|  |
| --- |
| **Phase One: Performance Information Analysis and Outcome Focussed Planning** |
| **Step One: Analyse pupil performance information** |
| Through analysis of pupil performance information identify a *small* group *(4-6)* of **vulnerable** learners to target in order to improve outcomes (attendance, attainment, exclusion/inclusion, engagement, participation).Target Group: Lowest performing 20% working within Early Level NumeracyNumber of Pupils: 4Detail the rationale for selection (SIMD, gender, LAC, ethnicity, lowest performing 20%):* Lowest performing 20%
* Gender
* Ethnicity
 |
| **Step Two: Identify SMART outcomes for the target group** |
| Following intervention, what improvements would you expect to see? *It might be helpful to review these outcomes following completion of phase 2.* Expected SMART outcomes (attendance, attainment, exclusion/inclusion, engagement, participation):* Improved attainment in all aspects of numeracy **(not measured)**
* Individual child’s engagement in their learning will improve (measured using the Leuven Scale)**(For some)**
* Individual child’s participation in learning experiences across all curricular areas throughout the Family Centre

increases and their curiosity/creativity develops positively (**timescale too short to measure-hard to prove if attainment improved due to workshops or daily/ongoing numeracy in nursery)*** Embedded understanding of core numeracy skills for Early level based on the benchmarks **(for some parents)**
* Ability to transfer skills & strategies introduced to all the aspects of their learning, based on a playful pedagogy
* Increased parental engagement through workshops and home links **(for most parents)**
 |
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|  |
| --- |
| **Phase Two: Exploring and Understanding the Target Group’s Performance** |
| **Step One: Explore the strengths of and pressures on your target group** |
| What are the factors that impact (positively/negatively) on this identified group of learners? You may want to consider the following (please note these are examples and not an exhaustive list).* School/Family Centre learning environment – e.g. expectations of pupils, staff/pupil relationships, peer relations, quality and deployment of teaching and support staff, pedagogy, parental engagement
* Parental factors – e.g. engagement with pupils learning, relationships with school/centre staff, value for education, parental educational experiences, parental physical, mental and cognitive health, parenting skills
* Pupil factors – e.g. SHANARRI, Aspirations for future, motivation for learning, pupils physical, emotional/mental and cognitive health, pupil involvement in their learning
 |
| Strengths/positive factors:* High expectations of children and families
* Environment of Family Centre and resources : Natural resources based on Froebelian ethos and Outdoor learning
* Ethos of Early Years Practitioners and positive relationships with children and families
* Professional networking and sharing of good practice

Pressures/negative factors:* Low levels of engagement and participation in learning experiences
* Lack of confidence in all areas of numeracy
* Limited parental involvement due to outside factors: time pressures, siblings, work
* Lack of understanding of expectations for child’s learning at Early Level
 |
| **Step Two: Evaluating the significance of the factors identified** |
| Consider ways in which you can test (confirm/disprove) the significance of the factors outlined (e.g. existing school information, research evidence, assessment, professional enquiry, questionnaires, focus groups). Confirmed strengths/positive factors:* Observations
* Learning Journals for individual children
* Discussion with keyworkers and teacher
* Parental questionnaire
* Pre/post assessments
* Myself as a Learner (MALS) adapted for numeracy
* Professional dialogue with partners & moderation
* Leuven Scales of Well-being and Involvement

Confirmed pressures/negative factors:* A consistent approach for all children throughout the setting
* Ongoing assessment which is meaningful
* Involvement with parents

**Helpful Tip*** Appendix 1 may be helpful in recording the above information
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase Three: Intervention and Evaluation Planning** |
| **Step One: Identifying evidenced based interventions through research/professional enquiry** |
| Through professional enquiry and reviewing the research literature, explore relevant evidence based interventions? * Barriers to parental involvement in education: an explanatory model, Garry Hornby & Rayleen Lafaele
* The Everyday Maths Project, University of Bristol
* The Impact of Parental Involvement, Parental Support and Family Education on Pupil Achievements and Adjustment: A Literature Review, Professor Charles Desforges
* Does Capital at home matter more than capital at school? Social capital effects on academic achievement, Mikaela J. Dufur

