

# St. Christopher's Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

1. Summary information					
School	St. Christopher's CE Primary School, Langford				
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP budget	£22,280	Date of most recent PP Review	Feb 2017
Total number of pupils	146	Number of pupils eligible for PP	16	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2018

2. Outcomes 2016/2017	Starting Points (number children)	Pupils eligible for PP	Other pupils not eligible for PP
Typical progress in reading from their starting points	Low (0)	N/A	2.9
	Middle (10)	2.6	
	High (4)	3.0	
% achieving age related expectations in reading,	Low (0)	N/A	76%
	Middle (10)	40%	
	High (4)	100%	
Typical progress in writing from their starting points	Low (1)	3.5	2.9
	Middle (13)	2.7	
	High (0)	N/A	
% achieving age related expectations in writing,	Low (1)	0%	72%
	Middle (13)	46%	
	High (0)	N/A	
Typical progress in maths from their starting points	Low (1)	1.0	3.0
	Middle (9)	2.8	
	High (4)	3.1	
% achieving age related expectations in maths	Low (1)	0%	74%
	Middle (9)	22%	
	High (4)	100%	

Expected progress in the academic year - 3 steps

## 2. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)

Data sources that can help you identify barriers to attainment include: RAISEonline; the EEF Families of Schools database; FFT Aspire; staff and pupil consultation; attendance records; recent school Ofsted reports; and Ofsted guidance.

**In-school barriers** (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills) Identify barriers that need to be addressed in-school, as well as external issues such as poor home learning environments and low attendance)

<b>A.</b>	Due to the low number of pupil premium children and their specific needs, it is difficult to identify common barriers to learning and implement all-encompassing group initiatives.
<b>B.</b>	Overall, children eligible for PP who join St. Christopher's after KS1, make less progress than those who join before.
<b>C.</b>	Reading attainment of some pupil premium is impacting on their ability to access the curriculum.

**External barriers** (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)

<b>D.</b>	Improved attendance rate for Pupil Premium Children in Year 2016-2017, but still below overall school attendance.
-----------	---

## 3. Outcomes (It is not essential to identify four desired outcomes; focusing on fewer aims in more depth is encouraged.)

	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
<b>A.</b>	Children make higher rates of progress through suitably trained staff delivering a broader range of new interventions that address the specific needs of the children.	Suitable resources identified and purchased. Staff trained to deliver interventions. Rates of progress closely monitored as part of pupil progress meetings. Termly Pupil Premium Reviews. Those identified pupils eligible for PP make rapid progress by the end of the year so that the attainment gap between their starting points and age related expectations is closed.
<b>B.</b>	Children's needs are identified sooner due to a well-developed 'PP child induction' baselining process.	Documented process. Baseline for PP children new to the school. Needs documented in PP pupil profiles Speedy and intense support provided so that rapid early progress is made.
<b>C.</b>	Children make higher rates of progress through identified and suitably trained staff being released to deliver regular intervention work.	Documented timetable Release time for staff to prepare for interventions. Positive impact on the rates of progress in reading.
<b>D.</b>	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Overall PP attendance improves from 95% to 97.1% in line with non-PP pupils.

**3. Planned expenditure** *Best practice is to combine professional knowledge with robust evidence about approaches which are known to be effective. You can consult external evidence sources such as: the Teaching and Learning Toolkit, the NFER report on supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils, Ofsted's 2013 report on the pupil premium and Ofsted's 2014 report on pupil premium progress.*

