# **Analysis of Variance - Kokopu School Targets 2023**

2022 (Mid-Year)

2022 (End of year)

....



Year 3 - 42% At/Above

Year 3 - 53% At/Above

Year 4 - 50% At/Above

Year 4 - 65% At/Above

Writing	Aski	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	!	antinina Th	:	the eve		sining Teachart		
Strategic Aims		<u> </u>	0,		0 0		Developing our Insp	<u> </u>		
Annual Aims		-	zing and ins	piring things t	ogether: Stu	dents cor	tinue to grow their underst	anding of writing & gain a	better phonetical understanding of s	spelli
		tterns.		<b>b</b>			e antico de la la la contra la tele come	114		
				ed approach to				inty writing programs that	make tangible differences to studen	ts lea
Target					<u> </u>		That Essay and growing phor	netical understanding		
Talget			•			-	, , ,	•	ove by the end of 2023. (3%+ increas	se)
				-					Year 4 54% At/Above. Year 5 64% At	
Background		round and E		_		,	, ,	, ,		<u>.</u>
Information &	0				writing level	s, the sta	ff at Kokopu undertook prof	essional development in t	he Write That Essay program (WTE).	. It ha
Baseline Data	-	-	-	eaching skills a	-					
Dasenne Data	Over 2	020, 2021, ar	nd 2022 thei	re was pleasin	g progress in	writing u	sing the Write That Essay pr	ogram. In term 2 2020 onl	ly 39% of students were achieving At	t/Abc
				o 77%. This exc		0				
								-	r target groups for the last 4 years an	
				•	inue to moni <sup>.</sup>	tor these	cohorts and add others as n	needed. The first two coho	rts below were our original target gr	oup
		The third and								
		year 2022 re			About	Tatal				
	YO	Well Below 0%	Below 0%	At 100%( <u>5</u> )	Above	Total (5)				
	Y0 Y1	0%	35%( <u>6</u> )	65%( <u>11</u> )	0% 0%	(5)				
	Y2	0%	10%(2)	81%( <u>11</u> )		17%(21)				
	Y3	31%(4)	15%( <u>2</u> )	38%( <u>5</u> )		11%(13)				
	Y4	0%	36%( <u>5</u> )	36%( <u>5</u> )		12%(14)				
	Y5	8%( <u>1</u> )	23%( <u>3</u> )	69%( <u>9</u> )		11%(13)				
	Y6	10%( <u>1</u> )	0%	70%(7)	20%( <mark>2</mark> )	8%(10)				
	Y7	0%	10%( <u>2</u> )	85%( <u>17</u> )		17%(20)				
	Y8	0%	25%( <u>2</u> )	50%( <u>4</u> )	25%( <u>2</u> )	7%(8)				
	Total	5%( <mark>6</mark> )	18%( <mark>22</mark> )	66%( <mark>80</mark> )	11%( <u>13</u> )	(121)				
			3%		7% 1%					
	Cohoi	rt tracking	over time	2020-2022						
	Year				ort 1		Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4	
	2020	(End of year)	)	Year 4 - 36% /	At/Above	Yea	r 3 - 37% At/Above	NA	NA	
		(End of year)		Year 5 - 53% A	At/Above		r 4 - 62% At/Above	NA	NA	

Year 5 - 59% At/Above

Year 5 - 69% At/Above

Year 6 - 78% At/Above

Year 6 - 80% At/Above

Actions (What did we do?)	Outcomes (What happened?)	Reasons for Variance (Why did it happen?)
All teachers will continue to engage in WTE PLD through Unit Holder and COL initiatives.	<ul> <li>Through the use of the COL AST, teachers continued to develop their knowledge of the WTE program and can clearly articulate their success and areas to work on.</li> <li>The Marking sheet is now fully understood by staff and teachers can easily justify why they place students in an area.</li> <li>Mark sheets are being adjusted for poetic writing.</li> <li>Teachers' personal writing skills continue to develop this can be seen in day-to-day writing but also in their approach to school reports and letters to parents.</li> </ul>	After 5 years of PLD, staff says this is the best change they have made in their teaching practice. It has up skilled them personally which has naturally flowed on to students. The WTE has also been a catalyst/template for other improvements in the school. Understanding that changing together is powerful and that using the same common language and approach is key to succeeding as a school. WTE focuses on Transactional writing but has somewhat neglected the joy of creating poetic and creative writing. The teachers needed to address this so have started adjusting the mark sheets to accommodate this.

