

Pupil premium strategy statement – Weyford Nursery and Primary School

1. Summary information					
School	Weyford Nursery and Primary School				
Academic Year	2018/19	Total PP budget	£141455	Date of most recent PP Review	Oct 18
Total number of pupils	437	Number of pupils eligible for PP	108	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2018

2. Current attainment (EoY data)		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% making Good Level of Development		
% achieving a pass in phonics – Year 1	61%	83%
% achieving ARE+ in reading - KS1	53%	76%
% achieving ARE+ in writing - KS1	40%	70%
% achieving ARE+ in mathematics - KS1	53%	76%
% achieving ARE+ in combination RWM - KS1	33%	65%
% achieving a pass in retakes phonics – Year 2	25%	61%
% at national standard or above in reading – KS 2	75%	75%
% at national standard or above in writing – KS 2	50%	78%
% at national standard or above in maths – KS 2	38%	75%
% achieving combined RWM – KS 2	31%	64%

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i>)	
A.	Oral skills in Nursery and Reception are lower for pupils eligible for PP than other pupils. This slows writing progress in subsequent years.
B.	Emotional, wellbeing and social needs, children have a poor social skills and difficulty forming relationships this impacts on their readiness to learn. There are many PP children in the school with multiple vulnerabilities which further impact on their outcomes.

C.	Poor levels of resilience and this impacts learning and becoming independent learners.			
D.	Low level literacy skills on entry including knowledge of phonic sounds impacting on reading and writing			
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)				
E.	Attendance rates for pupils eligible for Pupil Premium are 93% with non-pupil premium at 95% - summer 2018 Authorised absences, unauthorised absences and lateness are higher than that all children.			
F.	Poor parental engagement in children's learning including lack of understanding of standards and expectations			
4. Desired outcomes (<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>)			Success	
A.	Improved oral language skills for children eligible for PP impacting positively on writing skills.		Pupils eligible for PP make rapid progress and at least meet ARE by end of each milestone – EYs, KS1 and KS2	
B.	Children being ready to learn and have positive attitudes to learn. Children make positive attachments at school.		Children settled into school, class and are able to access learning effectively.	
C.	Disadvantaged children lessen the gap in reading, writing and maths across the whole school.		Detailed overview of Disadvantage children progress across the school through rigorously tracking and planned and evaluated interventions.	
D.	Children achieve greater independence, confidence and stamina in writing and reading so that they at least meet end of KS national.		Pupil Premium children make rapid progress in reading and writing and close the gap.	
E.	Children's phonic knowledge makes rapid progress and is developed so they are able to apply and use sounds in reading and writing.		All children eligible for PP pass phonics screening test Y1 (retakes in Yr2) and achieve ARE in reading and writing.	
F.	Effective support for children's wellbeing and emotional needs. Good communication to make important and sustain links with parents. Working with outside agencies to provide the level of support to enable children to thrive.		Parent and child feedback in structured, open conversations. Reading and homework completed regularly. Children to make good progress and reach ARE by the end of KS1.	
5. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year 2017/18				
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

