



Pupil Premium Report, 2016/2017

Number of eligible pupils: 71 Ever 6: 22 FSM: 49	Total Premium grant 2016/17: £92,000 Estimated in budget Total estimated spend 2016/17: £88,474
---	--

1. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year				
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
To develop language skills in those children with a poor literacy history; To provide 1-1 or small group intervention; To promote an interest in reading; To boost the number of children achieving good outcomes in key areas of the Early Learning goals: reading, writing, numeracy; To re-teach phonics; To provide SALT intervention.	Additional learning support for EYFS	60% of PPG pupils achieved ELG, and were at expected levels in the 17 outcomes; this is 4% more than Bucks data 69% of PPG pupils achieved expectations in reading, writing and mathematics 85% of PPG pupils achieved expected levels in speaking Of 4 EYFS pupils with significantly low starting points, 2 made expected progress in reading, writing and maths, 2 averaged 4 steps progress	Barriers to learning require greater analysis to ensure intervention has greater impact on point scores for all PPG children, so that children make accelerated progress, whatever their starting points. There is still a 10% difference in attainment between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils.	£7,203

<p>To close the gaps in understanding and key skills by: Pre-teaching or re-teaching To hear priority readers Provide 1-1 or small group phonics booster sessions Improve learning outcomes for vulnerable children Offer 1-1 social/emotional support Support for the less able.</p>	<p>Additional LSA support for KS1</p>	<p><u>Phonics</u> 75 % of PPG pupils passed screening in Year 1. This is 5% more than national data <u>Year 1</u> 49% of pupils reached ARE in reading 50% of pupils reached ARE in writing 25% of pupils reached ARE in maths <u>Year 2</u> 83% of pupils reached ARE in reading 83% of pupils reached ARE in writing 83% of pupils reached ARE in maths</p>	<p><u>Phonics</u> The gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged children is narrowing at IA (7.4%) which is 13% better than national data</p> <p>The school's tracking system and external data show that PPG pupils in the Year 2 cohort had significantly better attainment than non-disadvantaged pupils in reading, writing and maths. This is significantly different to the national picture. Diminishing the difference was the result of rigour in addressing the barriers to learning of disadvantaged children and putting in place effective intervention which was regularly evaluated.</p>	<p>£16,312</p>
<p>To provide short and long term intervention for vulnerable children, 1-1 or in small groups; To accelerate progress; To boost confidence; To address language difficulties with SALT; To close the gaps in understanding by pre-teaching or re-teaching; To hear priority readers.</p>	<p>Additional TA support for KS2</p>	<p><u>Year 6</u> 42% of pupils reached ARE in reading 42% of pupils reached ARE in writing 50% of pupils reached ARE in maths 41% of pupils reached ARE in all 3</p>	<p>The attainment gap between IA disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged is 13% lower than national data for those achieving R,W and M, however the outcomes are still too low overall. Provision needs to be more closely matched to the needs of the children in identifying and addressing gaps in knowledge and understanding. Tracking of vulnerable pupils need to be more frequent and forensic. Intervention needs to be begun earlier.</p>	<p>£15,084</p>
<p>To ensure staff are confident and knowledgeable in supporting vulnerable individuals and groups</p>	<p>Training</p>	<p>Year 1 EAL pupil passed phonics check despite no English at the start of the year</p>	<p>CPD has concentrated on Quality First teaching. Training now needs to incorporate strategies specific to narrowing the gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils</p>	<p>£1,878</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
To provide targeted support for the less able through small group teaching/ learning support in English and Mathematics; To provide challenge for the most able.	Additional teacher for KS2, 1 day per week	<u>Year 6</u> 42% of pupils reached ARE in reading 42% of pupils reached ARE in writing 50% of pupils reached ARE in maths 41% of pupils reached ARE in all 3	The attainment gap between IA disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged is 13% lower than national data for those achieving R,W and M, however the outcomes are still too low overall. Provision needs to be more closely matched to the needs of the children in identifying and addressing gaps in knowledge and understanding. Tracking of vulnerable pupils need to be more frequent and forensic. Intervention needs to be begun earlier.	£18,425
To maintain a high profile for vulnerable children: To support children and families at risk; To contribute to good attendance for vulnerable children; To enhance self-esteem in vulnerable children; To be a point of contact for supporting agencies such as the Virtual School;	Children and Families Manager	Child protection issues dealt with swiftly and effectively. Improved and positive peer and home relationships 21 children received regular support during the year Very few incidents of emotional outbursts in class 60% of PPG children receiving support had improved attendance 57% of PPG children attending breakfast club achieved good attendance	Those children receiving support have been well supported, however the impact on reducing barriers to learning needs to be more tightly linked to individual needs to maximise impact and outcomes for pupils. Greater focus needs to be given to intervention and diminishing the difference academically.	£23,944
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

<p>To promote reading and bridge the gap in literacy skills; To engage reluctant readers; To accelerate progress in literacy; To address the lack of 'literacy apprenticeship' in vulnerable groups; To provide a scheme to monitor reading at home To bridge the gap in phonic competency for KS1 pupils To develop learning resilience and challenge.</p>	<p>Resources: Reading Eggs program Purchase of 6 tablets Target Tracker Sundry Resources</p>	<p>Reading programme has provided an engaging resource for use by pupils in class and at home. Phonics competency has neared national data in Years 1 and 2</p>	<p>Whilst all children have had access to the scheme, and enjoy using it, impact and regularity of use needs to be more rigorously monitored. In all classes but Year 2, there is still an attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>Purchase of tablets was restricted by funding – cost of wi-fi was prohibitive</p>	<p>Reading Eggs: £907 Target Tracker: £688 Sundries: £850</p>
<p>To enhance the range and quality of learning experiences; To allow children to access a wider curriculum; To create memorable and valuable learning experiences;</p>	<p>Bursaries for trips and visits</p>	<p>Uniform was provided for 1 family (2 children) All pupils attended the school pantomime and the whole school trip to the zoo fully funded</p>	<p>All children attended and enjoyed the extra-curricular activities. Writing was enhanced as experiences such as the zoo trip were used as starting points.</p>	<p>£1,122</p>
<p>To provide a positive start to the day; To improve learning behaviours; To promote learning readiness; To enhance good health in vulnerable children; To improve time-keeping and attendance To give vulnerable children positive role models; To develop social skills;</p>	<p>Breakfast club, open to all children, free to P.P.</p>	<p>37/75 (49.3 %) regular attendees at breakfast club were PPG pupils Of these 57% had good attendance Year 6 SATs breakfast club attendance was 100% Initial start-up was aided by CGS students, but travel and timings became prohibitive. This gap was filled by parents.</p> <p>Focus has been on establishing the club rather than the measuring of impact.</p>	<p>Observation shows disadvantaged children attending breakfast club are developing social skills through play and interaction with adults. Focus has been on establishing the club rather than the measuring of impact. Qualitative data suggests the impact is good but this needs to be supported by hard data in 2017-8 Initial start-up was aided by CGS students, but travel and timings became prohibitive. This gap was filled by parents.</p>	<p>£1,260</p>

