



## 2ND FOLLOW-THROUGH INSPECTION REPORT

### **EAST END PRIMARY SCHOOL**

OFFICE OF EDUCATION STANDARDS  
NOVEMBER 2018

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	2
Recommendation 1 .....	4
Recommendation 2 .....	6
Recommendation 3 .....	8
Recommendation 4 .....	10
Office of Education Standards .....	12

# Introduction

In academic year 2014-15, the Minister for Education commissioned inspections of all government schools. The purpose of the inspections was to provide a baseline assessment of the quality of teaching and its impact on students' learning. Inspectors checked the progress students made and the standards they achieved, the effectiveness of the leadership and management of each school, and the academic standards, notably in English and mathematics. The reports were published during the same academic year and are available on the government website following the link below.

<http://www.education.gov.ky/portal/page/portal/mehhome/education/baseline-inspections-reports>

In academic year 2017-18, the Office of Education Standards commenced follow-through inspections to report on the progress made by each school since the initial visits in 2014-15.

## Follow-Through Inspections

During the follow-through visits, inspectors focused upon the recommendations that had been made at the time of the initial baseline inspections. They evaluated whether the school had made sufficient progress in addressing the areas requiring improvement. Inspectors used a four point scale to comment on progress, with evaluations ranging between excellent, good, satisfactory or weak.

The first follow-through inspection of East End Primary School took place in March 2018. The Office of Education Standards agreed to continue to monitor students' attainment and progress in the school following this inspection. Assessment results at the end of academic year 2017-18 indicated no significant improvement in students' achievement in mathematics and therefore an additional follow-through inspection was undertaken.

## Follow-Through Inspection of East End Primary School

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Follow-Through Inspection of East End Primary School took place on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2018. The inspectorate gathered evidence through lesson observations and discussions with staff and students. School documents and, where applicable, examination and assessment data were also reviewed.

## Consistency in quantitative terminology

Inspectors use quantitative terms in reports, as follows.

	Definition	Numerical
<b>All</b>	The whole – as used when referring to quantity, extent, or duration.	100%
<b>Almost all</b>	90% and more	90% to 99%
<b>Most</b>	Three quarters or more but less than 90%	75% to 89%
<b>Majority</b>	Half or more but less than three quarters	50% to 74%
<b>Minority</b>	15% or more but less than half	15% to 49%
<b>Few</b>	Up to 15%	0% to 14%

### Summary

The inspectorate judged that the school had made **satisfactory** progress in addressing the recommendations relating to mathematics.

## Recommendation 1

**Improve the analysis of students' performance data in order to ensure that they make sufficient progress. Expect students to make at least two sub-levels of progress per year and ensure that no student is standing still or regressing.**

The school had made **satisfactory** progress in addressing this recommendation.

Staff at East End Primary School used a number of assessments to check students' progress in mathematics. The tests included on-line assessments and end of unit checks, as well as external tests completed at the end of Year 6. There was a common expectation that all students should make at least two sub-levels of progress each academic year.

In academic year 2017-18, according to teacher assessment, most students from Years 1 to 6 made expected progress. This was not verified, however, by external tests used by the school. For example, in Year 6, in June 2018, only one third of students left the school having made the required two sub-levels of progress in their final year prior to starting secondary education. Consequently, too few achieved expected standards prior to transition.

The Principal and staff recognised the importance of reversing the trend in achievement in mathematics and, in September 2018, had introduced a number of initiatives to help improve students' attainment and progress in mathematics. Staff had benefitted from professional development which focused upon introducing more up-to-date teaching methods. The Principal had developed better arrangements for planning and assessment. In addition, coaching from the Ministry of Education mathematics team had helped all teachers reflect on their lessons and develop more effective strategies to meet the diverse learning needs of students in the different classes. In most classes teachers had introduced age-appropriate methods to give students greater responsibility for their learning. For example, in Year 3, students' targets were formalised into mathematics 'bookmarks' which included specific goals for every student. These were referred to by teachers in their discussions with the students and this helped establish ambitious, but realistic short-term goals for the students to achieve.

During the follow-through inspection conducted in November 2018, inspectors observed all teachers during mathematics lessons and also reviewed the quality of teaching within the various intervention classes. The inspectors reviewed all of the students' mathematics exercise books and analysed the data available regarding students' achievement and progress in mathematics since the start of the academic year 2018-19. Progress in mathematics was good in the majority of classes observed because teaching was effective and students were challenged in their learning. In almost all lessons students' books were marked regularly and

targets set for mental calculation. The senior staff had checked students' exercise books and had provided feedback to teachers regarding strengths and weaknesses in practice. As a result, there was improved and more consistent practice across the school in terms of planning and assessment.

