# The Evidence that student achievement and progress has been enhanced since using NS tools and school wide consistent, explicit, evidence based teaching and learning, focusing on results in Reading, Writing and Math

|  |
| --- |
| **CPS Yr. 1 – Yr. 8 compared to NZ Yr. 1 – 8 data for *at* or *above* in relation to the national standards** |
|  | **Reading %** | **Writing %** | **Mathematics %** |
|  | **CPS** | **NZ** | **CPS** | **NZ** | **CPS** | **NZ** |
| **2011** | 91% | 76.2% | 77% | 68% | 87% | 72.2% |
| **2012** | 91% | 77.5% | 80% | 70.2% | 90% | 73.6% |
| **2013** | 90% | 77.9% | 81% | 70.6% | 88% | 74.6% |
| **2014** | 92% | 78.0% | 88% | 71.3%  | 93% | 75.2% |

We have maintained and increased high achievement levels in all three learning areas over 4 years and during and post Christchurch earthquakes.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Whole school ***at*** or ***above*** **Mathematics** | 2011Total **87%** for ***at*** or ***above.*** **%** | 2012Total **90%** for ***at*** or ***above*****%** | 2013Total **88%** for ***at*** or ***above*****%** | 2014Total **94 %** for ***at*** or ***above***. **%** |
| Year 1 | **61**  | **92**  | **83** | **90:**  |
| Year 2 | **88**  | **79**  | **79** | **80:**  |
| Year 3 | **96**  | **93**  | **88** | **94:**  |
| Year 4 | **96**  | **92**  | **93** | **95:**  |
| Year 5 | **100**  | **98**  | **93** | **96:**  |
| Year 6 | **80**  | **100**  | **98** | **98:**  |
| Year 7 | **78**  | **86**  | **100** | **96:**  |
| Year 8 | **88**  | **76**  | **73** | **100:**  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Whole school ***at*** or ***above*** **Reading** | 2011Total **91%** for ***at*** or ***above.*** **%** | 2012Total **91%** for ***at*** or ***above*****%** | 2013Total **90%** for ***at*** or ***above*****%** | 2014Total **92 %** for ***at*** or ***above***. **%** |
| Year 1 | **77**  | **87**  | **83** | **88** |
| Year 2 | **100**  | **91** | **93** | **93** |
| Year 3 | **100** | **93**  | **91** | **96** |
| Year 4 | **92**  | **86**  | **91** | **93** |
| Year 5 | **86**  | **85**  | **86** | **86** |
| Year 6 | **86**  | **96**  | **93** | **93** |
| Year 7 | **87**  | **91** | **91** | **78** |
| Year 8 | **94**  | **93**  | **100** | **100** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Whole school ***at*** or ***above*** **Writing** | 2011Total **77%** for ***at*** or ***above.*** **%** | 2012Total **80%** for ***at*** or ***above*****%** | 2013Total **81%** for ***at*** or ***above*****%** | 2014Total **87 %** for ***at*** or ***above***. **N = 479****%** |
| Year 1 | **74**  | **97**  | **90**  | **90**  |
| Year 2 | **88**  | **72**  | **78**  | **90**  |
| Year 3 | **80** | **90**  | **73** | **74** |
| Year 4 | **76**  | **82**  | **83** | **87**  |
| Year 5 | **79**  | **73**  | **79** | **86** |
| Year 6 | **73**  | **87**  | **81** | **92** |
| Year 7 | **58**  | **63**  | **76** | **76** |
| Year 8 | **88**  | **75**  | **82** | **98** |

