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**SECONDARY**

**Performance Data and Data Tracking**

**Underachievement Intervention**

**Measurement of Impact**

The Data manager needs to meet twice yearly with each key user of data to see if needs are being met and if any extra help is needed, with brief report to SLT

There needs to be a review in July of the effectiveness of the systems, with changes brought in for next year as found necessary

Data

Essentially the data produced has to;

* Meet the needs as outlined below
* Help make possible objective monitoring of the impact within each section of the School Improvement Plan
* There should be regular checks on the accuracy of predictions by staff

Personalised underachievement intervention

* Brief records kept of all interventions, both within departments and also within the pastoral system
* Evidence from subsequent data trackings will show the effectiveness of interventions in terms of whether there is improved performance, and whether or not this is sustained in the longer term
* Views of students and parents/careers should be sought on how helpful were the interventions

**Provision**

**Possible actions to be taken over the year –a checklist**

Take account of the following, review the present policy and provision and put new initiatives into place as considered necessary:

* Staff should not be given excessive amounts of data, only what they really need, (keep it simple).
* CPD for middle managers and other staff on the use of data needs to be a high priority, but still in the context that user friendly data will be supplied to staff, and they will not have to spend too much time interrogating it to find what they need; ultimately it is the use of the data that is going to raise standards, rather than just its production, and it is in using data that staff should be spending most of their time
* Hopefully the data manager will be looking at how well data is stored and handled across the School and departments. It would be particularly useful to ensure that behavioural incidents and sanctions, and also praise and rewards, are being recorded in relation both to individual students and staff, in the most user friendly and effective way in terms of analysis and reporting, (see appendix)
* The school needs to be continuously aware of the need to observe its GDPR responsibilities
* The highest priority is to fine tune the School’s data tracking system, and SISRA is recommended as the basis for this. This is a suggestion fora model data tracking system as an example but each school will of course have this customised to its own situation

# Using data to track student progress and tackle identified underachievement

**Targets**

There is clear evidence that students will respond to the setting of realistic but challenging targets by reaching higher levels of attainment and by making more progress, but this will only happen as long as the School has a well- established culture of high expectations and high achievement for students of all abilities and that what is actually happening in the classroom is making it possible for students to achieve their potentials; there is also no point in setting ridiculously high targets that students will not achieve and which mean that the majority of students are failing continuously to achieve their targets

Many schools have now introduced a “life after levels” system in KS3 based on progress ladders for each subject area, with student progress monitored in both KS3 and KS4 in relation to whether they are on course at any particular time to achieve the target end of KS4 grade

