Hyde Community College

2015-16 (Academic Year)

Review – Measuring Impact of the Y7 Project

Y7 Intervention Project – Rationale and Organisation 2015-16

In the summer of 2015, it was decided to use some of the Year 7 Catch Up funding to enable the school to run a Y7 Intervention Project. This Project was to run for one year and then the impact to be measured. The rationale and the impact of the curriculum change for this small group of Y7 students is analysed below.

Number of students involved:	12 students in the A half
Hours allocated:	8 hours of humanities time and 4 hours of MFL time = 12 hours.
Division of hours:	2 hours of primary style MFL delivered by CEA. Remaining 10 hours divided between the core humanities curriculum, a literacy focus and nurturing of the key students identified for the intervention project. Students will also be identified for the 'Nurture' programme that runs within school and 'Nurture Decoding' will be delivered to those students identified as requiring those particular reading skills. Students will also have 8 lessons of English. Within the English lessons, students will have one Lexia (reading programme) lesson per week.
Rationale behind students identified:	Typically below NC L4 in English – these students will be identified as some of the lowest achieving students in Y7. Students who may find a fully mainstream curriculum challenging for social or behavioural reasons. There may be some overlap with SEND students. As much as possible, students with disruptive behavioural problems will not be placed within the project group.

Staffing		
Assistant Head in charge of Intervention		Lesley Mallon (Mat leave 2015-16)
Year 7 Project		
Line Manager for Project		Maria Howard
Group		Year 7 A-Half
Project Lessons	Humanities (7/fortnight) HOD: Katy Bentley	Sean Broderick
	Literacy (3/fortnight)	Jenny Tong/ (Literacy) TA/HLTA (Decoding)
MFL (2/fortnight)		Claire Eastwood
English (8/fortnight) Includes 1 LEXIA per week: Delivered by June Howard HOD: Alison Fletcher		Alison Fletcher
Streaming of Students:	JRO will identify (through liaison with HLTAs) those students with the weakest literacy needs in the year group. They will receive 3 lessons of 'Nurture Decoding'. There may be additional students who have been recommended through liaison with their feeder primary schools who do not fall into this category.	

	The students identified (in 7A4) as requiring 'Nurture Decoding' will have three lessons of this.
Identification of students:	KS2 data from primary school, primary school liaison, Alpha Centre input from vulnerable student intake day, 'Access Reading' and 'Vernon Spelling Tests' testing on intake day.
Rooming:	Alpha Centre 1 – to be used as a base for students to create a more primary style room.
Training needs:	SBR – English and humanities / literacy focuses - NC delivery and assessment information.
Line management:	MHO line manager of the project staff in the first instance, LMA to line manage MHO (LMA mat leave Sep 2014- June 2015).

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2015-16)

ENGLISH DATA (PROJECT GROUP)

7A4 ON ENTRY   7A4 – MEASURING IMPACT – TERM 2 TO TERM 5

Year 6 Results	
English APS	
N	
3a	23
4c	25
3b	21
3a	23
3a	23
4b	27
2a	17
2c	13
	22

X	Y	Z	AA	AB
English :Group(s)				
		T2	APS	T5	APS
7a/En4	3c	19	3b	21
7a/En4	3c	19	3a	23
7a/En4	3a	23	4b	27
7a/En4	2a	17	3b	21
7a/En4	3c	19	3a	23
7a/En4	3b	21	3a	23
7a/En4	3c	19	4c	25
7a/En4	2a	17	3a	23
7a/En4	3c	19	4c	25
7a/En4	3b	21	3a	23
7a/En4	2a	17	3c	19
7a/En4	2a	17	3c	19
RED		19	33.3%	22.7
AMBER			44.4%	
GREEN			22.2%	

The data on entry table for the Y7 Project group shows that 3 students did not arrive at HCC with any external data. One student was awarded an N grade at KS2. Of the remaining students, one student was a 2c, one was a 2a, one was a 3b, three were 3a students, one was a 4c and one a 4b.

The RAG highlighting on the table on the right above compares the students to their external KS2 data - as this is obviously the measure that they are held against in school.

