# Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

As part of your full strategy you will also wish to consider **results for specific groups of pupils** (such as particular year groups or minority groups) as well as the headline figures presented here. If you have very small pupil numbers you may wish to present 3 year averages here.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **School** | Calton Primary School | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2016 | **Total PP budget** | 165,000 | **Date of most recent PP Review** |  |
| **Total number of pupils** | 521 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 130 | **Date for next PP Strategy Review** | July 2017 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Current attainment** | | | |
|  | | *Pupils eligible for PP (your school)* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)* |
| **% achieving the national standard or above in reading, writing & maths** | | **46.2%** | *53%* |
| **KS1-2 progress score in reading** | | **-2.6** | 0.33 |
| **KS1-2 progress score in writing** | | **-4.4** | 0.12 |
| **KS1-2 progress score in maths** | | **-3.1** | 0.24 |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)** | | | |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)* | | | |
|  | Children begin school with lower attainment in reading, writing and maths than non-disadvantaged pupils | | |
|  | Parental Engagement | | |
| **C.** | Children and families require more support from our pastoral team than non-disadvantaged pupils | | |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* | | | |
| **D.** | Attendance rates | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Outcomes** *(Desired outcomes and how they will be measured)* | | **Success criteria** |
|  | PP children will make accelerated progress | The gap has closed by 2m in R,W,M. |
|  | Parental engagement will be higher | A higher percentage of children are completing home learning tasks |
|  | Attendance rates will improve | PP attendance is in line with non –pp attendance  Effective 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](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit), the [NfER report](https://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/PUPP01/PUPP01_home.cfm) on supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils, [Ofsted’s 2013 report](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/413197/The_Pupil_Premium_-_How_schools_are_spending_the_funding.pdf) on the pupil premium and [Ofsted’s 2014 report](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-pupil-premium-an-update) on pupil premium progress. |
|  |  |  |

You may have more than one action/approach for each desired outcome.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Planned expenditure** | | | | | | | | | | |
| * **Academic year** | | |  | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **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?** |
| Disadvantaged children will have access to a deeper level of learning than previously | A mastery approach to teaching and learning | | | There are a number of meta-analyses which indicate that, on average, mastery learning approaches are effective, leading to an additional five months’ progress over the course of a school year compared to traditional approaches. | 1. Overall, mastery learning is a learning strategy with good potential, particularly for low attaining students. 2. Implementing mastery learning effectively is not straightforward, however, requiring a number of complex components and a significant investment in terms of design and preparation. 3. Setting clear objectives and providing feedback from a variety of sources so that learners understand their progress appear to be key features of using mastery learning effectively. A high level of success, at least 80%, should be required before pupils move on. Incorporating group and team approaches where pupils take responsibility for helping each other within mastery learning appears to be effective | | | KN and the STEM team to initiate this for Maths  Staff meeting in November to work on the ‘Calton based approach’ for this. | | Lesson observations and regular team meetings and feedback |
| Disadvantaged children will have the opportunity to consolidate learning in areas that they are finding particularly challenging | Use of TAs in classrooms and to deliver interventions including talk boost, Maths and reading boosters in small groups. | | | Oral language intervention boasts +5m progress whilst small group tuition boasts +4m impact on EEF Toolkit – this is of course if the TA’s receive a good standard of training and monitoring on the intervention that they are delivering.  Research which focuses on teaching assistants who provide one to one or small group support shows a stronger positive benefit of between three and five additional months on average. Often support is based on a clearly specified approach which teaching assistants have been trained to deliver. | 1. We have identified the activities where TAs can support learning, rather than simply managing tasks – fed through the mastery curriculum. Staff training needs to focus on the support rather than management – also this is picked up and monitored regularly as Performance management for Teachers and TA’s 2. ***Have you provided support and training for teachers and TAs so that they understand how to work together effectively?*** We have delivered training for phonics and maths, EE has attended the S&L training too. Team teach sessions are due to happen before Christmas. 3. ***How will you ensure that teachers do not reduce their support or input to the pupils supported by TAs?*** Lesson observations, Pupil Progress meetings and staff training. 4. ***Have you considered how you will evaluate the impact of how you deploy your TAs?*** SPTO analysis of the group interventions, looking at progress, lesson observations, performance management and book looks | | | KN and NS (SENDCO) | | Implementation will be reviewed at the end of each term – Autumn, Spring and Summer |
