

## Data Overview

### Pupil Premium Students

	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
No. of students on roll	33	38	46
Students eligible for PP	9	11	14
Service children	0	0	0
Children in Care	0	0	0
Total money received for PP	£8, 415.00	£10, 285.00	£ 13, 090.00

### UTC Data 2018/2019

	Number of students	Pupil Premium	Percentage of year group	Looked after children	Service Premium
Year 1	1	0	0%	0	0
Year 2	5	1	20%	0	0
Year 3	7	3	43%	0	0
Year 4	4	0	0%	0	0
Year 5	7	3	43%	0	0
Year 6	5	2	40%	0	0
Year 7	9	2	20%	0	0

### Assessment data July 2019

	% On target or more	% Non-pupil premium on target or more	% pupil premium on target or more
My thinking (Writing)	32/36 89%	25/26 96%	7/10 70%
My thinking (Reading)	32/36 89%	24/26 92%	8/10 80%
My thinking (Maths)	31/36 86%	24/26 92%	7/10 70%
My communication (Communication and interaction)	24/36 67%	19/26 73%	5/10 50%
My well-being (Social, emotional, mental health)	17/36 47%	12/26 46%	5/10 50%
My body (Sensory and physical)	26/36 72%	20/26 77%	6/10 60%
Myself (Self-care and independence)	25/36 69%	18/26 69%	7/10 70%
How my world works (Sci, Geog, PSHE, PE, LLS etc)	29/36 80%	21/26 81%	8/10 80%

My creativity (Music, Dance, Drama, Art)	26/36 72%	20/26 76%	6/10 60%
--	--------------	--------------	-------------

### External KS2 Results Summary 2019

Year	No of students	PP	Result
6	2	50 %	B (working below the standard of the test)
6	1	100%	23 (94) NS (not achieved standard)
6	1	0%	44 (102) AS (achieved standard)
6	1	0%	U (pupil working at the standard but unable to access them)

## Expenditure Review

### Targeted Support

Desired Outcomes	Action	Cost	Impact	Explanation
Closing progress gap in reading, writing, maths and science	<p>Intervention (delivered by class teacher)</p> <p>ICT packages purchased to engage learners (Nessy &amp; Mathletics &amp; Bug Club &amp; TT rockstars)</p> <p>Science Resources through Empiribox</p> <p>CPD for staff for Reading and Writing, Maths and Science</p>	£2000		<p>All impact assessment for closing the progress gap has to be qualitative as we changed our assessment structure half way through the year and therefore do not have comparable data.</p> <p>In class action plans and interventions were carried to varied effect. Some students were taken off action plans over the course of the year because their progress data increased. In year changes to staffing and approach to the curriculum had a major impact on progress of all students, including PP. This particularly included utilising a greater specialist support staff team to carry out more targeted interventions.</p> <p>Nessy, TT rockstars and Mathletics were used throughout the year for homework. Parental engagement was mixed. We have planned for how to engage parents more before rolling out homework next academic year. Bug Club has been used in school for teaching phonics, guided reading and reading comprehension to good effect.</p> <p>There were changes to the leadership of Maths and English over the course of the year.</p> <p>Science resources have been a huge success; student engagement in science and teacher confidence has grown over the course of the year. Most children are now working at age related expectations.</p>
Identifying barriers to learning (e.g. Dyslexia, sensory processing disorder)	<p>GL Complete Digital Solution (CDS) assessment</p> <p>OT external practitioner assessing students for additional barriers and advising how to improve environment and sensory</p>	<p>£130 (GL)</p> <p>External OT seeing PP students £2000</p>		<p>Using the GL assessment CAT tests allowed us to identify some additional barriers that students were experiencing.</p> <p>The use of the OT has been an invaluable resource to us in making experienced assessments and informing best practice for student with sensory processing challenges. Our work with her will continue next year in the form of all staff training on sensory</p>

	integration/awareness into the classroom for children.			integration as it has proved so beneficial to our practice. She will also work with us as make further assessments to support our work with new students.
SEMH needs are addressed	<p>Play Therapy delivered by family link worker &amp; The Thrive Approach delivered by HLTA</p> <p>Breakfast Club (8.45am – 9.10am)</p> <p>Volunteer staff members in the school are chosen to be the 'Champions' for named PP student</p>	<p>Staff training (Thrive) £1,200</p> <p>Resources (Thrive) £150</p> <p>Supply costs @ £144 x 10 days = £1,440</p> <p>Staff training (Play Therapy) £350</p> <p>Resources (Play Therapy) £300</p> <p>Supply costs @ £144 x 1 day = £144</p> <p>Breakfast club start up resources £200</p> <p>Breakfast club ongoing (consumable) resources £200</p> <p>Family link worker role, part of salary contributed from PP budget £2170</p>		<p>Our Thrive practitioner has been trained and was able to share an approach to how to help children label their emotional reactions in a calm and empathetic manner. This has had good impact on staff language and understanding of attachment disorders. Her knowledge will be disseminated throughout the next academic year more strategically.</p> <p>The creation of the post of family link worker to deliver theraplay has contributed extensively towards reducing anxiety and stress in these students and has allowed them to engage in accessing school life. One parent's feedback is typical: 'I was very pleased the school could step in and assist. The teacher has been clear about what will happen and is very approachable. Her understanding of my child's needs and how best to deal with him is brilliant and I look forward to working with her further.'</p> <p>Volunteer PP student 'champions' was not impactful. Teachers/support team carried out this responsibility to varying effect.</p> <p>Breakfast club was successful in getting PP students ready to learn in the morning. This will be continued next year, with an attempt to gather evidence of impact.</p>

### Quality of Teaching

Desired Outcomes	Action	Cost	Impact	Explanation
Increased	SLT to monitor progress of	£0		As the year progressed the number of PP students on action

progress scores	students receiving PP allowance.			plans for underachieving decreased.  For foundation subjects (humanities, science, computing etc), myself (self-care and independence) and my well-being (social emotional mental health) there was no significant gap in progress data. There was a gap in all other curriculum areas, such as my thinking (reading, writing, maths).
Increased attainment	High quality feedback given to all disadvantaged students.	£0		Student feedback sheets completed by teachers once per fortnight proved successful in improving outcomes in writing over the course of the year. However, after teacher and SLT evaluation, this was deemed an unsustainable way to give feedback. Too much lesson time was being dedicated to feedback instead of practicing new knowledge and skills and teacher workload was impacted significantly. However, the positive aspects of this implementation and its core principles (such as specific feedback as to how to improve) are being used in new feedback policy.

### Other Approaches

Desired Outcomes	Action	Cost	Impact	Explanation
Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP	Whole school approach to raising profile of attendance	£0		The attendance for our PP students, excluding one PA with very specific circumstances, in 2018/2019 was 93%, whereas our non-PP students was 95.5%. Overall our attendance was 93.2%. National average attendance figure for special schools in 2018/2019 was 89.9%, so our overall attendance is higher than average.