



Narrowing The Gap
Evaluation Report and Summary
July 2014

Key Issue:

How can pupil premium funding be used most effectively in order to narrow the gap for those with FSM/CLA?

Research Topic:

What impact does Teacher/Pupil conferences have on Pupil Premium children in the networked schools?

Measure:

The amount of progress points made by a child receiving this intervention in identified area of focus from A2 to Sum2 in the academic year 2013-2014.

Proposal:

In each school the identified group of children will receive half termly pupil conferences with their class teacher. Within this conference the child's work and targets will be shared and planned steps on how the child can reach their target for their next meeting. This will be alongside continued high level feedback in their class work relating to these targets.

Initially focussing on Years 2 and 6 (however some network schools will be trialling with all FSM/CLA pupils) the study will establish starting points for each child and track their progress. For younger pupils (KS1) meetings with the child's parents will also take place so targets can be reinforced at home.

Six schools had shown a full commitment in this research. Fairlop Primary, Fullwood Primary, Mossford Green Primary, Newbury Park Primary, St Antony's Primary and Avanti Court Primary.

Intervention

1:1 Conferencing with pupils to provide quality feedback to those with Pupil Premium funding. The expectation was that each child would have a half-termly meeting with their class teacher funded by pupil premium money. The meeting would focus on the child's current achievement and strengths; their subject specific targets and any barriers to learning. These meetings would then extend into coaching of these skills.

Background evidence

Research by the Sutton Trust indicates that Feedback is the number one intervention in schools for improving the learning outcomes of children which creates high impact at low cost. The potential gains, if done correctly is 9 months which is even greater than giving homework (5 months) or reducing class sizes (3 months).

Evaluation objectives

The measure of the effect was a comparison between the progress made by the focus group compared to the rest of the children and whether the gap between the two groups was closed. In some cases schools compared the amount of progress made by the child in the previous year (without the intervention) and this year.

Project team

- St Antony's Catholic Primary School
- Mossford Primary School
- Fullwood Primary School
- Fairlop Primary School
- Avanti Court Primary School
- Newbury Park Primary School

Originally Nine schools signed up to the research project but six completed the whole year and recorded findings. However there was significant variation between the actions of each school. For example, Avanti Court only has a Key Stage One intake at present. The range of Pupil Premium children varies widely too from 4% to 33%. This has a big impact on how the project could be run in each school. Therefore each school has produced a summary of the project in their own school. Within these they have detailed how the project was run in their school and the impact on the children.

Findings

It was clear in our termly meetings that the variation would be so great that a direct comparison of findings would not be possible. However we did seek to see how effective this intervention was in our own schools and collate general findings which can be used going forward to next year.

In each school's final report you will also find that the schools presented their findings in different ways. Some comparing just the progress and attainment compared to non PP/FSM and others comparing the progress made in the previous year with the current year. As well as the quantitative data, the schools have also included in their reports the findings of questionnaires. This gives good feedback from the teachers and pupils on the benefits and drawbacks of the project. These will be taken into account when planning 2014-2015.

Moving forward we are meeting in early September to decide the methodology, focus groups, and manner of data collection for a more consistent approach. We will continue with the same group of schools as they have shown a commitment to following this investigation and intervention.

We would like to up skill the professionals who lead the 1:1 discussions as well as looking for consistency across the group of schools. We hope by doing this we will have better data to make comparisons and draw conclusions.

Summary of areas of development:

Staff training required

Better tracking of closing the gap

Improve feedback to parents and communicate project to them. Eg. send home the parent information card after each conference. Run a session in the school next year which tells parents what the pupil conference model is about and how it benefits the children. As yet, they have not had an informative briefing on this method of intervention/teaching.

Make sessions more child led

Avanti Court Primary School

Project:

At Avanti Court all teachers were briefed about pupil conferences , the importance and the potential impact based on the research by the Sutton Trust. The DH sat with all teachers and pupils in the Autumn Term to model the process. Initially, it was decided that teachers will conduct the pupil conferences every half term , however due to time constraints teachers opted to do this termly.

Focus Group (numbers/SEN/EAL/Yr Grp):

All pupil premium children from reception, year 1 and year 2. There are 15 children in this cohort.

Frequency/length of Meetings: Meetings lasted 15minutes, every term. However, some teachers have completed more than 1 termly when they were able to.

Details of meetings/agenda

All children had a Passport to Success sheet where the targets, areas for development and progress was recorded. The details of how the conference was given to staff in an INSET session. Questions were broken down to help support teachers with the probing and the direction in which the conference could go forward for eg , What did I do that was brilliant learning? : What is brilliant learning? How do you know that you learnt something meaningful or helpful? What did you do when this happened?

Meetings were held outside the classroom . A review of targets and how far pupils were working towards them is discussed including who and what will help the pupil to achieve better.

