

Pupil premium strategy / self-evaluation 2017-18

1. Summary information					
School	Colmers Farm Primary School				
Academic Year	2018-19	Total PP budget	299,060	Date of most recent PP Review	Jan 19
Total number of pupils	403	Number of pupils eligible for PP	223	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Feb 19

2. Current attainment			
KS2		<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths		24	48 (2017)
% achieving expected standard or above in reading		45	60 (2017)
% achieving expected standard or above in writing		55	66 (2017)
% achieving expected standard or above in maths		42	63 (2017)

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)

Academic barriers *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)*

A.	Most children entering reception are significantly below national expectations (Reading 91.4%, Writing 34.5% and Maths 82.5%) and need to make accelerated progress throughout school to meet KS2 age related expectations.
B.	Language development and speech on entry into Reception are well below national averages for most pupils (Speaking Sep 2018 – 92% of pupil premium children Vs 73% non pupil premium children), particularly those eligible for PP, and this is impacting on understanding, reading and writing throughout school, and phonics in KS1. Vocabulary (Sch 54% v Nat 69% Reading Test; Sch 74% vs Nat 82% GPS test) and Spelling (Sch 51% v Nat 65%) was also a limiting judgement in our 2017 KS2 writing outcomes and although improving, is still hindering the progress of some children.
C.	High levels of pupil premium children start school with low prior attainment (Sep 2018 -100%)) and this is impacting on the attainment at the end of each key stage. Poor parental involvement and a lack of reading, writing and maths skills themselves prevent support at home for most children eligible for pupil premium.

Additional barriers *(including issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)*

D.	High numbers of vulnerable children, including high level of safeguarding and behaviour needs (69 children- Sep 2018) that are addressed through child protection plans and early help and family support impacts on the children's emotional well-being and this can hinder their academic progress in school. The attendance of pupil premium children is lower by 2% ,and 73% of persistent absentees are Pupil Premium children. 29.5% of Pupil Premium children are Persistent Absentees, compared to 9% of non Pupil Premium children, which is impacting on their learning as they are missing days or parts of days and it is causing them to fall behind their peers.
-----------	--

4. Intended outcomes (specific outcomes and how they will be measured)		Success criteria
A.	Quality first teaching ensures high focused lesson design with challenging objectives and high demands of pupil involvement and engagement with their learning.	Good or outstanding teaching is improved from 47% (Dec 18) to 75% (July 19). Attainment RWM increased for each year group from Dec 18 baseline
B.	All children eligible for pupil premium close the attainment gap with their non-disadvantaged peers in mathematics across the whole school by a minimum of 10%. (December 2018 EYFS -8%, Year 1 17%, Year 2 41%, Year 3 12%, Year 4 42%, Year 5 26%, Year 6 24%). All children eligible for pupil premium close the attainment gap with their non-disadvantaged peers in reading across the whole school by a minimum of 10%. (December 2018 EYFS -0%, Year 1 14%, Year 2 16%, Year 3 14%, Year 4 23%, Year 27%, Year 6 16%). All children eligible for pupil premium close the attainment gap with their non-disadvantaged peers in writing across the whole school by a minimum of 10%. (December 2018 EYFS -20%, Year 1 13%, Year 2 13%, Year 3 -6%, Year 4 22%, Year 5 12%, Year 6 13%).	Attainment gap reduced between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils in RWM from December 2018 to July 2019.
C.	All children eligible for pupil premium need to make at least expected progress from their different starting points to diminish the difference when compared to their non-pupil premium counterparts. This will mean pupil premium children making accelerated progress will need to be above the national average for non-pupil premium children, as measured by end of key stage assessments.	All PP children make accelerated progress from their December 2018 starting point.
D.	The number of children working at greater depth at the end of each key stage improves, and we diminish the difference between disadvantaged pupils and other. Those PP children exceeding at EYFS or working at greater depth in KS1 make at least expected rates of progress to match the progress of their peers. This will be measured across all year groups using standardised tests, teacher assessment, moderation across the consortium schools and teaching alliance schools and end of key stage data. <i>PP children who were 3 in EYFS to GDS year 2 (Dec 18 R 0% W 0% M 0%) GDS Year 2 to GDS Year 6 (Dec 18- R 17% W 0% M 0%)</i>	A year on year improvement of PP children exceeding national expectations in all subjects and key stages, and pupils eligible for PP identified as HA make the same progress as other non-pupil premium children.
E.	We close the gap for the attendance from 1.8% in July 2018 to less than 1% in July 2019 of children eligible for PP, showing an improvement to be in line with non PP children and national expectations, as measured by year on year attendance measures.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP from 70 children 2017-2018 to 40 in 2018-2019, and attendance improves for PP children <i>from 92% to 94%</i>
F.	To develop parental engagement in order to reduce the attainment gap of Pupil Premium Children in RWM. To support early language development in EYFS and KS1 in order to impact on understanding in reading and writing via bespoke parent workshops.	Children make accelerated progress in EYFS 'Speaking' from baseline assessment of 92% PP children only entering significantly below expected standard. Gap between PP children and non-PP children in phonics screening test is no greater than the 2018 gap of 9%.

