Hyde Community College

2016-17 (Academic Year)

Review – Measuring Impact of the Y7 Project

DRAFT VERSION JULY 2017

Y7 Intervention Project – Rationale and Organisation 2016-17

The rationale and the impact of the curriculum change for this small group of Y7 students is analysed below.

Number of students involved:	18 students in the A half 18 students in the B 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 working towards national standards for KS2 in English – these students will be identified as some of the lowest achieving students in Y7. (Scores under 100) Students who may find a fully mainstream curriculum challenging for social or behavioural reasons. There may be some overlap with SEND students. Some EAL students may be placed within the group to help nurture and development of language acquisition. 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
Year 7 Project		
Line Manager for Project		Maria Howard
Group		Year 7 A-Half Year 7 B-Half
Project Lessons	Humanities (7/fortnight) HOD: Katy Bentley	John Ross Jenny Tong
	Literacy (3/fortnight)	Jenny Tong/ (Literacy) TA/HLTA (Decoding) TA/HLTA (Comprehension)
MFL (2/fortnight)		Claire Eastwood
English (8/fortnight) Includes 1 LEXIA per week: Delivered by June Howard HOD: Alison Fletcher		Emily Smith, Jenny Tong Lesley Mallon
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. Students identified as needing 'Nurture Comprehension' will receive this programme in Project time.
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:	As much as possible, Alpha Centre 1 – to be used as a base for students to create a more primary style room.
Training needs:	JRO –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

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2016-17)

ENGLISH DATA

7A4 – MEASURING IMPACT – TRACK 2 TO TRACK 6

English KS Target		Track 2	Track 4	Track 5	Track 6	
100	1	D+	1-	1-	1	
92	2-	1-	1	1	1	
86	D+	E	E+	D-	D+	
99	2-	1-	1	1+	2-	
105	2-	1+	2-	2-	2	
104	2-	E+	D-	D-	D	
101	2-	1	1+	1+	1+	
89	1-	E+	D	D+	1	
86	D	D-	D-	D-	D-	
106	3	D+	1	1	1	
	1	1-	1	1	1+	
90	1-	E	E+	D-	D	
99	2-	1-	1-	1-	1	
100	3-	D	1	1	1+	
109	3-	E+	E+	D	D	
93	1	D-	D+	1-	1	
90	1	D-	D	D+	1-	
111	3	1-	1-	1	1+	

The English data on entry table for the Y7 Project group (A Half) shows that 1 student did not arrive at HCC with any external data. Of the remaining 17 students, the average English KS2 score was 97.65. The students scores ranged from 86 to 111. All students were issued with an end of year target ranging from E (emerging) to grade 3.

To enable the impact and progress to be measured more accurately, it was decided to use internal data taken from term 2 (December 2016) and compare it to the data collated in term 6 (July 2017). When the school's internal data system is used for comparison, it can be seen that 7 students, of the 18, achieved their target across the academic year.

For statistical analysis, 43 subgrades of progress were made by 18 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 2.39 subgrades per student. The progress of the WBR was 2.27 subgrades on average.

There is quite a variation in the number of subgrades of progress made by individuals, however. One student, who arrived with a KS2 score of 86, failed to make any progress across the 4 internal tracks. In contrast to this, one student made 5 subgrades of progress, moving from an E+ to a grade 1 (after arriving with a KS2 score of 89).

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2016-17)

ENGLISH DATA

7B4 – MEASURING IMPACT – TRACK 2 TO TRACK 6

English KS2	Target	Track 2	Track 4	Track 5	Track 6
	D+	D	D+	D+	D+
	E+	E-	E	E+	E+
	D-	E	E	E+	E+
88	D	D-	D	D+	D+
	E+	D-	D	D	D+
	D-	E	E	E+	E+
	E+	D-	D+	1-	1
95	D+	D	1-	1-	1
	D-	D-	D	D	D
	E+	E-	E-	E	E
	1	1	1	1+	1+
90	1-	D	1	1	1+
	E-	E-	E	E+	D-
110	2-	D	1-	1-	1
	E	E+	D-	D	D+
98	2	1	1+	1+	1+
105	1-	E-	E-	E	E
93	1	1+	1+	1+	1+

The English data on entry table for the Y7 Project group (B Half)shows that 11 students did not arrive at HCC with any external data. Of the remaining 7 students, the average English KS2 score was 97. The students scores ranged from 88 to 110. All students were issued with an end of year target ranging from E- (emerging) to grade 2. There were a number of factors that meant students did not have KS2 scores. Some students were not entered for the KS2 tests whereas some students arrived in Year 7 (or towards the end of KS2) from education overseas. The group consisted of 5 EAL students.

