

PUPIL PREMIUM REVIEW

SCHOOL	DATE	REVIEWER	SCHOOL STAFF
Holy Family	07.05.2019	D Bostock	Headteacher Mrs Davidson
REVIEW OF WEBSITE			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pupil Premium Grant Review is published on the school website.			
REVIEW OF PUPIL PREMIUM STRATEGY STATEMENT (PPSS)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Whilst the school has used the recommended pro forma and the review is completed; the review will be re-organised to further increase clarity in response to advice from a recent HMI visit.			
REVIEW OF SCHOOL DATA AND TRACKING			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The school has effective and efficient systems for collecting both hard and soft data with regards to PP pupils:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ School uses the on-line BALANCE tracking system to record continuous daily formative assessments. This system allows Senior Leaders to quickly access individual/group specific reports.○ The school also uses a manual system to record half termly summative assessments. This ensures that all teachers are fully aware who the Pupil Premium children are in their class.• Information from both systems, plus targeted in depth analysis and other triangulation techniques, are used to inform Pupil Progress Reviews during which the progress and attainment of Pupil Premium children is tracked, individual/cohort needs identified and interventions including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Staffing○ Resources○ Bases○ Timetablesplanned• Disadvantaged pupils have a high profile within the school and this is matched by a high level of accountability. As part of the collection of hard data, all teachers are required to maintain class data which identifies all PP children and the SLT maintain a whole school register of the Year Groups and the PP children in these. This is consistently monitored by the SLT.• Continuous embedded liaison between the SLT/Safeguarding Lead and the SENCO contributes further to PP children being understood and supported on an individual basis.• There was no evidence to suggest that the school had low expectations for its PP children; rather evidence suggested that, despite significant challenges with regards to staffing, PPG interventions had remained a priority within the school's curriculum provision.			
CURRICULUM			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The school is aware of the new OFSTED FRAMEWORK (September 2019) and the focus on curriculum Intent, Implementation and Impact and is working with a range of partners to ensure that its curriculum provision is broad and balanced and responsive to the needs of its children.			
STANDARDISATION MODERATION AND ASSESSMENT			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The school is part of an established Learning Network and is pro-active in contributing to cross school standardisation, moderation and assessment.			
STAFFING			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Legacy staffing issues are being pro-actively addressed and, whilst this has of necessity contributed to some instability, the Headteacher has managed this effectively and the school is now benefiting from the resulting restructuring.			
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The school has worked continuously with a range of partners, including School Improvement Liverpool to continually refine its provision and maximise the impact of this in terms of outcomes for children.• The school will continue to look for partners to support continuous improvement for all of its children.			

REVIEW OF IMPACT OF INTERVENTIONS**EARLY YEARS: RECEPTION**

Class cohort: 26 PP cohort: 6 Non PP cohort: 20

SPECIFIC BARRIERS

- Speaking & Listening: Low levels of ability to communicate
- Significant % of children not school ready: not toilet trained, still use dummies
- High number of EAL children
- Children starting out of year: e.g. Parents kept child at home until aged 6 and then requested that they start in Nursery. School had had to place in Reception and implement an personalised acceleration programme

Intervention	Target EXP+	PP EXP+	Non PP EXP+	Gap
Small Group Phonics 1:1 Phonics	50%	67% (4/6)	50% (10/20)	No disadvantage gap
Small Group Writing		100% (6/6)	80% (16/20)	No disadvantage gap

EVALUATION

Interventions have:

- Been supported by high quality staff training: CHATTER, Talk for Writing
- Been rigorous and systematically implemented.
- Interventions have had impact
- Contributed to % of children achieving a Good Level of Development at end of Reception increasing each year: Target for 1819: 65%
- Ensured there are no gaps

KEY STAGE 1: YEAR 1

Class cohort: 25 PP cohort: 14 Non PP cohort: 11

SPECIFIC BARRIERS

- Speaking & Listening
- Attendance
- Bigger group of PP children than Non PP

Intervention	Target PP EXP+	PP EXP+	Non PP EXP+	Gap
Small Group Phonics 1:1 Phonics	74%	57% (8/14)	54% (6/11)	No disadvantage gap
Small Group Writing	67%	57% (8/14)	64% (7/11)	+ 7% Disadvantage gap = 2 children
1:1 Daily Reading	67%	57% (8/14)	75% (8/11)	+ 18% Disadvantage gap

EVALUATION

Interventions have:

- Been supported by high quality staff training: Talk for Writing
- Been rigorous and systematically implemented.
- Interventions have had impact
- Impact has been reduced due to Attendance issues
- Year 2 Attendance: Whole cohort: 95.7%/PP: 95%/Non PP: 96%
- School has increased the amount of EWO time targeted at Y2
- Refined school systems to ensure same day response
- Raised issues of attendance at early intervention meetings with parents