**Academic year**

**2017/18**

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**

<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
C. Increase in Reading rates of progress.	Further development of reading workshop practice.	In addition to reading being an area of development for PP children, it is also a school priority. Staff judgement is that reading workshops could be more effective. We want the approach to meet the needs of all pupils including PP children.	Release Leader in Learning to observe practice of local outstanding schools with outstanding outcomes in reading.  Discussion of outcomes of visits at Leadership and Teachers' meetings.	Literacy Leader in Learning	April 2018
IMPACT					
C. Increase in Reading rates of progress.	Seek external support for developing children's inference skills.	High ability pupils including those eligible for PP are making less progress than expected. We want to ensure that PP pupils can achieve high attainment as well as simply 'meeting expected standards'. We want to train all teachers in practices that provide stretch and encouragement for these pupils.	Course selected using evidence of effectiveness. Use INSET/Twilight to deliver training.  Peer observation of attendees' classes after the course, to embed learning (no assessment).	Literacy Leader in Learning	Jan 2018
IMPACT					
B. Sooner identification of new pupils needs.	Development and implementation of new children induction process.	Through analysis of rates of progress, it is clear that some of the children who are either SEND and/or PP, who join St. Christopher's during KS2, make less progress than their associated cohort.	Induction process documented.  Staff released to undertake baselining activities.  Identified needs documented and interventions quickly put in place.	Headteacher	Jan 2018
IMPACT					
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£3,110

<b>ii. Targeted support</b>					
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action/approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
A. Broader Range of Interventions.  C. Increase in Reading rates of progress.	Review current range of intervention resources.	Current range of interventions have been used with pupil premium children. The interventions have been successful for some, but there are a small number of pupils who have not made sufficient progress having received current interventions.	Consult local schools and MAT for programmes that have been successful.  Staff delivering interventions appropriately trained.  Close and regular monitoring of interventions impact.	PP Lead	Jan 2018 July 2018
IMPACT					
C. Increase in Reading rates of progress.	Daily interventions.	Previous approach of weekly 1-2-1 teacher led interventions had limited impact on some children. Teachers feel that children need shorter daily input.	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.	PP Lead	April 2018 June 2018
IMPACT					
A. Specific needs of children.  B. PP Induction Process	Pupil Premium Pupil Profiles	Given the small number of pupil premium children and their specific needs, we need to keep precise records of what has been delivered and the impact they have had on each child.	Quality of pupil profiles reviewed at leadership meeting.  Close and regular monitoring of interventions impact.	PP Lead	March 2018 July 2018
IMPACT					
A. Specific needs of children.  B. PP Induction Process	Termly Pupil Premium Reviews	Parental engagement for a small number PP children is not as strong as it could be. Meetings will give school and parents the opportunity to discuss what the school is doing and how parents can support their children.	Termly meetings diarised.  PP Lead and Teachers released for meetings.	PP Lead	April 2018 July 2018
IMPACT					
B. PP Induction Process  Increase rates of progress.	1 to 1 Teacher Led interventions for those who have yet to receive.	For some children, it has had a positive effect so carry out for those not yet received due to age or those it has had a positive effect in the past.	Clearly identified success criteria and session plans monitored.	Headteacher	July 2018
IMPACT					
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£14,000

<b>iii. Other approaches</b>					
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action/approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
Children are ready to start their learning.	PP children offered Breakfast Club.	Some children, including PP children, have shown that they are in a better position to learn when they have had an opportunity to “settle” down before entering classes in the morning.	PP children who staff feel need time to settle to offer parents free place at breakfast club.  Breakfast club leader aware of who the PP children are and ensure they are supported during sessions.	Breakfast Club Leader	Every Long Term.
IMPACT					
PP Children able to take part in wide range of extra curricula activities.	Extra Curriculum Clubs and Trips paid for by school.	PP children need to have opportunities to take part in a range of activities they might miss out due to inability to pay.	All trip letters to include wording about not being excluded due to inability to pay.  Admin to speak to PP parents when permission slips not received to check that it is not due to financial reasons.	Admin	Every Long Term.
IMPACT					
Children’s social and emotional needs are met.	Nurture Support	Some of the PP children have been identified with specific social emotional needs including low self-esteem.	Dedicated nurture member of staff.  Baseline assessment of S&E position and needs.  Monitoring of progress made against baseline.	Nurture Leader	July 2017
IMPACT					
PP Children enjoy and make the most out of their lunchtimes.	Additional Lunchtime Support focusing on PP Pupils.	Like breakfast club, in that teachers have identified that the impact of a “poor” lunchtime for some PP children has a negative impact on their learning in the afternoon.	Discussion with children about their lunchtimes.  Monitoring of behaviour logs – lunchtime and afternoon lessons.	Additional Lunchtime Supervisor	April 2017
IMPACT					
Increase in children’s self-esteem.	Staff “touching base” with PP children on a regular basis.	Rationale is that we want to	Staff to keep record of discussions with children.	PP Lead	April 2017
IMPACT					
D. Increased rates of attendance.	More proactive approach when monitoring of attendance shows PP group attendance lower than school.	No specific monitoring of PP group in the past led to school being unaware that attendance was not as high as non-PP children	Admin and head will collaborate to ensure school processes work smoothly together.	Headteacher	Every Long Term.

