

**Stoke Hill Infant and Nursery School Pupil Premium Strategy 2019-20**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Summary information**
 |
| **School** | Stoke Hill Infant and Nursery School |
| **Academic Year** | 2019/20 | **Total PP budget** | £44035 | **Date of most recent PP Review** | n/a |
| **Total number of pupils** | 310 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 23 | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | July 2020 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Current attainment in Y2 2018-19**
 |
|  | *Pupils eligible for PP* *(SHINS)* | *Pupils not eligible for the PP**(SHINS)* | *All pupils**(national average)*  |
| **% Achieving at least expected standard in reading**  | 67% | 77% | 75% |
| **% Achieving at least expected standard in writing** | 67% | 63%  | 69% |
| **% Achieving at least expected standard in maths** | 33% | 70%  | 76% |
| **% Achieving at least expected standard in science** | 89% | 85% | 82% |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Current attainment in Y1 Phonics 2018-19**
 |
|  | *Pupils eligible for PP* *(SHINS)*  | *Pupils not eligible for the PP**(SHINS)* | *All pupils* *(national average)*  |
| **% Achieving expected standard** | 33%  | 61% | 82% |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Current attainment in FS Good Level of Development (GLD) 2018-19**
 |
|  | *Pupils eligible for PP* *(SHINS)*  | *Pupils not eligible for the PP**(SHINS)* | *All pupils*  *(national average)*  |
| **% Achieving expected standard** | 60%  | 75% | 72% |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high attaining)**
 |
| **These barriers to learning have been identified after discussions with staff and pupils; considering what helps and hinders learning for groups and individuals.**  |
|  **In-school barriers**  |
|  | Limited every day vocabulary as the basis of learning in maths, science and project. |
|  | Poor phonic acquisition. |
| **C.** | Poor writing skills. |
|  **External barriers** |
| **D.**  | Home circumstances e.g. family break up, poverty, mental health issues, poor parenting skills |
| **E.** | Poor English language environment in the home e.g. few books, lack of drawing/writing materials, limited opportunities for sustained conversation |
| **F.** | Limited support for Home Learning e.g. reading practise and online maths practise. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Outcomes**
 |
|  | *Desired outcomes and how they will be measured* | *Success criteria*  |
|  | Pupils achieve at least expected in the English, maths and science SATs in June 2020.Half termly Developing Vocabulary Project Assessments show that PPG pupils are acquiring and applying targeted vocabulary. | Pupils use and understand age appropriate vocabulary in key subjects. |
|  | Pupils exit FS having secured ARE in phonics i.e. Phase 3 of Letters and SoundsY1 pupils pass the Y1 Phonic Check.Y2 pupils that failed the Y1 Phonic Check pass it in Y2. | Pupils acquire and apply phonic knowledge to their reading and writing, which contributes to good progress and achieving ARE. Pupils  |
|  | Targeted parents engage in the Achievement for All: ‘Structured Conversations’ programmeFS data June 2019 | Pupils are practising their reading at home in line with FS Home Learning expectataions. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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.  |
| 1. **Quality First Teaching**
 |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | **How will you ensure it is implemented well?** | **Staff lead** | **Review** |
| A.A whole school approach to teaching vocabulary. | **Participation in the Developing Vocabulary Project (Babcock).** The project aims to develop teachers’ pedagogy in the teaching of vocabulary, through a series of 6 Professional Development sessions over the course of the academic year. The implementation is supported by Rebecca Cosgrave (English Consultant - Babcock). | Three years ago we recognised that limited vocabulary was a barrier to many of our PPG pupils achieving ARE. We have been working on developing vocabulary in a number of ways and have had modest successes. We concluded three things:1. Many teachers believed that vocabulary was ‘caught’ and not ‘taught’.
2. Teachers had non- existent or very limited pedagogy on the teaching of vocabulary.
3. The school needed a whole school approach to the teaching of vocabulary from N to Y2.
4. The JS had participated in the project in 2018/19 and were impressed with its impact.
 | 1. Developing Vocabulary is a SIP for 2019/20.
2. In the absence of an English Co the DHT is leading the project and Juliet Okey was asked to support her.
3. The DHT and the English Co have dedicated time to work together.
4. The DHT plans the PDM timetable and can ensure that the necessary sessions are available to deliver the programme over the course of the spring and summer terms.
5. Rebecca Cosgrave visits each half term to support the implementation and monitor progress,
 | Alison KenneyJuliet Okey |  |
| B.PPG pupils pass the Y1 Phonic Check | 1. **Engage in the local authority Phonics Audit.**
2. **Employ the services of an English Consultant.**
 | As a consequence of very poor Y1 Phonic Check results in June 2019, the LA arranged a Phonic Review in September 2019. This raised a number of issues with respect to:* Phonic T&L programmes
* Suitability of Guided Reading texts

