

<b>Head Teacher:</b>	<b>Russell Tew</b>	<b>PPRs:</b>	<b>Lynn Cox, Director of Quality and Standards; Shamara Sadler, Principal Sunnyside Spencer Academy, The Spencer Academies Trust</b>
<b>Context of Review</b>			
<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"> <li>• <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)</li> <li>• <i>Leaders do not have a clear view of the effectiveness of the support they provide</i></li> </ul> <p>The report identified that in order to improve, the school needed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accelerate progress for pupils of all abilities in key stages 1 and 2, including those who are disadvantaged</li> <li>• Improve leadership at all levels by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ making sure that leaders have a secure overview of the attainment and progress of disadvantaged pupils throughout the year</li> <li>○ using more regular and timely analysis of assessment information to identify priorities for improvement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Leaders from Spencer Academies Trust undertook a PP review in June 2017 and made a series of recommendations. This report identifies progress on addressing those recommendations</p>			
<b>Evidence base for this pupil premium review</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of historic data (2017) - Inspection dashboard</li> <li>• Discussion of current data: achievement and attendance</li> <li>• Scrutiny of school documentation: PP strategy document, school improvement plan 2017-8,</li> <li>• Discussion with senior leaders, other staff, KS1 and 2 disadvantaged pupils,</li> <li>• Learning walk - all classes from Y1 to Y6</li> <li>• Work scrutiny - years 3,4,5 and F2</li> <li>• HMI monitoring visit November 2017</li> </ul>			
<b>Summary of school's areas of focus (2017-8 PP)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All staff have a clear understanding of pupil premium funding and the principles behind the national focus on disadvantaged pupils.</li> <li>• Diminish the difference between PP and non PP pupils in Maths in year 3 and 4</li> <li>• Reduced impact of social and emotional difficulties on the progress of PP pupils.</li> <li>• Improve attainment of pupils eligible for PP at the end of KS2</li> </ul>		

