# Pupil premium strategy statement (Sandgate Primary School)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **School** | Sandgate Primary School | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2016/2017 | **Total PP budget** | £74,100 | **Date of most recent PP Review** | n/a |
| **Total number of pupils** | 422 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 55 | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | April 2017 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Current attainment and progress 2015-2016 (end of KS2)** | | | | | |
|  | | | | *Pupils eligible for PP (9 pupils)* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)* |
| **% achieving expected in reading, writing and maths (combined)** | | | | **67%** | 73.4% |
| **% achieving expected in reading** | | | | **100%** | 83.9% |
| **% achieving expected in writing** | | | | **67%** | 78.6% |
| **% achieving expected in maths** | | | | **89%** | 82.4% |
| **Average progress point in reading** | | | | **6.94** | 0 |
| **Average progress point in writing** | | | | **-1.09** | 0 |
| **Average progress point in maths** | | | | **0.04** | 0 |
| **Standardised Score in reading** | | | | **109.8** | 103.8 |
| **Standardised Score in maths** | | | | **103** | 104 |
| **Targets for 2016-2017** | | | | | |
| **Key Stage 1 – 7 pupils** | | | | *Pupils eligible for PP* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (national average 2016)* |
| **% targeted for expected in reading** | | | | **86%** | 74% |
| **% targeted for greater depth in reading** | | | | **14%** | 24% |
| **% targeted for expected in writing** | | | | **71%** | 65% |
| **% targeted for greater depth in writing** | | | | **14%** | 13% |
| **% targeted for expected in maths** | | | | **86%** | 73% |
| **% targeted for greater depth in maths** | | | | **14%** | 18% |
| **% targeted for expected in reading, writing and maths** | | | | **71%** | 60% |
| **% targeted for great depth in reading, writing and maths** | | | | **71%** | 14% |
| **Key Stage 2 – 9 pupils** | | | | *Pupils eligible for PP* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (national average 2016)* |
| **% targeted for expected in reading** | | | | **89%** | 66% |
| **% targeted for greater depth in reading** | | | | **33%** | 19% |
| **% targeted for expected in writing** | | | | **89%** | 44% |
| **% targeted for greater depth in writing** | | | | **74%** | 15% |
| **% targeted for expected in maths** | | | | **89%** | 33% |
| **% targeted for greater depth in maths** | | | | **33%** | 17% |
| **% targeted for expected in reading, writing and maths** | | | | **89%** | 53% |
| **% targeted for great depth in reading, writing and maths** | | | | **11%** | 5% |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)** | | | | | |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)* | | | | | |
|  | | Oral language skills in EYFS are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other pupils. This slows reading progress in subsequent years and the number of eligible children attaining a Good Level of Development at the end of Foundation Stage | | | |
|  | | High ability children in KS2 in writing who are eligible for PP are making less progress than other high ability pupils. This prevents high levels of progress in KS2. | | | |
| **C.** | | In KS1 attainment is lower than national for pupils eligible for PP in reading and maths. This prevents high levels of attainment and progress in KS2. Of these 6 children, 4 have specific learning and cognition needs affecting attainment. | | | |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* | | | | | |
| **D.** | | Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP is 93% (all children is 97.4%). This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind on average. | | | |
| **E.** | | Involvement of parents with supporting children eligible for PP is lower than other families. This particularly applies to specific families. | | | |
| 1. **Desired outcomes** *(Desired outcomes and how they will be measured)* | | | **Success criteria** | | |
|  | Improve oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception class. | | Pupils eligible for PP class make rapid progress by the end of the year so that all pupils eligible for PP reach a Good Level of Development at the end of the year. | | |
|  | Higher rates of progress across KS2 for high attaining pupil eligible for PP. | | Pupils eligible for PP identified as high ability at the end of KS1 make as much progress as ‘other pupils’ identified as high ability, across Key Stage 2 in reading, writing and maths. This will be measured in Years 3, 4 and 5 by teacher assessments, STAR maths, NFER testing in maths and reading, NCETM progress checks in mathematics and successful moderation practices established across other schools. | | |
|  | Improve the attainment for pupils eligible for PP in reading and maths and the end of KS1. | | Pupils eligible for PP will reach the expected standard in reading and maths. % of children attaining expected in reading and maths will be above national standards. | | |