### Cohort tracking 2023

Year	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
2020 (End of year)	Year 4 - 36% At/Above	Year 3 - 37% At/Above	NA	NA
2021 (End of year)	Year 5 - 53% At/Above	Year 4 - 62% At/Above	NA	NA
2022 (Mid-Year)	Year 6 - 78% At/Above	Year 5 - 59% At/Above	Year 4 - 50% At/Above	Year 3 - 42% At/Above
2022 (End of year)	Year 6 - 80% At/Above	Year 5 - 69% At/Above	Year 4 - 65% At/Above	Year 3 - 53% At/Above
2023 (Mid-Year)	Year 7 - 67% At/Above	Year 6 - 91% At/Above	Year 5 - 91% At/Above	Year 4 - 46% At/Above
2023 (End of year)	Year 7 - 67% At/Above	Year 6 - 83% At/Above	Year 5 - 61% At/Above	Year 4 - 71% At/Above

• Cohort 4 has had an increase in achievement of 25%.

• Cohort 1 has stayed the same from Term 2

- Cohort 2 has had some decrease of 8%
- Cohort 3 has had a more significant drop of 30%

Teachers to target students' independent use of	• See phonics focus.	See phonics focus.
Spelling and Punctuation skills to achieve at their		
appropriate curriculum/WTE level.		
Teachers to target Crafting and Paragraphing in	<ul> <li>Students have had increased exposure to paragraph styles and</li> </ul>	
accordance with the WTE scorecards.	structures.	
	• Even with this extra focus, results have not been easy to move	• Staff have identified the year jump from years 2 to 3 and 4
	• Staff identified key areas of paragraphing holding students back.	to 5 as problematic. The requirements for paragraphs
	• A 16% average increase in paragraph length shows the quality of	change from can do to must do. This is difficult to achieve
	paragraphs are improving but the students are being held back	as the students can be inconsistent with this skill
	by the variety of paragraph styles they use.	depending on the writing genre. They are generally very

		good at this in a structured transactional writing piece but not so much in poetic.
All year 4-8 students use their WTE online tool as part of their programme.	<ul> <li>All year 4- 8 students now have access to and use the WTE online tool.</li> <li>Students use this tool to draft their work and are given instant feedback as they write. This has made a particularly positive improvement in speed and length of writing.</li> <li>10,353 times students sort feedback from Online Tool</li> <li>16,192 improvements made to writing</li> <li>74% value added on average.</li> <li>12% overall improvement to writing strength since 2022.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Students become self-managing and determined to improve their own learning.</li> <li>Improved engagement in writing.</li> <li>Students get measurable feedback instantly instead of waiting for a teacher to mark it and hand it back several days later.</li> <li>Students know their next steps.</li> </ul>
WTE Online Tool - November Analysis	Average Writing Strength Score       Number of times students sought feedback       Low Derage words per pice       Improveme based on adi Average words per pice         TASKS       ::       SENTENCES       ::       PARAGRAPHS       ::       PRECISION         100	6, 192 ens made to writing there from AI fredebac 74% Value add Arage increase in writing strength FLUENCY : FLUENCY : A7% a 7 sch b 2 sch a 3 styles Arage sentence styles used each month C VIDEOS : C VIDEOS
Year 4-8 teachers will undergo PLD in the implementation of iDeal phonetical spelling programs. Including Ideal website resources	<ul> <li>COL AST and LSC have done PLD with teachers and Teacher Aids.</li> <li>Program up and running in all year 3-8 classes.</li> <li>iDeal online subscription and resources purchased</li> <li>Student pre and post-data collected. See Reading/Phonics/Spelling for results.</li> </ul>	See Phonics results below

