

## Annex 2c: Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

1. Summary information					
School	Bede Burn Primary School				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£64,560	Date of most recent PP Review	
Total number of pupils	211	Number of pupils eligible for PP	49	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Oct 2017
2. Current attainment					
Cohort of 25 pupils, 12 of whom were eligible for PP.			<i>Pupils eligible for PP</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP</i>	
Number of children attaining the expected standard in Reading – cohort 68%			50%	84.6%	
Reading Progress Measure – cohort -0.6			-2.2	+0.8	
Number of children attaining the expected standard in Writing – cohort 76%			75%	76.9%	
Writing Progress Measure – cohort -0.7			0.05	-1.36	
Number of children attaining the expected standard in Maths – 52%			33.3%	69.2%	
Maths Progress Measure – cohort -2.5			-4.5	-0.7	
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.	The TA timetable meant that interventions were taking place during lessons, so children were missing content. Also, interventions varied in quality and were not timely or personal enough due to TAs' timetabling.				
B.	The children found it difficult to complete the reading test in time, due to the challenging texts and unfamiliar vocabulary. The vocabulary issues have been attributed to a lack of exposure through high-quality, varied texts at home and in school.				
C.	The children struggled with reasoning in mathematics, partly due to a lack of vocabulary and partly due to a larger emphasis being placed on teaching formal and mental methods. Teachers found it difficult to source appropriate reasoning and problem-solving activities.				

<b>External barriers</b> ( <i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i> )		
<b>D.</b>	More parental engagement is needed to support learning out of school, with timely feedback on work done at home.	
<b>E.</b>	There is a gap in attendance between our disadvantaged children and the rest of the cohort.	
<b>4. Desired outcomes</b> ( <i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i> )		
		<b>Success criteria</b>
<b>A.</b>	To ensure that interventions are timely, personal and high quality, so that children make rapid progress, improving their results. There will be a particular focus on maths intervention.	Pupils make good progress and results improve, evidenced in teacher assessment and tests.
<b>B.</b>	To improve children's speed and fluency when reading, and their recognition of higher level vocabulary. To improve children's ability to answer reading comprehension questions at speed.	Children able to read longer texts at speed and answer questions accurately, evidenced in reading journals and new guided reading assessment sheets.
<b>C.</b>	To improve children's reasoning and problem-solving skills, as well as improving fluency.	Children are fluent in basic maths skills and are able to solve problems and explain their answers, evidenced in books, Seesaw and tests.
<b>D.</b>	To increase parental engagement and pupil attendance through a number of initiatives, so that pupils are fully involved in school life and parents can support this effectively, improving results.	The attendance gap between disadvantaged children and the rest of the cohort narrows. Through attendance at school events/meetings and through our online platform, parents express that they are more able to engage with school work. Results gaps narrow.

<b>5. Planned expenditure</b>					
<b>Academic year</b>		<b>2016/17</b>			
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					
<b>i. Quality of teaching for all</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>

<p>To improve children's speed and fluency when reading, and their recognition of higher level vocabulary. To improve children's ability to answer reading comprehension questions at speed.</p>	<p>A change to whole-class guided reading by class teachers, with additional small-group and 1:1 reading for children not yet fluent in reading, from teachers and TAs. Introduction of a whole-school 'read with Erric' approach. Literacy leader to attend 'power of reading' course and feed back to other staff. Literacy leader to be released to model teaching. Ensure all classes are reading high-quality class readers and basing work on them.</p>	<p>Guided reading was not fully preparing children for the tests they face in year 6, nor focussing closely enough on each of the skills needed. It was taking up a lot of time which is now used for spelling work. Whole-class guided reading will take place every week and assessment sheets will record progress, as in maths and writing.</p>	<p>Seesaw Reading tests Teacher assessment Reading assessment sheets and journals Book scrutiny, teaching observation and data. Pupil progress and Numbers into Action.</p>	<p>N Faulkner M Todd</p>	<p>Half-termly and per the monitoring schedule.</p>
<p>To improve children's reasoning and problem-solving skills, as well as improving fluency.</p>	<p>Whole-staff training from Gareth Metcalfe, then visual maths used in staff planning and teaching. New interactive resources My Maths and Mathletics purchased. Numicon purchased for more visual maths. Textbooks and practical resources to match the new curriculum purchased. White Rose planning and tests adopted whole-school. Maths the focus of breakfast club intervention. Regular opportunities planned to discuss maths and reason.  <i>More opportunities for pupils to apply their skills to test questions – purchase various practice books eg Schofield and Sims, CGP tests.</i></p>	<p>The new curriculum and subsequent new testing has highlighted the need for new resources, training and methodology in our teaching of mathematics.  <i>Reflection on last year's cohort suggested that although pupils could answer maths questions in class, this did not always translate to test situations. This is also true of the current Y6 cohort, so this is a priority.</i></p>	<p>Seesaw Mathematics tests Teacher assessment Book scrutiny, teaching observation and data. Pupil progress and Numbers into Action. <i>Timetabled use of this resource.</i></p>	<p>N Faulkner A Lenney</p>	<p>Half-termly and per the monitoring schedule.</p>