# Example of Whole School PLG 2014 EOY used to set 2015 goals and Targets

## Analysis of Variance for 2014 results of set achievement goals and targets

|  |
| --- |
| **NAG2A (b)(i) Areas of strength: Reading and Mathematics based on 2014 EOY National Standard data** |
| **2014 Mathematics National Standards data continues to show high levels of student achievement across the school**At the end of 2014 we had 216/479 students (45%) across the school achieving “above” the national standard for their class level or time at school; 232/479 (48%) students “at” the national standard for their class level or time at school. This adds up to a high 93% of students “at” or “above” the national standard for their class level or time at school. 22/479 or 5% of students were “below” and 9/479 (2%) were “well below” the standard. These 7% of children have been identified and are receiving differentiated learning support within learning spaces where teachers are recognised as the main providers of this support. This is a better result in the “above” category from the 2013 end of year results. Below are a comparison of 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 data.**2011** **4% (Well below) compared with 2012 (3%) 2013 (2%) and 2014 (2%) a 3-2% improvement over 4 years****2011** **10% (Below) compared with 2012 (8%) 2013 (9%) and 2014 (5%) 2014 showed a 4% lower and better result when compared to 2013 and a 5% lower and better result when compared to 2011.****2011** **52%** **(At) compared with 2012 (47%) 2013 (50%) and 2014 48%. In 2014 there was a similar result to 2013 with more children shifting from the “at” to the “above” category.****2011** **32%** **(Well above and Above) compared with 2012 (43%) 2013 (39%) and 2014 45%. 2014 showed a 6% better result compared to 2013 and an improved result of 13% when compared to 2011. The result is similar and slightly better than the 2012 result (+2%).**The 2014 mathematics results continue to be pleasing and should be celebrated. Cashmere Primary School has continued high levels of achievement across the school for both genders and has made significant gains in the “above” and “at” categories when compared to data from 2011. There is improvement in the number of children in the “above” category in 2014 following a trend since 2011 and reversing the dip in 2013. Children in the below and well below categories have reduced since 2011 and this needs to be celebrated. Further discussion on which teaching and learning strategies are resulting in this improvement will be had to determine targets and next steps for 2015.**2014 Reading National Standards data continues to show high levels of student achievement across the school**At the end of the 2014 year we had 212/479 students (44%) achieving “above” and 230/479 (48%) achieving “at” the national standard for their class level or time at school. This adds up to 442/479 (92%) of students “at” or “above” the standard. 29/479 (6%) of students achieved “below” and 8/479 (2%) students achieved “well below” the national standard for their class level or time at school. These (8%) of children have been identified and are receiving differentiated learning support within learning spaces where teachers are recognised as the main provider of this support.**2014 results in Reading** were similar and improved from the 2011, 2012 and 2013 end of year results. See below**2011 1-2% (well below) compared with 2012 (1-2%) compared with 2013 (1-2%) and compared with 2014 (2%) Again a similar result in 2014****2011 7% (below) compared with 2012 (8%) compared with 2013 (8%) and compared with 2014 (8%) A similar result to 2011, 2012 and 2013.****2011 41% (at) compared with 2012 (40%) compared with 2013 (47%) and compared with 2014 (48%) A trend from 2011 to 2014 shows an increase in numbers in this category (from 41% to 48%).****2011 49% (above) compared with 2012 (50%) compared with 2013 (44%) and compared with 2014 (44%) An drop in 2013 and 2014 in favour of the “at” Category****.** **The reading results are pleasing and should be celebrated** because we have managed to hold our high levels of achievement across the school in the number of students in the “at” or “above” combined category. A drop in percentage of students (5-6%) from the “above” category to the “at” category in 2013 and 2014 requires further investigation.**Achievement by Māori: Reading and in Mathematics: N. = 25****In 2014** 21/25 (84%) of Māori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in Reading compared to 442/479 (92%) of European students. A -8% difference in favour of non-Māori students**In 2013** 15/18 (83%) of Māori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in Reading compared to 376/413 (91%) of NZ European students. A -8% difference in favour of non-Māori students**In 2012** (77%) of Māori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in Reading compared to (92%) of NZ European students. A -15% difference in favour of non-Māori students.