

Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

1. Summary information					
School	Holly Hill C Of E Infant School				
Academic Year	2016/2017	Total PP budget	£142,559	Date of most recent PP Review	
Total number of pupils	206	Number of pupils eligible for PP	93	Date for next internal review of this strategy	September 2017

2. Current attainment				
	Total % Pupils	Pupils Eligible for PP %	Pupils not eligible for PP %	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
End of KS1 assessment % achieving ARE in reading, writing and maths	Reading – 63% Writing – 49% Maths – 67%	Reading – 65% Writing – 53% Maths – 70%	Reading – 59% Writing – 42% Maths – 59%	Reading – 74% Writing – 65% Maths – 73%
Year One Phonics Check Results	75%	73%	80%	81%
Year Two Phonics Check Results	89%	88%	94%	91%
EYFS GLD	54%	41%	66%	69%

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.	Low prior attainment - Children enter Nursery significantly below age related expectations therefore accelerated progress is required to close the gap.(2015 – 2016 data shows current Reception PEPP children entered Nursery on average 13 months below Age Related Expectations and current Year 1 PEPP children entered Reception 12 months below Age Related Expectations) 2016-2017 data shows 0% of PEPP children entered Nursery at Age Related Expectations for Prime Areas of Learning and Literacy and Maths and 9% of PEPP children entered Reception at Age Related Expectations for Prime Areas of Learning and Literacy and Maths.)
B.	Speech and Language Issues- Children enter school working well below typical age related expectations– 2016-2017 Nursery Baseline data shows 13% of PEPP children were working at Age Related Expectations for Communication and Language. Reception Baseline data shows 45% of PEPP children were at Age Related Expectations for Communication and Language.
C.	PSHE (managing feelings and making relationships) 2016-2017 Nursery Baseline data shows 26% of PEPP children were working at Age Related Expectations for Personal Social and Emotional Development. Reception Baseline data shows 39% of PEPP children were at Age Related Expectations for Communication and Language.
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	

D.	Social deprivation. Potential lack of skills/resources to support learning at home including lack of rich and varied life experiences. Frankley estate is within the 5% of the most deprived areas in the country. School has a much higher percentage of pupil premium students – 54% in September 2016 compared with 25.9% nationally.	
E.	Attendance and punctuality- 2015/16 Total 95% - PEPP attendance 94.04% and Non PEPP 94.93% - National average for infant school was 95.7% in 2015/2016.	
4. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Pupil Premium children achieve in line with Non- pupil premium children nationally in Maths, Reading, Writing and Science	Improved progress & attainment against 2016 of PP pupils. PEPP attainment to be equal to attainment for non-disadvantaged pupils nationally. SATs scores to be in line with national for all groups of children.
B.	% of Pupil Premium pupils achieving Greater Depth in Maths, Reading, Writing and Science is in line with non PP nationally	Improved progress & attainment against 2016 of PP pupils. Greater Depth PEPP attainment to be equal to attainment for non-disadvantaged pupils nationally. PP children make better than expected progress from EYFS Profile to SATS
C.	% of PP children achieving GLD is in line with non-PP nationally	PP children make better than expected progress from entry point to end of reception % of PP children achieving GLD is in line with Non PEPP nationally.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year					
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?
To ensure that PEPP pupils attainment is equal to attainment for non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.	<p>Appoint a pupil premium champion.</p> <p>Appoint a highly skilled teacher to provide, plan and monitor high quality interventions.(RB)</p> <p>Appoint 1 x HLTA and 1 x TA to provide PEPP early interventions</p> <p>Teachers to ensure that first class teaching meets the needs of all learners including PEPP.</p> <p>Monitoring schedule for LW, BS and data evaluations set out for year</p>	<p>National Pupil Premium Champion David Law supports the use of Pupil premium funding to put in place a pupil premium Champion for the following reasons:</p> <p>Collection, analysis and use of data relating to individual pupils and groups. Definite focus on the quality of teaching for PEPP pupils</p> <p>Identification of the main barriers to learning for PP-eligible pupils.</p> <p>Frequent monitoring of the progress of every PP-eligible pupil.</p> <p>When a pupil's progress slows, PP Champion ensures interventions are put in place rapidly.</p> <p>If poor attendance is an issue, PP Champion will address this as a priority and use PP funding to address the decline in attendance.</p> <p>Reporting to all stakeholders on the progress of PP children and the impact of spending.</p> <p>Evidence from the Education and Endowment Fund suggests that early years and pre-school intervention is beneficial. On average, early years interventions have an impact of five</p>	<p>RB part of SLT with proven experience of leadership across the school</p> <p>RB to provide half termly impact of PEPP pupils.</p> <p>PEPP children receiving early intervention to have specific and measurable targets.</p> <p>RB/CT/DG to complete learning walks during PEPP interventions.</p> <p>All monitoring of progress is planned and effective at raising the standard of teaching and learning</p>	RB/DG	<p>Progress of PEPP children to be reviewed half termly at data analysis, pupil progress meetings and review of intervention impact.</p> <p>PEPP impact reported at Standards Committee.</p> <p>Outcomes from monitoring schedule reported to weekly SLT meetings</p>