Teachers will continue to moderate their assessments to make sure there is consistency in assessment udgements.	• Moderation undertaken with COL AS	T and betwe	en teachers.		curacy of format vould now like to		
Year 0-3 classroom will focus on a BSLA literacy	• Both junior classrooms now use BSLA	as their lite	eracy/writing				
approach to establish strong literacy foundation skills.	foundation program						
	• Introduced the LLLL program as an ac	ditional res	ource.				
	• Students are now phonetically approx	aching litera	icy and have				
	improved capability to decode indepe	endently.					
Whole school Data		\\/ri		Kōkopu So	chool Torm	4 2024	
Plus:				покори за		142024	
• 85% of year 8 are At or Above.			Well Below	Below	At	Above	Total
• 83% of year 6 are At or Above.		YO	0%	0%	100% ( <u>5</u> )	0%	4% (5)
• 81% of year 6 are At or Above.		Y1	0%	18% ( <u>2</u> )	55% ( <u>6</u> )	27% ( <u>3</u> )	9% (11)
• There are no Well Below in Years 0, 1, 6, 7 or 8		Y2 Y3	5% ( <u>1</u> )	29% ( <u>6</u> )	67% ( <u>14</u> )	0%	17% (21)
Minus:		Y3 Y4	17% ( <u>3)</u> 7% (1)	17% ( <u>3</u> ) 21%( <u>3</u> )	56% ( <u>10</u> ) 57% (8)	11% ( <u>2</u> ) 14% (2)	15% (18)
<ul> <li>34% of Year 2 and 3 students are below or well b</li> </ul>	elow. This has improved from 50%	Y5	8% (1)	31% ( <u>4</u> )	46% ( <u>6</u> )	15% (2)	11% (14)
in the year 3 group since term 2.		Y6	0%	17% (2)	75% (9)	8% (1)	10% (12)
• 39% of Year 5 students are below or well below.		¥7	0%	33% ( <u>3</u> )	67% ( <u>6</u> )	0%	7% (9)
<ul> <li>Boys are less likely to score well.</li> </ul>		Y8	0%	15% ( <u>3</u> )	55% ( <u>11</u> )	30% ( <u>6</u> )	16% (20)
• 40% of Māori are Below or Well Below. This has	improved from 50% in term 2.	Total	5% ( <mark>6</mark> )	21% ( <mark>26</mark> )	61% ( <u>75</u> )	13% ( <u>16</u> )	(123)
interesting:			26	5%	74	4%	
New students this year. Above/At = 54%, Below/Well Bel	ow = 46%						
Evaluation – Next Steps							
<ul> <li>Overall Writing has made significant improveme and target.</li> </ul>	nt in the 4 years it has been a strategic	Year	r4 Well Bel	ow Below	<u>/ At</u>	Abo	ve goa
<ul> <li>WTE is now a natural part of our school learning</li> </ul>	culture.	2020	6%	32%	31%	319	%
<ul> <li>It is no longer a strategic goal but how we do thi</li> </ul>		2023	L 8%	29%	56%	8%	6
• There has been a small drop back this year comp	•	2022		18%	66%		<b>72%</b>
• Next year we will look at our moderation again	-	2023		21%			
Having new poetic writing marking sheets next y	ear will help OTJ accuracy		570	21/0	01/0	15	
Continued involvement with the COL AST will keep	ep the writing momentum going.						

