

Primary School Pupil premium strategy statement

1. Summary information					
School	Primary School				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£45,560	Date of most recent PP Review	Autumn 2017
Total number of pupils	131	Number of pupils eligible for PP	89 (84 Service Premium; 5 Pupil Premium)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Spring 2018

2. Current attainment (Summer 2017) - Years 1 - 6		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average, where available)</i>
% achieving the expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths	Year 6: 18% service	Year 6: 0% (61%)
% making expected progress in reading	Years 1 – 6: 75% service 67% FSM	69%
% making expected progress in writing	Years 1 – 6: 65% service 67% FSM	53%
% making expected progress in maths	Years 1 – 6: 61% service 50% FSM	56%
3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)		
In-school barriers		
A.	Some pupils are EAL	

External barriers	
B.	High mobility – moving from school to school leads to gaps in learning, loss of friends, emotional upset, turmoil and instability.
C.	Military deployments and training, at times cause high levels of anxiety for children and their parents.
D.	Poverty and family welfare concerns.
4. Desired outcomes (<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>)	
For all pupils who are eligible for the pupil premium grant to make at least the same amount of progress as those who are not eligible for the pupil premium grant.	Success criteria All pupils will, from their different starting points, match the progress of pupils nationally.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year		2017-2018			
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 receive immediate intervention to fill any gaps in learning.	Maintain level of Teaching Assistants who will support learning in the classroom for English and Maths. TAs will also provide small group / 1:1 intervention to close gaps.	Initial baseline assessment on arrival shows that some PP children have learning gaps. EEF demonstrates that pupils make most progress if the TA is working to support learning within the classroom.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Lesson observations ❖ Learning walks ❖ Academy Council monitoring ❖ Work scrutiny ❖ Pupil progress meetings ❖ Ongoing assessment and data tracking 	Executive Headteacher Headteacher	Three times a year in Academy Council meetings. Three times a year in pupil progress meetings. Overall review in July 2018. Data analysis following assessment periods.
Total budgeted cost					£41,160

ii. 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?
Pupil records and documents are transferred swiftly.	Coverage of additional hours to enable administration staff to ensure that pupil information both into our school and from our school is swift.	The relatively high level of mobility means that a lot of pupil information needs to be dealt with to ensure that there are no gaps in learning.	Efficient record keeping showing movement of information. Accountability for teachers.	Executive Headteacher. Headteacher. Admin Team	Three times per year in discussion with SBM and Admin Officer.
For all of our Pupil Premium children to be supported emotionally when they need it.	TAs to provide 1:1 'Meet and Greet' or social skills group as appropriate.	We have noticed that PP children can be emotionally unstable during particular periods such as deployment, training exercises and forthcoming postings and this naturally can impact on their learning and well-being.	Discussions with parents, children and staff involved with the individual child.	Executive Headteacher. Headteacher	On-going discussions of needs and impact. Pupil Progress meetings. Meetings with class teachers and parents
For all pupils to have access to all activities.	Supplement school outings and trips as well as providing PE kit where needed.	We have seen that some of our PP children and FSM children do not always have PE kit; conversations with parents has revealed that they are unable to afford it. Similarly the cost of a school trip can be difficult for some parents to afford.	All of our PP, FSM and Looked after children have appropriate kit and are able to participate in school trips without financial hardship to parents.	Senior Leadership Team	Every term (3 times a year) although it will also be review throughout the year as needs arise.
Total budgeted cost					£4,400

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2016-2017		
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
All PP, FSM and Looked after pupils make progress which is at least as good as pupils not in these groups.	Small group in-class and individual support for pupils at risk of underachieving, provided by TA.	<i>Please see table in section 7 below, which shows the outcome in detail.</i> Across key stage 1 and 2 Pupil premium outperformed non-pupil premium. (13 – 11) Comparing like for like in our own school we can say that pupil premium money was spent well with those entitled to it academically doing better. However FSM pupils did not perform as well as non-pupil premium.	The approach of using our TAs to work with and support our PP, FSM and Looked after pupils has clearly worked and is therefore an approach that we will continue with next year.	£56,271
Small group and individual intervention for pupils at risk of underachieving	Teaching Assistants provided targeted intervention for pupils requiring this approach.	The outcomes show that overall our PP children attained at least as well as non PP children.	This approach will continue into 2016-2017	
All mobility transition will be carried out swiftly and successfully.	Provide additional admin time to ensure that incoming and outgoing documentation is dealt with swiftly.	All documentation was handled swiftly and successfully once it was in our control by the Admin staff. Minimal delays in receipt of information from previous schools; occasional delays caused by teachers who did not respond to deadlines.	The same approach will continue however we will review the accountability aspect for teachers who do not return documentation swiftly to the Office.	£4,400

When analysing this data care must be taken when interpreting numbers. Due to the low number one pupil can often account for upwards of 10%. All classes were split year group classes with the exception of reception. Because of this it means that year groups were shared.