IMPACT	
	<b>Total budgeted cost</b> £3,350

4. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year 2016-2017				
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. <i>Show whether the success criteria were met. Additional evidence of impact can also be referred to, including attainment data, progress data, and case studies.</i>	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) <i>Lessons learned may be about impact or implementation .For approaches which did not meet their success criteria, it is important to assess whether you will continue allocating funding and if so, why.</i>	Cost
C. Increase in Reading rates of progress.	Development of reading workshop practice.	<p><b>Medium - High Impact:</b></p> <p>The Literacy Leader in Learning facilitated two members of teaching staff observing reading workshop practice at an outstanding school. The school had adopted a 'Class Reading Book' approach rather than different books for different groups. Staff fed back at teachers' meeting and KS2 agreed to trial the approach in Spring Term. The approach included introducing a 'Writing about reading' book for gathering evidence to support teacher assessment. Feedback has been positive by staff and is to be adopted for the rest of the year. Teachers feel that it is providing more opportunities to gather evidence and assess children's attainment. The approach has also allowed disadvantaged children to access and contribute with the same reading material. (Apr 17)</p> <p>Guided reading structure for KS2 for 17-18 agreed. Books purchased in preparation for 17-18. 'Writing about reading' now changed to 'Responding to reading. All children will have specific book for the whole of 17-18 (Jul 17)</p>	<p>Positive whole school initiative which had a positive impact throughout the school. Will take time for changes in practice to imbed and children to build on previous learning.</p> <p>Continue next year.</p>	Staff Cover £750
C. Increase in Reading rates of progress.	Seek external support for developing children's inference skills.	<p><b>Medium - Low Impact:</b></p> <p>External advisor provided advice to Literacy Leader in Learning. Outcome included agreeing with teachers the non-negotiables surrounding reading workshop and gathering evidence. Further work being carried out to develop an understanding of progression in inference skills. Staff to use age appropriate picture books to support and develop children's precise observations skills and then transfer those skills to written word. Specific twilight session on inference organised for 16th May. (Apr 17)</p> <p>Whole school outcomes : 16-17 93% Expected or better than expected progress (15-16 95%) Disadvanatged pupils : 16-17 86% Expected or better than expected progress (15-16 81%) KS2 Reading progress: 16-17 -1.4 (15-16 -4.7) (Jul 17)</p>	<p>Although academic impact was lower than hoped in the first year, it did have an impact and feeling is that it needs to continue so as children's learning is built upon. No need for consultancy but will continue to use external CPD to continue drive for academic improvements</p> <p>Continue next year.</p>	INSET/Twilight £1000 Release Peer Observations £500