## Reading/Phonics/Spelling

next steps and
needs to be done
nts.
r

### Overall Reading Data T4 2022

	Well Below	Below	At	Above	Total
Y0	0%	0%	100% (5)	0%	4%(5)
Y1	0%	59% (10)	18% (3)	24% (4)	14%(17)
Y2	10% (2)	33% (7)	29% (6)	29% (6)	17%(21)
Y3	8% (1)	15% (2)	46% (6)	31% (4)	11%(13)
Y4	0%	0%	29% (4)	71% (10)	12%(14)
Y5	8% (1)	31% (4)	38% (5)	23% (3)	11%(13)
Y6	10% (1)	10% (1)	20% (2)	60% (6)	8%(10)
Y7	5% (1)	5% (1)	30% (6)	60% (12)	17%(20)
Y8	0%	13% (1)	25% (2)	63% (5)	7%(8)
Total	5% (6)	21% (26)	32% (39)	42% (50)	121
	265	%	749	%	

Year	Well Below	Below	<u>At</u>	<u>Above</u>
2020	4%	24%	59%	13%
2021	3%	17%	64%	17%
2022	5%	21%	32%	42%

planning to gather data u	spelling data using the Essential Lists. This is not sufficient to gain an u ing iDeal and BSLA to fill this gap. ssessments to capture this in 2023. Outcomes (What happened?)	Inderstanding of phonetical understanding and we are Reasons for Variance (Why did it happen?)
<ul> <li>Year 0-3 teachers will continue with the BSLA program</li> <li>Additional BSLA/LLLL resources purchased</li> <li>Year 4-8 Teachers engaged in the iDeal program.</li> <li>iDeal resources purchased</li> <li>Target data was established after pretesting</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>All Year 1-2 teachers now have a fully functioning Phonics-based literacy program.</li> <li>They are now using both LLLL and BSLA</li> <li>Year 3-8 Students now have phonics-based literacy learning in their classes.</li> <li>iDeal Spelling Term 2 data</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>All teachers now understand that the old approach to spelling/reading was not catering for all learners.</li> <li>This understanding has led to whole school change and willingness to work together to come up with common practices across the school.</li> <li>Since term 2, the last 6 months, there has been an <b>11.1%</b></li> </ul>
was completed in term 2.	Term 2Well BelowBelowAtAboveTotalY336% (5)50% (7)14% (2)14Y438% (5)46% (6)15% (2)13Y558% (7)42% (5)12Y658% (7)42% (5)12Y778% (7)22% (2)9Y824% (5)43% (9)33% (7)21Totals14.8% 1243.2% 3537% 304.9% 481Y30%27% (4)33% (5)40% (6)(15)Y40%29% (4)57% (8)14% (2)(14)Y50%62% (8)38% (5)0%(13)Y60%50% (6)0%0%(9)Y811% (2)32% (6)58% (11)0%(19)Totals6% (5)41% (34)43% (35)10% (8)(82)	<ul> <li>improvement in spelling achievement. From 41.9% to 53% At or Above.</li> <li>We still have no year 7 students at their expected level</li> <li>71% of year 4 at At or Above</li> <li>73% of year 3 at At or Above</li> <li>It is interesting that the students who have had the most exposure to phonics are doing their best. Eg years 3-4. The students who have had the least Yr 7-8 are struggling.</li> <li>We predict that naturally, like writing, student learning will improve over time as they have more time in the programs.</li> <li>Now that we have reliable data, we can target students for 2024.</li> <li>2024 continues to have Phonics/Spelling as a target and strategic goal.</li> <li>The likely group will be those students who are in Below but would normally be At.</li> </ul>
The unit holder, LSC and AST provided teachers and support staff with PLD in the implementation of the iDeal phonetical spelling program. Including Ideal website resources. Parents are informed about the program and home help resources are available.	<ul> <li>Teacher aides had significant assistance through the Learning Support Coordinator. She helped set up programs and upskill each Teacher Aide.</li> <li>This will be completed in 2024 as part of our new strategic plan.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The LSC was better placed to work with TAs as she had already been working with them on a regular basis.</li> <li>We felt that teachers needed this year to cement the program and their own learning before creating support</li> </ul>