The DHT then engaged Rebecca Cosgrave to support the school through the process. She raised other concerns in particular:* Teacher subject knowledge and pedagogy.
* Assessment
* Expectations
 | 1. Improving Phonic Check results is a SIP for 2019/20.
2. In the absence of an English Co the DHT is leading this SIP, supported by Juliet Okey.
3. The DHT and the English Co have dedicated time to work together.
4. The DHT leads on the PDM timetable and was able to secure x2 sessions of phonic training in the spring term.
5. Rebecca Cosgrave is working alongside the DHT and Juliet Okey to monitor the impact of the phonics training. Together they will observe phonic T&L sessions in early May 2020.
 | Alison KenneyJuliet Okey |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | £2700 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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** | **Review** |
| Pupils receive targeted support to narrow the gap  | Teacher /TA intervention | EEF Toolkit shows that well trained TAs can have a very positive impact on pupil’s learning.Kate Antony (EP) has recommended the use of Precision Teaching as an intervention for acquisition of key factual knowledge e.g. phonics, key words and number sequences. She has trained the KS1 TAs. The following intervention is in currently being provided:**Y2 Teacher Intervention**Phase 5 Phonics**Y2 TA Intervention**Reading – Better Reading Partners (BRP)Phonics Phase 3 – Precision TeachingPhonics Phase 3 – Small group teachingWriting – Think it, Say it, Write it, Read it, (TISiWiRi)Maths – Counting to Calculating  | 1. Phonics T&L is being led and monitored by Juliet Okey, through dedicated leadership time. Progress and impact are evaluated each half term in conjunction with the DHT.
2. Better Reading Partners and TiSIWiRi is being monitored by the DHT in the absence of an English Co. These interventions are evaluated each half term/term.
 | Juliet OkeyAlison Kenney |  |
| To be able to offer a range of therapies to meet the social and emotional needs of PPG pupils. | To invest in training SEND TAs to deliver play based therapies. To resource play based therapies. | Many of our PPG pupils have also experienced a number of ACE’s, leaving them with residual social and emotional issues. These act as significant barriers to learning. Our solution is three fold:1. Increase teachers/TAs subject knowledge around ACEs and Attachment and Trauma (A&T) so they are better equipped to support pupils in the classroom.
2. To train SEND TAs to deliver play based therapies.
3. To purchase therapy where necessary for very traumatised pupils.
 | 1. SEND and Behaviour are both SIP.
2. The SENCo attended the LEGO therapy training and has run a group herself so she is best placed to ensure high quality implementation and monitor impact.
3. The SENCo arranged for Matt Jones (Advisory Teacher for Behaviour) to train al teachers/TAs in A&T in spr 2.
 | Gill Holmyard |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | £32035 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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** | **Review** |
| C.Parents support Home Learning and are more interested and involved in their child’s education. | Achievement for All (AfA)Year 2  | We recognise that some parents and carers need support in order to fully engage with their child’s learning. Through the AfA we aim to: 1. Work in partnership with parents giving them opportunities to be listened to.
2. Support parents to have high aspirations and contribute to their child’s progress and achievement.
 | 1. Teachers identify need in Term 1 informed by Baseline assessment and early Phonics acquisition.
2. Teachers meet with parents for structured conversations ; share views and offer support
3. Teachers agree ongoing communication with parents.
4. Review assessment data termly and at EYFSP submission.
5. Review ‘Parent Voice’ before transition.
 | Claire Taylor |  |
| D.Pupils are able to make the most of their education | Educational Support Worker (ESW) | Supports families in all aspects of family life to reduce barriers to education. | ESW accessed through the weekly Inclusion Team meeting. Progress and updates on individual children/families is shared each week. | FLT |  |
| D. Pupils access curriculum enrichment | Reduction in cost of school trips and visits e.g. Theatre Alibi | To ensure all pupils have access to trips and visits that enrich/extend the curriculum | Monitor take-up of visits | Admin |  |
| D.Attendance is excellent | Free access to Breakfast Club for all PPG pupilsAttendance monitoring with Educational Welfare Officer (EWO) | EEF Toolkit shows that children learn more effectively if they have a calm start to the morning and have eaten breakfastAttendance less than 95% has significant impact on learning outcomes | Termly Breakfast Club reportsMonitor attendance of PP through PAWs and termly EWO meetings. | AdminHT |  |
| D.Pupils have a positive self-image | Provision of a uniform grant for all PPG pupils | Parents requested uniform grants to enable their children to have better self-image | Uniform grant reportPPG leaflet – January/April | PPG CoHT |  |
| E.Pupils have drawing and writing materials at home | School provides access to FREE reading books.  | FS baseline date and other measures reveal that PPG pupils often do not have access to books at home. |  | SLT |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | £6600 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Review of expenditure**
 |
| **Previous Academic Year 2018-19** |  |
| **Additional detail** |
| Outcomes for KS1 PPG pupils were not as good as they could be in 2018/19. The reasons for which are as follows: 1. Whilst there were plans to use TAs for targeted intervention of PPG pupils in Y1 this did not happen due to the very high SEND needs in that year group. TAs were simply unable to leave the room to deliver intervention. TA absence was also an issue in the summer term. Due to budget constraints we do not cover absent TAs.
2. In Y2 plans to use TAs for targeted intervention were prevented due to TA absence. Due to budget constraints we do not cover absent TAs.
3. The DHT usually runs Numbers Counts intervention in Y2 in the spring and summer terms, specifically targeting PPG pupils. But due to budget constraints she was class based for 2 days per week from March until the end of the year and did not have capacity to deliver maths intervention.
 |

**Attainment of Pupil Premium Pupils 2019/20**

The following tables shows the number/percentage of **PPG** pupils that achieved age related expectations (ARE), compared with **ALL** pupils.

**Early Years Foundation Stage**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Foundation Stage** | **Good Level of Development (GLD)** |
| **PPG**  |  |
| **Non PPG** |  |

**Phonic Check**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year 1**  | **Passed**  |
| **PPG**  |  |
| **Non PPG**  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year 2** | **Passed** |
| **PPG**  |  |
| **Non PPG** |  |

**Key Stage 1: Teacher Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 2** | **Reading Exp +** | **Writing EXP+** | **Maths EXP+** | **Science EXP** |
| **PPG**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Non PPG**  |  |  |  |  |