**In 2011** (72%) of Māori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in Reading compared to (92%) of NZ European students. A -20% difference in favour of non-Māori students.The 2014 results continues the upward movement of reading achievement for Māori students since 2011 (72%) to 2012 (77%) to 2013 (83%) and in 2014 (84%). A pleasing 12% improvement since 2011. The 2014 results also continue to narrow the gap between non – Māori and Māori students from 20% difference in 2011 – an 8% difference in 2014**In 2014** 23/25 (92%) of Māori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in **Mathematics** compared to 448/479 (93%) of NZ European students. This is a **near equal performance** and an improved performance from 2011, 2012 and 2013**In 2013** 16/18 (89%) of Maori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in **Mathematics** compared to 366/413 (89%) of NZ European students. **An equal performance** over the sum of both categories (both groups had 89% “above” or “at”) but the spread is between both categories from each group is different. There was a higher % of NZ European students in the “above” category. **In 2012** (82%) of Maori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in **Mathematics** compared to (90%) of NZ European students.**In 2011** (88%) of Maori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in **Mathematics** compared to (87%) of NZ European students. This is a **near equal performance**This continues the upward movement of Maori students since 2011 (88%) to 2012 (82%) to 2013 (89%) and to (92%) in 2014. This trend continues to see a small gap between non–Māori and Māori students from -1% difference in 2011, -8% in 2012, and equal result in 2013 and a –1% difference in 2014**In 2014** there were **25** Māori students in the school and the results of one child will change results by 5% and if from one category to another up to 10%. This needs to be understood when interpreting the data. Our long term goal remains to have no difference in the achievement levels between Maori and NZ European children and this has been achieved in maths in 2011, 2013 and 2014. We are also close to achieving this in reading.**Achievement by Gender: Reading and in Mathematics:** **In 2014** 240/255 (94%) of girls and 202/224 (90%) of boys were at or above the standard in **reading.** This is similar to 2013 where (90%) of girls and (91%) of boys were at or above the standard in **reading.** In 2012 (90%) boys and (90%) of girls reached or were above the standard. In 2014 there were 4% more girls “at” or “above” the standard than boys compared to 2013 where there were slightly more boys “above the standard and in 2012 it was equal. There is very little gender difference in **reading** though there is a slightly higher % of female students in the “above” category. **In 2014** 214/224(95%) of boys were “at” or “above” the standard in **mathematics** comparedto 234/255 (92%) of girls. This compares **to 2013** where 194/220(88%) of boys reached the standard in **mathematics** or were above it compared to 209/236 (88%) of girls. The 2014 result is better than 2013 by 7% for boys and 4% for girls and continues an upward trend since 2011. The 2013 results were lower than 2012 so the 2014 results have reversed this dip.We will explain through the team PLG process what happened to specific 2014 year level cohorts of children and identify strategies that lead to higher student achievement for boys and girls. |
| **NAG2A (b)(i) Areas for improvement** |
|  |
| National Standard subject: **Written Language****In 2014** we set goals for **Maori students**, for **high ability students** and for “**well below” and “below” students**. We targeted **written language** as an area we continued to want to improve in as there were lower numbers of students achieving “at” or “above” the standard when compared to reading and mathematics. We also had lower numbers of **high ability students** achieving “above” the standard in reading. Another group that we continued to focus on in 2014 were our **Maori students** who in 2011, 2012 and in 2013 were significantly below the achievement levels of European students in **written language**. **Our 2014** national standard data in **written language** shows significant improved levels of student achievement across the school. At the end of the year we had 132/479 (28%) of students across the school achieving “above” the standard, a further 286/479 (60%) achieving “at” the standard. This adds up to 418/479 (88%) of students “at” or “above” the national standard (a 7% improvement on 2013 and an 11% since 2011). There were 53/479 (11%) below the standard and 8/479 (2%) well below the standard. This is a big improvement from 2013, 2012 and 2011. The 61/479 (12%) of children who are “below” or “well below” the national standard have been identified and are receiving differentiated learning support within learning spaces where teachers are recognised as the main provider of this support. We will to explain through the team PLG process what happened to specific 2014 year level cohorts of children.The results are improved in 2014 when compared to 2011, 2012 and 2013 as set out below:**2011, 2012 and 2013 (1%-2%) were “well below” the standard.** **In 2014 8/479 (2%) students were “well below” the standard. A similar result to 2011, 2012 and 2013.****2011 (21%) were “below”, compared with 2012 where (17%) were “below”, compared with 2013 where (18%) were “below” the standard****In 2014 53/479 (11%) students were “below” the standard. A significant improved result to 2011-2013****2011 (55%) were “at” compared with 2012 (58%) were “at” compared to 2013 (56%) were at the standard****In 2014 286/479 (60%) of students were “at” the standard. A better result compared to 2011-2013** **2011 (22%) were “above” compared with 2012 (22%) were also 2013 (25%) were “above” the standard.