|  | Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP | | Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP to 2% or below. Overall PP attendance will improve from 93% to 96% in line with ‘other’ pupils. | | |
|  | Increased support and participation for pupils eligible for PP at home from parents. | | Pupils eligible for PP will read more frequently at home and complete home learning. This will raise standards at the end of KS1 for specific children so that they attain expected standards in reading, writing and maths. | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Planned expenditure** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * **Academic year** | | | | **2016/2017** | | | | | | | | |
| The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Quality of teaching for all** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | | **How will you ensure it is implemented well?** | | **Staff lead** | **When will you review implementation?** | | | |
| A. Improve oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception class. | Staff training on high quality feedback and role modelling of rich language.  Staff training on developing oracy for high attaining pupils in EYFS/KS1 and KS2 from English Lead and EYFS SLE | | We want to invest some of the grant in longer term change which will help all pupils. A lower percentage of children eligible for PP are attaining a Good Level of Development. The EEF Toolkit suggests a number of ways of supporting this. A number of studies show the benefits of trained teaching effectively supporting both oral language skills and reading outcomes. For all oral language interventions certain factors are associated with higher learning gains, suggesting that careful implementation is important. Approaches which explicitly aim to develop spoken vocabulary work best when they are related to current content being studied in school and when they involve active use of any new vocabulary. Likewise, approaches that use technology are most effective when technology is used as a medium to encourage collaborative work and interaction between pupils, rather than a taking a direct teaching or tutoring role. Most studies comment on the importance of training and teacher development or support with implementation. | | | Course selected using evidence of effectiveness.  INSET and twilight to deliver training.  Peer observations of TA’s in class.  Observations from deputy head to ensure high quality feedback. | | Deputy Head – Lianne Jones  English Lead – Jamie Evans | A. **Jan 2017** – Any child who did not pass the Language Link screening on entry to Reception are partaking in high impact language intervention following the individual programmes within the package.  A strong focus on oracy within the Reception class is linked to the teaching of English and through the use of Talk for Writing teaching.  Of the 7 children targeted to not reach Age Related Standard in Speaking, none are PP. 88% of children are targeted to attain at least Age Related Expectations with 45% targeted to receive above Age Related Expectations.  **April 2017**  7 children did not pass the language link assessment in September. 6 have now passed (86%) as a result of high level intervention. The one child who did not pass has severe delay with language skills and an EHC Plan in place. She is not PP.  From looking at trends over the past three years it is evident that the high quality language intervention programme impacts significantly.  For 2014-2015 – 10 children received language intervention (2 PP children)   * Of the 9 children who did not pass initially, a total of 8 passed the retest later in the year, a percentage of 88.9% * Two of the 9 children were pupil premium children, one of these passed the retest (with a diagnosis of Autism) and the second did not. The second child now has intensive speech and language support from therapists. It is worth noting that from their entrance assessments in listening and attention, speaking and listening both of these children made rapid progress to the end of the year.   For 2015-2016 – 14 children received language intervention (4 PP children)   * The one child who did not pass the initial test went on to make rapid progress and achieve an expected level in Listening and Attention, Understanding and Speaking. * Of these 14 children, 12 achieved the expected standard in listening and attention, understanding and speaking at the end of the year. A percentage of 85.7% * Four of the 14 children were PP and three of these reached the expected standards in reading, writing and maths. The one child who did not continues to have intensive support for language development and had other contributing factors – suspected ADHD, lack of home support, no pre-school education.   **July 2017**  6 children of the 7 who failed the language link on entry to EYFS passed at the end of the year. The 1 child who did not pass has and EHC Plan for language development delay. | | | |
