## **2024 Statement of Variance Reporting**

School Name Adventure School Number 1195

## Target 1

Increase the number of Year 2-8 students who meet or exceed expectations in Reading by the end of the year

2023 Baseline Data	2024 Overall Outcomes
<ul> <li>82% of Year 2-8 students met or exceeded EOY expectations (343/418)</li> <li>80% of students in Years 2-4 met expectations (147/183)</li> <li>83% of students in Years 5-8 met expectations (196/235)</li> </ul>	85% of Year 2-8 students met or exceeded EOY expectations (357/418).  - 90% of students in Years 2-4 met expectations (163/181)  - 82% of students in Years 5-8 met expectations (194/237)

Actions What did we do?	Outcomes What happened?	Reasons for the variance Why did it happen?	Evaluation Where to next?
<ul> <li>2024 was our 5th year implementing a structured approach to literacy in Years 0-4. We have a very stable staff and most teachers are now confident and skilled in this approach</li> <li>2024 marked the second year of implementing a structured literacy approach in Years 5-8. Teachers continued to grow in both confidence and knowledge in applying this approach</li> <li>New staff undertook structured literacy training with Helen Walls. This included in-class modelling and coaching sessions. Our Literacy Lead Teacher provided ongoing mentoring and coaching to embed this learning into practice.</li> <li>New teachers were also regularly mentored by their team leaders.</li> <li>Team Leaders shared their own practice and reviewed team practices with our PLD facilitators. PLD was then focussed around collaboratively identified needs.</li> </ul>	Students meeting or exceeding expectations by year level:  - Year 2: 86% (48/55) - Year 3: 94% (48/51) - Year 4: 89% (67/75) - Year 5: 78% (47/60) - Year 6: 80% (52/65) - Year 7: 80% (45/56) - Year 8: 89% (50/56)  It is also worth noting the growing percentage of children at expectations at the end of Year 1; these levels of achievement bode well for the future.  In 2024 94% (45/48) of Year 1 students met expectations.	<ul> <li>Positive Influences</li> <li>Each team leader gained insights from their work with the PLD facilitators that were then explored with their teams and transferred into classroom programmes.</li> <li>Individual teachers were supported to grow their Tier 2 practices.</li> <li>The PGC model supported teachers to own their professional growth and plan specific actions to meet their goals. Coaching skills were further developed through work with our leadership mentor.</li> </ul>	Ensure teachers become familiar with the refreshed English curriculum. This includes knowledge of expectations for each level and effective assessment practices. Teachers will be supported by both Team Leaders and Literacy Leaders who will work collaboratively as part of our PGC model.  Support teachers as needed to equally prioritise word recognition and language comprehension in Years 0-4 to ensure sustained achievement in Years 5-8.

- Literacy was a key focus within our PGC (Professional Growth Cycle), with both team-based and individual goals supported through targeted coaching and feedback.
- Our Literacy Leaders worked one-on- one with teachers to strengthen their Tier 2 practices. They also participated in sessions with our facilitator to extend their knowledge and ensure a shared understanding underpinned their guidance.
- Literacy remained a consistent focus in team meetings and planning days, with regular reflection on teaching practices, planning, and implementation.

#### **Gender Trends:**

- 91% of girls (201/222) are on track vs 88% of boys (215/244).
- 12% of boys are working towards expectations (with or without support), compared to 9% of girls.

#### Ethnicity:

Please note, ethnicity data has not been included as it contains information that could identify individual students.

#### **Limiting Influences**

- It has been difficult to find PLD to support teachers to develop Phonemic Awareness in children with a speech impediment.
- 46% of monitored students are ESOL, have a learning difference or did not start their schooling at Adventure.

Monitor, and potentially explore, the drop in achievement between Years 4 and 5. When considering possible reasons, it is important to note recent PAT scores have not reflected this dip.

Continued focus on embedding consistent literacy practice and supporting new staff is likely to sustain and further improve outcomes.