									materials for families. This way families get the best assistance.
Assessment data collected through iDeal, BSLA and Etap	SMS. • BSLA i	is still t	too diffic					analysed on our S and we have	<ul> <li>Teachers have found the BSLA assessments difficult to administer and hard to analyse for trends beyond single students.</li> <li>We have decided that the LLLL resources may be a better fit. This is a major focus of our 2024 strategic goal.</li> </ul>
Analyse assessment data and reported to staff,	• Staff	review	ed and n	nade sugge	stions for	next	steps		•
parents and BOT.				nade sugges			-		
				reated in th			•		
			-			-		cy learning	
		-	nool and						
					-hased t	each	ing and lea	rning practices	
		-		cy across the			-		
				cy and BSLA					
				-			ov to impr	ove learning	
		-		ting to pare		intera		ove learning	
				honetic lea		choo	aided by	whanau	
Term 4 2023 Reading OTJ			Readin		ners at s	schoo	n alueu by	wilaliau.	Plus:
Term 4 2023 Reading OTJ	Term 4			gon					• These are the best reading results in the last 4 years.
		Well B		Below	At		Above	Total	
	Y0 Y1	09		0% 18% (2)	100% 82% (		0% 0%	4% (5) 9% (11)	• 95% 19/20 of year 8 students are At or Above.
	Y2	10%		24% ( <u>5</u> )	48% (1	,	19% (4)	17% (21)	• 92 of year 6 students are At or Above
	Y3	6%		28% ( <u>5</u> )	50% (		17% ( <u>3</u> )	15% (18)	• 1/3 of the school is Above
	Y4	7%		7% ( <u>1</u> )	29% (		57% ( <u>8</u> )	11% (14)	<ul> <li>57% of year 4 students are Above</li> </ul>
	Y5	8%		8% ( <u>1</u> )	69% (		15% ( <u>2</u> )	11% (13)	<ul> <li>80% of year 8 students are Above</li> </ul>
	Y6 Y7	09 11%		8% ( <u>1)</u> 11% ( <u>1</u> )	67% ( <u>.</u> 56% (.		25% ( <u>3)</u> 22% ( <u>2</u> )	10% (12) 7% (9)	• There are no Years 0, 1, 2, 6 and 8 Well Below
	Y8	09		5% ( <u>1</u> )	15% (		80% ( <u>16</u> )	16% (20)	• The number of Year 1-2 students achieving At or Above in
	Total	4.5%		13.5% (16)	50% (6		32% (39)	(123)	reading has improved 22% since 2022.
			18%		0	83	%		Minus:
				_			•		<ul> <li>34% of our year 2 and 3 students are below.</li> </ul>
	Year (		Well Bel		low		At	Above	• 32% of Māori are Below/Well Below. This has improved
	202		4%		4%		59%	13%	from 50% in Term 2.
	202	_	3%		7%		64%	17%	• 23% of Males are Below/Well Below compared to females
	202		5%	2	1%		32%	42%	12.5%.
	202	3	4.5%	1	3.5%		50%	32%	Interesting:
									• As students move through the school the results get better.
									<ul> <li>New students this year. Above/At = 76%, Below/Well</li> </ul>
									Below = 27%

#### Evaluation/Next steps

- In all, this year has been about discovering what the potential of different phonics programs are.
- Teachers have delved into each program and put them into effect in their classrooms.
- The feedback from staff, students and parents has been very positive.
- Our next steps are to take these programs we have tried and set some formal structures and systems around them so that we are all clear about the approach we take at Kokopu School.
- We need to investigate which two of the junior programs we will use as our main program. BSLA or LLLL
- Updating our assessment approach will continue in 2024 as we now know that iDeal can cater for the whole school.
- We will now develop resources and support for whanau so that they can assist at home too.

