**Hamilton Infant School Pupil Premium Strategy 2016 – 2017 Reviewed July 2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2016 - 2017 | **Total PP budget** | £52,080 | **Date of PP review** | Feb / March 2017 |
| **Total number of pupils** | 172 (excluding nursery) | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 28 (excluding EYPP) | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | July 2017 |
| **Link Governor** | Mrs. D. Wiltshaw | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **End of Year 2 attainment 2016** | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | *Pupils eligible for PP (in school)* | | | | *Pupils not eligible for PP (in school)* | |  |
| **% achieving ARE(Age-Related Expectations) or above in reading, writing & maths (or equivalent)** | | | | 57% | | | | *60%* | |  |
| **% making at least strong (good) progress in reading** | | | | 87% | | | | 88% | |  |
| **% making substantial progress in reading** | | | | 57% | | | | 44% | |  |
| **% making at least strong (good) progress in writing** | | | | 91% | | | | 85% | |  |
| **% making substantial progress in writing** | | | | 43% | | | | 40% | |  |
| **% making at least strong (good) progress in maths** | | | | 91% | | | | 91% | |  |
| **% making substantial progress in maths** | | | | 57% | | | | 47% | |  |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)** | | | | | | | | | |  |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school)* | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Attendance and punctuality of pupils eligible for PP is not as good as those pupils not eligible for PP | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Communication and language skills on entry to school are lower for pupils who are eligible for PP | | | | | | | | |  |
| **C.** | Key skills (reading, writing, maths) on entry to school are lower for pupils who are eligible for PP | | | | | | | | |  |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* | | | | | | | | | |  |
| **D.** | Parents of pupils eligible for PP engage less with their child’s learning at home and school (identified as vulnerable/hard to reach) | | | | | | | | |  |
| 1. **Desired outcomes** *(Desired outcomes and how they will be measured)* | | | | **Success criteria** | | **Documents which provide evidence for the achievement of the success criteria.** | | | | **Lessons learned** |
|  | An increase in % attendance & improved punctuality for pupils eligible for PP | | | * Attendance for pupils eligible for PP is improved to 96% * % of pupils eligible for PP arriving on time for school is improving each half term * % of pupils eligible for PP are collected on time at the end of the school day is improving each half term | | * PP attendance is 93.80% (May 17) and this was 96.04% (May 16). This shows a decline of 2.24%.   FSM attendance is 95.85% (May 17) and this was 95.49% (May 16). This shows that attendance is in line with last year.   * PP attendance for the academic year 2016-2017 was 92.19% (34 children). This year there were 8 in year transfers. 5 of these in year transfers were persistently absent children. * PP children arriving late has decreased by 15% over the academic year. * 47 % PP children Autumn 1. * 36 % PP children Autumn 2. * 36% PP children in Spring 1 * 33% PP children in Spring 2 * 35% PP children in Summer 1 * 32% PP children in Summer 2.   14/31 PP children travel a distance to attend school. This school is not their local school. Of these 14 children, 5 have requested an in year transfer (including one referral to the EWO) and 1 is now going to be home schooled.  The school has only just begun monitoring children who are collected late so there is not comparable measure yet. | | | | Attendance continues to be a high priority in the school improvement plan.  Higher profile needed for the PDBW to intervene with attendance and meet with parents for those children persistently absent or late. This will be in next year’s improvement plan. |
|  | Improved levels of communication skills evident in reception pupils for pupils who are eligible for PP | | | * 10% improvement in reception classes in communication skills of pupils eligible for PP (language screen scores) | | * Stoke Speaks Out Language screen baselines Sept 2016   + PP children FS1 33% at ARE   + PP children FS2 67% at ARE * SSO language screens February 2017 * PP children FS1 83% at ARE * PP children FS2 100% at ARE * SSO language screens June 2017 * PP children FS1 80% at ARE * PP children FS2 55% (Not matched) at ARE * PP children FS2 83.3% (Matched data) at ARE   This data has changed by 3 late arrivals 33% of PP who did not quite achieve ARE in the screen. They arrived after the February screen.   * Dcpro data for AP4 shows 80% FS1 PP children are at ARE for Speaking. Showing improvement since baseline. * Dcpro data for AP4 shows 100% FS2 PP children are at ARE for Speaking. Showing improvement since baseline.   **Whole cohort progress data**  MAT reports AP4.   * FS1 whole cohort GLD increased from 0% baseline to 54% at AP4. * FS2 whole cohort GLD increased from 38% baseline to 70% at AP4. | | | | Effective strategy.  Communication is high priority on the school improvement plan for next year.  Children who arrived mid-year FS2 need very accurate baselining in communication so more personalised interventions can be planned for as they often have additional needs such as new to English. |
