

James Montgomery Academy Trust Pupil premium strategy statement



| 1. Summary information | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---|----------|---|--------------|
| School | Wath Victoria Primary School | | | | |
| Academic Year | 21- 22 | Total PP budget | £170.550 | Date of most recent PP Review | Spring 2019 |
| Total number of pupils | 317 | Number of pupils eligible for PP Number of pupils eligible for EYPP. | 107 2 | Date for next internal review of this strategy - Final review | October 2021 |

| 2. Current attainment (2019 KS2 results) | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i> | <i>Pupils not eligible for PP (school non-PP)</i> |
| % achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths | <p>75% ARE 6.3% Higher standard</p> <p>100% ARE (non-SEN) 14.3% Higher standard (non-SEN)</p> | <p>90% ARE 19% Higher standard</p> <p>100% ARE (non-SEN) 25% Higher standard (non-SEN)</p> |
| % making expected progress/attainment in reading | <p>81.3% ARE 12.5% Higher standard</p> | <p>95.2% ARE 38.2% Higher standard</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | 100% ARE (non-SEN) 14.3% Higher standard (non-SEN) | 100 %ARE (non-SEN) 43.8% Higher standard (non-SEN) |
| % making expected progress/attainment in writing | 75% ARE 6.3% Higher standard 100% ARE (non-SEN) 14.3% Higher standard (non-SEN) | 95.2% ARE 23.8% Higher standard 100% ARE (non-SEN) 31.3% Higher standard (non-SEN) |
| % making expected progress/attainment in maths | 75% ARE 12.5% Higher standard 100% ARE (non-SEN) 28.6% Higher standard (non-SEN) | 95.2 ARE 33.3% Higher standard 100% ARE (non-SEN) 31.3% Higher standard (non-SEN) |

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

In-school barriers *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)*

A. In the EYFS, PP pupils often enter with limited speech and language skills. This hinders their development on many levels including communication, phonics, reading and writing.

B. The SEMH needs of PP children and their parents impact on how safe and secure children feel in school, and therefore affects their ability to concentrate and achieve in their learning.

| | |
|---|---|
| C. | In KS2, many PP children have limited support from home; this includes not reading frequently with an adult and not being supported to complete homework. Some pupils eligible for PPG do not experience wide and varied vocabulary at home and have limited life experiences beyond their immediate home environment and locality. |
| External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>) | |
| D. | Lower attendance rates than national average for PP children (including those with SEND) |
| 4. Desired outcomes (<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>) | Success Criteria |
| A. | 58% (7/12) children eligible for PP in F2 achieve GLD by the end of the year. |
| B. | PP children with SEMH needs (14 children) are supported to be able to access learning successfully through effective pastoral provision, so that 50% of them make progress in line with ARE expectations, and 100% make progress in line with individual expectations. |
| C. | 70% of PP children without SEN meet (or are on track to meet) ARE in reading, writing and maths at the end of KS2. |
| D. | PP children with SEN are accessing provision over and above that which is allocated for their SEN spend allocation, and the provision is impacting positively on pupil outcomes. |

5. Planned expenditure – Note that the outcomes below are primarily continuing from the 19-20 academic year planned outcomes due to COVID disruption.

