Raising Attainment in Year 1 Project
End of Year Evaluation Report - July 2018

Introduction
The ‘Raising Attainment in Year 1 Project’ has been a project for targeted schools where there was clear evidence of slippage in attainment between the end of EYFS and end of Key Stage One. This report is an end of year evaluation and seeks to;

1. Revisit the aims of the project and the model of CPD
2. Present the evidence of impact on pupil outcomes
3. Highlight the pupil learning behaviours that have improved
4. Describe impact on leadership and teaching
5. Consider the model of CPD: identifying strengths of the model, potential obstacles for schools, areas for improvement in the CPD design
6. Identify barriers in schools which limited impact of the project
7. Implications for wider CPD offers for Cambridgeshire LA
8. Planning for extending the CPD for a second year to include a second cohort of schools

An annex provides a sample case study from one of the participating primary schools. This case study has been anonymised.

1. The aims of the project and CPD model
The project sought to primarily raise Y1 attainment in targeted schools through improving the quality of teaching in Year 1 classes. The design of the CPD model was a combination of both CPD sessions through the year and follow up school based CPD, with support from subject advisers. The model offered bespoke ways forward for schools depending on the specific areas for improvement for the school and their own contexts. Schools were expected to develop an improvement plan and to regularly submit progress data. Schools were given opportunities to work collaboratively with other schools within the project.

2. Impact on pupil outcomes
The schools were expected to submit data on pupil outcomes at intervals of the project and to detail end of year impact. Schools who have submitted case studies refer to:

- Improved phonics outcomes (the majority of schools)
- Accelerated progress of target groups of pupils
- Evidence of children exceeding targets set
- Improved reasoning skills

The extent to which all schools have engaged with effective quantitative data submission has been variable. Most schools have submitted some assessment data, however this has been shared in various forms. In many cases, teacher assessment data has identified the target group of pupils and shows their progress from September and gives a comparison to their final end of year data. To strengthen the overall project evaluation this data is needed for each school that took part. Along with this, evidence of targets set and performance against targets to demonstrate the accelerated progress of the target group, would have been useful. Below is a summary of the data provided by the schools who took part in the project.
### Summary of data provided by the schools involved in the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Target area</th>
<th>Number of pupils in Y1 (C) or target group (T)</th>
<th>Progress (number of pupils)</th>
<th>Less than expected</th>
<th>Expected +</th>
<th>Better than expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>19 (C)</td>
<td>1/19 5%</td>
<td>18/19 95%</td>
<td>8/19 42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>9 (T)</td>
<td>1/9 11%</td>
<td>8/9 89%</td>
<td>4/9 44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>3 (T)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/3 100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>9 (T)</td>
<td>2/9 22%</td>
<td>7/9 78%</td>
<td>3/9 33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>17 (T)</td>
<td>8/17 47%</td>
<td>9/17 53%</td>
<td>1/17 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>52 (C)</td>
<td>12/49 24%</td>
<td>37/49 76%</td>
<td>11/49 22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>58 (C)</td>
<td>22/55 40%</td>
<td>33/55 60%</td>
<td>30/55 55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>Phonics</td>
<td>14 (C)</td>
<td>2/12 16%</td>
<td>10/12 84%</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>18 (T)</td>
<td>2/18 11.1%</td>
<td>16/18 88.9%</td>
<td>8/18 44.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>No data submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 11</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>No data submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141/218</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Impact on learning behaviours
Case study evidence from schools highlights the following improvements in learning behaviours for the target pupils:

- Improved confidence
- Increased stamina for writing
- Improved self belief of being able to achieve
- Children more aware of expectations of them
- Improved independence
- Children supporting one another e.g. talk for maths: reasoning role models
- Increased accuracy in writing
- Improved attitudes to starting writing

4. Impact on leadership and teaching

Leadership
The project sought to have engagement with the headteacher as well as year 1 teachers and TAs in the development of an improvement plan. Where leaders engaged fully in the project, the following aspects of leadership improved:

- A sharper and more strategic focus on key priorities for improvement for raising attainment in year 1
- Raised expectations of Year 1 pupils as a result of the evidence of accelerating progress and children exceeding targets during the year
- Legitimising radical change to timetables to ensure optimum time for learning
- An understanding that the approach across the year to improving attainment in Year 1 could used provided an improvement model that could be generalised to other year groups
- Improved focus on improving transition R/Y1 and Y1/Y2

In those schools where leaders were fully engaged in the project, it is not surprising that there was a stronger evidence base of accelerated progress.

