the 6 students reached the target and made the desired progress of 26 e-asTTle points.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 25% of the students reached the Target. 2of the 8 students have moved from Below Standard to At the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 5** Containing 10 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **e-asTTle:** Base average e-asTTle score for cohort plus 8 months progress (26 aWs) | 1322 aWs April 2015 | 1375 aWs Oct 2015 | Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 10% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***E-asTTle Writing:*****Target Met**. 8 of the9 students reached the target and made the desired progress of 26 e-asTTle points.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 10% of the students reached the Target. 1of the 10 students moved from Below Standard to At the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 6**Containing 8Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **e-asTTle:** Base average e-asTTle score for cohort plus 8 months progress (26 aWs) |  1439 aWs April 2015 | 1451 aWs Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 25 % Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***E-asTTle Writing:*****Target Not Met**. 4 of the 8 students reached the target and made the desired progress of 26 e-asTTle points.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 25% of the students reached the Target. 2of the 8 students moved from Below Standard to At the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 7** Containing 13 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **e-asTTle:** Base average e-asTTle score for cohort plus 8 months progress (29 aWs) | 1384 aWs April 2015 | 1450 aWs Oct 2015 | Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 8% Dec 2015 | Nor Met |
| * ***E-asTTle Writing:*****Target Met**. 9 of the 13 students reached the target and made the desired progress of 26 e-asTTle points.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** Only 8% of the students reached the Target. 1of the 13 students moved from Below Standard to At the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 8**Containing 12Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **e-asTTle:** Base average e-asTTle score for cohort plus 8 months progress (29 aWs) | 1462 aWs April 2015 | 1500 aWs Oct 2015 | Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 % | 0 % Dec 2014 | 25 % Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***E-asTTle Writing:*****Target Met**. 5 of the 11 students assessed reached the target and made the desired progress of 26 e-asTTle points.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 25% of the students reached the Target. 3of the 12 students moved from Below Standard to At the Standard.
 |

# Executive Summary

# Writing Achievement

**E-AsTTle and Exemplar Targets:** 33 of the 53 (60%) students identified in the year group cohorts made accelerated progress. This being either one curriculum sub level or 26/29 aWs points. This equates to roughly 8 months academic progress in 6 calendar months.

**OTJ Targets:** There has been a shift in performance for this cohort with **13 students (20%)** moving from Below the National Standard to At the National Standard. At 1 December 2014 all 63 of these students of these students were rated as being either Below or Well Below the National Standard.

**MATHEMATICS TARGETS**

# Notes

1. The Maori Cohort contains all students enrolled as Maori at 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments.
2. The Pacific Island Cohort contains all students enrolled as Pacific Islanders at 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments.
3. The Year Group Cohorts are all the students in each year group that were judged as being Well Below or Below the National Standard in Mathematics at 19 December 2014. We track this group without adding new enrolments.
4. Students who belong to these cohorts and who leave during the year are still included in the baseline data but not in the performance data