Pupils brought with them their books and targets which they could go through. Teachers had to be prepared for the meeting by ensuring they knew what the child's baseline was and where they needed to go. A Parent Card- a take home card was written to record what the outcomes of the meetings and/or anything that the parent could do to supplement the learning at home.

RNLC NtG Network 2013 - 2014

Class Teacher: Ms Sa , Ms M , Ms P

Year Group: Reception

Number of children eligible for FSM: 7

Average Point score	Reading	Maths (Numbers)	Maths (SSM)	Writing
FSM	1.71	1.71	1.86	1.71
Non FSM	2.19	2.21	2.34	2.10
Difference	- 0.48	-0.50	- 0.48	-0.39

% achieving GLD	Reading	Maths (Numbers)	Maths (SSM)	Writing
FSM	57.1%	57.1	85.7%	57.1%
Non FSM	85%	92%	95%	85.7%
Difference	-27.9%	-34.9%	- 9.3%	-28.6 %

Child	Progress Made			Additional interventions received	Other factors which affect progress
	Reading	Writing	Maths		
Child A N Beginner Bilingual	30-50 E to ELG Exp 6 steps progress	30-50 E to ELG Exp 6 steps progress	30-50 E to ELG Exp (N, SSM) 6 steps progress	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	Attendance New to English
Child B A SEN	30-50 E to 40-60D 4 steps	30-50 E to 40-60 D 4 steps	30-50 E to 40-60 D (N) ELG Exp (SSM) (N) 4 steps (SSM) 6 steps	Reading 1:1 Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	New to English SEN- Speech and Language
Child C F	30-50 (Exc) to 40-60 S 3 steps	30-50 (Exc) 40-60 S 3 steps	40-60 (Emerg) 40-60 S 2 steps (N, SSM)	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	Never been to school Joined end of Spring 2.
Child D Fa	30-50 S to 40-60 D 2 steps	30-50 S to 40-60 D 2 steps	30-50D to 40-60D (N) ELG E (SSM) (N) 3 steps (SSM) 6 steps	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	

RNLC NtG Network 2013 - 2014

Child E S Beginner Bilingual	30-50 S to ELG Exp 5 steps	30-50 S to ELG Exp 5 steps	40-60 E to ELG E (N, SSM) 4 steps (N, SSM)	Reading 1:1 Drama/writing	New To English Joined mid year
Child F K	40-60 D to ELG Exc 5 steps	40-60 D to ELG Exc 5 steps	40-60 D to ELG Exp (N) ELG Exp (SSM) 4 steps	Maths catchup Mathletics	
Child G J	30-50 S to ELG Exp 5 steps	30-50 S to ELG Exp 5 steps	30-50 S to ELG Exp (N) ELG Exp (SSM) 5 steps	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	

- There is a wider gap between non-FSM and FSM in Literacy based on their Good Level of Development, however FSM pupils made between 2-6 steps of progress from their starting points.

RNLC NtG Network 2013 - 2014

Class Teacher: Mrs Si, Mrs K, Miss K, Mrs H

Year Group: One

Number of children eligible for FSM: 8

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	4.75	4.25	4.50
Non FSM	4.91	4.17	4.54
Difference	-0.16	+0.8	-0.4

Average Point score	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	11.00	10.00	10.50
Non FSM	11.04	10.96	10.72
Difference	-0.4	-0.96	-0.22

Child	Progress Made			Additional interventions received	Other factors which affect progress
	Reading	Writing	Maths		
Child A	4	4	4	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	
Child B SEN NEED	8	4	6	Reading 1:1 Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	New class teacher
Child C	6	6	4	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	Improved self esteem
Child D	4	4	4	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	
Child E	2	2	2	Reading 1:1 Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	
Child F	4	6	4	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	
Child G	4	6	8	Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	
Child H	6	4	2	Reading 1:1 Drama/writing Maths catchup Mathletics	

Findings from Pupil Questionnaires:

Pupils were much more positive about their experiences:

1. All pupils questioned said they liked the pupil conferences because:
 - They could talk about learning with their teacher
 - They enjoyed expressing themselves to their teacher
2. Most children felt that meeting with their teacher 1:1 helped them with their learning because the teacher helped them remember what they needed to do
 - Not many had parent input or conversations with their parents, those that did enjoyed talking about the targets with their parents.
 - Pupils felt that the time given to meet their teachers was just right.

Findings from Teacher Questionnaires:

1. Most teachers felt that the conferences were successful in closing the gap because
 - pupils want to learn more and their attitude to learning has improved
 - it's good to have quality 1:1 time with a pupil.
2. Teachers felt that the questioning was more geared up for KS2 than KS1- pupils required more prompting
3. Most teachers believed that the conferences were more suited to either KS1 or 2 and if done either in early KS1 or foundation stage questions needed more simplification.
4. All teachers felt that their pupils made progress and they have noticed a change in their behaviours for the better.
5. The venue for the conferences- staff did not prefer the classroom, most did the meetings outside the classroom (corridors).