KEY STAGE 1: YEAR 2

Class cohort: 44 PP cohort: 23 Non PP cohort: 21

SPECIFIC BARRIERS				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendance Children not achieving end of Y1 Phonics Threshold (14 but 2 have left) 				
Intervention	Target PP EXP+	PP EXP+	Non PP EXP+	Gap
Small Group Phonics 1:1 Phonics	70%	88% (7/8)	100% (3/3)	1 child: No significant disadvantage gap
Small Group Reading	65%	87% (20/23)	57% (12/21)	No disadvantage gap
Small Group Writing	60%	74% (17/23)	76% (16/21)	No significant disadvantage gap
Small Group Maths	67%	74% (17/23)	81% (17/21)	7% Disadvantage gap. PRIORITY
EVALUATION				
<p>Interventions have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Been supported by high quality staff training: Talk for Writing Been rigorous and systematically implemented. Interventions have had impact <p>Impact has been reduced due to Attendance issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 1 Attendance: Whole cohort: 95.1%/PP: 94%/Non PP: 97% <p>School has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased the amount of EWO time targeted at Y1 Refined school systems to ensure same day response Raised issues of attendance at early intervention meetings with parents <p>Impact has also been reduced due to number of PP children with SEND needs. The SENCO tracks these children separately.</p>				

KEY STAGE 2: YEAR 3				
Class cohort: 29		PP cohort: 15		Non PP cohort: 14
SPECIFIC BARRIERS				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEND: Behaviour issues Attendance 1 class + 0.5 class merged 				
Intervention	Target PP EXP+	PP EXP+	Non PP EXP+	Gap
Small Group Phonics 1:1 Phonics	80% 4/5	100% (3/3)	50% (1/2)	No significant disadvantage gap: 1 child: EHCP application in progress
1:1 Daily Reading	59% 17/29	73% (11/15)	71% (10/14)	No disadvantage gap
Small Group Maths	67% 20/29	80% (12/15)	71% (10/14)	No disadvantage gap
EVALUATION				
<p>Interventions have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Been supported by continuous staff training Been rigorous and systematically implemented. Interventions have had impact <p>Impact has not been reduced due to Attendance issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 3 Attendance: Whole cohort: 95.5%/PP: 95.0%/Non PP: 95.7% 				

A similar programme of interventions will be implemented in 1920; this will be refined, refreshed and re-positioned in response to the different needs of the new cohort.

KEY STAGE 2: YEAR 4

Class cohort: 38 PP cohort: 29 Non PP cohort: 9

SPECIFIC BARRIERS

- Very high levels of mobility Year 2 through to Year 4 have contributed to low levels of stability and cohesion within the year group
- 15 new children have joined the cohort 14 of whom are EAL
- Attendance is an issue as a high number of EAL children return home for extended periods
- High levels of SEND, particularly ASD, contribute to persistent behavioural problems
- 1 pupil is now in PEC
- There are a high number of refugees within the cohort with mental health and attachment issues
- Many of the parents of the cohort of refugees also require support from the school with regards to mental health issues
- This is a complex group and the school has employed the support of an Arabic teacher in its determination to ensure the progress of the children cohesively across reading, writing and maths in an attempt to ensure that they are Year 5 ready.

Intervention	RWM Combined Target PP EXP+	RWM Combined PP EXP+	RWM Combined Non PP EXP+	Gap
Small Group Phonics 1:1 Phonics Reading Writing Maths Support from Arabic Teacher	50% (19/38)	41% (12/29)	78% (7/9)	Significant disadvantage gap
Pastoral Support Counselling	It is difficult to assess the impact as individual children have individual baselines and pathways			

EVALUATION

Unfortunately, the attendance issues referred to above continue to reduce the impact of this provision:

- Year 4 Attendance: Whole cohort: 95.7%/PP: 96.0%/Non PP: 96.8%

As do the significant pastoral needs of both individual children and the cohort in general.

The high level of specialised support for this cohort will continue into Year 5.

