

St. Andrew's CEVA Primary School Pupil Premium Strategy Statement



1. Summary information					
School	St. Andrew's CEVA Primary School				
Academic Year	2019-2020	Total PP budget	£125,620	Date of most recent external PP Review	April 2019
Total number of pupils	353	Number of pupils eligible for PP	96	Date for next internal review of this strategy	November 2019
2. Current attainment					
End of KS2 2018 – 2019: 17 children = 28% of the cohort			<i>Pupils eligible for PP</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>	
% achieving in reading, writing and maths			23%	58%	
% achieving in reading			35%	65%	
% achieving in writing			35%	84%	
% achieving in maths			71%	79%	
reading progress score			-1.69	-1.43	
writing progress score			-0.82	0.87	
maths progress score			2.50	3.14	
End of KS1 2018 – 19: 10 children = 20% of the cohort					
% achieving in reading, writing and maths			20%	63%	
% achieving in reading			40%	68%	
% achieving in writing			20%	71%	
% achieving in maths			60%	73%	
% making progress in reading			80%	82%	
% making progress in writing			60%	85%	
% making progress in maths			70%	85%	

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)		
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i>)		
A.	High proportion of children eligible for PP funding are also below ARE. This has an impact on progress at the end of KS2.	
B.	Phonic skills in KS1 and reading skills are low across KS2 for some children eligible for PP funding. This has had an effect on their Reading and Writing outcomes at KS2.	
C.	Attainment on entry to EYFS for PP pupils is lower than that of non PP pupils both in school and nationally. The majority of PP pupils lack basic skills (well below age-related expectations) in speaking, listening, reading, writing and maths.	
D.	Many PP children across the school have gaps in learning in reading, writing and maths.	
E.	High ability PP pupils are making less progress than other higher ability pupils across the school.	
F.	Social and emotional issues evident in a high number of children eligible for PP funding and is a higher proportion than all other groups of pupils which is having an impact on their academic progress.	
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)		
G.	Attendance rates for some pupils eligible for PP is below the target for non PP children. There is a higher % of persistent and unauthorised absence than for non PP. This has an impact on their school hours and causes them to fall behind in their learning due to missed/part sessions.	
H.	A high number of PP pupils have difficulties at home (involvement with Social Services, CIN plans, CP plans, LAC, Post Adoption, EHA's and history of domestic violence, split/blended families, no/limited support from home) and have limited opportunities to participate in extra-curricular activities.	
4. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	High proportion of PP pupils are at or above ARE. Progress of PP pupils who are below ARE is accelerated and shows that differences are diminishing compared with the national average of non PP children.	90% PP children who are not ARE/+ have made accelerated progress to diminish differences with non PP pupils' within their year in all year groups. Year 2 attainment R = 70%, W = 70%, M = 80% Year 2 progress R = 90%, W = 90%, M = 90% Year 6 attainment achieving expected standard: R = 65%, W = 68%, M = 68% C = 59% Year 6 progress: R = 1.0 W = 1.5 M = 1.5
B.	Phonic screening outcomes for Year 1 PP pupils are broadly in line with the non PP national average. Phonic diagnostics are systematically carried out each term in KS2 and phonics taught through Sounds-Write programme The systematic diagnostics carried out each term in KS2 and subsequent Sounds-Write programme ensures that a high proportion of PP pupils can confidently apply all sounds in reading and spelling.	80% of children who are eligible for PP funding have passed the phonic screening at the end of Y1. 95% of children who are eligible for PP funding have passed the phonic screening at the end of Y2. 90% of children in Years 3, 4 and 5 know all sounds and related spellings. 82% of children achieve ARE+ in Spelling, Grammar & Punctuation at the end of KS2. 81% of children achieve ARE+ in Writing at the end of KS2.