****In 2014 132/479 (28%) of students were “above” the standard. An improved result of 6% from 2011** The graph above shows the steady improvement over time and this is to be celebrated. We have made gains for Māori Students who were targeted in 2013 and 2014. In **2014** 19/25 (76%) of Māori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in Writing compared to 374/426 (87%) of NZ European students. **An 11% difference**. In **2013** 12/18 (67%) of Māori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in Writing compared to 337/413 (82%) of NZ European students. **A 15% difference.** In **2012** (65%) of Māori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in Writing compared to (79%) of NZ European students. **A 14% difference.** In **2011** (42%) of Maori students were “at” or “above” the national standard in written language compared to (78%) of NZ European students. **A 36% difference.** **There has been a significant improvement in achievement levels for Maori Students “at” or “above” the national standard from 2011 – 2014. An increase of +34%.**The results are pleasing and should be celebrated. **In 2014** we have improved on the good level of student achievement results in writing compared to **2011**, **2012** and **2013** with 88% of the total number of students across the school being “at” or “above” the standard for their class level or time at school. Results show a 7% improvement across the whole school in 2014 (2011 results had (77%) “at” or “above” and the 2012 results had (80%) +3% “at” or “above” the 2013 had (81%) +1% “at” or “above” and 2014 had (88%) +7% of students achieving “at” or “above” across the school. This learning area will continue to be a focus in 2015 as it is still below the achievement levels of reading and mathematics although the gap narrowed in 2014.We continue to believe that future improvements in written language and in the other 2 learning areas is dependent on all teachers across the school implementing agreed to best practice.**Do we agree with the data?**These results are accurate, moderated and tend to be conservative to ensure we don’t overstate student achievement. We know through comparing our data with some other schools we tend to mark conservatively. **We advise that this data can’t reliably be compared to other schools’ data without moderation.****Variation of school data recorded on Musac Classroom Manager to MOE extracted Exel template**We use Musac Student Manager and Classroom Manager data base. The data reported has come from the MOE Exel extracted data where by Cashmere Primary School data went through a 4 step process to ensure data from years 1 – 4 was grouped and reported by the anniversary of each child being at school i.e. 40 weeks, 80 weeks and 120 weeks. This resulted in some children (who according to our EOY data had reached “at” the standard) being grouped in the “below” category because their anniversary date was before the end of year. At that stage the data entered and recorded on our data base showed the child was close to the standard but not “at” the standard. Subsequently the child has reached or even surpassed the standard but this isn’t reflected in the extracted data. Also to some degree it depended on when data was recorded and entered. This may have effected about 10 – 15 Year 1 – 3 children and will have altered our percentage results by 1% - 5%.**Post-Traumatic Stress**Recent research from the University of Canterbury has shown that post-traumatic stress has been evident in children/ families across Christchurch which may have impacted on this data. |
| **NAG 2A (b)(ii) Basis for identifying areas for improvement****Methodology:** We use the 3 step PLG (professional learning group) process of analysis of the data (what is the data saying?), validity of the data (do we believe it? Is it accurate?) And then finally where is the challenge for us as teachers and as a school community? (This 3rd step gave us our 2015 set of goals and targets).In the first year of the introduction to National Standards we spent a significant amount of time as a leadership team and staff deciding on how we would interpret the national standard data and how we would moderate the data between classes and across the school.The achievement levels presented in the data reporting template and referred to above are based on multi-sourced norm referenced assessment tools and qualitative criterion based evidence including work samples, learning progressions of curriculum levels and the knowledge of the student from teacher, peer and parent perspective to inform us of an overall teacher judgment (OTJ) to determine where a student is in relation to national standards. **End of the Year AT expected level**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Maths numeracy** | **Maths****Other strands** |
| **After 1 year**  | Green 1 -3Orange | Curriculum Level 1p | Stage 3 | Curriculum Level 1p |
| **After 2 years**  | Turquoise Purple | Curriculum Level 1a | Mid/ end stage 4 | Curriculum Level 1a |
| **After 3 years** | Gold 1 and 2Silver 1 and 2: Level 2b | The equivalent of NZC Level 2b | Beginning/Mid stage 5 | Curriculum Level 2b |
| **Year 4** | The equivalent of NZC Level 2p/2a | The equivalent of NZC Level 2p/2a | Mid/ End stage 5  | Curriculum Level 2p/2a |
| **Year 5** | The equivalent of NZC Level 3b | The equivalent of NZC Level 3b | Begin / mid stage 6 | Curriculum Level 3b |
| **Year 6** | The equivalent of NZC Level 3p/3a | The equivalent of NZC Level 3p/3a | Mid/ End of stage 6 | Curriculum Level 3a |
| **Year 7** | The equivalent of NZC Level 4b | The equivalent of NZC Level 4b | Beg/ Mid stage 7 | Curriculum Level 4b |
| **Year 8** | The equivalent of NZC Level 4p/4a | The equivalent of NZC Level 4p/4a | End of stage 7  | Curriculum Level 4p/4a |

