

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Thomas Hickman School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2018/2019

1. Summary information					
School	Thomas Hickman School				
Academic Year	2018/19	Total PP budget	£188,940	Date of most recent PP Review	July 2019
Total number of pupils	457	Number of pupils eligible for PP <small>(This info was taken from DFE report beginning of Sept 17)</small>	139	Date for next internal review of this strategy	December 2019

Key Stage 2 Progress measures for the 2018/19 Year 6 cohort

Other End of Key Stage 2 Data 2018/2019 (Cohort of 60 pupils in Year 6; 19 were eligible for Pupil Premium Funding.)

	THS Disadvantaged	National
		Validated results will be released November 2019
	% of pupils achieving expected standard	% of pupils achieving expected standard
Reading	38% (5% GDS)	73% (-35)
Writing	62% (0% GDS)	76 (-14)
Maths	57% (10% GDS)	75 (-18)

Note that the Government uses a comparison between the performance of pupils for whom the school receives the Pupil Premium and all other pupils nationally for whom schools do not receive the Pupil Premium for all statutory national assessments.

End of Key Stage 1 Data 2018/2019 (Cohort of 60 pupils in Year 2, of which 18 were eligible for Pupil Premium)

	All pupils (60)	Disadvantaged pupils (18)	National Other
	% of children achieving expected standard	% of children achieving expected standard	% of children achieving expected standard
			Validated data released in November 2019
Reading	73%	61%	79 (-18)
Writing	68%	56%	78 (-22)
Maths	75%	67%	79 (-12)
RWM combined	67%	50%	

	All pupils (60)	Disadvantaged pupils (18)	National Other
	% of children achieving Greater Depth	% of children achieving Greater Depth	% of children achieving Greater Depth
Reading	17%	11%	25%
Writing	5%	0%	15%
Maths	14%	6%	22%

Year 1 Phonics Screening Test Data 2019 (Cohort of 59 pupils in Year 1, of which 12 were eligible for Pupil Premium)

All pupils (59)	Disadvantaged pupils (12)	National
% of pupils achieving expected standard	% of pupils achieving expected standard	% of pupils achieving expected standard
91%	56% (3 didn't take screening)	84%
90%	45%(including the 3 who didn't take)	

Commentary: Three 'disadvantaged' children did not take the phonics screening. These children also have SEN requirements and attendance concerns. They will continue to receive phonic intervention next academic year, with the aim for them to take the screening when in Year 2. Four other 'disadvantaged' children did not meet threshold, one of whom scored 31. These children will all receive interventions whilst in Year 2 and re-take in June 2020.

End of Early Years Foundation Stage Data 2018 (Cohort of 59 pupils in the Reception Year, of which 16 were eligible for Pupil Premium)

Good level of development by the end of the Reception Year	All pupils (57)	Disadvantaged pupils (12)	National
	% of pupils achieving a Good level of development	% of pupils achieving a Good level of development	% of pupils achieving a Good level of development
	70%	47%	73%

Commentary: 2 of the 3 new arrivals in Summer Term had no previous school experience and are also PP.

D. Review of expenditure for year 2018 – 2019

i. BARRIER A (The % of pupils eligible for PP attaining the expected level in each year group is generally below that of pupils not eligible for PP)

