# Pupil premium strategy statement – Tattenhall Park Primary School

This statement details our school’s use of pupil premium (and recovery premium) 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 outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

## School overview

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Detail | Data |
| Number of pupils in school  | 202 |
| Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils |  |
| Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers **(3 year plans are recommended)** | 2022/2023, 2023/24 and 2024/25 |
| Date this statement was published | 17.7.23 |
| Date on which it will be reviewed | 1.6.24 (data 10/7) |
| Statement authorised by | Mair Fairweather |
| Pupil premium lead | Michelle Mason |
| Governor / Trustee lead |  |

## Funding overview

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detail** | **Amount** |
| Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year | £43110 |
| Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year | £3085 |
| Pupil premium (and recovery premium\*) funding carried forward from previous years *(enter £0 if not applicable)**\*Recovery premium received in academic year 2021 to 2022 can be carried forward to academic year 2022 to 2023. Recovery premium received in academic year 2022 to 2023 cannot be carried forward to 2023 to 2024.*  | £0 |
| Catch-up tutoring funding | £4536 |
| **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* | £ 50731 |

# Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

## Statement of intent

|  |
| --- |
| * At Tattenhall Park Primary, we have high aspirations and ambitions for our children and we believe that all learners should be able to reach their full potential.
* We strongly believe that reaching your potential is not about where you come from, but instead, about developing the necessary skills and values required to succeed.
* Our pupils in receipt of the Pupil Premium Funding may face specific barriers to reaching their full potential, and, at Tattenhall Park, we are determined to provide the support and guidance they need to help them overcome these barriers.
* In addition to this, we aim to provide them with access to a variety of exciting opportunities and a rich and varied curriculum.
 |

## Challenges

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Challenge number | Detail of challenge  |
| 1 | Increasing attainment gap across Reading, Writing and Maths while ensuring that the broad curriculum is also fully inclusive for all children. |
| 2 | Impact of school closure due to Covid-19 on pupil wellbeing and emotional support for all pupils, including those eligible for PP. |
| 3 | Recovery of Reading for Pupil premium children (after COVID). This includes speech and language difficulties and a lack of exposure to a wide range of vocabulary. |
| 4 | Pupils and their families have social & emotional difficulties, including medical and mental health issues. |
| 5 | A high proportion of persistent absentees are disadvantaged |
| 6 | Many of our PP children do not possess the phonological knowledge and understanding in line with their peers nationally and in school (particularly year 5 - 22/23 year 4 cohort) |

## 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 |
| Increase of KS1 and 2 attainments in reading, writing and maths– including catch-up provision. Closing gaps agenda for PP pupils. | Support groups planned, resourced and evaluated effectively to ensure that they have the maximum possible impact. Achieve national average progress scores in KS1 and KS2 |
| Increased well-being and emotional support for all pupils, including those eligible for PP | Support groups continued for PP children with trained TAs when required. Focus on mindfulness across school and raised awareness of everyone’s mental health |
| Disadvantaged pupils maintain at least the standard of attainment they achieved at the end of the previous year (Reading, Writing and Maths) and previous key stage; those who have ‘fallen behind’ make accelerated progress and ‘catch up’ or exceed prior attainment standards. To ensure fallen behind children receive targeted high-quality intervention monitored by intervention leader. | End of summer 2022 and 2023 data will show that 95 – 100% of disadvantaged children have made expected progress from the previous summer. End of summer data will also show that 10 – 20% of disadvantaged children will have made accelerated progress. Analysis of interventions will show that interventions have had a positive impact on the disadvantaged children’s learning and has helped in accelerating their progress. |