		additional months' progress, and appear to be particularly beneficial for children from low income families.			
To raise attainment through improved teaching and learning. 80% teaching to be good or better.	<p>Monitoring schedule for LW, BS and data evaluations set out for year.</p> <p>Teachers to engage as learners. Three planned peer observations across the year focusing on questioning, phonics and Numicon.</p> <p>RB to support teaching and learning in KS1 and DG to support in EY. Modelling good practice and supporting teachers with specific actions following monitoring.</p> <p>Teachers (and TAs) to attend courses(undertake CPD identified through monitoring of T&L, PPM and PM) and responsible for sourcing aspects for their professional development.</p>	Improved teaching and learning is the key to raising attainment for all pupils and therefore for identified pupil premium pupils. This is recognised by research from several organisations (NFER/Sutton Trust) as the most effective way to improve achievement.	<p>As part of the SIP key skills in English, Maths and Questioning will be developed through Maths and English leads hosting training and sharing outcomes with staff. Teachers will engage as learners and have termly peer observations. These will be monitored by the HT/DHT.</p> <p>All monitoring of progress is planned and effective at raising the standard of teaching and learning</p>	CT/DG	<p>Reviewed at the end of each half term following data and pupil progress meetings.</p> <p>Improved teaching and learning will be evident during lesson observations and learning walks and through all monitoring activities. Teaching and learning profile will be reviewed half termly by SLT.</p> <p>Teaching a learning profile reviewed by GB in standards committee.</p>

Pupils to be supported with their emotional wellbeing	Employment of one full time learning mentor and one part time learning mentor assistant.	<p>Evidence from Sutton Trust suggests that behaviour interventions can produce large improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviours. Specific behaviour interventions are put into place by the learning mentors where appropriate.</p> <p>Sutton Trust states on average, Social and Emotional Learning interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself (four months' additional progress on average). Improvements appear more likely when approaches are embedded into routine educational practices, and supported by professional development and training for staff.</p>	<p>Children's emotions will be monitored daily by learning mentors. A record of these will be kept. Extra support will be provided for pupils on specific issues. This may include attending Sulp group, lunch club, friendship group, one to one meeting with learning mentor, working alongside families, referral to outside agencies, in-class learning mentor support for individuals and groups.</p> <p>Self-esteem groups Annual PASS survey Support overview reviewed half termly – BECO, LM, SENCO.</p>	DH/MW £26400	<p>half termly attendance report for PEPP Children to Pupil Support Committee Behaviour report to PS committee Annual PASS survey</p>
	Therapeutic Family support provided to support complex needs .(Malachi)	Family Support Worker will support families in removing barriers such as; housing, benefits, job-seekers, new to the country and English, in order to enable their children to thrive and reach their full potential.	Case study provided for each child supported	£18,200?	
Total budgeted cost					
ii. Targeted support					
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>Improve attendance and punctuality of PEPP pupils to ensure that attendance is at least 95.7%, in line with national average.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Offering free places at our Golden Ticket breakfast club and then using HLTA support to deliver a story to those PP pupils attending.</p> <p>Whole school initiative on attendance.</p> <p>Children financed to come to Breakfast club</p> <p>MW and DH spotlight for consistently poor punctuality or attendance.</p> <p>Attendance policy written and implemented</p>	<p>Sutton Trust research suggests that small group intervention support and improved attendance all benefit pupil attainment. By offering free attendance at the club to targeted pupils. They will make greater progress which can be transferred to learning in class. Good attendance is recognised as being beneficial to pupil progress by researchers. Quickly addressing attendance concerns is one of NFER's 7 building blocks to improve achievement for disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>Clear expectations and accountability.</p>	<p>Designated PEPP lead (RB) to monitor the implementation of the interventions and the progress made through ½ termly data.</p> <p>MW to monitor attendance.</p> <p>RB to monitor and evaluate attendance of PEPP attending Golden Ticket Breakfast. PEPP to be in line with Non PEPP nationally</p>	<p>YF/RB/DH/ MW</p> <p>CT/DG</p>	<p>Half termly review following progress meetings and data. Half termly analysis of attendance data. Half termly attendance report for PEPP Children to Pupil Support Committee</p> <p>Pupil support committee evaluate attendance and punctuality</p>

