



Caldecote Community Primary School - Pupil premium strategy statement

1. Summary information			
School	Caldecote Community Primary School		
Academic Year	2019/20	Total PP budget	£265320
Total number of pupils	614	Number of pupils eligible for PP	201
Date of most recent PP Review	Date for next internal review of this strategy		Sept 2019 Jan 2020
2. Current attainment (Year 6 – end of July 2019)			
		Pupils eligible for PP (school)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% achieving in reading, writing and maths		75% EXP / 7% HIGHER	76% / 21% PP from Sch Data
% making progress in reading		+xxx Progress 75% EXP / 25% HIGHER	+xxx Non-PP Progress Nationally 76% / 37% Non PP from Sch Data
% making progress in writing		+xxx Progress 89% EXP / 14% HIGHER	+xxx Non-PP Progress Nationally 82% / 26% Non PP from Sch Data
% making progress in maths		+xxx Progress 86% EXP / 21% HIGHER	+xxx Non-PP Progress Nationally 84% / 45% Non PP from Sch Data
3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)			
In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)			
A.	No PP pupils on entry into Reception are working at age related expectations – on average at least 10-15% are for non PP pupils.		
B.	Ensuring that quality first teaching remains at least consistently good in all year groups.		
C.	Movement of teaching staff throughout the year – through leaving the school or long term absence issues (September 2019 five teachers new to the school or in their second year).		
D.	Staff provide very effective extra provisions for SEN pupils; however we need to raise further awareness of individual class profiles providing provisions to close the gap for PP pupils in all classes.		

E.	Limited family experience has led to fewer life opportunities for some PP children, which impacts on PP children's world experience, cultural capital and vocabulary.																																										
F.	Pupils in receipt of PP are more likely to be among CCPS' "weakest readers" (e.g. >2 years behind, for decoding and comprehension), which has an impact on academic attainment and can cause them to fall behind their peers on average.																																										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Number of weak readers in year group (2yrs+ behind)</th> <th>Number (%) of PP children in cohort</th> <th>% of weak readers who are PP</th> <th>% of PP group who fall into the 'weakest readers' category</th> <th>Summary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y1</td> <td>39 children (48.1%)</td> <td>21/81 = 25.9%</td> <td>12 / 39 = 30.8%</td> <td>12/21 = 57.1%</td> <td>More than half the PP fall into the 'weakest readers' category</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y2</td> <td>31 children (35.6%)</td> <td>24/87 = 27.6%</td> <td>10 / 31 = 32.3%</td> <td>10 / 24 = 41.7%</td> <td>Two fifths of the PP fall into the 'weakest readers' category</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y3</td> <td>25 children (27.8%)</td> <td>34/90 = 37.8%</td> <td>7 / 25 = 28%</td> <td>7 / 34 = 20.6%</td> <td>The PP are underrepresented in the 'weakest readers' category</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y4</td> <td>23 children (26.1%)</td> <td>30/88 = 34.1%</td> <td>11 / 23 = 47.8%</td> <td>11 / 30 = 36.7%</td> <td>Half the weakest readers are PP (despite PP only making 34% of cohort)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y5</td> <td>33/77 children (42.9)</td> <td>34/77 = 44.2%</td> <td>12 / 33 = 36.4%</td> <td>12 / 34 = 35.3%</td> <td>The PP are underrepresented in the 'weakest readers' category</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y6</td> <td>27/67 children (40.3%)</td> <td>33/67 = 49.3%</td> <td>19 / 27 = 70.1%</td> <td>19 / 33 = 57.6%</td> <td>70% of weakest readers are PP and more than half the PP are weakest readers</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number of weak readers in year group (2yrs+ behind)	Number (%) of PP children in cohort	% of weak readers who are PP	% of PP group who fall into the 'weakest readers' category	Summary	Y1	39 children (48.1%)	21/81 = 25.9%	12 / 39 = 30.8%	12/21 = 57.1%	More than half the PP fall into the 'weakest readers' category	Y2	31 children (35.6%)	24/87 = 27.6%	10 / 31 = 32.3%	10 / 24 = 41.7%	Two fifths of the PP fall into the 'weakest readers' category	Y3	25 children (27.8%)	34/90 = 37.8%	7 / 25 = 28%	7 / 34 = 20.6%	The PP are underrepresented in the 'weakest readers' category	Y4	23 children (26.1%)	30/88 = 34.1%	11 / 23 = 47.8%	11 / 30 = 36.7%	Half the weakest readers are PP (despite PP only making 34% of cohort)	Y5	33/77 children (42.9)	34/77 = 44.2%	12 / 33 = 36.4%	12 / 34 = 35.3%	The PP are underrepresented in the 'weakest readers' category	Y6	27/67 children (40.3%)	33/67 = 49.3%	19 / 27 = 70.1%	19 / 33 = 57.6%	70% of weakest readers are PP and more than half the PP are weakest readers
	Number of weak readers in year group (2yrs+ behind)	Number (%) of PP children in cohort	% of weak readers who are PP	% of PP group who fall into the 'weakest readers' category	Summary																																						
Y1	39 children (48.1%)	21/81 = 25.9%	12 / 39 = 30.8%	12/21 = 57.1%	More than half the PP fall into the 'weakest readers' category																																						
Y2	31 children (35.6%)	24/87 = 27.6%	10 / 31 = 32.3%	10 / 24 = 41.7%	Two fifths of the PP fall into the 'weakest readers' category																																						
Y3	25 children (27.8%)	34/90 = 37.8%	7 / 25 = 28%	7 / 34 = 20.6%	The PP are underrepresented in the 'weakest readers' category																																						
Y4	23 children (26.1%)	30/88 = 34.1%	11 / 23 = 47.8%	11 / 30 = 36.7%	Half the weakest readers are PP (despite PP only making 34% of cohort)																																						
Y5	33/77 children (42.9)	34/77 = 44.2%	12 / 33 = 36.4%	12 / 34 = 35.3%	The PP are underrepresented in the 'weakest readers' category																																						
Y6	27/67 children (40.3%)	33/67 = 49.3%	19 / 27 = 70.1%	19 / 33 = 57.6%	70% of weakest readers are PP and more than half the PP are weakest readers																																						

External barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)

G. Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are 94.6% and below non-PP pupils at 96.7%. This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind on average.

H. Persistent absence rates are higher for PP pupils (11.2% - 20 of 178 pupils) than for non-PP pupils (5.1% - 16 of 312 pupils).

I. Punctuality. PP arrive later to school than non PP pupils.

4. Desired outcomes	
A.	<p><i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i></p> <p>Improve further the extra provisions for all PP pupils across all year groups to close the gap between PP and non-PP pupils or to maintain PP pupils achieving higher than non-PP pupils.</p> <p><i>Success criteria</i></p> <p>Pupils eligible for PP identified by all teachers and planned, weekly interventions are used to increase attainment organised and agreed by Assistant Headteachers as required;</p> <p>Entry yr6 (TA – SUM2): EXS(GD) Reading: 36% (13%) PP; 74% (30%) non-PP Writing: 32% (10%) PP; 51% (20%) non-PP Maths: 48% (23%) PP 77% (51%) non-PP Combined: 29% (7%) PP 49% (20%) non-PP Year 6 PP to reduce the gap with non-PP by the end of 2019 in all subjects including combined by 10% at expected and 5% greater depth.</p> <p>Entry yr5 (TA – SUM2): EXS(GD) Reading: 50% (27%) PP; 41% (22%) non-PP Writing: 53% (9%) PP; 59% (15%) non-PP Maths: 65% (24%) PP; 70% (26%) non-PP Combined: 41% (6%) PP; 39% (11%) non-PP Year 5 PP to remain above non-PP by the end of 2019 in reading. Year PP and to reduce the gap with non-PP by the end of 2019 in writing and maths by 10% at expected and 5% greater depth. Year 5 PP to remain above non-PP by the end of 2019 in combined at expected and gaps closed in greater depth.</p> <p>Entry yr4 (TA – SUM2): EXS(GD) Reading: 50% (8%) PP; 64% (33%) non-PP</p>