C.	The end of EYFS outcomes show that PP pupils diminishing differences with the national average for GLD (Good Level of Development).	95% of children who are eligible for PP funding make accelerated progress and at least 50% achieve the GLD.
D.	The attainment of PP pupils in reading, writing and maths is in line with that of pupils not eligible for PP nationally.	At least 60% of all PP pupils achieve age-related expectations or above in reading, writing and maths combined. With the use of the school's new assessment and tracking system and accurate teacher assessment, through in-house & cross school moderation, PP pupils' gaps in learning are quickly identified and those children receive appropriate and timely intervention. 20 Day Challenge targets are used to give timely reminders and interventions to PP pupils to accelerate progress.
E.	High prior-attaining PP pupils make as much progress, if not better, than other higher prior-attaining pupils across the school in reading, writing and maths.	High prior-attaining PP children are still working at greater depth at the end of Key Stages 1 and 2. Those PP children at GD in Years 1, 3, 4 & 5 are on track to achieve greater depth at all assessment points. 20% of targeted ARE PP pupils will achieve GD at the end of the year.
F.	Improvement in the learning attitudes and behaviour of targeted PP pupils and greater engagement of families.	Pupil and parent voice show more positive attitudes towards learning and behaviour. Impact of Families Reviews show a greater level of parental and child engagement. Fewer behaviour incidents are recorded for targeted PP pupils on SIMS. Data shows that PP pupils with social and emotional issues have made good or better progress at all assessment points due to appropriate interventions.
G.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP. Decreased persistent absence for PP pupils	Attendance for the PP children is narrowing gap with national NPP attendance at 96.6%. Reduce the number of persistent absentees among PP children closer to 6.2% or below (NPP National Average).
H.	PP Children regularly attending and engaging in extra-curricular activities/residential.	Provision map to identify children who are attending no clubs and PP pupils are targeted to regularly attend at least one school and out-of-school clubs and activities. Provision Map to check/monitor attendance at clubs. PP pupils have 95% uptake of Year 4 and 5 residential using PP funding. Impact on Families Reviews show a greater level of parental and child engagement.

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2019 - 2020

The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the pupil premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.

i. Quality of teaching for all

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
<p>A. High proportion of PP pupils are at or above ARE. Progress of PP pupils who are below ARE is accelerated and shows that differences are diminishing compared with the national average of non PP children.</p>	<p>Teaching and support staff to use Compass system to track progress and assess pupils on a weekly basis in order to quickly identify gaps in learning.</p> <p>Regular pupil progress meetings to hold professional discussions re: PP pupils' progress</p>	<p>Some of the PP funding will be invested in purchasing more IT in order to efficiently capture evidence from each assessment opportunity. Using this system, assessment and feedback to pupils will be much more accurate and targeted. Training for all class based staff to use assessment and recording system.</p> <p>Feedback = +8 months EEF Toolkit, suggest high quality feedback is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we embed across the school.</p>	<p>Courses selected using evidence of effectiveness. Use Training days and twilights to deliver training (support staff also included). Termly monitoring timetable actioned by Leaders and PP governor and reports to governors (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to Learning Committee and FGB. Termly PP Strategy Meetings to gather evidence form a range of professionals. Termly pupil progress meeting with class teachers.</p>	<p>PP Lead Maths Lead English Lead</p>	<p>November 2019 March 2020 July 2020</p>
<p>B. Phonic screening outcomes for Year 1 PP pupils are broadly in line with the non PP national average. Phonic diagnostics are systematically carried out each term in KS2 & phonics taught through Sounds-Write programme. Systematic diagnostics carried out each term in KS2 & subsequent Sounds-Write programme ensures that a high proportion of PP pupils can confidently apply all sounds in reading & spelling.</p>	<p>Monitor phonics teaching in KS1 and check diagnostics (including SEN PP across KS2) Implement Sounds Write Spelling Programme in Years 3-6</p>	<p>Phonics approach to reading = +4 months EEF Toolkit</p>	<p>Termly monitoring by PP Lead, English Lead and PP governor and reports to governors (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to Learning Committee and FGB.</p>	<p>English Lead</p>	<p>November 2019 March 2020 July 2020</p>

