

## Making a Difference

### *A Six Month School Improvement Initiative*

<b>Name</b>	Laura Lovatt
<b>Title of Project</b>	Closing the gap for year 9, pupil premium underachievers
<b>Brief description of the issue you are seeking to resolve or initiative you wish to introduce (150-200 words)</b>	<p>Year 9 disadvantaged learners who were below their minimum target APP grade at the end of year 8 are selected for targeted intervention. They need to make improvements on the skills necessary at GCSE level. The GCSE skills will be taught in extra intervention lessons and entrance and exit tests will be taken in both Reading and Writing, in line with the new GCSE specifications.</p> <p>These learners complete an unseen, baseline entry test based on the new English Language GCSE. These will be marked and then learners grouped according to skill weaknesses from the English grain size. The students will have one term of weekly intervention lessons in preparation for the new GCSE exams. At the end of 12 weeks, they will complete the same baseline test as an exit test. These will be marked and results inputted onto the spreadsheet, then data analysed.</p> <p>The aim is for all students to make expected progress. This will be seen in a minimum 20% improvement between the entrance and exit test scores (or achieving 80% or higher, if 20% improvement is not possible).</p>
<b>Target Cohort</b>	Year 9 disadvantaged students not making expected progress at the end of year 8 when comparing their “current APP grade” in SIMS to the “minimum target grade”.
<b>Research evidence for strategies to be used (400-500 words)</b>	<p>The pupil premium was introduced by the Coalition government in April 2011 to provide additional funding for disadvantaged pupils. Sutton Trust (July 2015) emphasised the need to “close the gap”. Each year, teachers were asked how the pupil premium is being spent in their schools. A clear favourite continues to be early intervention schemes, an answer given by 31% of schools. A significant minority of schools use the funding to employ extra teachers or teaching assistants, but this is more common in primary than secondary schools. However, relatively few schools choose some of the best low cost proven approaches, according to the Sutton Trust/EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit, with only 4% citing improve feedback between teachers and pupils and 1% saying they use peer-to-peer tutoring.”</p> <p>The Sutton Trust-Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit: “[Teachers] can make a difference and ... they are the most important people in the education system who are able make that difference to children and young people’s learning. However, we think that the evidence indicates that that the challenge is to get the pupils to work harder, not the teachers.”  <a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/uploads/pdf/Technical_Appendices_July_2012).pdf">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/uploads/pdf/Technical Appendices (July 2012).pdf</a></p> <p>Dunne, Humphreys and Sebba (2007) found that there are three main ways in which schools and teachers motivate and inspire low attaining pupils to learn, by concentrating resources, customising to specific learning needs and skills and by creating a positive learning environment. Concentrating resources means “groups were smaller allowing greater personal learning support and attention”. Customising the learning to the learner’s needs ensures “curriculum materials were drawn from multiple sources and customised to meet the learning needs of low attaining pupils. Materials incorporated a range of cognitive demands to allow pupils to select the level of challenge.” They also recommend that “Test level entry decisions were delayed to reduce demotivation” and the inclusion of “peer-</p>

