

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

1. Summary information					
School	Romanby Primary				
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£54,753	Date for next internal review of this strategy	July 2017
Total number of pupils	276	Number of pupils eligible for PP	47		

2. Current attainment – Y6 pupils in 2016		
	Pupils eligible for PP (Cohort size 6)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
The expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths	33%	53%
Average progress in reading, writing and maths	-1.7	
Average 'scaled score' in reading and maths	102.5	102.8
A high level of attainment in reading, writing and maths	0%	5%

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i>)	
A.	High ability pupils who are eligible for PP are making less progress than other high ability pupils across Key Stage 1. This prevents sustained high achievement in Key Stage 2.
B.	Attitudes to learning, resilience and aspirations. PP children are making less progress than those in comparable schools, inhibiting their ability to meet or exceed Age Related Expectations.
C.	Female pupils making slower progress than male peers in some year groups.
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Parental engagement: understanding curriculum content and supporting children.
4. Desired outcomes (<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>)	
Success criteria	

A.	Higher rates of progress across KS1 for high attaining pupils eligible for PP and accelerated progress for those now in KS2.	Termly teacher assessment and tracking data reflect improved rates of progress. Evidence showing where mastery level opportunities have been provided and has been achieved.
B.	Improved engagement with and understanding of the learning process. (Attainment and achievement will accelerate and gaps will close)	Pupils demonstrate a positive growth mindset in relation to their potential Pupils are motivated to learn and can identify and use successful learning strategies. Teachers ensure learners have a clear picture of how they are performing, what they are aiming to achieve and how they will achieve it. Pupils are able to reflect on their own learning and articulate this (Written reflection evidence and comments).
C.	Female pupils eligible for PP making equable progress to males.	Data analysis shows that female pupils are making accelerated progress bringing them in line with male pupils.
D.	Improved communication and engagement with parents of children eligible for PP.	Parents are confident to approach the school and have access to suitable support advice and materials. Parents know what their children's targets are and are actively supportive domestically.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2016-2017				
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?

Improved progress for high attaining pupils.	CPD on providing stretch for high attaining pupils.	High ability pupils eligible for PP are making less progress than other higher attaining pupils across Key Stage 2 in writing. We want to ensure that PP pupils can achieve high attainment as well as simply 'meeting expected standards'. We want to train a small number of relevant teachers in practices to provide stretch and encouragement for these pupils.	Course selected using evidence of effectiveness. Use INSET days to deliver training. Peer observation of attendees' classes after the course, to embed learning (no assessment).	DP	April 2017 £1,000
Improved understanding of and engagement with the learning process.	CPD on Growth Mindsets and metacognitive approached to learning. Whole school implementation of routine teaching on Growth Mindsets and metacognition. (Weekly lessons with follow on expectations)	Successful learners have a good understanding of how they learn. We want pupils eligible for PP to understand their own learning styles and strengths so that they can become confident, aspirational and independent learners.	Metacognition Action Plan Use of INSET days and Curriculum Staff meetings Meeting time for training and reflection on implementation of the ReflectEd training materials.	SLT	£3,000 allowance from Achievement Unlocked initiative plus additional school resources
The gap between male and female pupil's performance is narrowed.	Focus in Pupil Progress meetings.	Analysis of school data shows a difference/ gap that needs to be targeted.	Pupil Performance Meetings.	Team Leaders Class Teachers	£500 supply cover to release staff
Total budgeted cost					£4,500

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?
Improved progress for high attaining pupils	Weekly small group sessions in maths for high-attaining pupils with experienced teacher, in addition to standard lessons.	We want to provide extra support to maintain high attainment. Small group interventions with highly qualified 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 such as talks from successful former pupils.	<p>Extra teaching time and preparation time paid for out of PP budget, not sought on a voluntary basis.</p> <p>Impact overseen by maths co-ordinator.</p> <p>Teaching assistant (TA) CPD for TAs supporting the sessions.</p> <p>Engage with parents and pupils before intervention begins to address any concerns or questions about the additional sessions.</p> <p>Case studies.</p>	SB JW	Mar 2017 X1 lesson per week teacher x 25 weeks = £850

