

# Seven Mills Primary School

## Headteacher's Report on STANDARDS and ACHIEVEMENT: 2016-17

**Green** = a positive

**Yellow** = a point that needs consideration as it *may* tell us something significant

**Pink** = an area we want to improve

### Headlines

#### Key Stage 2 (Year 6)

- Attainment at **expected** level (percentage of pupils attaining expected) was almost exactly in line with national average in Reading, Writing and Maths, and slightly better than national average in SPAG.
- Attainment at **higher** level (percentage of pupils attaining higher level) was lower than national average in all subjects, though we believe not statistically significantly so. Reading/Writing/SPAG were all closer to national averages than maths.
- The school's average scaled score was slightly lower than national average for all subjects.
- Progress from KS1 – KS 2 was slightly better than national average in all subjects.

I believe that the most significant points from our analysis of attainment by group is that:

- In spite of high levels of social disadvantage as a group, our non-EAL pupils scored well (better than all children nationally), particularly in Reading.
- In spite of their social disadvantage, our Pupil premium children scored well in all subjects – as well as all children nationally.
- Girls had stronger performance than boys at **expected** in Reading, Writing and Maths, but less strong at **higher** in writing and maths.

Compared with last year:

- Our writing results fell slightly but remained in line with national expectations.
- Reading attainment was up at both **expected** and **higher**.
- Maths attainment was up at **expected**.

#### Key Stage 1 (Year 2)

- Attainment in Reading and Writing is considerably improved on **last year**. Attainment in maths is slightly better.
- However, attainment at **expected** in Reading, Writing and Maths remains below national averages, although we believe not statistically significantly so. (At the time of writing, confidence intervals for attainment are not reported on Analyse School Performance (ASP) in the way that they were on RaiseOnline).
- Attainment at **higher** in Reading is somewhat below national averages. We are also below at **higher** in writing and maths, although the gap in these subjects is smaller.
- The percentage of pupils attaining **expected** or above in all three reported subjects (combined) is also lower than national averages – we had less congruence this year than last. However, we believe the score is nonetheless within the confidence interval.
- The performance of summer-born pupils was notably weaker than that of autumn-born pupils – we noted the same pattern in last year's data.
- Girls had weaker attainment at **expected** level than boys in all subjects, and at **higher** level in maths.

## Year 1 Phonics Screening

- Attainment was slightly above national expectations – this has been the pattern at Seven Mills for the past three years.

## Early Years Foundation Stage Profile

- Our proportion of children achieving a Good Level of Development is considerably improved from the past two years. However, it is still lower than national and the Local Authority averages, although we believe it is not statistically significantly so. Moreover, the cohort was moderated by the local authority throughout the year, and the school's assessments were repeatedly found to be exactly right.
- Our proportion of pupils **exceeding** the Good Level of Development is also lower than national averages, although this did increase slightly last year. We believe that these data in particular are a reflection of issues around EAL and weaker language levels.

## Other Year Groups

- Our internal systems track pupil attainment and progress in all year groups from Year 1 – 6. (We use the 'ages and stages' feeding into the e-Profile for Early Years.) As governors know, developing the system has been a difficult task – particularly in order to give us meaningful information about progress across time, rather than a crude 'snapshot' of whether a child is meeting year group expectations or not. Teachers are working hard to do a range of meaningful assessments that a) feed into their 'next steps' teaching and b) also feed into the progress tracker. The triangulation of all these data gives us rich information about what the children can achieve as individuals, but it still remains difficult to convert these data into a single 'points score' numerical value that we use to track progress in the way that we could with the old levels. We are closer to this goal than we were, but I believe it will still take another year or two before we can be absolutely confident in our system, so in the meantime the numerical data generated by our own tracker must be treated with extreme caution – particularly in terms of what it might tell us about the teaching or what it might predict for future attainment (e.g. at the end of key stage). The NFER tests (now done twice yearly in Years 3, 4 and 5) are helpful in indicating any problems (gaps in embedded learning) or successes (things that have 'stuck'), but these too are not fully tested in terms of their accuracy of reflecting how close children are to age-related expectations.