To enable impact to be measured more accurately, it was decided to use internal data taken from term 2 (December 2015) and compare it to the data collated in term 5 (May 2016). When the school's internal data system is used for comparison, it can be seen that all students made at least one sublevel of progress during these 3 half terms. For statistical analysis, 22 sublevels of progress were made by 12 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 1.83 sublevels per student.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2015-16)

ENGLISH DATA (CONTROL GROUP)

ON ENTRY   MEASURING IMPACT – TERM 2 TO TERM 5

Year 6 Results	
English APS	
3c	19
3a	23
N	
3a	23
4b	27
3a	23
4b	27
4c	25
4a	29
4a	29
	25

English :Group(s)				
	T2	APS	T5	APS
7b/En3	3b	21	4c	25
7b/En4	2a	17	2a	17
7b/En4	2b	15	3c	19
7b/En3	3b	21	4b	27
7b/En4	3c	19	3c	19
7b/En4	3a	23	3c	19
7b/En3	4c	25	4b	27
7b/En4	3c	19	3c	19
7b/En3	4c	25	4b	27
7b/En4	3a	23	3a	19
7b/En4	3c	19	3a	19
7b/En4	2a	17	2a	17
7b/En4	3c	19	3a	23
7b/En4	4c	25	4c	25
RED		21	70.0%	21.6
AMBER			20.0%	
GREEN			10.0%	

The data on entry table for the control group shows that 4 students did not arrive at HCC with any external data. One student was awarded an N grade at KS2. Of the remaining students, one student was a 3c, three were awarded a 3a, one was a 4c, two were 4b students and two were 4a. It can be seen, from this entry data, that the control group entered with a higher degree of achievement (25 APS compared to 22 APS).

The RAG highlighting on the table on the right above compares the students to their external KS2 data - as this is obviously the measure that they are held against in school.

To enable impact to be measured more accurately, it was decided to use internal data taken from term 2 (December 2015) and compare it to the data collated in term 5 (May 2016). When the school's internal data system is used for comparison, it can be seen that, of the 14 students in the control group, 6 did not make any sublevels of progress. One student, in fact, was recorded as achieving 2 sublevels below their initial term 2 data entry. This is a cause for concern.

Of the remaining students, 13 sublevels of progress were made. In terms of a class average, and for statistical analysis, 11 sublevels of progress were made by 14 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 0.79 sublevels per student.

In comparison to those students in the Y7 Project group, this is an average difference of 1.04 sublevels of progress per student in favour of the Project group.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2015-16)

MATHS DATA (PROJECT GROUP)

7A4 ON ENTRY	7A4 – MEASURING IMPACT – TERM 2 TO TERM 5

Year 6 Results	
Maths	APS
3c	19
4c	25
3a	23
3a	23
3b	21
4c	25
4a	29
4c	25
3b	21
3a	23
3b	21
3b	21
	23

Mathematics :Group(s)				
	T2	APS	T5	APS
7a/Ma3	2b	15	3b	21
7a/Ma3	3c	19	4a	29
7a/Ma4	3b	21	3b	21
7a/Ma4	4c	25	4c	25
7a/Ma4	3c	19	2a	17
7a/Ma4	4c	25	4b	27
7a/Ma3	4c	25	4b	27
7a/Ma3	3b	21	3a	23
7a/Ma4	3c	19	3b	21
7a/Ma4	3b	21	4b	27
7a/Ma3	2a	17	3c	19
7a/Ma3	3a	23	4c	25
RED		21	50.0%	24
AMBER			25.0%	
GREEN			25.0%	

The data on entry table for the Y7 Project group shows all students arrived at HCC with external data. One student was a 3c, four were 3b, three were 3a students, three were a 4c and one a 4a. Their initial (external) data shows that the APS per student was 23 – slightly higher than the comaparative English score of 22.

The RAG highlighting on the table on the right above compares the students to their external KS2 data - as this is obviously the measure that they are held against in school.

To enable impact to be measured more accuratel y- and to be comarable across KS3 subjects - it was decided to use internal data taken from term 2 (December 2015) and compare it to the data collated in term 5 (May 2016). When the school's internal data system is used for comparison, of the 12 students in the Project group, 2 did not make any sublevels of progress. One student, in fact, was recorded as achieving 1 sublevel below their initial term 2 data entry. This is a cause for concern.