5. Review of expenditure																															
Previous Academic Year			£322,971																												
i. Quality of teaching for all																															
Intended outcome	Action(s)	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																								
Improves outcomes for children by the end of EYFS, Year 2 and Year 6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>An additional teacher in Years 2, 6 and Early Years to improve outcomes in reading, writing and maths</i> <i>Attainment of PPP rises to diminish the difference with non-PPP.</i> <i>All teacher/TA performance management objectives linked to PPP</i> 	EYFS <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Year</th> <th>PP</th> <th>non</th> <th>Year</th> <th>PP</th> <th>Non</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td rowspan="3">2017</td> <td>43%</td> <td>65%</td> <td rowspan="3">2018</td> <td>73%</td> <td>74%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>43%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>74%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maths</td> <td>45%</td> <td>80%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>73%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>EYFS Attainment in year raised. Attainment gaps diminishing between pp and non pp pupils.</p>				Year	PP	non	Year	PP	Non	Reading	2017	43%	65%	2018	73%	74%	Writing	43%	60%	67%	74%	Maths	45%	80%	47%	73%	<p>The 3rd teacher in EYFS was effective in raising standards for both PP and non PP children and the attainment gap was reduced considerably. As a result, the third teacher in EYFS will continue next academic year.</p>		£76,962 £2000 PM Total £78692 LM £32,242
			Year	PP	non	Year	PP	Non																							
		Reading	2017	43%	65%	2018	73%	74%																							
		Writing		43%	60%		67%	74%																							
Maths	45%	80%		47%	73%																										
KS1 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Year</th> <th>PP</th> <th>non</th> <th>Year</th> <th>PP</th> <th>Non</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td rowspan="3">2017</td> <td>44%</td> <td>69%</td> <td rowspan="3">2018</td> <td>57%</td> <td>59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>29%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maths</td> <td>35%</td> <td>77%</td> <td>63%</td> <td>82%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Attainment raised from 2017. Gap between PP and Non-PP reduced from 2017.</p>				Year	PP	non	Year	PP	Non	Reading	2017	44%	69%	2018	57%	59%	Writing	29%	38%	40%	55%	Maths	35%	77%	63%	82%	<p>The 3rd teacher in year 2 also had a positive impact on the attainment of both PP and non-PP and the attainment gap was considerably reduced.</p>				
	Year	PP	non	Year	PP	Non																									
Reading	2017	44%	69%	2018	57%	59%																									
Writing		29%	38%		40%	55%																									
Maths		35%	77%		63%	82%																									
Year 6 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Year</th> <th>PP</th> <th>non</th> <th>Year</th> <th>PP</th> <th>Non</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td rowspan="3">2017</td> <td>61%</td> <td>64%</td> <td rowspan="3">2018</td> <td>45%</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>67%</td> <td>77%</td> <td>55%</td> <td>84%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maths</td> <td>39%</td> <td>45%</td> <td>42%</td> <td>84%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Attainment raised from 2017. Gap between PP and Non-PP reduced from 2017.</p>				Year	PP	non	Year	PP	Non	Reading	2017	61%	64%	2018	45%	68%	Writing	67%	77%	55%	84%	Maths	39%	45%	42%	84%	<p>Year 6 had high mobility in terms of staffing: 2 teachers left in December 2017. Replaced by 2 supply teachers in January 2018 thus losing continuity and year 6 expertise. As a result, it is essential that key staff, with year 6 expertise, as are kept as consistent as possible. In Set 18 AHT with Year 6 expertise will be the 3rd teacher in Year 6.</p>				
	Year	PP	non	Year	PP	Non																									
Reading	2017	61%	64%	2018	45%	68%																									
Writing		67%	77%		55%	84%																									
Maths		39%	45%		42%	84%																									
<p>Attainment raised only in maths for both PP and non PP children.</p>			<p>Performance Management targets that were specific to PP children had desired impact on whole school achievement in maths and reading. Performance management targets to include PP specific accountability in 2018-19.</p>																												