## Action Focuses for the Year Ahead (see also *School Improvement Summary Sheet*)

- Reading comprehension work and reading resilience work across the whole school to address attainment in reading comprehension tests.
- Increasing the proportion of children attaining at higher levels – this includes improving the progress of children with previous higher attainment. Strategies being introduced this year include: a greater focus on problem-solving (NRich) to support better attainment at higher level maths; daily concrete work with Numicon (Daily Digits) in Year R and Year 1 to strengthen understanding of basics for all children as early as possible; increased use of concrete and pictorial stages of learning across the school to avoid/address misconceptions.
- High quality teaching in the infants, combined with early interventions with children vulnerable to falling behind in order to continue the upward trend of attainment at Year 2 and Year R.

## The National Picture

This year there were significant jumps in national average attainment scores at Key Stage 2, as well as increases in national average attainment at Key Stage 1 and Foundation Stage. This does muddy the school's comparisons with our own data from last year. For example: At Key Stage 2 Seven Mills maths attainment at 'expected' went up from 73% to 77% (two pupils), but nationally attainment went up from 70% to 77% - so we changed from being slightly above national averages to being exactly in line with them, even though our actual attainment improved. Similarly our attainment at 'higher' level for reading this year was 5 children – 17% – which was very close to **last** year's national average figure of 19%, but still rather lower than **this** year's national average figure of 25%.

At the same time the 'pass marks' for the actual exams also went up – by a whole 5 marks (i.e. 10%!) for the reading paper.

Looking at the data is complicated further by the fact that the DfE has changed the way that it makes official data available to schools. Raise Online was closed last July and has been replaced by a website called ASP (Analyse School Performance) which reports some of the same data but in rather different ways. A particularly tricky aspect of this website is that comparisons for groups are sometimes made for **all** children nationally, sometimes for **the same group** nationally, and sometimes with **a different group** nationally. An additional complication for us is that confidence intervals are not currently published on ASP – this is a real issue for small schools (see below, Cohort Size). I believe that there may be more data still to be published on ASP, but it does feel currently that this year there are even more pitfalls than usual for the unwary!

A key shift is that we now even more reliant than ever on comparing ourselves to national mean averages – or national 'benchmarks' as they are referred to on ASP. There is probably some value in this at Key Stage 2, because (assuming that nobody cheats) there is a certain objectivity about the reading and maths data which comes from test papers.

However, national averages are more problematic at Key Stage 1 and Foundation Stage, where all the data is generated by teacher assessment. Between themselves, headteachers are very often heard to say that they don't want their own data to be too far adrift from national averages, and there is also a lot of pressure from the local authority for schools to submit data that is 'close to national'. I believe that this is the reason for the inexorable upward creep of EYFS and KS 1 data nationally year on year – schools overstate the children's attainment a little (or, being cynical, as much as they dare) each year because they are frightened of being too far below the national average. As governors know, I am strongly resistant to this 'upward creep' – I believe it is simply storing up trouble for the future to overstate what such young children can actually do consistently (their fully embedded learning). But it does give us comparatively low data at Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1 (though interestingly, not for Year 1 phonics, which is determined by a test). I do find some of the local authority-wide data (for example at Foundation Stage, which is now virtually in line with national) very difficult to credit, given the challenges – social and linguistic – that we know so many of the children in the borough bring into school with them. Furthermore, as we have discussed in previous

governors' meetings, almost all of our senior leaders and EYFS class teachers have taught in a wide variety of locations and socio-linguistic contexts, which maybe gives Seven Mills a broader perspective on the EYFS assessment process than schools where colleagues have taught only within Tower Hamlets.

### **A note on the methodology**

The data below are presented in the same format as last year. It's a system that I took from a Hackney school via the head at St Luke's, in our own cluster. She presented her data in this way for Ofsted early last year and they really liked it. I have kept the format for us again this year, because it seemed to work for us in looking at our own data.

