

Pupil Premium Strategy 2017-18



We encourage all members of the Sunnyhill Community **to respect one another**, to know **that everyone has an important part to play** in making the school as good as it can be, to **take responsibility and be responsible**, to **strive for excellence** and to **try one's best** in everything we do.

Aims:

- That our pupils and how our actions affect them are at the heart of everything we do.
- That we focus on developing collaboration, creativity, consistency and quality in everything we provide for our community.
- That we continue to provide outstanding opportunities in all aspects of school life- in learning, teaching, progress, relationships, leadership and management.

We will work to make sure that:

- Our children are at the heart of everything we do- we listen to what they say and build this into what we provide;
- Everything we provide is consistently of the highest quality;
- We encourage, support and challenge our children to strive for excellence in all areas;
- We encourage children, parents and colleagues to believe in themselves, to be resilient and to always try their best;
- We take time to celebrate successes in learning, progress, results, behaviour and attitudes;
- We include our children in making real decisions about the life of the school;
- We are solution focused- there is a 'can do' approach throughout the school.

Whole school progress data 2016-17

P- Progress: 1- 10 points from individual starting points; EXP- 11- 20 points; MEXP- 21 points+.

	No progress	P	EXP	MEXP
Boys	All children made progress from their starting points.	22%	65%	13%
Girls		21%	64%	12%
EAL		24%	64%	12%
Pupil Premium		19%	67%	14%
SEND		42%	56%	2%
Whole school		22%	64%	14%

Pupil Premium progress across the school was in line or slightly above whole school information.

100% of Pupil Premium made progress from their starting points.

81% made at least Expected progress.

14% made More than expected progress.

Whole school attainment data 2016-17

NMT- have not met target set, based on assessment end point from previous year and all making at least EXP over the course of the year; MT- met target set; T+- has exceeded target set.

	NMT	MT	T+
Boys	16%	56%	28%
Girls	12%	56%	32%
EAL	13%	58%	29%
Pupil Premium	13%	61%	26%
SEND	11%	60%	29%
Whole school	14%	56%	30%

Pupil premium attainment across the school is at least broadly in line with whole school information.

87% of Pupil Premium children met their targets.

26% of Pupil Premium children exceeded their targets.

Comparative Data

The Early Years Foundation Stage- Summer 2017

This information is based on the assessments that took place at the end of Reception.

We were moderated by Lambeth EYFS team this term; they confirmed that our assessments were accurate.

End of year information 2016-17

Children will be defined as having reached a good level of development at the end of the EYFS if they achieve at least the expected level in:

- the early learning goals in the prime areas of learning (personal, social and emotional development; physical development; and communication and language)
- and the early learning goals in the specific areas of mathematics and literacy.
- In the un-validated Contextual data for the EYFS profile for 2016-17:

	Sunnyhill				Lambeth*		
	Average points	GLD	ALG	Cohort size	Average points	GLD	ALG
Girls	34.1	76%	76%	34	34.9	77%	75%
Boys	33.0	72%	72%	47	32.5	65%	63%

*There is currently no National data for gender to act as a comparison. We have used Lambeth's data as this is all that is available to us.

Girls outperformed boys at Sunnyhill with a higher average point score (+1.1); a higher % of girls reached a Good Level of Development (in Communication and Language, Physical development, Personal, Social and Emotional development, Literacy and Maths) as well as in All Learning Goals (+4%). It should be noted that the cohort of girls in the EYFS in 2016-17 was much smaller than the cohort of boys. In comparison to Lambeth data, achievement of girls at Sunnyhill was broadly in line with girls across Lambeth, whilst boys at Sunnyhill achieve better than boys in Lambeth generally (+7% GLD/ +9% ALG).

The main reason underlying the difference in outcomes for children in the EYFS statutory assessments was around stages of fluency in English.

