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Teaching approaches and strategies that work

KEEPING CHILDREN ENGAGED AND ACHIEVING IN READING
Keeping children engaged and achieving in reading

This Education Review Office (ERO) report is one of a series of reports on teaching strategies that work. It features strategies and approaches that we observed in 40 primary schools selected from across New Zealand. These schools came from a database of 129 schools, all with rolls of 200 or more, in which the proportion of students in the upper primary years (Years 5 to 8) achieving at or above the expected standard had increased. In each case achievement levels were also above average for the decile.

We asked leaders in each school what they saw as the reasons for their school’s positive achievement trajectory and then investigated the teaching strategies that had been implemented, and the outcomes.

This report shares some of the strategies and approaches used by schools that had focused on improving achievement in reading. It also shares some of the simple strategies used in classrooms where achievement in reading had been accelerated.

Why ERO focused on reading programmes

Reading is a critical skill that enables children to engage with all aspects of The New Zealand Curriculum. Reading proficiency provides a doorway into the world. Children’s success in all learning is largely the consequence of effective literacy teaching. Literacy learning builds cumulatively on each learner’s existing proficiency.

Becoming literate is arguably the most important goal of schooling. The ability to read is basic to success in almost every aspect of the school curriculum, it is a prerequisite skill for nearly all jobs, and is the primary key to lifelong learning. Literacy determines, to a large extent, young children’s educational and life chances and is fundamental in achieving social justice.¹

Although many New Zealand students achieve well, by international standards our results are not improving when compared with other countries. The Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS-2016) results highlight minimal progress and then a decline in achievement in reading since the beginning of the century (as shown below). In 2011, the number of countries that significantly outperformed New Zealand exceeded the number of countries that New Zealand significantly outperformed. Results from different groups of children indicate that the 8-point decline in the mean score, from PIRLS 2011 to 2016, is across the board as it is visible in both genders, across ethnic groups, and in children across socio-economic backgrounds.

### Relative standing of countries in three cycles of PIRLS, 2001 to 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PIRLS 2001 Mean score</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PIRLS 2006 Mean score</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PIRLS 2011 Mean score</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PIRLS 2016 Mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>601 (2.2)</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>565 (3.4)</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>571 (3.0)</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>581 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>594 (2.4)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>568 (3.8)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>571 (3.0)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>576 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>555 (3.5)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>557 (2.9)</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>567 (3.7)</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>569 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>550 (3.8)</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>551 (2.9)</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>552 (2.2)</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>559 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>545 (2.6)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>549 (2.3)</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>546 (2.2)</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>555 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>541 (3.3)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>540 (2.2)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>542 (2.7)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>554 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>540 (2.1)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>547 (4.4)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>541 (2.7)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>549 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>541 (3.4)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>540 (3.4)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>541 (3.0)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>542 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>539 (2.9)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>539 (2.5)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>540 (2.9)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>542 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>535 (2.3)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>536 (2.2)</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>532 (4.5)</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>534 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>518 (1.8)</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>537 (1.7)</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>538 (1.7)</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>539 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>521 (2.9)</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>557 (1.7)</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>559 (2.3)</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>561 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>499 (2.9)</td>
<td>Lithuania*</td>
<td>532 (1.7)</td>
<td>Lithuania*</td>
<td>533 (1.7)</td>
<td>Lithuania*</td>
<td>534 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union Rep. of</td>
<td>494 (1.3)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>522 (4.5)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>531 (1.9)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>533 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Trend country mean | 525 (0.5) | Trend country mean | 535 (0.6) | Trend country mean | 537 (0.7) | Trend country mean | 541 (0.3) |

**Key**
- **Significantly higher than mean for the 10 best countries**
- **Not statistically different from the mean for the 10 best countries**
- **Significantly lower than the mean for the 10 best countries**

**Note:** Standard Errors appear in parentheses.


There is also still a wide variance in our children’s achievement. New Zealand has a group of children that demonstrate advanced reading comprehension skills. However, results also highlighted the wide difference between our highest and lowest achieving students. It is concerning to see that in the 2015/16 results not only have we not successfully closed the gap but we have less children achieving at the highest level and the lower-performing children achieved lower scores than was the case in previous cycles as shown below. Out of English speaking countries New Zealand had one of the largest ranges in reading ability. Those children who did not reach the bottom benchmark in the study (10 percent) had difficulty in locating and reproducing explicitly-stated information and making straightforward inferences from a simple passage of text.
New Zealand was one of 15 countries (out of 50) where informational reading was a weakness relative to their overall reading performance.

Another international assessment study also shows a decline in secondary school reading results, which is likely to be influenced by the rate of progress in upper primary school years. According to recent Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) data, the reading achievement of our 15-year-olds is steadily declining.

The 2014 National Monitoring Study of Student Achievement (NMSSA) on English: Reading showed that similar percentages of children at Year 4 and Year 8 scored above the minimum score associated with their expected curriculum levels. This is different to many other curriculum learning areas where considerably fewer children achieve as well in Year 8 as they do in Year 4. However Year 4 achievement in all other areas is higher than it is in reading. Overall, students were generally positive about reading, with students in Year 4 rating themselves higher on average on the scale than students in Year 8. A greater proportion of boys than girls expressed negative views about reading at both year levels.

Assessment Tools for Teaching and Learning (asTTle) norm data indicates the need for many children to progress through the levels more quickly in upper primary school. If most children were progressing well, our national norms would show changes of about three sub-levels every two years. However, data for the reading asTTle norms for the 2010 cohort indicated that the achievement trajectory does not ensure most children will reach Level 4A by the end of Year 8.

Declining rates of achievement in reading must be reversed so students are prepared for the demands of the secondary curriculum and, later, for success in further education and employment. We can only raise reading achievement by improving the teaching of reading.
What ERO already knows about improving reading in primary schools

Reading and writing in Years 1 and 2 (2009)
ERO found that effective teachers inquired into ways of improving their teaching, and worked collaboratively with other staff to share good practice. These teachers had a sense of urgency about developing the child as a reader and writer. Their teaching was evidence based, deliberate and gave children opportunities to practise new skills and knowledge during the instructional classroom programme. These teachers were adept at using a variety of assessment sources to make judgements about children’s literacy progress and achievement. They also applied a ‘teaching as inquiry’ process to find out what children had already learnt and what changes to make to their teaching, based on what children needed to learn next.

Raising achievement in primary schools: Accelerating Learning in Mathematics (ALiM) and Accelerating Literacy Learning (ALL) 2014
In schools where teachers’ involvement in the ALiM and ALL project had accelerated children’s progress:
> students were active partners in designing their learning plans; they were supported to monitor their own progress; knew what they needed to learn next; and were able to provide feedback about the teaching actions that worked for them
> parents and whānau were formally invited to be part of the process and were involved in workshops to develop home activities and frequent, regular three-way conferencing in which teachers emphasised progress and success
> teachers involved knew they were expected to critique the effectiveness of their practice and to make changes; had a willingness to seek both positive and negative evidence of progress; and were open to new practices that would make a difference.

Raising Achievement in Primary Schools (2014)
ERO reported that strategic and successful schools had a long-term commitment to improvement through deliberate, planned actions to accelerate student progress. These effective schools were highly strategic and evaluative when trialling new approaches and innovations. Five capabilities that made a difference in schools’ effectiveness in accelerating student progress were:
> leadership capability
> teaching capability
> assessment and evaluative capability of leaders and teachers
> leaders’ capability to develop relationships with students, parents, whānau, trustees, school leaders and other teaching professionals
> leaders’ and teachers’ capability to design and implement a school curriculum that engaged students.
These schools also had a focus on equity and excellence.
**Educationally powerful connections with parents and whānau (2015)**

In the best instances, teachers involved most parents in setting goals and agreeing on next learning steps with their child. Teachers responded quickly to information obtained from tracking and monitoring student progress and persisted in finding ways to involve all parents of students who were at risk of underachieving, and in finding ways for students to succeed. During conversations with parents and whānau, teachers aimed to learn more about each student in the wider context of school and home, to develop holistic and authentic learning goals and contexts for learning.

**Continuity of learning: Transitions from Early Childhood Services to Schools (2015)**

This ERO report stresses how critical an effective transition into school is for a child’s development of self-worth, confidence, resilience, and ongoing success at school. Schools that were very responsive to ensuring children successfully transitioned could demonstrate they had real knowledge about their newly-enrolled children. They took care to translate that knowledge into providing the best possible environment and education for each and every child. Leaders made sure transition was flexible and tailored to the individual child.

**Raising student achievement through targeted actions (2015)**

ERO emphasised the importance of schools identifying the specific needs of individual students and creating a plan based on those needs to raise student achievement for all. The most effective schools had a clear understanding of which students they needed targeted actions for to accelerate progress. Teachers were able to monitor their actions to determine if these resulted in positive outcomes for children.

Other factors contributing to success included a strong commitment to excellence and equity; high quality leadership; the quality of teamwork and professional learning conversations when taking actions; and building school capacity to sustain improvement into the future.

**Extending their language – expanding their world: Children’s oral language (Birth – 8 years) (2017)**

This ERO report highlighted the importance of supporting oral language learning and development from a very early age. Early childhood services and schools need to position oral language as a formal and intentional part of their curriculum and teaching programmes. Oral language interactions build children’s understanding of the meaning of a larger number of words, and of the world around them. This understanding is crucial to their later reading comprehension, and literacy in general. Early language skills also predict later academic achievement and success in adult life.
What we found in the schools focused on reading improvements

The schools with considerable improvements in reading achievement in Years 5 and 6 undertook carefully considered whole-school or whole-syndicate review and development. They completed assessments that identified the challenges for children and teachers and then accessed professional learning and development (PLD) that focused specifically on the teaching that needed to improve. Well-considered improvement plans outlined individual responsibilities, actions and associated timelines. School boards dedicated funds to resource the new programmes and provided for additional staff, and were well informed about the impacts of their funding.

Most of the schools featured in this report had undertaken an extensive review before beginning their changes. Leaders and teachers looked into assessment data together to see initial trends, successes and challenges. As well as looking at individual children’s scores, they also looked more deeply into groups of children’s assessment responses to identify strengths and specific needs. Teachers examined any contradictions between assessment results to identify any inconsistency in teachers’ expectations or confidence with using the assessment. In the best instances, they included parents’ and children’s views when undertaking such reviews.

The focus on assessment continued throughout their trials and improvements. Teachers worked in pairs or in syndicates to identify the next steps for children at risk of not achieving. Teachers in one school had reduced the number of reading assessments to allow time to look more deeply into the information they did collect. The teachers had accessed a New Zealand Council of Educational Research (NZCER) webinar to extend their data literacy and analysis from the standardised Progressive Achievement Tests (PAT) they used. Teachers also used tasks from the Assessment Resource Banks (ARBs) to check how well children were mastering new strategies trialled. Teachers recognised it was vital to check how well new approaches and strategies were working for children.

