

## Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

2016-17



<u>Summary Information</u>					
<b>School</b>	Shiremoor Primary School				
<b>Academic Year</b>	2016-17	<b>Total PP Budget</b>	£99,773  (This is then supplemented where required by school budget).	<b>Date of recent PP Review</b>	N/A
<b>Financial year</b>	2016-17	<b>Total PP Budget</b>	£171,040  (This is then supplemented where required by school budget).		

<b>Total number of pupils</b>	347  (not including Nursery)  400 including Nursery	<b>No. of pupils eligible for PP</b>	119  PP Y1: 14 (27%)  PP Y2: 20 (34%)  PP Y3:21 (42%)  PP Y4:33 (53%)  PP Y5:16 (50%)  <b><u>PP Y6:15 (39%)</u></b>  <b><u>FSM</u></b>  FSM (Reception)  R: 15	<b>Date for next internal review of this strategy</b>	End of academic year with on-going periods of monitoring

<b><u>Current Attainment</u></b>				
<b>2016 Data- (National Data in brackets)</b>	<b><u>School Average for Pupils Eligible for PP</u></b>	<b><u>National Average for Pupils not Eligible for PP</u></b>	<b><u>Gap Analysis for School PP and Non-PP</u></b>	<b><u>Gap Analysis for School PP and National Non-PP</u></b>
<b>% achieving at 'Expected' level in reading, writing &amp; maths at end of KS2</b>	29% (39%)	72% (60%)	-44%	-31%
<b>% achieving at 'Expected' level in reading.</b>	36% (53%)	72% (72%)	-36%	-36%
<b>% achieving at 'Expected' level in writing.</b>	71% (64%)	89% (79%)	-18%	-8%
<b>% achieving at 'Expected' level in maths.</b>	64% (57%)	94% (75%)	-30%	-11%

<b>Current FSM Data EYFS</b>			
2016 Data- <b>(School's Non FSM Data in brackets)</b>	<b>Reception</b>		
	<b>School Average for Pupils FSM</b>		
% achieving 'Expected' level for 'All Prime Areas'	67% (81%)		
% achieving at 'Expected' level in all ELGs	56% (71%)		
% achieving at 'Good Level of Development'	51% (69%)		
<b>Current Pupil Premium Data Phonics (Year1)</b>			
2016 Data- <b>(School's Non FSM6 Data in brackets)</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>National Average</b>	
	<b>School Average for Pupils Eligible for PP</b>		
% achieving at 'Working at or Above' Y1 level	84% (85%)	80.5%	
<b>Current Pupil Premium Data End of KS1 (Year 2)</b>			
2016 Data- <b>(National Data in brackets)</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	
	<b>School Average for Pupils Eligible for PP</b>	<b>School Average for Non-PP Pupils</b>	
% achieving at 'Expected' level in reading, writing & maths at end of KS2	58% (46%)	77% (64%)	
% achieving at 'Expected' level in reading.	58% (62%)	90% (77%)	
% achieving at 'Expected' level in writing.	58% (52%)	84% (69%)	
% achieving at 'Expected' level in maths.	68% (59%)	85% (76%)	

<b>Current Pupil Premium Data End of KS2 (Year 6)</b>		
<b>2016 Data-</b> <b>(National Data in brackets)</b>	<b>Year 6</b> <b>School Average for</b> <b>Pupils Eligible for PP</b>	<b>Year 6</b> <b>School Average for</b> <b>Non-PP Pupils</b>
% achieving at 'Expected' level in reading, writing & maths at end of KS2	<b>School Average for</b> <b>Pupils Eligible for PP</b>	72% (60%)
% achieving at 'Expected' level in reading.	29% (39%)	72% (72%)
% achieving at 'Expected' level in writing.	36% (53%)	89% (79%)
% achieving at 'Expected' level in maths.	71% (64%)	94% (75%)

