

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement 2018-19

1. Summary information					
School	Market Weighton Infant School				
Academic Year	2018/19	Total PP budget (based on 33 children at Jan 2018 census) 27 FSM @ £1,320 = £35,640 3 Service Children @ £300=£900 3 LAC @ £2,300 = 6,900	£43,440	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Termly
Total number of pupils	250 + 33 nursery	Number of pupils eligible for PP (September 2018) 23 FSM; 2 LAC; 1 Service Children	26		

Reception (F2) End of Year Date 2018					Key Stage 1 (Year 1 & Year 2) End of Summer Term 2018				
	Pupils eligible for PP(4)		Pupils not eligible for PP(67)			Y1 PP (12)	Y1 Non-PP(61)	Y2 PP (15)	Y2 Non-PP (60)
	Entry 2017	June 2018	Entry 2017	June 2018					
% on track for expected standard in Speaking	50%	90%	63%	89%	% children reaching expected standard in reading	50%	66%	60%	78%
% on track for expected standard in Reading	50%	50%	66%	80%	% children reaching expected standard in writing	33%	59%	60%	68%
% on track for expected standard in Writing	50%	50%	67%	75%	% children reaching expected standard in maths	42%	59%	87%	87%
% on track for expected standard in Number	50%	60%	75%	84%					

nat= national result 2017

PP: Pupil Premium LAC: Looked after child (or previously in care) F2: Foundation 2 FSM: Free School Meals PSE: Personal, Social & Emotional

2. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)		
In-school barriers <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)</i>		
A.	Oral language skills on entry in Reception are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other groups of pupils. This slows reading & writing progress in subsequent years.	
B.	Although PP pupils make more progress than most other groups, their attainment is so low on entry that it is difficult for them to reach the expected levels. Progress needs to increase even further.	
C.	Personal, social & emotional skills are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other groups. This effects their behaviour, confidence and independence in subsequent years. Problems with social & emotional difficulties and/or with home circumstances can have a significant effect on the learning of some PP pupils.	
D.	FSM children do not read at home as often as non-FSM children. This effects their progress in reading fluency and comprehension.	
External barriers <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>		
E.	2017-18 attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are 93.5% (below non-FSM at 96.5%). This reduces individual's school hours and causes them to fall behind on average.	
3. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Improved oral language skills for pupils eligible for FSM in Foundation. Measured by close tracking of the data.	Pupils eligible for FSM in Foundation make rapid progress in their oral language skills by the end of the year so that the number meeting expected standards increases.
B.	Improved progress of FSM pupils so that FSM pupil progress is the strongest of all groups. Measured by close tracking of data.	The rate of progress made each year by FSM pupils is increasing.
C.	Staff are able to address children's social & emotional difficulties with understanding & skill. Measured by staff feedback through evidence forms.	Evidence forms show that the training staff have received has improved their knowledge and skills & general ability to manage the situation.
D.	FSM children's progress in reading matches that of non-FSM children. Measured by close tracking of the data.	The rate of progress made each year by FSM pupils is increasing.
E.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP. Measured through attendance tracking systems.	Overall PP attendance remains above national PP levels (92.7%).

4. Planned expenditure						
Academic year	2018/9					
How we 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	Review	Cost
A.Improved phonic skills B.Improved progress of FSM children	Small group tuition in place of whole class teaching to ensure that pupils, especially boys, are active and involved according to their attention span.	EEF Toolkit finds that overall, the pattern is that small group tuition is effective and, as a rule of thumb, the smaller the group the better, e.g. groups of two have slightly higher impact than groups of three, but slightly lower impact than one to one tuition.	Staff training & monitoring will encourage less whole class teaching & more small group tuition to ensure that the children who find listening in large groups difficult are actively involved in small group work instead. Release time for monitoring needs to be provided for subject leaders.	Teachers English leader	termly	£350 monitoring & review TA cost: £11,000 = £11,350
Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate. F2 & Y1: children received small group tuition for phonics teaching. This enabled children to receive greater attention than they would in a larger group and ensured that lessons involved physical challenge to keep children's attention. As a result, 81% of children reached the expected level of the Phonics Check, which is just short of national levels at 82%. Pupils who receive PP funding benefitted, making good progress from their starting points with 64% reaching the expected level (compared to 70% PP national).						
Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) This approach to phonics needs to take place over two years (ie. not just during Year 1). In this way, children have received two years of small group tuition to enable them to meet the required standard. This is now always built into our practise with all children benefitting from this approach. Children who find reading difficult can still be taught to recognise letter sounds if they are taught in small groups which contain fun, interactive and physical experiences.						

