

Pupil Premium Strategy Impact Report 2018- 2019



1. Summary information					
School	Shaw Wood Academy				
Academic Year	2018/19	Total PP budget	£161,000	Date of most recent PP Review	September 2019
Total number of pupils	408 (ex nursery)	Number of pupils eligible for PP	125	Date for next internal review of this strategy	January 2020

1. Current attainment – children achieving the expected standard		
<b>EYFS (3 children PP children)</b>	<b>% PP children attaining expected outcome</b>	<b>% Pupils not eligible for PP attaining expected outcome</b>
% achieving expected standard or above in reading	100%	70%
% achieving expected standard or above in writing	100%	67%
% achieving expected standard or above in maths	100%	78%
<b>Year 1 phonics (5 PP children)</b>	<b>% PP children attaining expected outcome</b>	<b>% Pupils not eligible for PP attaining expected outcome</b>
	100%	86%
<b>Year 2 phonics (2 PP children – eligible for the test)</b>	<b>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</b>	<b>Pupils not eligible for PP</b>
	100%	33%
<b>Attainment for: 2018-2019 (end of KS1) (19 PP children)</b>	<b>% PP children attaining expected outcome (National)</b>	<b>% Pupils not eligible for PP attaining expected outcome (National)</b>
% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths	26% (50%)	64% (69%)
% achieving expected standard or above in reading	47% (62%)	70% (78%)
% achieving expected standard or above in writing	26% (55%)	67% (73%)
% achieving expected standard or above in maths	53% (50%)	73% (79%)
<b>Attainment for: 2018-2019 (end of KS2) (29 PP children)</b>	<b>% PP children attaining expected outcome (National)</b>	<b>% Pupils not eligible for PP attaining expected outcome (National)</b>

% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths	48% (52%)	74% (71%)
% achieving expected standard or above in reading	76% (62%)	97% (78%)
% achieving expected standard or above in writing	66% (68%)	97% (83%)
% achieving expected standard or above in GPS	72% (68%)	100% (83%)
% achieving expected standard or above in maths	62% (68%)	77% (84%)

A. Review of expenditure			
Academic year	2018-2019		
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.			
<b>i. Quality of teaching for all</b>			
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	Impact
For all children to make good progress in writing	<p>Full implementation and monitoring of last year's feedback policy</p> <p>1:1 Coaching conversations</p> <p>Writing linked to challenge curriculum</p> <p>School participating in 'Help handwriting shine' research project. This will be aimed at all children in year 2 and as an intervention group in y5.</p>	<p>Writing outcomes at the end of KS1 were below the national average. The most common reason for a child not achieving this was spelling and handwriting.</p> <p>Last academic year writing was a whole school priority. Developing staff knowledge on teaching writing through topic and being creative has proven to be particularly successful in the classes that have done this well.</p> <p>High quality feedback and marking is proven to be vital to pupils' attitude towards learning and attainment. Use of EEF toolkits and research on writing feedback to support change in feedback policy</p>	<p><b>EYFS</b> There were only 3 PP children in EYFS. All these children met the expected standard for writing.</p> <p><b>Key stage 1</b> The writing outcomes were disappointing for both PP and non-PP children. Only 26% of the PP children achieved expected standard compared to 50% of the same group nationally. 67% of 'other' children achieved expected standard compared to that national outcome for this group of 73%. The areas for improvement are spelling and quantity of written work. This will continue to be a priority for 2019-2020.</p> <p>The 'Helping Handwriting shine' project, had some impact on developing fine motor skills but was very time consuming (1.5 hours a week). The evidence showed that it would not be cost or time efficient to continue.</p> <p><b>Key stage 2</b> 97% of 'other' children achieved the expected outcome for writing by the end of KS2. 66% of the PP children achieved this, which is broadly in line with national figures. Writing progress was good for the whole cohort (1.82). The PP group made 0.15 points progress, 'other' children made 3.39</p>
For children to make good progress in	SDP focus for this year (priority 2)	Reading outcomes at the end of KS2 were lower than writing and maths, particularly for the PP children. School has invested a	<b>EYFS</b> There were only 3 PP children in EYFS. All these children met the expected standard for reading

