|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **School** | Hedworthfield Primary School | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2019-20 | **Total PP budget** | £136,820 | **Date of most recent PP Review** | 2015 |
| **Total number of pupils (Sept 19)** | 232 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP (Sept 19)** | 93 | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | February 2020 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2.** **Current attainment 2018-19 summary** | | | |
| KS2 ( pupils) | *Pupils eligible for PP*  *12* | *Without language unit and EHC* | *Pupils not eligible for PP*  *school* |
| **% achieving in reading, writing and maths (National 51.2% for disadvantage and 64%)** | 67 | 80 | 63.2 |
| **Reading** | 83 | 90 | 68 |
| **Writing** | 83 | 90 | 68 |
| **Maths** | 67 | 80 | 79 |
| **There were 4 EHC pupils within the additional resource base and 4 EHC pupils within the Year 6 cohort. Disadvantaged attainment without these pupils significantly improves. However there is still a significant gap in reading. There were two disadvantaged pupils without an EHC who did not reach ARE**  **Disadvantaged reading and maths are a significant element of the school improvement focus in 2018.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3.** **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)** | | | | |
| **In-school barriers:** | | | | |
| **A.** | | Pupil skills are weak in KS1 with many pupil premium pupils accessing wave two or SEND support. Access to high quality teaching and learning, intervention and increasing support at home will support the closing of this gap. | | |
| **B.** | | Pupils enter the school with skills with significant delay in their communication and language skills. This impacts significantly on pupils progress and attainment in literacy. This is particularly evident for free school meal pupils. | | |
| **C.** | | The school have a high proportion of pupils with additional needs and EHC plans who are also entitled to pupil premium. This impacts significantly on attainment outcomes. Ensuring the correct level of input is vital to support those pupils to achieve. | | |
| **D.** | | The school hosts a specialist speech and language provision on behalf of the local authority. The language unit provides education for 25 pupils of which are also pupil premium. The barriers many of these pupils face are combined speech and language disorder which make accessing mainstream provision not suitable. Their difficulties limit their confidence, social interaction and life skills. Academically these pupils make excellent academic progress although this may not be measured by scaled scores or even achievement against ARE. The pupils who remain with us until year 6 move onto specialist provision. We wish to eradicate the barrier the speech and language difficulties and the limited experiences our pupils have create to the life skills of our pupils. | | |
| **E** | | Attainment in reading for disadvantaged pupils improved in 2019 however is still a priority to address all year groups. Although EHC and LU pupils impact in these statistics without language unit the gap remains high (attainment has improved in reading on 2017 results by 14%). | | |
| **F** | | Attainment in writing is much lower for disadvantaged pupil. This is not a trend and is an issue due to the number of langauge unit pupils who’s speech and language skills limit their ability to reach ARE in writing who are also pupil premium. | | |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* | | | | |
| **D.** | | Attendance of individual pupils who are disadvantaged is a barrier to attainment. | | |
| **4.** **Desired outcomes** | | | |  |
|  | *Desired outcomes and how they will be measured* | | *Success criteria* |  |
| **A.** | Attainment in reading is at least in line with non- disadvantaged attainment. | | End of KS2-achievement is similar between disadvantaged and non disadvantaged meeting expected standard  80% of disadvantaged pupils reach the expected standard at KS2 |  |
| **B.** | Attainment in maths is in line with non- disadvantaged attainment | | End of KS2-achievement is similar between disadvantaged and non disadvantaged meeting expected standard  80% of disadvantaged pupils reach the expected standard at KS2 |  |
| **C.** | Attendance for free school meal pupils is in line with attendance of non- free school meal pupils. | | Attendance is at least 95% for the group |  |
| **D.** | Progress of disadvantaged pupils in reading is in line with other subjects | | 80% of disadvantaged pupils make expected progress |  |
| **E.** | Pupils with additional needs develop confidence and social interactions skills to gain skills for life. | | All pupils within the specialist unit develop recognised social skills and skills for life measured by PIVATS/ accreditation. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.** **Planned expenditure** | | | | | | | |
| **Academic year** | **2019-20** | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | |
| **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?** | **Cost** | **Monitoring/ to be updated at review in February** |
| **Improve attainment at the end of KS2 for disadvantaged pupils in reading and maths to 80%** | Reduction of class size in upper KS2 through employment of an additional teacher TLR 2 days per week to deliver lessons and interventions  Teacher interventions will be arithmetic focused. | Reducing class size appears to result in around 3 months additional progress for pupils, on average. EEF  **This strategy was successful in 2018-19 with**  **100% of targeted children reaching ARE and 80% overall. This is being extended into maths.** | Data analysis and identification of target groups of learners.  Additional classroom used as break out space for split class. | **G Jeynes** | Review will take place with the monitoring cycle. Work and planning and lesson observations each half term and data interviews termly. | £14,140.50  (KM) |  |
| Renew read write inc training for target staff. Many trained staff have moved on and there is a skills gap in this area. | The Rose Review (2006) states teaching synthetic systematic phonics is the most effective method to teach children to read.  Research from Royal Holloway University, London (2017), ‘shows that learning to read by sounding out words has a dramatic impact on the accuracy of reading aloud and comprehension.’ | Staff identified will attend training. As part of the package the RWI team provide development days where they work alongside the staff to ensure correct implementation and coaching. | K. Sparks | RWI assessment data phonics. | £3250 |  |
