

Dorothy Barley Junior Academy Pupil Premium Spending Plan 2019-2020

1. Summary information					
School	Dorothy Barley Junior Academy				
Academic Year	2019-2020	Total PP budget	£198,000	Date of most recent PP Review	NA
Total number of pupils	403	Number of pupils eligible for PP	150(37%)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Autumn 2/Spring 1 2020

Current attainment		
Based on Summer 2 data drop/Year 6 SATs 2020 and to be reviewed each term for the academic year 2019-2020	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths	TBC	Overall 2019 combined all 65%
% making expected progress in reading (as measured in the school)	TBC	National attainment TBC%
% making expected progress in writing (as measured in the school)	TBC	National attainment TBC%
% making expected progress in mathematics (as measured in the school)	TBC	National attainment 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% Girls 78%	Boys 79% Girls 67%	Boys 79% Girls 78%	Boys 79% Girls 67%
Year 4	Boys 39% Girls 65%	Boys 30% Girls 55%	Boys 57% Girls 60%	Boys 30% Girls 55%
Year 5	Boys 33% Girls 77%	Boys 33% Girls 77%	Boys 33% Girls 69%	Boys 33% Girls 69%
Year 6	Boys 53% Girls 72%	Boys 53% Girls 80%	Boys 60% Girls 68%	Boys 40% 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% Non PPG 62%	PPG 72 % Non PPG 57%	PPG 78% Non PPG 62%	PPG 72% Non PPG 54%
Year 4	PPG 51% Non PPG 71%	PPG 42% Non PPG 69%	PPG 58% Non PPG 75%	PPG 42% Non PPG 66%
Year 5	PPG 65% Non PPG 63%	PPG 56% Non PPG 56%	PPG 52% Non PPG 65%	PPG 52% 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

E.	Low aspiration and SEMH needs of PPG children who may also have multiple vulnerabilities	
F.	Lack of <i>positive</i> parental engagement for some PPG children	
4. Intended outcomes (<i>specific outcomes and how they will be measured</i>)		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		2019-2020			
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					
i. Quality of teaching for all					
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: - Maths Mastery Maths Hub costs - More Able training with REAch2	Greater % of PPG children reaching GD %s are broadly comparable to Non PPG	Identified as Ofsted Key Priority from Inspection 2017	Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PiRA, PuMA, PiXL and Governor scrutiny	SLT	In line with monitoring and evaluation cycle £6,754
Continue the focus on Quality First Teaching through: - 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	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 £13,500
Total budgeted cost					£20,254
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 includes Esater Booster and HLTA after school interventions plus AHT led afternoon rapid response	Greater % of PPG children reaching ARE and GD	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	Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PiRA, PuMA, PiXL and Governor scrutiny	SLT Y6 Team	At least half termly £25,392
Class Support (includes general TA plus 1-1 for PPG+ children)	Greater % of PPG children reaching ARE and GD	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 Year Group Leads INCo	Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly £39,330
Reading Boosters and interventions, includes Dyslexia screening, Phonics, Fresh Start, PiXL therapies	PPG children 'catch up' to non PPG at ARE	Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions - 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 Year Group Leads ENCo	Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly £10,026

<p>Maths Boosters and Interventions, includes rapid response and PiXL therapies</p>	<p>PPG children 'catch up' to non PPG at ARE</p>	<p>Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions - e.g. Success@Arithmetic, First Class@Number, PiXL</p>	<p>Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, PuMA, PiXL, provision mapping, baseline and end of intervention assessments</p>	<p>SLT Year Group Leads NUMCo</p>	<p>Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly £6,800</p>
<p>Writing Boosters and Interventions, includes rapid response and PiXL therapies</p>	<p>PPG children 'catch up' to non PPG at ARE</p>	<p>Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions</p>	<p>Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, Writing samples, evidence from spelling and grammar, provision mapping, baseline and end of intervention assessments</p>	<p>SLT Year Group Leads ENCo</p>	<p>Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly £2,433</p>
<p>Intervention for PPG children with multiple vulnerabilities, includes rapid response and PiXL therapies for PPG+ children</p>	<p>PPG+ children 'catch up' to non at ARE, make equivalent rates of progress to Non PPG or expected progress relative to their starting points</p>	<p>Targeted support has shown an improvement in outcomes historically – see overall % making expected progress and evidence from provision mapping and interventions</p>	<p>Through the school monitoring and evaluation cycle, data drops, evidence from provision mapping, baseline and end of intervention assessments</p>	<p>SLT INCo</p>	<p>Class support daily/weekly. Provision mapping half termly £7,609</p>

Total budgeted cost £91,590

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, ensure attendance leads highlight PPG children for overall attendance and PA monitoring</p>	<p>PPG attendance rates are same or better than Non PPG Reduction in PPA PA figures</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 HT DHT</p>	<p>Every three weeks £3,003</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 Specific targeting of PPG if reluctant</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. It supports our inclusion agenda and contributes positively to children's mental health.</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 £4,180</p>
<p>Ensure Inclusion Team support for children with multiple vulnerabilities (PPG+) includes: - 2 x Pupil Welfare - School Counsellor - Behaviour & Attitudes Lead</p>	<p>To ensure all PPG and PPG+ children and families are effectively supported pastorally and academically</p>	<p>High % of PPG (37%) 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 Inclusion Team</p>	<p>Termly £78,973</p>

Total budgeted cost

£86,156

Total predicted spend

£198,000

6. Additional detail

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