strategy statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase opportunities for parents and carers to apply for Pupil Premium funding.</li> </ul>																																																																																		
HMI findings – November 2017	<p>Leaders have/are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responded well to the findings of the external review of pupil premium funding for disadvantaged pupils</li> <li>Increased the challenge in lessons for all pupils</li> <li>Increased the amount of assessments for disadvantaged pupils to check more frequently their knowledge of times tables, their spelling age and their reading age.</li> <li>Use this information to plan appropriate intervention groups to meet their needs and boost their progress.</li> <li>Checking the quality of the intervention groups to ensure that the funding is being used well.</li> <li>The school's pupil tracking information shows that most disadvantaged pupils are making good progress.</li> <li><b>However, not enough disadvantaged pupils are making accelerated progress to achieve highly.</b></li> <li>Leaders from The Spencer Academies Trust have carried out a detailed review of the pupil premium funding and following their recommendations, the school has scrutinised the impact of intervention groups. Disadvantaged pupils are now making better progress.</li> </ul>																																																																																		
End of Key Stage achievement 2017 Inspection Dashboard and performance tables data	<p><b>Key Stage 2 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KS2 cohort of 61 (59 for progress) of which there were 13 PP (12 for progress: 4 low, 6 middle and 2 high prior attainers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress in reading, writing and mathematics for PP was broadly average</li> <li>Progress improved in all 3 subjects from the bottom quartile in the previous 2 years. It was strongest in maths (2<sup>nd</sup> quartile)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Of the 12 FSM6 in total, PP pupils attained</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="297 786 2112 1074"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="3">Expected standard</th> <th colspan="3">Greater Depth</th> <th colspan="2">Scaled Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Difference to national</th> <th>Difference to non PP nationally</th> <th>Change v non PP from 2016</th> <th>Difference to national</th> <th>Difference to non PP nationally</th> <th>Change v non PP from 2016</th> <th>Difference to non PP nationally</th> <th>Change v non PP from 2016</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>3 pupils</td> <td>-2</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>-2</td> <td>7 points</td> <td>Same</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>3 pupils</td> <td>-2</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>-1</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maths</td> <td>3 pupils</td> <td>4 pupils</td> <td>-3</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>3 pupils</td> <td>-3</td> <td>7 points</td> <td>-3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RWM combined</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>-1</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>-1</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EGPS</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>-1</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>2 pupils</td> <td>same</td> <td>4 pts (spelling)</td> <td>2 pts</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The above data indicates that whilst progress has improved from KS1, attainment gaps with non PP pupils nationally are not yet narrowing, which is one of the key purposes of the pupil premium funding, so closing the gaps remains a priority for the school. The biggest gaps are in maths</p> <p><b>Key Stage 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Y2 cohort of 57 of which 6 are PP</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="297 1270 2112 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="3">Expected standard</th> <th colspan="3">Greater Depth</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Difference to national</th> <th>Difference to non PP nationally</th> <th>Change v non PP from 2016</th> <th>Difference to national</th> <th>Difference to non PP nationally</th> <th>Change v non PP from 2016</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>same</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Expected standard			Greater Depth			Scaled Score		Difference to national	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016	Difference to national	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016	Reading	2 pupils	3 pupils	-2	2 pupils	2 pupils	-2	7 points	Same	Writing	2 pupils	3 pupils	-2	1 pupil	1 pupil	-1	N/A	N/A	Maths	3 pupils	4 pupils	-3	2 pupils	3 pupils	-3	7 points	-3	RWM combined	2 pupils	2 pupils	-1	1 pupil	1 pupil	-1	N/A	N/A	EGPS	2 pupils	2 pupils	-1	2 pupils	2 pupils	same	4 pts (spelling)	2 pts		Expected standard			Greater Depth			Difference to national	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016	Difference to national	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016	Reading	1 pupil	1 pupil	same	1 pupil	1 pupil	-1
	Expected standard			Greater Depth			Scaled Score																																																																												
	Difference to national	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016	Difference to national	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016																																																																											
Reading	2 pupils	3 pupils	-2	2 pupils	2 pupils	-2	7 points	Same																																																																											
Writing	2 pupils	3 pupils	-2	1 pupil	1 pupil	-1	N/A	N/A																																																																											
Maths	3 pupils	4 pupils	-3	2 pupils	3 pupils	-3	7 points	-3																																																																											
RWM combined	2 pupils	2 pupils	-1	1 pupil	1 pupil	-1	N/A	N/A																																																																											
EGPS	2 pupils	2 pupils	-1	2 pupils	2 pupils	same	4 pts (spelling)	2 pts																																																																											
	Expected standard			Greater Depth																																																																															
	Difference to national	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016	Difference to national	Difference to non PP nationally	Change v non PP from 2016																																																																													
Reading	1 pupil	1 pupil	same	1 pupil	1 pupil	-1																																																																													

Writing	1 pupil	1 pupil	same	0 pupil	1 pupil	same
Maths	2 pupils	2 pupils	-1	1 pupils	1 pupil	-1

- The gaps between school and national non PP are small but as with KS2, have not yet narrowed and remain widest in maths for those reaching the expected standard
- Y1 phonics 2017 – 79% non DP (in line with national average). Considerable improvement on 2016 outcomes when it was cited as weakness on inspection dashboard
- Y2 phonics 2017 - 94.7% non DP (above national average). Considerable improvement on 2016 outcomes.

