

Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

| 1. Summary information | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------|
| School | West Cliff Primary School | | | | |
| Academic Year | 2016/17 | Total PP budget | 56880 | Date of most recent PP Review | |
| Total number of pupils | 167 | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 34 | Date for next internal review of this strategy | Sep 16 |
| 2. Current attainment | | | | | |
| This section has no equivalence with new scaled scores | | | Pupils eligible for PP (your school) | Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) | |
| % achieving Level 4b or above in reading, writing & maths (or equivalent) | | | | | |
| % making at least 2 levels of progress in reading (or equivalent) | | | | | |
| % making at least 2 levels of progress in writing (or equivalent) | | | | | |
| % making at least 2 levels of progress in maths (or equivalent) | | | | | |
| 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. | Poor language skills on entry | | | | |
| B. | Some parents with low expectations/parenting issues | | | | |
| C. | | | | | |
| External barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates) | | | | | |
| D. | Attendance – coastal location - holidays | | | | |

| 4. Desired outcomes (<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>) | | Success |
|---|---|--|
| A. | Children on entry have improved communication skills | Baseline in 2017 in FS shows higher percentage at ARE. In year tracking of progress data in nursery shows accelerated progress |
| B. | Children in reception 'catch up' and meeting ELG for communication at end of FS | At least 70% of children from West Cliff nursery enter FS at ARE for CLL |
| C. | Attendance of all pp children to be above 96% (not including holidays) | |
| D. | All pupil premium children in Y6 reached ARE | |

| 5. Planned expenditure | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---|------------|----------------------|
| Academic year | | 2016/17 | | | |
| 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 |
| Children can use technology to support and accelerate Learning | 1:1 I pads for all children | This was trialled with small groups and showed accelerated progress and increased pupil engagement | Regular monitoring by GB and SLT | CZT | Half termly |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| All pp children to be at ARE in Maths | Mc Maths approach to be used in Maths lessons | Mc Maths is based upon personalised learning – assertive mentoring This has shown accelerated progress in first year of implementation | Half termly monitoring of lessons (Twinkle time) , planning and books | VL, SG | Half termly |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £10000 |
| 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 |
| Children school ready on entry | Opening of own nursery class | On entry data from previous private provider showed low levels of Literacy and Numeracy on entry. Our FS provision is strong so we are extending this. | Half termly monitoring – using on track and tapestry | CZT/AB | Half termly report to GB |
| Targeted children in Reception reach ARE in CLL | Elklan training/ intervention | This is a proven intervention to improve communication skills. Teacher is receiving weekly training on approach and implementing with a target group | Half termly monitoring – using on track and tapestry | HT (senco) | Half termly |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-------------------|---|
| PP children to reach ARE in reading and writing | Individual children receive read, write inc intervention | Proven intervention used by school for many years. Staff are highly trained and results are impressive. | SENCO monitors all interventions half termly and measures impact | HT (senco) | Half termly – data collected |
| Individual pupils are able to access learning | EP support purchased for support of individual pupils | Educational psychology service can provide very specific support for children with considerable barriers to learning | Review meetings with Senco | HT senco | Annually |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £27000 |
| 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? |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--------|---------------|
| Parents are better skilled to support/parent children at home Attendance above 96% for PP children | Teacher employed to work alongside parents on learning and parenting skills and attendance | We have an increasing number of parents that require parenting support, or support through difficult events and access to parent support workers and social care is limited. We therefore provide this ourselves. | Supervision by children's centre, monitoring by Head and SENCO and governor for SEND/safeguarding Detailed records kept | CZT/HT | Termly |
| PP children have opportunity to take part in wider activities | School pays for residential trips and music lessons | These children would otherwise miss out. | Finance committee of GB | CZT/GB | Annually |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £22000 |

| 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 |
| All pp children to be at ARE in | Mc Maths approach to be | Progress in Maths across school was outstanding or good in 2015/16 | | £5000 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-------------|
| Maths | Used in all Maths lessons | New curriculum/ standards were challenging but majority of pupils made accelerated progress and reached ARE in July 2016 | Add a new element – Twinkle time to improve fluency, particularly of table facts | |
| 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 |
| Children to make accelerated progress in reading and writing | Individual children received read, write inc intervention | All children receiving intervention made accelerated progress. As age related expectations were elevated this year they were unable to meet this standard | Continue approach – but with additional classroom based support | £20000 |
| Individual children to access learning | EP support for targeted children | children had significant improvement in behaviour resulting in ability to access learning | Although this is expensive it is worth the cost! | £3000 |
| Children to reach ARE in all areas in Y6 | Extra teacher each morning | Children either reached ARE or were very close (97+) in year progress was outstanding | This is not necessary this year ☺ | £18000 |
| 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 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--------|
| Attendance improved for PP children/ parenting skills improved | Employment of teacher to dedicate 2 days to parents/attendance and behaviour | Several social care referrals avoided Attendance of PP children was same or better than non pp children Positive feedback by parents | Continue role – firmer insistence from some families regarding attendance | £16000 |
|--|--|--|---|--------|