

# Croftway Primary Academy: External Review of Pupil Premium Funding July 2017

Reviewer:		External Review of Pupil Premium Funding at:	Croftway Primary Academy	
Reviewer contact details:	phone no:		Email:	
Reviewer's current role : School Improvement Partner, working for Northumberland LA.	Reviewer's background: Former headteacher and Ofsted inspector – 18 years experience of headship in 4 different schools, leading the last school from the Ofsted “special measures” category to “outstanding”.			
Chair of Governors  Pupil Premium Governor	<b>Names and email addresses needed</b>			
Date of last Ofsted inspection	25-26 April 2017	Date external pupil premium reviewer appointed	June 2017	
Ofsted judgement = Inadequate		Date of external review	July 2017	
<b>Background and context of school</b>	<p>Croftway Primary Academy became an academy on June 2013. It is a member of the Blyth Quays Multi-Academy Trust. The academy has its own headteacher and governing body and the academy trust has a board of directors.</p> <p>It is a larger than average sized primary academy with 457 children aged 3 to 11 on roll. This figure includes 62 children who attend the Nursery and Pre 3 classes on a part-time basis. The vast majority of pupils are of White British heritage. The proportion of pupils supported by the pupil premium (36.3%) is well above the national average. The proportion of pupils who are disabled or have special educational needs is above the national average and the proportion who have a statement or health care plan is below those found nationally. The academy meets the government's current floor standards, which are the minimum expectations for pupils' attainment in English and mathematics by the end of Year 6. The academy runs a breakfast club. After leaving Croftway Primary Academy most pupils transfer to Bede Academy, some go to Blyth Academy and a small number go to Seaton Sluice Middle School or St Benet Biscop's High School.</p> <p><b>LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE</b> The Blyth Quays Trust has three primary academy's in Blyth. There is an Executive Headteacher, (appointed on 1/2/2016), who is responsible for all three academy's and is also the acting headteacher at Croftway Academy this term; he was deployed by the trust to strengthen leadership, after the headteacher left in October 2016. A Director of Operations deals with finance and building management and three other staff are centrally employed. There is an Education Welfare</p>			

Officer (EWO) who works across the three schools. Subject leaders and teachers network to share good practice and cross moderate to ensure assessment is accurate and of a good standard. Northumberland LA externally moderated the Year 6 assessments on 26<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

The Ofsted inspectors stated that the Executive Headteacher had strengthened leadership by providing the necessary leadership vision and restructuring the leadership team to “enable leaders to work in a more cohesive and effective manner. Additional support from one of the trusts other headteachers was also supporting the development of leadership skills. The trustees have appointed an experienced headteacher, Mrs Ward, who is currently working at the school one day each week until she commences her full time post on 1/9/2017. Working in partnership with the Executive Principal, Mrs Ward will be supported by an enthusiastic senior leadership team consisting of a new Deputy Head, (0.8 starts in September 2017), who will have oversight of teaching, learning and curriculum standards and three Assistant Headteachers responsible for Early Years/KS1, KS2/Maths and Designated Safeguarding lead/PE.

#### EXTERNAL SUPPORT

Croftway Primary Academy is a member of The Dales Teaching School Alliance and from September 2017 it will benefit from links with the North Tyneside Council, Early Years and School Improvement Service. The academy also receives termly support from one of Northumberland’s SIP’s (School Improvement Partners). Ofsted specified in their April section 5 report that the school needed to commission an external review of pupil premium funding to “assess how this aspect of leadership and management may be improved.”

#### OFSTED INSPECTION

The school was inspected on the 25<sup>th</sup> – 26<sup>th</sup> April 2017 and judged to be inadequate with a “Notice to Improve.” The HMI and Ofsted Inspectors stated that the academy needed to:-

- “Urgently improve the quality of teaching, so that it is at least good, in order to improve progress for all groups of pupils.
- Improve pupils’ personal development, behaviour and welfare.
- Improve the effectiveness of leadership.”