<p>PEPP children make accelerated progress in Communication and Language to enable them to attain in line with National Average for non-disadvantaged pupils in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile at the end of reception</p>	<p>WellComm to be used to screen children for Communication and Language. This is then used to plan and deliver targeted language interventions and inform quality first teaching.</p> <p>Funded speech and language therapist to provide assessments, training to staff and work with children on a 1:1 basis.</p>	<p>Evidence from the Education and Endowment Foundation indicates that studies of oral language interventions consistently show positive benefits on learning, including oral language skills and reading comprehension. On average, pupils who participate in oral language interventions make approximately five months' additional progress over the course of a year.</p>	<p>YF overseeing Half termly rescreening using Well Comm Specific plans written and reviewed by SL therapist</p>	<p>RB AP</p>	<p>Termly review linked to pupil progress reports.</p>
<p>Eligible PEPP families experiencing difficulties will be supported so that pupils can be supported at home and therefore enjoy and achieve in school.</p>	<p>Engage family support services from Malachi to impact on emotional health and wellbeing of pupils and their families</p>	<p>The OFSTED document 'The Pupil Premium How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement' (Feb 2013) identifies that "providing well-targeted support to improve attendance, behaviour or links with families where these were barriers to a pupil's learning" is one of the characteristics shared by many of the schools who spent the Pupil Premium funding successfully to improve achievement.</p>	<p>Malachi team to provide termly report to Pupil Support Committee. Malachi to work with teachers to ensure that the service is making maximum impact upon pupil's wellbeing and achievement.</p>	<p>MW/DH £11,190</p>	
Total budgeted cost					

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?
Enable all pupils to benefit from school visits and experiences which they might otherwise not have the opportunity to do, giving them self esteem, co-operative skills, and enjoyment of school. Pupils to increase language & vocabulary to support progress in reading and writing.	All school experiences and after school clubs to be budgeted for so that educational visits, WOW days and visitors are free of charge to all pupils and families.	Collaborative learning and outdoor learning experiences benefit pupils and can raise attainment based on information from evidence from the Education Endowment Fund. As Frankley estate has a high level of deprivation often children do not have opportunities to visit places due to lack of parental income. This therefore affects their ability to share experiences by developing the broad vocabulary related to these experiences.	School visits mapped out in line with the curriculum. Before and after school experiences to be planned for.	CT	End of year review.
Total budgeted cost					
6. Review of expenditure					
Previous Academic Year		2015/2016			
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>80% of teaching to be good or better to raise standards for all groups of pupils.</p>	<p>Work alongside CTPSA to improve teaching and learning across the school.</p>	<p>71% of teaching was good or better in July 2016. Good Level of Development All Pupils 54% an increase of 16% from 2015 Pupil Premium 41% an increase of 5% from 2015 Non Pupil Premium 66% an increase of 23% from 2015 Girls 70% an increase of 18% from 2015 Boys 39% an increase of 12% from 2015</p> <p>Phonics Year 1 All Pupils 75% an increase of 16% on 2015 Pupil Premium an increase of 11% on 2015 Non Pupil Premium an increase of 27% on 2015 Girls 81% an increase of 24% on 2015 Boys 71% an increase of 9% on 2015</p> <p>Phonics Year 2 All Pupils 89% an increase of 5% on 2015 Pupil Premium 88% an increase of 8% on 2015 Non Pupil Premium 94% a decrease of 6% on 2015 Girls 89% an increase of 3% on 2015 Boys 90% an increase of 8% on 2015</p> <p>Year 2 SATs Reading All Pupils 63% Greater depth 12% Pupil Premium 65% Non Pupil Premium 59% Girls 61% Boys 66%</p> <p>Writing All Pupils 49% Greater depth 0% Pupil Premium 53% Non Pupil Premium 42% Girls 46% Boys 52%</p> <p>Maths All Pupils 67% Greater depth 0% Pupil Premium 70% Non Pupil Premium 59% Girls 61% Boys 72%</p>	<p>Targeted intervention worked well and increase GLD for all groups of pupils.</p> <p>Phonics scored were just below National Average (79%) in Year 1. However working alongside CTPSA and sharing good practice had a positive impact on results with all group achieving higher than previous years. Year 2 Phonics was in line with National Average. Non Pupil Premium pupils decreased. Action: Ensure that teachers are being held accountable for all groups of pupils and that they are not reliant on PEPP intervention. Next year pupil progress meetings will be held with individual teachers as opposed to year groups. All children to be taught in class together through quality first teaching.</p> <p>Year 2 SATs were below National Average for all subjects. Pupil premium out performed non pupil premium in all subjects. Action: Improve quality first teaching through support of Key Stage Leader during PPA sessions next year. Ensure that individual teacher are held accountable for all groups and have clear actions to address gaps between PEPP and Non PEPP children in pupil progress meetings.</p> <p>Year 2 were on track to achieve near National Average scores according to Step Up but this did not collate with the ITAF. Action: Track against the ITAF throughout the year and ensure that data on FROG is comparable. Buy in external moderation from DH to confirm judgments and address gaps in Spring 2.</p> <p>Reading was the only subject where children achieved greater depth. Action: Year 2 teachers to teach for Mastery in Maths to ensure that children achieve Greater Depth. Staff training and support by Maths Lead RB. Year 2 teachers to collate evidence towards Greater Depth much earlier in the year against the ITAF. Greater depth statements linking to the ITAF to be placed on FROG by subject leaders for Reading, Writing and Maths.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