#### EYFS

- Cohort of 7, 3 of which reached a good level of development, and 4 who did not. Gap with national non DP is 2 pupils
- Numbers of PP in 2017 were considerably higher than in the previous 2 years (2 in each year) making trend data unreliable. However, the gap with non PP nationally has widened in 2017 as the cohort has increased
- Attainment in reading is the strongest early learning goal for PP eligible pupils

### Area Areas to develop from last review

Leadership and Management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure there is <b>buy in from all staff at all levels</b> 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 teaching through the eyes of a disadvantaged pupil</li> <li>2. <b>Target setting for disadvantaged pupils</b> needs to be done at individual pupil level and aggregated up to ensure there is a narrowing of any gaps with non-DPs 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 PP eg children who are working towards EXS need to be targeted to reach EXS 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</li> <li>3. All DP attainment data needs to be analysed (internally and for governors) <b>and compared against non-DP nationally from similar starting points</b></li> <li>4. Ensure that <b>appraisal objectives for staff</b> refer specifically to key groups where progress needs to accelerate including DPs, to increase staff accountability for this group</li> <li>5. Sharpen <b>the analysis and use of data to target interventions at a more personalised level</b> and to evaluate the impact of PP funded support and intervention including through the use of case studies</li> <li>6. Use the EEF toolkit and <b>research based approaches</b> more routinely to guide the type and focus of interventions.</li> <li>7. The <b>2017-18 school improvement plan (SIP)</b> focus on DPs needs sharpening so that it explicitly refers to school aspirations and specific strategies for narrowing gaps for DPs throughout. This means setting clear success criteria and specific targets for each key stage (including phonics) that reflect where there are <b>attainment gaps with non-DPs nationally as</b> 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</li> <li>8. <b>Progress against the success criteria in the SIP</b> needs to be regularly (i.e at least termly) evaluated (eg RAG rated) and reported to governors, <b>based on a focused monitoring plan</b> 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</li> <li>9. Further develop <b>parent education workshops</b> 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.</li> </ol>
---------------------------	---