<p>Improved oral language skills for children eligible for PP impacting positively on reading and writing skills</p>	<p>Language link screening of all children by SALT LSA to assess areas of need. Targeted intervention 1:1 or small groups.</p> <p>*SIDNEY programme</p> <p>*The Narrative approach to talking and writing.</p> <p>*Children with individual SALT programmes -</p>	<p>Mixed- All teachers met with SMT at the end of each phase to discussed pupils and their barriers to learning. Focus was on what interventions were successful and the impact and further support/intervention needed to teach to the gaps or extend learning. 75% of QFT observed was general good and this has a positive impact on teaching and learning on the children in these classes. When reviewed teachers were able to say how the support had impacted on the children’s learning.</p> <p>Many children with individual SALT programmes were signed off this year.</p>	<p>Some interventions were effectively implemented. All LSA’s were out of class in the afternoons to deliver interventions. Lower percentage of interventions did not happen due to topic days, sickness. <i>This year LSAs will be in class every afternoon from 1:00 – 1:30pm to support children with misconception / pre teaching of key skills etc.</i> All class teachers had an intervention timetable and time has been carefully timetabled so that children are not out of the class environment to often or for too long. – <i>This will continue next year</i> Resources to support QFT are now classroom non-negotiable expectations.</p>	
<p>Children achieve greater independence, confidence and resilience in writing so that they meet at least age expected.</p>	<p>Children working towards ARE, clearly identified and their next steps known by all teaching staff.</p> <p>Quality first teaching to engage and support independence in writing is happening in all classes.</p> <p>Age appropriate non-negotiables are consistent across the school.</p> <p>Editing and “purple penning” is allowing children to respond to marking and given time to respond.</p>	<p>Mixed –</p> <p>*Year 1 - Writing: 7 out of 17 PP (41%) compared to 39 out of 50 non PP (78%)</p> <p>*Year 2 - Writing: 1 out of 3 PP (33%) compared to 34 out of 62 non PP (53%)</p> <p>*Year 3 - Writing: 0 out of 0 PP (0%) compared to 27 out of 40non PP (68%)</p> <p>*Year 4 - Writing: 5 out of 5 PP (100%) compared to 26 out of 40 non PP (65%)</p> <p>*Year 5 - Writing: 1 out of PP (50%) compared to 37 out of 54 non PP (69%)</p> <p>*Year 6 - Writing: 4 out of 4PP (100%) compared to 25 out of 44non PP (57%)</p>	<p>This strategy had a mixed effectiveness, and hasn’t been as successful as hoped. Children made progress but some did not make accelerated progress. However, if we look at just look at “PP only” as a vulnerable group and particularly in KS2 the gap has lessen and in some cases the pupils have achieved better.</p>	

Children's phonic knowledge makes rapid progress and is developed so they are able to apply and use sounds in reading and writing.	Daily phonic sessions which follow Letters and Sounds in phases. EYs and KS1 approach to teaching phonics has changed from RWI to Letters and Sounds	Successful - Data collection 2017/18 has shown a positive impact from following Letters and Sounds, daily focused sessions and the extra phonic support given during Year1 and for the Year 2 re-takes. Data shows that Year 1 PP children passing the phonic screening increased significantly - 7 out of 12 PP (58%)	We significantly improved our phonics data in both Year 1 and Year 2 and will continue to teach Letters and Sounds daily with pm interventions	
			Total budgeted cost	£ 22, 336.83
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
Children being ready to learn and have positive attitude to learning. Children make developmental progress against areas of need.	Timetabled nurture intervention groups with children identified as needing emotional needs. Support with social interaction in small groups "Friends" programme. 3 x ELSAs provide extra and individual provision when needed across all year groups.	Nurture groups has been proved to be successful in identifying areas where children need emotional support allowing children to deal with these issues in a safe non-threatening environment and then enabling them to access learning once their anxiety has been reduced.	Nurture groups needs to continue to be available to children to support emotional needs. These programmes can be tailored to individual pupils needs and will be led by trained ELSAs.	
SEN children make accelerated progress with specific areas of identified need.	1:1 or small group interventions which will work alongside SEN support to address a specific need e.g SIDNEY, first class @ number, Precision teaching, KS2 rapid read	Report from the SENCO states that "Every child on the SEN register has made good personal progress this year". All children on interventions made accelerated which was gradually being transferred into classes.	SEN support will continue to be managed by the SENCo and supported by the SENCO LSA. The SENCo LSA will work closely with the children, their parents, class teacher and outside agencies ensure	
			Total budgeted cost	£19,265.30

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
Effective support for children's wellbeing and emotional needs. Good communication to make important and sustained links with parents.	Family support through DSLs, SENCO, class teachers, newly appointed home-school link worker through personalised support, parent's meetings. Meetings with parents advising how parents can support their child's learning at home	The school has successfully supported families with a wide range of concerns including behaviour needs, communication, attendance, support with literacy and external agencies.	The appointment of the Home School Link Worker was a valuable and effective use of funding. Many families have benefitted from BS who has supported families with parent skills or supporting children at home.	
Working in partnership with outside agencies to provide the level of support to enable children to thrive.	Children's learning at home. Financial support for trips and breakfast club.	PP families are offered financial support for educational trips has ensured their children have equal access to all learning opportunities.	After discussion with Governors, PP children still need to be offered support for School field trips.	
			Total budgeted cost	£23,945.00
			Total Spend 2016-2017	£65,547.13

6. Additional detail

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

- Governors to meet with HT and DHT to discuss this strategy in detail. Strategy reviewed termly with DHT, SENCO and Home School link worker and annually to assess lessons learnt in order to inform future work with PP children.