* Targets were in the past set for Y7 ready for September, but with the introduction of SAT standard scores rather than NC levels in practice this process often has to be delayed until later in the term, and especially if the secondary school also wants to do its own diagnostic testing.
* There are alternative ways of setting end of Y11 targets, but they all have weaknesses, e.g:
* Use the latest national transition matrices from Progress 8 with added challenge. But:
  + - * How much challenge should be added
      * Would the targets then need to change when later transition matrices become available
* Use the principle that a standard score of 100 should lead to a GCSE target of 5, and then use historical data with challenge, taking account of the overall attainment level of different school years, to set targets for students with other standard scores
* Make historical comparisons with the indicators used for setting targets in the previous year
* Maths targets will be based on the maths SAT, and the English target on the Reading SAT. The other EBacc subject targets will usually be based on both these to match ASP methodology, although MFL targets might be set in the same way as English
* In those years where there are no SATS results, schools will need to carry out their own baseline testing
* The baseline for ASP and Ofsted will be the SATs, but there is still a case for carrying out baseline testing to modify targets given that:
  + The SATs only reflect student performance four months earlier
  + There are doubts about the accuracy of the information to be derived from SATs given the recent changes in their nature and standard
* In the “practical” subjects it makes no sense to base targets solely on KS2 SATs results, (although these should be made available to the departments as a useful piece of information), and there should be more flexibility in setting targets for Art, Drama, Music, PE and Technology, and especially in Year7 . It is better if departments have schemes of work in the first half term of Y7 whereby they set a range of assessments to ensure that the targets set, after checking by SLT, say by the end of October, do not have just basically academic origins. At the same time it has to be accepted that ASP uses KS2 M/E scores as the baseline for these subjects and thus the basis of determining how may levels of progress students have made.
* There is also a case for at this stage taking account of the information on individual students which is supplied by the primary school in terms of adjusting some targets.
* If students are set individualised targets with challenge then this should end the old quandary of whether to expect three or four levels of progress. Another system is to set each student an expected target and also an aspirational target. At times of data tracking it is the expected target that is the basis of the report back to the student, SLT, governors, Ofsted etc, but the challenge for the student of trying to reach the aspirational target may have motivational value
* Targets should always be set, checked and moderated centrally and then issued to teachers rather than just let teachers or departments set their own targets. These draft targets are then supplied to staff centrally by the data manager; staff do of course have the right to query individual targets as set.
* These targets should then be reviewed on a personalised basis for each Y7 student in January in the light of the extra information that is available by then, eg;
  + - CAT test results
    - MIDYIS
    - FFT data
    - First data tracking results
    - Revised national transition matrices
    - Base line testing
* Before they are re- issued, each target in each subject is checked by those who know the student to ensure that they are sufficiently challenging
* The targets for students set for the end of Y11 are essentially based on primary school performance. Full account has to be taken of how students develop throughout the secondary years, and thus there should be regular reviews of targets, with those for many students being raised throughout the secondary phase.
* Targets for Year 8 should be individually reviewed at the end of Y7, and should be available as soon as possible at the start of the Autumn term
* Targets for KS4 are also individually reviewed at the end of Y9 and are based on KS3 performance, and ,above all, the expectation that students will achieve a personally appropriate level of progress between Y7 and Y11 based on their performance and potential
* There is a case for fine tuning the monitoring of how student progress over KS4, by using 4-, 4+, 5-, 5+ etc rather than just the full grade. All targets can be recorded by students in their planners and exercise books, (they will add their tracking grades to the planners and put them against the targets when the former are issued five times over the year) Target setting days can be held with students and parents early in the year, especially in Y7 and 10
* Department targets and targets for individual teachers can be set centrally based on the targets set for each student and can also be issued at the start of the year; this is a much better system than letting departments set their own targets
* All the targets set for students/departments should be really challenging. However, it will not work just to set higher targets unless at the same time the school is challenging the students to raise their levels of progress and attainment by enhancing the achievement culture, aspirations and expectations of the school. It is also important in this first year not to put too much pressure on teachers who are at first struggling to get students to these new levels; they need support rather than intimidatory accountability. It is also the case that with very challenging targets that some students will not be reaching them at tracking points and this has to be handled sensitively to avoid student demoralisation

**Data Tracking**

* Progress tracking at least two times per year for all Years starting at the October half term for Y11. This will be done in the most user friendly way for staff using the School intranet and with two weeks allowed for completion and it being made clear that non-completion in this time scale for no good reason could be a disciplinary offence. Staff do not need to be given too much extra information, and how much they receive will be agreed in advance. Staff are issued class lists with pre-populated targets for each student and it already indicated when a student is from one of the ASP student grouping; they then record;
  + A current working at grade
  + Their prediction of likely performance in relation to the targets for each student, i.e, is a student on, above or below target in relation to his/her progress ladder flight path

They may also add:

* + An effort or attitude to study grade
  + By ticking a box, whether or not the student deserves special praise

It is expected that each department will have done some form of credible objective assessment exercise that is built into the scheme of work, prior to inputting the tracking data. This, along with an assessment of the quality of the students’ class work, provides the working at grade from which a prediction can be produced; schools then need to be checking how staff draw predictions from working at grades and also that each department is continuously monitoring how staff assess levels and grades to ensure consistency.

