

Pupil Premium Croyland Primary School 2018 – 2019 Action Plan

1. Summary information						
	Whole School PP	Eligible for PP £1,320	PP+ £2,300	Service Premium	Total	
November 2018	417	142	11	2	155	37%
Year 6	59	26	3	1		
Year 5	61	24	2			
Year 4	59	26	2	1		
Year 3	59	15	1			
Year 2	60	18	3			
Year 1	59	15	0			
Reception	60	18	0			
Budget:		<i>£171,600</i>	<i>£25,300</i>	<i>£600</i>	<i>£197,500</i>	

Cohort Summary October 2019 (Text not in Italics is evaluation text.)

Last Year's testing cohorts were each very diverse in their contextual characteristics. School percentages were above and in some cases, significantly above national average comparisons. Those that were, are highlighted in the table below. This demonstrates that our "disadvantaged" pupils are also challenged by other factors such as SEND. Published contextual data does not detail the many and various social issues that are predominant within our school community. The pastoral needs of our Year 6 2018/19 cohort, in addition to the label "disadvantage", included mobility, mobility following a PEX, historic low attendance, anti-social behaviour, crime and, various child protection and safeguarding concerns. We work closely with the Local Authority due to our reputation for inclusion. For children with multiple vulnerabilities, our measures of success are very different for this group of pupils.

Nova report 2018/19	EYFS %	KS1 %	KS2 %
Boys	63	58	50
SEN Support	15	11	6.8
EHCP	0	8.3	5.1
EAL	20	22	18.2
Disadv	31	26	42.4

PP cohort data from across the school does not, at first glance, does not imply that our spending decisions were as effective as we had hoped that they would be.

Our standards gap between disadvantage children and their peers is our greatest challenge at Croyland. The gap is stubborn because its causes are entrenched and complex and most lie beyond our control. However, we have made a difference across the needs of the whole child. Our measures of success are dependent on the priority need of the child when they arrive at our front door.

In evaluating our provision, and the impact that it has had, we have considered two sets of data. One set, as a cohort, with all “disadvantaged” children included. The second set, for the purpose of evaluating removes those pupils who vulnerabilities are complex and entrenched. In doing so, it is evident that the attainment gap is closing and our attainment direction for all pupils is moving closer to the National Average.

Year 6	Maths	Reading	Writing
National Data 19	79	73	79
Recalculated Data for full cohort: Consideration given to pupils with multiple vulnerabilities	76	69	75
National Data 19 for PP	79+	73+	79+
Recalculated Data for PP cohort: Consideration given to pupils with multiple vulnerabilities	68	63	72
Are we diminishing the attainment difference for PP pupils?			
Diminishing the difference (2016 /2017) * ofsted data	52%	52%	54%
Diminishing the difference (2017 2018)	69%	77%	73%
Diminishing the difference (2018 2019)	68%	63%	72%
Two year diminish – since last OFSTED Compared against 18/19 NA	Na 79%	Na 73%	Na 79%

We have repeated this process in Year 2. It is evident that, as a school team, we are diminishing the attainment gap for all learners in comparison to their national peers.

At KS2, reading remains a priority for our disadvantage cohort. At KS1, it is writing.

Year 2	Maths	Reading	Writing
National Data 19	76	75	70
Recalculated Data for full cohort: Consideration given to pupils with Multiple vulnerabilities	67	66	66
National Data 19	76+	75+	70+
Recalculated Data for PP cohort: Consideration given to pupils with multiple vulnerabilities	82	73	45
Are we diminishing the attainment difference for PP pupils?			
Diminishing the difference (2016 /2017) * ofsted data	52	52	54
Diminishing the difference (2017 2018)	69	77	63
Diminishing the difference (2018 2019)	82	73	45
Two year diminish – since last OFSTED Compared against 18/19 NA	Na 76%	Na 75%	Na 70%

As a school, we remain driven by the research of Maslow and provide a range of initiatives to meet the needs of all pupils. Our priority is always to ensure the basic and safety needs for our pupils are met as these are huge “head fillers” for our pupils. We focus on removing worry, and providing our children with head space to learn. Our ethos remains one of nurture and pupil wellbeing.

This year, our focus was predominantly targeted intervention and this has shown a very positive impact in learning, behavioural and pastoral interventions. Interventions are measured for impact through variety of measures. While these demonstrate impact in relation to the need of the child, impact in terms of pupils achieving national standards is less effective. Over time, the data above is showing that our focus on Maslow is our right response although it is not a quick fix!!

This year, 2019/20, we are going to shift our focus from targeted intervention to developing further quality first teaching following the research in the new EEF guide to Pupil Premium published in June 2019. Its aim is to support schools in spending their Pupil Premium to maximise the benefit for their students.

The report recommends school take a tiered approach to Pupil Premium spending. Teaching should be the top priority, including professional development, training and support for early career teachers and recruitment and retention.

Targeted support for struggling pupils should also be a key component of an effective Pupil Premium strategy; as well as strategies that relate to non-academic factors, including improving attendance, behaviour and social and emotional support

They have represented this approach visually and their research will form the basis of our 2019/20 plan.



2. Pupil Outcomes: July 2017				
YEAR 6 July 2017	<i>PP 2016</i>	<i>PP 2017</i>	<i>PP 2018</i>	<i>PP 2019</i>
Combined R/W/M	33%	32%	53%	47%
% reaching expected standard in reading	57%	52%	77%	52%
Progress measure reading from KS1	-3.80	-2.51	-3.5	-5.2

% reaching expected standard in writing	70%	54%	73%	56%
Progress measure writing from KS1	-1.26	-0.85	-2.1	-4.4
% reaching expected standard in maths	43%	52%	69%	52%
Progress measure maths from KS1	- 3.92	-2.97	-3.1	-4.3
% reaching expected standard in SPAG	57%	62%	73%	56%
Progress measure SPAG from KS1			-2.8	
YEAR 2 - July 2017				
	<i>PP 2016</i>	<i>PP 2017</i>	<i>PP 2018</i>	<i>PP 2019</i>
% reaching expected standard in reading	79%	64%	77%	65%
% reaching the higher standard in reading	33%	23%	31%	18%
% reaching expected standard in writing	79%	55%	62%	41%
% reaching the higher standard in writing	17%	14%	23%	12%
% reaching expected standard in maths	79%	77%	69%	59%
% reaching the higher standard in maths	29%	18%	23%	12%
Phonics				
Percentage of children achieving a pass	68%	62%	88%	60%
GLD				
GLD	71.4	70%	50%	53%

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)

In – school barriers:

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| A. | Pupil Needs – multiple vulnerabilities as barriers to learning and holistic growth and wellbeing. |
| B. | Parental engagement with learning opportunities at home (daily reading and spelling) |

C.	Internal learning drive – growth mind-set /aspiration. Pupils self-drive for success? What is out there in the world? Careers... Long term thinking?
External barriers:	
D.	<p>The Acorn profile ranks us as 37/321 in terms of proportion eligible. 1 being the highest. This is colour coded red. Our predominant community are living in urban adversity or are financially stretched. The title “urban adversity” totals at least 79% of the school community.</p> <p>We are in the highest Deprivation Quintile - lowest 20% of Schools. In all year groups, we have a greater number than the national average of disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>There are often many challenges for the family within their home which can distract from supporting a child’s educational growth. They themselves do not have the internal capacity, space or time to do this.</p> <p>Many of our parents will admit that their own schooling was poor and they themselves lack the skills and confidence to support their child’s learning as they grow older.</p> <p>There are also many easy distractions for children including electronic games and these take preference over homework.</p> <p>Where children’s home care is poor and social care is involved, the pace of positive change for the family is generally slow. This impacts on a learning mind-set/availability of the child.</p>
4. Desired outcomes: (Desired outcomes and how they will be measured) OFSTED	
Although outcomes are improving at Year 6 and 2, disadvantaged pupils in Years 1, 3, 4 and 5 are achieving less well than those in other year groups.	
The number of PP working below the expected standard in all year groups in the core subjects is reducing as the quality of teaching improves.	

Overall Maths - Ever 6				Overall: 2018 - 2019		Overall: 2017 - 2018	
				Writing			
		Overall: 2018 - 2019	Overall: 2017 - 2018	Working below Expect		Working below Expected	
		Working below Expected	Working below Expected	Year 1 (15)	47% (7)	R	
Year 1 (15)	27% (4)	R		Year 2 (16)	56% (9)	53% (8)	
Year 2 (16)	38% (6)	53% (8)		Year 3 (17)	53% (9)	33% (4)	
Year 3 (17)	47% (8)	23% (3)		Year 4 (25)	56% (14)	57% (13)	
Year 4 (25)	48% (12)	57% (13)		Year 5 (22)	41% (9)	38% (8)	
Year 5 (22)	14% (3)	52% (11)		Year 6 (22)	41% (9)	52% (12)	
Year 6 (23)	43% (10)	70% (16)		Total (117)	49% (57)	48% (45)	
Total (118)	36% (43)	54% (51)					