Teachers in these schools participated in considerable Professional Learning and Development (PLD) facilitated by either an external provider or lead teachers within the school. Leaders expected external providers to focus on the specific skills the children and teachers in the school needed. In many instances, facilitators built teachers’ content and pedagogical knowledge. Where appropriate, they modelled practices and supported school leaders to observe teaching and manage coaching and mentoring so improvements would be sustained after the PLD. Lead teachers in schools accessed a wide variety of research related to the teaching of reading and selected the approaches and strategies most likely to benefit their children. The rationale for their approach was clear and known by teachers and, at times, known by the children.
Leaders used a variety of strategies to make sure teachers understood the reading processes children experienced across the school. In some schools, at the beginning of the year, teachers changed to teaching other year levels to better understand what came before or next for children’s learning. In other instances, teachers collaboratively developed clear expectations about the content of their reading programmes and the children’s expected progress. Deliberate teaching actions were outlined, implemented and then monitored by leaders. Teachers in these schools focused on implementing consistent strategies that children could build on as they moved through the school.

Many of the schools trialled new strategies with small groups of children before implementing them more widely across the syndicate or school. In some cases, this practice began when teachers in the school joined the Ministry of Education’s Acceleration Literacy Learning (ALL) project. Teachers observed practices implemented by literacy leaders before applying them in their own core reading programme. Many of the schools were using this approach to reduce the number of withdrawal programmes children participated in. Leaders used a team problem-solving approach instead, where every teacher was responsible for ensuring every child could succeed.

New approaches evident in some schools had vastly improved the confidence and self-efficacy of reluctant readers in Years 5 and 6. Mixed-ability grouping allowed children with different reading ages to work together and support each other. Teachers grouped children to match their interests and needs rather than their reading ages. They introduced reluctant readers to text that matched their chronological ages and interests, and gave them strategies to succeed with the text. Children recognised each other’s strengths and needs, and used these to support their peers. Children, teachers and parents enthusiastically shared the benefits of these new approaches.

Children enthusiastically talked to ERO about the reading tasks that contributed to their success. They liked having choices about texts and activities. They also appreciated when the tasks were interesting and complex enough to challenge them. Some children particularly liked the competitive nature of things like book challenges or online programs where they could compete against themselves. They enjoyed knowing the purpose of their reading, and knowing when they had achieved their goals. Children valued specific feedback from their teachers and peers, and some told us that sometimes their teachers shared their personal teaching goals so they could give feedback too.
The reading approaches and strategies that worked

In the following pages we share the narratives of nine schools. Some share developments to improve reading achievement for children in all year levels. Other schools made improvements in specific year levels. The list below shows the year levels each school focused on improving.
01
Implementing a variety of research-based strategies and approaches to improve reading
WOODLEIGH SCHOOL
TARANAKI
- Whole school development
  - Literacy leader
  - Developments related to ALL
  - Extending new reading strategies
  - Impacts for children

02
Responsive programmes to help readers’ engagement and success
BLEDISLOE SCHOOL
HAWKES BAY
- Two syndicates
  - Improving phonological awareness
    - Years 1 and 2
  - Reading engagement and comprehension in Years 5 and 6

03
Using mixed-ability reading groups to improve achievement for reluctant readers
WOODEND SCHOOL
CHRISTCHURCH
- Years 5 and 6
  - Identifying and monitoring achievement and progress
  - Mixed ability reading groups

04
Improving children’s reading comprehension
ROSCOMMON SCHOOL
AUCKLAND
- Years 5 and 6
  - Reading lesson content
  - Reading assessment development

05
Board-funded initiatives to support reading success
RICHMOND SCHOOL
NELSON
- All Year levels
  - Developing foundation skills
  - A deliberate focus on information skills
  - A programme that engaged reluctant readers in Years 5 and 6
  - Monitoring impacts of the funding
06
Using a variety of approaches to improve reading at different year levels
MILSON SCHOOL
MANAWATU
All Year Levels
> An accelerated reading programme for Years 1 to 3 children
> In-class intervention for Year 4 to 6 children

07
Working collaboratively to improve children’s reading as they transition to school
SELWYN RIDGE SCHOOL
BAY OF PLENTY
Year 1
> Transition and working with parents
> Increasing the urgency for children to progress

08
Ensuring more children achieve success when initially learning to read
HOKOWHITU SCHOOL
MANAWATU
Year 1
> Planning for the developments
> Establishing and monitoring the expectations

09
Using the library to engage readers
TAMAHERE SCHOOL
WAIKATO
All Year levels
> Support with selecting books
> Summer reading

10
Two other reading approaches
> Online book club
> Community volunteers helping children to read

In most of the narratives we have included internet links to further explain the strategies the teachers have used.
Implementing a variety of research-based strategies and approaches to improve reading

ERO’s 2012 report, *The New Zealand Curriculum Principles: Foundations for Curriculum Decision-Making*, found coherence was one of the three least implemented principles evident in the schools’ curriculum. In some schools, teachers did not provide students with a coherent approach that allowed them to progressively build on their previous understandings and skills.

Leaders at WOODLEIGH SCHOOL had focused on the coherence of their reading programmes by having teachers consider each child’s learning and progress over time as they moved through the school. Leaders introduced consistent reading strategies and transition meetings to support children moving from an intervention or into a new class.

This narrative shares the variety of strategies teachers and leaders used to improve children’s reading achievement, and the resources and processes they used to make sure strategies were consistently applied.

Improvements implemented in this school over recent years aimed to increase the numbers of children successfully reading in Year 6 by increasing the numbers reaching the expected level of achievement at each year level. They carefully monitored and tracked cohorts to check their changes were having the desired impact. The table below shows the increases in the numbers of children meeting or exceeding the standard from 2011 to 2016.
Percentage of students at or above reading National Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leaders and the board provided a variety of approaches to support their improvements including:

- establishing and funding a literacy leader position
- teachers’ involvement in the Ministry of Education’s Accelerating Learning in Literacy (ALL) project
- extending the improved practices across the year levels.

After leaders and teachers started collating achievement data for reading in 2011, they focused on improving achievement overall. Initially, teachers sought to move children through the reading levels more quickly. While this approach resulted in more children reaching the reading expectations, the leaders recognised teachers needed a more consistent schoolwide approach to raising reading achievement. Their first attempt proved unsuccessful and frustrating as some teachers couldn’t get more children to accelerate their progress or sustain their recent gains. They needed to do something different.

Leaders encouraged teachers to think more about each child’s learning and progress over time as they moved through the school, rather than focus solely on what the child learnt and achieved in the year they were in their class. This was particularly important when focusing on children that were achieving below the expected reading level – their ‘priority students’. They wanted each priority student to have a pathway to success by the time they reached Year 6. They focused on giving children consistent strategies to build on as they moved through the school.
The literacy leader

The school established a literacy leader position funded to work half of each day to support the reading improvements. The literacy leader’s role was primarily to help teachers to guide inquiry into improving achievement and progress, and to provide coaching for teachers to further develop the teaching of reading. Some of the literacy leader’s key responsibilities are listed in the box below.

By working with all teachers at all year levels, the literacy leader could identify and focus on achievement trends across the school. It became apparent that the older students who were underachieving in reading required support to improve their vocabulary and reading stamina. They also needed to better understand how to apply their prior knowledge and experiences to what they were reading.

**Role of the literacy leader**

- In-class monitoring and support for students involved in learning interventions for the remainder of their time at the school.
- Testing (**observational survey**, phonological and phonemic screens) and analysis, feedback and next steps provided for teachers.
- Assessing trends and reporting to teaching teams, leadership team and the board.
- Leadership of **ALL** 2014-2016 including Professional Learning and Development (PLD) for all staff.
- Tracking of ALL students in conjunction with teams.
- Leading 10 week in-class pilots, modelling how to adapt literacy programmes for the needs of learners.
- Helping teachers using Teaching as Inquiry to identify priority learner needs and strategies.
- Attending team meetings to provide PLD, contribute to reflection time, and share information about the best use of the book room collection.
- Developing a ‘red flag’ strategy to identify, on entry, students at risk of not meeting expected milestones, and analyse needs and next steps.
- Developing early literacy interventions and resources to support at risk students in the first 40 weeks of school.
- Helping with class-to-class-transition meetings for priority students.
- Leading parent information sessions and liaising with parents of priority students.
- Overseeing purchasing of literacy resources and coordinating the book room.
- Developing a ‘Browse Box’ collection.
The literacy leader also took responsibility for other reading resources and worked with library staff to develop **Browse Boxes** for every child across all year levels to increase their reading stamina. The browsing boxes were stocked with ‘good fit’ books that took into account children’s interests and contained text structures they were familiar with.

Developments related to the Accelerating Learning in Literacy project

In 2014, the literacy leader and another teacher were involved in the **ALL** project. In the first year, a focus group of children were withdrawn for 15 weeks for reading support. The literacy leader supported and mentored the teacher taking the group. Leaders extended the programme more widely in 2015.

Their approach with the focus group had the following three tiers that drew on ideas from different research articles teachers had investigated.

1. Teachers used **browse boxes** to extend children’s reading stamina. The books in the browse boxes were selected by the children with some guidance from their teachers. The aim was to increase the range and variety of text children read by ensuring the books in the browsing boxes catered for their diverse interests, needs, values and perspectives.

2. Teachers introduced the **Daily 5** framework and used it to engage learners in independent choices within the classroom literacy programme. Daily 5 gave children the choice of five activities to work on independently to achieve their personal literacy goals. The activities included:
   > read to self
   > work on writing
   > read to someone
   > listen to reading
   > word work.
3. Teachers used High 5 to focus on the teaching of reading comprehension through:
   > activating background knowledge
   > for children to construct meaning and develop new understandings
   > questioning to help build a particular aspect of the child’s knowledge such as thinking critically
   > analysing text structure to help children predict unknown words or phrases
   > creating mental images so children would use their imagination to make connections to the ideas from the text with their prior knowledge
   > summarising by teaching children to differentiate between important points and supporting detail.

The new approaches allowed teachers and children to explore texts in more depth. Teachers focused on extending children’s knowledge and experience of the content of what they were reading. The key was to slow the process down and allow time for the students to explore more challenging texts over time.

“We use higher-level books over a longer period of time. We spend time on the title and the pictures, and connecting with the children’s prior knowledge. We take our time and work on small pieces, maybe just one page. They become fluent by the end of the week. It gave them real confidence.”

Teacher

By using the higher-level texts and carefully supporting children to read the text in small chunks, the priority students grew in confidence and built their perception of themselves as ‘readers’. Teachers described the confidence children gained when they were able to read the same books as their peers as immense.

Parents of the children in ALL focus groups were also able to learn about, and contribute to, their child’s learning. They were invited to a meeting to explain the new strategies their children were learning. The literacy leader and teachers kept in contact with parents and sought their feedback about how their child was progressing. Below is an example of the letter sent to parents explaining the new strategies in detail.
3. Teachers used High 5 to focus on the teaching of reading comprehension through:

- activating background knowledge for children to construct meaning and develop new understandings
- questioning to help build a particular aspect of the child's knowledge such as thinking critically
- analysing text structure to help children predict unknown words or phrases
- creating mental images so children would use their imagination to make connections to the ideas from the text with their prior knowledge
- summarising by teaching children to differentiate between important points and supporting detail.

The new approaches allowed teachers and children to explore texts in more depth. Teachers focused on extending children's knowledge and experience of the content of what they were reading. The key was to slow the process down and allow time for the students to explore more challenging texts over time.

We use higher-level books over a longer period of time. We spend time on the title and the pictures, and connecting with the children's prior knowledge. We take our time and work on small pieces, maybe just one page. They become fluent by the end of the week. It gave them real confidence.

Teacher

By using the higher-level texts and carefully supporting children to read the text in small chunks, the priority students grew in confidence and built their perception of themselves as 'readers'. Teachers described the confidence children gained when they were able to read the same books as their peers as immense.

