

Pupil premium strategy statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2021 to 2022 academic year) funding to help improve the attainment of our disadvantaged pupils.

It outlines our pupil premium strategy, how we intend to spend the funding in this academic year and the effect that last year's spending of pupil premium had within our school.

School overview

Detail	Data
School name	Thrunscoe Primary and Nursery Academy
Number of pupils in school	324
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	44% (143/324)
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended)	2021-2024
Date this statement was published	November 2021
Date on which it will be reviewed	July 2022
Statement authorised by	Mr S Bate
Pupil premium lead	Mr S Bate
Governor / Trustee lead	Mr R Beel

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£172254
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£16675
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	£0
Total budget for this academic year If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year	£188929

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

CONTEXT

Local area

- The school location deprivation indicator was in quintile 3 (average) of all schools.
- The pupil base is in quintile 5 (most deprived) of all schools in terms of deprivation.

	Ever6	FSM	SEN EHCP	SEN Other	EAL
You	41.4%	40.1%	3.1%	14.5%	4.6%
Similar	33.3%	24.9%	1.4%	14.3%	2.7%
LA Av.	27.6%	25.3%	1.1%	12.0%	28.2%
National Av.	23.0%	21.6%	2.1%	12.6%	20.9%

Current Learner Characteristics by Year Group

	Total	Boys	Girls	FSM (ever 6)	FSM	CLA	SEND (EHCP)	SEND Other	EAL
Nursery	23	15	8	7	7	0	0	0	0
Year R	45	22	23	20	20	0	0	1	3
Year 1	36	20	16	17	17	0	2	6	3
Year 2	45	22	23	16	16	0	2	6	2
Year 3	40	25	15	16	16	0	1	8	3
Year 4	44	25	19	21	20	0	2	13	2
Year 5	46	21	25	18	17	0	1	8	2
Year 6	45	23	22	19	17	0	2	5	0
TOTAL	324	173	151	134	130	0	10	47	15

What are our ultimate objectives for your disadvantaged pupils?

To address inequalities between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils by accelerating progress of disadvantaged pupils in R/W/M/GPS/Phonics/GLD so that the attainment gap between TPNA disadvantaged pupils and their in-house and national non-disadvantaged counterparts is closed and that they exceed their national like for like disadvantaged counterparts.

How does our current pupil premium strategy plan work towards achieving those objectives?

In order to achieve our objectives and overcome identified barriers we will implement our PPG strategy - in conjunction with the 'Academy Development Plan' – by:

- Providing all teachers and teaching assistants with high quality CPD to ensure that pupils access effective quality first teaching;
- Ensuring ALL pupils are able to read fluently and with good understanding to enable them to access the breadth of the curriculum;
- Providing targeted academic intervention and support to quickly address identified gaps in learning including the use of small group work and 1:3 national tutoring programme;
- Providing targeted social, emotional and mental health intervention to reduce it's negative impact on their learning;
- Providing funding so that all pupils have access to trips, residential and other first-hand experiences that will impact positively on their learning and self-esteem;

- Providing opportunities to participate in enrichment activities including sport, music and the world of work to support self-esteem and support building aspiration

What are the key principles of our strategy plan?

- Removing barriers to learning for disadvantaged pupils so that they are able attain as well as their non-disadvantaged counterparts.
- Removing economic and social barriers that may unduly influence what they aspire to be
- Identify and track our PPG pupils to ensure support is tailored to bring about good academic progress and attainment.

Challenges

This details the key challenges to achievement that we have identified among our disadvantaged pupils.

