

Pupil Premium Grant – Impact Review Audit

PPG Attainment 2016-2017

PPG attainment data is compared against National overall data

	GLD	National overall data						
Foundation	86%	71%						
ARE	Writing	National	Reading	National	Maths	National	GPS	National
KS1	50% (1ARB)	68%	63% (1ARB)	75.5%	63% (1 ARB)	75%		
KS2	77% (1ARB)	76%	31% (1ARB)	71%	62% (1ARB)	75%		

GDS/ Exceeding	Writing	National	Reading	National	Maths	National	GPS	National
KS1	13% (1ARB)	16%	13% (1ARB)	25%	25%	20.5%		
KS2	23% (1ARB)	18%	15% (1ARB)	25%	15% (1ARB)	23%	61%	77%

KS2 Combined	ARE	National Overall	GDS	National Overall
Reading/ Writing/ Maths	23% (1ARB)	61%	15%	9%

RAG Rating: Light green: Good Progress, Orange: Average Progress, Red: Limited Progress

School/Academy	St Stephens Community Academy			Academic Year 2016/17
PPG Strategy (PPG Provision Map – D1.6)	Lead	Cost	Evaluation Tools/ Evidence Base	Impact Review
Training				
A.To develop learning strategies for children through training staff using recognised/ well found programme of visible learning (18months)	Head of School/ Visible Learning Coaches	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£15,000</u>	Feedback from Staff from INSET. Visible Learning Action Plan. Pupil Conferencing/ Video Conferencing. Survey Monkey/ Questionnaire from staff and children. Learning Environment Evidence. Monitoring evidence of planning and books.	<p>July 2017 data shows impact of visible learning CPD in Foundation data. Foundation data shows an increase in PPG attainment at Expected and Exceeding.</p> <p>Year One data shows a significant improvement on Phonics data and PPG attainment achieving 86% compared to National.</p> <p>Key Stage One data shows overall attainment levels are inline/ above National at Year Two. Case study information for PPG children in Year Two.</p> <p>Overall attainment in Year 3 and 5 shows vast majority of children are working at expectations.</p> <p>PPG Pupils are achieving as well as Non PPG children in writing, most especially in Year 6, and in all subjects in Year 1.</p> <p>Indicative progress measures for Key Stage Two shows school is well within benchmarks.</p> <p>Visible Learning journey for 17-18 to focus on action research in classrooms to raise PPG attainment in narrowing the gaps in reading across the school and in Maths in Year 3/4.</p> <p>Review: Impact Good. On-going CPD programme for whole school staff. First 12 months completed.</p>
Pastoral				
B. To continue to develop effective and positive relationships with parents	SENDICO	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£9,000</u>	Feedback from parental in annual survey. Review of parental courses/ workshops provided. Feedback from multi agency involvement. Case study evidence: impact on attainment and attendance levels. Breakfast Club attendance list.	<p>Case studies compiled for attendance success by attendance leader.</p> <p>Lower attendance than 90% is minimal. Direct actions by EWO.</p> <p>School focus for attendance in 17 and 18 on those in 90-95% area as school remains around 95%.</p> <p>Review: Impact Good.</p>

C. To ensure children/ staff and families have access to specialist SEN provision and agencies	SENDICO	£16,778	Feedback from staff in annual survey. Request slips to SENDICO. SENDICO leader reports to SLT and Governors. Feedback from wider and external agencies. Case Study evidence of impact of specialist provision. CPD SEN Training Programme for Staff.	SENDICO shared SEN updates with Staff and LSAs e.g. Hearing Impairment Service throughout the year. Staff knowledge improved since September 2017. Impact seen in planning and provision. Case Study evidence shows impact of specialist reports and advice. SENDICO reviewing own services and documentation for teachers for September 2017 to have the most impact on learning. Review: Impact Good. School maintains good links with specialist agencies e.g EP/ Speech and Language.
D. To provide social/ emotional programmes to support the whole child	SENDICO	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£5,760.</u>	Feedback from staff in annual survey. Request slips to SENDICO. SENDICO leader reports to SLT and Governors. Case Study evidence of impact of specialist provision. CPD SEN Training Programme for Staff.	Teachers have compiled case studies. Monitored by SENDICO. Intervention data shows improved engagement level for interventions carefully designed and structured. Impact of Jubilee room provision and staffing seen after short programmes where children are positively transitioned back into classroom. 2 simple/use of leavon scale monitors behaviour and engagement levels to effectively inform provision. Children have been signed posted to provision such as breakfast club. Case Study evidence of positive impact. Full review of pastoral team structure and line management to ensure full impact of children's learning. LSA trained to provide support to other on social stories. School to train a member of staff on ELSA programme following research and review. Regular EP visits to school per half term as a result. Review: Impact Good/ Average. Further develop through ELSA Trained programme
Access to Enrichments				
E. To provide children in need with access to breakfast club for a half term Explore grant funding provision to provide wider access to breakfast club.	Breakfast Club Leader/ Head of School	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£2,700</u>	Breakfast Club attendance register. Breakfast club Letters. Feedback from Launceston Food bank. Feedback from parents on breakfast club. Feedback from children on breakfast club. Case Study evidence showing impact of breakfast club in attendance.	Additional support provided through Launceston Food bank. Review of letters/ booking and information has made impact on provision. Evidence in PPG data of positive impact of Maths breakfast club on attainment outcomes. Difference in PPG and Non PPG at Year Six was reduced. PPG allocation of funding for breakfast club still remains as a need for next PPG provision map. Chartwells/ PTFA provided a

