

Pupil premium strategy statement



1. Summary information					
School	St Christopher's C.E. Primary School				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£180,000	Date of most recent PP Review	n/a
Total number of pupils	430	Number of pupils eligible for PP	155	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2017

2. Outcomes <i>(2016 data)</i>	Low		Middle		High	
<i>As part of your full strategy you will also wish to consider results for specific groups of pupils (such as particular year groups or minority groups) as well as the headline figures presented here. If you have very small pupil number, you may wish to present 3 year averages here.</i>	Pupils eligible for PP (your school)	Other pupils not eligible for PP (national average)	Pupils eligible for PP (your school)	Other pupils not eligible for PP (national average)	Pupils eligible for PP (your school)	Other pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
Typical progress in reading from their starting points	-6.17 (3 chn)	-1.45 (6 chn)	-2.38 (14)	-3.13 (39)	-2.81 (2)	0.19 (3)
Typical progress in writing from their starting points	-1.59 (4)	0.32 (8)	-0.93 (15)	-0.71 (40)	+3.26 (2)	+4.93 (3)
Typical progress in maths from their starting points	-8.68 (4)	-3.73 (8)	-1.37 (15)	-0.88 (40)	-0.33 (2)	0 (3)
% achieving age related expectations in reading,	Awaiting validated Raiseonline (ROL)					
% achieving age related expectations in writing						
% achieving age related expectations in maths						

2. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)	
<i>Data sources that can help you identify barriers to attainment include: RAISEonline; the EEF Families of Schools database; FFT Aspire; staff and pupil consultation; attendance records; recent school Ofsted reports; and Ofsted guidance.</i>	
In-school barriers <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills) Identify barriers that need to be addressed in-school, as well as external issues such as poor home learning environments and low attendance)</i>	
A.	A large percentage of our children, including PP, enter school in nursery and reception with a very low baseline so although they make good progress, they are still not at a Good Level of Development by the end of the Early Years.

B.	Our interventions and provision across the school have helped to narrow the gap between our PP and non-PP children in terms of expected progress and expected levels of attainment. The gap in the percentage of PP and non-PP making accelerated progress and at a higher level of attainment has not had such a significant narrowing.
C.	Behaviour and attitude to learning within our Year 4 classes is not as strong as the rest of the school. The percentage of PP children in the year group is close to 50%.
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Attendance for children entitled to PP is just beneath that of children not entitled to PP. Punctuality is an issue for a number of children entitled to PP.

3. Outcomes (<i>It is not essential to identify four desired outcomes; focusing on fewer aims in more depth is encouraged.</i>)		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Accelerate progress of children entitled to PP in the EYFS	Pupils eligible for PP in the EYFS make rapid progress by the end of the year so that 69% of pupils eligible for PP meet age related expectations.
B.	Higher attainment across KS2 for high attaining pupils eligible for PP.	Pupils eligible for PP identified as high ability make at least as much progress as 'other' pupils identified as high ability, in maths, reading and writing and their attainment is equivalent.
C.	Behaviour and attitude to learning within Year 4 has improved	Attainment has accelerated to meet projected target for attainment in Year 4 and rates of progress have accelerated.
D.	Improved punctuality for pupils eligible for PP.	Narrow the gap in the percentage of PP children arriving late to within 5% of those children who are not entitled to PP.

3. Planned expenditure *Best practice is to combine professional knowledge with robust evidence about approaches which are known to be effective. You can consult external evidence sources such as: the Teaching and Learning Toolkit, the NFER report on supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils, Ofsted's 2013 report on the pupil premium and Ofsted's 2014 report on pupil premium progress.*