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1) <u>SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL HEALTH & WELL-BEING</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High levels of anxiety in pupils not attending physically during COVID lockdown (PPG specifically high) – attachment issues / social emotional issues caused by social distancing and long periods of self-isolation during closures or lockdown which mean pupils struggling with expectation, self-regulation etc • Pupil self-esteem – having access to the correct uniform / trips etc • Readiness to learn, motivation and resilience may have a detrimental impact on disadvantaged pupils' progress due to lower attendance during Covid 19 closures
2) <u>ATTENDANCE</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High levels of PPG not attending the Academy for face-to-face teaching during COVID 19 lockdowns: PPG NON-ATTENDANCE over COVID partial closures 41% / Non-PPG ATTENDANCE over COVID partial closures 16%; • PPG attendance over the year 93% / Non PPG over the year was 96.5%. Persistent absence is still of concern, specifically that of PPG pupils compared to non-PPG pupils: PPG persistent absence over the year 21% / Non PPG persistent absence over year 8%. • PPG pupils not performing in line with Non-PPG counterparts: FFT and NCER datasets (2021), which historically is not the case by the end of the pupils' journey with us (End of KS2 results).
3) <u>GAPS IN READING, WRITING, MATHS, GPS AND PHONICS</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of Covid 19 closures / self-isolations on pupil progress and overall attainment; compounded by lower attendance of disadvantaged pupils during lockdowns and their higher levels of persistent absence compared to Non- PPG pupils during this time
4) <u>WIDER OPPORTUNITIES</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to wider learning opportunities of disadvantaged pupils that supports pupil knowledge, skills and holistic development which ultimately impacts on disadvantaged child's ability to call upon life experiences thus impacting on reading and writing progress and attainment. • Pupil aspiration impacts on motivation, resilience and thus progress and attainment
5) <u>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parental aspirations in relation to the importance of education and attendance; • Parents' ability to support their child's learning effectively

Intended outcomes

This explains the outcomes we are aiming for **by the end of our current strategy plan**, and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

Intended outcome	Success criteria
<p>1) SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL HEALTH & WELL-BEING:</p> <p>Further improve the physical and mental well-being of disadvantaged pupils to further support positive learning behaviours, enjoyment, resilience and engagement thus enabling pupils to progress at an accelerated rate and thus close the gaps in learning created by COVID 19 closures / restrictions lockdowns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance of disadvantaged pupils improves on previous year's and becomes in line with national average for ALL pupils • Persistent absence of disadvantaged pupils compared to non-disadvantaged pupils improves and the gap closes compared to previous year. • Disadvantaged pupils feel safe and happy within the academy – comparable to non-disadvantaged (Pupil Survey 2021-22) • Disadvantaged pupils feel they are supported SEMH within the Academy – comparable to non-disadvantaged (Pupil Survey 2021-22) • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more is closed to academy non- disadvantaged pupils (KAPD – Key Assessment Point Data) • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more is closed to national non- disadvantaged pupils (KAPD) • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining greater depth is closed to national non-disadvantaged pupils (KAPD) • Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more exceeds National disadvantaged pupils @ ARE or more (KAPD) • Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ greater depth exceeds National disadvantaged pupils @ greater depth (KAPD)
<p>2) ATTENDANCE:</p> <p>Improve attendance of disadvantaged pupils in line with national Non-disadvantaged to ensure accelerated progress of PPG pupils can occur</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance of disadvantaged pupils improves on previous year's and becomes in line with national average for ALL pupils • Persistent absence of disadvantaged pupils compared to non-disadvantaged pupils improves and the gap closes compared to previous year. • Disadvantaged pupils enjoy attending the Academy - comparable to non-disadvantaged (Pupil Survey 2021-22) • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more is closed to academy non- disadvantaged pupils (KAPD – Key Assessment Point Data) • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more is closed to national non- disadvantaged pupils (KAPD) • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining greater depth is closed to national non-disadvantaged pupils (KAPD) • Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more exceeds National disadvantaged pupils @ ARE or more (KAPD) • Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ greater depth exceeds National disadvantaged pupils @ greater depth (KAPD)

