

Pupil premium strategy / self-evaluation, incorporating the coronavirus (COVID-19) catch-up premium

1. Summary information					
School	Copnor Primary School				
Academic Year	2020-2021	Total PP budget	£209,920	Date of most recent PP Review	Oct 2020
		COVID Catch up funding	£50,000		
		Portsmouth Tackling Digital Disadvantage Fund	£4284 (Nov 2020)		
Total number of pupils	674	Number of pupils eligible for PP	163 (of whom 9 are service children so receive less funding and 11 are Looked After Children or (Ever Looked After Children) and receive additional funding. However, this additional funding is held by Portsmouth City Council and has to be bid for separately.	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2021
<p>2. Current attainment (NB: As part of steps taken to fight the spread of coronavirus (COVID-19), the government announced that all exams due to take place in schools and colleges in England in summer 2020 were cancelled. Under these circumstances, and in line with 2020 government accountability policies, Copnor Primary School will not be publishing any school level educational performance data based on tests, assessments or exams for 2020. Therefore, the data produced below is for 2018-2019).</p>					
			<i>Pupils eligible for PP (national average Year 6)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average Year 6)</i>	
% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths			40% Y6 (46) 39% all years	66% Y6 (68) 64% all years	
% making expected progress in reading (as measured in the school)			88% -3.37 Y6 80% all years	89% Y6 (0.3) 85% all years	
% making expected progress in writing (as measured in the school)			97% -1.15 Y6 72% all years	84% Y6 (0.3) 84% all years	
% making expected progress in mathematics (as measured in the school)			86% -1.03 84% all years	86% Y6 (0.3) 86% all years	
3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)					
Academic barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)					
A.	EYFS entry points for disadvantaged children are lower than non-PP				

B.	A high proportion of PP children also have special education needs (SEN). Our percentage of all pupils with SEN (years 1-6) is 16% but the percentage of PP with SEN is 28%, compared to 11% for non-PP.
C.	The reading attainment of PP children is lower than for non-PP across the school despite their progress across the school mirroring that of pupils not eligible for PP.

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

D.	Persistent absence for PP children was 15.6% in 2019 which is significantly higher than all pupils of 7.8% but is improving. There is no data for 2019-2020 due to coronavirus (Covid-
E.	The engagement of PP parents is not as good as for other parents, with 15 PP parents/carers not attending any parents' evenings in 2018-2019 (the data for 2019-2020 remains incomplete due to coronavirus [Covid-19]0).
F.	Many of the PP children come from homes that are unable to support a positive reading culture. Percentage of pupils from households with adults in higher education sits at only 64% of the National Mean.

4. Intended outcomes (specific outcomes and how they will be measured)		Success criteria
A.	To reduce the gap between PP and non-PP in EYFS.	The gap is reduced to 5% by the end of year R.
B.	To ensure that the progress of PP with SEN at least matches that of non-PP students with SEN.	70% of PP with SEN to make 3 points progress in reading, writing and mathematics (expected progress from their starting points)
C.	To reduce the gap between PP and non-PP reading attainment.	To reduce the in-school gap from 5% to 0% across Year R to 6.
D.	To reduce persistent absence for PP pupils	To reduce persistent absence from 15.6% to less than 12%.
E.	To increase the parental engagement of PP parents.	To ensure that every PP parent/carers has attended at least two meetings about their child in this academic year.
F.	To ensure that every child is heard to read regularly at school.	To ensure that every child is read with at least once per half-term and at least twice a week for the lowest attaining PP children (those in the lowest 20% for attainment). To read twice a week with any PP child where they are not read with at home.

5. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year	2019-2020
-------------------------------	------------------

i. Quality of teaching for all

Action	Intended outcome	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? (Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate). NB: The assessments due in March were cancelled due to the build-up to the closure of the schools (with the attendance being significantly reduced in a number of classes before the actual lockdown.)	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost: NB: this is the budgeted amount due to the impact of lockdown.