Parents of the children in ALL focus groups were also able to learn about, and contribute to, their child's learning. They were invited to a meeting to explain the new strategies their children were learning. The literacy leader and teachers kept in contact with parents and sought their feedback about how their child was progressing. Below is an example of the letter sent to parents explaining the new strategies in detail.

Extending the new reading strategies

In the next stage in 2016, the literacy leader and the other teachers previously involved in ALL supported teachers from Years 2 to 6 to consistently use the same components of the reading programme in their classrooms. Teachers extended the time allocated for reading in their class timetables so all the necessary components of the reading programme could be included. These components included reading to students, shared reading, guided reading and independent reading. Teachers committed to provide four 15-20 minute reading lessons each week for the priority students in their class.

As teachers began to use the text processing and comprehension strategies, the literacy leader gave them a stepped process to use with their priority students. Teaching prompts and strategies displayed in the staffroom reinforced the learning from PLD sessions. The literacy leader’s modelling of the new strategies in classes also helped make sure strategies were consistently implemented across the classes.
Teachers implemented additional decoding strategies for children needing a greater focus on phonological awareness. A technique adapted from the Seven Plus programme was used where children were taught to ‘find the chunks and syllables in words’. An external PLD provider introduced ‘word clues’ activities that focused on spelling and phonological awareness by teaching younger children about word families, base words and their meanings, and rhyming words.

After the strategies were implemented in all Years 2 to 6 classrooms, leaders checked what teachers believed had worked for them. Their findings about what worked for teachers are listed below:

> Regular timetabling. Working in their teams to release teachers to work with their group, e.g. syndicate assembly times.
> Daily 5 reading framework provided uninterrupted teaching time.
> Resources available at each level.
> Taking more care with selection of text for students.
> Resources made to support **Literacy Learning Progressions** – high frequency words, prefix-suffix cards, upper/lower case alphabet cards.
> Using big books/poems/iPads to build up prior knowledge for students, and to practise/reinforce strategies identified for next steps.
> ‘Knowing the learner’.
> Knowing students’ strengths/interests.
> Providing clear and specific feedback.
> Teachers were supported – mentoring support as and when required.
> Don’t assume students know the meaning of words.
> Weekly focus (see image).
> Use of High 5 cards.
> Discussing with students ‘what good readers do’.
> Taking time to discuss/investigate word meaning/strategies.
> Able to identify next steps through assessment and discussions.
> Engagement of students through appropriate and engaging text.

**A focus on transition within the school**

Teachers also used two different types of transition meetings to support children to continue with their learning when they moved to a different teacher.

The first transition meeting supported children moving from a reading intervention where they were withdrawn from the class to reading back in their classroom. When the intervention was completed, the teacher leading the intervention met with the classroom teacher to discuss the child’s progress, the strategies they were successful with and their next learning steps. Ongoing monitoring by the intervention teachers supported the expectation that the child would continue to build on the strategies started in the intervention.

The second transition meeting occurred when children transitioned to a new class at the end of the year. Teachers scheduled these meetings to help with the children’s continuity of learning. The meetings also allowed teachers to discuss each child’s progress, their successful strategies and next learning steps.
Impacts for children

The children enjoyed the security of using the High 5 programme’s reading comprehension strategies. Activating background knowledge was particularly powerful for them. During the questioning phase, children were able to slow down and look in detail at the more complex texts they were presented with over time. One of the biggest impacts came from teachers’ work on analysing text structure. When the children were taught how a narrative worked, they started to think about the big picture of the story, predict more and ask questions independently because they had a better understanding of what questions to ask. Comparing expository texts with narrative texts was also seen as useful, particularly for younger children.

---

**MY LEARNING PATHWAY TO BECOMING AN INDEPENDENT READER**

**AT SCHOOL**

I can help myself by...

My good fit books are...

If I went to a book shop I would buy...

My teacher can help me by...

To be a great reader I must...

When reading gets hard I...

How can I read more at school...

My favourite book at school is...

My reading tools that help me are...

**AT HOME**

My family can help me by...

I can build up my reading stamina by...

My favourite book at home is...

Who do you read to at home...
Children also focused on building their independence through knowing the reading strategies and topics that had worked for them. As part of this learning, they completed the ‘learning pathway’ questionnaire shown here.

When ERO talked with some of the children who had made the most progress, they spoke about the **Browse Boxes** and some of the **High 5** strategies. Some showed us the chart (shared here) they used to select good fit books for themselves. They also shared many other strategies they learned and were using (see below).

The key to the children’s success was the way the leaders and teachers were able to incorporate practices from a variety of different articles and programmes found through their research. The programmes chosen focused on what each child needed and supported teachers to build the child’s confidence with the strategies that would work for them.

“I like reading the harder books and I read them all the time now.”

“All helped me a lot because I was practising reading all the time.”

“My teacher helped me to sound out words and look for the clue in the hard words.”

“My teacher chooses interesting books for me and my friends help me choose too. I help them choose their books. I like the hard books.”

**Year 5 children**

The additional resource allocated for a literacy leader to support teachers and children assisted with the implementation of a wide range of improvement strategies. Leaders acknowledged it was not one thing that worked, but was instead a variety of things. They recognise they may have the odd achievement glitch where results were not as expected, as they did with Year 5 at the end of 2016. However, they have processes in place to identify and analyse any such glitches or accelerated progress. Leaders had already developed plans to sustain and build on the gains made in 2017.
Responsive programmes to help readers’ engagement and success

ERO’s 2013 report, Accelerating the Progress of Priority Learners in Primary Schools emphasises the important role of leaders in accelerating learning. Leaders in the most successful schools communicated a clear vision that all students were able to succeed. They promoted an inquiry-based teaching and learning approach to focus on teaching practices that needed to improve for students not succeeding.

Leaders and teachers at BLEDISLOE SCHOOL worked together to accelerate learning. They trialled new strategies and collaboratively used data to assess the impact of their trials. They also changed from applying a remedial model, where children needing additional support were withdrawn, to one where every teacher was responsible for making sure all children could succeed.

This narrative shares some of the engaging learning activities they implemented and the ways they worked together to make sure more children enjoyed, and achieved in, reading.

Leaders at the school encouraged reflective practice by both children and staff. Teachers looked carefully at their data and sought new strategies when they saw groups of children who were not achieving well. They had also worked together to implement consistent practices across the school so children could apply the strategies they had learnt in a previous class.
Improving phonological awareness in Years 1 and 2

In the junior school, the early focus on phonological awareness (particularly letter sounds and phonemes) helped teachers achieve their aim to get children progressing through the early reading levels quickly. Leaders wanted more children to move from learning to read to reading to learn earlier. They also wanted children to have an increased ability to make spelling attempts when writing to extend the vocabulary they used in their writing. They introduced the changes as extra reading activities to complement what they were learning about comprehension and other reading strategies during their daily instructional reading programmes.

Before introducing the changes to their reading programme, teachers observed practices in another local school where improvements were already evident. They also worked with their Resource Teacher: Learning and Behaviour (RTLB) and sent three teachers to a phonics training course. Teachers then trialled the changes and completed six-weekly testing of all children to measure progress. The programme was then fully implemented in the junior school.

Four days a week children spent 20 minutes on phonics activities focused on early decoding and identifying chunks in words. ERO observed children excitedly participating in activities with actions and rhymes that challenged them. Children also explained to us how they applied their learning from the phonics activities during instructional reading and other shared reading they did each day. We observed short lessons focusing on phonemes in some classes. Part of a lesson with Year 1 children is described overleaf.
The children were asked to write the word ‘drat’ on their mini white boards. They then held up their word to see if it matched the teacher’s word. Next they were asked to change the letter ‘t’ for a ‘g’ and read the new word (drag). They practised exchanging other consonants and then the vowels in their new words. Their final challenge was to write the sentence ‘the drop went drip in the cup’. Children excitedly discussed the sentence that they described as a bit crazy before they each wrote the sentence. The fast finishers were given a related activity to work on while the teacher stayed with the slower finishers to encourage and prompt them further. Every child was expected to complete the sentence.

The five-year-old children settled to the independent activity quickly. The teacher recognised that two girls who had been away the previous day needed help to start the activity. However, the teacher clearly wanted to stay working with the slow finishers. She asked the next child that finished to teach the two girls what to do.

The child teacher took the two girls to a table alone and quickly explained the following. ‘You have to read the sound and then the words and then circle the words with the same sound.’ One girl said ‘I’ve got it’ and went away.

The child teacher then explained the activity in more depth. ‘Here is the sound at the beginning of the line. You read that and then you read all the other words in the line to check and then circle the one with that sound.’ The second girl said ‘I’ve got it’ and went away.

As soon as the teacher had finished with the slow finishers, she called out to the two girls to come to her for help. They explained that they knew what to do already.
Children’s Six-year-net results had considerably improved as shown here.

### Six-year-net data comparison: Hearing and recording sounds in words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanine</th>
<th>Pre phonics intervention</th>
<th>Post intervention start</th>
<th>1 year on intervention embedded Term 1-2, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers had also seen an increase in writing achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>2014 percentage at or above</th>
<th>2015 percentage at or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 children</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 children</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading engagement and comprehension in Years 5 and 6

Grouping in classrooms was flexible, depending on the learning purpose, interests and abilities of the children. The multi level group activities also helped every child to engage with texts that interested children of their age group. Teachers made sure the reading activities were interesting and complex enough for the less capable readers to fully explore text and improve their comprehension. Short, sharp and explicit teaching motivated and engaged students.

“We don’t just read the same type of books. We read classic and non fiction books as well as other interesting stuff. It’s always interesting to look at a great variety of books. At the moment we are reading a compilation of children’s writing. We are going to do an e-asTTle test in a few weeks and it is good to have really looked at others kids’ good writing.”

*Year 6 child*
Children enjoyed the many opportunities to choose which of the groups they would be in and which novels they would study. They took on different roles during activities like literacy circles. Video clips with reading and discussion were particularly popular. Teachers were seen as facilitators, ‘checkers’, and ‘go to people’, rather than the fixer up or the doer for students. They empowered students to help their peers with their learning.

“The best thing we have done in reading this year is the literacy circles because we all get to have different roles and work with other kids. Sometimes you might be the illustrator or the connecter who makes connections from the story to our own lives. Other times you can be the ‘word master’ or the ‘passage picker’ or the ‘discussion director’. The discussion director thinks up questions that the rest of us race to be the first to answer. The questions have to be open questions so they are hard enough to make us think.”

Year 6 child

Teachers had reviewed and reduced the number of reading assessments they used. They wanted to know what they should spend time teaching and what the children already knew. They also aimed to fully use the information gained from a small number of assessments rather than collect a lot of information that wasn’t fully used. Teachers accessed a New Zealand Council of Educational Research (NZCER) webinar to extend their data literacy and analysis from some of the standardised Progressive and Achievement Tests (PAT) they used. They looked for and noticed achievement patterns and trends and then together planned teaching to address the gaps identified. Thoroughly examining questions children struggled with helped them to decide on the deliberate teaching they should focus on.

“We think about what the children would have needed to be able to answer that question correctly. Doing this has provided us with useful insights to plan activities that will help them to do better and match with their interests.”

