

## Examples of good self-evaluation sentences

### 1.

On completing a question level analysis, and delving deeper into individual questions, it became clear that whilst many students understood the method required to solve a problem, such as formal multiplication, they made mistakes with their basic times tables knowledge.

Evaluative words: understood, made mistakes

### 2.

Using the School Resource Management Self-Assessment Tool, an analysis was made of the school's spending in different areas. Spending on teaching resources is broadly in line with similar schools. However, the school is in the highest 20% of similar schools for teaching staff costs. This is because there are two members of staff on the leadership scale, as well as three UPS teachers. Two of the UPS teachers also have a TLR. One member of staff is likely to move to the UPS next academic year. In 2020-21, of the six class teachers, one will be on the leadership scale and four will be UPS, representing a very experienced, and expensive, staffing line up.

Evaluative words: broadly in line, highest, likely, experienced, expensive

### 3.

Pupils' attainment across all subjects is an area of concern. During an Evaluation of Overall School Effectiveness visit (Nov 2022), it was identified that the quality of teaching and learning in foundation subjects needed to be further developed as well as approaches to checking what pupils knew and remembered against the intended learning. An analysis of foundation subject data for 2021-22 showed 29.2% of pupils were working at age related expectations or above across foundation subjects. Lower Prior attainers and disadvantaged pupils had been identified as the most vulnerable groups (Appendix 1).

Evaluative words: area of concern, needed to be further developed, most vulnerable

### 4.

Benchmarking data shows that the school has a significantly lower income than similar schools within the local area. It also has the second lowest figure from grant funding and self-generated funding totals. However, the school has the third highest in-year balance and came further up the table in Revenue Reserve per pupil, demonstrating that although finances were tighter than neighbouring schools with similar characteristics, they had been managed well.

Evaluative words: significantly lower, second lowest, third highest, tighter than, managed well

### 5.

To identify contributing factors for this in-school variation around boys, qualitative data was obtained through staff and pupil voice. Analysis of staff voice showed that:

- 78% felt that the main reason children were not achieving the expected standard for maths was not having secure basic number skills.

- 75% said they didn't have time to address gaps given the requirements of covering the full curriculum.
- 87.5% felt that maths interventions were having 'little' to 'no' impact on children's class learning.

Evaluative words: not achieving, not having, didn't have time, having 'little' to 'no' impact

## 6.

In July 2022 maths SATs results were very low at just 43% ARE. This result fell both below the national and local floor standards for that year. In contrast the Year 2 end of the Key stage SATs were 72% for maths, falling in line with the national and local standards of that year. This raised questions on why there was such a stark difference in maths results.

When analysing this data, the Year 6 cohort was extremely small with just 16 pupils and quite diverse. Only 9 of these pupils had been with us since the start of Reception and 7 of these children were supported as SEND, 6 joined during upper key stage 2. The next step was to delve in to the SATs results to see where pupils were missing points: the graphs used show that pupils were achieving higher with their arithmetic skills than in their problem solving and reasoning. This suggests they are not applying what they had learnt to different contexts, which is what they should have been doing if the mastery curriculum was properly embedded.

Through analysing the SATs data and also through discussions it was found that children had a high anxiety towards mathematics. 12.6% of the cohort who were assessed at working at standard missed the SATs pass by 1 mark. This was also the case for two other pupils targeted for greater depth. This data suggested that not only did the school need to look at the mastery curriculum but also the learning behaviours of the children.

In a pupil voice questionnaire, it was noted that 70% of KS2 children spoke negatively towards the learning of mathematics, whereas only 52% of KS1 spoke negatively. Their ideas of maths across the school 82% showed that they thought maths was just adding numbers and times tables. This data shows that the attitudes towards maths is on a downward trend the older they become.

Evaluative words: very low, fell below, in contrast, raised questions, achieving higher than, not applying, should have been doing, properly embedded, high anxiety, need to look, spoke negatively, downward trend

## 7.

Looking at outcomes at the end of KS2 initially, as the main performance data published due to being mixed key stages (Y5 – Y8). Firstly, the three year trend up until 2019 (see Appendix 1.2, pg 1). At the end of the academic year in 2022, the % of pupils reaching the Expected standard+ in Reading had dropped from 76% to 62%. This figure was actually lower than one year previously in 2021 with 64%. The pupil progress also showed a decrease from +4% to -11%. The Scaled Score Reading Score had decreased from 103.2 to 101.7, again lower than the figure back in 2017 of 102.4. However, the % pupils achieving the higher standard in Reading had improved from 12% to 19%. From this raw data, it was clear the main focus for school improvement needed to be improving the proportion of pupils achieving the expected standard.

Evaluative words: dropped, lower than, decrease, main focus needed to be

## 8.

In order to identify areas for improvement within the school, Data was collected and analysed (Appendix 1) from a range of sources: Analysing School Performance (ASP); School Inspection Data Summary Report (IDSR); *Perspective Lite* (LA comparison data); and internal school data through *Insight*.

