

Pupil premium strategy statement 2016/17

| 1. Summary information | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|---------|---|----------|
| School | Kirk Sandall Infants | | | | |
| Academic Year | 2016/17 | Total PP budget | £34,000 | Date of most recent PP Review | N/A |
| Total number of pupils | 341 | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 28 | Date for next internal review of this strategy | Jan 2017 |

| 2. Attainment for end of Key Stage 1 2016 | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----|------------------|
| | School (Disadv) | LA | National (Other) |
| Proportion of pupils in Y2 eligible for PP | 16% | | 24% |
| % achieving the expected standard in Reading | 38% | | 78% |
| % achieving the expected standard in Writing | 54% | | 70% |
| % achieving the expected standard in Maths | 62% | | 77% |
| % achieving the expected standard in SPAG | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| % achieving the expected standard in R,W, M | 38% | | 46% |

| Progress for end of Key Stage 1 2016 | | | |
|--|--------|----|----------|
| | School | LA | National |
| KS1 Reading compared with EYFS (progress measures) | -3 | | |
| KS1 Writing compared with EYFS (progress measures) | -3 | | |
| KS1 Mathematics compared with EYFS (progress measures) | 0 | | |

| 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability) | |
|---|---|
| In-school barriers | |
| A | Oral language skills & language development in Reception & KS1 are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other pupils. This slows reading/writing progress in subsequent years. |
| B | Key Stage One pupils who are eligible for PP are making less progress and have lower attainment in writing than other pupils across Key Stage 1. This prevents sustained high achievement in Key Stage 2. |
| C | Emotional issues for a proportion of pupils (mostly eligible for PP) are having detrimental effects on their academic progress and that of their peers. |
| D | School attainment data and progress data tends to indicate a gap between those eligible for PP in Key Stage One reading than for other pupils. |
| External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>) | |
| E | Some families and pupils (mostly eligible for PP) would benefit greatly from additional support and nurture and thereby improve overall engagement with school. |

| 4. Outcomes | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| | <i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i> | <i>Success criteria</i> |
| A | Improve oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception, Key Stage 1 classes to support pupils in the development of reading and writing. | Pupils eligible for PP in Reception and KS1 classes make rapid progress by the end of the year so that the % of pupils eligible for PP meeting age related expectations equals or exceeds that of non-PP pupils. |
| B | Higher rates of progress and attainment in KS 1 writing. | Pupils eligible for PP identified as high ability make as much progress as non-PP eligible pupils identified as high ability, across Key Stage 1 in maths, reading and writing. Measured in Y1 and Y2 by teacher assessments and successful moderation practices established. |
| C | Emotional issues of pupils attending nurture group work addressed. | Fewer crisis or anxiety fuelled incidents recorded for these pupils on the school system. |
| D | Higher rates of progress and attainment in KS 1 reading for those in receipt of PP. | Pupil/staff/parents survey will indicate that boys are more engaged with and enthusiastic about their learning. Pupil progress meetings will identify improvements in performance of boys (including those in receipt of PP). |

| | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| E (i) | Pupil premium children will come into school more calmly and with less anxiety as the school is working more effectively with these families as a unit. | Incidents of pupils arriving in school in an anxious state decreases. Conversations in nurture groups reveal less anxiety around out of school situations (calming hub - SMILE) group. 'Start Mornings in Laughter Everyday' |
| E (ii) | HT working with LA attendance officer to monitor and improve punctuality and attendance. | Pupils eligible for PP identified to have attendance rates in line with 'other' pupils identified as high attendance. |

