

## Dorothy Barley Junior Academy Pupil Premium Spending Plan 2018-2019

| 1. Summary information |                               |                                  |           |  |                        |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|--|------------------------|
| School                 | Dorothy Barley Junior Academy |                                  |           |  |                        |
| Academic Year          | 2018-2019                     | Total PP budget                  | £207,240  | Date of most recent PP Review                  | NA                     |
| Total number of pupils | 418                           | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 157 (38%) | Date for next internal review of this strategy | Autumn 2/Spring 1 2019 |

| Current attainment  |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Based on Summer 2 data drop/Year 6 SATs 2019 and to be reviewed each term for the academic year 2018-2019 | Pupils eligible for PP (your school)   | Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) |
| % achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths  | Cohort 53% (will be 55% post Tables Checking)<br>PPG school 53%<br>Non PPG 53%<br>(all data is before Tables Checking) | Overall 2019 combined all 65%                 |
| % making expected progress in reading (as measured in the school)   | In school data 98% of PPG children expected (Non PPG 99%)<br>Year 6 TBC  | TBC   |
| % making expected progress in writing (as measured in the school)   | In school data 97% of PPG children expected (Non PPG 96%)<br>Year 6 TBC  | TBC   |
| % making expected progress in mathematics (as measured in the school)                                     | In school data 99% of PPG children expected (Non PPG 98%)<br>Year 6 TBC  | TBC   |
| 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)   |  |   |
| Academic barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)                   |  |   |

A. 2019 Summer 2 data shows that Non PPG and PPG across **RWM combined** in End of Key Stage tests is comparable (53% for both groups), there were some differences in individual subjects (Reading 65% PPG/59% Non PPG, Writing 70% PPG/76% Non PPG, Maths 65% PPG/76% Non PPG) and close monitoring needs to continue to be in place so that gaps do not develop and so that overall attainment for PPG increases.

B. 2019 Summer 2 data shows that PPG Girls outperformed PPG Boys across all subjects in most year groups and that there are some marked differences in the attainment of PPG boys/girls across the school which require targeted support:

| PPG % at M/GD | Reading               | Writing               | Maths                 | Combined              |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Year 3        | Boys 86%<br>Girls 78% | Boys 79%<br>Girls 67% | Boys 79%<br>Girls 78% | Boys 79%<br>Girls 67% |
| Year 4        | Boys 39%<br>Girls 65% | Boys 30%<br>Girls 55% | Boys 57%<br>Girls 60% | Boys 30%<br>Girls 55% |
| Year 5        | Boys 33%<br>Girls 77% | Boys 33%<br>Girls 77% | Boys 33%<br>Girls 69% | Boys 33%<br>Girls 69% |
| Year 6        | Boys 53%<br>Girls 72% | Boys 53%<br>Girls 80% | Boys 60%<br>Girls 68% | Boys 40%<br>Girls 60% |

C. 2019 Summer 2 data internal data for Y3-5 shows a mixed picture at Met/GD for PPG vs Non PPG so targeted support is needed to diminish any differences.

| PPG % at M/GD | Reading                | Writing                | Maths                  | Combined               |
|---------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Year 3        | PPG 81%<br>Non PPG 62% | PPG 72%<br>Non PPG 57% | PPG 78%<br>Non PPG 62% | PPG 72%<br>Non PPG 54% |
| Year 4        | PPG 51%<br>Non PPG 71% | PPG 42%<br>Non PPG 69% | PPG 58%<br>Non PPG 75% | PPG 42%<br>Non PPG 66% |
| Year 5        | PPG 65%<br>Non PPG 63% | PPG 56%<br>Non PPG 56% | PPG 52%<br>Non PPG 65% | PPG 52%<br>Non PPG 51% |

**Additional barriers (including issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)**

D. Poor attendance especially when in conjunction with other significant contextual factors e.g. PPG + White British+ Boys

E. Low aspiration and SEMH needs of PPG children who may also have multiple vulnerabilities

F. Lack of *positive* parental engagement for some PPG children

**4. Intended outcomes (specific outcomes and how they will be measured)**

|   | Success criteria  |
|---|---|
| A. Equivalent rates of progress for PPG and non PPG children in RWM across the school as seen in teacher judgements and test scores | Data analysis of children shows that PPG and Non PPG children making equivalent rates of expected and more than expected progress (Test and Teacher Assessment) |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| B. | Attainment gaps from baseline data between PPG and Non diminish by end of year  | Data analysis of children shows that gaps are diminishing between PPG and Non (Test and Teacher Assessment)                 |
| C. | Attainment gaps from baseline data between PPG Boys and PPG Girls diminish by end of year   | Data analysis of children shows that gaps are diminishing between PPG Boys and PPG Girls (Test and Teacher Assessment)      |
| D. | The progress of PPG More Able children is tracked and the provision put in place which leads to more PPG children reaching GD (plus GD PPG %s are broadly comparable to GD non PPG) | Data analysis of children shows that a greater % of PPG are reaching higher levels across RWM (Test and Teacher Assessment) |