<p>3) GAPS IN READING, WRITING, MATHS, GPS AND PHONICS:</p> <p>Accelerate progress of PPG pupils in R/W/M/GPS/Phonics so that the attainment gap between TPNA PPG pupils and their in-house and national non-PPG counterparts is closed and that they exceed their national like for like PPG counterparts;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more is closed to academy non- disadvantaged pupils (KAPD) • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more is closed to national non- disadvantaged pupils (KAPD) • Gap for Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining greater depth is closed to national non-disadvantaged pupils (KAPD) • Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ ARE or more exceeds National disadvantaged pupils @ ARE or more (KAPD) • Academy disadvantaged pupils attaining @ greater depth exceeds National disadvantaged pupils @ greater depth (KAPD)
<p>4) WIDER OPPORTUNITIES:</p> <p>To further extend enrichment and wider learning opportunities for PPG pupils to support desire for greater attendance, widen experiences and support accelerated progress and improving attainment in R/W/M/GPS/PHONICS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance of disadvantaged pupils improves on previous year's and becomes in line with national average for ALL pupils • Persistent absence of disadvantaged pupils compared to non-disadvantaged pupils improves and the gap closes compared to previous year. • Disadvantaged pupils enjoy attending the Academy - comparable to non-disadvantaged (Pupil Survey 2021-22) • Disadvantaged pupils are happy that the Academy provide adequate clubs / visits / visitors / residential opportunities (Pupil Survey 2021-22) • Parents of disadvantaged pupils are happy that the Academy provide a variety of clubs / visits / residential opportunities that their children can attend (Parent Survey 2021-22) • See success criteria for point 3 also.
<p>5) PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT:</p> <p>To further extend parental engagement opportunities for disadvantaged pupils to support accelerated progress and improving attainment in R/W/M/GPS/PHONICS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent numbers of disadvantaged pupils that attend workshops for phonics, maths and reading are comparable to non-disadvantaged parent uptake; • Numbers of parents supporting disadvantaged Y6 pupils with the revision programme is equitable with parents of non-disadvantaged pupils. • Parents of disadvantaged pupils are happy that the Academy provide them with support to help their child with their learning (Parent Survey 2021-22) • See success criteria for point 3 also.

Activity in this academic year

This details how we intend to spend our pupil premium (and recovery premium funding) **this academic year** to address the challenges listed above.

Teaching (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £85348

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>CPD – National College Metacognition / Self regulation /</p> <p>(£2239)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach? The average impact of metacognition and self-regulation strategies is an additional seven months’ progress over the course of a year. Metacognition and self-regulation strategies can be effective when taught in collaborative groups so that learners can support each other and make their thinking explicit through discussion.</p>	1,3
<p>EP support staff CPD Emotion coaching and restorative approaches</p> <p>(SEND service level agreement)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach? The average impact of successful SEL interventions is an additional four months’ progress over the course of a year. The security of this evidence is, however, very low, so schools should carefully monitor the efficacy of approaches in their own settings. Alongside academic outcomes, SEL interventions have an identifiable and valuable impact on attitudes to learning and social relationships in school. Although SEL interventions are almost always perceived to improve emotional or attitudinal outcomes, not all interventions are equally effective at raising attainment. Improvements appear more likely when SEL approaches are embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional development and training for staff. In addition, the implementation of the programme and the degree to which teachers are committed to the approach appear to be important.</p>	1,3
<p>Employ additional staff to reducing class sizes and increasing adult support for pupils in phonics, reading and writing – EYFS / Y2 / Y3 – to support catch up</p> <p>(£80549)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach? The average impact for reducing class size is around 1 month additional progress over the course of an academic year. This comes with the increased flexibility of organising learners, quantity and quality of feedback focused lower down the Academy where research shows it is at its highest impact Change in teaching approach does accompany a class size reduction then benefits on attainment can be identified, in addition to improvements on behaviour and attitudes.</p>	1,3

<p>Monster Phonics CPD inc Parent workshops</p> <p><i>(Internally led)</i></p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of the adoption of phonics approaches is about an additional five months' progress over the course of a year. Phonics approaches have been consistently found to be effective in supporting younger pupils to master the basics of reading, with an average impact of an additional five months' progress. Research suggests that phonics is particularly beneficial for younger learners (4–7 year olds) as they begin to read. Teaching phonics is more effective on average than other approaches to early reading (such as whole language or alphabetic approaches), though it should be emphasised that effective phonics techniques are usually embedded in a rich literacy environment for early readers and are only one part of a successful literacy strategy.</p>	<p>3,5</p>
<p>Reading Comprehension strategies – whole academy approach development and CPD</p> <p><i>(£2560)</i></p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of reading comprehension strategies is an additional six months' progress over the course of a year. Successful reading comprehension approaches allow activities to be carefully tailored to pupils' reading capabilities, and involve activities and texts that provide an effective, but not overwhelming, challenge. Many of the approaches can be usefully combined with Collaborative learning techniques and Phonics activities to develop reading skills. The use of techniques such as graphic organisers and drawing pupils' attention to text features are likely to be particularly useful when reading expository or information texts.</p>	<p>3</p>

Targeted academic support (for example, tutoring, one-to-one support structured interventions)