Reading

Ever 6 underachievement 2017 - 2018

	Overall: 2018 - 2019	Overall: 2017 - 2018
	Working below Expected	Working below
Year 1 (15)	53% (8)	R
Year 2 (16)	44% (7)	9
Year 3 (17)	35% (6)	3
Year 4 (25)	52% (13)	12
Year 5 (22)	18% (4)	7
Year 6 (23)	48% (11)	11
Total (118)	42% (49)	45% - 42

Desired outcome evaluated as green for **maths**, Yellow for **reading** and red for **writing**

PP pupil attendance is above that of Non PP pupils.

PP pupil attendance is above that of Non PP pupils.

- 18/19 Whole school attendance 95.66
- 18/19 Whole school PP attendance 95.32%
- 18/19 Whole school Non PP attendance 95.66
- PP absence remains greater than the National Average 4.2%

5a. Committed Expenditure

A number of salaries are committed to the PP budget. This is calculated as 37% of their salary. Further details can be found in the action plan below.

5b. Planned expenditure:

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 Focus Evaluated following Evaluation data added	What is the evidence and rationale for this outcome? Educational Endowment Foundation	Chosen Action/Approach	How will we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff Lead Budgeted Cost	Measure of Success/ Lessons learned (and whether we will continue with this approach)
--	--	-------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--

<p>The notion of self-improvement and “practise makes perfect” is embedded throughout the school.</p>	<p>We want our children to be intrinsically motivated by learning and to know that “practise makes perfect” or in the very least, enables improvements to be made.</p> <p>EEF Reference: (Months)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meta – cognition and self-regulation +8 	<p><i>Getting better Plans:</i> Each teacher has one hour dedicated time each week; to work with 5 identified children, over six weeks.</p> <p>The class teacher and child will identify where and how they must improve and monitor and evaluate their own progress towards their targets.</p> <p>Additional practise opportunities will be sent home.</p> <p>Successful plans and achievements will be rewarded /awarded with a “Smarty pants” badge.</p>	<p>LH to teacher RE one hour a week to each class. This time is allocated to Getting Better Support.</p> <p>Monitoring of plans and outcomes by PP Lead will demonstrate the effectiveness of this time.</p> <p>Reporting of the value of this time will be made to CR – PP Governor.</p>	<p>RE Teacher : 37% of 12 hours x 38 weeks</p> <p>Badges £90</p> <p>Total £29,824</p>	<p>Targeted academic support: Our pupils thrive on individual one to one time with an adult and the majority of pupils have made the progress against the targets they have been set. This has been confirmed through secondary measures.</p> <p>As the GBP became embedded, White Rose, PIRA and Cracking comprehension data was used to qualify the child’s achievements.</p> <p>Personalised letters of achievement and a badge were sent home through the post and were well received by parents who had supported the additional practise at home.</p> <p>This initiative will continue in the same form in 2019/20 with a focus on more able PP learners.</p>
---	--	---	---	--	--

<p>PP pupils demonstrate (within class cohorts) improvements in their reading achievements</p>	<p><i>Reading Comprehension Strategies focus on the learners' understanding of written text and the authors thought processes.</i></p> <p><i>Pupils are taught a range of techniques which enable them to immerse themselves in a story and comprehend what they read and why the author chooses the techniques they did.</i></p> <p>EEF Reference: (Months) <i>Reading Comprehension Strategies (+6 months).</i></p>	<p><i>PIRA assessments in the three core areas, taken 3 x a year show progress, as a cohort from term to term and are inline or above the year group average in Summer 2019 testing.</i></p> <p><i>Engagement and motivation to Reading: Cracking Comprehension: Online comprehension tool to promote reading as an alternative to books within Book Talk.</i></p>	<p><i>PIRA Testing dates within the calendar</i> <i>Autumn Testing Completed.</i> <i>Reading lead, leading on how to use the diagnostic information to plan next steps teaching and learning.</i></p> <p><i>Reading Monitoring Review of Cracking Comprehension: Implementation</i> <i>Frequency</i> <i>Teacher Voice</i> <i>Pupil Voice</i> <i>ARE outcomes – is it value for money?</i></p>	<p><i>PIRA Testing Costs</i> £1,081</p> <p><i>Cracking Comprehension</i> £509</p> <p>£1,590</p>	<p>Quality of Teaching and learning:</p> <p>The success of PIRA testing and Cracking comprehension is demonstrated in our school's internal data</p> <p>Across both KSs, the average % of pupils achieving the pass mark across the year has increased.</p> <p>KS1 63.5% – 73% KS2 69% – 73%</p> <p>This is due to the data analysis that takes places following the tests and the personalised and focussed teaching that follows.</p>
Total budgeted cost					£31,414
ii. Targeted support :					

