



Pupil premium strategy statement:

1. Summary information					
School	St Laurence's				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£223,163	Date of most recent PP Review	June 2016
Total number of pupils	297	Number of pupils eligible for PP	169	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Feb 2017

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving in reading, writing and maths	23%	60%
KS 1-2 progress in reading	-0.8	0.3
KS 1-2 progress in writing	-7.5	0.1
KS 1-2 making progress in maths	+1.2	0.2

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
In-school barriers	
A.	Oral language skills on entry are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other pupils. This slows reading and subsequently writing progress in subsequent years.
B.	Pupils who reached expected standard in reading, writing and maths in EYFS 2014 and who are eligible for PP are making less progress than all pupils across Key Stage 1. This prevents sustained expected achievement in Key Stage 2.
C.	Progress of children eligible for PP from KS1 -2 in writing across the board, reading for middle and high ability and the higher ability for maths lags behind all children
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Poor punctuality in coming to school in the morning reduces the children's school hours and causes them to miss the input to lessons.

4. Desired outcomes	
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>
	<i>Success criteria</i>

A.	Improve oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in EYFS	Pupils eligible for PP in EYFS make rapid progress by the end of Reception so that the percentage of these pupils that meet age related expectations (GLD) matches or exceeds that of all pupils
B.	Higher rates of progress across KS1 for all pupils eligible for PP.	Pupils eligible for PP and meet age related expectations in EYFS continue to reach age related expectations at the end of KS1.
C.	Higher rates of progress across KS2 for all LA, MA and HA groups within children eligible for PP.	Pupils eligible for PP identified in LA, MA and HA groups make as much progress as all pupils in these groups across Key Stage 2 in maths, reading and writing. Measured in Y4, 5 and 6 by teacher assessments and successful moderation practices.
D.	Improved punctuality for pupils eligible for PP.	Reduce the number of persistent latecomers among pupils eligible for PP to 10% or below. .

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2016/17				
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?
<p>A. Improved oral language skills in Reception</p> <p>B. Increase progress of all children across the school including diminishing the difference between the disadvantaged pupils and the non-disadvantaged pupils nationally</p>	<p>Active Literacy A Chance to Talk</p> <p>Retention of two classes per year group.</p>	<p>An investment of some of the PP in longer term change which will help all pupils. Many different evidence sources, e.g. EEF Toolkit suggest high quality feedback is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we can embed across the school. Improvement +8 months. The decreasing in pupil to teacher ratio allows for more specific targeted feedback. Additionally reducing class sizes (EEF +3 months).</p>	<p>Implementation of Monitoring cycle 7. Performance management Cycle Data analysis from the end of year Raiseonline</p>	<p>SJ Carroll</p>	<p>Summer Term 2017</p>

C. Increase progress of all children across KS1 including diminishing the difference between the disadvantaged pupils and the non-disadvantaged pupils nationally	Additional teacher to support Year 2.	An investment of some of the PP in longer term change which will help all pupils. Many different evidence sources, e.g. EEF Toolkit suggest high quality feedback is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we can embed across the school. Improvement +8 months. The decreasing in pupil to teacher ratio allows for more specific targeted feedback. Additionally reducing class sizes (EEF +3 months).	Implementation of Monitoring cycle 7. Performance management Cycle Data analysis from the end of year Raiseonline	SJ Carroll	Summer Term 2017
Total budgeted cost					£118,000
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?
Writing will improve due to a more developed understanding of phonics and oracy	Active Literacy A Chance to Talk. Letters and Sounds CLPE Reading and Writing Scales	Early Years Interventions (EEF +5 months) Oral Key Interventions (EEF +5 months) Phonic programmes (EEF +4 months) Assessment recommendation from NATE training seminar to English lead. This should accelerate progress in Reading and Writing from Years 1 to 6.	Through progress meetings on impact of interventions. Completed termly. Review impact of interventions at the end of the year.	SJ Carroll F Sutton	Summer Term 2017
Attendance and punctuality will improve.	Attendance service Additional Learning mentor	Home visits Case studies Rapid response from school (Late comer analysis by additional mentor) Breakfast club	Liaison with attendance service on half termly basis and adhoc when required.	J Cushion DMcCaffery	Mar 2017
Increase attainment in all phases and core subjects across the school	Teaching assistants employed all day with class interventions and other support. Look for additional interventions that will provide increased impact of learning and attainment.	Good working relationships with children and community links to improve parental engagement.	TA appraisal	SJ Carroll	Implemented Reviewed Jan 17 Next review Summer 2017
Total budgeted cost					£65,000