| B Higher rates of progress across KS2 for high attaining pupils eligible for PP  C Improve the attainment for pupils eligible for PP in reading and maths at the end of KS1. | CPD on providing stretch for high attaining pupils especially in maths.  Staff training on developing oracy for high attaining pupils in EYFS/KS1 and KS2 from English Lead and EYFS SLE | | High ability pupils eligible for PP are making less progress than other high attaining pupils from KS2 particularly in maths.  KS1 data shows that pupils eligible for PP are not attaining the expected standard in reading and maths. The school falls below the National data for PP children in these two subjects. The EEF toolkit promotes the following strategies for raising attainment in reading and maths:  Reading comprehension: Reading comprehension approaches to improving reading focus on learners’ understanding of the text. They teach a range of techniques that enable pupils to comprehend the meaning of what is written, such as inferring the meaning from context, summarising or identifying key points, using graphic or semantic organisers, developing questioning strategies, and monitoring their own comprehension and identifying difficulties themselves. | | | Course selected using evidence of effectiveness. (Maths mastery course for Maths lead)  Mike Askew Maths project for all staff (developing conceptual understanding of maths across the whole school)  Monitoring and observations of mathematics in Term 3 by the leadership team with a focus on high ability children.  Each teacher to observe the Maths leads in class (peer observations) | | Maths leads  Leadership team  English Lead | **Jan 2017**  B – Using the STAR assessment standardised score we can determine that the PP children are making better rates of progress in maths compared to non PP children. At the end of KS2 in Term 2 the PP children are making more progress (using STAR assessment data) than non PP children.  Within the Year 5 classes there is a more significant gap in the attainment of the PP children against non PP and this is being addressed through intervention and specific support. These children are also making a slower rate of progress in maths. In Year 3 and 4 the attainment gap using the STAR assessment data is marginal and progress for all PP children is better for non PP children in all classes except one. For this specific class there is a significant overlap of children who receive the grant but who are also on the SEND register for specific learning needs.  **April 2017**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | MATHS | Non | PP | | HEDGE | 65% | 59% | | RABB. | 64% | 48% | | KANG. | 80% | 82% | | KOAL. | 75% | 55% | | JAGU. | 66% | 60% | | WOLV. | 68% | 71% | | ARMA. | 60% | 52% | | GIRA. | 60% | 56% | | MEER. | 53% | 44% | | MONK. | 54% | 44% | | EAGL. | 65% | 72% | | RHIN. | 56% | 51% |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | WRITING | Non | PP | | HEDG. | 60% | 50% | | RABB. | 53% | 45% | | KANG. | 54% | 56% | | KOAL. | 52% | 35% | | JAGU. | 72% | 66% | | WOLV. | 75% | 60% | | ARMA. | 78% | 80% | | GIRA. | 83% | 79% | | MEER. | 78% | 70% | | MONK. | 72% | 46% | | EAGL. | 78% | 75% | | RHIN. | 79% | 65% |   This table shows the attainment of our school PP children against non PP children. Percentages indicated the amount of school being attained at band 2 plus. 80% of these skills would be equivalent to expected standard.  The following should be noted:  **Hedgehogs**: x2 PP pupils. One child has had severe disruption to home life. No pre-school education. Pupil has made rapid progress from baseline in EYFS and her attainment gap is closing in all areas; cross-reference to high level of intervention.  **Rabbits**: x7 PP children. X2 pupils are on the SEN register, one for cognition & learning difficulties and one for severe global learning delay (additionally no pre-school education). These children engage in a huge variety of intervention. X1 pupil is EAL, started in EYFS with no English but attained a GLD at the end of EYFS.  **Koalas**: x4 PP pupils. X1 suffered severe neglect and failure to thrive – significant gains can be seen in social, emotional and mental health. X1 child has autism and this affects his language skills and intervention is in place across all areas of the curriculum.  **Armadillos**: x8 pupils. X1 child has had significant absence this term due to an operation/hospital stay. X1 pupil has an unsettled home-life which can affect attendance (one parent has a mental health illness and one parent had a serious medical illness).  **Meerkats**: x5 pupils. X1 child has had severe disruption to home life.. No pre-school education. Child also has diagnosed severe dyslexia – he has personalised learning and interventions.  **Monkeys**: x5 pupils. X1 pupil has an EHC Plan for communication and interaction difficulties – autism. Child finds accessing the STAR computer adaptive tests challenging in light of the timer. Problem solving and reasoning is particularly difficult for the child due to her literal thinking.  **July 2017**  End of KS2 data shows high attaining PP children attained greater depth in reading, writing maths. (top 25% of the country for progress)  C  See above analysis. – awaiting SATS results. Above predictions in Section 2 remain the same.  C – In maths the PP children at the end of KS1 are making significantly faster rates of progress than non PP (according to the STAR assessment data) in reading and maths. There is a slight gap in the attainment in maths within one class however, the specific child has a range of learning needs as well as receiving the grant. In reading the attainment gap (using STAR assessment data) is minimal between PP and non PP | | | |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | C  July 2017  Combined reading, writing and maths 44% of PP children reached expected standards in r,w and m compared to 60% national all pupils.  Reading 78% reached the expected standard (National 74% all pupils)  Writing 44% reached the expected standard (National 65% all pupils)  Maths 78% reached the expected standard (National 73%).  Writing will now become a focus area.  £9000 | | | |
| 1. **Targeted support** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | | | **How will you ensure it is implemented well?** | | **Staff lead** | **When will you review implementation?** | | |
| Improve oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception class.  Improve the attainment for pupils eligible for PP in reading and maths at the end of KS1. | Small group provision of Nuffield Early Language Intervention for children in the EYFS and KS1 | | The Nuffield Early Language Intervention is an evidence-based oral language intervention for children in nursery and reception who show weakness in their oral language skills and who are therefore at risk of experiencing difficulty with reading. It is delivered over 30 weeks by teaching assistants in groups of 3-4 children.  After 30 weeks, the children who had received the intervention had improved expressive language skills, including the use of vocabulary and grammar. Their letter-sound knowledge and spelling also improved, indicating the foundations of phonics were in place.  There will be a higher proportion of teaching assistants across the school; specifically in KS2 with each Year 3 and 4 classes having full time TA’s to ensure that interventions take place.  After six months, the children in the intervention group had maintained their progress and actually outperformed the waiting control group on reading comprehension. It is proven to raise attainment in reading by 4 months.  Some of the pupils need targeted support to catch up especially if they have not been to preschool. | | | | Organise intervention and staffing so that it can be ran for 3 x20 mins a group. | | Reception class teachers and teaching assistants | **Jan 2017** – Any child who did not pass the Language Link screening on entry to Reception are partaking in high impact language intervention following the individual programmes within the package.  A strong focus on oracy within the Reception class is linked to the teaching of English and through the use of Talk for Writing teaching.  Of the 7 children targeted to not reach Age Related Standard in Speaking, none are PP. 88% of children are targeted to attain at least Age Related Expectations with 45% targeted to receive above Age Related Expectations.  **April 2017**  7 children did not pass the language link assessment in September. 6 have now passed (86%) as a result of high level intervention. The one child who did not pass has severe delay with language skills and an EHC Plan in place. She is not PP.  From looking at trends over the past three years it is evident that the high quality language intervention programme impacts significantly.  For 2014-2015 – 10 children received language intervention (2 PP children)   * Of the 9 children who did not pass initially, a total of 8 passed the retest later in the year, a percentage of 88.9% * Two of the 9 children were pupil premium children, one of these passed the retest (with a diagnosis of Autism) and the second did not. The second child now has intensive speech and language support from therapists. It is worth noting that from their entrance assessments in listening and attention, speaking and listening both of these children made rapid progress to the end of the year.   For 2015-2016 – 14 children received language intervention (4 PP children)   * The one child who did not pass the initial test went on to make rapid progress and achieve an expected level in Listening and Attention, Understanding and Speaking. * Of these 14 children, 12 achieved the expected standard in listening and attention, understanding and speaking at the end of the year. A percentage of 85.7% * Four of the 14 children were PP and three of these reached the expected standards in reading, writing and maths. The one child who did not continues to have intensive support for language development and had other contributing factors – suspected ADHD, lack of home support, no pre school education.   Above predictions in Section 2 remain the same.  **July 2017**  End of KS2 data shows high attaining PP children attained greater depth in reading, writing maths. (top 25% of the country for progress) | | |