<p>Smaller classes in KS2 to allow the teachers to be able to focus more on each child.</p> <p>Targeted groups in years 3, 4 and 6 in English and maths and 4 way split in year 5.</p>	<p>To ensure that the progress of PP SEN children at least matches that of non-PP students.</p>	<p>Review January 2020: Performance Review Meetings (PRMs) were successfully completed: looking at the children in November and then as year groups in January. Actions for each year group where target groups were identified, had been discussed and were implemented at the start of January 2020. A number of the extended leadership team/subject leaders had been working with members of the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) to observe lessons e.g. science leaders. Regular observations and learning walks were being undertaken by SLT. The impact was due to be measured in March 2020 but was not able to be ascertained due to coronavirus (COVID-19).</p> <p>For 2018-2019, the data for PP had shown that:</p> <p>PP Progress in Y4/5/6 was in line with All Pupils at Exp and was accelerated at GDS.</p> <p>Reading: Y4 All P 84 v PP 85 and MA All P 20 v PP 21 Y5 82 v 72 and 15 v 14 Y6 89 v 88 and 31 v 57</p> <p>Writing: Y4: 88 v 82 and 18 v 31 Y5 87 v 75 and 25 v 38 Y6 95 v 97 and 50 v 55</p> <p>Maths: Y4: 86 v 91 and 25 v 33 Y5: 86 v 74 and 19 v 11 Y6: 89 v 86 and 35 v 52</p>	<p>This will be continued in 2020-2021 although it will be adapted to reflect staffing for 2020-2021.</p>	<p>Budget: £122,580</p> <p>From March –July, the budget was used to support teaching of children in bubbles where they did not exceed 15 bubbles.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p>Phonics groups targeted at the children's phonological awareness.</p> <p>Guided reading planning reconfigured to ensure that reading domains are focused upon.</p>	<p>To reduce the gap between PP and non-PP reading attainment.</p>	<p>Review January 2020:</p> <p>Interventions had been set up for those children who had a gap in their phonics knowledge in Y1 with the hope of catching these children up by the end of spring term. The latest phonics assessment showed that there was a rise in the amount of children who are now on track.</p> <p>Y1 - before - 33% Autumn 2 - 53%</p> <p>Y2 - 23 children accessing the intervention - 49% are now back on track</p> <p>Y3 - 21 children accessing the intervention - 54% are now back on track</p> <p>Y4 - 6 children accessing the intervention 67% are now back on track</p> <p>Y5 - 18 children accessing the intervention 56% back on track.</p>	<p>There was clearly an impact in the improvements made with regards to the children's ability to read words of increasing complexity.</p> <p>However, the coronavirus (COVID-19) lockdown sent some of the children's progress to where it was before (or even lower in some cases).</p> <p>8 week programme to be set up to support the children who are struggling to read phonetically.</p>	<p>£25,291</p> <p>See above.</p>
---	--	--	---	----------------------------------

ii. Targeted support

Action	Intended outcome	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: NB: this is the budgeted amount due to the impact of lockdown.
		<p>NB: The assessments due in March were cancelled due to the build-up to the closure of the schools (with the attendance being significantly reduced in a number of classes before the actual lockdown.)</p>		

<p>Attendance officer to support families where problems are identified</p> <p>Walking bus for pupils who are persistently late/absent.</p> <p>Places offered at breakfast club/ after-school club for children who are persistently absent or late.</p> <p>Welfare support/ELSA support and other support provided to help children e.g. with attendance, motivation, behaviour for learning.</p>	<p>To reduce persistent absence for PP pupils</p>	<p>Persistent absence for the PP children has reduced from 16.4% to 15.6%. This is an improvement from 2016, where persistent absence was 19.5%.</p> <p>Absence for all PP pupils has improved from 94.16% (in 2017-2018) to 94.52%. This is an improvement of 0.36%, compared to a similar improvement overall (for all pupils) of 0.12%.</p> <p>The walking bus had been used to support parents/carers where the children were persistently late/absent or are at risk of doing so. 75% of the pupils accessing the walking bus were PP children. One child's attendance improved from 91.8% in 2018 to 95.4% in 2019. Another reduced their lateness from 13 recorded late arrivals in March to 4 in April.</p> <p>At the point of lockdown, the families needing additional support were being targeted with different support as appropriate to the families. 10 places were being offered to pupils at the breakfast club and after school club (5 per session).</p> <p>The walking bus was also being used to support families where their children were persistently late.</p> <p>A number of families were being supported by the pastoral team.</p> <p>Following lockdown, every PP family was contacted by either their class teacher or a member of the SLT. A key group of more vulnerable children's families were contacted weekly.</p> <p>The walking bus was continued for a PP child who was persistently absent/late.</p> <p>Every PP - who was also deemed to be a vulnerable child - was offered a place at school when the lockdown was eased in June 2020 with a member of the SLT speaking to each child's family in order to encourage the family to allow the child/ children to attend.</p> <p>The walking bus has been used to support parents/carers where the children are persistently late/absent or are at risk of doing so. 75% of the pupils accessing the walking bus are PP children. One child's attendance improved from 91.8% in 2018 to 95.4% in 2019. Another reduced their lateness from 13 lates in March to 4 in April.</p>	<p>Persistent absence for the PP children had reduced from 16.4% to 15.6% from 2018-2019. This was a continuing improvement from 2016, where persistent absence was 19.5%.</p> <p>For the last full year of data available: Absence for all PP pupils had improved from 94.16% (in 2017-2018) to 94.52% in 2018-2019. This was an improvement of 0.36%, compared to a similar improvement overall (for all pupils) of 0.12%.</p> <p>Up to 20/3/20, PP attendance was 93.04% compared to 95.97%. Authorised absence was 4.63% compared to 2.22% while unauthorised was 2.33% compared to 1.81%.</p> <p>The use of a minibus would allow more targeted support for the walking bus as it would allow the bus to be deployed for children who are out of our catchment area.</p> <p>The number of places at wraparound care my need to be reduced due to restrictions to the number of children able to attend.</p>	<p>£23,733</p> <p>In reality, the cost of the actions undertaken during lockdown were greater than the budgeted amount.</p>
--	---	---	--	---