Academic year	2016/17				
The three headings below enable schools to demonstrate how they 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	When will you review implementation?
Pupils eligible for PP in the EYFS make rapid progress by the end of the year so that 69% of pupils eligible for PP meet age related expectations.	Nursery to have a different teacher for each session, so they do not have to miss out on time with one nursery class while they have their break. Additional staffing to support teachers with language interventions.	Many children from more deprived backgrounds enter school already behind their peers e.g. in language acquisition. Investing in nursery to such a degree will ensure those children entering the school at Reception will have had quality input from teachers throughout their nursery sessions.	Termly tracking of pupils and comparison of groups followed by pupil progress team meetings Monitoring of teaching and learning as part of the whole school process.	Foundation Stage Lead/Deputy Headteacher	Jan 2017
Increase attainment for all children in writing – progress of high attaining PP children is accelerated	Talk 4 writing project to develop all TAs across the school to support the learning in literacy	Attainment last year in phonics across KS1 was a clear indicator of the success of projects such as this. Maths progress and attainment will be developed with the embedding-in of the two part maths teaching. This project enables all staff to develop consistent, good writing teaching across the school	Audit of TA needs in Autumn 1 followed up by tailored training and support – measure impact by Summer 2 in terms of writing progress and confidence of support staff.	English lead & Lead TA	Jan 2017
Total budgeted cost					£56,500

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?
Improved progress and attainment for higher attaining PP children in maths	Targeted support in the form of 1:1 sessions or group maths	Progress of children supported last year in maths this way was good.	Tracking of interventions	Deputy Headteacher	Jun 2017
Improved behaviour and attitude for learning in Year 4	<p>New class teacher – great deal of behaviour experience</p> <p>DHT to observe behaviour and support through interventions e.g. Learning Mentor</p> <p>Additional adults in Year 4 to support the teachers to target learning needs and help build self-esteem and desire to learn</p>	A positive relationship with their teacher is key for these children to succeed. The classes are boy heavy and will need to have good behaviour and attitude modelled to them before being taught/supported to develop self-discipline and the desire to learn	<p>Progress monitoring</p> <p>Behaviour records show a decrease in children reaching later steps</p>	<p>Class teachers</p> <p>Deputy HT</p>	March 2017

Improved behaviour and attitude for learning in Year 4 – Raising self-esteem by individual support across the curriculum	1:1 Tuition to begin after Christmas	Positive impact evidenced from Year 6 last year	Tracking of progress	Deputy HT	June 2017
Total budgeted cost					£30,000
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?
Improved punctuality of children entitled to PP	Individual family support	Attendance has improved via this method and we now need to focus on punctuality	Tracking of individual children and their attendance	Attendance officer & HSLW	Jan 2017
Continue work with all children on SEMH support	Learning Mentor support for children across the school. Increase the availability of Forest School to two year groups	Positive results from both systems of support over the last year (see evidence below)	Continue with current tracking system for impact	Forest School Leads Learning Mentor	Jun 2017
Pupils eligible for PP in the EYFS make rapid progress by the end of the year so that 69% of pupils eligible for PP meet age related expectations.	Increased number of sessions of PEEP with parents in Reception and Nursery	The greater involved parents can be in supporting their children, the better progress is made.	Tracking	Nursery Teacher	January 2017
Total budgeted cost					£100,000

4. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year <i>This is a review of the previous year, so the outcomes and success criteria will be different to above.</i>				
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. <i>Show whether the success criteria were met. Additional evidence of impact can also be referred to, including attainment data, progress data, and case studies.</i>	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) <i>Lessons learned may be about impact or implementation. For approaches which did not meet their success criteria, it is important to assess whether you will continue allocating funding and if so, why.</i>	Cost
Accelerate progress in mathematics	Introduction of a two-part maths lesson across the school to develop pace and help fill gaps.	Mixed: Progress of PP and Non-PP equivalent in Years 3, 5 and 6. Not as good in 1, 2 and 4	There were mixed responses to the two part lesson, but it did work in developing pace in the majority of classes which in turn helped PP children, particularly in the older year groups close gaps. We will be continuing with the system and ensuring that all new staff are aware of the reasoning and practicalities behind the 2 part lesson.	Release time for teachers to observe others 4 days' supply cover £800
Improved phonics results	Lower School phase leader to lead project as part of NPQML training	High: Phonics test results for all hugely improved. The proportion of disadvantaged children that met the expected standard in phonics was above the national figure for other pupils in Year 1 100% of our children entitled to PP passed the Year 2 retake.	Continue the intensive phonic work with groups and expand the intensive focus to Reception and Nursery.	NPQML costs & cover for phase leader to run project £1000 Updated phonics resources £500
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

