

Ivy Lane School: Pupil Premium Strategy Statement 17/18

1. Summary information					
School	Ivy Lane Primary				
Academic Year	17/18	Total PP budget	£105020	Date of most recent PP Review	Dec 2017
Total number of pupils	371	Number of pupils eligible for PP	75	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Mar 2018

2. Current attainment (April 2017)									
		Y1- Y6 Ivy Lane Pupils Non- PPG				Y1- Y6 Ivy Lane Pupils eligible for PP (difference*)			
(*the gap at KS2 core in 2017 was 21%)	KS2 national average 2017	Previous A3 16/17	A1	A2	A3	Previous A3 16/17	A1	A2	A3
% achieving expected in reading, writing and maths	61%	72%	71%			44% (28%)	47% (24%)		
% achieving expected in reading	71%	82%	84%			67% (15%)	63% (21%)		
% achieving expected in writing	76%	78%	77%			61% (17%)	57% (20%)		
% achieving expected in maths	75%	78%	76%			71% (7%)	65% (11%)		

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high attainers)	
In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)	
A.	Reading for pleasure and purpose and higher-order comprehension skills
B.	Meeting new curriculum expectations
C.	Children from disadvantaged backgrounds reaching Greater Depth
External barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)	
D.	Parental support and aspirations (for some pupils)

4. Desired outcomes

	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>															
A.	Differences in attainment between groups at end of KS2 (PP eligible & non) to be narrowed in comparison to KS1 gaps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage of children achieving expected levels in core subjects is lowered so that the gap between PP and non is narrowed during the year 2. Higher percentage of Y6 children, who are eligible for PP, achieve expected levels in end of KS2 assessments than nationally 															
B.	Differences in attainment between groups at end of KS1 (PP eligible & non) to be narrowed in comparison to EYFS gaps <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Cohort 2021 (53 children)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015 EYFS PP Gap</th> <th>2017 Y2 PP Gap</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>13%</td> <td>01%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>20%</td> <td>09%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maths</td> <td>27%</td> <td>07%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Cohort 2021 (53 children)			2015 EYFS PP Gap	2017 Y2 PP Gap	Reading	13%	01%	Writing	20%	09%	Maths	27%	07%	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Higher percentage of Y2 children, who are eligible for PP, achieve expected levels in end of KS1 assessments than nationally in 2017 (R:76% W:68% M:75%) 2. Percentage of children passing phonics screening check is similar for PP eligible and non PP pupils 3. From Early Years to KS1 and from KS1 to KS2 additional PP children achieve the expected standard
	Cohort 2021 (53 children)																
	2015 EYFS PP Gap	2017 Y2 PP Gap															
Reading	13%	01%															
Writing	20%	09%															
Maths	27%	07%															
C.	Difference between attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed for those children who achieve the exceeding standard in KS1 and KS2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage of Y2 children, who are eligible for PP and achieve exceeding in end of KS1 assessments are similar to those nationally 2. Percentage of Y6 children, who are eligible for PP and achieve exceeding in end of KS2 assessments are similar to those nationally 3. PP children who achieved higher standards in KS1 continue to achieve similar progress to their non PPG peers 4. PP children who achieved higher standards in Early learning goals continue to achieve similar progress to their non PPG peers 5. From Early Years to KS1 and from KS1 to KS2 additional PP children achieve the higher standard 															
D	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Increased attendance & punctuality for PP pupils ii) To fully meet the social and emotional needs of eligible PP children (especially those who are also SEND) iii) Increased engagement with parents of PP pupils iv) Raise the aspirations of PP children 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further close the gap between PP and non PP children's attendance (15/16: FSM 3.9 & non FSM 2.5%) 2. Close the gap for persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP (15/16: FSM 10.5% & non FSM 3.3%) 3. PP children show improved confidence and engagement in the classroom (qualitative evidence through questionnaires with staff and pupil) 4. Close the gap for the number of PP children vs non PP parents that attend parents' evening 															

--	--	--

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year	17/18
----------------------	--------------

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 ?
A. Difference between KS2 attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed	Use of assembly time to target PPG children specifically with comprehension	EEF research suggests that this is an effective way to target children who receive pupil premium funding. Comprehension has been identified by the school as a major barrier to reaching the expected standard in different year groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback to staff across the school from trial in Y3 Roll out across the school-agree expectations and non-negotiables Monitor consistency across the school through pupil conferencing and data analysis 	JF	March and July
A. Difference between KS2 attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed B. Difference between KS1 attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be	Preteaching of PPG children using TAs and Teacher	SENCO has identified this as an effective way to ensure children who receive pupil premium are able to access learning in the classroom more effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback to staff across the school from trial in Y3 Roll out across the school-agree expectations and non-negotiables Monitor consistency across the school through pupil conferencing and data analysis 	JF	March and July

