

Ash Trees Academy Statement of pupil premium strategy 2018-19

1. Summary information					
School	Ash Trees Academy			Type of SEN PMLD, complex medical, ASD, SLD, MLD	All
Academic Year	2018/19	Total PP budget	£69, 960	Date of most recent PP Review	February 2019
Total number of pupils	153	Number of pupils eligible for PP	53 (34.9%) + 5 in receipt of PPG+	Date for next internal review of this strategy	July 2019
Number of pupils in receipt of LAC Premium Grant	6	Total LAC Premium Grant available to the academy	£8400		

2. Current attainment (2017-18)		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP</i>
% achieving targets in communication (speaking & listening)	80%	81%
% achieving targets in maths	76%	73%
% progress specific to school setting - English	82%	80%

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
Severe and complex needs, medical conditions, health and well-being.	
In-school barriers	
A.	Attendance, a small proportion of pupils have difficulties maintaining access to school. As evidence in internal review Feb 19 shows there is a positive attendance gap due to effective use of the grant this will continue to be monitored and good attendance sustained.
B.	Self-regulation of a number of pupils is impacting upon learning.
C.	Communication difficulties linked to severe and complex SEND.

D.	Progress for some pupils in meeting wider outcomes/EHCP targets
External barriers	
E.	Providing support and signposting of services to a small number of parents; enabling them to support their child's SEND and academic needs.

4. Outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Ensure PP pupils make progress in all areas of the curriculum commensurate to abilities. This includes improving attendance.	Data tracking indicates progress is in line with teacher expectations particularly in the Using and Applying of Mathematics.
B.	PP pupils develop a 'self-assessment of needs' leading to self-regulation of behaviour. This improves access to learning.	Pupils apply learned therapeutic strategies and lose minimal learning time as a result of deregulated behaviour. This is evidenced in a reduction of incidents- Behaviour Watch, school log.
C.	Pupil Premium pupils assessed needs are identified within the EHCP as measurable targets, which lead to specific personalised interventions.	Staff understand the outcomes and impact of PP priorities. These are reviewed in SEND meetings and further interventions planned to optimise learning.
D.	'Communication for learning skills' are targeted to those pupils who require individualised support and this impacts on progress and achievement.	Therapy strategies are utilised effectively by staff and pupils. There is measurable impact on progress and achievement as pupils access learning at a level, which optimises motivation. Resources are targeted to ensure pupils have a 'voice'-Big Macs, iPads.
E.	Ensure PP pupils and their families receive well targeted early support	Evidence will demonstrate where early support prevents escalation to CP categories. Attendance sustains or improves for key pupils. Pupils make progress academically/wider outcomes.

5.Planned expenditure

Academic year 2018-19

The 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 & rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
<p>Further increase communication skills and the different forms of communication. EEF Digital technology +4 Early Years intervention +5 months Oral language interventions +5 One to one tuition +5</p>	<p>Employ a part time speech and language assistant. SaLT to evaluate pupils and put plans in place to be carried out daily for the assistant.</p>	<p>Rationale - EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit Speaking and listening the weakest area of English progress</p>	<p>The therapist and assistant to work closely with the SEN team and report back weekly progress. Monitoring by the SENCO and the SEN team</p>	<p>GM - DHT</p>	<p>Weekly SEN team review Termly progress measures, including IEPs Summer 19 – end of year progress measures</p> <p>£10 000 in the Summer Term</p> <p>Family liaison role used to deliver Early Bird Plus Course within the academy.</p>

