**Knowsley Village Primary School**

**‘Respect for All’**

**Pupil premium strategy statement**

**Pupil Premium Coordinator- Lin Woods Pupil Premium Governor- Alison Hambley**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **School** | Knowsley Village Primary School | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2016-17 | **Total PP budget** | £54,120 | **Date of PP Reviews** | Sept ‘16  Apr ‘17  July ‘17 |
| **Total number of pupils** | 171\* | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 40\* | **Date of external review of this strategy** | May ’17, Oct ’18. Commissioned by LA. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

\*subject to change and reviewed half termly

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year group** | **Reception** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **Year 6** | **Total** |
| **Number on roll** | **28** | **27** | **25** | **26** | **24** | **15** | **26** | **171** |
| **Disadvantaged** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **6** | **5** | **11** | **40** |
| **% in year** | **21%** | **18.5%** | **16%** | **11.5%** | **25%** | **33%** | **42%** | **23%** |
| **% in school** | **4%** | **3%** | **2%** | **2%** | **4%** | **2%** | **6%** | **23%** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Current Percentages of pupils in year group Year 6** | | | | | |
|  | *SEN pupils eligible for PP* | *Other pupils eligible for PP* | *SEN pupils not eligible for PP* | Other pupils not eligible for PP | All pupils ( not inc SEN) |
|  | 8% | 35% | 4% | 58% | 88% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Current Percentages of pupils in year group Year 5** | | | | | |
|  | *SEN pupils eligible for PP* | *Other pupils eligible for PP* | *SEN pupils not eligible for PP* | Other pupils not eligible for PP | All pupils ( not inc SEN) |
|  | 7% | 27% | 13% | 66% | 80% |
| **Current Percentages of pupils in year group Year 4** | | | | | |
|  | *SEN pupils eligible for PP* | *Other pupils eligible for PP* | *SEN pupils not eligible for PP* | Other pupils not eligible for PP | All pupils ( not inc SEN) |
|  | 8% | 12% | 4% | 80% | 88% |
| **Current Percentages of pupils in year group Year 3** | | | | | |
|  | *SEN pupils eligible for PP* | *Other pupils eligible for PP* | *SEN pupils not eligible for PP* | Other pupils not eligible for PP | All pupils ( not inc SEN) |
|  | 4% | 8%. | 15% | 88% | 81% |
| **Current Percentages of pupils in year group Year 2** | | | | | |
|  | *SEN pupils eligible for PP* | *Other pupils eligible for PP* | *SEN pupils not eligible for PP* | Other pupils not eligible for PP | All pupils ( not inc SEN) |
|  | 4% | 12%. | 4% | 84% | 92% |
| **Current Percentages of pupils in year group Year 1** | | | | | |
|  | *SEN pupils eligible for PP* | *Other pupils eligible for PP* | *SEN pupils not eligible for PP* | Other pupils not eligible for PP | All pupils ( not inc SEN) |
|  | 4% | 16%. | 8% | 80% | 88% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including higher ability)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)* | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Poor aural skills - Following consultation with teachers, poor listening skills were highlighted as a contributing factor to lower attainment. This is impacting on reading and comprehension across key stage 1 and 2.  At key stage 2 school results 60% against national of 72%, therefore a significant difference of 12% lower  (Raise on line Feb. 2017 p.11 validated results) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Poor attention skills – Following screening of all pupils by the sports coach, it was highlighted that children had lower than expected attention skills. This impacts on all areas of their learning.  (School data carried out by PPC) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **C.** | | Low self esteem – Following consultation with teachers and support staff low self esteem was highlighted as a contributing factor to lower attainment. PASS data from 2016 shows the following result; 65.4% of pupils scored low on Self regard as a learner,66.9% on Response to curriculum demands and 77.6% on Confidence in learning, against Feelings about school which scored highly at 98.1%. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **D.** | | Poor punctuality / persistent absence – Currently 28.9% of our PP children are persistently absent against a national average of 15.1%. Overall absence 6.5 % against national absence of 5.2%(Raise on line P58) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **E.** | | Greater Depth of study – Pupils achieved 0% at greater depth of study in KS2 against national average of 7% by end of year.  (Raise on line p.17 Feb 2017 validated) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Desired outcomes** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | *Desired outcomes and how they will be measured* | | | | | | | *Success criteria* | | | | | |
|  | To increase aural skills to match the average percentage of all learners. Children to be given a set of age appropriate instructions to follow and success measured by response. Impact in the classroom will be measured during observations. | | | | | | | Children will be able to follow and act upon age appropriate instructions, impacting on reading, writing and maths resulting in number of children achieving ARE in line with other children in the school and nationally. | | | | | |
|  | To increase attention skills of pupils to 1 minute to match the age of the child plus 1 minute. Children will be given a task to pay attention to for the number of minutes to match their age plus 1 minute. Impact in the classroom will be measured during observations. | | | | | | | Children are able to remain attentive for the age appropriate time. This will impact on reading, writing and maths resulting in the number of children achieving ARE in line with other children in the school and national average. | | | | | |
|  | To raise all children’s self esteem in line with peers. Children to be resilient, prepared to take risks in their learning and pride in their work. This will be measured through classroom and PSE observations. Also through pupil interviews and book scrutinies. | | | | | | | Children are able to accept and act upon advice, be open to moving their learning forward and prepared to try. Impacting on reading, writing and maths resulting in number of children achieving ARE in line with other children in the school and national non PP average | | | | | |
|  | To improve persistent absence to expected school levels. This will be measured through school data collected daily. Attendance governor to carry out termly meetings with Head teacher to discuss impact of strategy and agree next steps. | | | | | | | Pupils to have good attendance at all times. Children to be in line with non PP children within school. In line nationally with PP children of 15.1% | | | | | |