* It is often best that data tracking for all years occurs at the same time, but some schools prefer to track individual years at different times. Y12 and 13 tracking can also be at the same time, but some schools prefer to do this more frequently and at key times for post 16 in the school year
* The results of the data tracking are used for;
  + **Identifying underachieving students**. The data manager produces the results of the tracking in formats whereby underachievement, (**defined by prediction in relation to target and not working at grade in relation to target**), can most easily be identified on completion, eg a traffic lighted spreadsheet. These go to;

* + - Heads of Departments who receive this data by class for all years and can then look at underachievement in their areas by students and by teachers/groups. They can also see if any particular topics do not seem to have been grasped by a good number of students and thus if teaching needs to be modified. This is then shared with class teachers so that the whole department can see who the underachieving students are. (Note, Heads of Department should also have set up systems that ensure that the department staff are continuously monitoring student progress, spotting underachievement and acting upon it)
    - Pastoral Leaders, who can see underachievement by students across all areas, information that can then be shared with tutors and mentors
    - The staff responsible for the achievement of the key ASP student groupings including Pupil premium, (see below)
    - SLT who look for patterns of underachievement in terms of teachers and classes and who can take action where there seem to be dysfunctional groups

In all cases, and with coordination, a range of **personalised intervention strategies** need to be put in place, (cpd should be in place to ensure that these are both comprehensive and imaginative)

* + - By the department and class teacher, led by the HoD/SLT line manager. The aim should be to create a culture whereby teachers see that improving the performance of underachieving students is an integral part of good teaching and not an add-on; external support is only sought when the teacher has tried all he/she can within the classroom. This will apply equally to all subject in all years
    - By pastoral staff, with the extensive use of mentors, where students are underachieving in a range of areas
    - By staff responsible for ASP student groupings, checking that their underachieving students are receiving the type of intervention that they need

It is the quality of the intervention work that is crucial and it should be of equal intensity across all subjects and all years

Where a student has been the subject of intervention, it is important that the success of this be checked by use of the data that comes out of the subsequent tracking exercises with this clearly and separately recorded

* + **Praise and celebration**, i.e. where students are making excellent progress in terms of being on or above target in a specified number of subjects or it is indicated that they deserve special praise – it can, e.g., lead to both department and Head of Year commendations
  + **Reports.**  By use of MIS, the tracking exercise will also generate a written report which if coordinated with other computer logged items can comprise for each student:-
    - progress in relation to targets
    - effort
    - attendance
    - behaviour record
    - praise record

This report can be issued after each tracking point to parents. Brief written comments could be added to two of these reports, by the pastoral Leader in one case and tutor in another. Another report can be given out before the parents evening/ consultation evening for that school year. At this evening, teachers can either give each parent a typed, bullet pointed list of up to 5 ways in which their child can improve his/her work, (these are posted to parents who do not attend), or at least put this across to parents verbally The advantages of this are;

* It is an extension of AFL
* Copies are kept in school of these lists to prove that there has been some written documentation given to parents and not just verbal comments
* Subject Teachers no longer have to write reports to parents as an addition to the data based reports that are sent out.

These reports can also be the basis of each student’s **Individualised Learning and Care** **Plan, [ILCP**], issued at the same time as the report to parent and based on the same data, with these then discussed with students by tutors. This will enhance the role of the tutors and tutor time

Much of this data will also be available for parents to access on a continuous basis via the school’s learning platform

* **Target groups of students**. The school may set up target groups of students from the very beginning of KS4 e.g.:-
  + - Students who could get 4+/5+ grades in both Mathematics and English, but will need support
    - Students who should be achieving their targets in the EBacc subjects but are currently not achieving this
    - Level 7/8/9 students
    - Students who may not get all the scores for Attainment 8 – these students can also be put in for extra, prescribed non- GCSE qualifications to ensure that they do get eight scores. These students may well be on vocational courses, college courses or an alternative curriculum, and rightly so, but it is still possible that they can achieve eight qualifications which give points to the school. .
    - Any seriously underachieving ASP group students, e.g. middle ability boys, able girls, PP students etc
    - From the middle of Y10, the school should be monitoring the Attainment 8 performance of each students based on the latest predictions. This will show in which of the subjects that is likely to count in Attainment 8 they are underachieving and thus where intervention is needed

These students, along with other students shown to be underachieving, can over KS4, for example:-

* + receive regular mentoring
  + have their work specially checked and redrafts arranged
  + have parents bought in for regular meetings with staff, students over progress
  + have their revision techniques developed in conjunction with parents and their revision monitored on a weekly basis