The data indicated that writing should be a priority area for development. There were clear decreasing trends in end of phase data and a consistently large or increasing gender gap. Additionally, trends in the data showed that the standard of writing in the school was below the national average and similar schools.

According to the EEF, Great Cross CofE VA Primary School is a school with a similar likeness based on the characteristics of pupils. St Hilda's writing progress is -1.3 compared to Great Cross's 0.8. Additionally, Great Cross has a greater proportion of pupils reaching a higher standard in RWM. Although there could be many school specific reasons for these differences, the results demonstrate a need to improve writing at ARE/+ and GD at St Hilda's.

To collect further evidence, an analysis was made of internal teacher assessment data; teaching through learning walks; staff opinions through staff voice and learning through book looks.

Class data for Summer 2019 shows there is a large variance between the percentage of pupils performing at ARE/+ and the percentage of pupils working at GD across different classes. During a learning walk, all classes were visited within the school and it was found that provision for writing was variable: in some classes, pupils' planning was not effective, some teachers were teaching grammar without considering applications to writing; some pupils were writing independently but without clear modelling; and one teacher had given pupils a large bank of vocabulary they were struggling to use.

This led to a focus for teacher lesson observations (LO) in the teaching of writing. Teachers are assessed in three areas: curriculum, teaching and behaviour. Curriculum assessment includes lesson content being appropriate to the year group and there being a logical sequence to lessons. Teachers are scored from 5 – embedded in practice to 1 – absent in practice. I found that there was an average score of 2.9 – sufficient but there are some weaknesses.

To get staff views, a teacher voice questionnaire was given out (Appendix 2). It was clear that teachers were lacking confidence in teaching pupils the writing process and composition elements. Additionally, one teacher commented that they would like support with teaching writing with a clearer structure. Following this up in discussions in meetings, teachers felt that additional support would be helpful in planning and teaching.

After considering the data, teacher voice and monitoring in 2018-19, there were a number of factors identified as potentially contributing to this variance: planning and teaching the curriculum; confidence and experience of class teachers; subject knowledge of teachers; teachers' attitudes towards early writing.

These factors relate heavily to the teachers and teaching which are going to be key in ensuring that all pupils are exposed to quality first teaching to support their progress in writing, particularly as 11 teachers are within the first five years of their teaching career. When dealing with in-school variance, two of the key areas identified are quality of teaching and learning and standardising procedures. It is clear that not every subject, pupil and teacher can be pressed into a single mould but standardisation works best when applied to core aspects of lesson planning. (National College & TDA, 2009). Additionally, looking into research on improving boys' writing, a recommendation is that they will benefit from tightly focussed, well-structured lessons (Daly 2002).

## 9.

Prior to children starting school, we work closely with the nursery settings to moderate their assessments so that they are accurate to each developmental stage. Previous experiences have highlighted that nursery staff have varying interpretations of children's learning and development at each age band. Meaning that children were arriving from the setting assessed as working far higher than what they were benchmarked on-entry to reception. This was evident where a child arrived in school, who was non-verbal and who had an undiagnosed additional need, and yet had been assessed at working 40-60 months. This causes many issues for us as a school not least when applying for an Education, Health, and Care Plan (EHCP) where needed. Therefore, it was important to moderate with these settings to ensure data is accurate.

Evaluative words: varying interpretations, far higher, evident, causes issues, important to moderate, ensure data is accurate

## 10.

An analysis of the academic results for reading and identified that a lower percentage of pupils were achieving greater depth scores in reading in Y1-6 in school than the national average. The national average of pupils that achieved greater depth in reading at the end of KS2 in Summer 22 was 27%. Within school, 19.2% of pupils were achieving greater depth in reading which was below the national average. This was not impacted by the high EAL cohort as EAL children achieved higher than non-EAL (seen in appendix A). Furthermore, 19.6% of pupil premium eligible students achieved greater depth, lower than the national average of 31% for students with pupil premium. Students classified as non-mobile achieved 24.5% greater depth, showing that whilst school mobility harms whole school percentages, the non-mobile cohort was 2.5% below the national average. When comparing to schools with similar cohorts and areas via *schoolslikeyours* from FFT, the end of KS2 percentages of pupils achieving greater depth (18%) was lower than 8/10 similar schools – see appendix A. This showed that the school was performing below average in this area throughout a range of cohorts. Upon further investigation, it became apparent that students struggled to answer longer questions with enough depth and evidence from the text to be able to achieve the marks necessary to score at the greater depth standard.

When evaluating staff survey data, staff felt the most effective techniques for teaching reading were the explicit teaching of reading skills within a teacher-led group and the tasks based upon this. Teachers found independent tasks that were not strongly linked to the texts were least impactful upon learning. This meant that 3/5 sessions per week for children were deemed to be the least impactful due to the carousel method currently used. Pupil voice supported this point of view. This showed me that too many guided reading lessons were not having a positive impact on pupil progress and attainment.

It became clear a more focused style of teaching reading was required to allow for skills to be taught in more depth and with more teacher modelling of them. A higher focus on the skills of inference, vocabulary and explanation was needed – all these elements would be incorporated into the new approach.