A review of assessment data indicated that most students were on track to make two sub-levels of progress by the end of the academic year. To ensure consistent progress, the Principal and other relevant senior leaders should meet each term with class teachers to review students' progress and develop appropriate individualised interventions, as necessary.



## Recommendation 2

### **Raise the standards achieved by students, particularly in Key Stage 2.**

The school had made **satisfactory** progress in addressing this recommendation.

Across the school, in 2017-18, most students achieved at the expected level in mathematics. There were 75 students on roll and according to teacher assessment and end of unit tests, in almost all year groups, most students met or exceeded expected levels of achievement in mathematics. In Year 6, however, achievement was significantly lower and this was reflected in the end-of-year tests in which only around one third of the class achieved expected levels. Inspectors noted a similar trend over the last four years in previous Year 6 classes where students' performance in formal, external assessments had been significantly below national and international standards.

For the 2018-19 session, staff had assessed students' skills and knowledge in mathematics at the very beginning of the year. This information had been used to set targets for the end of the year. The Principal made use of a tracking system, which provided a useful visual indication for staff of students' expected and actual attainment levels. Based on this information, most students including the current Year 6 class were on track to achieve at the expected level. It was noted, however, that relatively few students achieved at the highest level and a significant number of students at risk of under achievement, particularly in Year 4, received no formal additional support from current intervention programmes.

In order to address the dip in achievement at Year 6 in mathematics, the school had introduced a number of initiatives in the current session. An intervention programme was in place to support those students experiencing difficulties in their learning. In Key Stage 2 classes (from Year 4 to 6), teachers began lessons with a mental mathematics starter, which aimed to improve the students' speed and accuracy in calculation skills. Most students had individualised targets and these included a goal to increase their knowledge of multiplication facts. Overall, such arrangements were appropriate because they focused on the identified weaknesses of individual students and groups of learners.

During the follow-through inspection, lesson plans and students' exercise books were reviewed. It was noted that staff placed a significant focus on developing the students' number skills and knowledge. There were regular opportunities for students to practise their skills in real life

contexts. However, overall, the range of content did not include sufficient focus on the wider range of mathematics content including, for example, shape and measures.

To help improve students' skills and confidence in formal assessment contexts, the teachers in Key Stage 2 classes had introduced more regular opportunities for students to practise problem solving in mathematics. This approach, within timed contexts, was a useful step to help address the older students' relative weaknesses as demonstrated in end of year tests.



## Recommendation 3

**Improve the effectiveness of the teaching of mathematics. Explore ways of providing the necessary support for the least able and challenge for the most able students.**

The school had made **good** progress in addressing this recommendation.

During the follow through inspection conducted in November 2018, inspectors observed mathematics lessons across all year groups as well as some mathematics intervention classes. All class teachers were seen at least once. The quality of teaching in over 50 per cent of the lessons was judged to be good with more examples of effective teaching observed in Key Stage 1.

All teachers planned lessons with clear learning objectives but there was the need for more deliberate alignment of lesson objectives to curricular standards to ensure that instructional strategies and classroom assessments reflected the curriculum framework. Most teachers demonstrated sound content knowledge and were able to respond adequately to the students' questions and to provide clear examples to illustrate learning concepts. In addition, the majority of lessons were logically sequenced to support the students' understanding.

A majority of teachers utilised a range of teaching strategies such as effective questioning, demonstration, as well as paired and other purposeful grouping to promote students' understanding, knowledge and skills. Moreover, most teachers supported students' critical thinking skills and students were encouraged to explain their answers. As Year 2 and 4 students' mental skills were observed to be weak, mental starter activities needed to be a feature of lessons across all year groups. There was also need for a clear strategy by which teachers addressed students' erroneous calculations so as not to lessen the pace of lessons or cause confusion for some students. Notably, the majority of teachers provided meaningful opportunities for students to practise the skills associated with the lesson concepts to reinforce their understanding. For example, in a Key Stage 1 mathematics lesson, the teacher created an authentic context for the students to understand number operations as students purchased candies from 'a store' and allocated these among characters printed on a worksheet. Furthermore, in the majority of lessons at Key Stage 1, most teachers provided a range of tasks to meet the different learning needs of the students. For instance, in a Year 3 lesson, following the whole class activity, groups of students completed activities according to ability levels. Three students completed simple problems on work sheets supported by the teacher, two students worked independently to complete a mathematics activity using software on laptops whilst others students completed worded problems on the interactive white board. In Key Stage 2,

however, there was greater need for teachers to adapt lesson content to meet the needs of all learners. In addition, there was scope for more effective use of previous assessment data to personalise students' learning where appropriate as tasks did not always provide sufficient challenge for the higher achieving students.