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																												
PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with National in RWM.	<p>All year groups to have a target for children reaching ARE by the end of the academic year.</p> <p>Additional teacher to be placed in year 5 to teach English and Maths. This cohort has the highest proportion of PP children within the school.</p> <p>Identify and address the main barriers for learning for pupils eligible for PP (Venn diagrams)</p> <p>SENTA supporting individual children that are requiring additional time in lessons. The SENTA will also support the SEN lead and liaise with them regarding interventions to be used.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Summer data 2018</th> <th>Summer 2 (2019) Target</th> <th>Summer 2 Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 1 12 children</td> <td>R 50% W 50% M 50%</td> <td>R 65% W 65% M 65% Comb: 60%</td> <td>R 75% W 50% M 67% Comb: 50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2 18 children</td> <td>R 44.4% W 22.2% M 44.4%</td> <td>R 60% W 40% M 60% Comb: 40%</td> <td>R 61% W 56% M 67% Comb: 50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3 15 children</td> <td>R 53.3% W 46.7% M 66.7%</td> <td>R 65% W 66% M 86% Comb: 65%</td> <td>R 71% W 67% M 71% Comb: 57%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4 25 children</td> <td>R 64% W 52% M 56%</td> <td>R 80% W 72% M 76% Comb: 72%</td> <td>R 46% W 23% M 39% Comb: 23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 5 24 children</td> <td>R 54% W 25% M 41.7%</td> <td>R 70% W 45% M 61% Comb: 44%</td> <td>R 73% W 62% M 77% Comb: 58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6 19 children</td> <td>R 52% W 36.8% M 21.1%</td> <td>R 72% W 45% M 41% Comb: 39%</td> <td>R 38% W 62% M 57%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Summer data 2018	Summer 2 (2019) Target	Summer 2 Actual	Year 1 12 children	R 50% W 50% M 50%	R 65% W 65% M 65% Comb: 60%	R 75% W 50% M 67% Comb: 50%	Year 2 18 children	R 44.4% W 22.2% M 44.4%	R 60% W 40% M 60% Comb: 40%	R 61% W 56% M 67% Comb: 50%	Year 3 15 children	R 53.3% W 46.7% M 66.7%	R 65% W 66% M 86% Comb: 65%	R 71% W 67% M 71% Comb: 57%	Year 4 25 children	R 64% W 52% M 56%	R 80% W 72% M 76% Comb: 72%	R 46% W 23% M 39% Comb: 23%	Year 5 24 children	R 54% W 25% M 41.7%	R 70% W 45% M 61% Comb: 44%	R 73% W 62% M 77% Comb: 58%	Year 6 19 children	R 52% W 36.8% M 21.1%	R 72% W 45% M 41% Comb: 39%	R 38% W 62% M 57%	<p>Next academic year (2019-20) we have planned for a 'Not ARP' for lower KS1. This is to support the transition of those leaving EYFS, but are not yet ready for Year 1 Curriculum. Two specialist TA's will work in conjunction with Year 1 staff to deliver appropriate learning activities.</p> <p>2019-20 will also see a senior teacher taking English lessons in Year 5 and 6. English / Reading is a priority in THS and this will support children in securing an ARE judgement.</p> <p>The use of a SENTA will continue – she will be primarily based in Year 4 during the mornings, but will support and deliver</p>	<p>£27,553 (CT)</p> <p>£12,886 (SENTA)</p>
	Summer data 2018	Summer 2 (2019) Target	Summer 2 Actual																													
Year 1 12 children	R 50% W 50% M 50%	R 65% W 65% M 65% Comb: 60%	R 75% W 50% M 67% Comb: 50%																													
Year 2 18 children	R 44.4% W 22.2% M 44.4%	R 60% W 40% M 60% Comb: 40%	R 61% W 56% M 67% Comb: 50%																													
Year 3 15 children	R 53.3% W 46.7% M 66.7%	R 65% W 66% M 86% Comb: 65%	R 71% W 67% M 71% Comb: 57%																													
Year 4 25 children	R 64% W 52% M 56%	R 80% W 72% M 76% Comb: 72%	R 46% W 23% M 39% Comb: 23%																													
Year 5 24 children	R 54% W 25% M 41.7%	R 70% W 45% M 61% Comb: 44%	R 73% W 62% M 77% Comb: 58%																													
Year 6 19 children	R 52% W 36.8% M 21.1%	R 72% W 45% M 41% Comb: 39%	R 38% W 62% M 57%																													

		<p>The above table shows the % of children who were ARE at the end of the academic year (2018-2019.)</p> <p>Year 1 writing showed that disadvantaged boys were not making the same progress as their peers. Staff changed their FOS to ensure that they captured boys imaginations and took part in a national poetry competition.</p> <p>Although Reading targets were met by some year groups, reading is a focus of next academic year. The National Curriculum states that it the fundamental skill for children to succeed. In year 6, fluency of reading held the children back in reaching the scaled score of 100 in their SATs. Analysis of their papers showed that children could decode unfamiliar words and retrieve information, however not all were able to complete the reading tasks.</p> <p>There is still a noticeable gap between PP and Non-PP in year groups. Although many year groups disadvantaged children did meet there ARE target.</p> <p>The challenges in PP are:</p> <p>Y1 PP gap has increased in RWM combined</p> <p>Y5 PP gap is increasing in R, W and M</p> <p>Year 4 was an area for concern and individual analysis of classes took place.</p>	<p>interventions with the SENCO in the afternoons.</p> <p>Venn diagrams were a useful tool for class teachers and feedback from them showed that they referred to them daily. This tool supported staff in targeting the children in different areas, and understanding their individual need.</p>	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

ii. BARRIER B (Pupils eligible for PP lack opportunities due to financial disadvantage)

