

Redhill Primary School Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

Pupil Premium Provision Strategy and expenditure:

The Pupil Premium is additional funding allocated to schools to help support disadvantaged students, diminishing the difference between them and their peers. At Redhill Primary School Pupil Premium is funding allocated to pupils who are currently children looked after (CLA), eligible for free school meals and who have been eligible for free school meals at any point in the last six years. This equates 11% (47 pupils) of our school population. The funding has contributed to a wide range of resources designed to maximise pupil potential in every possible way.

Principles:

All members of staff and governors accept responsibility for 'socially disadvantaged' pupils and are committed to meeting their pastoral, social and academic needs within a caring environment. As with every child in our care, a child who is considered to be 'socially disadvantaged' is valued, respected and entitled to develop his/her full potential, irrespective of need.

Background:

The Pupil Premium targets extra funding for pupils from deprived backgrounds. Research shows these pupils underachieve compared to their non-deprived peers. The premium is provided in order to support these students to reach their potential. The DFE use pupils entitled to free school meals (FSM), children of service personnel and Looked After Children as an indicator for deprivation and have deployed a fixed amount of money to schools per pupil, based upon the number registered for FSM. At Redhill Primary School, we will be using the indicator of those eligible for FSM as our target children to diminish the difference in attainment and progress.

The Government have not dictated to schools how to spend this money, but are clear that schools will need to employ strategies that they know will support these pupils to increase their attainment.

Provision:

In order to meet the above requirements, the Governing Body of Redhill will ensure that provision is made which secures the teaching and learning opportunities that meet the needs of all pupils. As part of the additional provision made for pupils who belong to the vulnerable groups, the Governors of the school will ensure that the needs of socially disadvantaged students are adequately addressed. At Redhill Primary school we have looked at the evidence regarding approaches that have been effective. We base all our approaches on identifying individual barriers. We use pupil premium to fund whole-school approaches, professional development for teachers and well as creating our own interventions which enable the school to design an approach tailored to own pupils' needs, whilst mindful of staff's areas of expertise.

Education Endowment Fund (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit, Ofsted 2013 and 2014, NFER Report – Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils

1. Summary information					
School	Redhill Primary School				
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£51,480 School £11,400 Service £1,900 LAC £1,018 Nursery	Date of most recent PP Review	Sept16
Total number of pupils	415	Number of pupils eligible	(39) (38) (1) + 1 Nursery	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Nov16

2. Current attainment		
% achieving ARE in:	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school) 2016/2015/2014 No. of pupils 42/39/30</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) 2016 Year 6 only</i>
Reading	76%, 82%, 90%	71%
Writing	72%, 72%, 90%	86%
Maths	69%, 77%, 87%	57%
SPAG	74%	86%
% making expected progress in reading (or equivalent)	98%, 98%, 97% 17%, 26%, 47%	92%
% making expected progress in writing (or equivalent)	98%, 92%, 93% 21%, 31%, 40%	95%
% making expected progress in maths (or equivalent)	85%, 98%, 100% 7%, 31%, 57%	91%
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.	Poor language skills due to EAL or Oral language skills in Reception are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other pupils. This slows reading progress in subsequent years.	
B.	PP lower attainment on entry	
C.		
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)		
D.	Home learning environment, mobility factors	
4. Desired outcomes		Success criteria
A.	Improve oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP	Pupils eligible for PP in Reception class make rapid progress by the end of the
B.	Good or better academic progress, diminishing any difference between our disadvantaged pupils and	Measured by SAT results 2017
C.	Ensure health and wellbeing of disadvantaged pupils is positive	Parent/child feedback in structured conversations
D.		

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year		2016-17			
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?

Ensure all lessons meet the needs of all students and engage target groups; raise expectations of staff and pupils TAs and other additional adults are used effectively to secure high rates of progress for pupils	All Teaching and Support Staff receive the same high quality See CPD plan Lesson Study work see RAP		Lesson observations and book scrutinies completed. Lesson study monitoring and analysis	SLT	December 2016
Improved oral language skills in Reception Improved progress for high attaining pupils	Staff training on high quality feedback. Staff training on developing oracy for the high attaining pupils in EYFS and reception Y1 from EYFS/Reception SLE.	We want to invest some of the PP in longer term change which will help all pupils. Many different evidence sources, e.g. EEF Toolkit suggest high quality feedback is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we can embed across the school.	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). Lessons from training embedded in school feedback policy.	Foundation Leader	Jan 2017
Total budgeted cost					£15,923
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?
Accelerated progress to ensure difference diminished for reading, writing and maths	To run a targeted interventions plans in each year group. See pupil premium assessment tracker, RAP, and intervention plans	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.	SLT monitoring of planning and delivery of interventions	CL/CF	December 2016
Improved oral language skills in reception	121 and small group provision of Nuffield Early Language Intervention for	Some of the students need targeted support to catch up. This is a programme which has been	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.	Reception class teachers	Jun 2017

	children in Reception.	independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.			
Good or better academic progress, diminishing any difference between our disadvantaged pupils and national. SATS as measured More able pupils reach their full potential	Small group Tuition in Maths is provided for all pupils in receipt of PPG in Year 6 who are not on track to attain expected ARE based on starting points	EEF toolkit evidence indicates that small group tuition can be effective, on average accelerating learning by approximately five additional months' progress. Moderate impact for moderate costs.	SLT monitoring of planning and delivery of interventions		
Total budgeted cost					£123,375
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?
Ensure the progress of all target students is tracked and that all relevant leaders are held accountable for the progress of these students	Identification, Tracking and Accountability Through pupil progress meetings, Explicit focus in monitoring systems	That whole school accountability for the progress of PP is far more effective than a role designated to an individual	HT/Data Lead track performance of year groups in different key stages Linked to performance management	CL/CF	December 2016
Pupils are in school on time each day and ready to learn. Attendance is above national average and above 95% for all FSM children.	Breakfast Club is subsidised for pupils in receipt of PPG. A trained HLTA level supervisor runs this support so that pupils receive high quality support from the beginning of the day	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.	Monitor the attendance of PP. discussions with class teacher readiness for learning	CL/ZB	December 2016
Pupils able to manage the demands of the	Actively engage pupils in outdoor	Research shows that pupils dealing with emotional and social issues,	Pupil questionnaire Take up of clubs and residential	MW/DS/DS	December 2016

school curriculum and be in an emotional state which allows them to learn and reduce anxiety	learning opportunities with experienced instructors To support pupils with emotional needs, bereavement, trauma and relationship needs Pupils are identified as needing additional support for managing anger, managing feelings and developing relationships.	make less progress, not ready to learn and don't fully engage in lessons.			
Total budgeted cost					£5,826

6. Review of expenditure – NA end of 2016-7 academic year				
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
ii. Targeted support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action	Estimated impact:	Lessons learned	Cost
iii. Other approaches				
Desired outcome	Chosen action	Estimated impact:	Lessons learned	Cost

7. Additional detail

Link governor for PP meets with Head teacher termly to discuss this strategy in individual detail. Head teacher reports to governors termly regarding overall effectiveness of the strategy. Strategy reviewed annually to assess lessons learned in order to inform future work.