We assess students when they join us with a standardised test which gives them an age-related score, with 100 being the 'average student' their age. Most students we were able to target with intervention had scores of less than 90.

Within one 10 week intervention cycle, we've had a student with a starting point of 85 increase to 102 whilst another started with 78 and went up to 103 ! This means they've had
the gap closed and are now in line with, or slightly above, age-related expectations.
We were also interested to see the longer term impact, so with students that did one intervention cycle up to Easter and came up with fantastic scores of around 100 and above, we stopped the intervention and they went back into lessons [full-time]. We then tested them at the end of the second cycle, even though they'd had no intervention.

All of them have either maintained [standardised age scores], and one has actually carried on improving above this. Our interpretation is that by the gaps being closed, we have been able to further increase their skills, and we've seen that impact translate into the curriculum.
It's definitely impacted on their confidence as well - they are now able to access lessons successfully, and as a result, they're keeping up with their own age-related expectations or improving further.

In particular, one students' test scores keep flying and that's just 'the number' - their attitude wasn't great across their subjects, but because they are now achieving and making progress
in maths, that confidence translates into their other subjects. It has made a really big difference in their confidence across the board.

- Hayley Briggs, SENCO, Scarborough UTC
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# So actually we did a trial we ran students on 3 sessions of 20 minutes a week for 10 weeks we did the pmt before and the pmt after... and the gains in numeracy skills were stupendous standardised test scores going from 73 way below average to 106 
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