<b><u>Barriers to Future Attainment</u></b>
<b>In-school barriers</b>
Speech and Language delay on-entry to school is high which affects learning generally in all areas.
Low starting points of children (particularly those eligible for PP) which means that not all children are school ready.
Vocabulary of many children is limited and many are unfamiliar with books or print.
PP children currently do less well than non-pupil premium children and this gap begins on entry and is not yet closing (other than the gap in Year 1 phonics) Although PP children do perform in line with, and above those children nationally (other than in reading last year).
<b><u>External Barriers</u></b>

The figures for PA attendance show that generally PP absence is higher than that of non-PP children. This reduces their hours in school and causes them to fall behind.
A group of pupils eligible for PP display difficulties in Social and Emotional aspects for their learning.
Children have a lack of experiences outside of school which often presents issues with children not being suitably equipped to start their school journey or access content in the curriculum.
Children don't always have access to a range of literature thus limiting their comprehension and vocabulary which presents limitations to their ability to access the changes in the new National Curriculum.

<b>Planned Expenditure £119,142</b>					
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>2016-17</b>				
<b>Quality of teaching for all</b>					
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action/approach</b>	<b>Evidence and rationale</b>	<b>How it will be implemented</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>Review of implementation</b>
Reading at 'Expected' and 'Greater Depth' scores to improve	On-going reading training for all staff from internal and external providers.  Teaching vocabulary explicitly and implicitly	Identified by staff at the end of academic year 2015-16 as an area of development based on End of Key Stage 2 SAT's data.  36% of PP achieved in reading compared to 53% nationally. Our in school gap was 36%.	Rigorous monitoring of data and delivery of teaching and learning.  Appraisal to have a reading focus.	Laura Kinsey  Kate Pritchard	67% of PP children achieved expected standard in reading compared to 59% nationally.  There was a 23% increase in PP chn achieving 'expected standard' in

	<p>Close reading strategies</p> <p>Comprehension approaches</p>	<p>Writing and maths are significantly higher results.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Teaching and Learning toolkit states Reading Comprehension strategies have moderate impact, very low cost, based on extensive evidence</p>	<p>All staff to engage in research-based practice and shared with one another.</p> <p>Peer observation across key stage.</p> <p>Book moderations with a set focus to be comparable across year groups.</p> <p>Staff CPD. This is to include both internal and external providers. Impact to be evident through book moderations, observations and feedback.</p> <p>Reading challenges, competitions, and rewards for all age groups- Nursery upwards.</p> <p>Small, withdrawn reading intervention groups. Child</p>		<p>Reading in academic year 16-17 from 15-16.</p> <p>14% of PP in Y6 achieved Greater Depth' in Reading in 16-17 compared to 0% in year 15-16.</p> <p>The impact of staff training and focus on comprehension skills has improved reading standards across school. All year groups saw an increase in children achieving at the expected standard or above except for Y3 but provisions have since been put in place and they are being targeted in Autumn 2017.</p> <p>Y2- 74% at or above expected level.</p> <p>Y3- 60% at or above expected level.</p> <p>Y4- 73% at or above expected level.</p> <p>Y5- 73% at or above expected level.</p> <p>Y6- 64% at or above expected level.</p>
--	---	---	--	--	---

