

Pupil premium strategy statement



1. Summary information					
School	St Christopher's C.E. Primary School				
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP budget	£200,640	Date of most recent PP Review	Sept 2017
Total number of pupils	414	Number of pupils eligible for PP	154	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2018

2. Outcomes	ALL		Low		Middle		High	
	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)	Pupils eligible for PP (your school)	Other pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
WAITING FOR VALIDATED DATA								
Typical progress in reading from their starting points	0.1	-0.8						
Typical progress in writing from their starting points								
Typical progress in maths from their starting points	-0.3	-1.6						
% achieving age related expectations in reading,								
% 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 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. We still need to focus on accelerating further to narrow the attainment gap particularly in Years 2, 5 and 6.
C.	
External barriers <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>	
D.	Attendance is poorer for our PP children than for our non-PP. Last year absence for FSM children was 6.1% compared to 5.4% for non-FSM. Persistent Absenteeism was 14.4% compared to 10.8% for non-FSM.

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.	Continue to focus on early intervention and 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 the school for pupils eligible for PP. Key year groups – Years 2, 5 and 6.	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.		
D.	Improved attendance for pupils eligible for PP.	Narrow the gap between PP and non-PP children, and target for PP persistent absenteeism to be the same as that of non-PP children.

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	2017/18				
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 staff to support with interventions across the early years.	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.	This is the second year of increased staffing. 29 of our children moved up into reception in September so we will see the true impact of our actions in Summer 2018. 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	Summer 2018
All children are more resilient and able to identify and address how to improve their own learning across the curriculum. Raised standards of attainment (particularly those entitled to PP) across the curriculum.	Development of metacognition and learning mindset across the school (see SIP) Focus on mastery in mathematics (see maths plan). NLP training for all teaching staff	A variety of research supported by the Education Endowment Foundation has shown that the development of meta-cognition and self-regulation has a big impact on attainment. Many of our children 'give up' when they meet a challenge and find it hard to apply their learning across the curriculum.	Regular pupil conversations – led by phase leaders and subject co-ordinators Termly tracking of pupils and comparison of groups followed by pupil progress team meetings Phase leaders working closely together and including as a standing item on team meeting agendas	Phase leaders	Jan 2018
Total budgeted cost					£50,000

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?
The gap continues to narrow between PP and Non-PP children across all subjects and year groups with a particular emphasis on Years 2 & 5.	Additional Support staff for mornings in Year 2 and Year 5 classes to help accelerate progress in reading, writing and maths	These two year groups are the weakest in terms of percentages attaining Age Related Expectations. They also have high numbers of children entitled to PP. The additional staff will enable teachers to address more misconceptions and gaps in learning.	Half termly data analysis with a clear focus on groups – pupil progress meetings with team leaders.	Deputy Headteacher	Jun 2018
The gap continues to narrow between PP and non-PP across all subjects and year groups.	1:1 Tuition in maths Additional group tuition in maths for catch-up and challenge of most able Further investment this year in Reading Quest	Our children who received these interventions have made good progress. Reading Quest in particular has a hugely positive impact on our Year 2 readers.	Group progress monitoring every half term Tracking of impact of interventions	Deputy HT	Summer 2018

The gap between attendance of PP children and non-PP children has decreased. There is a significant drop in the percentage of PP children who are persistent absentees.	Attendance policy is reviewed and poor attendance picked up sooner for all children. Continue the targeted work with families and children with SEMH needs particularly persistent absentees.	Many absences from school are linked to different reasons such as SEMH needs or parental needs. These needs can be addressed asap with more vigorous tracking and targeted support	Tracking of attendance every week.	Attendance Officer HSLW	Summer 2018
Total budgeted cost					£75,000
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?
Continued positive progress for children with SEMH needs	Forest School increased to two days a week now focussing on the younger children. Learning Mentor Support for individuals and support at lunchtimes	Ongoing 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	Summer 2017
Early support to help parents prepare their children for school and learning	PEEP sessions open for all parents in nursery but with some key parents targeted to attend.	The greater involved parents can be in supporting their children, the better progress is made. The earlier the support, the less behind the children will be when they enter reception	Parent feedback Attendance tracking Tracking of progress of children whose parents/carers attend	Nursery Teacher	Summer 2017
Total budgeted cost					£25,000