				breakfast for Year Six during SATs week.
				Review: Impact Good. Further extended Breakfast Club leader hours to maintain budgets and ordering.
F. To provide children with access to learning in context through visitors/ enrichments/ residential	SENDICO/ Head of School	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£3,200</u>	Feedback from parents in annual survey. Feedback from children in annual survey. Feedback from parents and children based on residential. Feedback and review of enrichment visits. Evidence in books of writing/ learning in response to enrichment opportunity.	Access to clubs meant school obtained Gold Sports Mark Award. Access to clubs meant children have experienced wider sports competitions and awards which success. Further access to wider enrichments has improved transition e.g. KS Beach Visit, access to local area Evidence of enrichments for Year F/ ARB seen in data. Evidence in books of children's confidence in writing about real life experiences- Year 2 and 5. Large majority of children participated in Year 4/5/6 residential. PPG provision support access to ensure financial pressures did not excluded children. Vast majority of classes have had visitors to classrooms to link to activity days/ enrichment which have seen good attendance from parents e.g. Spanish Day/ Teddy Bears Picnic.
				Review: Impact Good. Year groups to plan out enrichment over year to support funding for event: Parental funding/PTFA funding and PPG funding.
G. To provide children with learning experience outdoors using Wild Tribe experience	Outdoor Learning Leader/ SENDICO	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£1,800</u>	Feedback from parents and children in annual surveys. Feedback from staff on confidence levels in planning and leading sessions outdoors. Feedback from outdoor learning days. Outdoor Leader termly impact report. Outdoor Leader reports to governors.	All children in Foundation/ Key Stage One and ARB continue to have regular Wild Tribe experiences. Outdoor Leader led a successful outdoor learning day. Improved behaviour on this day for most. Feedback from parents from this day was positive. Vast majority of parents and children are now prepared for outdoor learning days through appropriate dress and footwear. Year Five attainment reflects the impact of outdoor learning in areas such as Reading 70% and Writing 67%. New lunchtime provision ensures all children are outside and actively engaged in purposeful play for 30mins each day across

				<p>the school site. Outdoor Leader impact on modelling outdoor learning provision for all staff. Number of learning sessions outdoors has increased.</p> <p>Review: Impact Good. Development of impact of outdoor Maths on attainment levels. Training for new staff through outdoor learning leader.</p>
Attainment and Learning Progress				
H. To provide a learning Breakfast Club for Year 6 pupils	Key Stage Two Leader	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£1,325</u>	<p>Feedback from parents and pupils on provision. Attendance registered. Tracking and attainment Data. Class Teacher monitoring of learning completed/ book scrutiny evidence/ planning evidence and annotations. Standardisation results. Year 6 Teacher/ Maths Leader Reports to SLT on progress of intervention.</p>	<p>Impact of breakfast club seen in narrow gap in PPG and Non PPG in Maths attainment in Year Six results in July 17. (-17% gaps between PPG and Non/ -8% PPG and overall). (GDS -6% PPG and Non and -1% PPG and overall). This is compared to 15-16 where the gaps on EXP was (-22% and -10% and at GDS 0% of PPG children on track). 16-17 23% of PPG achieved GDS. Confidence levels improved for children. Feedback from parents was positive. Regular attendance by children early morning for the duration of this intervention.</p> <p>Review: Impact Good most especially at GDS.</p>
I.To accelerate the progress and attainment levels at ARE for Upper Key Stage Two (Maths and writing)	Key Stage Two Leader	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£11,700</u>	<p>Feedback from learning tutor/ PPG half termly impact reports. Feedback from class teacher from half termly monitoring. Evidence in Planning/ Maths books/Learning Tutor assessment notes. Evidence from standardised assessments/ testing.</p>	<p>Impact not as great as expected due to Learning Tutor absence. School relocated LSA and Class teacher provided additional provision. Data shows a narrow gap between PPG/ Non PPG in Writing and Maths which were the focused areas for PPG Provision. Writing PPG higher than Non PPG at + 13%/ Maths -17% difference.</p> <p>Review: Impact Good. Next year focus on difference in Reading with -41% between PPG and Non PPG.</p>

