# Pupil Premium Strategy Statement

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **School** | Yarborough Academy | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2016-17 | **Total PP budget** | £91080 | **Date of most recent PP Review** | Jan 17 |
| **Total number of pupils** | 433 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 69 | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | April 17 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Current attainment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | *Pupils eligible for PP (your school)* | | | | *Pupils* ***not*** *eligible for PP (national average)* | | |
| **Proportion achieving expected attainment or above in reading, writing & maths** | | | | | | | | **38%** | | | | 60% | | |
| **Average progress score in reading** | | | | | | | | **-0.32** | | | | 0.3 | | |
| **Average progress score in writing (TA)** | | | | | | | | **2.85** | | | | 0.1 | | |
| **Average progress score in maths** | | | | | | | | **2.22** | | | | 0.2 | | |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (ie an increased *likelihood* that pupils eligible for PP will exhibit these factors)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Inhibited communication skills and a vocabulary deficit, leading to general underachievement in reading for identified pupils. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Attendance and persistent absence inhibiting access to quality first teaching for identified groups following data dashboard analysis. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **C.** | | Requirements of new mathematics curriculum and internal tracking have widened gaps in understanding of basic mathematical concepts | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **D.** | | Family- and home-related issues (eg emotional and relationship difficulties, lower academic aspiration, housing and transport challenges, etc) for a small but significant groups of children | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **E.** | | Attendance issues (see overlaps with above) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **F.** | | Reduced home reading and mathematical opportunities | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **G.** | | Increased take up of FSM in Key Stage 1 to ensure appropriate funding | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Desired outcomes** *(Desired outcomes and how they will be measured)* | | | | | | | | | | **Success criteria** | | | | |
|  | Diminishing average achievement difference between ‘Disadvantaged’ and ‘Other’ pupils in all year groups, with particular regard to reading and attainment of middle attaining children as identified in data dashboard analysis.*(RAISE and l depth of learning index, PUMA and PIRA summative testing, class provision maps)* | | | | | | | | | Internal data to show diminishing differences between ‘Disadvantaged’ and Other pupils throughout the school with particular regard to reading, taking into account individual pupils’ varied starting points and cognitive ability. Middle attaining pupils to be a particular focus in pupil progress meetings and class provision maps to ensure a trend does not occur. | | | | |
|  | Increased attendance and consistently positive behaviours for learning evident for the vast majority of targeted pupils. *(SIMS Attendance data, ECM survey and Boxall profiles from Nurture group)* | | | | | | | | | The difference between attendance data for PP and non-PP pupils continues to diminish over time. Persistent attendance >10%) for the group FSM is addressed, ceasing to be a weakness in dashboard. | | | | |
|  | Diminishing average achievement difference between ‘Disadvantaged’ and ‘Other’ pupils in all year groups, with particular regard to maths and achievement of disadvantaged middle and higher attaining children as identified in data dashboard analysis.*(RAISE and depth of learning index, PUMA and PIRA summative testing, class provision maps)* | | | | | | | | | Internal data to show diminishing differences between ‘Disadvantaged’ and Other pupils throughout the school with particular regard to maths, taking into account individual pupils’ varied starting points and cognitive ability. Focus on middle and higher attaining disadvantaged pupils in Pupil Progress meetings and class provision maps. | | | | |
|  | Use of wrap around provision, nurture group, learning mentor and EWO to provide targeting of support and challenge for attendance and punctuality. (*SIMS data, Boxall profiling, pre and after school club take up data*) | | | | | | | | | All disadvantaged group, including the most able, have strong provision that impacts on diminishing differences in attendance and punctuality as compared to other groups, regardless of ability to pay. | | | | |
|  | Substantially increased attendance for targeted children. *(SIMS attendance data)* | | | | | | | | | See above | | | | |
|  | Increased out of school take up of Bug club, in-school reading for targeted pupils, fostering a love of reading and a greater likelihood of reading at home, either independently or with support from a family member. Increased IXL and TT rockstar take up leads to improved mathematical outcomes. *(Home reading data and outcomes from PIRA, PUMA, IXL TT rockstar and Bug club)* | | | | | | | | | Improved outcomes via internal tracking and statutory data for disadvantaged pupils, including the most able, leads to diminishing differences between disadvantaged pupils and those Nationally (where applicable) and those not Disadvantaged internally. | | | | |
