**Northwood Broom Pupil Premium Strategy 2016 – 2017 Reviewed July 2017**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Summary information**
 |
| **Academic Year** | 2016 - 2017 | **Total PP budget** | £81,400 | **Date of PP review** | Feb / March 2017 |
| **Total number of pupils** | 179 (excluding nursery) | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 71 (excluding EYPP) | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | May 2017 |
| **Link Governor** | Mrs. D. Wiltshaw |

STRATEGY REVIEWED ANNUALLY AND MONITORED TERMLY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **End Year 2 attainment 2016** |  |
|  | *Pupils eligible for PP (in school)* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (in school)* |  |
| **% achieving ARE(Age-Related Expectations) or above in reading, writing & maths (or equivalent)** | 59% | *68%* |  |
| **% achieving ARE(Age-Related Expectations) or above in reading** | 70% | *75%* |  |
| **% achieving ARE(Age-Related Expectations) or above in writing** | 60% | *68%* |  |
| **% achieving ARE(Age-Related Expectations) or above in maths** | 73% | *79%* |  |
| **% making at least strong (good) progress in reading** | 100% | 94% |  |
| **% making substantial progress in reading** | 100% | 89% |  |
| **% making at least strong (good) progress in writing** | 100% | 89% |  |
| **% making substantial progress in writing** | 88% | 78% |  |
| **% making at least strong (good) progress in maths** | 100% | 89% |  |
| **% making substantial progress in maths** | 88% | 72% |  |
| **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)** |  |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school)* |  |
|  | Pupils eligible for PP are often not emotionally and physically ready to learn |  |
|  | Communication and language skills on entry to school are lower for pupils who are eligible for PP |  |
| **C.** | Key skills (reading, writing, maths) on entry to school are lower for pupils who are eligible for PP |  |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* |  |
| **D.**  | Parents of pupils eligible for PP engage less with their child’s learning at home and school |  |
| 1. **Desired outcomes** *(Desired outcomes and how they will be measured)*
 | **Success criteria**  | **Evidence****Documents which provide evidence for the achievement of the success criteria.** | **Lessons learned** |
|  | A reduction in the number of pupils eligible for PP who are on a behaviour plan | * Pupils eligible for PP who are on a behaviour plan exit the plan within 6 months and sustain behaviour over time in line with school expectations

A reduction over a period of time for identified pupils eligible for PP of aggressive / discriminatory incidents | PP pupils on a behaviour plan Autumn 1 2016 = 7, January 2017 = 4. (MC, LS, RL back to stage 1 generic behaviour policy and sustaining this; SC moved from stage 3 to stage 2+ - making sustained progress towards targets). See Positive Behaviour Register changes summary Feb 2017Behaviour monitoring and analysis (Summer 2, Autumn 1&2 2016 and Spring 1, Spring 2 and Summer 1 2017) and Positive Behaviour Register shows reductions in recordable incidents for the majority of PP pupils on the behaviour register. May 2017 – Only 3 children (33%) on the PBR are identified as PP. A reduction from 7 (50%) in Autumn 1. One of those remaining on the register has additional needs that are supported by multi-agencies.  | Effective strategy.Need to improve systems for monitoring behaviour as they are not easy to interpret. Governors identified a need for clarification over use of ABC forms.  |
|  | Improved levels of communication skills evident in reception pupils for pupils who are eligible for PP | * 10% improvement in reception classes in communication skills of pupils eligible for PP (language screen scores)
 | * Stoke Speaks Out language screen baselines Sept 2016 show 39% increase from Nursery to Reception (NOT matched pupils).
* SSO language screens March 2017 show a 22% increase in Reception (72% ARE) – matched .
* GLD increased from 13% baseline to 38% at AP2 to 42% at AP3 (see Summative Assessment report for latest Assessment Point).
* PP SEND progress in developmental profile
 | Effective strategy. Raising the profile of communication is a whole-school priority next year.  |
|  | The majority of pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress during their time in school (reading, writing, maths, phonics, science) | * 85 % pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress during their time in school (for any pupil entering school below or well-below ARE).
