\*\*\*\*\*Community Primary School Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.Summary**  **Information** |  | | |
| **School** | \*\*\*\*\*Community  Primary School |  |  |
| **Academic Year** | 2016/17 | **Total PP budget** £58,304 |  |
| **Total number of**  **pupils** | 163 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** 44 | **Date of External PP Review** November 2016 |

**Whole school 2016 overview**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading, Writing & Maths – Yr6 | | | | Reading, Writing & Maths – Yr2 | | | | GLD | | | |
| \*\*\*\*\*CP | National Other | National Gap | School Gap | \*\*\*\*\*CP | National Other | National Gap | School Gap | Selby CP | National Other | National Gap | School Gap |
| 0% | 58% | 20 | 58 | 17% | 64% | 18 | 47 | 83% |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Current Attainment Year 6- Pupil Premium** | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Reading | |  | Writing | | | Maths | | |  |
|  | No of  Pupils | Barlby Bridge  CP | National | No of  Pupils | \*\*\*\*\*CP | National | No of  Pupils | \*\*\*\*\*CP | National |  |
|  | Working at |  |  | Working  at |  |  | Working at |  |  |  |
|  | 5/10 | 50% | 66% | 5/10 | 50% | 74% | 5/10 | 50% | 70% |  |
|  | Higher |  |  | Higher |  |  | Higher |  |  |  |
|  | 3/15 | 30% | 19% | 2/10 | 20% | 15% | 3/10 | 30% | 17% |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)** | |
| **In-school barriers** | |
| **A.** | Reading and maths progress for PP pupils across school |
| **B.** | Progress of low prior attaining PP pupils in KS1 and KS2. |
| **C.** | Progress of most able pupil PP pupils across school |
| **D.** | Progress of DSEN pupils eligible for PP funding |
| **E.** | Resilience, confidence and tackling the unknown for all Key Stages (PP and non-PP) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **External Barriers** | |
| **F.** | Low starting points for high proportion of PP pupils in school particularly in speech and language development –non-school Nursery attendees  vulnerable group |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4.Outcomes** | |  |
|  | Desired Outcomes and how they will be measured | Success Criteria |
| **A.** | Increased % of children making accelerated progress in reading and  maths in KS1 and KS2. | Pupils eligible for PP make rapid progress by the end of the year so  that the % of pupils reaching age-related expectations increases. |
| **B.** | Increased % of PP pupils with low prior attainment make accelerated progress to meet age related expectations in KS1 and KS2. | Pupils within lower prior attainment bands in EYFS and KS1 make rapid progress in KS1 and KS2 so that the % of these pupils reaching  age-related expectations increases. |
| **C.** | Higher rates of progress across KS2 for higher attaining pupils eligible for PP | Pupils eligible for PP identified as high ability make accelerated progress so that the % of PP pupils working at GDS increases. Measured through moderation in KS2 including whole school work,  cluster group and links North Star Teaching Alliance. |
| **D.** | DSEN progress is monitored and tracked effectively in order to ensure  this group make progress in line with non-DSEN | Carefully selected research based interventions maximise progress of  DSEN PP pupils. |
| **E.** | Increased % of pupils demonstrate a positive mindset and ability to reflect constructively upon their learning seen through pupil voice  evaluations. | The ReflectED Metacognition programme becomes embedded in school and children develop the skills to overcome barriers to  learning. |
| **F.** | Increased parental engagement in EYFS and improved transition between different settings into the EY2. | Improved transition to EY2 ensures increased percentage of pupils  make good progress. Speech and language intervention in EYFS ensures increased percentage of pupils meet the GLD in 2017. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.Planned Expenditure 2016/17** | | | | | |
| **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** | **Review** |
| **A.** Increased % of | Staff training on | PP pupils are not making as | English and maths lead to monitor progress | English and maths | March 17 |
| children making | reading | much progress in KS1 and | on a half-term basis. | lead |  |
| accelerated progress in reading and maths in KS1 and KS2. | New approach to reading/comprehension that develops the use  of whole class texts and | KS2 in maths and reading.  The percentage of pupils making expected progress  in Y6 for the last two years | Focused six weekly pupil progress meetings track pupils whose attainment places them into a vulnerable for underachievement  category. | Headteacher and DHT |  |