| 5. Planned expenditure   |   |   |  |            |  |
|--|---|---|--|------------|--|
| Academic year  |   | 2018-2019   |  |            |  |
| The three headings enable you to demonstrate how you are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies |   |   |  |            |  |
| <b>i. Quality of teaching for all</b>  |   |   |  |            |  |
| Action   | Intended outcome  | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?   | How will you ensure it is implemented well?  | Staff lead | When will you review implementation?                             |
| Ensure a continued Mastery & Greater Depth whole school focus including:<br>- Maths Mastery Maths Hub costs<br>- More Able training with REAch2                              | Greater % of PPG children reaching GD<br>%s are broadly comparable to Non PPG<br><br><b>REVIEW Summer 2019</b><br>More Able INSET sessions and a focus on PPG in Pupil Progress Meetings means that more able PPG have been highlighted as a group. The % of PPG/Non reaching GD is comparable in some cohorts in some subjects. See Table 1. | Identified as Ofsted Key Priority from Inspection 2017<br>Mastery and GD work at the school has shown an increase in %s working at GD across the school 2017-2018 from baseline to end of year: | Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PiRA, PuMA, PiXL and Governor scrutiny | SLT        | In line with monitoring and evaluation cycle<br><br><b>£6994</b> |

|   |  |  |  |     |  |
|---|--|--|--|-----|--|
| Continue the focus on Quality First Teaching through:<br>- CPD and training, Peer Practice Development, Team Teaching/Planning, monitoring and evaluation | Ensure that 100% of teaching is good or better for all children in the school<br><b>REVIEW Summer 2019</b><br>90% of teaching is good or better with 20% outstanding. Where teaching is not good support plans are in place. Rates of progress across the school are good: 2018-2019 98% across the school in Reading, 97% across the school in Writing and 99% across the school in Maths | Securely good or better teaching leads to securely good outcomes and at least expected progress. | Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PiRA, PuMA, PiXL and Governor scrutiny, REAch2 Teaching and Learning Audits/MTIs | SLT | In line with monitoring and evaluation cycle<br><br><b>£14,303</b> |
| <b>Total budgeted cost</b>  |  |  |  |     | <b>£21,297</b>   |

### ii. Targeted support

| Action   | Intended outcome   | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?  | How will you ensure it is implemented well?  | Staff lead                      | When will you review implementation?  |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---|
| Team Teaching/ booster/resources and interventions in Year 6 | Greater % of PPG children reaching ARE and GD<br><b>REVIEW Summer 2</b><br>2019 Y6 Summer 2 data shows that Non PPG and PPG across <b>RWM combined</b> in End of Key Stage tests is comparable (53% for both groups) | Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically (use of PiXL, rapid response intervention, Easter Booster etc)- see End of Key Stage increases in all subjects 2018 | Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PiRA, PuMA, PiXL and Governor scrutiny | SLT<br>Y6 Team                  | At least half termly<br><br><b>£27,769</b>                                      |
| Class Support  | Greater % of PPG children reaching ARE and GD<br><b>REVIEW Summer 2</b><br>See Tables 1 & 2  | Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions                      | Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PiRA, PuMA, PiXL, provision mapping    | SLT<br>Year Group Leads<br>INCo | Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly<br><br><b>£41,335</b> |