B. Sooner identification of new pupils needs.	Development and implementation of new children induction process.	No Impact Yet: Not yet completed. (Apr 17) Not completed (Jul 17)	Data shows that this is urgently needed to be completed.  Complete next year.	
<b>ii. Targeted support</b>				
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action/approach</b>	<b>Estimated impact:</b> Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	<b>Lessons learned</b> (and whether you will continue with this approach)	<b>Cost</b>
A. Broader Range of Interventions.  C. Increase in Reading rates of progress.	Purchase of new intervention resources.	<b>Medium-High Impact:</b> Partnership and Academy consulted over successful intervention material, although limited response. Additional reading 'boxes', meeting the needs of a broader range of attainment, purchased. Feedback from TAs delivering is very positive. TAs have been using their professional judgement to extend the questioning to meet the needs of the children. New maths intervention resources, similar in structure to the Reading Boxes purchased. Again, positive feedback from TAs delivering. Teachers providing information on areas being taught in class and reinforcement/pre-learning being delivered. (Apr 17) Positive verbal feedback from both staff and children. Improvement in rates of progress of disadvantaged pupils compared with 15-16 (Jul 17)	Resources purchased supported intervention work. Now resources purchased there may not be a need for significant purchases, but reserve budget just in case specific resources are needed.	Nessy £100 Reading Box £400 Maths Box £1000 Maths Training £1000  £3000
C. Increase in Reading rates of progress.	Daily interventions.	<b>Medium-High Impact:</b> Daily interventions being delivered – two afternoons of reading intervention and two afternoons of maths interventions. Currently the four children with the highest needs are being provided with wave three interventions. Following appraisal of impact this will be reviewed. (Apr 17) Interventions delivered on a weekly basis. Improvement in rates of progress of disadvantaged pupils compared with 15-16 (Jul 17)	Positive outcomes, just need to start interventions earlier next year.  Continue next year.	Staff £7082
A. Specific needs of children.  B. PP Induction Process	Pupil Premium Pupil Profiles	<b>No Impact Yet:</b> Pupil Premium profiles created and being updated over Eater Holiday. For those disadvantaged children who are also on the SEN register the SEN pupil profiles will be used. (Apr 17) Record of support documented. Further development of initiative needed next year. (Jul 17)	Continue process next year.	Staff £500
A. Specific needs of children.  B. PP Induction Process	Termly Pupil Premium Reviews	<b>No Impact Yet:</b> Not yet implemented – planned for summer term. (Apr 17) Did not happen. Need to diarise from the start of the year alternating with SEN reviews; just too many children to fit in alongside SEN reviews. (Jul 17)	Need to formalise dates early next year to ensure that they happen.  Implement next year	
B. PP Induction Process  Increase rates of progress.	1 to 1 Teacher Led interventions for those who have yet to receive.	<b>Medium-High Impact:</b> Implemented in a 1-to-3 small group afterschool intervention led by a teacher. Teacher feels that it is having a positive, but slow impact. (Apr 17) Very positive impact on progress in Summer I and Summer II (Jul 17)	Worked well as a 1 to 3 session. Need to identify PP children who will benefit from this approach.  Continue next year.	Staff £500

<b>iii. Other approaches</b>				
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action/approach</b>	<b>Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.</b>	<b>Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Children are ready to start their learning.	PP children offered Breakfast Club.	<b>High Impact for those who take up offer:</b> Two families (4 children) have taken up this offer. Positive effect on all four children with improved attitudes to learning observed by staff, (Apr 17) Extended to another new family (Apr 17)	Continue next year.	£1000
PP Children able to take part in wide range of extra curricula activities.	Extra Curriculum Clubs and Trips paid for by school.	<b>High Impact for those who take up offer:</b> Limited take up of offer with many parents of disadvantaged children choosing to pay for clubs (Apr 17) Slight improvement on take up. New family using ASP.	Continue next year.	£1000
Children's social and emotional needs are met.	Nurture Support	<b>High Impact:</b> Impact from previous years measured and very positive. Believe that this will be the case this year although formal "assessment" will not be carried out until after Easter. (Apr 17) Very positive outcomes at Easter, expecting similar outcomes at the end of academic year – still waiting on data. (Jul 17)	Continue next year.	£1200
PP Children enjoy and make the most out of their lunchtimes.	Additional Lunchtime Support focusing on PP Pupils.	<b>Medium-High Impact :</b> Positive feedback in terms of identified children having good lunchtimes. Lower number of behavioural issue involving disadvantaged children than non-disadvantaged. Record of interactions being kept and analysed. (Apr 17) Continued positive feedback for having additional member of staff supporting, although initiative to provide a specific lunchtime club was not seen positive from some pupils – they just wanted to get on with their own play! (Jul 17)	Implement right from the start of the year.  Continue next year.	£600
Increase in children's self-esteem.	Staff "touching base" with PP children on a regular basis.	<b>Medium-High Impact:</b> Very positive impact for one specific child who has started to admit to 'mentor' when they have made the wrong behavioural choices. Previously would deny. Positive impact on another child whose attitude to learning has changed dramatically. Limited impact on some other disadvantaged children who are 'difficult' to 'catch' as they are fully involved with their peers during playtimes. (Apr 17) Feedback sheets completed by staff. All have seen "their child" develop in a positive manner, but difficult to assess if this initiative has been contributed to that development. It has however ensured that we could react quickly if there were issues. (Jul 17)	No cost and part of our school ethos.  Continue next year.	
D. Increased rates of attendance.	More proactive approach when monitoring of	<b>Medium Impact:</b> Weekly tracking of disadvantaged group is providing visibility of those with lower attendance than 95%. Rates of attendance for	Little cost. Constant monitoring will provide early visibility of any issues.	