<p>C. The end of EYFS outcomes show that PP pupils diminishing differences with the national average for GLD (Good Level of Development).</p>	<p>Review provision to ensure that this reflects children's interests and promotes good progress in all areas of learning. Use 20 day challenge to quickly address gaps in learning.</p>	<p>Early Years Intervention = +5 months Improved provision and timely intervention EEF Toolkit</p>	<p>Termly monitoring by EYFS Lead/AHT and EYFS/PP governor and reports to governors (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to Learning Committee and FGB. Termly pupil progress meeting with class teachers.</p>	<p>EYFS Lead</p>	<p>November 2019 March 2020 July 2020</p>
<p>D. The attainment of PP pupils in reading, writing and maths is in line with that of pupils not eligible for PP nationally.</p>	<p>20 day challenge targets to be set using accurate assessment of PP pupils and Compass tracking system.</p> <p>20 Day Challenge targets to be monitored by PP Lead and PP gobs</p> <p>Implement daily guided reading.</p>	<p>Individualised instruction = +3 months EEF Toolkit 20 day challenge for PP pupils. Research shows that when children are given short, 1-1 input on a consistently regular basis about targets in their learning, they make rapid progress in a short space of time, and this progress is sustainable after the 20 day period.</p> <p>1-1 tuition = +5 months EEF Toolkit shows that where pupils are given intensive</p> <p>Feedback = +8 months EEF Toolkit, suggest high quality feedback is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we embed across the school.</p> <p>Guided Reading (T4R) has had excellent results in improving attainment in reading in other schools, including with the high attaining pupils. Individualised support</p>	<p>Termly monitoring timetable actioned by Leaders and PP governor and reports to governors (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to Learning Committee and FGB. Termly pupil progress meeting with class teachers.</p>	<p>PP Lead Maths Lead English Lead</p>	<p>November 2019 March 2020 July 2020</p>
<p>E. High prior-attaining PP pupils make as much progress, if not better, than other higher prior-attaining pupils across the school in reading, writing and maths.</p>	<p>Teaching and support staff CPD in AfL, planning, peers assessment, guided reading, feedback, meta cognition and challenge – questioning.</p> <p>Implement one-to-one tuition for children who have gaps in learning.</p>	<p>Meta cognition and self-regulation = +8 months EEF Toolkit suggests that teaching strategies for pupils to set their own goals and monitor their own learning.</p>	<p>Termly monitoring by Challenge Lead and PP governor and reports to governors (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to Learning Committee and FGB. Termly pupil progress meeting with class teachers.</p>	<p>Challenge and PP lead</p>	<p>July 2020</p>
<p>Total budgeted cost: £30,931</p>					
<p>ii) Targeted support</p>					

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
A. High proportion of PP pupils are at or above ARE. Progress of PP pupils who are below ARE is accelerated and shows that differences are diminishing compared with the national average of non PP children.	Provide weekly targeted intervention sessions to identified PP pupils in reading, writing and mathematics. Use 20 day challenge to target support at gaps in learning. PP HLTA Year 6 x2 pms weekly , Intervention teacher Year 5 and 6 x 2 days weekly PP Intervention Teachers Year 6 x 4pms All years x2 pms Switch on Reading, Breaking Barriers TA x5 pms in Years 1 and 2 (Subject and pupil changes due to data analysis/ reviews.) Talking Progress x3 pm in EYFS	Data shows that many PP children are working behind age-related expectations and need to 'catch up' with their peers (see PP file). Small group tuition = +4 months EEF Toolkit Providing personalised teaching and learning. Feedback = +8 months EEF Toolkit, suggest high quality feedback is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we embed across the school.	Termly monitoring by PP Lead and Inclusion Lead (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to ensure that the correct PP children are chosen for intervention, quality of delivery and evaluation of progress in Pupil Premium Progress Meetings. Use of new Provision Map to check intervention is working. Reviews will inform changes to be made to current provision.	Inclusion Lead/Pupil Premium Lead	RAG rated every 10/20 days Int RAG rated every 6 weeks
B. Phonic screening outcomes for Year 1 PP pupils are broadly in line with the non PP national average	Provide targeted sessions to identified PP pupils in phonics 1 x intervention teacher x3 weekly. Targeted Sounds-Write 1-1/small group support in KS2 TA x3pms in Y3,4,5,6	Data shows that many PP children are not passing the Phonic Screening Test in Year 1. Small group tuition = +4 months (EEF Toolkit) Providing personalised teaching and learning.	Termly monitoring by PP Lead and Inclusion Lead (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to ensure that the correct PP children are chosen for intervention, quality of delivery and evaluation of progress in Pupil Premium Progress Meetings. Reviews will inform changes to be made to current provision.	Inclusion Lead/Pupil Premium Lead	Diagnostic every term. Phonic screening check every term.
C. The end of EYFS outcomes show that PP pupils are broadly in line with the national average for GLD (Good Level of Development).	20 Day Challenge targeted support for gaps identified through observations.	Early Years Intervention = +5 months Improved provision and timely intervention	Termly monitoring by PP Lead and Inclusion Lead (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to ensure that the correct PP children are chosen for intervention, quality of delivery & evaluation of progress in Pupil Premium Progress Meetings. Reviews will inform changes to be made to current provision.	Inclusion Lead/Pupil Premium Lead	Formal assessments every term. Ongoing assessment in the provision
D. The attainment of PP pupils in reading, writing and maths is	Pupil Progress meetings focussed on PP pupils to scrutinise the support of	Data shows that many PP children are working behind age-related expectations and need to 'catch up' with their peers (see PP file).	Termly monitoring by PP Lead and Inclusion Lead (including data, work scrutiny, observations,	Inclusion Lead/Pupil Premium Lead	Termly reviews