<p>Targeted support /interventions meet their individual needs and improve behaviour resulting in less exclusions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>COBS – behaviour support to provide advice for teachers on strategies for improving targeted pupils’ progress.</i> • • <i>Behaviour choice supported with small group/ individual support. Behaviour through focused groups.</i> • <i>Play therapist to support with behaviour choices</i> • <i>Malachi family support provides early intervention and support to prevent exclusions and the number of exclusions for individual pupils reduced.</i> • Self-confidence and participation/ motivation increased for targeted pupils • <i>Team Teach training</i> 	<p>Exclusions reduced. Fixed term exclusions 2016-17 = 76 2017-18= 60 Permanent Exclusions 2016 -17 = 5 2017-18 = 4</p> <p>Number of serious incidents 2016-17 = 108 2017-18= 151 Number of assaults 2016-17 = 55 2017-18= 52</p> <p>Parent view questionnaire in July 2018 show that parents gave positive feedback about the school.</p>	<p>COBS support was useful in terms of providing support to individual teachers and leaders in the management and strategies to deal with certain types of behaviour.</p> <p>The school has taken on previously excluded children from other schools</p> <p>Malachi support has helped identify early support needed and exclusions reduced for targeted children. Feedback from parents and children report that they have felt that the emotional support has helped them find strategies to understand and manage certain behaviours and emotions.</p> <p>2 Managed moves has helped reduce permanent exclusions and the school will continue to use the support of local schools to avoid permanent exclusions.</p> <p>Learning mentor has enabled the DHT to focus more on whole school improvement.</p> <p>The leaning mentor has also enabled the school to work more closely with families who need targeted support.</p>	<p>£4370 COBS</p> <p>£39075 (pastoral)</p> <p>£40000 play therapist</p> <p>£17,750 Malachi</p> <p>Total £133,437</p>
--	---	---	---	--

