

Pupil Premium Review

Leen Mills Primary School

30th June 2017



Head Teacher:	Russell Tew	PPRs:	Angela O'Brien, NLE and Lynn Cox, Director of QA, The Spencer Academies Trust
Context of Review			
<p>Ofsted inspection of March 2017 indicated that the school should commission a pupil premium review in the context of the following weaknesses being identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Disadvantaged pupils in most year groups are not making as much progress as other pupils nationally</i> (Disadvantaged pupils do not make good enough progress from their starting points. Expectations for disadvantaged pupils are low. The school's current assessment information shows that disadvantaged pupils in Years 2 to 5 make slow progress in all subjects....Only in the early years, in Year 1 and in Year 6 are pupils making similar progress to that of their peers nationally) • <i>Leaders do not have a clear view of the effectiveness of the support they provide</i> <p>The report identified that in order to improve, the school needed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerate progress for pupils of all abilities in key stages 1 and 2, including those who are disadvantaged • Improve leadership at all levels by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ making sure that leaders have a secure overview of the attainment and progress of disadvantaged pupils throughout the year ○ using more regular and timely analysis of assessment information to identify priorities for improvement. 			
Evidence base for this pupil premium review			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of historic data (2016) - RAISEonline, Inspection dashboard, FFT Aspire reports • Review of current data: achievement and attendance • Scrutiny of school documentation: PP strategy document, school improvement plan 2016-7, Teaching and learning policy • Discussion with senior leaders, other staff, year 2 and year 6 disadvantaged pupils, PP champion governor • Learning walk - all classes from EYFS to Y6 • Work scrutiny - years 2, 4 and 6 			
Summary of school's existing areas of focus (from 2016-7 pupil premium strategy statement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus: improving the teaching of reading • Improve KS1-2 progress in reading and maths; • accelerate progress in phonics; • improve attainment in all year groups in maths • Improve behaviour in classrooms, around school and at lunchtime and improve self esteem; reduce exclusion rates • Allow young people to better express and communicate feelings and enable them to develop friendships • Develop team work, improve gross motor skills and raise self esteem • Improve attendance and punctuality • Ensure access to curriculum enrichment activities i.e visits and residential 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow access to organised holiday activities <p>Leaders have used a significant element of the pupil premium to employ additional teacher capacity in year 6 (to create an extra group each morning), for small group teaching in years 2,3,4 and 6 and to increase TA support for interventions in Y2/3. Funding has also been used for Staff CPD, phonics intervention, play therapy, Forest schools, breakfast club, trips and sports camp funding</p>
School context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a 4-11 primary school with 2 classes per year group. There is no nursery. • There are currently 422 pupils on roll of which 14% are FSM6. This is below the national average of around 25%. Numbers have reduced since the introduction of universal FSM but are broadly stable. Highest numbers eligible for the pupil premium (PP) are in years 3 and 6 • There are also 16 pupils from Armed Forces families given that there is a settlement from Chilwell barracks in the catchment area • The school PP strategy statement identifies an increase in pupils showing anxiety/ASD traits across the family as being additional barriers to learning external to the school. Some PP pupils have SEN but the SEN population overall is below average. Very few pupils have EAL. A minority of pupils are known to Social Services • School was graded as Requires Improvement at its March inspection. Teaching, achievement and leadership were judged similarly as RI but both EYFS and Personal development, behaviour and welfare were judged to be good
End of Key Stage achievement 2016 Inspection Dashboard and FFT Aspire reports	<p>Key Stage 2 (EXs = expected standard/ GDS = greater depth)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KS2 cohort of 42 (41 for progress of which there were 7 PP - 2 low, 3 middle and 2 high prior attainers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ KS2 progress in reading and mathematics for PP was broadly average ○ KS2 writing progress for PP was broadly average but significantly below average for low prior attainers (LPA) one of whom was assessed as Working Toward at KS1 ○ In EGPS, where there is no progress measure, there is a 19% attainment gap between PP and non PP overall for EXS and 5% at GDS. The average spelling mark is 2 marks difference between PP and non PP • Of the 8 FSM6 in total (including 1 with no prior attainment at KS1), PP pupils attained above non PP at the school at GDS for reading, writing and maths but below for EXS. However, their reading/maths combined scaled score was lower than non PP by 4 scaled points • On the combined RWM measure, value added for FSM6 was slightly better than for non PP <p>Key Stage 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KS1 cohort of 59 (57 for progress) of which 7 are PP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ in reading there were 2 low (LPA), 4 middle (MPA) and 1 high prior attainers (HPA). LPA and MPA PP were below national non PP in EXS reading but HPA were above. No LPA or MPA PP attained GDS but the one HPA PP did so. ○ in writing there were 2 LPA, 5 MPA and 0 HPAs. LPA and MPA PP were below national non PP in EXS. No LPA or MPA PP attained GDS ○ in maths there were 2 LPA, 5 MPA and 0 HPA. LPA and MPA PP were below national non PP in EXS although MPA were close. No LPA or MPA PP attained GDS • Y1 phonics: Only 50% PP (of 6) passed the phonics screening check compared to 85% non PP (52 pupils) - Cited as weakness on inspection dashboard • Y2 phonics: Only 57% PP (of 7) passed the phonics screening check compared to 94% non PP (52 pupils) Cited as weakness on inspection dashboard <p>EYFS</p>