	Sunnyhill				Lambeth		
	Average points	GLD	ALG	Cohort	Average points	GLD	ALG
Stage A New to English	26.4	27%	27%	11	29.4	50%	48%
Stage B Early acquisition	32.8	67%	67%	9	32.0	63%	60%
Stage C Developing competence	34.2	75%	75%	12	34.0	76%	74%
Stage D Competent	33.8	80%	80%	5	35.5	84%	81%
Stage E Fluent	37.3	100%	100%	4	37.3	86%	83%
Non-fluent (A-D)	31.8	59%	59%	37	32.7	66%	63%
English	34.9	85%	85%	40	34.4	74%	72%

only							
------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

In the 2016-17 EYFS cohort:

32 pupils out of 81 Reception children were Stage A- C EAL (so at the very earliest stages of learning English.) Children working at Stage A had the biggest impact on our EYFS outcomes (on average point scores, GLD and ALD when compared to Lambeth statistics.) 1 child assessed as being Stage D did not reach the expected standard at GLD or ALD. Generally, at all other stages of English pupils at Sunnyhill did at least as well as children across Lambeth in the EYFS.

	National 2016-17	Sunnyhill 2016-17
Speaking	85.9%	85%
Reading	77%	78%
Writing	73.3%	79%
Maths- Number	79.2%	83%
Maths- Shape Space Measures	81.6%	86%
GLD	70.7%	76%

Key for assessment information:

	Above target (5% or more above last year's score)
	Broadly in line with last year's data (4% or less away)
	In line with last year's data (-1/+1 or more away from 2015-16 score)
	Not on target (5% or more away from last year's score)

- In Prime learning goal of Speaking, the 2016-17 cohort's attainment is broadly in line with last year's data;
- In Specific learning goal of Reading, the 2016-17 cohort's attainment is line with last year's data;
- In Specific learning goal of Writing, the 2016-17 cohort's attainment is in line with last year's data;
- In Specific learning goal of Maths- Number, the 2016-17 cohort's attainment is above last year's data;
- In Specific learning goal of Maths- Shape, Space and Measures, the 2016-17 cohort's attainment is above last year's data;
- The % of children achieving GLD in the 2016-17 cohort is in line with last year's data.

Summary 2016-17

Our results again at the end of the Summer term 2017 were in line with targets set and in most cases were above Lambeth and National percentages.

There is some difference between how well ethnic groups achieve in the EYFS (White British-achieved 100% GLD; Black other achieved 63%, Black Caribbean 89%; White other 88%.) We need to make sure that our learning offer meets the needs of all of our groups of children in the EYFS over the coming year.

Y1-6 Summer 2017

Y1 phonics screening (cohort of 72 children)

	Working towards	Working At	National Working At
2015-16	27%	73%	81%
2016-17	16%	87%	81%

Break down by class: 1 Esk 87%, 1 Eden 90%, 1 Ely 83%.

The number of EAL stage A-B in this cohort will have had an impact on individual class scores (67% EAL, 28% stage A-B).

There has been outward mobility of 17% in this year group, the majority of these leavers were predicted to be at Secure or Secure+ when targets were set. There has been inward mobility of 11%; of these children, 6 are stage A-C EAL (4 joining 1Ely), 6 have been assessed as being at Developing or Developing+ this term.

This is a very positive result- Y1 staff have prepared the children exceptionally well, supported brilliantly by the English learning leads and the COLT team.

KS1 (cohort of 74 children)

SATS information

	Sunnyhill Expected Standard	National EXS	Sunnyhill Greater Depth	National GDS
Reading	45% (65%)	51% (76%)	20%	24%
Writing	45% (60%)	52% (65%)	15%	13%
Maths	44%(67%)	55% (73%)	23%	18%

- Year 2 SATS - 5 children (7%) left during the course of the year after targets were set who were predicted to score in the Secure or Exceeding domain. This has impacted on the end of year scores (actual scores increasing by a possible 7%).
- 5 children joined this year group, none of whom have been assessed as working at the expected level (having a negative impact on our data by as much as 7%).
- If this cohort had remained the same (no leavers- +7%, no new children- +7%), then our statistics for children working at the EXS would have been in line with or above the National average (Reading- 79%, Writing- 74%, Maths- 81%).
- What is striking in this data is that we have a higher percentage of pupils working at greater depth in writing and Maths than the National statistic.