|  | The majority of pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress during their time in school (reading, writing, maths, phonics, science) | | | * 85% pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress during their time in school (for any pupil entering school below or well-below ARE). * Pupils eligible for PP attain in line with national pupils eligible for PP at all statutory assessment points | | * Y2 SLT progress from GLD groups analysis shows that Y2 PP children at AP4 are exceeding all pupils in reading, writing and maths and in line with all pupils in reading * Reading 83% ARE+ * Writing 83% ARE+ * Maths 83% ARE+ * Progress over time matched data for AP4 shows: * Reception (5 children) – 100% of PP pupils make strong progress in R, W &M, 60% of PP pupils make substantial progress in R, W & M. * Year 1 (8 children) – 75% of PP children make strong progress in R, W & M. 62.5% make substantial progress in M, 50% make substantial progress in R and 37.5% make substantial progress in W. * Year 2 (6 children) – 83% of PP children make strong progress in R & W and 100% make strong progress in M. 50% make substantial progress in R & W and 67% make substantial progress in M. * Phonics screen 82% at ARE * Raise Online same data analysis shows * Y2 Reading 12% above national PP EXP * Y2 Reading 8% above national PP GD * Y2 Writing 10% above national PP EXP * Y2 Writing 9% above national PP GD * Y2 Maths 7% below national PP EXP * Y2 Maths 1% above national PP GD * Y1 PP Phonics 5% above national PP * Y2 PP Phonics 9% above national PP | | | | The majority of pupils make at least strong progress and many make accelerated progress.  PP children who join mid-year do not make strong progress despite a good deal of intervention. Often these pupils also have additional needs such as SEND or they are new to English. Interventions need to be further personalised to meet the needs of these pupils. |
|  | Increased engagement of parents of pupils eligible for PP in school and home learning | | | * Increased attendance at parent workshops to at least 70% PP parents * 100% attendance at Parents Evening for PP pupils’ parents * 25% PP parents attend family learning sessions in school * 80% pupils eligible for PP complete weekly homework | | * PP Parents attending workshops * Spelling/reading 32% * Maths 76% * Reading FS1 100% * 100% attendance at Parents Evening for PP pupils (and all pupils) Nov 16 * Christmas concerts – 100% * 100% attendance at Parents evening for PP pupils (and all pupils) March 17 * Easter service accessible to all but this was not a registered event. * Mother’s day tea party - 84% PP * Family learning * Currently 17% - PP children regularly targeted but attendance is low due to sibling’s childcare or working parents. * 4 PP parents are signed up for session 2 of early words together. * Homework * 70% of PP children regularly complete homework. | | | | Attendance is increasing in parental engagement in workshops, but impact has not been measured regarding engagement.  It continues to be challenging to engage some PP parents in home-school learning. This will remain a priority for teachers, HSLW and PDBW lead.  Homework needs reviewing across the whole-school to ensure it is fit for purpose and valued by parents and teachers. This will be a priority for the school improvement plan for next year. |
| **5. Planned expenditure £** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Academic Year 2016 – 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| The three headings below demonstrate how we are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies | | | | | | | | | | |
| **i Quality of teaching for all** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | | **Chosen action / approach** | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | **How will you ensure it is implemented well?** | | **Staff lead & estimated cost** | | **When will you review implementation?** | |
| 1. An increase in % attendance & improved punctuality for pupils eligible for PP | | Increased input from class teachers ref attendance and punctuality – communication with parents (impact on lost learning recoded in communication diaries). | EEF T and L toolkit shows that parental involvement accelerates learning.  PP research identifies issues around attendance and punctuality as contributory factors to limited progress/attainment outcomes. | | HSLW/PDBW lead monitoring of communication diaries. | | Contribution to salary of AHT (1 day / week dedicated to PDBW including attendance and Parental Engagement)  & Home School Link Worker salary  £35,713 | | PDBW plan monitored termly by Link Governor.  AHT for PDBW Appraisal Reviews. | |
