

CUP Report 2016/17

Reading

At the start of the academic year 2016/17, there were 48 students who achieved a score of less than 100 in their KS2 Reading SAT and who were therefore classified CUP. This was roughly double the number from previous years. During the year four students left the College making the final total for CUP students in Reading 44 at the end of the year.

It was decided by the SEN department that the strategy for intervention would be to complete Paired Reading with all Reading CUP students in the Autumn term. This was carried out by a team of LSAs who received training from Sarah Teasdale prior to beginning intervention. The aim was for every student to read at least twice a week for ten minutes each time following a prescriptive Paired Reading format. An individual reading record was completed by the LSA completing the reading and a log was kept centrally of when a student on the list had been heard read. In addition to this, each CUP student received a "Reading at Home Reward Chart" to encourage them to read outside of school. Prizes were awarded for the completion of a number of sessions of reading at home.

It was decided that a sample of the CUP students should be retested using the NGRT test (National Group Reading Test) at the end of the Autumn Term. Initially a sample of 10% of the students were retested, however the results proved inconclusive in terms of whether the Paired Reading was having an impact on reading attainment. The whole group were therefore retested in January 2017 and the results were analysed. Anyone who appeared to have regressed was assessed using the YARC test (York Assessment of Reading Comprehension) as this is a more detailed and personalised test. Twenty one out of the 48 CUP students had improved their Standard Age Score (44%). Nine of these students (19%) could now be classed as "Secondary Ready" having increased their score to 100 or more. Three students did not have September data so could not be compared and one had left the College (8%). For twelve students there had been no measurable impact (25%) and eleven students (23%) needed to complete the YARC test. This demonstrated that whilst some students had increased their Standard Age Score as a result of the Paired Reading, a different intervention strategy was necessary for other students.

Using the January NGRT results, each student's information was analysed to establish whether their problem with reading was Phonics, Retrieval, Comprehension or Inference. In the spring term, the students were then organised into groups according to both their Standard Age Score and their area of need. Students deemed "Secondary Ready" were to be removed from CUP intervention and monitored. It was decided that motivation levels of the students might be higher if they were not coming out of different curriculum subjects and the English Department were keen to integrate intervention into Library Lessons. This marked a move towards a "workshop" style approach to fit with the KS3 SAIL Curriculum. Students were timetabled to either two or three sessions of "Inference Training", "Paired Reading", "Moondog" or "Challenge" (led by the English Department for newly Secondary Ready Students). All LSAs received training on the Inference Training programme by Kim Broadbent, as did Sue Canty from the Learning Resource Centre. Sarah Teasdale organised folders of resources to enable staff to pick up the folder and deliver an effective session with minimal preparation (in order to minimise problems around staff time and differences in standards of delivery). These interventions ran from the spring term until the summer half term. This was in order to allow twelve weeks for each intervention or workshop.

In June, the whole of Year 7 repeated the NGRT test. The progress from the September NGRT Standard Score to the June NGRT Score was analysed. Fifteen students made significant accelerated progress (31%) from September to June (categorised as an increase in Standard Age Score of more than four points). Seven students maintained their September Standard Age Score or increased it by up to four points (15%). This demonstrates progress in line with age expectations since the Standard Age Score takes into account the student's age and performance against other students of the same age nationally. Therefore, in total twenty two students made progress (46%). Six students are missing data (four students who left plus four who either joined late or missed one of the NGRT tests) (13%). Twenty students did not make progress

between the September NGRT and June NGRT as evidenced by their Standard Age Scores (42%). If the June NGRT data is compared with the KS2 Reading SAT scores (as a different measure of progress), the figures are broadly similar to the comparison between the two NGRT results. Eleven students made accelerated progress (23%), nine students made progress in line with age expectations (19%) giving a total of twenty students (42%). This figure is slightly lower as a result of the five students (11%) who did not sit their KS3 Reading SAT. Five students again are missing data (10%) and eighteen students (38%) did not show progress as evidenced by their Reading Standard Age Scores. YARC tests were completed for any students who appeared to have regressed. These results are generally more positive and are broken into Word Reading and Comprehension rather than an overall figure. Eight students could be judged "secondary ready" from the CUP students according to the NGRT results. Two of the students deemed "secondary ready" in January had dropped back to below 100 in June.

