

Pupil premium strategy / self-evaluation

1. Summary information					
School	Tanfield Lea Community Primary School				
Academic Year	2018-19	Total PP budget	£95,040.00	Date of most recent PP Review	Nov 18
Total number of pupils	338	Number of pupils eligible for PP	72	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Feb 19 June 19

2. Current attainment		
<u>Year 6 2017-18 data</u>	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>National Average</i>
% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths (%)	33%	64%
% making expected progress in reading (as measured in the school)	-0.1	N/A
% making expected progress in writing (as measured in the school)	-1.5	N/A
% making expected progress in mathematics (as measured in the school)	-0.5	N/A

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
Academic barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i>)	
A.	Lack of ability to regulate emotions – can impact on behaviour and therefore engagement
B.	Poor literacy skills
C.	Difficulty in retaining basic number facts
Additional barriers (<i>including issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Lower attendance of PP children as opposed to Non PP (about 50% of PP have pattern of attendance lower than 95%)
E.	Lack of enrichment experiences in the local area and beyond
4. Intended outcomes (<i>specific outcomes and how they will be measured</i>)	
Success criteria	

A.	Children engage in learning as they can regulate their emotions	Behaviour Data shows increase in engagement through reduced loss of P.T.
B.	Accelerated progress for PP children in reading and writing	Progress accelerated evidenced through iTrack data, other internal data and books.
C.	Accelerated progress for PP children in maths	Progress accelerated evidenced through iTrack data, other internal data.Children can readily recall Learn Its and Times Tables
D.	Attendance of PP children increases	Gap closes between attendance of PP and Non PP

5. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year

N/A see report for 2017-2018

6. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2018-2019

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

Action	Intended outcome	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>Focus on Non-Negotiables/Basic maths facts throughout school (Eng and Maths)</p>	<p>A concentrated focus on basic skills will improve Writing attainment across the school.</p>	<p>Feedback is 'high impact for very low costs, based on moderate evidence' (EEF)</p>	<p>Work scrutiny</p>	<p>MT, SLT</p>	<p>Approximately monthly</p> <p>Feb: Focus on the Basic Skills is a feature of regular work scrutinies.</p> <p>July: 82% of DA children achieved the Expected standard in Y6 Writing, an improvement of 36%.</p> <p><u>For following year, discuss non-negotiables at staff meeting</u></p>
---	--	---	----------------------	----------------	--

<p>Accelerated Reader to continue to be used throughout KS2</p>	<p>Reading for 20 minutes a day with high accuracy will secure accelerated progress in Reading.</p>	<p>Accelerated Reader has had a positive effect on all children, including PP. Progress scores for Reading +2.0 (statistically significant in 2017-18).</p>	<p>Termly STAR assessments and review of ITrack data</p>	<p>MT</p>	<p>February 2019: Analysis completed. PP children making accelerated progress is 4 out of 6 KS2 classes (See separate report).</p> <p>July 2019: 3 out of 6 classes have PP children making more progress than their peers (see separate report) 72% of DA children achieved Exp in Reading, which is 10% more than last year. Progress scores were lower (-0.7) but could change marginally.</p>
---	---	---	--	-----------	---

<p>Maths Rockstarz and Mathletics to be used throughout KS1 and KS2</p>	<p>Regular skills practice will secure accelerated progress in Mathematics.</p>	<p>Focus on basic skills will ensure that application is stronger in Year 5 and 6.</p>	<p>Mathletics/Rockstarz data and review of ITrack data Work scrutinies and discussion with children</p>	<p>MB/MP</p>	<p>February 2019: 100% children in 6/8 classes are accessing TTRS. Tables are set in relation to Learn Its per year group. Stats show average speed has increased since starting TTRS. Next steps – to increase accuracy and time playing.</p> <p>July 2019: Average response speed for the school has dropped from 4.7 secs to 3.6 secs 64% of DA children reached the expected standard. This is 10% better than the previous year, but the progress score was lower (-1.6).</p>
---	---	--	---	--------------	--

