School visit template

Merrydale Junior School visit 10th May 2018	
Summary of the school's existing areas of focus and approaches	• Quality for teaching for all • Need to accelerate progress, scaffold learning and provide quality feedback • additional class Y6 • quality of feedback • scaffolding support • Additional TA • Quality CPD – what is foci? • Engagement within the curriculum • Residential • Trips • Sports • Total Expenditure: ££60,773 • • Targeted Support • Identify gaps in learning – accelerate progress • L3 TAs small group/individuals closing the gap support • Catch up phonics • Improving Reading Skills - comprehension • 1:1 reading small group • Lunchtime enrichment • Summer read intervention • Self esteem • Forrest School • Provision and improved attainment for higher attainers • Square Mile project • Improve Vocabulary/language • Speech and language provision • Total Expenditure: £19,999 • • Other approaches • Behaviour at unstructured times • Pastoral care • Lunch club • EAL group

	• Garden are lunchtime • CPOMS • SEMH needs • Pastoral Support officer • Parental Engagement • Family Support • DSL training • Attendance • EWO support • Engagement within the curriculum • DSAT challenge • Improving reading skills • Breakfast reading club • Homework club • Total Expenditure: £42,128
Summary of how the school uses evidence to identify effective approaches	*Area one:* *E.g. Evidence from the EEF toolkit shows that both these strategies are effective relative to their costs – particularly for upper primary children.*
Names of key people and outline itinerary	

Thursday 10th May 2018	
8.30am	Meet with Head Pupil premium Lead Go through the timetable for the day & additional information required -
9.15am	Learning walk – focus on provision made for pupils through QF: quality of feedback/impact of additional class/TA support, (how children's learning scaffolded, feedback, engagement, provision for higher attainers, impact of CPD)
	BREAK
After break	Learning walk Continue learning walk Where possible learning walk focusing on quality/impact of

			interventions e.g. closing the gap support, English catch up, small group reading,
		11.30am	Data analysis, action plan/strategy including attendance data
		12.30pm	WORKING LUNCH Follow on data analysis
		1.15pm	Meeting in relation to impact of interventions, including SEMH, family support
		2.00pm	Pupil books: Sample across each year group, two children on track to achieve ARE, two children just below/not on track. Focus on writing and mathematics
		2.45pm	Impact of attendance data
		3.30pm	Feedback to SLT

The reviewer may work with the school on all or some of the following topics:

Topic (including sources of evidence)	Suggested questions and areas to explore	Strengths	Areas for development
Pupil characteristics • Interview with pupil premium co-ordinator or member of staff with PP responsibility • Published data	How are pupil premium pupils spread throughout the school? Does the number / proportion vary significantly from year to year? Is this likely to have an effect on pupil progress data? Are there any patterns within pupil premium cohort data? E.g., Are girls eligible for pupil premium making better progress than boys? Why? Do any of your pupil premium pupils have additional barriers to learning which may make it even harder for them to attain expected levels? E.g. SEN, EAL, Safeguarding factors. **How are multiple vulnerabilities identified? How is this then utilised to track impact of expenditure on attainment and progress?**	School has an accurate understanding of the spread of PP children throughout the school Y3: 23 pupils Y4: 26 pupils Y5: 36 pupils Y6: 32 pupils. The school monitors pupils arriving and establishes eligibility and provision required. Systems are in place for each teacher to be able to identify their children and also be informed of any other vulnerabilities this child may be presented with, School is aware particularly in Y5 and Y6 those middle and higher previous prior attainers who are at risk of not achieving ARE. School has detailed analysis particularly for those children on the cusp of each prior attainment band and the challenges this presents. The school has sought to work in partnership with the infant school in relation to moderation and transition to minimise risk of children falling behind.	With support from the Trust Identify transitional support for PP KS1 children.