Academic year | 2020-21

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 | 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? |
|--|---|---|---|-------------------|--|
| PP children without SEN achieve in line with non-PP children in school, and nationally, in RWM and phonics and close the gap at the higher standard. | <p>Release time for AHT (English/reading), TLR (English/writing) and AHT (Maths) to support teaching for GD and close monitoring and intervention for PP children.</p> <p>Employment of reading/phonics teacher for one day a week to provide teaching in phonics and comprehension</p> | <p>EEF - Using proven reading comprehension strategies tested through EEF trials has an impact of +6 months progress. Small group tuition also has impact of +4 months and children targeted through this intervention would work in small groups with a qualified teacher experienced in reading support.</p> <p>Teaching for mastery in maths raises aspirations for all with fluid setting allowing children to push beyond their teaching group when they are able to aim higher.</p> | <p>Pupil progress meeting 3x per year to review individual progress of children and switch reading interventions as appropriate to need. Quality resources purchased and used to deliver enhanced reading comprehension support.</p> <p>Leader reports to SLT weekly.</p> | CM/JP/EN/DH | <p>November 20, February 21, April 21.</p> <p>Through performance management meetings/observations twice annually.</p> <p>Through phase reviews, work scrutinies and workwatch weekly.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-------------------|---|
| | and writing and maths to children from F2-Y4. | | | | |
| All teachers delivering excellent learning for PP children and hence all pupils. | Targeted CPD for individual staff needs, and all staff attend CPD meetings weekly. | EEFs research school network (September 2018) – effects of high-quality teaching are especially significant for children from disadvantaged backgrounds – equivalent to 1.5 years’ worth of learning. Rosenshine’s research into the principles of teaching and learning. The Great Teaching Toolkit. Sweller (1988)/Kirschener (2006) cognitive load theory. Rosch (1978) Cognition and categorisation. | Phase leader overview of teaching and learning in all key stages. SLT phase reviews to check on the quality of teaching and learning. Staff training records and follow-up on impact of these. Pupil progress meetings 3x per year to review individual progress of PP children. | SLT/phase leaders | After each assessment point (3 x per year). Through performance management meetings/observations twice annually. Through phase reviews, work scrutinies and workwatch weekly. |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £55,635 |

| ii. 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 | When will you review implementation? |
| <p>PP children with SEMH needs (19 children) are supported to be able to access learning successfully through effective pastoral provision, so that 58% of them make progress in line with ARE expectations, and 100% make progress in line with individual expectations.</p> | <p>Employment of 2 learning mentors and HLTA able to engage in therapy-based interventions.</p> <p>Employment of two full-time TAs trained in trauma-informed strategies to offer 1:1 and small group SEMH support to vulnerable children.</p> | <p>EEF research shows that behaviour interventions have a +3 month impact and social and emotional learning has a +4 month impact pupil outcomes.</p> <p>Research carried out for the Government's Green paper (Dec 2017) on children/ teenagers aged 2-18 found: <i>"There is evidence that appropriately trained and supported staff such as teachers, school nurses, counsellors, and teaching assistants can achieve results comparable to those achieved by trained therapists in delivering a number of interventions addressing mild to moderate mental health</i></p> | <p>Learning mentor team will carry out entry and exit assessments on all children they work with and the impact of their work will be analysed in line with school's 2 assessment points across the year.</p> <p>Children will be able to talk about how they have made progress with their emotional health and well-being.</p> | DM | <p>After each assessment point 2 x per year and in line with the inclusion review pathway every 6-8 weeks.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|----|--|
| | | <i>problems (such as anxiety, conduct disorder, substance use disorders and post-traumatic stress disorder).</i> | | | |