ii. Targeted support

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>PEPP pupils to make accelerated progress to achieve National Average in Reading</p>	<p>1:1 and Small group intervention led by funded TAs and a PEPP funded teacher (1 x teacher 3 x TAs and 1 x HLTA)</p>	<p>Reception: Baseline: 3% of PEPP were at ARE for Writing at Baseline October 2015. 41% of PEPP attained ELG for Reading. (NA 77%) This is an increase of 38%.</p> <p>Year 1: Baseline: 55% of PEPP attained ELG for reading in June 2015). 69% of PEPP at ARE at the end of year 1 (July 2016) (measured against KPIs from Step Up curriculum) This is an increase of 14%.</p> <p>Year 2: Baseline: 48% of PEPP attained ARE at the end of year 1 in July 2015) 65% achieved at least expected in SATS for Reading (NA 74%). 10% at Greater Depth (NA 23.6%) This is an increase of 17%.</p>	<p>Year One and Year Two PEPP children made most progress in Reading between Dec'15 and March '16 These interventions were led and planned by a PEPP funded teacher and delivered by the PEPP funded teacher and PEPP funded TA. Pupils made most progress when inventions were strategically managed, led and planned by a PEPP funded teacher. Action: PEPP funded teacher 'PEPP Champion' to be employed for academic year 2016/2017.</p> <p>1:1 reading interventions were effective enabling children to 'catch up' and make progress through reading bands but this did not always translate to these pupils being 'on track' to reach ARE when assessed against the KPIs from the Step Up curriculum. This was particularly the case later in the year as intervention analysis show children achieving book band targets but this does not have a significant impact on the percentage of children 'on track'. Book banded levels and PM Bench Mark do not always correlate all skills required to achieve KPIs and assessment criteria on the ITAF in Year Two. Action: 1:1 reading will continue however children will have SMART targets linked to KPIs and (in year two) the ITAF.</p> <p>10% of children achieved Greater Depth in Reading in SATs. Action: Planned PEPP interventions to target higher ability children to achieve Greater Depth criteria.</p> <p>There was sometimes a disparity between the class teacher's assessment of a child's reading level in class and the reading level that children were reading in intervention groups.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<p>PEPP pupils to make accelerated progress to achieve National Average in Writing and in line with Non PEPP pupils</p>	<p>Small group intervention led by funded TAs and a PEPP funded teacher (1 x teacher 3 x TAs and 1 x HLTA)</p>	<p>Reception: Baseline: 15% of PEPP were at ARE for Writing at Baseline October 2015. 41% of PEPP attained ELG for Writing. (NA 72.6%) This is an increase of 26%.</p> <p>Year 1: Baseline: 42% of PEPP attained ELG for Writing in June 2015). 42% of PEPP at ARE at the end of year 1 (July 2016) (measured against KPIs from Step Up curriculum)</p> <p>Year 2: Baseline: 21% of PEPP attained ARE at the end of year 1 in July 2015) 53% achieved at least expected in SATS for Reading (NA 65.5%). 0% at Greater Depth (NA 13.3%) This is an increase of 32%.</p>	<p>There was sometimes a disparity between assessments made by Teachers and Teaching Assistants. Teachers did not always value assessment judgements made in interventions.</p> <p>Action: PEPP funded teacher to take the lead on ensuring that assessments are moderated half termly and that there is ongoing communication between PEPP TAs and class teachers.</p> <p>Action: Teachers and TAs to moderate assessment judgements half termly at internal phase moderation meetings.</p> <p>Intervention Work was not completed in class work books and assessment for work completed in interventions was not always used to inform ongoing assessment against the step up by class teachers.</p> <p>Action: All work completed in PEPP interventions to be completed in pupil's books to ensure that this informs assessment of pupil's progress.</p> <p>In Year 1 half termly targets were set by teachers and interventions were carried out by PEPP funded TAs. Some children achieved their targets quickly and some did not meet their targets.</p> <p>Action: All children to have SMART targets for interventions led and monitored by PEPP funded teacher.</p> <p>0% of PEPP children achieved Greater Depth for writing. Action: Greater Depth Writing groups with specific KPI targets to be planned and led by PEPP funded teacher.</p>	
---	--	--	--	--