Teacher
Teachers also selected assessment tasks to check how well children applied the strategies focused on. ERO evaluators attended a syndicate meeting where a teacher shared the results from a recent assessment. The task focused on children’s confidence answering inference questions and was selected from the Assessment Resource Banks (ARBs). The teacher acknowledged that she should still continue the focus with many of the children she was working with who needed to accelerate their progress.

ERO observed an in-class intervention with a small group of children who needed extra support to read successfully. The new approach (described below) was trialled and implemented with small groups of children in all Years 5 and 6 classes.

This group of children were participating in the same types of activities that are described in the observation shared below. Here they are decoding complex words from their text.
The deliberate acts of teaching lesson focused on decoding and fluency using text that would interest the children and matched their chronological age. Most of the children in the group were Māori. The story they read featured a historic event involving the Māori Battalion. The teacher aimed to increase the children’s motivation and engagement by incorporating values, perspectives and knowledge from their own culture into their learning activities.

The teacher’s deliberate modelling, prompting, questioning, explaining, directing and feedback meant the children could read the challenging text fluently by the end of the short teaching session.

First they worked on decoding
Before they began reading the first passage, the teacher and the children skim read to identify words and phrases that might be challenging. Together they identified a small list of words the teacher wrote down. The children wrote all of the words from the list they didn’t know on their mini whiteboard. One girl said she knew all but one word, and wrote the word ‘mythical’. The teacher directed the children to break their words into chunks and solve them. They then worked together to solve the word ‘mythical’. They worked out ‘myth’ and a child explained what a myth was. They solved the rest of the word. The teacher asked what a mythical creature would be and they shared their ideas.

They then looked at and discussed the pictures on their next page before looking at the list of possible challenging words in that passage.

Next they focused on fluency
The teacher read the story to them to model the fluency she expected. Next, the teacher prompted the children to look at the pictures and find the characters or events in the story from the picture. The children discussed them and made links to their own lives and their prior knowledge.

The children then read the story aloud with the teacher. As they had already solved most of the complex words, they were able to read fluently with the teacher. They had difficulty decoding one word that they quickly solved, and moved on.
The children then read the passage aloud without the teacher. They read fluently and all the voices could be heard reading even the most challenging words. They then went away to read the story by themselves.

**Outcomes**

The teacher told us the deliberate teaching actions and fast-paced timing of the lesson felt contrived at the beginning, but after seeing how much the children were improving, the reasoning behind the actions became clearer.

The children said they knew they were better readers because they could read harder stories and books now.

The teacher responded to the children’s strengths, needs and interests well by:
> carefully selecting texts that matched their interests and would engage them
> identifying the words they would have difficulty decoding
> enabling them to explain the strategies they successfully used
> providing them with the strategies to successfully read texts matched to their chronological age.

The photograph below is one of a series prominently displayed at the school. It shows the whole school reading together and highlights the emphasis place on reading success.
Using mixed-ability reading groups to improve achievement for reluctant readers

ERO’s 2013 report, Mathematics in Years 4 to 8: Developing a responsive curriculum, explained how ability groupings within and across classes disadvantaged children in the lower groups who often developed negative attitudes to mathematics.

Teachers of Years 5 and 6 children at WOODEND SCHOOL trialled and then used mixed-ability reading groups. They focused less on children’s reading ages and more on their interests and the skills they should practise.

They found that children working together in a group identified their own strengths and needs and supported each other. Children who had previously been in the lowest reading group improved their self image along with their reading enjoyment and success when working with children that were good at reading.

This narrative shares the teachers’ and children’s perspectives of the approach.

Children in Years 5 and 6 learned in a modern learning environment with four teachers. Most Years 5 and 6 children at the school achieved well in reading. Generally well over 90 percent achieved at or above the reading expectations by the end of Year 6. Teachers were highly focused on having the few remaining children also achieving success.
Identifying and monitoring achievements

Leaders identified children’s progress and achievement using well-established assessment and monitoring processes. Teachers collaboratively tracked children’s progress and achievement using information from formative assessments, conferencing notes, anecdotal notes, and from the work children completed in their Reading Response workbooks.

Teachers and leaders carefully identified the specific strengths and learning needs of all children that were below expectations in reading. Each child’s reading level was recorded each school term along with the strategies the teacher has used with the child and the progress resulting from the strategies. These were collated in one document where leaders used a colour code to identify which children were well below, below or at the National Standards. (Blue for well below, orange for below and yellow for at.)

Below is an example of the records kept for Years 5 and 6 children. Child A was well below the reading standards at the beginning of the year and Child B was assessed as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies / interventions/ Planned / Used</th>
<th>Evaluative comments Updated throughout the year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child A needs to be encouraged to build on his reading mileage both at school and at home. Incentives and encouragement will help in this area. Reading buddies will also help with this. He will be supported to increase his fluency in his reading group.</td>
<td>Child A had moved from well below to below. He is trying hard to develop his confidence with reading and is on track to reach the standard. No longer a priority learner! (At the standard) -19/9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child B will continue to be supported this year in decoding and fluency skills as well as developing her comprehension and retell skills. We will work to develop her confidence and build her reading mileage through encouragement and incentives.</td>
<td>No longer a priority learner! 6/5/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considerable progress was evident for children previously identified as reluctant readers. In 2016, 18 children were identified as achieving below the expected reading level. At the end of the year, 13 of these children had reached the expected level. ERO investigated the actions that contributed to their success.
Mixed-ability reading groups

One teacher in the Years 5 and 6 teaching team was responsible for all three low-ability reading groups. Previously, she had successfully empowered low achievers through helping them to know what they needed to do to succeed. Early in the year, the teacher had grouped children with similar reading ages and needs. However, part way through the year the teacher decided to trial a mixed-ability reading group approach, and instead worked with groups of children with reading ages from 6.5 to 9 years.

When working with a group, the teacher used a combination of shared reading and guided reading to increase the children’s repertoire of reading strategies. The children were given chapter books to read. Initially, the teacher read aloud a section with the children following the text in their own copy of the book. This initial reading helped motivate the children.

The teacher explained the reading comprehension strategies the children needed that could be practised while reading the text. Children were directed to make predictions about what might happen next. The discussions helped children think about the vocabulary and concepts they were likely to encounter. They were also supported to make connections with their own experiences and identify the main ideas in the text section they explored. Then they went back to the section and discussed themes and characters, along with new vocabulary introduced in the text. Children were also encouraged to cross check and confirm information they had gained from the text. Over time, children became more confident and read sections independently.

One child had visual problems with reading anything from a distance. Previously, he had often worked alone because he was so far behind. When working in the mixed-ability group he became an expert in some things and started teaching others. He just blossomed. When ERO was in the class, he was supporting a child who had recently transitioned to the school and who needed help with self-management skills. The child that had recently started in the class was reciprocating by helping the child with visual problems to continue to improve his rereading and decoding.
The teacher also focused on developing the children’s reading confidence. These children had struggled with reading for years and had negative attitudes to reading, with many exhibiting high levels of anxiety about reading. Statements about failure and “things I can’t do” were turned into goals. Children began to view failure as ‘something they couldn’t do yet’.

Specific feedback the teacher provided to children in the group meant they were able to recognise each other’s different goals and strengths. Some children got stuck on words and had to practice rereading and decoding while others needed to work on predicting or looking more deeply into what they had read. Children were then able to use their strengths to help others in their group, and became more comfortable asking someone to help them when necessary. The active involvement of children in monitoring their own progress and in getting and giving appropriate feedback about their learning was strongly motivational for them.

ERO met with a child who had previously struggled with reading and at the beginning of the year had been reading junior readers usually enjoyed by children three or four years younger than he was. He talked about the impact of the mixed-ability group reading activities for him.

“We used to read a paragraph a day and then do some work on the sheets, but now we read a chapter a day. It has helped me a lot. When I was little, I didn’t like reading. I used to read the little kids’ books and they weren’t interesting. I used to be always in a group that was just me. I would work with a teacher aide or a teacher, and it was just me.”

“When I came into this class, Miss B helped me a lot. She told me things to do when I got stuck on a word. I can read on to the end of the sentence and then go back to the word. Or I can look at the word carefully for clues about the beginning or end of the word, or any part of the word I already know. We do lots of really interesting activities and I had to be able to read to do the activities.”

“When we started the chapter books, I became really interested in reading. I didn’t know that books could be so interesting. I like art and I like drawing what I read. Before in reading time when it said to draw something I couldn’t because I couldn’t read what I had to draw.”

“I read more at home now. I really like mystery books, chapter books and ghost books. Mum talked with the teachers about books and stuff and then she started getting me books that I wanted to read. I read a lot at home now.”

Year 6 Child
The child showed us his class timetable and his reading group. He said he was in a different group because he loved dogs and the teacher knew this. The teacher put him in the group with the book about dogs. He showed us the chapter book and his Reading Response workbook. He went back to the beginning of the workbook to show how much he had progressed and the standard of work he now was capable of. He was now enthusiastic about reading and his improved level of success was evident.

Other teachers in the team saw the impact the trial had on the reluctant readers during their regular collaborative sharing of data. They extended the mixed-ability groups more widely to enable children to learn through reading about things that interested them.

“We looked at the data and saw what was happening for some of our lower achievers. We could also see it in their levels of confidence. It was working for that teacher’s reading groups. We saw that some of those children were able to teach others and it made them feel really proud. The change has been dramatic. If it’s making such a difference why wouldn’t we try it. We try things and if it works, we extend it.”

Teacher

When ERO visited, some children continued to work with the teacher originally supporting them to build on and apply what they had learnt recently. These children needed additional time to build their confidence in themselves as readers. The remainder of the original group were working with the other teachers in their learning space. They joined other groups of children reading texts that matched their interests. Many children told us they really liked the interesting reading activities they did. They were learning new things about reading from the other teachers too. Their increased reading confidence was highly evident.
ERO’s 2014 report *Raising achievement in Primary Schools* shared how some schools limited children’s progress by only focusing on short-term remedial programmes for children needing support. Conversely, teachers and leaders in effective schools were able to explain how other experts in the school, or parents, could help the child, while also being very clear that they as teachers were responsible for student achievement.

Leaders and teachers at **ROSCOMMON SCHOOL** identified what Years 5 and 6 children and their teachers specifically needed to do to improve. They accessed Professional Learning and Development (PLD) that targeted those areas. Teachers were taught specific strategies to use with their children. Leaders learnt how to monitor the practices and mentor teachers to sustain the practices and progress.

This narrative shares the strategies introduced and the assessment processes used to monitor the impacts of the new strategies.

In this large Auckland school almost all the children were either of Māori or Pacific ethnicity. Assessment data revealed that, generally, many of the children were able to decode well by the time they were in Year 3. However, achievement dipped in Years 5 and 6 because of children’s limited comprehension. Leaders decided to break away from their more traditional whole-school PLD. They introduced reading PLD for teachers of Years 5 and 6 children only.

Leaders and teachers participated in a Ministry of Education PLD contract to improve literacy teaching practice. This focused on developing teachers’ capabilities to teach, assess and reflect on the reading comprehension of Years 5 and 6 children. An external facilitator modelled observation and questioning techniques and supported leaders to develop the confidence to engage in challenging conversations about teaching practice. The facilitator also worked with teachers developing processes and strategies to use when making judgements about children’s achievement.
Content of reading lessons

Shared expectations of what should happen in a reading lesson were agreed. Teachers adopted the practice of having children complete pre-reading activities and then reading the text before their group worked with the teacher. This meant instructional time was optimised for improving comprehension and was not taken up by silent reading or decoding, which the children could already do.