J. To raise progress attainment levels in reading at ARE across the school with a focus on GDS (Library Access)	Literacy Leader	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£720</u>	<p>Feedback from parents and children on home reading through survey monkey survey from Literacy Leader.</p> <p>Monitoring of Library environment from Library leader and Literacy Leader.</p> <p>Application, interview and job descriptions/ guidelines for librarians.</p> <p>Book Band trackers.</p> <p>Reading assessment data itrack/ standardised testing. Analysis of standardised testing through online tool/ Headstart by class teachers and Literacy Leader.</p>	<p>School librarians continue to maintain orderly environment with literacy leader. Interviews and application completed for next year.</p> <p>Reading rewards reviewed with a focus on collecting stickers on bookmarks to obtain karate bands in September 2017 to have more impact on home reading.</p> <p>Reading attainment Data in Foundation/ Year Two is above/ on track against National.</p> <p>Year One Phonics results have significantly increased to 86% compared with previous school 50% in 2015. Impact of change of phonics approach to curriculum is seen in data.</p> <p>Attainment for Year Six reduced to around 40%- which impacted on combined score. 5/6 children scored above 95 but standardised score was 100. PPG Provision map will focus on Reading attainment for KS2. Attainment Data for Year Five shows children are working on track in reading. Analysis of reading has shown where Year Six marks were reduced e.g. longer written response questions.</p>
K. To raise progress attainment levels in reading at ARE across the school with a focus on GDS (Project X Code Programme)	Literacy Leader	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£3,600</u>	<p>Feedback from children on intervention programme.</p> <p>Monitoring evidence from Senior leaders/ MAT SIP.</p> <p>Reading tracking and attainment on itrack and standardised assessments.</p> <p>English Subject Leader Report to LST/ Governors.</p>	<p>Project X interventions feedback from children and staff is positive.</p> <p>Monitoring feedback on Project X interventions show high engagement levels from children.</p> <p>GDS Reading attainment July 2016: Only Year Two achieved 7% at GDS. Compared with results in July 2017. Year 2 10%/ Year 3 6%/ Year 5 18% and Year 6 15%.</p>
				<p>Review: Average Impact. However Gap between PPG and Non PPG in GDS in Year 1/3 and 4.</p>

L. To provide opportunities to raise maths progress towards GDS standard	Maths Leader	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£1,440</u>	Feedback from children on intervention programme. Monitoring evidence from Senior leaders/ MAT SIP. Maths tracking and attainment on itrack and standardised assessments. Maths Subject Leader Report to LST/ Governors.	<div>Comparison Data of PPG and NON PPG. Show still a difference in results in Year 3 and 4.Data for other classes show a narrow or positive difference. Impact of Maths interventions in Year 2/ 5 and 6 seen.</div> <table><tr><th>2016 Number of PPG on track at GDS+</th><th>2017 Number of PPG on track at GDS+</th></tr><tr><td>0%</td><td>Yr 1 17% (2)</td></tr><tr><td>0%</td><td>Yr 2 30% (3)</td></tr><tr><td>0%</td><td>Yr 3 11% (2)</td></tr><tr><td>0%</td><td>Yr 4 0%</td></tr><tr><td>0%</td><td>Yr 5 9% (1)</td></tr><tr><td>0%</td><td>Yr 6 23% (3)</td></tr></table> <div>Overall GDS Attainment in Maths has significantly improved compared with July 2017 with only 1 child at GDS in Year Three. GDS Maths Attainment July 2017:</div> <table><tr><th>Exceed</th></tr><tr><td>28% (8)</td></tr><tr><td>23% (7)</td></tr><tr><td>25% (8)</td></tr><tr><td>14% (4)</td></tr><tr><td>17% (5)</td></tr><tr><td>26% (7)</td></tr><tr><td>22% (39)</td></tr></table>	2016 Number of PPG on track at GDS+	2017 Number of PPG on track at GDS+	0%	Yr 1 17% (2)	0%	Yr 2 30% (3)	0%	Yr 3 11% (2)	0%	Yr 4 0%	0%	Yr 5 9% (1)	0%	Yr 6 23% (3)	Exceed	28% (8)	23% (7)	25% (8)	14% (4)	17% (5)	26% (7)	22% (39)
2016 Number of PPG on track at GDS+	2017 Number of PPG on track at GDS+																									
0%	Yr 1 17% (2)																									
0%	Yr 2 30% (3)																									
0%	Yr 3 11% (2)																									
0%	Yr 4 0%																									
0%	Yr 5 9% (1)																									
0%	Yr 6 23% (3)																									
Exceed																										
28% (8)																										
23% (7)																										
25% (8)																										
14% (4)																										
17% (5)																										
26% (7)																										
22% (39)																										

