

Analysis of Variance Reporting



Writing Target

School Name:	St Joseph's School	School Number:	3533			
Strategic Aim:	Provide quality teaching and learning experiences for all.					
Annual Aim:	To have literacy and numeracy programmes that promote student learning with National Standards as signposts to progress and achievement.					
Target:	As a Community of Learning, work towards the accelerated progress of boys and Maori particularly in literacy(writing). Target St Joseph's School Raise the achievement of boys in writing across the school with the particular focus on target students in Year 2, Year 4, Year 6, and Year 8 who were below in 2016 accelerating their progress to the expected level in 2017.					
Baseline Data:	In 2016, 83.8 % of students achieved at or above below or well below in writing.		•			



Tātaritanga raraunga



engagement in writing.

investigate further cognitive

Accessing PLD through CoL work to

Actions What did we do?	Outcomes What happened?			Reasons for the variance Why did it happen?	Evaluation Where to next?	
 Implemented teaching and learning programmes to meet needs of specific students identified through achievement targets and in relation to National Standards. Whole school inquiry into the development of oral language to support literacy programmes. Precision in pinpointing what a student can do/is doing and identifying next steps using the literacy progressions. 	Yr2 5- Yr4 4- Yr6 3- 13- 2- Yr8 1- 4.	2016 -20.8% -17.4% -WB 3.6% -B 9.1% WB .5% -B	2017 1-3.4% 4-16% 1-WB 4.8% 3-B 14.3% 2WB 9.5% 4-B 19%	Why did we get (or not get) the outcomes we thought we would? The focus on oral language development strengthened the writing programme with the development of ideas and vocabulary support. The library programme also supported the engagement in writing bringing in visiting authors who particularly engaged boys in writing. Which strategies worked well and had a significant impact on our progress in	What impact is there on current and ongoing teaching practice as a result of the actions taken and the results? Developing strong oral language programmes that support literacy programmes. Ensuring students are engaged and motivated to write. Developing and using strategies that work and going back to resources that have proved successful from All PLD etc. Ongoing teacher or student needs	
 Surface Feature issues: demand that students use what they know. Balancing this with developing writer's voice has been identified as most important. Investigated what motivates and 	In Year 2 there was a significant improvement % students progressing towards the expected level. In Year 6 one student moved to the expected level and two moved from well below to below. In Year 8 There was also some movement from well below to		rogressing el. In Year 6 expected well below was also	think this was the case? Teachers continued to inquire into ways to engage and support students to write fluently. Strengthening expectations around surface features and the use and linking of item knowledge e.g. spelling also proved positive.	Further work on engagement for reluctant writers. What funding/resourcing may be necessary to support identified actions and needs? School Funded withdrawal group if banked staffing allows.	

below and from below to at.

engages boys in writing.

also proved positive.

important.

Balancing this with developing writer's

voice has been identified as most



Tātaritanga raraunga



Maintain target group students accelerated progress using strategies trialled over last 5 years.

- → Vocabulary Work
- → Unpacking writing
- → Motivating
- → Drafting, Reworking
- → Pigs teaching(punctuation, grammar, spelling)
- → Linking explicitly reading and writing
- → You Choose grid
- → Show not tell
- → Borrowing
- → Learning conversations
- → Seed writing

School funded withdrawal group 2017: Term 3.

Gender Differences; Students who were below or well below

	2016	2017
Boys	23	14
Girls	6	12

Gender differences have evened out and there are now no obvious differences between boys and girls achievement with similar numbers of students below the expected curriculum level. This does show that several boys have accelerated their progress in 2017 to reach the expected level. There is a gender difference in those students who are writing above the expected level with 43.7% of girls and only 20.5 % of boys.

Overall 86% of students were writing at or above the expected level with 33.3% or a ½ of students writing above the expected level.

Teacher inquiry into oral language, particularly work around vocabulary also had a positive impact.

Which strategies were not effective and had little or no impact in achieving our target? Why do you think this was the case?

More work is needed in using the literacy progressions to pinpoint what a student can do and what their next steps are with students so that the writing pathway is clear and students can make connections between different types of writing.

The timing of the withdrawal group in Term 4 was not ideal and although those students made progress it is more beneficial earlier in the year.

Planning for next year:

Support teachers through PLD to continue to work on engagement in writing and developing writer's voice.

Monitor the achievement of all students but in particular those who are below the expected level and those who are at who could with work exceed the expected level. Provide funding if possible for a withdrawal group of at risk writers.