Achievement[1]	What evidence is there that the school has utilised research such as EEF to inform decision-making relating to rationale?	How do differences in attainment and progress, compare to the previous year? Is there evidence of gaps in attainment diminishing? Is this true for disadvantaged pupils by the end of KS2?	
• Published data • Current progress data • Lesson observation and work scrutiny • Interview with PP Coordinator	Do senior leaders liaise with colleagues from trust schools to find out what has proved successful for pupils in the past? What assessment system/s does the school use to evaluate the impact of interventions? Does the school evaluate the impact of interventions regularly? E.g. half-termly, termly. Are the gaps closing in all subjects / aspects? How quickly? **What is the impact of the following interventions on attainment and progress of disadvantaged children:** **How are interventions, tracked, monitored and evaluated?**	<table><tr><td></td><td>2016</td><td>**2017 C**ohort: 59 children: 40 children disadvantaged (39 included in progress measure):</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">**Reading**</td></tr><tr><td>Attainment at expected standard</td><td></td><td>**59% (43% all pupils in school)** **(Nat 72% and 77% all others)**</td></tr><tr><td>Attainment at greater depth</td><td></td><td>**14%,) (Nat 25 and 29% all others** **9% all pupils in school**</td></tr><tr><td>Progress</td><td></td><td>**--0.5 (Nat: 0.3 all other)** **-0.5. all pupils in school**</td></tr><tr><td>Scale Score</td><td></td><td>**101.1 (Nat: 105.4 all other)** **99 all pupils**</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">**Writing**</td></tr><tr><td>Attainment at expected standard</td><td></td><td>**70%** **57% all pupils in school**</td></tr></table>	

[1]When reviewing special schools reviews may also wish to consider 'enrichment', and the following question: How will pupil premium eligible pupils benefit from the funding and how is its impact monitored as far as enriching their opportunities is concerned?

			(Nat 76% and 81% all other)
Attainment and progress for all pupils and for disadvantaged pupils is below national at the expected standard and greater depth.	Attainment at greater depth		**14%:** **10% all pupils in school** **(Nat 18% and 21% all other)**
Focusing on the national comparison of comparing disadvantaged children to all other children nationally:	Progress		**1.4** **1.5 all pupils in school (0.2 all other)**
Attainment and progress is lower	Scale Score		**n/a**
than the group national all other, in all 3 subjects. Gap in attainment	**Mathematics**		
and progress is wider in reading both at the expected standard and at greater depth.	Attainment at expected standard		**62%** **47% all pupils in school** **(Nat 75% and 80% all other)**
Key Questions to explore: How does the attainment and progress of disadvantaged children compare to non-disadvantaged within school?	Attainment at greater depth		**22%** **13% all pupils in school** **(Nat 23% and 27% all other)**
How do differences in attainment and progress, compare to the previous year? Is there evidence of gaps in attainment diminishing? Is this true for	Progress		**0.5** **0.5 all pupils in school** **(Nat 0.3 all other)**
disadvantaged pupils by the end of KS2? Are the gaps closing in all subjects / aspects? How quickly?	Scale Score		**102.4** **100 all pupils in school** **(Nat 105.3 all other)**

	What is the provision through funding for higher attaining pupils?	RWM		

RWM

Attainment at expected standard		**46%** **(30% all pupils in school)** **(Nat all pupils 61%, 67% all other)**

Comparing disadvantaged children to all within the school and nationally all other pupils

Difference compared to disadvantaged in school	Reading		Writing
	All within school	National all other	All within school
%ARE expected	+16	-18	+13
% greater depth	+5	-15	+4
Difference in progress	0	-0.8	-0.1
Difference in scale score	+2.1	-4.3	n/a

Whilst reading, writing and mathematics attainment has been in the bottom 20% for at least two years for all pupils, disadvantaged attainment is higher than all pupils in school.

Attainment gap is diminishing quicker for disadvantaged children compared to non- disadvantaged children.

Trends over time demonstrate that progress of disadvantaged children is improving.

In writing disadvantaged children made better progress than all other children did nationally.

