

Pupil premium strategy statement 2018 - 19

Name of academy: Bugle

1. Summary information					
School	Bugle				
Academic Year	2018/19	Total PP budget	£90,020	Date of most recent PP Review	July 18
Total number of pupils	222	Number of pupils eligible for PP	66+1+2	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 19
		66 x FSM Ever 6 (66x£1320=£87120) 1x looked after (1x£2300=£2300) 2 x service children (2x£300=£600)			

2. Current attainment			
		Y6 pupils eligible for PP (your academy)	Pupils not eligible for PP - school (national average-TBC)
% of Y6 pupils achieving ARE in reading, writing and maths		3/10 = 30%	5/15 = 33% (64)
% of Y6 PP pupils making at least expected progress from end of KS1 to end of KS2: reading		3/10 = 30%	7/15 = 46.7% (75)
% of Y6 PP pupils making at least expected progress from end of KS1 to end of KS2: writing		7/10 = 70%	10/15 = 66.7% (78)
% of Y6 PP pupils making at least expected progress from end of KS1 to end of KS2: maths		3/10 = 30%	7/15 = 46.7% (76)

There were 25 children within the cohort, of which 10 children were eligible for Pupil Premium. Only 22 of these 25 children had KS1 data and of these 22 children 9 children were eligible for Pupil Premium. 1 child was eligible for Pupil Premium but had no KS1 data. 9/25 have been at Bugle since Reception with 8/25 joining from Year 4 onwards.

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)	
A.	62% of PP children have other identified possible barriers to learning (EAL, GRT, SEN, EBD).
B.	SEMH issues arising from adverse ACEs (Adverse Childhood Experiences) affect many of our disadvantaged children. In many cases, this has resulted in low resilience and self esteem, poor behaviours for learning and is having a detrimental impact on the children's academic attainment and progress. This can also negatively impact on the learning of their peers within the class.
C.	Maintain progress of High Ability Pupil Premium Children to ensure they reach 'Greater Depth' and their full potential.

External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)		
D.	Attendance rates for all eligible PP children was 91.8% last school year (2017-18). This is below the 96% target and national expectation, and reduces school hours thus causing these children to fall behind.	
E.	Extremely high deprivation and associated challenges, such as low aspiration, which impacts on children's emotional wellbeing and learning (SEMH).	
F.	Disengagement of some parents and low aspirations towards their child's education.	
4. Desired outcomes (<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>)		Success criteria
A.	Teachers have awareness of these children in lessons and are able to plan specific, targeted interventions for PP children (see Class Intervention Timetables) based on next steps targets, with a clear exit criteria.	Careful grouping, support and further intervention ensures a removal of barriers to learning.
B.	SENDCo and Trained TA have attended and gained Trauma Informed Schools (TIS) accreditation. All staff have also attended an introductory session related to this. Staff, in conjunction with Behaviour Support Lead, are confident to support these children and their needs, to ensure that they are settled, have opportunities to talk, and are ready to learn.	Focused interventions led by trained staff for identified vulnerable children reduces high and low level behavioural incidents leading to less disruptions and ensuring that all children are settled and ready to learn, with limited impact on the remainder of the class.
C.	Teachers have awareness of these children in lessons and are able to plan specific, targeted interventions for PP children (see Class Intervention Timetables) based on next steps targets, with a clear exit criteria.	Good progress is maintained by High Ability PP children. This is evident in data tracking and Summative Assessments.
D.	Attendance Monitoring Team to continually monitor attendance and challenge poor attendance, offering support where appropriate. This will be supported by other key stakeholders, such as Family Support Advisor and Hub Councillors.	Attendance rates are improving for all children (including Pupil Premium children).
E.	Parents and carers of PP children will be supported by the school to ensure that deprivation is not a barrier to their learning or limits high aspirations. All children are encouraged to aim high in all areas of school life to achieve their full potential.	Parents and carers aware of how to access support and have equal access to wider opportunities.
F.	Raising and maintaining high aspirations for children and their parents.	Aspirations and expectations of parents are monitored and challenged through parental consultation meetings and questionnaires.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic Year		2018-19			
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	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Raising profile of all children, staff awareness of possible barriers to learning.	Staff aware of children's barriers and complete Venn Diagram related to this.	Raising the profile of vulnerable groups ensures staff awareness of vulnerability.	Dedicated non-contact time for PP champion to attend relevant meetings and CPD, sharing good practice with all staff.	Senior Head of School / Head of School	Termly
In-Class additional support for disadvantaged children to ensure they are able to access teaching and have the opportunity to achieve their full potential.	Funding of additional in-class TA's across the school to support teaching and learning of all pupils. TA's to run targeted interventions for disadvantaged children.	Evidence suggests that disadvantaged children often fail to reach their full potential from wave 1 quality teaching alone, thus requiring additional support on a 1:1 or small group basis. The EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit identifies additional TA's as low impact for high cost intervention, based on limited research (+1). However, small group tuition has been shown to be moderate impact for moderate cost (+4).	Attainment and progress of whole cohort, including (and in particular) disadvantaged children is closely monitored through tracking of data and half termly pupil progress meetings.	Class Teachers TA's Senior Head of School / Head of School	Half Termly
Total budgeted cost					Currently under review

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?
Improved Reading, Writing and Maths skills for a range of children (including disadvantaged / PP) in all year groups, with a particular focus on Year 6.	TA led interventions (designed by class teacher) and informed through rigorous gap analysis. Extra Teacher led interventions for Year 6 children.	Short, focused interventions can lead to a 'catch up' when children have fallen behind. Small group tuition has been shown to be moderate impact for moderate cost (+4).	Clear target based interventions and exit criteria for these. Half termly pupil progress meetings and data analysis are used to monitor impact.	Senior Head of School / Head of School. Subject Leaders. Class Teachers. TA's.	Half Termly.
Improved Behaviour of some disadvantaged children throughout the school.	Trauma Informed Schools (TIS), behavioural interventions and social skills focus.	High and Low level behavioural disruptions have a negative impact on learning.	Observations, learning walks and general feedback shows evidence of less disruption in classes.	Senior Head of School / Head of School. Subject Leaders. Class Teachers. TA's.	Half Termly.
Total budgeted cost					Currently under review
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?