<p>Targeted 1:1 and small group interventions for EYFS children</p>	<p>To reduce the gap between PP and non-PP in EYFS.</p>	<p>GLD (good level of development for EYFS) improved from 41% in 2018 to 57% in 2019. This brought it back (broadly) in line with previous years. The gap to non-PP reduced from 31% to 14%. There is no data for 2019-2020</p> <p>Review Jan 2020: As a whole, this cohort, although they have a stronger phonics knowledge than previous years, are weaker at applying this to their writing. They were observed in a learning walk on 10/1/20 and it was clear that EYFS need to inundate the learning environment with phonics and writing opportunities everywhere and continue this throughout the year.</p> <p>While improvements were made to the provision following this learning walk, the lockdown prevented these improvements from continuing.</p>	<p>Phonics teaching to start earlier in the year than in previous years. A new EYFS lead, who is also the English lead, will be in charge of the EYFS provision for September 2020, with their focus on ways to improve the core provision in EYFS, including the reduction of the gap between PP and non-PP in GLD.</p>	<p>£12,056</p> <p>From March –July, the budget was used to support teaching of children in bubbles where they did not exceed 15 bubbles.</p>
<p>Targeted reading with the lowest 20% of children being read with twice per week.</p> <p>Reading at least once half-termly with all children.</p> <p>Guided reading planning changed to reflect a focus on the reading domains.</p>	<p>To ensure that every child is heard to read regularly at school.</p>	<p>January 2020: SLT had read with a selection of children in the bottom twenty percent. Target year groups reviewed the books being taken home by the children (as a few of the children’s books were too difficult for them).</p> <p>Reading folders showed that reading twice a week with the bottom 20% was happening more consistently.</p> <p>Golden tickets launched to promote more reading at home</p> <p>Year groups were setting for the lower ability readers to target those pupils for reading (in 3 and 4)</p> <p>Pupils who were struggling with reading fluency targeted for phonics interventions either during guided reading or during an afternoon intervention.</p> <p>During the lockdown, social distancing was actively encouraged and minimised the opportunities to complete 1:1 reading. Furthermore, for a long period of the lockdown, books from the library were not allowed to be used.in school.</p>	<p>This approach to be continued. However, there will be an additional criteria that any child who is PP and is not read with at home, will be read with at least twice a week.</p>	<p>£22,089</p> <p>From Mach to July, the budget was used to support teaching of children in bubbles where they did not exceed 15 bubbles.</p>
<p>iii. Other approaches</p>				
<p>Action</p>	<p>Intended outcome</p>	<p>Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? (Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate).</p> <p>NB: The assessments due in March were cancelled due to the build-up to the closure of the schools (with the attendance being significantly reduced in a number of classes before the actual lockdown.)</p>	<p>Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)</p>	<p>Cost: NB: this is the budgeted amount due to the impact of lockdown.</p>

<p>Half-termly parents' meetings for PP parents</p>	<p>To increase the parental engagement of PP parents.</p>	<p>Parents had been contacted with updated information about their children. Where parents were difficult to contact/ were not engaging, alternative measures were to be attempted, including sending a letter/ phone calls home. Support from Welfare team also sought to March.</p> <p>With lockdown, the support to parents and families changed to reflect the needs of the stakeholders. Vulnerable families (many of whom are PP) were supported with regular phone calls from the pastoral team/ members of the SLT.</p>	<p>With face-to-face meetings discouraged, meetings will be via Zoom. Some families do not have access to the internet to allow them to access Zoom calls, in which case phone calls will be made instead (and a very limited number of face-to-face meetings initiated where required). This approach will then be extended to additional meetings/ calls for PP parents/carers in each half-term from Autumn 2 (whereas the normal offer is 3 per year, PP families will have access to 5).</p> <p>A number of families do not respond to emails/ letters; therefore, phone calls/ catching in the playground are more effective strategies for these families.</p>	<p>£2000</p> <p>In reality, the cost of the actions undertaken during lockdown were greater than the budgeted amount.</p>
<p>Welfare and pastoral support , including coffee mornings on a range of parenting topics</p>	<p>To increase the parental engagement of PP parents.</p>	<p>10 parents/ carers at start of year were attending coffee mornings e.g. on mental health. However, by the end of the year (2019) 30 parents/carers attended. Impact of these sessions is too early to quantify but there has been improved parental engagement due to these events.</p> <p>Coronavirus (COVID-19) stopped the ability to continue coffee mornings and other onsite support activities for parents. Instead, the support was provided via support through 1:1 phone calls to vulnerable families. In addition to this, a variety of information regarding mental health and well-being support was published on the school website throughout lockdown and a number of supportive websites were highlighted to relevant families.</p> <p>In addition all PP children were contacted at least once during lockdown, with the majority being contacted more than non-PP children. Pupils or families who required support during lockdown were added to the schools' vulnerable tracking list and regularly contacted by a member of the pastoral team.</p>	<p>The coffee mornings will not be able to be continued as it stands under the current guidelines (until December 2020 at the earliest).</p> <p>Additional support from the pastoral team will continue for 2020-2021.</p>	<p>Budget: £28,269</p> <p>In reality, the cost of the actions undertaken during lockdown were greater than the budgeted amount.</p>

6.