<p>Targeted support /interventions improve outcomes for all PP pupils</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support in class for identified year groups from trained Teaching Assistants, developing reading, writing and maths interventions. • Catch up reading sessions at playtimes • Reading project work, 15 mins at lunchtime. • Educational Psychologist Provides support / educational advice for individual PP • Speech and • Language Service Provides support / educational advice for individual PPP • Parent link worker • Challenge staff meeting • Easter school • Additional tuition provided for Year 6 pupils prior to SATs. Improved outcomes for PPP in Year 6. • Providing specific Sound Training (word Segmentation • Specific CPD -Thrive training/CP/T4Wr • Teacher Coach providing additional support/ strategies for improving pupil progress and adding challenge to teachers' expectations and lesson planning. 	<p>Whole school attainment of PP children in Reading and Maths raised. Whole school ave point score of PIRA in 2017 was 94.57 in 2018 = 99.9. In maths, PUMA in 2017 was 98.95 and 2018= 104.1</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="808 220 1514 571"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">PIRA Year group Breakdown</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year group</th> <th>Ave attainment PP</th> <th>Ave attainment non PP</th> <th>Ave Progress PP (sum 17-sum18)</th> <th>Ave Progress Non PP (sum 17-sum18)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 1</td> <td>102.1</td> <td>106.2</td> <td>6.9</td> <td>11.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2</td> <td>96.7</td> <td>107.2</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>6.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3</td> <td>95.1</td> <td>105.8</td> <td>-2.5</td> <td>0.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4</td> <td>91.9</td> <td>98</td> <td>4.6</td> <td>-0.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 5</td> <td>94.9</td> <td>100.5</td> <td>6.1</td> <td>3.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6</td> <td>99.7</td> <td>100.5</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>5.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Pupils premium pupils have made less progress than other pupils (-0.5). This is in line with the difference made between disadvantaged and other pupils nationally. PP children in Year 3 made below expected progress and significantly less progress than non - pp pupils in Reading. Non PP children attain better in Reading in all year groups. The difference between the groups is largest in Years 1,2 and 3 and smallest in Year 6 and Year 2</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="808 778 1514 1137"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">PUMA Year group Breakdown</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year group</th> <th>Ave attainment PP</th> <th>Ave attainment non PP</th> <th>Ave Progress PP (sum 17-sum18)</th> <th>Ave Progress Non PP (sum 17-sum18)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 1</td> <td>105.7</td> <td>107.5</td> <td>7.9</td> <td>7.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2</td> <td>94.2</td> <td>100.5</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>-6.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3</td> <td>93.4</td> <td>100.8</td> <td>-3.1</td> <td>-3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4</td> <td>99.1</td> <td>105.1</td> <td>7.9</td> <td>3.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 5</td> <td>100.3</td> <td>106.7</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>4.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6</td> <td>98.9</td> <td>102.1</td> <td>3</td> <td>-1.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Pupils premium pupils have made more progress than other pupils (+3.9 SS). This is in contrast to the progress made between disadvantaged and other pupils nationally. PP children in Year 3 made below expected progress although other Non PP children attain better in Mathematics in all year groups. The difference between the groups is largest in Years 2 and 3 and smallest in Year 6 and Year 1. Pupils in Year 3 made the same progress in Maths.</p> <p>Teacher coach improved overall good / outstanding teaching from 17 % October 2017 to 60% in July 2018. High focus on Year 2 teachers which improved attainment.</p>	PIRA Year group Breakdown					Year group	Ave attainment PP	Ave attainment non PP	Ave Progress PP (sum 17-sum18)	Ave Progress Non PP (sum 17-sum18)	Year 1	102.1	106.2	6.9	11.6	Year 2	96.7	107.2	3.8	6.7	Year 3	95.1	105.8	-2.5	0.7	Year 4	91.9	98	4.6	-0.8	Year 5	94.9	100.5	6.1	3.9	Year 6	99.7	100.5	6.3	5.8	PUMA Year group Breakdown					Year group	Ave attainment PP	Ave attainment non PP	Ave Progress PP (sum 17-sum18)	Ave Progress Non PP (sum 17-sum18)	Year 1	105.7	107.5	7.9	7.4	Year 2	94.2	100.5	0.6	-6.2	Year 3	93.4	100.8	-3.1	-3	Year 4	99.1	105.1	7.9	3.2	Year 5	100.3	106.7	2.3	4.6	Year 6	98.9	102.1	3	-1.1	<p>Teacher coach to continue to work with specific staff required for development in 2018-19.</p> <p>All teachers and TAs had a PP maths specific target 2017-18 which has had a positive impact on the attainment and progress of PP children.</p> <p>Reading interventions, have had not had the desired impact on reading for PP children.</p> <p>Extra tuition for Pupil premium children has impacted on year 6 in terms of closing the attainment and progress gap between PP and Non PP children compared to previous year.</p> <p>Educational psychologist and Speech and Language therapist have helped teachers and teaching assistants provide specific assistance to PP children with specific language and behavioural needs.</p> <p>Pupil progress meetings have risen awareness to teachers of the PP children in specific year groups and classes with regards to their progress and attainment throughout the year.</p> <p>Provision Tracker will also be used as a means of recording all class based interventions to show and track the expenditure and support for all pupil premium children.</p>	<p>£84,811.96 (TA)</p> <p>£4369 (ED PSy)</p> <p>£6000 S+L</p> <p>£5000 tuition</p> <p>£6000 Easter School</p> <p>£300 challenge</p> <p>£2500 sound training</p> <p>£3000 CPD</p> <p>£11500 teacher coach</p> <p>Total</p> <p>£123,480</p>
PIRA Year group Breakdown																																																																																				
Year group	Ave attainment PP	Ave attainment non PP	Ave Progress PP (sum 17-sum18)	Ave Progress Non PP (sum 17-sum18)																																																																																
Year 1	102.1	106.2	6.9	11.6																																																																																
Year 2	96.7	107.2	3.8	6.7																																																																																
Year 3	95.1	105.8	-2.5	0.7																																																																																
Year 4	91.9	98	4.6	-0.8																																																																																
Year 5	94.9	100.5	6.1	3.9																																																																																
Year 6	99.7	100.5	6.3	5.8																																																																																
PUMA Year group Breakdown																																																																																				
Year group	Ave attainment PP	Ave attainment non PP	Ave Progress PP (sum 17-sum18)	Ave Progress Non PP (sum 17-sum18)																																																																																
Year 1	105.7	107.5	7.9	7.4																																																																																
Year 2	94.2	100.5	0.6	-6.2																																																																																
Year 3	93.4	100.8	-3.1	-3																																																																																
Year 4	99.1	105.1	7.9	3.2																																																																																
Year 5	100.3	106.7	2.3	4.6																																																																																
Year 6	98.9	102.1	3	-1.1																																																																																