Greater engagement and support of parents.	Class Teachers monitor and challenge low aspirations when evident and appropriate to do so. Family Support Advisor to engage with parents where necessary.	Evidence suggests that when parents have greater involvement in their child's education, aspirations are higher for their children.	Feedback from class teachers. Feedback from FSA related to meetings with parents.	Class Teachers. Family Support Advisor (FSA).	Regular (Weekly) / Ongoing.
Increase attendance levels of all children, including disadvantaged children, and keep persistent absence at a minimum.	Attendance Team to track attendance and absence levels, providing support and challenge to parents where appropriate. Work closely with EWO.	Strong evidence base to show that increased levels of attendance has a positive impact on attainment and progress. Adversely, high levels of absence can have a damaging and negative impact on a child's ability to reach their social, emotional and academic potential.	Attendance team to monitor and track figures, with a particular focus on vulnerable groups, on a weekly basis. Attendance Team to take action with clearly defined protocols set out in the new / updated Attendance Policy (text messages, phone calls, letters, meetings, etc...) Link attendance to progress and attainment during half termly pupil progress meetings.	Attendance Team and EWO Senior Head of School / Head of School Subject Leaders Class Teachers	Regular (Weekly) / Ongoing.
Increase knowledge and further ideas for maximising the impact of Pupil Premium funding / expenditure.	Attendance at Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) course related to PP expenditure. Follow up meetings with other Aspire colleagues.	Education Endowment Foundation is a research based foundation for education. This is an agreed focus for Aspire schools.	Further discussion at Aspire meetings. Development of an evidence based pupil premium strategy for the school. Feedback to all staff.	Senior Head of School / Head of School.	3 days in the Spring Term (early 2019).
Total budgeted cost					Currently under review

6. 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 £52000
PP children make good progress.	All staff have awareness of PP children and support accordingly in lessons.	On average, PP children made the same progress as non PP children in Reading, slightly more progress in Maths and less progress in Writing.	Continue to raise staff awareness of PP children and support accordingly in lessons. More focused data led and target based intervention to support children, with a clear exit criteria.	
Improve progress for high attaining PP children.	Staff training on effective ways to challenge higher attaining children (Mastery in Maths, course feedback in English). Greater tracking of HA children.	When tracking the progress of higher attaining PP children, it is clear (from tracking) that they have made good progress and maintained their higher ability (Blue) status.	Continue to investigate ways to challenge higher attaining children as this has been an action from Hub Monitoring visits.	
To give concise, precise feedback aimed at giving achievable next steps.	Continue to focus on quality of marking and feedback during all sessions.	Staff using and confident with updated marking policy which focused on clear feedback, based on giving further challenges related to consolidation or extension. DIT (Dedicated Improvement Time) is now more effective.	This is embedded and is expected that teachers will continue to do so. However, we aim to make further improvements. This will continue to be scrutinised as part of monitoring visits and book scrutinies.	
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 £22000

PP children make accelerated progress.	Timetabled and targeted interventions for PP children.	On average, PP children made the same progress as non PP children in Reading, slightly more progress in Maths and less progress in Writing.	Continue to raise staff awareness of PP children and support accordingly in lessons. More focused data led and target based intervention to	
PP children to make good progress and show progress in line with non pupil premium children, thus 'narrowing the gap'.	Employment of an extra Year 6 Teacher for two days per week (Monday and Friday).	On average, PP children made the same progress as non PP children in Reading, slightly more progress in Maths and less progress in Writing. In Year 6, progress for PP children in comparison to non PP children was similar for Writing, below for Reading and significantly below for Maths.	Continue to raise staff awareness of PP children and support accordingly in lessons. More focused data led and target based intervention to support children, with a clear exit criteria. Continue with this approach as there are key reasons why a number of the PP children did not make expected progress (case studies).	
Improved behaviour of PP children in Year 6 cohort.	Social Skills Intervention and general behaviour support.	For most of the class, behaviour is good. However, a few children occasionally showed challenging behaviours. This was dealt with accordingly and in line with school policy. On occasions, this impacted on the whole class.	There has been a legacy of children who were part of the school for a short amount of time having a longer term profoundly negative impact on the other children within the cohort.	

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 £7100
Greater engagement and support of parents.	Family Support Advisor to support parents, where required.	Family Support Advisor regularly meets parents and offers support and guidance in relation to their complex needs. This is fed back to Senior Head of School / Head of School and appropriate class teachers.	We will continue with this approach and adopt new strategies for the most vulnerable and harder to reach parents. This will include home visits and a range of events to encourage parents into the school.	
A consistent approach for the social, emotional and behavioural needs of all children.	Head Start (TIS) programme delivered by SENDCo.	SENDCo and TA have completed the 10 day TIS training. Other staff will receive relevant introductory and basic training in September 2018. This has had a profound impact in other Aspire Schools (feedback at recent HoS meeting).	We will continue with this approach as this is an Aspire and Whole School approach. It will continue to be a focus in 2018-19.	

7. Additional detail

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

Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) website.

Mid-year review of impact of PP funding: