

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

| 1. Summary information | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------|
| School | Lancaster Lane Primary School | | | | |
| Academic Year | 201718 | Total PP budget | £34 580 (when budget set) | Date of most recent PP Review | December 2017 |
| Total number of pupils | 211 | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 39 | Date for next internal review of this strategy | April 2018 |

| 2. Current attainment (Autumn Term 2017, Rec -Y6) | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i> | <i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) (149 – YR)</i> |
| % achieving in reading, writing and maths | R – 46% W – 31% M – 46% | R – 91% W – 63% M – 77% |
| % making AT LEAST EXPECTED progress in reading (1 term progress) | 56% (70% non SEN PP) | 97% |
| % making AT LEAST EXPECTED progress in writing (1 term progress) | 44% (64% non SEN PP) | 83% |
| % making AT LEAST EXPECTED progress in maths (1 term progress) | 51% (64% non SEN PP) | 90% |

| 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. | 41% of our Pupil Premium children have SEN |
| B. | Speech and language from when the children enter school is impacting learning particularly in phonics and writing |
| C. | The children's fine motor skills can be a barrier to making progress particularly in writing |
| External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>) | |

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| D. | Emotional well being | |
| E. | Behaviour | |
| 4. Desired outcomes | | |
| | <i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i> | <i>Success criteria</i> |
| F. | Specific interventions to have impact on children to enable them to make accelerated progress - teachers using the targets achieved to plan the next steps; children's behaviour for learning (emotional well being) makes learning possible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The needs of individual pupils are identified during PPM meetings/through assessment by and external agency - Use of PIVATS shows smaller progress for SEN pupils - Provision maps show allocated times and adults for interventions - IPP paperwork shows interventions are taking place and there is progress in targets achieved - Family worker to support the child within the family home |
| G | Children able to hear and articulate sounds to enable them to blend and segment words to impact on reading and spelling | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identified pupils are referred to Speech and Language - TA to carry out interventions in school |
| H. | Progress in writing, particularly lower down the school and for PP children, not as fast as non PP children | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement a motor skills intervention programme delivered by the TA within class |
| I. | Non SEN pupil premium children to perform as well as non pupil children in reading, writing and maths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tracking data and SATS analysis show non-SEN PP attain in line with non PP children - All PP children make the same rates of progress non-PP children. - Interventions show progress/impact for PP children |

| 5. Planned expenditure | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|------------|--------------------------------------|
| 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 | | | | | |
| 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? |
| Pupil premium children to perform as well as non pupil children in writing . | Review phonics in EYS / KS1 in light of staff changes Provide CPD | Termly tracking data for autumn (writing): Rec - 0% PP vs. non PP 23% Y1 – 0% PP vs. non PP 60% Y2 – 50% PP vs. non PP 60% Y3 – 80% PP vs. non PP 84% Y4 – 20% PP vs. non PP 57% Y5 – 33% PP vs. non PP 57% Y6 – 25% PP vs. non PP 47% | Planning scrutinies Book Looks Pupil Progress Meetings Class observations Pupil interviews | KG | Termly |
| Children's individual and additional needs are identified and met quickly | Specific interventions e.g IDL, ToebyToe Additional TAs within the class | 41% of our PP children have SEN, including 3 with EHC Plans 3 of the children are CLA 6 of the 39 are on track in reading, writing and maths (working at year group expectations). 18 / 39 children are below expected progress in reading, writing and maths | Planning scrutinies Book Looks Pupil Progress Meetings Class observations Pupil interviews | KG | Termly |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £8,000 |
| 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? |
| Phonics skills improved for pupil premium children in Y2 which will have a knock on effect on later years. | Provide appropriate CPD Implement fast track phonics in Y2 | A significant number of our pupil premium children did not pass the phonics screening test in Y1: These children plus xx are below track for both reading and writing. (xx just writing) | Review and evaluate CPD Observe lessons Monitor children's progress at least half termly | KG | Half termly |
| Improved speech | Sp & Lang specialists training TAs in class | 5 out of the 11 PP children in EYFS / Y1 require speech and language intervention | Regular assessments | LW | Half termly |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------|---|
| Improved fine motor skills | Additional TA in class to be able to carry out short, sharp burst of fine motor skills interventions | 3 of the 4 Pupils in Y1 are lacking the fine motor skills to be able to write fluently | Book looks and planning scrutinies | KG | Termly |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £5,000 |
| 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? |
| Encourage behaviour for learning / readiness for learning by providing a link between home and school for specific families | Employment of Angela Braithwaite (outreach worker) for 1.5 days per week to target families Becky Marsden (TA) to work with specific children within school | Children are displaying behavioural issues in school and some families have requested support | Weekly meetings with SLT and AB Monitoring CPOMS BM to report back to SLT | JG LW | Termly |
| | | | | | |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £19,000 |

| 6. Review of expenditure | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| Previous Academic Year | | 2016-17 | | |
| 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 |
| Phonics skills improved | Review of how phonics is delivered T&L styles, group rotation, adult subject knowledge and skills + CPD, | Phonics screen result in line with national average but 3/5 PP children did not achieve the required standard and are working considerably below the standard | Monitor delivery of phonics More regular progress checks | £500 |
| 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 |
| PP children perform as well as non PP children in maths | Intervention programme | No – this did not work well. Theory did not translate into practice, impact was minimal. | Interventions last resort. Withdrawal from class should be minimal. Quality first teaching essential. Effective AfL necessary. | £500 + TA 5 pms per week |
| 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 |
| Targeted PP attendance improves | Outreach worker | Fantastic! Positive impact on PP children, | Impact of outreach worker incredible. | £16,000 |
| 7. Additional detail | | | | |
| The governors have made the financial decision to have the deputy head teacher non class based with her brief to improve the quality of teaching and learning. | | | | |
| 8. Outcomes / Impact | | | | |

| | Term | Review |
|--|-------------|---------------|
| | | |
| | | |