| Whole school ethos of attainment for all | An ethos of high attainment for disadvantaged children | | | More successful schools have an ethos of high attainment for all pupils. They view each pupil as an individual and consciously avoid stereotyping disadvantaged pupils by referring to them as a group – they never assume that all disadvantaged pupils face similar barriers or have less potential to succeed.  *‘Our targets have always been to ensure that groups of disadvantaged students are doing as well as other groups of students.’*  (Assistant headteacher, more successful secondary school) | 1. A team based approach to recognise the potential in all disadvantaged children. 2. Staff supporting disadvantaged pupils will work with disadvantaged pupils of all abilities. 3. Pupil progress meetings will focus on the ‘can do’ approach   Staff training will encourage positive mindsets | | | KN, JBD, LT, AP | | On going |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |  | |  |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | £57682 |
| 1. **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?** | |
| PP children will close the gap with non-PP children by 2m | | Pupil Premium Teachers | | The teachers will work with all PP children as research in the EEF has shown that the brighter disadvantaged children fall behind.  One to one tutoring +5m  Phonics and reading comprehension strategies +5m  Early years Provision +5m | | Lesson learnt from previous years is that intervention is more effective when carried out in the afternoon so that it does not interfere with quality first teaching for English and Maths. Where this is not possible this will work on a rotational basis.  Mrs Brown – Will deliver Maths Interventions to KS2  Miss Piper – Will deliver phonics/reading and maths passport to KS1.  Mrs Godfrey is working with 2 Y6 children and Y1 children on reading skills.  Mrs Horga – Will deliver reading interventions to KS2 but also has a KS1 writing group.  As SPAG (writing) has been identified as a point of improvement from RAISE then all of the intervention teachers are practising spellings with their assigned children. | | KN | 6 x per year – Data collection and PP meetings.  The performance management of the PP team will be carried out 1 x per term. | |
| PP children will close the gap with non-PP children by 2m | | After school tutoring | | The EEF toolkit states that One to one tutoring equates to +5m progress | | Observations of the tutoring will take place as well as regular meetings with the staff carrying out the tutoring and meetings with the class teachers to ensure that the content is of the highest quality. | | KN, AP | 3 x per year | |
| PP children will close the gap with non-PP children by 2m | | Individual readers/phonics support | | The EEF toolkit states that One to one tutoring equates to +5m progress | | The Lunchtime supervisors that are delivering the one to one reading have been trained in phonics and reading strategies  Regular observations will take place | |  | Progress will be monitored regularly  Pupil progress meetings and regular conversations with staff members. | |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | £53563 | |
| 1. **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?** | |
| Disadvantaged children will be ready to access the curriculum. Families will receive support and advice that they require. | | Behaviour Intervention  Pastoral Team | | Evidence is +4m impact on EEF toolkit.  Social and Emotional learning +4m impact on EEF  Mentoring +1m impact on EEF | | Regular meetings with SS (Pastoral Team Lead)  Implement structured conversation  Keep clear logs of the disadvantaged children receiving support ad provision. | JBD, SS | | Meeting each term with SS | |
| Parents will be better equipped to support their children with home learning activities.  Disadvantaged children will complete more home learning activities. | | Parental involvement | | EEF states that greater parental involvement can add +3m progress | | Disadvantaged parental workshops will form a part of the ‘Pupil Premium Team’s’ performance management targets.  Plans for the workshop will be assessed and reviewed as a team.  Times will be extended and parents will have resources to take away and use at home. | JB,LP, KG, MD,  Overseen by KN | | After the first workshops have taken place in January | |
| The gap between PP attendance and non PP attendance will be reduced. | | Attendance Officer | | Beginning with a focus on attendance and behaviour alongside quality teaching, schools can embed their support for disadvantaged pupils – NFER Report | | Agreed policy and procedures. Regular update meetings.  Data to be reported regularly. | JBD and KN | | Meetings to take place every half term. | |
| **Total budgeted cost**  Show whether the success criteria were met. Additional evidence of impact can also be referred to, including attainment data, progress data, and case studies. | | | | | | | | | £ 38,061  £3642  £3,000  £500 | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Review of expenditure**   Lessons learned may be about impact or implementation. | | | | |
| **Previous Academic Year** | |  | | |
| 1. **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)  For approaches which did not meet their success criteria, it is important to assess whether you will continue allocating funding and if, so, why. | **Cost** |
