



Bromesberrow St Mary's Church of England Primary School and Preschool

Pupil Premium Funding

Action Plan 2016-17

Cohort 2016-2017: **11 children PP(17%) - 2 FSM (18%)** (figures based on September 2016)

Funding total based on last year's figures : £13, 200

This plan has been drawn up taking into account the research from the Education Endowment Foundation, staff, governors, parents and children.

The overall aims of the plan are to

- *Raise the in-school attainment of both disadvantaged pupils and their peers*
- *Ensure that all children, regardless of socio-economic factors have access to the same educational opportunities.*

1. Summary information					
School	Bromesberrow St. Mary's C of E Primary School				
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£13,200	Date of most recent PP Review	NA
Total number of pupils	63	Number of pupils eligible for PP	11	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 17

2. 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 (or equivalent)	5/11 (45%)	61%
% making good progress measure in reading (or equivalent)	11/11 (100%)	
% making good progress measure in writing (or equivalent)	10/11 (91%)	
% making good progress measure in maths (or equivalent)	11/11 (100%)	

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.	Speech and Language delay causing barriers to learning in the Early Years and Ks1
B.	Attitude to learning and self-esteem causing barriers to children's achievement.
C.	Poor spelling, handwriting and vocabulary skills impeding success in writing.
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Travelling lifestyles leading to extended periods of absence from school, which leads to children falling behind and not making expected progress

4. Desired outcomes (<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>)		Success criteria
A.	Improve oral language skills and comprehension in the early years and KS1 for eligible PP children	Children to meet age related expectations
B.	Raise children's self-esteem, in turn leading to an improved attitude and readiness to learn	90-100% of PP to make good progress
C.	Improved outcomes in writing	90-100% of PP to make good progressWriting
D.	Travelling families to enrol in education or complete home education packs whilst travelling	Children to maintain progress in learning

5. 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					
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?
Improve oral language skills and comprehension in the early years for eligible PP children	<p>Use of TalkBoost http://www.ican.org.uk/talkboost and SALT strategies (last year's training.)</p> <p>Further Speech and Language targeted training for new Early Years staff.</p>	<p>Accredited by Early Talk and Primary Talk and supported by SALT NHS services. Strong case studies in schools to show impact on oral language improvement, behaviour, listening skills and attention.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;">   </div> <p>EEF/Sutton Trust Toolkit Evidence <i>'Overall, the evidence suggests that early years and pre-school intervention is beneficial. On average, early years interventions have an impact of five additional months' progress, and appear to be particularly beneficial for children from low income families.'</i></p>	Monitoring, observation and feedback, coordinated by the SENCO.	SENCO	Jan 2017 – Talkboost used for small groups initially but staff trained then left the school, will look to train up new members of staff for 17/18

Further improve feedback given to children, verbally and through marking.	Use of school marking policy, built through working in partnership with another school. Develop peer on peer feedback Improve collaborative working opportunities through mixed ability groupings.	Feedback to pupils and metacognition and self-regulation (EEF Toolkit) “Feedback studies tend to show very high effects on learning.”	Monitoring and observation, through: Pupil Voice, Book Looks, Learning Walks, Progress Data and Lesson Observations	Head and Literacy Lead	Jan 17 – New marking policy written. Children trained in peer to peer feedback and use of “purple pen” More verbal feedback used across the school. -
Total budgeted cost					£2100
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?

<p>Raise children's self-esteem, in turn leading to an improved attitude and readiness to learn.</p>	<p>Use of Therapeutic Storywriting in KS2 and Zippy's Friends Groups in Ks1</p> <p>Training for Apples Friends KS2 <i>(All strategies for developing emotional awareness and resilience)</i></p> <p>Use of collaborative learning</p> <p>Play Therapy for specific children</p> <p>Educational Psychology input</p>	<p>+ 8 months</p> <p>Feedback to pupils and metacognition and self-regulation (EEF Toolkit)</p>	<p>Monitoring and observation, focusing on children's attitudes and aspirations. Sources of evidence: Pupil Voice, Book Looks, Learning Walks, Progress Data and Lesson Observations</p>	<p>Head</p>	<p>Jan 2017 – Apples Friends rolled out to Key Stage 2 – monitoring appropriateness of it with the oldest children. Works better in small groups.</p> <p>Play therapy positive outcome for specific children leading to children coping better with anger management and self-esteem</p>
<p>Improved outcomes in writing</p>	<p>1 to 1 and group tuition with Senco and specialist <i>Reading and Writing</i> teacher.</p> <p>Specific Interventions: Rapid Writing Precision Teaching Apples and Pears.</p> <p>Mark making opportunities extended in the early years, through environment and staff CPD</p>	<p>+ 5 months</p> <p>Individual tuition and Mastery Learning (EEF Toolkit)</p> <p>+ 4 months</p> <p>Group tuition (EEF Toolkit)</p>	<p>Regularly reviewing data and outcomes, aiming for:</p> <p>90-100% of PP children to have made good progress measure in writing across the school.</p> <p>50-60% of PP children to have attained in line with their peers</p> <p>100% of PP children achieve writing ELG</p>	<p>Head and English Lead</p>	<p>Nov 16 and Jan 17 – All interventions having positive outcomes. Progress of children improving -all except one children making good or better progress in writing.</p>

					Total budgeted cost	£10,000
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?	
Travelling families to enrol in education or complete home education packs whilst travelling	<p>Packs put together in conjunction with EWO for Y6 Leavers not going on to Higher Education</p> <p>Work with families to increase awareness of the importance of good attendance and the impact of poor attendance on achievement.</p>	<p>EEF Toolkit shows 3 months can be gained through <i>parental involvement</i>.</p> <p>'Research shows that in primary schools less than 65% of poor attenders get good results in Maths and English in schools with an average of 15 days absence compared to around 90% in schools where the average is less than 8 days. Many parents are surprised how quickly their children accumulate 15 days absence'</p> <p>http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=56832&p=0</p>	Outcomes for travelling families eligible for PP to have improved due to better attendance or engagement with work outside of school.	Head	Jan 17 -Staff put together packs and were given to travelling family for extended travelling periods, but on return in summer 2017 children had not engaged with them.	
					Total budgeted cost	£1000