| Attendance of pupil premium children is improved year on year and attendance of PP children without SEN is in line with, or above that of all pupils in school. | Employment of a student welfare manager and non-teaching inclusion lead to engage in parental engagement work and attendance analysis. Employment of a sports coach to promote healthy living decisions and provide interventions to promote attendance of PA children. | Our school attendance is below the national average of 96%. The inclusion lead is also SENDCo and so can identify target children easily e.g. those without significant health concerns who we know are likely to have lower attendance as a result of their needs. | The student welfare manager will work closely with the admin support staff to engage in early identification of attendance issues and intervene appropriately. Attendance is robustly monitored daily and weekly. Any patterns or issues are raised with parents quickly. Attendance panels are held for children with attendance plans in place with governors/JMAT representatives in attendance. Attendance is reported to governors 4x annually. | DM | Daily/Weekly in school. 4 x annually in governors' meetings. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-----------|--|
| <p>100% (4/4) children eligible for PP in F2 achieve GLD by the end of the year.</p> | <p>Buy in speech and language therapist time fortnightly. Use of resources and training for programmes such as Early Talk Boost, Talking Tables and Listening Lola. Sustained shared thinking and vocabulary development training in place to upskill staff.</p> | <p>In-school assessments of PP children starting in our pre-school provision suggests that many children start school without the level of speech and language skill and levels of interaction required to be successful in school. The Early Years EEF toolkit suggests that communication and language interventions have +6 months impact on pupil outcomes.</p> | <p>The work of the speech and language therapist is monitored by the inclusion lead and reports demonstrate impact and progress at individual pupil level.</p> <p>Pupil progress is monitored 3 x yearly by the EYFS leader and SLT.</p> <p>Staff are trained to deliver interventions/upskill language work in provision with children.</p> | <p>DH</p> | <p>3 x yearly in pupil progress meetings after each assessment point.</p> <p>Monthly on each speech and language visit.</p> <p>Through SLT monitoring cycle.</p> |
| <p>73% (8/11) PP children pass the phonics screening assessment</p> | <p>Use of Active Phonics programme to engage PP boys particularly.</p> <p>Use of qualified teaching staff to deliver phonics teaching in small groups.</p> | <p>EEF research shows that phonics programmes have a +4 month impact on pupil outcomes and that the use of qualified teachers to deliver phonics programmes gets better results (up to twice the effectiveness of other staff).</p> | <p>Staff trained in active phonics. Monitoring of progress at each assessment point and individual pupil progress assessed.</p> | <p>DH</p> | <p>3 x yearly in pupil progress meetings after each assessment point.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|-------------------|--|
| | Training of sports coach in active phonics. | | | | |
| 100% of PP children with SEN make progress in line with their individual expectations by the end of the school year. 30% of these children will also meet age-related expectations. | Children engage in 1:1 and small group tuition in line with need. This is both teacher and TA led. | EEF research shows that small group tuition has a +4 month impact and one to one tuition has a +5 month impact on pupil outcomes. | Monitoring of individual pupil progress at each assessment point 2 x yearly. | DM | Monitoring of individual pupil progress at each assessment point 2 x yearly. |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £102,617 |
| 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? |
| Support PP children in KS2 to | Funding support for curriculum | Children will be able to engage more readily in school if they | PP children and families will be targeted to ensure that | CM/DM/K B | Annually. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|----------|
| access life experiences beyond the immediate locality and to engage in different activities they may not ordinarily have access to out of school. | linked visits/visitors. Funding for after-school and extra-curricular clubs. Funding support for outdoor adventure learning. | have attended all curriculum linked provision and can draw on real-life experience. Children develop resilience and self-confidence through trying new activities and stretching themselves beyond their comfort zone – this raises aspirations. | children most in need are able to access all provision available to them. | | |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £2528 |
| Grand total | | | | | £160,780 |