Lexia	15 minutes x 2 a week for vulnerable children will accelerate decoding skills, which are essential to later language acquisition.	A number of previous studies of Lexia have found promising results and the balanced approach, combined with the initial diagnostic assessment (EEF).	Termly review of ITrack data and Pupil Progress Meetings	KH	<p>March 2019: Several children in Y2-4 using Lexia well.</p> <p>July: Training given in staff meeting. Focus next year will be SEN/EAL. 1D have trialled doing the screener placement. The focus in 2019-2020 will be to use Lexia in KS1 and with some EAL/SEND children in Upper School.</p>
Quality Questioning for deeper learning	A greater variety of questioning will lead to more probing questioning, which will in turn accelerate progress within lessons.	Quality questioning will enable children to secure deeper understanding across the curriculum.	Termly observations	KH/SLT	<p>Spring 2019: Staff meetings included training on Duplo questioning, diamond ranking, snowball and 'you say, we pay'.</p> <p>Teaching is generally good across the school.</p>

Developing vocabulary	Developing children's vocabulary will enhance the wider curriculum and access to challenging comprehension texts.	There is a large vocabulary deficit between DA and non-DA peers (A.Quigley).	Termly review of Reading data Curriculum coordinator time Baseline of EE's MLDP project.	MT/MP/KH Curriculum coordinators EE	February 2019: Baseline conducted and shared with staff. New words shared in Y3-6 fortnightly. July 2019: MLDP presentation by EE showed that familiarity of Tier 2 words increased, with 100% of children being able to use at least 1 Tier 2 word. (Separate report available)
Marking and Feedback termly scrutiny for PP children	Written feedback for children is high impact. Developing this will support accelerated progress.	A leadership focus on feedback. Feedback is 'high impact for very low costs,based on moderate evidence' (EEF)	Work scrutiny	MT, SLT	Approximately monthly. Feb: Focus on the Basic Skills is a feature of regular work scrutinies. July: Work scrutiny used for cross moderation, focussing on Y2 and 6.

Total budgeted cost **£42,730.00**

ii. Targeted support Every cohort to have targeted intervention according to the needs of the PP

Action	Intended outcome	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>Reception to plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP – currently Reading gap 50% vs 78% = 28% Writing gap 33% vs 76% = 43% Maths (N) gap 16% vs 76% = 50%</p> <p>Overall (From ITrack) 33% vs 86% = 53%</p>	<p>Small group intervention focusing on specific areas has higher impact than whole class teaching for this group.</p>	<p>Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.</p> <p>* Being inline defined as having 30 – 50 most on entry (Autumn) Being inline defined as having 40 – 60 some in Spring. Note: Autumn % affected by children leaving</p>	<p>AG</p>	<p>Termly</p> <p>Feb Reading gap 57% vs 88% = 31% (increased by 3%) Writing gap 57% vs 86% = 29% (decreased by 4%) Maths (N) gap 72% vs 94% = 22% (decreased by 28%)</p> <p>July Reading gap 50% vs 79% = 29% (increased by 1%) Writing gap 50% vs 79% = 29% (decreased by 14%) Maths (N) gap 50% vs 79% = 29% (decreased by 21%)</p> <p>Overall GLD gap: 50% vs 79% (decreased by 24%)</p>

<p>-Y1 to trial Precision Training to ensure basic skills in English and Maths are consolidated</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 39% Writing gap 41% Maths gap 51%</p> <p>* The July comparison uses ITrack Attainment Dashboard % from Working at or Above Secure.</p>	<p>Children need consolidation of the basic skills in phonics and recall of number facts. Through repetition and specific teaching this intervention has been shown to have impact.</p>	<p>Monitoring every 15 days.</p> <p>Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.</p>	<p>AMc / KH</p>	<p>Termly</p> <p>Reading Feb: 46% increased by 7%; Writing Feb: 37% decreased by 4%; Maths Feb: 35% decreased by 16%</p> <p>Reading July: 20% (gap decreased by 19%); Writing July: 30% (gap decreased by 30%); Maths July: 29% (gap is decreased by 22%)</p>
<p>Y2 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 11 ahead% Writing gap 22 ahead % Maths gap 30 ahead%</p>	<p>Certain children need additional consolidation of skills in English and Maths.</p> <p>These groups will focus on PP children.</p>	<p>Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.</p>	<p>KH / MT</p>	<p>Termly.</p> <p>Reading Feb: 3% increased by 14%; Writing Feb: 17% ahead Maths Feb: 23% ahead</p> <p>Reading July: DA 20% ahead ; Writing July: DA 25% ahead Maths July: DA 7% ahead</p>