| 5. Planned expenditure | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-------------------|---|
| Academic year | | 2016/17 | | | |
| 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 (costs) | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? | How will you ensure it is implemented well? | Staff lead | When will you review implement action? |
| Children to know and value who they are and understand how they relate to other people the world. | Jigsaw (£500) | Jigsaw PSHE is a comprehensive and completely original Scheme of Work. It brings together PSHE Education, emotional literacy, social skills and spiritual development in a comprehensive scheme of learning. SMSC (Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural) development opportunities are mapped throughout. The learning helps children to know and value who they are and understand how they relate to other people the world. Jigsaw PSHE is designed as a whole school approach, with all year groups working on the same theme (Puzzle) at the same time. | Planning scrutiny, Pupil's views SMSC Lead MER | NH/SLT | Termly |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|---|-----|-------------|
| | | It helps to children to reflect on their behaviour and attitudes. | | | |
| To develop and embed a whole school approach related to attitudes for learning. | Learning Powers (£500) | We have developed the use of 'Kirk Sandall Seven' These learning powers are linked to the whole school principle and ethos for learning with the aim to support our children to become autonomous, resilient and life-long learners. | Learning Walks Focused assemblies Pupils' voice | SLT | Termly |
| To review systems and procedures for monitoring attendance | Breakfast Club (£1,000) | Identified children (including PP) come into school with anxieties that prevent them from accessing the curriculum to attend breakfast club. Current Nurture work in the school demonstrates a significant impact as evidenced by Profile assessments. | Monitoring of attendance Monitoring parental engagement | NB | Half Termly |
| To review deployment and impact of teaching assistants using the EEF 'Making Best Use of Teaching Assistants' guidance report. | TA Project (£5,000) | The Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) Guidance Report contains seven recommendations to maximise the impact of Teaching Assistants (TAs) in school, based on best available research evidence. They provide a framework by which schools can transform the ways TAs are deployed and supported, to help them thrive in their role and improve outcomes for children. We will carry out a 'health check' and develop a 'change team/working party' to drive whole school development. Upskilling TA's and teachers to ensure we are maximising impact for all learners within whole class learning and structured intervention, small group and 1:1. | TA working party meeting minutes Lesson observations Intervention data Assessment data | NM | Termly |

| | |
|----------------------------|---------|
| Total budgeted cost | £ 7,000 |
|----------------------------|---------|

| 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? |
| Improve progress of attainment for all disadvantaged children. | High staff ratio: early intervention, timely intervention. (£18,000) | We want to provide extra support to maintain and improve high attainment. Small group interventions with highly qualified staff have been shown to be effective. We want to combine this additional provision with some 'aspiration' interventions such as 'maths challenge' and creative writing competitions. | Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time. Impact of interventions are regularly reviewed and staff all receiving refresher training in new strategies. | NM CR/KS | Termly |
| Improved outcomes for higher attaining children who have been identified as disadvantaged | Booster Sessions (£5,000) | We want to provide extra support to maintain and improve high attainment. Small group interventions with highly qualified staff have been shown to be effective. We want to combine this additional provision with some 'aspiration' interventions such as 'maths challenge' and creative writing competitions. | Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time. Impact of interventions are regularly reviewed and staff all receiving refresher training in new strategies. | NM CR/KS | Termly |
| Improved outcomes for children with SEMH needs. | THRIVE - Nurture approach intervention (£1,000). Roots of Empathy – F2 Pastoral TA lead – THRIVE groups, calming hub, Lego therapy, theraplay. | Identified children (including PP) come into school with anxieties that prevent them from accessing the curriculum. Current Nurture work in the school demonstrates a significant impact as evidenced by Profile assessments. Parent Questionnaires indicate a desire to be more involved with the school in supporting their children's education. | Extra teaching time and preparation time paid for out of PP budget Impact of maths overseen by maths coordinator. Teaching assistant (TA) CPD. Data monitoring termly will evidence the progress | Inclusion Lead (s) | Termly |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-------------------|---|
| | Play therapist (£1,000) | | | | |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £ 25,000 |
| iii. 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? |
| Increased knowledge of place value and number in Y2. | 1 st class@number intervention (£2,000) | School are part of the EEF research trial of 1stclass@number for KS1. The TA is receiving training and delivering the small group intervention with the aim to repeat the programme with other children throughout the year. | Specialist training of the programme for the TA supported by the maths lead. Joint observations and diagnostic assessments before and after the programme will show how much progress is made. Regular review meetings with the staff and parents. | KS | Termly |
| Increased phonics knowledge in KS1 so that disadvantaged children make the same progress as other children. | Phonics booster sessions in KS1 (£1,000) | Disadvantaged children are not making as much progress in phonics as other children as seen in the screening test for Y1? | Regular evaluations and pupil progress meetings with the staff. | CR | Termly |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £3,000 |