<b>Leadership &amp; Management</b>	<p>10. Develop a consistent approach <b>to teaching and learning for DPs</b> 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. <b>Define this in a revamped teaching and learning policy</b></p> <p>11. <b>Create a school provision map for DPs</b> 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</p> <p>12. <b>Support the new pupil premium governor to develop his role</b></p> <p>13. Ensure <b>governors monitor the attendance of DPs</b> through information provided in the head teacher's report at least termly</p>
	<p><b>Action and impact</b></p> <p>1. The achievement of PP eligible pupils has been made a priority and used recommendations from review to feed into SIP and appraisal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PP policy – information for staff and visitors</li> <li>• INSET day focused on PP – provision mapping undertaken</li> <li>• Strategies advocated have been seen in work scrutiny</li> <li>• More flexibility of grouping is now in place</li> <li>• More frequent assessment – half termly for DPs – small steps - now being rolled out to SEN pupils (confirmed by staff)</li> </ul> <p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some PP only events eg Y2/6 trips as part of Enterprise week – focus on Business to support aspiration Trying to connect with Nottingham University</li> <li>• Statement of learning bars have been developed to give pupils more flexibility to choose more demanding starting points – more language of challenge in the classroom too</li> <li>• Now have APE – apply, prove and explain – part of mastery language</li> <li>• Yrs 1 and 3 PP reading predicting 80%/88%+ EXS – done Switch On.</li> <li>• Y4 57% PP predicted to attain EXS RWM but some SEN in this cohort of PP pupils (3/8),</li> <li>• Y5 50% RWM,</li> <li>• Y6 expecting 67% (8-17% GDS) - big gains on this measure predicted</li> <li>• Phonics 2018 75% - Current predictions 45-54% DP v 86% non DP – this is low</li> <li>• EYFS GLD - 3 pupils in cohort of which only 1 is expected to reach GLD: 1 poor attendance, 1 has additional needs</li> </ul> <p><b>Staff discussions confirmed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PP eligible pupils have a higher profile – tracking of progress more rigorous – information shared more widely - they know what's happening across the school (TAs and teachers)</li> <li>• They were aware of some of the presenting barriers for PP eligible pupils and could give examples of increased parental support from school and some of the strategies being used to develop reading skills</li> <li>• They could give some examples of how 2017 outcomes had been used to shape actions and could identify current priorities</li> <li>• The February inset (supported by Spencer Academies Trust) had been well received and staff could cite examples of how this was beginning to impact on practice</li> <li>• They confirmed that the progress of PP eligible pupils was a focus in school quality assurance, and that they received feedback</li> </ul>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Targets – Y2 and Y6 based on Prior attainment groups and with some extra challenge for accelerated progress.</li> <li>3. Done analysis of school PP compared with school and national non DP. Data shared with all staff – shared key questions for all staff after each tracking point</li> <li>4. Based on both attainment and progress – combined measures and named children -confirmed by staff</li> <li>5. (and 11) Whole school provision map tracks the amount of support each child is getting. Analysis of expected RWM combined undertaken at all points. TAs report to class teachers the impact of interventions – been sharper and using additional staff in a better way and doing interim reviews to stop ineffective work or change tack. Staff move more frequently around classroom to address misconceptions. Use of additional adults commended in recent learning walk</li> <li>6. This has developed - Switch on, live marking and feedback, time to respond to marking before assembly, lots of CPD - staff have teamed up based on self-evaluation of strength and open door for teachers and TA and being signposted to good practice</li> <li>7. The back of the SIP sets targets for DPs in all year groups for EXS but not for GDS in years 3 and 4. Priority 1 (progress) refers explicitly to DPs in the priority and Priority 2 (leadership) refers to leaders having a secure overview of the attainment and progress of DPs but there is no reference to DPs in the objectives or the milestone success criteria of either. However, Priority 3 is specifically related to DPs, contains a range of activities and the plan is detailed.</li> <li>8. Progress is reported termly through HT reports to governors– all staff involved in reporting back. Learning walks, pupil voice for PP on specific focus, work scrutiny – always PP</li> <li>9. Stay &amp; read session in EYFS weekly half termly in KS1 (teachers model reading with child); phonics sessions in foundation stage, every class has run a maths session (better attended in EYFS/KS1 than KS2) targeted for parents. Leaders track attendance eg to open afternoon: targeting non-attendance. Structured conversations based on AfA model. Very positive feedback – some use class Dojo to load materials – high subscription rate</li> <li>10. Defined – creating a new T&amp;L policy linked to vision – T&amp;L working party developing – using staff voice as part of this</li> <li>12. Work commitments making this more difficult – changing role as have a new governor expert from NTU. HMI visit found <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The governing body has a good understanding of the school’s strengths and areas for improvement.</li> <li>• Governors regularly come into school and focus their visits on the areas for improvement.</li> <li>• Minutes of the governing body meetings show that governors asking pertinent questions to school leaders about the progress of pupils.</li> </ul> </li> <li>13. Attendance data is reported to form part of the HT report to governors</li> </ol>
<b>Achievement</b>	<p><b>Areas to develop from last review</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clearly <b>present summaries of progress</b> 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 with national from different starting points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Attainment data for years 3 and 4 suggest that progress from September baseline has been slow in reading, and in year 3 maths.</li> <li>1.2 Progress also needs to accelerate in year 1, 3,4 and 5 writing</li> <li>1.3 Although the school contends that PP pupils with SEN have some impact on the writing data in years 3 and 4, data presented does not readily evidence this</li> <li>1.4 Overall, there is limited evidence of the impact of additional teacher support in years 3-4 on the attainment of disadvantaged pupils</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b>Action and impact</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whole school overview v national non DP is in place – now easier to see prior attainment groups – flight trackers. Language of prior attainment has changed from teachers – moving into science. Leaders have simplified data into one system. Using Excellence grids to track progress</li> </ol>