In mathematics they made similar progress to all other pupils nationally

Key issues/groups from analysis of data

Reading and mathematics : Attainment and Progress of middle attainers, particularly boys

End of previous KS compared to Spring 2 current pupils

Y3

	Reading	Writing	Maths

	End of KS1	Sp 2	End of KS1	Sp 2	End of KS1	Sp 2
EXS	55%	45%	41%	36%	55%	45%
GDS	14%	23%	14%	18%	9%	18%
EXS +	69%	68%	55%	54%	64%	63%

In all three subjects, similar percentage of children attaining ARE+ at this point in Y3 compared to end of KS1. Greater percentage are working at greater depth. There is not accelerated progress of children who were working towards ARE now achieving ARE hence overall ARE+ increasing and therefore gap in attainment is not yet diminishing compared to national. This is evidenced in the book scrutiny where feedback is not as concise to move learning forward as in other year groups.

Y4

	Reading		Writing		Maths	
	End of KS1	Sp 2	End of KS1	Sp 2	End of KS1	Sp 2
EXS	40%	36%	36%	36%	36%	44%
GDS	8%	20%	8%	12%	0	8%
EXS +	48%	56%	44%	48%	36%	52%

See teaching and learning actions relating to Y3

In all three subjects, there has been an increase in the overall percentage of children achieving ARE+ since the end of KS1, particularly stronger in reading and mathematics. In addition, a higher percentage of children achieve a greater depth judgement.

Year 5

	KS1 Below 2b+	Y5 below ARE	KS1 2b+	Y5 ARE+	KS1 L3+	KS1 GDS
R	29%	33%	71%	67%	19%	27%
W	39%	43%	61%	57%	6%	7%
M	32%	37%	68%	63%	3%	20%

Considering mobility from Y2 to Y5, there is on average 4% difference (2 children) in relation to the decrease in % at ARE comparing L2b+ to ARE in Y5.

Overall strategies focused on provision for more able is impacting on a higher percentage of children now achieving greater depth.

Y6

	KS1 Below 2b+	Y5 below ARE	KS1 2b+	Y5 ARE+	KS1 L3+	KS1 GDS
R	43%	39%	57%	61%	17%	26%

Clear who are children at risk of not achieving Are – review provision

W	54%	55%	46%	45%	0	19%
M	43%	48%	57%	52%	0	26%

Similar to Y5, overall strategies focused on provision for more able is impacting on a higher percentage of children now achieving greater depth

Impact of the school focus on improving attainment in reading is evidenced in increased attainment achieving ARE in Y6.

In writing % achieving ARE in writing is similar to that of L2b+ at the end of KS1 however significant increase in those now achieving greater depth. There is evidence of the impact of talk for writing strategies and intervention in writing for more able pupils

Small decrease (2 pupils) in mathematics, comparing L2b+ to ARE in Y6.

Leadership & Management • Interview with Head Teacher (HT) and Chair of Governors (CoG) • Interview with PP Coordinator • Scrutiny of pupil premium policy documents • Scrutiny of SEF • Most recent Ofsted report • Published and current data	Do senior leaders observe out of classroom interventions to ensure that pupils are receiving the same quality of teaching they would expect within whole class sessions? Do senior leaders focus on the quality of teaching and learning of particular groups of pupils when conducting lesson observations? E.g. pupil premium pupils How much do senior leaders consider evidence, such as the EEF toolkit, when making decisions? **How are key actions/approach monitored and evaluated? What key evidence is collated to demonstrate impact?**	Whilst monitoring and evaluation task are not evident in the school strategy, in reality tasks are undertaken to monitor attainment and progress of PP children including lesson observations, book and planning scrutiny and through pupil progress meetings. In relation to pastoral provision, impact is evaluated through records kept, use of Boxall profiles and SDQ. Schools identifies practice could be further improved by planning throughout strategy an approach to identifying evidence to be collected to evaluate impact of the strategy. School identifies through monitoring of after school activities, particularly homework clubs, that often PP do not regularly attend. School has identified in its own evaluation of its strategy that it wishes to review the process of establishing a yearly strategy and how it can make better use of EEF research. As with other schools in the trust there is no specific governor/adviser with responsibility for PP.	Within the strategy, it states expenditure of £191,400 for the academic year 2017- 2018.This contradicts expenditure on the strategy statement of £302,280. This may be due to the school, carrying forward expenditure or utilising other funds. School review allocation of spending, focusing funding towards quality teaching for all. The policy states that monitoring and evaluation of the strategy is robust. The 2017-2018 strategy document does not highlight specific key monitoring and evaluation tasks Within strategy plan identify - **How are key actions/approach monitored and evaluated? What key evidence is collated to demonstrate impact?** Barriers for future attainment are not identified within the plan and therefore desired outcomes and success criteria are not identified. From analysing data and reading through documentation presented, consideration need to

