

Pupil premium strategy / self-evaluation

1. Summary information					
School	Tanfield Lea Community Primary School				
Academic Year	2019-20	Total PP budget	£98,700.00	Date of most recent PP Review	Nov 19
Total number of pupils	317	Number of pupils eligible for PP	73	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Feb 20 June 20

2. Current attainment		
<u>Year 6 2018-19 data</u>	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>National Average</i>
% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths (%)	58%	64%
% making expected progress in reading (as measured in the school)	-0.7	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)	-1.6	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
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 2018-2019

6. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2019-2020

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?
--------	------------------	---	---	------------	--------------------------------------

Focus on Non-Negotiables/Basic maths facts throughout school (Eng and Maths)	A concentrated focus on basic skills will improve Writing attainment across the school.	Feedback is 'high impact for very low costs, based on moderate evidence' (EEF)	Work scrutiny	MT, SLT	Termly End of Year: This was done throughout the school. There is no internal data from March to July due to Lockdown. Y6 TA data suggests DA children broadly matched their peers in Writing. 82% vs 88% at ARE.
Accelerated Reader to continue to be used throughout KS2	Reading for 20 minutes a day with high accuracy will secure accelerated progress in Reading.	Accelerated Reader has had a positive effect on all children, including PP. Progress scores for Reading for DA children to improve from -0.7.	Termly STAR assessments and review of ITrack data	MT	Termly End of Year: There is no internal data from March to July due to Lockdown. Y6 TA data suggests DA children broadly matched their peers in Reading. 82% vs 84% at ARE.
Maths Rockstars and Mathletics to be used throughout KS1 and KS2	Regular skills practice will secure accelerated progress in Mathematics.	Focus on basic skills will ensure that application is stronger in Year 5 and 6.	Mathletics/Rockstars data and review of ITrack data Work scrutinies and discussion with children	MB/MP	Termly End of Year: There is no internal data from March to July due to Lockdown. Y6 TA data suggests DA children did not perform as well as their peers in Maths . 73% vs 83% at ARE

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	Termly End of Year Review: There is no internal data from March to July due to Lockdown. 3 Y2 children were given 2Sec TA after using Lexia (all had <15% of achieving at start of year)
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	Termly End of Year Review: EE's MLDP project was successfully implemented. Children across KS2 have been exposed to list of new vocabulary.
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	Termly End of Year: Increased work scrutiny was done throughout the school. There is no internal data from March to July due to Lockdown. Y6 TA data suggests DA children broadly matched their peers in Writing. 82% vs 88% at ARE.
Total budgeted cost					£43,850.00

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?
Reception to plan small group intervention according to need	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP – currently</p> <p>Reading gap 40% vs 70% = 30%</p> <p>Writing gap 30% vs 70% = 40%</p> <p>Maths (N) gap 40% vs 72% = 34%</p> <p>Overall (From ITrack) 20% vs 67% = 47%</p>	Small group intervention focusing on specific areas has higher impact than whole class teaching for this group.	<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)</p> <p>Being inline defined as having 40 – 60 some in Spring.</p>	AG	<p>Termly</p> <p>End of Year: There is no internal data from March to July due to Lockdown.</p> <p>Spring TA data shows that the Reading gap at ARE has narrowed by 21% to 9% (78% vs 87%).</p> <p>Spring TA data shows that the Writing gap at ARE has narrowed by 22% to 18% (67% vs 82%).</p> <p>Spring TA data shows that the Maths gap at ARE has narrowed by 22% to 12% (77% vs 89%)</p>

<p>-Y1 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 29% Writing gap 29% Maths gap 29% (From EY data)</p> <p>* The 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. Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.</p>	<p>KH / MT</p>	<p>Termly End of Year Review: Spring TA data shows that the Reading gap at ARE has widened by 2% to 31%.</p> <p>Spring TA data shows that the Writing gap at ARE has widened by 19% to 48%.</p> <p>Spring TA data shows that the Maths gap at ARE has widened by 11% to 40%.</p>
<p>Y2 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 20% Writing gap 30% Maths gap 29 %</p>	<p>Certain children need additional consolidation of skills in English and Maths. 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. End of Year Review: Spring TA data shows that the Reading gap at ARE has widened by 12% to 32% Spring TA data shows that the Writing gap at ARE has widened by 11% to 41%. Spring TA data shows that the Maths gap at ARE has widened by 11% to 40%.</p>