* Pupils eligible for PP attain in line with national pupils eligible for PP at all statutory assessment points

Seem to be group of PP pupils in Y2 who have received much intervention but still not at ARE.  | See SLT progress data for AP1, AP2 and AP3:* AP1 - Y2 PP making substantial progress (pupils in school since nursery) at AP1:
	+ Reading 77%
	+ Writing 59%
	+ Maths 77%
* AP2 - Y2 PP making substantial progress (pupils in school since nursery) at AP2:
	+ Reading 70%
	+ Writing 65%
	+ Maths 78%
* AP3 - Y2 PP making substantial progress (pupils in school since nursery) at AP3:
	+ Reading 70%
	+ Writing 65%
	+ Maths 74%
* AP4 – Y2 PP making substantial progress (pupils in school since nursery) at AP4:
	+ Reading 79%
	+ Writing 88%
	+ Maths 88%
* Y2 pupils who have joined since nursery, 6 out of the 15 have made substantial progress since their starting point in ALL areas (R, W and M)

 * See RoL ‘same’ data analysis):
	+ Y2 Reading 8% above national PP EXP
	+ Y2 reading 17% above national PP for GD
	+ Y2 writing 7% above national PP EXP
	+ Y2 Writing 3% above national PP at GD
	+ Y2 maths 13% above national PP EXP
	+ Y2 Maths, 10% above national PP for GD
	+ Y1 PP phonics 1% above national PP
	+ Y2 PP phonics 11% above national PP (whole cohort)
 | The majority of pupils make at least strong progress and many make accelerated progress.There are a few hard to reach pupils eligible for PP who do not make strong progress, despite a good deal of intervention. Interventions need to be further personalised to meet the needs of these pupils. Further training in the teaching of reading is needed. A significant number of pupils eligible for PP join school midway through yeargroups, usually with additional needs such as SEND, or they are new to English.  |
|  | Increased engagement of parents of pupils eligible for PP in school and home learningMost significant barrier is childcare – SLT discussion needed.  | * Increased attendance at parent workshops to at least 60% PP parents. What is the impact of this?

 * 100% attendance at Parents Evening for PP pupils’ parents
* What is the impact?
* 25% PP parents attend family learning sessions in school (inc. EWT)
* 80% pupils eligible for PP complete weekly homework
 | Parental engagement analysis: Spring 2 2017 – 100% of PP parents have attended at least 1 event, 53% have attended at least 2 events, 31% attended all events (DURING THE SPRING 2 TERM).Feedback from middle and senior leaders is that ALL parents attended parents evening, although many PP needed significant chasing from class teacher and HSLW, including re-arranged appointments. This is being monitored. 37.5% of parents currently attending EWT are parents of PP children. Homework tracking to be standardised to allow effective monitoring of this. Cohort 2 for EWT – 29% were PP. May 2017 – 35% of parents attending Family learning were PP.Spring 2 – 58% of PP pupils complete 100% of homework set. 93% complete at least half of their homework tasks on a weekly basis. | Impact measures need to be embedded in success criteria, as these actions were achieved but no impact measured. Homework needs reviewing across the whole-school to ensure it is fit for purpose and valued by parents and teachers. It continues to be challenging to engage some PP parents in home-school learning. This will remain a priority.  |
| **Planned expenditure** |  |
| **Academic Year** | **2016 – 2017** |  |
| The three headings below demonstrate how we are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies |  |
| **i 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?** | **Estimated cost** |
| 1. Reduction in the number of pupils eligible for PP who are on a behaviour plan
 | QFT evidences consistent application of revised behaviour policy and MAGIC learning behaviours | EEF T and L toolkit evidence that meta-cognition and self-regulation are effective in accelerating progress. | (See PDBW (Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare) plan for further detail.½ termly monitoring of all elements of revised behaviour plan:* Application of policy by all staff all around school
* PBPs (Personalised Behaviour Plans)
* ABC and MAPA forms
* Parent behaviour clinics
* Rewards and sanctions
* Recording and logging of behaviour incidents
 | Inclusion leader.  | Termly – reported in HT report to Governors | £14,401 Contribution to salaries of:Inclusion LeaderAssistant SENCO |
| 1. Improved levels of communication skills evident for all pupils who are eligible for PP