Improved progress for identified PP vulnerable learners	Individualised 121 support twice a week (maths focus group)	We want to provide extra support to improve attainment. Research has shown that TAs delivering 121 interventions shows a consistent impact of three to four additional months progress (effect size 0.2 – 0.3). Criteria from EEF Making Best Use of Teaching Assistants Guidance Report (Sharples, Webster and Blatchford): Connections should be made between class and out-of-class learning, and interventions should be clearly planned for, structured and resourced. Interventions should be evidence based.	As above Comparison of standardised assessment materials and tracking schedule. Flexible, responsive targeting using data analysis and progress indicators. Case studies	SB, Teaching Assistants	Termly review of data. £1,200 TA time
Improved progress for identified PP vulnerable learners	Small group work	We want to provide extra, intensive support to improve attainment and learner confidence for vulnerable PP pupils. Research has shown that vulnerable learners are more successful where learning is focussed on specific goals, follows a specific structure and is delivered in short, frequent sessions. (Sometimes scripted) Connections should be made between class and out-of-class learning. (EEF Making Best Use of Teaching Assistants Guidance Report. Sharples, Webster and Blatchford)	As above Comparison of standardised assessment materials and tracking schedule. Flexible, responsive targeting using data analysis and progress indicators. Case studies	SB, Teaching Assistants	Termly review Mop Up TA release time KS2 x6 classes/ 3hrs/week for 39 weeks = £2,000
Total budgeted cost					£4,050
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?
Improved parental engagement and communication	Changing the format of Parent Teacher Conferences.	Parent voice indicates that some lack confidence with curriculum content and the appropriate methods and strategies to use when working with their children at home. We want parents to be better aware of and equipped to support their children in attaining their personal targets.	Extending conference time to 15 minutes. Sending home performance and behaviour information prior to the meeting for familiarisation. Introducing a structured format to be followed in meetings with agreed target setting.	JF, Class Teachers	Termly
Total budgeted cost					£500

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		Weekly Spend 15/16 £1,305 per week/ £50,895 p.a.		
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

Improved progress and narrowing of the gap for pupils eligible for PP.	TA support in Maths, English and Learning Challenge lessons.	<p>In Y1 80% of disadvantaged pupils achieved the Phonics expected standard compared to 70% nationally.</p> <p>In Y6 the progress of disadvantaged pupils in Reading was 0.84 compared to 0.35 nationally. The percentage of disadvantaged Y6 children achieving the expected standard or above in Grammar Punctuation and Spelling, Maths and Science was higher than the national percentage.</p> <p>We wanted extra adult support in core subjects targeted to improve attainment for pupils. EEF evidence of impact where TAs add value to what teachers do.</p> <p>Data analysis showed that gaps were closed as follows (PP performing better than NPP/ meeting or exceeding age related expectations): Reading : Y1, Y3, Y4 and Y5 Writing: Y1, Y3 and Y6 Maths: Y1, Y3, Y4 and Y5 Please see expanded data analysis in Section 7 below.</p>	<p>Whilst there are still gaps to be addressed, overall this strategy was successful in narrowing the gap. Continue with additional staff training as necessary</p> <p>150 hours at £8.19</p>	Weekly £1,230
Improve teacher knowledge of strategies that impact on pupil performance	Involvement in NYCC Achievement Unlocked Project	<p>Staff now have a greater understanding of strategies that impact on pupil performance e.g. use of EEF materials.</p> <p>ReflectEd metacognition lessons implemented across school.</p> <p>Maximising the Impact of Teacher Assistant Training.</p>	<p>Continue with additional staff training as necessary until the end of the Project in March 2017.</p> <p>Continue to embed ReflectED lessons.</p>	
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 progress for identified PP vulnerable learners	Additional, small group, targeted support for Maths and English.	We wanted to provide extra support to improve attainment and to enhance the impact of Quality First Teaching. Please see data profile above.	Mop Up and pre-teaching small group activities improved engagement with whole class lesson teaching and contributed to improved performance and pupil confidence (see above) Entry/Exit data needs to be more tightly regulated and used to evidence impact of group work. (See targeted support for 2016/2017 above)	£ 75 weekly
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
Improved progress for identified PP vulnerable learners	Support for visits and 1 to 1 support	Pupils able to access all aspects of school life and supported with some specific needs and resources.	Maintain for the coming year.	