## 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: **£9721.32**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Purchase of a DfE validated Systematic Synthetic Phonics programme to secure stronger phonics teaching for all pupils.**£3196.62** | Phonics approaches have a strong evidence base that indicates a positive impact on the accuracy of word reading (though not necessarily comprehension), particularly for disadvantaged pupils:[Phonics | Toolkit Strand | Education Endowment Foundation | EEF](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics) | 1, 3 |
| Teaching Assistant to deliver interventions, nurture and work with pupil premium children in Year 6.2 x 30 min x 5days**£50 per week x 39****£1950**2 x 30 min x 5days**£58.50 per week x 39****£2281.50**KS2 Phonics14 x 10 mins x 2days**£58.80 per week x 39****£2293.20** | [EEF](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/reducing-class-size)*“As the size of a class or teaching group gets smaller it is suggested that the range of approaches a teacher can employ and the amount of attention each student will receive will increase, improving outcomes for pupils.”* We have analysed the needs of our PP cohort and have identified a number of children who would benefit from smaller group teaching and interventions this will allow us to increase the amount of attention each child will receive Allocations of TAs to ensure that each class has at least morning support in maths and English for lower attainment children in KS2. Extra TA support with KS2 children in phonics has been facilitated. *Smaller working groups working on sounds more accurately with those children.* | 1, 3, 6 |

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

Budgeted cost: **£21784.76**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| NELI6 children6 x 30mins x 2days**£72 per week x 20****£1440**Group1 x 30mins x 3days**£54 per week x 20****£1080**Year 1 catch-up1 x 30mins x 3days**£54 per week x 5****£270** | [EEF](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/projects/nuffield-early-language-intervention1#nav-evaluation-conclusions)The Nuffield Early Language Intervention (NELI) programme is designed to improve the language skills of reception pupils (aged 4 – 5) and involves scripted individual and small-group language teaching sessions delivered by trained teaching assistants (TAs).NELI is published by Oxford University Press and was delivered in this trial by the University of Oxford in partnership with Elklan. The 20-week intervention consists of two 15-minute individual sessions and three 30-minute small group sessions each week, which focus on developing children’s narrative, vocabulary and listening skills, in addition to their phonological awareness and letter sound knowledge. *The children selected to participate in this were the six children in the classroom who obtained the lowest scores on a school-administered app-based assessment of oral language skills (LanguageScreen).* TAs have received two days of initial training, followed by ongoing support, while teachers also attend an initial half-day of training so that they can understand the programme and support TAs. | 3, 6 |
| WELLCOMM3 children3 x 20min x 3days**£36 per week x 39****£1404** | [WELLCOMM](https://www.gl-assessment.co.uk/case-studies/identifying-speech-language-and-communication-needs-with-wellcomm-primary/)According to the latest data released by the DfE (24 June 2021), speech, language and communication needs (SLCN) are the most common type of primary special educational need (SEN) in state schools. Almost 295,000 children were listed as having SLCN as a primary SEN in early 2021. Our service works closely with our partners in NHS Speech and Language Therapy Services, and we know that they are inundated with referrals for assessment and advice.[EEF](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Early_Years_Toolbox_Report_%28final%29.pdf)Early Years Toolbox Report | 3, 6 |
| IDL**£698**Monitoring**£24 per week x 3****£72** | Literacy – 26Maths – 28 IDL Case Study<https://www.idlsgroup.com/case-studies/accelerating-literacy>IDL Literacy effectively improves reading and spelling amongst pupils with various literacy problems, removes visual stress by the use of colour, and is very effective overall – particularly with those who have poor phonological skills. The effectiveness is due to the integration of reading and writing, the integration of visual and auditory cues to teach letter/sound and blend/sound correspondence, a continuum of exercises that start with recognising the alphabet, and the requirement to re-read typed sentences. | 1, 3, 6 |
| SALT1 x 30min x 5days**£30 per week x 30****£900**1 x 15min x 5 days**£15 per week x 30****£450** | [EEF](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/early-years-toolkit/communication-and-language-approaches#nav-how-effective-is-the-approach)Communication and language EEF | 1, 3, 6 |
| NTPSmall group tuition Teacher led**£7182**Funding from DfE£4536 (65%)School contribution£2646 (35%) | [EEF](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/small-group-tuition)Small group tuition is defined as one teacher, trained teaching assistant or tutor working with two to five pupils together in a group. This arrangement enables the teaching to focus exclusively on a small number of learners, usually in a separate classroom or working area. Intensive tuition in small groups is often provided to support lower attaining learners or those who are falling behind, but it can also be used as a more general strategy to ensure effective progress, or to teach challenging topics or skills.**Key Findings**1. Small group tuition has an average impact of four months’ additional progress over the course of a year.2. Small group tuition is most likely to be effective if it is targeted at pupils’ specific needs. Diagnostic assessment can be used to assess the best way to target support.3. One to one tuition and small group tuition are both effective interventions. However, the cost effectiveness of teaching in small groups indicates that greater use of this approach may be worthwhile.4. Providing training to the staff that deliver small group support is likely to increase impact.5. Additional small group support can be effectively targeted at pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds, and should be considered as part of a school’s pupil premium strategy. | 1, 3, 6 |
| Phonics tutoring3:1 (5 groups) x 2 per week x 38 weeks**£2234.4**6:1 (5 groups) x1 per week x 30 weeks**£1575.36**Supply to cover**£4500** | [EEF – Phonics](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics)The majority of studies have been conducted in primary schools, though there are a number of successful studies with secondary age pupils with a similar overall impact (+5 months)Most studies of phonics are of intensive support in small groups and one to one with the aim to supporting pupils to catch up with their peers. The effects of one to one tends to be a little higher (+5 months) compared with small group interventions (+4 months), but this needs to be offset by the number of pupils who can receive support.Approaches using digital technology tend to be less successful than those led by a teacher or teaching assistant. Studies of intensive support involving teaching assistants show slightly lower overall impact (+4 months) compared to those involving teachers. This indicates the importance of training and support in phonics for interventions led by teaching assistants.Studies in England have shown that pupils eligible for free school meals typically receive similar or slightly greater benefit from phonics interventions and approaches. This is likely to be due to the explicit nature of the instruction and the intensive support provided.It is possible that some disadvantaged pupils may not develop phonological awareness at the same rate as other pupils, having been exposed to fewer words spoken and books read in the home. Targeted phonics interventions may therefore improve decoding skills more quickly for pupils who have experienced these barriers to learning. | 1, 3, 6 |

