## **KS1 Assessment Analysis 2016**

## **Data Summary**

After a review of the 'Raise Online' data analysis, we were able to take a close look at patterns and trends emerging from our KS1 2016 results. Below, you can find a review of the KS1 summative unvalidated data for the 2016 cohort.

Teacher assessment (TA) is the main focus for end of KS1 assessment and reporting. It is carried out as part of teaching and learning. TA provides a judgement that is based on knowledge of how the pupil has performed over time and in a variety of contexts.

In 2016, teacher assessments had to be reported using the <u>standards</u> set out in the interim teacher assessment frameworks.

At Windmill Hill Primary School, we were chosen to participate in external moderation for the Local Authority to ensure the accuracy of our judgements.

			At least expected standard in reading				Below expected standard in reading						
	Cohort	National comparator type	Expected standard + Sch % Nat %		Greater depth		Below pre-KS1		Foundations Sch % Nat %		Working towards		
all pupils	17	all	47	74	24	24	0	2	24	5	29	19	
male	9	same	33	70	22	20	0	3	33	6	33	21	
female	8	same	63	78	25	27	0	1	13	4	25	16	
disadvantaged	7	non	29	78	14	27	0	2	43	4	29	16	
other	10	same	60	78	30	27	0	2	10	4	30	16	
Free School Meals	7	non	29	78	14	27	0	2	43	4	29	16	
Children Looked After	0	non	-	74	-	24	-	2	-	5	-	19	
SEN with statement or EHC plan	0	all	-	74	-	24	-	2	-	5	-	19	
SEN support	4	all	0	74	0	24	0	2	75	5	25	19	
no SEN	13	same	62	82	31	27	0	0	8	2	31	15	
English first language	17	all	47	74	24	24	0	2	24	5	29	19	
English additional language	0	all	-	74	-	24	-	2	-	5	-	19	
autumn birth	7	same	57	80	29	31	0	2	43	3	0	14	
spring birth	7	same	43	74	14	23	0	2	0	5	57	18	
summer birth	3	same	33	68	33	17	0	3	33	7	33	23	

- Male pupils are outperforming female pupils in KS1 Reading Assessment 3 males managed to reach the expected standard (33%) vs 5 females (63%).
- Results have a positive correlation with age.
- No children with SEN support reached the expected standard.
- Non-SEN children were closer to the National Data than the cohort as a whole.
- > Our school's results for children working at a 'Greater Depth' are equivalent to the number of children who achieve the standard nationally (24%).



			At least expected standard in writing				Below expected standard in writing						
	Cohort	National comparator type	Expected s	tandard + Nat %	Greate	r depth Nat %	Below   Sch %	pre-KS1 Nat %	Found Sch %	lations Nat %	Working Sch %	towards Nat %	
all pupils	17	all	29	65	0	13	0	2	24	5	47	27	
male	9	same	33	59	0	10	0	3	33	7	33	31	
female	8	same	25	73	0	17	0	1	13	4	63	22	
disadvantaged	7	non	14	70	0	16	0	2	43	4	43	24	
other	10	same	40	70	0	16	0	2	10	4	50	24	
Free School Meals	7	non	14	70	0	15	0	2	43	4	43	24	
Children Looked After	0	non	-	66	-	13	-	2	-	5	-	27	
SEN with statement or EHC plan	0	all	-	65	-	13	-	2	-	5	-	27	
SEN support	4	all	0	65	0	13	0	2	75	5	25	27	
no SEN	13	same	38	73	0	15	0	0	8	2	54	24	
English first language	17	all	29	65	0	13	0	2	24	5	47	27	
English additional language	0	all	-	65	-	13	-	2	-	5	-	27	
autumn birth	7	same	43	73	0	19	0	2	43	4	14	21	
spring birth	7	same	14	66	0	13	0	2	0	5	86	27	
summer birth	3	same	33	58	0	8	0	3	33	7	33	32	

- Results indicate that writing is an area for school development in Key Stages 1 and 2.
- Males perform better in writing than females and school data for males was closer to National Data than for females (33% compared to 59% vs 25% compared to 73%)
- No children with SEN support reached the expected standard in writing.
- ➤ Removal of best fit meant that a large proportion of our children were assessed at 'Working towards the Expected Standard' (47% compared to 27% nationally). Children in this band could miss out on the 'Expected Standard' because they have not met just one of the 18 statements required. You can visit <a href="this page">this page</a> to find out more information on KS1 Writing Assessment.
- > Spring birth children performed substantially worse in writing than in reading (43% vs 14%).

			At least e	expected sta	Below expected standard in mathematics							
	Cohort	National comparator type	Expected s	standard + Nat %	Greate	r depth Nat %	Below	pre-KS1 Nat %	Found Sch %	lations Nat %	Working Sch %	towards Nat %
all pupils	17	all	41	73	0	18	0	2	18	4	41	21
male	9	same	56	72	0	19	0	3	22	5	22	20
female	8	same	25	74	0	16	0	1	13	4	63	21
disadvantaged	7	non	14	77	0	20	0	1	43	3	43	18
other	10	same	60	77	0	20	0	1	0	3	40	18
Free School Meals	7	non	14	77	0	20	0	2	43	3	43	18
Children Looked After	0	non	-	73	-	18	-	2	-	4	-	21
SEN with statement or EHC plan	0	all	-	73	-	18	-	2	-	4	-	21
SEN support	4	all	0	73	0	18	0	2	75	4	25	21
no SEN	13	same	54	80	0	20	0	0	0	2	46	17
English first language	17	all	41	73	0	18	0	2	18	4	41	21
English additional language	0	all	-	73	-	18	-	2	-	4	-	21
autumn birth	7	same	57	80	0	25	0	2	29	3	14	15
spring birth	7	same	14	73	0	17	0	2	0	4	86	20
summer birth	3	same	67	65	0	12	0	3	33	6	0	26

- Males performed significantly better in their KS1 Mathematics Assessment than females (56% achieved the expected standard vs 25% of females). This contradicts the national trend of females performing better.
- As with the reading results, 'spring birth' children performed significantly worse (just 14% achieved the expected standard) than the rest of the cohort.
- No children with SEN support reached the expected standard.
- No children were deemed to be working at 'greater depth' in mathematics.