Pupil Premium Statement

bentley new village primary school

headteacher: kirsten mckechnie

2017-2018

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **School** | Bentley New Village Primary School | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2017-18 | **Total PP budget** | £194,00.00 | **Date of most recent PP Review** | Oct 2017 |
| **Total number of pupils** | 296 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 156 (53%) | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | Jan 2018 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **KS2 Attainment 2016-17** | | | | |
|  | *2016-17 KS2 Outcomes Pupil Premium* | *2016-17 KS2 Outcomes*  *Non Pupil Premium* | *2016-17*  *Difference* | *2016-17 KS2 Outcomes National* |
| **% achieving in reading, writing and maths** | 33% | 64% | 31% | % |
| **% making progress in reading** | 38% | 64% | 26% | % |
| **% making progress in writing** | 48% | 71% | 23% | % |
| **% making progress in maths** | 67% | 71% | 4% | % |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)** | | |
| **Identified Issues** | | |
|  | | Higher ability pupils, who are eligible for PP, are making less progress towards greater depth learning than other high ability pupils, most notably in Years 5 & 6 where PP numbers are highest.  This prevents sustained high achievement in KS2 outcomes |
|  | | Pupils in KS1, who are eligible for PP, do not achieve as well as other pupils in attaining a pass in the Year 1 Phonics screening or during Year 2 re-sits. This has impact upon the success of PP eligible pupils in attaining Exp Or GD in KS1 reading outcomes |
| **C.** | | Pupils in Years 3 & 4, who are eligible for PP, do not achieve as well as other pupils in reading and writing –including those that did not pass the KS1 phonics screening. This has impact upon the success of PP eligible pupils in attaining Exp Or GD in KS2 English outcomes |
| **D.** | | Behaviour issues for a small group of Year 2, 3 & 4 pupils (mostly eligible for PP) is having a detrimental effect on their ability to access the classroom, remain on task and thus make academic progress, compared that of their peers. |
| **Identified External Issues** | | |
| **E.** | | The Deprivation Report 2016-17 recognises the New Village catchment intake as being the most deprived area in Doncaster.  Attendance is lower for pupils eligible for PP meaning their access to learning is reduced.  The levels of heart disease, cancer and other serious illnesses is higher in Bentley than in the majority of other Doncaster districts. Healthy life styles are not adopted; PP pupils represent the most vulnerable group.  PP pupils are also most likely to arrive at school without breakfast or having eaten a balanced and healthy diet |
| 1. **Desired outcomes** | | |
|  | *Desired outcomes* | |
|  | Higher ability pupils (2a and 3 at KS1), who are eligible for PP, make expected or better progress towards greater depth learning in Years 5 & 6 (where PP numbers are highest in school). | |
|  | Pupils in KS1, who are eligible for PP, achieve as well as other pupils in attaining a pass in the Year 1 Phonics screening or during Year 2 re-sits.  There is an increase in the number of PP pupils attaining Exp Or GD in KS1 reading outcomes | |
|  | Pupils in Years 3 & 4, who are eligible for PP, achieve as well as other pupils in reading and writing.  There is an increase in the number of PP pupils attaining Exp Or GD in KS2 English outcomes | |
|  | Behaviour issues for the small group of Year 2, 3 & 4 pupils are addressed reduced and they make progress against their targets | |
|  | Attendance, for pupils eligible for PP, is improved  Access to sporting activities, for pupils eligible for PP, is improved  PP pupils have eaten breakfast each day | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Planned expenditure** | | | | | |
| **Academic year** | **2017-18** | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Project A – Year 5 & 6 HA Attainment** | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | **Staff lead** | **When will you review implementation?** |
| Higher ability pupils (2a and 3 at KS1), who are eligible for PP, make expected or better progress towards greater depth learning in Years 5 & 6 (where PP numbers are highest in school). | Additional qualified teacher working in Y6 50% of week to work at increasing points scored in reading, writing and maths to ensure good progress towards GDS  Teaching Assistant to support GDS reading 60% of each week | | We want to provide extra support to maintain high attainment. Small group interventions with highly qualified teaching staff have been shown to be effective, as discussed in reliable evidence sources such as Visible Learning by John Hattie and the EEF Toolkit.  We want to combine this additional provision with some ‘aspiration’ interventions that are led by skilled qualified teachers | **AS**  **With VS** | **Jan 2018**  **May 2018**  **July 2018** |
