**School Development Plan 2018-2019 - Jessie Younghusband School**

**This plan should be read in conjunction with**

**subject leader action plans, the termly monitoring schedule and records, and data analyses.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Priority 1 – Leadership and Management – actions required to be ‘Outstanding’.** (Ofsted July 2013 – ‘Outstanding’)July 2017 – self-evaluation judged by the school to be securely ‘Good’ July 2018 – self-evaluation judged by the school to be securely ‘Good’  |
| **Key Objective** | 1. To improve on outcomes achieved in July 2018 (50%) in Reading, Writing and Maths combined at the end of keystage 2 so that they are in-line with, or above, National outcomes ( 64% July 2018).

***Note this dip in outcomes is exceptional and believed to be year group specific however the school recognises the need to address this and to ensure that outcomes return to their historically high level by the end of this year (July 2019).*** |
| **Summary Actions** | 1. This plan to be shared with all staff at the start of term to ensure a shared understanding of the priorities facing the school. This to be regularly reviewed by SLT and shared staff to enable all involved to be as proactive as possible within their role to bringing about rapid improvements.
2. Review tracking systems for those currently in keystage 2 who are just below or have only just achieved Age Related Expectations (ARE) at the end of keystage.
3. Identify pupils who are vulnerable to underachievement and may not reach ARE without additional targeted teaching.
4. Put in place CPD which will secure improvement to teaching and learning across the school particularly for vulnerable learners (see point 2).
5. Literacy and maths leaders to focus on these priorities in a more detailed action plan.
6. All SLT and governor monitoring to be focussed on the priorities identified in this plan. Swift action to be taken where progress towards the targets is not on track.
7. Additional targeted interventions to be planned for SEN, PP and those not making strong progress. These will be monitored within a provision Map. The impact of interventions will be tracked so that the impact can be measured in a quantifiable way.
8. This to be a focus for performance management objectives 2018/19)
 |
| **Actual Sept’ 2018** Nos/% on track for ARE- July’18Year 3 – (23) 77%Year 4 – (19) 63%Year 5 – (17) 59%Year 6 – (21) 64% | **Milestone Target Dec’ 2018** Nos/% on track for ARE in July 2019Year 3 – embed at (23) 77%Year 4 – (20) 67%Year 5 – (18) 63%Year 6 – (22) 67% | **Milestone Target March 2019** Nos/% on track for ARE in July’19Year 3 – (24) 80%Year 4 – (21) 70%Year 5 – (19) 67%Year 6 – (23) 70% | **End Target July 2019**Nos/% on track for ARE in July ‘19Year 3 – (24) 80%Year 4 – (22) 73%Year 5 – ( 20) 65% Year 6 – (24) 73% |
| **Expected Impact and Outcome.** | In July 2019 65 % or more children will achieve ARE in RWM at the end of keystage 2  |
| **Priority 1: Leadership and Management - Review, Evaluation and impact** *See the data summary sheets for a more detailed picture of progress and attainment across the school towards the targets for this year.* |
| **Questions to support evaluation.** | **Progress - Autumn 2018** | **Progress - Spring 2019** |
| 1. Has monitoring focussed on the SDP priorities? What impact has been seen? Where is the evidence?
2. What was the impact of the actions undertaken during the period of review? What actions have led to progress towards the targets?
3. Are PM targets directly linked to SDP priorities? Were PM targets shared with governors and approved? Have reviews indicated good progress towards targets?
4. What is the impact of CPD planned to support staff to achieve their PM targets and to support SDP priorities??
5. What else does the school leadership need to do to achieve the targets?
6. What impact have leaders at all levels had on school improvement objectives?
 |  | . |
| **End of Year Evaluation - Leadership and Management - Summer 2019** |
| **Governor Monitoring - Leadership and Management**  |
| **Questions to support evaluation – to be raised at Governor meetings** |
| 1. How have this year priorities been identified?
2. Are leaders undertaking rigorous and effective self-evaluation and review against these focussed priorities? What is the evidence for this?
3. Have the planned monitoring activities been undertaken – what was the outcome and has this informed follow up actions?