			<p>In year 2 PEPP children outperformed non-PEPP children in SATS for Writing.</p> <p>Action: Improve quality of teaching to accelerate progress for all groups of learners and raise attainment.</p>	
<p>PEPP pupils to make accelerated progress to achieve National Average in Maths and in line with Non PEPP pupils</p>	<p>Small group intervention led by funded TAs and a PEPP funded teacher (1 x teacher 3 x TAs and 1 x HLTA)</p>	<p>Reception: Baseline: 0% of PEPP were at ARE for Number. 48% of PEPP attained ELG for Number (NA 78.8%) This is an increase of 48%.</p> <p>4% of PEPP were at ARE for Shape Space and Measure at Baseline October 2015. 56% attained ELG for Shape Space and Measure. (NA 81.7%) This is an increase of 52%.</p> <p>Year 1: Baseline: 55% of PEPP attained ELG for Maths in June 2015). 61% of PEPP at ARE at the end of year 1 (July 2016) (measured against KPIs from Step Up curriculum) This is an increase of 6%.</p> <p>Year 2: Baseline: 52% of PEPP attained ARE at the end of year 1 in July 2015) 70% achieved at least expected in SATS for Maths (NA 72.6%). 0% at Greater Depth (NA 17.8%) This is an increase of 18%.</p>	<p>There was sometimes a disparity between assessments made by Teachers and Teaching Assistants. Teachers did not always value assessment judgements made in interventions.</p> <p>Action: PEPP funded teacher to take the lead on ensuring that assessments are moderated half termly and that there is ongoing communication between PEPP TAs and class teachers.</p> <p>Action: Teachers and TAs to moderate assessment judgements half termly at internal phase moderation meetings.</p> <p>Intervention Work was not completed in class work books and assessment for work completed in interventions was not always used to inform ongoing assessment against the step up by class teachers.</p> <p>Action: All work completed in PEPP interventions to be completed in pupil's books to ensure that this informs assessment of pupil's progress.</p> <p>Year 1 maths data in Dec'15 showed PEPP children performing significantly below ARE for maths. Step Up was used effectively by maths lead to set specific interventions for PEPP pupils. These interventions were delivered by PEPP funded Teacher. Significant progress was made by year 1 PEPP pupils as a direct</p>	