in line with that of pupils not eligible for PP nationally.	PP pupils in R,W,M X1 pm per term per teacher. Provide weekly targeted intervention sessions to identified PP pupils in reading, writing and mathematics. PP HLTA Year 6 x2 pms weekly , Intervention teacher Year 5 and 6 x 2 days weekly All years x2 pms Switch on Reading, Breaking Barriers TA x5 pms in Years 1 and 2 (Subject and pupil changes due to data analysis/ reviews.)	Small group tuition = +4 months EEF Toolkit Providing personalised teaching and learning.	class reviews and pupil voice) to ensure that the correct PP children are chosen for intervention, quality of delivery and evaluation of progress in Pupil Premium Progress Meetings. Reviews will inform changes to be made to current provision.		Int RAG rated every 6 weeks
E. High prior-attaining PP pupils make as much progress, if not better, than other higher prior-attaining pupils across the school in reading, writing and maths.	Provide weekly targeted intervention sessions to identified PP pupils in reading, writing and mathematics. PP HLTA Year 6 x2 pms weekly , Intervention teacher Year 5 and 6 x 2 days weekly G&T lead to identify PP pupils who need further challenge within lessons and extra-curricular activities.	Data shows that many PP children are working behind age-related expectations and need to 'catch up' with their peers (see PP file). Small group tuition = +4 months EEF Toolkit Providing personalised teaching and learning.	Termly monitoring by PP Lead and G&T Lead (including data, work scrutiny, observations, class reviews and pupil voice) to ensure that the correct PP children are chosen for intervention, quality of delivery and evaluation of progress in Pupil Premium Progress Meetings. Reviews will inform changes to be made to current provision.	G&T Lead PP Lead	November 19 March 20 July 20

Total budgeted cost: £57,253

iii) Other approaches

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
F. Improvement in the learning attitudes and behaviour of targeted PP pupils and greater engagement of families.	Full time Family Support Worker (FSW) to work with families and children having difficulties at home and involve outside agencies if required. This includes setting up EHAs and using "Impact" pro-forma with families to track engagement and progress. Offer of £100 voucher to all PP families in order to increase engagement and remove any financial barriers that may affect well-being and attendance of PP pupils.	Attainment for children cannot be improved if they aren't actually attending school. NfER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step. Offering PP families a £100 voucher will remove any financial barrier that may be present and ensure PP children are able to access extras offered by the school and are not left feeling excluded. This will also give PP children a greater sense of belonging to the school community, leading to greater engagement with their learning.	Same day calls for all pupils to ensure regular attendance. Thorough briefing of FSW about existing absence issues. Attendance and progress discussed with PPC fortnightly. Attendance monitoring monthly then letters to parents/ guardians. Daily check of vulnerable children's attendance. FSW discuss attendance with families and explore barriers. PP attendance data gathered to see patterns/ trends and case studies show that the attendance	Inclusion Lead Pupil Premium Lead FSW	November 19 March 20 July 20