	<p>Writing: 39% (12%) PP; 59% (27%) non-PP Maths: 62% (19%) PP; 71% (40%) non-PP Combined: 39% (8%) PP; 57% (21%) non-PP Year 4 PP to reduce the gap with non-PP by the end of 2019 in all subjects including combined by 10% at expected and 5% greater depth.</p> <p>Entry yr3 (KS1 SATs data): <i>EXS(GD)</i> Reading: 72% (28%) PP; 74% (25%) non-PP Writing: 72% (24%) PP; 66% (16%) non-PP Maths: 76% (31%) PP; 77% (25%) non-PP Combined: 66% (24%) PP; 62% (12%) non-PP Year 3 PP to close the gap with non-PP by the end of 2019 in reading (2%) and maths (1%) and to remain above non-PP by the end of 2019 in writing. Year 5 PP to remain above non-PP by the end of 2019 in combined at expected and greater depth.</p> <p>Entry yr2 (TA – SUM2): <i>EXS(GD)</i> Reading: 50% (20%) PP; 57% (25%) non-PP Writing: 50% (25%) PP; 70% (19%) non-PP Maths: 65% (25%) PP; 83% (29%) non-PP Combined: 33% (4%) PP; 57% (10%) non-PP Year 2 PP to reduce the gap with non-PP by the end of 2019 in all subjects including combined entirely by 10% at expected and 5% greater depth.</p> <p>Entry yr2 (TA – SUM2): <i>EXS(GD)</i> Reading: 50% (20%) PP; 57% (25%) non-PP Writing: 50% (25%) PP; 70% (19%) non-PP Maths: 65% (25%) PP; 83% (29%) non-PP</p> <p>Phonics screening nationally – 71% PP 84% non-disadvantaged met the standard Phonics screening at CCPS – 62% PP 86% non-disadvantaged met the standard Year 2 PP to close the gap with non-PP by the end of 2019 in phonics (number of the 11 PP pupils who did not pass in year 1 to pass in year 2)</p> <p>Year 1 PP to reduce the gap with non-PP by the end of 2019 in all subjects including combined by 10% at expected and 5% at greater depth.</p> <p>This includes all ability groups – LA, MA and, especially, HA.</p> <p>Number of PP children nationally = 21% (CCPS has 32.6%, including Nursery/Reception classes)</p> <p>Progress to be measured against attainment data from ASP 2020. Progress gaps at the end of 2019 for HA disadvantaged pupils to be closed and brought in line with National other 2020.</p> <p>Phonics screening nationally – 71% PP 84% non-disadvantaged met the standard Phonics screening at CCPS – 62% PP 86% non-disadvantaged met the standard</p> <p>KS1 national – reading 62% PP EXS 78% non-disadvantaged writing 55% PP EXS 69% non-disadvantaged maths 62% PP EXS 76% non-disadvantaged</p>
<p>B. Increase the progress scores at the end of Key Stage 2 for all higher prior attaining pupils</p>	

		<p>KS1 CCPS – reading 72% PP EXS 74% non-PP writing 72% PP EXS 66% non-PP maths 76% PP EXS 77% non-PP</p> <p>Check in with the new ASP results – October 2019</p> <p>Progress to be measured against attainment data - see above for specific details relating to current cohorts. Data to be assessed using reading, writing and maths assessments. All PP pupils to reach full potential by end of Year 6 and at least in line with national non PP pupils for all abilities.</p> <p>Pupils eligible for PP make 20% more progress as 'other' pupils across the school. This includes all ability groups – LA, MA and, especially, HA.</p> <p>Reduce the number of children who are persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP from 20 in 2018-2019 to below 15, to close the gap with 'other' pupils. Overall PP attendance improves from 94.6% to 95.5% to close the gap with non-PP pupils.</p> <p>Reduce the number of PP children arriving late in school by 25%.</p> <p>Every pupil in receipt of PP engages in an additional event outside of their familiar cultural environment during the academic year.</p> <p>Reduce the number of children who are in among the pupils eligible for PP in the "weakest readers" readers from 71 in 2019-2012 to below 50, to close the gap with 'other' pupils. Overall PP attendance improves from 94.6% to 95.5% to close the gap with non-PP pupils.</p>
C.	Significantly higher rates of progress than non PP pupils where required across all year groups and for all ability groups	
D.	Quality first teaching remains never less than good in all year groups, especially when short term staffing problems arise	
E.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	
F.	Increased punctuality rates for pupils eligible for PP.	
G.	Increase the opportunities for pupils eligible for PP to engage with activities which provide world experience, cultural capital and vocabulary from beyond their familiar setting and life experience.	
H.	Increased reading ability for the 'weakest reader' pupils eligible for PP.	