| Additional support staff and HLTA deployed to allow class teacher in Year 5 to focus upon PP children an additional 20% of the week | | **VS**  **With RE & VS** | **Jan 2018**  **May 2018**  **July 2018** |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | **£34,000.00** |
| **Project B – KS 1 Phonics and Reading** | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action/approach** | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | **Staff lead** | **When will you review implementation?** |
| Pupils in KS1, who are eligible for PP, achieve as well as other pupils in attaining a pass in the Year 1 Phonics screening or during Year 2 re-sits.  There is an increase in the number of PP pupils attaining Exp Or GD in KS1 reading outcomes | A group of skilled phonics delivers – including the R,W, Inc Champion to deliver daily phonics sessions to Year 1.  RWInc Champion to monitor the impact of teaching and learning in phonics in FSU and KS1. | Some of the students need targeted support to catch up. This is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.  Children failing to pass the Year 1 phonics screening do less well in the future in reading. Those that do not pass the re-sit in Year 2 often never catch-up | | **SH**  **With KMc** | **Jan 2018**  **May 2018**  **July 2018** |
| 1:1 phonics sessions delivered to support borderline children in becoming securely competent at decoding, fluency and accuracy | **SH**  **With KMc** | **Jan 2018**  **May 2018**  **July 2018** |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | **£40,000.00** |
|  | | | | | |
| **Project C – Year 3 & 4 Reading** | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | **Staff lead** | **When will you review implementation?** |
| Pupils in Years 3 & 4, who are eligible for PP, achieve as well as other pupils in reading and writing.  There is an increase in the number of PP pupils attaining Exp Or GD in KS2 English outcomes | Fresh Start intervention to be delivered and monitored by skilled practitioners  Literacy Leader to monitor the impact of teaching and learning in reading and writing in Y3 & Y4 | Some of the students need targeted support to catch up. This is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.  Fresh Start evidence  BeanStalk evidence via LA | | **SH**  **With VS** | **Jan 2018**  **May 2018**  **July 2018** |
| Volunteer readers programme match funded by school so that trained reading volunteers listen to pupils x3 times per week | **KMc** | **Jan 2018**  **May 2018**  **July 2018** |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | **29,000.00** |
|  | | | | | |
| **Project D – Behaviour** | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | **Staff lead** | **When will you review implementation?** |
| Behaviour issues for the small group of Year 2, 3 & 4 pupils are addressed reduced and they make progress against their targets | Using Thrive programme  Training, delivery, monitoring and evaluation, presenting impact  Positive Handling Training, monitoring and evaluation | The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues can be effective, especially for older pupils.  Thrive data, case studies and promotional information suggests that children with emotional development gaps and behavioural problems need these issues addressing in order for them to be able to access the academic learning | | **AS**  **With Inc M** | **Dec 2017**  **Mar 2018**  **June 2018** |
| Employing Inclusion Manager with clear remit – see job description  Impact of Inc Manager monitored and reported | **AS with KMc** | **Dec 2017**  **Mar 2018**  **June 2018** |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | **£60,000.00** |
|  | | | | | |
| **Project E – Challenging Deprivation** | | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action / approach** | **What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?** | | **Staff lead** | **When will you review implementation?** |