To try and make the levels of attainment easier to 'read', I have highlighted results in different colours, explained above the table **for each subject**. For the **expected level** I have taken the 5% either side of the national average to be 'broadly in line with national expectations' and then gone up and down in 10% bands from that. For the **higher level** (which far fewer children attain), I have again taken the 5% either side of the national average as 'broadly in line with national expectations' but then gone up and down in just 5% bands.

**Please note however:** that the numerical values of the bands are **different** from last year because the proportions of children achieving the pass marks nationally have changed.

**Please note also:** the coloured bands to show our attainment when compared with national mean averages are my own, and do **not** correspond to any published national system. Nor do they reflect any confidence intervals for the different sizes of cohorts and groups. These confidence intervals are **always** large for us (because we never report on more than 30 pupils) and they also vary enormously depending on the size of the groups we are looking at. **Where groups comprise six pupils or fewer no colour is used because the group is too small to give meaningful information.** However, even for our whole year cohorts of 30 max the confidence intervals only permit the data to be 'significantly above' or 'significantly below' national averages in very extreme circumstances. So for us the percentages tend to 'point the way' rather than providing any conclusive evidence about attainment one way or the other. This is quite aside from the need for us always to look at trends across time, so that we don't respond disproportionately to 'blip' years.

### **Analysis of Data for Years 3, 4 and 5**

For our own internal information I have done a similar analysis of the attainment in Years 3, 4 and 5. The data analysed for these year groups comes from the optional NFER tests for these year groups for maths and reading. I have also used the Year 6 percentages 'bands' and applied them (for each subject) to our attainment in Years 3, 4 and 5 too. However, because I used **this year's** Key Stage 2 (Year 6) national attainment to determine the bands for our 'in-school' data for Year 3, 4 and 5 cohorts, these bands have also risen – which does make it difficult to compare last year's 'in-school' Key Stage 2 data with this year's.

We will **not** publish this analysis on the school website as I believe there are just too many variables/unknowns/uncertainties for these data to give a reliable summative picture of how each cohort or group within each cohort is performing.

### **School Size and Cohort Sizes**

As always, any of our school's data when expressed as percentages **MUST** be treated with caution because of the small cohorts. At Key Stage 1 in 2017 each child is worth almost 4%, as we only had 26 children in the class for the summer term.

The key thing to remember – in good years as well as poorer ones – is that a couple of marks either way for three or four individual children can make the data look remarkably different. There were a couple of instances at Key Stage 2 of 'bad luck' of one kind or another (very recent unprepared new arrivals from abroad, children who were ill) – but to be honest the most noteworthy aspect of the school's Key Stage 2 data is really that we are closely in line with national average attainment (and progress) for so much of the data, despite our very low starting points in the Nursery. At the moment I do not believe there is much statistically significant variation from national averages in most of our KS 2 data, although I do explore some of the 'pointers' in the detailed analysis below.

### **Understanding the Tables**

When you look at the tables, please remember that:

- the DfE now just reports if children have reached '**expected**' levels, or if they are attaining 'at a **higher** level/in greater depth';
- at Key Stage 2 children are given a 'scaled score' between 80 and 120 – the 'expected level' is set at 100, so anything higher than 100 is better than expected. The school is also given an 'average scaled score' for the whole cohort or for groups – the value of this cohort score lies in its being much less susceptible to giving a 'false impression' of attainment by children who fall just above or just below the exam thresholds;
- **Progress** is given as a + or – number compared with a national average progress of 0. (So 0 is not a 'bad' progress score – it is exactly average.) Anything that is + is better than national average. However, negative scores don't mean pupils are going backwards! Just that they are not going forwards quite as quickly as the national average. Confidence intervals for progress of
- the whole Year 6 cohort **are** given on ASP – and they are very wide indeed for us. So I am comfortable that we are 'in the positive', and the fact that we sit pretty much in the middle of each of the confidence intervals also suggests there is nothing statistically unusual about our progress measures.
- Each individual's scaled scores are used to calculate their **progress** from Key Stage 1 results (which were the old 'levels' and corresponding points scores) using quite a complex formula. There are still teething troubles with this system – for example it is possible in some circumstances for a pupil

who moves from the highest prior attainment group at Key Stage 1 to a 'higher level' score at Key Stage 2 nonetheless to be given a 'negative' progress score. (We had at least one of these this year.)