			be given more to identifying internal/academic barriers to attainment focusing on issues relating to • reading skills, • attainment and progress of middle attainers in reading and mathematics, • aspects of teaching pedagogy relating to supporting children and providing quality feedback which has informed the decision • self-esteem/confidence/resilience/behaviours for learning • combined attainment in RWM • External barriers • engagement of families – confidence/esteem • meeting basic needs of pupils • relationships with parents The pro-formas utilised has been modified from the Teaching School Council, which identifies three strands, quality teaching for all, targeted approaches and other approaches. The school has amalgamated all three sections into one. It may be useful to consider to separating, as this would then allow a clearer understanding of how

			internals/academic barriers are being addressed in a sustainable way through quality teaching for all.

Teaching			
Teaching • esson observation/ learning walks, to include work scrutiny and discussion with teachers • bservation of out of class interventions • urrent progress data	How often do pupils receive high quality constructive verbal feedback and marking? **How has funding impacted on quality of reading provision across whole school** **What specific focus has there been on pedagogy relating to quality first teaching? How has expenditure impacted on improving the attainment and progress of disadvantaged children in each year group?** How are outcomes of pupil progress meetings utilised to identify QFT strategies as well as intervention? How are these monitored throughout QFT. How are teachers held to account? Do all staff – leaders, teachers and support staffs – know which pupils are eligible for pupil premium and understand their barriers to learning? Do the school's strategies for spending specifically match the perceived barriers for learning for its disadvantaged pupils? For example, do interventions designed to raise attainment in English target the right aspect / skills? How does the school target pupil progress in particular subjects / aspects?	No formal observation of teaching was undertaken focused on English and Mathematics as the school had organised a thematic day. Focus of reviewing teaching and learning focused on how school utilises funding to deliver intervention within quality first teaching and as additional intervention focused on: • Identify gaps in learning – accelerate progress • L3 TAs small group/individuals closing the gap support • Catch up phonics • Improving Reading Skills - comprehension • 1:1 reading small group Y6 Focus of funding within Y6 is utilised to improve quality of feedback on learning and target gaps in learning. Funding has been targeted at employing additional L3 TA to support the process. Additional support is utilised to respond to feedback on learning whether within class support or out of the classroom. Staff had coordinated well a flexible grouping mechanism where children according to the outcome of feedback can be identified for ore-teaching, specific block of swift intervention or additional scaffolded support in the classroom. All staff are clear about their roles and the immediate children they are targeting. Feedback between all adults is well managed. Targeted support is identified for all abilities but a specific focus on middle attainers has been given priority. As year has progressed targeted support has been refined particularly in mathematics with a focus on reasoning	Identify for specific longer running interventions clear system of identifying entry, exit points and agreed measures to monitor impact.

	How well is the school using Pupil Premium funding to support pupils to develop positive attitudes to learning and a thirst for knowledge across all learning contexts? Does the school carry out lesson observations to monitor the quality of interventions? Do senior leaders monitor pupil progress data regularly? E.g. termly, half-termly?	Specific interventions identified focus on - Reading coaching – led by SENCo - Arithmetic - Spelling and handwriting Children are encouraged to self-nominate for support. Currently as intervention is flexible, changing daily, impact is measured through increase in % at ARE and progress made each half term. Impact is evident in quality of feedback seen in books, pupils responding to feedback and evidence of progress within books (see book scrutiny below) Y3 small focus group – PP children 4 children identified as requiring differing provision for teaching of English due to significant delay in learning and SEMH needs evident on transition to the junior school. 3 out of 4 children displayed anxiety daily when entering the classroom, resulting in low attendance and inability to engage in classroom. Specific teaching group led initially by L3 TA now led by L2 TA. Teaching is based on daily phonics, spelling and sentence structure. Small unit of work are planned overtime. Children are confident to interact in the small group. Ta unclear how impact and progress would be measured. Trust use of yearly test would have little impact on measuring progress made, as children are not working at an age appropriate level.	Ensure teacher has an over view of learning. Children need opportunity to experience sequence of reading to writing and appropriate talk for writing strategies. Learning needs to be based on need to move learning forward – e.g. is speech marks most appropriate – develop independent writing skills through appropriate activities. Identify a process to identify attainment and progress made based on small steps planned. E.g. utilise phonics screening and programme