| Attendance, for pupils eligible for PP, is improved  Access to sporting activities, for pupils eligible for PP, is improved  PP pupils have eaten breakfast each day | Employing Inclusion Manager with clear remit for attendance– see job description  Attendance awards and rewards | We can’t improve attainment for children if they aren’t actually attending school. NfER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step.  Evidence that physical well-being and exercise produce endorphins to enhance mood and concentration and support for focused learning  Evidence linked to poor diet and brain development | | **AS**  **With KMc** | **March 2018** |
| Funded breakfast, lunchtime and after-school sports clubs | **RG** | **Dec 2018**  **June 2018** |
| Breakfast club funded for key Pupil Premium children  Staffed and supported | **GF** | **Nov 2017**  **April 2018**  **July 2018** |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | **£29,000.00** |
| **Total** | | | | | **£194,000.00** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Review of expenditure** | | | | |
| **Previous Academic Year** | | **2017-2018** | | |
| **Project A – Year 5 & 6 HA Attainment** | | | | |
| **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** |
| Higher ability pupils (2a and 3 at KS1), who are eligible for PP, make expected or better progress towards greater depth learning in Years 5 & 6 (where PP numbers are highest in school). | Additional qualified teacher working in Y6 50% of week to work at increasing points scored in reading, writing and maths to ensure good progress towards GDS  Teaching Assistant to support GDS reading 60% of each week  Additional support staff and HLTA deployed to allow class teacher in Year 5 to focus upon PP children an additional 20% of the week | **Year 6 PP** x17 pupils  **Reading**: progress 1.4 compared with 2.1 for nonPP  Attainment 3 chn in cohort attained GDS all (100%) were PP chn; of the 8 PP chn who achieved 2a/3 at KS1 2/8 (25%) att GDS; x1 PPchild who achieved 2b at KS1 att GDS  **Writing**: progress 0.8 compared to 1.6 for nonPP Attainment 3 chn in cohort attained GDS 2/3 were PP chn; of the 2 PP chn who achieved 2a/3 at KS1 2/2 (100%) att GDS  **Maths**: progress 2.6 compared to 4.2 nonPP  Attainment 5 chn in cohort attained GDS, 3/5 were PP chn; of the 7 PP chn who achieved 2a/3 at KS1 3/7 (43%) att GDS  **Combine:** 12/17 PP chn (70.5%) achieved combine  **Year 5 PP** x19 pupils  **Reading**: attainment 4/19 (21%) PP chn att GDS; 12/19 (63%) att ARE/GDS; at KS1 10/19 (53%) achieved 2a/3;  **Writing**: attainment 4/19 (21%) PP chn att GDS; 11/19 (58%) att ARE/GDS; at KS1 7/19 (37%) achieved 2a/3;  **Maths** attainment 4/19 (21%) PP chn att GDS; 12/19 (63%) att ARE/GDS; at KS1 7/19 (37%) achieved 2a/3;  **Combine**: 12/19 PP chn achieved combine RWM (63%) | * PP chn did better in 2018 than in 2017; attainment improved as a whole * A progress gap remains; PP chn made less progress than nonPP in RW&M   Y6 Reading   * 75% of PP chn att 2a/3 at KS1 did not convert to GDS; * 6/7 chn (86%) of PP chn att 2b at KS1 converted to ARE   Y6 Writing   * More PP chn left KS1 WTS for writing * 100% of PP chn att 2a/3 at KS1 converted to GDS; * 7/7 chn (100%) of PP chn att 2b at KS1 converted to ARE; 4 PP chn converted 2c at KS1 to ARE   Y6 Maths   * 57% of PP chn att 2a/3 at KS1 did not convert to GDS; * 9/9 chn (100%) of PP chn att 2b at KS1 converted to ARE; 2 PP chn converted 2c at KS1 to ARE   Support delivered from a teacher showed better impact then previous year when additional support cam e from teaching assistants  Y5 Reading   * 60% of PP chn who achieved 2a/3 at KS1 did not convert to GDS   Y5 Writing   * 43% of PP chn who achieved 2a/3 at KS1 did not convert to GDS   Y5 Maths   * 43% of PP chn who achieved 2a/3 at KS1 did not convert to GDS | **£34,000.00**  + cost of teacher booster  1hour per week for x5 teachers |
| * **converting a 2a/3 from KS1 to GDS in all areas** * **GDS attainment** * **Progress gap although reduced remains** * **Quality of additional support improved when teachers rather than TAs delivered it** | | | | |
| **Project B – KS 1 Phonics and Reading** | | | | |
| **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** |