The group instructional time then focused on:

> comprehension skills – activating prior knowledge, predicting, self-monitoring, questioning, making connections, visualising, summarising and retelling, inferring and synthesising (as outlined in Sheena Cameron’s resources)
> having children discuss and justify their answers and the strategies they used so both the child and the teacher could clarify what reading processes were used
> using teacher and student modelling books to highlight successful reading strategies children used and could refer to later
> developing and discussing goals and learning intentions at the beginning of each group-teaching session so children were familiar with the language of learning and what was expected of them
> providing specific feedback about the strategies the children had successfully used to see the links between what they did and successful outcomes
> combining reading and writing to make the links between reading and writing clearer so children could better understand the forms and purposes of different texts and become aware that texts are intended for an audience.

Teachers practised:

> fully explaining the learning intentions for the series of group lessons
> providing specific feedback to a child when attempting a strategy linked to the learning intention
> deeper questioning to allow children to build on what they knew already when engaging with the text.

Adopting the new teaching strategies involved ongoing practice and reflection. Teachers individually and collaboratively reflected on both their developing practice and the resulting impacts for children. Teachers videoed some reading lessons to identify how well their questioning had moved from predominantly recall to inference. They also checked whether their feedback had changed from general feedback to specific feedback about the mastery of a reading strategy. They then shared the video and their reflections with a senior leader and discussed where they had already improved and how they could improve further.
Reading assessment developments

During the PLD, teachers also developed their assessment and analysis skills. New sources of evidence to make judgements about children’s achievements. Teachers used the following sources of evidence to consider children’s reading achievement in Years 5 and 6:

> students’ books
> modelling books
> follow up tasks identified from reading running records completer for the small number of children who were not yet fluent readers
> Progressive Achievement Test Reading Comprehension
> Assessment Resource Banks that assessed at Level 3 of The New Zealand Curriculum
> Video responses linked to Level 3 Literacy Learning Progressions.

The associate principal and teachers used the assessment data to undertake comprehensive formal reviews to determine:

> progress made and what worked for the children
> areas of concern
> other considerations including possible next steps
> what the information showed about the children.
An example of the analysis and review from a recent assessment is shared below.

### Years 5 and 6 teachers’ self review

**Progress made:**
Planning done in modelling books was successful as a form of evidence for teachers and for children to refer to when extra support was needed, particularly for reading comprehension strategies. I always directed students to their modelling books for those who were away during a small group session.

**Areas of concern:**
Need a lot more time on inference, synthesis and analysis of text. Though these were covered in reading, it was often the things they were not confident about how to use in a range of text. This was evident in both group lessons and ARBs tests.

**Other considerations**
Need to revamp our pre-reading activities so children get more from unseen texts. Perhaps even give them some multi-choice questions so they are not so shocked when they see a PAT question.

**So what does this tell us?**
With guidance and group support, our students are capable, hardworking readers with a developing grasp of a range of comprehension strategies.

Teachers also collaboratively analyse children’s actual assessment responses, rather than just reporting on the data from their results. In one recent assessment, teachers had sought to learn more about how well children could answer inference questions. They used a task from the ARBs, and analysed the resulting data using a framework they developed. They jointly planned a response to the findings and then developed their own class plans to address specific areas of weakness identified by the ARB task. Find out more about the specific ARB task at [https://arbs.nzcer.org.nz/resources/what-or-who-am-i](https://arbs.nzcer.org.nz/resources/what-or-who-am-i)

Teachers then carefully designed their next reading lessons to respond to their assessment findings. Below is an example of one teacher’s reflections after reviewing a variety of evidence sources. The next term’s planning subsequently focused on the learning intentions identified. Their process is shown opposite.
ERO observed reading lessons to see the practices in Years 5 and 6 classes.

In one class, the teaching of reading and writing had recently been integrated.

The teacher’s modelling book shared the children’s strengths and needs, and a learning intention related to making connections to what they already knew. The group of children working with the teachers looked in detail at a set of questions before watching and analysing a music video.

The teacher told the children that he was practising giving feedback to them that related to the learning intention – noticing when you make connections to your own lives. After watching the video, the children wrote and then shared some of their answers. They discussed how they could use the same strategies when reading. The teacher ‘borrowed’ some of the children’s answers to use in the answers he recorded in his modelling book and identified why he had selected some of the answers as a way to give specific feedback to children.

In another class, one group of children were working with the teacher while the others were involved in pre- and post-reading tasks. Each child had the learning intention displayed on cards they had with them. One pre-reading activity involved watching a video clip. The other children read the text they would discuss later with the teacher.

When a group of children went to the teacher, they discussed the pre-reading activities and the goals they had set for themselves earlier in the week. The children agreed they had too many goals to deal with in one lesson. They selected some they could include that linked to the learning intention.
The teacher then shared examples of a factual describer and evaluative describer and asked children to determine what types of questions they had in front of them. When children shared their ideas, the teacher regularly reminded them to justify their answers so that other children could learn from them. When a child had difficulty answering a question, the teacher turned to a previous page in the modelling book to show the links with things they had learned the previous week. Children then worked in pairs to discuss and answer their remaining questions.

In both classes, children were motivated, engaged and challenged by their reading tasks.

Years 5 and 6 children told us their learning was now set at more challenging levels than in the past. They valued being exposed to challenge.

“We are not afraid of hard learning and we’re more confident to ask questions when we don’t understand things. We ask more because we know this is what good learners do.”

Year 6 child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of children at or above National Standards for reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Year 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading results showed the progress children were making because of the new teaching approaches and strategies.

Teachers were continuing to embed their new strategies and were also sharing them with the teachers of Years 3 and 4 children.
ERO’s 2014 report, *Raising student achievement through targeted actions* highlights the importance of the board of trustees’ role in making decisions about allocating resources to accelerate children’s progress.

Boards of successful schools made careful decisions about where best to allocate the resources they had. These boards regularly reviewed progress and the success of the learning opportunities provided.

At *RICHMOND SCHOOL*, the board allocated additional resources to support reading. In response to findings from a curriculum review they funded an information skills teacher. They purchased licences and software for an online reading programme. This was trialled and related assessment data was analysed and reported before the reading programme was extended. The board also funded extra support for junior children.

This narrative shares the three funded approaches and the ways leaders and teachers trialled, monitored and reported outcomes.

Leaders identified a combination of strategies contributing to children’s success with reading. The board provided additional funding for the following three strategies:
> developing foundation skills in reading
> focusing on information skills
> trialling and introducing a new approach that engaged reluctant readers.
Developing foundation skills

Leaders focused on creating a strong base where junior school students achieved success they could build on in the future. The board provided extra resources to support reading for children in Years 1 and 2. They aimed to have all children experience success with reading as soon as possible after starting school. The funding enabled the Reading Recovery teacher to take groups of two or three five-year-old children who needed additional support with text processing strategies. The teacher also supported students who did not qualify for Reading Recovery. The teacher identified the strategies those children needed more practice with and provided them the relevant learning activities from a Reading Recovery programme.

Leaders aimed to have all teachers understand how reading is taught through all the year levels in the school. Teachers observed lessons taught by other teachers in the school, including observing both the Reading Recovery and Information Literacy teachers. They also moved to different year levels over their time at the school to better understand what had come before and what the children would focus on next. Guidelines were in place that outlined leaders’ expectations for the teaching of reading. One expectation was that reading programmes were to happen every day without exception.

“It’s about knowing the reading process inside and out and how children learn to read. Reading is not just a 45-minute lesson.”

Leaders

The impact of changes from the additional reading support in the Year 1 classes was highly evident. In 2013, 41 percent of their children reached the reading standards after a year at school but in 2015, 61 percent achieved this goal.

Focusing on information skills

A key initiative involved the information literacy programme, introduced as a result of a curriculum review. Leaders identified that children needed more confidence with a variety of information skills to allow them to fully engage with the rich inquiry topics they experienced during Term 2. The board funded a teacher to implement the information literacy programme for 24 hours a week. Leaders designed the programme so the information literacy teacher focused on information skills, while the class teacher focused more on the knowledge the children accessed.

Each of the school’s 20 classes participated in the information literacy programme in the school’s library for 30 to 45 minutes every week. The teacher designed a series of deliberate acts of teaching that matched the inquiries or programmes
children were involved in, in their classroom. Below is an example of the information skills the teacher planned for one of the Years 5 and 6 inquiries. The same type of planning was completed for the Years 1 and 2 and the Years 3 and 4 teaching syndicates.

**DISASTERS**

*Year 5/6 Syndicate*

**Information Literacy Lessons**

*Term 2 - 2017*

**Library Skills:** Through planned learning activities children will be able to:

- Use the library computer catalogue to locate fiction and non-fiction books.
- Use index and contents to read appropriate sections of a book.
- Make use of the reference section (e.g. dictionary, atlas, encyclopaedia).
- Have an awareness of copyright and bibliographies.
- Begin to use appropriate tools (index, contents, blurb, glossaries, bibliographies, catalogues, search engines, map grids).
- Find library resources using the Dewey Decimal groupings.
- Begin to recognise terms such as footnote, preface, appendix, forward, epilogue, cross-reference.

**Information Literacy Skills: (Level 3)** Through planned learning activities children will be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Independently brainstorm ideas</em></td>
<td><em>Library Skills</em></td>
<td><em>Skim and scan to find keywords</em></td>
<td><em>Can note ideas and make bulleted notes from a variety of sources</em></td>
<td><em>Present information in a variety of ways</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Independently mind map key ideas (topic and subtopics)</em></td>
<td><em>Finds information from a wide range of sources (encyclopaedias)</em></td>
<td><em>Uses information to answer key questions</em></td>
<td><em>Take account of audience when presenting findings</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Asks inferential questions.</em></td>
<td><em>Chooses appropriate information sources.</em></td>
<td><em>Evaluates information for relevance and currency.</em></td>
<td><em>Uses modelled and independent recording techniques with increasing independence.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Combines keywords</em></td>
<td><em>Broadens or narrows search where necessary.</em></td>
<td><em>Uses graphic organisers to gather information (Word maps, timelines, diagrams, charts etc.)</em></td>
<td><em>Use graphic organisers e.g. Venn diagrams.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Uses search terms and synonyms</em></td>
<td><em>Uses the internet for specific searches.</em></td>
<td><em>Uses graphic organisers to gather information.</em></td>
<td><em>Acknowledge sources of information with a bibliography.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Independently plan a research timeline.</em></td>
<td><em>These maps and graphs.</em></td>
<td><em>Confidently interviews experts.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A key aim was to provide activities that would motivate and engage children. During the planning and introduction stages of the inquiries, teachers set up a **scaffold sheet** that helped students find answers to problems from webpages or sites, similar to a **WebQuest**. The information literacy teacher recognised it was important to keep...
discussing what the children wanted to focus on to get the ‘trigger to engagement’ in the inquiry.

Teachers hyperlinked or coded all the pages required and sites in the students’ scaffold sheets. This meant that initially the children didn’t have to spend time surfing and searching the web. They could go straight to the tasks. Teachers found this had particularly engaged the boys and resulted in minimal down time for children while they were finding appropriate sites online.

The information literacy teacher also developed library displays that celebrated the work the children had completed, and which encouraged them to read and search more widely. A recent term’s work and associated display featuring graphic novels resulted in many children choosing to take them from the library and read them.