Academic year

2020-2021

The three headings enable you to demonstrate how you are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies

i. Quality of teaching for all

Action	Intended outcome	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) Smaller classes in KS2 to allow the teachers to be able to focus more on each child. Targeted groups in year 4 in English and maths and 4 way split in Years 5 and 6.</p>	<p>To ensure that the progress of PP SEN children at least matches that of non-PP students.</p>	<p>In 2018-2019 (there is no data available for 2019-2020): PP Progress in Y4/5/6 was in line with All Pupils at Exp and was accelerated at GDS (where this approach was used).</p> <p>OFSTED 2014 The Pupil Premium How Schools are Spending the Funding Successfully to Maximise Achievement, p10, shows that this approach allows the teachers to focus on specific children within class.</p> <p>The three year groups with the most PP children are in year 4 and 6 (31 children and 38 children respectively), while year 5 has as many as Years 1 and 3 (23 children)</p> <p>In Year 4, 12 children will be taught in a smaller group. 5 of the 6 PP children who did not make GLD will be in this group. The 6th will be supported in class (as they do not need maths support so are not joining the group).</p>	<p>PRMs with individual teachers where each teacher will discuss the progress of the individual children, looking at their books and setting targets with a member of SLT. Regular learning walks by members of SLT/the wider leadership team. Time will be spent training the wider leadership team and subject leaders to effectively observe lessons.</p>	<p>Matt Johnson</p>	<p>Ongoing with termly data reviews.</p> <p>Budget: 1 HLTA for 15 hours per week = £11,700</p> <p>2 teacher for 25 hours per week = £39,000</p> <p>Total: £50,700</p>

<p>b)Phonics groups targeted at the children’s phonological awareness, including children in Years 3 and 4 who did not pass the phonics check in Year 2 (if in 4) and in Year 1 if in Year 3</p> <p>Phonics catch up lessons in Year 2 to enable the children to catch-up with their learning in order to pass the Year 1 phonics screening check and provide additional support where they do not pass</p> <p>Phonics lessons for Year 1 to reflect that the children did not complete phase 3 and 4 in EYFS.</p> <p>Guided reading planning reconfigured to ensure that reading domains are focused upon.</p> <p>Individual PP children supported via additional interventions/</p>	<p>To reduce the gap between PP and non-PP reading attainment.</p>	<p>Phonics for Year 1 PP children had improved from 56% to 71% (2018-2019). The gap to non-PP had reduced from 28% to 15%.</p> <p>5 of the 9 children who needed to retake their phonics test in Year 2 passed. All children improved the raw score they achieved.</p> <p>There was no data for 2019-2020 due to coronavirus (COVID-19).</p> <p>Whether children have been out of school for 6 months or where they were in school and the teaching was impacted by the impact of coronavirus (COVID-19), their phonics have been impacted in many cases.</p> <p>13/23 Y1 PP children below GLD at start of Y1 = 57% 20/67 Y1 non-PP children below GLD at start of Y1 = 30%</p> <p>5/13 Y2 PP children below GLD at start of Y1 = 38% (NB: a further 2 have not made the required progress during Y1 and will need additional support, while a further 2 will need to be monitored. This equates to 69% of the PP cohort) 17/77 Y2 non-PP children below GLD at start of Y1 =22%</p> <p>10/23 Y3 PP children below GLD at start of Y1 = 43% (2 of these are now on track; however, they will receive twice weekly reading, reducing the % to 35%). 20/76 Y3 non-PP children below GLD at start of Y1 = 26% (9 have caught up with their peers but will need to be monitored . this reduces the % to 14%)</p> <p>6/31 Y4 PP children below expected standard at start of Y3= 19% (A further 3 have fallen behind their peers and will also need additional reading support, taking the total to 9/31 = 29%. One additional greater depth child will need monitoring as they, too, have fallen behind their peers.) 13/71 Y4 non-PP children below expected standard at start of Y3=18%</p> <p>8/23 Y5 PP children below expected standard at start of Y3 = 35% (4 additional children will also need support as they have fallen below their peers, taking the % to 52%)</p> <p>11/77 Y5 non-PP children below expected standard at start of Y3 = 14% (2 of these will need monitoring as now on track but may not need twice weekly reading.)</p>	<p>Assessments completed at the completion of the groups in order to ascertain next steps and which children need targeting.</p> <p>Learning walks completed during guided reading/ phonics lessons.</p> <p>Planning reviewed by English Leader weekly and English Champions in each year group met weekly to discuss next steps with the planning and how it is being implemented in the classroom.</p> <p>Staff meetings to include a focus on reading.</p>	<p>Amy Chambers</p>	<p>After an initial 8 week programme, the children will be assessed and then the groupings/support will be targeted to reflect the assessments.</p> <p>Budget: KS1 5 hours a week for 9 teachers, 17 teaching assistants and 2 members of the SLT = £88, 725</p> <p>KS2 Two and a half hours a week for 12 teachers and 15 teaching assistants = £43875</p> <p>Total =£132,600</p>
---	--	--	---	---------------------	--