4. Review of expenditure

<p>Previous Academic Year <i>This is a review of the previous year, so the outcomes and success criteria will be different to above.</i></p>				
<p>i. Quality of teaching for all</p>				
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
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Additional staffing to support teachers with language interventions.</p>	<p>End of reception data proves positive impact: % of children who achieved a GLD was: PP Children = 70% and non PP = 70.6%. In literacy 80% of PP children made at least expected and 70% more than expected progress since baseline. This is better than the cohort as a whole: 75% & 62% In maths 80% of PP children made at least expected and 70% more than expected progress since baseline. This is better than the cohort as a whole: 76% & 53% 29 children moved up from Nursery to our reception – we will continue to monitor these children and see how they achieve at the end of Reception.</p>	<p>This has worked well for the first year. One more year before we can judge the impact on the nursery children. Data for the whole school is now on TT which will help with the tracking from nursery onwards. Continue to fund as impact evident.</p>	<p>1 x teacher costs: £38,800</p> <p>1 x extra TA costs: £13,500</p>
<p>Increase attainment for all children in writing – progress of high attaining PP children is accelerated</p>	<p>Talk 4 writing project to develop all TAs across the school to support the learning in literacy</p>	<p>Partially Successful – affected by staff absence. All TA needs audited and most TAs now confidently engaged in supporting Talk 4 Writing across the school. In terms of progress – mixed picture of PP children compared to non-pp children: Year 1 – same, Year 2, Year 4 & Year 6 – less progress and Year 3 & Year 5 more progress. Mixed picture also for attainment with the same or higher percentage of PP achieving expected in Years 2, 3 and 5. Less in Years 1 and 4 where attainment is already significantly low.</p>	<p>Continue with this and revisit TA audits to update any training needs. Accelerated progress needed in Current Years 3 & 5. Attainment focus for current years 2 and 5 to achieve at expected level and more PP children need to attain above expected level in Years 2, 5 and 6.</p>	<p>£500 for project bonus</p> <p>1 day of TA time: £2700</p>

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 progress and attainment for higher attaining PP children in maths	Targeted support in the form of 1:1 sessions or group maths	This continues to have a positive impact: End of Key Stage 2 progress for PP children was -0.3 compared to -1.6 for our non-pp children.	There was no 1:1 tuition, instead we focussed on groups which worked well. We started to direct this lower towards the end of the academic year with the Year 4 children.	£1,300: paid hours of qualified teacher time.
Improved behaviour and attitude for learning in Year 4	New class teacher – great deal of behaviour experience DHT to observe behaviour and support through interventions e.g. Learning Mentor Additional adults in Year 4 to support the teachers to target learning needs and help build self-esteem and desire to learn	There is no reflection of improvement in the attainment but there was clear evidence of an improved attitude to learning by the cohort by the end of the academic year.	Very difficult to measure the progress and the impact particularly with this year group will not be seen in terms of results until at least Summer 2018. We will continue with increased staffing to help fill gaps now that behaviour and attitudes to learning have improved so much.	Additional TA support: £13,500
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	This worked well for individuals. The tuition was group tuition and didn't begin until after Easter.	As above – continue with boosters and small group tuition with the Year 5 children.	Reading Quest costs: £7500 Project X-Code costs: £7000

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
Improved punctuality of children entitled to PP	Individual family support	This objective affected greatly by certain individuals so difficult to judge impact at this stage.	Figures skewed by statistical low number of children involved – New focus for next year will be to target the families (including PP children) who are persistent absentees.	Half a week of attendance officer costs: £12,900
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	Excellent impact on individual needs and progress for those referred to the Learning Mentor. Particularly positive impact in Year 3 – excellent attainment at end of year and clear pro-learning mind set.	Continue to target children who need this support (Learning Mentor is now a qualified Emotional Learning Support assistant) All children have now had access to some Forest School so we will go back to early intervention. EYFS & Year 1 will all get time at the Forest School.	Cost of Learning Mentor: £13,585 Cost of 2 TAs for 2 days: £11,000 Forest School Resources: £500

<p>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.</p>	<p>Increased number of sessions of PEEP with parents in Reception and Nursery</p>	<p>% of children who achieved a GLD was: PP Children = 70% and non PP = 70.6%. In literacy 80% of PP children made at least expected and 70% more than expected progress since baseline. This is better than the cohort as a whole: 75% & 62% In maths 80% of PP children made at least expected and 70% more than expected progress since baseline. This is better than the cohort as a whole: 76% & 53% 29 children moved up from Nursery to our reception – we will continue to monitor these children and see how they achieve at the end of Reception.</p>	<p>It is difficult to get those reluctant, hard to reach parents/carers involved. This could be something we target for this year.</p>	<p>Cost of additional nursery teacher and TA as above.</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>5. Additional detail</p>
<p>Our deputy head is lead on inclusion and monitors and targets interventions/support for children entitled to pupil premium. (£22,500) 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. (£23,000) 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 (£15,000)</p>

Expected Progress 2016-17

Year 2, 3, 5 & 6		Reading	Writing	Maths
PP		75/86 (87%)	76/86 (88%)	80/86 (93%)
NON-PP		107/119 (90%)	104/119 (87%)	107/119 (90%)