Riwaka School Analysis of Variance Reporting 2022 on 2021 Data



School Name:	Riwaka School		School Nu	School Number: 3217	
Strategic Aim:	Aim 1: To improve student learning and achievement by building our teaching and learning culture throughout our school.				
Annual Aim:	We are looking to see increased engagement and accelerated achievement for learners across the school in mathematics.				
Target:	No numerical target was recorded.				
Baseline Data: MEAN SCALE SCORE RESULTS AND SHIFTS FOR Y5-8 STU				DENTS	
	Year Level for 2022	2020 November Mean Scale Score Results	2021 November Mean Scale Score Results	Mean Scale Score Shift	Scale Score shift comparison to National Reference group mean scale score shift
	8	52.6 (49.6)*	48.3 (55.0)*	-4.3 (5.4)*	-9.7
	7	41.3 (45.1)*	49.5 (49.6)*	8.2 (3.5)*	+4.7
	6	40.9 (38.9)*	43.1 (45.1)*	2.2 (6.2)*	-4
	5	-	30.3 (38.9)*		
	*Numbers in brackets provide statistics for all students in the national reference group				



Actions What did we do?	Outcomes What happened?	Reasons for the variance Why did it happen?	Evaluation Where to next?
All teaching staff continued to use DMIC pedagogy and practice to teach mathematics across the school. This included mixed ability grouping and whole school moderation supported by DMIC mentor. DMIC assessment tasks used school-wide as part of Riwaka assessment criteria and for the DMIC research project.	Students continued to perform at below expected levels. Y6 (2021) students showed the highest scale score shift. This is largely due to teaching staff at that level not using the DMIC methodology. The highest reduction in scale score shift was from Y7 (2021) Results from DMIC assessment tasks for the research project were not shared with the school. Results from the DMIC testing were moderated for a curriculum level. Informal student voice collection showed a disengagement with the DMIC pedagogy across the school. There was no formal survey to collect student (pulse taking).	We anticipated accelerated progress in mathematics across the school but test results show this did not occur. One reason for this could be that the standardised testing we used (PAT) did not correlate with the teaching pedagogy (DMIC). The DMIC methodology focuses on explaining and justifying mathematical thinking, the PAT testing focuses on knowledge, often providing multiple choice answers which do not require justification. DMIC presents questions in a particular way which students were accustomed to. This presentation is different to the standardised testing format. Younger students struggled with using technology to complete the PAT testing. Furthermore, a number of the students found reading the test challenging and may have interpreted the questions incorrectly.	We will ensure that the baseline data is taken from DMIC assessments. We will ensure all teaching staff are using the DMIC pedagogy; they will continue to have In Class Support (ICS) from our DMIC mentor. We will collect teacher and student voice to monitor engagement with mathematical practices. In Term 3, we will analyse the ongoing effectiveness of DMIC pedagogy across the school through engagement and achievement. We will then decide if this approach aligns with the overarching pedagogical direction of Riwaka school. We have identified teachers who may need additional mentor support. We have identified students who need additional support in maths on our support register. We have staff engaged in ALiM for 2022 to raise student achievement and confidence in maths.



	Funding for maths resources as all classes are teaching the same strand simultaneously.
	Funding for teacher release to meet with DMIC mentor to ensure consistency across classes in terms of teaching practice and pedagogy.

Planning for next year:

The Board of Trustees would see higher student achievement if all teaching staff were held accountable to follow the same pedagogical approach. In order to see improvement in mathematics (and other curriculum areas), an initial target is required and direct correlation is needed between the teaching format and assessment format. This will ensure that when students are tested, they are able to thoroughly show their understanding of mathematical concepts across the different strands. We are taking steps to more closely monitor student achievement in mathematics, including adding them to our school support register.



Strategic Aim:	To improve student learning and achievement by building our teaching and learning culture throughout our school				
Annual Aim:	We are looking to see accelerated achievement in phonemic and phonological awareness for identified learners.				
Target:	Target learners were not identified, however baseline testing was established using 'The Code' - Phonological Awareness Screening Tool and Word Check for spelling				
Baseline Data:	Data from Spelling- Word Check Assessments - The Code				
	Term 1 2021 YEAR LEVEL	MEAN CODE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT	Term 4 2021 YEAR LEVEL	MEAN CODE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT	
	8	4.11	8	6.3	
	7	3.05	7	5.41	
	6	3.08	6	4.87	
	5	2.43	5	3.8	
					•



Actions What did we do?	Outcomes What happened?	Reasons for the variance Why did it happen?	Evaluation Where to next?
In 2021, 4 staff attended PLD related to Liz Kane's 'The Code', a structured approach to teaching the alphabetic code/phonics/spelling. Whole staff induction to Structured Literacy and The Code. 2 additional teachers attended Christine Braid's Structured Literacy workshop through the Kahui Ako. Code testing was implemented in all classes as a means of tracking progress in phonics/spelling across the school. Decodable texts and supporting activity resource books purchased. Teachers given access to Little Learners Love Literacy teacher resources, The Code by Liz Kane	Target group of students from our support register not formally identified to show tracking and movement. Therefore we cannot measure outcomes relating to this target. No baseline phonological awareness data was provided as a target group of students was never identified, therefore no outcomes can be shared. Inconsistent levels of staff engagement so implementation of the Structured Literacy approach was to varying degrees. This may be due to inconsistent expectations across the school and lack of clear directive as to what teaching needed to occur. We were aiming for at least an improvement of two year levels in mean year level achievement by the end of the year. Code levels accelerated over all year levels Year 8 - increase of 2.19 Year 7 - increase of 2.36 Year 6 - increase of 1.77 Year 5 - increase of 1.37	Code levels accelerated over all year levels Year 8 - increase of 2.19 Year 7 - increase of 2.36 Year 6 - increase of 1.77 Year 5 - increase of 1.37 The average increase for Year 7&8 students was 2 Code Year Levels-The reason could be because the Year 8 students had been exposed to this approach in 2020. The approach was taught daily. The Year 7&8 teachers had both been to the Liz Kane PLD sessions and were confident in the delivery of the Structured Literacy approach Levels of teacher buy-in and engagement with the approach varied may have had an impact on results The validity of the initial data presented in 2021 School Charter does not accurately show student progress as creating a Mean number for a Code Level does not accurately show student progress For consistency, we have followed the same process to create a Mean comparison however this may not be a true reflection of student achievement. We	We will ensure all teaching staff are using the SL pedagogy; they will continue to have support from teachers who are currently using the approach. Present future data in a valid format which is able to be interpreted with validity and accuracy. Ensure that the aims/targets of the Charter are upheld and that it is a working document which helps inform and direct our teaching. Ensure that expectations are clear across the school regarding teaching of The Code and implementing the Structured Literacy Approach schoolwide. Provide teachers with additional PLD support if necessary, and hold teachers to account if they are not engaging in practices which align with our aims and targets. We have a number of students who have been identified on our support register as needing additional literacy support. They require support which aligns with



question if the initial data in the 2021 School Charter is indeed a valid data set.

our school wide approach - Structured Literacy.

There are still some teachers who are still in the beginning phases of their pedagogical shift towards implementing a Structured Literacy approach. They need additional PLD support to feel empowered and ready to make this change in their teaching approach.

Funding to support teacher knowledge, PLD. We have the opportunity for further staff to attend a Liz Kane workshop in 2022. To ensure consistency across classes in terms of teaching practice and pedagogy.

Teacher release time to work with experts/professionals in the literacy field - Dr Christine Braid in 2022.
Continue to build up our resources and teacher resources to support the SL approach.

Planning for next year:

The Board of Trustees would see higher student achievement if all teaching staff were held accountable to follow the same pedagogical approach. There needs to be consistency across the school, with all teachers implementing a Structured Literacy approach to their literacy teaching. In order to see improvement in literacy (and other curriculum areas), an initial target is required and direct correlation is needed between the teaching format and assessment format. We need to also ensure that the data that is collected and reported to the Board of Trustees is a valid data set and is an accurate measure of variance across the school year. Any aims/targets need to be clearly communicated, so that the Charter is in fact a working document.

We are taking steps to more closely monitor student achievement in literacy, including adding them to our school support register.