Factors impacting on learning for Y2 2016-17:

The percentage of EAL children in this cohort is high- 64%. Of these, 16 children are code A/B. The percentage of children in this cohort with SEN is high- 28% are SEN, 2 children have or are in the process of getting an EHCP- receiving 1:1 support.

Year 2 data- 5 children (7%) left during the course of the year after targets were set who were predicted to score in the Secure or Exceeding domain. This has impacted on the end of year scores (all scores increasing by a possible 7%); 5 children joined this year group, all working in the developing domain (again 7%).

Further reflections:

After attending moderation meetings and moderating against the expected standards for Year 2 with other Lambeth schools, the Year 2 team adjusted some end points to ensure that the Sunnyhill data was in line with the Lambeth data. This exercise made us question whether we were moving children from Developing to Secure too quickly (e.g. in Writing), and whether some children targeted as possibly reaching Exceeding was an accurate view of what they were capable of (e.g. in writing).

Analysis of progress/ attainment of children not reaching target

Reading

2Bailey	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys	5			5			5	
Girls	3			2	1		2	1

2Beam	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys	3	1		3	1		4	
Girls	3			2	1		3	

2Beck	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys	1	3		3	1		4	
Girls	2			2			2	

21 children did not reach their target in Reading- of these, more were boys. Children were more likely not to reach their target if they started in the developing domain (18/21). Even though the progress they had to make in most cases was not more than 10 points over the year, they did not achieve this. Of children not achieving target 12/21 were SEN, 13/21 were EAL- receiving support through intervention. Of the children not reaching their targets, 7 were within 3 points, 4 were 9 points or more away.

Writing

2Bailey	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys		2		2			2	
Girls	2	6		4	4		5	3

2Beam	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys	3			3			3	
Girls	1			1			1	

2Beck	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys	1	1		1	1		2	
Girls	3			3			3	

19 children did not reach their target in Writing- of these, more were girls (12/19). Children were more likely not to reach their target if they started in the developing domain (10/19), but 9 children who started the year as secure also did not meet their target- the majority of these were girls (6/9). Children starting in Secure mostly made more than 10 points progress, but still were 10-12 points away from their target at the end of the year. Even though the progress children starting in Developing had to make in most cases was not more than 10 points over the year, they did not achieve this. Of children not achieving target 12/19 were SEN, 12/19 were EAL- receiving support through intervention. Of the children not reaching their targets, 7 were within 3 points, 4 were 9 points or more away.

Maths

2Bailey	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys	3	1		4			4	3
Girls		1			1		1	

2Beam	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys	2	1		3			3	
Girls	3							

2Beck	Starting point domain			Progress over the year			Points away from target	
	D	S	E	1-10	11-20	21+	>10	<10
Boys	1	2			1		2	
Girls	4	1		4	1		5	

17 children did not reach their target in Maths - of these, slightly more were boys (9/17). Children were more likely not to reach their target if they started in the developing domain (12/17), but 5 children who started the year as secure also did not meet their target- the majority of these were boys (3/5). Children starting in Secure mostly made more than 10 points progress, 4 were within 3 points of reaching their targets. Even though the progress children starting in Developing had to make in most cases was not more than 10 points over the year, they did not achieve this. Of children not achieving target 8/17 were SEN, 10/17 were EAL- receiving support through intervention. Of the children not reaching their targets, 9 were within 3 points, 1 was 9 points away.

Teachers felt that in Reading, Writing and Maths, children working at Secure who did not achieve their targets were given too high a starting point. They could show the progress these children had made over the year, but the children were not able to make the progress necessary to move from Secure to Exceeding by the end of the year.

KS2 SATS comparison

Factors impacting on learning for Y6 2016-17:

The percentage of EAL children in this cohort was high- 73%. Of these, 28 children were stage A or C (34%).

The percentage of children in this class with SEN was high- 32% were SEN, 3 children had or were in the process of getting an EHCP- receiving 1:1 support.

We had 2 children who had to be included in our data who were working at a pre-national curriculum (P) level, and one child who went on holiday in the middle of the tests who also has to be included in our data.

