Mackie Hill Junior and Infant School - Pupil Premium Report

Step 4 – 2nd February 2018

Mackie Hill Junior and Infant School - Pupil Premium Profile 2017/2018	
Total number of pupils in the school	189
Number of PP eligible pupils	48
Amount per pupil	£1,320 (£1,900 for LAC; £302.10 for EYPP)
Total Pupil Premium budget	£60,400

Evidence of school performance	
Key statements from Ofsted report in December 2017 relating to the performance of disadvantaged pupils	1) Disadvantaged pupils and those who have special educational needs (SEN) and/or disabilities are not making the rapid progress they need to in order to catch up with other pupils nationally or achieve well. 2) What does the school need to do to improve further? Rapidly improve outcomes for all groups of pupils to make sure that they are at least good by: accelerating pupils' progress and diminishing differences in attainment between all pupils, including those who are disadvantaged, and other pupils nationally. 3) The curriculum does not meet the needs and abilities of all pupils, particularly lower attaining and disadvantaged pupils. Leaders have not done enough to ensure that pupil premium funding is spent to enable disadvantaged pupils to achieve well. Leaders plan and deliver an 'enrichment' curriculum to help build pupils' social skills and self-esteem but this has been at the expense of developing pupils' deeper knowledge in the humanities and the arts. 4) Disadvantaged pupils are not supported well enough and make even less progress than other pupils. 5) Teachers are not ensuring that disadvantaged pupils and those with low prior attainment are equipped with the skills they need to understand what they are reading. Some pupils said that they do not have enough opportunity to read. This has led to low attainment in reading in both key stages 1 and 2. 6) In 2017, at the end of key stage 2, the attainment and progress of pupils, including those who are disadvantaged, was substantially below national figures in reading, writing and mathematics. 7) In 2017, at the end of key stage 1, pupils' attainment was broadly average in writing and mathematics but well below in reading. Some pupils in key stage 1 have not sustained the strong start made through early years and have not made sufficient progress from their starting points. Disadvantaged pupils attained less well than other

	pupils nationally. 8) Work in pupils' books shows large variations in the progress made by different groups. There are considerable differences between the progress of disadvantaged pupils and others, with disadvantaged pupils doing less well. 9) The leader for early years uses the funding for disadvantaged children to secure the services of a speech therapist. This is helping less-confident children and those who struggle with language to make a good start. Consequently, the difference in attainment between disadvantaged children and others is diminishing, as they get ready to enter Year 1.
Summary of school's performance data	Mackie Hill has an IDACI rating of 9.92 (IMD tool website) placing the **school's** postcode in the 2nd quintile out of 5. However, although the LA's Primary Profile Data 2017 states that no pupils live in the 10% most deprived areas, 63% of pupils have a postcode that is in the lowest 2 quintiles (page 2). The IDSR places the school as 3rd quintile overall which is in the average band for deprivation. The 2017 published progress data for the disadvantaged pupils (11 pupils) in the Year 6 cohort is as follows: Reading IDSR -7.1 Writing IDSR -7.8 Maths IDSR -6.0 Age related attainment for Year 2 disadvantaged in 2017 (9 pupils) was: Reading 33% (national other 79%) GD 11% (n other 28%) Writing 44% (national other 72%) GD 0% (n other 18%) Maths 56% (national other 79%) GD 0% (n other 23%) Age related attainment for Year 6 disadvantaged pupils in 2017 was: Reading 18% (national other 77%) GD 0% (n other 29%) Writing 27% (national other 81%) GD 0% (n other 21%) Maths 27% (national other 80%) GD 0% (n other 27%)
School's Pupil Premium strategy statement	The Pupil Premium Strategy 2017/18 accounts for the plans on spending Pupil Premium funding. The statement is easily accessible via the school's website. The school has not used the DfE template. The review document for 2016/17 is easy to access via the website but compares school's disadvantaged attainment data against the same data measure for the school's other pupils rather than **national other**. It has listed the school's Key Stage 2 exit attainment data for 2017 but not recorded any progress measures. The current strategy lists 12 identified barriers to future attainment for disadvantaged pupils. The first 6 all relate to literacy – only 1 relates to maths.

	The barriers are listed as:
	1) limited vocabulary and delayed language skills
	2) additional support with early reading skills is required
	3) less likely to read at home and have limited higher order reading skills
	4) limited delayed fine motor skills on entry to school
	5) additional support with the development of basic grammar and application of spelling rules required
	6) limited experience of high level vocabulary and the use of descriptive language
	7) additional support with embedding then using and applying basic maths skills higher order problem solving required
	8) attendance and punctuality may impede achievement*
	9) lack understanding of key instruction words for tests
	10) increased emotional support needs
	11) exhibit peer problems and lack self-confidence and self-esteem
	12) lack of aspiration and self-belief
	*Attendance and punctuality is the biggest area of spend at £22,535.
How the school's pupil premium statement meets website requirements	The Pupil Premium Strategy 2017/18 does the following for the current academic year: • Includes the grant allocation amount (£60,400) • Summarises the main educational barriers faced by eligible pupils (12 barriers which are listed above) • Details how the funding will be used to overcome these barriers and to meet other targets (listed under the heading 'Objectives/Actions') • States how you will measure the effect of pupil premium (this is addressed under the heading 'Intended Outcomes' but there are no numerical targets that outcomes will be measured against) • Includes a date when the strategy will be reviewed (Sept 2018). As the strategy does not include either numerical targets or milestones, it makes it difficult to monitor whether the strategy is having the impact that school is aiming for in overcoming the barriers of disadvantaged pupils. Another weakness is that there is no clear line of accountability as the key personnel are missing from each of the actions. For last academic year, the 2016/17 review statement on the website does the following: • Details the impact of the spending on eligible pupils. However, the 2016/17 document does not: • Account for the 2016/17 spend.

Issues that were explored …

1) <u>What is the current the attendance and persistent absenteeism (PA) of disadvantaged pupils in 2017/18 (number 1 spend)?</u>
The in-year attendance of disadvantaged pupils was 92.16% at the time of the Pupil Premium review. This is very low attendance and is much lower than the attendance figure of school's other pupils. The PA of disadvantaged pupils was 32%, which is extremely high compared to national figures for all pupils over school year which has been around 8 to 9%.

2) <u>Why does the attendance and punctuality work cost so much?</u>
During discussions with staff, it was suggested that the 'Walking Bus' is the most expensive strategy in place to try to promote good attendance as it involves 3 adults daily. Further analysis of this approach revealed that between 4 and 8 pupils are accessing the 'Walking Bus', which represents very low take-up for a staff intensive approach.

3) <u>How much work is being done with parents and carers and what has the impact been?</u>
Early Years staff have several approaches to engage with parents even before children begin attending school. These include 'Families Enjoying Everything Together' (FEET) and home visits. The impact has been that trust begins to be built with families at a very early stage of a child's education. FEET also provides an excellent opportunity for staff to communicate key messages to families such as the importance of good school attendance, reading with children at home, toilet training and encouraging children to be independent in general. These approaches also enable staff to become more familiar with pupils' individual characteristics and needs at an early stage. The Learning Mentor also works closely with families in her role.

4) <u>What is being done to try to improve the rate of pupils' progress in reading?</u>
At the time of the Pupil Premium review, the school did not have an English leader in the building. The school has had a 3-year upward trend in its Year 1 phonics data and phonics was acknowledged as a strength in the Ofsted inspection of December 2017. However, the disparity between 2016 phonics outcomes for Year 1 of 93% and 2017 Year 2 reading outcomes of 67% at age related or better for the same pupils, suggests that more can be done to improve pupils' reading comprehension in Key Stage 1.

Overall, a lot more needs to be done to improve the profile of reading, to celebrate reading and to improve feedback in reading activities. Similarly, it is imperative that school increases the rate of pupil progress in reading, writing and maths for all pupils (including disadvantaged pupils) in Key Stage 2. The IDSR places the school in the bottom 10% for 3 years in a row for all pupils' progress and disadvantaged pupils'

progress across Key Stage 2 in reading and maths, and the data is only slightly better for progress in writing.