1. Review of expenditure

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Previous Academic Year 2015/16 | website |
|---------------------------------------|---------|

| 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 |
|---|---|--|--|---------|
| Improve phonics for smaller groups of pupils with PP | For some individuals 1:1 pupil to adult ratios have been enabled them/ others to maintain a good learning development. | <p>High: staff feel adequately trained to be able to support phonics where needed.</p> <p>Pupils have been able to make progress in their ability to concentrate (both direct and indirect). 1:1 support for individuals has allowed pupil premium children to keep pace of progress with non PP peers in phonics</p> | Need to ensure there is a rolling programme of training and records are kept up to date. | £7,750 |
| Provide nurture support for individuals with specific needs including emotional and behavioural. Enabling children to develop emotional resilience and self-esteem. | <p>Inclusion Lead to lead the delivery of THRIVE intervention / nurture groups, 1:1 behaviour support and lunchtime “calming hub”</p> <p>Inclusion Lead to monitor and track pupil progress to ensure timely intervention. Necessary resources.</p> | <p>High: records from THRIVE/nurture work show work has a big impact upon the children’s ability to remain on task, remain in class and in several cases move to a point where they no longer need to be part of groups. Success criteria: some children have met.</p> <p>Autumn 2015-Summer 2016 All 20 children that accessed the intervention made emotional development progress – the level of progress is indicated below: 14 children progressed one full developmental strand 3 children progressed 2 full developmental strands 2 child has progressed 3 developmental strands</p> <p>Out of all 20 children that started intervention this year 9 children have now met developmental expectations</p> | This enables teaching staff to identify pupils who need to have additional supports emotionally. Next year we intend to develop the role of a pastoral lead TA to deliver all PSED intervention so they have a better understanding of need, family background and communication channels and monitoring systems are more effective. | £10,000 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------------|
| | | and no longer require additional intervention. | | |
| Improved spelling for PP pupils | High staff ratio throughout school: early intervention, timely intervention. | High: observed increased progress amongst participating children compared to peers, as measured using teacher assessments. Success criteria: met. School tracking demonstrates accelerated progress for PP in spelling. | This seemed to be most effective to enable the staff to target interventions. | £8,000 |
| Improved Year 2 literacy and numeracy results | High staff ratio throughout school: early intervention, timely intervention. | High: observed increased progress amongst participating children compared to peers, as measured using teacher assessments. 14/32 pupils in Y2 deemed as PP. Success criteria: met. School tracking evidenced significant improvements in reading for PP pupils (and in particular PP). | This seemed to be most effective to enable the staff to target interventions to support and boost skills in the core subjects. | £8,000 |
| Develop ability to concentrate in the mornings. Improve attendance and punctuality. | Provide breakfast for individuals who may not necessarily access this at home before school. | High: Pupil attendance for this group has improved significantly. Success criteria: met. | Need to continue to promote this for parents where it is felt beneficial. | £1,000 |
| Enable all pupils to access first hand learning experiences. | Subsidise all school trips to ensure the maximum spent for day visits per term is £15. | High: Almost all pupil participation in termly day visits. Subsidising all visits is the fairest way to ensure all pupils participate in educational visits (including those who are just above the PP threshold). Subsidies have included provision of extra staffing. | Need to promote that the visits are subsidised and offer payment plans for anyone who requires it. | £3,000 |
| | | | Total cost | £37,750 |