4. Are the development priorities identified in the SEF reflected in the SDP for 2018/19?
5. What progress has been made on the development priorities – what comes next?
6. Is the school on track to achieve interim milestones and end of year targets? What is the evidence for this?
7. Were PM targets for 2017/18 met? Have these outcomes informed the pay decisions?
8. How well do the PM targets for 2018 /19 match the identified improvement priorities?
9. How do the expectations in the teachers PM targets reflect their experience and pay grade? What is the evidence for this?
 |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Priority 2 – Improving the quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment – actions required to be ‘Outstanding’.**July 2017 – self-evaluation currently judged by the school to be very securely‘ Good’ (Ofsted July 2013 – ‘Outstanding’)July 2018 – self-evaluation judged by the school to be ‘Good’ |
| **Key Objective** | 1. Evidence of strong progress in pupil books and data tracking (strong progress is defined as 6 steps a year on target tracker) will indicate that the teaching of maths is consistently ‘good’ or better across the school.
2. In addition, there will be evidence of accelerated progress (more than 6 steps on target tracker) for identified ‘target children’ in maths to ensure that numbers on track for Age Related Expectations is increasing.
 |
| **Summary Actions** | 1. More detailed system of assessing children’s progress in maths to be agreed and implemented.
2. Children who are just below / just at ARE in maths to be clearly identified as ‘Target children’(reference to be made to attainment at the end of the previous year and for Yr 4,5,6 attainment at the end of keystage1) . Teachers to plan for specific additional or focussed class teaching to support their next steps so that progress is sustained and accelerated. Progress of these children to be the focus during half termly PPMs.
3. CPD for teachers to be focussed on improving pedagogy in maths so that teachers can identify gaps and barriers to progress and plan appropriately to enable to every child to overcome these therefore improving their rates of progress.
4. External support to be planned for maths CPD – this to include an INSET (30th Oct 2018) by Chichester University and possible involvement of a maths advisor.
5. All teachers to be involved in peer observations and coaching as well as book scrutiny to support their own learning and also provide feedback to colleagues.
6. Teachers to develop topics and contexts for learning which alongside pedagogy which seeks to engage and motivate all learners, will ensure strong progress across the curriculum, and particularly in Reading, writing and Maths, for every child from their individual starting points.
7. Teachers and TAs will further develop use of pertinent feedback to address barriers to learning and close gaps in understanding, skills and knowledge.
8. This to be a focus for Performance Management Objectives 2018/19.
 |
| **Actual Sept’ 2018** Target children Nos/% making strong progress in maths - July’18Year R - March / July tbc Dec’ Year 1 – 100 % Year 2 – 33% (10)Year 3 – 87% (26)Year 4 – 83% (25)Year 5 -100% (26) \* 3 new chnYear 6 - 73% (24/33) | **Milestone Target Dec’ 2018** Target children Nos/% making strong progress in maths in July 2019N/AYear 1 – 100% - embedYear 2 – 66% (20)Year 3 – 90% (27)Year 4 – 87% (26)Year 5 - 100%Year 6 – 80% (27) | **Milestone Target March 2019** Target children Nos/% making strong progress in maths in July’19Year R tbcYear 1 – 100% embedYear 2 – 73% (22)Year 3 – 90% (27)Year 4 - 90% (27)Year 5 – 100%Year 6 – 87% (29) | **End Target July 2019**Target children Nos/% making strong progress in maths in July ‘19Year R – 100%Year 1 – 100% (30)Year 2 – 83% (25)Year 3 – 93% (28)Year 4 – 90% (27)Year 5 – 100% + 3 new chnYear 6 – 93% (31\*/33)\* to include Chn new in Yr 5 believed to be ‘on track’ |
| **Expected Impact** July 2019 | Identified ‘target children’ will have made strong progress in maths and some of those below ARE in maths will have made accelerated progress and be at, or closer to, ARE by July 2019. |
| **Priority 2: Teaching, Learning and Assessment - Review, Evaluation and impact** *See the target sheet for an overall summary of progress towards the targets for this year.* |
| **Questions to support evaluation.** | **Progress - Autumn 2018** | **Progress - Spring 2019** |
| 1. Have the focus children been correctly identified and have these children been the focus of PM objectives and PPM discussions?