- Data shows a gap between school PP, school non PP and national PP but numbers (2) are too small to be statistically meaningful eg 73% cohort attained GLD (50% PP of 2/74% non PP of 58); maths ELG: 50% PP/86% non PP; reading ELG: 50% PP/76% non PP; writing ELG: 100% PP/78% non PP

At the time of this review, 2017 outcomes had not been released

Area	Strengths	Areas to develop
Leadership & Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders are able to reflect on the need to target support for learning more sharply in 2017-18 eg TA moving to year 5 to work with the pupils • One to one tuition offered after school by senior leaders, targeted at disadvantaged pupils, shows their commitment to going the extra mile • The school is using a range of intervention programmes eg TA's trained on CPD - switch on reading; First Class maths; Post teaching in Key Stage 2 and specific groups in years 1 (writing) 4 (maths) and 6 (reading) which benefit high prior attaining disadvantaged pupils • There is a increase in outward facing engagement eg through George Spencer TSA courses and visits to other schools. The school is investing in CPD to develop the quality of teaching - staff have had CPD on what makes a good lesson and on phonic interventions, TA's have undertaken lesson study, staff attend subject TSA network meetings and TA's have looked at questioning and visited Fairfield academy to look at this in practice • Leaders are committed to developing good links with parents - for example, parents of disadvantaged pupils are involved in structured conversations at parent evenings. There are home/school books for any children with challenging behaviour and regular conversations with parents of children in the Tree house nurture provision • Leaders recognise the need to support emotionally vulnerable pupils and to measure their progress eg through the Boxall profile • The school provides its disadvantaged pupils with wider opportunities such as though Forest Schools, residential trips and other visits. Breakfast clubs, after school sessions and holiday provision is targeted at pupil premium pupils • Leaders have identified some of the same issues as the pupil premium reviewers around strengthening the school improvement plan (SIP), making interventions more purposeful/targeted and on increasing the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there is buy in from all staff at all levels as to the reason for pupil premium funding, putting in time to reflect as a school on the school's performance against the national picture and the principles behind this national focus on disadvantaged. There is an inconsistency of experience for disadvantaged pupils at Leen Mills – staff need to look at the experience of learning and teaching through the eyes of a disadvantaged pupil • Target setting for disadvantaged pupils needs to be done at individual pupil level and aggregated up to ensure there is a narrowing of any gaps with non disadvantaged pupils nationally by the end of the key stage for both proportion reaching the expected standard and a greater depth. There needs to be higher aspiration for progress which factors in the use of the pupil premium eg children who are working towards the expected standard need to be targeted to reach the expected standard by the end of the key stage and consideration should be given as to how many can reach greater depth, with well focused teaching and intervention • All disadvantaged pupils' attainment data needs to be analysed (internally and for governors) and compared against non-disadvantaged pupils nationally from similar starting points • Ensure that appraisal objectives for staff refer specifically to key groups where progress needs to accelerate including disadvantaged pupils, to increase staff accountability for this group • Sharpen the analysis and use of data to target interventions at a more personalised level and to evaluate the impact of PP funded support and intervention including through the use of case studies

focus on greater depth, to stretch and challenge the more able disadvantaged pupils