|  | To increase the number of pupils who achieve greater depth of study by the end of KS2 so that it is in line with National average. | | | | | | | Children to achieve the exceeding level in overall attainment by the end of key stage 2 to be in line with national average. | | | | | |
| **Links to SDP** | 1. To increase aural skills 2. To increase attention skills 3. To raise self esteem 4. To improve persistent absence 5. To increase the number of pupils achieving greater depth in overall attainment. | | | | | | | Priority in SDP  A. Outcomes for pupils – priority 2 (Disadvantaged children’s progress across the curriculum)  B. Outcomes for pupils – priority 2 (Disadvantaged children’s progress across the curriculum)  C. Quality of teaching, learning and assessment – priority 2 (Pupils resilience enjoyment of and interest in their learning)  C. Personal development, behaviour and welfare – priority 1 ( Pupils’ attitude  to learning).  D. Personal development behaviour and welfare – priority 2 (Pupils attendance)  E. Quality of teaching, learning and assessment – priority 1 (Impact of feedback) | | | | | |
| 1. **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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **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** | | | **Evaluation** |
| **Practices are embedded in the teaching in all classes** | | | **Whole staff inset training on growth mind set.**  **All classrooms to display learning styles and promote growth mind set.** | | **Evidence from EEF has shown that children learn better when they have better cognition and self regulation.**  **( EEF toolkit Meta-cognition and self regulation +8 months impact).** | **Learning walks looking at learning styles and through pupil interviews to look at children’s attitudes to and understanding of their learning. Class teachers will regularly monitor and meet with PP children in their class to discuss work and targets. Mrs Woods, Pupil Premium Coordinator (PPC), to meet with PP children and class teachers half termly to discuss their progress and agree next steps.** | | | | **JB/SLT**  **LW**  **All staff** | | | Pupil interviews and book scrutiny  Aut ’16, Spr’17, Sum’17  Outcomes –  Class teachers regularly monitor PP children, file established and used in all classes. Evidenced through observation by PP teacher and monitoring of files. |
| **Feedback to be used effectively in all classes in all subjects** | | | **Whole staff training, feedback policy agreed and followed by all.** | | **Evidence from EEF has shown that effective feedback has a positive impact on children’s learning and self esteem.**  **(EEf toolkit Feedback+8 months impact).** | **Lesson observations termly, book scrutiny, pupil interviews, learning walks. Mrs Woods PPC to meet with PP children and class teachers half termly to discuss their progress and agree next steps.** | | | | **JB/SLT**  **LW**  **All staff** | | | Pupil interviews and book scrutiny  Aut ’16, Spr’17, Sum’17  Outcomes-  Feedback has improved having more impact on learning. Evidenced in children responding to feed back in books and through lesson observations. |
| **SEN pupils to receive individual tuition providing a structured and intensive coaching**  **programme.** | | | **Specialist SEN teacher to train TA’s to deliver one to one intervention programmes, precision reading and spelling, speed reading.** | | **Evidence from EEF has shown that one to one tuition can be effective by accelerating learning.**  **(EEF toolkit + 5 months impact).** |  | | | | **JG**  **JH**  **EW** | | | Outcomes-  This was not as affective as other strategies used, having limited impact. We will use the Specialist teacher to offer training and support to teachers, carry out baseline assessments, agree targets and review on a half termly basis. |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | | | | £6,920 (3,200 JH SEN teacher |
| 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** | | **Evaluation** |
| To raise standards in maths in upper KS2. | | | Small group intervention | Following research into the Pixl programme and its success rate, school has decided to buy into the scheme and we will target PP who are below ARE across KS2 to help fill gaps in maths knowledge and understanding.  ( EEF toolkit Small group tuition +4 months). | | | Training of 1 teacher externally, TA internally trained. North West Pixl Coordinator visiting school to offer support termly.  Teaching and prep time required, resources out of PP budget.  Pre and post assessments ½ termly | | | | LW  EW | | Pupil interviews and book scrutiny  Dec’16  Apr’17  Outcomes-  This was very successful, ks2 results 96% against National of 75%. PP achieving 90%,  (Subject to validation) |
| To raise standards in reading in upper KS2. | | | Small group intervention | Following research into the Pixl programme and its success rate, school has decided to buy into the scheme and we will target PP who are below ARE across KS2 to help fill gaps in reading knowledge and understanding.( EEF toolkit Reading  comprehension strategies +5 months). | | | Training of 1 teacher externally. Pixl Coordinator visiting school to offer support termly.  Teaching and prep time required resources out of PP budget.  Pre and post assessments ½ termly | | | | LW | | Pupil interviews and book scrutiny  Dec’16  Apr’17  Outcomes- |
| To raise standards in writing across KS2. | | | Handwriting  Spelling punctuation and grammar being a focus across the school | Following success with Y6 handwriting, Y6/Literacy subject leader to deliver handwriting and SPAG teaching across KS2 and to up skill kS2 teachers. TA to work with individual pupils on handwriting programme. | | | Y6 teacher to work with each KS2 class for 4 weeks and deliver handwriting programme, monitor class teacher continuing programme. | | | | GH | | Outcomes-  This has improved to 73% of PP achieving expected standard. Against National of 76% |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | | | | £38,600 (PixL programme, LW PPC + EW TA3) |
| 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** | | | **Evaluation** | |
| To develop children’s social, emotional and well being. Also impacting on children’s punctuality and attendance | | | Small PSHE group intervention. | | The EEF Toolkit states that on average, SEL interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself.  (EEF toolkit Social and Emotional learning +4 months). | Trained sports coach to deliver a specific programme. Monitor and evaluate progress. | | | LW  SMc | | | Assessment of impact  Dec’16  Apr’17  July’17  Observations  May ‘17  Outcomes  This has had some impact on punctuality, children attending school on time.  PP pupils attendance was …% against whole school of …% | |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | | | | | | | £6,400 S Mc sports coach  £2,200 attendance service. part time, 2,000 – magic /singing coach - 1,720 -counsellor) | |