				<p>Review: Good/ Average Impact. Focus on attainment in Key Stage Two: Year 3/4/5.</p>																																
<p>M. To ensure children have the breadth and depth in Maths skills across Key Stage One and Lower Key Stage Two- raise progress</p>	<p>Maths Leader</p>	<p><u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£1,440</u></p>	<p>Feedback from class teachers. Feedback from PPG leaders. Monitoring and tracking from Maths Leader, Maths Leader reports to SLT and Governors. Evidence in planning/ book scrutiny and assessment annotations from PPG leaders. PPG leader half termly impact reports.</p>	<p>Data shows impact on provision and interventions in Year 1 and 6. (-7%/ -17% gaps between PPG and Non PPG)</p> <p>Data for Year 2 shows impact (-20%) (Year 2 has case studies for SEN/ EAL children).</p> <p>School to focus on attainment in Year 4 and 5 (Year 5 and 6) Maths.</p> <p>School in the Summer term placed focused interventions in KS1 and Year 6. Impact seen in attainment Data.</p> <p>Progress Data shows PPG and NON PPG Expected and good Progress:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="2">Pupil Premium</th><th colspan="2">Not Pupil Premium</th></tr><tr><th>Expected</th><th>Good</th><th>Expected</th><th>Good</th></tr><tr><td>13% (1)</td><td>63% (5)</td><td>56% (10)</td><td>39% (7)</td></tr><tr><td>64% (9)</td><td>29% (4)</td><td>50% (6)</td><td>50% (6)</td></tr><tr><td>63% (5)</td><td>13% (1)</td><td>76% (13)</td><td>18% (3)</td></tr><tr><td>70% (7)</td><td>20% (2)</td><td>71% (12)</td><td>29% (5)</td></tr><tr><td>45% (5)</td><td>45% (5)</td><td>42% (5)</td><td>58% (7)</td></tr><tr><td>53% (27)</td><td>33% (17)</td><td>61% (46)</td><td>37% (28)</td></tr></table>	Pupil Premium		Not Pupil Premium		Expected	Good	Expected	Good	13% (1)	63% (5)	56% (10)	39% (7)	64% (9)	29% (4)	50% (6)	50% (6)	63% (5)	13% (1)	76% (13)	18% (3)	70% (7)	20% (2)	71% (12)	29% (5)	45% (5)	45% (5)	42% (5)	58% (7)	53% (27)	33% (17)	61% (46)	37% (28)
Pupil Premium		Not Pupil Premium																																		
Expected	Good	Expected	Good																																	
13% (1)	63% (5)	56% (10)	39% (7)																																	
64% (9)	29% (4)	50% (6)	50% (6)																																	
63% (5)	13% (1)	76% (13)	18% (3)																																	
70% (7)	20% (2)	71% (12)	29% (5)																																	
45% (5)	45% (5)	42% (5)	58% (7)																																	
53% (27)	33% (17)	61% (46)	37% (28)																																	
				<p>Review: Good/ Average Impact. Progress Measures for PPG and NON PPG were as expected or above however: Attainment in Year 4 and 5 needs to improve.</p>																																