			<p>selection to be based on information from termly data and teacher assessment.</p> <p>Y6 have an experienced teacher for small intervention groups focusing on reading, comprehension and vocabulary.</p>		<p>100% of PP chn who received a form of reading intervention made progress.</p> <p>23% increase in PP chn achieving 'expected standard' in Y6 in academic year 16-17 from previous year.</p>
<p>To continue to improve the phonic abilities of all from nursery throughout KS1 so that each year we have improved outcomes for phonics.</p>	<p>High-quality phonics teaching and grouping across all of KS1</p>	<p>Teaching and learning toolkit states that phonics has a moderate impact, very low cost and extensive evidence.</p> <p>Our Year 1 phonic data is strong and improving on a 3 year trend.</p> <p>End of nursery data demonstrated higher achievement on Letters and Sounds.</p>	<p>LK English Manager will audit phonic delivery of all</p> <p>Experienced teacher dedicated to focusing on phonic interventions in Year 1. Trained TA to focus on phonic intervention in Y1 and Y2. TA is also implementing weekly research –based practice.</p>	<p>LK (English Manager)</p>	<p>PP chn outperformed Non-PP chn by 7% in Year 1 phonics.</p> <p>92% of PP chn in Y1 achieved the required standard.</p> <p>67% of PP retaking the Phonics test achieved the required standard.</p> <p>Of the 33% who did not, they are receiving Speech and Language support and have external agency involvement. They did however, make 16 points progress in reading and writing during the year.</p>
<p>Continue to improve basic skills of all children.</p>	<p>Employment of additional, part time staff to reduce</p>	<p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p>LW to oversee timetabling, targeting and</p>	<p>LW (Deputy Head)</p>	<p>All year groups where class sizes were smaller or had additional teacher</p>

	class sizes in Year 1, 4, 5 and 6	Whilst Teaching and Learning Toolkit suggests that reducing class sizes has moderate impact for very high cost based on moderate evidence, our in-school quantitative data suggests that reducing class sizes impacts sufficiently to justify this.	data of this support to ensure value for money  Teachers to have set areas of focus for ensuring effective teaching and learning.		support, showed an improvement in basic skills across all areas which resulted in an increase number of PP chn achieving at/above the expected standard for their age.  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>R</u></th> <th><u>W</u></th> <th><u>M</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Y1</u></td> <td>92%</td> <td>77%</td> <td>85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Y4</u></td> <td>73%</td> <td>64%</td> <td>73%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Y5</u></td> <td>73%</td> <td>87%</td> <td>73%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Y6</u></td> <td>64%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>R</u>	<u>W</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>Y1</u>	92%	77%	85%	<u>Y4</u>	73%	64%	73%	<u>Y5</u>	73%	87%	73%	<u>Y6</u>	64%	71%	64%
	<u>R</u>	<u>W</u>	<u>M</u>																						
<u>Y1</u>	92%	77%	85%																						
<u>Y4</u>	73%	64%	73%																						
<u>Y5</u>	73%	87%	73%																						
<u>Y6</u>	64%	71%	64%																						
Total budgeted cost					£9894 (Not including cost of staffing for reduced class sizes which is coming from main budget.																				

<u>Targeted Support</u>					
<u>Desired outcome</u>	<u>Chosen action/approach</u>	<u>Evidence and rationale</u>	<u>How it will be implemented</u>	<u>Staff lead</u>	<u>Review of implementation</u>

<p>To improve progress and attainment for PP children in reading, writing and maths to ensure that we give these pupils opportunities to succeed across the curriculum.</p>	<p>BLAST And additional staffing of EYFS</p>	<p>Baseline assessments in nursery showed children have low starting points.</p> <p>Gap between PP and Non-PP at GLD is 15% and for prime areas the gap is 14%. We need to close the gap.</p> <p><b><u>Evidence</u></b></p> <p>Teaching and Learning toolkit suggest moderate impact for very high costs which is based on extensive evidence. It declares that overall, the evidence suggests that early year's intervention is beneficial. On average, early years interventions have an impact of five additional months' progress, and appear to be particularly beneficial for children from low income families.</p> <p><b><u>Evidence</u></b></p> <p>According to the Teaching and Learning Toolkit, Early Years Intervention- moderate impact, high cost, extensive evidence. Overall, studies of oral language interventions consistently show positive benefits on learning, including oral language skills</p>	<p>Member of staff received training for BLAST last term and delivery was monitored.</p> <p>EYFS Manager monitors weekly the use of additional staffing and timetabling to ensure impact. BLAST works on the underpinning skills for language, communication and literacy – turn taking, discrimination, listening, attention and social communication as well as developing basic language skills both receptively and expressively.</p> <p>Groups will be targeted based on data</p>	<p>Nicola Penketh Tracey Hill Laura Kinsey Laura Haig</p>	<p>Baseline data showed PP chn had low starting points. On entry data for Reception chn in academic year 16-17 were working 'below national expectation' in all areas. By the end of Reception, 100% of PP chn have made progress, with 62% working at the expected level in all areas.</p> <p>PP chn have seen a 3 year positive trend within the area of Reading.</p>
---	--	---	--	---	---