|  | Promotion of FSM and the advantages in funding opportunities it provides the school. Use of learning mentor to encourage applications from new entrants, Reception intake and also current on role via coffee mornings, parent evenings, exhibitions of learning. Deeper involvement of Governing body in Pupil Premium oversight | | | | | | | | | Increased funding stream in KS1 especially from those eligible for FSM. NLG review to include specific reference to next steps of Pupil Premium. | | | | |
| 1. **Planned expenditure** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * **Academic year** | | | | | **2016-17 (estimated costs for 2 terms only – approx. £60720)** | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Quality of teaching for all (including evidence-based, focused group learning delivered by support staff)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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?** |
| 1. Diminishing average achievement difference between ‘Disadvantaged’ and ‘Other’ pupils in all year groups, with particular regard to reading and attainment of middle attaining children as identified in data dashboard analysis | | | | TA work in classes to support QFT by additional targeted roving, questioning and feedback  (approx.)  20TAs x 1.5 x 26 weeks x £13 = £10140)  Non contact time for SLT (English/SEN/Assess)to evaluate data, teaching and learning and model excellent practice as lead practitioners.  Staff training in key areas to support and challenge PP pupils. (3 days assessment, 3 days SENCO, 2 days Lexia, 1 day lead teacher  = £1998  Educational Psychologist time  £500 | | EEF TA recommendations  MITA recommendations (IoE research and scaffolding techniques)  Robust analysis of internal tracking and statutory outcomes in order to have whole school focus and coaching model to improve practice from Hattie (2014) Ch 12, & effective identification Ofsted (2013)  The quality of first teaching is thought to have a disproportionately high effect on PP pupils, and effective CPD / training is a precursor to this.  Schools that use PP most effectively identify those pupils who are underachieving. The school can only target the correct interventions at pupils with the most detailed knowledge of their specific needs. Ofsted 2013. | SLT and HT to monitor delivery.  Consider additional training for all teachers in how to deploy TAs in the classroom.  See below for specific intervention delivered by additional support and training required.  HT to ensure that appropriate areas for training are identified and input delivered effectively based on internal tracking and statutory data analysis.  SENCO to select the pupils to be assessed and monitor the work of the EP and TAs. | | | | SLT and  HT | | | April 2017 |
| 1. Increased attendance and consistently positive behaviours for learning evident for the vast majority of targeted pupils. | | | | 1:2 iPad deployment across Academy (Apportion of cost = £3000)  Embedding of bespoke curriculum based on Chris Quigley essentials (apportioned cost-  69/433 x 50000  (£8000) | | Access to innovative technology to supplement excellent teaching – effect size 0.37 and has a role in fostering a love of learning and effective assessment/feedback for teachers (Hattie ch.21 and report from Marking Policy review group as mentioned in our Challenge Partners report). Proven outcomes have shown impact of new curriculum on standards. | Internal tracking, self evaluation schedule to include performance management and evaluation of teaching and learning – focus on learning journals, quality of work presented in books and discussion with appropriate children. | | | | SLT/LM | | | Monthly attendance meetings |
| 1. Diminishing average achievement difference between ‘Disadvantaged’ and ‘Other’ pupils in all year groups, with particular regard to maths and achievement of disadvantaged middle and higher attaining children as identified in data dashboard analysis. | | | | Staff training in key areas to support and challenge PP pupils. (approx £3000)  Non contact time for SLT (Maths/SEN/Assess)  to evaluate data, teaching and learning and model excellent practice as lead practitioners  3 days assessment, 3 days SENCO, 2 days Lexia, 1 day lead teacher  = £1998 | | The quality of first teaching is thought to have a disproportionately high effect on PP pupils, and effective CPD / training is a precursor to this. (Ofsted 2013, p11)  Robust analysis of internal tracking and statutory outcomes in order to have whole school focus and coaching model to improve practice from Hattie (2014) Ch 12 | HT to ensure that appropriate areas for training are identified and input delivered effectively based on internal tracking and statutory data analysis.. | | | | HT  SLT | | | Summer 2017  Apr 2017 |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **£28636** |
| 1. **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?** | |