2. Have teachers been supported to identify appropriate interventions and strategies to accelerate progress? What has the impact been? What evidence is there of this?
3. Have targets been set on target tracker to support the overall SDP targets?
4. What has been the further impact of Action Research findings in 2017/18 and further CPD?
5. What impact is the impact of T&L CPD on outcomes?
6. What further actions are needed to achieve the targets?
7. What other CPD is needed to support staff to achieve these targets?
 |  | . |
| **End of Year Evaluation - Teaching, Learning and Assessment - Summer 2019** |
| **Governor Monitoring - Teaching, Learning and Assessment** |
| **Questions to support evaluation – to be raised at Governor meetings** |
| 1. Are leaders undertaking rigorous and effective self-evaluation and review? What is the evidence for this?
2. Have the planned monitoring activities been undertaken – what was the outcome and has this informed follow up actions?
3. Are the development priorities identified in the SEF reflected in the SDP for 2018/19?
4. What progress has been made on the development priorities for maths across the school – what comes next?
5. Is the school on track to achieve interim milestones and end of year targets? What is the evidence for this?
6. Were PM targets for 2017/18 met? Have these outcomes informed the pay decisions?
7. How well do the PM targets for 2018 /19 match the identified improvement priorities?
8. How do the expectations in the teachers PM targets reflect their experience and pay grade? What is the evidence for this?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Priority 3 – Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare – actions required continue to be ‘Outstanding’.**July 2017 – self-evaluation currently judged by the school to be very securely‘ Outstanding’ (Ofsted July 2013 – ‘Outstanding’)July 2018 – self-evaluation judged by the school to be ‘Outstanding’ |
| ***Note*** *There is no specific focus in this area during 2018/19 however the school will continue to embed the growth mindset approach and to develop the PHSE curriculum both of which were implemented during 2017/18.* |
| **Priority 3: Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare - Review, Evaluation and impact** *See the target sheet for an overall summary of progress towards the targets for this year.* |
| **Questions to support leadership’s on-going evaluation.** |
| 1. What evidence is there that SMSC including British Values is an established part of the school’s wider curriculum and ethos?
2. How are children supported to know how to keep themselves safe?
3. What developments have happened in further developing Growth Mindset?
4. What opportunities have there been for ‘pupil voice’ across the school?
5. How is the school evaluating the impact?
6. Have outcomes for vulnerable children improved? Are gaps narrowing?
 |
| **End of Year Evaluation - Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare - Summer 2019** |
| **Governor Monitoring - Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare** |
| **Questions to support evaluation – to be raised at Governor meetings** |
| 1. How does the school ensure SMSC and British Values are a key aspect of learning in the curriculum?
2. What evidence is there that pupils learn how to keep themselves safe?
3. How has the impact on their attitudes been measured? What has been the impact?
4. Has there been an impact on outcomes in reading, writing and maths for vulnerable pupils ? What next?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Priority 4 – Outcomes – actions required to secure ‘Good’** July 2017 – self-evaluation currently judged by the school to be securely ‘Good’. (Ofsted July 2013 – ‘Outstanding’)July 2018 – self-evaluation judged by the school to be ‘Good’ overall but needing improvement in some areas. |
| **Key Objective** | To improve on outcomes achieved in July 2018 (50%) in Reading, Writing and Maths combined at the end of keystage 2 so that they are in-line with, or above, National outcomes ( 65% July 2018). |
| **Summary Actions** | 1. Detailed analysis of the reasons for the dip in keystage 2 results will be undertaken and the self-evaluated to determine an appropriate response. (As detailed in this School Development Plan.)
2. End of year data analysis will be undertaken using internal data and when ePODs and ASP are available to further unpick the gaps which need addressing.
3. Tracking systems in use in school will be reviewed at the start of the year and adjusted to address any areas which need to be more closely monitored by Teachers and SLT.
4. PPMs will be scheduled for each half term with a specific aim of reviewing outcomes for ‘Focus children’ (see leadership and Management section).
5. Levels of accountability for teachers and SLT will be clearly set out in performance management objectives and in the expectations of this improvement plan.