	<p>1.1 Y5 (Y4 last year) still weakest cohort – leaders assert there are strong teachers for those classes– legacy of weak teaching in Y3. Girls’ maths is weakest. Maths Hub work has taken place with the maths lead</p> <p>1.2 Best progress in Y1 and Y6, EYFS, maths Y3</p> <p>1.3 Writing – lots of work and moderation work (exemplification) Yr 1,3,4,5 have examples from other schools – has increased expectations - checked consistency across year groups – moderation judged to be accurate. Y3 confidence might be shakier as less experienced. More transition work planned for summer</p>
<p><b>Teaching, Learning, Assessment</b></p>	<p><b>Areas to develop from last review</b></p>
	<p>Ensure that teachers take account of the following aspects, at the critical points of teaching for learning i.e <b>planning, in the moment delivery and in the subsequent reflective stage:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A planned approach to <b>developing independence</b> - some children seem to be waiting for permission to progress - limiting effect of some of the success criteria (toolkits). Independent and open ended tasks need to be more evident with less use of worksheets</li> <li>2. <b>Quickening pace</b> in some classes - eg in Y4 topic work: children wasting time on low level or no activity</li> <li>3. <b>Consistent classroom environments</b> that allow children to work independently</li> <li>4. <b>Flexibility of grouping</b> – some children appeared fixed to a table which predetermines what work they can access</li> <li>5. More <b>challenge</b> is needed - teaching for GDS 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</li> <li>6. Developing <b>learning rather than activity focused objectives</b> (linked to improving the quality of curriculum planning) - pupils typically currently describe what they are doing more than what they are learning</li> <li>7. <b>Raise expectations about quality</b> of work in books</li> <li>8. <b>Differentiate learning</b> objectives for pupils of different starting points - Lack of evidence of moving onto next challenge in some books</li> <li>9. Ensure that <b>success criteria are expressed as measurable indicators of quality</b> as opposed tasks. Not all success criteria are guiding pupil responses. Some are framed in STA speak not pupil speak. Maths objectives appear better defined than those for writing. There is inconsistent presentation of learning objectives between classes, even in the same year group</li> <li>10. <b>Marking needs to make next steps evident</b> –there is a lot of secretarial marking and marking is inconsistent in some classes in requiring a response beyond spelling correction</li> <li>11. Separate books may not be supporting a view of progress over time</li> <li>12. <b>Consider curriculum design.</b> It currently appears resource/task led not child/learning led.</li> <li>13. Put in place a <b>strategic &amp; bespoke approach to CPD</b> specific to priorities, starting with an audit of staff strengths/areas for development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Put in place a Professional Development Plan for each which will deliver quality first teaching</li> <li>○ Increase the opportunities for the <b>guide on the side</b> approach which enables professional dialogue</li> </ul> </li> <li>14. Pockets of good practice throughout the school are not being consistently applied between and a cross year groups. Leaders at all levels need to <b>establish the non-negotiables</b> that all teachers and other adults adhere and hold staff to account for delivering these through regular monitoring.</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Action and impact</b></p>
<p>HMI visit found</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scrutiny of current pupils’ work shows that teachers are challenging the most able pupils in Years 5 and 6.</li> <li>• In Year 5, teachers provide many opportunities for pupils to express their thoughts about their reading to develop their inference skills. However, these opportunities are not as prevalent in Years 3 and 4.</li> </ul>	

- In mathematics, pupils are being asked to explain their thinking mathematically to show a deep understanding of the concepts they are learning. However, they do not get enough opportunities to demonstrate their thinking.
- Some most-able pupils feel the work is too easy for them and does not make them think hard.
- Pupils in Years 1 and 2 are being challenged.
- Pupils are making good progress in their books.
- Occasionally, teachers are not correcting pupils' misconceptions and their progress slows. External support

Leader contend they have tackled all the recommendations from the last PP review – many came from new feedback policy and new statement bars