<p>All PP children, within Years 3, 4, 5, 6 who require additional learning intervention in maths, achieve their targets, a two term timescale.</p>	<p>There are children, who are falling behind their peers despite leaving KS1 at the same standard. We hope to ensure, that through additional teaching, this slippage from year to year can be halted.</p> <p>EEF Reference: (Months) Small Group Tuition = (+6 months)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To employ an additional T/TA of maths to enable identified learners to “keep up” not “catch up” <p>JW - maths interventions 2 x days EB - maths intervention 2 x day</p>	<p>Maths Intervention Teacher £6,904</p> <p>Maths Intervention Teacher £1,469</p> <p>£8,373</p>	<p>Targeted academic support:</p> <p>Intervention impact for individuals and taught groups are Rose test data to confirm progress against individual targets.</p> <p>Intervention reports demonstrate pupils are increasing in their arithmetic scores, with some pupils making significant progress and achieving the pass score for their year group and no longer requiring intervention.</p> <p>Intervention Evaluation provides individual details.</p>
---	---	--	--	---

<p>All pupils with SEND/who are receipt of PP, make good progress within their area of need</p>	<p><i>Speaking and Listening:</i></p> <p><i>Many of our children display Speech and language Needs. In order to support their development, we have employed a specialist TA to deliver NHS SALT programs.</i></p> <p><i>Switch On :</i></p> <p><i>Reading is a life skill and currently, there are many distractions that prevent reading at home and not all parents are equipped with the knowledge of how to support their child with engaging and understanding more challenging texts.</i></p> <p>EEF Reference: (Months)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualised Instr. +3 • Teaching Assistants +1 • Early Years intervention +3 • Oral Language Interventions +5 	<p><i>Role of ML in providing S & L support</i></p> <p><i>Role of AI in ensuring provision for this group of pupils.</i></p> <p>Core Group of Pupils: EHCP/SEND register, support class teacher with the implementation of specific strategies that will enable them to make good progress against their identified areas of need.</p> <p><i>Role of LB in providing Switch on Reading</i></p> <p><i>Roll of SEND TAs in supporting individual Learning:</i></p>	<p><i>SEND TA SO - £16,114</i></p> <p>£34,275</p>	<p>Targeted academic support:</p> <p>Our Evaluation Of Reading Intervention demonstrate that Switch on and Read write ink are highly effective reading interventions when executed correctly for PP. Executed effectively refers to the number of sessions that are required within a week.</p> <p>The effectiveness of this, in addition to the rigor of the intervention, 11-nurture and adult motivation of the child.</p> <p>Speech and language support and our provision if this is fundamental to a child's holistic development and growth, It is not appropriate to average out the achievements of these pupils because their needs are so individual. Some progress is vast, and others require more time. The S & L need directs this.</p>
---	---	---	--	---

<p>All pupils/who are receipt of PP, make good progress within their area of need</p> <p>Pastoral Intervention</p> <p>Behavioural Intervention</p>	<p>At Croyland primary School, we use Maslow's hierarchy of needs to ensure that children have the available capacity to learning. This can be both short term and long term need in children's lives.</p> <p>Both of these teams also work with parents to achieve better holistic outcomes for their children.</p> <p>EEF Reference: (Months)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individualised Instr. +3 Social and Emotional Learning +4 Parental involvement 	<p>Sensory Circuits</p> <p>Hub Breakfast</p> <p>Behaviour Team: GS/NF/MW</p> <p>Pastoral Team : CB/RC/SW</p> <p>Nurture Class: KJ/GS</p> <p>PW: School Counsellor</p>	<p>Pastoral Team (x 3 staff)</p> <p>Behaviour Team (x 3 Staff)</p> <p>Penny Willis</p>	<p>£18,631</p> <p>£47,424</p> <p>£2,280</p> <p>£68,335</p>	<p>Targeted academic support:</p> <p>Although there isn't a quantitative measure to identify the impact of this various support, school internal measures show that it makes such a positive difference. We use both pupil and parent voice to assess impact.</p> <p>. Last year Family Support was received by over 50% of PP families Private counselling was given to 15% of PP pupils and their families.</p> <p>10% of PP pupils accessed behaviour support and 10 pupils attended a KS2 nurture class. Achievement for All (we are a lead school in this pilots) assessments demonstrate this is invaluable for our most vulnerable, less confident pupils who carry significant worry and social need.</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--

