



Pupil Premium Strategy Statement: St Swithun's CE Primary School

1. Summary information

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---------|---|----------|
| School | St Swithun's CE Primary | | | | |
| Academic Year | 2016-17 | Total PP budget (2015-16) | £41,111 | Date of most recent PP Review | Dec 2016 |
| Total number of pupils | 369 | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 40 | Date for next internal review of this strategy | Mar 2017 |

2. Current attainment

| | <i>Pupils eligible for PP *(4 children)</i> | <i>Pupils not eligible for PP</i> |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| % achieving in reading, writing and maths | 25%* | 65% |
| % making expected or better progress in reading | 25%* | 83% |
| % making expected or better progress in writing | 25%* | 78% |
| % making expected or better progress in maths | 25%* | 78% |

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 | Pupils eligible for PP are not succeeding in writing. |
| B | 25% of our children eligible for PP have SEND. 10% have EAL. 22.5% of pupils eligible for PP are particularly vulnerable to under-achievement as a result of their family circumstances. 53% pupils eligible for PP have more than one indicator. |
| C | Pupils eligible for PP are not attaining as well as their non-PP peers in reading, writing and maths individually and combined. |
| D | |

External barriers *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)*

| | |
|----------|--|
| E | Attendance rates for 30% of the school's pupils eligible for PP are below the target for all children of 96%. This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind on average. |
| F | In general our pupils eligible for PP do not share the same rich experience of opportunities beyond the school day as their non-PP peers. |

4. Desired outcomes

| <i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i> | <i>Success criteria</i> |
|---|-------------------------|
| | |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| A. | Accelerate progress of all PP pupils. | Outcomes for all year groups for PP pupils are in line with or above 'all pupils' (Reading, writing, mathematics, GLD, PSC) Pupils eligible for PP identified as high ability make as much progress as 'other' pupils identified as high ability, across Key Stage 2 in maths, reading and writing. Measured in Y1, 3, 4 and 5 by teacher assessments Successful moderation practices established across the school and partnership. |
| B. | Provide additional support with writing for PP pupils to raise attainment and progress. | Writing data shows that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attainment in writing for PP pupils is inline with or above non-DA pupils in each year group. • Most-able PP pupils are in line with most-able nationally at the end of KS2. |
| C. | Increased attendance rates for the 30% of pupils eligible for PP whose attendance is below 96%. | Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP to 10% or below. Overall PP attendance improves from 92.5% to at least 96% in line with 'other' pupils. |
| D. | Pupils eligible for PP engage in activities beyond the school day to enrich their experiences. | All PP pupils in Years 3 to 6 to engage with an extra-curricular club during the school year. |

