

Pupil premium strategy statement (Orchards CE Academy)

1. Summary information					
School	Orchards Primary School				
Academic Year	2018-2019	Total PP budget	£207,240	Date of most recent PP Review	Dec 2017
Total number of pupils	477	Number of pupils eligible for PP	148 (31%)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Mar 2019
Key Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit sufficient teachers so that all pupils are taught by a qualified teacher, or within a year of qualifying through an in-school pathway Improve the quality of current teaching in all year groups Work effectively with parents so they can better support their children's learning 				

2. Previous attainment: (end of summer term July 2018)			
EYFS GLD 2017-2018			
Cohort size=23 out of 71 pupils (32%)			
All pupils	49%		
Disadvantaged	61%		
Gap	-12%		
KS2 Attainment 2017-2018			
Cohort size=23 out of 56 pupils (41%)			
	All Pupils	Disadvantaged	Gap
Reading	43%	42%	-1%
Writing	52%	50%	-2%
Maths	30%	29%	-1%
KS2 Progress 2017-2018			
Cohort size=23 out of 56 pupils (41%)			
	All Pupils	Disadvantaged	Gap
Reading	-1.65	-4.06	-2.41
Writing	-2.48	-4.63	-2.15
Maths	-1.69	-2.67	-0.98

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i>)	
A.	Severe issues with recruitment and retention of teaching staff over at least the last 5 years has meant enormous variation in the quality of teaching received. Some pupils have had as many as 7 different teachers in the last 2 years. This is being addressed but it will take time for the increased quality of teaching to have impact on pupils' progress.
B.	Notwithstanding the recruitment issues in A above, the planning and delivery of progressive, adequately differentiated SfL, particularly En and ma, across the year groups, is poor.

C.	The quality of provision academy wide is not good. In terms of future attainment, tackling the quality of provision and transition procedures into EYFS is essential. A significant number of children enter nursery with little or no language. Some children enter reception from other local nurseries where standards are also not good enough. The nursery, previously not part of the school, has been neglected over past years and is poorly resourced.	
D.	Several different approaches to phonics are being implemented across the Academy which hinders the progress particularly of PP children.	
E.	A small group of children (predominantly PP) are poorly behaved. This has a detrimental effect on the progress of their peers and stretches staff resource.	
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)		
F.	A number of PP children have been or are currently involved with social care. Amongst these children there is significant poverty and neglect.	
G.	Parent knowledge to support the development of reading is poor; oracy is poor from nursery onwards.	
H.	Parents not insisting their children attend school for 100% of the time	
4. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Fully qualified quality teachers replace the current mix of supply teachers and UQTs	By September 2019, 100% staff will be fully qualified teachers or within 12 months of being qualified
B.	A new fully differentiated Scheme of Work for maths has been purchased and is being used to raise the standards of maths teaching in all classrooms A new methodology for teaching of guided reading has been successfully implemented in years 1-6 A new scheme of work for literacy has been successfully implemented in years 1-6	Book scrutiny, drop-ins and lesson observations suggest the schemes have been implemented across all classes Outcomes show an improving trajectory
C.	Improve the quality of provision across the Nursery with a focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the curriculum and the quality of the outdoor and indoor environment instigating a forest school curriculum the approach to the teaching of phonics is the same as in the remainder of the school Transition procedures improve so children's learning does not dip 	The DEMAT specialist adviser for EYFS will provide evidence in her Note of visit that both indoor and outdoor environments are much improved compared to September 2018 The Nursery Manager has received her Forest School Award and Forest School sessions are planned into the curriculum Staff have received CPD and are implementing the same approach to phonics as in YR and Y1 Outcomes from nursery pupils have been moderated and shared with YR staff 63% pupils gain GLD in July 2019
D.	A new phonics programme has been implemented and is used consistently across the whole school	Phonics outcomes in Y1 and retakes in Y2 are improving towards national average Evidence from learning walks suggests phonics teaching methodology is more consistent
E.	A new behaviour policy is to be implemented and there is subsequently less disruption to all pupils' learning	Weekly tracking shows decreasing numbers for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> exits from class internal and external exclusions lunchtime playground incidents

F.	All PP pupils and their families who are involved with social care (EHA, CIN or CP) are well supported	Feedback, support and challenge at weekly DSL meetings Note of Visits by the DEMAT's Inclusion Manager are positive in respect of the quality of safeguarding Termly monitoring by the Chair of Governors indicates safeguarding is good An annual external review of safeguarding scheduled for May 2019 states that safeguarding is fit for purpose
G.	A series of events, spanning different year groups provided good information and resources so parents can better support their child's reading The amount and quality of entries in pupils' reading journals increases	Standards in reading improve
H.	School attendance team works with external agencies, particularly the EWO to ensure reduced lateness, improved attendance and decreased PA	Overall PP attendance =94.5% PA=12% or less