# Cohort Targets

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Maori** Containing 52 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **PAT Maths:** Progress that is at or above the average progress of the majority ethnic cohort (NZ European/Pakeha) as measured by patm |  Maori41.2 Feb 2015 | Maori47.6 Feb 2016 | Met |
| NZ Euro/Pakeha42.0 Feb 2015 | NZ Euro/Pakeha48.0 Feb 2016 |
| 2 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** Average baseline plus 12 months progress (0.75 Stages) | Stage 4.4 Oct 2014 | 4.8 StageOct 2015 | Not Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 0 %. | 86 % Dec 2014 | 81 % Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***PAT Maths:*****Target Met** 7 of the 26 students who sat both assessments made in excess of 18 months progress. Another 6 students made 12 months progress. 6 students regressed while the remaining 7 students made between 0 and 12 months progress.
* ***NUMPA*: Target Not Met**. 19 of the 52 students met or exceeded the target. 40 of the 52 students made progress. 8 students regressed.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 81%of all Maori Students reached the target. There was drop from the base line of 5%. 42 students were classified as being At or Above. 9 students were classified as being Below Standard and 1 Student was classified as being Well Below. Once again that fact that this cohort did not reach the target is in part because the target was set so high. The whole Maori cohort is high achieving with 81% of students At or Above Standard. There is no disparity of note between Maori and other ethnicities.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pacific Peoples** Containing 11 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **PAT Maths**: Progress that is at or above the average progress of the majority ethnic cohort (NZ European/Pakeha) as measured by patm  |  Pacific Peoples39.7 Feb 2015 |  Pacific Peoples43.6 Feb 2016 | Not Met |
| NZ Euro/Pakeha42.0 Feb 2015 | NZ Euro/Pakeha48.0 Feb 2016 |
| 2 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** Averag**e** baseline plus 12 months progress (0.75 Stages)  | Stage 4.4 Oct 2014 | Stage 4.4Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above Whole School Average 85% Dec 2014  | 60 % Dec 2014 | 45% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***PAT Maths:*****Target Not Met** 2 of the 6 students who sat both assessments made in excess of 18 months progress. 2 students regressed while the remaining 2 students made between 0 and 12 months progress.
* ***NUMPA*: Target Not Met**. 4 of the 11 students met or exceeded the target. 8 of the 11 students made some progress. 3 students regressed.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 45%of all Pacific Peoples reached the target. There was drop from the base line of 15%. 5 students were classified as being At or Above. 6 students were classified as being Below Standard and 0 students were classified as being Well Below. There is a major disparity between Pacific Peoples and other ethnicities. It is worth noting that several of the students in this cohort at ELLs and are recent immigrants to NZ from a third world education system.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 2**Containing 1 Student | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** The average baseline plus18 months progress (0.75 Stages)  | Stage 2.8 Oct 2014 | Stage 3.4Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 %. | 0% Dec 2014 | 0% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***NUMPA*: Target Not Met**. The 1 student failed to reach the target.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** The 1 student remains Below the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 3**Containing 1 Student | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** The average baseline plus18 months progress (0.75 Stages)  | Stage 2.1Oct 2014 | Stage 3.0Oct 2015 | Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 %. | 0% Dec 2014 | 0% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***NUMPA*: Target Met**. The 1 student in this cohort met or exceeded the target.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 0% of the students reached the Target. The one student remains Well Below the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 4**Containing 4 Students  | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **PAT Maths**: Average baseline plus 18 months progress (12.45 patm)  | 18.4 Feb 2015 | 27.4 Feb 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** The average baseline plus 18 months progress (0.75 Stages)  | Stage 3.4Oct 2014 | Stage 3.5Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 %. | 0% Dec 2014 | 0% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***PAT Maths*:** **Target Not Met** 2 of the 4 students who sat both assessments made in excess of 18 months progress while the remaining 2 students made between 0 and 12 months progress.
* ***NUMPA*: Target Not Met**. None of the 1of the 4 students in this cohort met or exceeded the target. 2 of the student are described as Being Well Below or At Risk, 2 students are described as being Below or Cause for Concern and 1 student is described as Being At as per the Indicative National Standards.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 00% of the students reached the Target. 3students have moved from Below Standard to At and 1 students have remains Below the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 5**Containing 8 Student | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **PAT Maths**: Average baseline plus 18 months progress (9.3 patm) | 29.7 Feb 2015 | 35 Feb 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** The average baseline plus18 months progress(0.75 Stages) | Stage 4.0Oct 2014 | Stage 4.8Oct 2015 | Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 %. | 0% Dec 2014 | 25% Dec 2015 | Met |
| * ***PAT Maths*:** **Target Not Met** 2 of the 8 students who sat both assessments made in excess of 18 months progress. Another 1 students made 12 months progress. 1 student regressed while the remaining 4 students made between 0 and 12 months progress.
* ***NUMPA*: Target Met**. 6 of the 8 students in this cohort met or exceeded the target. 1 student is described as Being Well Below or At Risk, 6 students are described as being Below or Cause for Concern and 1 student is described as Being At as per the Indicative National Standards.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 25% of the students reached the Target.2 students have moved from Below Standard to At. 5 students have remained Below the Standard. 1 student remains Well Below the Standard
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 6** Containing 5 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **PAT Maths**: Average baseline plus 18 months progress (6.75 patm) | 37.2 Feb 2015 | 39.6 Feb 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** The average baseline plus 18 months progress (0.75 Stages)  | Stage 4.6Oct 2014 | Stage 4.7Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25%. | 0% Dec 2014 | 20% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***PAT Maths*:** **Target Not Met** 1 of the 4 students who sat both assessments made in excess of 18 months progress. Another student made 12 months progress. 2 students regressed.
* ***NUMPA*: Target Not Met**. None of the 6 students in this cohort met or exceeded the target. 3 students is described as Being Well Below or At Risk, 2 students are described as being Below or Cause for Concern and 1 student is described as Being At as per the Indicative National Standards.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 20% of the students reached the Target.1 students has moved from Below Standard to At and 4 students have remained Below the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 7**Containing 11 Student | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **PAT Maths**: Average baseline plus 18 months progress (8.1 patm) | 40.9 Feb 2015 | 45.9 Feb 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** The average baseline plus18 months progress (0.75 Stages) | Stage 5.2Oct 2014 | Stage 4.6Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 3 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25 %. | 0% Dec 2014 | 18 % Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * **PAT Maths:** **Target Not Met** 4 of the 10 students who sat both assessments made in excess of 18 months progress. Another 2 students made 12 months progress. 2 students regressed while the remaining 2 students made between 0 and 12 months progress.
* ***NUMPA*: Target Not Met**. All of the 11 students in this cohort failed met or exceeded the target. All 11 students are described as Being Well Below or At Risk,
* ***National Standards:*****Target Met.** 18% of the students reached the Target. 2 students have moved from Below Standard to At and 8 students have remained Below the Standard and 1 has moved to Well Below the Standard.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 8**Containing 10 Students | **Assessment Tool** | **Base line** | **Performance** | **Met or Not Met** |
| 1 | **NUMPA Best Fit Stage:** The average baseline plus18 months progress (0.75 Stages)  | Stage 4.8Oct 2014 | Stage 4.8Oct 2015 | Not Met |
| 2 | **OTJs:** End of Year OTJs. % At and Above. Base line plus 25%. | 0% Dec 2014 | 0% Dec 2015 | Not Met |
| * ***NUMPA*: Target Not Met**. None of the 10 students in this cohort met or exceeded the target. 9 students are described as Being Well Below or At Risk, 1 student is described as being Below or Cause for Concern.
* ***National Standards:*****Target Not Met.** 0% of the students reached the Target.10 students remain Below Standard.
 |