Budgeted cost: £20928

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>1:3 online tutoring in reading and maths NTP - FLEET.</p> <p>(£8222)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of the small group tuition is four additional months' progress, on average, over the course of a year.</p> <p>Evidence shows that small group tuition is effective and, as a rule of thumb, the smaller the group the better. Some studies suggest that greater feedback from the teacher, more sustained the engagement in smaller groups, or work which is more closely matched to learners' needs explains this impact. Once group size increases above six or seven there is a noticeable reduction in effectiveness.</p> <p>Although the rule "the smaller the better" there is some variability in impact within the existing evidence. For example, in reading, small group teaching can sometimes be more effective than either one to one or paired tuition. It may be that in these cases reading practice can be efficiently organised so that all the pupils stay fully engaged as each take their turn, such as in Guided Reading.</p> <p>The variability in findings suggests two things. First, the quality of the teaching in small groups may be as, or more important than, the precise group size (there is evidence of the benefits of staff professional development on pupil outcomes). Second, it is important to evaluate the effectiveness of different arrangements, as the specific subject matter being taught and composition of the groups may influence outcomes.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty and the lower cost, small group tuition may be a sensible approach to trial before considering to one to one tuition.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>Small group interventions – RWMP – TAs / DH Y5/6 / Nuffield EYFS</p> <p>(£9974)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of the deployment of teaching assistants is about an additional four months’ progress over the course of a year. However, effects tend to vary widely between those studies where teaching assistants are deployed in everyday classroom environments, which typically do not show a positive benefit, and those where teaching assistants deliver targeted interventions to individual pupils or small groups, which on average show moderate positive benefits. The headline figure of four additional months’ progress lies between these figures.</p> <p>Research which focuses on teaching assistants who provide one to one or small group targeted interventions shows a stronger positive benefit of between four and six additional months on average. Often interventions are based on a clearly specified approach which teaching assistants have been trained to deliver.</p> <p>There is also evidence that working with teaching assistants can lead to improvements in pupils’ attitudes, and also to positive effects in terms of teacher morale, workload and reduced stress.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>SALT / SEMH 1:1 & small group interventions</p> <p>(£2732)</p>	<p>The average impact of Oral language interventions is approximately an additional six months’ progress over the course of a year. Some studies also often report improved classroom climate and fewer behavioural issues following work on oral language.</p> <p>Approaches that focus on speaking, listening and a combination of the two all show positive impacts on attainment.</p> <p>Most of the studies focus on reading outcomes. The small amount of studies that do study maths and science show small positive effects. Language approaches in these subjects may be used to explicitly practice subject specific vocabulary.</p> <p>The studies in the Toolkit indicate that language interventions with frequent sessions over a sustained period may have a larger impact, overall. Approaches that are delivered one-to-one also have larger impacts.</p> <p>The average impact of successful SEL interventions is an additional four months’ progress over the course of a year. The security of this evidence is, however, very low, so schools should carefully monitor the efficacy of approaches in their own settings. Alongside academic outcomes, SEL interventions have an identifiable and valuable impact on attitudes to learning and social relationships in school.</p>	<p>1</p>

	<p>Although SEL interventions are almost always perceived to improve emotional or attitudinal outcomes, not all interventions are equally effective at raising attainment. Improvements appear more likely when SEL approaches are embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional development and training for staff. In addition, the implementation of the programme and the degree to which teachers are committed to the approach appear to be important</p>	
<p><i>Boosters – extending school day for Y6 (Reading and Maths)</i></p>	<p>How effective is the approach? The average impact of approaches involving extending school time is about an additional three months’ progress over the course of a year. The average impact is influenced by the targeted use of before and after school programmes, which have higher impacts on average.</p>	<p>2, 3</p>

Wider strategies (for example, related to attendance, behaviour, wellbeing)

