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# Improving mathematics in upper primary and lower secondary

## Red Amber Green (RAG) self-assessment guide

### 1. Use assessment to build on students’ existing knowledge and understanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Improving</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments are often set without careful consideration of their intended purpose.</td>
<td>Assessments are sometimes set with consideration of their purpose, but this is inconsistent. Not all teachers are confident users of assessment for different purposes.</td>
<td>Careful consideration is given to how the results of an assessment will be used before an appropriate assessment is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers collect summative data but rarely use assessment to collect information about students’ mathematical strengths and weaknesses. Teaching does not respond to students’ developing understanding.</td>
<td>Teachers are able to achieve a good understanding of students’ strengths and weaknesses, using a variety of data sources, but they do not adapt their teaching in response.</td>
<td>Teachers use a variety of types of assessment, as appropriate, to collect information about strengths and weaknesses. They adapt their teaching in response and use assessment information to inform planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many teachers are not knowledgeable of the common misconceptions in mathematics. This has not been a focus of professional learning.</td>
<td>Teachers’ knowledge of common misconceptions is inconsistent. Some teachers need support to improve their knowledge.</td>
<td>Teachers have a good knowledge of the common misconceptions in maths and why they arise. They use this knowledge to inform their assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When planning future lessons, teachers do not consider the misconceptions that are likely to arise.</td>
<td>Some teachers plan to address likely misconceptions but this practice is not consistent throughout the school.</td>
<td>Teachers use their knowledge of common misconceptions to plan future lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ feedback is not specific, accurate or clear. It is often limited to empty praise.</td>
<td>Some teachers can confidently and consistently provide effective feedback, but others do not.</td>
<td>Feedback is effective and generally resembles the principles outlined in the guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is inefficient and creates a large workload for teachers. Teachers spend a large amount of time marking work. This is potentially distracting teachers from more beneficial activities.</td>
<td>There is a recognition that marking workload is a problem, but there is still work to be done to minimise the burden of marking.</td>
<td>Feedback is efficient and does not create a large workload for teachers. There is a healthy balance between oral and written feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 2 Use manipulatives and representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Improving</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manipulatives are rarely or never used to teach maths.</td>
<td>Manipulatives are often used, but without a clear rationale for how they will develop more sophisticated mathematics.</td>
<td>Teachers use manipulatives appropriately, and with a clear rationale for why the manipulative will support students to understand mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulatives are only used with younger children and when teaching simpler mathematics.</td>
<td>Manipulatives are used across the school. However, with older children they are only used as a tool in catch up interventions or to teach simpler mathematics.</td>
<td>Manipulatives are used across the different year groups in the school. The decision to remove a manipulative is made in response to the students’ improved knowledge and understanding, not their age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students often become reliant on manipulatives to do a type of task or question. Teaching can tend to focus on ‘getting them to the right answer’ to a specific problem instead of developing understanding.</td>
<td>Teachers’ use of manipulatives to develop independent understanding is patchy. Some teachers do this consistently, but others do not.</td>
<td>Teachers enable students to understand the links between the manipulatives and the mathematical ideas they represent. Teachers use manipulatives to develop students’ independent understanding of the mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number lines do not feature in teaching.</td>
<td>Number lines are used, but teachers need more professional learning to use them confidently and competently.</td>
<td>Teachers are confident and competent in their use of number lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers rarely introduce students to multiple representations.</td>
<td>Teachers and students compare and discuss different representations. However, this discussion is not carefully orchestrated to introduce more abstract, diagrammatic representations. Teachers might introduce too many representations at once, causing confusion.</td>
<td>Teachers and students compare and discuss different representations. Teachers aim to support students to develop more abstract, diagrammatic representations. Teachers are careful to not overload students with too many representations at once.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Teach strategies for solving problems

Ineffective

There is a lack of genuine problem solving tasks in teaching. Tasks tend to be routine and can be completed using a procedure that students know well.

Teachers lack knowledge and understanding of problem solving strategies. They do not feature in their teaching.

Teachers do not consciously vary the structure and context to problems.

Teachers rarely encourage students to use representations and manipulatives to represent problems mathematically.