<p>reading, and to be in line with children nationally</p>	<p>New reading books suitable for all ages and reading levels purchased and launched to the children</p> <p>Reading school launch and promotion of reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Library</li> <li>-Author visits</li> <li>-Purple Octopus rewards</li> <li>-Reading areas in classes</li> <li>-Purchase books related to topics</li> </ul> <p>Book week and book day</p>	<p>significant amount in reading resources and needs to make sure these are used effectively and have an impact for the children's progress.</p> <p>Rapid reading has proven to be highly effective for the school in the past. The children that participate, always make accelerated progress</p>	<p><b>Phonics</b> There were 5 PP children in the year 1 cohort. All children met the expected standard. 2 PP children retook the assessment in year 2, all of the children met the expectation.</p> <p><b>Key stage 1</b> The reading outcomes were lower than expected. 47% of the pp children met the standard compared to 62% nationally. Whereas 70% of non-PP met the standard compared to 78% nationally. Additional intervention and support will be put in place for the children whom did not meet the expected standard.</p> <p><b>Key stage 2</b> Reading outcomes were strong at the end of KS2. 76% of PP met the standard compared to the national figure of 62%. 97% of non-pp children met the standard compared to the national figure of 78%.</p>
<p>Improved oracy in EYFS</p>	<p>Full time teacher deployment into nursery</p> <p>Enhance provision to improve high quality speaking opportunities with a focus on small world, role play and outdoors.</p> <p>Development of outdoor area and resources for promoting oracy</p>	<p>Data continues to show that the vast majority of children entering our nursery start below the expected in speaking and in listening.</p> <p>Extensive EYFS training and experience and a broader understanding of how children develop and learn.</p> <p>Extending and varying the range of resources available for the children to use as a stimulus will actively engage all children.</p> <p>Training and enabling staff members to facilitate the development of language within EYFS will improve speech and language outcomes.</p>	<p><b>EYFS – F1</b> At baseline 27% of 11 Early Years PP children were attaining expected standard in the prime area of Communication and Language. Children made excellent progress so that on transition to F2 60% of the group attained expected standard.</p> <p><b>EYFS – F2</b> On entry to F2 each of the 3 PP children were working at expected standard. Each of the three children made expected progress and maintained expected standard at the end of the year</p>
<p><b>Total budgeted cost</b> £332,894</p>			
<p><b>ii. Targeted support</b></p>			
<p><b>Desired outcome</b></p>	<p><b>Chosen action/approach</b></p>	<p><b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b></p>	<p><b>Impact</b></p>

<p>For all PP children to make good progress in writing, and to be in line with the other children (non-PP)</p>	<p>In addition to lessons, small writing intervention for spelling in year 2 and year 3</p> <p>After school writing intervention within year 6.</p> <p>1:1 tuition after school for LAC</p> <p>1:1 coaching conversations</p>	<p>Writing outcomes at the end of KS1 were below the national average. The most common reason for a child not achieving this was spelling and handwriting.</p> <p>Small group interventions with qualified staff are shown to be effective, if planned well and differentiated to the correct level. Work needs to link directly with topics and in class daily foci.</p> <p><a href="https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/resources/teaching-learning-toolkit/feedback/">https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/resources/teaching-learning-toolkit/feedback/</a></p>	<p>Average progress writing scores were broadly similar for PP and non-PP children throughout most year groups. In F2 and Y1 PP children made better progress than non-PP children. A gap of -0.62 points was evident in Year 4. National data for Y6 pupils shows a significant gap of -3.24; this lower outcome was contributed to by the -1.33 score of the 7 SEN children who were also eligible for PP</p>
<p>For all PP children to make good progress in reading, so outcomes are in-line with the other children</p>	<p>Data based reading intervention (including Rapid Reading)</p> <p>1:1 tuition after school for LAC</p>	<p>Reading outcomes at the end of KS2 were lower than writing and maths, particularly for the PP children. At KS1 the PP children's outcomes were just below the national average. The gap between PP and non-PP was 8%.</p> <p>Small group interventions with qualified staff are shown to be effective, if planned well and differentiated to the correct level. Work needs to link directly with topics and in class daily foci.</p>	<p>Average progress scores in reading were broadly similar throughout school for PP and non-PP children. Progress in most year groups was good based on every child needing to make one chronological year's progress – equating to 3 points. The exceptions to this were Years 2 and 4 where progress for both groups – based on prior attainment was slightly lower (-0.5 points average). Outcomes for both groups in Year 6 were positive and above national comparative data for both groups.</p>