Budgeted cost: £82653

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>Fortis Therapy and Compass Go counselling</p> <p>(£12210)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of successful SEL interventions is an additional four months' progress over the course of a year. The security of this evidence is, however, very low, so schools should carefully monitor the efficacy of approaches in their own settings. Alongside academic outcomes, SEL interventions have an identifiable and valuable impact on attitudes to learning and social relationships in school. Although SEL interventions are almost always perceived to improve emotional or attitudinal outcomes, not all interventions are equally effective at raising attainment. Improvements appear more likely when SEL approaches are embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional development and training for staff. In addition, the implementation of the programme and the degree to which teachers are committed to the approach appear to be important.</p>	<p>1,2,3,5</p>
<p>Well-being mentor support</p> <p>(£33522)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of successful SEL interventions is an additional four months' progress over the course of a year. The security of this evidence is, however, very low, so schools should carefully monitor the efficacy of approaches in their own settings. Alongside academic outcomes, SEL interventions have an identifiable and valuable impact on attitudes to learning and social relationships in school. Although SEL interventions are almost always perceived to improve emotional or attitudinal outcomes, not all interventions are equally effective at raising attainment. Improvements appear more likely when SEL approaches are embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional development and training for staff. In addition, the implementation of the programme and the degree to which teachers are committed to the approach appear to be important.</p>	<p>1,2,3,5</p>
<p>Behaviour strategy – house teams / rewards / restorative approach / emotion coaching / house</p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of behaviour interventions is four additional months' progress over the course of a year. Evidence suggests that, on average, behaviour interventions can produce moderate</p>	<p>1,2,3,4,5</p>

<p>points / in house competition</p> <p>(£1000)</p>	<p>improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviours. However, estimated benefits vary widely across programmes.</p> <p>Approaches such as improving teachers' behaviour management and pupils' cognitive and social skills are both effective, on average.</p>	
<p>Attendance strategy – EWO service level agreement / attendance officer / incentivisation for parents along with pupils SAP / LAP / attendance reviews / newsletters / phone calls at day 1 etc</p> <p>(£11547.20)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>Higher overall absence leads to lower attainment at KS2 and KS4 The Department for Education (DfE) published research in 2016 which found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The higher the overall absence rate across Key Stage (KS) 2 and KS4, the lower the likely level of attainment at the end of KS2 and KS4 • Pupils with no absence are 1.3 times more likely to achieve level 4 or above, and 3.1 times more likely to achieve level 5 or above, than pupils that missed 10-15% of all sessions • Pupils with no absence are 2.2 times more likely to achieve 5+ GCSEs A*- C or equivalent including English and mathematics than pupils that missed 15-20% of KS4 lessons <p>See pages 12 and 15 to 16.</p> <p>There's a clear link between poor attendance and lower academic achievement</p> <p>DfE research (2012) on improving attendance at school found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of pupils with absence over 50%, only 3% manage to achieve 5 or more GCSEs at grades A*-C including maths and English • 73% of pupils who have over 95% attendance achieve 5 or more GCSEs at grades A*-C <p>Pupils with persistent absence are less likely to stay in education</p> <p>Advice from the National Strategies (hosted on the National Archives) says that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The links between attendance and achievement are strong 	<p>1,2,3,4,5</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pupils with persistent absence are less likely to attain at school and stay in education after the age of 16 years 	
<p>SEMH lessons - Jigsaw – weekly teaching in every class by HLTAs / assemblies</p> <p>(£9010)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of successful SEL interventions is an additional four months' progress over the course of a year. The security of this evidence is, however, very low, so schools should carefully monitor the efficacy of approaches in their own settings. Alongside academic outcomes, SEL interventions have an identifiable and valuable impact on attitudes to learning and social relationships in school. Although SEL interventions are almost always perceived to improve emotional or attitudinal outcomes, not all interventions are equally effective at raising attainment. Improvements appear more likely when SEL approaches are embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional development and training for staff. In addition, the implementation of the programme and the degree to which teachers are committed to the approach appear to be important.</p>	1
<p>Pastoral tracker (CPOMS)</p> <p>(£1128)</p>	Plays a vital role in allowing us to monitor and address barriers which arise on a daily basis	1,2
<p>O Track academic tracking</p> <p>(£1100)</p>	Plays a vital role in allowing us to monitor pupil progress, identify early intervention requirements and track PPG against non-PPG.	1,3
<p>Sweatshirts</p> <p>(£1080)</p>	To build self-esteem, improve attendance and ensure no child is disadvantaged due to financial constraints – see research regarding attendance	1
<p>Wider opportunities – residential subsidies / music tuition / club subsidies / enterprise / working with business</p> <p>(£11180.80)</p>	To build self-esteem, improve attendance and ensure no child is disadvantaged due to financial constraints – see research regarding attendance	1,2,4
<p>Parental engagement opportunities – revision support programme in Y6 / workshops reading / phonics / maths throughout the academy</p> <p>(£875)</p>	<p>How effective is the approach?</p> <p>The average impact of the Parental engagement approaches is about an additional four months' progress over the course of a year. There are also higher impacts for pupils with low prior attainment.</p> <p>The evidence about how to improve attainment by increasing parental engagement is mixed and much less conclusive. There are examples where combining parental engagement strategies with other interventions, such as extended early years</p>	1,2,3,5

