

FAIRFIELD COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Aiming for Happiness and High Standards



Intervention Policy

Mission Statement

*At Fairfield Community Primary School, we aim to provide a safe, secure environment which will promote **Happiness and High Standards**.*

We aim to meet the needs and celebrate the achievements of all pupils, who, through high expectations and high standards of teaching, will reach their own potential regardless of ability.

We offer equal opportunities to all in the belief that Fairfield children will take their places as productive, valued and tolerant members of society.

RATIONALE

The Intervention Policy has been developed in response to both internal and external strands of school performance monitoring and in response to the need to be fully accountable for the impact of Pupil Premium Grant spending.

School Performance Between 2000 and 2011 Fairfield School had a tradition of high performance, particularly when this was compared to the schools position on the index of multiple deprivation. High proportions of children achieving and exceeding nationally expected levels at the end of KS2 compared strongly with national levels and was recognised in three DFE "School Achievement Awards". Progress from the end of KS1 to the end of KS2 was also markedly strong during this period. (in 2004 it was in equal first place at the top of the Bury LA Contextual Value Added table). In 2008 and 2009 Raiseonline recorded the school as having a **Significant +** points score difference above national averages for Reading, Writing and Maths. (The school took part in the national boycott of SATs in 2010).

Internal Monitoring In 2011 and 2012 there was a sharp dip in achievement (attainment and progress). This reflected the high proportion of children with SEN:

2011 - 5 statements; 6 at SAP; 1 at SA (SEN = 34%) ;

2012 - 2 statements; 11 at SAP; 1 at SA (34% on the SEN register).

Key improvements at KS1 meant that a dip in traditionally high levels of progress was expected. However, the performance of the SAP group of pupils in 2012 gave cause for special concern.

Their inability to respond to teaching which had always proved so successful in Y6 and a profound lack of work stamina evident throughout the year and when test papers were analysed raised serious questions. These were the children who, because of their difficulties had been supported by Teaching Assistants within classes. Classroom observations were already showing that in weaker lessons observed, this meant translating the task for the child. Whole class inputs were being re told and therefore children being supported didn't have to listen. When work commenced, tasks were being modelled to the extent that in essence the TA was doing the work for the child. This particular group of children, either through lack of work ethic and/or lack of confidence, were more than happy to let this happen. **The intervention policy aims to radically alter the role of Teaching Assistants.**

External Monitoring

In 2007 OFSTED had judged the school to be "Good with some outstanding features". In February 2013 the school was inspected with the performance of children eligible for the new Pupil Premium Grant Funding (PPG) a key category for scrutiny. School internal data did not at that time isolate this group in all but the end of key stage reports. The SAP children in the 2012 cohort were those whose performance in national tests was closely noted above qualified for FSM and as such their performance and progress measured. This led to the judgement *"Pupils in Y3-Y6 do not always make good enough progress, particularly disabled pupils, those with SEN and those who are supported by the pupil premium"*.

The Intervention Policy aims to ensure that the progress of children eligible for PPG is closely monitored and that funding is appropriately used to ensure their progress in line and where possible beyond national expectations.

In recent years, the demographic of the school has shifted further towards deprivation as the children of a stable more affluent section of the community have left and their places were taken from the publicly owned housing estates of east Bury. Like many schools in similar areas we are finding that children come to school with far lower levels of language, social skills and life experiences and are far harder to engage as learners than had been the case prior to 2010. This is a generalisation but there is no doubt that we now serve a

community within which there is a higher proportion of families for whom education is a low priority. **The Intervention Policy aims to provide a cohesive structure for "Closing the Gap".**

AIMS OF THE INTERVENTION POLICY

- To meet the aims of our mission statement.
- To ensure that **all** children make progress in line with their potential.
- To ensure that children are set SMART learning Intentions in order make progress.
- To ensure the efficient use of skilled and dedicated team of support staff
- To develop children's skills so that they following an intervention that become independent learners.
- To ensure that interventions have high impact and that success ensures progress being maintained within the mainstream classroom.
- To develop staff skills in specialist teaching methods.
- To foster a "team" approach to child development throughout the school.
- To ensure that low levels of progress are quickly identified and strategy put in place to rectify issues.
- To ensure that parents are partners in work programmes and intervention plans.
- To measure the effectiveness of PPG in terms of finance and progress.
- To "Close the Gap".

PROCEDURE

In recognising the importance of the Intervention Policy we have made it the priority within school development planning and made the appointment of an Intervention Manager, a key action. This role is currently fulfilled by Mrs Jane Stuckey who has a 0.5 teaching post to plan, monitor, timetable and review interventions. She works closely with class teachers, the SENCO (Mrs Karen Tomlinson) and support staff. Work with the SENCO has been essential as there is a new SEN code practice from September 2014 and the school is moving from Individual Education plans (IEPs) to Individual Intervention Plans (IIPs). These are working documents formally reviewed in six week cycles.

The intervention process is as follows:

1. Need identified through Assessment for Learning and Assessment of Learning. (Verbal feedback; marking; six point assessment calendar and analysis; pupil Progress Meetings; recommendations from outside agencies etc).
2. Class teacher completes "Request for Intervention" form.
3. SLT and Intervention Manager (IM) consider request. E.g could this child be helped to progress through differentiation within the classroom?
4. If suitable IM allocates staff, location, frequency and timings on "Whole School Intervention Plan".
5. Teacher/TA carries out pre-intervention assessment.
6. Teacher completes "Individual Intervention Plan" (IIP) (replacement for IEP) for each child and each intervention. (The IIP includes: TARGET; PRE-INTERVENTION SCORE AND COMMENT; PLAN - START AND END POINT)
7. Copies of IIP sent to parents/carers and SENCO. One copy in planning file, one copy in centrally stored "yellow file". (one in each key stage)
8. Parents invited to discuss plan.
9. TA/Teacher carries out the intervention - Handwritten notes in "Do" section of the IIP make it a working document.
10. Class teacher and TA hold six week review. Record progress and submit to IM.
11. Next steps identified and recorded.

APPENDICES

- Request for Intervention slip
- Interventions Available reference sheet
- Fairfield CP Whole School Intervention Plan (Names to be removed for web site copy of policy)
- Individual Intervention Plan