support via TAs' Performance Management (PMSs)		9/38 Y6 PP children below expected standard at start of Y3 = 23% (An additional 4 children have fallen below their peers and will also require additional reading support, increasing the % to 34%)			
Total budgeted cost					£183,300
ii. Targeted support					
Action	Intended outcome	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>c)Attendance officer to support families where problems are identified.</p> <p>Walking bus for pupils who are persistently late/absent. (Minibus use to also be considered)</p> <p>Places offered at breakfast club/ after-school club for children who are persistently absent or late. Up to 5 places available per session.</p> <p>Welfare support/ELSA support and other support provided to help children e.g. with attendance, motivation, behaviour</p>	To reduce persistent absence for PP pupils	OFSTED 2014 The Pupil Premium How Schools are Spending the Funding Successfully to Maximise Achievement Persistent absence impacts upon the children's progress and while the absence figure for PP children has reduced, it is still significantly above that for non-PP within the school.	<p>Attendance officer works closely with the pastoral team, headed up by an assistant headteacher.</p> <p>Attendance officer to meet formally with a member of the SLT, at least once per half-term, to discuss any concerns as well as successes that have been had and next steps.</p>	Allie Roberts	<p>Half-termly</p> <p>See additional detail point 1 above</p> <p>Budget: £3900 for walking bus £975 for minibus costs £10,725 for breakfast club and after school club places £1950 for welfare support (1 hour a day) 35 hours of ELSA per week £13650 Total: £31,200</p>

<p>d)Targeted 1:1 and small group interventions for EYFS children.</p> <p>NB: This is particularly important considering that most of the children were unable to experience half a year of pre-school.</p>	<p>To reduce the gap between PP and non-PP in EYFS.</p>	<p>GLD (good level of development for EYFS) improved from 41% in 2018 to 57% in 2019. This brought it back (broadly) in line with previous years. The gap to non-PP reduced from 31% to 14%. There is no data, due to coronavirus (COVID -19) for 2019-2020.</p>	<p>PRMs with individual teachers where each teacher will spend an afternoon discussing the progress of the individual children, looking at their books and setting targets.</p> <p>Regular learning walks by members of SLT/the wider leadership team.</p> <p>Time will be spent training the wider leadership team/ subject leaders to effectively observe lessons.</p> <p>Assessment data drops three times per year with focused analysis of the data with target groups and actions devised as a result of the analysis.</p> <p>Plus an assistant headteacher will be working closely with the team this academic year, looking at progress and how to maximise the opportunities to impact on</p>	<p>Darran Cowell</p>	<p>Half-termly from Autumn 2</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>7.5 hours EYFS per week (30 minutes of additional targeting: split between T and TA)</p> <p>=£5118.75</p>
---	---	--	--	----------------------	---

<p>e)Targeted reading with the lowest 20% of children being read with twice per week.</p> <p>Children who are PP and are not read with at home, to be read with at least twice a week.</p> <p>Reading at least once half-termly with all children.</p> <p>Guided reading planning changed to reflect a focus on the reading domains.</p>	<p>To ensure that every child is heard to read regularly at school.</p>	<p>IN 2018-2019, reading at Year 6 was lower than had been expected, with progress low compared to the children’s starting points.</p> <p>Improvements have been made in other year groups and the EOY2 reading results are very encouraging. However, there are a number of children who are not successful at reading and these children need targeted support.</p> <p>(See above for data on the lowest 20% in each year group)</p> <p>NB: Years 1 and 3 have more than a bottom 20% in the cohort who need to be read with at least twice a week. The focus will be on PP children first.</p> <p>In Year 3, 8 of the 10 children who did not achieve GLD in reading remain below their peers. They are in the bottom 20% of the year group and will be targeted first. The two children who did not achieve GLD but have made good progress and are matching their peers, will be monitored, with additional support put in place should they start to fall into the bottom 20% bracket.</p> <p>In Year 1, regular analysis of the phonics and reading data will be analysed and discussed with the Year 1 to determine who is to be targeted. However, the 13 PP children will remain the priority.</p> <p>From September 2020, Librarian has and is reading with PP children in Year 6 to further close the gap.</p>	<p>Checking of reading records and logs.</p> <p>Monitoring of planning and work scrutiny undertaken.</p> <p>Learning walks regularly completed.</p> <p>Children asked about their reading habits and regularity of reading by English team and SLT during pupil interviews.</p> <p>Librarian has had a PM with SLT to discuss how to support Year 6 PP children to questioning them effectively to support progress and how to liaise effectively with Year Leader.</p>	<p>Amy Chambers</p>	<p>Termly</p> <p>Budget: 1 hour per class per week £8970</p>
--	---	--	---	---------------------	--