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?
Improved Attendance and punctuality	Breakfast and After School Club	Children are attending school and learning. They are accessing the full curriculum.	Attendance and punctuality logs	Learning Mentor J Cushion	March 2017
Increased attainment in English and Maths	Extra Curricular Activities and Booster Session including before school	Children are wanting to come to school. Meta cognition and self regulation (EEF + 8 months for booster classes) Sports Participation and extending school day (EEF +2 months)	Monitoring of understanding of children by teacher and TA delivering booster session.	SJ Carroll	Summer 2017
Participation for all pupils	Access to wider opportunities using the Mini Bus and Trips	Ability to save parents money through transporting children to cultural and sporting events. Art and Sports Participation (EEF +2 months)	Evidenced in the school calendar that these events have been attended. Evidence of attending sports events (movement towards gaining Active Mark Gold)	SJ Carroll	Summer 2017
Successful monitoring of the desired outcomes above.	Deputy time allowing for management and tracking of evidence based interventions above.	N/A Time needs allocating.	Through monitoring evaluations and feedback to governors. Termly Headteacher report.	SJ Carroll/ Deputy Head	Termly to Governors Annually - Summer 2017
Total budgeted cost					£40,000

6. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year	2016-2017				
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	
A. Improved oral language skills in Reception	Active Literacy A Chance to Talk	More children achieved GLD at the end of Reception. This was an increase on last year 67% (66%). Number of children achieving Communication and Language 78% (39) and Speaking Early Learning Goals was 92%(46)	How we use the Chance to Talk programme needs to be revisited this year. Problems surrounding the person delivering this in school and throughout the collaborative may have hindered the children's overall learning. Need to discuss this at a collaborative level to ensure all schools are receiving maximum impact.	£4000	

B. Increase progress of all children across the school including diminishing the difference between the disadvantaged pupils and the non-disadvantaged pupils nationally

Retention of two classes per year group.

The number of pupils achieving the expected levels of progress in R, W and M increased.

Year 1

Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM
82% (74%)	70% (60%)	78% (64%)	68% (-)

Year 2

Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM
60% (68%)	67% (60%)	75% (60%)	52% (-)

Year 3

Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM
67% (58%)	62% (48%)	44% (58%)	41% (35%)

Year 4

Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM
65% (55%)	47% (37%)	61% (41%)	43% (33%)

Year 5

Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM
66% (49%)	50% (39%)	58% (41%)	44% (33%)

Year 6

Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM
52% (58%) (56%)	69% (42%) (48%)	75% (78%) (47%)	46% (34%) (40%)

We will continue with this approach in using two classes per year group as this has shown an increase in pupil progress across the school as shown in the data opposite.

KS2:

Reading progress - -0.8

Writing progress – 1.6

Maths Progress – 2.0

£89,000

<p>C. Increase progress of all children across KS1 including diminishing the difference between the disadvantaged pupils and the non-disadvantaged pupils nationally</p>	<p>Additional teacher to support Year 2.</p>	<p>Number of children achieving the expected standard for Phonics was 90% (80% last year) The number of disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in Phonics was 16/18. (89%) The number of non disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in Phonics was 29/32. (90%)</p> <p>KS1: The number of disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in reading was 53.8%. The number of disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in writing was 53.8%. The number of disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in maths was 61.5%. The number of disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in RWM was 38.5%.</p> <p>The number of non-disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in reading was 62.9%. The number of non-disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in writing was 71.4%. The number of non-disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in maths was 80.0% The number of non disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard in RWM was 57.1%.</p>	<p>An improvement in the number of children achieving the Phonic standard this year increased above National standard. This was due to changing the way Year One children were taught. This was in smaller groups and more focused with specific groups of children.</p> <p>Standards at the end of Key Stage 1 also improved with the number of children achieving the expected standard increasing compared to last year.</p>	<p>£25,000</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------