	Overall Teacher Judgements - READING												
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8				
ı Levels	Achieving well beyond expectations	-	2% (1)	-	-	-	•	2% (1)	4% (2)				
Curriculum	Achieving beyond expectations	2% (1)	38% (21)	20% (10)	36% (27) 5% (3)		17% (11)	23% (13)	20% 11)				
	Achieving within expectations	92% (44)	47% (26)	75% (38)	53% (40)	73% (44)	63% (41)	55% (31)	66% (37)				
nt Agai	Working towards expectations	6% (3)	13% (7)	4% (2)	9% (7)	20% (12)	18% (12)	20% (11)	9% (5)				
Achievement Against	Working towards expectations (with support)	-		2% (1)	0 (1) 1% (1) 2% (1)		2% (1)		2% (1)				
Ā	466 students	48	55	51	75	60	65	56	56				

	School-wide Reading Achievement by Gender																	
	Yed	ar 1	Yeo	ar 2	Yeo	ar 3	Yeo	ar 4	Yeo	ar 5	Yeo	ar 6	Yeo	ar 7	Yeo	ar 8	Tot	als
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
Achieving well beyond expectations	•	•	3% (1)	1		•		1	1	-		•	4% (1)	•	1	8% (2)	1% (2)	1% (2)
Achieving beyond expectations	-	4% (1)	33% (10)	44% (11)	22% (5)	18% (5)	40% (17)	30% (10)	8% (2)	3% (1)	31% (8)	8% (3)	21% (5)	25% (8)	16% (5)	24% (6)	22% (52)	18% (45)
Achieving within expectations	95% (21)	88% (23)	53% (16)	40% (10)	78% (18)	71% (20)	57% (24)	48% (16)	67% (16)	78% (28)	58% (15)	67% (26)	50% (12)	59% (19)	81% (25)	48% (12)	66% (147)	63% (154)
Working towards expectations	5% (1)	8% (2)	10% (3)	16% (4)	-	7% (2)	2% (1)	18% (6)	21% (5)	19% (7)	12% (3)	23% (9)	25% (6)	16% (5)	3% (1)	16% (4)	9% (20)	16% (39)
Working towards expectations (with support)	-	-	-	-	-	4% (1)		3% (1)	4% (1)	-		3% (1)	-	-	-	4% (1)	1% (1)	2% (4)
Total Girls/Boys	22	26	30	25	23	28	42	33	24	36	26	39	24	32	31	25	222	244
466 students	4	8	5	5	5	1	7	75	6	60	6	5	5	6	5	5	40	56

Target 2	Target 2 Increase the number of students who achieve expectations in Writing after 12 months at school									
2023 Baseline Data 2024 Overall Outcomes										
■ 58% of six year	olds met expectations	■ 74% of 6 year olds met expectations								

• 58% of six year olds met expectat	ions	■ 74% of 6 year olds met exp	ectations
Actions What did we do?  • The Professional Growth Cycle for	Outcomes What happened?  • There was a significant increase	Reasons for the variance Why did it happen? Positive influences	Evaluation  Where to next?  • Ensure writing is prioritised as
<ul> <li>2024 had a focus on literacy. Rebecca, the Year 1 Team Leader, worked with facilitators from Massey to grow her knowledge and guide her team.</li> <li>Rebecca also created a sense of urgency in meeting student needs through progress monitoring twice a term, team discussions and collaborative planning for meeting needs.</li> <li>Year 1 learning support focussed on foundation skills (phonics, fine motor &amp; handwriting skills).</li> <li>Teachers continued to implement quality writing programmes that reflect best practice e.g. daily handwriting and code knowledge lessons, explicit teaching of sentence structure and vocabulary, use of motivating contexts for writing.</li> </ul>	in the number of students meeting expectations (44%).  NB: In 2024 our expectation after 12 mths was 2 perfect sentences, which exceeds expectations in the refreshed curriculum. The refreshed curriculum sets the target at only 1 or more simple sentences, including an additional phrase. Accurate punctuation is only expected with support.  Gender:  90% of girls met expectations compared to 60% of boys.  Ethnicity: Please note, ethnicity data has not been included as it contains information that could identify individual students.	<ul> <li>Strong teacher knowledge and awareness of foundational skills.</li> <li>A very strong cycle of 'notice, recognise and respond,' as embedded practice in the team.</li> <li>The strong collaboration within the team that allowed teachers to provide additional opportunities to practice foundational skills.</li> <li>Limiting influences: <ul> <li>10 children did not meet expectations and all had additional support with at least 2 foundation skills.</li> </ul> </li> <li>7 had underdeveloped expressive language <ul> <li>2 had difficulty pronouncing sounds</li> <li>8 had underdeveloped fine motor skills and 6 of these went onto have difficulty with handwriting</li> <li>8 needed additional support to build early phonemic awareness skills (blending and segmenting)</li> <li>6 were slower to build code knowledge</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>much as reading from the start of the year.</li> <li>Continue to inquire into ways to accelerate development of fine motor skills needed for handwriting. This is a key barrier to progress in the first year and a team PGC goal for 2025.</li> <li>Closely monitor handwriting development in children who had support for underdeveloped fine motor skills and also provide additional support in handwriting if needed.</li> <li>Provide additional support for children with underdeveloped phonemic awareness and implement intervention strategies (Lindamood Bell approach)</li> <li>Establish and strengthen processes for teachers, The Structured Literacy Support Teacher and parents to work in partnership and ensure strong foundations.</li> </ul>

