



Jesus and Mary College

Our Lady's Grove, Goatstown Road, Dublin 14

60891E

School Improvement Plan

Evaluation period: **Sept 2015 / May 2016**

Report issue date: **May 2016**

School improvement plan

1. Introduction

1.1 The focus of the evaluation

A school self-evaluation of teaching and learning in Literacy, Numeracy and Assessment practices was undertaken during the period September 2015– May 2016.

During the evaluation teaching and learning in all subjects was evaluated.

- Literacy : in all subjects – Improvement plan in place
- Numeracy: Understanding and using Mathematics – Improvement plan in place
- Assessment practices – improvement plan – Embedding practice September 2016

This school improvement plan sets out the actions that we will undertake. The main purpose of these actions is to improve our students' learning.

2. Summary of school strengths (SSE report)

2.1 Our school has **strengths** in the following areas:

- Student performance in the state examinations compares favourably with the national norms, taking due cognisance of school context.
- Excellent IT facilities are available for teachers use in all classrooms.
- High quality displays promoting the development of subject - specific learning in literacy and numeracy boards are evident.
- Expected learning outcomes are curriculum and syllabus linked and therefore relevant.
- Teachers regularly provide clear and focused feedback.
- Subject specific plans reflect the schools literacy , numeracy and assessment strategies.
- Students enjoy working in pairs and small groups.
- Students are enabled to present their work to others.
- Management provided in school whole staff C.P.D. in Assessment for learning and also I-pad training.

We know this because we consulted with students, parents and teachers. We examined state examination results, surveyed students, parents and teachers and did follow up focus group interviews.

2.2 Our school has decided to prioritise the following **areas of development**:

- Reading – Further promote reading for pleasure culture in the school community and focus on the students who have a below average reading score.
- Subject Specific Literacy and Numeracy action plans to be further developed and integrated into classroom practices in all subjects.
- Improve students' competence and confidence in oral expression and digital literacy.
- Encourage student reflection on their own work.
- Encourage greater accuracy in students' written work.
- Subject departmental approach to teach pre-reading, during-reading and post-reading

comprehension strategies.

- Assessment for learning practices – focus on embedding three selected strategies across all subjects starting with first years Sept 2016 and continuing same with second years. These are sharing the learning outcome, effective questioning and comment only feedback.
- Students reflecting on learning as part of key skill of 'Managing myself' .Following C.P.D Subject Coordinators to lead this in their departments.
- Sharing an understanding the language of assessment with parents of first years Sept 2016.
- Ensuring that first year students make adequate progress and improve their competence in a range of mathematical areas identified by a numeracy testing – especially addition, subtraction, multiplication, division also fractions, decimals, ratio , problem solving etc.
- Monitoring by yearheads and S.E.N. coordinator of first and second year students at risk of underachievement.
- Promoting an awareness amongst students of the relevance of numeracy to all other subject areas, everyday life and to many different careers.
- Creating a numeracy rich environment.
- Improving the students' ability to handle the numeracy demands of all subjects.
- Creating opportunities for students to experience numerical enjoyment and fun.

JESUS AND MARY COLLEGE - School Improvement Plan for Literacy Numeracy and Assessment - Sept 2016