| 1. Improved levels of communication skills evident for all pupils who are eligible for PP | | Train staff to embed effective teaching of speaking and listening skills across the curriculum so that all pupils can take the ESB (English Speaking Board) qualification; (focus on feedback to pupils)  **Deferred to 2017-18 plan** | EEF T and L toolkit evidence that effective feedback to pupils accelerates pupil learning.  Monitoring evidence shows that ‘Talk for Writing’ approaches improve writing outcomes, and that the teaching of vocabulary improves attainment in reading, writing, maths and science. | | TLA (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) will detail training, implementation and monitoring arrangements.  PDBW lead to monitor PP attainment and progress in reading, writing, maths, phonics, science and communication; identify priorities and respond as appropriate. | | Assistant Head Teachers  TLA (Teaching, learning & assessment) leader (supported by Communication Champion)  PDBW (Personal development, behaviour & welfare) leader  Staff Training  £2,000 | | TLA & PDBW plans monitored termly by Link Governors.  Appraisal reviews/Pupil progress meetings. | |
| C. The majority of pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress during their time in school (reading, writing, maths, phonics) | | Provide extra support through support staff to enable pupils to master basic skills.  Staff CPD to improve QFT with a focus on mastery of basic skills and effective feedback to pupils.  Provide CPD for all staff in effective teaching of writing (especially spelling and rehearsal)  Review and update systems and processes for teaching reading (guided). | EEF T and L toolkit that mastery learning and feedback are effective in accelerating progress | | CPD for staff to share expectations and best practice in mastery and feedback.  Leaders attend regular CPD to remain informed of recommended practice.  Weekly drop-ins and regular book scans provide CPD on best practice and areas for further development.  PDBW lead to monitor PP attainment and progress in reading, writing, maths, phonics and communication; identify priorities and respond as appropriate. | | TLA & PDBW leads  Contribution to Support staff in classrooms £14,367 | | TLA & PDBW plans monitored termly by Link Governors.  Appraisal reviews/Pupil progress meetings. | |
| **ii Targeted support** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | | **Chosen action / approach** | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | **How will you ensure it is implemented well?** | | **Staff lead** | | **When will you review implementation?** | |
| 1. An increase in % attendance & improved punctuality for pupils eligible for PP | | Increased (monitoring and actions) from inclusion team (HSLW & AHT for PDBW) – working alongside office manager.  HSLW & AHT for PDBW to meet weekly. Review, plan, do, review…approach to individual cases. Measure impact. | EEF T and L toolkit shows that parental involvement accelerates learning.  PP research identifies issues around attendance and punctuality as contributory factors to limited progress/attainment outcomes. | | Minutes of meetings (including actions and impact) to be submitted to HoS weekly for monitoring. | | Staffing and costings as  As 5i above. | | PDBW plan monitored termly by Link Governor.  AHT for PDBW Appraisal Reviews. | |
| B. Improved levels of communication skills evident in reception pupils for pupils who are eligible for PP | | Nuffield language interventions in nursery & reception classes  SEND interventions | EEF T and L toolkit evidence that oral language interventions are effective in accelerating progress. | | See TLA action plan for details of training, implementation and monitoring.  All staff delivering interventions to be trained.  Regular meetings with SALT (Speech and Language Therapist) Victoria Bailey to review implementation and progress | | TLA & PDBW Leaders (supported by Communication Champion)  Staff training costs included in above.  SEN interventions costs included in above. | | TLA & PDBW plans monitored termly by Link Governors.  Appraisal reviews/Pupil progress meetings. | |
