



Tewkesbury C of E Primary School

Pupil premium and vulnerable groups, IMPACT REPORT.

Date of report: 2017-2018, (Presented in October 2018).

SENCO: Charlotte Black

Pupil premium profile for the last 12 months

- Pupil Premium register according to SIMs/SPTO at the Summer 2018 census.

Pupil Premium	N	R	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Total
Free school meals children		1	7	6	8	5	5	7	39
Ever 6 children						2	6	7	15
Service Children		2	1	0	2	1	2	0	8
SGO/ LAC children		1	3	1	1	0	0	1	6
Total									
								Total	68

- Pupil Premium register according to SIMs/SPTO at the Autumn 2018 census.

Pupil Premium	N	R	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Total
Free school meals children		2	7	6	8	5	5	7	40
Ever 6 children		0	0	0	2	4	6	7	19
Service Children		2	0	0	2	1	2	1	8
SGO/ LAC children		1	3	2	1	0	0	1	8
Total									
								Total	75

Number of pupils on Pupil premium, EAL and Vulnerable Groups registers as a percentage of pupil population

2017-2018	School data at the Autumn Census	LEA data published July 2018	National data published July 2018 (collated Jan 18)
Pupil premium	68 pupils 18.0%	Not published	
Free school meals	10.5%	10.4%	13.7%
Service Children	2.1%	Not published	
LAC/SGO children	1.6%	Rate of 48 per 10,000	Rate of 62 per 10,000
EAL	11.3%	8.2%	21.2%
CIN/ CPP children	17 children 1.6%	Rate of episodes 605.6 per 10,000	Rate of episodes 635.2 per 10,000
Well being children*	5.2%		
Exclusions and	Permanent exclusions =0	Permanent exclusion rate	Permanent exclusion rate

absences...	(Average no of days lost per pupil excluded = 7 days).*	0.05 Fixed period exclusion rate 1.39 (Average no of days lost per pupil excluded 4.92 days)	0.03 Fixed period exclusion rate = 1.39 (Average no of days lost per pupil excluded 4.21 days)
-------------	---	--	--

• **Numbers of children joining the registers and coming off the register this year.**

Transferred into school.	Added to the registers.	Left the school	Improvement noted
*3 Children transferred in with SGo status in September 2018. *5 new Service Children started in September 2018 * 5 New EAL children entered school September 2018	* 2 new SGO cases *3 new children registered with/ referred to wellbeing agencies.	Year 6 moved on to secondary school consisted of 2 service children, 3 EAL, 3 well being children etc.	5 cases closed by social services.

School Evidence

This evidence comes from

- The school's SIMs data.

Government reports

- Children in need and child protection statistics; published 2nd November 2017
- Exclusions statistics ; published 19th July 2018
- Looked after children statistics; 28 March 2018
- Pupil absence; published 18th October 2018
- School and pupil numbers; published 23 August 2018
- Schools , pupils and their characteristics; published January 2018

Overall quality of provision for pupil premium children, EAL and vulnerable groups

This should be based on the following Ofsted descriptors:

1. Inspectors will always have regard for how well children and learners are helped and protected so that they are kept safe. Although inspectors will not provide a separate numerical grade for this key aspect of a provider's work, inspectors will always make a written judgement under leadership and management about whether or not the arrangements for safeguarding children and learners are effective.
2. Inspection is primarily about evaluating how well individual children and learners benefit from the education provided by the school or provider. Inspection tests the school's or provider's response to individual needs by observing how well it helps all children and learners to make progress and fulfil their potential. In making judgements, inspectors will pay particular attention to the outcomes for the following groups:
 - children and learners for whom English is an additional language
 - children and learners from minority ethnic groups
 - Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children and learners
 - young carers
 - disadvantaged¹ children and learners
 - children looked after and care leavers
 - children and learners of different religions and beliefs
 - other vulnerable groups.²

• **Outcomes for pupil premium children (academic and wider outcomes)**

- Quality of teaching, learning and assessment for pupil premium children and vulnerable groups.

Within observations, learning walks and book trawls by Carolyn Scott and Tim Rylatt all lessons were seen to be good or better.

- Effectiveness of leadership and management for pupil premium children and vulnerable groups.

