



End of Key Stage 2 - Reading												
(equivalent national figures in brackets)												
	2019				2018				2017			
	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard
All	30	50	(73)	10 (27)	29	55%	(75%)	14% (28%)	30	57%	(72%)	17% (25%)
Girls	15	53	(78)	13 (32)	16	69%	(79%)	13% (32%)	17	71%	(75%)	12% (28%)
Boys	15	47	(69)	7 (22)	13	39%	(72%)	15% (24%)	13	38%	(68%)	23% (21%)
Disadvantaged	10	50	(62)	0 (17)	14	43%	(64%)	7% (18%)	7	71%	(60%)	14% (14%)
'Other'		50	(78)	15 (31)	15	67%	(80%)	20% (33%)	23	52%	(77%)	13% (29%)
SEN					~	~	(38%)	~ (8%)	~	~	(33%)	~ (7%)
~ If group size is smaller than 5, data is suppressed												

End of Key Stage 2 - Writing												
(equivalent national figures in brackets)												
	2019				2018				2017			
	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Greater Depth	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Greater Depth	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Greater Depth
All	30	76	(78)	17 (20)	29	79%	(78%)	35% (20%)	30	73%	(76%)	0% (18%)
Girls	15	73	(85)	13 (25)	16	94%	(85%)	44% (25%)	17	54%	(83%)	0% (23%)
Boys	15	80	(72)	20 (15)	13	62%	(72%)	23% (15%)	13	88%	(70%)	0% (13%)
Disadvantaged	10	70	(68)	10 (11)	14	71%	(67%)	21% (12%)	7	86%	(66%)	0% (10%)
'Other'	20	80	(83)	20 (24)	15	87%	(83%)	47% (24%)	23	70%	(81%)	0% (21%)
SEN					~	~	(33%)	~ (3%)	~	~	(30%)	~ (2%)
~ If group size is smaller than 5, data is suppressed												



End of Key Stage 2 - Maths												
(equivalent national figures in brackets)												
	2019				2018				2017			
	Pupils	Expected Standard+	Higher Standard		Pupils	Expected Standard+	Higher Standard		Pupils	Expected Standard+	Higher Standard	
All	30	77 (79)	20	(27)	29	79% (76%)	28%	(24%)	30	60% (75%)	13%	(23%)
Girls	15	73 (79)	13	(24)	16	88% (76%)	31%	(22%)	17	65% (75%)	6%	(21%)
Boys	15	80 (78)	27	(29)	13	69% (75%)	23%	(26%)	13	54% (75%)	23%	(24%)
Disadvantaged	10	70 (67)	0	(16)	14	71% (64%)	14%	(14%)	7	57% (63%)	14%	(13%)
‘Other’	20	80 (84)	30	(31)	15	87% (81%)	40%	(28%)	23	61% (80%)	13%	(27%)
SEN					~	~ (37%)	~	(5%)	~	~ (36%)	~	(5%)
~ If group size is smaller than 5, data is suppressed												

End of Key Stage 2 - EGPS																		
(equivalent national figures in brackets)																		
	2019						2018						2017					
	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard		Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard		Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard				
All	30	57	(78)	10	(36)	29	62%	(75%)	24%	(34%)	30	53%	(77%)	20%	(31%)			
Girls	15	67	(83)	13	(41)	16	81%	(82%)	19%	(39%)	17	71%	(81%)	18%	(35%)			
Boys	15	47	(74)	7	(31)	13	39%	(73%)	31%	(30%)	13	31%	(73%)	23%	(27%)			
Disadvantaged	10	50	(67)	0	(25)	14	50%	(67%)	14%	(24%)	7	57%	(66%)	29%	(21%)			
‘Other’	20	60	(83)	15	(41)	15	73%	(82%)	33%	(39%)	23	52%	(82%)	17%	(35%)			
SEN						~	~	(35%)	~	(7%)	~	~	(34%)	~	(6%)			
~ If group size is smaller than 5, data is suppressed																		