|  |   |  |  |                                  |   |
|--|---|--|--|----------------------------------|---|
| Reading Boosters and interventions, includes Dyslexia screening, Phonics | PPG children 'catch up' to non PPG at ARE<br><br><b>REVIEW Summer 2</b><br>See Table 3  | Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions<br>- e.g. Rapid Phonics, Fresh Start, PiXL             | Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PiRA, PiXL, provision mapping, baseline and end of intervention assessments  | SLT<br>Year Group Leads<br>ENCo  | Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly<br><br><b>£11,021</b> |
| Maths Boosters and Interventions   | PPG children 'catch up' to non PPG at ARE<br><br><b>REVIEW Summer 2</b><br>See Tables 3   | Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions<br>- e.g. Success@Arithmetic, First Class@Number, PiXL | Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PuRA, PiXL, provision mapping, baseline and end of intervention assessments  | SLT<br>Year Group Leads<br>NUMCo | Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly<br><br><b>£7,303</b>  |
| Writing Boosters and Interventions                                       | PPG children 'catch up' to non PPG at ARE<br><br><b>REVIEW Summer 2</b><br>See Tables 3   | Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions  | Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, Writing samples, evidence from spelling and grammar, provision mapping, baseline and end of intervention assessments | SLT<br>Year Group Leads<br>ENCo  | Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly<br><br><b>£2,430</b>  |
| Intervention for PPG children with multiple vulnerabilities              | PPG+ children 'catch up' to non at ARE, make equivalent rates of progress to Non PPG or expected progress relative to their starting points<br><br><b>REVIEW Summer 2</b><br>See all Tables | Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions  | Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, evidence from provision mapping, baseline and end of intervention assessments  | SLT<br>INCo                      | Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly<br><br><b>£9,109</b>  |

Total budgeted cost £98,967

iii. Other approaches

| Action   | Intended outcome   | 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>Ensure effective targeting of attendance for all PPG children- increase robustness of current systems</p> | <p>PPG attendance rates are same or better than Non PPG<br/>Reduction in PPA PA figures<br/><b>REVIEW Summer 2019</b><br/>See Table 3</p>  | <p>Good attendance increases the chance of better outcomes, current attendance issues with PPG children are having a negative impact on their educational outcomes</p>  | <p>Through weekly attendance monitoring, half termly reporting</p>  | <p>Attendance leads<br/>HT<br/>DHT</p> | <p>Every three weeks<br/><br/><b>£3,003</b></p>  |
| <p>Ensure subsidised Education Visits, Activities and Enrichment (Trips, Clubs inc breakfast)</p>            | <p>Equality of access for PPG to all enrichment and educational visits<br/>Specific targeting of PPG if reluctant<br/><b>REVIEW Summer 2019</b><br/>List B for breakfast club = 31 children of which 18 are free FSM/PPG funded by the school places:<br/>- 10 were offered to help with being late/attendance issues in the mornings.<br/>- 4 were offered due to family funds issues or concerns regarding food in the house.<br/>- were offered as part of a CAF to support the family.<br/><br/>For Educational Visits funding support see Table 4</p> | <p>The school has used subsidised places for a number of years to ensure all children attend trips and are subsidised or given free places at clubs. Access to trips, clubs and other enrichment activities is considered a basic right of all children irrespective if they can afford the opportunities or not.</p> | <p>Through monitoring of uptake for clubs, trip payment monitoring etc, through feedback from Pupil Welfare to Inclusion Team</p> | <p>Pupil Welfare</p>                   | <p>Termly and report to Local Governing Body when requested<br/><br/><b>£4,180</b></p> |

|   |  |  |   |                               |   |
|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <p>Ensure Inclusion Team support for children with multiple vulnerabilities (PPG+) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 x Pupil Welfare,</li> <li>- School Counsellor</li> <li>- Learning Mentor</li> </ul> | <p>To ensure all PPG and PPG+ children and families are effectively supported pastorally and academically</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>REVIEW Summer 2019</b></p> <p>In total the number of families given assistance by the PWOs/Inclusion Team in various ways (SEMH, Counsellor, emotional support, Family support etc) was 55.</p> <p>38 of these are FSM/Pupil Premium</p> | <p>High % of PPG (38%) with the vast majority having additional vulnerabilities on top of PPG e.g. SEND, EAL, White British, SEMH, Parental Mental Health needs, Safeguarding concerns</p> | <p>Through Inclusion Team minutes and agendas, through Annual Safeguarding Report to Governors, through staff Inclusion Surveys, Case Studies, external reviews</p> | <p>SLT<br/>Inclusion Team</p> | <p>Termly</p> <p style="color: red;"><b>£79,973</b></p>                             |
| <b>Total budgeted cost</b>  |  |  |   |                               | <p style="color: red;"><b>£86,796</b></p> <p>Total predicted spend<br/>£207,240</p> |
| <b>6. Additional detail</b>   |  |  |   |                               |   |

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

Barking and Dagenham is the 22nd most deprived authority in England and many families in the borough are either on low incomes, where full-time salaries are lower than any other authority in London, or they are dependent on benefits. More than a fifth of working age residents in the borough claim at least one type of benefit, compared to the national average of one in seven. Housing benefit claimant levels are high and have increased by 12% since 2008. Almost a third of households rent through either a housing association or the Council and house prices and average rent levels remain the lowest in London. The rate of unemployment is high, at 5%, and has risen faster in the last two years than it has across London and the UK. Child poverty levels are the 9th highest for any authority in the UK and 36% of children are living below the poverty line. Across the borough over a quarter of school pupils are eligible for Free School Meals compared to 18% nationally (evidence taken from ‘Summary Needs Assessment- Barking and Dagenham’s Children and Young People’s Plan 2011 – 2016’). The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Education Strategy 2014-2017 document reports that approximately one in three children (34%) in Barking and Dagenham are born into poverty, higher than the national average of one in five. The borough has the highest rate of domestic violence in London.

