

## Abbotsbury Primary School Pupil Premium Strategy Statement 2016 - 17

1. Summary information					
School	Abbotsbury Primary School				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£117,789	Date of most recent PP Review	Sep '16
Total number of pupils	425	Number of pupils eligible for PP	89	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Dec '16

2. Current attainment (KS2 results 2016)			
	Our pupils who receive PP funding	Our pupils who do not receive PP funding	Pupils who do not receive PP (national average)
% achieving EXS+ in reading, writing & maths	42%	53%	tbc
average progress score in reading	1.7	0.3	tbc
average progress score in writing	-1.1	-0.2	tbc
average progress score in maths	0.2	2.8	tbc

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
<b>In-school barriers</b> ( <i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i> )	
A.	Low verbal / communication skills and high proportion of PP children with SEN
B.	Issues associated with low socio-economic areas (poor housing/low expectations/lack of rich language)
C.	Children not physically or emotionally prepared and ready to start the school day
<b>External barriers</b> ( <i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i> )	
D.	Poor attendance is an issue for some children

4. Desired outcomes ( <i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i> )		Success criteria
A.	Children will make at least expected progress.	Be in line with or above national non Pupil Premium progress rates
B.	More able children will continue to be challenged and given new experiences.	Increase the proportion of PP exceeding expected standards
C.	Children who are emotionally affected by their situation will receive support in school.	Children will be settled, emotionally secure and able to learn
D.	Improving verbal and communication skills and literacy skills.	Children will be able to fully access the curriculum and be ready for the next key stage.

**5. Planned expenditure**

<b>Academic year</b>	<b>£117,789</b>
----------------------	-----------------

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**

<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
Staff absence does not adversely affect provision	Familiar and good quality absence cover	Our more vulnerable pupils respond better to a known member of staff.	Use existing staff members for cover, when possible.	SLT	April 2017

**ii. Targeted support**

<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
Disadvantaged pupils make at least expected progress	Literacy teacher (Small groups and 1:1)	Literacy skills lag behind those of other pupils, especially in writing.	Good quality teacher in place for 1:1 or group work. Monitoring of impact.	SLT	Termly (at progress meetings)
More able PP pupils exceed expected standards	Literacy teacher (Small groups and 1:1)	To continue to deepen pupils' understanding and improve progress of HA children.	Good quality teacher in place for 1:1 or group work. Monitoring of impact.	SLT	Termly (at progress meetings)
All disadvantaged pupils are ready for the next stage of their learning (i.e KS1 or KS2)	TAs for MELLP and 1:1 reading	Children arrive in school with poor communication skills and vocabulary. MELLP works to develop speaking and listening skills with Nursery and Reception children.	Experienced well-trained member of staff implementing MELLP. SLT to monitor quality of provision and impact.	SLT	Termly (at progress meetings)

<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<b>£85,334</b>
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	----------------

--	--	--	--	--	--

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?
Children are nurtured and emotionally able to learn	Jigsaw4U and TAMHs workers	This has had significant impact in the past few years and represents good value for money.	Reports from workers. Children monitored by teachers and SENCo.	SLT	Termly (Provision map review) £19,000
Children are fit to learn and prepared for the day	Breakfast Club	Children perform better when well fed and not hungry	Advertise to parents; invite specific target children, Class teachers to monitor.	SLT	Ongoing £1,298.20
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<b>£20,298.20</b>

6. Review of expenditure 2016/17				
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
Staff Absence does not adversely affect provision.	Familiar and good quality absence cover	Teacher from within school covered some absence when appropriate. This meant that vulnerable pupils had a known familiar teacher to work with which had a positive impact on pupil behaviour and learning, especially in classes with high level of need.	Using PP teacher for cover had an adverse effect on the continuity of group work and intervention programmes and, therefore, this strategy will not be continued on a regular basis next year.	
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
Disadvantaged groups make at least expected progress	Literacy teacher (Small groups and 1:1)	Where support was used most effectively, pupils in the target group made better than expected progress. Some pupils made very significant gains.	Analysis of where support was most effective was shared with staff and specific interventions and approaches are being extended to other year groups. Arrangements have been made to allow for these interventions to run with minimal disruption. Two intervention programmes that were not having a significant impact have been discontinued. A new intervention has been initiated.	Total staffing cost for i) + ii) = £83,438

More able PP pupils exceed expected	Literacy teacher (Small groups and 1:1)	The PP support teacher has worked with identified higher ability pupils in reading and writing at KS2. The maths subject lead has worked with identified pupils in both key stages. Both strategies have led to improvements being made. However, some areas were identified that are holding back the progress of some pupils. (Reading comprehension and vocabulary)	Staff members have been trained in the use of a new intervention which targets inference, as this was the area that was preventing higher attainment in reading. This intervention will be delivered by a larger number of staff members and a wider age range, as the impact of small group work needs to be replicated on a larger scale. This intervention is being trialled and implementation will be altered in response to impact studies at the end of the trial period. (Summer Term 2017)	
All disadvantaged pupils are ready for the next stage of their learning (i.e. KS1 or KS2)	TAs for MELLP and 1:1 reading	MELLP programme has had proven results for a number of years and has been extended to include areas of difficulty. Changes have been made to ensure that a larger proportion of disadvantaged KS1 pupils are working at expected levels. Attainment in Y2 is rising.	Provision for reading and early literacy will be continued, including phonic support for disadvantaged pupils.	

### iii. Other approaches

<b>Desired outcome workers</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</b>	<b>Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.</b>	<b>Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Children are nurtured and emotionally ready to learn	Jigsaw4U and TAMHs workers	The positive impact of this support has had significant impact upon the emotional well-being of a number of pupils. This also has an impact upon the children's ability to learn and in some cases the improvement in learning behaviour, which reduces negative impact upon other pupils' learning. The expertise of the Jigsaw worker also helped to prepare the pupils in Y6 for transition to their secondary school. Some pupils need more regular support than the weekly or fortnightly slots.	Jigsaw and TAMHs support will continue. ELSA support and Nurture sessions will also be extended, which will involve staff training.	£11,000 £6,000
	Reduction in costs of residential school trip	Pupils were enabled to participate in residential trip (over a weekend). This had social and emotional benefits in addition to sporting and extra-curricular learning	Where funding allows this will be continued.	£489.50
Children are fit to learn and prepared for the day	Breakfast Club and KS2 Fruit Tuck shop	Offering free breakfast club to PP pupils has enabled some pupils to be better prepared for the school day and has also enabled some pupils to arrive at school on time. The take up for fruit tuck shop was relatively low and the impact upon well-being and learning was less evident. (KS1 fruit is provided free of charge)	We believe that all pupils need to have breakfast before the start of the school day and will continue to offer breakfast club to facilitate this.  Fruit tuck shop has been discontinued.	£1676 £940.20

## 7. Additional detail

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