f) Targeted literacy support from the Literacy Hubs Pompey Pirates Programme,	To improve the engagement of targeted children with reading, writing and	14 of the 23 PP children in Year 5 were below age expectations at the end of KS1 in writing with 8 additionally below age expectations in reading. 19 of the 23 PP children were offered places on the Pompey Pirates Programme. 12 of these children accepted the places.	Reviewing the impact on their progress in school Discussing with the children the impact that the programme has had on their confidence and their literacy learning.	Darran Cowell	Termly £4500 £4860 for staff costs (2 staff for 6 hours a week). £180 minibuss costs Total £9540
---	--	---	---	---------------	--

Total budgeted cost £54,828.75

iii. Other approaches

Action	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
g) Half-termly parents' meetings for PP parents	To increase the parental engagement of PP parents.	Parental Engagement and Narrowing the Gap in Attainment for Disadvantaged Children (NFER 2013) Reported outcomes of increased parental engagement include improved academic performance; improved relationships between parents, teachers and schools; and increased parental involvement in schools. Teachers commented positively on the improved engagement and that the conversations that they have had with the parents/carers have been constructive. A number of the harder to reach parents/carers had also started to become more engaged.	Discuss the engagement with the teachers to ascertain their views on whether engagement has improved and what the impact of this improvement has been. Talk to a selection of parents to ascertain their views. Discuss with the children their views on the communication between home and school.	Darran Cowell	Termly Budget 23 classes x 1 ½ hour, with 2 of these evenings scheduled = £1380

h)Welfare and pastoral support	To increase the parental engagement of PP parents.	<p>NFER 2013 –see above</p> <p>10 parents/ carers at the start of the year were attending coffee mornings e.g. on mental health. However, by the end of the year, 30 parents/carers attended. Impact of these sessions is too early to quantify but there has been improved parental engagement due to these events.</p> <p>It is very difficult to quantify the impact of the support, including during the lockdown. However, attendance had improved (pre-COVID), exclusions remained low (significantly below the local authority average) and in the 2017 OfSTED, it was stated that: Pupils’ personal development and welfare are outstanding.</p>	<p>Reviewed at SLT meeting at least termly.</p> <p>Talk to a selection of parents to ascertain their views.</p>	Allyson Roberts	<p>Termly</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>£4680 for 8 hours a week of welfare support</p> <p>£5850 for 5 hours a week of SLT work</p> <p>Total £10,530</p>
i) Additional laptops to support children both in school and at home to enable access to online learning	To reduce the digital divide gap between PP and Non-PP children in order to help reduce the academic gap between PP and Non-PP children.	<p>An estimated 9% of families in the UK do not have a laptop, desktop or tablet at home. This digital divide is not new, but during the Covid-19 crisis its implications have been particularly stark.</p> <p>https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/2020/08/18/children-without-internet-access-during-lockdown/</p> <p>...only 51% of households earning between £6000-10,000 had home internet access compared with 99% of households with an income of over £40,001. The link between poverty and digital exclusion is clear: if you are poor, you have less chance of being online. From "Pay the wi-fi or feed the children": Coronavirus has intensified the UK’s digital divide</p> <p>https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/digitaldivide</p> <p>During the first lockdown (March 2020) ‘A report from the Institute for Fiscal Studies, a think-tank, found that children from the richest fifth of families were spending over 75 minutes more than their peers in the poorest fifth of households on educational activities.’</p> <p>https://www.ft.com/content/50fcc605-674d-4630-9718-d3890eccffbf</p>	<p>Progress of purchase and distribution reviewed at SLT meeting termly.</p> <p>Talk to the children and their teachers to see the impact of the devices on the children.</p> <p>Review data about these individual children.</p>	Darran Cowell	<p>Termly</p> <p>Budget £450 per device x10 devices.</p> <p>£4500</p> <p>Matched funding from the Portsmouth Tackling Digital Disadvantage Fund of £4284 was agreed with PCC in November 2020 and will be used to purchase additional devices.</p> <p>19/11/20 20 laptops’ purchase agreed at Whole Governing Body (WGB) with 3 year new for old warranty. Further 20 laptops will also be purchased in order to create a class set.</p>