| 5. Planned Expenditure | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---------------------|---|
| Academic year | 2016/17 | | | | | |
| The three headings below demonstrate how we are using the pupil premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies. | | | | | | |
| Quality of teaching for all | | | | | | |
| Desired outcome | Chosen action / approach | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? | Cost | How will you ensure it is implemented well? | Staff lead | When will you review implementation? |
| All children learn to read and spell quickly and fluently. | Read Write Inc | RWI is a proven strategy that is working very well in our school. Results above LA and National for the last two years. Monitoring and CPD are essential to maintain and develop standards and the fidelity with which the programme is implemented. | 2 x dev days New staff training eg 2 days for 2 reading teachers Overtime for Ali every two weeks Some of Ali's core time(?) | Development Days with our RWI trainer, training for new staff, masterclass sessions. Regular monitoring of quality of teaching and learning. | Reading leader (AT) | Termly assessments. Annual review in June 2017 |
| Children reach their age-related expectation or above in spelling. | Read Write Inc spelling | Natural follow-on from the successful RWI programme. | Staff meeting time Staff release time | Termly staff meetings. End of unit assessments. Learning walk. | KD and RJ | June 2017 |
| Attainment in writing to improve. | Big Writing CPD to enable consistent implementation from Years 1 to 6. | We had been using the Big Writing strategy for some time. However, very few teachers had received formal training and the strategy was not being fully implemented consistently across the school. | £900 | Writing moderation of assessed work. Book scrutinies. Learning walk of VCOP lessons and Big Write sessions. | RJ | April and June 2017 |
| Children attaining expected standard or above in maths. | INSPIRE Maths | Success of the programme in KS1 in 2015-16 led to its introduction in KS2 from September 2016 Mastery approach (link to EEF research) | CPD Sept 16 | | CT | June 2017 |
| | | | Total budgeted cost | | | |
| 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? |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|
| Children able to read at or above their age-related expectations. | Reading Recovery | An established early reading intervention with proven success over many years. | £11,000 (Cost of reading manager) | | | |
| | Full Circle (social and emotional learning) | Recommended to have a positive impact by the Educational Endowment Foundation. | £390 | | | |
| | Reading interventions that include Precision Teaching, Fresh Start, Reading and Thinking and Accelerread/Accelwrite | Individually tailored interventions to have maximum impact on the children's learning as recommended by the Oxfordshire SEN support team. | £2500 | | | |
| | Keep Up not Catch Up | Recommended by the INSPIRE maths programme to support the mastery curriculum. Aims to ensure that no child goes home not achieved the day's maths learning objectives. | £4680 | | | |
| | One to one phonics top-up | Recommended by the Read Write Inc programme to accelerate learning and prevent children falling behind their peers. | £7,800 | | | |
| | Additional mentoring sessions | Supporting meta-cognition. Focused conversation with a named adult. Additional sessions for disadvantaged children. | £3,000 | | | |
| Children know what they need to do to improve. | Feedback and marking: all DA children's work marked first and in depth every time. | Teachers have a very good knowledge of the children's attainment and next steps in learning. High quality feedback highly recommended by the EEF. Links to mentoring strategy. | Part of Quality First Teaching | | | |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | | £25,000 |
| i. | | | ii. 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? |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|------------------------|
| D. Increased attendance rates | School administrator time employed to monitor pupils and follow up quickly on absences. First day response provision. | 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. | | Staff awareness about existing absence issues. Inclusion leader, administrator, head etc. will collaborate to ensure new provision and standard school processes work smoothly together. | Inclusion Leader | End of each half-term. |
| E. Enriching the children's experiences. School is a positive experience. | Provision of extra-curricular clubs: funding club places where a charge is involved. Encouraging children to attend clubs. Funding school visits, including residential outdoor education opportunities. | Contributing to parity of opportunity for DA children and their non-DA peers. | | Records of children's attendance/participation. Children's responses. Children's attitudes to school and learning. | Headteacher | |
| | | | | | Total budgeted cost | |

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 |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Improve attainment cross-circular | Staff sent on external 'growth mind-set' course | Mixed: training has informed approach to building aspiration in school. We measured the impact on attainment for all children, not just PP eligible. Success criteria: not fully met. Approach shows promise as evident from staff developing questioning technique as seen in lesson observation – best practice shared in briefings. But Progress 8 data shows that PP students did not make expected progress. | Staff were positive about the training and believe it has affected attitudes of students. We will not repeat the training, but continue implementing the approach and monitoring pupil response. | £420 per teacher for 15 teachers. Plus staff cover for training days. £10,050 |

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 |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Improved Year 6 literacy results | One to one tuition delivered by qualified teacher using planned programme. | High: observed increased progress amongst participating children compared to peers, as measured using scores on the Progress in English test. Success criteria: met. | This seemed to be most effective when the focus area was determined by the class teacher based on their observations of the pupil. We will continue next year. | £1550 per pupil for 13 pupils. £20,150. |

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 |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Maintain progress for high ability pupils over summer. | Summer school programme for high ability PP pupils. | Medium-low: positive impact for students who attended but many did not. Success criteria: not met. | Next year we will try to provide more intensive after-school support instead, with parental engagement to encourage attendance. | £1260 per pupil for 21 pupils. £26,460. |

7. 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