Ta	ra	et	Z
ΙU	I G	ヒι	Э

Target	In Writing, lift the number of stud	ents at expectations in Years 5-8
	2023 Baseline Data	2024 Overall Outcome
- 70% of bo	B students met or exceeded EOY expectations (173/237) ys in Years 5-8 met or exceeded expectations (89/127) Is in Years 5-8 met or exceeded expectations (84/110)	<ul> <li>•71% of Year 5-8 students met or exceeded EOY expectations (166/234)</li> <li>64% of boys in Years 5-8 met or exceeded expectations (85/132)</li> <li>80% of girls in Years 5-8 met or exceeded expectations (84/105)</li> </ul>

#### Actions What did we do?

- Our Literacy Leaders actively participated in Cluster Literacy Network meetings throughout the year. This provided valuable opportunities to stay aligned with broader literacy initiatives, share best practices, and collaborate with other schools in the cluster to improve literacy outcomes.
- Teachers took part in ongoing professional learning opportunities to deepen their understanding of evidence-based literacy practices, including Structured Literacy and other effective literacy teaching strategies.
- We continued our collaboration with Massey University, particularly with Christine Braid, Professional Development based on current research.
- New staff undertook structured literacy training with Helen Walls. This included in-class modelling and coaching sessions. Ongoing mentoring and coaching were provided by our Literacy Lead Teacher to embed this learning into practice.

#### Outcomes What happened?

- See table below.
- Overall Progress:
- Mid-year: 75% (176/234) of students were on track. End of year: 71% (166/234) were on track.
- Year 5: On-track students dropped from 69% (mid-year) to 50% (end of year).
- At mid-year, a Year 5 student was considered on track if theu were performing at a 2E or 3M level. However, it's possible that students at the 2E level did not make enough progress to reach 3B by the end of the year.

#### • Gender Trends:

- 68% of airls (71/105) are on track vs. 58% of boys (76/132).
- 36% of boys need support, compared to 20% of girls.
- Girls outperform boys at all uear levels.
- Year 5 boys may benefit from targeted interventions.

### Reasons for the variance Why did it happen?

Continued professional development, alianed with the draft and then refreshed curriculum, has led to encouraging improvements in teaching practice. Teachers have begun to adopt new strategies and frameworks with growing confidence, contributing to more focused and responsive classroom instruction.

However, the transition from the previous curriculum to the refreshed version has introduced some uncertainty and inconsistency. Without a unified assessment tool or clear benchmarks. teachers have interpreted expectations in varied ways. This has made it difficult to ensure consistency in how progress is assessed and reported across classrooms and year levels.

As a result, variation in student outcomes can be linked to several limiting influences:

#### • Inconsistent Teacher Judgement

**Reasoning:** In the absence of a shared, standardised assessment tool, teachers have relied on their own professional judgment, which can differ based on experience, interpretation of curriculum levels, and expectations for student progress

#### Evaluation Where to next?

- Ensure teachers become familiar with the refreshed English curriculum. This includes knowledge of expectations for each level and effective assessment practices. Teachers will be supported by both Team Leaders and Literacy Leaders who will work collaboratively as part of our PGC model.
- Apply for Structured Literacy PLD for teachers in Years 5-8 that aligns with PLD already undertaken in Years 0-4.
- Use ministerial guidelines to finalise a new assessment rubric and provide PLD in using it to make judgements.
- Implement progress monitoring of target students to increase responsiveness.
- Engage in ongoing PLD with literacy lead teachers to build internal expertise.
- Support teachers with mentoring and coaching to refine writing instruction strategies.
- Align writing instruction with the school's literacy framework and expectations.

Target 3 cont.