| C. The majority of pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress during their time in school | | Support staff provide targeted interventions for pupils eligible for PP, with objectives targeted at gaps in their learning to accelerate progress.  Focus will be on providing effective feedback on learning and how to improve. Fix-it and prove it to be done in every session. | EEF T and L toolkit evidence that feedback is effective in accelerating progress. | | See TLA &PDBW plans for further detail of implementation and monitoring. | | TLA &PDBW Leaders  Support staff interventions, costing included above. | | TLA & PDBW plans monitored termly by Link Governors.  Appraisal reviews/Pupil progress meetings. | |
| **iii Other approaches** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | | **Chosen action / approach** | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | **How will you ensure it is implemented well?** | | **Staff lead** | | **When will you review implementation?** | |
| D. Increased engagement of parents of pupils eligible for PP in school and home learning | | Embed ‘Hard to Reach’ process for identifying and intervening any parent not engaging in their child’s learning.  Family Learning sessions  Extension of ‘Watch me Learn’ sessions  Extension of Parent Forum to ensure representation of parents of pupils eligible for PP.  HSLW to target parents of pupils eligible for PP to attend parent workshops in school. | School monitoring and analysis shows that where parents understand how to support their child’s learning, and engage with school life, pupils demonstrate higher self-esteem and make more rapid progress.  EEF T and L toolkit shows that parental involvement accelerates learning | | See PDBW plans for further detail of implementation and monitoring. | | AHT/HSLW – costings included above. | | It continues to be challenging to engage some PP parents in home-school learning. This will remain a priority. | It continues to be challenging to engage some PP parents in home-school learning. This will remain a priority. |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | £52,080 | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review of expenditure £60, 720.00** | | | | |
| **Previous Academic Year 2015 – 2016** | | | | |
| **targeted support – Target 1 & 2 & 3 on plan**  **Positive impact on educational outcomes** | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **Estimated impact:** | **Lessons learned** | **Cost** |
| * Disadvantaged children make outstanding (better than expected) progress in reading, writing and maths (from starting points at each intervention cycle) * Disadvantaged children pass the Y1 phonic screen and Y2 re-takes * School gaps in each year group and the difference between school and National gaps in Y2 narrow/close in reading, writing & maths | After school teacher-led intervention clubs for Reading, Writing and Maths. | **IN SCHOOL GAPS 2015-2016**   * Gaps – Y2 reading & writing gaps narrowed; maths gap widened (see SEN chronologies) * Gaps Y1 – reading slight widening; writing zero gap maintained all year; maths gap narrowed * Gaps YR – the gaps have closed in reading and maths and there are now positive differentials in these areas. The zero gap in writing has been maintained   Gaps YN – reading and maths gaps have closed and there are now positive differential in these areas. The slight gap in writing has been maintained/not narrowed  **Progress 2015-2016**   * Y2 leavers made substantial progress in reading and writing but less than strong in maths * Y1 made substantial progress in reading and maths but less than strong in writing * YR made substantial progress in reading, strong progress in maths but less than strong in writing * YN made substantial progress in reading and maths and strong progress in writing * Progress over time in school shows impact of interventions/value for money. The large majority of pupils eligible for PP make at least strong (good) progress, and a significant number make substantial progress. Of the minority that do not, all have additional vulnerabilities.   **Attainment**  *NB – small numbers of PP influence % and comparisons*  **RAISE ONLINE 2016**   * Disadvantaged transformation from ELG to Y2 outcomes compares well with national in reading and writing. There is a slight differential in maths (equivalent of 1 child) in transforming from emerging ELG to the expected standard in KS1   *NB – high expectations, comparing disadvantaged to non-disadvantaged nationally, have been reported. However, ‘same’ comparators will evidence a pleasing picture*   * Y2 leavers 2016 reading at the expected standard - disadvantaged children at Hamilton attained at 4% below non-disadvantaged pupils nationally * At greater depth, disadvantaged children at Hamilton attained 4% below non-disadvantaged pupils nationally * Y2 leavers 2016 writing at the expected standard - disadvantaged children at Hamilton attained at 7% below non-disadvantaged pupils nationally * At greater depth, disadvantaged children at Hamilton attained at in line with non-disadvantaged pupils nationally – **very pleasing** * Y2 leavers 2016 maths at the expected standard - disadvantaged children