N. Linked with VL strategies to provide children with small group immediate feedback to their learning	Head of School	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£6,300</u>	Feedback from PPG leaders. Feedback in PPG half termly impact report. Monitoring of PPG interventions/ planning by Senior Leaders and MAT SIP. Termly/ Half termly PPG training and review sessions with PPG leaders to share good practice/ PPG provision map review/ data and training from VL strategies. Performance Management of PPG Leaders.	PPG leader meeting minutes show evidence of type of intervention and PPG leaders ensured that provision and capturing of evidence was consistent across the school.																													
				PPG leaders sharing practice and procedures with other ADMAT schools.																													
				Provision impact seen in PPG leader evidence. Impact seen in leaven scale and confident levels. Children are ready for learning in class after these sessions.																													
				Monitoring evidence shows impact can be seen clearly in books where PPG leaders have used pupil response feedback stickers.																													
				Attainment Data in Writing: Shows attainment above 65% in 2017 (except Year 4)																													
				<table><tr><td>2016</td><td>2017</td></tr><tr><td>Year 1 63%</td><td>65%</td></tr><tr><td>Year 2 77%</td><td>60%</td></tr><tr><td>Year 3 40%</td><td>72%</td></tr><tr><td>Year 4 67%</td><td>23%</td></tr><tr><td>Year 5 48%</td><td>63%</td></tr><tr><td>Year 6 85%</td><td>73%</td></tr></table>	2016	2017	Year 1 63%	65%	Year 2 77%	60%	Year 3 40%	72%	Year 4 67%	23%	Year 5 48%	63%	Year 6 85%	73%															
				2016	2017																												
				Year 1 63%	65%																												
				Year 2 77%	60%																												
				Year 3 40%	72%																												
Year 4 67%	23%																																
Year 5 48%	63%																																
Year 6 85%	73%																																
Data 2017	Data 2016																																
<table><tr><td>Expected</td><td>Exceed</td></tr><tr><td>48% (14)</td><td>17% (5)</td></tr><tr><td>43% (13)</td><td>17% (5)</td></tr><tr><td>72% (23)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>23% (7)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>50% (15)</td><td>17% (5)</td></tr><tr><td>46% (12)</td><td>27% (7)</td></tr><tr><td>47% (84)</td><td>12% (22)</td></tr></table>	Expected	Exceed	48% (14)	17% (5)	43% (13)	17% (5)	72% (23)		23% (7)		50% (15)	17% (5)	46% (12)	27% (7)	47% (84)	12% (22)	<table><tr><td>Expected</td><td>Exceed</td></tr><tr><td>63% (17)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>69% (18)</td><td>8% (2)</td></tr><tr><td>40% (10)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>67% (18)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>48% (11)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>71% (20)</td><td>14% (4)</td></tr><tr><td>60% (94)</td><td>4% (6)</td></tr></table>	Expected	Exceed	63% (17)		69% (18)	8% (2)	40% (10)		67% (18)		48% (11)		71% (20)	14% (4)	60% (94)	4% (6)
Expected	Exceed																																
48% (14)	17% (5)																																
43% (13)	17% (5)																																
72% (23)																																	
23% (7)																																	
50% (15)	17% (5)																																
46% (12)	27% (7)																																
47% (84)	12% (22)																																
Expected	Exceed																																
63% (17)																																	
69% (18)	8% (2)																																
40% (10)																																	
67% (18)																																	
48% (11)																																	
71% (20)	14% (4)																																
60% (94)	4% (6)																																

