



## Outcomes of Pupil Premium Spending 2016-2017

Summary of item/project	Cost	Objectives	Outcome and Evidence of Impact (Reviewed September 2017)
<p><b>Music teacher</b> Specialist Music Tutor employed in Key Stage 2 to release teachers to allow specific feedback time between teachers and identified pupils. Also an opportunity for higher achieving pupils to move on in their learning.</p>	<p><b>Budget: £8260</b> <b>Cost: £9 355</b></p>	<p>To diminish the difference in attainment (reading and maths) in KS2 between PP pupils and Non PP</p> <p>To address misconceptions in key reading, writing and maths skills throughout the school</p> <p>Discussion around the use of this time took place in pupil progress meetings.</p>	<p>The gap between attainment of PP and non-PP in Maths year 6 was 36% in 2015-2016. This year it is 9%. The difference has diminished by 27%.</p> <p>The gap between attainment of PP and non-PP in Reading year 6 was 21% in 2015-2016. This year it is 11%. The difference has diminished by 10%.</p> <p>The difference has not been diminished as successfully in the year 4 and 5 groups but children continue to make progress. Teachers report that these sessions have contributed to children being more engaged in their learning and they have had increased participation in lessons. This was also evident in an A4A learning walk in the Summer term.</p>
<p><b>Teaching Assistant</b> Additional TA employed to encourage language and play development in Reception and to support in the early learning of phonics</p>	<p><b>Budget £14500</b> <b>Cost: £12 844</b></p>	<p>To develop personal and social skills</p> <p>To develop language acquisition</p> <p>To allow children to succeed without Nursey experiences</p>	<p>Last year GLD was 71% for non Pp and 50% for PP. (+21%) This year its 89% for non and 40% for PP. (+49%)</p> <p>The gap is the same or worse taking only social, emotional and communication into consideration. There was a child in this year group with significant behavioural needs who impacted on staff time. There was also a period of unsettled staffing in reception.</p> <p>Next steps: To ensure the gap for this particular cohort diminishes next year.</p>
<p><b>Residential Payments and other educational trips</b></p>	<p><b>Budget: £1200</b> <b>Cost: £284</b></p>	<p>Pupil Premium pupils to access all school trips</p>	<p>8 of the 9 children in year 6 attended the residential. 2 of these were subsidised. Despite a phone call from the</p>

			<p>head, the parents of the child not attending did not want the child to go; not a financial barrier</p> <p>No children missed any class trips last year (apart from those who may have been absent on trip days)</p>
<p><b>After school clubs</b></p> <p><i>Allows children from a disadvantaged background to access paid for clubs</i></p>	<p><b>Budget: £1200</b> <b>Cost: £478</b></p>	<p>To develop personal and social skills To allow for inclusion</p>	<p><i>There was only 1 child who was funded for after school club. Other children eligible for pupil premium attended the club but this was funded by the families.</i> <i>Next steps: Consider how we can raise awareness parents, both school staff and after school club providers about the additional funding and how to access it.</i></p>
<p><b>Staff Training - 1st Class@Number</b></p> <p><i>An intense intervention programme for children in lower KS2 who are not making progress or attaining in Maths.</i></p>	<p><b>Budget: £2950</b> <b>Cost: £1823</b></p>	<p>To improve basic number skills and confidence in manipulating numbers. To diminish the difference in attainment (maths) in KS2 between PP pupils and Non PP.</p>	<p><i>PP children made equal or better progress than their peers in this intervention. In discussion with the pupils they feel more confident in their Maths lessons since accessing the intervention. Staff reported an increase in the children's skills and participation since the intervention too.</i> <i>Next steps: Consider training staff on 1stclass@number1 to support children in KS1</i></p>
<p><b>Breakfast Club</b></p> <p><i>Paid for attendance at Breakfast Club for vulnerable pupils</i></p>	<p><b>Budget £600</b> <b>Cost - £0</b></p>	<p>To improved attendance and punctuality To increase engagement through play To have a healthy start to the day</p>	<p><i>No families made use of the additional funding for this service this year.</i> <i>Next steps: Consider how we can raise awareness parents, both school staff and the breakfast club provider about the additional funding and how to access it.</i></p>
<p><b>Reading Assessment and training – KS2</b></p> <p><i>All pupils in Key Stage 2 performing below age expected</i></p>	<p><b>Budget: £3000</b> <b>Cost: £1000</b></p>	<p>To Improve attainment in reading for children who are already behind in order to meet age related expectations  To diminish the difference in attainment</p>	<p><i>The gap between PP and non-PP children in 65% in year 3, 25% in year 4 and 22% in year 5. In year 3 the gap has diminished by 13% since the previous year. The gap remains similar in year 4 and 5 in comparison to the previous year's results.</i></p>