Actions for own school:

- Change the format for Foundation and KS1 (simplify questions)
- Keep same format for KS2
- All teachers to have further CPD to ensure the quality of the meetings is consistent
- Increase the time for the conferences- shorter time for foundation and KS1. Conduct the conferences half termly.

Fairlop Primary School

Project:

To develop the role of pupil conferencing along with high quality feedback to narrow the pupil premium gap. AS part of the performance management cycle, one target was for pupil premium children to achieve more than expected progress so that the gap narrowed. To achieve this one strategy was to embed pupil conferencing along with high quality oral feedback/discussions within normal classroom practise.

Focus Group: (numbers/SEN/EAL/Yr Grp)

Year 6 – 94 children in cohort

Pupil Premium 36%

Pupil Premium and SEND 9%

EAL 38%

Frequency/length of Meetings:

With the focus to embed conferencing as part of the normal classroom teaching, meetings took place with the focus children during assembly, lunch and break times and as part of the class focus group work. The meetings took place in a variety of settings and on a 1:1 basis and within small focus groups. Majority of discussions had a focus on literacy with a specific reference to writing, however these also took place with children who were targeted for mathematics. The length of discussions varied depending on the child and class teacher. Supply cover was used to release an experienced Literacy teacher to conference with children to across the year groups. This enabled the monitoring of the quality of the conferencing taking place and formed part of the performance management cycle.

Details of meetings/agenda:

Staff would meet with children during a variety of times on a more formal one to one basis during assemblies and lunch times as well as informally as part of the lessons, with the main emphasis of ensuring that the children were aware of their current targets and the progress they were making towards these.

Teachers would focus their discussions on the current work the children were completing and would refer to the target booklet that each child has as a reference point. These indicate the current level the child is working at, targets that had meet towards this level and those they were working on.

Discussions would involve looking at the level the child was currently working at and discuss the progress they were making towards the next level, as well as highlighting targets achieved.

The discussions would finish by agreeing new targets, based on the current progress the children are making, and what the child would need to do to achieve this.

Along with looking at the specific piece of work teachers would also discuss how the children felt they were getting on with their achieving their targets, what they thought they were doing well and how they knew this.

Findings

Year Group: Six

Assessment period autumn 13 – summer 14.

Number of children eligible for PP: 34 (36%)

(Points are based on teacher assessments)

Progress Points	Reading	Writing	Maths
PP	4.9	5.3	6.2
Non PP	3.3	5.3	5.0
Difference	+1.6	0	+1.2

Average Point score	Reading	Writing	Maths
PP	29.6	28.2	29.1
Non PP	31.3	30.9	32.2
Difference	1.7	2.7	3.1

Findings from Pupil Voice Meeting:

- The children asked enjoy school and when the teachers took time to discuss their work with them.
- They felt that the small focus groups helped their learning, it was beneficial to have the teacher discussing their work, targets and what they need to do to improve.
- As the year progressed they became clearer about what their targets were rather than just knowing the level they were working towards. This meant that they felt more aware of their current targets and knowing the specific next steps they need to take in their learning, this was in both literacy and numeracy.
- Children found the marking helped to reinforce their learning and valued the fact that teachers would respond and discuss this with them.
- The children said that when discussing targets it helped that the teacher modelled examples of the next steps in their learning.
- Children know they are doing well as teachers often discuss what they are doing in the lesson with them and they have opportunity to respond and discuss.

Findings from Teacher Questionnaires:

- Teachers found the quality of the recorded example of 1:1 conferencing was beneficial to see the process of pupil conferencing.
- It is difficult to evaluate the success of pupil conferencing/high quality oral feedback in closing the gap as many other interventions were undertaken by the pupil premium children through the year and as embedded in daily teaching high quality feedback was also given to non-PP.
- Using the pupil premium progress meetings, gave the staff an opportunity to consider the progress, levels and the next steps for the pupil premium children. This also gave opportunity to reflect on the other interventions that the children were being provided with.

- Some teachers thought that in the future more formal one to one meetings on a regular basis might be beneficial to support some of their pupils with specific needs.

Actions for own school:

- Consider the space used for conferences outside the classroom environment, not just within the classroom.
- To select a target group of PP children whose progress is expected or slower and complete regular formal pupil conferencing cycle until progress has increased.

Suggestions to go forward:

- Develop further staff training regarding the use of pupil conferencing within the classroom.

Fullwood Primary

Project

The project was introduced at Fullwood as a pilot and part of the research that the RNLC would be undertaking as part of the narrowing the gap agenda. Staff were already committed to closing the attainment gaps that are existing in their classes or year groups and had received a good deal of input into Quality First Teaching in the classroom; meeting the needs of all pupils, including those eligible for pupil premium.

Deputy Headteacher asked teachers to volunteer to be part of the pilot, ensuring we had coverage across both Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2. In total, 15 children were part of this pilot.