	<p>support and more feedback and praise”. Finally, a positive learning environment: “the school ethos promotes mutual respect and value for the contribution of all pupils irrespective of attainment group, teacher-pupil relations are strengthened in and out of class and improved communications between schools, teachers, pupils and their communities sustain motivation. A more relaxed disciplinary regime in class is offered with emphasis on participation and teamwork, praise and positive affirmation to encourage and motivate active pupil participation and engagement in learning. Pupils’ views are solicited and used in productive ways to inform teachers and school change and provide a more conducive and comfortable environment. Co-ordinated multi-agency support and involvement are provided to support learning needs. The support of parent/carers, the community and local businesses are drawn in as important contributors to a positive and motivating learning environment”.</p> <p><a href="http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/6622/1/DCSF-RR011.pdf">http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/6622/1/DCSF-RR011.pdf</a></p>
<b>Metrics</b> <b>Baseline data and data/evidence to be collected</b>	<p>43 year 9 disadvantaged learners who were below their minimum target APP grade at the end of year 8 were selected for targeted intervention when comparing their “current grade” in SIMS to the “minimum target grade”.</p> <p>43 learners took the baseline entrance test, in line with new GCSE specification. The baseline entrance test results will be compared to the exit test results.</p> <p>The Reading test had three different skill style questions and was out of 20 marks.</p> <p>In the entrance test, the average score was 7/20.</p> <p>Learners making over 20% progress moved on from Reading Fiction to Writing Fiction.</p> <p>Learners making 1-19% progress stayed on Reading but moved from Fiction to Non-Fiction.</p> <p>Learners who made less than 1% progress stayed on Reading Fiction.</p>
<b>Actions Taken &amp; Leadership Approaches (400-500 words)</b>	<p>This role has involved a variety of actions to strengthen my leadership abilities and styles. Prior to this, my main experience was in a Coaching style as a Trainee Teacher Mentor, however, this initiative allowed me to experience other styles including <i>Authoritative</i>, <i>Affiliative</i>, <i>Democratic</i>, <i>Pacesetting</i> and <i>Coach</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I firstly had to identify PP students working below target, based on summative data,</li> <li>- I collated departmental data and results from summative assessments,</li> <li>- I liaised with English staff regarding students to be added to intervention after each Assessment Cycle, for learners achieving double Red on both Reading and Writing summative assessments (<i>Affiliative style when meeting the department</i>),</li> <li>- I timetabled students, ensuring they were not taken out of a core lesson such as English, Maths or Science and also checking that they were taken out of a different subject on Week A and B so that they did not miss the same lesson twice,</li> <li>- I analysed year 9 PP data, after the exit test,</li> <li>- I re-timetabled learners after the first round of intervention, when they needed regrouping based on weaknesses on key skill areas,</li> <li>- I then broadened the study by rolling out the scheme to year 7: PP learners on double Red from AC2 were targeted (<i>Authoritative style when pitching the idea to HOD and department</i>),</li> <li>- I set and met deadlines (<i>Pacesetting style when chasing up deadlines not met by colleagues</i>)</li> <li>- I wrote home to inform parents that their year 7 child was to undergo English intervention (<i>Authoritative style when dealing with parents</i>)</li> </ul>

	<p>or enquiries),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I informed all year 7 class and form tutors of the new year 7 intervention timetable,</li> <li>- I produced and marked/ moderated baseline tests (<i>Coach style when advising RMO on her marking</i>),</li> <li>- I arranged the intervention for years 7 and 9 with RMO (<i>Affiliative style</i>),</li> <li>- I DAFITAlled intervention to see how the results looked,</li> <li>- I arranged meetings with PBR to produce test results spreadsheets,</li> <li>- I analysed and identified year 8 data and results, before compiling a list of year 8 PP learners in need of intervention,</li> <li>- I attended all of the KS3 PP Coordinator meetings (<i>Democratic style valuing input from knowledgeable colleagues</i>),</li> <li>- The KS3 PP Coordinators and I also collated our data to identify around 20 students having difficulties with mental toughness and resilience, for extra targeted intervention,</li> <li>- I arranged and attended meetings with NRI and JLA to go through progress reports (<i>Democratic style valuing input from knowledgeable colleagues</i>),</li> <li>- I oversaw the PP budget for English (<i>Affiliative style</i>),</li> <li>- I oversaw the English Ambassador programme (<i>Affiliative style</i>),</li> <li>- I oversaw the KS3 PP extra-curricular clubs and maintained a current register.</li> </ul> <p>I feel the best leadership opportunities were during meetings with other KS3 Coordinators, when I had to summarise my work and relay the results. Here, a Democratic style of leadership was practiced, valuing input from knowledgeable colleagues. We also discussed different departmental approaches to data and how each department dealt with it. It was interesting to learn that Maths had a teacher delegated to analyse the data and Science had bought a programme that analyses tests and data for them.</p> <p>Further leadership was exemplified when asking staff to meet deadlines for delivering data to me, then chasing these deadlines if they were not met, exercising a Pacesetting style, combined with Authoritative.</p> <p>Similarly, when overseeing the budget, colleagues had to run expenses by myself, for example paying for theatre trip places for PP students, buying refreshments for PP extra-curricular clubs and purchasing costumes for the Shakespeare showcase. These were authorised by myself, before being passed on to NRI to authorise.</p> <p>Furthermore, leadership opportunities presented themselves whilst overseeing and leading RMO developed when designating and delegating jobs to her, enabling the Coaching and Affiliative styles to be used.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation of Impact</b>  <b>What worked, What didn't</b>  <b>&amp; How do you know? (400-500 words)</b></p>	<p><b>Results :</b></p> <p>In Round 1 Reading Fiction-</p> <p>92% (15/38) improved.</p> <p>29% (11/38) progressed by 20% or more.</p> <p>63% (24/38) made 2.5 to 19% progress.</p> <p>8% (3/38) did not make progress.</p>

**Outcomes:**

After a progress meeting with RMO, it was decided that learners should be regrouped according to strengths and progress.