- “ Disadvantaged pupils’ progress is weak. Their attainment is well below that of other pupils nationally by the end of

<p><b>Key statements from the Ofsted report dated 25<sup>th</sup> – 26<sup>th</sup> April 2017 relating to the performance of disadvantaged pupils.</b></p>	<p>key stages 1 and 2.” <i>Page 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “While the overall outcomes for children in the early years have improved over time, the difference between outcomes for disadvantaged children and others nationally has not been substantially diminished.” <i>Page 1</i></li> <li>• To further improve the academy needs to improve the quality of teaching to ensure that the “early years provision helps disadvantaged children to make accelerated progress so that the differences between their outcomes and others nationally is diminished year-on-year.” <i>Page 2</i></li> <li>• To further improve the academy also needed to improve the effectiveness of leadership by “improving the planning, monitoring and evaluation of pupil premium spending.... To ensure that their progress improves.” <i>Page 2</i></li> <li>• “An external review of the school’s use of the pupil premium should be undertaken in order to assess how this aspect of leadership and management may be improved.” <i>Page 2</i></li> <li>• “Leaders’ spending of the pupil premium as a means to improving disadvantaged pupils’ progress and that of other pupils nationally are not diminishing. Current leaders, including trustees, have identified this, and they have recently commissioned an external review of the spending of pupil premium.” <i>Page 3</i></li> <li>• “Progress for pupils known to be eligible for the pupil premium funding is weak. The differences between the progress made by disadvantaged pupils and others nationally are not diminishing. As a result, too many disadvantaged pupils do not attain the expectations for their age by the end of Year 2 and Year 6.” <i>Page</i></li> <li>• ““Early years provision requires improvement because disadvantaged children do not make enough progress when compared to other pupils nationally. The additional funding has had variable impact, which means that the differences have not diminished.” <i>Page 8</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Summary of the school’s performance data on the attainment of pupil premium children compared to their classmates.</b></p> <p><i>FSM = Free School Meals children</i></p>	<p>Key documents consulted included:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAISEonline Summary Reports for 2016 (Validated/ version)</li> <li>• Inspection Dashboard for 2016</li> <li>• Pupil premium documents published on the website</li> <li>• Academy SEF, development plan and current data</li> <li>• Minutes of the academy trust committee meetings</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Early Years Foundation Stage % of pupils that achieved a good level of development</u></b></p>

PP = Pupil Premium children, classified as disadvantaged.

NAO = National average for pupils who are not disadvantaged.

NA = The national average of all children in the Key Stage.

Green = Above NAO or NA

Red = Below NAO or NA

2014 FSM children = 24% (4 of 17) well below non FSM national average of 64%. **Gap = - 40%**  
 Non FSM = 65% (28 of 43) slightly above the national average for non FSM children (64%).

2015 FSM children = 53% (9 of 17) below non FSM national average of 69%. **Gap = - 16%** **Gap has closed significantly.**  
 Non FSM = 70% (30 of 43) slightly above the non FSM national average of 69%.

2016 FSM children = 48% (10 of 21) well below non FSM national average of 72%. **Gap = - 24%** **Gap has increased.**  
 Non FSM children = 77% (30 of 39) above the non FSM national average of 72%. **Gap has closed and is + 5%.**