- Teachers map provision being made for individual disadvantaged pupils and some (but not all) indicate impact of this

Governance

- New PP champion (been a parent governor since November 15) appointed in last three weeks following the departure of the previous lead from the governors body. No induction as yet - discussions with the head teacher are in train
- Governors are involved in deciding how the PP funding is spent
- The lead governor understands the role in challenging the head, staff and PP lead to prove that the PP funding is adding value in improving attainment and providing value for money
- Shows a knowledge about PP attainment in the school at the end of KS2 in comparison with LA performance
- Governors receive a range of information on the attainment and progress of disadvantaged pupils (DPs) each term, although this is benchmarked against school non PP rather than national non PP, and is not broken down by different starting points. Governors question elements and celebrate success. They are keen to ask questions about what action being taken and the consequences of not taking any action
- The information from the head teacher is valued but the governor is also keen to check independently

- Use the EEF toolkit and **research based approaches**¹ more routinely to guide the type and focus of interventions. Staff need to understand the school's PP strategy and their role within it.
- The **2017-18 school improvement plan (SIP)** focus on disadvantaged pupils needs sharpening so that it explicitly refers to school aspirations and specific strategies for narrowing gaps for disadvantaged pupils throughout. This means setting clear success criteria and specific targets for each key stage (including phonics) that reflect where there are **attainment gaps with non disadvantaged pupils nationally** as indicated through analysis of the inspection dashboard. The plan needs to be carried through into the existing key stage development plans so that these deliver the success criteria of the SIP
- **Progress against the success criteria in the SIP** needs to be regularly (i.e at least termly) evaluated (eg RAG rated) and reported to governors, **based on a focused monitoring plan** which involves leaders at all levels. This should include regular i.e at least half termly activity such as work scrutiny where disadvantaged pupils have a focus
- Further develop **parent education workshops** so that all parents, and especially those of disadvantaged children, are better enabled to support their child's learning. It would also be useful to analyse take up for work shop sessions for parents of disadvantaged pupils.
- Develop a consistent approach **to teaching and learning for disadvantaged pupils** at Leen Mills by defining what best practice looks like for these pupils in quality first teaching in order to release reliance on additional intervention especially from TAs. Consider what the barriers are for disadvantaged pupils in learning so that teaching can more specifically address this and use pupil voice to inform this, including that of the disadvantaged pupils.
Define this in a revamped teaching and learning policy

• ¹ For example https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/473976/DFE-RS411_Supporting_the_attainment_of_disadvantaged_pupils_-_briefing_for_school_leaders.pdf and <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/resources/teaching-learning-toolkit>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a school provision map for disadvantaged pupils so that leaders can evidence the access to provision (and therefore funding) for each pupil - this will also support annual evaluation of those strategies which have proved most effective • Support the new pupil premium governor to develop his role - he is keen to learn from other schools, and find out more about actions taken in school- suggestions would be to look at data itself; talk to PP lead to plan visits, talk to pupils and discuss with leaders how they are monitoring quality experience for PP pupils • Ensure governors monitor the attendance of disadvantaged pupils through information provided in the head teacher's report at least termly
Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attainment data for disadvantaged students in years 1,3,5 and 6 now shows accelerated progress from September 2016 baseline in reading and maths, and for year 6 in writing • Progress data is tracked using spelling ages and KPI's to see how children are progressing. 2 staff lead on nurture provision, the impact of which is reported on pupil behaviour and readiness to learn. • Test base is used to validate the accuracy of assessment and broader moderation takes place • The progress of disadvantaged pupils with SEN is measured using Boxall Profiles and shows a reduction of pupils on the SEN register 	<p>Clearly present summaries of progress over time and over the key stage for disadvantaged pupils which show the impact of PP funded activity on rates of progress and on narrowing attainment gaps for disadvantaged pupils with national non disadvantaged pupils from different starting points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attainment data for years 3 and 4 suggest that progress from September baseline has been slow in reading, and in year 3 maths. Progress also needs to accelerate in year 1, 3,4 and 5 writing (School said....data for disadvantaged students in years 2,3,4 now shows accelerated progress from baseline but this is not evident from the data presented) • Although the school contends that PP pupils with SEN have some impact on the writing data in years 3 and 4, the data presented does not readily evidence this • Overall, there is limited evidence of the impact of additional teacher support in Y3-4 on the attainment of disadvantaged pupils • Progress meeting data from one year group (which one?) appears to show little shift between march and June
Teaching, Learning, Assessment	<p>From learning walk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handwriting and presentation is good • Pupils are keen to talk - confident and articulate • The quality of writing in Y5 and 6 is good • Relationships are positive and constructive • Adults are engaged with pupils 	<p>Ensure that teachers take account of the following aspects, at the critical points of teaching for learning i.e planning, in the moment delivery and in the subsequent reflective stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A planned approach to developing independence - some children seem to be waiting for permission to progress - limiting effect of some of the success criteria (toolkits). This results in some passivity

