Pupil premium strategy statement (Ferham Primary School)

1. Summary information					
School	Ferham Primary School				
Academic Year	2017-18	Total PP budget	£114,840	Date of most recent PP Review	N/A
Total number of pupils	201	Number of pupils eligible for PP	88	Date for next internal review of this strategy	July 2018

2. Current attainment		
	Pupils eligible for PP (your school)	*Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)*
% achieving in reading, writing and maths	7%	67%
KS2 progress score in reading	-2.89	0.33
KS2 progress score in writing	-3.16	0.17
KS2 progress score in maths	-3.37	0.28

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
In-school barriers *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)*	
A.	Language development of pupils, especially EAL pupils and those at the early stages of English acquisition
B.	Lower attaining pupils do not make expected progress
External barriers *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)*	
C.	Attendance and stability for some PP children (extended periods of term time leave or as CME pupils and subsequent periods of time out of education)

4. Desired outcomes		
	Desired outcomes and how they will be measured	*Success criteria*
A.	Improve language skills in reading and writing of EAL pupils and those eligible for PP	Pupils eligible for PP and EAL pupils make at least expected progress within the year and across the key stage.
B.	Higher rates of progress across KS2 for lower attaining pupils eligible for PP.	Pupils eligible as PP identified as lower ability make as much progress as 'other' pupils identified as lower ability across KS2 in maths, reading and writing. Measured in all KS2 classes by teacher assessments and successful moderation practices within school and across the learning community.
C.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP	Reduce the number of PA among pupils eligible for PP.

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 and 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?**
• Improve language skills of EAL pupils • Higher rates of progress across KS2 for lower attaining pupils eligible for PP	• Teaching assistant in each KS2 class to support the delivery of Wave 1 quality first teaching and precise differentiation within the classroom for all pupils. • Teaching assistants support the pupils to apply the learning from the wave 2 and wave 3 interventions as part of the classroom strategies. • As a result of the pupil progress meetings and SEN reviews, the teaching assistants deliver focused interventions for targeted children as identified on the SEN and Pupil premium provision mapping.	• Recognising and support language/learning needs to accelerate progress • Evidence base from interventions that are most effective for children's learning and progress when learning is followed up and supported by classroom strategies.	Termly SEND review meetings for identified pupils. Termly Pupil progress meetings monitor the summative assessment of pupils. Formative assessment and classroom progress is monitored regularly as part of the whole school monitoring programme	Headteacher SENDCO	Every term
				Total budgeted cost	£68,432
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?**
• Higher rates of progress across KS2 for lower attaining pupils eligible for PP	• As a result of SEN reviews and the identification of specific SEMH targets, learning mentor to deliver targeted programmes of support to identified pupils.	• PIVATS used to identify small targets for children with SEMH needs to support the child to access other areas of the curriculum	Termly SEND review meetings for identified pupils. Termly Pupil progress meetings monitor the summative assessment of pupils. Formative assessment and classroom progress is monitored regularly as part of the whole school monitoring programme	SENDCo	Every term
				Total budgeted cost	£22,514
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?**

• Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP	• As a result of rigorous tracking of pupil attendance, Senior admin officer and learning mentor to work with EWO and Early Help to support children and families to increase attendance, making referrals for fixed penalty notices, reporting children as missing from education and developing personalised incentives to encourage good attendance.	Attendance and progress can only be improved if attendance improves.	Monthly meetings with EWO/Early Help team.	Headteacher	Every term
				Total budgeted cost	£16,147

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
• Improve language skills of EAL and NTE pupils • Higher rates of progress across KS2 for lower attaining pupils eligible for PP	• To employ 2 HLTAs to support in the classroom for differentiation and enabling the strategic deployment of HLTAs through school to deliver quality first teaching in PPA/SENCO/SLT release time and to cover any staff absence providing continuity and stability for the children	All pupils benefitted from being taught by familiar adults and minimising disruption due to any staff absence and PPA/management time. School systems and approaches for differentiation and delivery are consistent therefore there is consistency in the delivery of quality first teaching. The level of pupil engagement and curriculum continuity is evident during monitoring by SLT.	All pupils benefit from being taught by familiar adults who have a clear understanding and knowledge of their individual needs. It also provides consistency in approaches and curriculum. The school will continue with this approach but not using the PP funding.	£50,268

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

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact	Lessons learned	Cost
• Improve language skills of EAL and NTE pupils • Higher rates of progress across KS2 for lower attaining pupils eligible for PP	• To provide targeted interventions and classroom support for other PP children • To provide specialist SEN and bi-lingual support for the children at the early stages of language acquisition.	As a result of targeted support and interventions increase from previous year in % of children: • meeting phonics screening check in Y1 (57.7% of the whole cohort, 50% of EAL pupils) • achieving expected standard in reading at the end of KS1 (54% whole cohort – 10% increase, 45% of EAL – 28% increase, 63.6% PP – 20% increase) • achieving expected standard in writing at end of KS1 (50% whole cohort – 9% increase, 41% of EAL – 23% increase, 63.6% PP – 20% increase) • achieving expected standard in maths at the end of KS1 (54% whole cohort – 2.3% increase, 45% of EAL – 16% increase, 63.6% PP – 13% increase) • achieving expected standard in reading at the end of KS2 (29% whole cohort – 8% increase, 20% PP – 6% increase) • achieving expected standard in writing at the end of KS2 (29% whole cohort – 2% increase, 30% PP – 9% increase) • achieving expected standard in maths at the end of KS2 (33% whole cohort – 10% increase, 30% PP – 16% increase) • achieving expected standard in reading, writing and maths at the end of KS2 (21% whole cohort – 2% increase)	Provided targeted support in all classes with a TA per class to support quality first teaching and precise differentiation. Additional interventions to be delivered by the class TA to meet the needs of individual pupils.	£40,922

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

| Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP | • Senior admin officer to track pupil attendance and to work with EWO to increase attendance
• Learning mentors to work with families and external agencies to increase attendance of identified PA children | Overall attendance decreased from 91.7% in 2015-16 to 90.9% 2016-17.
Detailed tracking of pupil attendance identified and reported 24 pupils as CME (totalling 384 days of absence from school). Without this, the school attendance would have been 92.1%.
Extended periods of unauthorised term time leave affected the overall attendance. Without this, the school attendance would have been 92.4%. Referrals for Fixed Penalty Notices were made for all pupils with unauthorised leave who met the criteria.
The identification of external factors affecting the pupils attendance (CME, extended unauthorised term time leave, religious observance) significantly effects the attendance figures. By analysing the data and removing these external factors, the school attendance would have been 94.2%.
Incentives for good attendance were reviewed and additional ones introduced to promote good attendance for all pupils. | Daily attendance tracking is essential considering the mobility of our school community. Rigorous monitoring and the implementation of the school absence procedures ensure that children are quickly identified as CME and referrals for fixed penalty notices are issued. This in-depth and rigorous monitoring and processes need to continue with the follow up and action plans to support individual children. | £43,514 |

7. Additional detail

2016-17 Attendance %	Actual attendance	Without any CME absence	Without any term time leave	Without any religious observance	Without any influencing factors
Total Y1-Y6	**90.9%**	**92.1%**	**92.4%**	**91.5%**	**94.2%**