 | Train staff to embed effective teaching of speaking and listening skills across the curriculum so that all pupils can take the ESB (English Speaking Board) qualification; (focus on feedback to pupils)Deferred to 2017-18 plan | EEF T and L toolkit evidence that effective feedback to pupils accelerates pupil learning.Monitoring evidence shows that ‘Talk for Writing’ approaches improve writing outcomes, and that the teaching of vocabulary improves attainment in reading, writing, maths and science.  | TLA (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) action plan will detail training, implementation and monitoring arrangements. Monitor progress in core subjects.  | Literacy leader (supported by Communication Champion) | Termly – reported in HT report to GovernorsTLA plan monitored termly by Link Governor. | £2,000 Staff Training |
| C. The majority of pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress during their time in school (reading, writing, maths, phonics) | Provide extra support through support staff to enable pupils to master basic skills. Staff CPD to improve QFT with a focus on mastery of basic skills and effective feedback to pupils. Provide CPD for all staff in effective teaching of writing (biggest focus for development), especially spelling and rehearsal. Retention strategy for RQTs (Recently Qualified Teachers) includes additional time for PPA and a programme of targeted support to ensure they progress from good to outstanding teachers.  | EEF T and L toolkit that mastery learning and feedback are effective in accelerating progress | CPD for staff to share expectations and best practice in mastery and feedback. Leaders attend regular CPD to remain informed of recommended practice.Major priority for Teaching, Learning and Assessment plan.Weekly drop-ins and regular book scans provide CPD on best practice and areas for further development.Individual development plans for RQTs to ensure they progress towards becoming outstanding classroom practitioners. | TLA (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) leader | Termly monitoring of Teaching, Learning and Assessment action plan and milestones by link governor. Appraisal reviews | £9,852 Retention strategy for RQT £26,451 Contribution to Support staff in classrooms |
| **ii 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?** | **Estimated cost** |
| B. Improved levels of communication skills evident in reception pupils for pupils who are eligible for PP | Nuffield language interventions in reception classesSEND interventions | EEF T and L toolkit evidence that oral language interventions are effective in accelerating progress.  | See T,L,A (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) action plan for details of training, implementation and monitoring.All staff delivering interventions to be trained. Regular meetings with SALT (Speech and Language Therapist) Victoria Bailey to review implementation and progress | Literacy leader (supported by Communication Champion) | Termly monitoring of Teaching, Learning and Assessment action plan and milestones by link governor. | Staff training costs included in above.SEN interventions costs included in above. |
| 1. Reduction in the number of pupils eligible for PP who are on a behaviour plan
 | * Train staff in a range of approaches to support social, emotional and mental health such as emotion coaching, nurture provision, ASD, attachment and Massage in Schools
* ~~Trained counsellor for targeted pupils~~
 | EEF T and L toolkit evidence that meta-cognition and self-regulation are effective in accelerating progress. Pupils need to be in the classroom and able to access learning to be able to make progress.  | See PDBW (Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare) action plan for details of training, implementation and monitoring.  | Inclusion leader | Termly monitoring of PDBW (Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare) action plan and milestones by link governor. | £500 Estimated training for support staff Counsellor funded via alternative means. |
| C. The majority of pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress during their time in school | * Support staff provide targeted interventions for pupils eligible for PP, with objectives targeted at gaps in their learning to accelerate progress.
* Focus will be on providing effective feedback on learning and how to improve. Fix-it and prove it to be done in every session.