Bear in mind that the way that progress in particular is calculated means that:

- if two or three pupils go 'off the rails' in a small cohort, it can greatly impact on the overall progress figure;
- if you have a number of very highly achieving pupils in a small cohort, they can compensate for other pupils overall.

## YEAR 6

### Contextual Information for the Year 6 Cohort

- Boy heavy cohort for second year running.
- Fewer EAL pupils than is normal for Seven Mills
- Much smaller proportion of Bangladeshi pupils than usual at Seven Mills – half the class of non-Bangaldeshi heritage. This class has always been unusual in this respect.
- Larger proportion of white British pupils than usual at Seven Mills (although one of the five we believe to be incorrectly reported).

### Reading

Year 6 Reading Attainment of National Averages (71% expected, 25% higher)									
Inadequate		Vulnerable		Broadly average		Good		Outstanding	
Bel 56%	Bel. 14%	56- 65%	14– 19%	66 – 76%	20 - 30%	77– 86%	31 – 25%	87% +	36% +
Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher

Different Groups	No.	READING		
		At or above Expected	At Higher	Progress
<b>ALL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0.2</b>
Boys	18	61%	11%	-1.9
Girls	12	83%	25%	3.1
Pupil Premium	19	74%	21%	1.8
White British	5	80%	40%	1.9
Bangladeshi	15	60%	7%	-0.7
SEND (EHC)	0			
SEND (without EHC)	5	20%	0%	1.2
No SEND	25	84%	21%	0
EAL	21	67%	5%	-0.3
No EAL	9	78%	44%	1.1

**NB: Where groups comprise six pupils or fewer no colour is used because the group is too small to give meaningful information.**

- **Progress** scores for each subject are shown as positive and negative numbers either side of 0. The score of 0 means that schools /cohorts make the national average progress for pupils with similar prior attainment.
- **Please Note:** The background colour compares each group with **all** children nationally, **not** the national figure for that particular group.

Prior Attainment Groups	No.	READING		
		At or above Expected	At Higher	Progress
<b>ALL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0.2</b>
HA	5	100%	40%	-1.9
MA	19	79%	16%	-0.2
LA	5	20%	0%	3.8

## Commentary on Year 6 Reading

- Overall, attainment and progress very closely aligned to national.
- More higher level readers than last year (up by two pupils to 17%) but still slightly fewer than we would like, as the national average went up this year to 25%.
- Boys attainment and progress were somewhat weaker than national. This may be because we had one child who was working below the level of the test, and two others who had significantly low scores (one a transfer in from another school at KS2 with an unaccountably high KS 1 score).
- By comparison there were no girls who were too far adrift from national expectations, and the girls had both good attainment and progress.
- Bangladeshi pupils have slightly lower attainment than all national, which is unusual for us.
- Both Bangaldeshi and EAL pupils did less well than national averages at the higher level.
- However, disadvantaged children did very well generally – at least in line with all pupils nationally (slightly better at 'expected').
- Our non-EAL pupils did rather better than national averages, and significantly better than our own EAL pupils. In many contexts this might not be a big surprise, but it is worth noting that all but one of these 9 pupils is pupil premium eligible, and at least one is a post looked-after child – with others having children's social care involvement. So we are actually very pleased with the attainment and progress of this group.
- SEN pupils made good progress.
- Some previous higher attainers had comparatively weak progress (this was caused by three of the five not quite reaching the higher score).
- However, previous low attainers made very good progress in reading.

## A general note on previous higher attainers also eligible for pupil premium

- There were only two previous higher attainers eligible for pupil premium, making it difficult to comment on these as a group. One of them converted to higher in all subjects, the other managed it for writing and GPS, and just missed the maths higher level by a mark.