	Offer of 85% payment of Year 4 and Year 5 residentials to encourage take-up for PP pupils		of PP children have improved as a result of FSW involvement.		
G. Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Full time Family Support Worker (FSW) and Attendance Manager to monitor the attendance of pupils and promptly follow up absences. First day response provision. Targeted families have Breakfast Club provision funded by PP.	In addition to the £100, targeted families will be offered Breakfast Club funded through PP to improve attendance and punctuality.	100% of PP children engage with educational visits. Increase % of PP children accessing extra-curricular opportunities. PP children are in school uniform. Parent voice on the voucher system. PP Lead to monitor how families are using their vouchers.	Pupil Premium Lead FSW Attendance Manager	Monthly Attendance Reports Fortnightly Safeguarding mtgs November 19 March 20 July 20
H. PP Children regularly attending and engaging in extra-curricular activities/residential.	All PP pupils in Year 4 and 5 to be offered 85% payment from PP funding to attend residentials and encourage full take-up of places.	Less than half of the PP pupils previously attended residentials and missed out on a range of life-skills/opportunities to improve self-esteem and awareness.	PP children/ families with current FSW and agency involvement will be discussed at fortnightly Safeguarding Meetings. The progress of cases will be reviewed and future actions recorded to be updated at the next meeting.	Inclusion Lead Pupil Premium Lead	November 19 March 20 July 20

Total budgeted cost: £29,545

Estimated Overall total spend: £117,729

6. Review of Expenditure

Previous Academic Year

2018 - 2019

i) Quality of teaching for all

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
------------------------	-------------------------------	---	--	-------------

<p>A. Attainment and progress of PP & SEND PP pupils show that differences are diminishing compared with the national average of non PP SEND children.</p>	<p>Teacher planning & intervention delivery x 5 days per week x1 intervention session/20DC input</p> <p>TA intervention delivery x 5 days per week x1 intervention session/20DC input</p>	<p>Impact: medium-high</p> <p>Progress measures show that this has been effective in Maths at the end of KS2. Progress in R & W dipped due to cohort specific issues.</p>	<p>Targeted support using 20 day challenge targets has shown that SEN PP pupils have out-performed non PP SEN pupils at the end of KS2 for ARE+ outcomes.</p> <p>Recommendations:- continue to embed 20DC targets in all year groups and with all groups of PP pupils particularly all PP who are below ARE+ have their gaps in learning quickly identified and receive targeted work to fill gaps. Use new Provision Map to track intervention programmes in order to quickly assess their effectiveness.</p>	<p>£30,733</p>
<p>ii) Targeted support</p>				
<p>Desired outcome</p>	<p>Chosen action/approach</p>	<p>Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.</p>	<p>Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)</p>	<p>Cost</p>
<p>B. Phonic screening outcomes for Year 1 PP pupils are broadly in line with the non PP national average</p>	<p>Intervention teacher 4 x ½ day per week.</p>	<p><i>Impact: high</i></p> <p>Data from most interventions groups show the accelerated progress of pupils in reading and writing in Y1 although a dip in the number of PP pupils passing screening.</p>	<p>Outcomes at end of Year 2 were above line with national averages and an increase on the previous year.</p> <p>Recommendations: Earlier teaching of phonics in EYFS – week 2 and earlier interventions for PP pupils in EYFS and Y1 where PP pupils are falling behind.</p>	<p>£7,523</p>
<p>C. The end of EYFS outcomes show that PP pupils are broadly in line with the national average for GLD (Good Level of Development).</p>	<p>Talking Progress Programme delivered x3 weekly by TA Targeted intervention x 5 weekly by teacher</p>	<p><i>Impact: Low - Medium</i></p> <p>PP pupil outcomes for GLD at the end of EYFS were well below national. However, 95% of PP pupils made accelerated progress from very low starting points. 0% of PP entered EYFS at ARE in CLL and Numeracy.</p>	<p>Early identification of barriers is necessary to target support that has most impact.</p> <p>Recommendation- Better tracking of progress of PP pupils in EYFS and improved communication between EYFS practitioners to ensure gaps are filled.</p>	<p>£7,500</p>