<p>To support children through more adult support, by ensuring that each class has at least one TA present all morning, every morning. Interventions to run in the afternoon.</p>	<p>Rearranging TA timetables to ensure consistency in support.</p>	<p>Allowing the teachers to plan for an additional adult present every day, who knows the needs of the children, should result in more focussed support.</p>	<p>TA training Planning Regular scrutiny of books, lessons and data. Pupil observations. Pupil progress meetings and Numbers into Action.</p>	<p>N Faulkner</p>	<p>Half-termly and per the monitoring schedule.</p>
<p><i>To narrow the gap between disadvantaged pupils and the rest of the cohort, more in line with LA levels.</i></p>	<p><i>EYFS lead and HT to attend training on PP provision in EYFS.</i></p> <p><i>Funding for an additional TA in EYFS, for increased adult modelling.</i></p> <p><i>Funding for new resources and outdoor area resurfacing, so that children have a wide range of experiences.</i></p> <p><i>Quality first teaching – our EYFS lead to visit other successful settings and share good practice.</i></p> <p><i>Complete forest school training and embed in our curriculum.</i></p> <p><i>Use Seesaw to engage parents and link home and school learning.</i></p> <p><i>Increase opportunities for more able pupils to excel, including more opportunities to write narratives freely.</i></p>	<p><i>Data shows that adult modelling is one of the most effective ways of diminishing the difference between the achievements of PP pupils and the rest of the cohort.</i></p> <p><i>As above – more equipment and outdoor learning will lead to more opportunities to learn from modelling and exploratory play that pupils would otherwise not experience.</i></p> <p><i>The NFER report reiterates that this can lead to an improvement of 18.7%</i></p> <p><i>Offer more life experiences and inspire pupils to achieve.</i></p> <p><i>Parental engagement is crucial if schools are to be partners in children's learning.</i></p> <p><i>Recent monitoring suggested that this is an area to focus on. Our % of pupils exceeding in 2016 was low.</i></p>	<p><i>PP training.</i></p> <p><i>Training by, and shadowing of, experienced staff members.</i></p> <p><i>Careful research in purchasing; visiting a range of settings. Planning and purchasing together.</i></p> <p><i>Work closely with mentor HT.</i></p> <p><i>Monitor regularly.</i></p> <p><i>Incorporate this in regular monitoring. Offer parental workshops and support to access Seesaw until it becomes routine.</i></p> <p><i>Regular monitoring and sharing good practice from another school.</i></p>	<p><i>N Faulkner</i></p> <p><i>J Evans</i></p> <p><i>N Faulkner</i> <i>J Evans</i></p> <p><i>N Faulkner</i></p>	<p><i>After training event.</i></p> <p><i>Termly (PP meetings).</i></p> <p><i>Regular monitoring to review effectiveness of provisions (termly formally)</i></p> <p><i>Termly</i></p> <p><i>Once training is completed (Summer)</i></p> <p><i>Weekly</i></p> <p><i>Half-termly</i></p>

<i>To narrow the gaps in the performance of PP children in reading, writing and maths across the school</i>	<i>Data tracking meetings analyse the performance of all groups of children termly progress monitored and intervention planned together with class teachers</i>  <i>Performance management targets relate to expected or better progress for all disadvantaged pupils</i>	<i>NFER report supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils showed an 18.8% increase in outcomes using paired or small group teaching</i>  <i>NFER indicated that personalised learning plans enhanced outcomes by 2.0%</i>  <i>NFER report highlights data driven schools which focus on early intervention rather than end of key stage raised attainment more effectively</i>	<i>Interventions tracked on insight. Data analysed by teachers, SLT and HT, and discussed in PP meetings. Performance management targets agreed, reviewed mid-year and again at the end of the year.</i>	<i>N Faulkner A Lenney M Todd</i>	<i>Termly pupil progress</i>  <i>Bi-annual performance management meetings</i>
<i>To ensure quality first teaching for all by increasing the quality and focus of CPD</i>	<i>Staff training:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoning in maths</li> <li>• Maths on the new curriculum</li> <li>• Peer observation</li> <li>• Good practice modelling</li> <li>• New tracking system</li> <li>• Moderation</li> <li>• Intervention training</li> <li>• Writing</li> <li>• Middle leadership</li> </ul>	<i>The NFER report reiterates that this can lead to an improvement of 18.7%</i>	<i>post training expectations( i.e. work reflected in books, changes to practise in lesson observations etc )</i>  <i>Changes to practise and impact on teaching and learning</i>	<i>N Faulkner A Lenney M Todd</i>	<i>Implementation reviewed as part of the monitoring cycle.</i>  <i>Performance management reviews</i>  <i>Work scrutinies</i>
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					
<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>

To support children who are not meeting age related expectations through afternoon maths, reading and writing interventions such as breaking barriers, spellodrome, my maths, mathletics, (with linked homework where appropriate) additional guided reading, and so on.	Spellodrome My maths Mathletics Breaking Barriers Targeted CPD for staff More stable TA timetabling to allow for stable intervention. <i>1 plus 1</i> <i>Power of 2</i>	NFER indicates that paired or small group additional teaching had an impact of 18.8%.	TA training Regular scrutiny of books, lessons and data. Pupil observations. Intervention assessment. Pupil progress meetings and Numbers into Action. Engagement in interventions and homework.	N Faulkner M Todd A Lenney	Half-termly and per the monitoring schedule.																
Increased, targeted support for a group in Y4 working significantly below age-expectations.  Small-group support for a pupil in Y2 with an EHC.	Interventions as above Extra TA in each class.	Both groups have complex needs and by providing an additional TA, more time can be devoted to these children and to the rest of the class.	As above	N Faulkner A Lenney L Reece	Half-termly and per the monitoring schedule.																
Targeted booster sessions ensure that y6 pupils have every opportunity to work towards national standards in a small group.	Staff funded to teach booster sessions. Interventions mentioned above.	NFER indicates that paired or small group additional teaching had an impact of 18.8%.	Attendance at booster sessions. Regular scrutiny of data. Pupil voice. Pupil progress meetings.	N Faulkner M Todd A Lenney	Half-termly and per the monitoring schedule.																
<i>To support pupils to pass the phonics screen, and to support those pupils in Y2 who need to resit the phonics screen.</i>	<i>Intervention sessions throughout the year with TA.</i>  <i>Quality first teaching in Y1 and Y2, with a consistent approach to phonics throughout EYFS and KS1.</i>	<i>NFER report supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils showed an 18.8% increase in outcomes using paired or small group teaching</i>  <i>The NFER report reiterates that this can lead to an improvement of 18.7%</i> <i>This also proved a very successful strategy in school last year.</i>	<i>PP meetings termly. Data is analysed to support pupils' needs; pupils receiving intervention are highlighted on school tracking system so progress can be assessed.</i>  <i>English lead to liaise with KS1 and EYFS staff to ensure consistency in approach.</i>	<i>N Faulkner</i>  <i>Marie Todd</i>	<i>Termly</i>  <i>End of the year</i>																
<i>To extend the more able to achieve more than expected levels in Reading, Maths and Writing.</i>	<i>Targeted differentiation, high quality marking and feedback and booster extension groups for more able groups in y2 and y6.</i>  <i>Ensure boys have quality texts (through power of reading) which inspire them to write.</i>	<i>In KS1 last year, all of the disadvantaged pupils met expected in R,W,M, however 0% met higher standard (only 2 pupils in this group).</i> <i>In KS2 last year, none of the pupils achieved greater depth in reading or maths. Only 4% of the cohort achieved higher standard in maths.</i>	<i>Regular monitoring through planning and work scrutiny, lesson observation and intervention impact</i> <table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">Target-greater depth KS1</td></tr><tr><td>Reading</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>Writing</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td>Maths</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Target-greater depth KS2</td></tr><tr><td>Reading</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>Writing</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>Maths</td><td>23%</td></tr></table>	Target-greater depth KS1		Reading	19%	Writing	22%	Maths	22%	Target-greater depth KS2		Reading	20%	Writing	20%	Maths	23%	<i>N Faulkner</i> <i>M Todd</i> <i>A Lenney</i>	<i>Termly data analysis, made more robust with 1:1 PP meetings, detailed data analysis by three parties, more SENDCO involvement, tracking of interventions.</i> <i>Half-termly review of intervention and practice.</i>
Target-greater depth KS1																					
Reading	19%																				
Writing	22%																				
Maths	22%																				
Target-greater depth KS2																					
Reading	20%																				
Writing	20%																				
Maths	23%																				

