



**Pupil premium strategy statement**

1. Summary information					
<b>Academic Year</b>	2017-2018	<b>Total PP budget (estimated) Total PP budget (actual)</b>	£20080	<b>Date of most recent PP Review</b>	July 2017
<b>Total number of pupils</b>	110	<b>Number of pupils eligible for PP</b>	9 Ever 6 (FAM) 2x post LAC and 2 service	<b>Date for next internal review of this strategy</b>	November 2017

2. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)		
<b>In-school barriers</b> <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)</i>		
<b>A.</b>	Not all children enter school at age related expectations and therefore need support to achieve age related expectations	
<b>B.</b>	Not all children have financial access to educational visits and therefore need support to access these visits	
<b>External barriers</b> <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>		
<b>D.</b>	Not all children achieve 96% attendance	
3. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
<b>A.</b>	All PP children to reach ARE (in comparison to non PP children)	No gap between PP and non PP children
<b>B.</b>	All PP children to make at least good progress (in comparison to non PP children)	No gap between PP and non PP children
<b>C.</b>	All PP children attendance to be at least 96%	No gap between PP and non PP children

4. 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 First Teaching and ii.Targeted intervention						
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?	<u>End of Year Evaluation</u>
All PP children to reach ARE (in comparison to non PP children)	to fund Teaching Assistant time to provide support (Wave 1 and 2) and to deliver intervention programmes to raise standards such Lexia and Friendship/Social skills groups	Wave 2 intervention will support those children at risk of underachievement	Monitoring of impact of intervention Pupil Progress meetings with class teachers	HT DHT	Mid year – February 2018	<p><b>Percentages of PP children who reached ARE:</b></p> <p><b>EYFS (2 children) – 0% reached GLD</b></p> <p><b>Y1 (2 children) R – 50% W – 50% M – 50%</b></p> <p><b>Y2 (1 child) R – 100% W – 0% M – 100%</b></p> <p><b>Y3 – n/a</b></p> <p><b>Y4 (2 children) R – 100% W – 100% M – 50%</b></p> <p><b>Y5 (4 children) R – 75% W – 75% M – 75%</b></p> <p><b>Y6 (1 child) R – 100% W – 100% M – 100%</b></p>
All PP children to make at least good progress (in comparison to non PP children)						<p><b>EYFS – 100% of PP children made at least good progress in EYFS Stage</b></p> <p><b>Year 1 – 50% of PP children made at least good progress in writing. 100% of PP children made good progress in reading and maths</b></p> <p><b>Year 2 - 100% of PP children made at least good progress in R/W/M</b></p> <p><b>Year 3 – n/a</b></p> <p><b>Year 4 – 0% made at least good progress in reading. 100% made at least good progress in writing and maths</b></p> <p><b>Year 5 – 100% of PP children made at least good progress in R/W/M</b></p> <p><b>Year 6 – 0% made at least good progress in reading. 100% made at least good progress in writing and maths</b></p>

<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£18,000	
<b>iii. Other approaches</b>						
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action/approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>	
All PP children attendance to be at least 96%	To closely monitor attendance of PP children	PP children attendance needs to be at least in line with national	HT and secretary will lead monitoring of attendance and follow up actions	HT	Mid year – February 2018	<b><i>PP overall attendance was 96.2%</i></b>
	To contribute towards the cost of visits to ensure children can access school visits	PP children should have access to visits	Separate letters will be sent to parents of PP children outlining support available	HT	Mid year – February 2018	<b><i>Subsidy enabled all pupils to take part in visits and residential resulting in them demonstrating increased resilience, independence and improved self-confidence. Subsidy enabled some PP pupils to attend after school clubs. Feedback from pupils and parents has been very positive regarding these clubs.</i></b>
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£2,080	