			<p>result of these timely and focussed interventions. Action: PEPP / Maths lead support teacher's planning and to work in class in 2016/2017 to ensure that that progress for all groups of learners is met.</p> <p>In sum1 and sum 2 class teachers planned interventions and these were delivered by PEPP TAs. Weekly objectives were set for intervention groups.</p> <p>Action: All PEPP interventions to have SMART targets.</p> <p>0% of PEPP children achieved Greater Depth for Action: Greater Depth PEPP interventions to be planned for HA children.</p> <p>In year 2 PEPP children outperformed non-PEPP children in SATS for Maths. Action: Improve quality of teaching to accelerate progress for all groups of learners and raise attainment.</p>	
<p>PEPP pupils to make accelerated progress to achieve National Average in Phonics and in line with Non PEPP pupils</p>	<p>Spr 1 and Spr 2 -PEPP Teacher planned interventions and PEPP Teacher and PEPP TA led interventions Interventions were delivered in small differentiated groups out of class -Progress and gaps were identified through detailed analysis of phonics</p>	<p>Year 1: 73% PEPP passed phonics screening. (NA 81%)</p> <p>Year 2: 88% PEPP passed phonics screening. (NA 91%)</p>	<p>The direct impact on progress and attainment of phonics interventions was measurable.</p> <p>Detailed analysis of Phonics Screening checks enabled both PEPP funded Teacher and Class Teachers to plan effective interventions which were effective when delivered by either PEPP funded teacher or PEPP funded TA.</p> <p>Changes to class teacher in one year 1 class in Spring led to significant decrease in percentage of pupils passing phonics screening in that class (78% to 66%) This had an impact on attainment of PEPP In Phonics in year 2 non PEPP children outperformed PEPP children.</p>	

	<p>screening test by PEPP funded teacher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Parent Phonics workshop for identified PEPP children where this was identified as a barrier to attainment in phonics. <p>Sum 1 and Sum 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Class teacher planned interventions and PEPP TA led interventions -Small group out of class support -Progress and gaps were identified through detailed analysis of phonics screening test by PEPP funded teacher 		<p>Action: Improve quality of teaching to accelerate progress for all groups of learners and raise attainment.</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>To improve the Communication and Language skills of PEPP children so that they achieve Age Related Expectations for Communication and Language.</p>	<p>PEPP Teacher planned and delivered interventions using Well Comm for interventions in Spring 1</p> <p>Class teacher planned interventions and interventions were delivered by TA in Spr 2, sum 1 and sum 2 using Well Comm.</p> <p>Interventions were delivered out of class in small differentiated groups</p> <p>Pupils targeted through SLT led pupil progress meeting</p> <p>Progress measured and SMART targets set using Well Comm and Development</p>	<p>Nursery: Baseline: 0% of PEPP were at ARE for Speaking at Baseline October 2015. 67% of PEPP attained ARE for Speaking. This is an increase of 67%. Baseline: 0% of PEPP were at ARE for Understanding at Baseline October 2015. 75% of PEPP attained ARE for Understanding. This is an increase of 75%. Baseline: 0% of PEPP were at ARE for Listening and Attention at Baseline October 2015. 54% of PEPP attained ARE for Listening and Attention. This is an increase of 54%.</p> <p>Reception: Baseline: 0% of PEPP were at ARE for Speaking at Baseline October 2015. 67% of PEPP attained ELG for Speaking. (NA 85.1%) This is an increase of 67%. Reception: Baseline: 4% of PEPP were at ARE for Understanding at Baseline October 2015. 67% of PEPP attained ELG for Understanding. (NA 85.9%) This is an increase of 63%. Baseline: 4% of PEPP were at ARE for Listening and Attention at Baseline October 2015. 70% of PEPP attained ELG for Listening and Attention. (NA 86.3%) This is an increase of 66%.</p>	<p>Well Comm screening tool was used effectively by class teacher to screen children and plan effective interventions. Impact of interventions was measurable using clear assessment criteria from the Well Comm screening toolkit and development matters. Action: Well Comm screening tool to continue to be used in 2016/2017. Children to be screened half termly to ensure they remain on track.</p> <p>In summer term the Introduction of Snack and Chat and improvement in weekly planning for CL as part of quality first teaching implemented by new EYFS lead had a significant impact on raising attainment in speaking and understanding. Action: Snack and chat to be introduced to the children all year. Good practise to be shared across the year group.</p> <p>Interventions delivered by Class Teacher and PEPP funded TA were effective in raising attainment for PEPP children in understanding and speaking. In nursery PEPP children's attainment in Listening and Attention was lower than PEPP children's attainment in Understanding and Speaking. Action: Time for Talk and Sulp programmes to be implemented.</p> <p>Well Comm interventions were highly successful at raising attainment in Communication and Language for children who did not have specific Speech and Language delays or disorders. However a significant number of PEPP (32/47 68%) are on the school's SEND register and need specialist advice and support to improve their Communication and Language. Action: PEPP Funded speech and language therapist to provide assessments, training to staff and work with children on a 1:1 basis.</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

	Matters.			
--	----------	--	--	--

7. Additional detail

For a full review of 2015.2016 PEPP impact please see attached 'Impact of PEPP interventions 2015-2016'.