Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Summary information** |
| **School** | \*\*\*\*\* Primary School |
| **Academic Year** | 2017/18 | **Total PP budget** | 44874 | **Date of most recent PP Review** |  |
| **Total number of pupils** | 167 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 30 | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | Sep 18 |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Current attainment** |
|  | *Pupils eligible for PP (your school)* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)* |
| **% achieving in reading, writing & maths (or equivalent)** | **33%** | *63%* |
| **% making expected progress in reading (or equivalent)** | **33%** | na |
| **% making expected progress in writing (or equivalent)** | **66%** | na |
| **% making expected progress in maths (or equivalent)** | **100%** | na |
| **3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)** |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)* |
| **A.** | Low levels of communication on entry to school |
| **B.** | Some parents with low expectations/parenting issues |
| **C.** | Poor levels of resilience in children and parents |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* |
| **D.** | Attendance – coastal location - holidays |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Desired outcomes** *(Desired outcomes and how they will be measured)* | **Success** |  |
| **A.** | Children on entry have improved communication skills throughout school Children in reception ‘catch up’ and meeting ELG for communication at end of FS PP children reach expected standard in phonics screening test | Baseline in 2018 in FS shows higher percentage at ARE. In year tracking of progress data in nursery shows accelerated progressAt least 70% of children from \*\*\*\*\* nursery enter FS at ARE for CLL |
| **B.** | Vulnerable children identified and families supported by school and Prevention team Attendance and routine of identified children improves | Staff aware of and monitor vulnerable families – daily update in briefing. Success different for each family – not justacademic |
| **C.** | Whole school to develop resilience through a CPD programme with the Esk Valley Teaching Alliance and the University of York | Resilience scores (tested by Uni) show an increase yearly |
| **D.** | Attendance of all pp children to be above 96% (not including holidays) | Attendance 96% or above |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Planned expenditure** |
| **Academic year** | **2017/18** |
| The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, pr ovide 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** | **When will you review** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Teaching of phonics is consistent across school and impacts upon phonics results and reading for PP children and those reaching GLD inReception. | Whole school training from Literacy team at North YorkshireContinuation of Elklan from last year | Consistent and high quality synthetics phonics teaching has a proven track record of improving standardsElklan children showed accelerated progress last year. | Termly monitoring by Literacy Co-ordinator | LE | Termly |
| Children are more resilient – therefore attainment and progress improves | Resilience project with EVA and University of York. Whole school training to developresilience | Scores from testing show increased resilience in children (particularly vulnerable and PP children) | Termly monitoring by SENCO | HT | Termly |
| **Total budgeted cost** | £ 4000 |
| **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** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PP children to reach ARE in reading and writing | Individual children receive read, write inc intervention | Proven intervention used by school for many years. Staff are highly trained and results are impressive. | SENCO monitors all interventions half termly and measures impact | LE | Termly |
| Children school ready on entry | Opening of own nursery class | On entry data from previous private provider showed low levels of Literacy and Numeracy on entry. Our FS provision is strong so we are extending this. | Half termly monitoring – using on track and tapestry | HLH | Termly |
| **Total budgeted cost** | £36000 |
| **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?** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parents are better skilled to support/parent children at homeAttendance above 96% for PP children | Head teacher and class teachers works alongside parents on learning and parenting skills and attendance | We have an increasing number of parents that require parenting support, or support through difficult events and access to parent support workers and social care is limited. We therefore provide this ourselves. | Supervision of Head by children’s centre, monitoring by SENCO and governor for SEND/safeguarding Detailed records kept | CZ/HT | Termly |
| PP children have opportunity to take part in wider activities | School pays for residential trips and music lessons | These children would otherwise miss out. These activities build resilience. | Finance committee of GB | CZ/GB | Annually |
| **Total budgeted cost** | **£5000** |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Review of expenditure** |
| **Previous Academic Year** |  |
| **i. Quality of teaching for all** |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action****/ approach** | **Estimated impact:** Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | **Lessons learned**(and whether you will continue with this approach) | **Cost** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Children can use technology to support and accelerate learning | 1:1 I pads for all children | His approach showed accelerated progress and increased pupil engagement | We will continue to use this approach – but money is only now needed for upkeep of devices | n/a |
| All pp children to be at ARE in Maths | Mc Maths approach to be used in Maths lessons | Mc Maths is based upon personalised learning – assertive mentoringThis has continued to show accelerated progress in second year of implementation | Gaps are largely filled in learning now so school is moving to a more whole class ARE approach to the teaching of Maths | n/a |
| **ii. Targeted support** |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action****/ approach** | **Estimated impact:** Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | **Lessons learned**(and whether you will continue with this approach) | **Cost** |
| Children school ready on entry | Opening of own nursery class | On entry data from previous private provider showed low levels of Literacy and Numeracy on entry. Our FS provision is strong so we are extending this. | Children were much more ‘school ready’ upon transition to Reception. Nursery will continue. | n/a |
| Targeted children in Reception reach ARE in CLL | Elklan training/ intervention | This is a proven intervention to improve communication skills. Teacher is receiving weekly training on approach | Targeted children made accelerated progress. This approach was cascaded to all staff and used across school | n/a |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PP children to reach ARE in reading and writing | Individual children receive read, write inc intervention | Proven intervention used by school for many years. Staff are highly trained and results are impressive. | PP children are closing the gap – individual intervention needs to continue | 36000 |
| **iii.** Individual pupils are able to access learning |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action****/ approach** | **Estimated impact:** Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. | **Lessons learned**(and whether you will continue with this approach) | **Cost** |
| Parents are better skilled to support/parent children at homeAttendance above 96% for PP children | Teacher employed to work alongside parents on learning and parenting skills and attendance | We have an increasing number of parents that require parenting support, or support through difficult events and access to parent support workers and social care is limited. We therefore provide this ourselves.Many families were supported and signposted to other agencies | Many families were supported by school – the teacher doing this role has now retired but the HT will continue this work with supervision. | 1000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PP children have opportunity to take part in wider activities | School pays for residential trips and music lessons | Children participated in these activities and gained in confidence and resilience.. | Finance committee of GB | 4000 |