**Summer 2017 Provisional Results**

**62.5% of pupil premium children achieved GLD.**

**67.8% of the whole cohort achieved GLD.**

**Phonics Year 1: percentage of pupils who met the expected standard in Year 1**

2014 Disadvantaged = 81% Others = 79% NAO = 78% **Difference = + 3%**

2015 Disadvantaged = 79% Others = 86% NAO = 80% **Difference = - 1%**

2016 Disadvantaged = 71% Others = 84% NAO = 83% **Difference = - 12%**

**Gap between the schools disadvantaged and national others has increased significantly since 2014**

**Summer 2017 Provisional Results (60 in cohort)**

**64% of Year 1 pupil premium children passed the phonics test.**

**80% of the whole cohort passed the phonics test.**

**2016 End of Key Stage 1 (Year 2) 59 pupils, including 25 disadvantaged pupils (42%)**

**Pupils reaching expected standard or above**

						Gap between academy's disadvantaged and NAO
<b>Reading</b>	Whole cohort	61 %	NA = 74%	<b>Gap = - 13%</b>	Disadvantaged 44%	NAO = 78% <b>Gap = - 34%</b>
<b>Writing</b>	Whole cohort	51%	NA = 65%	<b>Gap = - 14%</b>	Disadvantaged 32%	NAO = 70% <b>Gap = - 38%</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	Whole cohort	53%	NA = 73%	<b>Gap = - 20%</b>	Disadvantaged 28%	NAO = 77% <b>Gap = - 49%</b>
<b>Science</b>	Whole cohort	83%	NA = 82%	<b>Gap = + 1%</b>	Disadvantaged 72%	NAO = 85% <b>Gap = - 13%</b>

**Summer 2017 provisional results for End of Key Stage 1 (Year 2) 59 in pupils, including 23 disadvantaged pupils**

**Percentages that achieved or exceeded the expected standard**

	Pupil premium	Non pupil premium	Whole cohort
Reading	56.5%	80.6%	71.2%
Writing	60.9%	72.2%	67.8%
Mathematics	60.9%	63.9%	62.7%

**2016 End of Key Stage 1 (Year 2) 59 pupils, including 25 disadvantaged pupils (42%)**

<b>Pupils working at greater depth/ exceeding expected standard</b>				Gap between academy's disadvantaged and NAO	
<b>Reading</b>	Whole cohort	29 %	NA = 24%	<b>Gap = + 5%</b>	Disadvantaged 8% NAO = 27% <b>Gap = - 19%</b>
<b>Writing</b>	Whole cohort	12%	NA = 13%	<b>Gap = - 1%</b>	Disadvantaged 0% NAO = 15% <b>Gap = - 15%</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	Whole cohort	22%	NA = 18%	<b>Gap = + 4%</b>	Disadvantaged 8% NAO = 20% <b>Gap = - 12%</b>

**Summer 2017 provisional results: Year 2 pupils working at greater depth/exceeding expected standard**

	Pupil Premium	Non pupil premium	Whole cohort
<b>Reading</b>	8.7%	27.8%	20.3%
<b>Writing</b>	17.4%	25%	22%
<b>Mathematics</b>	8.7%	27.8%	20.3%

**PROGRESS SCORES: 2016 End of Key Stage 2 (Year 6) 46 pupils, including 20 disadvantaged pupils (43%)**

National average progress score = 0

<b>Reading</b>	Whole cohort	<b>- 3.31</b>	Disadvantaged	<b>- 2.75</b>	<b>Sig – in for whole cohort and in bottom 10%</b>
<b>Writing</b>	Whole cohort	<b>- 7.02</b>	Disadvantaged	<b>- 11.01</b>	<b>Sig – for both, and both in bottom 10%</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	Whole cohort	<b>- 3.79</b>	Disadvantaged	<b>- 3.07</b>	<b>Sig – for both, and in bottom 10% for whole cohort.</b>

**ATTAINMENT: 2016 End of Key Stage 2 (Year 6) 47 pupils, including 21 disadvantaged pupils (45%)**

<b>Pupils reaching expected standard or above</b>				Gap between academy's disadvantaged and NAO	
<b>Reading</b>	Whole cohort	38 %	NA = 66%	<b>Gap = - 28%</b>	Disadvantaged 24% NAO = 72% <b>Gap = - 48%</b>
<b>Writing</b>	Whole cohort	57%	NA = 74%	<b>Gap = - 17%</b>	Disadvantaged 38% NAO = 79% <b>Gap = - 41%</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	Whole cohort	36%	NA = 70%	<b>Gap = - 34%</b>	Disadvantaged 29% NAO = 76% <b>Gap = - 47%</b>
<b>RWM</b>	Whole cohort	26%	NA = 53%	<b>Gap = - 27%</b>	Disadvantaged 19% NAO = 60% <b>Gap = - 41%</b>
<b>GPS</b>	Whole cohort	49%	NA = 72%	<b>Gap = - 23%</b>	Disadvantaged 38% NAO = 78% <b>Gap = - 40%</b>
<b>Science</b>	Whole cohort	51%	NA = 81%	<b>Gap = - 30%</b>	Disadvantaged 43% NAO = 86% <b>Gap = - 43%</b>