- Lots of group work in evidence enabling pupils to support each other
- In Yr 1 - quality environment for learning: tools which children could use independently to support their learning
- Where teaching is more effective, there is evidence of joint teacher planning, an open classroom culture and informal, reflective feedback between professionals on teaching

From work scrutiny

Year 2 literacy

- Low PA girl. Progress in handwriting and quality of writing evident
- Boy MA- Progress evident in quantity, quality and presentation

Year 4 English

- Some of LPA's small group work is better than her class work.

Year 6 English

- MA girl now working at GDS: clear evidence of progress in control of language - evidence of feed forward marking

Year 6 maths

- Pitch appears correct and objectives are framed in terms of learning - success criteria are much sharper than in English books

From Y6 pupil interviews

- Grammar work is challenging - but children show good command of this when asked to select and talk about one of their best pieces of writing
- Classroom walls can be useful for maths work eg place values
- Two pupils have support from other adults in lessons which they value. Outside of lessons, they value the Tree House: helps to settle behaviour/worries and support socialising. One has also accessed 1:1 teacher support
- Homework - used to get it weekly in English and maths: learning poem, pre SATs help to learn memory, maths examples.
- All enjoy lessons. Most like: maths as building up confidence to tackle harder things. Literacy - helps with writing as they are taught really good vocabulary and sentence structures
- What helps:
 - maths - repeating learning across lessons; doing examples on board/working through an example and the teacher keeping it

evident. Independent and open ended tasks need to be more evident with less use of worksheets

- **Quickening pace** in some classes - we saw examples eg in Y4 topic work of children wasting time on low level or no activity
- **Consistent classroom environments** that allow children to work independently
- **Flexibility of grouping** – some children appeared fixed to a table which predetermines what work they can access
- More **challenge** is needed - teaching for greater depth needs higher profile. Planning needs to be pitched to the top of the group with scaffolding to enable all pupils to access this and achieve well
- Developing **learning rather than activity focused objectives** (linked to improving the quality of curriculum planning) - pupils typically currently describe what they are doing more than what they are learning
- **Raise expectations about quality** of work in books (including for presentation)
- **Differentiate learning objectives** for pupils of different starting points - Lack of evidence of moving onto next challenge in some books
- Ensure that **success criteria are expressed as measurable indicators of quality** as opposed tasks. Not all success criteria are guiding pupil responses eg "To research meteorology". Some are framed in STA speak not pupil speak eg "shifts in formality and manipulating grammatical structures" in a WTS Y6 pupil. Maths objectives appear better defined than those for writing. There is inconsistent presentation of learning objectives between classes, even in the same year group
- **Marking needs to make next steps evident** –there is a lot of secretarial marking and marking is inconsistent in some classes in requiring a response beyond spelling correction

Separate books may not be supporting a view of progress over time

- **Consider curriculum design.** It currently appears resource/task led not child/learning led.