| Higher rates of progress across KS2 for high attaining pupil eligible for PP. | Weekly small group sessions in reading, writing and maths for high attaining PP, who receive the grant, in addition to standard lessons, in Years 3,4,5 and 6.  Daily reading session with class teacher 1-1 across KS2  Weekly tutoring sessions with an experienced teacher in reading, writing and maths. | | We will provide extra support in 1-2 and 1-4 tutoring sessions to maintain high attainment. These sessions will take a maths focus to begin with before moving to Reading.  The staff member used is high qualified, shown to be effective, as discussed in reliable evidence sources such as Visible Learning by John Hattie and the EEF Toolkit.  There will be a higher proportion of teaching assistants across the school; specifically in KS2 with each Year 3 and 4 classes having full time TA’s to ensure that interventions take place.    Each child receiving the grant will read daily with the class teacher across the whole of KS2. | | | | Extra teaching time and preparation time paid out of PP budget.  Impact overseen by deputy head and class teachers.  Engage with parents and pupils before intervention begins to address any concerns or questions.  Provide transport for those children who require it to attend. | | Deputy Head | Jan 2017  Using the STAR assessment standardised score we can determine that the PP children are making better rates of progress in maths compared to non PP children. At the end of KS2 in Term 2 the PP children are making more progress (using STAR assessment data) than non PP children.  Within the Year 5 classes there is a more significant gap in the attainment of the PP children against non PP and this is being addressed through intervention and specific support. These children are also making a slower rate of progress in maths. In Year 3 and 4 the attainment gap using the STAR assessment data is marginal and progress for all PP children is better for non PP children in all classes except one. For this specific class there is a significant overlap of children who receive the grant but who are also on the SEND register for specific learning needs.  The impact of the after school maths tutoring for PP children is significant. There is now no attainment gap in maths between these children and non PP children when using the standardised scores from STAR assessment.  PP children – Term 1 102.3 Term 3 111.9  Non PP children – Term 1 108.8 Term 3 111.8  April 2017  Above predictions in Section 2 remain the same.  **July 2017**  End of KS2 data shows high attaining PP children attained greater depth in reading, writing maths. (top 25% of the country for progress) | | |
| C Improve the attainment for pupils eligible for PP in reading and maths at the end of KS1. | * 1. Reading every day for each child in EYFS, Year 1 and Year 2.   Additional phonics sessions 3 times a week for all children receiving the grant. (in groups no larger than 1-4)  Additional maths learning for EYFS, Year 1 and 2 for children receiving the grant. (in groups no larger than 1-4) | | Phonics approaches have been consistently found to be effective in supporting younger readers to master the basics of reading, with an average impact of an additional four months’ progress. Research suggests that phonics is particularly beneficial for younger learners (4-7 year olds) as they begin to read. Teaching phonics is more effective on average than other approaches to early reading (such as whole language or alphabetic approaches), though it should be emphasised that effective phonics techniques are usually embedded in a rich literacy environment for early readers and are only one part of a successful literacy strategy.  Overall, the pattern is that small group tuition is effective and, as a rule of thumb, the smaller the group the better, e.g. groups of two have slightly higher impact than groups of three, but slightly lower impact compared to one to one tuition. Some studies suggest that greater feedback from the teacher, more sustained engagement in smaller groups, or work which is more closely matched to learners’ needs explains this impact. Once group size increases above six or seven there is a noticeable reduction in effectiveness. | | | | Extra teaching time and preparation time paid out of PP budget.  Impact overseen by deputy head and class teachers.  Engage with parents and pupils before intervention begins to address any concerns or questions.  Ensure group size remain small for maximum impact | | Class teachers  Teaching assistants  Deputy head teacher | January 2017  In maths the PP children at the end of KS1 are making significantly faster rates of progress than non PP (according to the STAR assessment data) in reading and maths. There is a slight gap in the attainment in maths within one class however, the specific child has a range of learning needs as well as receiving the grant. In reading the attainment gap (using STAR assessment data) is minimal between PP and non PP.  April/May - Above predictions in Section 2 remain the same.  July 2017  Combined reading, writing and maths 44% of PP children reached expected standards in r,w and m compared to 60% national all pupils.  Reading 78% reached the expected standard (National 74% all pupils)  Writing 44% reached the expected standard (National 65% all pupils)  Maths 78% reached the expected standard (National 73%).  Writing will now become a focus area. | | |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | £37,100 + TA | | |