Therefore the overall aim of our spending plan is ensure an effective and coherent PPG strategy through:

- Providing short term intervention programmes for underachieving pupils and those with SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities).
- Providing additional adult support and intervention for pupils in Year 6.
- Providing new resources/strategies that will support learning and teaching in and out of the classroom.
- Providing part time Therapeutic Counselling support for pupils.
- Providing online learning materials for Reading and mathematics (available 24/7) from outside the school network.
- Making sure that all children have full access to a daily diet of at least good teaching
- Ensure adults are deployed defectively to support those children most ‘in need’ academically and pastorally

**Table 1 PPG/NON PPG at Greater Depth**

| PPG/Non % at GD                 | Reading                | Writing                | Maths                  | Combined              |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Year 3</b><br><b>PPG 34%</b> | PPG 34%<br>Non PPG 21% | PPG 31%<br>Non PPG 11% | PPG 22%<br>Non PPG 16% | PPG 13%<br>Non PPG 7% |
| <b>Year 4</b><br><b>PPG 42%</b> | PPG 7%<br>Non PPG 22%  | PPG 7%<br>Non PPG 17%  | PPG 12%<br>Non PPG 24% | PPG 5%<br>Non PPG 15% |
| <b>Year 5</b><br><b>PPG 25%</b> | PPG 24%<br>Non PPG 19% | PPG 24%<br>Non PPG 13% | PPG 16%<br>Non PPG 16% | PPG 8%<br>Non PPG 7%  |
| <b>Year 6</b><br><b>PPG 40%</b> | PPG 18%<br>Non PPG 16% | PPG 15%<br>Non PPG 12% | PPG 10%<br>Non PPG 22% | PPG 5%<br>Non PPG 7%  |



**Table 2 PPG/NON PPG at Age Related Plus**

| PPG/Non % at ARE +              | Reading                | Writing                | Maths                  | Combined               |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Year 3</b><br><b>PPG 34%</b> | PPG 81%<br>Non PPG 62% | PPG 72%<br>Non PPG 57% | PPG 78%<br>Non PPG 62% | PPG 72%<br>Non PPG 54% |
| <b>Year 4</b><br><b>PPG 42%</b> | PPG 51%<br>Non PPG 71% | PPG 42%<br>Non PPG 69% | PPG 58%<br>Non PPG 75% | PPG 42%<br>Non PPG 66% |
| <b>Year 5</b><br><b>PPG 25%</b> | PPG 56%<br>Non PPG 63% | PPG 56%<br>Non PPG 56% | PPG 52%<br>Non PPG 65% | PPG 52%<br>Non PPG 51% |
| <b>Year 6</b><br><b>PPG 40%</b> | PPG 65%<br>Non PPG 59% | PPG 70%<br>Non PPG 76% | PPG 65%<br>Non PPG 76% | PPG 53%<br>Non PPG 53% |

**Table 3 PPG/Non PPG Attendance**

| Attendance          | 2017-2018                  | 2018-2019                  |
|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Whole School</b> | PPG 93.3%<br>Non PPG 96.0% | PPG 94.8%<br>Non PPG 96.6% |

**Attainment overall:** differences between PPG and Non-PPG at both GD and ARE+ are more marked lower down the school. As children move through the school, due to sustained targeting and tailored provision the differences start to diminish.

**Attendance overall:** While attainment for PPG remains lower than non-PPG up until 16.07.19 there had been a marked increase in overall attendance for PPG (an increase of 1.5% from last year for PPG and 0.6% for Non-PPG).

**Table 4 PPG access to trips funded by the school.**

| Number of PPG children funded by the school | Year 3  | Year 4   | Year 5  | Year 6   |
|---|---|--|---|--|
|   | 40 chn in Y3 had 4 trips paid for by the school | 33 chn in Year 4 had 1 trip paid for by the school | 47 chn in Year 5 had 4 trips paid for by the school | 38 chn in Year 6 had 3 trips paid for them by the school<br><br>1 child was funded for the Y6 residential. |