Worked examples rarely feature in teaching.

Teachers rarely use the following approaches to improve students’ use of strategies:

• Encouraging students to share and discuss strategies
• Encouraging students to interrogate and use their mathematical knowledge to solve problems
• Encouraging students to communicate their reasoning about their choice of strategies
• Requiring students to compare and evaluate multiple strategies

Improving

Some teachers select non-routine problems, but other teachers do not. Teachers sometimes do not feel confident enough to work on genuine, non-routine problem solving.

Teachers effectively model a range of problem-solving strategies. However, they do not effectively support students to self-regulate their use of strategies.

Teachers do pay attention to context and structure when setting problems, but this is not systematic and does not support improved understanding.

Some teachers encourage students to use representations and manipulatives to represent problems mathematically. However, this practice is not consistently adopted by teachers throughout the school.

Teachers deploy worked examples, but they are mainly used to consider steps in a procedure and are rarely used to examine problem-solving strategies.

Teachers are confident using only some of these approaches, or they could improve in some areas.

Exemplary

Most teachers confidently select genuine, non-routine problem-solving tasks.

Teachers know a range of strategies, which they can model effectively for students. They teach students to carefully and consciously choose the most appropriate strategy for the problem at hand.

Teaching is organised so that problems with similar structures and different contexts are presented together, and, likewise, that problems with the same context but different structures are presented together. Students are taught to identify similar mathematics that underlies different situations, and identify and interrogate multiple relationships between variables in one situation.

Teachers encourage students to use representations and manipulatives to represent problems mathematically.

Teachers use worked examples to enable student to examine the use of different problem solving strategies.

Teachers are confident and capable when using all of these approaches to improving students’ use of strategies.
Enable students to develop a rich network of mathematical knowledge

### Ineffective

- Teachers do not make connections between different aspects of mathematics. They might themselves lack the content knowledge to do this confidently.
- Students struggle to recall basic number facts. This is affecting their progress elsewhere in mathematics.
- Students are taught the steps behind a procedure, but teachers do not support students to develop their understanding of why a procedure works. The focus is on “getting the students to the right answer”. Teachers might themselves lack confidence when explaining how and why procedures work.
- Teaching does not provide a range of different methods and strategies. Students are generally taught one procedure, and are not taught to reflect on when different methods might be appropriate. Students are not taught to use calculators.
- Students do not understand that fractions are numbers that can be put on a number line. Teaching does not seek to address this misconception.
- Teachers and students often fail to recognise mathematical structure. Teachers might themselves struggle to identify the mathematical structure in a particular context, and might often use vague non-mathematical language themselves.

### Improving

- Teachers do have sufficient content knowledge to understand the links between aspects of mathematics. However, they do not consistently make these links explicit when teaching students.
- Teachers plan lessons that utilise students retrieving and using their previous learning of arithmetic facts.
- Teachers’ own understanding of procedures is sound. However, the teaching of this understanding is inconsistent. Sometimes teachers ensure that students develop understanding of procedures, but sometimes they do not.
- Teachers teach a range of computational methods and approaches, including the use of a calculator. However, they do not teach students to reflect on when different methods are appropriate and efficient.
- Teachers are aware of this common misconception, but do not respond effectively.
- Teachers are able to recognise mathematical structure, but do not always successfully communicate this to students.

### Exemplary

- Teachers are able to emphasise the connections between different aspects of mathematics, and do this consistently.
- Teachers plan lessons that utilise students quickly and consistently retrieving and using their previous learning of arithmetic facts. Students are confident in their quick retrieval of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division facts.
- Teachers ensure that students develop their understanding of how and why procedures work.
- Teachers teach a range of mental, calculator, and pencil-and-paper methods, and encourage students to consider when different methods are appropriate and efficient.
- Teachers understand this key misconception and seek to address it. They consider using the number line to represent fractions.
- Teachers use precise mathematical language themselves. Teachers support students to recognise mathematical structure, for example by rephrasing students’ responses that use vague, non-mathematical language with appropriate mathematical language.
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5 Develop students’ independence and motivation

Ineffective

Students have limited opportunities to practise and develop metacognition.

Teachers struggle to orchestrate productive classroom discussions.