	<p>provision, has not been associated with any additional educational benefit. This suggests that developing effective parental engagement to improve their children's attainment is challenging and needs careful monitoring and evaluation. There is some evidence that supporting parents with their first child will have benefits for siblings. Parents' aspirations also appear to be important for pupil outcomes, although there is limited evidence to show that intervening to change parents' aspirations will raise their children's aspirations and achievement over the longer term.</p> <p>The EEF has tested a number of interventions designed to improve pupils' outcomes by engaging parents in different types of skills development. The consistent message from these has been that it is difficult to engage parents in programmes. By contrast, a trial which aimed to prompt greater parental engagement through text message alerts delivered a small positive impact, and at very low cost</p>	
--	---	--

Total budgeted cost: £ 188929

Part B: Review of outcomes in the previous academic year

Pupil premium strategy outcomes

This details the impact that our pupil premium activity had on pupils in the 2020 to 2021 academic year.

Internal data, using NFER testing, demonstrates that PPG pupil progress rates is at least in line with non-PPG pupils and in several areas exceeded rates of progress.

Summer End Outcomes 2021 compared to Autumn End outcomes 2020 – KEY ASSESSMENT POINTS

Y6 End of KS2 ALL PUPILS:

On track to achieve expected or more							
YEAR		On track Autumn End	Target	Forecast	Summer End Actuals v Entry		National 2019
Y6	RWM	5%	65%	60%	60%	+55%	65%
	R	38%	75%	74%	71%	+33%	73%
	W	12%	75%	74%	71%	+59%	78%
	M	38%	75%	70%	69%	+31%	79%
	GPS	45%	75%	74%	69%	+24%	78%

Y6 End of KS2 PPG V NON-PPG:

On track to achieve expected or more							
YEAR		On track Autumn End PPG	On track Autumn End NON-PPG	On track actuals Summer End PPG	On track actuals Summer End NON-PPG	PPG Progress?	GAP closed to non-PPG ?
Y6	RWM	0%	10%	55%	65%	+55%	=
	R	30%	45%	64%	80%	+34%	+1%
	W	5%	20%	64%	80%	+59%	+1%
	M	32%	45%	59%	75%	+27%	+3%
	GPS	36%	55%	59%	80%	+23%	+2%

Y2 End of KS1 ALL PUPILS:

On track to achieve expected or more							
YEAR		On track Autumn End	Target	Forecast	Summer End Actuals		National 2019
Y2	RWM	18%	75%	70%	37%	+19%	
	R	24%	75%	76%	58%	+34%	75%
	W	32%	75%	71%	39%	+7%	69%
	M	34%	75%	80%	66%	+32%	76%

Y2 End of KS2 PPG Vs NON-PPG:

On track to achieve expected or more							
YEAR		On track Autumn End PPG	On track Autumn End NON-PPG	On track actuals Summer End PPG	On track actuals Summer End NON-PPG	PPG Progress?	GAP closed to Non-PPG ?
Y2	RWM	7%	25%	29%	42%	+22%	-5%
	R	14%	29%	57%	58%	+33%	-14%
	W	21%	38%	36%	42%	+15%	-11%
	M	14%	46%	57%	71%	+43%	-18%

PHONICS SCREENER: Y2 AUTUMN 2 2020 / PLUS 10 PUPILS RETAKE SUMMER 2021

All pupils: 32/38 - 84% achieved the pass standard (Y1 National 2019: 82%) by the end of the academic year. 74% achieved this in Autumn 2, 2020

PPG: 79% achieved the pass standard compared to 87% Non-PPG (8% GAP)

Y1 Phonics Screener:

On track to achieve expected in Y1 Phonics screener (National 2019 - 82%)				
YEAR	On track Autumn End	Forecast	Summer End Actuals	Change
Y1	0%	50%	78%	+78%

PPG: 65% achieved the pass standard compared to 85% Non-PPG (20% GAP)

EYFS:

2020/21 EYFS Targets & Forecasts				
% of Learners expected to achieve a Good Level of Development by 2020 (NATIONAL 72% 2019).				
	Entry Baseline on track GLD	Forecast based on Autumn End	Summer End Actuals	Change
All	32%	61%	54%	+22%

TPNA PPG pupils also attain in line or higher than their national PPG counterparts when using 2020-2021 national datasets from NCER (NFER) and FFT at Key Assessment points.

