

## **Y7 FORM GROUP TEACHING**

**Hypothesis:** Delivering the Y7 Maths Curriculum in a form group will improve progress for all students.

### **Reasoning:**

- Smoother transition from KS2 environment.
- Easier to support the low achievers when there are fewer in a class
- Higher ability students will naturally model good learning habits thus improving the middle ability students.
- More opportunity to develop cross-curricular links with other subjects delivering their curriculum in tutor groups.
- Strengthen the collaboration with other teachers on class strategies – promoting the new teaching strategy.

### **Potential weaknesses:**

- Differentiation needs increased
- More difficult to stretch higher ability students.
- NQT experience at teaching a mixed ability group.

### **Methodology:**

- Two Year 7 groups remain in form groups – taught by JWB and MA (NQT). The remaining four classes to be set on ability.
- Y7 to be assessed upon entry and again at the end of each term. All classes to take the same synoptic test to measure progress.
- Staff voice to identify the strengths of the differing setting styles – in terms 1 and 3.

### **Cross-Curricular Planning:**

- The “Maths in...” project – JWB to collaborate with Humanities, Science, Art and EBIT to develop week long termly projects that can be delivered across two subjects at the same time.
- Students to develop their transferable skills across the curriculum.

## Results – Data Analysis

### Assessment Point 2

Group	7S1	7 B1	7 Ma1	7 Ma2	7 Ma3	7 Ma4	Setted Groups	Mixed Ability Groups
NOR	29	20	32	30	28	19	109	49
NOR with no baseline	1	0	4	8	10	2	24	1
Progress	21	6	26	8	-2	3	35	27
Ave Progress/student	0.75	0.30	0.93	0.36	-0.11	0.18	0.41	0.56
<b>Group make up on Entry</b>								
High (level 5+)	17	7	22	6	1	0	29	24
Mid (Level 4)	8	8	6	17	12	3	38	16
Low (L3-)	3	5	0	0	5	14	19	8
<b>Ave Progress/ability</b>								
High	0.88	0.29	0.86	0.00	-1.00	#####	0.62	0.71
Mid	0.50	0.25	1.17	0.47	-0.17	0.00	0.34	0.38
Low	0.67	0.40	#####	#####	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.50

### Analysis:

#### 1) Mixed ability grouping encourages more progress

- The results are conclusive that students on average made better progress in the mixed ability groups.
- All ability groups upon entry have made more progress on average.
- The best progress made by mid-ability students on entry placed in Set 1. This supports mixed ability grouping when the work is aimed at the top end.
- Low ability on entry students made over double the average progress as the students in the setted groups.
- Mid ability upon entry students have made comparable progress in both setted and mixed ability groups.

## 2) Setted groups are more appropriate for encouraging high ability students

- Set 1 has encouraged good progress from the high ability students upon entry however as has 7S1.
- 7S1 is a comparable group with similar proportions of high ability upon entry,

## 3) Teacher quality encourage more progress

- Clear difference in progress between 7S1 (Experienced teacher) and 7B1 (NQT).
- Set 1 is taught by a second year “outstanding teacher” teacher. The other sets taught by “good” teachers.

### Assessment Point 3

Group	7S1	7B1	7 Ma1	7 Ma2	7 Ma3	7 Ma4	Setted Groups	Mixed Ability
NOR	28	20	32	30	29	18	109	48
NOR with no baseline	1	0	3	7	12	3	25	1
Progress	31	13	38	26	6	8	78	44
Ave Progress/student	1.15	0.65	1.31	1.13	0.35	0.53	0.93	0.94
<b>Group make up on Entry</b>								
High (level 5+)	17	7	22	6	1	0	29	24
Mid (Level 4)	7	8	7	17	11	1	36	15
Low (L3-)	3	5	0	0	5	14	19	8
<b>Ave Progress/ability</b>								
High	1.24	1.14	1.23	0.83	0.00	#DIV/0!	1.10	1.21
Mid	1.14	0.50	1.57	1.24	0.09	0.00	0.92	0.80
Low	0.67	0.20	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	1.00	0.57	0.68	0.38

## **Analysis:**

### **1) Mixed ability grouping encourages more progress**

- The results are not conclusive. It is clear that ability grouping has had no effect on the average progress made by students.
- Low ability on entry students have made better progress in the setted groups.
- Mid ability students have made more progress in the setted groups – although only in the top two sets.
- 7S1, 7Ma1 and 7Ma2 have made similar progress.
- 7B1, 7Ma3 and 7Ma4 have made similar progress.
- The largest gains have been made from 7Ma2 since the last assessment
- There have been big gains in progress from the high ability groups in 7B1 although a decline in average progress from the low ability.

### **2) Setted groups are more appropriate for encouraging high ability students**

- The results appear to show that the mixed ability groups have encouraged the higher average progress/student however not by a significant amount.

### **3) Teacher quality encourage more progress**

- Clear difference again in progress between 7S1 (Experienced teacher) and 7B1 (NQT).
- Set 1 is taught by a second year “outstanding teacher” teacher. The other sets taught by “good” teachers.

## **Conclusions:**

- Progress results are inconclusive. A larger sample size is required to make significant judgements.
- Teacher quality remains the most important factor of encouraging progress not the style of ability grouping.
- NQT benefitted from the experience however wasn't experienced enough to assess and cater for the needs of the students in the lesson. The teaching style improved her quality of teaching in her setted groups.
- KS2 data to inaccurate to make fair judgements on progress. Some students levels on entry did not reflect their ability.
- Students loved the scheme of work and enjoyed Maths in the mixed ability groups. These activities should be made available for all of the year group to access.
- Mixed curriculums will not help the transition into Y8.