Year 1		Emerging	Developing	Expected	Exceeding	Expected +	Expected + at last assessment
Reading	8 PP (13%)	0	25	63	13	75	38
	5 Non PP (20)	0	20	80	0	80	33
Writing	PP	0	25	75	0	75	25
	Non PP	0	40	40	20	60	33
Maths	PP	0	25	63	13	75	75
	Non PP	0	40	40	20	60	33
SPaG	PP	0	13	88	0	88	63
	Non PP	0	40	60	0	60	67

- No FSM pupils. Pupil premium pupils outperformed non pupil premium pupils in 3 out of 4 areas. Reading being the exception. If one additional pupil premium pupil had achieved expected + then we would have been above in all areas.

Year 2		Emerging	Developing	Expected	Exceeding	Expected +	Expected + at last assessment
Reading	15 PP (7%)	0	20	53	53	80	44
	1 FSM (100%)			100		100	0
	6 Non PP (17%)	17	17	67	0	67	67
Writing	PP	0	40	60	0	60	47
	1 FSM (100%)			100		100	0
	Non PP	17	17	67	0	67	20
Maths	PP	0	40	60	0	60	19
	1 FSM (100%)		100			0	0
	Non PP	17	17	67	0	67	33
SPaG	PP	0	40	33	27	60	19
	Non PP	17	17	50	17	67	17

- Pupil premium outperformed by non-pupil premium in 3 out of 4 areas, reading being the exception. This was only by one pupil in each of the other 3 areas. The 1 FSM pupil has attained the expected standard in all areas of literacy but not in maths.

Year 3		Emerging	Developing	Expected	Exceeding	Expected +	Expected + at last assessment
Reading	11 PP (9%)	0	18	45	36	82	58
	1 FSM (100%)			100		100	100
	8 Non PP (11%)	0	0	75	25	100	78
Writing	PP	0	45	55	0	55	17
	1 FSM (100%)			100		100	100
	Non PP	0	38	63	0	63	11
Maths	PP	0	36	55	9	64	33
	1 FSM (100%)			100		100	100
	Non PP	0	38	50	13	63	56
SPaG	PP	0	36	45	18	64	33
	1 FSM (100%)			100		100	100
	Non PP	0	13	88	0	88	56

- Pupil premium outperformed by non-pupil premium in 3 out of 4 areas, maths being the exception. This was only by one pupil in writing but 2 pupils in SPaG and Reading. The 1 FSM pupil has achieved expected in all areas.

Year 4		Emerging	Developing	Expected	Exceeding	Expected +	Expected + at last assessment
Reading	18 PP (6%)	0	7	73	20	93	53
	3 FSM (33%)		33	67	0	67	
	4 Non PP (25%)	0	50	50	0	50	60
Writing	PP	6	56	39	0	94	32
	3 FSM (33%)	33	67			0	
	Non PP	25	50	25	0	25	0
Maths	PP	0	22	78	0	78	37
	3 FSM (33%)	0	33	67	0	67	
	Non PP	0	25	75	0	75	40
SPaG	PP	6	39	56	0	56	21
	3 FSM (33%)	33	67			0	
	Non PP	0	50	50	0	50	20

- Pupil premium outperformed by non-pupil premium in all areas. 3 FSM pupils in this class. They only outperformed non-pupil premium in the area of reading

Year 5		Emerging	Developing	Expected	Exceeding	Expected +	Expected + at last assessment
Reading	12 PP (8%)	17	17	42	25	67	53
	6 Non PP (17%)	0	0	50	50	100	83
Writing	PP	8	67	25	0	25	6
	Non PP	0	67	33	0	33	0
Maths	PP	17	58	25	0	25	18
	Non PP	17	50	17	17	33	33
SPaG	PP	25	50	17	8	25	24
	Non PP	17	33	33	17	50	33

- No FSM pupils in year 5. Pupil premium pupils were outperformed by non-pupil premium in all areas.

Year 6		Emerging	Developing	Expected	Exceeding	Expected +	Expected + at last assessment
Reading	11 PP (9%)		64	36		36	73
	1 FSM (100%)	0				0	
	7 Non PP (14%)		86	14		14	43
Writing	PP		27	73		73	0
	1 FSM (100%)	0				0	
	Non PP		57	43		43	0
Maths	PP		36	64		64	45
	1 FSM (100%)	0				0	
	Non PP		57	43		43	29
SPaG	PP		36	64		64	55
	1 FSM (100%)	0				0	
	Non PP		71	29		29	29

- Pupil premium significantly outperformed non-pupil premium in all areas. The greatest difference was in SpaG. The 1 FSM pupil had no score in the SATs for any area.