		and reading comprehension. On average, pupils who participate in oral language interventions make approximately five months' additional progress over the course of a year. Some studies show slightly larger effects for younger children and pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds (up to six months' benefit).			
	Numbers Count	<p>Year 2 data showed a gap between PP and non-PP in maths of -12% for academic year 2015-16. Year group data and teacher assessment for marking and feedback, highlighted PP children who needed additional support with basic number facts to make progress in relation to age related.</p> <p><b><u>Evidence</u></b></p> <p>Research shows the following based on the impact of the intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Learners made an average Number Age gain of 16.5 months in only 4 months –</li> </ul>	Lesley Soulsby, a specially trained Numbers Count TA to give targeted Year 1 and 2 PP children at least three 30-minutes lessons a week for a term, individually or in small groups. After a detailed diagnostic assessment, the teacher to plan a tailored programme for each child.	Lesley Soulsby Natalie Foster	<p>100% of PP chn who received Numbers Count intervention achieved the 'expected standard' in the end of KS1 SATs.</p> <p>In academic year 16-17 the gap between Y2 Non-PP and PP narrowed to -7% for Maths.</p>

		<p>over 4 times the expected progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 95% of them showed more confidence and interest in learning mathematics in class after Numbers Count.</li> <li>• 73% of learners went on to achieve national expectations at the end of Key Stages 1 and 2, despite not being originally predicted to do so.</li> </ul>			
	Success@Arithmetic	<p>Year group data and teacher assessment from marking and feedback highlighted PP children working below age related expectation in Key Stage 2. Targeted children who need support to understand the number system and develop fluency with number facts.</p> <p><b><u>Evidence</u></b></p> <p>Research shows the following based on the impact of the intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They made an average Number Age gain of 17.5 months in 4.5 months –</li> </ul>	Targeted group intervention for PP children. Small group and one-to-one withdrawal sessions, 3 times per week.	Sally Clarke	<p>Of the PP chn who received Success@Arithmetic support, 100% made progress.</p> <p>73% of these PP chn achieved the 'age-related expectations' in maths.</p>

		<p>almost 4 times the expected progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>92% of pupils achieved national expectations at the end of their school year, despite not being originally predicted to do so.</li> </ul> <p>A 2011 evaluation of Every Child Counts also found that the programme had a positive impact when delivered on a one to one basis, or with groups of two or three, with all group sizes making similar amounts of progress.</p>			
	Phonics Intervention	<p>Even though we have a positive 3 year trend from 65% to 84% for FSM6 Y1 children 'Working At' or the 'Expected' level, we want to continue to present this trend and reduce the percentage of Y2 retakes. In addition, by improving phonics in Y1 we can focus on comprehension, inference and vocabulary further up school to support with developing the school priority.</p> <p><b><u>Evidence</u></b></p> <p>Phonics approaches have been consistently found to be</p>	Targeted group intervention for PP children. Small group and one-to-one withdrawal sessions. All sessions are with an experienced KS1 teacher focusing solely on interventions in Y1.	Natalee Cook	<p>PP chn outperformed Non-PP chn by 7% in Year 1 phonics.</p> <p>92% of PP chn in Y1 achieved the required standard. This continues a positive trend with PP attainment in Phonics.</p>