## Writing

Year 6 Writing Attainment of National Averages (77% expected, 18% higher)									
Inadequate		Vulnerable		Broadly average		Good		Outstanding	
Bel 62%	Bel 9%	62 - 71%	9 - 14%	72 - 82%	13 - 23%	83 - 92%	24 - 29%	93% +	30% +
Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher

Different Group	No.	WRITING		
		At or above Expected	At Higher	Progress
<b>ALL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0.2</b>
Boys	18	72%	11%	-0.5
Girls	12	83%	8%	1.1
Pupil Premium	19	74%	10%	0.4
White British	5	80%	20%	0.9
Bangladeshi	15	73%	7%	0.6
SEND (EHC)	0			
SEND (without EHC)	5	0%	0%	-2.1
No SEND	25	92%	12%	0.6
EAL	21	76%	5%	0.2
No EAL	9	78%	22%	-0.3

### Commentary

- Attainment in writing at expected is exactly in line with national averages.
- Higher level attainment is closer to national for boys than girls, but overall somewhat below national. This is in comparison with the stronger reading performance by girls at higher level.
- However, girls outperformed boys at expected level.
- Solid attainment in writing is paralleled by strong attainment in SPAG (Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar) (See page 10 below).
- Although both Bangladeshi and EAL children performed closely in line with national averages at expected, they were below at higher level.
- Conversely, White British and non-EAL pupils performed better than national at higher. This is similar to the reading attainment for these groups.
- Disadvantaged children performed broadly in line with all pupils nationally at expected, though slightly below at higher.

Prior Attainment Groups	No.	WRITING		
		At or above Expected	At Higher	Progress
<b>ALL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0.2</b>
HA	5	100%	60%	1.4
MA	19	89%	0%	-0.3
LA	5	0%	0%	0.6

## SPAG

Although the results from the Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar tests are part of Analyse School Performance, and may be published elsewhere, they do not currently seem to form part of the DfE's 'school accountability measures'. Seven Mills children attained as follows:

- Expected Level: 83% (compared with 77% nationally)
- Higher score 27% (compared with 31% nationally)

Our proportion of children gaining the higher score increased from last year, but not as much as the national increase. Our proportion of children gaining expected fell by a couple of children from last year, but still remains above the national average.

Girls outperformed the boys (and the girls nationally) at expected (this cohort of girls was strong for literacy) but not at higher level. Our disadvantaged children scored better than our non-pupil premium children, although the non-pupil premium children still attained in line with national benchmarks at both expected and higher.

## Maths

Year 6 Maths Attainment of National Averages (75% expected, 23% higher)									
Inadequate		Vulnerable		Broadly average		Good		Outstanding	
Bel 60%	Bel. 12%	60 - 69%	12 - 17%	70 - 80%	18 - 28%	81 - 90%	29 - 34%	91% +	35% +
Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher

Different Group	No.	MATHS		
		At or above Expected	At Higher	Progress
<b>ALL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0.4</b>
<b>Boys</b>	18	72%	17%	1.2
<b>Girls</b>	12	83%	0%	-0.8
<b>Pupil Premium</b>	19	79%	10%	-0.4
<b>White British</b>	5	80%	0%	1.0
<b>Bangladeshi</b>	15	80%	7%	1.0
<b>SEND (EHC)</b>	0			
<b>SEND (without EHC)</b>	5	20%	0%	0.9
<b>No SEND</b>	25	88%	12%	0.1
<b>EAL</b>	21	76%	5%	0.4
<b>No EAL</b>	9	78%	22%	0

### Commentary

- Overall maths attainment at **expected level** is broadly in line with national, or somewhat better, for all groups, including disadvantaged pupils.
- However, maths attainment is weaker than national averaged at **higher level** and previous higher attainers had relatively weak progress. This may be a reflection of the teaching focus with this cohort – there was a large group in the middle of the cohort who were working below expectations at the start of the school year, and moving them over the threshold was the chief concern. In previous years, we have had strong performance in higher level maths, and now that the new curriculum is embedded lower down the school, a focus of school improvement work this year is looking at how we teach problem solving across the school – in the anticipation that this will improve our higher attainment in particular.
- However, previous low attainers made very good progress in maths, just as they had in reading.