End of Key Stage 2 - RWM Combined												
(equivalent national figures in brackets)												
	2019				2018				2017			
	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard	Pupils	Expected Standard+		Higher Standard
All	30	50	(65)	10 (11)	29	52%	(64%)	14% (10%)	30	47%	(61%)	0% (9%)
Girls	15	53	(70)	13 (13)	16	63%	(68%)	13% (12%)	17	59%	(65%)	0% (10%)
Boys	15	47	(60)	7 (9)	13	39%	(61%)	15% (8%)	13	31%	(57%)	0% (7%)
Disadvantaged	10	50	(51)	0 (5)	14	36%	(51%)	7% (4%)	7	43%	(47%)	0% (4%)
'Other'	20	50	(71)	15 (13)	15	67%	(70%)	20% (12%)	23	48%	(67%)	0% (11%)
SEN					~	~	(21%)	~ (1%)	~	~	(18%)	~ (1%)
~ If group size is smaller than 5, data is suppressed												

End of Key Stage 2 – Progress												
(national progress = 0.0) Red = significantly below average Green – significantly above average												
	2019				2018				2017			
	Pupils	Reading	Writing	Maths	Pupils	Reading	Writing	Maths	Pupils	Reading	Writing	Maths
All	30	-2.63	0.67	-0.32	29	-2.7	2.1	1.5	30	-3.5	-4.1	-3.8
Girls	15	-3.14	-0.25	-1.68	16	-2.7	2.7	-0.2	17	-1.8	-1.4	-3.0
Boys	15	-2.09	1.64	1.14	13	-2.8	1.3	3.7	13	-5.7	-7.6	-4.9
Disadvantaged	10	-4.12	0.38	-1.59	14	-2.1	2.7	2.5	7	-2.8	-1.8	-3.4
Other	20	-1.84	0.80	0.35	15	-3.3	1.5	0.6	23	-3.7	-4.8	-4.0
SEN					~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
~ If group size is smaller than 5, data is suppressed												



End of Key Stage 2 – Average Scaled Scores																					
(equivalent national figures in brackets)																					
	2019							2018							2017						
	Pupils	Reading		Maths		GPS		Pupils	Reading		Maths		GPS		Pupils	Reading		Maths		GPS	
All	30	100.2	104.4	103.5	105	100.2	106.3	29	100	(105)	104	(104)	102	(106)	30	101	(104)	101	(104)	101	(106)
Girls	15	100.4	105.5	102.8	104.8	101.9	107.4	16	102	(106)	104	(104)	104	(107)	17	103	(105)	102	(104)	103	(107)
Boys	15	99.9	103.3	104.3	105.3	98.7	105.3	13	98	(104)	104	(105)	99	(105)	13	99	(103)	100	(104)	100	(105)
Dis	10	100.6	102.5	100.6	102.5	99	103.8	14	98	(103)	102	(102)	100	(104)	7	100	(102)	100	(102)	101	(104)
Other								15	103	(106)	106	(105)	104	(107)	23	102	(105)	102	(105)	102	(106)
SEN								~	~	(98)	~	(98)	~	(98)	~	~	(97)	~	(97)	~	(98)

Evaluation	<p>-RWM improved over 3 years from 2016, but has stabilised at 50% this year. This is low due to reading EXS+ which is not in line with other subjects which are broadly in line with national.</p> <p>- No children achieved higher standard in RWM in 2016 and 2017, but 5 children (17% of the year group) achieved this consistently high standard of attainment in 2018; significantly higher than national. This year is in line with national.</p> <p>-Reading EXS+ lower than last year & significantly lower than national (see below for breakdown of question analysis). Although progress score has improved since 2017 it has remained significantly lower than national over last three years due to majority of children falling just short of average scaled score achieved by children with similar prior attainment</p> <p>-Reading GD lower than last year & national.</p> <p>-Reading Disadvantaged also lower than national.</p> <p>-Writing EXS+ is sustained over 3 years & is in line with national. Progress has improved over three years & has shifted to more in line with national this year.</p> <p>-Writing GD shows upward trend compared to 2017. Even though % is lower than last year, it is still in line with national.</p> <p>-Maths EXS+ shows upward trend compared to 2017. However, % sustained over last two years to match national. Progress was significantly below average in 2017 & was close to being significantly above average in 2018. This year's figure is just below the national figure of zero, but is comfortably within the 'average' range of scores.</p> <p>-Although GD in Maths has improved compared to 2017 it is lower than last year (slightly higher than national) & lower than national this year.</p> <p>-Although GPS EXS+ & GD were starting to close the gap to national since 2016, there has been a dip this year to significantly lower than national.</p>
-------------------	--