There was inward mobility of 3% in this cohort.

The % of children classified as pupil premium was also very high- 49%.

This cohort was tested on a 4-year curriculum that they only had studied for 3 years- Y6 teachers were left to fill gaps in knowledge in less than 7 months. There has been a hike in expectations in what Y6 children are expected to know at the end of the year to be at an expected standard.

Further reflections on KS2 testing system:

Again this year, the testing regime has been difficult to make sense of- information about the tests was often contradictory so preparing the children for the test continues to be difficult.

Lambeth stressed emphatically in training for teachers that 'greater depth' should be given rarely in writing- but this seemed to contradict national statistics from 2016. This view also was not supported in National statistics for 2017 SATs (although this information is not validated- and will not be until Autumn 2 2017).

Comparative KS2 information 2016-17

KS2 SATs	National	Sunnyhill	National Greater depth	Sunnyhill Greater depth
Reading, Writing (TA), Maths – combined	61%	63%	9%	8%
Reading	71%	72%	25%	45%
GPS	77%	79%	18%	27%
Maths	75%	87%	23%	11%

- In comparison to our own data from last year, we are down slightly in our combined score (64% compared to 69%), and in Reading (72% compared to 79%). This can be explained by the number of children working at a pre-national curriculum in Y6 who had to be included in this data set.
- The raw score to standardised score conversion went up by 1 mark in reading this year.
- We had 7 children in reading who would have been working at the standardised score of 100 (the age related expectation) last year, but who were graded as being at 99 (slightly below the age related expectation) this year. This is very frustrating.
- However, our scores are up in GPS (Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling- 79% compared to 72%), and in Maths (87% compared to 73%).

We are above the National average **IN ALL AREAS**. We are very proud of our results.

Sunnyhill Assessment Information

Please remember that our assessment system is one that we have designed ourselves. There is not a direct comparison with the National assessment system that we are required to administer at the end of Y2 and Y6.

	Year 2				Year 6			
Reading	Target	Actual%	Target	Actual%	Target	Actual%	Target	Actual%
	S <		E <		S <		E <	
	79%	72%	31%	30%	72%	76%	43%	44%
Writing	S <	Actual%	E <	Actual%	S <	Actual%	E <	Actual%
	76%	73%	29%	25%	74%	71%	30%	27%
Maths	S <	Actual%	E <	Actual%	S <	Actual%	E <	Actual%
	80%	81%	31%	29%	82%	86%	25%	22%

	Broadly in line with target set (4% or less away)
	On target (-1/+1)
	Not on target (5% or more away from target set)

As already shared in relation to KS1 SATS information - 5 children (7%) left during the course of the year after targets were set who were predicted to score in the Secure or Exceeding domain. This has impacted on the end of year scores (all scores increasing by a possible 7%); 5 children joined this year group, all working in the developing domain (again 7%). This has also impacted on this data (e.g. if this cohort remained the same throughout the year without any changes, Reading Secure % at the end of the year could be as much as 86%).

Class teachers have shared some concerns in relation to our assessment system that were highlighted when administering the Y2 SATS – they observed that there was a mismatch between the expectations for the National assessments for Y2 and our assessment system. SLT have explored this issue; it became clear that children were being assessed as Secure using the school's Key performance indicators who weren't when assessed against reading book bands, which indicates a child's reading fluency. We have been working on our KPIs in light of this and are highlighting the core skills and knowledge that a child needs to demonstrate to be working

comfortably within a domain not just in Reading, but also in Writing and Maths- and not just for Y2, but across the school. We are using the term 'fluency' in all three areas, making it clear what a child needs to master before they can be assessed as ready to move from one domain to the next. We are spending a lot of time working with staff on the changes that we have made to our assessment system this term so that they are involved in the process and that they understand the thinking behind it.

Achievement compared to Whole school targets 2016-17

Our targets for 2016- 17 were based on:

- Progress and attainment of last year's Y2 and Y6;
- Progress and attainment of children across the school last year;
- Target setting meetings this year.