Prior Attainment Groups	No.	MATHS		
		At or above Expected	At Higher	Progress
<b>ALL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0.4</b>
HA	5	100%	20%	-1.0
MA	19	89%	11%	-0.4
LA	5	20%	0%	4.6

## Reading, Writing and Maths Combined

Year 6 Reading/Writing Maths Combined Attainment cf National Averages (61% expected, 9% higher)									
Inadequate		Vulnerable		Broadly average		Good		Outstanding	
Bel 46%		46 - 55%	Bel 4%	56 – 66%	4 – 14%	67 – 76%	15 – 20%	77% +	21% +
Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher

Different Group	No.	COMBINED	
		At or above Expected	At Higher
<b>ALL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Boys</b>	18	56%	6%
<b>Girls</b>	12	75%	0%
<b>Pupil Premium</b>	19	63%	5%
<b>White British</b>	5	80%	0%
<b>Bangladeshi</b>	15	60%	0%
<b>SEND (EHC)</b>	0		
<b>SEND (without EHC)</b>	5	0%	0%
<b>No SEND</b>	25	76%	4%
<b>EAL</b>	21	62%	0%
<b>No EAL</b>	9	67%	11%

### Commentary

- Nationally, the proportion of pupils attaining the expected level in Reading, Writing **and** Maths went up significantly. (This is partly because of ironing out some extreme regional variations in how the guidance on marking and assessing writing had been applied in the previous year.)
- At Seven Mills, the proportion of pupils attaining the expected level in Reading, Writing **and** Maths was exactly the same as last year – putting us closely in line with national averages.
- Nationally 9% of pupils attained at a higher level across the board, compared with 5% last year.
- At Seven Mills we managed for one pupil to attain the higher level in all subjects.
- The figures for combined attainment a) at higher level generally and b) for boys at expected are both rather on the low side.
- Combined attainment for vulnerable groups (EAL & Pupil Premium) is good – very closely aligned with attainment for all pupils nationally.
- Combined attainment for girls at expected level was somewhat better than national averages for all pupils.

Prior Attainment Groups	No.	At or above Expected	
		At Higher	At Higher
<b>ALL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>3%</b>
HA	5	100%	20%
MA	19	68%	0%
LA	5	0%	0%

## Year 2

### **A Note on Prior Attainment and Other Group Data**

Last year, the KS 1 data were presented on Raise Online with a lot of information about prior attainment – i.e. comparing end KS 1 attainment with judgements made at the end of the Foundation Stage (i.e. who was working at expected and exceeding levels). There was also an analysis of attainment by term of birth. So, at Seven Mills, for instance, almost half the cohort were very young (summer born), and these children had (perhaps unsurprisingly) weaker performance at the end of KS 1 than their older classmates. Last year was the first time that the data had been presented in this way.

This year, however, ASP does not yet contain any data grouped by prior attainment (at end Foundation Stage). I am trying to put the information together myself, but it involves a bit of digging that I didn't expect to do, so isn't complete as yet. I have managed to use our own tracker to do some analysis comparing autumn and summer born children, with notes below.

### **Contextual Information for Year 2 Cohort**

- An unusually small cohort – several children transferred out during the autumn and spring terms.
- Very high proportion of EAL pupils.

## Reading

Year 2 Reading Attainment of National Averages (76% expected, 25% higher)									
Inadequate		Vulnerable		Broadly average		Good		Outstanding	
Bel 61%	Bel. 14%	61 - 70%	14 – 19%	71 – 81%	20 – 30%	82 – 91%	31 – 36%	92% +	37% +
Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher

Different Groups	No.	Reading	
		At or above expected	At Higher
ALL	26	62%	15%
Boys	14	64%	14%
Girls	12	58%	17%
Pupil Premium	17	65%	18%
White British	2	100%	0%
Bangladeshi	19	53%	11%
SEND (EHC)	0		
SEND (without EHC)	3	0%	0%
No SEND	23	70%	17%
EAL	24	50%	17%
No EAL	2	100%	0%

Previous Attainment (at EYFS Profile)	No.	Reading			
		School at or above expected	National at or above expected	School at higher	National at higher
Emerging	10	40%			
Expected +	15	12		4	
Exceeding					