<p>Internal Review Feb 19</p>	<p>Recruitment for this post has been unsuccessful. The academy has used grant expenditure to provide CPD to colleagues to enable quality first teaching and provided increased CPD to a small number of colleagues to enable them to provide targeted intervention.</p> <p>The impact of the targeted support and interventions show that there is no longer a gap in the progress of speaking and listening between PPG and Non PPG pupils (Evidence January assessment analysis).</p> <p>Next Steps: Continue to provide interventions and staff CPD to increase pupils' communication skills and staff knowledge. Redeploy some of the family liaison role to support communication strategies for parents who have a greater need.</p> <p>Funding adjustment - £10, 000</p>				
<p>Increase pupil attendance Continue to employ a family support advisor (FSA) to monitor attendance and to support families. Home visits to be carried out. Support pupils to get into school. Meet with the SEN team weekly to monitor attendance (specifically persistent absence) and to complete actions.</p> <p>EEF Social and emotional learning +4 months Parental involvement +3</p>	<p>Weekly monitoring through the SEN team. Daily actions (including home visits and bringing pupils into school) as required. Letters sent home. Parental support and help with appointments.</p>	<p>Rationale - EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit</p> <p>Pupil attendance 2016-17 was 93.2% Persistent absence 2016-17 was 16.8%</p>	<p>Weekly updates and monitoring Report to Trustees termly</p>	<p>JM – PSA GM - DHT</p>	<p>Termly attendance data</p> <p>£15,000</p> <p>Adjusted to £18, 333 after interim review for Summer Term</p> <p>Attendance for pupils in receipt of the pupil premium is up 1.6% to 95.1% (compared to 93.5% last year). Of 34 pupils who finished the year as a persistent absentee, only 24% of these were in receipt of the pupil premium.</p>
<p>Internal Review Feb 19</p>	<p>Evidence on attendance and persistent absent rates analysed. Analysis of autumn term data shows that there is currently a positive gap -95.8% PPG 91.94 non PPG. In the whole academy there are 32 students who are persistently absent (have attendance below 90%) of which 25% 8 pupils are in receipt of PPG. Reviewing the impact of targeted interventions for those pupils the PPG PA figure has reduced further and by 7th Feb this had reduced by 50% with only 4 of the now 26 pupils being in receipt of PPG.</p> <p>Impact of grant expenditure shows that attendance has increased and PA has decreased. There is a+ gap between attendance of pupils in receipt of PPG vs non PPG.</p>				

	<p>Next Steps: Sustain the improved picture. Utilise the FSA to support improvements in attendance of the 4 current PAS and to continually support those at risk of being a PA. Review the FSA role to widen impact into communication</p> <p>Funding adjustment - £18, 333 (adjusted focus on attendance and communication for FPSA using Summer Term's expenditure on intervention TA).</p>				
<p>Increase the number of pupils making expected progress in English and Maths particularly focusing on the Using and Applying element of Maths</p> <p>EEF Small group tuition +4 months Early Years intervention +5 months Collaborative learning +5 months</p>	<p>Intervention TA to be deployed to work with individuals and small groups of pupils to target specific areas of weakness for 0.5 of school week.</p>	<p>Rationale - EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit</p> <p>A small number of pupils making below expected progress.</p>	<p>Following termly progress measures, those pupils making below expected progress to be identified through pupil progress meetings. SLT and teacher to set targets for following term.</p>	<p>ME – Interventions Teaching Assistant</p>	<p>Termly progress measures, including Learning Plans Summer 19 – end of year progress measures</p> <p>£10,000</p> <p>£6, 666 adjusted for Summer Term. Intervention TA to focus specifically on pupils who are LAC using PPG+</p> <p>When using PIVATS 5 as a progress measure the gap between pupil performance in maths has narrowed so that only 1% fewer pupils in receipt of PPG make expected or better progress than those not in receipt. This represents an improvement on last year's assessment using PIVATS 5.</p>

					In English, pupils in receipt of the grant had 3% fewer pupils making expected or better progress when compared with those who are not.
Total budgeted cost					£35, 000
Internal Review Feb 19	<p>At the point of the internal review an autumn term assessment collation had taken place, however due to the target setting rationale and expected rates of progress full evaluation of this area will take place at the whole year point. Evidence in the review looked at data analysis and a conversation with the Intervention lead took place. The whole case load of the intervention lead is either LAC & PPG and all receive 1:1 3 days per week. Intervention targets are set based upon an analysis of EHCP/PEP targets and in conjunction with the class staff and Educational Psychologist. Progress annotations are recorded at session.</p> <p>Impact to date shows identified pupils' needs are met through quality first teaching, class intervention and withdrawal. Evidence of annotations and analysis shows pupils are making progress.</p> <p>Academy next step: Adjust funding according to case load LAC Premium/PPG grant</p> <p>Funding Adjustment: £6, 666 for the year. Summer Term intervention TA to be paid for using PPG+ to support pupils who are LAC.</p>				
ii. Targeted support					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence & rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?