Students are often unmotivated and disengaged when learning mathematics. Students demonstrate limited persistence and resilience in their learning.

There is a general perception among staff and students that some people are naturally ‘good’ at maths, whilst others are not. Staff often complain about their own difficulties with maths.

Improving

Teachers provide frequent opportunities to practise and develop metacognition. Students are taught to plan, monitor and evaluate the approaches they take to mathematics.

Teachers can sometimes struggle to orchestrate productive classroom discussions. Some students refrain from participating in discussion or actively listening to other students’ ideas.

Students demonstrate increasing persistence and resilience. A minority of students struggle with motivation.

Maths teachers model confidence and interest in maths, but many other staff do not. Some staff and students believe that some people are naturally ‘good’ at maths, whilst others are not.

Exemplary

Teachers provide extensive opportunities to practise and develop metacognition. This includes regular opportunities for students to explain their approaches to mathematical tasks to themselves, the teacher and other students. Teachers carefully increase their expectations regarding students’ independence as the students gain competence and fluency.

Teachers are able to orchestrate productive classroom discussions. Students actively take part in discussions.

Nearly all students are motivated and engaged during lessons. Students get enjoyment and satisfaction from learning mathematics.

Maths teachers model confidence and interest in maths. Staff and students believe that everyone can succeed in maths if they work hard.
Use tasks and resources to challenge and support students’ mathematics

6

Ineffective

Tasks are selected without proper consideration of students’ strengths and weaknesses. Tasks fail to provide sufficient challenge.

Teachers do not give careful consideration to how they use tasks to develop students’ understanding. Tasks are often used without careful consideration of how they can:

• provide examples and non-examples of concepts;
• provide opportunities to discuss and compare different solution approaches;
• provide opportunities to investigate mathematical structure;
• build conceptual knowledge in tandem with procedural knowledge.

Technology and other resources, including textbooks, are frequently adopted without careful consideration of how they will be used to improve teaching and learning. The school has purchased many technological devices and resources which are no longer used.

Improving

Teachers use appropriately challenging tasks, which address weaknesses in students’ understanding.

Some teachers give careful consideration to how they use tasks, but this practice is inconsistent across the school.

Staff provide a clear rationale for how new resources will support improved teaching and learning. However this is not followed by careful implementation. Resources are regularly introduced without concurrent professional learning to support teachers to use them effectively.

Exemplary

Assessment of students’ strengths and weaknesses is used to inform the selection of tasks. The selection of tasks is also designed to address common misconceptions.

Teachers consistently use tasks to support students’ developing understanding. Careful consideration is given to how tasks:

• provide examples and non-examples of concepts;
• provide opportunities to discuss and compare different solution approaches;
• provide opportunities to investigate mathematical structure;
• build conceptual knowledge in tandem with procedural knowledge.

Before purchasing new resources, staff have a clear rationale for why they will support improved teaching and learning. There is also a clear plan for implementation. Teachers receive training on how the resources can support improved teaching and learning.
Ineffective

Identification of struggling students is often slow and action taken to support them is limited.

Interventions are restricted to extra classes with an exam focus towards the end of primary schooling.

Teaching is not systematic and lacks the key features which evidence suggests are common to effective interventions.

Staff are over-burdened and do not have sufficient time to effectively plan interventions. Interventions are not prioritised, meaning staff are often unavailable to deliver the sessions.

Teachers and Teaching Assistants have received inconsistent training in the delivery of interventions. Many staff involved in delivering interventions do not have strong pedagogical skills or knowledge of mathematics.

Continued…

Improving

When a student is identified as struggling with their mathematics they are given extra support, but this may not be effectively matched to their specific needs.

Gaps in students’ knowledge and understanding may be identified early, but interventions may not happen quickly and effectively.

Some of the strategies suggested in the guidance report (explicit teaching, models of proficient problem-solving, verbalisation of thought processes, guided practice, corrective feedback, and frequent cumulative review) are beginning to be included in intervention teaching.

Staff are usually available for interventions, but are not given specific or sufficient time for the planning of sessions and review of students’ work.