| Quality Teaching First | Implementation of the new curriculum | Yes – impact on all children. See lesson observation criteria for more information. | The new curriculum has presented as challenging for all groups of pupils but the lower ability pupils have found this particularly challenging. | Not taken from PP budget |
| Quality Teaching First | Mastery approach to teaching and learning | Yes – impact on all children. See lesson observation criteria for more information. | Now we will work on embedding and making it ‘ours’ | Not taken from PP budget |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **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 complete target work | Pupil Premium Teacher/s | A PP teacher worked with Y2 children to boost the SATS – this was effective but not as effective as the PP teacher that worked on a rotational basis so that the children did not miss a core subject each time.  The impact of this was that disadvantaged pupils made more rapid progress through their passport targets than non-disadvantaged pupils. The children improved their phonic knowledge recognising more sounds within the letters and sounds phases.  From the non-SEND, disadvantaged Year 6 children who worked with the Pupil Premium teacher on reading comprehension papers 78% achieved the expected standard in the SATS test.  68% of our year 1 disadvantaged pupils achieved the phonics screening despite over 80% of those pupils beginning Reception with below average starting points and only 42% of the children achieving ELG met at the end of the Reception year.  A small number of disadvantaged parents from KS1 attended a parental workshop for supporting maths passports at home – there was positive feedback from this. | | Interventions are not as effective if they take place during the morning Maths and English session.  A PP teacher has a better impact on a rotational basis and this ideally needs to begin at the start of the year  The PP teachers were appointed late in the year – the impact was good for the time that they were there but this needs to happen at the beginning of the year and we need to have people in place for succession. | £ 15, 000 |
| To close the gaps | Maths Specialist Teacher | The progress that the children working with the maths specialist teacher made in maths was outstanding.  **Disadvantaged pupils in year 6 made 16 months progress on average compared to 15 for all children. The average scaled score was 99.9 in the KS2 Maths Test for disadvantaged children and 103.4 for disadvantaged non – SEN with an average scaled score of 103.3 – higher than 103 for non-disadvantaged pupils.**  **Year 5 disadvantaged pupils made 1y2m progress in maths compared to 1y1m progress of non-disadvantaged pupils.**  **Year 2 pupils made 1y3m progress compared to 1Y2m progress of non-disadvantaged pupils.** | | We learnt that working on the strategies for the arithmetic paper was really successful for Y6 children – this will be used again this year.  Again NOT during lesson time as this had limited impact working in a smaller group. Much better as ‘additional’ | £8000 |
| For children to pass the phonics screening test | Phonics Intervention | TA’s were carrying out interventions with the children but after attending a ‘Closing the Gap’ course we identified that the Class teacher would have a better impact. We released our most experienced Y1 teacher to work with the children who needed more phonics support. | | The school achieved 77% in phonics which was a vast improvement. |  |
| To work on Targets | Inclusion TA | The inclusion TA worked with Y3 and Y4 pupils to work on targets. It was effective but did not have as much of an impact as the PP teacher.  **The interventions that took place helped the children to make good progress in reading and writing. In reading, writing and maths the children in receipt of pupil premium funding made the same progress or better progress than non-disadvantaged pupils within school. Disadvantaged pupils in KS1 made 2m more progress on average than non – disadvantaged pupils compared to 1m on average** | | The SEND interventions were not complementing the PP interventions and in some cases different methods/ strategies were being taught. For next year the SENDCO and PP teacher must work more closely to ensure a consistency of approach. | Included in the overall TA budget  £57682 |
| To close the gaps | After school/lunchtime tutoring | This was effective when it took place but needs to begin immediately and consistently. | | Children have to attend! It has been difficult to target the children that really need it – and where it doesn’t happen then that provision needs to be planned for in another way during the school day. |  |
| 1. **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** |
| For disadvantaged children to be ready to access the curriculum socially and emotionally | Pastoral Team | | **5 pupils in receipt of the Pupil Premium funding have attended our nurture group. 16 have received intervention from the Learning Mentor. 32 children or their families have been supported by the Family Support Worker. 12 Pupil Premium children have been supported with behaviour. Some of the children have received more than one type of support.** | That the pastoral team need to be ‘seen more’ next year we will look to open up the doors and make them more visible. We also want to run more in house training and support groups. | £29200 |
| For disadvantaged pupils attendance rates to improve | Attendance Officer | | **The Attendance officer tracked and monitored attendance, sent letters and met with families to offer support and advice where attendance was becoming an issue.** | To continue to build relations with persistent offenders – data needs to be shared regularly. | £3642 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Additional detail** |
| In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to support the sections above. |