		Y4 Greater Depth Similar gap analysis intervention to Y6 is ran in Y4 with focus on more able pupils. In addition, these pupils are utilised within a peer-mentoring programme. Pupils support other middle attainers through providing feedback and helping them to respond to feedback in order for those identified children to be able to access learning later. Children are confident to peer evaluate work honestly providing appropriate feedback. As a result pupils are better at taking responsibility for their own learning and becoming more independent to select own resources to support learning. Peer mentors known as the teaching team, are self-sufficient in organising timetables of support. Teacher identifies focus and any pre-teaching required, mentors utilise own work as models to support others. **Work Scrutiny sample pupils at Are and just below within target groups.– focus on impact of funding to improve quality of feedback on learning, how learning is scaffolded and planned to meet the needs of all PP children.** Y6 - Feedback relating to writing moves learning forward. \evidence of children responding swiftly to feedback and making improvements. - Success criteria utilised by staff and children to evaluate success. Children evaluate each piece of work against an assessment line drawn, relating to	Review how funding relating to PP and EAL can be utilised to develop quality first teaching for all

			ARE. This is usually an accurate reflection of the task completed.	Identify best practice across Y4 that can be shared with Y3 in relation to developing effective feedback and utilising analysis of gaps in learning to inform planning and structure of learning

ARE. This is usually an accurate reflection of the task completed.
- Range of evidence where strategies are utilised to support individuals.
- Questions asked move learning forward.
- Good evidence of cross-curricular links. Expectations are consistently high
- Clear evidence of progress within books.
- Children identified as working within target group just below ARE are working at a similar level to those at ARE.

Y5
Evidence is similar to that of above plus
- Those working just below ARE are often those who are EAL. Sentence structure is identified as an area of weakness. Evidence of teacher identifying gaps in learning and providing appropriate support.
- In mathematics children working at ARE, just below and at greater depth are given similar challenges. Need to identify how challenge could be further improved or structure of lesson used more flexibly to challenge all learners

Y4
- Evidence of appropriate differentiation
- Feedback moves learning forward. \evidence of children responding swiftly to feedback and making improvements
- Evidence for those working towards ARE demonstrates that children are not working independently hence it hols back achieving ARE.
- Talk for writing strategies support learning
- Evidence in maths of differentiated tasks and scaffolds to support
- Evidence of gap analysis intervention utilised to improve learning

Y3
Feedback on learning not as consistently applied as in

Identify best practice across Y4 that can be shared with Y3 in relation to developing effective feedback and utilising analysis of gaps in learning to inform planning and structure of learning

Evaluate how mathematics approach is ensuring all learners are challenged.

Identify with school approach to talk for writing how all learners can have learning structured over time in order to able to independently show what they have learnt – specific group of below ARE

		other year groups, particularly in Mathematics Challenge is at times similar for all pupils	