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

Budgeted cost: **£7871**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Evidence that supports this approach | Challenge number(s) addressed |
| Sunshine circlesKS1 30mins 1 x 30min x 20**£126**LKS2 30mins1 x 30min x 20**£120** | Therapy Play Website<https://theraplay.org/training/training-programs/sunshine-circles/>Sunshine Circles are adult-directed, structured play therapy-based groups that incorporates playful, cooperative, and nurturing activities that enhance the emotional well-being of children. Unlike other play therapy-based group approaches, Theraplay learning takes place on a non-verbal level. Instead of talking about positive social behaviour, the group leaders and children DO positive social interaction. Gradually, positive messages from the groups become a part of the child’s internal sense of himself.It consists of a series of simple tasks designed to elicit behaviours in four primary dimensions in order to evaluate the caregivers’ capacity to:* Set limits and provide an appropriately ordered environment (Structure);
* Engage the child in interaction while being attuned to the child’s state (Engagement);
* Meet the child’s needs for attention, soothing and care (Nurture); and
* Support and encourage the child’s efforts to achieve at a developmentally appropriate level (Challenge)
 | 2, 4 |
| ELSAGroup 11 x 1 hr x 2 days **£25.20 per week x 20****£504**Group 2 1 x 1 hr x 2 days **£24 per week x 20****£480** |  | 2, 4 |
| Trips and visits – organise trips linked to curriculum & support financially if necessaryResidentials**£2028.50**Swimming**£472.50** | [EEF](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/guidance-for-teachers/using-pupil-premium)Evidence from Education Endowment Foundation - The Guide to Pupil Premium: A tiered approach to spending |  |
| Head teacher to ensure that parents are made aware of expected attendance levels when they fall below 90%.**2 x £100 x 38 weeks****£7600** | [EEF – Attendance intervention](https://d2tic4wvo1iusb.cloudfront.net/documents/pages/Attendance-REA-report.pdf?v=1669711762)Report on Rapid Attendance interventionPoor school attendance is a significant problem in the UK and many other countries across the world. In 2019/20, it was reported as 4.9% overall, with special schools showing a higher rate equal to 10.5% and persistent absence at 13.1% in England (gov.uk 2020). Research has found that poor attendance at school is linked to poor academic attainment across all stages (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012; London et al., 2016) as well as anti-social characteristics, delinquent activity and negative behavioural outcomes (Gottfried, 2014; Baker, Sigmon, & Nugent, 2001). However, evidence suggests that small improvements in attendance can lead to meaningful impacts for these outcomes. | 1 |