ii. Other approaches				
Intended outcome	Action	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
The safeguarding needs are met and improve outcomes for children	<i>Home structures improved enabling homework to be completed. PPP are safer. My Concern enables all staff to clearly log CP concerns more effectively.</i>	We met the Safeguarding needs of our school and were able to support more families and identify concerns earlier. The pastoral team provided emotional and welfare support for vulnerable families, particularly those with challenging circumstances. This included the provision of counselling support through Play Therapy and Malachi. As a result, home-school links were strengthened and parents have been provided with a wide range of support including 1:1 and small group sessions and home visits. The counselling has addressed the health and wellbeing of identified children and has dealt with issues such as bereavement, behaviour concerns, medical issues, loss, separation and reluctance to come to school to name but a few. As we have a counsellor working within school, it has enabled both staff and parents to signpost children and have concerns dealt with imminently rather than having to wait for support. This in turn, has been replicated with Malachi.	Continue with My Concern	£1000 Team Teach £576 My Concern

<p>To improve attendance and punctuality</p>	<p>Breakfast Club Providing a healthy breakfast for those PPP who may not have breakfast in the morning at home. Staffed by 3 TAs per morning.</p>	<p>Children start the school day with proper sustenance, thus enabling them to be able to concentrate on learning.</p> <p>Pupil premium attendance figures:</p> <p>92.17 attendance 2017/2018 (From the schools MIS) compared to a national average of 94.6% for pupil premium pupils in 2017 and a national average of 96.0% for all pupils (2016/2017).</p> <p>Number of pupil premium children who attended breakfast club was</p> <p>Walking bus children were all PP.</p>	<p>Commitment from parents</p> <p>To improve attendance and punctuality, we had two systems in place - Spotlight & Fast Track, which made it difficult to track families already on Spotlight as it is a longer process. Having clear procedures with a shorter time frame has enabled early identification of those families with attendance issues. Punctuality for some families remains a concern, and as a result, meetings to involve Governors will be arranged as part of the monitoring process.</p> <p>Breakfast Club will continue as the provision is used regularly by children whose punctuality was a concern –this has now improved due to attending the breakfast club regularly. Also, breakfast is vital in promoting energy and concentration which is essential for learning to take place. However, low numbers at breakfast club for 2017-18 (ave 15 children per day). Better marketing approach needed to encourage more children to attend breakfast club.</p> <p>Children with 100% attendance were rewarded at the end of 2017/2018 and this will continue next year, and awards for shorter time have been instigated.</p>	<p>£4811 Breakfast club (from TA budget)</p>
---	--	--	---	--

<p>Broaden the children's curricular opportunities and purchase resources to support and engage the children's learning and teaching experiences</p>	<p>To subsidise travel costs for swimming</p> <p>To purchase 'Growing Gains' (science)</p> <p>KES Broadening horizons days</p>	<p>Number of children able to swim 25m by the end of KS2 was 0.</p> <p>Greater awareness of livings in the science curriculum. Depth of knowledge increased for Year 1 pupils. Hands on approach to learning about plants and " seed to supper" planting and cooking activities.</p> <p>Year 5 children raised aspirations form feedback from children</p>	<p>Growing gains to continue next year. Continue good links with KES schools.</p> <p>Swimming lessons for year 6 consisted of only 2 weeks (2 sessions) due to timetabling issues. The cohort did not attend swimming lessons through school in Year 5 and year 4.</p> <p>Swimming has been timetabled more rigidly for the forthcoming year to enable all year groups to go swimming.</p>	<p>£5000 growing gains</p> <p>£1750 swimming</p> <p>£1200 transport</p> <p>KES £965</p>
---	--	--	--	---

6. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2018-19

The three headings enable you to demonstrate how you are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies

i. Quality of teaching for all

Intended outcome	Action	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
<p>End of year results for all year groups demonstrate that the gap between PP children and Non-PP is reduced for both progress and attainment.</p> <p>All children will make at least expected progress from their starting points in December 2018</p> <p><i>(Intended Outcomes Ref: 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d)</i></p>	<p>Additional Leadership support (£35000)</p> <p>1:1 coaching support for identified middle leaders (£9500)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To stabilize the leadership capacity and develop leaders to facilitate substantial school improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop an effective leadership team of senior and middle leaders who can implement, monitor and evaluate high quality teaching throughout the school. 	LF/JD	See monitoring timetable
	<p>CPD for all staff: Talk4 Writing Maths No Problem SEMH training Behaviour training Feedback policy TA Intervention Training Read Write INC KS2 to KS3 transition support from Secondary School partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quality of teaching and learning is not yet consistently good. Develop teaching and learning, teacher subject knowledge, planning and assessment to ensure that all staff have a clear understanding of the learning expectations for all pupils. This will be achieved through quality coaching, mentoring and peer to peer support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pupil progress meetings half termly Work scrutiny Lesson observations Coaching reviews. Mid-point performance and end point performance management meetings Use of OTRACK to track and evaluate Use of PiRA, PUMA and GAPS tests to track individuals, groups and whole school progress in relation to standardised scores Sharing and embedding good practice Quality first teaching to ensure that all children's needs are met Planned monitoring cycle of teaching, book reviews, planning and assessments Continued whole school focus on improving reading, writing and maths. 		

Total budgeted cost

£46000

ii. Targeted support

Intended outcomes	Action	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
<p>Targeted support / interventions improve outcomes for pupils and meet their individual needs for PP pupils.</p> <p><i>(Intended Outcomes Ref: 4b, 4c, 4d)</i></p>	<p>Additional adults in Reception and Year 6 enable smaller teaching groups in Reception and Year 6 (£66,500)</p>	<p>EEF research on groups states "There is some evidence that pupils in disadvantaged areas in the UK benefit from classes of fewer than 20 pupils in primary schools...Overall, the evidence does not show particularly large or clear effects until class size is reduced substantially to fewer than 20 or even 15 pupils."</p> <p>Gap between PP and Non-PP children is significant in RWM across all year groups and this is impacting on KS2 standards.</p>	<p>Use of OTRACK and whole school monitoring to track and evaluate individual children and the impact of smaller group teaching.</p>	<p>JW/EW</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Half- termly reviews of assessments and tracking data • Regular reviews of interventions & these are discussed at pupil progress meetings half-termly • Weekly updates from Behaviour Support Assistants' • Weekly behaviour reports generated by My Concern to inform future training needs for all staff. • Half-termly evaluations of the speech and language therapy sessions
	<p>Speech & language therapist to work with identified pupils and train TAs to deliver language sessions (£2300)</p>	<p>Oral language interventions, consistently show positive benefits on learning, including oral language skills and reading comprehension.</p>	<p>Children are discharged from speech and language therapy as they have met their targets and TAs are providing S&L support to small groups in class.</p>	<p>LN</p>	
	<p>Introduce and Embed accelerated reader scheme (£7500)</p>	<p>Accelerated Reader is to be embedded further as research by the EEF and Durham University indicates that it produces particularly positive effects and increases the reading age of pupils by three additional months in just 22 weeks. The effect on low-income pupils was even greater, with their reading age improving by five additional months in the same amount of time. The effect on low-income pupils was even greater, with their reading age improving by five additional months in the same amount of time.</p>	<p>Accelerated Reader is embedded and targets the teaching of reading which improves the outcomes for all children in the PiRA reading tests.</p>	<p>AC</p>	
	<p>Leader for RWI to develop and lead phonics team across the school (£2,000)</p>	<p>Last year's improvement in phonics demonstrated a very good improvement. Refining the RWI provision will ensure that the phonics outcomes are above national average.</p>	<p>Daily release time for Phonics Lead to monitor, evaluate and review the teaching of RWI</p>	<p>JH</p>	
	<p>Behaviour Support Assistants employed to reduce disruption to learning through pupil's emotional needs. (£27500)</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that, on average, behaviour interventions can produce moderate improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviours.</p>	<p>Behaviour Support Assistants support children who are experiencing behavioural, social and emotional problems to ensure that it is not impacting on their learning.</p>	<p>JT</p>	
	<p>Behaviour Support Assistants employed to reduce behaviour incidents at Lunchtime. (£5000)</p>	<p>The rationale for employing Behaviour Support Assistants is to support children so that they can achieve well academically and develop ways to deal with behavioural, social and emotional issues.</p>	<p>Reduction in behaviour incidents and exclusions leads to better pupil outcomes</p>	<p>JT</p>	
	<p>High focus groups meet the needs of all children by skilfully addressing the children's learning needs following accurate assessments (£69060)</p>	<p>Children are in danger of not meeting Key Stage Targets based on prior attainment progress from starting points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timetabling for targeted support and focus groups • Use of OTRACK and whole school monitoring to track and evaluate individual children and the impact of the focus groups. • Effective delivery of FLS, Springboard, ELS, Precision Teaching and use of Provision Maps to track progress 	<p>LN</p>	
Total budgeted cost					£183835