|  | question level work linked to age related expectations. | has been significantly below national figures. | Tracking data of expected/ exceeding progress for PP compared to non PP |  |  |
|  |  |  | Staff Meetings/Moderation in maths and |  |  |
|  |  |  | reading |  |  |
|  | Staff training in maths leads to improvement in teaching of mastery  and reasoning skills. |  | Subject leader analysis of reading and maths assessments are carried out more frequently and are evidence based. |  |  |
|  | White Rose and Maths  No Problem materials |  | Parental feedback |  |  |
|  | as a resource. |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C.** Higher rates of | Higher ability pupils | Sutton Trust state the focus upon using PP funding to support all children, with particular focus upon more able learners.  The NACE (National Associated for Able Children) website has examples of how some schools have used the PP to support wider provision for more able pupils and individualised support e.g. funding to enable children to attend relevant courses and extra-curricular activities and individualised support (e.g. mentoring, one to one tuition). | Staff moderation and meetings | Headteacher | March 17 |
| progress across KS2  for higher attaining pupils eligible for PP | need to receive targeted teaching and support in order to ensure an increased | Pupil progress meetings half termly  Monitor impact of teacher led groups which focus upon targeting teaching at most able | Deputy Headteacher |  |
|  | percentage currently  meeting ARE are working at GDS by the | pupils- meetings with teachers to ensure this feeds into classroom practice. | SLT |  |
|  | end of the academic | Use of able maths and writers workshops |  |  |
|  | year. | through school cluster group. | SENCO |  |
|  |  | SLT oversee impact of teaching and learning |  |  |
|  |  | upon most able through monitoring. Lines of |  |  |
|  |  | enquiry linked to this group when |  |  |
|  |  | triangulating evidence. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Cost: £10,500** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** | **Review** |
| **A.** Increased % of children making accelerated progress in reading and maths in KS1 and KS2. | 1:1 and Small group provision  Use of Reading recovery intervention.  Paired reading support.  Introduce structured research based intervention.  After school small group tutor sessions. | Some of the pupils need targeted support to catch up due to significant attainment gaps in certain year groups. Programmes selected have been evaluated and shown to be effective by the EEF. | Organisation of timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient delivery time.  Structured and effective training for support staff leading interventions.  Intervention data analysis. Pupil voice questionnaires. | English and maths leads.  Class Teachers | Spring 2016 |
| **B.** Increased % of | Review of intervention | Research conducted by the | Intervention training selected using evidence | SENCO | March 17 |
| PP pupils with low  prior attainment make accelerated progress to meet  age related expectations in KS1 | provision  Whole staff training- Maximising the Impact of teaching assistants. | British Educational Research Association found a negative relationship between the amount of TA support received and the | of effectiveness from EEF  Staff Meetings to deliver training. Peer observations to embed learning. | PP Lead Head  Phase Leaders |  |
| and KS2. | Focused work with | progress that children | Book scrutiny and Pupil Conferencing. |  |  |
|  | teachers and teaching assistants based upon | made. The MITA training is  a structured approach to |  |  |  |
|  | effective support for PP | the deployment of |  |  |  |
|  | learners. | teaching assistants based  upon research studies |  |  |  |
|  |  | relating to adapting |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | practice in order to ensure it has greatest impact.  These recommendations have come from research by EEF. |  |  |  |
| **C.** Higher rates of | Weekly small group sessions in maths, reading for high- attaining pupils led by an experienced teacher- in addition to first quality wave 1 teaching. Close liaison between both teachers in order to ensure impact of sessions within whole class learning.  Weekly small group sessions in maths and reading for W3 pupils with experienced teacher and TA. | We want to provide extra | Targeted teacher time support | Maths and | March 17 |