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
<p>Writing will improve due to a more developed understanding of phonics and oracy</p>	<p>Active Literacy A Chance to Talk. Letters and Sounds CLPE Reading and Writing Scales</p>	<p>74% Reading score in EYFS compared to Year One score of 82% 60% Writing score in EYFS compared to Year One score of 70%. This has been due to more writing being completed during the year and more focused work in Phonics.</p>	<p>This approach will continue to be used as best as possible next academic year. Reductions in staff will mean that more focused groups will need to be completed.</p>	<p>£4,000</p>

Attendance and punctuality will improve.	Attendance service Additional Learning mentor	<p>School attendance improved to its best ever – 96.6% this was 0.6 above the National average set in the previous year.</p> <p>This has been as a result of increased learning mentor time and also rapid first day response. Our PA rate has been supported by the attendance service in completing visits on specific days as requested by the school. This has improved the attendance of some of PA cohort. Case studies have been completed.</p>	<p>Due to a staffing review we will not be able to maintain the additional learning mentor post. We will however endeavour to continue improving our attendance in line with National. It is clear that what we are currently doing in school is working to the benefit of both the children and the school community.</p>	£35,000																																																
Increase attainment in all phases and core subjects across the school	Teaching assistants employed all day with class interventions and other support. Look for additional interventions that will provide increased impact of learning and attainment.	<p>Please see above data for expected standard with all children.</p> <p>Below is disadvantaged children at expected standard.</p> <p>Year 1</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="674 564 1184 651"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>RWM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>78% (72%)</td> <td>56% (44%)</td> <td>73% (61%)</td> <td>-% (-)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 2</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="674 683 1184 769"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>RWM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>65% (64%)</td> <td>60% (58%)</td> <td>70% (52%)</td> <td>% (-)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 3</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="674 801 1184 887"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>RWM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>57% (50%)</td> <td>47% (29%)</td> <td>43% (54%)</td> <td>34.8% (38%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 4</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="674 919 1184 1005"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>RWM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>50% (46%)</td> <td>35% (19%)</td> <td>50% (27%)</td> <td>34.6% (19%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 5</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="674 1037 1184 1123"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>RWM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>51% (35%)</td> <td>37% (27%)</td> <td>45% (34%)</td> <td>31% (21%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 6</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="674 1155 1184 1241"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>RWM</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>40% (38%)</td> <td>50% (29%)</td> <td>60% (33%)</td> <td>40% (24%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>More interventions with children across the school from a variety of vulnerable backgrounds have occurred. See</p>	Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM	78% (72%)	56% (44%)	73% (61%)	-% (-)	Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM	65% (64%)	60% (58%)	70% (52%)	% (-)	Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM	57% (50%)	47% (29%)	43% (54%)	34.8% (38%)	Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM	50% (46%)	35% (19%)	50% (27%)	34.6% (19%)	Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM	51% (35%)	37% (27%)	45% (34%)	31% (21%)	Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM	40% (38%)	50% (29%)	60% (33%)	40% (24%)	<p>Numbers of disadvantaged children achieving the expected standard increased in most year groups across the school. Due to a staffing review there has been a reduction in Teaching Assistants in classes.</p> <p>KS2: Ever 6 FSM Compared to National reading progress was -1.5 Non DA - - 0.3 (40%) National was 77%</p> <p>Compared to National Writing progress was 1.51 (50%) National was 81%</p> <p>Compared to National Maths progress was 1.81 (60%) National was 80%</p> <p>Compared to National RWM progress was 40% National was 67%</p>	£26,000
Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM																																																	
78% (72%)	56% (44%)	73% (61%)	-% (-)																																																	
Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM																																																	
65% (64%)	60% (58%)	70% (52%)	% (-)																																																	
Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM																																																	
57% (50%)	47% (29%)	43% (54%)	34.8% (38%)																																																	
Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM																																																	
50% (46%)	35% (19%)	50% (27%)	34.6% (19%)																																																	
Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM																																																	
51% (35%)	37% (27%)	45% (34%)	31% (21%)																																																	
Reading	Writing	Maths	RWM																																																	
40% (38%)	50% (29%)	60% (33%)	40% (24%)																																																	