### Commentary

- Overall, reading attainment remains weaker than national overall, although we believe that it is not statistically significantly so: **expected** is 14% points below national; **higher** is 10% points below. In the past these differences would have been within the confidence intervals for such a small cohort.
- However, reading attainment at both **expected** and **higher** has increased at Seven Mills compared with last year (**expected** up from 53% to 62%; **higher** up from 10% to 15%)
- EAL and Bangladeshi pupils did rather less well than all pupils overall.
- Girls attainment in reading is slightly weaker than boys at expected level.
- Information from the school's own tracker about performance by age is interesting: 78% of the nine autumn born children were at expected or above, and three of them (33%) gained the higher level; by comparison only 40% of the ten summer-born children attained expected, and none gained the higher level (greater depth). This is a similar picture to last year, and does suggest that our younger children in particular struggle to attain expected level in reading.
- As last year, it's worth noting that although the reading attainment is lower than national levels overall, at Year 1 this cohort attained slightly higher than national averages in the phonics screening test (85% passed). Once again, this continues to bear out our feeling that the higher comprehension demand of the new test is really beyond the language capacity of some of our children. This observation informs our current focus of Spoken Language and Communication specialist work in the infants, alongside doing more early comprehension work (e.g. Daily Directed Reading in Year 1).

## Writing

Year 2 Writing Attainment of National Averages (68% expected, 16% higher)									
Inadequate		Vulnerable		Broadly average		Good		Outstanding	
Bel 53%	Bel. 6%	53- 62%	6 – 10%	63 – 73%	11 – 21%	74 – 83%	22 – 26%	84% +	27% +
Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher

Different Groups	No.	Writing	
		At or above expected	At Higher
ALL	26	58%	12%
Boys	14	64%	7%
Girls	12	50%	17%
Pupil Premium	17	53%	10%
White British	2	0%	0%
Bangladeshi	19	63%	5%
SEND (EHC)	0		
SEND (without EHC)	3	33%	0%
No SEND	23	61%	13%
EAL	24	63%	13%
No EAL	2	0%	0%

Previous Attainment (at EYFS Profile)	No.	Writing			
		School at or above expected	National at or above expected	School at higher	National at higher
Emerging	10	30%			
Expected +	15	12		3	
Exceeding					

### Commentary

- As with Reading, our Writing attainment is below national averages, though again I do not believe that the 10% gap with national is statistically significant.
- Attainment in writing has improved on last year (from 50% at expected to 58% at expected.)
- Girls performed less well than boys at expected level – i.e. more of the boys are performing in line with national expectations.

- Analysis of performance by age (comparing summer-born with autumn-born children) and by prior attainment at end Foundation Stage shows an almost identical pattern as the reading data.

## Maths

Year 2 Maths Attainment of National Averages (75% expected, 20% higher)									
Inadequate		Vulnerable		Broadly average		Good		Outstanding	
Bel 60%	Bel. 10%	60- 69%	10 – 14%	70 – 80%	15 – 25%	81 – 90%	26 – 30%	31% +	30% +
Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher

Different Groups	No.	Maths	
		At or above expected	At Higher
ALL	26	62%	15%
Boys	14	71%	21%
Girls	12	50%	8%
Pupil Premium	17	59%	18%
White British	2	50%	50%
Bangladeshi	19	63%	5%
SEND (EHC)	0		
SEND (without EHC)	3	0%	0%
No SEND	23	70%	17%
EAL	24	63%	13%
No EAL	2	50%	50%

Previous Attainment (at EYFS Profile)	No.	Maths			
		School at or above expected	National at or above expected	School at higher	National at higher
Emerging	10	30%		10%	
Expected +	15	14		3	
Exceeding					

### Commentary

- Maths results are at expected are exactly the same as for reading overall – and they are still below national averages, but we believe not by a statistically significant margin.
- There is an even bigger gap between girls' and boys' performance in maths than reading.
- Pupil Premium, EAL and Bangladeshi pupils all performed closely in line with the cohort as a whole.
- There is the same difference in performance between autumn and summer-born children as for reading and writing.