					Total budgeted cost
<b>iii. Other approaches</b>					
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?
To ensure engagement in a broad, rounded curriculum for all.	Supported school trips and visitors. Subsidised residential trip, and additional residential being planned.. Supported school clubs, including pyramid club to raise self-esteem. Inspirational visit from Colin Nell. Pantomime so all children can enjoy this experience. Music tuition for one term in year 3,4,5 and 6 supported.	Increasing pupils' engagement and enjoyment of school will lead to an increased likelihood of engagement at home and better results in school.	Attendance at school clubs/residentials. Pupil voice. Levels of engagement and interest in school.	N Faulkner. J Summers to lead club organisation.	Termly.
To ensure full engagement with school, including involvement from home.	Supervision of the library after school to encourage parents and children to choose books together. Staffing a breakfast club, free to disadvantaged pupils, with targeted intervention, Online learning platform 'Seesaw' to forge links with home, including tutorials of maths methods. Use of mathletics, spellodrome and my maths to set homework linking to school work.	Parental engagement has been shown to affect pupils' success at school and ensures a positive attitude towards school and learning, to create lifelong learners. Our attendance gap and results gap between disadvantaged pupils and the rest of the cohort suggests that this is an area for improvement.	Levels of involvement with Seesaw. Pupil voice. Use of the library facilities. Attendance at breakfast club.	N Faulkner. M Todd to lead on the library provision.	Termly.
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£64,560

## 6. Review of expenditure

<b>Previous Academic Year</b>				
<b>i. Quality of teaching for all</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>
Year six pupils worked at a lower ratio child:adult support.	Salary of a part-time teacher funded to work with year 6.	The progress in mathematics of the group working with the FSM-funded teacher was above that achieved by the cohort, at -1.52 compared to -2.5. Achievement in maths was also higher than the national average and LEA average. Disadvantaged pupils did not meet the achievements of the rest of the cohort in reading or writing.	Focussed intervention helped to speed up progress in maths, however it was felt that missing lessons to do these interventions, as in other classes, was detrimental. This year we will not maintain this approach.	Salary of part time teacher.
<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>
Year 3 pupils and Year 1 pupil with specific learning needs are well-supported in class.	Additional TAs in year 3 and year 1 to work with children with additional needs.	The addition of these 'extra' TAs in class all of the time showed that pupils could make good progress and others in the class could receive more adult support.	The impact of having the same TA working with the same children was clear, and will be adopted across school.	Salary of two TAs.
<b>iii. Other approaches</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>


**7. Additional detail**

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

In 2016 at the end of Key Stage 2, the disadvantaged pupils (48% of the class) 50% (6 out of 12 pupils) achieved the expected standard in reading compared to the national average of 66% and PP LEA average of 56.6% (One pupil achieved a standardized score of 99, one pupil had social worker involvement and upheaval at home, one pupil in hindsight should have been on the SEN register).

In 2016 at the end of Key Stage 2, the disadvantaged pupils (48% of the class) 33.3% (4 out of 12 pupils) achieved the expected standard in writing compared to the national average of 74% and FSM LEA average of 68.9%. 25% achieved greater depth compared with a LEA average of 16.9%

In 2016 at the end of Key Stage 2, the FSM pupils (48% of the class) of the class 75% (9 out of 12 pupils) achieved the expected standard in mathematics compared to the national average of 70% and PP LEA average of 74.7%.

The progress in mathematics of the group working with the FSM-funded teacher was above that achieved by the cohort, at -1.52 compared to -2.5.

Although we are proud of the achievements of our pupils, we have reassessed the use of funding and have decided to make some changes this year, as detailed above, in order to maximise impact. These interventions and other initiatives will be closely monitored for their impact on results 2016-2017, with monitoring every half term, rather than termly.