Teaching
Evidence from the case studies, and from discussions with teachers both in school visits and through the CPD sessions, highlighted the following areas of impact on teachers and TAs:

- Raised expectations and a clearer understanding of ‘what good looks like”
- Improved teacher confidence
- Improved teacher understanding of specific pedagogies e.g guided approaches, the use of talking partners, response partners
- A shifting culture where “all time is learning time” which ensured teachers were making the most of time in the classroom for Year 1 pupils
- Teachers becoming more solution focused to tackling specific learning gaps based on improved knowledge of their children.

5. The strengths and areas for development of the model of CPD:

Strengths
The advisers reflected on the strengths of the model of CPD in evaluating the project for the second cohort and identified the following strengths:
Involvement of the Headteacher from the outset with an expectation of leading change

Focus given to an identified target group in year 1 class

Providing examples of year 1 children’s work to challenge teacher expectations

School to school collaborations - to explore samples of books, for all schools to review, to demonstrate progress

Bespoke CPD aligned to schools identified priorities and specific gaps

Follow up school visits by Advisers

Engagement of TAs and teachers together in the CPD

External specialist input to present evidence based approaches to improve achievement

Engaging an enthusiastic Year 1 lead teacher who led improvements

Areas for development of the model

The Advisers identified a number of areas for development to further improve the model, which are listed below and will be addressed in future design:

- Improved agreements/contracts with schools from the start of the project on expectations of the project, involvement of leaders, action planning, data collection and formats for submitting data
- Timing of the start of the project needs to be September
- The project needs to have a better balance for maths and English through targeted invitations as only one school was working on maths
- Introduce more tools for self evaluation particularly teacher confidence schedules - focused on issues such as pedagogic repertoire, gap analysis
- Further work is needed on developing exemplification of “what good looks like” aligned to an improved understanding of end of year expectations (refer to NZ national standards models provided by Sally Rundell)
- The potential for hosting the training in school venues should be explored
- The reach of the project needs to extend to more schools through provision of materials that may be developed in the project e.g. exemplification examples provided on the learning platforms for all schools
- The involvement of school advisers needs further development in terms of alignment with the project e.g. the KIT meeting of targeted schools should make reference to the expectations of the project
- Further support is needed for schools in data analysis to review impact

6. Barriers in schools, which limited impact of the project

The list of issues below limited impact in a minority of schools.

- Clashing of projects/training which meant the school found it difficult to focus on identified area for improvement
- Staffing issues e.g. one school both the headteacher and the class teacher left during the course of the project
- Communication from headteachers/SLT leads to the teaching team was not always effective
- Lack of experience of analysis of key and relevant quantitative data
7. Implications for the Cambridgeshire CPD offer For the LA

The findings from the project have resulted in a change in the CPD offers for Cambridgeshire schools. The adviser team are now offering a significantly expanded programme of data courses for Year 1 and KS1. The issue of mixed age planning has been highlighted during the project and the subject advisers are now offering more courses for teachers and support in schools is also offered to enable teachers to tailor planning to the mixed age context. The evidence from the project is that teachers do not always have a secure repertoire of pedagogic approaches. Terms such as shared and guided are not well understood and need to be revisited in CPD models.

8. Planning for extending the CPD for a second year to include a second cohort of schools

The adviser team are planning a second year of the project. Eight headteachers have already expressed an interest in the project following the headteacher briefing sessions. Given the issue for Cambridgeshire of the need to improve achievement of disadvantaged pupils, it is important that schools where there is a significant underperformance profile for disadvantaged pupils at the end of KS1 are targeted.

The Advisers have set an initial timeline for the design of the second year of the project detailed below:

July 17th: Meeting with the Head of Service to share the draft evaluation report and regarding the final request for data from schools

July 19th: SIS meeting - feedback and evaluation document to be shared with SIS team following completion of 2017-2018 project

Before end of term (July 23rd): Identification of target schools; 5 maths, 5 English

August/September: CPD prepared by advisers

September 6th SIS meeting: SIS team to be briefed about schools to be involved in the project. Specific communication sent to the Primary Advisers of the targeted schools so that reference can be made at KIT meeting