The majority of lessons had sufficient pace to maintain student engagement and many teachers used a good range of resources effectively to promote students' understanding. For example, in another Key Stage 1 lesson, the teacher ably supported students' understanding of arrays as they used manipulatives and mini whiteboards to allocate objects among three individuals. The activity provided a good visual image to support students' learning of basic number facts. In other lessons, almost all teachers used a variety of resources such as interactive white boards, laptops, activity sheets and pictures to support the teaching of skills and concepts.

In the classes where they were deployed, teaching assistants provided good support to less able students, in particular. Furthermore, some students with learning difficulties benefitted from pull-out sessions with interventionists where they received one-on-one support and structured opportunities to promote their mathematical understanding and skills.

## Recommendation 4

**Improve the effectiveness of the teaching of mathematics. Check that there is continuity and progression of learning from year to year.**

The school had made **satisfactory** progress in addressing this recommendation.

Teachers followed specified curriculum plans for mathematics, which had been developed by the Department of Education Services and the Ministry of Education. From Years 1 to 6 these provided a clear structure to the mathematics curriculum and helped ensure continuity and progression in learning. The Principal had introduced a common format for lesson planning across the school and all teachers followed the requirement. As a consequence, monitoring of standards and lesson content was more consistent and comprehensive. Most lessons followed a similar structure and during the follow-through inspection, it was noted that most teachers made effective use of resources to facilitate their explanation of new concepts. In Year 1, the teacher made good use of the interactive whiteboard to help students understand the value of Cayman currency and different coins. The students had access to a class shop, which they used to calculate the change they should receive when making purchases to the value of one dollar. In following the curriculum plans most teachers made sure to include a good variety of tasks which allowed students to practise their skills in small groups, with peers and individually. In Year 6, for example, the mathematics lesson started with a whole class group review of a problem. This formed the basis for individualised work where students worked independently on similar problems. Overall, most teachers made effective use of a range of resources to help the students visualise and practise mathematical operations, following the teachers' explanation.

Inspectors checked the students' exercise books to review the content of lessons over the term. It was noted that teachers often provided real and meaningful contexts for mathematics lessons. There was evidence of regular inclusion of mathematical learning in other curriculum subjects, including science. For example, students in Key Stage 1 were learning about healthy foods and were required to gather data from other classes to report on the popularity of different fruits. This required use of data handling skills and knowledge to ensure success. In most classes, teachers insisted upon the students' correct use of mathematical terminology. For example, in Year 3, students were required to refer to 'vertices' and different terms for various calculation strategies. This was consolidated and extended in later year groups.

Although curriculum planning was effectively organised and standardised, inspectors did note examples across certain year groups where mathematical content was repeated from one class to the next. Arrangements for monitoring were not yet sufficiently robust to check that all content was consistently age-appropriate and sufficiently challenging. At times, too much time

was spent on certain topics and teachers did not always review work with their students to check satisfactory completion within the required time.

---

### **What happens next?**

As overall progress towards meeting the recommendations has been judged as satisfactory, there will be no further Follow-Through Inspection of the school. East End Primary School will receive a full inspection from the Office of Education Standards within the current cycle of inspections which commenced in September 2018.

# Office of Education Standards

## Who are we and what do we do?

The Office of Education Standards is part of the Portfolio of Civil Service within The Cayman Islands Government. Our function is to inspect early childhood care and education centres, public and private schools and report upon standards in all educational institutions in The Cayman Islands.

---

## How to contact us

You can contact us using the following e-mail address.

**[adminOES@gov.ky](mailto:adminOES@gov.ky)**

---

## Where to read our reports?

Our reports are published regularly and are currently available on the Portfolio of Civil Service website. Please use the following link to read our latest publications.

**[www.oes.gov.ky](http://www.oes.gov.ky)**