**National Standards at Cashmere Primary School are referenced by OTJ’s from multi source data including** * Student work samples
* CPS teacher co-constructed *learning progressions* based on NZC
* Evidence of student learning which is observable in a learning context including teacher observations and conferences
* Knowledge of the learner through student and whanau voice.
* Norm referenced tests (E-asTTle and PAT):

**National Standards are referenced by OTJ** Work Samples Learning ProgressionsEvidence of student **O. T. J.**Learning (hard copy and on line) Observable in a learning context Knowledge of the Norm referenced tests (only one needed)Learner: Parent, teacher, peer and student. **NB We moderate and report on achievement levels conservatively so that we don’t overstate individual or cohort achievement.**  |
| **Statement Improvement Plan****2014 Achievement Goals and Specific Targets** |

**Base line data (see above)**

**Mathematics:**

**Strategic Goal 1:**

Maintain the high levels of maths achievement across the school:

**Target 1:**

Have 90% or more students across the school “at” or “above” the standard.

**Result:** 93% of students across the school were “at” or “above” the standard. This target was met.

 **Target 2:**

Have 90% of year 1, 2, 3 and 4’ students reach “at” or “above” the national standard for their time at school or class level in mathematics

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2014 EOY Results** | **At %** | **Above %** | **Total %** | **Met/ not met** |
| **Year 1** | 58 | 28 | 86 | Not met (but close to) |
| **Year 2** | 60 | 19 | 79 | Not Met |
| **Year 3** | 72 | 22 | 94 | Met  |
| **Year 4** | 36 | 59 | 95 | Met |

**Target 3:**

Have Year 1 students reach end of stage 3 in numeracy after 40 weeks at school. This target exceeds the national standard for Year 1’s after 40 weeks at school. We chose to have a higher standard at Year 1 in order to support year 2’s reach their standard after 80 weeks at school.

**The results were**:

Number of Year One children who have been at school for 40 weeks or more N. = 61

* Number who reached the target of Numeracy Stage 3 End or above:  N. = 38 (62%)
* Number who did not reach the target of End of Stage 3: N. = 23 (38%)
* Number who did not reach the end of Stage 3 but did achieve standard of Mid Stage 3: N. = 11 (18%)
* Number who reached Stage 3 Start (the actual national standard of 'at' for Year 1) = 10 (16%)

Number who were below Stage 3 (the national standard) = 1 (2%)

By setting a higher expectation at year 1 our aim was to improve the number of students reaching “at” or “above” the national standard for year 2 after 80 weeks at school. This will continue to be a goal for 2015

**Written language**

**Strategic Goal 2:**

Continue the improvement happening in Written Language since 2011

2013 results showed that Years 2, 3, 5 and 7 had below 80% achieving at or above the national standard.

**Result:**

In 2014 88% of all students across the school were “at” or “above” the national standard for their class level or time at school. This is a 7% improvement of 2013 results and 2% better than the 85% aimed for. This target was met.

Below are the 2014 results broken down by year levels. Those year levels highlighted in yellow had less than 85% achieving “at” or “above” the NS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year level** | **Above****%** | **At****%** | **Total of “at” and “above”****%** | **Below****%** | **well below****%** | **Total of “below” and “well below”****%** | **Comment****Was this year level 85% or more at or above the NS** |
| **1** | 14 | 76 | 90 | 10 | 0 | 10 | **Yes** (exceeded target by 5%) |
| **2** | 13 | 77 | 90 | 8 | 2 | 10 | **Yes** (exceeded target by 5%) |
| **3** | 30 | 44 | 74 | 26 | 0 | 26 | **No**  |
| **4** | 42 | 45 | 87 | 10 | 3 | 13 | **Yes** (exceeded target by 2%) |
| **5** | 33 | 53 | 86 | 11 | 3 | 14 | **Yes** (exceeded target by 1%) |
| **6** | 18 | 74 | 92 | 8 | 0 | 8 | **Yes** (exceeded target by 7%) |
| **7** | 29 | 47 | 76 | 18 | 6 | 24 | **No**  |
| **8** | 45 | 53 | 98 | 2 | 0 | 2 | **Yes** (exceeded target by 13%) |

**Target 4:**

Have 85% of all students “at” or “above” the national standard.