<p>D. The attainment of PP pupils in reading, writing and maths is in line with that of pupils not eligible for PP nationally.</p>	<p>Intervention teacher 4 x ½ day per week.</p>	<p>Impact: medium-high</p> <p>Progress measures show that this has been effective in Maths but not in English.</p>	<p>Targeted support using 20 day challenge targets has shown that PP pupils have out-performed non PP pupils at the end of KS2 for ARE+ R,W,M outcomes.</p> <p>Recommendations: Continue to embed 20DC targets in all year groups and with all groups of PP pupils particularly all PP who are below ARE+ have their gaps in learning quickly identified and receive targeted work to fill gaps. Embed effective use of Provision Map to track intervention programmes in order to quickly assess their effectiveness. Intervention teacher to focus on reading.</p>	<p>£18,733</p>
<p>E. High prior-attaining PP pupils make as much progress, if not better, than other higher prior-attaining pupils across the school in reading, writing and maths</p>	<p>Weekly targeted intervention sessions to identified PP pupils in reading, writing and mathematics. PP HLTA Year 6 x2 pms weekly , Intervention teacher Year 5 and 6 x 2 days weekly</p>	<p><i>Impact: low-medium</i></p> <p>The % of PP pupils at GD is lower than non PP and still way off national averages for GD.</p>	<p>Recommendations: Through pupil progress meetings and regular monitoring by PP Lead, higher attaining PP pupils need to be targeted, particularly those who are ARE but could achieve GD.</p>	<p>£7,500</p>
<p>iii. Other approaches</p>				
<p>Desired outcome</p>	<p>Chosen action/approach</p>	<p>Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.</p>	<p>Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)</p>	<p>Cost</p>

<p>F. Improvement in the learning attitudes and behaviour of targeted PP pupils and greater engagement of families.</p>	<p>Full time Family Support Worker (FSW) to work with families and children having difficulties at home and involve outside agencies if required. This includes setting up EHAs and using "Impact" pro-forma with families to track engagement and progress. £100 vouchers to improve engagement.</p>	<p>Impact: medium The % attendance for PP is below that of non PP pupils and below the national for all other pupils (93.9%). A much higher % of PP children have been persistently absent The FSW and Attendance Manager have worked with families to improve the % of attendance but this has not necessarily risen above the 90% persistent absence %</p>	<p>Regular meetings to discuss attendance with SLT and Attendance Manager have resulted in earlier targeted support for families.</p> <p>Recommendation: Continue with targeted support of families who have difficulties with attendance. Continue incentive such a class certificates for best attendance. Start up new certificates for individuals with FSW to share with families. Use of taxis to support families who have transport issues which are a barrier to improved attendance. Continue to target children whose attendance is showing a downward trend from 97% - early intervention.</p>	<p>£12,000</p>
<p>G. Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.</p>	<p>Full time Family Support Worker (FSW) and Attendance Manager to monitor the attendance of pupils and promptly follow up absences. First day response provision.</p>	<p><i>Impact: Medium</i> Targeted families have Breakfast Club provision funded by PP. Targeted families have taxi transport to ensure attendance due to distance, parent illness.</p>	<p>The pupils who most needed the breakfast club to improve attendance did not turn up to breakfast club. This will require ongoing work with families.</p> <p>Recommendation: continue working with good attendees at Breakfast Club/clubs and continue to target additional support for families who children are persistently absent.</p>	<p>As above (F)</p>
<p>H. Parents/ families respond well to appropriate targeted outside agency and in-school support.</p>	<p>Full time FSW to work with families and children having difficulties at home and involve outside agencies if required. This includes setting up EHAs and using "Impact" pro-forma with families to track engagement and</p>	<p><i>Impact: medium – high</i> <i>EHAs are having limited impact where outside agencies are unreliable in attendance in meetings or show reluctance to engage with the EHA process.</i> <i>EHAs which require low level assistance are more successful as school staff are able to support families adequately to facilitate improvement.</i></p>	<p>Families who have attended regular meetings with FSW/attendance manager have made progress with attendance and engagement.</p> <p>Recommendation: Continue formal recording of impact of work with families to log progress over time in terms of engagement and academic progress.</p>	<p>£12,000</p>

6. Additional detail

- All parents whose children were entitled to FSM were issued with £100 voucher. £9,600
- Milk is provided to all PP pupils £536
- Additional resources / training £4,360
- Breakfast and After School Club provision £4,170
- Taxis for school transportation £ 6,333 (x9 pupils)
- Extra-curricular opportunities £5,759