<p>Increase in pupil engagement. Continue to employ Future Steps to work with individual pupils to develop sensory profiles. Train staff to carry out the sensory programs in class. Additional sensory resources for individual pupils and classes</p> <p>EEF Social and emotional learning +4 months Meta-cognition and self regulation +8 months.</p>	<p>Classes to refer individual pupils to Future Steps. Initial assessments. Annual reviews of programs. Training for staff and families.</p>	<p>Rationale - EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit</p> <p>High impact in previous years – STRIVE progress data</p>	<p>Regular updates from Future Steps. Sensory plans and programs devised. Pupils revisited in classes to review impact. SEN team weekly monitoring. Increased sensory resources in classes. STRIVE progress measure</p>	<p>Future Steps JM (FPSA)</p>	<p>Weekly discussion through SEN team Termly STRIVE progress measure</p> <p>£24,500</p> <p>Resources £490</p> <p>Reduction in physical interventions for pupils in receipt of the pupil premium</p> <p>Referrals made for pupil premium pupils in line with % of pupils in receipt of the grant.</p>
Total budgeted cost					£32, 750
<p>Internal Review Feb 19</p>		<p>Future Steps provide OT assessments, whole class and individual therapy programmes. The current year case load is defined and as a result of the programmes there is a reduction in identified pupil behaviours and through EHCP learning plans evidence of progress in the wider outcomes.</p> <p>Academy steps: Continue to evaluate impact Funding Adjustment: Remain £32, 750</p>			

<p>ii. Targeted support (2)</p>					
<p>Desired outcome</p>	<p>Chosen action/approach</p>	<p>What is the evidence & rationale for this choice?</p>	<p>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</p>	<p>Staff lead</p>	<p>When will you review implementation?</p>

<p>Reduction in pupil behaviours and physical interventions Employ a full time academy behaviour lead to support the reduction of complex behaviours in classrooms and reduce the number of physical interventions within the academy</p> <p>EEF Behaviour Interventions +3 Meta-Cognition +7 Social and Emotional Learning +4</p>	<p>Close working with Academy SEND Team, Futuresteps and multi-agencies. Offer support to administer sensory integration programmes and provide staff with advice and guidance on use of behaviour management strategies. Quality assure all paperwork related to behaviour. Collate data to report to the SEND Team and identify patterns and trends.</p>	<p>Rationale – EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit</p> <p>Success of full time behaviour lead in other academies leading to reduction in number of physical interventions</p> <p>Effectiveness in reducing physical interventions and level 3 behaviours in current role working part time.</p>	<p>Weekly guidance via SEND Team meetings. Regular monitoring of behaviour watch. Individual class targets for behaviour. Use of behaviour watch data to monitor trends and patterns. Regular reports to Local Accountability Board.</p>	<p>GM - DHT</p> <p>MC – Behaviour Lead</p>	<p>Weekly through SEND Team Meetings</p> <p>Termly during LAB meetings</p> <p>QA visits from executive leadership</p> <p>Use of Challenge Partners Review Initiative</p> <p>Cost of 0.5 week Behaviour Lead</p> <p>£10, 000</p> <p>PIs of pupils in Autumn Term in receipt of the pupil premium was slightly greater than those not in receipt of the pupil premium,</p> <p>Pupils in Receipt of the Grant accounted for 26% of PIs in the Spring Term</p> <p>Pupils in Receipt of the Grant accounted for 25% of PIs in the Summer Term</p>
Total budgeted cost					£10, 000
<p>Internal Review Feb 19</p>		<p>The academy made the decision to increase the behaviour lead time from 0.5 to whole time at the during the autumn term. This enabled greater capacity to observe, evaluate and plan strategies to reduce behaviours, liaise with the SEN and MDT teams and work alongside pupils and class staff.</p>			

Analysis of behaviour data shows that there has been a gap between the number of recorded incidents for those in recruit of PP and those non PP pupils. However, one PP pupil contributed significantly to the figures and reviewing the data with that knowledge means there is no gap. Evidence shows that well targeted support and use of the PP grant has supported all pupils to reduce the incidents of negative behaviour.

SEN team meetings, board meetings, safeguarding team time, use of the family liaison lead, pastoral plans all demonstrate the high level of analysis and intervention that takes place.

Academy Next Steps: With the added capacity of the whole time behaviour lead review strategies/models for pupils to reflect and think about and manage their behaviours (EEF:Behaviour Interventions +3 Meta-Cognition +7, Social and Emotional Learning +4)

Funding Adjustment: £10, 000

Total budgeted cost of PP Spend	£69, 960
--	-----------------

5. Additional detail

In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.

Website, SLT discussion. Ofsted reports. Pupils discussion. Staff meetings. Scrutiny of meetings minutes and pupils work