

### IMPACT and EVALUATION of 2017-18 Pupil Premium Expenditure

Area of expenditure	Analysis																									
<b>1. Early Years Teacher (50%)</b> (EEF +6 – Early intervention)	<p>Our nursery staff are led by a qualified teacher who has been critical and intrinsic in embedding the strategies and programmes planned by the speech and language therapist including ‘Quiet party/Box time/ Early Years Talk Boost and ‘Teaching Vocabulary in Early Years’ (Word Aware).</p> <p>This high quality planning and modelling has enabled provision to be of the highest quality as other less experienced/qualified staff follow this lead and ensure that more children enter reception with language skills that are in line with their age and stage.</p> <p><b><u>In school assessment (WELLCOMM Language Assessment) summary Sept 17- July 18 Older Funded 3s</u></b>                      Sept 17 – 57% all children below ARE          July 18- 25% all children below ARE                      43% all children at ARE+                                  75% all children at ARE+</p>																									
<b>2. Inclusion team provision (50%)</b> (EEF +8 – Meta Cog and Self reg/pastoral support)	<p>Within the Y2 cohort, there were 5 children who at times were at high risk of exclusion. The inclusion team, with class teachers planned bespoke programmes in order to reduce this risk. Support was provided in class and in small group and 1:1 sessions to enable the individual to be successful whilst supporting the smooth running of the class, enabling other children including those for whom we received PP to access learning in a calm environment.</p> <p>Development of in class based inclusion practices has seen a reduction in persistent disruptive behaviour as reported by class teachers and monitored by inclusion lead. These powerful individual case accounts that demonstrate how effective and coherent the system for managing behaviour has been in enabling some of the most vulnerable to be included and make progress in formal learning as well as in their self regulation. See also section 7. Family Support Worker.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Subject</th> <th style="text-align: center;">%meeting and exceeding expected</th> <th style="text-align: center;">%working at greater depth</th> <th style="text-align: center;">PP%meeting and exceeding expected</th> <th style="text-align: center;">PP%working at greater depth</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Reading</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">66</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">61</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Writing</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">56</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17</td> <td style="text-align: center;">43</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Maths</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">76</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Science*</b> <i>No Working at greater depth</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc; text-align: center;">NA</td> <td style="text-align: center;">70</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc; text-align: center;">NA</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Subject	%meeting and exceeding expected	%working at greater depth	PP%meeting and exceeding expected	PP%working at greater depth	<b>Reading</b>	66	20	61	13	<b>Writing</b>	56	17	43	13	<b>Maths</b>	76	20	65	13	<b>Science*</b> <i>No Working at greater depth</i>	80	NA	70	NA
Subject	%meeting and exceeding expected	%working at greater depth	PP%meeting and exceeding expected	PP%working at greater depth																						
<b>Reading</b>	66	20	61	13																						
<b>Writing</b>	56	17	43	13																						
<b>Maths</b>	76	20	65	13																						
<b>Science*</b> <i>No Working at greater depth</i>	80	NA	70	NA																						

4.RWI 1:1/ Maths 1:1 small group allocation in KS1

**Attainment and Progress for PP from EYFSP 2016**

**Reading:** 61% Expected standard+ (62% Nat); 100% expected progress; 64% made very good progress

**Writing:** 43% Expected standard+ (53% Nat); 100% expected progress; 47% made very good progress

**Maths:** 65% Expected standard+ (60% Nat); 92% expected progress; 44% made very good progress

**Working at greater depth PP**

**Reading:** 13% (25% Nat; 13% Nat PP.2016)

**Writing:** 13% (13% Nat; 7% NatPP.2016)

**Maths:** 13% (21% Nat; 10% NatPP.2016)

**Attainment and Progress for all children from EYFSP 2016**

**Reading:** 86% Expected standard+ (76% Nat); 96% expected progress; 63% made very good progress

**Writing:**69% Expected standard+ (68% Nat); 91% expected progress; 40% made very good progress

**Maths:** 76% Expected standard+ (75% Nat); 93% expected progress; 46% made very good progress

- Whilst attainment is lower than national, achievement from very low starting points is good.
- PP children marginally performed better in Writing by 4%
- PP children were 6% lower in Maths. However of those PP children not at the expected standard 72% had a significant SEND need.
- School PP significantly outperformed National PP in each area of learning.

Non Pupil Premium children are out performing Pupil Premium children. However, we are able to demonstrate the progress these Pupil Premium children have made and the complexity of their needs; for example in Reading of the 9 children not meeting the expected standard, 6 of these children also have significant SEND including two children with Educational Health Care plans. In summary, in reading, 67% of PP children have significant SEND.

Overall 52% of children receipt of Pupil Premium have an identified SEND. 40% of the PP group have significant additional needs related to safeguarding concerns.

The school continues to identify barriers to progress and are currently exploring a further reading intervention for 'stubborn non-readers'.

<p><b>8.</b>Additional FTE teacher RWI/Phase lead (35% of directed time)</p>	<p><b><u>Phonics</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Year 1</u></b></p> <p>85% of Y1 passed the phonic check from a low starting point at the beginning of the year with 26% predicted to pass. 78% of PP children passed the phonic check in Year 1.</p> <p>This is a sharp rise from 2017-18 The previous evaluation had highlighted the need to improve the impact of 1:1 for supporting with phonics and reading. This intervention and improvement has been highly effective with a very significant improvement this year.</p> <p><b><u>Year 2</u></b></p> <p>68% of Y2 passed the phonic re-check - 39% of this group were PP (11 children) 64% of PP children passed the phonic re-check</p> <p>The outcomes in Year 2 phonics are significantly lower than our normal outcomes in Y2, where in recent past we have achieved greater than national average. Again this is representative of the level of and type need within this particular cohort. However 85% of our current Year 2 passed the phonic check in either 2017 or 2018. This indicates our tenacious approach to supporting all children on their journey to become fluent reader. It is clear from the 2018 Year 1 data that outcomes in Year 2 in 2019 are likely to be much higher than current Year 2 outcomes.</p>
<p><b>3.</b>Speech and Lang therapist (50%)</p> <p><b>5.</b> EY Speech and Lang TA (50%)</p> <p><b>6.</b> Listening and Attention renewable resources</p>	<p>WellComm assessment data provides comprehensive evidence of impact of early intervention, working with families and professionals to improve language delays and at times, language disorders.</p> <p>At the beginning of Reception there were 39% Non PP and 45% PP assessed as below and well below in C&amp;L. EYFSP data shows an acceleration in progress in key areas for PP which must be underpinned by language development.</p> <p><u>Achieving expected in ELG June 2018:</u> Communication and Lang – PP 70% All 72%</p>
<p><b>7.</b> Family Support Worker (50%)</p>	<p>58% of PP children accessed Family Support worker during 2017-18. This could be for a very wide range of issues ranging from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• high levels of children who during the year or time in school have been subject to Child protection (Section 47) or who are subject to Child in need Plan (Section 17)</li> <li>• families accessing early help</li> </ul>

- families with FSP (Family Support Process/CAF)
- domestic abuse
- supporting challenging behaviour
- financial issues
- housing
- alcohol/substance abuse
- improving attendance
- adult mental health
- child mental health
- imprisonment

Whilst it is difficult to attribute improvement solely to this aspect of Pupil Premium expenditure, it undoubtedly plays a significant role in stabilising home conditions, providing strategies for behaviour management, protecting children from harmful adult behaviours, signposting to appropriate support services.