Actions What did we do?	Outcomes What happened?	Reasons for the variance Why did it happen?	Evaluation Where to next?
<ul> <li>Ongoing discussions at senior teacher level regarding students achieving below curriculum expectations. Also followed up at team level.</li> <li>Professional Growth Cycle focussed on writing. Teachers worked closely with Team Leaders and Literacy Leaders to pinpoint specific literacy needs and focus areas, ensuring that appropriate support and guidance were provided to enhance teacher capability and foster continuous professional growth.</li> </ul>	Comparison to National Trends:  Writing achievement is lower than in reading and maths.  Unlike national trends, Māori and Pasifika students at our school are not underachieving compared to overall cohorts.  Ethnicity:  Please note, ethnicity data has not been included as it contains information that could identify individual students.	Impact: This can result in some students being over- or under-assessed, affecting their reported progress and final evaluation. We are in the early stages of shifting practice and professional learning in this area.  • Lack of Shared Assessment Tools or Standards  Reasoning: Without a consistent framework or agreed-upon assessment system, teachers have used a range of methods to evaluate student writing.  Impact: This lack of alignment makes it difficult to compare achievement data across classes or year levels and has contributed to disparities in reported outcomes.  • Mid-Year to End-of-Year Performance Variability  Reasoning: Some students who were assessed as 'Emerging' (2E) mid-year did not progress to 'Achieved' (3B) by the end of the year. This may be due to a range of factors, including irregular attendance, individual learning needs, or prior gaps in understanding.  Impact: These factors may have hindered their expected progress, resulting in outcomes that do not reflect their earlier trajectory.	<ul> <li>Provide targeted interventions for students who need additional support.</li> <li>Lift achievement in writing for boys (target group Y6/Y7). Learning support programmes in place for these students (DPs/TAs). Tracked by DPs.</li> </ul>

2024 Writing	OTJ's in	Years 5-8
--------------	----------	-----------

			Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8
<u>s</u>	Achieving well beyond	Mid Year	•	•	•	2% (1)
Levels	expectations	End of Year	•	•	•	-
mnlr	Achieving beyond	Mid Year	5% (3)	11% (7)	21% (12)	27% (15)
Curriculum	expectations	End of Year	-	15% (10)	7% (4)	14% (8)
	Achieving within	Mid Year	65% (37)	62% (40)	52% (29)	56% (31)
t Against	expectations	End of Year	50% (30)	57% (37)	73% (41)	70% (39)
men	Working towards	Mid Year	29% (17)	26% (17)	23% (13)	11% (6)
Achievement	expectations	End of Year	45% (27)	26% (17)	16% (9)	13% (7)
¥	Working towards	Mid Year	2% (1)	2% (1)	2% (1)	4% (2)
	expectations (with support)	End of Year	5% (3)	2% (1)	4% (2)	4% (2)

Writing Achievement by Gender Year 5-8											
	Yed	ar 5	Year 6		Yeo	ar 7	Year 8		Totals		
	Girls	Boys									
Achieving well beyond expectations			•	•		-					
Achieving beyond expectations		-	27% (7)	8% (3)	8% (2)	6% (2)	13% (4)	16% (4)	12% (13)	7% (9)	
Achieving within expectations	63% (15)	42% (15)	58% (15)	57% (22)	79% (19)	69% (22)	71% (22)	68% (17)	68% (71)	58% (76)	
Working towards expectations	29% (7)	55% (20)	12% (3)	36% (14)	13% (3)	19% (6)	16% (5)	8% (2)	17% (18)	32% (42)	
Working towards expectations (with support)	8% (2)	3% (1)	4% (1)		-	6% (2)	-	8% (2)	3% (3)	4% (5)	
Total Girls/Boys	24	36	26	39	24	32	31	25	105	132	
	6	0	6	55	5	6	5	6	2:	37	

# Possible Targets 2025

#### Maths

- Identify and implement targeted strategies to lift achievement in Years 3, 6 and 8.
- Maintain or improve the overall school-wide achievement rate of 85% of students working at or above expected levels.

#### Reading

- Sustain achievement levels in Years 1-4 (90% proficient or exceeding) when expectations are based on the refreshed curriculum
- In reading, lift the number of students proficient or exceeding in Years 5-8 based on the expectations of the refreshed curriculum.

#### Writing

- Further increase the percentage of students meeting expectations after 12 months at school.
- Sustain levels of achievement in writing, Years 2-4 (88% proficient or exceeding), when expectations are based on the refreshed curriculum.
- In writing, lift the number of students proficient or exceeding in Years 5-8 based on the expectations of the refreshed curriculum. Boys in Year 6, 2025, will be a target group.