## Maths

Strategic Aims	Achieving	Amazing,	Inspiring	Things Tog	getner - De	veloping o	ur Inspiring	Teachers.		
Annual Aims	<ul> <li>S</li> <li>Developing out</li> </ul>	xperience mo tudents will h r inspiring tea	re success in ave an increa achers:	mathematics, e sed understand	ding of fractions	5.		solving through st articularly in fracti		
Target	2. Overall, lif	t fractions acl	nievement acı	ross the school	tations and pro from 82% at ar ild's learning at	nd above to 85%				
Background	Background	and Baseline	Data:							
Information &	Background and Baseline Data:Over the last 2 years, by looking at the data and teacher observation, students have had less than satisfactory understanding of fractions.The data shows that lifting fractions knowledge will lift overall student progress and success.									
Baseline Data	-			•	•		the three strategy			
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula	achievement 6% and Year 7	between Add/ 7 65% in compa	•	ons and a 10% d average of 73% cowards the tar	lifference with Mu 5 overall. get	ult/Div	ak down	
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student By lifting these	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula	achievement 6% and Year 7	between Add/ 7 65% in compa	Sub and Fractio arison with the	ns and a 10% d average of 73% owards the tar <b>Ratios ar</b>	lifference with Mu 5 overall. get <b>Id Proportions (Fi</b>	ult/Div ractions) year bre		Total
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student By lifting these Addition/Sub	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula <b>otraction</b>	achievement 6% and Year 7 ar groups sign	between Add/ 7 65% in compa ificant progress	Sub and Fractio arison with the s will be made t	ons and a 10% d average of 73% cowards the tar	lifference with Mu 5 overall. get	ult/Div	Above	Total
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student By lifting these Addition/Sub Well Below 0%	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula <b>otraction</b> Below 10%	achievement 6% and Year 7 ar groups sign At	between Add/ 7 65% in compa ificant progress Above	Sub and Fractio arison with the s will be made t	ns and a 10% d average of 73% owards the tar <b>Ratios ar</b>	lifference with Mu 5 overall. get <b>Id Proportions (Fi</b>	ult/Div ractions) year bre At		3
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student By lifting these Addition/Sub Well Below 0% Multiplicatio	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula otraction Below 10%	achievement 6% and Year 7 ar groups sign At 55%	between Add/ 7 65% in compa ificant progress Above 35%	Sub and Fractio arison with the s will be made t Y3 Y4	ns and a 10% d average of 73% owards the tar <b>Ratios ar</b>	lifference with Mi 5 overall. get nd Proportions (Fi Below	ult/Div ractions) year bre At 100% (1)	Above 100% (3)	3
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student By lifting these Addition/Sub Well Below 0% Multiplicatio Well Below	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula otraction Below 10% n/Division Below	achievement 6% and Year 7 ar groups sign <u>At</u> 55% <u>At</u>	Above Above Above	Sub and Fractio arison with the s will be made t	ns and a 10% d average of 73% owards the tar <b>Ratios ar</b>	lifference with Mu 5 overall. get <b>Id Proportions (Fi</b>	ult/Div ractions) year bre At	Above	3
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student By lifting these Addition/Sub Well Below 0% Multiplicatio	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula otraction Below 10%	achievement 6% and Year 7 ar groups sign At 55%	between Add/ 7 65% in compa ificant progress Above 35%	Sub and Fractio arison with the s will be made t Y3 Y4 Y5	ns and a 10% d average of 73% owards the tar <b>Ratios ar</b>	lifference with Mi 5 overall. get <b>Id Proportions (Fi</b> <b>Below</b> 15% (2)	alt/Div <b>actions) year bre</b> At 100% (1) 54% (7)	Above 100% (3) 31% (4)	3 1 13
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student By lifting these Addition/Suk Well Below 0% Multiplicatio Well Below 0%	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula otraction Below 10% n/Division Below 17%	achievement 6% and Year 7 ar groups sign At 55% At 57.5%	Above Above Above	Sub and Fractio arison with the s will be made t Y3 Y4 Y5 Y6	ns and a 10% d average of 73% owards the tar Ratios ar Well Below	lifference with Mi 5 overall. get <b>Ind Proportions (Fr</b> <b>Below</b> 15% (2) 54% (7)	alt/Div <b>Factions) year bre</b> <b>At</b> 100% (1) 54% (7) 31% (4)	Above 100% (3) 31% (4) 15% (2)	3 1 13 13
Baseline Data	Using the GloS There is a 17% Year 6 student By lifting these Addition/Sub Well Below 0% Multiplicatio Well Below	difference in s achieve at 4 two particula otraction Below 10% n/Division Below 17%	achievement 6% and Year 7 ar groups sign At 55% At 57.5%	Above Above Above	Sub and Fractio arison with the s will be made t Y3 Y4 Y5 Y6 Y7	ns and a 10% d average of 73% owards the tar Ratios ar Well Below	lifference with Mi 5 overall. get <b>Ind Proportions (Fr</b> <b>Below</b> 15% (2) 54% (7) 33% (3)	ult/Div ractions) year bre At 100% (1) 54% (7) 31% (4) 33% (3)	Above 100% (3) 31% (4) 15% (2) 22% (2)	3 1 13 13 9