TABLE SECTION 2: COMPARISONS TO FFT NATIONAL DATASET SUMMER 2021 – KEY ASSESSMENT POINTS

END OF KS2	FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA		
	% RWM COMBINED ARE OR MORE			% READING ARE OR MORE			% WRITING ARE OR MORE			% MATHS ARE OR MORE			% GPS ARE OR MORE		
	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference
ALL	64	57	↓ -7	77	69	↓ -8	71	71	→ 0	74	67	↓ -7	61	69	↑ 8
PPG	47	60	↑ 13	64	67	↑ 3	55	67	↑ 12	58	67	↑ 9	51	67	↑ 16
SEND	24	29	↑ 5	43	43	→ 0	31	43	↑ 12	39	43	↑ 4	43	43	→ 0

END OF KS1	FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			FFT NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA		
	% RWM COMBINED ARE OR MORE			% READING ARE OR MORE			% WRITING ARE OR MORE			% MATHS ARE OR MORE		
	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference
ALL	54	39	↓ -15	67	58	↓ -9	59	42	↓ -17	68	66	→ -2
PPG	37	36	→ -1	51	57	↑ 6	42	43	→ 1	52	57	↑ 5
SEND	16	0	↓ -16	30	28	→ -2	20	0	↓ -20	31	14	↓ -17

YEAR 1	NCER NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			YEAR 2	[REDACTED]
	% PHONICS ARE OR MORE				% PHONICS ARE OR MORE
	NCER	TPNA	Difference		TPNA
ALL	69	80	↑ 11	ALL	84
PPG	52	61.5	↑ 9.5	PPG	78.6
SEND	34	80	↑ 46	SEND	25

EYFS	NCER NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			NCER NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			NCER NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			NCER NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA			NCER NATIONAL 2021 COMPARED TO TPNA		
	% GLD ARE OR MORE			AVERAGE APS ARE OR MORE			% PRIME GOALS ARE OR MORE			% SPECIFIC GOALS ARE OR MORE			% ALL GOALS ARE OR MORE		
	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference	FFT	TPNA	Difference
ALL	58	54	↓ -4	32.2	30.8	→ -1.4	69.2	65.7	↓ -3.5	57.7	54.3	↓ -3.4	55.9	54.3	→ -1.6
PPG	40	43	↑ 3	29.1	30.2	→ 1.1	56	64.3	↑ 8.3	39.8	42.9	↑ 3.1	38.7	42.9	↑ 4.2
SEND	16	33.3	↑ 17.3	23.9	26	→ 2.1	20.6	33.3	↑ 12.7	18.9	33.3	↑ 14.4	15.5	33.3	↑ 17.8

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you purchased in the previous academic year. This will help the Department for Education identify which ones are popular in England

Programme	Provider
NESSY	https://www.nessy.com/en-gb
TT ROCKSTARS	https://trockstars.com
NINJA VOCABULARY	https://vocabularyninja.co.uk
JIGSAW	https://www.jigsawpshe.com
SPAG.COM	https://www.spag.com

Further information (optional)

Our historical progress figures show the impact that our strategies have on accelerating progress for our disadvantaged pupils; TPNA disadvantaged pupils exceeded progress scores for national non-disadvantaged (**red arrows**) and national disadvantaged (**green arrows**) in all areas in 2019.