iii. Other approaches					
Intended outcome	Action	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
The safeguarding and welfare needs of PP children are met and improve outcomes <i>(Intended Outcomes Ref: 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e)</i>	MyConcern – Electronic Safeguarding Software implemented whole school. (£2500)	We want to ensure that our safeguarding practices are embedded and highlight concerns early to support the wellbeing of children and their families. This will be done through the use of 'Myconcern' and all staff completing the online safeguarding training. The S175 audit will also identify areas of improvement for developing our safeguarding practices further.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff to be trained in safeguarding practices Monitor use of on 'MyConcern' effectively and the online training Regular safeguarding staff meetings to ensure safeguarding practices are embedded children and their families are met Ongoing - Fortnightly welfare meetings My Concern will help identify early interventions 	EW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes for vulnerable pupils tracked through OTrack Strategic planning meetings reviewing progress following feedback from all stakeholders
	Improve attendance (see attendance improvement plan) (£2500)	29.5% of PP children who are Persistent Absentees 73% of Persistent Absentees who are PP children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walking /driving bus to ensure all children have the provision to enable them to attend school Attendance rewards Fast Track to target persistent PPG pupils 	EW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fortnightly attendance meetings Outcomes for vulnerable pupils tracked through OTrack Attendance action plan
	Full time Pastoral Manager to provide early help and pastoral support. (£28500) 58% of chn who are PP with a further 10% LAC/PLAC or service children	High percentage of pupils who are on the vulnerable children's list are also eligible for pupil premium funding. These pupils require a triangulated approach to the Early Help and SEND services the school has access to.	<p>Pastoral manager to coordinate and review the triangulated approach in accordance to Right Help Right Time.</p> <p>Pastoral manager to attend training enabling them to deliver effective targeted support.</p>	JT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic planning meetings reviewing progress following feedback from all stakeholders Outcomes for vulnerable pupils tracked through OTrack

	Malachi Family counselling. (£7500) 67% of chn who are PP	Research has shown that improvements are more likely when approaches are embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional Through our pastoral support, Early Help assessments, CP & CIN plans, parenting workshops, counselling and family support through Malachi, we want to reduce barriers to learning and develop effective home school relationships with parents providing support to reduce the impact on their children's learning. EEF suggest that these interventions have a significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself. Development and training for staff.	Qualified specialists to deliver effected targeted support	JT/LN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic planning meetings reviewing progress following feedback from all stakeholders Outcomes for vulnerable pupils tracked through OTrack
	Malachi Child counselling. (£7500) 67% of chn who are PP		Qualified specialists to deliver effected targeted support	JT/LN	Strategic planning meetings reviewing progress following feedback from all stakeholders Outcomes for vulnerable pupils tracked through OTrack
	Play therapist (£6500) 78% of chn who are PP		Qualified specialists to deliver effected targeted support	JT/LN	Strategic planning meetings reviewing progress following feedback from all stakeholders Outcomes for vulnerable pupils tracked through OTrack
Total budgeted cost					£55,000

iv) Wider curriculum opportunities

Intended outcome	Action	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
-------------------------	---------------	--	--	-------------------	---