Our strategies for maintaining and improving children's outcomes

- Continue to work on stamina, speed and accuracy of reading & comprehension across school through:
embedding Book Talk & DERIC approach to reading
regular speed reads in KS1 & KS2
improving volunteer readers programme to increase frequency of reading practice
introducing weekly non fiction class reading as part of class 10 minute daily reading pledge
updating range of questions from last year to develop DERIC sessions & add new style questions from SATs paper. Insistence on precise answers.

-Review testing conditions to maximise performance for all (mental health, cognitive needs)

-Develop system & routine for analysing morphology & etymology so that it is consistent across school.

-Planned balance of fiction & non fictions books to be read in each class married to Curriculum For Future Citizens (CFFC) Theme.

-Non fiction writing CPD in line with write Stuff approach & linked to themes for CFFC.

-Review & embed approach to independent writing.

-Embed use of sentence stems & agreed specific mathematical process vocabulary.

-Rewrite maths questions as 2 part

-Implement strategy for practicing multiplication table (I pad)

FINDINGS FROM QUESTION ANALYSIS:

1. **TECHNIQUE:** Answer in sentence-like responses, including a VERB... e.g. How can we attract more bees? “**plant** more bee-friendly flowers” is right, but “more bee-friendly flowers is wrong”
2. **VOCAB:** The word impression came up again and again and was badly answered – also needed more sentence-like responses for precision
3. **VOCAB:** Generally needs a more formal tone of answer – both 99 pt ch used words like ‘bloke’ and ‘she’ – not being clear who they are talking about
4. **TECHNIQUE:** Learn to answer the layout questions which are boxed up:

Character's Actions	Impression



	<p>5. PRECISION: True-false statements – based on evidence in text – cause a lot of problems because pupils need 3/4 right for one mark.</p> <p>6. TECHNIQUE: Ability to compare and contrast characters – character studies, character motivations</p> <p>7. VOCAB: shades of meaning – word studies, e.g. “Did a decent job” actually means did the best you could, not did an excellent job.</p> <p>8. TECHNIQUE: Time was an issue for CHG, but the others also lacked precision towards the end. The final text was unusual and they did not get the gist of its context (sci-fi / dystopian)</p> <p>9. TECHNIQUE: Changing answers – JCa changed correct answers 2x = confidence = but exam techniques says you read it earlier and that was your first thought, so don’t change your answer.</p> <p>10. TECHNIQUE: E.g. Q15 – using an evidence box – new layout (technique)</p> <p>11. TECHNIQUE: Work out what the Q is asking – is it who, where, why, what, when, how... think of the adverbial you are responding to – similar to the way we write a narrative – what are we telling? What is it asking?</p> <p>12. VOCAB: Vocabulary was an issue for these pupils – slow drip-feed.</p> <p>Inherited OS OP TB – all with low attainment (however improved progress)</p> <p>Progress journey over 3 years</p> <p>5 pupils were 98/99 which is raw score deficit of 1 to reach ss. This would give us 65%, which would give RWM 65%</p> <p>Special consideration for one child. These pupils have been scoring 100 & above throughout year on SATs papers</p> <p>Disputing marking for 2 pupils</p> <p>10% SEND & 7% sat the test</p>
--	---