at Hamilton attained significantly below (24%) non-disadvantaged pupils nationally * At greater depth, disadvantaged children at Hamilton attained 9/10% below non-**disadvantaged pupils nation**   **Year 2 Phonics**   * Disadvantaged and Free School Meal attainment was above national in 2016. This is very pleasing   **Year 1 Phonics**   * Disadvantaged and Free School Meal attainment was above national in 2016. This is very pleasing   **SCHOOL AND LOCAL ATTAINEMNT COMPARATORS**   * Y2 leavers 2016 reading only 3% below school non-PP, and above 3 other local infant schools PP. * Y2 leavers 2016 writing below school non-PP but above 3 other local infant schools PP. * Y2 leavers 2016 maths significantly below school non-PP but above 2 of 3 other local infant schools PP. * Y2 phonics retakes, above school non-PP and above 2 of 3 other local infant schools. * Y1 2016 reading only 3% below school non-PP, and above 3 other local infant schools PP. * Y1 2016 writing below school non-PP but above 2 of 3 other local infant schools PP. * Y1 2016 maths significantly below school non-PP but below 2 of 3 other local infant schools PP. * Y1 phonics PP significantly below school non-PP and below all 3 other local infant schools PP (whole school SIP) * YR 2016 reading significantly below school non-PP, and below 2 of 3 other local infant schools PP. * YR 2016 writing below school non-PP and below 2 of 3 other local infant schools PP. * YR 2016 maths above school non-PP and 3 other local infant schools PP. * YR GLD PP below school non-PP and below all 3 other local infant schools PP (whole school SIP) * YN 2016 reading only 2% below school non-PP, and above 3 other local infant schools PP. * YN 2016 writing 5% below school non-PP and above 3 other local infant schools PP. * YN 2016 maths above school non-PP and 3 other local infant schools PP. * YN GLD PP below school non-PP but above 2 of 3 other local infant schools PP (whole school SIP) | Impact on teacher work-life balance detrimental to their wellbeing and to retention of quality staff. | Staff salaries £1883  Resources  £500 |
| * Disadvantaged children make outstanding (better than expected) progress in reading, writing and maths (from starting points at each intervention cycle) * Disadvantaged children pass the Y1 phonic screen and Y2 re-takes * School gaps in each year group and the difference between school and National gaps in Y2 narrow/close in reading, writing & maths * Support staff demonstrate planning for progression * Support staff understand their responsibilities within value for money / impact. | To deliver small group follow up intervention sessions for Reading, Writing and Maths to impact positively on educational outcomes in core subjects (Target 2 on Action Plan) | **See data above**  All intervention leads plan and evaluate own groups (with support of teachers) – Evidence file 2.7& 11 | Support staff need further training in feedback to pupils, and in evaluating impact of the interventions.  Specific children to be identified as part of appraisal cycle (value for money) | Staff salaries  Support Staff  Staff salaries £6,355  Resources  £500 |
| * Disadvantaged children make outstanding (better than expected) progress in reading, writing and maths (from starting points at each intervention cycle) * Disadvantaged children pass the Y1 phonic screen and Y2 re-takes * School gaps in each year group and the difference between school and National gaps in Y2 narrow/close in reading, writing & maths * Self-esteem raised through celebration & recognition of individual strengths/talents | To offer teacher led spring/summer holiday school tuition to all children that are eligible for The Pupil Premium Grant (who are not making ‘better than expected’ progress) (Target 3 on Action Plan) | **See data above**  **All children in Y1 and Y2 that were not at Age Related Expectations or making at least strong progress were targeted for Easter Club provision**  Easter school definitely had an impact on self-esteem (3A.4, 2.10)  It was **focussed on reading/phonics** and majority of PP who attended made strong or substantial progress in reading last academic year.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **child** | **Progress Reading** | **Progress Writing** | **Progress maths** | **Passed phonics?** | | TG (Y1) |  |  |  |  | | LC (Y2) |  |  |  |  | | JB (Y2) |  |  |  | Left? | | Attendance an issue – need more support and presence of HSLW if we are to run this again. Need to consider if location/held at NB is influencing this – explore through Parent Forum  Not enough staff could commit to deliver the Summer club on the agreed dates so it was unable to run. Need to consider solution/alternatives | Easter school 1 week x 5 pupils = £1,350  Salary costs  Resources  £100 |