### **Work scrutiny showed (PP books only)**

#### Writing

- EYFS – good evidence of assessment log and of interaction to move learning on
- Y3 girl (WTS). Evidence of redrafting for improvement following feedback. Some work becomes more worksheet based and less extended in latter part of book
- Y4 boy – writing book well presented. Control of language is improving. Evidence of response to marking. Girl – evidence of self-assessment. Increasing control. Well presented. Work plentiful in both books
- Y5 – High prior attainers –evidence of feedback being used to improve control of language. Middle prior attainer (MPA) – evidence of feedback (less of impact) – handwriting poor. Low prior attainer- feedback evident – need to ensure pupils respond. Handwriting improving over time and also some elements of control
- Low prior attainer (LPA) – work sheets - not enough response to marking and not much extended writing

#### Maths

- Y4 MPA girl -evidence of pre learning task. Evidence of children choosing their own higher challenges as starting points. Feedback challenges pupils to develop their thinking. Boy tends to opt for least challenging objective. Both pupils' work well presented.
- Y5 LPA. Feedback indicates issues being picked up. Pupil is not consistently self-rating against SOL bar. (Teacher picks up)

### **Learning Walk showed**

- All staff know their PP children
- Lots of examples of WAGOLLS on learning walls – all DPs refer but some stronger than others – could do with minimum expectations for all classes
- Most classes have polished writes on the wall – in best classes there is a range of information to refer to eg Rainbow Grammar in all – supplemented in some.
- Use of talk partners embedded across every class.
- In strongest classes, children clear about class text through children words and walls
- Consistent use of red/purple pen and cursive handwriting
- Use of additional adults effective across the school
- Links between activities are more explicit in some classes than others
- Ensure RAG rating is consistent
- Use of DoJos – how consistent is this?

- Year 6 – SoL inconsistent in one class. Inconsistent use of RAG rating/APE. Otherwise strong practice.
- Y5 – looked in classroom. Are there non negotiables for display as lack of evidence of learning journey on both walls especially in Peacock and in some cases there is too much information, so that the current focus is unclear
- Y4 – Leopards/Polar. Both classes get to choose where to start on the Sol but Leopard are not RAG rating consistently. Clear teacher modelling in both classes. Reading approaches not consistently embedded? Leopard behaviour more fidgety. 2/3 PP didn't volunteer to answer questions and weren't picked. Polar – more confident in their learning and adult supporting PP child. Next steps help him learn – last one was 13.3.18 – it looks like teachers are not getting to every child
- Y3-5 all used SNOT to support independent skills
- Y3 – strong teaching in Wolves – 2 PP children engaged, use of whiteboards to support, active learning strategy. Both classes used DoJos really well to motivate children. Use of learning environment better in Wolves than Tigers. Wagolls clear about current topics. Tables practice helped
- Y2 – strong in both classes. Good adult team work with teacher eg TA had a high and low prior attaining pupil together. Quantity and quality of writing influenced by Wildlife park visit. Strong working wall content, sustained focus writing, v independent pupils
- Y1 – Developing a small world area – what is the impact for PP children? PP sometimes use it. Y1 SoL very wordy (Hippo) - how supportive for less able readers? Only 2 children reflected on SoL at the end as they were being too fussy. Sentence reminders for PP useful.
- Musical instrument for all classes – how many have 1:1?

### **Pupil voice**

#### *Year 4 and Year 6*

- Best things that teachers do that help you learn
  - Y6 – small group - maths – timetables and calculation. Reading, maths, literacy 0 can give examples
  - Y4 – enterprise week – INTU visit – wanted to become an entrepreneur.
  - Y6- word problems linked to real life; 1:1 after feedback – like the cards to self-assess. Useful to have in the moment marking as have time to correct. Y4 - like time to respond to marking before assembly
  - Reading – DoJo points linked to reading time. 2 in Book-club have to report back – real life feedback into bookshop – they really like this
- All but one think their writing and maths has improved this year – children can give examples
- Have option to start on statement boxes further up and in higher groups pushed to do higher starting points – like being able to start higher
- What would improve things further?
  - Love 'hidden' learning eg literacy (project based work in lessons and homework)
  - Access to dictionaries on table for a cold write
  - More frequent marking in Y6 literacy for some pupils - perceive that teachers run out of time - and for teachers to mark their maths to clarify