**Total budgeted cost: £** *43173.76 (working document total)*

# Part B: Review of the previous academic year

## Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2022/23 – Disadvantaged attendance = 92.3% (non-disadvantaged = 94%) NAT AVG 93.7%2021/22 – Disadvantaged attendance = 93.6% (non-disadvantaged = 95.5%) 2022/23 Persistent Absentee Percentage – Whole School = 15.6% NAT AVG 19.4%2021/22 Persistent Absentee Percentage – whole school = 11.3% (5.5% 2020/21)2022/23 Percentage of Persistent Absentees who are disadvantaged = 32.3% NAT AVG 19.4%2021/22 Percentage of Persistent Absentees who are disadvantaged = 23.3% (28.1% 2020/21)Pupil steps of progress 22/23 (21/22 in red)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Whole schoolBelow EXP Progress***TOT 202*** | Whole schoolEXP progress***TOT 202*** | Whole schoolAbove EXP Progress***TOT 202*** | Whole school**PP**Below EXP Progress***TOT 26*** | Whole school**PP**EXP progress***TOT 26*** | Whole school**PP**Above EXP Progress***TOT 26*** |
| READING | 86 (37.6%)79 (37.6%) | 64 (31.7%117 (55.7%) | 62 (30.7%)37 (17.6%) | 15 (57.7%)11 (32.3%) | 8 (30.8%)13 (38.2%) | 3 (11.5%)10 (29.4%) |
| WRITING | 84 (41.6%)92 (43.8%) | 73 (36.1%)104 (49.5%) | 45 (22.3%)35 (16.7%) | 18 (69.2%)14 (41.1%) | 6 (23.1%)20 (58.8%) | 2 (7.7%)10 (29.4%) |
| MATHS | 56 (27.7%)84 (40%) | 86 (42.6%)112 (53.3%) | 60 (29.7%)28 (13.3%) | 16 (61.6%)13 (38.2%) | 5 (19.2%)21 (61.8%) | 5 (19.2%)8 (23.5%) |
| R W M | 153 (72.8%)  | 57 (27.1%) | 6 (2.9%) | 2119 (55.8%) | 413 (38.2%) | 12 (5.8%) |

PP Breakdown - EXP or above progressWhole School Breakdown - EXP or above progress**Intended outcome and success criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Disadvantaged pupils maintain at least the standard of attainment they achieved at the end of the previous year (Reading, Writing and Maths) and previous key stage; those who have ‘fallen behind’ make accelerated progress and ‘catch up’ or exceed prior attainment standards. To ensure fallen behind children receive targeted high-quality intervention monitored by intervention leader. | End of summer 2022 and 2023 data will show that 95 – 100% of disadvantaged children have made expected progress from the previous summer. End of summer data will also show that 10 – 20% of disadvantaged children will have made accelerated progress. Analysis of interventions will show that interventions have had a positive impact on the disadvantaged children’s learning and has helped in accelerating their progress. |

**Reviewed**End of summer 2022 and 2023 data will show that 95 – 100% of disadvantaged children have made expected progress from the previous summer. This will be an additional target for 23/24 due to only 30% of disadvantaged children making expected progress from previous Summer scores (this will be relayed to staff as a focus).End of summer data will also show that 10 – 20% of disadvantaged children will have made accelerated progress. Data shows that accelerated progress was made by 3 (11%) in reading, 2 (8% in writing) and 5 (20%) in maths. Contextually there is very little reading being done at home with the disadvantaged children due to barriers to learning within households. Children do access 1:1 daily reading in school and staff will be encouraged to ensure this is maintained in 23/24).Analysis of interventions will show that interventions have had a positive impact on the disadvantaged children’s learning and has helped in accelerating their progress.Interventions were carried out by class teachers to the time cost of £19,000. Children accessed reading interventions and this ensured a small amount of children made accelerated progress. Contextually there is very little reading being done at home with the disadvantaged children due to barriers to learning within households, this has a negative impact on the intentions of the interventions. |