To enable the impact and progress to be measured more accurately, it was decided to use internal data taken from term 2 (December 2016) and compare it to the data collated in term 6 (July 2017). When the school's internal data system is used for comparison, it can be seen that 12 students, of the 18, achieved their target across the academic year.

For statistical analysis, 35 subgrades of progress were made by 18 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 1.94 subgrades per student. The progress of the WBR was 1.00 subgrade on average.

There is quite a variation in the number of subgrades of progress made by individuals, however. One student, who arrived with a KS2 score of 93, did not make any progress across the 4 internal tracks. This student was, during the year diagnosed with dsylexia. In contrast to this, one EAL student made 5 subgrades of progress, moving from an E+ to a grade 1.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2016-17)

MATHS DATA (PROJECT GROUP)

7A4 – MEASURING IMPACT – TERM 2 TO TERM 6

Maths, KS	Maths set	Target	Track 2	Track 4	Track 6
106		3	1+	1+	2
106	7AMA1	4-	2-	2-	2
100		2-	D+	D+	D+
95	7AMA2	1	1	1+	1+
94		1	1-	1-	1
87	7AMA4	1-	E-	D	D+
100		2	1	1	2-
97	7AMA4	1+	E+	1-	1-
91		D+	E+	D	D
106	7AMA3	4+	D+	D+	1
	7AMA4	1-	E	D-	D-
94	7AMA4	1	E-	E+	E+
94	7AMA4	1	E	E	D-
103	7AMA2	3	1+	2-	2-
103	7AMA4	3+	E-	E	E+
96	7AMA2	1+	1-	1-	2
96	7AMA3	2-	D+	1	1+
100	7AMA2	2+	2-	2-	2-

The table shows that some of the students highlighted by their weak literacy skills for the Y7 Project groups, do not have correlating maths weaknesses. This is demonstarted by the range of maths sets that the stuednts were placed in (sets 1-4)

The maths data on entry table for the Y7 Project group (A Half)shows that 1 student did not arrive at HCC with any external data. Of the remaining 17 students, the average maths KS2 score was 98. The students scores ranged from 87 to 106. All students were issued with an end of year target ranging from 1- to grade 4+.

To enable the impact and progress to be measured more accurately, it was decided to use internal data taken from term 2 (December 2016) and compare it to the data collated in term 6 (July 2017). When the school's internal data system is used for comparison, it can be seen that 3 students, of the 18, achieved their target across the academic year.

For statistical analysis, 36 subgrades of progress were made by 18 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 2 subgrades per student. The progress of the WBR students was remained the same at 2 subgrades on average.

There is quite a variation in the number of subgrades of progress made by individuals, however. One student, who arrived with a KS2 score of 93, did not make any progress across the 4 internal tracks. This student was, during the year diagnosed with dsylexia. In contrast to this, one EAL student made 5 subgrades of progress, moving from an E+ to a grade 1.

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2016-17)

MATHS DATA (PROJECT GROUP)

7B4 – MEASURING IMPACT – TERM 2 TO TERM 6

Maths KS2	Target	Track 2	Track 4	Track 6
95	1	D	D+	D+
	E	E	E-	D-
	E	E	E+	E+
94	1-	1+	1-	1
	E	1	1-	1-
80	D-	E+	E+	D-
	D-	D+	1-	1+
	E	1-		1
	E	E+	E+	D
	E	U	E	E
	1-	D	D+	D+
97	1+	1+	1-	1-
	D-	E+	D+	1-
101	2+	1	D+	1-
	2-	1+	1-	2-
102	3	1+	1+	1+
102	3-	D	D+	D+
94	1	D	D+	1

The maths data on entry table for the Y7 Project group (B Half) shows that 10 students did not arrive at HCC with any external data. Of the remaining 8 students, the average maths KS2 score was 96. The students scores ranged from 80 to 102. All students were issued with an end of year target ranging from E (emerging) to grade 3.