## Year 1-4

Using the Jam assessment, we can see that there is less of a disparity in achievement for our juniors.

There is a small group of three year 3 students that fall in the below

Jam Fractions							
Well Below	Below	At	Above				
0%	6%	42.5%	51.5%				
Jam Overall							
Well Below	Below	At	Above				

Jam overall year breakdown							
	Well Below	Below	At	Above	Total		
Y0							
Y1			100% (5)		5		
Y2			81% (13)	19% (3)	16		
Y3		15% (3)	10% (2)	75% (15)	20		
Y4			10% (1)	90% (9)	10		
Totals	0%	5.8% 3	42.3% 22	51.9% 27	52		

Actions (What did we do?)	Outcomes (What happened?)	Reasons for Variance (Why did it happen?)
PLD into the New NZ Maths curriculum	• Teachers now understand the new structure of the maths curriculum including Understand, Know, Do.	The new curriculum has a different structure that teachers needed to understand so that they can plan accordingly.
	_	Due to the minimal content change in the new curriculum teachers were
	• Teachers have adapted their planning to suit the new curriculum	able to adapt quickly.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Kokopu School curriculum folder updated	
Analysis of current practice and assessment tools.	<ul> <li>Current planning methods and assessments were</li> </ul>	Unfortunately, no new resourcing was provided by MOE to support the
	looked at and it was decided to continue these until	new Maths curriculum so it was decided to wait for this before making
	more information and support materials became	any other changes to the classroom programs.
	available for the new curriculum.	
	<ul> <li>New curriculum Maths Unit planning templates were</li> </ul>	
	obtained to assist with planning. These include	
	Understand, Know Do	
Through assessment data, staff identified students	Students identified	See the data sheet below for variance.
who have less than satisfactory progress	<ul> <li>Pre-data was gathered and analysed.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Post data gathered and analysed.</li> </ul>	
Teachers to investigate a variety of fractions	• Staff sharing of programs and their effectiveness at staff	
resources that link to the NZC and implement them in class.	meetings.	
	Additional resources purchased including updated	
	textbooks for year 7-8 and NUMICON sets throughout	
	the junior rooms.	
	• Improved programs are up and running in classrooms.	

See Data on the next page

#### Year 5-8

Using the GloSS assessment, we can clearly see the disparity in achievement between the three strategy areas. There is a 17% difference in achievement between Add/Sub and Fractions and a 10% difference with Mult/Div. Year 6 students achieve at 46% and Year 7 65% in comparison with the average of 73% overall.