6. Gaps in each year group at JYS vary depending on the year group. These will be clearly identified at the start of the year so that they can be closely monitored and teachers supported through individualised CPD to close these gaps.
7. Targets for improvement with termly milestones will be set out in this SDP and progress towards these will be reviewed on a half termly basis at PPMs.
8. Ensure that this is seen as a whole school development priority as what is taught in EYs and KS1 Has an impact on children’s progress and attainment in KS2.
 |
| **Actual Sept’ 2018** Nos/% on track for ARE in RWM - July’18Year R – tbc Oct Year 1 – (25) 83%Year 2 – (25) 83%Year 3 – (23) 77%Year 4 – (19) 63%Year 5 – (17) 59%Year 6 – (21) 64% | **Milestone Target Dec’ 2018** Nos/% on track for ARE in RWM July 2019Year R - tbcYear 1 – (25) 83%Year 2 – (25) 83%Year 3 – embed at (23) 77%Year 4 – (20) 67%Year 5 – (18) 63%Year 6 – (22) 67% | **Milestone Target March 2019** Nos/% on track for ARE in RWM July’19Year R - tbcYear 1 – 83%Year 2 – 83%Year 3 – (24) 80%Year 4 – (21) 70%Year 5 – (19) 67%Year 6 – (23) 70% | **End Target July 2019** Nos/% at ARE in RWM July ‘19Year R – 77% (as prev’ 2 years)Year 1 – maintain and embed at 83%Year 2 – maintain and embed at 83%Year 3 – (24) 80%Year 4 – (22) 73%Year 5 – ( 20) 65% Year 6 – (24) 73% |
| **Expected Impact** July 2019 | Nos/ % of children achieving ARE at the end of KS2 July 2019 will be in-line with or above those Nationally. (65% July 2018) |
| **Priority 4: Outcomes - Review, Evaluation and impact** *See internal whole school data summaries for termly attainment and progress analyses.* |
| **Questions to support evaluation.** | **Progress - Autumn 2018** | **Progress - Spring 2019** |
| 1. Are identified ‘Target Children’ making accelerated progress in maths and writing across keystage 1 and 2?
2. What progress is there towards targets for RWM in keystage 2 ?
3. Do teachers PM objectives link directly to the SDP targets for improvement?
4. Is there an improvement in the numbers of children on track for age related expectations (ARE) in maths across keystage 2?
5. Is school tracking effective in supporting teachers and school leaders to track improvements? What is the evidence for this?
6. Is the Pupil Premium grant being used effectively to support vulnerable children and to increase rates of progress? What is the evidence?
7. Has the Provision Map for SEN and vulnerable children been drawn up? Is the impact of interventions being closely and regularly monitored (every half term)? What is the impact of these interventions?
 |  | . |
| **End of Year Evaluation - Leadership and Management - Summer 2019** |
| **Leadership and Management - Governor Monitoring** |
| **Questions to support evaluation – to be raised at Governor meetings** |
| 1. Has the school set targets for the end of the year and interim milestones so that progress can be monitored to improve outcomes for the end of keystage 2?
2. How effective has monitoring been in bringing about improvement?
3. What provision has been made for vulnerable learners including SEN and Pupil Premium children?
4. How is SEN intervention monitored and evaluated for impact?
5. How will leadership be monitoring progress towards the targets set?
6. What are the potential reasons why SDP targets in this plan have not yet been met – what actions will SLT be taking as a result?
7. How are teachers being supported to achieve the targets?
8. What will happen if these actions are not effective in bringing about the expected improvements?
9. Are gaps in attainment / rates of progress closing? What evidence is there of this?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Priority 5 – Early Years – actions to maintain ‘Outstanding**July 2017 – self-evaluation judged by the school to be ‘Outstanding’ (Ofsted July 2013 – Overall ‘Outstanding’ – not a separate judgement)July 2018 – self-evaluation judged by the school to be ‘Outstanding’ |
| ***Note*** *there is no specific priority for Early Years in this year’s development plan however developments and improvements in teaching maths (see earlier sections) will include the whole school so that foundations of learning in maths build from the start of school and secure improved outcomes across keystage 2.* |