<p>j)Support from Achievement for All (AfA)Pilot to close the gap for Pupil Premium Children</p>	<p>To close the gap between PP children and Non-PP children, accelerating their progress and attainment.</p>	<p>AfA had a significant impact upon progress in English and Maths among pupils with SEND (Achievement for All National Evaluation: Final Report, November 2011 http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/)</p>	<p>Deep dive analysis by a coach from AfA to identify the areas of focus, priority and development.</p> <p>Strategies and reviews to be based upon the deep dive.</p>	<p>Darran Cowell</p>	<p>Termly</p> <p>Budget £3500</p> <p>Meeting 1 organised for 8/12/20</p>
--	--	---	---	----------------------	--

<p>k)Extended services:</p> <p>Actively promote opportunities for PP children</p> <p>Uniform fund</p> <p>Residential and visits fund</p> <p>Additional equipment fund (e.g. water bottles)</p>	<p>To provide the same opportunities for PP children.</p>	<p>Opportunities, such as sporting competitions and participation in activities such as the Children’s Concerts, targeted at PP children.</p> <p>The Educational Endowment Foundation found that residential “...show positive benefits on academic leaning and wider outcomes, such as self-confidence.”</p> <p>Children who do not have the school uniform may feel separated from the rest of the school or might not participate in PE without a PE kit.</p> <p>Some children do not have equipment at home (pencils, pens etc) or water bottles for school. This can have a detrimental impact on their wellbeing at home and school.</p>	<p>Reviewed at SLT meeting at least termly.</p> <p>Talk to a selection of parents/ carers to ascertain their views.</p> <p>Talk to the children who have had their visits partly funded to ascertain the impact.</p> <p>Speak to the children who have been supported with uniform etc. to ascertain their views.</p>	<p>Allie Roberts</p>	<p>Termly</p> <p>Budget £1881.25</p>
Total budgeted cost					£26,075.25

7. Additional detail

2/10/2020 c): **Persistent Absence**

As of the 2/10/20, there were 42 persistent absentees (with more than 90% absence and excluding isolating due to coronavirus [COVID-19]). Of these, 17 were pupil premium children and accounted for 10% of the total PP children, whereas for Non Pupil Premium, there were 25 children, representing 5% of the total NonPP children. 2 of the PP children are on reduced timetables and these have been actioned to support the needs of these two children. In regards to the other children, the attendance officer has been in contact with the parents/carers in order to support them with their child’s/children’s attendance, including letters warning about attendance where appropriate with 3 letters being issued to PP children’s parents/carers and 3 to NonPP.

Absence due to isolating (coronavirus [COVID-19] symptoms/ reasons)

As of the 2/10/20, 762 sessions of school have been lost due to children self-isolating. Of these session, 531 were for NonPP children, with 231 for PP children. This equates to just over 1 session per NonPP child lost due to isolating, compared to 1.4 sessions lost per PP child. Some, but not all, of this difference can be explained by the timing of their

symptoms: the four children (all PP) with the longest absences from school isolated when the testing system was under extreme stress, resulting in an absences of tests and/or delays in receiving test results.

Attendance for all pupils (excluding coronavirus [COVID-19] isolation).

As of the 2/10/20, PP attendance was 95.46%, compared to non-PP attendance of 97.34%, a difference of 1.88%. Overall, the school’s attendance figure was 96.95%. The PP attendance rate is 0.94% higher than the 2017-2018 rate.

Authorised absence for PP children was higher at 2.97%, compared to non-PP of 1.72%, making a whole school total of 1.99%.

Unauthorised absence for PP children was higher at 1.55% compared to non-PP of 0.94%, making a whole school total of 1.06%.

NB: self-isolating due to coronavirus (COVID-19) is not considered as absence in the same way as it is for other illnesses, holidays, medical appointments etc. and is not included in the figures above.

2/11/20 a)As of the 2/11/20, the additional group in Year 4 will not be undertaken due to the promotion of the member of staff (in another establishment). Therefore, the six PP children who did not make GLD will be supported in class.

4/11/20 **Staff meeting**

A staff meeting was held on Wednesday 4th November 2020. Each teacher reviewed their class (using a 3I sheet) looking at the key issue each child who is PP has (including for the children who are on track) and the initiative/ initiatives put in place to support the children. The impact of these initiatives will be reviewed at a further staff meeting in Spring 1. An example of a 3I sheet for a Year R child is provided below:

Name of child	Issue/issues	Initiative	Impact
	<p>Speech: struggles to speak in full sentences, uses incorrect tenses.</p> <p>Memory: poor recall of taught skills.</p> <p>Phonics: struggles to remember the sounds taught so far and to apply them. Struggles to write name.</p> <p>Maths: struggles to recall numbers and match numbers to their amounts.</p> <p>Fine Motor: Poor fine motor control including pencil grip and using scissors.</p>	<p>Focus during day-to-day, correcting speech and modelling correct tenses/ full sentences.</p> <p>10 minutes daily 1:1 memory games with TA.</p> <p>20 minute daily phonics with TA. Teacher: phonics focus child throughout the day. 15 minutes daily: name writing.</p> <p>Daily 20-minute focus group with TA. Focusing on numbers 1 to 5.</p> <p>15 minutes daily dough disco with TA.</p>	

1/12/20 c) **Walking Bus (minibus) usage November 2020**

17 PP children have accessed the walking bus (minibus) during the month of November 2020. A total of 26 children have used the bus during November 2020. It has been used in order to support the attendance of key children who were at risk of being persistently late and/or absent. It has also been used to support parents/carers where a member of the family was self-isolating as they had been in contact with a positive case of COVID-19 and the family were unable to organise for a child/children who was not isolating to come into school.