* Train staff in Better Reading Programme
* Deliver Better Reading Programme to targeted PP pupils
 | EEF T and L toolkit evidence that feedback is effective in accelerating progress.  | See TLA (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) action plan for further detail of implementation and monitoring.  | Key Stage Leaders.  | Termly monitoring of TLA action plan and milestones by link governor. | Support staff interventions, costing included above. |
| **iii 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 engagement of parents of pupils eligible for PP in school and home learning | Embed ‘Hard to Reach’ process for identifying and intervening any parent not engaging in their child’s learning. Family Learning sessions Extension of ‘Watch me Learn’ sessionsExtension of Parent Forum to ensure representation of parents of pupils eligible for PP. HSLW to target parents of pupils eligible for PP to attend parent workshops in school.Chase attendance at parents evening.  | School monitoring and analysis shows that where parents understand how to support their child’s learning, and engage with school life, pupils demonstrate higher self-esteem and make more rapid progress. EEF T and L toolkit shows that parental involvement accelerates learning | PDBW plan (Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare) details implementation, monitoring and evaluation plans.Senior leader (AHT) to lead.  | AHT | Termly review by link governor of PDBW plan and milestones.  | £28,196 Contribution to salary of AHT (1 day / week dedicated to PDBW & Parental Engagement)& Home School Link Worker salary |
|  **Total budgeted cost** | £81,400 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Review of expenditure** |
| **Previous Academic Year** | **2015 – 2016** |
| **targeted support** |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **Estimated impact:** | **Lessons learned**  | **Cost** |
| * Disadvantaged children make outstanding (better than expected) progress in reading, writing and maths (from starting points at each intervention cycle)
* Disadvantaged children pass the Y1 phonic screen and Y2 re-takes
* School gaps in each year group and the difference between school and National gaps in Y2 narrow/close in reading, writing & maths
 | After school teacher-led intervention clubs for Reading, Writing and Maths.  | * Progress over time in school shows that all pupils eligible for PP make strong (good) progress, and a significant number make substantial progress.
* Progress during 10 week interventions showed that pupils eligible for PP generally made strong progress in all year groups, with a significant number making substantial progress in some subjects (see Wave 2 analysis for figures)
* Y2 reading above school non-PP, and in-line or above 3 other local infant schools PP.
* Y2 writing in-line with school non-PP and in-line or above 3 other local infant schools PP.
* Y2 maths above school non-PP and significantly above 3 other local infant schools PP.
* Y2 phonics retakes, 3 out of 4 PP pupils passed (TS = SEND)
* Y1 phonics PP in-line with school non-PP and in-line or above 3 other local infant schools PP.
* YR GLD for PP significantly lower than school non-PP but significantly above most local infant schools PP
* Gaps – Y2 reading gap narrowed; writing gap narrowed significantly; maths gap narrowed
* Gaps Y1 – reading now PP outperform non-PP; writing zero gap maintained all year; maths small gap maintained all year
* Gaps YR – gaps widened slightly in all areas
* Gaps YN – reading and maths widened slightly, writing narrowed
 | Impact on teacher work-life balance detrimental to their wellbeing and to retention of quality staff.  | Staff salaries £5649 |
| * Disadvantaged children make outstanding (better than expected) progress in reading, writing and maths (from starting points at each intervention cycle)
* Disadvantaged children pass the Y1 phonic screen and Y2 re-takes
* School gaps in each year group and the difference between school and National gaps in Y2 narrow/close in reading, writing & maths
* Support staff demonstrate planning for progression
* Support staff understand their responsibilities within value for money / impact.
 | To deliver small group follow up intervention sessions for Reading, Writing and Maths to impact positively on educational outcomes in core subjects (Target 2 on Action Plan) | See above figuresSee next column for support staff comment.  | Support staff need further training in feedback to pupils, and in evaluating impact of the interventions.  | Staff salaries Support Staff £38,608Middle Leaders 2 days per week£16,618 |
| * Disadvantaged children make outstanding (better than expected) progress in reading, writing and maths (from starting points at each intervention cycle)
* Disadvantaged children pass the Y1 phonic screen and Y2 re-takes
* School gaps in each year group and the difference between school and National gaps in Y2 narrow/close in reading, writing & maths
* Self-esteem raised through celebration & recognition of individual strengths/talents