| 6. Review of expenditure – Pupil premium | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|-------------|
| Previous Academic Year | | 2018-19 (19-20 review of impact limited due to COVID – outcomes continuing into 20-21). PP budget in 19-20 was spent as per 19-20 plan which was primarily on staffing. | | |
| i. Quality of teaching for all | | | | |
| Desired outcome | Chosen action / approach | Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) | Cost |
| PP children without SEN achieve in line with non-PP children in school, and nationally, in RWM and phonics. | <p>Two smaller classes in Y5 where the number of PP children is highest, using PPG to employ a full time class teacher.</p> <p>Employment of a targeted specialist reading intervention teacher, with specialist phonics experience.</p> | <p>Combined RWM in Y5 at year end: Non-SEN Pupil Premium – 77% Non-PP – 90% At end of Y4 Pure PP – 75% Increase of 2% of pure PP on track by end of Y5.</p> <p>Phonics screening results for the Y1 cohort were 77%. Whilst this was below national standards it is 10% above the predicted outcomes in March 2019. The specialist approach to teaching and review supported 100% of pupil premium children in Y1 without SEN to achieve in line with age-related expectations in reading and phonics compared to 83%</p> | <p>In line with EEF research, the impact of reducing class size on pupil outcomes is minimal however there was a slight increase in performance of pure PP children across the academic year. This is not an intervention we will continue with in 2019-20.</p> <p>Well-planned and targeted phonics teaching for all children impacted on pupil outcomes positively. This approach to continue next year.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---------|
| | | of non-PP children. The impact on non-PP children was that 62% of children with SEN achieved in line with age-related expectations in reading as a result of the shared benefit of this approach. | | |
| All teachers delivering excellent learning for PP children and hence all pupils. | Targeted CPD for individual staff needs, and all staff attend CPD meetings weekly. | Target 85% of PP children without SEN on track to meet RWM combined expectations by the end of KS2. Current progress: Y1 – 82% Y2 – 88% Y3 – 62% Y4 – 100% Y5 – 77% Y6 – 100% | EEFs research school network (September 2018) – effects of high-quality teaching are especially significant for children from disadvantaged backgrounds – equivalent to 1.5 years’ worth of learning. Targeted CPD for staff will continue through ROSIS training, in-house CPD and maths hub work amongst other initiatives. | £57,600 |
| IPEEL writing project develops self-regulation in writing specifically for disadvantaged learners, and so has a positive | English leader released from class to attend project meetings and to support staff to implement the strategies in their classrooms. | Writing data from start of the year to end of the year for cohorts of non-SEN pupil premium children using IPEELL strategies: Y2 – start 88.2% to end 100% Y3 – start 64.3% to end 64.3% | EEF research into metacognition and self-regulation strategies is based on extensive research and shows +7 months impact. Some impact on PP and all children was seen through implementing this project. English writing leader to be released half a day a week to support the teaching and modelling of writing as a school priority this year. | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-------------|
| impact on all learners. | | Y4 – start 77.8% to end 100% Y5 – start 83.3% to end 76.9% (fluctuation in cohort number). | | |
| ii. Targeted support | | | | |
| Desired outcome | Chosen action / approach | Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) | Cost |
| PP children with SEMH needs (26 children) are supported to be able to access learning successfully through effective pastoral provision, so that 65% of them make progress in line with ARE expectations, and 100% make progress in line with individual expectations. | Employment of 2 learning mentors able to engage in therapy-based interventions, and specialist behaviour support professionals to train staff in behaviour interventions, restorative practice and trauma informed techniques. | 66% of pupils with SEMH made progress in line with ARE expectations and 96.2% of pupils with SEMH needs made progress in line with individual expectations. 1 pupil did not make progress in line with personal targets. | This approach will continue and a HLTA role with responsibility for supporting children with trauma-induced SEMH needs to be employed to further support this vulnerable group of children and support and train staff in appropriate techniques. | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|----------------|--|
| <p>Attendance of pupil premium children is improved year on year and attendance of PP children without SEN is in line with, or above that of all pupils in school.</p> | <p>Employment of an attendance/student support champion 0.4 fte plus non-teaching inclusion lead who can coordinate the approach across the inclusion team.</p> | <p>Attendance of PP children increased in 18-19 by 0.6%.</p> <p>Attendance of PP children without additional SEN needs was above that of all pupils by 0.8% at 94.8%</p> | <p>The approach will continue with some changes. The attendance/student support champion role will be shared between the learning mentor, the pupil welfare manager and the inclusion lead, supported by the admin team. New attendance pathway processes will be implemented.</p> | <p>£86,610</p> | |
| <p>83% (10/12) children eligible for PP achieve GLD by the end of the year.</p> | <p>Buy in speech and language therapist time fortnightly. Use of resources and training for programmes such as Early Talk Boost, Talking Tables and Listening Lola.</p> | <p>91% of children eligible for PP achieved GLD by the end of the year (10/11 – cohort fluctuation).</p> | <p>This approach will continue with the SALT worker attending monthly and EYFS staff implementing programmes as listed here. Staff release time to be built in for language lead network meetings also.</p> | | |
| <p>71% (10/14) PP children pass the phonics screening assessment</p> | <p>Use of Active Phonics programme to engage PP boys particularly.</p> | <p>5/5 (100%) of PP children without SEN passed the phonics screening test. 100% of PP boys without SEN passed the test. 83% of non-PP</p> | <p>This approach will continue and further equipment and re-organisation of teaching spaces will be facilitated to allow for it.</p> <p>Children (particularly boys) engaged with the active teaching and smaller groups led by</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>Use of qualified teaching staff to deliver phonics teaching in small groups.</p> | <p>children passed the phonics screening test.</p> <p>Of all PP children, 8/13 (62% - cohort fluctuation) passed the test. The 5/13 who did not pass have specific SEND.</p> | <p>qualified teachers in short bursts helped children to make rapid, sustained progress in a short period of time.</p> <p>Those with specific SEND could not focus long enough on the activities to draw much benefit from them.</p> | |
| <p>100% of PP children with SEN make progress in line with their individual expectations by the end of the school year. 50% of these children will also meet age-related expectations.</p> | <p>Children engage in 1:1 and small group tuition in line with need.</p> | <p>There were 62 children in school who were PP with additional SEND needs. 98% of these children made progress in line with their individual expectations (1 child didn't)</p> <p>58% of these children met age related expectations.</p> | <p>Children will continue to have individualised pupil support plans which will include 1:1 and small group support to meet needs. Some children will have a personalized curriculum.</p> | |