<p>For PP children to express themselves effectively by the time they leave EYFS</p>	<p>Trained and experienced speech and language TA, delivering 1:1 programmes and talk boost or Lego language development with small groups. Liaising with EYFS staff linking to oracy work within the classrooms.</p>	<p>TA liaises effectively with speech and language therapists, with excellent outcomes based on achieving targets (see SLT targets and reviews)</p> <p>Talk boost is a proven language intervention tool, used to support confidence, discussion and language knowledge.</p> <p><i>“There is good evidence that children’s early speech, language and communication skills are powerful predictors of later life chances.”</i> EEF</p>	<p>Each of the three children eligible for PP in F2 achieved expectations in speaking and listening.</p>
--	---	--	--

**Total budgeted cost**  
£31,273

**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?
<p>To improve attendance for PP children so it is above 96%</p>	<p>Employed Pastoral manager, where one day a week she will be focused on school attendance, liaising with EWO and meeting with parents.</p> <p>PP breakfast club, aimed at encouraging children to come to school on time and regularly.</p> <p>PP reward voucher scheme</p>	<p>We can’t improve attainment for children if they aren’t actually attending school. NFER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step.</p> <p>Breakfast club to be a success last academic year and improved lateness and attendance for the targeted PP children. Therefore we have continued the club this year, but have changed the targeted children.</p>	<p>Attendance for PP children in 2018-19 was 96.2%</p>		

<p>To improve experiences for the children that are outside that of their normal daily life, enabling them to have higher aspirations and expectations.</p>	<p>A wide range of after school clubs, school trips and residential visits throughout school (at least 2 per year).</p> <p>Outside educational visitors in school e.g. Planetarium, Sam Safari, Dinosaurs and fossil, Shakespeare company and theatre performers.</p> <p>Topics are varied and exciting.</p> <p>Continued development of challenge curriculum throughout school. Curriculum aims to excite children and support their learning through 'real life' learning experiences</p> <p>Challenge coach in position from June 2017, supporting small groups to develop socially and learning behaviours (e.g. resilience)</p> <p>School holiday club to ensure children have fun and enriched school holiday, accessing a range of indoor and outdoor activities</p>	<p>Children are given opportunities to see what is beyond their normal experience, which should enable them to aspire to do well in school and have aspirations for the future.</p> <p>After a successful year introducing the challenge curriculum, school will continue to develop and embed the challenge ethos into daily planning and learning. This is priority 3 in the school development plan</p>	<p>All children eligible for pupil premium engaged with the range of trips and visitors provided by school during the academic year.</p> <p>23% of the children who graduated from Children's University were in receipt of pupil premium.</p> <p>Each of the year groups embraced the Challenge Curriculum. Discussions with pupils, observations within classes and scrutiny of the work produced by children clearly shows that children enjoy their learning, find the curriculum stimulating and that they make good progress as a result of being immersed in rich and active learning.</p> <p>More measurable outcomes can be seen in the progress outcomes listed previously in this report.</p>
---	---	--	--

<p>To ensure that all pupil premium children are emotionally and socially ready to access learning</p>	<p>Employed a full time pastoral manager</p> <p>Employed a full time behaviour manager</p> <p>Thrive emotional, social and behavioural support programme</p> <p>1:1 mentoring from Worth Ltd</p>	<p>Thrive shows impact through measurable outcomes, and has supports a child so they are ready to learn.  <a href="http://www.thethriveapproach.com">www.thethriveapproach.com</a></p> <p>Government document November 2015: 'Knowledge and skills statements for practice leaders and practice supervisors.'</p>	<p>A total of 22 children were supported through the Thrive programme during the academic year. 11 of these children were eligible for pupil premium. This represents 9% of the total pupil premium children in school as compared to the non-pp children being supported through the programme who represent 4% of the remaining school community.</p>
<p><b>Total budgeted cost</b> £44,681</p>			