Staff’s preparedness for interventions is mixed. Some teaching staff may need updated training on the programme or may need to develop their pedagogical skills or content knowledge.

Continued…

Exemplary

When a student is identified as struggling teachers quickly identify the specific reason(s) why. Teachers use this information to intervene and address the aspect of maths that the students are struggling with.

Interventions happen as soon as weaknesses are identified, and are classroom based where possible. This reduces the risk of children developing negative attitudes and anxiety about mathematics.

Interventions include explicit teaching, models of proficient problem-solving, verbalisation of thought processes, guided practice, corrective feedback, and frequent cumulative review.

Teaching staff are always available for the intervention sessions and the sessions are well planned with time set aside for this purpose.

Teachers and Teaching Assistants are appropriately trained for interventions that they deliver. This training is kept up-to-date and new staff are always appropriately trained.

Continued…
Ineffective

Interventions take place with little or no link to the teaching in the classroom. Intervention deliverers and class teachers do not work together to ensure consistency. It is left largely to students to make the links between what is covered in interventions and their learning in general classroom teaching.

Interventions do not motivate students, leading to boredom or maths anxiety.

Students are removed from lessons for intervention without any consideration as to what they might be missing in the classroom. This means they can often miss lessons in which they might subsequently fall behind, or may come to resent intervention sessions due to missing lessons they enjoy or excel in.

Interventions lack focus and an end point. This leads to students staying in intervention classes longer than is necessary and developing ‘intervention fatigue’ as a consequence. This can increase a student’s dislike of, and feelings of resentment towards, mathematics.

Improving

Intervention teachers have begun to plan their work around what is happening in the classroom (e.g. by reference to the scheme of learning or brief conversations with classroom teachers) but this is not yet common practice.

Some work is done to improve motivation of students, but this is not seen as a priority.

Some consideration is given to what a student misses whilst in intervention sessions, but this is limited.

Interventions are targeted and have a defined time scale but can be inflexible in their planning. The ongoing and inevitable nature of these interventions can have a fatiguing effect on staff, if not necessarily on students.

Exemplary

Intervention lessons are consistent with, and an extension of, work done in the classroom, and students understand (with support from their teachers) the links between them. Intervention and classroom teachers ensure that there is a mutual understanding of each others’ work.

Interventions motivate students, potentially using games where appropriate to counteract the association of mathematics with boredom or anxiety.

The school ensures that interventions taking place outside of the classroom are more effective than the instruction students would otherwise receive. Intervention timetabling is done carefully so intervention sessions avoid removing students from lessons they enjoy or lessons where they will miss significant amounts of curriculum content.

Interventions are planned to take the shortest amount of time needed to get the student back on track. They are well targeted.
Support students to make a successful transition between primary and secondary school

**Ineffective**

Teachers are unaware of both the curriculum and teaching approaches used in other levels.

Year 7 teachers have no knowledge of students’ strengths and weaknesses beyond the results from standardised testing conducted in upper primary.

Students are placed in maths classes according to their prior attainment, and teachers often have different expectations of children according to their assigned set. Disadvantaged students are more likely to be assigned to lower sets, which can lead to a widening of the attainment gap between disadvantaged students and their peers.

**Improving**

Whilst there is some awareness of subject content across the different levels, little is done to develop a shared pedagogy or to develop a cross-level curriculum.

Year 7 teachers have limited knowledge of students’ strengths and weaknesses, either through baseline assessment or a thorough analysis of information from upper primary. However, this is not used to build on students’ prior understanding, resulting in too much repetition or in work which is not pitched at the appropriate level.

Students are set by prior attainment, and the curriculum is designed in such a way as to meet their individual needs. There is still some evidence of teachers having different expectations of children according to their assigned set.

**Exemplary**

Teachers across upper primary and lower secondary are familiar with and have an understanding of the mathematics curriculum and teaching methods outside of their level. Mathematics teaching and learning is seen as a continuous journey, rather than fitting into discrete levels, and this is planned for.

Prior attainment data is used to build on key aspects of the Foundation to Year 6 mathematics curriculum in ways that are engaging, relevant, and not simply repetitive.

The school is moving away from rigid setting by prior attainment, perhaps adopting mixed attainment or more flexible grouping.