Observations:

- the group who made the most collective progress were the fifteen readers with the lowest KS2 SAT results at the start of the year. Only two of those students failed to show progress and one of those did not have a KS2 SAT result to compare the NGRT with. Our intervention strategy therefore has been effective for our lowest ability learners
- very few students were heard read the allotted twice a week in the original Paired Reading programme. This was as a result of many LSAs having intervention on their timetables, having to chase students in different lessons and the time taken recording the session so that staff did not double up
- the group who showed the least progress were our "middle ability" CUP students; those students who arrived with a SAT score between 90 and 95. All of these were targeted with Paired Reading, Lexia and (if comprehension or Inference were a problem) Inference Training. They generally had two interventions happening concurrently
- seven out of nine students deemed "Secondary Ready" in January, maintained this and remained "Secondary Ready" in June
- behaviour, particularly with the students in the "middle" band is a factor. This could have impacted on the way that those students conducted themselves in the assessments but it is also likely that their behaviour is having a negative impact on their academic progress more generally
- ten students not identified as CUP based on their SAT Reading Scores are now showing as "not secondary ready" with a Standard Age Score of less than 100 in the June NGRT. These students have not received CUP intervention but are now a concern. This could call into question the validity of the test results (students are able to skew results by continually pressing "next" instead of attempting questions or, more difficult, looking at each other's work) but it could also suggest that in 2016/17 our reading strategies did not have sufficient positive impact on the students' attainment and engagement
- Lexia appears to have had little impact when comparing start and end figures, though the results were much more positive in the January assessment. This could be influenced by the timetabling since Lexia groups continued to come out of curriculum subjects
- Inference Training seems to have had limited impact on reading progress, however there were staffing problems that may have also had a negative impact on these figures. The level of the texts was deemed too low for many of our CUP students who are nearing the 100 by the staff delivering the programme. A consultation with EMS for Literacy did not suggest any other programmes that would be more appropriate for this age and level of learner. Sarah Teasdale did organise some higher level texts to be used within the same format, however there is not enough evidence to judge if these were helpful
- single word reading scores are generally higher than comprehension scores for students who have completed the YARC. The exception is for the three students who are underperforming where they understand far better than they can decode. This could be part of their frustration. More generally, intervention will generally need to focus on comprehension skills.

Recommendations:

- consider how baseline assessments are staffed and timetabled. Consistency is important for tracking and accountability and the students seem to respond better when they are not coming out of their favourite subjects. Having all groups based in the Library seemed to work well
- continued communication with the English department so that "workshops" are relevant to their Library lessons
- monitor those students who are often in trouble to check that their progress is not being adversely effected
- consider different strategies for those students who are between 95 and 99 in their KS3 Reading SAT. Liaise with the English Department.

Maths:

In the academic year 2016/17 there were 39 students identified as "CUP" (Catch up Premium) at the start of the year. Again this reflects the number of students who received a score of 99 or below in their KS2 SAT and showed an increase on the previous year's figure.

It was decided that the students who received 96 to 99 on their KS2 SAT would not receive intervention but would receive Quality First Teaching at their own level. The students who achieved 90 to 85 in their SAT would receive Success @ Arithmetic intervention programme and those who either were disapplied from SATs or who received below 85 would complete First Class @ Number.

Before each intervention, the students were assessed using the Sandwell Test which gives a raw score and a maths age. This is administered on a one-to-one basis with the member of staff who is running the intervention. Fourteen students received intervention in the year 2016/17 and 100% of those made a gain of at least two points (maximum raw score gain was sixteen points) and at least two months (maximum gain was one year and three months) within a twelve week period. The student who made the lowest gain is on an EHCP and is identified as making very limited progress.

Observations:

- we currently only run two maths programmes as intervention – Success @ Arithmetic and First Class @ Number. These are more appropriate for our lower ability students and focus purely on number. Once a student has completed S@A (which builds on F@N), as an SEN department, we do not have an intervention programme that builds on the skills learnt
- only Faye Coaten is trained to deliver the Maths programmes on the Scoresby Site. She has trained Theresa Trueman but timetabling constraints limit the number of groups that can complete the programmes in a year.

Recommendations:

- consider workshop sessions that could challenge the CUP students who are at a level higher than appropriate for S @ N and F @ N and those who need topics other than number
- consider training more staff or dedicating more staff hours to the intervention.