A briefing was held so that teachers understood the procedures for holding pupil conferences and the proformas were discussed.

Teachers, with targeted pupils, were asked to choose the areas of focus (Reading, Writing, or Maths) We decided that all sessions will take place with the child's own class teacher and not somebody different.

The first pupil conference started by discussing strengths in the pupil's work as well as talking about goals and targets. Sessions thereafter were a combination of input (teaching) as well as coaching and goal setting. Teachers were encouraged to look out for these children using their teaching points from the conferences, in everyday lessons. The final session looked at how well the goals and targets had been achieved so show how measurable the impact is.

Focus Group (numbers/SEN/EAL/Yr Grp)

Year Group	Boys	Girls	Also DSEN	Also EAL	Total
1	0	4	3	2	4
2	0	2	0	2	2
4	3	2	3	2	5
5	3	1	2	3	4

Frequency/length of Meetings

In total, three sessions took place although the initial plan was for one conference each half term. Meetings generally lasted between 30 and 40 minutes each. All sessions were 1:1 between the child and their own class teacher.

Findings

Class Teacher: LH

Year Group: 1

Number of children eligible for FSM: 4

Progress points measured from start of academic year to the end of Spring

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	+2.3	+2.0	+3.7
Non FSM	+3.6	+2.7	+3.7
Difference	-1.3	-0.7	-

Average point score at end of Spring

Average Point score Attainment	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	9.8	9.2	10.8
Non FSM	11.2	10.1	10.8
Difference	-1.4	-0.9	-

Child	Progress Made			Additional interventions received	Other factors which affect progress
	Reading	Writing	Maths		
Year 1 AG	+2.0	+3.0	+3.0	Daily reader Daily phonics+ Books4Breakfast	D/SEN Vulnerable/CP
Year 1 LMM	+3.0	+3.0	+2.0	Daily reader Daily phonics+	D/SEN
Year 1 CN	+2.0	+2.0	+2.0	Daily reader Daily phonics+	
Year 1 AS	+2.0	+3.0	+2.0		CP/Vulnerable D/SEN

RNLC NtG Network 2013 - 2014

Class Teacher: AR

Year Group: 2

Number of children eligible for FSM: 11

Progress points measured from start of academic year to the end of Spring

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	+2.8	+2.6	+2.5
Non FSM	+2.7	+2.5	+2.7
Difference	+0.1	-0.1	-0.2

Average point score at end of Spring

Average Point score Attainment	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	15.3	14.8	15.3
Non FSM	15.5	15.0	15.5
Difference	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2

Child	Progress Made			Additional interventions received	Other factors which affect progress
	Reading	Writing	Maths		
Year 2 EA	+2.0	+4.0	+3.0	Daily +Number Daily reader	
Year 2 SJ	+1.0	+2.0	+2.0	Daily +Number Daily reader	

Class Teacher: HC

Year Group: 4

Number of children eligible for FSM: 8

Progress points measured from start of academic year to the end of Spring

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	+0.9	+1.7	+1.7
Non FSM	+1.8	+1.7	+1.8
Difference	-0.9	-	-0.1

Average point score at end of Spring

Average Point score Attainment	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	20.6	20.6	20.8
Non FSM	21.9	21.5	21.3
Difference	-1.3	-1.1	-0.5

Child	Progress Made			Additional interventions received	Other factors which affect progress
	Reading	Writing	Maths		
Year 4 CA	+1.0	+1.0	+2.0	Additional reading and number (3xWk)	
Year 4 RA	+1.0	+1.0	+2.0		P/T with hospital school Vulnerable
Year 4 JA	+2.0	+2.0	+2.0	Additional reading and number (3xWk)	
Year 4 AAH	+2.0	+3.0	+2.0		AGT
Year 4 RG	+2.0	+2.0	+3.0	1:1 LSA support	D/SEN ST

Class Teacher: NC

Year Group: 5

Number of children eligible for FSM: 8

Progress points measured from start of academic year to the end of Spring

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	+2.8	+2.8	+2.0
Non FSM	+4.1	+4.2	+2.5
Difference	-1.3	-1.4	-0.5

Average point score at end of Spring

Average Point score Attainment	Reading	Maths	Writing
FSM	24.0	23.5	27.8
Non FSM	27.0	26.1	27.0
Difference	-3.0	-2.6	-0.8

Child	Progress Made			Additional interventions received	Other factors which affect progress
	Reading	Writing	Maths		
Year 5 EE	+2.0	+2.0	+2.0	1:1 Language support	EAL D/SEN
Year 5 NS	+2.0	+2.0	+2.0	Additional number and writing intervention	
Year 5 JS	+3.0	+2.0	+2.0	None	
Year 5 KNT	+2.0	+4.0	+2.0	Mentoring	BSED D/SEN

Findings from Pupil Questionnaires:

All pupils from all year groups were positive about the pupil conferences. The vast majority would like to continue and say that all children should get the chance to have them.