Children used digital devices in the library and classrooms as research tools and were then able to access the information from both their class and from home. Children’s enthusiasm and engagement were clear, as ERO saw many children using digital devices to access new information even before school had started each day.

Children and parents were able to access their child’s schoolwork at home. A parent portal allowed parents to see what their child was learning. Parents and children could log on through Office 365 to see what their child was currently focused on. Teachers told ERO that some parents had then talked to their children about their inquiries and/or writing, and had suggested further ideas for them.

**Introducing a programme that engaged reluctant readers**

Teachers were encouraged to trial and implement new strategies and initiatives. An online reading programme, focused on reading fluency, comprehension and vocabulary development, was successfully engaging Years 5 and 6 students in reading. The online programme Reading Plus was trialled as part of their regular reading programme in three classes in 2014. Teachers saw that the programme was tailored to engage children from across a wide range of abilities. Leaders used the Progressive Achievement Tests (PAT) Reading stanines to evaluate the impact. The positive changes in student engagement and achievement data supported the continuation of the programme for Years 5 and 6 children.
“The programme doesn’t replace instructional reading for groups. We still have that, especially for those who need that close teaching. There were lots of discussions before going down this track, as we had some sceptics who are now convinced. Most rooms use the programme for a term on, and then a term off.”

“We’ve found it makes a real difference for some of our boys. We had a group that used to think that it wasn’t cool to read. They liked the competitive nature where you can move up levels. Now some of them are getting up really early in the morning to get more aspects completed and correct.”

Leaders

ERO spoke to children who enthusiastically shared their improvements in reading. They understood their personal comprehension achievement rate (generated by the computer) and enjoyed being able to choose the vocabulary development activities that accompanied the passages they were reading. They also knew how to track their reading mileage and proudly stated how many thousands of words they had read. They liked the feedback the programme gave and that they could select passages that interested them.

Monitoring the impacts of the funding

Each of the three aspects the school shared with ERO had required additional funding from the board. Leaders monitored and reported children’s engagement and progress to show the impacts of the funding to the board. Each month teachers wrote statements about the success of the programmes that were then shared at the board meeting. Leaders also regularly shared data with the board related to charter targets.

Both the information literacy teacher and the teachers in each syndicate completed a SWOT analysis to formally determine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats they perceived from each inquiry topic. This included a focus on the information skills children were gaining. Every year leaders collated the evaluations from each term and discussed them with the board. Trustees were clearly able to determine how well their resourcing decisions had improved outcomes for learners.
A copy of part of the SWOT analysis showing the evaluation comments after one inquiry topic is shown below.

### R.P.S. INQUIRY LEARNING - REVIEW 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Children are learning to ask a question.  
Consistent throughout the school so the children build on their skills.  
Inquiry model is consistent. | Difficult to manage a large number of individual questions without independent inquiry skills. | Work with senior buddy class on inquiry. | |
| Working with buddy class to help with research. | Juniors can't successfully research and sift through information without support. | Have an outcome in mind and work backwards so that the information is being used.  
Parents supporting children in the computer suite to read information for the children and help in search for information. | |

| YG / SYNDICATE | YJ / SYNDICATE |
Using a variety of approaches to improve reading at different year levels

ERO’s 2014 report, *Raising achievement in primary schools: Accelerating Learning in Mathematics (ALiM) and Accelerating Literacy Learning (ALL)* found that ALiM and ALL had positively influenced supplementary support for students in some schools. In these schools close monitoring of learning and a quick and short-term response when progress was ‘flat lining’ were strongly emphasised. Students focused on, and understood, what they needed to learn, how they were progressing, and how they would get there. At the same time, teachers were also focused on improving their practices.

At MILSON SCHOOL teachers involved in the ALL project in Years 4 to 6 and in a programme to accelerate progress in Years 1 to 3 used the above approach. Leaders also made sure other teachers observed and implemented the new strategies so more children would benefit from the new practices.

The school’s reading data showed a positive trajectory where many children achieved well in reading by the time they reached Years 5 and 6. However, leaders knew they needed to manage considerable improvements across some of the year levels to have more children succeed. In 2014, only 45 percent of children reached or exceeded their reading expectations after their second year at school.

Leaders introduced changes to both teaching and assessment. Firstly, leaders and teachers worked with an external provider who led professional learning and development (PLD) focused on building teachers’ content and pedagogical knowledge. They also introduced more collaborative assessment, analysis and...
moderation practices. Teachers worked in teaching teams or in pairs to look at a class’s reading data and to determine progress, next steps and where additional support was needed. Other assessment developments included:

> introducing a cyclic review of their assessment tools to see if they were identifying what teachers needed to know about children’s achievement and progress
> PLD about some of the new assessment tools
> revisiting some of their current assessment tools such as running records to improve how they were administered
> using the Progress and Consistency Tool (PaCT), which provided them with a learning progression framework over seven aspects of reading.

Teachers were trialling further interventions to accelerate children’s progress. These included:

> an accelerated reading programme for Years 1 to 3 children
> an in-class intervention for groups of Years 4 to 6 children.

**An accelerated reading programme for Years 1 to 3 children**

A teacher in the school with considerable literacy experience developed this reading programme for children in Years 1 to 3. The teacher selected the programme content after closely analysing more than 50 running records for Years 1 and 2 children. The running records came from children achieving below the expected reading level and those identified as unlikely to reach the expected reading level at their anniversary reporting. The following trends were evident from the analysed running records:

> a substantial number of children neglected to monitor their own reading or correct errors
> most children relied on visual cues when making predictions
> no children read on past a tricky word to gain more meaning
> there was only some evidence of rereading to confirm meaning.

An analysis of the children’s behaviours when they started the programme showed that children didn’t know what to do to be a good reader. They lacked confidence and were anxious.

The school’s Accelerated Reading Programme consisted of 10 to 12 minute sessions, four times a week. Children selected for the programme were reading between junior readers book levels 6 and 21 (from Yellow on the colour wheel). The aim was to boost their confidence and give them a variety of reading strategies ‘to help them get unstuck’.
Accelerated Reading Programme – Years 1 to 3

The programme focused on:
> using a balance of whole language and visual analysis of words
> making learning visible and explicit

Lesson format, 10-12 minutes
1. Reread yesterday’s new text
2. Practise sight words or blends
3. Remember reading rules focus
4. Introduce new text

Children focused on four reading rules that were color coded. They also had a variety of prompts to remind them what to do if they got stuck when reading. The four reading rules and related guidelines are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Reading Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lots of familiar reading.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children monitor their own reading.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This strategy is a key one for children to master.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rule 4

Some tips when you’re stuck on a word:
1. Look at the beginning, middle and end of the word.
2. Look for little bits in the word that you know.
3. Break it up into its sounds or syllables.
4. Try to think of a word that looks right and makes sense.

Teach visual analysis: It is important that this is done in context.
1. The child needs to be able to read consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC) syllables. Teach them to use the ‘reading glasses’.
2. Multiple word families, e.g. -ight, -and, -ack, -ound are taught in context.
3. Suffixes, primarily -ly, -y, -er
4. Prefixes, primarily un-, a-
5. Syllables, look for bits of the word you know.
6. Blended vowel sounds taught as necessary.

When children practised words as part of Rule 3, the sounds and parts of words they focused on were recorded in a modelling book that was taken back to the classroom teacher to reinforce and help with their learning in their own class.

The teacher carefully recorded the details of each lesson, along with the progress of each child on the programme, on an electronic spreadsheet. As part of the monitoring and reflection, each child’s focus for the next day was careful considered. The emphasis was on building on and extending what the child already knew. Below is the monitoring and planning format used for each child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text level</th>
<th>Reread text</th>
<th>Sight words</th>
<th>New text</th>
<th>Strategies used</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
<th>Text level tomorrow</th>
<th>Where to next from yesterday?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Accelerated Reading programme made a positive difference for children and teachers. Some children progressed a book level every week once they had mastered a wider range of reading strategies. By the end of 2016, the school saw a small increase in the numbers of children reaching the expected reading level by the end of their first year at school. However, the number of children achieving success by the end of their second year had considerably improved.

Some teachers observed the programme in action so they could introduce some of the practices to their own class reading programme. Leaders were planning to use this new programme further in 2017 and intended to add more of the practice to core reading programmes in classes.
An in-class intervention for Years 4 to 6 children

This in-class intervention began in 2016 when two teachers were part of the Ministry of Education’s ALL project. The two teachers led an intervention for 16 children in Years 4 and 5 who were achieving below expectations. The two leaders choose to have children from four classes participate, so any new practices would be spread more widely across the school. They also wanted the four teachers to share ideas about making reading more “real for children”.

The intervention focused on developing children’s questioning. The aim was to improve their ability to **form and test hypotheses about texts**. The rationale for the approach is shown in the box. The teachers aimed to:

- improve children’s comprehension by giving them time to develop their own questions before, during and after engaging with text
- improve children’s questioning to build their critical thinking skills rather than accept information solely at face value
- ignite children’s curiosity about the texts they were using to motivate and engage them in reading.

Questioning is effective for improving comprehension because it:

- actively connects students’ prior knowledge of a text to new learning
- provides students with a purpose and direction for learning
- fosters engagement and higher order thinking for students while reading
- is a transferable skill used to promote understanding and make meaning in a range of learning areas.

Teachers and children used a question chart showing how children could score different points depending on the type of questions they posed. Teachers asked children to pose questions before, during and after reading the text. They could score 5, 10, 15 or 20 points depending on the level of question they set themselves (as shown on the Q Chart below). Carefully selected texts matched to children’s interests helped extend their questioning.
Children picked a word from the left axis and the top axis on the Q chart to begin their questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is/are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levelled question chart below identifies the different types of questions that could be formed using the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levelled Question Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: To help formulate higher-level thinking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How: Pick a word from the row on the left and one from the top column; then add an ending to your question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Why would the character solve the problem this way?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: Where the left row and top column intersect, it tells you the level and skill-type of your question (Level 4 higher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>is/are</th>
<th>did/does</th>
<th>can</th>
<th>would</th>
<th>will</th>
<th>might</th>
<th>should</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Factual 1</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
<td>Prediction Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
<td>Analytical Level 2</td>
<td>Analytical Level 2</td>
<td>Analytical Level 2</td>
<td>Synthesis and Application Level 4</td>
<td>Synthesis and Application Level 4</td>
<td>Synthesis and Application Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>Analytical Level 2</td>
<td>Analytical Level 2</td>
<td>Analytical Level 2</td>
<td>Synthesis and Application Level 4</td>
<td>Synthesis and Application Level 4</td>
<td>Synthesis and Application Level 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the second week of the intervention, teachers classified the majority of the questions children asked as lower-order factual questions. A small number were classified as middle-order analytical questions. When children used the Q Chart they became more confident about asking and sharing their questions. Below are some of the questions and answers one teacher recorded in their modelling book. Some of the questions moved to levels 3 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When do baby crocodiles hatch?</td>
<td>Do they have a tongue?</td>
<td>Do crocodiles bite people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long does it take them to hatch?</td>
<td>How big are the eggs? 5 to 8 cm</td>
<td>Why do they live near water?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do crocodiles hibernate?</td>
<td>I wonder what a pregnant mother crocodile looks like.</td>
<td>Do crocodiles eat many sea animals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many eggs does a mother crocodile lay?</td>
<td>How big are crocodiles when they come out of the egg?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(My guess 46)</td>
<td>25 cm long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60!</td>
<td>I wonder how fast they grow?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do they lay their eggs?</td>
<td>Why do the eggs get covered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of animals eat crocodile eggs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crocodiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It says most baby crocodiles won’t grow into adults. Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children attempted to answer their ‘before’ questions using their prior knowledge and then by reading the text. Teachers also recorded children’s prior knowledge and ‘I wonder’ questions, so children could see how they could self-direct their learning. They focused on their ‘during’, questions while they re-read and looked more deeply into the text. Group discussions and interactions were encouraged to clarify children’s thinking and to learn from each other.