| **ii Other approaches – Target 4 & 5 on plan**  **Provide family support, increase parental engagement/build positive relationships (impact on outcomes including attendance and punctuality)**  **Build aspiration & self-esteem** | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **Impact:** | **Lessons learned** | **Cost** |
| * Children’s needs are identified earlier preventing escalation to higher levels of need. * Parents are active as partners and feel well supported in this * Improving attendance and punctuality for identified children * Children know and proactively work towards learning and welfare targets. * Self-esteem raised through increasing praise and success. | To provide Family Support to increase partnership working to impact positively on improving attendance, punctuality & educational outcomes (Target 4 on Action Plan) | * See individual chronologies for impact of early intervention – appointment of teacher qualified, HSLW with safeguarding responsibility, has led to more rigorous systems, including attendance & punctuality, to ensure no ‘case drift’ for targeted PP families (evidence files 1.15, 4, 7) * HSLW taken on responsibility for parents and gives firm but fair messages to ensure parents engage appropriately and follow school policies and parent code of conduct – see attendance clinics, behaviour clinics, parent meeting book, inclusion meeting notes, multi-agency report forms (evidence files 1.15, 4, 7)1.15, 2.15, 4, 7) * Impact on children’s self-esteem/inclusion evident e.g. all children in pyjamas for Children in Need, attending trips, wanting to show learning to teachers and visitors (evidence files 2.12, 2.15, 4, 8) * Hard to reach systems and processes identified as a strength of the school during external Teaching and Learning Review (evidence files 1.15, 4, 7, 1.10) * Monitoring of parental attendance at school events shows an improving engagement of parents whose pupils are eligible for PP (evidence files 2.10, 4) * The majority of pupils eligible for PP completed weekly homework * Establishment of a parent forum with representation from families whose pupils are eligible for PP(evidence files 2.10, 4) * School Council representation (evidence files 2.7, 4) * 100% of parents/carers attended Parent Evening discussions (evidence file 1.15, 2.10, 4) * An increased range of opportunities for parents to come into school and learn how to support them at home e.g. ‘Watch me learn maths’ ‘Watch me learn spelling’ (evidence files 2.10, 4) * Learning targets simplified for all pupils and more time given to embed them so that pupils understand the progress they are making (see target sheets and Pupil Passports for children with multiple vulnerabilities). Support staff targeting disadvantaged under achievers as routine (evidence files 3A.4) * Children are able to discuss their learning/targets with increasing skill/clarity (evidence files 3A.4) | Need to ensure all school tracking systems allow easy identification of vulnerable groups to help prove impact | HSLW salary  £22,500  AHT - 1 days per week – data analysis & CPD  £8,309  Resources  £500  Interpreter  £800  Class base support costs  £ 17,723 |
| * All Pupil Premium are accessing extra curricula provision * Improved self-esteem/confidence of children (lead/share/celebrate with peers) * Pupils basic skills develop across the curriculum * Improved understanding of teaching & learning (parents) * Improved engagement of parents as partners * Impact on progress, attainment and attendance * Empowerment of parents and children/raised aspirations | Provide a range of after-school clubs & target disadvantaged pupils  Representation on School Council, Playground Leaders  Parent representation on parent forum  (Target 5 on Action Plan) | **Also see above**   * Increase in PP accessing sports clubs , currently 29% attend * Focus on embedding the new National Curriculum which is skills based – book scans show that these basic skills are becoming embedded – more work to do on basic spelling skills (see all monitoring – planning, drop ins, work scrutinies…) * Parent feedback from ‘watch me learn’ events shows parents felt better informed about how to help their children learn at home (evidence file 2.10) * Scrutiny of home-school diaries shows staff make comments to support parents in knowing how to help pupils and an improvement can be seen for some pupils in the quality of parent comments so that they are now beginning to focus on pupil skills (evidence file 3A) * Empowering parents has improved through the development of The Parent Forum (evidence file 2.10, 2.15, 4) * PP pupils are given areas of responsibility to boost their self-esteem and are well-represented as play leaders and on the school council (evidence file 2.7, 4) | PDBW leaders to ensure that evidence files truly represent the excellent development, provision and impact (including qualitative evidence base) | Staffing cost for homework club  £500  Resources  £200 |