September 27th: Launch CPD event – Headteachers/SLT and Y1 teachers
Focus on aims of project, successes and lessons learned from first year, detailing the offer to schools and expectations of schools in the project. Input sessions from participating schools from 2017/18 – TBC.
Key note from Sally Rundell: What works for raising attainment in Y1 and particularly PP, key strategies for schools; checklist, successful teaching approaches - use of confidence schedules

Explicit contract with future schools needs to be made clear at the beginning of the project:

- September: pupil level data and % of children who achieved GLD and 1,2,3 in chosen subject area at the end of EYFS (e.g. writing)
- September: % of children targeted to achieve WTS, EXS, GDS
- February: pupil level data (school to indicate if they feel that pupils are on track/not on track to achieve their end of year target)
- July: pupil level data and % of children who achieved WTS, EXS, GDS. Progress data (% and number of pupils who made less than expected/expected/better than expected progress)

Autumn 2: action planning visit to schools and collection of targets and pupil level data

January CPD session - Teachers and TAs

Feb half term: data collection from schools

Spring term: up to two in-school visits

End of April: twilight including moderation and collecting exemplification: to be hosted in school(s)

End of May: twilight case study support: to be hosted by school(s)

End of June: final case study to be submitted by schools

July: final evaluation report, including lessons learned, to be collated and shared by advisers

'Raising Attainment in Year 1 Project' end of year evaluation compiled by Sally Rundell, Thomas Oakley, Kathryn Brereton and Anna Walker.
‘Raising Attainment in Year 1’ - Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cohort | Number of pupils in Y1: 74  
Target group(s): 17  
School focus for project: Writing |
## Summary of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First/Given name</th>
<th>EYFS Outcome + writing</th>
<th>October TA</th>
<th>November TA</th>
<th>March TA</th>
<th>June Phonics screen result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child A</td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
<td>1dev+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child B</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child C</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child D</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>1 Beg</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child E</td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td>WT C</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child F</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child G</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child H</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child I</td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td>WT C</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child J</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child K</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child L</td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child M</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child N</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>1 Beg</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
<td>1 dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child O</td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>1 Beg</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child P</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
<td>WT B</td>
<td>1 Beg</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
<td>1 Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Q</td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td>WT C</td>
<td>WT A</td>
<td>1 Beg+</td>
<td>1 Dev+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete the table, or attach the relevant data for your target group(s) of pupils, using your own school system.
### School's coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment/explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1beg</td>
<td>working below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1beg+</td>
<td>working below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1dev</td>
<td>working towards age related expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1dev+</td>
<td>working towards age related expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sec</td>
<td>working at age related expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exc</td>
<td>working at age related expectations with greater depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attainment and progress made by all pupils

**Figures below respective from July 2017 to March 2018:**
- Average Attainment of group: **1Beg+**
- Average Progress of group: **2.66 points** (approximately 2 points would be expected school progress at this point in the year)

### Identified pupils/target group

**Figures below respective from July 2017 to March 2018:**
- Average Attainment of group: **1Beg+**
- Average Progress of group: **2.71 points** (approximately 2 points would be expected school progress at this point in the year)

**Figures below respective from July 2017 to June 2018 (rest of year group data unavailable at present):**
- Average Attainment of group: **1Dev+**
- Average Progress of group: **3.44 points** (approximately 2.8 points would be expected school progress at this point in the year)

The group have performed broadly in-line with the rest of the cohort in terms of pupil premium, SEN children and in reading progress (just above expected progress, by March 2018).

The group have demonstrated above expected progress in year (June 2018)

### Evaluation of outcomes

*Identified trends using end of year data and including any relevant statutory assessments undertaken (i.e. Phonics Screening Check results - may link to reading/writing)*

There is a correlation between the lower scores in phonics and attainment in writing.
### Actions taken (i.e. in-school development, support from Advisers)

- English planning format change: children taught x4 skills before weekly big write
- Abolition of T4W (teachers able to ‘dip in’ and use methods as appropriate in order to encourage more frequent/quantity of writing)
- In-school moderation of writing: identification of focused group/s based on teacher assessment (potential to reach EXS by EOY)
- Tracking group/s established on in-school software to chart progress/attainment versus whole cohort
- In-school support: English Adviser support x3 focused group writing support – observations from Year 1 team to inform future practice
- Pupils identified on some English plans with regards differentiated support and/or work/tasks
- Attended the securing judgements session at Cambridge Golf Centre: moderated writing and had discussions with colleagues around writing and their judgements. Using the moderation materials provided, we were able to RAG rate the children to home in on specific areas acting as obstacles to EXS: 15% of areas were identified as RED; 61% as AMBER and only 23% as GREEN. The RED areas identified were largely respective of spelling and culture of self-editing work. Teachers to focus on these areas from mid-May onwards.