#### *Y1/2*

- Most chose maths work which they were proud of
- Confident about SoL – Y2 self-assessment is AFTER the teacher has done this. Some of the APEs were highlighted but not all.
- SOL starting points still appeared to be linked to seating table – Y2 very verbal about that. They state that tables are ability grouped and they can't move onto higher challenge. Perception of not wanting challenge – need to develop their resilience



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like open afternoons – proud of their work</li> <li>• Like teacher comments in books as know what done well</li> <li>• Use of next steps in red pen – they liked that (Y1 couldn't find any examples of next steps)</li> <li>• Class book – incentivised by colour bands – all have support at home for reading</li> <li>• Improvements? More reading spaces and more help with maths</li> </ul> <p>11 Separate books have been combined now</p> <p>13 Didn't go down the PDP plans – good practice map. Lots of outward work to improve teaching evident</p>
<b>Personal development Behaviour &amp; safety</b>	<b>Areas to develop from last review</b>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Inspection dashboard 2016 showed</b> FSM persistent absence 19.3% and in the highest 10%). <b>Cited as weakness on inspection dashboard</b></li> <li>2. explore a higher threshold than 90% attendance for triggering letters of concern to parent</li> <li>3. Analyse DoJo awards by groups, including for DPs, to ensure they are benefiting from these incentives</li> <li>4. As Tree House is partly funding by PP funding, access to this and impact should be carefully analysed for DPs</li> <li>5. 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</li> </ol>
	<b>Action and impact</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Working with some children – e.g medical needs. Clearly analysing data and adapting to meet individual needs. 2016-17 persistent absence (PA) 9% (5/54 pupils). Which was average and much improved from 2016. Current is 15% (9/57). Leaders clearly monitoring PP as individuals and group and also the gap with non PP. As at Oct 17, attendance was low in EYFS (64%/2 pupils); Y2 (85%/5 children) and in years 4-6 (88-90% for 8-12 children) but by end of autumn term had improved in all year groups with lowest at 89% (4 EYFS pupils) and Y5&amp;6 (92-93%). 70% of DPs with &lt;90% attendance had holiday in term time, 20% illness, medical or unauthorised absence.</li> <li>2. Increased expectations of attendance – interim letter for 90-95% -</li> <li>3. Analysis not yet done – aware of need to be more consistent use – widening with community – worth looking at DP parental access</li> <li>4. Tree house – over 50% DPs are accessing – starting to put together impact data. Visit to this provision – 1 DP there – focus is on reintegration into mainstream activity. How well are children encouraged independently to apply their phonic knowledge in writing?</li> <li>5. Still recommended to define purpose to justify expenditure. Enterprise week really energised the children – found it purposeful</li> </ol>
<b>Next steps</b>	<b>Areas to develop from last review</b>
	<p>Sharpen the PP review statement/strategy for 2017-18 by ensuring</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All actions and evaluation of impact are specific to disadvantaged pupils</li> <li>2. Ensure that weaknesses identified from analysis of data, including the inspection dashboard, are addressed in the section on in-school and external barriers</li> <li>3. Capture the use of the PP in relation to early years (F2) where appropriate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmark PP pupils outcomes against non PP nationally, in any evaluation or success criteria</li> <li>• Ensure retrospective evaluation of spending for 2016-17 is clear about <b>impact</b>, especially on attainment and progress, (evaluation for 2015-6 was more about actions taken)</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
	<b>Action and impact</b> <p>The PP statement has been revised - there is evidence of impact of spending in relation to year 6 2017 but the statement needs to review the impact of all key PP funded activity against intended outcomes. The statement for 2017-18 would benefit from the addition of end of key stage and phonics</p>

targets, which take account of national attainment for non PP pupils. The plan would also benefit from a reference to securing good attendance for key cohorts and whole school averages