A summary of their responses:

- Children liked the time spent with their teacher on a 1:1 basis
- Children said that their teacher listened to them and helped them to make progress
- All children felt the sessions were exciting and many described the time as 'special' with their class teacher.
- When asked to tell us what they did not like about the conferences, children told us that they would like their friends to come too and that some of the sessions went on for too long. Other than this, responses were overwhelmingly positive.
- When asked to describe how the conferences helped with their learning, children said "...we looked at my targets and worked on those", "we looked through my book and picked out things to improve", "my teacher helped me to make improvements to my work", "I remembered Miss C's advice and used it in the next lesson" "If we both look at the problem we can fix it together", "I could show how good I am and show my progress"
- Parents were keen to hear their children talk about the sessions. Most children spoke to their parents about the sessions and were positive to support the pilot.
- Children all felt the duration of the sessions was appropriate and all said that they liked the session to take place just outside the classroom.
- All children agree that it is important to know what level they are working at but all explained that it is more important to understand next steps in their learning.
- All children agreed that the conferences had moved their learning forward.
- Lots of children wanted the session to run on a weekly basis but when discussed, they agreed that once each half term would be best.

Findings from Teacher Questionnaires:

Teachers were very positive about the pilot at Fullwood. They took it on with open arms and were very willing to give it a try.

Teachers felt the conferences were successful because they had the opportunity to work with pupils on an individual basis, working on challenging targets and having time to teach directly to meet the needs of individual children.

All teachers prepared for the sessions by looking through the child's books, checking back on previous conference notes and making a few notes about things they wanted to target. The sessions were not too prescriptive as it is important for the child to lead their own learning as much as possible. Teachers had a bank of activities that could be used to enhance certain targets and tried to make the sessions as interactive as possible, using ICT to enhance learning.

All teachers felt that the children responded very positively. They said the children were honest about their learning and what they wanted to improve. Children were proactive in setting their own targets and worked hard to achieve them. One class said that the children were quite shy at first because they had not previously had the same level of intense teaching on a 1:1 basis.

All teachers said that the sessions contained a good mixture of talk, teacher input and time to look at targets and teach examples so that these could be applied into every day lessons. The conferences were as much about teaching as they were about coaching to meet targets and book scrutiny together; including uplevelling.

When asked if the staff had found out anything new about the children and/or their learning, teachers said that they found out things they had not known before in relation to their hobbies and interests as well as misconceptions in their learning.

The word 'definitely' was used by all teachers when they were asked whether or not the children's attitudes to learning had changed or improved. Many commented that children made changes to their learning immediately after conferences, e.g. with handwriting or calculation strategies.

In terms of encountering any problems; the teachers' only comments were regarding time to undertake them and keeping to the allotted 30 or 40 minutes. However, the flip side to this is that all felt the sessions were extremely useful and would want to repeat them again next academic year.

Actions for own school:

- Schedule dates in the school diary in advance, at the start of the academic year
- Focus on one area of learning e.g. Mathematics (school focus)
- Include all pupils eligible for PP next year (both classes in the year group, and not only one)
- Disseminate findings to all staff and encourage them to understand the wider benefits of pupil conferencing – for all pupils and not only this focus group.

Areas of development:

- Send home the parent information card after each conference.
- Run a session in the school next year which tells parents what the pupil conference model is about and how it benefits the children. As yet, they have not had an informative briefing on this method of intervention/teaching.

Suggestions to go forward:

- We need to see if the gap is closing for the pupils that undertook this year's pilot. I want to see a gap which closes more quickly than it did last year so that I know that this intervention is having the desired impact on raising achievement.

Mossford Primary School

Project: Conferencing for Vulnerable and Pupil Premium Children

Focus Group: 9 children: – 8 children eligible for Pupil Premium, 1 disadvantaged child

Frequency/length of Meetings: 20-30 minutes

Details of meetings/agenda: Meetings were held every term, with the nine children. This was at a quiet table away from the rest of the class. The initial meeting started by looking through the children's work and celebrating the positives. The children were then encouraged to find areas that they needed to improve on. The teacher would guide or support the process if necessary. The teacher would then model, coach and support the children to ensure that they understood and could meet the targets. Follow on meetings would begin by reviewing targets set from last time.

Class Teacher: Mr F

Year Group: Year 5

Number of children eligible for FSM: nine children chosen from one year five class

Findings: The children who were in the project made significantly more progress than they did last year, they also made accelerated progress compared to the non-conference children in the class. However their attainment was only in line with national averages (if you removed Moss S 8 from the data though, who had many other significant issues in his life, the progress is above national averages – 4.5)

An interesting point to note though is that although the PP children who took part in the conferences did better than those non-PP children in the same class and did better than the non-PP children in the other year 5 class, they did less well than the PP children in the other class who did NOT take part in the conferencing.