<p><i>will undertake 1:1 reading assessments and appropriate interventions will be put in place as a result.</i></p>		<p>(reading and maths) in KS2 between PP pupils and Non PP</p>	
<p><b>SATS Companion – Year 6</b></p> <p><i>All pupils to have paid for access to SATS companion (online resource tool) and opportunities created to use this in school if access is not available in the home.</i></p>	<p><b>Budget: £1300</b> <b>Cost: £600</b></p>	<p>To diminish the difference in attainment (reading and maths) in KS2 between PP pupils and Non PP</p>	<p><i>Reading: The percentage of children eligible for PP funding achieving ARE has increased by 7%. The achievement of non-PP children increased by 4%. The difference has increased by 3% as with the difference now being 11%. At the higher level, the percentage of children eligible for PP has decreased by 35 (less than 1 child) The percentage of pupils not eligible for PP achieving at the higher level was 55%. This means that the gap increased by 23% even.</i></p> <p><i>Maths: The percentage of children eligible for PP funding achieving ARE has increased by 32%. The achievement of non-PP children increased by 12%. The difference has diminished by 22%. . At the higher level, the percentage of children eligible for PP funding has increased by 11% (from 0%). The achievement of non-PP children increased by 13%. Although more children eligible for PP achieved the higher level this year. the difference between the two groups has increased slightly, by 2%</i></p> <p><i>Next steps: Consider running a club to support children with using this resource</i></p>
<p><b>TLC live</b></p> <p><i>Online, interactive 1:1 Maths tutoring programme for all pupils below age expectation in year 5 and 6. (10 sessions each)</i></p>	<p><b>Budget: £3510</b> <b>Cost:£2918</b></p>	<p>To diminish the difference in attainment (maths) in KS2 between PP pupils and Non PP</p>	<p><i>In year 6, 5 of the 9 children eligible for PP funding had access to the TC online programme. On average their scores on the TLC assessment improved by 40%. (Non-PP was 38%). Pupil voice indicated that they enjoyed the programme and found it helpful. 3 of the 5 met the expected standard at the end of the year and 1 achieved the higher level.</i></p> <p><i>The children who did not have access to the TLC live</i></p>

			<p>programme had weekly sessions after school with a TA who is an ex-secondary school teacher. They all achieved the expected standard in Maths.</p> <p>Next steps: Consider using this earlier in the year as well as for year 5. Due to building works, space will need to be considered,.</p>
<p><b>Interventions (Year 3/4/5)</b> All children will have access to the range of intervention programmes currently established for use with children with SEN and can be accessed as appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Budget: £2000</b> <b>Cost: £2034</b></p>	As per individual interventions.	<p>The majority of PP children who took part in interventions made progress that was equal to or better than their peers in the same programme. The exception was a few PP children who had additional needs – these children will be referred the specialist teaching team.</p>
<p><b>Additional professional services</b> Family workers and/or EWO and/or workshops to enable parents to support their children at home with their learning and development. Therapists to support children as necessary with emotional development and mental health.</p>	<p><b>Budget: £2000</b> <b>Cost: £0</b></p>	<p>To continue to diminish the difference between the attendance of PP pupils and Non PP</p> <p>To diminish the difference in attainment between PP pupils and Non PP</p>	<p>No cost. Sourcing appropriate opportunities is a challenge. Family worker has been unwell and has since left however a new early intervention worker is in place for 2017-2018. We were in a position this year that we did not have to pay for a play therapist as she is in training. The school is looking to recruit a new counsellor.</p>
<p><b>Mastery/deep learning training</b> Targeting all pupils (but specifically year 6) who, based on their KS1 data, should be aiming at greater depth in Maths. Targeting year 2 pupils who, based on their Early Years profile, should be aiming for</p>	<p><b>Budget: £1000</b> <b>Cost: £1000</b></p>	To diminish the difference in attainment (maths) in between PP pupils and Non PP	<p>A year 2 teacher and the head took part in a teacher research group through the Cambridge Maths Hub. This supported the year 2 team to explore mastery in their classrooms. KS2: 5 of the 8 pupils who we have KS1 data for made progress that was accelerated in comparison to their KS1 average point scores. The AvSS was 102.8 which is below Non-disadvantaged children by 4 but above national PP by 1. KS1: 2 of the 4 pp children in year 1 met the expected outcome at the end of</p>