<p>All class and SEND TAs facilitate effective teaching and learning for their allocated pupils.</p>	<p>Croyland is recognised as a fully inclusive school and the number of children identified as having significant needs are high. In order to provide effective education for these children and the welfare requirements they need – additional adult support in the form of TAs is necessary. EEF Reference: (Months)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualised Instr. +3 • Teaching Assistants +1 	<p>Monitoring, in response to the training, shows that all facilitators are effective in their role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autumn 1 (Baseline) • Spring 2 (Review 1) • Summer 2 (Review 2) <p>Areas observed and rated against:</p> <p>1: Thorough discussion – TA demonstrates a secure knowledge of the child's needs academically and or within PSED.</p> <p>2. Observation demonstrates that TA makes a positive impact on learning and or PSED needs.</p> <p>3. Evidence from Learning Scrutiny demonstrates sustained positive impact by TA against ASP targets.</p> <p>4 TA is motivated to improve their practice.</p>	<p>37% of class TAS Budget :</p> <p>Year R X 2</p> <p>Year 1 X 2</p> <p>Year 2 X 2</p>	<p>£17,845</p> <p>£61,435</p> <p>£79,280</p>	<p>Targeted academic support:</p> <p>19 children had their ECHP/HNF allocation topped up by the PP allocation.</p> <p>TA Monitoring was completed throughout the year against the four areas of effective practice,</p> <p>By June 2019 effective and sustained practise was evident in all four areas by 96% of TAS. These percent's have risen significantly from baseline monitoring in the Autumn term.</p> <p>Our focus for next year's budget allocated subject knowledge, particularly in the area of mathematics. As children's PSED needs are being met, learning against an age appropriate curriculum can be developed through confident and capable staff.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

<p>PP child are given every opportunity to enhance and embed their school learning</p>	<p>Not all children have a place, resource and the adult support to complete out of school learning tasks. Homework clubs are provided and pupils are encouraged to attend.</p> <p>EEF Reference: (Months)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework +2 • Parental involvement +3. 	<p>Review PP numbers who read at home.</p> <p>Review of PP Reading Activities/reading to an adult – increase the number of reading volunteers in school.</p> <p>Track PP attendance at Homework club and direct parents/child to this after school club.</p> <p>PP focused learning scrutinises are completed and their outcomes are compared against the Non – PP cohort.</p> <p>Registers of clubs are analysed and children are positively discriminated to ensure attendance.</p>	<p>Homework Club: NF</p> <p>(4 hours a week)</p> <p>37% of £6986</p>	<p>£847</p>	<p>Wider Strategies:</p> <p>Although Homework Club was provided, it had 10/30 regulars PP attenders a week. Various snacks were offered to incentive.</p> <p>The sports clubs were preferred options for parents.</p>
<p>Total budgeted cost</p>					<p>£172.949</p>

iii. Other approaches:					
<p>PP pupils experience a wealth of new and exciting learning opportunities to give them positive aspirations for the future</p>	<p>EEF Reference: (Months)</p> <p>Arts Participation +2 Outdoor learning +4</p>	<p>Response To Need: Application</p>		<p>£5,000</p>	<p>Wider Strategies:</p> <p>A coach was provided for our Year 6 trip to the House of Parliament – this ensured we had full attendance.</p> <p>Actual spend Outdoor Learning: £727</p>
<p>PP pupils demonstrate the value of “Be Smart” in their appearance</p>	<p>Be Smart is a core school value.</p> <p>EEF Reference: (Months)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Uniform +0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children’s economic status is not visible within the school community due to uniform. All pupils who are deemed eligible for PP funding are given a £30 voucher for families to spend on uniform/trips as parents require. 	<p>All children who enter as a mid-year entry and in EYFS are asked to check their eligibility. On receiving confirmation, we will provide the voucher.</p>	<p>£1,457</p>	<p>The school voucher was welcomed by parents and this will continue.</p> <p>Voucher: 20 x £30 = £600</p>
Total budgeted cost					£7,057
				Total Spend October 2019	£211,420
				Total Income	£207,941
					-£3,479