| Pupils in KS1, who are eligible for PP, achieve as well as other pupils in attaining a pass in the Year 1 Phonics screening or during Year 2 re-sits.  There is an increase in the number of PP pupils attaining Exp Or GD in KS1 reading outcomes | A group of skilled phonics delivers – including the R,W, Inc Champion to deliver daily phonics sessions to Year 1.  RWInc Champion to monitor the impact of teaching and learning in phonics in FSU and KS1.  1:1 phonics sessions delivered to support borderline children in becoming securely competent at decoding, fluency and accuracy | **Year 1 PP**  x24  Cohort = 37 pupils of which 78% attained a screening pass.  62% of PP chn achieved GLD previous year  24/37 (65%) of cohort were PP chn  21/24 PP chn (88%) attained a screening pass compare to 62% screening pass for nonPP chn; PP APS was 35.5 compared to 26.7 for nonPP chn  Our school outperformed local and national PP data: BNV = 88%; LA = 68%; National = 71%  PP chn attained better than previous year: 2016 76%, 2017 52%, 2018 88%  **Year 2 Reading PP** x21  Cohort = 39 pupils of which 56% achieve ARE in reading  21/39 (54%) of cohort were PP chn  10/21, 48% att ARE compared to nonPP at 67% att ARE  Our school underperformed against local and national PP data: BNV = 48%%; LA = 61%; National = 61%  Upheaval in KS1 (teaching) last year had a direct impact on the progress and attainment pupils achieved  This cohort achieved 62% GLD; 50% PP chn achieved GLD at EYFS | **Year 1 PP**   * PP chn outperformed nonPP chn in the phonics screening * 1:1 phonics sessions delivered by HLTA had notable impact * Accurate and regular tracking of pupil achievement *at word level* was effective in identifying areas for development * Engaging parents (where possible) showed impact on pupil attainment   **Year 2 Reading PP**   * **PP chn underperformed in reading compared to nonPP chn, national and local data** * Upheavals in teaching had a direct, and negative, impact on the quality of teaching and learning * New reading system/approach was introduced in Dec 2017, progress and attainment from this point, with substantive class teacher shows much impact and progress. | **£40,000.00** |
| * **Fewer PP chn attain ARE at the end of KS1 than nonPP chn** * **Non-substantive staff had the biggest negative impact on disadvantaged pupils** * **Whole school reading approach had good impact** | | | | |
| **Project C – Year 3 & 4 Reading** | | | | |
| **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** |
| Pupils in Years 3 & 4, who are eligible for PP, achieve as well as other pupils in reading and writing.  There is an increase in the number of PP pupils attaining Exp Or GD in KS2 English outcomes | Fresh Start intervention to be delivered and monitored by skilled practitioners  Literacy Leader to monitor the impact of teaching and learning in reading and writing in Y3 & Y4  ~~Volunteer readers programme match funded by school so that trained reading volunteers listen to pupils x3 times per week~~ | **Year 3/4** 11 pupils on **Fresh start**; 9/11 (82%) were PP chn  1/9 (11%) attained ARE which was her end of year target  8/9(89%) did not att ARE: 6 were BL and x2 were WTS. None of these chn had ARE as a target, most were Bl at KS1  **Reading Year 3**  Teaching non-substantive for Year 3. Staffing changed during the course of the academic year and had a negative impact upon Year 3 pupils. Substandtive teacher appointed at Easter had good impact  **Reading Year 4**  61% attained ARE as a total cohort. Of cohort, 20 were PP chn.  9/20 (45%) attained ARE; 11/20 not att ARE 5 were Bl at KS1 and 4 were WTS at KS1. X1 chn achieved WTS with KS1 att of Bl | * **Year 3/4 Fresh Start had little measurable impact on the overall attainment of chn chosen to complete the programme. It had the least impact upon the chn who were BL at KS1 and remained so throughout.** * Progress in work can be seen across the programmeand chn’s confidence and engagement with the programme was good. Chn enjoyed Fresh Start and therefore their enjoyment of reading increased * Fresh start would have best impact on those chn who were WTS with a target of ARE. The wrong target chn were chosen and therefore the gap was too large to address with a term’s Fresh Start intervention * Biggest impact on slow pupil progress and low attainment is the quality of teaching; teaching is at it best when staff are substantive * **On the whole, more PP chn leave KS1 with Bl or WTS and not enough make rapid progress from this to achieve the next level.** | **£29,000.00** |
| * **Fresh Start programme has reduced success on chn working Bl and needs to run for more than a term** * **More PP chn leave KS1 with Bl or WTS, too few make rapid progress to close the gap and attain the next level** * **Quality First Teaching has the boggest impact on pupil progress and attainment** | | | | |
| **Project D – Behaviour** | | | | |
| **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** |