Of the remaining 9 students, 17 sublevels of progress were made. In terms of a class average, and for statistical analysis, 16 sublevels of progress were made by 12 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 1.33 sublevels per student over 3 half terms.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2015-16)

MATHS DATA (CONTROL GROUP)

ON ENTRY   MEASURING IMPACT – TERM 2 TO TERM 5

Year 6 Results	
Maths	APS
4c	25
3c	19
5c	31
3a	23
4c	25
3b	21
4c	25
4c	25
4c	25
4c	25
4b	23
4b	23
	24

Mathematics :Group(s)				
	T2	APS	T5	APS
7b/Ma3	4c	25	4a	29
7b/Ma4	2b	15	2b	15
7b/Ma3	3b	21	4c	25
7b/Ma3	4c	25	4b	27
7b/Ma2	4b	27	5b	35
7b/Ma3	4c	25	4b	27
7b/Ma4	3a	23	4a	29
7b/Ma4	3c	19	3a	23
7b/Ma3	4c	25	4a	29
7b/Ma4	3a	23	4b	27
7b/Ma4	3b	21	4c	25
7b/Ma3	3c	19	3b	21
7b/Ma4	3b	21	3b	21
7b/Ma3	4c	25	4b	27
RED		22	50.0%	26
AMBER			16.7%	
GREEN			33.3%	

The data on entry table for the control group shows that 2 students did not arrive at HCC with any external data. Of the remaining students, one student was a 3c, one was awarded a 3b, one was a 3a, 6 were awarded a 4c, two were 4b students and one was a 5c. It can be seen, from this entry data, that the control group entered with a slightly higher degree of achievement (24 APS compared to 23 APS).

The RAG highlighting on the table on the right above compares the students to their external KS2 data - as this is obviously the measure that they are held against in school.

To enable impact to be measured more accurately – and for comparative purposes- it was decided to use internal data taken from term 2 (December 2015) and compare it to the data collated in term 5 (May 2016). When the school's internal data system is used for comparison, it can be seen that, of the 14 students in the control group, 2 did not make any sublevels of progress. This is a cause for concern.

Of the remaining students, 22 sublevels of progress were made. In terms of a class average, and for statistical analysis, 22 sublevels of progress were made by 14 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 1.57 sublevels per student.

In comparison to those students in the Y7 Project group, this is an average difference of 0.24 sublevels of progress per student in favour of the control group.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2015-16)

SCIENCE DATA (PROJECT GROUP v control group)

7A4   TERM 2 TO TERM 5   CONTROL GROUP

Science :Group(s)

	T2	APS	T5	APS
7a/Sc4	3b	21	4c	
7a/Sc3	3b	21	4c	
7a/Sc3	4c	25	4b	
7a/Sc3	5b	33	4b	
7a/Sc3	4c	25	4c	
7a/Sc2	5c	31	5b	
7a/Sc3	5c	31	5c	
7a/Sc3	4b	27	4a	
7a/Sc3	4c	25	4c	
7a/Sc3	4a	29	4a	
7a/Sc4	3b	21	4c	
7a/Sc4	4c	25	4b	
		26		27.3

Science :Group(s)

	T2	APS	T5	APS
7b/Sc4	3a	23	4c	25
7b/Sc3	4a	29	4a	29
7b/Sc4	4b	27	4a	29
7b/Sc3	4a	29	5c	31
7b/Sc4	3a	23	4b	27
7b/Sc4	4a	29	4a	29
7b/Sc4	4b	27	4a	29
7b/Sc4	4b	27	4a	29
7b/Sc4	5c	31	5c	31
7b/Sc4	4a	29	5c	31
7b/Sc4	3c	19	3a	23
7b/Sc4	4c	25	4a	29
7b/Sc3	4a	29	5c	31
		27		29

The internal data for science shows that the Project group students ended term 2 with an average APS of 26. They ended term 5 with an average APS of 27. In comparison, the control group went from an average APS of 27 to one of 29 over the same period of time.

In terms of internally assessed NC levels, the Project group of 12 students made 7 sublevels of progress (an average of 0.58 sublevels per student) whereas the control group of 14 students made 13 sublevels of progress (an average of 0.93 sublevels per student). This presents a difference of 0.35 sublevels of progress per student in favour of the control group.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

	ENGLISH PROJECT	ENGLISH CONTROL	MATHS PROJECT	MATHS CONTROL	SCIENCE PROJECT	SCIENCE CONTROL
AVERAGE NUMBER OF SUBLEVELS OF PROGRESS MADE	1.83	0.79	1.33	1.57	0.58	0.93

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON ATTENDANCE (Academic year 2015-16)

7A4   CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS

Attendance
97.09
95.64
95.64
98.84
98.26
88.37
97.09
94.19
93.31
99.13
98.55
99.71
96.32

Attendance
97.09
98.26
99.71
88.37
93.6
99.13
97.38
95.21
97.67
98.26
96.8
98.26
96.8
97.67
96.73