At the end of AC1, all year 9 English teachers were asked to identify PP learners not making progress, on Red and put these learners forward for intervention. These were collated and seven students were added to the cohort for intervention and began on Reading Fiction.

Learners were regrouped according to strengths and progress. Learners who made over 20% progress moved on from Reading Fiction to Writing Fiction. Learners who made 2.5-19% progress stayed on Reading, but moved from Fiction to Non-Fiction. Learners who did not progress, stayed on Reading Fiction and the new cohort of seven students began on this.

Class teachers continued to be involved and put forward PP learners on Red after AC3 by 29/4/16.

**Results In Round 2:****Reading Non-Fiction**

100% (25/25) improved.

80% (20/25) progressed by at least 20% or achieved 80% or higher.

20% (5/25) made 7.5 to 19% progress.

0% (0/25) did not make progress.

**Writing Fiction-**

80% (8/10) improved.

50% (5/10) progressed by at least 20% or achieved 80% or higher.

30% (3/10) made 5 to 19% progress.

20% (2/10) did not make progress.

The learners who had made at least 20% progress (or achieved 80% or above) after Round 2 exit tests, in both Reading and Writing graduated intervention, as they made excellent progress in all skill areas. Therefore 50% of the Writing group (five students) left intervention after Round 2. Three learners who made outstanding progress, (over 30% improvement), were rewarded with a prize. The others continued to Round 3.

**Results In Round 3:****Reading Non-Fiction-**

100% (27/27) improved.

81% (22/27) progressed by at least 20% or achieved 80% or higher.

19% (5/27) made 7.5 to 19% progress.

0% (0/27) did not make progress.

	<p><b>Writing Fiction-</b>  86% (24/28) improved.  61% (17/28) progressed by at least 20% or achieved 80% or higher.  25% (7/28) made 5 to 19% progress.  14% (4/28) did not make progress.</p> <p>The scheme was then rolled out to year 7, with 31 underachieving, PP learners identified and sitting entrance tests in April. They have had some intervention, but unfortunately, due to exam invigilation and access arrangements, KS3 intervention with RMO was interrupted. Thus the original deadline for exit test completion of 29/5/16 became unfeasible for both year 7 and 9. This was also impacted further due to year 10 mock examinations, so these exit tests for round 3 of year 9 and round 1 of year 7 were completed late and some year 7 students had only had one lesson of intervention, thus results are not as impressive as year 9.</p> <p><b><u>Results In Y7 Round 1:</u></b></p> <p><b>Reading Fiction-</b>  83% (19/23) improved.  17% (4/23) progressed by at least 20% or achieved 80% or higher.  65% (15/23) made 1 to 19% progress.  17% (4/23) did not make progress.</p> <p><b><u>What Worked?</u></b></p> <p>Overall, the identification of learners was not as smooth as it could have been because of the transition from APP levels to colours (which were departmentally agreed upon and changed/ tweaked as a work in progress throughout the year after each assessment cycle and DAFITAL). Therefore, originally, end of year 8 APP data was used to identify the cohort, yet after AC1, some of these learners were Amber or even Green, yet still in intervention as I had to make the decision to maintain the original 20% progress stipulation.</p> <p>Analysing baseline test data worked well, and grouping learners according to their skills weaknesses was successful as it meant intervention classes could be tailored and heavily differentiated.</p> <p>The 20% improvement guideline proved difficult for learners who may have done particularly well in the entrance test, for example receiving 17/20 in the Writing Assessment. In this case, a 20% improvement was impossible, so I devised the new stipulation that 20% improvement or achieving over 80% in the test was enough to move out of intervention.</p>
<p><b>Reflections</b>  <b>What would you do again,</b>  <b>What would you do differently &amp; What will you do next?</b></p>	<p>Delegating roles definitely helped my workload and also needed leadership qualities, for example asking extra-curricular club staff to maintain their own registers and email me any changes.</p> <p>Additionally, having baseline data from which progress could be measured was highly effective.</p> <p>Hopefully, the KS3 interventions will carry on next year, with year 8 and 9 students already identified and it can be rolled out to year 7</p>

	<p>after AC1 summatives and DAFITALs.</p> <p>I personally hope to progress my role into KS4 within a TLR or an R&amp;D to devise intervention for highly targeted/ high attaining PP students in year 10 who underachieve after AC1.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------