5. 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
PP children to reach ARE (in comparison to non PP children)	to (part) fund the employment of a teacher to enable all children to be taught in smaller class sizes. This will also improve the capacity for small group teaching and to focus intervention more appropriately for our disadvantaged children.	See Disadvantage Analysis below – at KS2 with only 4 children in Y6 (3x PP Ever 6 FSM and 1 x Service ) this can only equate to 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% or 100% We do not have any PP children in our current Y2 cohort	We will use next years PP funding to fund employment of Teaching Assistants	£10,720
PP children to make at least good progress (in comparison to non PP children)				
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
PP children to reach ARE (in comparison to non PP children)	to fund Teaching Assistant time to provide support (Wave 2) and to deliver intervention programmes to raise standards such Lexia and Friendship/Social skills groups	See Disadvantage Analysis below – at KS2 with only 4 children in Y6 (3x PP Ever 6 FSM and 1 x Service ) this can only equate to 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% or 100% We do not have any PP children in our current Y2 cohort	We will continue to use next years PP funding to fund employment of Teaching Assistants	£8,000
PP children to make at least good progress (in comparison to non PP children)				
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

All PP children attendance to be at least 96%	to contribute towards the cost of visits to ensure children can access school visits	PP attendance 95% All attendance 95.8% 1/9 PP children PA	This will continue. We will also budget for some time to track attendance of PP children now that EWO service from LA is no longer available.	£40 (due to difference in estimated PP funding compared to actual )
---	--	---	---	---

### Disadvantage Analysis (vs National)

Percentage of pupils achieving expected standard (100+ SATs or EXS/GDS Writing TA)

PERFORMANCE DATA Expected Standard		2017		
		Boys	Girls	Total
No. of pupils		7	4	11
School Disadvantaged pupils characteristics:	Disadvantage	2	2	4
	SEN	0	0	0
	EAL	0	0	0
	LAC	0	0	0
SPaG* TEST	School Dis	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	National Other	73.0%	83.0%	78.0%
	GAP School Dis vs National Other	27.0%	17.0%	22.0%
	National All	68.0%	78.0%	72.0%
	National Dis	55.0%	67.0%	61.0%
READING TEST	School Dis	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	National Other	68.0%	76.0%	72.0%
	GAP School Dis vs National Other	32.0%	24.0%	28.0%
	National All	62.0%	70.0%	66.0%
	National Dis	49.0%	57.0%	53.0%
MATHS TEST	School Dis	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	National Other	76.0%	75.0%	76.0%
	GAP School Dis vs National Other	-26.0%	-25.0%	-26.0%
	National All	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%
	National Dis	58.0%	57.0%	58.0%
WRITING TA	School Dis	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	National Other	73.0%	85.0%	79.0%
	GAP School Dis vs National Other	27.0%	15.0%	21.0%
	National All	68.0%	81.0%	74.0%
	National Dis	56.0%	72.0%	64.0%
RWM** TEST (Reading / Maths) TA (Writing)	School Dis	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	National Other	56.0%	64.0%	60.0%
	GAP School Dis vs National Other	-6.0%	-14.0%	-10.0%
	National All	50.0%	57.0%	53.0%
	National Dis	36.0%	43.0%	39.0%

**KEY:** The graphs below show the difference between Disadvantaged Pupils in school compared to Other Pupils, All Pupils and Disadvantaged Pupils Nationally

■ School Dis    ■ National Other  
■ National All    ■ National Dis

**SPaG\* TEST - % expected standard or high score**

School Dis	100%
National Other	78%
National All	72%
National Dis	61%

**READING TEST - % expected standard or high score**

School Dis	100%
National Other	72%
National All	66%
National Dis	53%

**MATHS TEST - % expected standard or high score**

School Dis	50%
National Other	76%
National All	70%
National Dis	58%

**WRITING TA - % expected standard or greater depth**

School Dis	100%
National Other	79%
National All	74%
National Dis	64%

**RWM\*\* TEST - % expected standard or high score**

School Dis	50%
National Other	60%
National All	53%
National Dis	39%

\* SPaG - Spelling, punctuation and grammar

\*\* RWM - Reading, Writing TA and Maths combined