End of Year Attendance - 2018-2019 - Dis and Non-Dis Comparisons									
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Total	PA No.	PA %
All	94.4%	95.8%	96.0%	96.4%	96.2%	97.5%	96.0%	36	7.50%
Dis	93.6%	94.7%	92.6%	94.1%	95.0%	97.0%	94.6%	20	4.20%
Non Dis	94.6%	96.3%	97.5%	98.2%	97.2%	97.9%	96.7%	16	3.30%
Gap	-1.0%	-1.6%	-4.9%	-4.1%	-2.2%	-90.0%	-2.1%		1.10%

5. Planned expenditure		2019-2020			
Academic year					
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?
<p>A. Improved provisions for all PP pupils.</p> <p>B. Increase the progress scores at the end of Key Stage 2 for all higher prior attaining pupils.</p> <p>C. Significantly higher rates of progress across all year groups for PP pupils</p> <p>D. Quality first teaching remains never less than good.</p>	<p>Do we go down the 'Staff training' route but look at developing the 'softer skills' e.g. metacognition and self-regulation (+7 months) or stick with feedback (+8 months)</p>	<p>We want to invest some of the PP in longer term change which will help all pupils. Many different evidence sources, e.g. EEF Toolkit suggest metacognition and self-regulation is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we can embed across the school – improvement of plus 7 months.</p> <p>Targeted interventions designed by the Leadership Team for all Pupil Premium pupils at risk of not achieving targets.</p> <p>All targets for Pupil Premium pupils take into account prior attainment at the end of EY and KS1 along with current attainment.</p>	<p>Course selected using evidence of effectiveness.</p> <p>Staff training in staff meetings.</p> <p>Shared practice.</p> <p>Evaluation of outcomes in books and where areas of development need to be changed.</p> <p>Lessons from training embedded in school feedback policy.</p>	<p>HT and DHT</p>	<p>Jan 2020 including a governor review – March 2020.</p>
<p>A. Improved provisions for all PP pupils.</p> <p>B. Increase the progress scores at the end of Key Stage 2 for all higher prior attaining pupils.</p> <p>C. Significantly higher rates of progress across all year groups for PP pupils</p> <p>D. Quality first teaching remains never less than good.</p>	<p>CPD on different approaches to providing support for small groups in addition to quality first teaching.</p> <p>Smaller class sizes in Year 6. This enables greater emphasis on feedback for individual pupils and increased progress.</p>	<p>Pupils eligible for PP are making less progress than other pupils across some classes in KS2 in reading, writing and maths. We want to ensure that PP pupils can achieve high attainment as well as simply 'meeting expected standards'. We want to ensure that all staff are trained at identifying where extra provisions can be used to support PP pupils along with effectively reviewing the success of individual provisions.</p> <p>Smaller classes in Year 6 – EEF suggests this can lead to a close of 3 months in an academic year.</p>	<p>Course selected using evidence of effectiveness.</p> <p>SENCo and SLT support staff CPD in developing provisions that can be offered.</p> <p>Review provisions and detail value for money.</p> <p>Maintain 3 teachers per year group.</p>	<p>HT, DHT and SLT.</p>	<p>Jan 2020 including a governor review – March 2020.</p>

Total budgeted cost	To be confirmed.
----------------------------	------------------