Evaluation Theme (Literacy)	Improvement targets (related to student performance)	Required actions (related to teaching and learning that will help achieve the targets)	Timeframe for actions	Success criteria measurable outcomes	Review Date
Reading	<p>Cohort 2015</p> <p>1) To decrease the percentage of students who read for less than 1 hour from 37% to 34%</p> <p>2) To increase the percentage of students who read for between one and three hours from 40% to 43%</p> <p>Cohort 2014</p> <p>1) To ensure that the students understand the scope of the phrase 'reading for pleasure'.</p> <p>2) Hence to reduce the percentage who read for less than one hour i.e. to explore the relationship between these two things.</p>	<p>D.E.A.R. strategy</p> <p>6 times in the year</p> <p>All 1st years to join the library</p> <p>Survey of 1st years to see level of membership. Any non-members then join the library.</p> <p>Register our school to take part in the Well-read initiative (i.e. engagement with and by parents, students, staff and the wider community)</p> <p>Set up a digital reading log for cohort 2016</p>	<p>One year</p> <p>Starting sept 2016 (2 per term)</p> <p>Library membership survey Sept 2016</p>	<p>Measuring percentage change in reading by re-administering the original questions from student survey on Literacy.</p> <p>We will ensure that there is 100% library membership in first year</p> <p>Steering committee will be composed of two members of the literacy committee and three prefects.</p> <p>External accreditation</p>	May 2017
Reading Score	<p>Cohort 2014</p> <p>To improve reading scores through the comparison of first years 2015 to how they are in May 2016 i.e. the movement in those reading below, above and at their chronological age.</p>	<p>In addition to the actions above, we will specifically teach reading Strategies pre-reading /during/post</p> <p>Subject Department will choose one strategy from each stage and use it in class.</p> <p>Students who have a below average reading score to be assisted</p>	Implementing strategy-ongoing	<p>Analysis of movement in C.A.T. scores (S.E.N coordinator)</p> <p>Feedback at departmental level from subject coordinator</p> <p>Literacy team</p>	May 2016 /2017
Accuracy in Written work	<p>Cohort 2014</p> <p>To increase the number of students who check their written work for mistakes from 54% to 57%</p> <p>Cohort 2015</p> <p>To maintain the number of students who check their written work for mistakes at 60%</p> <p>Our initiative will focus on first years, second years and third years.</p>	<p>Target spelling across subjects</p> <p>Each department will compile a correct version of commonly misspelled words in that subject area.</p> <p>Each department will decide the number of spellings to teach per week.</p> <p>Class teachers will test the spellings at their discretion daily/weekly/monthly</p> <p>Peer/oral/written</p> <p>Written work checklist</p>	Continue with the C.U.P.S initiative	<p>Administer questionnaire to ascertain the percentage who now check their written work for accuracy.</p> <p>Department discussion to ascertain degree of improvement in misspelled words.</p> <p>First year and Second year to continue on each year depending on review.</p> <p>Teacher discussion at department and whole staff level to ascertain if there has been an improvement in written accuracy.</p>	<p>May 2016</p> <p>May 2016/May 2017</p>
Oracy (student competence in oral expression)	<p>Cohort 2014</p> <p>To increase the number of students who are willing to present their work orally in class from 59% to 62%</p> <p>Cohort 2015</p> <p>To increase the number of students who are willing to present their work orally in class from 64% to 67%</p> <p>The target group will be first second year and third year.</p>	<p>Regular Oral presentations in each subject (3 per year)</p> <p>Groups or individual</p> <p>Debates</p> <p>Presentations (digital)</p> <p>Etc.</p>	May 2017	Administer the questionnaire to ascertain what percentage of students now feel comfortable presenting their work orally.	May 2017

Evaluation Theme	Improvement targets (related to TEACHERS understanding and practice)	Required actions (related to teaching and learning that will help achieve the targets)	Timeframe for actions/persons responsible	Success criteria measurable outcomes	Review Date
ASSESSMENT	Embedding of A.F.L Practices for first years and second years across all subject departments as agreed at dept. level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing the learning outcomes • Effective questioning • Comment only feedback • Students reflecting on their own learning 	C.P.D provided - on embedding effective questioning and students reflecting on their own practices	May 2016-May 2017	Staff Survey (SSE – Assessment committee)	May 2016
Subject planning	Subject specific plans to include detail of A.F.L practices.	Subject Department meetings Subject co-ordinator and subject teachers to discuss , agree and document . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing the learning outcomes • Effective questioning • Comment only feedback • Students reflecting on their own learning Other A.F.L methodologies as appropriate to each subject to be discussed and subject schemes of work updated accordingly.	May 2016 and May 2017 Subject co-ordinator	Survey subject co – ordinators	Dec2015