| Behaviour issues for the small group of Year 2, 3 & 4 pupils are addressed reduced and they make progress against their targets | Using Thrive programme  Training, delivery, monitoring and evaluation, presenting impact  Positive Handling Training, monitoring and evaluation  Employing Inclusion Manager with clear remit – see job description  Impact of Inc Manager monitored and reported | The impact of improved behaviour is felt by all. The majority of the chn receiving Thrive© support are PP Boys.  Lost learning time has been reduced although some key pupils still cause unrest for the members of their class  Pupils on reduced timetables from beginning of year to end: 6 – 0  Good impact seen  **Behaviour Incidents**  Term 1 2017-18 = 245  Term 2 2017-18 = 95  Term 3 2017-18 =  **Exclusions (in school, FT & PEx)**  Term 1 2017-18 = 33  Term 2 2017-18 = 24  Term 3 2017-18 =  After the Positive Handling training, holds were reduced; time in holds was reduced.  The use of the ‘safe space’ was eliminated completed and no chn were using the space: it became redundant and has now become a different space altogether  Coded entry systems were removed from the doors into/exiting the nurture facility which became the Thrive© rooms  *All* chn taking in the Thrive© approach who were screened showed progress against the PSE targets | * Employment of expertise knowledge through the Inclusion Manager allowed for focused support of staff and screening of key children so progress could be measured against the accurate targets set; when targets were accurate, pupils made progress that they sustained * **Some chn with a clear ‘interruption’ are still unable to access main-stream classroom situations; learning for other disrupted** * Key children now identified as having an interruption in their development and requiring focus PSE support which has been identified as of equal importance to their academic achievements * Larger more upskilled team would allow school to further establish the Thrive© ethos across the wider school | **£60,000.00** |
| * **Children made progress when their targets were accurately identified against their need; PSE success allowed some pupils to better access their academic learning** * **Where PSE needs are not accurately addressed, the learning is disrupted for self, and peers** * **Staffing limitations reduced the number of children who had success** | | | | |
| **Project E – Challenging Deprivation** | | | | |
| **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, for pupils eligible for PP, is improved  Access to sporting activities, for pupils eligible for PP, is improved  PP pupils have eaten breakfast each day | Employing Inclusion Manager with clear remit for attendance– see job description  Attendance awards and rewards  Funded breakfast, lunchtime and after-school sports clubs  Breakfast club funded for key Pupil Premium children  Staffed and supported | **PP chn attendance**  Autumn 2017-18 = 91.95%  Spring 2017-18 = 93.63%  Summer 2017-18 = 95.36  Attendance became high profile in school and for parents through newsletters, rewards and celebration assemblies, attendance parties, weekly reviews  All chn arriving without breakfast (whether PP chn or nonPP) were offered breakfast. On the whole, most chn had breakfast each day. All chn who said they hadn’t had breakfast were given it. Milk and fruit offered an additional opportunity for sustenance  Less learning time lost as chn were better ready to engage and learn  Breakfast Club was well-attended with a daily Sports Coach delivering games and sporting activities. Numbers varied | * PP chn attendance improved across the year by 3.41%. * Raising the overall awareness of attendance for all impacted on PP chn also * Renewed and revised systems and processes linked to attendance allowed more accurate tracking and led to more proactive tackling of PA, lateness and general attendance * Key chn/families identified as concerning were shared with office staff, inclusion manager and attendance lead which led to quicker school response * Chn were better engaged and focused after having breakfast * Anxiety levels were reduced for some key chn/families as they knew food was available * The levels of physical activity were increased with the opportunity to attend 30 mins a day through breakfast club | **£29,000.00** |
|  | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Additional detail** |
| In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.  Our full strategy document can be found online at: www.aschool.sch.uk |