

Pupil premium strategy statement

1. Summary information					
School	St Christopher's C.E. Primary School				
Academic Year	2019/20	Total PP budget	£205,000	Date of most recent PP Review	July 2019
Total number of pupils	434	Number of pupils eligible for PP	139	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2020

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)
Typical progress in reading from their starting points	-2.38	0.03						
Typical progress in writing from their starting points	-0.93	0.03						
Typical progress in maths from their starting points	-3.47	0.03						
% achieving age related expectations in reading,	34%	73%						
% achieving age related expectations in writing	48%	78%						
% achieving age related expectations in maths	52%	79%						

2. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)

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.

In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i>) Identify barriers that need to be addressed in-school, as well as external issues such as poor home learning environments and low attendance)	
A.	A large percentage of our children, including PP, enter school in nursery with a low baseline so although they make good progress, some are still not at a Good Level of Development by the end of the Early Years.
B.	We need to narrow the attainment gap between PP and non-PP children. Teacher assessment June 2019 indicates that our biggest gaps are in the current Years 3 and 4. The gap is also high in reception in all areas and Year 1 reading. These are smaller numbers of children, so percentages are skewed but the gap needs to be narrowed.
C.	Mobility affects all children, PP and non-PP, as resources are taken to help new arrivals or children who have been supported, leave the school mid-year.
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Attendance has traditionally been poorer for our PP children than for our non-PP and traditionally PP children have had a higher percentage of persistent absentees than non-PP. This has evened out with our efforts over the last three years but our focus needs to be maintained in order to ensure attendance does not slip back.

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.	Narrow the attainment gap for PP children in Years 1, 4 and 5 by accelerating their progress	Pupils eligible for PP in key year groups make accelerated progress
C.		
D.	Maintain the attendance for pupils eligible for PP.	There continues to be a negligible gap in attendance and persistent absenteeism between PP and 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	2019/20
----------------------	----------------

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.	Talk Boost for all children across the foundation unit over the year. ½ x TA	Many children from more deprived backgrounds enter school already behind their peers e.g. in language acquisition.	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	January 2020 June 2020
Develop a positive attitude to school work and ensure there is excellent behaviour for learning across the school. Resulting in: raised standards of attainment (particularly those entitled to PP) across the curriculum.	Nurture and positive mental health will have a raised profile across the school. Maths mastery & fluency focus continues across the school Development of reading incl. phonics attainment across the school 2 days x teacher 5 ams x Learning Mentor 1 day a fortnight x Deputy HT	Children cannot learn if their basic needs are not met – including good mental health. Quality first teaching is the key to raising attainment for all children, but it is important that the PP children are identified by all staff working with them. There are gaps between PP and non-PP in maths in Years R, 1, 3 and 4 (Summer 2019) Teacher assessment data Summer 2019 shows a gap in all year groups except Year 5 between PP and non-pp in reading. Year 1 phonics PP (6/11) 54.5% & Non-PP (24/39)62% There is a gap between PP and non-PP in writing	Small group work with key children on behaviour for learning Development of team of adults to support key children in class when they are struggling behaviourally, so they do not miss the learning. 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 PP children as a standing item on team meeting agendas	Deputy Headteacher/ Class teachers/Phase leaders	January 2020 June 2020

		in Years R, 3 and 4 (Summer 2019)			
Total budgeted cost					£38,500

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?
The gap continues to narrow between PP and Non-PP children across all subjects and year groups with a particular emphasis on Years 4 & 5	<p>Teacher led small group focus on boys in Year 5 to help develop positive attitudes to learning. Majority of the targeted children are below ARE across the curriculum. (teacher costs in outcome above)</p> <p>1:1/group tuition targeted on Year 4 in all areas. (£1875)</p>	These two year groups are the weakest in terms of percentages attaining Age Related Expectations.	Half termly data analysis of groups.	Deputy Headteacher	Jan 2020 June 2020
The gap continues to narrow between PP and non-PP across all subjects and year groups.	<p>Group Tuition in maths in Year 6 (£1875)</p> <p>Continue to invest in Reading Quest (Year 2) and staff for Project X Code reading intervention (Year 3) (£16,474)</p>	Our children who received these interventions have made good progress. Reading Quest in particular has a hugely positive impact on our Year 2 readers.	<p>Group progress monitoring every half term</p> <p>Tracking of impact of interventions</p>	Deputy HT	Jan 2020 June 2020

There continues to be no or virtually no gap between attendance of PP children and non-PP children.	<p>Attendance policy is being reviewed again in line with OCC directives in September.</p> <p>Poor attendance picked up as soon as possible for all children.</p> <p>Continue the targeted work with families and children with SEMH needs particularly persistent absentees.</p> <p>Attendance Officer: £19,495 HSLW time: £6128</p>	Many absences from school are linked to different reasons such as SEMH needs or parental needs. These needs can be addressed asap with vigorous tracking and targeted support	Tracking of attendance every week.	Attendance Officer HSLW	Jan 2020 June 2020
Total budgeted cost					£45, 850
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	<p>Forest School will be running four mornings a week plus nurture groups for older children as required</p> <p>Learning Mentor Support for individuals and support at lunchtimes</p> <p>Learning Mentor time: £4189</p> <p>Cost of 2 TAs for 2 days: £12,245</p>	Ongoing positive results from both systems of support	Continue with current tracking system for impact	Forest School Leads Learning Mentor	Jan 2020 July 202