The impact on the average attendance of students within the Project group (7A4) in comparison to the control group was minimal. 7A4's average attendance was 96.32% and the control group's average attendance was 96.73%. This is a difference of 0.41% in favour of the control group.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON BEHAVIOUR (Academic year 2015-16)

7A4   CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS

Behaviour	
Positive	Negative
182	-30
152	-4
194	0
176	-9
162	-43
124	-14
156	-6
128	-195
148	-5
165	-8
178	-76
191	-2
163	-33

Behaviour	
Positive	Negative
124	0
132	-24
142	-30
130	0
154	-239
120	-3
123	-41
144	-215
125	-60
132	-4
128	-28
134	-1
165	-5
139	-130
135	-56

The impact on the average number of behavior points recorded by each of the students within the Project group (7A4) in comparison to the control group can be seen in the tables above.

7A4's average number of behaviour points (taking into account both positive and negative) was +130 per student. In comparison to this, the average number of behavior points per student in the control group was +79.

This is a difference of 51 behaviour points.

It is believed that the nurturing style and nature of the Project group contributed to their more positive approach to their learning and attitude in lessons.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON READING AGES (Academic year 2015-16)

The students in the Y7 Project group were tested for their reading ages on entry, in January 2016 and for a third time in July 2016. The table below documents the impact the Nurture decoding programme, which runs parallel to the Y7 Project, has had on their progress in terms of reading.

| RA Entry | Jan-16 | | Jul-16 | |
	RA	PROGRESS	RA	PROGRESS
6y 11m	8y 5m	+ 1y 6m	8y 5m	+1y 6m
8y 8m	9y	+4m	8y 8m	0m
8y 9m	8y 9m	0m	9y 6m	+9m
11y 6m	10y 9m	-9m	11y 6m	0m
8y 5m	8y 8m	+3m	8y 5m	0m
7y 9m	8y	+3m		
8y 3m	10y 9m	+2y 9m		
8y 9m	8y 9m	0m	11y 6m	+1y 9m
8y	8y 8m	+8m		
9y 4m	9y 6m	+2m	11y 6m	+2y 2m
8y 8m	10y 3m	+1y 7m	11y 11m	+3y 3m
7y 9m	8y	+3m	8y 3m	+6m

Analysis of the data relating to reading ages suggests that, as an average, there was 14.59 months of progress per child. As a chronological improvement would be that of 12 months, this figure suggests an improvement of 2.59 months per child over the academic year.

Data, however, seems skewed as some students made significant progress (39 months) whereas some made zero progress. This suggests unreliability in the tests or the testing methods and adjustments, as such, will need to be made for the 2016-17 academic year.

Incomplete data is also an issue in terms of monitoring progress accurately. This also needs to be addressed.

IMPACT ON SPELLING AGES (Academic year 2015-16)

The students in the Y7 Project group were tested for their spelling ages on entry, in January 2016 and for a third time in July 2016. The table below documents the impact the Nurture decoding programme, which runs parallel to the Y7 Project, has had on their progress in terms of spelling.

	Jan-16		Jul-16		
SA Entry	SA	PROGRESS	SA	PROGRESS	
7y 7m	9y	+1y 5m	9y	+1y 5m	
10y 3m	10y 3m	0m	11y 2m	+11m	
11y 8m	12y 1m	+5m	12y 8m	+1y	
9y 4m			6y	-3y 4m	
7y 10m	8y 4m	+6m	7y 8m	-2m	
7y 8m	8y 2m	+6m			
12y 6m	14y	+1y 6m	13y 10m	+1y 4m	
12y 10m	13y 4m	+6m	14y 4m	+1y 6m	
10y 10m			12y 6m	+1y 8m	
10y 5m	11y	+7m	12y 8m	+2y 3m	
13y 9m	14y 10m	+1y 1m	15y	+1y 3m	
6y 10m	7y 3m	+5m	7y 10	+1y	

Analysis of the data relating to reading ages suggests that, as an average, there was 13.81 months of progress per child. As a chronological improvement would be that of 12 months, this figure suggests an additional improvement of 1.81 months per child over the academic year.

Data, however, seems skewed as some students made significant progress (27 months) whereas some made negative progress. The figure of -3y 4m is an unreliable figure from a student who has specific needs and also requires a laptop to complete tests. This student's performance in assessments varied significantly depending on when he took them and the nurture teacher did not feel that this particular result accurately reflected the student's progress.

This data once again suggests some unreliability in the tests or the testing methods and adjustments, as such, will need to be made for the 2016-17 academic year.

Incomplete data is also an issue in terms of monitoring progress accurately. This also needs to be addressed.