However, **all** students should get support (and regular mentoring for all students has been shown to be very effective), even if these targeted students may have an extra level of support

Targets once set should never go down (unless they were clearly hopelessly wrong in the first place). Where students are doing well, then their targets should be raised after tracking exercises

* **Underachieving students in KS3.** These need spotting as soon as possible and need intervention, as that will mean there is less to be done in KS4 –eg mentoring, alternative curriculum, extension activities etc, with data being used regularly to chart their progress
* **Report to SLT.** The summative **prediction** data that emerges from the tracking exercise should be the basis of a report to SLT; for both Y11 and Y10, KS3 and also Y12 and 13 if their tracking is carried out at the same time, The Data Manager creates a grid that tracks all students and also the ASP student groupings against the key performance indicators from the performance tables and ASP. This will make it clear what the school is likely to achieve at the end of the year if these predictions prove to be correct

By also looking in the same week at other data this can set up an “Impact Assessment Week”, e.g, attendance, lesson observations, behaviour, praise etc

All this data will then also be a crucial part of the school’s monitoring, review and evaluation of its success in terms of revising the SEF and the School Improvement Plan

* **ASP student groups** The data manager should also ensure that from the overall tracking data, discrete databases of the results of the tracking for specific groups of students are sent to those staff responsible for the progress of the various ASP groups, with an overall summary to SLT eg
  + - SEND
    - Higher ability
    - Gender by ability
    - White British and other ethnic groups
    - Pupil Premium

These staff will then be in a position to check that interventions are in place for those of their students who are underachieving.

* **Class target sheets** The data manager could also produce a progress tracking sheet for each timetabled class, showing for each student in the class the original target and then the predictions, (i.e on, above or below target), at each data tracking point; these are then distributed to the class teachers, but it is important that they be checked before they are issued to see if they actually show progress, with action taken where no progress is obvious. Ofsted like to see these when they observe lessons, but should not see them if they do not show that good progress is being made

**Appendix 1**

**Other data systems that need to be devised/modified by the data manager**

Sanctions/Referrals,

Praise and Rewards,

Lesson Observations

CPD/Performance Management,

* Individual staff cpd records, plans based on strengths and weaknesses
* Individual performance management records

Public examination/Teacher assessments analysis,

Attendance and Punctuality,

Sixth Form,

Data Manager to meet with Head of 12/13 to decide how ICT can be used to better support all Sixth Form systems and databases

Departments/Admin

Data Manager to make it clear that he is available to assist departments in devising better ICT based systems and databases

SEND (SENCO)

Data Manager to assist Senco in having a data base that;

* Records the progress of students in terms of reading ages, core skills etc
* Records the progress of students on the register across the curriculum in relation to their targets