<i>greater depth.</i>			<i>Reception. Both children made accelerated progress in Maths this year and left year 1 at a 1s+ (above expected) level. There were no children in year 2 who achieved expected at the end of EYFS. (These two children have SENS and are being referred to specialist services)</i>
<b>Phonics</b>	<b>Budget: £2000 Cost: £810</b>	To diminish the difference in attainment between PP and non-PP in the Year 1 phonics check.	<i>Children who were at risk of not achieving completed an in house 'Over teach phonics' as well as a 'Teach your Monster to Read' intervention. The percentage of children achieving the expected standard for phonics at year 1 increased by 5%. The gap remained similar as the percentage of non –PP group increased too. The gap between disadvantaged pupils and non in year 1 was 82% in 2015-2016. For 2016-2017 it was reduced by 82% to 13%. In the year 2 retake group it was reduced by 12% from 19% to 7%.</i>
<b>Year 1/2 – RWM</b>	<b>Budget: £2000 Cost: £10608</b>	To diminish the difference in attainment (reading, writing and maths) in KS1 between PP pupils and Non PP <b>Year 2 – see main objective 3</b>	<i>Both year 1 classes had a full time TA. Year 2 classes had a TA every morning. Unfortunately staff illness meant that one of the year 2 classes did not consistently have this TA time.</i>  <i>Year 2: Pupil Premium pupils achieving ARE is lower than last year and the difference has increased in all 3 subjects. However, this is a small cohort of 2 pupils both of whom are on SENS and will be referred for support from specialist teaching team in the 2017-2018 year. The picture in year 1 is more positive with 75% of children achieving ARE in Reading (compared to 87% Non –PP), 50% achieving ARE in Writing (compared to 73% Non-PP) and 75% achieving ARE in Maths (compared to 89% Non-PP). This cohort is made up of 4 PP children.</i> <i>Comparing Year 1 data on entry to the end of the year: In Reading both groups have made similar progress and the</i>

			gap has remained similar (25%). In writing the gap has diminished by 14% from 38% to 24%. In Mathematics the gap has reduced by 2% from 14% to 12%.
<p><b>Unknown/other</b> Unknown needs and opportunities that come about throughout the year that will contribute to our objectives and/or pp statements.</p>	<p><b>Budget £2000</b> <b>Cost: £3712</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Year 6 boosters (with subject leaders) after Easter for Reading and Writing <b>£576</b></li> <li>10 of the 36 children took part in the A4A programme this year. <b>£1100</b></li> <li>Piano lesson subsidy <b>£213</b></li> <li>Success@arithmetic intervention and training <b>£1823</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Reading booster:</b> Reading: The percentage of children eligible for PP funding achieving ARE has increased by 7%. The achievement of non-PP children increased by 4%. The difference has increased by 3% as with the difference now being 11%. At the higher level, the percentage of children eligible for PP has decreased by 35 (less than 1 child) The percentage of pupils not eligible for PP achieving at the higher level was 55%. This means that the gap increased by 23% even.</p> <p><b>Writing booster:</b> The difference between children eligible and those not eligible for PP has diminished to 3% from 27% last year.</p> <p><b>A4A:</b> A recent (21.6.2017) learning walk showed all children purposefully engaged in their learning.</p> <p><b>Piano Subsidy:</b> This pupil finds learning a challenge but has been more successful at piano. At a recent meeting discussing what he does when he finds things difficult he made links to feeling calmer when he plays and using the strategies or practising in small amounts of time in piano to doing the same in Maths.</p> <p><b>Success@arithmetic</b> All children completing the programme made expected or better progress across the year. This included children eligible for PP who made 6 steps (expected) progress over the year.</p>
<p><b>TOTAL BUDGET</b> <b>TOTAL SPEND</b></p>	<p><b>£47520</b> <b>£47 466</b></p>		