### Commentary from Teacher A (Year 1 Teacher)

During class teaching, focused group children worked with Class Teacher or Teaching Assistant, initially focusing on structure of simple sentences and leaving finger spaces and punctuating it correctly. We used cut-up sentences and writing simple sentences using a picture as a stimulus. During this, and their normal English lessons, the children were encouraged to, first of all practise sentences repeatedly, orally and then, when they were complete, to read them aloud to the adults, to help begin self-editing work. They often realised that they had omitted words or punctuation that meant that it hadn’t made sense, before they self-edited.

To try to improve spelling, the children began to use their own spelling dictionaries, so that when they misspelt words which they should have known, (High Frequency), or words that they could have spelt correctly using their phonic knowledge, they had to record them in this dictionary and then use this when they were next writing. Children were then encouraged to extend their sentences with a focus on conjunctions such as “and”, “because” or “but”.
Commentary from Teacher B (Year 1 Teacher)
During the time on the project and having identified my target group, I have made sure that for each writing session they have had additional input from either myself or the TA. They have been supported with sentence starters and word mats and been encouraged to tell me their sentence before writing it. Once I have heard their sentence, I have repeated back and counted the number of words on my fingers, in doing this I am also able to show how many finger space they need due to the gaps in my fingers. As finger spaces were a problem with this group they were each given a character finger spacer. I also frequently pointed out the words that were available to them on the wall to help with their spelling e.g. conjunctions, time conjunctions and tricky words.

Commentary from Teacher C (Year 1 Teacher)
During class teaching, focus group children worked with Class Teacher or Teaching Assistant initially focusing on structure of simple sentences. During this and their normal English lessons the children were encouraged to, first of all practise sentences repeatedly, orally and then, when they were complete, to read them aloud to the adults, to help begin self-editing work. They often realised that they had omitted words or punctuation that meant that it made sense. To try to improve spelling the children began to use their own “Handy Words” Mats. Children were then encouraged to extend their sentences with a focus on conjunctions such as “and”, “because” or “but”. I also pointed out the words that were available to them on the wall to help them with their spelling.
Impact of actions on pupil outcomes (i.e. quantitative and qualitative)

**Commentary from Teacher A (Year 1 Teacher)**

All 5 of my children appeared to settle better to their writing and write at greater length. 

Child M had really struggled with leaving finger spaces; the continuous “gentle” reminders and use of a “lollystick finger” has helped him (mostly overcome this). He writes using good sentence structure and mostly uses full stops and capital letters correctly. He is so much happier and confident to write now. 

Child N often found it difficult to get started with her writing and, consequently wrote very little. Practising her sentences and working in small groups has improved the quality and particularly quantity of her writing. She still struggles with some of her spellings, but this is improving. She often uses full stops and capital letters correctly. 

Before we began the focused project, Child J was a very reluctant writer. She really lacked confidence in her own ability and would ask an adult what to write next, almost after every word. As a consequence, she often wrote very little. Now, however, she is much happier to “give it a go” and often writes with fervor. She structures sentences well, but her spelling is still a concern. 

Child O is my EAL student and he still finds structuring his sentences difficult. He has become a little more focused and motivated, but I would say that the project has had the least impact on his writing. Maybe he needs more EAL focused provision. 

Child P is now such an enthusiastic little writer. She structures her sentences well and can punctuate mostly correctly. She has now begun to extend her sentences using conjunctions.

**Commentary from Teacher B (Year 1 Teacher)**

The impact that I have seen has varied from child to child. 

Child L has made the most progress as is now able to write independently sentences that include adjectives and conjunctions. She now spaces her words, sounds out phonetically correct and when asked to read her work back to me, she realises when she has missed out words. 

Child A, who is a selective mute, varies from day to day. On the days she is willing to speak to me, we get the chance to discuss number of words and finger spaces she can produce some lovely writing which is phonetically correct, includes conjunctions and adjectives. However, this is inconsistent, on the days she refuses to speak she doesn’t use finger spaces, her letters aren’t on the lines and her sentences don’t make sense. Very frustrating as I know she can do it! 