| 1. **Other approaches** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | | **Chosen action / approach** | | | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | | | **How will you ensure it is implemented well?** | | **Staff lead** | **When will you review implementation?** |
| D Increased attendance rates  E Increased support and participation for pupils eligible for PP at home from parents. | | - | | | Attainment for children cannot improve if they are not attending school. NfER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step.  Limited opportunities outside of school mean that some children do not experience a wide range of activities. Providing these in school will raise attendance, and therefore attainment.  Although parental involvement is consistently associated with pupils’ success at school, the evidence about how to increase involvement to improve attainment is mixed and much less conclusive. This is particularly the case for disadvantaged families. There is some evidence that supporting parents with their first child will have benefits for siblings. However, there are also examples where combining parental engagement strategies with other interventions, such as extended early years provision, has not been associated with any additional educational benefit. This suggests that developing effective parental involvement to improve their children’s attainment is challenging and will need careful monitoring and evaluation.  Developing effective parental involvement to improve their children’s attainment is challenging.  The impact of parents’ aspirations is also important, though there is insufficient evidence to show that changing parents’ aspirations will raise their children’s aspirations and achievement over the longer term. Two recent meta-analyses from the USA suggested that increasing parental involvement in primary and secondary schools had on average 2-3 months positive impact. | | | | Thorough analysis of performance of FLO in raising the attendance of these pupils.  Every child will have attended two clubs.  The head teacher, FLO and deputy head teacher will work collaboratively together to ensure that new provision and standard school processes work smoothly together. | | Deputy Head teacher  Family Liaison Officer  All staff – provision of clubs. | Jan 2017  Term 1 attendance for PP – 96.5  ALL – 96.3  As of 7.2.17  PP – 96.6  Non PP – 97.6  May 2017    PP  -  96.3%  ALL - 96.9%  Non PP - 97.0%  Minimal gap between PP and non due to support from FLO with specific target families  .  July 2017  PP – 96.4%  ALL – 96.9% |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | | | **£28,100** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Review of expenditure** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Previous Academic Year** | | **2015-2016** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Quality of teaching for all** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **Estimated impact:** Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | | | | **Lessons learned**  (and whether you will continue with this approach) | **Cost** | | | |
| Children eligible for the grant will attain similarly to those not eligible in reading, writing and maths. | Higher proportion of teaching assistants across the school supporting learning. | EYFS:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Pupils | % attaining a GLD | | Eligible for PP (4 pupils) | 50% | | No eligible for PP (56 pupils) | 87.7 |   See additional notes for more data.  Medium – Whilst some groups of pupils eligible for PP out attain non eligible children there are some gaps in the percentages reaching age-related expectations in reading, writing and maths. It needs to be remembered that in some year groups there are only 6 children eligible for PP and therefore the percentage for 1 pupil is significantly greater. Areas of focus for the next academic year and funding include the following: EYFS for a Good Level of Development, Reading in Years 2 and 3 for specific children, writing in Years 2, 3 and 6 and Maths in Year 3. The end of KS1 data was not strong for children receiving PP and this now needs to be focused on in Year 3. | | | | Intervention needs to be personalised and specific for these children, with groups no bigger than 1-4. Two of the specific children need more personalised, tapered differentiation. | Cost of a teaching assistant – full time:  £14,134  Cost of a teaching assistant for afternoons only in KS2: £5653  **TOTAL £17,837** | | | |
