Provision Map case study: Croyland Nursery School, Wellingborough

The provision map was used at Croyland to monitor and track the children in a variety of groups and to ensure that the intervention that we were providing was suitable and having an impact. These included children with High Needs Funding, Child Protection, EAL, SEND, EYPP and Resourced Provision.

OK is a Polish child who attended Croyland Nursery School in the morning from Monday to Thursday. He had had no previous experience in an early years setting and was displaying some challenging behaviours and communication and language difficulties when he started.

With this in mind, different interventions were planned for OK. These included some 1:1 support with regards to settling into nursery and also play skills with his peers. This was at the beginning of the sessions as this was when the staff had identified the support was needed. Targets were set and monitored by the member of staff, along with the school SENCO. This was very child specific which meant that we could assess and track the progress of these individual targets and RAG rate them.

OK was also involved in a Language Facilitation Group. This was group based with targets that all of the children in that group were working on.

The provision map was used to plan out and track the progress over three terms, once the assessments had been completed. This meant that the progress of the children could be RAG rated.

The cost implications for this particular child was worked out on the basis of the amount of time that a member of staff was spending with them. This was calculated by the staff members wages divided by the number of children they supported. This was covered by the school budget.

The impact that using the provision map has had on the child has been that the staff have been able to monitor and track the impact of the interventions and see whether they are benefiting the child or whether adaptations needed to be made.

From a senior leader perspective, it has been interesting to see the cost implications and also ensuring that each child was receiving the support they required, either on an individual basis or group. At SMT meetings, after each of the 3 rounds of assessments were completed and the provision map updated, we looked at each child individually to see how it was working. This meant that all senior leaders had an understanding of the impact.