This is to be achieved by targeting the 2013 year groups who achieved below 80% achieving “at” or “above” i.e. years 3, 4, 6, and 8 2014 year groups and the continuation of the “ALL” intervention.

**Result:**

In 2014 years 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 8 had 85% or more students reaching “at” or “above” the National Standard for their year level or time at school. Years 3 and 7 didn’t reach the 2014 85% target. See table above.

**High Ability Students**

**Strategic Goal 3**:

Identify and record these students and their strengths and communicate to team leaders and teachers the names, strength(s) of these students so that an appropriate, challenging and differentiated programme is put in place to meet their specific needs

Results:

All teachers across the school identified and named students who were high ability and high performing within their learning space and were able to articulate a differentiated learning programme happening in their classrooms to support these children.

**Target 5:**

Have 60% of identified high ability students (cluster 5 students) achieve “well above” in their particular area of strength in relation to reading and mathematics national standards.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Teams** | **Results** |
| **Rata Team** | **N/A** |
| **Kowhai Team** | **Year 3**Reading: 71% **(achieved)** of students identified as high ability achieved “Well Above” in Reading.Maths: 92% **(achieved)** of students identified as high ability achieved “Well Above’ in Maths**Year 4**Reading. 83% **(achieved)** of students identified as high ability achieved “Well Above” in Reading.Maths: 40% **(not achieved)** of students identified as high ability achieved “Well Above’ in Maths |
| **Matai Team** | **Year 5**Reading: 33% **(not achieved)** of students (3 of 9) identified as high ability “Well Above” in Reading.Maths: 82% **(achieved)** of students (9 of 11) identified as high ability achieved “Well Above’ in Maths**Year 6**Reading: 30% **(not achieved)** of students (3 of 10) identified as high ability “Well Above” in Reading.Maths: 100% **(achieved)** of students (8 of 8 and 3 more) identified as high ability “Well Above’ in Maths |
| **Totara Team** | **Year 7**Reading: 50% **(not achieved)** of students identified as high ability achieved “Well Above” in Reading.Maths:14 % **(not achieved)** of students identified as high ability achieved “Well Above’ in Maths**Year 8**Reading: 55% **(not achieved)** of students identified as high ability achieved “Well Above” in Reading.Maths: 25% **(not/achieved)** of students identified as high ability achieved “Well Above’ in Maths***This will be a focus for the Totara team in 2015. In the PLG analysis of data there is a sense that we may be being too conservative. We will link with the advisory service and CHS to moderate our OTJ’s*** |

**Target 6:**

Have the teachers of these children demonstrate the evidence based differentiated programme and can track the progress towards the above target.

 **Results:** This target was met. Using learning walks by the principal, team leaders and peer support along with appraisal interviews all teachers were able to identify high ability and high performing students and could provide evidence of a differentiated programme being offered to these children.

**Teacher Practice**

**Strategic Goal 4:**

**That all classroom teachers demonstrate an understanding of and can articulate the pedagogy of the school**

**Results:** Using learning walks by the principal, team leaders and peer support including teaching as Inquiry reports and appraisal interviews all teachers were able to demonstrate an understanding and could articulate the pedagogy of the school to a greater or lesser extent.

 **Target 7:**

**Differentiated explicit teaching programmes in literacy and mathematics operate in 100% of classrooms**

**Results:** This target was met. We know this by using evidence from learning walks by the principal, team leaders and appraisal interviews.

**Target 8:**

**That 100% of classroom teachers know the individual needs, strengths and next steps of their students and can demonstrate evidence based classroom planning and delivery to meet these.**

**Results:** This target was met. We know this by using evidence from learning walks by the principal, team leaders and appraisal interviews.