

## Strategy to support disadvantaged children's learning

### Reason for Call in –

1. The 'Action Plan' needs 'Outputs' between 'Who' and 'Outcomes'. As precise as possible. This provides a measure of evidence for drawing conclusions as to whether 'Outcome' achieved.
2. 'Outcomes' are more difficult. Precision can be helped by re-wording, and/or defining words like 'the best..' There is so much wiggle-room currently. The devil is in the detail. There is no devil present! Should generate a series of questions with Yes/No answers to help determine if 'Outcome ' has been achieved plus a recognised procedure for then drawing conclusions.
3. The theory is parent/child have integral say. Yes – to a point. Very 'professionally' orientated this plan. Can give impression that parent/child views can become an add-on, rather than central to decision-making.
4. There are some 'When' days already passed. Related Outputs to Outcomes can be assessed now as to whether achieved.

### **Suggestion**

A. In the pdf Strategy Document virtually at the end pages 27-28, there are the Priority higher-level outcomes Plus a supposed 'What will Success look like by 2020' section. So:

- i) hold them to these – both Priority and 'Success';
- ii) are these successes realistic/stretching enough e.g. FSM Achievement Gap: is 12% reasonable and fit for Torbay purpose? Should it be 0%? If not, why not?; and
- iii) The 'success' should be related to the Priority Actions and Outcomes. It looks disjointed,.

B. Prepare monitoring (day-to-day managers, recording results) and evaluation approaches (specific review by other than day-to-day managers. This for Overview & Scrutiny.

C. For those whose date is passed, assess achievement of that Outcome now. Record approach, criteria, Yes/No questions that pointed towards assessed achievement. This substantiates real progress to date & helps inform future progress and success.