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2018-2019

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?
C,D,E,F&G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve resources in nursery in the lunch room, inside and outside (£9000) Re-zone internal areas to improve the curriculum (£3000) Coaching for nursery staff to improve levels of interaction (£2000) Improved transition procedures from local nurseries to Orchards and then onward to reception (£2500) Intensive support from EAL lead where PP children have no English (£2000) Complete training for Forest School and implement a FS curriculum (£1000) Reception nurture group created and staffed by an HLTA (£10000) Speech and Language sessions in Nursery and EYFS including where appropriate the delivery of the I can programme (£9000) 		<p>EYFS leader, leader of nursery and headteacher have twice termly development meetings to monitor progress against the development plan</p> <p>Support from the DEMAT EYFS lead</p> <p>Daily learning walks by SLT</p>	JH/JS/CC JS has target to support nursery as part of PM	Jan 2019 April 2019 July 2019
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New phonics programme purchased CPD for staff throughout the Academy Support from DEMAT English lead (£3000) 		English lead (JS) will ensure quality CPD DEMAT English and EYFS leads will undertake development and monitoring	DEMAT leads and JS	Mar 2019 June 2019
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to purchase and staff time for CPD in implementing the new En/ma schemes (£5000) TA training for planning and differentiation (£3500) 		JS to monitor DEMAT specialist leads are supporting staff with implementation Whole staff feedback re implementation during CPD	JS	Dec 2018 Mar 2019 July 2019
B	Contribution to participation in Maths Hub Project, training of Orchards maths mastery specialist and staff time to coach staff in mastery pedagogy (£3500)		JS to work with maths mastery specialist	JS	Termly
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cover required whilst staff extend termly PPM meetings to discuss progress of PP pupils (£3600) Teacher CPD specifically to consider needs of PP pupils (£3000) 		JS leads these meetings with input from EAL specialist and SENCO	CC, JS and CH	Termly input

Total budgeted cost					£60 100
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?
E,F,H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily sensory circuits for targeted children from EYFS to Y2 (£3000) 		Leader appointed and half termly outcomes collected and sent to SLT	NK	May 2019
E,F,H	Breakfast Club (nurture) (£4500) Breakfast Club Football (£2000)		Weekly learning walks and feedback from parents via a parent survey	JD	July 2019 (Implementation scheduled to begin in May 2019)
E,F,H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dog therapy for disadvantaged pupils across all year groups (£3000) 		Monitored by Wellbeing team	DG and JD	Termly
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PiXL interventions (1 afternoon per week) for targeted children (£3000) PiXL booster sessions for Y6, afterschool 1 day per week, 3 groups run by SLT (£6000) PiXL booster sessions for Y2, TA led (£3000) 		Monitored by JD	JD	December 2018 February 2019
Total budgeted cost					23 500
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?
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to teacher and TA recruitment and retention (overstaffing when needed) (£15000) 		CC working with DEMAT HR staff to ensure quality recruitment process is in place and of good quality	CC	Ongoing and daily
B,C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to PiXL annual membership; staff time to introduce the scheme and whole staff CPD (£3000) Contribution to Accelerated Reader programme and implementation (£2800) 		PiXL associate visits half termly and written feedback received and acted upon	JS/JD	Half Termly
F,H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support of 3 family workers (£18000) Attendance support for PP families (£4500) Wellbeing Team intervention for PP pupils, SEMH (£32000) 		Weekly DSL meetings ensure support and challenge of all vulnerable families	JC	Weekly

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP Officer time for support to PP pupils and their families (£19000) 			
E,F,H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily managed playtime and lunchtime for disadvantaged pupils who cannot cope in the mainstream or who also have EHCPs (£25000) 	LF/LJ/DG	JD	Termly through joint meetings with the Wellbeing Team
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weekly themed parent cafes Input at parent evenings (SLT and bilingual staff) Introduction of a more flexible homework policy that supports the needs of parents (£2400) 	Feedback from parents through parent survey	JS/CC	May 2019
A-H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SBM time to monitor PP development plan finances (£1500) 	CC and KB to meet monthly Feedback from DEMAT L&M leader	CC/KB CG	Dec 2018 April 2019 July 2019
Total budgeted cost				£122 400