				Review: Impact Good/ Average. Attainment data for all but one class is above 65%. Use intervention to raise overall attainment to 75+ through targeting PPG children.																											
Technology for Learning																															
O. To develop technology skills and access for children to support provision to accelerate learning	Maths/ English Leader	Unit Cost: £10,000	Feedback from children using ipads/ technology. APPs for ipads installed on ipads by school ICT technician. Evidence of ICT skills through computing lessons.	School continues to use software such as My Maths, Maths Rock Stars and ebook access. New apps installed onto school ipads. New school ipads purchases for Foundation/ Key Stage One staff to monitor learning through 2 simple. School purchased Just 2 Easy computing software. All children have access. Impact seen in computing attainment levels. Computing Data 2016 and 2017: <table><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Expected</td><td>Expected</td><td>Exceed</td></tr><tr><td>85% (23)</td><td>57% (17)</td><td>23% (7)</td></tr><tr><td>73% (19)</td><td>60% (18)</td><td>17% (5)</td></tr><tr><td>92% (24)</td><td>94% (30)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>77% (23)</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>61% (14)</td><td>63% (19)</td><td>10% (3)</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>63% (17)</td><td>11% (3)</td></tr><tr><td>86% (24)</td><td>69% (124)</td><td>10% (18)</td></tr></table> 20162017				Expected	Expected	Exceed	85% (23)	57% (17)	23% (7)	73% (19)	60% (18)	17% (5)	92% (24)	94% (30)			77% (23)		61% (14)	63% (19)	10% (3)		63% (17)	11% (3)	86% (24)	69% (124)	10% (18)
Expected	Expected	Exceed																													
85% (23)	57% (17)	23% (7)																													
73% (19)	60% (18)	17% (5)																													
92% (24)	94% (30)																														
	77% (23)																														
61% (14)	63% (19)	10% (3)																													
	63% (17)	11% (3)																													
86% (24)	69% (124)	10% (18)																													
P. To ensure teachers can track and evidence children’s learning to provide accurate assessment (2 simple)	Head of School	Unit Cost £2,000	Feedback from governors on information in reports. Feedback from staff and leaders about functions of itrack and 2 simple assessment packages. Evidence in both tracking systems. Evidence from pupil progress meetings.	Review: Impact Good. Further actions: School to develop technology access for children through subscription to reading wise intervention programme £500. School to purchase of 10 ipads to continue to develop technology for learning for intervention groups/ Guided Reading sessions. Itrack is being effectively used and now school is using new target setting function/ dashboard function and new progress dashboard function. Results for Foundation remain above National at 86%, Year Two attainment data is inline/ above school last year/ National. Impact seen as Itrack is being used to inform senior leader tracking and report. Evidence in subject leader reports. itrack used to report to governors- evidence in Head of School Report. Impact of 2 simple seen in moderation of evidence, reporting																											

				function to parents and tracking tool to inform planning. 2 simple tracking used in pupil progress meetings to triangulate data.
				Review: Impact Good.
ARB Provision				
Q. To ensure teachers can track and evidence children's learning to provide accurate assessment To provide ARB children with access to technology (one per child) to utilise technology devices to enhance learning provision	ARB Leader	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£600</u>	Evidence from monitoring of ipads being used by children and staff. Evidence from pupil progress meeting of impact of 2 simple being used by all staff during learning sessions. Feedback from staff about ability/ access to technology to support and assess learning.	New Smartboard installed into ARB to provide further technology resources. ICT technician installed SEN APPS onto ipads. Continued staff training required and provided over time. Itrack used to track progress over time, supported by internal progress and tracking data reported in pupil progress meetings to ARB Manager. School has done a review of SEN Assessment visiting other settings. School to use B squared from September 17.
				Review: Impact Good.
R. To provide children with access to learning in context through visitors/ enrichments/ residential	ARB Leader	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£1000</u>	Feedback surveys/verbal feedback from parents. Feedback from staff. Evidence in impact of learning behaviours through leaven engagement levels.	Feedback from parents shows positive impact of ARB therapies and enrichments. Engagement levels of children are high and evidence in pupil progress meeting reports.
				Review: Impact Good.
Additional Attainment Interventions				
S. To provide support to Key Stage One to ensure effective learning provision of Phonics to ensure National attainment ARE is achieved	Key Stage One Leader	<u>Unit Cost:</u> <u>£8,1000</u>	Evidence in Phonics Screening Results. Evidence in Phonics screening analysis. Evidence in monitoring over time. Evidence in Key Stage Leader reports to SLT and Governors.	School has achieved 86% in National Phonics Screening in July 2017. School has closed gap on gender and PPG/ NON PPG. Analysis of screening evidence completed to inform provision for next academic year.
				Review: Impact Good.
T. To ensure attainment levels are maintained from	Key Stage One/ Foundation	<u>Unit Cost:</u>	Evidence in Foundation attainment data. Evidence in Foundation tracking data on itrack and 2 simple.	School achieved 86% of children at GDS which again is above National. Impact of provision seen in data. School improved PPG Exceeding Data for all subject areas. School

Foundation in Year One (Early Intervention Strategies)	Leader	<u>£3,600</u>	Evidence through Cornwall/ ADMAT moderation. Feedback from staff on provision through pupil progress meetings and performance management.	achieved own targets set. School has planned for this provision next year and evidence of impact clear. Children achieve/ exceed in Foundation and are ready for their entry into Year One and the National Curriculum. Evidence of transition activities and arrangements
				Review: Impact Good.