<p>Y3 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 20% ahead Writing gap 25% ahead Maths gap 7% ahead</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. End of Year Review: Spring TA data shows that the Reading gap at ARE is 8%. Spring TA data shows that the Writing gap at ARE has DA children 13% ahead. Spring TA data shows that the Maths gap at ARE has widened to 26%.</p>
<p>Y4 To plan small group intervention according to need</p>	<p>Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 18% Writing gap 18% Maths gap 31%</p>		<p>Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.</p>	<p>KH / MT</p>	<p>Termly. End of Year Review: Spring TA data shows that the Reading gap at ARE has widened by 8% to 26% Spring TA data shows that the Writing gap at ARE has widened by 16% to 34%. Spring TA data shows that the Maths gap at ARE has narrowed by 6 % to 25%.</p>

Y5 To plan small group intervention according to need	Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 9% Writing gap 26% Maths gap 9%	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.	Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.	KH / MT	Termly. End of Year Review: Spring TA data shows that the Reading gap at ARE has narrowed by 3% to 6% Spring TA data shows that the Writing gap at ARE has narrowed by 10% to 16%. Spring TA data shows that the Maths gap at ARE has widened by 9% to 18%.
Y6 To plan small group intervention according to need	Gap reduced between PP and non PP - currently Reading gap 12% Writing gap 21% Maths gap 16%		Termly monitoring of the intervention to ensure it is having impact.	KH / MT	Termly. End of Year Review: Summer TA data shows that the Reading gap at ARE has narrowed by 10% to 2% Summer TA data shows that the Writing gap at ARE has narrowed by 15% to 6%. Summer TA data shows that the Maths gap at ARE has narrowed by 6% to 10%.
Total budgeted cost					£55,600

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?
--------	------------------	---	---	------------	--------------------------------------

<p>Addressing barriers to attendance (Parents) - Meetings with parents</p>	<p>Raised parental awareness of the importance of good attendance. Attendance to be 96%+. Last year's DA attendance: 94.38% (gap of 2.5%)</p>	<p>This intervention has 'moderate impact for moderate cost' (EEF). Previously, the school has shown that these interventions can improve attendance of persistent absentees.</p>	<p>Termly meetings between KH and LB</p>	<p>KH</p>	<p>Termly Autumn 1 data: Gap: 3.11% DA attendance: 94.18% (Using FSM data) End of Year Review: Gap: 2.73% DA attendance: 93.92%</p>
<p>Barriers to attendance (Children) - Weekly meetings, reward system, Termly awards (98% get a certificate, 100% = badge, trophy)</p>		<p>This is designed to build upon previous success with persistent absentees, by raising aspirations for DA children whose attendance is less than 95%.</p>	<p>Weekly meetings between PM and target group. Termly review and reward trip.</p>	<p>KH/PM</p>	<p>12 out of 16 targeted DA children improved their attendance over the year. (from PM)</p>
<p>Peer tutoring (Reading buddies)</p>	<p>Improved reading scores for those mentored. Targetted children in Y2 and Y3 paired with Y4 and Y6 respectively.</p>	<p>Peer tutoring has moderate impact for very low costs (EEF).</p>	<p>Termly review between Y2/3 and Y4/6 children</p>	<p>MT</p>	<p>Termly. End of Year Review: Programme worked very effectively with high levels of engagement. 4 out of 5 Y2 buddies made at least good progress despite lockdown. 4 out of 8 Y4 buddies improved their AR NRSS score, despite lockdown. This programme will have to suspended due to Covid restrictions and children being in different bubbles.</p>
Total budgeted cost					£6,800.00

7. Additional detail

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

Y5 / 6 Residential (Howtown, Germany, Grinton), trips to the theatre and the beach, class excursions, 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: £8,300.00

TOTAL PUPIL PREMIUM EXPENDITURE: £114,550