5) <u>Are teachers and all support staff aware of disadvantaged pupils in their classes and are they actively tracking their progress each half-term?</u>
Discussion with leaders suggested that staff awareness of which pupils are disadvantaged has not been consistent and this may not have been made explicit to all staff in the past. This led to the consideration of how this can be made much clearer in the future. Teachers need to ensure that all staff working with their classes know which pupils are disadvantaged. Involving support staff in pupil progress meetings in the future, when disadvantaged pupils should be discussed as a specific group, should also support this process.

6) <u>What do you believe are the main reasons for the attainment data for disadvantaged pupils being so much lower than other pupils in Year 6 in 2017?</u>
The school's Pupil Premium leader stated that many of the disadvantaged pupils in Year 6 in 2017 had Special Needs. However, as well as attainment being very low for disadvantaged pupils, so was their progress from their Key Stage 2 start points, so even though some of this cohort may have had special needs which affected their attainment, they still failed to make rapid enough progress over Key Stage 2.

7) <u>What are the targets for disadvantaged pupils in SATs in current Years 2 and 6?</u>
The intention of looking at pupils' targets was overtaken by the recognition during this process that monitoring and tracking are 2 aspects of school which can be much better. Indeed, improving systems and expectations of all staff needs to be done as a matter of urgency so that the school begins to create a greater consistency of approach, more consistency in its tracking and begins to establish a more effective and better understood way of working.

8) <u>Who is your Pupil Premium governor and how involved and knowledgeable is this governor?</u>
There were no governors present during the review. However, the school's Pupil Premium strategy refers to half-termly updates for the Pupil Premium governor which is good practice.

Closer analysis of the strategy reveals that the lack of either milestones or numerical targets makes it very difficult for governors to assess whether the proposed strategy is on track or judge the strategy's impact. Moving forwards, the school will be wise to consider adopting the DfE Pupil Premium template which will ensure that there is more

clarity and greater accountability which will make it easier for governors to provide appropriate challenge and support.

9) <u>How well have support staff been trained and are they monitored? How many are involved in interventions? Do the key support staff involved in interventions attend Pupil Progress meetings?</u>
The school was involved in the year-long training on 'Making best use of Teaching Assistants' in 2015/16, which was provided by Outwood Grange Academy. However, the recent staffing instability and turnover has meant that many of the school's personnel have changed and it has proved difficult to implement some of the training's recommendations.

10) <u>Do you actively track the impact of interventions? What do you do if your tracking is showing that these interventions are not having much impact on progress?</u>
The review process identified that there needs to be more rigorous tracking of attendance and PA interventions, particularly considering the high spend in proportion to and its lack of impact. Monitoring of teaching and learning, as well as the impact of interventions, needs to be improved in general but there needs to be other work done first (see 7).

11) <u>How much ownership are teachers taking for the effective deployment of TAs? (Teaching Standard 8c)</u>
The review identified some good deployment of Teaching Assistants, especially in Early Years and Key Stage 1, however the recent Ofsted report is unequivocal is stating that this is an aspect of school which can be improved, and specific reference is made in the report to the need for all teachers to effectively direct Teaching Assistants.

12) <u>How much of an overview do the English Leader and Maths Leader have of the performance of disadvantaged pupils in their areas of responsibility?</u>
In discussion, it was stated that book scrutiny, planning analysis and learning walks have been part of the school's monitoring cycle. However, these activities have not had sufficient impact as marking in books is a weakness and learning environments in many classrooms are failing to showcase pupils' work, give clear messages about the importance of reading or raise aspirations of pupils' learning.

The Maths leader identified that marking could be better and that staffing instability has contributed to school's difficulties. These points are consistent with the findings over the course of the review as book scrutiny identified that marking is an area which needs to improve rapidly (see 13 and 14).