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>A. Improved provisions for all PP pupils.</p> <p>B. Increase the progress scores at the end of Key Stage 2 for all higher prior attaining pupils.</p> <p>C. Significantly higher rates of progress across all year groups for PP pupils</p> <p>D. Quality first teaching remains never less than good.</p>	<p>121 and small group provisions provided for PP pupils: not</p>	<p>Some of the students need targeted support to catch up, whether it be academically or in other areas.</p> <p>Individual provisions are provided for short focused periods of time and evaluated against specific criteria to measure their impact over time. Targeted interventions designed by the Leadership Team for all Pupil Premium pupils at risk of not achieving targets.</p>	<p>Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.</p> <p>Provide staff CPD to lead provisions needed.</p> <p>Evaluate effectively by the SLT to find value for money and redeploy to other year groups as needed.</p>	<p>All teaching staff. SLT</p>	<p>Jan 2020 including a governor review – March 2020.</p>
<p>A. Improved provisions for all PP pupils.</p> <p>B. Increase the progress scores at the end of Key Stage 2 for all higher prior attaining pupils.</p> <p>C. Significantly higher rates of progress across all year groups for PP pupils</p> <p>D. Quality first teaching remains never less than good.</p>	<p>Small group sessions in reading (as required) for all PP pupils in Year Six with an experienced adult, in addition to standard lessons in preparation for KS3.</p>	<p>We want to provide extra support to maintain closing attainment between PP and non-PP pupils along with maintaining PP pupils progressing at higher rates than non-PP pupils. Small group interventions with highly qualified staff have been shown to be effective, as discussed in reliable evidence sources such as Visible Learning by John Hattie and the EEF Toolkit. Small group tuition in addition to standard lessons can achieve a 4 month close in an academic year.</p>	<p>Extra teaching time and preparation time paid for out of PP budget, not sought on a voluntary basis.</p> <p>Impact overseen by PP AHT (and SLT relevant to individual subject areas).</p> <p>Teaching assistant (TA) CPD for TAs supporting the sessions.</p> <p>Engage with parents and pupils before intervention begins to address any concerns or questions about the additional sessions.</p>	<p>All teaching staff. SLT.</p>	<p>Jan 2020 including a governor review – March 2020.</p>

Total budgeted cost	Costs to be confirmed

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?
E. Increased attendance rates	First day absence calling. Individual absence falling below 90% - family engage with EWO. EWO time at 0.5 days per week to track. Weekly attendance review to analyse potential falls before they materialise.	We can't improve attainment for children if they aren't actually attending school. NFER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step. EEF report suggests two month improvement yearly when pupils maximise their time in school.	Thorough briefing of support worker about existing absence issues. PP AHT, support worker, head etc. will collaborate to ensure new provision and standard school processes work smoothly together.	HT, EWO, PP AHT and Attendance Officer.	Jan 2020 including a governor review – March 2020.
F. Increased punctuality rates	Initial observations shows that often pupils who arrive late in school are also PP pupils. Weekly analysis of lateness patterns for PP pupils to identify potential support for individual families through FSF, Learning Mentor etc.	We can't improve attainment for children if they aren't actually attending school. NFER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step. EEF report suggests two month improvement yearly when pupils maximise their time in school. This is the same for lateness where pupils miss the first vital steps of learning for that day.	Thorough briefing of support worker about existing absence issues. PP AHT, support worker, head etc. will collaborate to ensure new provision and standard school processes work smoothly together.	HT, EWO, PP AHT and attendance officer.	Jan 2020 including a governor review – March 2020.
G. Developing cultural capital	Increase the opportunities for pupils eligible for PP to engage with activities which provide world experience, cultural capital and vocabulary from beyond their familiar setting and life experience.	There is some research now to indicate where a lack of life experience can lead to reduced academic outcomes. Our aim is to try and broaden the horizons for our PP Pupils.	The PP AHT will use the Edukey system to log strengths and development points for pupils around their wider engagement and experience of the society and experiences around them. Each individual PP Pupil will attend one new event each year.	PP AHT, all teaching staff.	Jan 2020 including a governor review – March 2020.
Total budgeted cost					Costs to be confirmed.