		<p>effective in supporting younger readers to master the basics of reading, with an average impact of an additional four months' progress. Research suggests that phonics is particularly beneficial for younger learners (4-7 year olds) as they begin to read. Qualified teachers tend to get better results when delivering phonics interventions (up to twice the effectiveness of other staff), indicating that expertise is a key component of successful teaching of early reading.</p>			
	Inference Intervention	<p>KS1 data highlighted that for reading FSM6 children (58%) are below National Average (62%). There is also a -32% gap between Non-FSM6 and FSM6. This is much greater than the National Average of -18%.</p> <p>KS2 highlighted that for reading all children performed lower than National Average (56%) to (66%). A gap of -37% between Non- FSM6 and FSM6. This is</p>	<p>Targeted group intervention for PP children. Small group and one-to-one withdrawal sessions. All sessions are with an experienced TA's who have received training for this intervention.</p>	<p>Laura Kinsey</p> <p>Sally Clarke</p>	<p>16-17 KS1 data shows that PP chn performed in line with PP chn nationally and the gap between Non-PP and PP narrowed substantially to -17%. This is now marginally higher than the National Average of -16%.</p> <p>16-17 KS2 data shows that PP chn performed better (67%) than the PP chn nationally (59%).</p>

		<p>much larger than the National Average of -19%.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>The key areas brought up on the End of Key stage 2 test analysis in the data pack were surrounding vocabulary, inference, meaning and comprehension.</p>			<p>The gap between Non-PP and PP chn (-24%) is still larger than the National Average (-18%) but has closed for in-school data from academic year 15-16 (-37%).</p> <p>Of the Pp chn who received a form of inference intervention, 100% made progress and 81% achieved 'age-related expectations' in all year groups.</p>
	Year 5 and 6 Maths Intervention	<p>KS2 data highlighted that for maths we were below National Average for children achieving 'Greater Depth' by 4%. (13% to 17%). Even though our FSM6 were above National for 'Expected' level in maths, the gap between Non-FSm6 and FSM6 was -30% in comparison to the National Average of -18%.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Teaching and Learning Toolkit suggests that small group tuition holds moderate impact with moderate costs however it</p>	<p>Qualified teacher as a designated TA for year 5 and 6 maths. Targeted children with teacher assessed areas of development. Pre and post-tests to be used. Each group to work with TA twice a week for 45mins each sessions.</p>	<p>Dan McConville</p> <p>Natalie Foster</p>	<p>14% of PP chn in Y6 achieved 'Greater Depth'.</p> <p>Our PP chn were above (67%) National Average for 'Expected' level in Maths (63%)</p> <p>The gap also closed between Non-PP and PP to -24% however, this is still higher than National of -17%.</p> <p>PP chn in Maths achieved a positive 0.72</p>

		has limited evidence. It states an impact of most children improving by 4 months compared to +5months with one-to-one tuition which is moderate impact but with high costs.			progress points in KS2 SATs.
	Year 5 and 6 writing intervention	<p>Employment of a teacher who has had extensive training in writing moderation and spelling and grammar to target small groups in year 6. Employment of an additional English specialist to target Year 5 Writing.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Research suggests that this approach has beneficial effects for both FSM and non-FSM pupils. It has moderate impact with moderate costs but with limited evidence.</p>	Since we have used this approach, writing data shows an upward trend for all and Spag and writing results are above national.	LW (Deputy Head) PW (Writing teacher) KP (Year 5 English)	<p>Year 5 saw a 27% increase in PP chn working at/above 'age-related expectations' in 16-17 compared to 15-16.</p> <p>Year 6 PP performed better (73%) than the National Average of (66%). This is a 3% improvement on academic year 15-16 end of KS2 data and continued an upward trend.</p> <p>14% of PP chn in Y6 achieved 'Greater Depth' in Writing in academic year 16-17.</p> <p>16-17 KS2 data shows PP chn were above (67%) national (66%) for SPAG. The gap</p>