- There has been a slight increase in maths attainment overall on last year (from 60% to 62%).

### Actions

The following actions were detailed in last year's report:

- We have put strong and experienced teachers lower down the infants – we expect to feel the benefit of this move in years to come.
- We are starting a daily reading comprehension element for all children in Year 1 (and planning for Year R in the summer term) as part of a Daily Supported Reading lesson. We hope that this will help particularly to prepare children for developing good comprehension skills **before** Year 2.
- Continue with the spoken language and communication development work – we know this work impacts on pupil achievement in the end.

We will continue with these strategies over the coming year, as they do appear to be gradually improving our performance and bringing us closer into line with national averages.



## Reading, Writing and Maths

Year 2 Reading, Writing and Maths Combined cf National Averages (64% expected, 11% higher)									
Inadequate		Vulnerable		Broadly average		Good		Outstanding	
Bel 49%	Bel. 1%	49- 58%	1 – 5%	59 – 69%	6 – 16%	70 – 79%	17 – 22%	80% +	23% +
Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher	Expected	Higher

Different Groups	No.	COMBINED	
		At or above expected	At Higher
ALL	26	50%	8%
Boys	14	57%	7%
Girls	12	42%	8%
Pupil Premium	17	47%	6%
White British	2	0%	0%
Bangladeshi	19	53%	0%
SEND (EHC)	0		
SEND (without EHC)	3	0%	0%
No SEND	23	56%	9%
EAL	24	57%	8%
No EAL	2	0%	0%

### Commentary

- Our combined score for attainment at expected level is rather (8%) lower than that of any single subject – this particular cohort had less congruence of achievement at expected level across all three subjects than last year. I am not sure that we should read too much into this – the overall percentage is probably still not statistically significant at 14% below the national average for the combined score.

## Year 1 Phonics Screening Test

Different Groups	No.	Maths	
		School Results	National Results 2016
ALL	30	87%	81%
Boys	19	89%	
Girls	11	82%	
Pupil Premium	12	100%	
White British	3	100%	
Bangladeshi	23	83%	
SEND (EHC)	1	100%	
SEND (without EHC)	5	20%	
No SEND	24	100%	
EAL	26	84%	
No EAL	4	100%	

### Commentary

- National results have improved year on year since the test was first introduced five years ago.
- School results have improved more quickly than national, and we have moved from an initial position of quite low attainment to one where we are very slightly ahead of national average.
- Note that this cohort actually comprised 30 children, but one child was off school on long-term sick leave at the time of the test.

## **EYFS Data**

The DfE use a key measure from the Early Years Foundation Stage Data which is 'pupils achieving a good level of development' (GLD). This is awarded to all pupils who are assessed as being at **expected** level in **all** the key areas of Communication and Language, Literacy (Reading and Writing) and Maths.

In **2014** our GLD was low (40%) compared with national mean average (61%)

In **2015** our GLD improved to 52%, though the national mean average jumped to 66% (which probably says more about the pressure on Reception teachers to assess more generously than it does about the standards of Reception teaching nationally).

In **2016** our GLD fell again to 46.7%, putting us close to the bottom of the local authority, whose mean average was 66.4%. The national mean average was 69.3%.

In **2017** our GLD went up to 59%. For the first time we had one child who attained exceeding in all areas. For comparison the national mean average was 69% and the local authority average was 68%. So although we are lower than national average, the gap is not statistically significant. Interestingly, our GLD attainment is almost exactly the same as our nearest 'neighbours' on the Island – Arnhem Wharf and Harbinger.

## **Groups**

### **In 2017 . . .**

69% of girls achieved a good level of development, compared with just 50% of boys. (The cohort had slightly more boys than girls.)

## **Commentary**

The improvements in 2017 reflect the strong teaching for the cohort in both their Reception and Nursery classes – this was recognized by the moderation process. I believe that we remain below national averages because so many of our children have very low starting points- particularly in terms of their spoken language and communication. It is a challenge to make up the ground even for those who have two years of full time provision with us; language acquisition is a longer process – we know that for many of our children it continues into Year 6 and beyond.