| 1. Diminishing average achievement difference between ‘Disadvantaged’ and ‘Other’ pupils in all year groups, with particular regard to reading and attainment of middle attaining children as identified in data dashboard analysis. | | | | Additional out of school tuition offered by class teachers to foster love of reading and improve inference/deduction skills (Aut term – 2 teachers x £30 x 10 weeks - £600  Spr Term – 1 teacher x twice a week x £30 x 10 weeks - £600  4 teachers x once x £30 x 10 weeks - £1200)  Total cost - £2400  Lexia licence  (£3088 – two terms) | | Development of ‘automaticity’ in fluent reading required with demands of new curriculum and through our analysis of 2016 reading KS2 SATS – see also Hattie Ch 7, DFE Research evidence for reading for pleasure (2012)  Targeted use of Lexia intervention and associated training/analysis to identify, teach and reflect on individual reading needs | Identified children through Pupil Progress meetings and effectiveness underlined by PIRA results  SENCO to provide data on use and training. | | HT  HT and SENCO | | | | Apr 2017 | |
| 1. Increased attendance and consistently positive behaviours for learning evident for the vast majority of targeted pupils   D.Use of wrap around provision, nurture group, learning mentor and EWO to provide targeting of support and challenge for attendance and punctuality.  E. Substantially increased attendance for targeted children. | | | | Nurture group based on Boxall principles and focussed on disadvantaged pupils. Use of Learning Mentor to track attendance, punctuality, exclusion and pastoral issues. Extension of contract to include work over school holidays.  (34 weeks x 3hours x £20= £2040  EWS SLA to track and improve attendance  £2500  Use of sports coach (separate to Sports Premium) to focus on extra-curricular provision and participation in pre and after school clubs – include Change for life, reflexology, cooking club, fencing, dance, gym, violin, guitar, theatre, lunchtime clubs  Sports coach -2hours x 26 weeks x £30 = £1560  Club staffing and running costs  69/433 x £7000= £1115  Total costs  £2675  Breakfast club targeted at disadvantaged families  (£2500 staffing  £600 games etc)  Mentis therapy  £2700  Contribution towards the cost of residential and non-residential educational visits for targeted eligible pupils.  £5000 | | Supporting children with challenging behaviour (2011) shows effectiveness of nurture group provision, when allied to academic outcomes. Evidence of effectiveness from Ofsted 2013, (P.19)  Attendance and punctuality correlated with attainment (Ofsted 2013 \_ how schools are spending the funding, p.18)  Case studies from Ofsted 2013 describe broadening social experiences conducive to improved learning behaviour and development of social and emotional skills. (p.18)  EEF report on breakfast clubs November 2016  Addressing the mental well being of disadvantaged pupils.  Ofsted 2013 p18, including those describing broadening of experience for PP children. | LM and sports lead accountable to HT and attendance data/take up analysed termly for targeted children. Reports based on Boxall/ECM data and also correlate with PUMA/PIRA outcomes. | |  | | | | Apr 2017 | |
| 1. Diminishing average achievement difference between ‘Disadvantaged’ and ‘Other’ pupils in all year groups, with particular regard to maths and achievement of disadvantaged middle and higher attaining children as identified in data dashboard analysis. | | | | Numicon training, advocacy status and intervention programme across the Academy  (6 TAs x 26 weeks x £13) x twice a week  £4056)  Easter school for Year 6  £600 | | The use of concrete mathematical methods has been identified as being effective in raising attainment, with some examples showing great promise in trials (see EEF website reports on TAs delivering structured maths interventions to small groups of pupils)  Additional support from teachers and TAs targeted to improve outcomes. (Ofsted 2013, p25 mentions effectiveness of summer school – use as a basis for Easter version) | Maths subject lead will train and monitor a small team of TAs who will become familiar with the potential for Numicon (and other resources) to rapidly develop the maths skills and knowledge of targeted pupils.  Close planning with Year 6 teachers and other invited subject specialists to ensure | | SLT and HT | | | | April 2017 | |
| F. Increased out of school take up of Bug club, in-school reading for targeted pupils, fostering a love of reading and a greater likelihood of reading at home, either independently or with support from a family member. Increased IXL and TT rockstar take up leads to improved mathematical outcomes. | | | | Bug club licence  (£2100)  IXL licence  £1650  TT rockstar licence  £60  Reading rewards  £1000 | | Meeting the specific needs of individuals, to keep them on track, prevent them from underachieving or broaden their horizons via home school interaction and learning Ofsted 2013, (p.20) | SLT and HT to have information about frequency and effect of additional schemes. Pupil progress meetings to use this data so that provision mapping can be as precise as possible. | | SLT | | | | Apr 2017 | |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **£32969** | |
| 1. **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?** | |
| G.Promotion of FSM and the advantages in funding opportunities it provides the school. Use of learning mentor to encourage applications from new entrants, Reception intake and also current on role. Deeper involvement of Governing body in Pupil Premium oversight | | | Learning mentor to publicise via coffee mornings, parent evenings, exhibitions of learning.  £300  NLG review of governance to include Pupil Premium recommendations for further support and challenge  £500 | | | Data analysis of Yarborough context shows spike in FSM from KS2 onwards. School believes that offer of universal FSM to KS1 discourages applications until Year 3.  Head and Chair have identified the need for strategic review of governance as an independent academy. Ofsted 2013 (p.22) note the contribution of effective Governance | LM performance management to be included in PM schedule and for targets to be agreed  Recommendations from NLG to form part of larger all action plan for Governance. | | LM and HT  CoG and HT | | | | June 2017  Mar 2017 | |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **£800** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Review of expenditure** | | | | |