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>Increased home support; leading to greater parental engagement.</p>	<p>Every disadvantaged child in the school to have a trip / experience every ½ term.</p> <p>Uniform support will be offered to all disadvantaged children.</p> <p>Invite PP children to attend more clubs, than no PP children. This will give the children a range of experiences that they will be able to use in future.</p> <p>Coaches will be paid for children learning to swim in Year 4 and Year 2.</p> <p>Outside clubs offered to those with a passion for an area of learning.</p>	<p>100% of Pupil Premium children have had their school trips fully funded. Disadvantaged families were given PE kits and uniform, when requested.</p> <p>Last academic year (2018-2019) 82% of Pupil Premium children accessed an extra-curricular club, compared to 81% of non-Pupil Premium children.</p>	<p>The cost of ensuring that every child in the school went out on a school trip per half term was more expensive than we anticipated. Staff meetings have been dedicated to plan trips carefully, ensuring that we make the most of the local area and therefore keeping costs low. The approach of a trip per ½ term will continue, as our children at THS deserve to see the wider world and have aspirations reaching beyond our local community.</p> <p>Clubs are an important factor in life at THS. Autumn term 2019-20 will showcase over 30 clubs for the children to choose from.</p> <p>Uniform varied from family to family. Next term, to ensure that all disadvantaged children are catered for we shall offer 1 PE shirt, 1 School Shirt and them offer financial support to those who require further.</p> <p>Outside clubs were given to two children. Both of these clubs offered a social dynamic, which our children needed. However, they have both since stopped attending these clubs, due to parental support. During the academic year 2019-20, we will continue this provision,</p>	<p>£3012.07 (coach)</p> <p>£4995.65 (trips)</p> <p>£1442 (swimming)</p> <p>£150 (uniform)</p> <p>£330 (Stagecoach)</p>

			however it will be looked at on an individual basis.	
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------	--

iii. BARRIER C (Pupils eligible for PP suffer from low self-esteem)

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
Social and emotional needs of PP children are met, resulting in a more positive learning attitude.	<p>'Helping Hands' programme run in the Acorn Centre.</p> <p>Aviary available for lunchtimes – children who are having difficulty self-regulating will be supported by a behaviour teaching during lunchtime.</p> <p>Full time therapist, on site, to support children and their families.</p>	Last academic era, our School Therapist has worked with various children, of which 23 were eligible for Pupil Premium. This has had a positive impact on children's confidence, self-esteem and emotional well-being which we hope, with further interventions next year, will lead to accelerated progress and higher attainment. See individual case studies.	<p>Our availability of a full time therapist on site, along with a WELTA and DSL are an important factor at THS. We will continue to offer pastoral care to children and their families.</p> <p>The Aviary and Acorn Centre are an invaluable resource. So much so, that during the academic year of 2019-20, we will be renovating a 3rd room that can be used for pastoral care in the Acorn Centre.</p>	£74, 612

iv. BARRIER D (Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are 93.95% - this is below the target of all children of 95%)

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>Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.</p>	<p>Class teachers to aim for 100% attendance to parental consultations for disadvantaged children.</p> <p>Staff to phone parents to check why children are absent – assembly times were moved to support staff with this.</p>	<p>92% of disadvantaged families attended a parent consultation. Although the target of 100% was not met, every family attended at least one of the three consultations.</p> <p>Staff phoned parents to question why and support those who were absent. The attendance figures were 91.68% for disadvantaged children (Whole School 93.9%). Although this was lower than the academic year of 2017-18, if we removed 1 disadvantaged family from the percentages, disadvantage rises to 94%. This is still lower than the national expectations, but .9% higher than last academic year.</p>	<p>Attendance is the nemesis in THS and although strategies have been put in place to support attendance, it still is not where it needs to be.</p> <p>In 2019-20, we will introduce a 97+ club. This will entail any disadvantaged child in the school with 97% attendance, or higher, per term will receive a free swimming voucher. This will also make explicit links to the Sports Fund and encourage children to carry on with leading a fit and healthy lifestyle.</p>	<p>Time</p>
Total expenditure				£124,980.72
E. Additional detail				