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year				
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
<p>A. Improved provisions for all PP pupils.</p> <p>B. Significantly higher rates of progress across all year groups for PP pupils</p> <p>C. Quality first teaching remains never less than good.</p>	<p>Staff training on high quality feedback.</p>	<p>Medium:- Attainment at the end of KS2 broadly in line or above at expected in all areas however attainment at the higher level is lower in all areas (-14%, -12%, -12% and -24% - RWM, R, W, M respectively). Progress to be confirmed from ASP 2019 (expected October 2019). Attainment and progress gaps increased in Year 5 (heavy staff absence) and in Year 3. In Year 4 gaps in attainment widened at the higher level. In Year 2 end of KS outcomes showed attainment for PP in all areas, including the higher levels, was either broadly in line or above. In Year 1 progress rates were generally in line for PP pupil with non-PP.</p>	<p>There is no doubt that PP progress was heavily affected by staff absence in Year 5 however the reliance on individual class teachers to plan and track the progress of specific PP pupils has to be questioned as to whether it is effective or not. Towards the end of the academic year it was agreed to add the PP development to that of an AHT to change the whole provision and specifically target individual PP pupils for additional support, be it both to access the curriculum or to raise attainment.</p>	<p>£165,000 – 3 additional teachers and 3 additional TA's.</p>
<p>A. Improved provisions for all PP pupils.</p> <p>B. Significantly higher rates of progress across all year groups for PP pupils</p> <p>C. Quality first teaching remains never less than good.</p>	<p>CPD on different approaches to providing support for small groups in addition to quality first teaching.</p> <p>Smaller class sizes in Years 5 to 6. This enables greater emphasis on feedback for individual pupils and increased progress.</p>	<p>Medium:- The impact on progress and attainment was significant in classes where the first quality teaching was highly effective. Two year groups were disrupted by staff absence throughout the year (Years 4 and 5) and two year groups were affected by staff capability issues (Years 1 and 4). This affected progress and attainment of selected classes and thus selected year groups (as detailed through data analysis in each individual class in Years 1 and 4). There is no indication that smaller class sizes have had a direct influence on increased progress and attainment of PP pupils.</p>	<p>There were significant gaps closed in Year 6 where there were smaller class sizes however staff absence affected the progress of pupils in Year 5, including those PP Pupils. Towards the end of the academic year it was agreed to add the PP development to that of an AHT to change the whole provision and specifically target individual PP pupils for additional support, be it both to access the curriculum or to raise attainment.</p>	<p>£165,000 – 3 additional teachers and 3 additional TA's.</p>

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
A. Improved provisions for all PP pupils. B. Significantly higher rates of progress across all year groups for PP pupils	121 and small group provisions provided for PP pupils.	High: observed increased progress amongst participating children compared to peers, as measured using reading benchmarking scores and half term teacher assessments.	This seemed to be most effective when staffing was consistent and extra provisions were planned for and carried out. This still needs to be brought back into the classroom more. Also a greater degree of leadership needs to be in place to further develop and maintain these effective provisions. Towards the end of the academic year it was agreed to add the PP development to that of an AHT to change the whole provision and specifically target individual PP pupils for additional support, be it both to access the curriculum or to raise attainment.	£79,200 – 2 hours of provisions daily, 5 days per week, 36 weeks per year involving 22 TA's.
A. Improved provisions for all PP pupils. B. Significantly higher rates of progress across all year groups for PP pupils	Weekly small group sessions in reading, writing and maths for all PP pupils with an experienced adult, in addition to standard lessons.	High: observed increased progress amongst participating children compared to peers, as measured using reading benchmarking scores and half term teacher assessments.	This seemed to be most effective when staffing was consistent and extra provisions were planned for and carried out. This still needs to be brought back into the classroom more. Also a greater degree of leadership needs to be in place to further develop and maintain these effective provisions. Towards the end of the academic year it was agreed to add the PP development to that of an AHT to change the whole provision and specifically target individual PP pupils for additional support, be it both to access the curriculum or to raise attainment.	£79,200 – 2 hours of provisions daily, 5 days per week, 36 weeks per year involving 22 TA's.
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
D. Increased attendance rates	First day absence calling. Individual absence falling below 90% - family engage with EWO. EWO time extended to 1 day per week to track. Weekly attendance review to analyse potential falls before they materialise.	Low:- the attendance gap between PP and non-PP has grown from 1.8% (2017-2018) to 2.1% (2018-2019). High:- The Persistent Absentee rate 'gap' fell from PP (13.0%) against non-PP (3.8%) for 2017-2018 to PP (11.2%) against non-PP (5.2%) for 2018-2019.	Next year we will try to provide more intensive support instead, with parental engagement to encourage attendance. Early monitoring is essential to identify where pupils begin to fall in attendance rates. Pupil attendance also needs to be included in Pupil Progress Meetings as additional information to be tracked half termly. This is now possible through the development of additional software for SIMS. Also a greater degree of leadership needs to be in place to further develop and maintain these effective provisions. Towards the end of the academic year it was agreed to add the PP development to that of an AHT to change the whole provision and specifically target individual PP pupils for additional support, be it both to access the curriculum and increased attendance, or to raise attainment.	£7720 – based on 0.5 FTA attendance officer and 0.2 EWO LA support.

Final changes etc to be agreed and presented to governors for approval – 25th November 2019.