School evidence

- Natalie Packer Provision maps.
- Common inspection guidance
- SIMs behaviour programme.
- SPTO data.
- Reports of Racism and Bullying.
- Pupil voice.
- Pupil progress meeting notes
- Tim's Information with Teachers.

Achievement of vulnerable groups :-

- Statutory assessment data

Keystage 2	School 2018	Average National data for a non disadvantaged child	School 2017	National
Writing	+0.47		-3.61	
SPaG				
Reading	-5.47 (Average test 97.6)	106.1	-2.99	
Maths	-5.09 ((Average test 97.3)	105.4	-3.56	
RWM				

Case study:-

In 2018, there were 11-12 children on the Pupil premium register depending on which census you look at. However this data looks at only Ever 6 and LAC children which was 9 children.

Out of these 9 children

3 of them were also SEN, two with Irlens syndrome and one with SEMH needs.
There were no EAL or LAC as part of this group and ethnicity all white British.

Support and tracking of these children:-

All children received specialized SATs booster sessions over two terms by qualified and experienced teachers. Some of the children were supported by qualified and experienced SATs markers and moderators. Two children were being seen by CYPs or TIC for anxiety and attachment needs within this year.

However lower learners had been targeted in previous years, with maths and reading interventions

Such as plus 1, timetable sessions and 1:1 reading. (4x qualified for support of readers/ extra time and 1 a scribe)

Key Stage 1

Attainment %	Reading		Writing		Mathematics	
	EXS+	GDS	EXS+	GDS	EXS+	GDS
School 2017	76	27	68	14	73	19
National 2017	76	25	68	16	75	21
School 2018	76	20	71	16	71	20
National 2018	75	26	70	16	76	22

The proportion of pupils at the expected standard or above has remained the same in reading across 2017 and 2018, risen slightly in writing and fallen slightly in mathematics. Fewer pupils achieved the greater depth standard in reading, but there has been a slight rise in both writing and mathematics. **Progress:** Pupils made better progress in writing and reading than in mathematics. Middle- and lower-attaining pupils made less progress than higher-attainers in mathematics.

Phonics screening check

%	Year 1	End KS1
School 2017	81	88
National 2017	81	92
School 2018	84	88
National 2018	82	92

Year 1: The proportion of pupils reaching the expected standard in the phonics screening check has risen from in line with the national average in 2017 to just above in 2018.

Year 2: Of the nine pupils taking the phonics screening check in 2017, two achieved the expected standard (22%), one of the seven boys and one of the two girls. Five of the pupils taking phonics had SEND support, with two successful.

In 2018, 10 pupils took the phonics screening check, nine boys and one girl. Four boys reached the expected standard (40%). Two out of the five pupils with SEND support were successful. Two pupils just missed the expected standard, achieving one mark lower than the 32 marks required.

End of Key Stage 1: In 2017 and 2018, the proportion reaching the expected standard in the phonics screening check remained just below the national. Pupils who did not achieve phonics by the end of Key Stage 1 are being given support. There is an increased focus on reading support, using volunteers, with the aim of making further impact.

VG attainment tracking	Writing	SPaG	Reading SPTO	Reading Test base (Autumn term)	Maths SPTO	Maths test base (Autumn term)
Whole School	47.3% (-4m)	37.5% (-6m)	56.4% (-3m)		58.2% (-1m)	
Reception						
Year 1	57.1% (-2m)		57.1% (-1m)		57.1% (+1m)	
Year 2	33.3% (-2m)	66.7% (-2m)	66.7% (-1m)		83.3% (-1m)	
Year 3	50% (-3m)	12.5% (-7m)	75% (-2m)	25% (-6m)	62.5% (-2m)	50% (-4m)
Year 4	50% (-4m)	30% (-5m)	50% (-4m)	37.5% (-4m)	60% (-4m)	14.3% (-3m)
Year 5	41% (-6m)	25% (-9m)	41.7% (-6m)	69.2% (6m)	50% (0m)	72.7% (4m)
Year 6	50% (-4m)	58.3% (-3m)	58.3% (-3m)	42.9% (-3m)	50% (-1m)	37.5% (-1m)

Break down of attainment by group.

	writing	SPaG	Reading	Maths
Ever 1 FSM	44.4% (-5m)	35.7% (-7m)	60% (-4m) 35% (-3m) ks2 TB	54.3% (-2m) 17.4% (-3m) ks2 TB
Ever6	55.6% (-3m)	38.9% (-4m)	61.1% (-2m) 55.6% (0m) ks2TB	61.1% (0m) 62.5% (+3m) ks2TB
LAC/SGO	60% (-1m)	100% (0m)	60% (-1m)	60% (-1m) 0% (-2m) ks2TB
Service	0% (-3m)	0% (-8m)	25% (-6m) 75% (+5m) ks2 TB	75% (-1m) 66.7% (0m) ks2TB

What does this show?