<p>Y3 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 35% Writing gap 21% Maths gap 25%</p>	<p>Catch up Numeracy will be used as this is a proven intervention (EEF) Phonics will be used as it gives 'moderate impact for very low cost' (EEF) In addition, certain children need additional consolidation of skills in English and Maths.</p>	<p>Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.</p>	<p>KH / MT</p>	<p>Termly. Reading Feb: 20% decreased by 15%; Writing Feb: 10% decreased by 11%; Maths Feb: 18% decreased by 7% Reading July: 18% decreased by 17%; Writing July: 18% decreased by 3%; Maths July: 31% increased by 6%</p>
<p>Y4 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 16% Writing gap 13% Maths gap 9%</p>		<p>Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.</p>	<p>KH / MT</p>	<p>Termly. Reading Feb: 21% increased by 5%; Writing Feb: 15% increased by 2%; Maths Feb: 14% increased by 6% Reading July: 9% decreased by 7%; Writing July: 26% increased by 13%; Maths July: 9% (gap was the same)</p>

<p>Y5 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 33% Writing gap 27% Maths gap 14%</p>	<p>PP Breakfast Club supports PP children in Maths (previously shown to have a positive impact). Phonics will be used as it gives 'moderate impact for very low cost' (EEF) In addition, certain children need additional consolidation of skills in English and Maths.</p>	<p>Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact. New child will have impacted the %.</p>	<p>KH / MT</p>	<p>Termly. Reading Feb: 33% Writing Feb: 24% decreased by 3% Maths Feb: 20% increased by 6% Reading July: 12% decreased by 21%; Writing July: 21% decreased by 6%; Maths July: 16% increased by 2%</p>
<p>Y6 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 5% ahead (GD 8% gap) Writing gap 20% Maths gap 11%</p>		<p>Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.</p>	<p>KH / MT</p>	<p>Termly. Reading Feb: 6% increased by 11%; Writing Feb: 24% increased by 4%; Maths Feb: 26% increased by 15% SATS Results Reading July: 20% decreased by 10%; Writing July: 3% ahead (Gap decreased by 23%); Maths July: 28% (gap increased by 17%)</p>
Total budgeted cost					£53,500
iii. Other approaches					

Action	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Addressing barriers to attendance (Parents) - Meetings with parents	Raised parental awareness of the importance of good attendance. Attendance to be 96%+.	This intervention has 'moderate impact for moderate cost' (EEF). Previously, the school has shown that these interventions can improve attendance of persistent absentees.	Termly meetings between KH and LB	KH	Termly Autumn 1 data: Gap: 3.15% DA attendance: 93.16% Feb: Gap: 2.53% DA attendance: 94.03% (This is 1.47% better than a direct comparison with 2017-18 data)
Barriers to attendance (Children) - Weekly meetings, reward system, Termly awards (98% get a certificate, 100% = badge, trophy)	Raised child awareness of the importance of good attendance. Attendance to be 96%+.	This is designed to build upon previous success with persistent absentees, by raising aspirations for DA children whose attendance is less than 95%.	Weekly meetings between PM and target group. Termly review and reward trip.	KH/PM	July: Gap: 2.5% DA attendance: 94.38% (This is 2.27% better than a direct comparison with 2017-18 data). At the end of the year, 22 of 32 of Persistent Absentee children had improved their attendance. (See report by PM for further detail.)

Peer tutoring (Reading buddies)	Improved reading scores for those mentored.	Peer tutoring has moderate impact for very low costs (EEF).	Termly review between Y3 and Y6 children	MT	Termly. Feb: Very positive review. 5/8 Y3/4 made at least expected progress and 8/8 for Y6. PSHCE benefits too. July: 6/8 Y3/4 and 8/8 Y6 made at expected progress See separate report.
Total budgeted cost					£6,400.00
7. Additional detail					

BARRIER E: Lack of enrichment experiences in the local area and beyond

Y5 / 6 Residentials (Howtown, Germany, Grinton), trips to the theatre and the beach, class excursions, work with artists (Sue Warlock, Graeme Hopper), Waterstones Reading Challenge, music tuition, visits from authors all offer opportunities to disadvantaged pupils to access experiences that they would not otherwise get.

TOTAL Cost of these activities: £7,800.00

TOTAL PUPIL PREMIUM EXPENDITURE: £110,430