 | To offer teacher led spring/summer holiday school tuition to all children that are eligible for The Pupil Premium Grant (who are not making ‘better than expected’ progress) (Target 3 on Action Plan) | Easter school definitely had an impact on self-esteem. It was focussed on reading and majority of PP who attended made strong or substantial progress in reading last academic year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **child** | **Progress Reading** | **Progress Writing** | **Progress maths** | **Passed phonics?** |
| IA (Y1) | +5 | +3 | +3 | 32 - Y |
| CA (Y1) | +5 | +4 | +5 | 24 - N |
| TA (Y2) | +4 | +4 | +4 | NA |
| KB (Y2) | +2 | +3 | +2 | NA |
| ED (Y2) | +4 | +3 | +3 | NA |
| RL (Y1) | +6 | +6 | +6 | 37 - Y |
| DM (Y1) | +4 | +3 | +6 | 33 - Y |
| UN (Y1) | +3 | +5 | +5 | 27 – N\* |
| Leo S (Y1) | +4 | +3 | +4 | 21 - N |
| Lex S (Y1) | +4 | +3 | +5 | 39 - Y |
| TS (Y2) | +2 | +3 | +3 | 17 - N |

RL (Y1) previously displayed challenging behaviour and is now ready to come off behaviour plan, and made 6 points progress in R,W,M. The raised expectations in the new National Curriculum impacted particularly on progress in writing. See above for info on closing gaps in each year group, and for attainment of PP in comparison with local infant schools.  | Attendance an issue for some pupils – need more support and presence of HSLW if we are to run this again.Not enough staff could commit to deliver the Summer club on the agreed dates so it was unable to run.  | Easter school 1 week x 10 pupils = £3000 |
| **ii Other approaches** |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **Estimated impact:** | **Lessons learned**  | **Cost** |
| * Children’s needs are identified earlier preventing escalation to higher levels of need.
* Parents are active as partners and feel well supported in this
* Improving attendance and punctuality for identified children
* Children know and proactively work towards learning and welfare targets.
* Self-esteem raised through increasing praise and success.
 | To provide Family Support to increase partnership working to impact positively on improving attendance, punctuality & educational outcomes (Target 4 on Action Plan) | * See individual case studies for impact of early intervention – appointment of AHT with safeguarding responsibility has led to more rigorous systems to ensure no ‘case drift’
* AHT taken on responsibility for parents and gives firm but fair messages to ensure parents engage appropriately and follow school policies and parent code of conduct – see Parent Meeting book for evidence
* HSLW continues to provide strong pastoral support for vulnerable families
* Monitoring of parental attendance at school events shows an improving engagement of parents whose pupils are eligible for PP
* The majority of pupils eligible for PP completed weekly homework
* Establishment of a parent forum with representation from families whose pupils are eligible for PP
* PP attendance increased by 1% to 95.8% (whole school 96.2%)
* Improvement in punctuality across school over the year, including for pupils eligible for PP
* An increased range of opportunities for parents to come into school and learn how to support them at home
* Learning targets simplified for all pupils and more time given to embed them so that pupils understand the progress they are making
 | Need to ensure all school tracking systems allow easy identification of vulnerable groups to help prove impact | Staff salaries£44,125(AHT 2 days, Home School Link Work, Administrative support) |
| * All Pupil Premium are accessing extra curricula provision
* Improved self-esteem/confidence of children (lead/share/celebrate with peers)
* Pupils basic skills develop across the curriculum
* Improved understanding of teaching & learning (parents)
* Improved engagement of parents as partners
* Impact on progress, attainment and attendance
* Empowerment of parents and children/raised aspirations
 | Provide a range of after-school sports clubs with funded placesRepresentation on School Council, Playground LeadersParent representation on parent forum(Target 5 on Action Plan) | * Increase of 14% in PP accessing sports clubs , currently 31% attend, funded places had a positive impact
* Focus on embedding the new National Curriculum which is skills based – book scans show that these basic skills are becoming embedded – more work to do on basic spelling skills
* Parent feedback from ‘watch me learn’ events shows parents felt better informed about how to help their children learn at home
* Scrutiny of home-school diaries shows staff make comments to support parents in knowing how to help pupils and an improvement can be seen for some pupils in the quality of parent comments so that they are now beginning to focus on pupil skills
* Parent Forum has been hugely successful in beginning to engage parents, next steps are to widen representation on this of vulnerable groups
* PP pupils are given areas of responsibility to boost their self-esteem and are well-represented as play leaders and on the school council
 | Need to develop more robust systems for gathering evidence of these types are success criteria, which are qualitative.  | Staffing costs covered by PE Grant for after school clubs, AHT time also included in above. |