2016-17 Targets	D	S	Exceeding <
Reading	20%	70%	40%
Writing	20%	70%	35%
Maths	18%	70%	30%

Since setting these targets in the Autumn term, 31 children have left us, 55 have joined us. This equates to outward mobility of 6%, and inward mobility of 10%. We need to remember our mobility when looking at our year group and whole school data as it will have affected our statistics. We have lost the equivalent of a whole class of who we have supported and worked with, whose needs and abilities were included in our targets. We have had the equivalent of almost 2 classes of children join us this academic year, the majority of whom have been newly arrived to the UK, with little or no English or who have additional needs, who have been out of school or a combination of all of the above.

Year 1	Reading	Writing	Maths
D/D+	19%	34%	15%
S/S+	45% (81%)	43% (66%)	52% (85%)
E/E+	36%	23%	33%
Year 2	Reading	Writing	Maths
D/D+	28%	27%	19%
S/S+	42%	48%	52%
E/E+	30%	25%	29%
Year 3	Reading	Writing	Maths
D/D+	17%	18%	15%
S/S+	43%	63%	55%
E/E+	40%	19%	30%
Year 4	Reading	Writing	Maths
D/D+	18%	21%	13%
S/S+	60%	58%	49%
E/E+	22%	21%	38%
Year 5	Reading	Writing	Maths
D/D+	26%	23%	19%
S/S+	27%	36%	40%
E/E+	47%	21%	41%
Year 6	Reading	Writing	Maths
D/D+	25%	29%	14%
S/S+	31%	44%	64%
E/E+	44%	27%	22%

Whole school end of year domain scores	D	S	Exceeding <
Reading	22%	78% (41%)	37%
Writing	25%	75% (49%)	26%
Maths	16%	85% (52%)	32%

	Broadly in line with target set (4% or less away)
	On target (-1/+1)
	Not on target (5% or more away from target set)

Apart from in Writing, our targets have been broadly met. More than expected children were still working at Developing in Writing at the end of the year than predicted, fewer children were working at exceeding than predicted.

In Reading:

- 3 out of 6 year groups matched the whole school target for those children working in the Developing domain, one year group was broadly in line- across the school, the % of children working at Developing was broadly in line with the target set;
- all 6 year groups matched the whole school target for % of children working in the Secure domain;
- 4 out of 6 matched the target for % of children working at Exceeding, 1 year group was broadly in line- across the school, the % of children working at Exceeding was broadly in line with the target set.

In Writing:

- 4 out of 6 year groups matched the whole school target set for those children working in the Developing domain- across the school, a higher % of children are working in this domain for writing than the target set;
- 5 out of 6 year groups matched the target set for those children working at a Secure domain, one year group being broadly in line with this target- across the school, we have met the target set for those children working in this domain.
- In writing, no year group reached the target set for the % of children working in the Exceeding domain.

In Maths:

- the majority of year groups (apart from Exceeding at Y6) and therefore our whole school data shows that targets were met at each domain in Maths this year.

Potential barriers to learning 2017-18, based on information from 2016-17

- *Mobility was the most difficult issue that we faced as a school in 2016-17 (there was inward mobility of 17% in this cohort). The main reason for children moving to other local or Lambeth schools was that families lived closer to another setting, or that they already had another child who attended the school and were waiting for a place to become vacant, accepting a place at Sunnyhill until this happened. We were aware that potentially this churn could impact on standards and highlighted it in our progress meetings and in the way we deployed support*
- *The percentage of EAL children in the 2016-17 cohort was high- 67% (16% of the school population were at Code A or B, 41% were at Code A-C)*
- *Children with little or no English needed additional support to settle into an unfamiliar education system; for some, Sunnyhill was their first formal educational experience (e.g. children coming to the school from Portugal).*
- *Some parental expectations are low- some children have little or no support from home; parents cannot see the positive effect that education has on life choices because of their own lack of education or negative experiences of schooling.*
- *Some children have little opportunity to experience anything to broaden their knowledge and understanding of the world outside of what the school provides.*