| Targeted teaching to close gaps for individuals in reading.  (non teaching DHT ⅓ of time table intervention teaching.)Timetables teaching and quality teaching first | EEF small groups tuition + 4 months.  100% of targeted pupils met ARE in 2018-19 | Tracking of individual pupils progress.  Progress measure from baseline | K. Sparks | Termly monitoring.  July outcomes for KS2 | £20,371  (ER) |  |
| Pupils with additional needs develop confidence and social interactions skills to gain skills for life.  Attendance for free school meal pupils is in line with attendance of non- free school meal pupils. | Reduction of cost for enhancement visits to set the scene for learning. Reducing the cost of educational visits in school to allow greater opportunities to engage learners. | Action research has demonstrated that there is greater involvement in learning of all children when topics are introduced following an enhancement activity.  CC case study. | Feedback will be taken from learners.  Monitoring will look at the impact of educational visits on reading and writing. | G. Jeynes | Termly monitoring. | £5000 |  |
| To reduce the impact of low speech and language skills in EYFS and KS1 through ICAN interventions | Across the federation a joint project to undertake the ICan implement systems and processes and develop a network of training opportunities. This is sustainable and will continue to impact from previous years spend.  Inhouse training | Oral language interventions are deemed to provide +5 months impact on pupil achievement. EEF  ICAN direct research +18 months on completion of ICAN programme.  Dockerill, J. and Lindsay, G. Specific Speech and Language Difficulties and Literacy.  T. Nunes and P. Bryant (eds) (2003) Handbook of Children’s Literacy pp 403-435 L  <http://www.ican.org.uk/download%20files/ReadOnGetOn%20I%20CAN%20SLCN%20and%20literacy.pdf> | ICAN is an accredited course and is moderated and evaluated externally.  The ICAN programme is a measured impact programme and outcomes will be set against a baseline assessment. | D Watson | I can assessment data | £2500 |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | 4 |  |  |
| **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?** |  | **Monitoring** |
| **Improve attainment at the end of KS2 for disadvantaged pupils in reading and maths to 80%** | 1:1 tuition for target individuals (4 in 2018-19 cohort reading/  1:1 tuition for target individuals 6 in maths Yr6) | 1:1 tuition gain of +5  Short, regular sessions (about 30 minutes, 3-5 times a week) over a set period of time (6-12 weeks) appear to result in optimum impact.  Evidence also suggests tuition should be additional to, but explicitly linked with, normal teaching, and that teachers should monitor progress to ensure the tutoring is beneficial. | Targeted pupils through effective data analysis.  Pre planning sessions with class teacher to ensure 1:1 tutor has a clear knowledge and understanding of their target pupil and specific priorities have been identified. . | K. Sparks | Start and end of 10 week block assessment data on itrack. | £5000 |  |
| Improve attainment in reading across school so disadvantaged pupils particularly disadvantaged boys attain in line with non disadvantaged pupils. | Targeted individual reading programmes focusing on teaching comprehension.  FT TA in years 4, 5 and 6 peer to peer reader in breakfast club and story time.  Non- pupil premium funded. timetabled | On average, reading comprehension approaches improve learning by an additional five months’ progress over the course of a school year.  Reducing class size appears to result in around 3 months additional progress for pupils, on average. EEF | Wednesday 3.00-3.30 Y6 readers engage with younger targeted pupils to secure reading- monitored by Literacy Lead. | G. Jeynes | Tracking and teacher assessment each half term. Personalised learning summary. | £66,086  (JP/ LM/AA/MD) |  |
| KS1 and y3 Daily phonics and reading intervention for targeted pupils  £3000 | EEF +4  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. | Monitoring cycle. | G. Jeynes | Tracking and teacher assessment each half term. Intervention summary. | £7979 |  |
| **EYFS PP**  To close the disadvantaged gap in communication, language and learning by the end of reception | Speech and language therapist (not linked to language unit) provides targeted support to pupils with a priority on disadvantaged pupils. 1 day per week. | Studies of oral language interventions consistently show positive benefits on learning, including oral language skills and reading comprehension. On average, pupils who participate in oral language interventions make approximately five months' additional progress over the course of a year. |  | H Richardson | Data tracking and improved outcomes for pupils.  % of pupils reaching GLD. | £3000  Metis |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | £ |  |  |
| **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?** |  | **Monitoring will be updated at review in February** |
| Improve attendance so disadvantaged attendance is in line with non disadvantaged and above 95% | Inclusion manager per week will monitor attendance, send out reminder letters, liaise with the LA attendance team for fines and enforcement.  Call and collect service.  Non- class based DHT time to target attendance. | Children need to be in school to learn and achieve.  In February 2015 the Department for Education (DfE) published a report on the link between absence and attainment in KS2 and KS4: Pupils with no absence are 1.6 times more likely to achieve level 4 or above, and 4.7 times more likely to achieve level 5 or above, than pupils that missed 15-20 percent of all sessions. | Attendance monitoring termly. | C. Henderson | December 19  March 20  June 20 | £7,532  (CH) |  |
| Use of external agencies to support persistent absenteeism.  Outreach support.  Attendance at review meetings. | Attendance monitoring termly. | C Henderson | December 19  March 20  June 20 | £641 |  |
|
| Personal budget allocation | This section is used to ensure individuals have equal and fair access. This fund is flexible | The evidence varies depending on need. This can be solely to make a child more comfortable, to purchase specialist equipment for a subject or hobby, to support a family in financial difficulty in meeting basic needs, pay for pp transport to young carers or activities which would otherwise be missed. | Inclusion manager to review impact on emotional well being of activities and events. Feedback form class teachers following spend. | DHT | In response to need. | £1341 |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | £ |  |  |