7. Additional detail

In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to support the sections above.

2015/2016 Data analysis shows that pupils eligible for PP performed better than NPP pupils in 50% of Y1-Y6 in Writing and in 67% of Y1 – Y6 in Reading and Maths. (See Table 1 below)

Analysis of calculated averages for 2015/2016 shows PP outperforming NPP in all three core subjects in KS2. (See Table 2 below)

Comparison of male/female PP pupil performance for Y1 – Y5 2015/ 2016 shows an emerging disparity with female performance lagging behind that of males in some year groups. This has been addressed in the targets above for this year. (See Table 3 below)

Table 1 2015/16 Data.

Data taken from Target Tracker Teacher Assessment Summer ii
Pupil numbers (percentage)

PP performing better than NPP

Reading		No (%)	Working below	Working at	Working at or above	Working above
Y1	PP	6 (15.8%)	1 (16.7%)	4 (66.7%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)
	NPP	32 (84.2%)	4 (12.5%)	20 (62.5%)	28 (87.5%)	8 (25.0%)
Y2	PP	5 (13.2%)	2 (40.0%)	2 (40.0%)	3 (60.0%)	1 (20.0%)
	NPP	33 (86.8%)	2 (6.1%)	19 (57.6%)	31 (93.9%)	12 (36.4%)
Y3	PP	11 (25.6%)	3 (27.3%)	8 (72.7%)	8 (72.7%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	32 (74.4%)	12 (37.5%)	19 (59.4%)	20 (62.5%)	1 (3.1%)
Y4	PP	6 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (50.0%)	5 (83.3%)	2 (33.3%)
	NPP	30 (83.3%)	7 (23.3%)	22 (73.3%)	23 (76.7%)	1 (3.3%)

Y5	PP	8 (18.2%)	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)	5 (62.5%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	36 (81.8%)	16 (44.4%)	19 (52.8%)	20 (55.6%)	1 (2.8%)
Y6	PP	6 (25.0%)	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	18 (75.0%)	10 (55.6%)	8 (44.4%)	8 (44.4%)	0 (0%)

Writing		No (%)	Working below	Working at	Working at or above	Working above
Y1	PP	6 (15.8%)	1 (16.7%)	5 (83.3%)	5 (83.3%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	32 (84.2%)	6 (18.8%)	18 (56.3%)	26 (81.3%)	8 (25.0%)
Y2	PP	5 (13.2%)	2 (40.0%)	3 (60.0%)	3 (60.0%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	33 (86.8%)	3 (9.1%)	21 (63.6%)	30 (90.9%)	9 (27.3%)
Y3	PP	11 (25.6%)	2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)	9 (81.8%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	32 (74.4%)	16 (50.0%)	13 (40.6%)	16 (50.0%)	3 (9.4%)
Y4	PP	6 (16.7%)	3 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	30 (83.3%)	8 (26.7%)	21 (70.0%)	22 (73.3%)	1 (3.3%)
Y5	PP	8 (18.2%)	5 (62.5%)	3 (37.5%)	3 (37.5%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	36 (81.8%)	19 (52.8%)	16 (44.4%)	17 (47.2%)	1 (2.8%)
Y6	PP	6(25.0%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	18 (75.0%)	17 (94.4%)	1 (5.6%)	1 (5.6%)	0 (0%)