# Executive Summary

# Mathematics Achievement

**NUMPA Targets;** 6 of the 9 cohorts have made progress in the 12 month period with the exception of the Pacific Peoples and the Years 7 and 8 cohorts. Disappointingly, one cohort, Year 7 has actually gone backwards. The performance of three of the nine target groups matched or exceeded the target. The Year 3 Cohort showed the most improvement and progressed .8 Stages within the 12 month period The Year 8 cohort regressed by .6 of a Stage 24% (3 of the 41) students identified as being Well Below or Below the Indicative National Standards at the end of 2014 are now performing At the Indicative National Standards.

**PAT Mathematics;**

* The Maori Cohort is progressing and achieving at or about the rates and levels of the majority cohort of NZ European/Pakeha.
* The Pacific Peoples Cohort is making some good progress but is still well behind other ethnic cohorts in levels of achievement.
* Many individual students in the Year Group cohorts have made accelerated progress. This being 18 months progress in a 12 month period. This is really good news! In the year group cohorts where comparisons can be made the following has occurred … 9 out of 29 (31%) students have made accelerated progress (18 months academic progress in 12 calendar months)

**OTJ Targets** There has been a small shift in performance for this cohort with **5 students (12.5%)** moving from Below the National Standard to At the National Standard. At 1 December 2014 all 40 of these students of these students were rated as being either Below or Well Below the National Standard

# Actions and Interventions

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Actions and Interventions** | **Responsibility** | **$** | **Dates** | **Expected Outcomes** |
| **Targeted Interventions** | Target groups of Priority Learners performing at well below/below identified by 2014 end of year OTJs | Management Team | Free | Start of Term 1 | Groups will be identified and inputted into the SMS and information passed onto syndicate leaders and classroom teachers |
| School-wide assessments collected and analysed by teachers | DP/Senior Leaders, Class Teachers |  | Term 1 |  |
| Class teachers identify any other Priority Learners in their class who are below/well below from the assessments and observations | Syndicate LeadersClass teachers | Free | Mid-way through Term 1&2 | Class teachers will know the children who are in their class that are well below or below in their achievement. |
| Create an intervention plan | Syndicate LeadersClass teachers | Staff Meeting s | Towards the end of Term 1&2 | Teachers work in groups using assessment data to identify trends and gaps. They select an area to focus on as a group and develop an intervention plan to target these specific needs. |
| Implement plan | Class teachers | Free | Term 2&3 | Teachers will plan appropriate classroom programmes that target the student needs as identified in the intervention plan. Documentation will clearly show adaptation or programmes specifically designed for the Priority Learner’s needs. Interventions will be discussed through syndicate meeting, staff meetings in “Chit Chat” sessions. |
| Monitor plan | Class teachers | Syndicate Meetings and staff meetings | On going  | Regular syndicate meetings and “Chit Chat” sessions to share progress and discuss any issues or concerns, and to share successful practice. Re-assess using the same assessment tool to measure progress made.  |
| Revise plan | Class teachers | Syndicate Meetings | Mid-way through Term 2&3 | Groups will re-visit their assessment data to identify a new focus and to cater for changing student needs or newly identified students. |
| **Commentary*** All staff successfully identified students who were below/well below within their own class. Staff were also able to identify other students of concern from other assessments and observations.
* Professional development focused heavily around the Teacher Inquiry Cycle as a vehicle for improving achievement of the students below/well below or at risk of falling below the standard. There were numerous staff meetings that focused on the teacher inquiry cycle its implementation within the classroom. Staff worked in teams either related to the goal or focus of their inquiry or the age of the students. As part of the professional development staff were focused in on how to use professional readings and research to support and develop their own knowledge and understandings in relation the needs of their students. They were supported in developing a plan to target the needs of a specific group of students in their class as part of the classroom programme. The plans were to include specific goals and strategies as well as indicators to assess and measure progress. The use of specific Learning Intentions and Success Criteria continue to be a focus as is developing staff’s use of SMART goals and measureable assessments to track progress. On evaluating the success of the plans we discovered that there was:
* increased motivation and excitement because of student success
* increased independence
* a shift in achievement in most cases
* greater coverage of specific concepts
* a transference of skills across activities or curriculum areas
* students experimented with new concepts
* effective teamwork and collaboration because of the way that staff were grouped
* a clear pathways and next steps because of the targeted nature of the plans
* more awareness from students of their actual achievement level and where to next
* increased ability of students to analyse their work and create their own goals
* eagerness from students to share what they had achieved with home