	<p>visible on the board; teacher asks other children to answer a question from other students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ writing: Good examples stuck in book for reference, improving sentences, use of whiteboards to experiment with language,. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trips were valued <p>From interviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The school runs Y2 and Y6 SATs parent sessions plus phonics workshops for parents and new EYFS leader is planning to do some stay and read sessions. There is also an open afternoon to look at work in session and parents evenings - this has high take up. ● Strongest teaching in Y6 - weaker teaching in Y5- being supported by DHT ● Staff know which pupils are eligible for the PP and list the interventions in place for them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Put in place a strategic and bespoke approach to CPD specific to Leen Mills priorities, starting with an audit of staff strengths and areas for development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Put in place a Professional Development Plan for each which will deliver quality first teaching – the George Spencer Teaching School Alliance can help with this. ○ Increase the opportunities for the guide on the side approach which enables professional dialogue ● Overall , there are pockets of good practice throughout the school. However, these are not being consistently applied between/across year groups. This has the potential to create a barrier to success for disadvantaged pupils. Leaders at all levels need to establish the non-negotiables that all teachers and other adults adhere and hold staff to account for delivering these through regular monitoring.
<p>Personal development Behaviour & safety</p>	<p>Inspection dashboard 2016 showed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Overall absence below average at 3.1% and improved over time. FSM 4.9% but not low ● Overall persistent absence below average at 6.8%. ● No repeat FT exclusions (any group) in 2015 and no permanent exclusions <p>Current Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Current data for 2016-17 shows that attendance for disadvantaged pupils has improved over last 4 months to 96%+ in all year groups except Yr4 ● There are 4 disadvantaged children with attendance below 90% as at 16.6.17 compared to 7 at the end of February ● Leaders can articulate how this improvement has been achieved through regular review of data, targeted communication with parents and use of external agencies where appropriate including Early Help. There is a free breakfast club place for disadvantaged pupils ● The school has a clear system for monitoring/addressing repeated lateness ● The head teacher is knowledgeable about the specific circumstances of individual pupils with attendance below 90%, some of whom have medical or anxiety related conditions. The Tree House nurture provision is used to settle pupils in and leaders can cite the impact of this eg one Y4 persistent absentee has rising attendance to full attendance bar 1 day in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inspection dashboard 2016 showed FSM persistent absence 19.3% and in the highest 10%). Cited as weakness on inspection dashboard ● explore a higher threshold than 90% attendance for triggering letters of concern to parent ● Analyse DoJo awards by groups, including for DPs, to ensure they are benefiting from these incentives ● As Tree House is partly funding by PP funding, access to this and impact should be carefully analysed for DPs ● Explore ways of capturing the benefit (impact) of PP funding for trips and visits - the AfA conversation with parents could be extended to evidence this, for example ● See reference in teaching and learning section to increasing independence and reducing passivity in learning

	<p>this half term. Another Y3 persistent absentee achieved 100% attendance last half term, which was recognised by the HT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders are willing to prosecute where appropriate <p>Behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the review, children were polite, friendly and happy to engage with visitors. Conduct was good in lessons and around the school • Exclusions - none this year • Behaviour - school has introduced the DoJo systems and replaced merit points from Easter - good feedback from pupils and parents. • The school has strong and effective arrangements for supporting socially and emotionally vulnerable pupils including use of the Tree House which is part funded from pupil premium monies • Good provision is made for armed forces children so that they are making at least expected progress. <p>Personal development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers encourage disadvantaged pupils to be chosen for school council and they are currently well represented (25% of members are PP eligible) • School encourages teachers to nominate disadvantaged pupils to fulfil the role of playtime buddies - currently well represented at 20% • Residential/trips occur for every year group supported by PP funding t 	
<p>Next steps</p>	<p>Work with strategic partners (LA school improvement adviser, LLE and the wider George Spencer Teaching Alliance (TSA) to respond to the recommendation of the review. Advise the TSA if it can support in facilitating visits to other schools or in the sharing of exemplars. The new school improvement plan should be drawn up in conjunction with the LA school improvement adviser</p> <p>Sharpen the PP review statement/strategy for 2017-18 by ensuring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All actions and evaluation of impact are specific to disadvantaged pupils • Ensure that weaknesses identified from analysis of data, including the inspection dashboard, are addressed in the section on in-school and external barriers • Capture the use of the PP in relation to early years (F2) where appropriate • Benchmark PP pupils outcomes against non PP nationally, in any evaluation or success criteria • Ensure retrospective evaluation of spending for 2016-17 is clear about impact, especially on attainment and progress, (evaluation for 2015-6 was more about actions taken) <p>The school has requested a follow up review via the TSA in 6 months' time – this has already been budgeted for in the cost of the review. The headteacher should contact the TSA to arrange this</p>	

Signed: _____ *AOBrien* _____ PPR