To enable the impact and progress to be measured more accurately, it was decided to use internal data taken from term 2 (December 2016) and compare it to the data collated in term 6 (July 2017). When the school's internal data system is used for comparison, it can be seen that 12 students, of the 18, achieved or exceeded their target across the academic year.

For statistical analysis, 18 subgrades of progress were made by 18 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 1 subgrade per student. The progress of the WBR students was also 1 subgrade on average.

There is quite a variation in the number of subgrades of progress made by individuals, however. One student, who arrived with a KS2 score of 94, was recorded to move down one subgrade across the 4 internal tracks. This is obviously a cause for concern and a follow up conversation regarding the internal data is a priority. In contrast to this, one EAL student made 4 subgrades of progress, moving from an E+ to a grade 1-.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2016-17)

HUMANITIES DATA (PROJECT GROUP)

7A4 – MEASURING IMPACT – TERM 2 TO TERM 6

Target	Track 2	Track 4	Track 5	Track 6
1	D+	1-	1	1+
2+	D-	D+	D+	1
D+	E	D-	D+	1-
1	D	1-	1+	2-
1+	D-	2-	2-	2-
1-	E	E+	1-	1-
2-	D	D+	2-	2
D+	D+	1-	1+	2-
D-	E-	E+	D-	D
4	E	1-	2	2
1	D-	D+	D+	1
D+	E	D-	D+	D+
1	D	D+	1-	1
3-	D	2	2+	2+
3	E	E+	1+	1+
D+	E	D	D+	1
1-	E	D	D+	D+
3	D	1-	2	2

Overall, the humanities data for this group is positive. 11 out of 18 students have met or exceeded their targets.

For statistical analysis, 87 subgrades of progress were made by 18 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 4.8 subgrades per student. This is a significant amount of progress. Of this group, 15 students are of WBR heritage. Of these 15 students, the average progress made was 4.9 subgrades of progress. The average of the 3 non WBR students was 4.3 subgrades.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON STUDENT PROGRESS (Academic year 2016-17)

HUMANITIES DATA (PROJECT GROUP)

7B4 – MEASURING IMPACT – TERM 2 TO TERM 6

External target	Track 2	Track 4	Track 5 (Castles	Track 6
D	E+	D-	D-	D
E	E-	E	E	E
E	E	E+	E+	E+
D	D-	D+	1-	1-
E	D-	D	D+	D+
E+	E-	E	E+	E+
D	D-	1-	1-	1-
D-	E+	1-	1-	1
E	E-	E+	E+	E+
E	U	E-	E	E
1-	D+	1-	1-	1-
1-	1-	1-	1-	1
E+	E+	D	D+	D+
3-	D-	D+	D	D+
E+	D-	D	D	D+
3	1+	1+	1+	2-
2+	1-	1-	1-	1-
D+	1-	1	1	1 1+

Overall, the humanities data for this group is positive. 15 out of 18 students have met or exceeded their targets.

For statistical analysis, 35 subgrades of progress were made by 18 students during this timescale. This is, on average, progress of 1.94 subgrades per student.   Of this group, 9 students are of WBR heritage.   Of these 9 students the average progress made was 1.3 subgrades of progress. The average of the 9 non WBR students was 2.6 subgrades. This progress was increased due to the 5 EAL students in the group making rapid progress as their progress with the English language increased too.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

<u>IMPACT ON ATTENDANCE AND BEHAVIOUR</u> (Academic year 2016-17)

7A4

Percentage attendance	Net Behaviour score
98.39	248
92.74	250
100	232
98.92	351
96.49	271
94.89	192
98.12	293
95.7	214
93.28	207
99.19	204
96.15	210
88.17	207
97.31	225
98.38	347
91.67	79
100	338
96.51	197
96.77	249

7B4

Percentage attendance	Net Behaviour score
97.85	250
97.31	253
96.77	231
96.51	-122
98.92	260
96.24	127
98.9	289
99.46	263
95.43	260
90.86	215
92.2	299
95.43	120
88.71	272
99.73	244
96.89	263
98.38	285
84.14	-598
94.89	251

The impact on the average attendance of students within both Project groups (7A4 and 7B4) was minimal. 7A4's average attendance was 96.26% and 7B4's average attendance was 95.48%. Both of these figures were above the average attendance for the whole of Y7 which was 95.24% (as of July 18th 2017).