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2017 to 2018. This was only reviews mid-year during 2017-2018 (see Section 7). At this time there was some evidence of actions being taken but minimal evidence of impact. Current baseline testing (2 baselines in September 2018 suggested that much of the end of year data from July 2018 was inaccurate and it was never moderated. It is therefore difficult to draw conclusions about impact since some interventions did not have a baseline and for others, the efficacy of the end of year data was questionable since it was not reliable.		
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
Uncertain if outcome was met				
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
Uncertain if outcome was met				
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
Uncertain if outcome was met				

7. Additional detail			
Intervention	Has there been a positive impact so far on the progress of pupils involved?	Has there been a positive Impact on wider class data?	Points to consider...
ENGLISH			
Reading Recovery (Y1/2)	2 children have complete the intervention and made on average 9 months progress in reading age score. 3 children currently on intervention.	Neither child has reached ARE or has noticeably narrowed the gap.	Are we targeting the correct children? How closely does the programme link to the year 2 assessment strands?
Guided Reading Groups (Y2)	Book Band Levels	Reading Progress	Is the intervention linked to comprehension? Do the intervention leads gather evidence against the year 2 curriculum strands?
Speech and Language Groups	Participation Confidence Vocabulary	Reading Progress (5/7)	Are the children been given opportunity to use topic words within writing? Does there need to be a follow up writing intervention to support this.
		Writing Progress (1/7)	
Project X Reading Intervention		Reading Progress	
1:1 reading	Yr 1 (19 children)	Average progress in book bands from start of the intervention is 5.7	All children have begun to make progress and as a result the progress gap is narrowing, but only 3 of the children are on track to be at ARE.
	Yr 2 (5 children)	Average progress in book band levels 5.2 levels	
Intervention Groups Year 3	All children making progress.	3/4 great depth group on target to achieve. 3/4 ARE group on target to achieve	
1 st Class @ Writing.	2 children accessing this intervention. Both have made good progress during the intervention in relation to their targets.	1/2 has made expected progress across the year. Both children are currently working just below ARE.	Is independent writing from the session being used to inform teacher assessment? Are the skills being transferred into whole class sessions? Are the expectations of the children the same?
Additional reading support year 6	1 child accessing this intervention. SAT reading practice score has increased by 11 points over the course of the intervention.	Child now on track to achieve ARE.	
SALT EYFS	1 child is accessing this intervention. He has gained confidence and will now join in group sessions such as phonics, but 1:1 is still a selective mute.	Still working below ARE but has made good progress across all areas of learning.	
RW A-Z EYFS	2 children to begin intervention in May		
MATHS			

1:1 Booster Sessions Year 6	Continued improvement in SAT practice scores with average score increase Marks	More PP children are currently on track to reach ARE at the end of the year. However gap to national has not yet been closed.	Monitor in July
1 st class @ Number 2 Yr 4	All 3 children accessing this intervention have shown good progress, with the average increase in number age 14.5 months. This exceeded the targeted increase in the interventions success criteria.	All children have reduced the gap to ARE but are still working 1 year below.	Does the programme help the children to apply their new skills across a range of mathematics?
Success @ Arithmetic Yr 5	4 children began intervention, 1 child left the school shortly after. 2 out of the remaining 3 have made good progress.	All children are currently working below ARE, however 2 are closing the gap.	
Intervention Groups Yr 3		2/4 greater depth group on target to achieve 3M. 3/7 ARE group on target to Achieve.	Do all the children in the group have the same gaps in knowledge? Would smaller groups have more affect? #
SEBD			
Nurture Group 8/8:30 8 PP children attend	Attendance: 7/8 have improved attendance and 6 are now in line with schools expectations. 1 child is on a greatly reduced timetable and the family have been referred for EWO intervention. Behaviour logs: 4/8 have incentive charts which show a positive improvement in general behaviour, especially in the mornings.	2/8 children working @ ARE across reading, writing and Maths. Impact of behaviour on class cohort has improved, although 2/8 still have regular exits.	6 children are working considerably below ARE, and some have individualised curriculum.
Managed Play & Lunch 15 PP children attend either 1 or both sessions.	Progress has been made against the referral targets for all children. Those referred for social/friendship/turn taking are able to play and interact with a variety of other children during the sessions. Those who have been referred for behaviour have had a reduction in incidents.	7/15 are on track to reach ARE at the end of the year. Class based incidents have reduced in the period directly after these interventions, but have not totally disappeared.	Can we track their focus and engagement in lessons following these sessions?
Attendance intervention	The gap between PP and non PP attendance has been closed.	Attendance as a whole is still below the whole school target of 96%	