Y3

Y4

Y5

Y6

Y7

Y8

By lifting these two particular groups significant progress will be made towards the target

Term 4 <mark>2022</mark> Ratios and Proportions (Fractions) year break down							
	Well Below	Below	At	Above	Total		
Y3				100% (3)	3		
Y4			100% (1)		1		
Y5		15% (2)	54% (7)	31% (4)	13		
Y6		54% (7)	31% (4)	15% (2)	13		
Y7	11% (1)	33% (3)	33% (3)	22% (2)	9		
Y8		15% (3)	75% (15)	10% (2)	20		
Totals	1.5% 1	25.5% 15	51% 30	22% 13	59		

There has been an overall lift in achievement from 73% - 82% At/Above.

• Year 7 has moved from 55% to 100%. This is one of our Target groups

#### Totals Minus:

42% of year 6 are below

Well Below

0%

0%

0%

0%

0%

0%

0%

• Girls tend to perform better than boys by about 10%. (Data no included)

Term 4 2023 Ratios and Proportions (Fractions) year break down

At

78%(7)

45%(5)

69%(9)

25%(<u>3</u>)

100%(9)

42%(8)

56%(<mark>41</mark>

Above

22%(2)

36%(4)

15%(2)

33%(4)

0%

37%(7)

26%(19)

Total

12%(9)

15%(11)

18%(13)

16%(12)

12%(9)

26%(19)

(73)

Total (5) (11) (21) (9) (4) (50)

Below

0%

18%(2)

15%(2)

42%(5)

0%

21%(4)

18%(13)

- Year 5 has moved from 85% to 91%
- There are no students in the school that are Well Below.

#### Year 1-4

Plus:

Using the Jam assessment, we can see that there is less of a disparity in achievement for our juniors. There is a small group of three year 3 students that fall in the below

Term 4 <mark>2</mark>	Term 4 <mark>2022</mark> Jam overall year breakdown			Term 4 <mark>2023</mark> Jam overall year breakdown							
	Well Below	Below	At	Above	Total		Well Below	Below	At	Above	
Y0						Y0	0%	0%	100%( <u>5</u> )	0%	
Y1			100% (5)		5	Y1	0%	0%	64%( <u>7</u> )	36%( <u>4</u> )	
Y2			81% (13)	19% (3)	16	Y2	0%	24%( <u>5</u> )	<b>38%(<u>8</u>)</b>	38%( <u>8</u> )	
Y3		15% (3)	10% (2)	75% (15)	20	Y3	0%	22%( <u>2</u> )	<b>11%(<u>1</u>)</b>	67%( <u>6</u> )	
Y4			10% (1)	90% (9)	10	Y4	25%( <u>1</u> )	25%( <u>1</u> )	50%( <u>2</u> )	0%	
Totals	0%	5.8% 3	42.3% 22	51.9% 27	52	Totals	2%( <u>1</u> )	16%( <mark>8</mark> )	46%( <mark>23</mark> )	36%( <u>18</u> )	

#### Plus:

• 82% of this group are At or Above.

• 100% of year 0/1 students are At or Above

- 67% of year 3's are Above
- There is only 1 student in the school that is Well Below.

#### Minus:

- There has been an overall drop in achievement from 94% to 82% At/Above Interesting
- The year 4 students are our lower students as they would normally do the GloSS senior test.
- The better Years three students also do the GloSS test.

#### Evaluation – Where to next

- In all, Students as a whole have made pleasing progress (11%) over 2023 in fractions.
- Our overall At and Above for Maths is now 83% which can be attributed to the rise in fractions knowledge. These are the highest Maths results in the last 5 years.
- There are still a number of year 6 students who are not doing as well with fractions. There was improvement in this group but 54% of the group (7 students) are still Below. Their year 7 teacher next year will continue to focus on improving this.
- Next year we will not have a school-wide focus on maths but individual students will continue to have support.