**Summer 2017 provisional results: Year 6 pupils reaching expected standard or above**

	Pupil premium	Non pupil premium	Whole cohort	2017 national averages
<b>Reading</b>	34.5%	66.7%	49.1%	71%
<b>Writing</b>	31%	54.2%	41.5%	76%
<b>Mathematics</b>	24.1%	54.2%	37.7%	75%
<b>Grammar, punctuation &amp; spelling</b>	44.8%	58.3%	50.9 %	77%
<b>Combined figure for RWM</b>	17.2	41.7%	28.3%	61%

Please note the 2016 sections compare the school figures to national averages as the "national averages for others" had not been published when this report was written.

**ATTAINMENT: 2016 End of Key Stage 2 (Year 6) 47 pupils, including 21 disadvantaged pupils (45%)**

**Pupils working at greater depth/ exceeding expected standard** Gap between academy's disadvantaged and NAO

<b>Reading</b>	Whole cohort	6%	NA = 19%	<b>Gap = - 13%</b>	Disadvantaged	14%	NAO = 23%	<b>Gap = - 9%</b>
<b>Writing</b>	Whole cohort	0%	NA = 15%	<b>Gap = - 15%</b>	Disadvantaged	0%	NAO = 18%	<b>Gap = - 18%</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	Whole cohort	4%	NA = 17%	<b>Gap = - 12%</b>	Disadvantaged	10%	NAO = 20%	<b>Gap = - 10%</b>
<b>RWM</b>	Whole cohort	0%	NA = 5%	<b>Gap = - 5%</b>	Disadvantaged	0%	NAO = 7%	<b>Gap = - 7%</b>
<b>GPS</b>	Whole cohort	2%	NA = 22%	<b>Gap = - 20%</b>	Disadvantaged	5%	NAO = 27%	<b>Gap = - 22%</b>

**Summer 2017 provisional results: Year 6 pupils working at greater depth/exceeding expected standard**

	Pupil Premium	Non pupil premium	Whole cohort
<b>Reading</b>	0%	33.3%	15.1%
<b>Writing</b>	3.4%	0%	1.9%
<b>Mathematics</b>	0%	4.2%	1.9%
<b>GPS</b>	3.4%	8.3%	5.7%
<b>Combined RWM</b>	0%	0%	1.9%

**Absence Rates**

2015/6 FSM 4.5% (NA 5.2%) Non FSM 2.8% (NA 3.4%) Within school gap = - 1.7%

Gap between academy's FSM and NAO = - 1.1%

September 2016 to 23 /6/2017 Disadvantaged % Not disadvantaged % Within school gap = - %

**Persistent Absence (PA)**

In 2015 to 2016 a child was classified as being a persistent absentee if their attendance rate was below 90%.

**PA rates**

2015/6 FSM 16.1% (NA 15.1%) Non FSM 4.8% (NA 6.2%) Gap between academy's FSM and NAO = - 11.3%

September 2016 to 23/6/2017 Disadvantaged % Not disadvantaged XX% Within school gap = %

The Pupil Premium section of the website needs to be revised so it fully complies with the latest DFE requirements. I recommend the school uses the format recommended by the National College for Teaching and Leadership in their May