The Maths leader's point about marking led to a discussion about the importance of establishing a clear Marking and Feedback Policy which should then provide clear expectations of staff, encourage greater consistency of practice in English and Maths and support all leaders in offering appropriate support and challenge to colleagues in order to make future improvements to teaching and learning.

The Maths leader and her colleague were positive about the potential benefits of some of the recent support and good practice that is being shared by a neighbouring primary school and recognised the value that this can add to practice in Mackie Hill. They recognised that seeing good practice elsewhere is beginning to provide useful models for staff at Mackie Hill and believe that this will support future improvements.

13) <u>How strong is marking and is the response to marking showing evidence that additional learning is being made (linking to EEF Teaching Toolkit and evidence-based approaches)?</u>
A book scrutiny during the review identified a lack of consistency of practice across school in marking. Similarly, there was little evidence that pupils were responding consistently to marking or that marking was having a positive impact on pupils' learning. It is clearly important that the school creates a new Marking and Feedback policy as a matter of urgency to begin to address this situation.

14) <u>What else did the book scrutiny reveal?</u>
The book scrutiny identified that presentation of pupils' work needs to improve. However, there is also an issue around the consistency of adults' presentation with a range of different colours being used for marking and inconsistency in adult modelling of the school's handwriting style.

15) <u>Which other areas became a focus over the course of the review?</u>
Pupils were friendly, polite and courteous over the course of the review day. However, the school's internal data shows that a total of 83 sessions (or 41.5 days) have been lost to exclusions of disadvantaged pupils in the first half of the academic year.

This is a very high figure and discussion with the Learning Mentor identified the need to be more pro-active and build pupils' resilience at an earlier stage so that less time is spent in future being reactive to poor behaviour. The Learning Mentor has some good ideas involving a personalised approach which she has begun to introduce. This model of working with pupils in a positive manner to develop greater resilience and to promote positive behaviour is something that can be developed in the future, and, if successful, will support these pupils' chances of behaving well and increase their chances of better attainment. This initiative will be supported if school's Behaviour Officer is involved so that in future the role involves a more pro-active approach, which, if successful, will reduce the need for as much reactive work at a later stage.

<u>What is going well?</u>

- Children speak with confidence and fluency from an early age. The clear majority are polite, friendly, keen to engage with peers and adults and are positive about their school.

- The Early Years environment and provision are of a high standard. Children are provided with a stimulating and engaging curriculum which enables them to make a good start to their education and which supports all pupils in developing their self-confidence.

- Early Years staff start to build positive relationships with parents and carers before pupils begin their formal education. 'Families Enjoying Everything Together' (FEET) and home visits are 2 examples of practical approaches which are part of this work and enable staff to begin to implement approaches that have the potential to start to help disadvantaged pupils overcome some of their barriers to learning.

- Reading and writing are effectively promoted and celebrated in Early Years and Year 2. The showcasing of pupils' best writing and the active promotion of reading sends important messages to pupils about these key aspects of their learning in these parts of the school.

- There is a positive 3-year trend in Year 1 phonics outcomes. This is important as phonics provides pupils with the mechanics to start to read. However, the disparity between the high Year 1 phonics score of 2016 and the much lower Year 2 reading test outcomes for the same pupils in 2017 suggests that there may need to be more of a focus on comprehension in Key Stage 1. The book scrutiny identified that pupils only begin to work on comprehension in an exercise book in Year 3, which may be a practice that school begins to start at an earlier age in the future.

- The Learning Mentor has introduced a new approach to measuring children's resilience and begun to work with pupils to develop this. She has some good ideas on extending her work in this area to support pupils in their self-regulation, self-esteem and behaviour which should help disadvantaged pupils in overcoming their barriers to learning.

- The school has begun to develop close links with a neighbouring primary school that is sharing some strong models of good practice. All staff spoken to express a positive response to the potential benefits that this might lead to and believe that it will support the school in future efforts to strengthen teaching and learning for all pupils, including the disadvantaged.