<p>Parental Engagement & Early Language Development.</p>	<p>Parent Workshops held to inform and provide training to parents in reading, writing and maths strategies used in class enabling them to support learning at home.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RWI • Talk 4 Writing • Maths Mastery • Times Table Rockstars/ Mathletics • Accelerated Reader 	<p>Limited parental knowledge and understanding of RWM strategies used in school impacts on the support children receive at home to further their learning.</p>	<p>Quality workshops delivered by subject specialists.</p>	<p>JH/SD AC/LF/ JD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation rates before and after workshops. • Parents Questionnaires • Attendance at parent showcases and assemblies. • Completion of homework • Outcomes for vulnerable pupils tracked through OTrack
<p>Total budgeted cost</p>					<p>£15,700</p>

7. Additional detail

Outcomes from Summer 2018

EYFS			
	2017		2018
	% of pupils achieving ELG		% of pupils achieving ELG
Disadvantaged Pupils ()	40%	Disadvantaged pupils (15)	53%
Other pupils ()	60%	Other pupils (42)	64%
Difference	-20%%	Difference	-11%
National gap (2017)	-9	National gap (2018)	nyp
13% increase on PPP achieving GLD. LA average GLD (dis 61% / other 70%).			

Year 1 Phonics			
	2017		2018
	% of pupils achieving expected outcomes		% of pupils achieving expected outcomes
Disadvantaged Pupils (35)	57%	Disadvantaged pupils (37)	76%
Other pupils (22)	68%	Other pupils (20)	85%
Difference	-11%	Difference	-9%
National gap (2017)	14%	National gap (2018)	
There has been a 19% increase this year on PPP achieving expected outcomes. The gap with Non-PPP has reduced from 2017. PPP outcomes are above LA averages (Dis74% / other 85%).			

KS1

Percentage at expected or greater depth	2017			Percentage at expected or greater depth	2018		
	Reading	Writing	Maths		Reading	Writing	Maths
Disadvantaged Pupils (34)	44%	29%	35%	Disadvantaged pupils (35)	57%	40%	63%
Other pupils (26)	69%	38%	77%	Other pupils (22)	59%	55%	82%
Difference	-25%	-9%	-42%	Difference	-2%	-15%	-19%
National gap (2017)	-17%	-19%	-18%	National gap (2018)	nyp	nyp	nyp

PPP outcomes in reading, writing and maths have improved this year from 2017, though they are still well below LA averages (66%, 59% and 66% respectively). The attainment difference between PPP and no PPP in reading and maths has reduced from 2017.

KS1

Percentage working at greater depth	2017			Percentage working at greater depth	2018		
	Reading	Writing	Maths		Reading	Writing	Maths
Disadvantaged Pupils (29)	6%	3%	0%	Disadvantaged pupils (34)	3%	0%	6%
Other pupils (31)	8%	0%	0%	Other pupils (26)	5%	5%	5%
Difference	-2%	3%	0%	Difference	-2%	-5%	+1%
National gap (2017)	14%	-10%	-12%	National gap (2018)	nyp	nyp	nyp

School still considerably lower than LA average R 13%, W 8% and M 12%

KS2							
Percentage of pupils who attained a scaled score of 100 or +	2017			Percentage of pupils who attained a scaled score of 100 or +	2018		
	Reading	Writing	Maths		Reading	Writing	Maths
Disadvantaged Pupils (36)	61%	67%	39%	Disadvantaged pupils (38)	45%	55%	42%
Other pupils (22)	64%	77%	45%	Other pupils (19)	68%	84%	84%
Difference	-3%	-11%	-7%	Difference	-23%	-29%	-42%
National gap (2017)	-7%	-7%	-7%	National gap (2018)	nyp	Nyp	nyp

PPP outcomes in reading, writing and maths were well below in comparison with LA averages (65% ,69% and 66 % respectively). The attainment gap between PPP and Non PPP in all subjects is a cause for concern.

KS2							
Percentage of pupils who attained at greater depth	2017			Percentage of pupils who attained at greater depth	2018		
	Reading	Writing	Maths		Reading	Writing	Maths
Disadvantaged Pupils (36)	6%	3%	11%	Disadvantaged pupils (38)	8%	3%	3%
Other pupils (22)	32%	9%	27%	Other pupils (19)	21%	16%	26%
Difference	-26%	-6%	-16%	Difference	-13%	-13%	-23%
National gap (2017)	-4%	-3%	%	National gap (2018)	nyp	nyp	nyp

LA PPP outcomes in reading, writing and maths were 18%, 11% and 16% respectively.