					between Non-PP and PP also narrowed to -15% which is in line with the National Average.
	Pirate and Dragon writing	<p>Highly trained TA to deliver Writing intervention.</p> <p><b>Evidence</b>  <i>Impact on Achievement (ECC Website)</i>  300 pupils in 70 schools took part in 1<sup>st</sup>Class@Writing in 2014-15. Their teachers reported an almost immediate impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 88% of pupils became more confident and motivated to write</li> <li>• 70% made more progress than their teachers had expected</li> <li>• their spelling scores improved by 42%</li> </ul>			<p>Of the PP chn who received these interventions, 100% made progress. 88% achieved 'age-related expectations'. On average chn in Y5 receiving this intervention made 6.5 points progress.</p> <p>Pupil case studies showed that Child 'A' in Y5 made 7 points progress and achieved 'ARE'.</p> <p>Child B in Y3 made 6 points progress and achieved 'ARE'. On averages chn in Y3 who received this intervention made 5.8 point progress.</p>

	<p>One trained TA to have allocated time to speech and language programmes for targeted individuals.</p>	<p>Baseline assessments in nursery showed children have low starting points.</p> <p>EYFS data for 2015-16 showed the gap between FSM6 and Non FSM6 pupils is -15%, larger than 2014-15.</p> <p><b><u>Evidence</u></b></p> <p>Teaching and learning Toolkit states that it has moderate impact for very low costs which is based on extensive evidence. It has potential to offer an impact of +5months additional progress for the child. A number of studies show the benefits of trained teaching assistants effectively supporting both oral language skills and reading outcomes. There is an extensive evidence base on the impact of oral language interventions, including a substantial number of meta-analyses and systematic reviews. The evidence is relatively consistent, suggesting that oral language interventions can be successful in a variety of environments. Although the majority of the evidence relates to younger children, there is</p>	<p>Trained TA to work with external agencies to offer children a personalised programme to enable them to achieve their learning goals.</p>		<p>The gap between Non-FSM and FSM chn has widened marginally (-16%) since 2015-16.</p> <p>FSM did better in GLD for academic year 2016-17 (58%) than in 15-16 (56%) by +2%.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

		also clear evidence that older learners, and particularly disadvantaged pupils, can benefit.			
Total budgeted cost					£77,348

<b><u>Other Approaches</u></b>					
<b><u>Desired outcome</u></b>	<b><u>Chosen action/approach</u></b>	<b><u>Evidence and rationale</u></b>	<b><u>How it will be implemented</u></b>	<b><u>Staff lead</u></b>	<b><u>Review of implementation</u></b>
Improved attendance and support for children with social and emotional problems.	Employment of Lead Learning Mentor	<p>Since employing over Lead Learning mentor 4 years ago, our attendance data has improved annually and is now better than national data for general attendance and persistent attendance issues.</p> <p><b><u>Evidence</u></b></p> <p>Teaching and Learning Toolkit identifies that behaviour interventions moderate impact at moderate cost with extensive evidence. On average, SEL interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school,</p>	<p>First day response to absence</p> <p>Early Help Assessments carried out as required</p> <p>Child protection issues followed up swiftly and barriers to learning addressed where possible with behaviour and emotional support programmes and social skills groups.</p>	<p>Pauline McNamara</p> <p>Kimberley Quinn</p> <p>Leigh Elsaghier</p>	<p>Absence of PP chn in 15-16 was 3.3%. There has been an increase in 16-17 to 4.1% however, we are still below the National Average.</p> <p>Persistent absence of PP chn in 15-16 was 5.2%. There has been an increase in 16-17 to 5.7% however, we are still below the National Average.</p> <p>This issue was addressed mid-year and</p>

		<p>and attainment itself (four months' additional progress on average).</p> <p>Case Studies around key children also evidence impact of this role.</p>			<p>parents/guardians were invited into school to discuss issue surrounding this. They meet with all responsible staff and support was put in place. Attendance was tracked throughout the year and lead learning mentor fed information to SLT weekly. Attendance was tracked weekly by LE and a class celebration was introduced.</p>
				Total budgeted cost	£31,900