 * Points to note for future reference
* students experimenting with new concepts sometime neglect other previously secure concepts
* need to check that skills and ideas have been retained in the longer term
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Actions and Interventions** | **Responsibility** | **$** | **Dates** | **Expected Outcomes** |
| **Professional Development** | **Revisit** | Establishing a Learning Culture | DP/AP/Senior Leaders, Class Teachers | Staff Meetings | Term 1 2015 | Class teachers will know a number of strategies for developing a growth mind-set amongst students in their class and effective strategies for maintaining it. Students will have experienced activities that enable them to compare the influence a positive or fixed mind-set has on learning. |
| Creating ‘pure’ Learning Objectives that are effective and meaningful | DP/AP/Senior Leaders, Class Teachers | Staff meeting | On-going | Staff will continue to increase knowledge of how to construct pertinent learning objectives including:* Open and closed objectives
* Distinguishing and separating objectives from context
* Creating effective starts to lessons to aid understanding of objectives

These will be discussed each time new interventions are set for the Priority Learners. |
| Creating effective success criteria with students | DP/AP/Senior Leaders, Class teachers | Staff Meetings | On-going | Staff will continue to learn techniques to enable pupils to generate effective and useful success criteria.These will be discussed each time new interventions are set for the Priority Learners. |
| **New focus** | Understanding and creating SMART goals | DP/AP/Senior Leaders, Class teachers | Staff Meetings | Term 1 2015 | Staff will learn about how to set SMART goals (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Relevant and Time bound) and implement them within their PLP |
| **ICT** | Increase the use of Google Docs across the school | Principal, DP/AP/Senior Leaders, Class Teachers | Staff Meetings | On-going | Staff will be guided through the process of adding evidence to their Registered Teacher Criteria document in Google Docs and sharing it with their appraisers. Staff will become more familiar and comfortable using Google Docs with students in their class. |
| See ICT plan |  |  |  |  |
| **Commentary** The use of learning intentions and success criteria was revisited during the year to support the development of focused and targeted intervention plans. Some work is still required on refining this further.As the Priority Learner Plans were group focussed this time, each group had their own Google Doc that teachers added to as the plan progressed. This included adding in pre and post assessment data, sharing resources and ideas, and evaluating the effectiveness. Tātaiako was a focus for professional development this year. The professional development was delivered by Lynette Bradnam and involved unpacking the document and focusing on two of the 5 cultural competencies in detail. The chosen competencies were Ako and Manaakitanga. Staff developed a targeted plan focusing on Maori learners in their class with a specific focus on either Ako or Manaakitanga.Evidence Logs for RTC’s and PTC’s were established with staff using Google Docs. The Google Doc document is designed to support teachers in recording evidence for appraisal and registration purposes. Staff meeting time was spent unpacking the criteria statements to give staff an understanding of what they meant and what could be included under each criteria heading, Staff are responsible for keeping their own documents updated and relevant. The leadership team have a leadership component attached to their documents. * Points to note for future reference
* Continued work on Tātaiako is required
 |