One student in 7B4 has had a number of FTE and this has impacted his attendance significantly (84.14%). With this student's data withdrawn from analysis, the group's average attendance was 96.15%.

The impact on the average number of behaviour points recorded by each of the students within the Project groups (7A4 and 7B4) can also be seen in the tables above.

7A4's average number of behaviour points (taking into account both positive and negative) was +240 per student. In comparison to this, the average number of behaviour points per student in 7B4 was +176.

The average net number of behaviour points awarded per student in year 7 was 120.

This shows an increase of +120 behaviour points in 7A4 and +56 in 7B4.

It is believed that the nurturing style and nature of the Project group has contributed to their more positive approach to their learning and attitude in lessons. This can be further evidenced in the new attributes being reported termly.

MEASURING IMPACT AND PROGRESS

IMPACT ON READING AND SPELLING AGES (Academic year 2016-17)

The students in the Y7 Project groups were tested for their reading ages on entry, in December 2016 and for a third time in June 2017. The table below documents the impact the Nurture decoding and comprehension programmes and the online Lexia Core 5 reading programme, which run parallel to the Y7 Project, has had on their progress in terms of reading and spelling ages.

On Entry (RA)	Spelling Age	Maths	Reading Age Dec 2016	Spelling age 2016	Reading Age June 2017	Spelling age 2017
12:00	12:04	4b	13.00	12.66	12.75	14+
06:10	08:07	2a	5.5	9.83	6.58	11.41
05:06	06:04	2c	5.5	9.0	6.16	8.58
11:08	14:04	5c	10.58	14.83		12.41
05:06	06:07	2b	7.00	9.66	5.6	9.5
09:11	07:07	3b	8.5	8.66	8.83	8.83
12:09	13:10	3b	13.75	14.16	14.75	13.91
10:11	05:00	2a	12.00	7.41	12.00	7.66
11:04	10:01	4c	12.75	11.66	13.75	12.25
08:06	09:04	3c	8.83	11.5	12.75	9.91
06:02	09:01	2a	7.83	10.25	8.83	9.91
05:06	07:01	3c	5.75	7.83	11.33	10.91
05:06	08:04	2c	5.5	9.0	<5.5	9.08
09:03	10:01	3b	8.5	11.5	9.58	10.25
07:02	09:00	3b	9.58	11.00	11.66	11.75
07:00	05:00	2b	7.83	7.83	9.25	9.91
06:02	06:07	2c	5.5	8.33	6.41	9.08

12:00	12:07	4c	13.25	12.33	13.0	12.41
07:06	09:10	3c	8.5	10.58	9.58	11.41
05:09	12:07	3c	7.83	11.33	8.16	11.75
11:08	11:04	3c	13.25	12.08	13.25	11.58
<5y 6m	06:10				11.33	9.08
08:02	09:00	3b	7.5	11.00	9.25	10.5
09:03	09:07	2a	9.91	11.16		11.25
#REF!	07:10	3b	12.25	8.83	13.25	10.91
11:08	13:07	3b	10.91	14.0	9.91	12.91
08:10	10:10	4c	12.0	11.16		
07:00	07:04	3b	13.0	6.83		
09:07	08:04	3b	10.91	9.5	8.50	8.58
08:10	09:07	3a	11.33	10.41	10.58	11.25
6:02	9:10	3b	11.66	8.0	13.0	9.25

At present, due to testing needing to be completed, analsyis of the data would be inconclusive.

The students highlighted in green can be identified as having increased their progress in reading ages since being tested on their Y6 intake days.

This data – along with the data for the students' spelling ages - shall be further analysed upon its competion.