	Reading Explore data in detail	Writing Explore data in detail	Maths Explore data in detail
Progress score for disadvantaged pupils	1.48	2.02	2.77
Confidence interval	-1.5 to 4.4	-0.7 to 4.7	0.2 to 5.3
Number of disadvantaged pupils	17	17	17
Disadvantaged pupils with adjusted scores	0	0	0
National average for non-disadvantaged pupils	0.32	0.27	0.37
Switch comparator			

	Reading Explore data in detail	Writing Explore data in detail	Maths Explore data in detail
Progress score for disadvantaged pupils	1.48	2.02	2.77
Confidence interval	-1.5 to 4.4	-0.7 to 4.7	0.2 to 5.3
Number of disadvantaged pupils	17	17	17
Disadvantaged pupils with adjusted scores	0	0	0
National average for disadvantaged pupils	Like-for-like	Like-for-like	Like-for-like
Switch comparator	-0.62	-0.50	-0.71

This subsequently, this results in TPNA disadvantaged pupils by the end of their journey with us (Y6) achieving age related outcomes broadly in line with national non-disadvantaged pupils in Reading and writing and more than in Maths (red arrows). The gap has closed. In addition, when considering the impact of progress rates of TPNA disadvantaged pupils further we see that the resulting attainment of our pupils is far greater than their national disadvantaged counterparts in all areas by the end of their journey with us (green arrows).

Reading progress and attainment by pupil group

This is revised data for 2018/19.

Key stage 2 reading by pupil group													
Breakdown	Reading progress						Reading attainment						
	Cohort	Adjusted score		Unadjusted score		Cohort	Achieving the expected standard		Achieving a higher standard		Average score		
		School	National	School	National		School %	National %	School %	National %	School	National	
All pupils	40	1.01	0.03	1.01	0.00	41	80	73	27	27	105.1	104.4	
Male	19	1.05	-0.54	1.05	-0.58	19	79	69	21	22	104.7	103.3	
Female	21	0.97	0.62	0.97	0.61	22	82	78	32	32	105.5	105.5	
			Like-for-like		Like-for-like			Like-for-like		Like-for-like		Like-for-like	
Disadvantaged	17	1.48	-0.62	1.48	-0.66	17	76	62	18	17	103.8	101.9	
Ever 6 FSM	17	1.48	-0.61	1.48	-0.65	17	76	62	18	17	103.8	101.9	
Children looked after	0	N/A	-0.28	N/A	-0.37	0	N/A	50	N/A	12	N/A	100.3	
Other	23	0.66	0.32	0.66	0.30	24	83	78	33	31	106.0	105.5	

Writing progress and attainment by pupil group

This is revised data for 2018/19.

Key stage 2 writing by pupil group										
Breakdown	Writing progress					Writing attainment				
	Cohort	Adjusted score		Unadjusted score		Cohort	Achieved the expected standard		Achieved a greater depth	
		School	National	School	National		School %	National %	School %	National %
All pupils	40	2.04	0.03	2.04	0.00	41	90	78	24	20
Male	19	1.43	-0.73	1.43	-0.78	19	89	72	16	15
Female	21	2.59	0.82	2.59	0.81	22	91	85	32	25
			Like-for-like		Like-for-like			Like-for-like		Like-for-like
Disadvantaged	17	2.02	-0.50	2.02	-0.54	17	82	68	18	11
Ever 6 FSM	17	2.02	-0.47	2.02	-0.52	17	82	68	18	11
Children looked after	0	N/A	-0.87	N/A	-0.96	0	N/A	51	N/A	8
Other	23	2.05	0.27	2.05	0.25	24	96	83	29	24

Maths progress and attainment by pupil group

This is revised data for 2018/19.

Key stage 2 maths by pupil group												
Breakdown	Maths progress					Maths attainment						
	Cohort	Adjusted score		Unadjusted score		Cohort	Achieving the expected standard		Achieving a higher standard		Average score	
		School	National	School	National		School %	National %	School %	National %	School	National
All pupils	40	1.94	0.03	1.94	0.00	41	95	79	24	27	106.7	105.0
Male	19	2.23	0.73	2.23	0.70	19	95	78	26	29	106.5	105.3
Female	21	1.68	-0.69	1.68	-0.72	22	95	79	23	24	106.9	104.7
			Like-for-like		Like-for-like			Like-for-like		Like-for-like		Like-for-like
Disadvantaged	17	2.77	-0.71	2.77	-0.77	17	94	67	24	18	105.7	102.5
Ever 6 FSM	17	2.77	-0.68	2.77	-0.73	17	94	68	24	18	105.7	102.6
Children looked after	0	N/A	-0.98	N/A	-1.08	0	N/A	52	N/A	9	N/A	100.4
Other	23	1.32	0.37	1.32	0.35	24	96	84	25	32	107.4	106.1