

## PUPIL PREMIUM EVALUATION 2019-2020

The pupil premium statement that was published online was developed and created by a previous senior leadership team. Following trust level pupil premium reviews, we have been able to identify areas for development in this document and fully reviewed it to ensure that the 2020 - 2021 document is more measurable and targeted.

Total number of pupils on roll September 2018 (excluding nursery and kindergarten)	212
Total number of pupils eligible for Pupil Grant	£1,345
Total number eligible for Early Years Pupil Premium	£310
Total numbers eligible for Previous Looked After Grant	£2,345
Total number of service children	£0
Total amount of Pupil Premium Grant received	£157,080

### Outcomes for Jervoise School in 2019 compared to the national 2019 data.

(2019 data is published due to the fact that National SATs were not held in 2020, following the COVID crisis.)

% of Pupils	Jervoise all Pupils	Jervoise non-disadvantaged	Jervoise Disadvantaged	in school Gap	National all pupils	National non-disadvantaged	<u>Gap compared with national non-disadvantaged</u>
EYFS – GLD	70%	94%	33%	-61%	71%	74%	-41%
Phonics	80%	87%	73%	-14%	81%	85%	-12%
Key Stage 1							
Reading	80%	86%	75%	-11%	75%	79%	-4%
Writing	77%	79%	75%	-4%	69%	73%	+2%
Maths	83%	86%	81%	-5%	76%	79%	+2%
Key Stage 2							
Reading	55%	55%	55%	0%	73%	78%	-23%
Writing	83%	78%	85%	+7%	78%	83%	+2%
Maths	66%	67%	65%	-2%	79%	84%	-19%
Combined	41%	44%	40%	-4%	65%	70%	-30%
Progress							
Reading	-3.8	-4.8	-3.2	-1.6	0	0.3	-3.5

Writing	+1.0	+0.6	+1.2	+0.6	0	0.3	-1.5
Maths	-2.0	-3.0	-1.5	-1.5	0	0.4	-1.9

Action:	Impact	Cost	Lessons Learnt
<p>Attendance actions as outlined in the pupil premium grant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning mentor to support attendance.</li> <li>• SLT monitoring attendance.</li> </ul>	<p>There has been limited impact on attendance across the year.</p> <p>Attendance remains an issue (below national) within the school and actions need to be taken to improve this.</p> <p>Actions that were put in place were not targeted sufficiently and aspects of SLT role should not be attributed to the use of PPG.</p>	£34,000	<p>Attendance continues to require further attention, particularly for those who are eligible for the PPG.</p> <p>Fast track processes need to be reviewed to ensure that they are robust.</p> <p>Actions currently in place need to be removed and more targeted strategies put in place, for example an attendance officer.</p>
Curriculum planning/ monitoring/ coaching / supporting staff.	<p>There is no evidence from monitoring and evaluation processes to prove that this has had impact on quality first teaching.</p> <p>Challenge advisor visits confirm that improvements to teaching and learning have been limited.</p>	£10,000	<p>Research confirms that raising QFT has the greatest impact on the performance and progress of all pupils. Quantifiable targets need to be set.</p>
<p>Resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention resources</li> <li>• Phonics resources</li> <li>• Reading Resources</li> </ul>	<p>It is not clear what resources were purchased and whether these resources were targeted to where gaps in performance between PPG and their non PPG counterparts were considered.</p>	£15,720	<p>These need to be targeted to improve QFT teaching and barriers to learning e.g. arithmetic skills.</p> <p>A review of the largest gaps in performance needs to be carried out to ensure more targeted expenditure in the future, this should take into account, subjects and year groups to ensure trends are clearly identified.</p>

