

## Twelfth Partnership meeting - 20th January 2017

### Schools Assessment Framework

The Jersey Primary Assessment Framework was presented to the group.

The key issues of discussion were as follows:

Fundamental to the success of the new framework is an understanding that the new curriculum needs to be assessed in a completely different way from the old curriculum. This is a challenge for the department and for both head teachers and classroom teachers.

Developing the framework in partnership with head teachers has resulted in a slower process however it is thought that by head teachers taking ownership of assessment in their schools the resulting outcome will be better in the future – it will be embedded, trusted and moderated successfully. Communication about the framework to the classroom teacher is important and possibly something the Partnership needs to work on.

Key to the development of the framework has been to improve transition with Year 7 teachers involved in moderation at Year 6. In 2016 approximately three quarters of meetings involved Year 7 teachers. Future plans will be to hold these meetings in secondary schools. Moderation training sessions now involve both Year 6 & Year 7 teams.

It is the aim to get every school to have a trained moderation representative available for external moderation. All Year 2 and Year 6 external moderators are current classroom teachers. Supply is paid to backfill teachers when they undertake their moderation role.

The data produced after the first year has shown consistency within schools which is positive. However, and not surprisingly, within the first year of the framework and a new curriculum there is a lack of consistency between schools. It was decided for the first year that the data lacked the necessary consistency to act as a baseline for pupils moving into Year 7. These could have been caused by a variety of reasons, but may include:

- The extent of changes (philosophy and practicalities) reduced confidence and expertise (including amongst moderators).
- Gaps in prior learning given more weight in some schools than others.
- Decision to delay reporting until end of year prevented early “sense check” and action to tackle misunderstandings.
- Some schools failed to access training opportunities (eg cluster meetings).

The Department is working hard with moderators to try to achieve more consistency between schools. This year the Department is collecting data twice a year (January and July) so gaps in school data and inconsistency can be identified by the statistical team at an earlier point. Limited Year 6 tests and results from GL baseline tests at Year 7 on entry are also providing a means for cross checking information.

The outcomes of these tests highlighted more pupils achieved expected outcomes than were reported as secure at the end of Key Stage 2. This is positive and shows teachers have initially been cautious in their assessments. This will enable further discussions to be had in order to create greater consistency.

Future discussions should include using island wide Key Stage 2 tests to validate assessment judgements made in the classroom. There is concern that these result will form the high stakes league tables seen in the UK. However, this is firmly not the intention and the test results will only be used to triangulate the judgements made during assessment. Also, as no interim performance indicators will be undertaken (as is the case in the UK) the result will not be able to be accurately compared to UK schools.

A key issue will be how this information will be reported both to the media and to the destination secondary school. It is key that the overall picture of assessment is understood at the end of Key Stage 2, and both the media and secondary schools do not simply look to the test result in isolation.

The intention will be for a pupil's progress from Key Stage 2 to be measured from a score derived from their CAT scores, teacher assessment and test outcomes. These will be triangulated at the end of Key Stage 2.

A review of the framework was carried out in November 2016 by a UK head teacher. Findings have shown that the introduction of the framework has provided opportunities for cross-school discussion. However, the principles of the framework are yet to be fully understood and communication needs to be improved.

Other discussion points included the importance of not accelerating pupils to future year groups, but if appropriate to report on pupils working at previous year groups.

Levels have now been removed from Jersey schools.

Partnership members from the NASUWT feel very positive about the work undertaken and in particular how this impacts on practitioners in the classroom. Concerns from the UK have often centered on how the process of moderation is conducted. The questions which arise include how can the process of moderation be manageable and meaningful and not result in vast amounts of work being undertaken by the practitioner to justify the information passed to the moderator. This is the opposite of the Jersey context where a professional dialogue is key with the pupil being at the centre of all discussions.

In England some examples show the re-creation of levels. Assessment in England needs to be rethought as was the case in Jersey. It is vitally important that schools move away from the concept of linear models of assessment as the new curriculum and the way children learn does not match this anymore.

Jersey has benefited from having a team with expertise who are able to work in partnership with schools and teachers. It also promotes the trust of a professional teachers' judgement. It is now key to involve parents more. A leaflet is soon to be distributed and in the future the parent forum could be used to encourage further positive messages about the scheme.

### **Celebration of the 2nd Anniversary of the Education Partnership**

*Attended by the Minister for Education (Deputy Rod Bryans) and NASUWT President (Kathy Wallis)*

### **Further feedback from pilot schools – Jersey School Review Framework**

The first three pilot schools have been reviewed. The next stage is the digestion of the findings and planning any interventions required.

A further term of pilots is scheduled for this Spring term which enables further tweaks to the process to be made. The findings of this survey was presented to the Partnership and these highlighted a balanced response for the process. All agreed that the information gained from the survey will inform the development of the review process further.

All in attendance agreed that what is not wanted is a climate within schools where additional workload prior to a review is required and then once the review is over there is a feeling that the process has been completed. The messages that need to be made clear from the department is that this would not make any difference to school improvement. What is needed is an understanding of the context of the school and then a plan of improvement which goes on past the day the review team leaves the school.

Consistency of messages is important. The review document is being revised based on this feedback, other stakeholders and the comments made at the last Partnership meeting. It is important to dispel the myths about this Framework.

A communications plan for the review framework is being developed and the Partnership will look to develop a 'note' at this time.

### **Action plan for the Teachers' Survey**

A draft action plan was presented to the Partnership for discussion. It was agreed that members would take the survey away and comment at the next meeting with the aim of publishing in the near future.

### **Timetable for discussing DfE best practice reports**

Members of the Partnership posed the question of how can the department and practitioners in schools learn and reflect on some of the points from these reports to benefit teachers in Jersey?

An example of how teachers plan was discussed and it was noted that teachers teach in different ways and therefore plan in a different way. The format of how these plans are recorded and presented to school leaders will therefore differ and both school leaders and classroom teachers should be encouraged that a 'one size fits all' approach to planning misses the point of good teaching.