SPA[RK]

Pupil Premium Grant review report -

Methodology

The review was carried out on 20th April 2023 following a review of documents published on the school website, a discussion with the Lead Assistant Head and information available from the DfE. The review was carried out by Cathy Potter, Schools Based Adviser for Pupil Premium. The school was seeking external quality assurance of their PPG provision, using this to inform the evaluation and review of their PPG strategy.

For the review, a range of evidence was collected through a comprehensive programme organised by the school. This included:

- Brief observation of start of day system for lateness
- Learning walk of reception, Y1, Y2, Y5 and Y6
- Discussion with KS1 children
- Discussion with KS2 children
- Discussion with a group of Support Staff
- Discussion with a group of Class Teachers
- Discussion with Attendance Officer
- Discussion with Wellbeing Teacher
- Discussion with Lead Assistant Head

1. The school's PPG strategy

Strengths:

- Shows a clear vision, clearly linked to the EEF's tiered model.
- Class Teacher and Support Staff voice reflected the principles and tone of the strategy.
- Demonstrates thorough evaluation.
- Emphasises quality first teaching, with adaptations for individual needs.
- Demonstrates movement towards the three year goals (for example, interventions needed streamlining and improved monitoring, this has been implemented and was also reflected in staff voice)
- Shows a clear link between challenges, outcomes and activities.

- Uses language which reflects disadvantaged families being held in high esteem. Does not contain deficit language.
- Positions the challenges as within the school's remit, rather than 'the problem' being located in the child.
- Refers to challenge and aspiration for disadvantaged pupils.
- This is impressive considering that the PPG Lead has not held this responsibility for very long.

Areas for further consideration

- The school may consider sharing their vision and strategy with all stakeholders to further clarify how their role contributes to outcomes for disadvantaged pupils.
- As language development, vocabulary, reading and oracy can often be areas which hinder progress for pupils, the school may want to consider refining their strategy so that this particular area is more clearly defined as a strand running through challenges, outcomes and activities.

2. The school's attendance systems

Strengths:

- The school has a clear system for absence.
- The culture around attendance seems rigorous and seeks out ways to improve.
- New systems for lateness have enabled better monitoring, leading to better following up.
- The Wellbeing Teacher and SENCO stand at the gate at the beginning of the day, enabling positive investments in relationships every day.
- In the very brief observation, a positive but challenging tone was observed about lateness. Relationships appeared warm and welcoming, but emphasised that the school expected children to be in on time.

Areas for further consideration:

- The school could consider taking feedback from Class Teachers on their conversations with parents and carers regarding low attendance (do they feel confident in having these conversations? The conversations they had, have they seen a positive impact?).

- The school could consider communicating with parents and carers about attendance of a child in comparison with their peers.
  https://leadinglearner.me/2017/07/02/absences-matter-and-you-can-help/

3 Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

Strengths:

- The PPG lead has a focus on PPG pupils attaining a greater depth standard. This should continue to be pursued.

From your 2022 outcomes report:

- There were only six disadvantaged pupils in Year 1 last year, 67% of whom achieved the expected standard in the phonics screening check.
- There were only seven disadvantaged pupils in Year 2 last year, 86% of whom achieved at least the expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics.
- There were 11 disadvantaged pupils in Year 6 last year, who achieved VA scores of +2.2 in reading, +3.1 in writing and +2.0 in mathematics, indicating they made similar progress to the national average in all subjects.
- This year's targets for children in Y6, though below last year's level of attainment, are broadly in line with FFT 50/20 targets.

Areas for consideration:

The following is based on small numbers of PPG children, and so data sets are small. However, the progress and attainment of these children deserves particular care and attention.

- Only half of the pupil premium children in reception are expected to achieve a good level of development. The school may want to consider what implications this has for the transition into year 1.
- Only half of the pupil premium children in Y1 are expected to gain the pass mark of 32 in the phonics test. The school should now monitor whether the newer phonics systems are having an impact on children's progress as part of their PPG evaluation. The school could examine these particular children as case studies to see if there are common themes which could be addressed. If there are highly personalised approaches needed, these could also be put in place.
- The school could consider an 'exit interview' with disadvantaged children.

- In Y6 only 40% of pupil premium children are projected to achieve the expected standard in reading. We discussed the complexities amongst this small group of children in terms of SEND and significant SEMH and home life issues.
- The school could consider the intersectionality of PPG and SEND in its context. 20% of PPG pupils have SEND, whereas 8% of non-PPG have SEND. An interesting line of enquiry for the school would be to consider how PPG and SEND plays out for learners. Are there particular issues for families and learners because of this intersection?

4 Quality first teaching and disadvantaged pupils

Strengths:

- The school has considered ways to assess children's prior knowledge before starting a new unit of work. The agreed model is for some important prior knowledge to be checked, with slides prepared ready to use if pupils do not have the knowledge required. A key component of this model is '100% engagement'.

Areas for consideration:

- The school should consider how to shift teachers' habits from hands up to checking for understanding and whole class responses. In observations, most of the time, teachers were asking a question to their class, receiving an encouraging answer from one or two individual pupils before proceeding. Most of the time, these children had volunteered answers, meaning that teachers were judging the level of understanding of the whole group based upon the most confident pupils.
- As disadvantaged children are in the minority in this context, teachers could get a false confidence regarding the strength of background knowledge of their pupils. The majority of pupils are likely to have advantageous background knowledge and vocabulary and so a few pupils without this may not be fully recognised. Methods for checking for understanding, particularly whole class response (such as mini-whiteboards, or voting on multiple choice questions) are important to this end. The AfC inclusion toolkit section on questioning (p.38) may be helpful. https://kr.afcinfo.org.uk/pages/senco-zone/school-senco/access-advice-and-support/inclusion-charter-and-toolkit

Cathy Potter