<u>What could be better?</u>

- The rate of progress of all pupils, including disadvantaged pupils, is very low in Key Stage 2 and has been in the lowest 10% of schools nationally in each of the last 3 years. This makes it imperative that school tracks progress rigorously, that all teachers take ownership of their class's data and are accountable for their pupils' progress and that all leaders are assiduous in monitoring the impact of teaching on learning outcomes and pupil progress in their areas of responsibility.

- Attendance of disadvantaged pupils was very low, at 92.16% at the time of the review. Similarly, persistent absenteeism of disadvantaged pupils was extremely high at 32%. This is despite over a third of school's Pupil Premium spend being accounted for on attendance-based approaches including the walking bus, which requires 3 adults, and which is supporting between 4 and 8 pupils. This is not an effective or cost-effective approach and school needs to assess how it can work more effectively to improve the attendance and PA data of disadvantaged pupils.

- Attendance needs to be tracked more often and more rigorously, and key data needs to be shared with the Pupil Premium leader and Pupil Premium governor. This can be addressed by the Learning Mentor introducing a weekly attendance summary which records whole school attendance and PA, and disadvantaged pupils' attendance and PA. This key information can then be shared with the stakeholders named above to ensure that there is closer tracking, greater awareness and a more active response to disadvantaged pupils' absence.

- Attendance sanctions involve 2 standard letters; the first is to raise a concern and the second to identify the possibility of a fine. This system is clearly not working as despite already issuing 7 fines for non-attendance this academic year, the attendance and PA figures of disadvantaged pupils remain a major concern. The system can be developed by adding an additional letter to improve the communication with parents and carers and to create more opportunity to work with them on attendance. A possible way forward is that a third letter might be an interim step between the 2 current letters, at which point parents or carers might be invited into school to meet the Learning Mentor. This will give the Learning Mentor more opportunity to work with families on attendance, allow more opportunity to identify the causes of low attendance and provide a better chance of working with families to find a solution before fines become a consideration.

- Learning environments, apart from Early Years and Year 2, need to have clearer and more positive messages about the value of reading, show more examples of pupils' best writing and reflect more ownership of pupils such as by including their photos and work. If school acts on this recommendation then this should increase the profile of reading, give some strong models of writing (which can then be utilised to

raise the expectations and aspirations of all pupils) and give pupils a greater sense of pride in their achievements and ownership of their learning.

- Lessons in Key Stage 2 need to be pacier and there needs to be a much greater focus on maximising the opportunities for pupils to show and record their learning. Adults often spoke at length during the review day which slowed learning by limiting pupils' opportunities to discuss or record their ideas. Ensuring that adult input is quicker and more concise should increase the impact of teaching by ensuring that children have greater opportunity to make and demonstrate learning.

- The marking in books is not having enough impact on learning and there is inconsistency of practice. This can begin to be addressed by creating a new Marking and Feedback policy which needs to be understood and followed by all staff to create a consistency of approach.

- As part of a new Marking and Feedback policy, there need to be more consistent expectations of pupils' responses to marking and improved practice in order that pupils' follow-up work leads to additional learning. This is happening far too infrequently and is a missed opportunity to extend pupils' learning. This is particularly important as the Education Endowment Foundation's Teaching Toolkit has shown that feedback, and pupils' response to feedback, can add as much as 8 additional months' learning per pupil over the course of an academic year.

- The monitoring cycle is ineffective and has not been supported by the recent staffing instability, the lack of rigour and the inconsistency of approaches to teaching and learning. Moving forwards, there needs to be a clearer monitoring cycle to support senior and middle leaders in introducing greater rigour and more consistent expectations of approaches to teaching and learning. All leaders then need to offer appropriate support and challenge to colleagues.

- There are far too many days being lost to learning because of the exclusions of a small number of disadvantaged pupils. School now needs to give more thought to what will have a positive impact on this situation and look to be more active in identifying pupils who will benefit from work to develop their resilience at an earlier age. Although this is a long-term piece of work, the Learning Mentor has made an encouraging start and needs to be supported in developing a system that will better support the emotional and behavioural needs of some of its disadvantaged pupils.

Craig Batley

February 2018