Databases for staff i/c the progress of the ASP student groupings

**Appendix 2**

**Progress ladders in KS3 as part of life after levels**

**Issues and considerations**

* The main purpose of a progress ladder for a subject area is to allow a teacher to have some objectivity in making the judgement as to whether a student is demonstrating the appropriate level of skill, literacy/numeracy, factual knowledge recall, conceptual understanding and examination technique in the context of his/her present school year such that they are on target to achieve their end of Y11 target grade
* The life after levels system is based on assessing whether or not a student is on target; we are not using the steps approach whereby we expect a student to have reached a certain grade at the end of each year as steps towards their target –this method is flawed in that it assumes that students learn in a linear fashion, i.e, up a grade each year, and they do not
* Progress ladders are best constructed by identifying the key skills, facts, and concepts that are needed for success in GCSE and then using the progress ladder to assess the extent to which individual students in a school year are acquiring and demonstrating these; where appropriate, the ladder could be based on AOs
* The system of progress ladders, and the content of each needs to be as simple as possible, and thus very user friendly, (it could be argued that some of the PIXL exemplars are too long and complex we don’t want to bring back APP!)
* There should be as little subjectivity as possible in the interpretation of the elements of the ladder, so that staff in a department can be as consistent as possible in their judgements; there is value in the “I can….” model
* The first decision is to agree on the format, and only then start discussing the content
* It may well be the case that different subject areas will have progress ladder in different formats; this is acceptable in that GCSEs requirements vary greatly between subjects
* There should be a progress ladder for each school year, e.g, it will not work to have a progress ladder for KS3
* Progress ladders are for KS3, with reliance on reference to the GCSE specs in KS4 which do the same job and are directly related to the GCSE
* It is probably best if there is one progress ladder per year per subject area rather than one per each unit within each year; this can be done if there is a concentration just on the key skills, knowledge and content that are being developed across the year as part of the preparation for GCSE
* There is a case for producing a student version of the ladder that they keep in their books which will enable them to understand better how they can best make progress and also the amount of progress they have made so far
* PE poses a potential problem in that students do practical PE in KS3, but those who choose it in KS4 also do theory.
* An issue for ICT is that student take two routes in KS4, i.e, computer science or ICT, and thus the ICT progress ladder has to cover both
* Progress ladders are difficult for mathematics in that there are so many types of skills being developed; in maths, the best way to judge whether students are on target is the use of frequent assessments which are closely focused on preparation for GCSE
* It is a problem at present for staff in assessing what will be expected to achieve the new grades because it is still not clear what is expected for each grade. For this reason, some academies may in the first instance at least, base the progress ladders on combined rather than separate grades, i.e, 9/8, 7/6 etc rather than 9, 8, 7, 6 etc. However, using combined grades will obviously mean that it is more difficult to be precise over whether or not a student is on target to achieve a specific grade.
* Pearsons produce material which some academies want to use as the basis of their progress ladders in, say, science and maths, and AQA does the same for English. What Pearsons and AQA produce is useful, but it needs considerable adaptation and customisation if it is to be turned in to quality, user friendly, progress ladders
* In some schools, the targets of students never change after being set at the start of Y7, which is clearly wrong. As students develop and improve, targets, and thus student flight paths, should move upwards
* Progress ladders should never be “fixed in stone”; they will be continuously developed and improved with experience, and the time period for these changes could well cover the full teaching time for the new GCSEs
* It is essential that progress ladders are developed in conjunction with schemes of learning and assessments. The scheme of learning allows the student to develop the skills and factual knowledge and conceptual understanding that are in the progress ladder- the assessments check where the student is on the progress ladder. In theory, every scheme of learning should specifically contain the opportunities which allow students to be on course to meet or exceed their targets as set through the progress ladder. It is no use just adding progress ladders to unrelated schemes of learning or continuing to use assessments that bear no relation to the progress ladders
* Academies need to consider whether or not the introduction of progress grids will necessitate a change in the academy marking policy. Progress grids are about whether or not students are on target, but students may want some information from marking as to what level they are achieving with pieces of work, which is not what progress grids do. An academy will avoid this issue if in marking they don’t give levels but only suggestions for improvement, but there is evidence that this can cause student and parent frustration –they like to know how good something is and what is the standard of the overall work
* The main purpose of progress grids is as stated outlined above, but they can also have other beneficial advantages. They make clearer to teachers and students what is required for successful learning; they are a particular help to new teachers; they can help give a clear focus to schemes of learning; they make clear the aims of an assessment; they can help set learning objectives for lessons; they can help improve the teaching of GCSE by highlighting the skills, factual knowledge and conceptual understanding that are necessary for GCSE success; they can add to AFL, e.g, a teacher can show a student from the ladder the skills they need to develop to reach or exceed his/her target level
* A progress ladder alone, should not be the only way of assessing whether or not a student is on target.
  + There is the evidence that comes from marking and assessment
  + Teachers will also use their experience to assess the progress a student is making and the ability and potential that they are showing, (just as they did when assessing progress with NC levels); this will be less easy for NQTs and young teachers, which is why there will still need to be a lot of department moderation. It could be said, that progress ladders bring some objectivity to otherwise subjective judgements
  + A progress ladder only covers the specific skills of the subject. These new GCSEs demand generic academic skills, e.g, recall, conceptual understanding, revision, interpreting questions, examination technique, good literacy skills, the ability to write concisely or with depth and detail etc, etc. All these have to be taken in to account, or the judgement as to whether or not a student is on target will not be taking account how he/she is likely to perform in an examination
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