1. On average only 50% of pupil premium children are on track.
2. In many areas the average ARE is only 1-2 months behind which is easy to close.
3. Trend of KS2 being an area of concern is also highlighted in these groups.
4. LAC who are mainly ks1 are doing the best across all core subjects.
5. Emphasis on SPaG where percentage is lowest in all groups.

• Progress data (average progress and percentage of children making 3 point progress)

	Writing	SPaG	Reading	Reading TB Autumn 1/KS2 *	Maths	Maths TB Autumn 1/KS2*
Whole school (SEN)	+1y0m 78.7 %	+1y0m 61.4%	+11m 83%	+6m 68.2%	+1y0m 78.3%	+3m 55.8%
Year 1						
Year 2	+11m 50%	+10m 33.3%	+11m 66.7%		+11m 66.7%	
Year 3	+1y0m 87.5%	+8m 25%	+11m 75%	0m 37.5%	+1y1m 75%	+1m 50%
Year 4	+1y0m 90%	+1y0m 87.5%	+11m 90%	0m 50%	+11m 80%	+1m 28.6%
Year 5	+1y0m 90.9%	+1y2m 72.7%	+11m 83.3%	+1y0m 92.3%	+1y2m 81.8%	+6m 81.8%
Year 6	+ 11m 66.7%	+1y1m 72.7%	+1y0m 90.9%	+8m 73.3%	+1y1m 81.8%	+3m 56.3%

Break down of progress by group. (2017-2018)

	Writing		SPaG		Reading		Maths	
Ever 1 FSM	+11m	66.7%	+11m	54.2%	+11m	77.8%	+11m	73.1%
Ever6	+1y1m	88.9%	+1y1m	70.6%	+1y0m	88.9%	+1y 2m	83.3%
LAC/SGO	+1y2m	100%	+9m	0%	+1y2m	100%	+1y2m	100%
Service	+1y0m	75%	+7m	25%	+8m	50%	+1y0m	75%

What does this show?

1. On average 11m-1yrs progress was made last year.
2. Although in some areas it was a low proportion of children who made the 3 points progress especially SPAG.
3. Concerns with the progress made so far in years 3 and 4 (in the autumn1)
4. Maths in ks2 has low percentage of children making progress this term.
5. Service children in SPaG and Reading is low.
6. High percentages for LAC but these are predominantly KS1 and a low case number.

• Wider outcomes

	Average attendance of vulnerable children	Temporary Exclusions
Year 1	95.67% (aa 4.33%)	0
Year 2	94.80% (aa 5.20%)	0
Year 3	92.91% (aa 5.89%)	0
Year 4	96.97% (aa 3.03%)	1
Year 5	97.44% (aa 2.32%)	0
Year 6	97.09% (aa 2.67%)	0
Whole School	96.07% (aa 3.64%)	1

What this shows?

Attendance is good, and children are in attendance for sessions taught.
Behaviour incidences/ low level are not based around pupil premium children.

School evidence

- SPTO data.
- National government data collection reports.
- Raise online. (Needs updating)
- SIMs behaviour log and attendance.

Pupil premium policy

When was this reviewed? (This year due to changes).

Policy changes?

- Data
- Support- types
- External agencies

Pupil premium audit/ information report on school website.

Policy on the school website.

When was this reviewed and does it meet statutory requirements? Yes

School evidence

See website.

Staffing for

Any staff employed specifically to support pupils with Vulnerable groups and their qualifications.

In 2017-2018 we held temporary contracts with...