| iii. Other approaches | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--------|
| Desired outcome | Chosen action / approach | Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) | Cost |
| Support PP children in KS2 to access life experiences beyond the immediate locality and to engage in different activities they may not ordinarily have access to out of school. | <p>Funding support for curriculum linked visits/visitors.</p> <p>Funding for after-school and extra-curricular clubs.</p> <p>Funding support or outdoor adventure learning.</p> | <p>5 children eligible for PP were supported to buy costumes for performances in the local community and further afield and to attend the after-school club rehearsals.</p> <p>Children eligible for PP were funded to attend curriculum linked school visits.</p> <p>PP funding was allocated to outdoor learning for all in the school premises and to in-school theatrical performances.</p> <p>5 PP children were allocated funding to attend breakfast club.</p> | We will continue to use PP funding to widen participation for all children and to support specific children to access extra-curricular activities, especially those which they would not ordinarily have access to involving the arts. We found that children and families' aspirations were raised as a result of such initiatives. | £1,250 |

COVID catch-up premium plan

| 6. Planned expenditure | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------------|--|
| Academic year | | 2020-21 | | | |
| <i>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> | | | | | |
| Covid catch up funding allocation: £21,840 | | | | | |
| 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? |
| Reduce class size in Y3/4 to enable targeted teaching in phonics, reading, writing and maths for those children identified as needing intense support to catch-up. | Create a new class for morning teaching in key skills to be staffed by an experienced teacher, HLTA and TA. | Small group tuition has impact of +4 months (EEF) and children targeted through this intervention would work in a small class with work designed to ensure rapid progress and tailored to individual needs. | Daily planning time for the staff and handover PPA slot for staff working on different outcomes with the children. Phase leader monitoring of progress with class teachers. Subject leaders and HT monitoring impact regularly. | JS/JP | Half termly. Intention is to move focus to Y1/2 at February half term depending on progress in Y3/4 and Y1/2. |
| Total expenditure | | | | | £19,006 |
| To support children from F2-Y6 to catch-up in reading and maths by having ready | Purchase of two online systems: reading planet and MyMaths. | Children can be set work quickly on a system with they are familiar with in school. Weekly homework can be monitored this way and revision | The home learning champion, maths team and English leaders will monitor its set up and use. | JP/DHaw/ DHarris/ EN | Weekly and after any bubble closures. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----|--|
| access to home learning to embed learning in school and to ensure children's continuity in learning can continue should further bubble close. | | of objectives re-taught can be embedded at home to allow in-school curriculum time to be focused on new learning – interleaved practice (Rohrer, 2012). Further limitations can be made from any future missed learning. | Phase teams will review usage and impact at pupil progress meetings and in weekly phase meetings. | | |
| Total expenditure | | | | | £834 |
| To implement the Nuffield Early Language Intervention (NELI) - an evidence-based oral language intervention for children in nursery and reception who show weakness in their oral language skills and who are therefore at risk of experiencing difficulty with reading | Staff cover to allow two teachers and 2 teaching assistants to train to deliver this programme. | Government approved catch-up programme. EEF recommended programme from early trials of impact. | 4 staff will take part in training to deliver the 20 week programme. Time will be built into assessment and teaching in class to identify those most in need of the programme, and then to deliver the programme to them. | DH | Training from Jan 2021 and reviewed half termly. |
| Total expenditure | | | | | £1000 |
| Grand total expenditure | | | | | £21,840 |