| 1. **Targeted support** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | | | **Estimated impact:** Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | **Lessons learned**  (and whether you will continue with this approach) | | | **Cost** | | |
| Children eligible for the grant will attain similarly to those not eligible in reading, writing and maths. | Focused intervention by class teachers and teaching assistants.  Daily reading for every child eligible.  Senior leaders to support PP children every morning in small group teaching for maths, reading and writing.  Tutoring afterschool with a highly experienced teacher in Years 5 and 6. | | | See above notes and analysis of data. | Intervention size needs to be reduced for maximum impact from 1-6 to 1-4 for these children. | | | 36 pupils in intervention at cost of £351 pp for the year (3x20 mins every week) **£12,356**  Daily reading 57 pupils at cost of £48 each **£2750**  7 Year 6 pupils will be taught reading, writing and maths every morning for 3 terms. **£12, 900**  39 weeks, 2 hours tutoring at £30 an hour **£2340**  **3** | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | | **£30,346** | | |
| 1. **Other approaches** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | | **Estimated impact:** Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | | **Lessons learned**  (and whether you will continue with this approach) | | | | | **Cost** |
| Pupils eligible for the grant will have wider curriculum opportunities. | Every pupil eligible will attend 2 after school clubs throughout the year.  Educations trips for children will be funded to ensure attendance.  Specific learning resources such as laptops will be purchased for specific children. | | High – Every pupil receiving the grant attended 2 after school clubs throughout the year, ran by teachers.  High - All pupils receiving the grant attended all school trips when they could not pay to go themselves. | | In future we will ask parents for a contribution towards school trips and educational visits to keep costs lower for us.  The after school clubs were a huge success. Attendance was better when families with many children could collect all the children at the same time. This was a result of effective communication between the class teachers to ensure that these children were prioritised with clubs. | | | | 57 pupils at £25 each **£1425**  28 pupils at £30 each **£840**  3 pupils at £300 each **£900** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The attendance and of all pupils eligible for the grant will improve.  Increased support and participation for pupils eligible for PP at home from parents | The Family Liaison Officer will work closely with families providing support and encouraging better attendance.  Learning support and classes led by the FLO for parents. Workshops on teaching phonics and maths. Encourage reading skills at home. | Medium – Attendance was 94.2% for the academic year and the whole school was 96.6% - need to further improve this so they are in line with one another. | Daily calls to parents are necessary and collection by staff could be required. | **£25000**  **TOTAL: £27400** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Additional detail** |
| In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to support the sections above.  **Reading:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Year Group** | **Number of pupils** | **Eligibility for PP** | **% at Age Related Expectations** | | 1 | 7 pupils | Yes | 85.7% | | 53 pupils | No | 88.7% | | 2 | 9 pupils | Yes | 56% | | 51 pupils | No | 84% | | 3 | 16 pupils | Yes | 93.8% | | 44 pupils | No | 97.7% | | 4 | 9 pupils | Yes | 78% | | 51 pupils | No | 98% | | 5 | 8 pupils | Yes | 100% | | 52 pupils | No | 98% | | 6 | 9 pupils | Yes | 100% | | 51 pupils | No | 92% |   **Writing:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Year Group** | **Number of pupils** | **Eligibility for PP** | **% at Age Related Expectations** | | 1 | 7 pupils | Yes | 57% | | 53 pupils | No | 75% | | 2 | 9 pupils | Yes | 56% | | 51 pupils | No | 78% | | 3 | 16 pupils | Yes | 81% | | 44 pupils | No | 81% | | 4 | 9 pupils | Yes | 77.8% | | 51 pupils | No | 90% | | 5 | 8 pupils | Yes | 62.5% | | 52 pupils | No | 82.7% | | 6 | 9 pupils | Yes | 67% | | 51 pupils | No | 94% |   **Maths:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Year Group** | **Number of pupils** | **Eligibility for PP** | **% at Age Related Expectations** | | 1 | 7 pupils | Yes | 100% | | 53 pupils | No | 90.5% | | 2 | 9 pupils | Yes | 56% | | 51 pupils | No | 80% | | 3 | 16 pupils | Yes | 82% | | 44 pupils | No | 88.6% | | 4 | 9 pupils | Yes | 88.9% | | 51 pupils | No | 98% | | 5 | 8 pupils | Yes | 87.5% | | 52 pupils | No | 78.9% | | 6 | 9 pupils | Yes | 89% | | 51 pupils | No | 98% | |