Behaviour & safety • Learning walk and discussion with PPCo • Scrutiny of behaviour records	**How is the impact of intervention relating to attendance, tracked and monitored in order to evaluate impact?** **How do you monitor impact of expenditure relating to the role of the family Support Worker?** Does the school provide emotional and social support for its pupil premium pupils to ensure that they feel happy and safe and ready to learn? Does the school audit participation? How could the school increase the proportion of pupil premium pupils who attend? E.g., provide transport, telephone parents. How well does the range of clubs on offer reflect pupil interest? Does the school provide a mentoring / buddying service for its pupils? Do pupils feel confident about who to ask for help?	Parent Support Worker Strengths of role focus on improved interactions between school and parents. Focus of all work is aimed at supporting PP families as a priority. Everyday queries addresses efficiently. Each day role entails monitoring attendance, contacting individual parents, identifying support to improve attendance. Alongside other responsible for attendance series of mechanisms implemented ranging from letters to participating in panel meetings. Key role is participation in matters relating to differing levels of thresholds in relation to care of children. E.g. attendance at core meetings, CIN, CP, TAF. In addition support parents in attending medical appointments – role is impacting on supporting and tackling external barriers impacting on children's learning at school. Role in addition supports school strategy though • Workshops based on Fun families approach • Maths workshops focused on calculations • Reading workshops • Supporting families with online platforms accessed for home learning • • Impact of current work is monitored through parent questionnaires and evaluation from courses designed. Evidence identifies that this is a valued service to parents. • • • Pastoral Support Officer • Development of the role has enabled a programme of interventions to be identified for PP children allowing them to access learning through improved	Identify a tracking/monitoring system to measure impact of role on improving attendance for target families. Identify how reports could be utilised from CPOMs to evaluate types of support given, reduction in incidents. Identify case studies that could be utilised to demonstrate best practice. Identify mechanism to identify how impact of intervention is impacting on attainment...

- behaviours for learning.
- Interventions include:
- Therapy sessions based on drawing/talking, understanding specific emotions identified for individual children
- Music therapy – take note
- All Y3 focus on rules/expectations
- All Y4 focus on understanding anger
- Children identified for a specific intervention have individual targets identified based on specific vulnerabilities, these are monitored and refined where appropriate over time.
- Incidents are recorded on CPOMs and utilised to monitor impact of intervention.
-
- During a learning walk across the school, children were engaged in a theme of activities based on the school's learning behaviours. Children were able to talk about differing learning behaviours and how this impacts on their learning.

In each year, group children were engaged in learning, contributing to activities and enthused to participate. No incidents of inappropriate behaviour were seen. Evident individual children has targeted support to engage them in their learning but staff were deployed effectively.

Analysis of Attendance data

	HT1	HT2	HT3	HT4
PP	89.1	95.3	93.6	93.8
Non PP	94	97.3	95.7	95.4

Persistence Absence

	HT1	HT2	HT3	HT4
PP	23.1	12.4	21.7	21
Non PP	9.4	6.9	13.8	12.6

School analyses attendance twice a month focusing on individuals and on a half termly basis.

Identify cumulative picture of attendance for both groups – identify reasons for absence for each year group and impact of holiday and religious observance.

Identify process for monitoring impact of intervention to improve attendance in order to identify best

		Similar fluctuating pictures occur for both groups across terms. There is a need to unpick patterns further to identify impact of religious observance, long stay holidays after term starts and the positive impact of interventions. Currently analysing in such a way is disheartening for staff and does not identify effective practice.	practice.
Evaluation of impact, drafting action plan and next steps • Discussion with HT/ CoG/PPCo	How well is pupil premium funding used to: Ensure quality first teaching and above expected progress? Support effective interventions? Widen opportunity? What support can the reviewer offer for action planning and ongoing monitoring of the plan?	Evidence across Y4, 5 and 6 that funding is impacting on the quality of provision within English and mathematics, particularly for more able pupils. Interventions chosen which focus on identifying gaps in learning are effectively utilised this therefore is now impacting on attainment, particularly more able pupils. Schools tracking system is being utilised to identify those at risk of not achieving ARE, considering attainment from KS1. As processes continue to be embedded this should further impact on attainment and progress. The leadership of the school has self-evaluated how they can further improve their strategy by reviewing barriers to learning, utilising these to form desired outcomes and success criteria in order to formulated informed decisions about agreed actions. Leaders identify the need to plan and identify key monitoring tasks which would gather evidence across all strategies to demonstrate impact. The school already has utilised evidence but wishes to enhance this	

		process.