The only real conclusions we can draw from this data is that the PP children made significant progress across the whole of year 5, beyond the progress made by non-PP children, however, conferencing only formed

Child	APS Progress Made July-July	Additional interventions received	Other factors which affect progress
	Writing		
Moss K 1	4.0	Reduced Class size	
Moss B 2	6.0	Reduced Class size	
Moss Y 3	6.0	Reduced Class size Phonics x2 - 20 min sessions	
Moss T 4	6.0	Reduced Class size	
Moss D 5	2.0	Reduced Class size Phonics x2 - 20 min sessions	
Moss M 6	4.0	Reduced Class size	
Moss Z 7	2.0	Reduced Class size	
Moss S 8	0.0	Reduced Class size	The child's circumstances at home mean there is no calm, supportive learning environment.
Moss I 9	6.0	Reduced Class size	
PP Total:	4.2		
Class Total:	3.6		
Non PP total:	3.3		
Other Year 5 class non-conference PP	6.0		
Other Year 5 class non-conference, non PP	3.5		
Other Year 5 class	4.0		

Findings from Pupil Questionnaires: Children all agreed that the conferencing helped them better understand what they had to do to improve to 'push' them. They all felt the sessions were long enough, although some children would want more frequent conferencing. They all wanted them to continue into next year. The children felt more comfortable talking in a quiet room away from class, although there were a few exceptions.

Findings from Teacher Questionnaires: The teachers all agreed it was worthwhile and would want to continue. They did feel more regular meetings would be beneficial.

Actions for own school: To plan in the diary at the start of the year days when conferences will happen – to be kept sacred.

Areas of development: To one session a half-term, one session a term being 1-2-1 conferences, the other being a groups meeting to talk generally about their targets and carry out group teaching/coaching as well as self and peer assessment. Improve the feedback/communication between the school and parents – include tasks to carry out at home. Pupil feedback has shown that sessions need to be more child-led.

Newbury Park School

Project: Pupil conferences in Years 2 and 6

Focus Group: Pupil premium and children working at less than expected levels in Years 2 and 6

Frequency/length of Meetings: Termly. Depending on need conference time can vary between 15 to 30 minutes.

Details of meetings/agenda:

Look at books, discussion re 'where you are at', including strengths and next steps to achieve goal. Targets.

Opportunity for child to talk about any difficulties and barriers to learning and for teacher to model and re explain specific teaching points.

Findings

Year Group: Two

Number of children pupil premium 13

Results in Year 1:

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
PP	4	4.1	3.3
Non PP	5.2	4.5	4.5
Difference	1.2	0.4	1.2

Average Point score	Reading	Maths	Writing
PP	9.3	9.5	8.4
Non PP	11.7	10.7	10.7
Difference	2.4	1.2	2.3

Results in Year 2

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
PP	4	4.6	3.8
Non PP	5.3	6.1	5.5
Difference	1.3	1.5	1.7

Average Point score	Reading	Maths	Writing
PP	13.3	14.1	12.8
Non PP	17	16.8	16.1
Difference	3.7	2.7	3.3

As a result of the above figures we did some further analysis:

Children who did not achieve Level 2 (out of 120)	Points progress
9 children pupil premium (3 of whom were new to the school in Year 2)	2.6
8 children non-pupil premium	2.1

A higher percentage of our pupil premium pupils were lower attainers at the start of Year 2 and although they have made more progress than non pupil premium children at this level the gap between them and children who achieved Level 2 has widened. An issue for us is how to narrow the gap between lower and higher attainers in KS 1.

Other interventions for lower attainers include: writing groups, phonic groups, reading buddies, numicon groups, social groups.

Year Group: Six

Number of children pupil premium: 31

Results in Year 5

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
PP	4.5	3.2	4.0
Non PP	4.2	3.9	3.8
Difference	- 0.3	0.7	- 0.2

Average Point score	Reading	Maths	Writing
PP	24.8	23.5	23.9
Non PP	26.2	26.2	25
Difference	1.4	2.7	1.1

Results in Year 6

Progress Points	Reading	Maths	Writing
PP	4.5	5.4	4.1
Non PP	4.1	6.2	3.9
Difference	-0.4	0.8	-0.2

Average Point score	Reading	Maths	Writing
PP	29.3	28.9	28.0
Non PP	30.3	32.4	28.9
Difference	1.0	3.5	0.9

Other interventions in Year 6 include: 1:1 tuition, booster classes, small group work in English and maths.

Findings from Pupil Questionnaires:

All pupils thought the conferences helped their learning.

Some children were very specific about what they had learnt eg writing in sentences.

Children liked talking about their learning in order to: 'sort things out', 'get things right' 'so my teacher knows if I like learning or not'.

75% of children surveyed spoke to their parents eg 'My teacher says I am doing well', 'What my targets are', 'What my strengths and weaknesses are'.