ERO observed some of the small groups of children involved in the ALL intervention. In one of the groups, the children were discussing tornados. Firstly, they individually wrote down their prior knowledge, and their wonderings. They then enthusiastically posed a variety of different level questions that they shared with the group.

> How long would it take for cold air and hot air to form into a tornado?
> Where is this tornado happening?
> How long would it take for a tornado to stop spinning?
> Can a tornado affect the space time continuum and time travel?
The children were keen to read the text to find out more. Later, they each recorded, on a circle chart, new knowledge they had gained from the text.

By the 12th and final week of the intervention, the majority of questions were classified as higher-order level 3 and 4 questions. At least six of the 16 children had moved two or more stanines which indicated they had accelerated their progress when comparing *Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading* (STAR) pre-test results. Six other children that had moved one stanine were to be monitored further to see if they continued to make good progress.

- one child moved three stanines
- five moved two stanines
- six moved one stanine.

The other four children were more enthusiastic about reading but had not progressed as much. Their teachers recognised they needed to try different approaches for them.

Teachers surveyed both the children and their parents at the end of the intervention and found children were more enthusiastic about reading. Many were able to share with their parents what they were learning to do.

Leaders planned to incorporate the questioning strategies across the school through sharing the practices in staff and team meetings in 2017.
ERO’s 2015 report, *Educationally powerful connections with parents and whānau*, found that the best examples of educationally powerful connections with parents and whānau were learning-centred collaborations focused on the students’ learning and progress. In the best instances, leaders and teachers removed the separation between home and classroom learning experiences.

Teachers at SELWYN RIDGE SCHOOL identified the need to work more closely with parents to improve the achievement of children in Year 1. They had completed a review of their actions for Year 1 students and had a board trustee involved in their review to gain some parent perspectives.

Teachers improved their partnerships with parents. They also made changes to make sure children better understood the reading strategies to use and knew when they had mastered them.

This narrative shares their recent changes that promote an increased urgency for Year 1 children’s early success.

Selwyn Ridge School is arranged in three vertically grouped teams where each team had classes from Years 1 to 6. New entrant children start school in one of the three teams.

The majority of children in the school were successful readers by the end of Year 2 through to the end of Year 6. However, in 2014, analysis of the achievement data from all the Year 1 classes revealed many children were below expectation by the end of their first year at school. Subsequently, they needed to catch up in Year 2 or later. Leaders and teachers had not expected this as many children had attended
an early learning service (ELS) and the school was in a high social-economic community. Previously, the school had consistently high results across the year levels.

A team leader formed a review team to inquire into the possible reasons that might have contributed to the Year 1 results. The review team included a board trustee, Year 1 teachers, and their Resource Teacher: Learning and Behaviour (RTLB). They identified two key areas to improve. The first related to their relationships with parents and transition to school processes. The parents wanted to be more involved but didn’t know how they could be. The school also identified a lack of urgency for children to progress. Teachers reviewed the amount of time given for all children to develop early literacy through play to carefully balance this with more formal reading instruction. They wanted to make sure their programme responded to and built on every child’s previous literacy learning.

**Transition and working with parents**

Feedback from parents identified that some children needed more transition support than others. After becoming aware of these issues, the teachers immediately changed their transition activities to respond better to those that needed extra support. In some cases, teachers engaged with a child and their parents and whānau for the whole school term before the child started school. Leaders and teachers also introduced new practices that included the following:

> Teachers visited the child’s ELS a term before the child started
> Leaders reviewed and improved the transition letter and information they sent to parents to include more information about who was at the school, maps and activities information
> Year 1 classes were set up to have play alongside formal learning to help children transition to school.

Their main change however, was to involve parents in their children’s learning more, during and after the transition. Leaders recognised that to grow learner-focused relationships with parents and whānau they had to work with them more regularly. They wanted to take more opportunities to hear and respond to the parents’ opinions about their child’s interests, strengths and needs. They began to meet with parents to hear about and share their child’s strengths, interests, achievement, progress, goals and next steps throughout the year.

“We wanted to take a more strengths-based approach where we focused on what the child could do rather than what might be missing. So we started new sharing information sessions with parents that now happen every 10 weeks for the first 40 weeks the child is at school.”

*Leader*
Teachers completed more comprehensive assessments. Ongoing 10 weekly assessments were introduced to determine the child’s progress with alphabet knowledge, concepts about print, writing vocabulary, and their current maths strategy stage. They also undertook initial testing of oral language and some of the child’s physical skills. These assessments were shared during each of the 10 weekly learning-focused meeting with parents. As part of these sharing discussions, they also reviewed previous goals and set new goals together. Teachers shared what they were focusing on at school, how the child was responding and what they would do next. Parents shared information about what learning and other things were happening at home and what they could do in the future. If resources were needed for any at home activities, the teacher provided them.

**Increasing the urgency for children to progress**

Teachers also wanted to make sure they had clear expectations about changes for their own teaching. They agreed to give children a greater sense of purpose by making sure children knew more about what they were trying to achieve and when they had achieved their goals. They wanted to develop children’s awareness of the knowledge and skills they were acquiring in their literacy activities. Teachers also aimed to extend opportunities for children to celebrate what they were achieving. They trialled ways of introducing goals and self-reflection activities for children in each of the Year 1 classes.

We observed reading and writing lessons in Year 1 classes and saw children highly focused on their goals. The classrooms had displays featuring the goals children were currently focused on. Teachers and children frequently referred to these goals.

Teachers constantly reminded children of the links between reading and writing. Before they started reading or writing teachers asked children to look at the relevant rubric and share what they were doing well with a buddy. They then decided where they were placed on the rubric.

After the reading lesson, the children worked on a short writing activity and ERO talked to them about their literacy goals. They explained what their current focus was. They were able to
explain how they were progressing with spelling some basic words. They also knew their reading level and what they had to do to read even better.

“‘If I get stuck I use the chunky monkey to break the word into chunks or I use skippy frog to miss out the word and then go back to fix it.’

Year 1 child

Children focused on their own progress and were not competing with others. They were highly motivated and knew how they could improve.

After the teachers had introduced deliberate teaching and more specific feedback to children, they continued to collaborate across the teaching teams to monitor the impacts for children. Teachers from Year 1 classes met together for a day in each of the school holidays to continue to refine their expectations and review their progress. They were able to see the positive impacts of their changes.

In 2014, only 47 percent of children had met the reading standard. However, in 2015, 60 percent of the children had met the expectations and in 2016, 62 percent achieved the standards.
ERO’s report, *Reading and writing in Years 1 and 2 (2009)* highlighted the need for teachers, schools leaders and board members to be clear about their important roles in setting achievement expectations and monitoring how their teaching practices and processes help Years 1 and 2 children to be successful young readers and writers.

Leaders at HOKOWHITU SCHOOL aimed to increase the numbers of children achieving well in reading by improving their reading programmes in Year 1. Teachers collaboratively analysed their reading data and focused their Professional Learning and Development (PLD) and changes in practice on the specific needs they identified.

They also extended intervention programmes they knew worked to make them core programmes for more children. They set clear expectations for the skills children should master as they moved through the junior readers.

This narrative shares some of their strategies, data analysis processes and teaching expectations.

During the previous five years, the school had gone through considerable leadership, teaching and environmental changes. Teaching was now more innovative, taking place in flexible learning spaces where children at most year levels worked in teaching pods with three teachers. The children had increased choice about how and what to learn. Crucially, robust systems were put in place to make sure evidence informed all initiatives and changes to practice. Leaders carefully monitored impacts, and extended successful changes across the school so they became expected practice.
Although much of the teachers’ PLD had an across-the-school focus, the key changes in reading occurred for children in Year 1. Leaders wanted all children to have early success in reading that they could then build on in future years. They were not satisfied with the reading results they were getting and believed that if more children were successful in Year 1, more children would be successful in Years 5 and 6.

Planning the developments
During 2014, teachers and leaders looked carefully at the reading data for five- and six-year-old children, and saw that teachers had to support many children to catch up in their second year at school. Less than 60 percent of children had reached the expected reading level when they turned six. By the time children turned seven, about 80 percent reached the expected reading level, but some of them weren’t able to sustain their improvements.

Leaders noticed a discrepancy between the identified reading levels of some children. The levels identified by the Reading Recovery teacher were often higher than those identified by the pod teachers. Leaders also saw that sometimes children’s progress wasn’t sustained after they were withdrawn from the Reading Recovery programme. They wanted to have more children succeed in the teaching pods with fewer requiring withdrawal from their class for intervention programmes.

In 2015, the board of trustees set an annual school improvement target to have all learners reach or exceed the reading expectations after their first 40 weeks at school. Before the start of the school year, leaders met with the teachers from the Year 1 teaching team and the Reading Recovery Teacher and decided to take the following actions to make the desired improvements:

> Access and implement PLD to improve the links from reading to writing, and to access any other reading PLD available.
> Introduce parent education sessions for parents of four- and five-year-old children.
> Improve the monitoring of children’s progress and introduce portable data boards to highlight progress to discuss at team meetings.
> Teachers were to view the practice of colleagues and/or specialists teachers of reading.
Monitoring expectations

> All students to have a running record completed within two weeks of starting school.
> Regular discussions at staff/team meetings about reading skills, motivational text and experience.
> Team leaders to minute discussions/findings/results about reading from team meetings and share with senior leadership team.
> Data analysed and reported to board in March, July and November.
> Reflection at leadership level – how are we going, who needs more support, who is having real success we should be learning from?
> Support for teachers who have students not making progress with the expected parameters.

Resourcing expectations

> New reader/resources specifically targeting beginning readers.
> Time to release staff for observations and feedback.

The monitoring focused on both the children’s and teachers’ progress. Leaders were keen to not only support teachers with additional PLD, but wanted to learn from the teaching responses that had contributed to the greatest improvements.

Collaborative analysis of assessment data collected in March identified two issues. The first was that many children had difficulty with one-to-one finger pointing when they started school. They introduced more one-to-one pointing activities with colour charts and mathematics activities to help reinforce this skill.

The second issue came from an analysis of the Observation Survey (Six year-net) results. Some of the children who scored within the expected stanines, for most of the subtests, had been previously identified as reading well below the expected reading level. The teachers discussed the discrepancies and ways to resolve them.