Speech and Language Therapy	Due to COVID 19 forcing school closures at short notice, intervention cycles were not completed and so evidence is not available to prove that pupils who were eligible for PPG and required SALT intervention made accelerated progress.	£4,000	Needs to be reviewed to ensure that the outcome and progress of this measure is targeted and having an impact that is in-line with expenditure.
Supply cover for PP.	Due to COVID-19, pupil progress meetings and end of year data, were not reviewed. Pupil progress meetings prior to the closure of schools, were held. Concerns over the performance of PPG pupils in specific year groups at this point were addressed at the time – due to closure, evidence of improvements is limited as assessment of pupil’s progress was unable to take place.	£10,000	Pupil progress meetings would take place as good practice, whether PPG was received or not.  PPG should not have been used to fund this element of school systems and processes.
SENDCO release.	Due to COVID-19, IEP targets were not reviewed at the end of the year. Evidence of impact on PPG eligible pupils by the SENDCO is limited. This needs addressing in the follow on statement.	£20,000	This should be funded through the SEND notional budget. Where PPG is being used for those who are identified as SEND and PPG, more targeted use of the funds is required.  Actions put in place did not specifically target pupils who are eligible for PPG and have multiple barriers to learning and making progress.
Lane Clark Training	No evidence of impact is available. Direct impact of this training on classroom teachers and their quality first teaching is limited.	£4,000	No direct impact tracking possible. Cost to impact ratio is likely to be significantly different.  Deployment of this CPD was not targeted and used in a way to ensure sustainable development by leaders. This has resulted in little improvement in quality first teaching.

Specialist KS 2 support.	There is little impact from this and the funding has not been targeted to ensure that improvements in quality first teaching enables the PPG pupils to make greater progress. Data doesn't provide evidence that pupil premium children have made accelerated progress to close the gap in key areas. It may well be that the previous SLT had intended on using this support in the period prior to SATS, but due to closure, this was not possible. Evidence of outside agencies being deployed is not available.	£10,500	Use of SLE's or supporting external staff needs to be targeted to where gaps between PPG eligible pupils and those who are not eligible are largest.  This can provide significant improvement and should be considered when the next PPG statement is formulated.
Pupil Voice.	The money was allocated to the children's safeguarding board which is in place in all Trust schools. There is no evidence available for this action having direct impact on the progress and attainment of PPG eligible pupils	£2,880	Monitoring and evaluation cycle will need to incorporate this and this should be part of the school's daily practice. Deep dive methodology to be deployed to ensure that this happens.
Residential.	Residential was not held due to the COVID-19 outcome.  There is no evidence to show that this action could have improved outcomes for pupils.	£2,000	This funding would need to be taken from the GAG.  Funding would need to be targeted to ensure that it was enabling pupils to gain better outcomes.
Middle Leaders Course	There is no evidence of this funding having impact on middle leadership capacity. There is no evidence that middle leadership development has had an impact on the attainment and progress of PPG pupils.	£3,500	This funding would need to be taken from the GAG.  If tracking monitoring processes, alongside clear expectations of middle leaders were implemented, this action could be considered for improving standards for PPG eligible pupils.

Children's University	This has not been implemented in the school.	£1,000	This funding would need to be taken from the GAG. Impact in raising standards for PPG eligible pupils could not be tracked from this action.
Teaching assistant CPD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speech and language</li> <li>• Phonics delivery</li> </ul>	Due to school closures, during the COVID-19 pandemic, this planned CPD was unable to take place.	£5,500	Strategies for improvements in quality first teaching need to be reviewed. Recommendations from independent research such that of the EEF need to be considered here.
IT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education city</li> <li>• Matheletics</li> <li>• Maths Whizz</li> <li>• Classroom secrets</li> <li>• Letter Join</li> <li>• Widget</li> <li>• Testbase</li> </ul>	There is limited impact on quality first teaching across the school. Observations of teaching and learning do not evidence the effective use of any of these strategies.	£4,300	Not to be used for resources that support teacher's workload.  Difficult to evidence these strategies in a measurable way.  CPD around these to ensure maximum impact on quality first teaching.  If using PPG to provide resources for home or remote learning, evidence of usage and impact needs to be tracked more robustly.
Assessment Training	Due to COVID-19 school closures, a full cycle of pupil progress meetings were unable to take place. We are unable to prove that teachers have used assessment systems to ensure more rapid progress in PPG pupils in closing the gap.	£2,400	Assessment training would need to come through the GAG.
Ed Psych	No evidence of this strategy having led to improved progress and attainment of PPG pupils.	£7,000	This funding should be taken from the notional budget unless those pupils who have multiple barriers and so are eligible for PPG require

			additional support beyond that which is normally allocated to pupils with SEND.
Increase ICT equipment	No evidence of this strategy having led to improved progress and attainment of PPG pupils.	£14,000	Tracking of usage would need to be in-place.  Consider the use of PPG to enable access to technology and the internet for some pupils at home.