What evidence based interventions could you implement to address the identified pressures of the target group?* Universal and targeted interventions and support targeting parent and child
* Collaboration should be proactive rather than reactive; engagement of all parents should be worked for
* Collaboration involves sensitivity to the wide ranging circumstances of all students and families.
* Collaboration recognises and values the contributions parents have to make to the educational process.
* Collaboration must engender parent empowerment; all parents must be given a voice and that voice must be heard. (Raffaele & Knoff, 1999. P452)

What actions could you take to build on the identified strengths of the target group?* Parents will support each other through the group context and through sharing their experiences
* Making mathematical connections visible in everyday experiences

Are there areas where the evidence base for improvement is weak?* There is no convincing evidence that the ways in which parents have been involved in previous interventions result in more effective outcomes.
* There is little evidence to show that parental involvement programmes are effective. (White, Taylor & moss, 1992 – analysed impact of 172 parental involvement programmes in the USA). (Mattingly at al 2002 analysed 41 studies of parental programmes)

**Helpful tips:*** multifaceted interventions tend to be the most successful (i.e. they target child, family and school/class factors)
* consider other groups that are performing well despite similar ‘risk factors’ and how can you learn from their success
 |
| **Step Two: Action Planning** |
| Research question/s (no more than 2 or 3): * Engagement

What are you going to do?Workshops were organised by all staff and involved parents. Cartmill and Hazeldene opened these to all parents. What are the timescales - When are you going to do it? How long are you going to do it for? 4 workshops/1 a fortnight or weekly. Workshops are different in each setting depending on parent group. Who is going to be involved? 1 member of staff and parents. (targeted parents in Eaglesham)How will the intervention be evaluated in the short and long term? Parent feedback questionnaires in the short term. Do you intend to have a control/comparison group (i.e. a group of pupils who have similar needs who do not receive the intervention but take part in the pre and post evaluation for comparison purposes)? No**Helpful tips/reflective questions:*** A research question is a clear, focused, concise and arguable question around which to centre your research.
* What are the resource implications?
* Do you need to plan CLPL?
* What might get in the way of the intervention being successful? If possible, how are you going to avoid this?
* Do you need to plan time for pre and post information/data gathering and analysis?
* Appendix 2 may be helpful to plan the actions required to implement your intervention
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase Four: Action (Implement intervention)** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase Five: Evaluation and Reflection** |
| **Step One: Measuring impact and outcomes** |
| Following evaluation of the intervention (as planned in phase 3):What impact has the intervention had? As a result of the positive feedback, workshops can continue next session. Parents said children were showing more interest in everyday numeracy. Parents said tasks were simple everyday tasks they could do. Have the SMART outcomes been achieved? Please describe. (See phase 1 step 2)We were able to engage some parents who normally wouldn’t choose to be part of nursery life. Most parents stated in their feedback that they are more confident in their ability to do every day numeracy in the home.  |
| **Step Two: Critical Reflection** |
| What have you learned?That there is a lack of basic numeracy/life skills at home for many children. There is a lack of parental knowledge and understanding of everyday numeracy skills in the home. We realised that outcomes were hard to measure as work is going on at home so little evidence, only parental feedback. What went well?* Good to engage and work with a small group of parents
* Positive feedback from parents
* Networking with colleagues
* Parents said they had fun
* Activities were not time consuming and inexpensive (using things at home)
* Some parents have developed confidence

What didn’t work so well?* Timescale was difficult to work with
* Collecting evidence as there was a lack of this from parents
* Trying to target just 4 parents was difficult for Cartmill and Hazeldene

Is there anything that could have been done better?* Timescale of when we start
* Research question more concise and not as broad
* Collecting evidence
 |
| **Step Three: Planning for Improvement** |
| What are you going to do now?Continue workshops across curriculum  |