| progress across KS2  for higher attaining | support to raise % of high  attainers. Small group | Impact overseen by English/Mathematics Lead | English lead |  |
| pupils eligible for PP | interventions with high quality staff have been  shown to be effective, as | Teaching assistant CPD  Staff Meeting/ Moderation/ North star | Class teachers |  |
|  | discussed in reliable | Alliance Moderation Meetings |  |  |
|  | sources such as Visible Learning by John Hattie and the EEF Toolkit. | Pupil premium monitoring of targeted more able pupils (six weekly) |  |  |
| **D.** DSEN progress is | Use of MITA project- | The Education Endowment | Use research from EEF to select interventions | Headteacher | March |
| monitored and | effective use of teaching | Foundation recommends | which have been researched to have most |  | 2017 |
| tracked effectively  in order to ensure this group make progress in line with non-DSEN | assistants. Research from Education Endowment Trust related to effective use  of Teaching assistants. | schools should use TAs to deliver high-quality one to- one and small group support using structured  interventions. In addition is | impact and train TAs accordingly.  English and maths lead + SENCO to observe TAs conducting interventions in order to ensure consistent approach. | SLT and SENCO |  |
|  |  | recommended that schools |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Introduce research based interventions- monitor impact every six weeks. | adopt evidence-based interventions to support Explicit connections should be made between interventions and classroom practice. | Monitoring of before and after intervention data and whole school tracking analysis. | Class teachers |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | £29,862 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **iii.Other approaches** | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chose action/approach** | **What is the evidence/rationale for this choice?** | **How will you ensure it is implemented well?** | **Staff Lead** | **Review** |
| **E**. Increased % of | CPD to introduce | Meta-cognition and self- | Whole staff training led by senior leaders in | Headteacher and | Jan 17 |
| pupils | ReflectEd approach to | regulation approaches | order to raise profile of approach throughout | Deputy |  |
| demonstrate a | teaching metacognition | have consistently high | school. | Headteacher |  |
| positive mindset and ability to reflect  constructively | Implement ReflectED across whole school. | levels of impact. The evidence (EEF) indicates that teaching these  strategies can be | Lesson monitoring. Pupil conferencing. |  |  |
| upon their |  | particularly effective for | Book scrutiny and monitoring of learning |  |  |
| learning seen |  | low achieving and older | reflections. |  |  |
| through pupil |  | pupils. We want to |  |  |  |
| voice evaluations. |  | implement the ReflectED |  |  |  |
|  |  | programme that was |  |  |  |
|  |  | trialled by the EEF and was |  |  |  |
|  |  | shown to have an average |  |  |  |
|  |  | gain of four months |  |  |  |
|  |  | progress. |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **F.** Increased | All parents to have | EEF toolkit gives parental | Records of parental engagement in open | EYFS lead | April 17 |
| parental engagement in EYFS and  improved | opportunity to share PP individual passports and receive practical advice  relating to how to support | engagement gain of 3 months.  Research published by the | mornings and information sessions.  Records of parental engagement completed on PP passport. | EYFS staff |  |
| transition between different settings into the EY2. | their child at home.  EYFS teacher to trail use of additional parent  sessions and monitor | Nuffield Foundation have  stated that private and voluntary sector Nurserys need better disadvantaged pupils. | Parental questionnaires Pupil progress meetings.  Records of transition meetings between |  | July 17 |
|  | impact of control group.  Nursery teacher to meet staff in other settings to try to develop consistency | The study, by researchers at the University of Oxford, analysed data relating to 1,079 private, voluntary (non-profit-making) and | settings/ discussions with staff during pupil progress meetings.  Observations of TAs delivering speech and language support. |  |  |