- All teachers and TA's are responsible for Vulnerable Groups, as part of the safeguarding and keeping children safe in education' documentation. Teachers are responsible for the plan, do and review aspect.
- Additionally last year Hilda Webb and Dorothy Chatworth were employed on a contract basis to assess and support children with literacy needs to aid closing the gap and teaching strategies to support learning. Both professionals hold the AMBDA accreditation which demonstrates they are recognised as Specialists in Dyslexia/Specific Learning Difficulties (SpLDs) and qualified to conduct specialist diagnostic assessments.
- Some of our vulnerable children needed blocks of play therapy, these were delivered by Lianne Taylor, and Gemma both are qualified as Therapists and hold professional degree level accreditation and specialist PCAP practitioner qualifications in play and creative Art therapy, sand play therapy and Lego therapy. (In some cases, where long term needs were identified TiC were also commissioned and referrals to CYPs completed).
- 3 TA's were employed on a part time basis solely for vulnerable groups, these TA's worked either on a 1:1 basis with translation, parental support or as a family worker. All TA's are employed on a Grade g basis and are all qualified up to a level 2 in retrospective teaching assistant qualifications.

School evidence

- Natalie Packer Provision maps.
- School contracts.
- Keeping children safe and other safeguarding documentation.

Interventions

What interventions have been used for pupils with vulnerable groups and how effective have these been?

How do you measure the impact?

Year group	Type	No of Children attending interventions	Vulnerable group children	Expected Progress SPTO
1	Maths Handwriting Sentence Work Tricky Words Reading	13 12 9 9 3	4 3 3 1 1	
2	Maths Sentence/Spag wk Phonics/CEW Reading Handwriting	13 8 11 6 6	11 4 3 0 3	
3	Reading Phonics/word wk Maths Writing/sentences SEMH	15 1 12 14 1	3 0 6 6 0	
4	Reading Writing Sentence/SPaG Handwriting Phonics	36 23 13 14 16	12 12 2 7 0	

	EAL SEMH Maths	1 6 43	5 3 1	
5	Writing Reading Handwriting Motor control SEMH SPaG Phonics/Word wk Maths	23 25 28 1 10 5 17 10	9 6 7 0 5 0 3 1	
6	Reading SEMH Handwriting Maths	1 5 5 6		
Specialised	Sensory group Fizzy Clever Hands/Dough gym Speech and Language	6 13 10 6		

School evidence

- Provision Maps
- Costings
- SPTO
- Attendance records.
- Baselines/ Myplans

CPD related to vulnerable groups.

What CPD has taken place and what has been the impact of it for pupils?

Training completed 2017-2018	Date
THRIVE practitioner training	October 2017
Lego Therapy	December 2017
Introduction to THRIVE online workshop	February 2018
Natalie Packer and Impact workshop	February 2018
Team Teach Refresher Training	April 2018
GDPR Training	June 2018
Safeguarding Refresher training	July 2018
Pink curriculum refreshers	September 2018

Impact

7. A new thrive room, using cheaper alternatives to sensory equipment to de-escalate needs. Using reflection time and improving emotional learning strategies.
8. Safeguarding expectations are clearer and understood.
9. Wellbeing in the classroom is being developed and relationships highlighted as important.
10. Measuring effectiveness with new questionnaires and pupil voices.
11. Cases online to meet requirements of GDPR but also to develop communication.

School evidence

- Handouts given
- Online calendar dates

Engagement with stakeholders

Pupil voice: How have vulnerable group pupils been involved in their provision?

Within pupil conversations, pupils have noted...

- Pupils would like more trips and visits to engage and give reasons to write, inspire etc.
- More time with the teacher to discuss targets and

Parent/carers voice: How have parents or carers of pupil premium pupils with been involved?

Parents have an opportunity to voice needs and positive elements within stars and a wish documents at parents evening, on some occasions parents will make appointments to come into school and discuss needs with either Headteacher or SENDco.

12. Communication

13. More TA's in year groups.

14. More support in applications for external services whether this is educational, housing or play therapy.

Multi-agency work: What external agencies have been involved and what impact has this had?