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	Review	Cost
A.Improved oral language skills in reception & Y1 B. Improved progress for PP pupils	Small group provision of Talk Boost intervention for children in Foundation	Some of the pupils need targeted support to catch up. Talk Boost is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.	SENDCo	termly	Talk Boost TA cost & cover £5,000 Monitoring & review: £350 = £5,350
C. PSE issues of PP pupils are addressed	2 ELSAs (Emotional Literacy Support Assistants) are deployed to support children with individual social and emotional needs x 3 sessions.	EEF toolkit finds that on average, social & emotional learning interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself (four months' additional progress on average).	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.	SENDCo	termly	TA cost contribution £5,000 Resources: £440 Monitoring & review: £350 = £5,790
C. PSE issues of PP pupils are addressed	Staff are trained in "Therapeutic Skills" in order to be best able to understand children's emotional problems and be able to address them.	EEF toolkit finds that on average, social & emotional learning interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself (four months' additional progress on average).	Discuss the impact of the training with staff and collect evidence of its impact using Evidence Forms.	HT	termly	Training cost: £4,000 TA cost: £3,000 = £7,000
A.Improved phonic skills B.Improved progress of FSM children	Introduction of Lexia Reading Core5® as an intervention to help boost reading and phonics skills using bespoke ICT programme.	Some of the pupils need targeted support to catch up. Lexia is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.	Teachers	termly	TA cost contribution: £4,350 Monitoring & review: £350 = £4,700
B.Improved progress of FSM children	Small group work to improve gross motor skills in order to impact on fine motor control to improve handwriting.	Some of the pupils need targeted support to catch up. There is much written evidence (eg. L.Addy) to support the belief that the maturity of gross motor skills is key to developing a good handwriting script.	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.	SENCo	termly	TA cost: £5,000 Monitoring & review: £350 = £5,350

D. Reading progress of FSM children matches that of non-FSM children	1 to 1 reading support on a daily basis	EEF Toolkit finds that overall, the pattern is that small group tuition is effective and, as a rule of thumb, the smaller the group the better, e.g. groups of two have slightly higher impact than groups of three, but slightly lower impact than one to one tuition.	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time. Provide training so that the adults involved are confident in their approach.	English lead / Teachers	termly	Adult support cost: £3,000 Monitoring & review: £350 = £3,350
--	---	---	--	-------------------------	--------	--

Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.

- F2: Small group provision of Talk Boost took place each week, providing time for children to develop their speech and language skills. As a result, the number of targeted children meeting expectations in speaking rose from 67% at the beginning of the year to 88% by the year end.
- Y1 and Y2: PP children received Lexia reading tuition- up to 3 times per week. As a result, this group learnt to read and spell more words accurately, giving them more confidence in their reading and writing. The intervention also had the benefit of motivating the children so that they enjoyed reading and writing.
- Y1 and Y2: 2 ELSAs (Emotional Literacy Support Assistants) supported children with individual social and emotional difficulties which helped to ensure that children were happy and settled in school, ready to learn. Staff who have received the Therapeutic Skills training also contribute to ensuring that children's emotional needs are addressed as they are equipped with the necessary skills.

Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)

These approaches will continue next year because our results show that they are having an impact on children's outcomes. This supports teachers in providing differentiated literacy instruction.

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	Review	Cost
E. Increased attendance rates	Office staff monitor pupils and follow up quickly on absences. First day response provision. Careful tracking of PP absence if causing concern.	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.	Thorough briefing of office about existing absence issues. Inclusion Manager, head, governors etc. will collaborate to ensure school processes work smoothly together.	Head-teacher	termly	Admin costs: £400 Monitoring & Review £150 =£550

Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.

The year ended with attendance levels that are above national (96.4% compared to 95.8% national). PP attendance is in line with national. PP attendance is only 1.8% lower than non-PP children which is an improvement on last year which saw a 3% gap.

Lessons learned

(and whether you will continue with this approach)

Attendance monitoring will continue in the same way as this helps to maintain whole school attendance at national levels.