| **Previous Academic Year** | | **2015-16 £92260 (Three terms)** | | |
| 1. **Quality of teaching for all (including evidence-based, focused group learning delivered by support staff)** | | | | |
| **Desired outcome**  **Chosen action / approach**  To evaluate data, teaching and learning with respect to children eligible for Pupil Premium  Beginning of 1:2 iPad deployment across Academy Years 1 – 6 (apportion 15%)  Report analysis for Key Stage one and two with reference to children eligible for Pupil Premium.  Embedding of Project Based Learning as curriculum offer (apportion 15%) | | **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**  **£20316** |
| Clear focus on Pupil Premium children, close analysis of internal tracking.  This has led to diminishing differences in outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in statutory data. Challenge Partners report. (apportion 33%)Parental responses to new curriculum overwhelmingly positive and evidenced via feedback forms.  Data dashboard confirms progress and attainment of disadvantaged pupils across the Academy has been the result of close analysis of tracking and coaching of staff from lead practitioners. | New assessment without levels has meant a clear focus on the internal progress of all pupils, but with particular regard to those disadvantaged.  Continued development of curriculum offer needed to deepen learning behaviours and engagement. Continued careful focus on tracking and also coaching of teaching staff by lead professionals required to raise the levels of all children, but also to diminish the differences between disadvantaged and not.  Close analysis of key reading and maths areas to be more precisely addressed 2016/17 | £6938  £1752+£810  £1150  £666  £9000 |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **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**  **£27717** |
| Additional out of school tuition in small groups delivered by teachers | | Data dashboard indicates continued improvement at all stages (with some discrepancies ie reading attainment at Year 6). | Use of internal data, class provision maps shows where additional need is to quality first teaching. This small group offer to continue as has a potential to be powerful in impacting on achievement for disadvantaged children. | £3180 + £500 resources |
| ‘Bug Club’ licence  Bug club trial  Easter school  Lexia trial  Numicon training and investment in equipment  Numicon sessions  Curriculum trips | | These trials have established the need for additional in school and out of school practise for reading and maths. Some early indications that a more strategic whole school approach will raise the achievements of disadvantaged children. | Investment in Numicon has led to advocacy status with associated links to best National practice. Trials have showed how disadvantaged children and any gaps they have in their understanding can be addressed in these ways.  Easter school a success with high participation rates from disadvantaged children. | £3149  £594  £4632  £1240 +£411  £3180  £6000 |
| 1. **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**  **£45037** |
| Use of 2 learning mentors to track attendance, pastoral, exclusion, time in class data.  Readiness for learning index used to support individual children. Extension of contract to include work with pupils eligible for the Pupil Premium over school holidays.  Creation of nurture group focussed on vulnerable Pupil Premium children  Use of sports coach to focus on sporting participation of PP children weekly  Mentis therapy (now Fortis)  Use of SLA with EWS to track and improve attendance  Additional pastoral offers;-  Reflexology for pp parents  Cooking club  DJ  Fencing  Gym  Dance  Violin  Guitar  Theatre  Lunchtime club + resources  Breakfast club | | Tracking of attendance and new SLA has contributed to some improved attendance. Too early to evaluate the long term impact of nurture group on learning behaviours and academic outcomes (wait for summative data in Spring 2017), however, attendance is extremely positive and addresses persistent absence noted on data dashboard.  Sports coach and additional provision continues to attract more disadvantaged pupils- leading to closer relationships/improved attendance/punctuality – this to be evidenced tightly in coming year. | Wrap around pastoral offers continue to enhance the community aspect of our Academy, with particular regard to disadvantaged children. Giving them access to additional facilities and opportunities, whether sporting, social or pastoral, is key to improving attendance and punctuality – and hence to achievement.  This approach will continue and we will tighten further the impact/evidence to ensure effective use of Pupil Premium. | £10395  £1844  £2000  £6822  £1500  £3680  £711  £700  £1062  £900  £2165  £900  £7318  £700  £1640  £2000 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Additional detail** |
|  |