- *Some children have already been to several settings in this country or abroad before they are enrolled at Sunnyhill. There has been little consistency in their educational provision.*
- *The percentage of children in the 2016-17 cohort with SEN was high- 25%.*
- *All of these factors influenced the way that we allocated resources- decisions had to be made on who had the most need and how we could best use financial and staffing resources to support them and have the biggest impact.*
- *Supporting children throughout the school was more difficult last academic year because of the general uncertainty around expectations following the abolition of the use of levels and the resulting changes to national assessments. In particular, the Y6 cohort were tested on a 4year curriculum that they only had studied for 3 years- Y6 teachers were left to fill gaps in knowledge in less than 7 months because children had not experienced all areas of learning throughout KS2. The hike in expectations in what Y6 children were expected to know at the end of the year to be at an expected standard compared to previous Y6 cohorts also was still a relatively new factor in the way we prepared children for the end of their primary education.*
- *This testing regime was difficult to make sense of- information about the tests was often contradictory or published late in the term.*

Actions to target barriers to learning

For the academic year 2017-18, the Pupil Premium grant has been allocated to the following support and school priorities:

- To cover the cost of specialist teaching for Sport and Creativity, focusing particularly on those who have shown a particular talent in these areas.
- To cover the cost of school trips for pupil premium children, school journey and extra-curricular activities to boost learning and bring the curriculum to life.
- To part fund quality curriculum resources that are required to support creative learning and teaching.
- To provide additional individual or small group tuition programmes of intervention for those children eligible for Pupil Premium who need a boost to their learning in order to reach their potential, particular support being given to those children who are Pupil Premium who have English as an additional language or who are special needs. This support included access to focused intervention groups for maths, reading and writing both during the school and outside of normal school hours (e.g. homework club, providing access to computer based interventions such as Bug Club, Rapid Reading and Dynamo Maths).
- To support Pupil Premium pupils in Year 6 with 1:1 tuition for one term this academic year to ensure that identified pupils, including those who have joined the school more recently, are provided with the best possible opportunities to 'close the gap' before transferring to secondary school.
- To support the cost of employing senior leaders and staff with particular responsibility for inclusion, to work to support pupils to overcome barriers to learning resulting from their deprivation. This has included opportunities for team teaching, joint planning with teachers and focused intervention groups to 'close the gap' for pupils with difficulties in acquiring phonics, writing and maths skills. This included the employment of a full time Reading Recovery Teacher.
- To support the cost of employing senior leaders with particular responsibility for the development of a targeted curriculum meeting the needs of our pupils. This enabled the school to reduce class sizes for the teaching of maths and writing in selected year groups as well as including a focus on more-able and gifted pupils.
- To support the cost of employing staff with the particular responsibility of ensuring that the children who are eligible for Pupil Premium have their needs clearly identified and their progress closely monitored throughout their time at the school. The funding allowed us to develop a school based 'Inclusion Team' to support the needs of pupils in the following

areas: Cognition and Learning; Communication and Language; Social and Emotional Needs; Physical and Sensory needs. The team consists of an SENDCO, team leader and specialist TAs for each of the 4 inclusion teams and access to commissioned services provided by the speech and language therapy team, educational psychology team and from this year for the first time the occupational therapy team.

- To support the expansion of the MESH team, to give more targeted support for children who find managing their emotions difficult, who need support with mental health issues. The team is also supporting parents who exhibit similar issues.
- To support the cost of employing or releasing Senior Teachers to develop an appropriate and targeted assessment system. For Senior Teachers to work with class based colleagues to analyse information generated and set targets for all pupils including those who are disadvantaged.
- To support parents in understanding how to help their child's learning and development at home including: a programme of Family Learning, with input from school staff and outside professionals and continued support from a Family Outreach worker, who is also a trained counsellor.

Actions for 2017-18:

- **Review assessment in the light of these statistics- how does our assessment system align with National testing requirements?**
- **Give more time during staff meetings to review our assessment systems so that all members of staff are confident when assessing, that we are sure that there is consistency in the way children are assessed across all phases and year groups;**
- **That more time is taken to set accurate starting points based on evidence from last year at the start of term- that teachers lead on starting point setting.**