MEETING TEMPLATE

The Pupil Progress Meeting Agenda

Forty minutes, four sections, every question pointing at an instructional decision. Data meetings fail when they end at description.

1. The headlines (5 minutes)

- [ ] Standardised scores summarised: who moved, who stalled, who dipped.
- [ ] One sentence per cohort pattern, no speculation yet.
- [ ] Anomalies flagged: scores that contradict classwork evidence.

2. The gaps (10 minutes)

- [ ] Question-level analysis: which skills or domains carried the misses?
- [ ] Is the gap knowledge, application or test technique? Name it.
- [ ] Cross-check against books and classroom checks before believing the test.

3. The decisions (20 minutes)

- [ ] Each flagged learner leaves with ONE action: tier, target, owner, start date.
- [ ] Whole-class reteach decisions named where a gap is general, not individual.
- [ ] What stops happening to make time for what starts: named explicitly.

4. The follow-through (5 minutes)

- [ ] Review date set; evidence that will count agreed now.
- [ ] Last meeting's actions checked: done, working, dropped?

PLANNING TEMPLATE

Three Tiers of Response

Standardised data sorts learners into responses, not labels. Each tier has a default action and a review clock.

ALL Tier 1: whole-class reteach

When a third or more missed the same domain, the gap is instructional, not individual. Reteach differently, then re-check.

In class: Inference questions sank across the class: two weeks of modelled inference in normal lessons, then a five-question re-check.

SOME Tier 2: small-group boost

A focused group with a shared, named gap. Short, sharp, inside the timetable, six weeks maximum before review.

In class: Five learners weak on multi-step word problems: three 20-minute sessions weekly, pre-teaching before the unit hits.

FEW Tier 3: individual investigation

Scores far adrift of classroom evidence trigger investigation, not just intervention: technique, access, attendance, SEND?

In class: Strong reader, floor-level score: check access arrangements and test technique before booking catch-up.

ANALYSIS CARDS: CUT AND KEEP

Gap Analysis Cards

Four questions that turn a spreadsheet into a teaching plan. Work through them in order, per cohort.

Where exactly?

Domain and question-level before learner-level: skills first, names second.

Say: "Which three question types carried most lost marks, across everyone?"

Why, honestly?

Knowledge gap, application gap, technique gap or access issue: different causes, different fixes.

Say: "Could they do it in class last month? Then the gap is retrieval or technique, not teaching."

Who else says so?

Triangulate before acting: one test is one sample on one morning.

Say: "Do books, classroom checks and the previous test agree with this picture?"

So what changes?

The only question that improves outcomes. Every analysis ends in a scheduled instructional change.

Say: "What will be taught differently, to whom, starting when, reviewed by whom?"

SEND CHECKLIST

Access Arrangements Check

Before treating a low score as a learning gap, rule out an access gap. Run for any learner with SEND or suspected need.

Before the test

- [ ] Normal way of working applied: the test mirrors everyday classroom support.
- [ ] Reader, scribe, rest breaks or extra time arranged where they are routine.
- [ ] Test environment matches need: small room, movement breaks, sensory load.

Reading the score

- [ ] Score interpreted alongside the arrangement actually used on the day.
- [ ] Untested strengths recorded: what the test format could not show.
- [ ] Standardised score never pasted into a report without this context.

After

- [ ] Arrangement effectiveness reviewed: did it remove the barrier?
- [ ] Findings feed the SEND record so next term's test starts right.

CPD BRIEFING: STAFF ROOM COPY

Assessment Data: A 5-Minute Evidence Briefing

What the research says about data use in schools, and the trap most data systems fall into.

Data use can move achievement

Four of six strong-design interventions on data-based decision making showed positive effects on standardised outcomes. The practice has legs when done fully.

The bottleneck is translation, not interpretation

Trained teachers read progress data competently; the consistent struggle is converting it into adapted teaching. Meetings that end at coloured spreadsheets change nothing.

Gains concentrate where instruction changes

Trials show no automatic main effect: benefits appear for learners who actually receive extended or adapted instruction, and concentrate among lower attainers and disadvantaged learners.

The honest caveat

Evidence comes mostly from primary mathematics in well-supported programmes, and effects vanish without the instructional follow-through. Buy the meeting discipline, not the dashboard; one acted-on insight beats ten admired charts.

Evidence base

Visscher, A.J. (2020). On the value of data-based decision making in education: the evidence from six intervention studies. Studies in Educational Evaluation.
van der Scheer, E.A. and Visscher, A.J. (2018). Effects of a data-based decision-making intervention for teachers on students' mathematical achievement. Journal of Teacher Education.
Staman, L., Timmermans, A.C. and Visscher, A.J. (2017). Effects of a data-based decision making intervention on student achievement. Studies in Educational Evaluation.