KEY STAGE 2: YEAR 5

Class cohort: 38 PP cohort: 18 Non PP cohort: 20

SPECIFIC BARRIERS

- High levels of EAL
- High levels of SEND: ASD and Specific learning difficulties
- High number of safeguarding and child protection issues

Intervention	Target PP EXP+	PP EXP+	Non PP EXP+	Gap
Small Group Phonics 1:1 Phonics				

Small Group Maths	60% 23/38	100% 18/18	30% 6/20	No disadvantage gap
1:1 Daily Readers	45% 17/38	83% 15/18	40% 8/20	No disadvantage gap
EVALUATION				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact of the interventions has been significant and gaps, including legacy issues around disadvantage, have been closed. Year 5 Attendance: Whole cohort: 96.7%/PP: 96.3%/Non PP: 97.4% The school will continue to build on this significant progress 				

KEY STAGE 2: YEAR 6

Class cohort: 39

PP cohort: 28

Non PP cohort: 11

SPECIFIC BARRIERS

- High number of PP children
- High level of mobility
- High number of EAL children
- Attendance is an issue as a high number of EAL children return home for extended periods
- Year 6 Attendance: Whole cohort: 95.5%/PP: 94.7%/Non PP: 97.4%
- Legacy issues arising from disrupted provision

Intervention	Target PP EXP+	PP EXP+	Non PP EXP+	Gap
Third teacher appointed and class sizes reduced				
Small Group Reading	68% 26/39	64% 18/28	100% 11/11	Disadvantage Gap
Small Group Writing	68.4% 26/39	50% 14/28	81% 10/11	Disadvantage Gap
Small Group Maths	64% 25/39	50% 14/28	91% 10/11	Disadvantage Gap
RWM ARE	61% 24/39	54% 15/28	91% 10/11	Disadvantage Gap

EVALUATION

- Whilst the re-organisation to include a third teacher and reduce class sizes has had some impact it has not been able to address the gap exacerbated by both the specific barriers identified above and the legacy issues arising from disrupted provision.

OVERALL EVALUATION

- The school is pro-active in addressing potential gaps linked to deprivation.
- The Senior Leaders have a firm understanding of the data around its Pupil Premium cohort: distribution, placement, barriers, progress and attainment
- The school has implemented targeted systematic interventions, both pastoral and academic, in all year groups.
- The input of these in Reception through to Year 4 has been significant and gaps due to disadvantage have been closed.
- The impact in Year 5 and Year 6 has been less significant as the children in these year groups have only benefited from this systematic approach for a relatively short period of their school life; the school has worked hard to address these legacy issues.
- In Year 6 this hard work will continue beyond Year 6 SATs as the school is determined to ensure that as many as possible of their Year 6 children are secondary school ready.
- As the programmes in each year group have proven impactful, they will remain in place in 2019 -20220. However each year group programme will be reviewed, refreshed and repositioned in order to ensure it most appropriately meets the specific needs of the new cohort.
- The impact will continue to be tracked and evaluated half termly and programmes adjusted accordingly.

NEXT STEPS

- Re-organise the Pupil Premium Grant statement on the website to reflect the advice from the HMI
- Share report and outcomes with Governing Body and Staff
- Identify 2019-2020 programme of interventions including staffing resources and timetables
- Identify costs per year group in order to track effectiveness and efficiency in future years
- Use report to inform Governor training
- It would also be appropriate for Governors to be able to answer the following questions. It would be useful to go through this with all Governors and to record the answers in the form of a “crib sheet” which Governors could refer to during an interview with OFSTED, HMI, LA:
 - How many pupils are eligible for the PPG?
 - What is the amount the school receives for the PPG?
 - How is the funding used?
 - Are all staff aware of which pupils are eligible for the PPG and the strategies they should be using to support these pupils?
 - Have all staff received the training they need to support the disadvantaged children effectively?
 - How is the school evaluating the effectiveness of its Pupil Premium (PP) strategy?
 - Is the school checking the impact it is making with the PP funding against impact in successful schools in the country?
 - Is the school using its best teaching and support staff with PP-eligible pupils?
 - How much progress is being made by each pupil receiving the PPG, given that she/he must make at least good progress?
 - What is the school’s ambition for the attainment and progress of PP-eligible pupils and is that in line with the national average?
 - What are the barriers to learning that staff members have identified for PP-eligible pupils?
 - What specific outcomes does the school aim to achieve with PP funding in relation to raising attainment, accelerating progress, improving attendance, reducing gaps and increasing opportunities?
 - Because high expectations of pupils are so important, what is the school doing to raise expectations for what PP-eligible pupils can achieve among the children themselves, their parents and the school staff?
 - What evidence has the school used to learn about the most effective strategies in the context in which it works?
 - Is the school using the PPG to improve the engagement of parents with the educational progress of their children; if so how and is it effective?
 - Looked-after children (i.e. children in care) need particular support with the PPG. What interventions are making a positive difference for them?
 - How does the school promote awareness of eligibility among the parents so that all eligible pupils claim and are supported?
 - On the school website, how good is the account of the PPG, how much is being received and how well it is used?