Setting and monitoring the expectations

Teachers then attended a series of PLD workshops about reading along with other PLD provided by their regional Reading Association. The workshops provided teachers with a wide range of deliberate acts of teaching to focus on as children progressed through the junior reading levels. Leaders added these practices into the school’s curriculum guidelines that detailed teaching expectations. Below are the reading strategies emphasised in their curriculum that were relative to some of the junior reading levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour/Level</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pink Level 1-2 | > Read the picture, images.  
> Think before you read, as you are reading and when you have finished.  
> Notice whether words and pictures match.  
> Practise high frequency words.  
> Attempt high frequency words.  
> Attempt words that make sense.  
> Cross checking.  
> Aware of alphabet and letters having more than one sound. | > Understands what a picture is.  
> Knows the picture conveys a message.  
> One-to-one word finger pointing.  
> Concepts about print e.g. left to right.  
> Knows how words are organised e.g. letters go from left to right.  
> Story makes sense and sounds right.  
> Learn letters and sounds.  
> Uses a variety of strategies. |
| Red Level 3-5 | > Uses chunks at the beginning and end of a word.  
> Uses blends.  
> Beginning to use punctuation to enhance reading.  
> Re running.  
> Uses all strategies to help to read. | > Recognise words endings.  
> Letter represent sounds in 2 letter words.  
> Knows basic punctuation e.g. quote marks and full stops  
> Tracking.  
> Stops at the end of a sentence.  
> Scoop words and phrases.  
> Knows what a sentence is.  
> Acknowledges and practises using a variety of strategies. |
| Dark Blue Level 9-11 | > Chunking.  
> Decode simple, irregular words.  
> Recognise high frequency words.  
> Check to see if a big word is a compound word. | > Try a range of strategies.  
> First sound chunk.  
> Endings: s, ed, ing, ly.  
> Two consonants, chop it e.g. rab/bit.  
> Magic “e” on the end of a word.  
> Chunks e.g. oo, un, in, it.  
> New high frequency words, along, around about.  
> “y” on the end of a word says “ee”.

Teachers also used the processing behaviours described in pages 10 and 11 of *The Literacy Learning Progressions* to remind them of other processes children should be becoming confident with during their first year at school.

Teachers increased their monitoring and urgency for all children to succeed. They created a data board that identified the names and reading levels of children that weren’t making the expected progress. During team meetings, teachers referred to the data board and each child’s progress was discussed. Teachers reviewed their current practices and suggested other teaching practices to support the children. Children as young as five years and two months were identified to start instructional interventions that focused on early literacy related sub-skills such as
alphabet sounds and names. Collaborative analysis of data helped identify successful strategies as well as individual children’s progress and achievement.

Leaders identified one programme where considerable success was evident and extended this to more children. The programme provided groups of children with early decoding strategies through a greater emphasis on mastery of letter sounds and names, and high frequency words. Teacher aides originally took a 15 to 20 minute daily Early Words programme they had adapted from other programmes. However, once the positive results were evident, leaders changed the programme from an intervention to part of the core teaching programme so the successful strategies would benefit more children. Details of their Early Words programme are shared below.

The school’s own adapted Early words programme

The programme included children learning and practising the following:
> letter SOUNDS (followed by letter names)
> the correct formation of lower case letters
> segmenting of sounds in words followed by the blending of sounds to problem solve an unknown word
> HEART words (words that learners need to know ‘off by heart’ as you can’t use letter sounds to solve the words e.g. the, was) are learned to be recognised and written instantly and are spelled aloud using the letter names
> other basic words are solved and remembered through the segmenting/ blending of letter sounds (e.g. am makes the word am).

Improvements weren’t immediately evident during the trialling and introduction of many of the strategies in 2015. However, considerable progress occurred in 2016. The percentage of children achieving the expected level soon after the programme was introduced in 2015 and then by the end of 2016 are presented below.

| Percentage of Year 1 children achieving the Reading National Standards |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------|-----|-------|---------|
|                                          | Well below | Below | At  | Above | Total at or above |
| 2015 After 40 weeks                      | 3%         | 52%   | 34% | 11%   | 45%      |
| 2016 After 40 weeks                      | 2%         | 30%   | 44% | 38%   | 68%      |

Leaders expect these improvements will positively influence the numbers of children enjoying reading and achieving successfully in Years 2 to 6.
Using the library to engage readers

Libraries are key components of every school’s reading and information skills programmes.

This narrative shares some of the strategies used at TAMAHERE SCHOOL to encourage reading, particularly for reluctant readers.

A librarian funded by the board of trustees had a variety of responsibilities aimed at engaging children in reading. These included supporting children to access books at school and in other libraries, promoting a love of reading and building children’s reading mileage.

The board funded 18 hours a week for a qualified librarian, as part of their commitment to developing successful readers. Two of the activities the librarian helped with aimed to foster children’s love of reading. The first specifically supported reluctant readers and the second encouraged children to read over the holidays.
Support with selecting books
The librarian used a variety of strategies to support reluctant readers to become more engaged with texts. Teachers let her know which children were reluctant readers or who needed extra support choosing books. The librarian also used the library software to track the number and kinds of books children borrowed. This quickly identified children who:
> were reluctant readers
> had difficulty choosing what they could read
> were stuck on a particular genre or series of books.

The librarian then interviewed each identified child to support them to read more. A consistent factor she noticed with children who were underutilising the library was that they felt overwhelmed.

“I ask them, ‘when you come into the library and you’re asked to choose a book, do you feel like there are too many books?’ Astonishingly every single one of them says yes. Then we talk about what they like to do and what they don’t like, and if they’ve liked any particular books.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Advisory list for G****** B***** 25/04/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Gates series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiny Timmy Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Soccer Boy series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diary of a rugby champ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weirdo series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She talked to them about their interests and reminded them of the areas and ways books are stored in the library. She then developed a ‘Reading Advisory’ list of books for each child based on their preferences. An example is shown in the box.

The list stayed in the library and was available to the student each time they went to the library. The student was then able to access their individualised sheet and select from a variety of books that considered their particular interests. Sometimes other children asked for their own reading advisory list. The librarian would then interview them and provide personalised choices.
Summer reading

At the end of the school year, the library was open to parents and students to select books for issue over the summer holidays. A newsletter was sent to parents outlining the library opening times and inviting them to select books with their child. The librarian was available to help choose books.

The newsletter also provided parents with a link to the National Library providing information about the summer slide.

50 book challenge

An additional activity that children and parents told us helped with reading was the 50 book challenge undertaken every second year. Students could choose whether they took part in the book challenge, where they recorded each book they had read, or had had read to them.

Parents commented on how motivating this was for their children. Including a record of books read to the child, meant that even the youngest children were able to participate, and this encouraged families and whānau to read to their child at home.

Other activities to encourage reading

A library blog shared such things as online books, reading activities, links to authors, the latest books, book awards and information for parents of reluctant readers.

The librarian taught children how the library is organised using games that explain the Dewey Decimal system, and how to use and online public access catalogue (OPAC).

Children’s information packs shared what was available and popular with reluctant readers.

Covers of some books in the library were displayed together as posters to show children some of the options available to them and to encourage them to read more widely.
During our visits to the schools, ERO evaluators talked to children and parents. We heard about the two different strategies from them.

The first is an online reading opportunity to engage with books and other New Zealand children who were reading the same books.

The second school had many volunteers helping children with their reading.

The strategies the school used to attract the volunteers and the training they provided are shared here.

Online book club

One school had recently joined Chapter Chat. Children were highly motivated to read something that other New Zealand children were reading. Here is the information the school shared about Chapter Chat with parents.

Room 20 is joining Chapter Chat!

This term Room 20 is very excited to be joining Chapter Chat, a twitter-based book chat for New Zealand students in Years 3-4 and 5-6.

Chapter Chat is run by two NZ teachers whose aim is to generate discussion around books and foster a love of reading. Each week we will be reading part of a specific book and completing tasks based on the chapter. On Fridays we will be joining other NZ students on Twitter to share our work and discuss the chapter we have read. As well as encouraging a love of reading, Chapter Chat also provides a great opportunity to learn about good social media etiquette and practice using social media in a positive way.

This term we will be reading My Baby’s Last Day by John David Anderson. We will also be sharing our work on our student blogs, so make sure you check on our learning from time to time!
Here are some of the children’s thoughts about the book they had read recently were published on the class blog.

**Community volunteers helping children to read**

The second school had a large number of adults and students from the community helping children to read. The school had a high percentage of Pacific children attending for whom English was their second language.

A previous principal, who had started the programme six years ago, led the volunteer programme. The principal had read about positive results for Pacific students in other schools using a **similar approach** with parent volunteers. The school had advertised widely for volunteers. Notices asking for volunteers to help with children’s reading were placed in the school’s newsletter, a local high school’s newsletter and a community newsletter. When ERO visited the school, over 80 volunteers had been warmly welcomed and were supporting children’s reading. Many of the volunteers didn’t have children attending the school.

A coordinator trained all the volunteers and kept in contact with them. The training emphasised the following:

- **Pause, prompt, praise**
- a focus on fluency to help get the child’s reading to sound like talking
- looking at the initial sound of the word to then think about a word that would fit
- thinking about the meaning of some words.

The volunteers used notebooks and/or monitoring sheets to record what the child had read and what they had focused on.

ERO spoke with some of the volunteers and found they were keen to develop a positive relationship with the child and to see them achieve success.
“People want to help; they just need to know how. If I can change one child’s life, that’s awesome.”

“We build a good relationship with children that sometimes spills over into areas other than reading. One child I worked with came when others in her class had gone swimming. When I asked her why she didn’t go swimming she told me she didn’t have any togs. I asked the principal, at the school my children go to, to put a notice in their newsletter asking for togs for kids at another school. We got lots that I brought to this school.”

Two of the volunteers

The school’s community collaborations enriched opportunities for students to become successful learners.
Linking the narratives to the School Evaluation Indicators

The table below cross-references the eight narratives to the relevant indicators from ERO’s *School Evaluation Indicators*. Leaders can use the table to facilitate discussion about the variety of effective practices found in the different narratives. Where leaders, teaching teams or teachers are currently focusing their attention on a particular domain, they can use the table to select narratives that feature effective practices in that domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>School evaluation indicators</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stewardship</strong></td>
<td>The board scrutinises the effectiveness of the school in achieving valued student outcomes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership for excellence and equity</strong></td>
<td>Leaders collaboratively develop and pursue the school’s vision, goals and targets for equity and excellence</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders ensure effective planning, coordination and evaluation of the school’s curriculum and teaching</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders promote and participate in professional learning and practice</td>
<td>1, 4, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders build collective capacity in evaluation and inquiry for sustained improvement</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders build relational trust and effective collaboration at every level of the school</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educationally powerful connections and relationships</strong></td>
<td>School and community are engaged in reciprocal learning-centred relationships</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication supports and strengthens reciprocal, learning-centred relationships</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student learning at home is actively promoted through the provision of relevant learning opportunities, resources and support</td>
<td>1, 3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community collaboration enriches opportunities for students to become confident, connected, actively involved, lifelong learners</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsive curriculum, effective teaching and opportunity to learn</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students participate and learn in caring, collaborative, inclusive learning communities</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students have effective, sufficient and equitable opportunities to learn</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective and culturally responsive pedagogy supports and promotes student learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment for learning develops students’ assessment and learning-to-learn capabilities</td>
<td>1, 4, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Professional capability and collective capacity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>References</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic, collaborative inquiry processes and challenging professional learning opportunities align with the school vision, values, goals and targets</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational structures, processes and practices enable and sustain collaborative learning and decision making</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to relevant expertise builds capability for ongoing improvement and innovation</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation, inquiry and knowledge building for improvement and innovation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coherent organisational conditions promote evaluation, inquiry and knowledge building</td>
<td>1, 5, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective capacity to do and use evaluation, inquiry and knowledge building sustains improvement and innovation</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>