<p><b>School's pupil premium statement, pupil premium policy and pupil premium action plan.</b></p>	<p>2016 publication entitled "Effective Pupil premium reviews". Current pupil premium documents on the website are very detailed but do not measure impact well, or comply fully with DFE guidance.</p> <p>To comply with DFE guidance dated May 2016, on what maintained schools must publish on their website this school needs to add to its website by September 2017:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of how the pupil premium funding made a difference to the attainment of disadvantaged pupils in 2016/17.</li> <li>• Details of how much pupil premium funding the school received for this academic year (2017/18.)</li> <li>• Details of how the school intends to spend 2017/18 allocation to address barriers to learning, including reasons for how the money is being spent in an online pupil premium strategy statement.</li> </ul> <p>I will work with the school to produce a new concise pupil premium statement for 2016-2018.</p> <p>There is no requirement for schools to publish information about how they spend the early years pupil premium (EYPP), however it would be good practice to do this by inserting details in your new online pupil premium strategy statement.</p> <p>I could not locate a pupil premium policy on your academy website. I will provide you with an exemplar policy which can be personalised so it meets the requirements of Croftway Primary Academy. The new pupil premium policy will need to be discussed and approved by governors.</p> <p>I also recommend a personalised meeting for all new parents, where they will be helped to complete the necessary paperwork if they are eligible for pupil premium funding; this will help you to ensure that all your pupils receive the funding they are entitled to receive.</p> <p>I will provide you with examples of pupil premium strategies that I have seen working well in other schools and several excellent publications which contain more superb ideas for ensuring the pupil premium money is wisely spent, so it impacts strongly on the attainment and progress of your children.</p>
<p><b>Barriers to improving the progress and attainment of disadvantaged children and other weaknesses.</b></p>	<p><u>The main barriers to improving the progress and attainment of disadvantaged children are:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A high number of pupil premium children also have special educational needs.</li> <li>• Low aspirations of some pupils and their parents.</li> <li>• When they join the academy many children are below age related expectations and have poor language, communication and social skills.</li> <li>• Poor attendance of some disadvantaged children.</li> <li>• Next steps marking is not yet impacting strongly on pupil progress.</li> </ul>

- The need to increase the percentage of good and outstanding teaching.

Disadvantaged learners are most successful where teachers in the classrooms feel accountable for their outcomes.

High quality teaching must be at the core of all pupil premium work. The effect of outstanding and good teaching is a lot bigger for a student who does not have a privileged background than for a student who has lots of educational resources. High quality teaching and learning is the key to narrowing the gap between the attainment of disadvantaged and not disadvantaged students.

**Key areas for action**

1. The impact of the new strategies outlined in the new “Croftway Primary Academy 2016- 2018 Pupil Premium Strategy Statement” will need to be carefully reviewed by the Head Teacher, Pupil Premium Governor and subject leaders after each data collection point listed below.
2. Once the impact columns have been completed and new actions identified to increase impact, the latest updated version will need to be uploaded onto the website, so governors, staff and parents can assess it. I recommend that this document is discussed at governors meetings; this will enable the governing body to carefully monitor the schools use of the pupil premium funding and assess if the pupil premium strategies are impacting well on the attainment and progress of disadvantaged children.
3. I recommend that the school leaders, sometimes accompanied by the Pupil Premium Governor or School Improvement Partner (SIP) continue to do learning walks that focus on the progress of pupil premium children in their lessons and intervention sessions. In addition, a book scrutiny to see if pupil premium children are receiving high quality feedback from their teachers to progress their learning could be done every half term.
4. Once the academies new pupil premium policy has been approved by governors it will need to be uploaded onto the website.
5. I recommend that the academies SEF makes regular references to pupil premium outcomes and the new “2016-2018 Pupil Premium Strategy Statement” is attached as an appendix to the academies development plan.
6. Finally, the senior leaders need to monitor the quality of support/interventions provided for pupil premium children by the teachers and teaching assistants, to determine if they are of a consistent high standard across the academy and decide what additional INSET the teaching assistants/teachers need in to ensure disadvantaged students achieve their challenging targets.

**Date for progress and**

**After each data collection point on:-**

**impact reviews**

**18<sup>th</sup> October 2017**  
**22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017**  
**19<sup>th</sup> February 2018**  
**21<sup>st</sup> March 2018**  
**21<sup>st</sup> May 2018**  
**25<sup>th</sup> June 2018**