Improved Year 6 maths results	<p>One to one and 1:2/3 tuition delivered by qualified teacher in close collaboration with class teacher</p> <p>Employ a teacher to lead groups in the afternoons – gap filling and addressing misconceptions</p>	<p>High: Of the 14 children who took part in the tuition, 5 made expected progress over the term (2 steps) and 9 made accelerated progress with the average steps progress for the whole group being 3.4 steps.</p> <p>Middle - High: 11 children in the groups. 5 made expected progress (2 steps) and 6 made accelerated progress with the average steps progress for the whole group being 3.2 steps.</p>	<p>Continue to fund next year – close collaboration needed with CT to maximise impact. Also, children actually benefited more from 1:2 and 1:3 as they felt more comfortable and able to discuss the maths.</p> <p>Repeat next year – works well as teacher was volunteering in the morning maths sessions as well so she was able to build a relationship with the children and work on the gaps. Start earlier in the academic year to enable catch up faster and therefore accelerate progress</p>	<p>£125 per pupil for 14 pupils £1,750</p> <p>£1,300: paid hours of qualified teacher.</p>
Improved attitudes for learning, approaches to learning and skills such as team working – focus on Year 1	Forest School	<p>Difficult to measure the impact of this style of intervention in a concrete way. Progress can be seen in their Forest School Books and maturity (less arguments/loss of playtimes) had increased by the end of the academic year.</p> <p>All children in Year 1 took part and the average progress was 5 steps in reading and 4.4 steps in writing and maths – better than the expected 4 steps.</p>	The whole of the Forest School experience is positive for the children, so we will be expanding it and next year, both Year 1 and Year 3 will attend.	<p>Training for new TA: £300</p> <p>Two TAs for 1 day a week working in Forest School: £6000</p>
Continue to improve reading attainment for children across the school	Year 2 – focus on reading with 'Reading Quest' Tutor and 'Project X-Code' Tutor	<p>Reading Quest: High The average reading age increase for a roughly 6 weeks 1:1 intervention is 16 months. The average spelling age increase is 9 months. From the start to the end of the year, the expected 'steps' progress in reading was 7.5 (expected for all children was 4 or 5).</p> <p>Project X-Code. High. The average steps progress was 7.4. The expected was 5 steps.</p>	Continue – the faster and earlier our children can read at the expected level for their age, the more able they will be to make expected or accelerated progress across the curriculum.	<p>Reading Quest costs: £16,120</p> <p>Project X-Code £7,000</p>
Continue to maintain or improve attendance of our children entitled to PP	Attendance Officer – regular meetings with parents and carers to look at difficulties and work with HSLW to support families in improving their attendance	High impact – The average attendance for children entitled to PP last year was 94.18%. Very close to the average attendance of children not entitled to PP which was 94.88%	Continue to focus on reaching at least 95% attendance for all children including those entitled to PP. Punctuality was very poor for PP children compared to non-PP. This needs to be a focus over the next academic year.	Attendance Officer time: £10000

iii. Other approaches				
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
Address the SEMH needs of our children across the school	HSLW training to deliver therapeutic play Development of a Learning Mentor role to support with SEMH issues across the school	High – 4/8 of the individual children receiving intensive play therapy were entitled to PP. The feedback has been very positive about the impact on those individual children in school and at home. High – feedback from the children has shown they are happier when working with the LM and this then has a positive impact on their SEMH needs at school. Statistics for the progress academically of the children (entitled to PP) who have worked with the LM on SEMH needs is good. Average: Reading 4.7 steps, writing 5 steps and maths 4.8 steps. Expected is 4 steps.	Continue provision for children across the school. HSLW looking to develop her qualification and training further to eventually be able to support the children with Play Therapy Continue provision for all children.	1 day of HSLW time £4310 LM time £9630 Resources £500

5. Additional detail

Our deputy head is lead on inclusion and monitors and targets interventions/support for children entitled to pupil premium. (£16,800)
 Our HSLW works with any children and families struggling to access learning either through home issues or safeguarding concerns. Many of these children are entitled to PP. (£17,240)
 In order to support those children who might not otherwise be able to access activities such as clubs and residentials, and even breakfast club, these are subsidised (£10,000)

Progress 2015-16

Year 2 to Year 6		Reading	Writing	Maths
PP		83/92 (90%)	80/92 (87%)	81/92 (88%)
NON-PP		156/173 (90%)	156/173 (90%)	160/173 (92%)