Ensuring that all children who are entitled to pupil premium are registered	Simplification of initial form so it does not deter parents whose children are entitled to PP Those who complete form on arrival at the school and are entitled will receive a free school jumper 50 x jumpers = £250	We still have 81 children (July 2019) in the school whose parents have not yet returned forms to be checked for PP Our form may have been deterring some parents/carers. There may still be a stigma attached to applying for FSM.	All new children have been checked to see if they are entitled to PP	Office Team	Jan 2020 July 2020
Provide a base for foodbank to reach our PP families and families in financial difficulties	Continue to provide a foodbank three afternoons a week before the end of school 90 hours of staff time = £1350	There has been regular use of the foodbank by both PP and targetted nonPP families over the past 6 months.	Ongoing monitoring of usage and access for our most deprived families	Office Team	
Total budgeted cost					£18,000

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

<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>Additional staff to support with interventions across the early years.</p>	<p>67% of pupils eligible for PP met age related expectations Of the 20 children in nursery coming up to our reception, 75% are comfortably at ARE and 15% are close. 2 children (10%) need EHCPs and are not at expected level.</p>	<p>The extra support in nursery has had an impact but again, mobility affects the whole unit with only 20 children coming up to reception. However, our PP children did meet the target set, so we will continue to focus on early intervention and support within the Foundation Unit.</p>	<p>1 ½ x extra TA = £22961</p>
<p>All children are more resilient and able to identify and address how to improve their own learning across the curriculum.</p> <p>Raised standards of attainment (particularly those entitled to PP) across the curriculum.</p>	<p>Development of metacognition and learning mindset across the school (see SDP – continuing work from last year) Focus on mastery in mathematics (see school development plan) Focus on developing positive mental health strategies across the school</p>	<p>This is an area that has not received as much focus aside from mastery in maths which is starting to have an impact on children’s explanation skills. Mental Health has a high priority in next year’s SDP</p>	<p>Impact alongside other intervention focussed on maths in Year 6 has been evident. Maths reasoning is also developing well for all children across the school. This will continue to be a focus next year alongside our focus on nurturing, meeting emotional needs to ensure children can access learning and develop their resilience.</p>	<p>£900 Lead teacher time</p>
<p>ii. Targeted support</p>				
<p>Desired outcome</p>	<p>Chosen action/approach</p>	<p>Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.</p>	<p>Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)</p>	<p>Cost</p>

<p>The gap continues to narrow between PP and Non-PP children across all subjects and year groups with a particular emphasis on Years 3 & 6</p>	<p>Additional Support staff for mornings in Year 3 and Year 6 classes to help accelerate progress in reading, writing and maths</p>	<p>Mixed picture: Years 2 and 5 there is a negligible gap in R,W & M. Year 5 PP are doing better in maths than non-PP. Years 3 & 4 – no narrowing of the gap. Year 6 – Gap narrowed in writing but not in R & M</p>	<p>Staffing in Year 3 had to be interrupted in the Autumn Term to support a child in need of 1:1.</p> <p>Support in Year 6 had a positive impact for all children which meant unfortunately the gap didn't narrow!</p> <p>We will continue to target the cohort that needs the most support with additional staffing as required.</p>	<p>Year 6 = 2 x am TAs = £15307</p> <p>Year 3 = 1 extra TA for 1 term = 5102</p>
<p>The gap continues to narrow between PP and non-PP across all subjects and year groups.</p>	<p>1:1 Tuition in maths</p> <p>Additional group tuition in maths for catch-up and challenge of most able</p> <p>Investment in Reading Quest and staff for Project X Code reading intervention (Year 3)</p>	<p>Reading Quest had a big impact with average Reading age progress 1 y 2m after the 18 sessions. 70% of the Project X-Code children made expected or better progress. The maths tuition was converted to group tuition and this had a positive impact on PP and non-PP children.</p>	<p>These continue to have a positive impact on individual children so we will continue with them next year.</p>	<p>Maths tuition = £1875</p> <p>Project X-Code = £7653</p> <p>Reading Quest = £8820</p>
<p>There continues to be no gap between attendance of PP children and non-PP children.</p>	<p>Attendance policy is reviewed and poor attendance picked up sooner for all children.</p> <p>Continue the targeted work with families and children with SEMH needs particularly persistent absentees.</p>	<p>PP Attendance = 94.85% Non PP Attendance = 94.90%</p> <p>9/15 (60%) children with less than 90% attendance are PP.</p>	<p>This continues to be a big success. We need to maintain the support and continue close monitoring to maintain the success.</p>	<p>Attendance Officer: £19,495 HSLW time: £6128</p>

iii. Other approaches				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost

		pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.		
Continued positive progress for children with SEMH needs	<p>Forest School increased to two days a week now focussing on the younger children (nursery and Y1, plus nurture groups for older children as required)</p> <p>Learning Mentor Support for individuals and support at lunchtimes</p>	Forest School continues to have a positive impact on children's self esteem and confidence.	We intend to continue with these positive interventions/support and ensure that all PP children are appropriately targeted.	<p>Learning Mentor time: £4189</p> <p>Cost of 2 TAs for 2 days: £12,245</p>
Early support to help parents prepare their children for school and learning	The school has been chosen to take part in a Pilot LA project to engage parental involvement, called 'EasyPeasy'	This was not successful at our school.	This was not a successful way to engage our parents. We will continue with the more positive impact of 1:1 support from our HSLW and look at engaging parents through play with their children.	Lead teacher time: £500

5. Additional detail

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. (£18,385)

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. Breakfast Club: £5000, Clubs: £3600, Trips: £900, PGL: £3150, Targeted Y4 breakfast club: £2250

Learning mentor to support vulnerable children and help to develop positive mental health across the school (£12,569)