The survey had mixed results for where was the best place for a conference to take place, but, some year 6 children felt that it should be where other children could not hear as it was a private conversation and they should not be distracted.

They thought it was important to know their levels to: impress their parents; to improve; to know how well they were doing.

Particular likes:

Improved learning!

Opportunity to check through work.

Opportunity to evaluate and choose targets.

Opportunity to learn with the teacher and talk about how to improve.

Opportunity to learn new things.

The positive feedback they received.

Receiving a clear message from the teacher.

Getting help!

One child was proud of the certificate they received as the pupil conference had helped them with their maths.

Dislikes:

1 child did not like being out of class.

Findings from Teacher Questionnaires:

All teachers thought the strategy was worth continuing.

Impact:

Higher awareness of where chn are at so can stretch them further.

Misconceptions could be 'cleared up' before they became embedded.

Children became more focused on their targets as they were now more relevant.

Chn responded well to questions as they knew the teacher well and felt comfortable with them.

Chn were more likely to ask questions.

Chn were very honest and not as hesitant as in class.

Chn had ownership of their own learning as they identified their own gaps and set their own goals.

Children liked getting 1:1 attention

It boosted children's confidence

Organisation:

Need full awareness of chn's needs beforehand

Helpful to have specific questions prepared (especially for lower attainers)

Important to be organised so time is used effectively. Ensure have books and any resources to demonstrate eg wipeboards, bead strings etc beforehand.

Most helpful at start of term

Barriers

Time management, absences of chn, finding a quiet place.

One teacher reported that lower attainers were more likely to focus on what they enjoyed rather than difficulties and strengths and this needed careful planning for.

Following up parent feedback forms as some parents did not return them.

Taking chn out of class can be disruptive to the supply teacher.

Actions for own school:

Continue termly and extend to Year 5.

Areas of development:

Training –how to ask questions so less articulate chn can still contribute.

How to narrow the gap between lower and higher attainers in Key Stage 1.

How to narrow the pupil premium gap in maths in KS2.

St Antony's Catholic Primary School

Project

The project at St Antony's was carried out with Years two and six. We have a small amount of FSM eligible children in our school but there was still a gap between the achievement of those with Pupil Premium funding and those without. The pilot project set out to see whether the conferences had an impact by comparing the progress and attainment with each group to that made in the previous year. It also looks to see if the gap is closed or narrowed between those on FSM and those not.

The teachers were asked to meet with the children on a half termly basis to discuss levels, progress, learning targets and personal targets.

Proformas were designed and shared through the network. These were explained to the staff in a briefing meeting as well as the expectations of the intervention. We wanted to see if 1:1 conferences with the pupils would bring about a significant improvement in their learning. We were hoping to close the gap between the FSM and Non FSM children.

Due to the network starting in November the first conferences were held at the end of the autumn term. These were then repeated in March and again in June. Although we had intended for these meetings to be half termly this, in its first year, became impractical.

During the discussions the child and teacher discussed successes and looked through books to identify areas for development. We thought it best that the class teacher held these meetings as it allowed for on-going support and direction from the same adult.

At the end of the year the teachers and children who took part in this pilot completed questionnaires about the experience and its impact.

Focus Group (numbers/SEN/EAL/Yr Grp)

Year Group	Boys	Girls	Also SEND	Also EAL	Total
2	2	3	1	0	5
6	2	1	0	0	3

*In year six one of the children was discounted from the pilot due to severe SEND needs.

Frequency/length of Meetings

Although we have initially wanted to have a meeting each half term, there were three meetings through the year. The meetings lasted approximately 20 minutes with the year two children and between 30 -40 minutes for the year six children.

Findings

Year Group: 2

Number of children eligible for FSM: 5

Tables compare the progress and attainment made in Year One with that in Year Two

Progress Points	Reading		Maths		Writing	
	Yr1	Yr2	Yr1	Yr2	Yr1	Yr2
FSM	5.4	4.0	4.5	4.8	4.6	3.6
Non FSM	6.0	4.7	6.3	4.8	5.1	4.1
Difference	-0.6	-0.7	-0.8	-	-0.5	-0.5

Attainment	Reading		Maths		Writing	
	Yr1	Yr2	Yr1	Yr2	Yr1	Yr2
FSM	12.6	16.6	12.2	17.0	11.4	15.0
Non FSM	12.8	17.6	13.3	18.1	12.3	16.4
Difference	-0.2	-1.0	-1.1	-1.1	-0.9	-1.4

Child	Progress Made						Additional interventions received
	Reading		Writing		Maths		
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 1	Yr 2	
Child A	+3	+4	+1	+4	+4.5	+4	BESD support Writing group Reading group Maths group
Child B	+6	+4	+6	+4	+6	+4	BESD support Writing group
Child C	+6	+6	+6	+8	+4	+8	
Child D	+6	+6	+6	0	+4	+4	
Child E	+6	+2	+6	+2	+4	+4	Writing group

RNLC NtG Network 2013 - 2014

Year Group: 6

Number of children eligible for FSM: 3

Progress Points	Reading		Maths		Writing	
	Year 5	Year 6	Year 5	Year 6	Year 5	Year 6
FSM	4.0	2.5	4.3	4.0	3.1	5.5
Non FSM	3.9	3.6	4.5	4.0	3.8	4.6
Difference	+0.1	-1.1	-0.2	-	-0.7	+0.9

Attainment Points	Reading		Maths		Writing	
	Year 5	Year 6	Year 5	Year 6	Year 5	Year 6
FSM	22.5	25.0	21.0	25.0	19.0	24.5
Non FSM	28.4	32.0	28.0	31.9	26.7	31.3
Difference	-5.9	-7	-7	-6.9	-7.7	-6.8

Child	Progress Made						Additional interventions received
	Reading		Writing		Maths		
	Yr 5	Yr 6	Yr 5	Yr 6	Yr 5	Yr 6	
Child A	+6	+2	+6	+6	+4	+2	Reading Intervention Writing Intervention Maths Booster
Child B	+4	+2	+2	+8	+6	+4	Reading Intervention Writing Intervention Maths Booster
Child C	+4	+2	+4	+4	+6	+6	Reading Intervention Writing Intervention Maths Booster

Findings from Year Two

Progress

If you compare the progress made by the same group of children in year one and in year two you can see that they made less progress in Reading and Writing in year 2 and more in maths.

If you compare the progress made between the two groups the gap stays the almost the same or the same in Reading and Writing but was closed in maths, meaning that both FSM and non FSM made as much progress.

Attainment

Again the gap between FSM and Non-FSM increased from Year One to Year Two in Reading and Writing but not in maths where the gap remained the same.

The pilot in this year group failed to close the gap in Reading and Writing.

Findings from Year Six

Progress

In Reading the gap widened in year six. In Maths it was closed and in Writing the children with FSM made significant gains.

Attainment

The gap between children on FSM in all areas was very wide more than a level in most cases. The intervention in Year six did not narrow this gap.

The pilot in this year group failed to close or narrow the gap in all areas.

Findings from Pupil Questionnaires:

What did you like?

- I like talking about my work as it will teach me more
- I don't like talking about what's wrong if it is hard to change.
- I have my own time to say stuff and the school will do what I need
- I got to know what I need to do
- I got to talk about my learning which helped me
- I got to talk to the teacher
- You get a chance to think about your learning
- I could say what I was good at and what I could improve
- They were great and now I have a level five in every subject
- I like to talk about my learning as it helps me know what I need to work on
- We do not always get the chance to discuss things with my teacher.
- I liked that it was private and that my friends were not there.

How will it help you?

- I will get more help
- I tried to reach my targets
- It made me think and gave me targets.
- It helped me know what to include in my work
- It helps me not to get confused
- It helped me to manage my study
- It helps me know what to do next
- It's time to have 1:1 with your teacher and she can give you individual feedback
- You need to know what you are good at and how to move on
- My teachers made it clear what I had to do

What would you change?

- I would like to chat in the playground
- I got a bit nervous talking to the teacher
- A different room with fresh air
- I would like it to be on a quiet table so I do not get distracted
- I don't want to do it in front of my classmates

Findings from Teacher Questionnaires:

Preparation

- Come prepared knowing the next steps the child needs to make to steer their ideas
- The 1:1 attention allowed children to become more motivated, organised and decreased anxiety.
- Have all the data ready for the meetings and know next steps
- Having examples of work to refer to during the sessions.

Who would benefit more?

- KS2 – more able to self-assess
- EYFS – start earlier to make quicker improvements
- KS2 children had time to discuss concerns and worries regarding the SATs
- KS2 - all children would benefit the 1:1 time with their teacher away from the class.

Sessions

- They are time consuming and more successful when done out of class
- I felt that talking to the child helped them focus on what they had to do but felt it could be done more informally without the structured sessions.
- Finding the time and the space was a challenge.
- Would be good to do with all children.
- The children were very forth coming with their thoughts and not just saying what they thought we would want to hear.
- Having time from class allowed me to focus on that child and their needs rather than grabbing them for a quick chat which built a better relationship.
- I do not feel they would have been effective if the sessions were not out of class with additional time. They can not be rushed.

Actions for own school:

There is still a concern over the gap between FSM and Non FSM. Making all the teachers more aware of this gap through this pilot will highlight the need to ensure interventions target this group.

Better planning at the beginning of the year and timetabling of the sessions (including booking cover) in advance would ensure they happen. Booking a room for the meetings is also needed.

Areas of development:

Staff training to ensure that the meetings are effective and carry in to classroom practice.

Better tracking of children with FSM to ensure gap is closing.