	attendance shows PP group attendance lower than school.	disadvantaged group, currently 95%, is slightly down on whole school 97%. Difference mainly down to 1 family's (2 children) unauthorised week holiday in October. (Apr 17) Still slight difference in rates of attendance 97% school 95% disadvantaged pupils. (Jul 17)	Continue next year.	
--	---	--	---------------------	--

## 5. Additional detail

### FSM Analysis (2017-2018 Outcomes)

	Reading			Writing			Maths		
	Difference in attainment compared with non PP children	Child Progress This Year	Difference in this year's progress compared with non PP children	Difference in attainment compared with non PP children	Child Progress This Year	Difference in this year's progress compared with non PP children	Difference in attainment compared with non PP children	Child Progress This Year	Difference in this year's progress compared with non PP children
Child A	-5.0	2	-1.1	-5.8	0.5	-2.7	-5.8	1	-2.1
Child B	-6.5	0.5	-2.6	-1.3	3.5	0.3	-0.8	3.5	0.4
Child C	0.5	3	-0.1	0.7	3	-0.2	0.8	3	-0.1
Child D	0.2	3	0.1	-1.1	2.5	-0.4	0.5	3.5	0.0
Child E	0.7	3	0.0	0.2	3	-0.2	0.7	3	0.0
Child F	-0.8	2.5	-0.5	-3.3	3	-0.2	-3.3	2.5	-0.5
Child G	-0.8	3	0.0	-0.8	3	-0.2	-0.8	3	0.0
Child H	0.7	3	0.0	0.2	3	-0.2	0.2	3	0.0
Child I	0.3	3	-0.1	0.0	3	0.1	-0.2	3	0.1
Child J	0.3	3	-0.1	0.5	3	0.1	0.8	3	0.1
Child K	-0.3	3	-0.1	0.5	3	0.1	-0.2	3	0.1
Child L	0.3	3	-0.1	0.3	3	0.1	0.1	3	0.1
	-0.9	2.7	-0.4	-0.8	2.8	-0.3	-0.7	2.9	-0.2

Expected progress 3.0 steps per year.

Colour coding: (Progress – Green - 3.0 or better; Difference in Progress – Green better than non PP; Attainment – Green better than non PP)

(Progress – Amber- 2.5, Difference in Progress – Amber - Equal or less than 0.5steps difference, Attainment – Amber - Equal or less than 0.5steps difference)

### LAC & Adopted from Care Analysis (2017-2018 Outcomes)

Reading	Writing	Maths
---------	---------	-------

	Difference in attainment compared with non PP children	Child Progress This Year	Difference in this year's progress compared with non PP children	Difference in attainment compared with non PP children	Child Progress This Year	Difference in this year's progress compared with non PP children	Difference in attainment compared with non PP children	Child Progress This Year	Difference in this year's progress compared with non PP children
Child N	-1.3	2.5	-0.4	-4.6	2	-0.9	-3.0	1.5	-2.0
Child M	-0.3	3	-0.1	-0.5	2.5	-0.4	-0.2	2.5	-0.4
	-0.5	2.8	-0.3	-0.8	2.3	-0.7	-1.6	2.0	-1.2

Expected progress 3.0 steps per year.

Colour coding: (Progress – Green - 3.0 or better; Difference in Progress – Green better than non PP; Attainment – Green better than non PP)

(Progress – Amber- 2.5, Difference in Progress – Amber - Equal or less than 0.5steps difference, Attainment – Amber - Equal or less than 0.5steps difference)