<p>C. Difference between attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed for those children who achieve the exceeding standard in KS1 and KS2</p>	<p>Preteaching of PPG children using TAs and Teacher</p> <p>Marking of PPG children's books first and regular & frequent verbal feedback to PPG children (at least 2 x a week)</p>	<p>EEF & Warwick university research has suggested that this is an effective means of narrowing the gap.</p> <p>Number of other schools locally adopting a similar approach.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPD for all staff • Monitor consistency across the school through pupil conferencing and data analysis 	<p>JF</p>	<p>March and July</p>
<p>A. Difference between KS2 attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed</p>	<p>Whole school CPD – 20 principles of phonics teaching.</p>	<p>Training is to be delivered by an Advanced Skills Teacher based in Bristol and will provide a range of strategies and ideas for teachers to help struggling readers improve and close the gap with their peers.</p>	<p>Review & feedback from all staff who attended the training</p> <p>Follow up discussion in PDMs with all staff</p> <p>Signposting of good practise (informed through observations and drop ins)</p>	<p>JF</p>	<p>March and July</p>
<p>A. Difference between KS2 attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed</p>	<p>Targeted parental engagement and use of Wiltshire Adult Learning Network</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that some families do not engage with learning at home due to a lack of confidence or skills. Wiltshire's programme can support this and improve children's chances in the classroom.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage parents might otherwise be reluctant to access the programme through conversations, personal invites, shared home learning projects 	<p>JF</p>	<p>March and July</p>
<p>Total budgeted cost</p>					<p>£22917 (additional Y6 teaching team). £20714 (TA led interventions) Total: £43631</p>

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 ?
B. Difference between KS1 attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed	Reading Recovery	The school has an experienced Reading Recovery teacher and has collected evidence to show how it has helped pupils to accelerate their learning in reading (with the added benefit of increased performance and confidence in other subjects). Evidence suggests that early intervention is the most effective.	Regular reports from the Reading Recovery teacher (presented to governors).	Helen Fahey (Reading Recovery Teacher) JF	Progress reviewed at the end of each reading recovery cycle (approx. 3 times a year)
A. Difference between KS2 attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed B. Difference between KS1 attainment groups (PP eligible & non) in 2017 to be narrowed	Early Reading Partnership (ERP) Talking Stories Back on Track Success @ Arithmetic Talk Boost Pre-teaching	Pupils who are eligible for PP are prioritised for the interventions listed. All are delivered in afternoons by staff who have been specifically trained for that intervention. Evidence from previous years has shown a positive impact on the attainment and progress of pupils in the school.	Progress reviews enable all the interventions to be reviewed. The progress of children taking part in interventions are included in TA appraisals.	Laura Phillips (SENCO) Disadvantaged Learner Lead	Progress reviewed at the end of intervention cycles.
Total budgeted cost					£26685
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 ?
Increased attendance for PP pupils	Use of Pastoral Manger to chase children who are absent from school. Provision of breakfast club in school to encourage children to get in earlier	Increasing amount of evidence around the effect that breakfast clubs can have on children in school. Pastoral manager contact with parents has previously helped improved children's attendance in school. Attendance has improved at Ivy Lane over several years and the school is now in a position to focus on PP pupils attendance directly.	Regular analysis of attendance (specifically of PP children).	Pastoral Manager & Breakfast Club Leader	3 x a year

Meeting the social and emotional needs of eligible PP children (especially those who are also SEND)	Forest School (0.1 FTE) ELSA Additional (0.1) FTE SENCO hours	The school has used forest schools to support children for a number of years and has prioritised its use for PP children following evidence around 'nature deficit'. A significant number of children eligible for PP are also on the SEN register and so specific provision for these pupils has to be carefully thought out. A trained ELSA will enable focused interventions around social and emotional needs.	Forest school leader reviews ELSA reviews SENCO monitoring	SENCO LB Disadvantaged Learner Lead	3x a year
D iii) Increased engagement with parents of PP pupils D iv) Raise the aspirations of PP children	SENCO @ parent meetings Vulnerable Learner Group formed (SEN and PP) Mentor scheme across whole school	Data from previous years revealed a group of children who were particularly vulnerable as they were PP and were on the SEN register. Specific support has therefore been identified to address this need.	Parents' Evening monitoring Mentor scheme organised and children allocated to teachers	SLT Pastoral Manager Additional SENCO hours to allow for increased attendance of PP / SEND children	3 x a year
Learning mentors to support emotional wellbeing and learning.	TAs and Teachers to be allocated children who meet the ILS Vulnerable learner criteria (PPG and SEND) and provide support.	Evidence from other schools and research suggests that this approach has a positive impact on attainment, progress and well-being.	Monitoring of pupil attainment , progress and wellbeing. Pupil conferencing.	JF	3 x a year
Total budgeted cost					£35273

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year 15/16				
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
To diminish the difference between PP eligible and non PP in core subjects at the end of KS2	Two smaller Y6 classes	Attainment gap for those achieving the expected standard Reading: 13% attainment gap Writing: 3% Maths:10% Core:20%	The reading results had the largest impact on the overall data and there have been wide ranging strategies across the whole school in 16/17 to improve this area of the curriculum this year. There were many positives from the KS2 results last year as well. 73% of children met the expected standard in writing (74% nationally) and 78% of children met the expected standard in maths (70% nationally).	£14821
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
To diminish the difference between PP eligible and non PP in core subjects in KS1	Reading Recovery Numbers Count	The phonics screening check at the end of Y1 showed 78% of PP children passed (70% nationally). In reading recovery, children made an average reading age gain of 13.2 months over an average of 16.8 weeks. One child gained 18 months over 17 weeks.	This approach will continue in 16/17 with a strong focus on the performance of PP children.	£20180 £20195
iii. 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

Meeting the social and emotional needs of eligible PP children	WWT Pastoral Manager Wild Wood (Year 3) Attendance	Positive impact in terms of attendance. Wild wood showed good impact on attitudes for those children that attended.	Approach to continue next year but with further emphasis on PP children who are also on the SEN register.	£15631
--	---	---	---	--------

7. Additional detail

Number of eligible PP pupils is reducing each year (despite an increasing NOR) so PP funding will reduce
 Funding for financial year (14/15) was: £124900
 Funding for 17/18 will be £105020