- Family support workers based at Noah's Arc in Priors Park. These have had to be accessed and bidded for, but once gained, they have completed home visits, completed charity applications and supported the family by attending recommended therapy or health sessions with them, completed family plans and supported the family with these actions such as clearing rubbish, decorating etc.
Impact:- time wise lots of benefits to using this service, they have more knowledge and time to complete applications, plus leaving school as a professional agency within the school environment. Accountability many families were signed off family plans after usage. Negatives to this is either contract payments or time to apply for the service.
- Refugee services, to aid translations, access school uniforms and settle families into the area.
Impact:- The children settled into school and aid to the family with integration. Support not just academically but also socially and emotionally especially with younger children with attachment needs and less resilience. Negative it took longer to develop the spoken English due to speaking in their own tongue.
- The church, Reverend Wendy has supported a variety of families with pastoral care within multi agency meetings and setting up appointments with parents.
Impact:- Families have noted that they felt listened to and supported, but negatives to this is safeguarding procedures triangulating communication where possible where permission allows.
- Social services and keyworkers, have supported families in regards to therapy sessions about divorce, separation and in some cases gaining pupil voices etc. (Sometimes children open up more to people outside of the school).
- Impact- safeguarding and initial assessments completed, expectations of meetings with lack of notice.

How has the school contributed to vulnerable groups in the local authority/ MAT/ wider education community?

School evidence

Children's voice and parental engagement-

15. Communication

16. More TA's in year groups.

17. More support in applications for external services.

18. More trips and visits to engage and

School evidence

- 3 stars and a wish from parents at parents evening.

Any other developments regarding vulnerable groups?

1. Following our Ofsted in 2018 we have been looking at recording procedures for behaviour incidents and safeguarding procedures. Therefore purchasing Cpoms which is the most used programme within the area for these needs.
2. New procedures for Child Protection. In 2014 the Department of Education and Health introduced the code of practice. This was revised in 2016 to take into account a more versatile triangulated approach with Health, Social Care and Education- however this was reinforced in August 2018 with publication of 'working together to safeguard children, a guide to interagency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children', 2018 paper. The social care system are now rigorously using the graduated approach system of plan do and review. Meaning more family plans will need to be generated in the coming months to gain access to low level support.
3. Expectation of more transparency and accountability means a more detailed approach to assessing leadership and management, a joint approach with Tim with curriculum needs, and more detailed analysis.
4. Development of the Pink Curriculum, which now has an expectation of 45 minute lesson per week to review social, moral, spiritual and cultural values, economic development, healthy diet and healthy living including drug education, safeguarding such as sex education and appropriate touch, anti-bullying along with personal, social and emotional education. As a school we need to review how to record these sessions.

School evidence

- Ofsted letter
- Working together to safeguard children, a guide to interagency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children', 2018 paper.
- Common inspection guidance
- <https://www.ghll.org.uk/pink-safeguarding-curriculum/core-themes/>

Are there any concerns regarding provision for pupils with Pupil Premium?

This is an opportunity to share any areas that the Pupil premium leads feels may become a concern in the next year unless action is taken; this could include staffing issues, issues relating to specific pupils (without names), support from external agencies, other resourcing issues etc

- Increasing number of children with wellbeing and attachment needs and timetabling/ prioritising support.
- A push on progress and attainment by teachers increasing anxiety in some children.
- Number of children on registers rising meaning time limited on cases.
- Parental engagement in systems and supporting the school.
- Multi agency expectations.
- Cuts in different agencies and folding of charities due to an increased demand.

School evidence

Staffing, cost cutting seen in finance manager's spread sheets, costings, observations, provision mapping,

Disadvantaged pupils

Disadvantaged pupils' progress: Key	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
-------------------------------------	---------	---------	-------------

Stage 2	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018
No. of disadvantaged pupils	10	9	10	9	8	9
Progress score	-2.99	-5.47	-3.61	+0.47	-3.56	-5.09
No. of other pupils	46	46	47	46	46	46
Progress score	+0.33	+0.44	-2.73	-1.08	-1.47	-1.22

Much lower progress in reading and mathematics. The progress figure for disadvantaged pupils in writing exceeds that of other pupils, but the reverse is true for reading and mathematics. The group of nine disadvantaged pupils in 2018 included four pupils with SEND.

Actions:-

- Pupil voice
- Embed thrive assessments
- Set up CPOMs assessment and training.
- Teaching assistant review
- Pink curriculum recording
- Liase with Tim re teaching and learning focus
- Planning scrutiny checking highlighting of vulnerable groups and how we cater for them.
- Review breakdown of groups and venn diagram of overlaps- EAL/SEN/PP.
- EAL audit and staff audit of needs.
- Staff meeting to create generic family plans
- Natalie Packer and review SATs data.
- Pupil progress meeting- sit in on or do my own?
- Anti bullying week planning