1/12/20 g) **Analysis of Parents' Evening Data for Autumn Term**

Pupil premium parents/carers who booked an appointment equalled 78% of PP children. For non-PP, 79% of parents/carers booked an appointment.

6/12/20 **Progress Data September 2020- November 2020**

- a) The smaller classes in Year 5 have had a positive impact on all the pupils in Year 5 but with a significant positive impact on pupil premium pupils in reading, writing, mathematics and SPAG. For Year 6, both pupil premium and all pupils have made significant progress above the 1 point expected. However, in maths and SPAG, the gap has increased as a result of the additional progress overall that the all pupils have made in comparison to pupil premium pupils, suggesting that non-pupil premium pupils have made better progress than the pupil premium pupils. (See Table 1)
- d) The pupil premium children have made significantly better progress since September in writing and science (Understanding the World). In maths and reading, the pupil premium children are broadly in line with all children. (See Table 1)

Table 1: Progress Data September 2020- November 2020

(Expected progress = 1 point. Disadvantaged progress in red) Significant positive progress in green and significant negative progress in red.)

	Reading	PP v All	Writing	PP v All	SPAG	PP v All	Maths	PP v All	Science	PP v All
R	2.13 2.16	+0.03	2.41 2.5	+0.09	n/a	n/a	1.3 1.25	-0.05	1.27 1.4	+0.13
1	0.88 0.75	-0.13	1.2 1.04	-0.16	1.2 1.04	-0.16	1.25 1.0	-0.25	1.2 1.29	+0.09
2	0.79 0.77	-0.02	2.06 2.08	+0.02	1.18 1.38	+0.20	0.9 1.0	+0.1	1.81 1.75	-0.06
3 *	0.82 0.72	-0.10	0.84 0.4	-0.44	0.88 0.7	-0.17	0.68 0.7	+0.02	0.89 0.7	-0.19
4	0.63 0.43	-0.20	1.11 1.03	-0.08	1.03 1.07	+0.04	0.73 0.7	-0.03	1.06 0.87	-0.19
5	1.01 1.23	+0.21	1.39 1.5	+0.11	1.32 1.5	+0.18	1.1 1.18	+0.18	1.27 1.32	+0.05
6	2.73 2.69	-0.04	1.9 1.89	-0.01	2.85 2.69	-0.16	2.58 2.14	-0.44	1.92 1.89	-0.03
Accumulative	n/a	-0.02	n/a	-0.06	n/a	-0.01	n/a	-0.07	n/a	-0.03

*1 class unable to complete assessments due to self-isolating

6/12/20 e) **Reading with the lowest 20% of each Year Group**

The gap between pupil premium children and all children for reading is 0.02 across the school. However, when looking at the lowest 20% of each year group, the progress made by those who are pupil premium is lower than those who are non-pupil premium in all year groups apart from Year 6. (See Table 2)

Table 2

Year Group	Reading for lowest 20% PP	Reading for lowest 20% non-PP
1	0.71	1.14
2	1.14	1.26
3 *	1	1.5
4	0.67	1.1
5	1	1.36
6	2.38	2.11

6/12/20 f) **Pompey Pirates Children's Progress**

Despite the interruption caused by COVID-19 (two cancelled sessions and then the sessions being completed at school rather than at the Pompey Pirates Hub), all 14 children have enthusiastically written their story. The reading intervention has not been able to be completed due to the move to online learning. (See Table 3)

Table 3	Reading	Writing	SPAG
Pompey Pirates	1.14	1.29	2.23
All of year group	1.01	1.39	1.32

9/12/20 c) **SEND Parents' Meeting** Parents' meeting about SEND provided online. Open invitation for all parents along with targeted emails and phone calls for some of the PP children. 25% of the parents who attended have PP children.

9/12/20 c) **Food Bank** School food bank created and is currently supporting 12 families with provisions. Service includes a drop off service for the food. Impact: Children not needing to be fed at school as the parents/carers have food at home.

18/12/20 c) **Walking Bus (minibus) usage December 2020**

Nineteen children accessed the minibus to collect and/or take home during the month of December. Of these children 15 were PP with 4 being non-PP.

NB: Approximate hourly rates for staffing are: £30 SLT, £25 TLR/UPS Teachers, £20 teachers, £15 HLTAs, £10 TAs. These are underestimates of the costs as they do not, as an example, include the on costs for each member of staff.