Child E has come on in leaps and bounds he has gained lots of confidence with his writing. He now spaces his words without a spacer and thinks carefully about what he wants to write and verbalises before putting pen to paper. He has worked hard on his handwriting and it is now consistent in size and ascenders and descenders are correctly formed. 

Child I …. He is a very capable little boy, but has no desire to write. His handwriting has improved dramatically and he tries hard to sound out words carefully, however he is very reliant on scaffolding and reluctant to try any writing without an adult next to him. 

**Commentary from Teacher C (Year 1 Teacher)**

Most of my children appeared to settle better to their writing and write at greater length. Child G still struggles to write more than a couple of sentences in a lesson. However when she focuses she can write sentences using full stops and capital letters correctly. Child C is so much happier and confident to write now. It has been lovely to see him gain in confidence and he can now form his letters
correctly and neatly. He is reading aloud his sentences before he starts writing which is really improving the quality of his writing. Before it was difficult at times to read his writing but recently his presentation has improved. **Child H** often found it difficult to get started with her writing and, consequently wrote very little. Practising her sentences and working away from a group has improved the quality and particularly quantity of her writing. She still struggles with some of her spellings, but this is improving. She often uses full stops and capital letters correctly. Before we began the focused project, **Child B** was a very reluctant writer. He lacked confidence in his own ability and he needed a lot of teacher input to "give it a go". As a consequence, he often wrote very little. Now, he is much happier to "give it a go" and his handwriting is very neat and easily read. He structures sentences well and he knows how to use his “Helpful Words” mat to support his spellings. **Child F** is becoming more confident with his writing every day. He started the project because his writing was often very untidy and hard to read. He wasn’t using finger spaces, capital letters or full stops. I’m very pleased to say the impact the project has had on **Child F**’s writing is dramatic; his writing is much easier to read now and he knows how to use finger spaces and full stops correctly most of the time. He has really grown in confidence and he always tries hard to produce his best writing. **Child K** structures her sentences well and can punctuate mostly correctly. **Child K** now uses a writing wedge and a pencil grip to support her writing. She seems a lot happier to write and she always tries her best. **Child D** has worked hard on her writing and she always has very creative pieces of writing that are a joy to read! She can write sentences now with capital letters and full stops more often used correctly. However, she needs to remember to use finger spaces and her word mat to improve her spelling.
### Implications for future provision

**How has the project helped to inform future provision or school developments (e.g. by building capacity / creating sustainability in Y1 / transition arrangements)?**

- Tighter focus via identification, planning and assessment (in school and through materials at securing judgment course) of a focus group for writing. The analysis and work will be used to inform key groups/transition to year 2 teachers.

**Whole school implications – maximising impact of project**

**Commentary from Teacher A (Year 1 Teacher):**

Think it’s important that identification is carried out earlier rather than later. It is good that 1 year 2 teacher was involved in moderation and key groups will need to be passed up with detail.

**Commentary from Teacher B (Year 1 Teacher):**

It has made me realise how important first hand experiences are to make children want to write. Without the correct stimulus children are very quickly ‘turned off’ writing and won’t attempt to write. Writing tasks need to be kept simple and appeal to their imagination. Sentences need to be spoken again and again and words and spaces discussed. The use of sentence starters and word mats encourage independence and character finger spacers have proved a hit.

**Commentary from Teacher C (Year 1 Teacher):**

Writing needs to be planned using a quality text that will appeal to the children and enable good teaching of writing skills. Are we giving the children enough stimuli to write imaginative pieces of writing? Children in Year 1 need to repeat out loud what they want to write and this will ensure they don’t miss out words and they will know when to put in a full stop. The use of Helpful Word mats, Word Banks, sentence starters and given scaffolds has helped the children to grow in confidence with their writing.

### Overall

- support from the English Adviser in school
- opportunity to meet other colleagues and look at other Year1 writing
- resources provided by LA to inform decision making and strategic focus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Even better if ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Would've liked to been involved in the project since the start not halfway through, albeit this was out of your control (comment from HT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unfortunately, moderation opportunities led by the English Adviser and hosted by us, but did not happen due to lack of take up from other schools (comment from all involved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning support, for focusing on different aspects (comment from Teacher A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I would have liked the opportunity to work with the group outside the classroom, to enable me to gain more focus for the group - staffing issue (comment from Teacher B and Teacher C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>