Maths		No (%)	Working below	Working at	Working at or above	Working above
Y1	PP	6 (15.8%)	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	4 (66.7%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	32 (84.2%)	5 (15.6%)	21 (65.6%)	27 (84.4%)	6 (18.8%)
Y2	PP	5 (13.2%)	4 (80.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	33 (86.8%)	3 (9.1%) 9 (81.8%)	23 (69.7%)	30 (90.9%)	7 (21.2%)
Y3	PP	11 (25.6%)	2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)	9 (81.8%)	0 (0%)
	NPP	32 (74.4%)	15 (46.9%)	16 (50.0%)	17 (53.1%)	1 (3.1%)
Y4	PP	6 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	5 (83.3%)	6 (100%)	1 (16.7%)

Table 2: 15/16 PP averages

Maths

KS1		below	at	at or above
	PP	56.65	43.35	43.35
	NPP	48.7	67.65	87.65

KS2		below	at	at or above
	PP	37.8	57.95	62.1
	NPP	54.25	43.6	45.75

Reading

KS1		below	at	at or above
	PP	28.35	86.7	71.65
	NPP	15.55	91.3	9.7

KS2		below	at	at or above
	PP	37.05	54.6	62.95
	NPP	40.2	57.47	59.8

Writing

KS1		below	at	at or above
	PP	28.35	71.65	71.65
	NPP	13.95	59.95	85.9

KS2		below	at	at or above
	PP	53.5	46.5	46.5
	NPP	55.97	40.15	44

Table 3: 2015 2016 PP Male/ Female Performance Comparison Data

Writing

	below	at	At or above
Y1 x6	B x1 (33%)	B x2 (66%)	B x2 (66%)
Bx3 Gx3	G x 2 (66%)	G x1 (33%)	G x1 (33%)
Y2 x5	B x0	B x0	B x0
Bx0 Gx5	G x4 (80%)	G x1 (20%)	G x1 (20%)
Y3 x11	B x1 (14%)	B x6 (86%)	B x6 (86%)
Bx7 Gx4	G x1 (25%)	G x3 (75%)	G x3 (75%)

Y4 x6	B x3 (100%)	B x0	B x0
Bx3 Gx3	G x0	G x3 (100%)	G x3 (100%)
Y5 x8	B x4 (100%)	B x0	B x0
Bx4 Gx4	G x4 (100%)	G x0	G x0

Reading

	below	at	At or above
Y1 x6	B x1(33%)	B x1 (33%)	B x2 (66%)
Bx3 Gx3	G x 2 (66%)	G x0	G x1 (33%)
Y2 x5	B x0	B x0	B x0
Bx0 Gx5	G x4 (80%)	G x1 (20%)	G x1 (20%)
Y3 x11	B x2 (28%)	B x5 (72%)	B x5 (72%)
Bx7 Gx4	G x3 (75%)	G x1 (25%)	G x1 (25%)
Y4 x6	Bx1 (33%)	Bx2 (66%)	Bx2 (66%)
Bx3 Gx3	G x0	Gx1 (33%)	Gx2 (66%)
Y5 x8	B x4 (100%)	B x0	B x0
Bx4 Gx4	G x 3(75%)	G x1 (25%)	G x1 (25%)

Maths

	below	at	At or above
Y1 x6	B x1 (33%)	B x2 (66%)	B x2 (66%)
Bx3 Gx3	G x 2 (33%)	G x2 (66%)	G x2 (66%)
Y2 x5	B x0	B x0	B x0
Bx0 Gx5	G x4 (80%)	G x1 (20%)	G x1 (20%)
Y3 x11	B x2 (28%)	B x5 (72%)	B x5 (72%)
Bx7 Gx4	G x2 (50%)	G x2 (50%)	G x2 (50%)
Y4 x6	B x0	B x3 (100%)	B x3 (100%)
Bx3 Gx3	G x1 (33%)	G x2 (66%)	G x2 (66%)
Y5 x8	B x2 (50%)	B x2 (50%)	B x2 (50%)
Bx4 Gx4	G x 2(50%)	G x2 (50%)	G x2 (50%)