|  | of teaching between | independent nurseries and |  |  |  |
|  | school and private | 169 state-maintained |  |  |  |
|  | nursery- our data | nursery schools in England. |  |  |  |
|  | indicates children who attend our Nursery have higher starting point in | The study found the tendency for quality to be  lower in disadvantaged |  |  |  |
|  | EY2. | areas only applied to |  |  |  |
|  | EYFS leader to develop | private, voluntary and  independent nurseries and |  |  |  |
|  | work with other settings | not to maintained schools. |  |  |  |
|  | at the end of the year in |  |  |  |  |
|  | order to ensure an |  |  |  |  |
|  | effective transition. | EYFS profile and baseline |  |  |  |
|  | Use of PP funding to support speech and language development in the early years. | data indicates PP children  start school significantly below in speaking and listening areas. |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A.** Increased % of | Introduce breakfast club | Education Endowment | Ensure teachers oversee the club and provide | HT and DHT | July 17 |
| children making  accelerated progress in reading and maths in KS1 and KS2. | provision in order to improve attainment outcomes by increasing the number of children who eat a healthy breakfast. | Foundation research  relating to the impact of a before school breakfast club. The provision of the club led to an improvement of KS1 outcomes of around  two months’ progress. | opportunities for additional reading through  attending.  Provide significantly reduced cost for children in receipt of PP funding and approach parents to try to ensure most vulnerable learners attend. | Teachers and TAs  – AL and SW |  |
|  |  | Growing Up in Yorkshire surveys 2016 indicate 25%  of our children (Y2) come | Before and after survey- use Growing Up in NY info. |  |  |
|  |  | to school without eating | Tracking data comparisons- half termly impact |  |  |
|  |  | breakfast compared to 2% | upon children attending the club. |  |  |
|  |  | in North Yorkshire and 18% |  |  |  |
|  |  | of Y6 compared to 5% in |  |  |  |
|  |  | North Yorkshire. |  |  |  |
|  |  | Focus breakfast club |  |  |  |
|  |  | around paired reading |  |  |  |
|  |  | strategies. |  |  |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | **£5000** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6.Review of Expenditure** | | |  |  |
| Previous Academic Year **2015/16** | | | | |
| **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 | **Lessons learned** (and whether you will continue with this approach) | **Cost** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | appropriate. |  |  |
| Raise attainment | To employ a teacher to | **Medium:** Progress rates- expected = | Although good impact this was a | **£22017** |
| in maths and  English through teacher led interventions. | lead intervention and  booster work for three days each week. | 6 points. | high cost approach. Decision has now been made to employ teacher for one day each week. We have  analysed data and info related to |  |
|  |  |  | coverage last year. Where strategies |  |
|  |  |  | had the highest impact, we have |  |
|  |  |  | used this information when |  |
|  |  |  | formulating the timetable this year. |  |
| **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 | Contribution of class | Medium: Progress of Y5 PP pupils in | Ensure that where spending is being | **£17674** |
| attainment of PP | teacher to reduce class | maths and reading was rapid | used to reduce class sizes that time |  |
| Pupils across school | size. | however writing progress was not as  strong for this group. | and support is targeted specifically at closing gaps for PP groups. |  |
| **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** |
| Progress of  children working | Targeted intervention | Medium-low:- see impact report | School needs to now adopt an  evidenced based approach to | **£15,548** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **R** | **W** | **M** |
| Y6 | 5.6 | 8.4 | 8.4 |
| Y5 | 6.3 | 7.5 | 6 |
| Y4 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| Average progress gain:  6.9 points | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| below ARE. |  | 2015-16. | interventions using EEF toolkit. Pre and post teach will be used to support children in accessing wave 1 teaching. |  |
|  | | | | |
| **7.Additional Information** | | | | |
| Our full strategy document can be found online at: [**www.barlbybridge.n-yorks.sch.uk**](http://www.barlbybridge.n-yorks.sch.uk/) | | | | |