|  |
| --- |
| **EYFS**  **Summary information** |
| Year group- Nursery Number on roll\* Disadvantaged (EYPP) |

\*This changes termly as there is a new intake of nursery children in the spring and summer term

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EYFS. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including higher ability)** | | |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school).* | Baseline assessment for PP children in 15/16 showed scores on entry for Communication and Language were low.  ( KV tracking system) | Speech and Language specialist TA to support in Nursery using Dough Disco for development of muscle control and fine motor skills. Speech and language sessions for individuals/ targeted groups. EYFS teacher to use the Blast programme to develop vocabulary, listening skills and early reading skills. |
|  | Listening and attention. Below 22 months |
|  | Understanding. Below 22 months |
|  | Speaking. Below 22 months |
|  | Reading Below 22 months |  |
|  | Writing Below 22 months | **EYPP funding** £320 |
|  | **EYFS profile 2016**  Reading - 50% expected Writing - 50% expected | **Total budgeted cost** £320+ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Desired Outcomes** | |
| *Desired outcomes and how they will be measured* | *Success criteria* |
| At the end of Nursery the gap, between PP and national non- PP children, in Communication and Language will close. | Pupils eligible for Pupil Premium in Early Years make accelerated progress so the number of pupils meeting A.R.E. in Listening & Attention, Understanding & Speaking are in line with *other* children in school and nationally. |

1. **Review of expenditure**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Year** | 2015-16 | **Total PP budget** | £47,520 | **Date of most recent PP Review** | Sept 16 |
| **Total number of pupils** | 161(R-Y6) | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 41 | **PP strategy number** | 1. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | |  |
| Previous Academic Year | 2015-16 | | | |
| **Quality of teaching for all** |  | | | |
|  |  | | |  |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action/approach** | **Estimated impact**: | **Lessons learned:** | Cost |
| To enable all children to access a full and varied curriculum and increase family support. | Funding provided for family learning across KS1 and FS Funding for school trips, children’s university, performing arts. | Impact has been positive across KS1, children achieving 100% expected rate in maths, against national of 77%.  (Raise on line Feb 2017 p.22)  Impact has been positive across KS1, children achieving 100% expected rate in reading, against national of 78%.  (Raise on line Feb 2017 p.38)  Social inclusion – this had limited impact on PP, uniform provision had no impact, trips had limited impact with only 3% benefitting from this funding. | Family learning to continue but to be delivered by school staff and therefore requires no funding. School uniform no funding will be allocated. Limited money to be allocated for PP to access trips, residential holidays. | £7,390 |
| ii. **Targeted support** | | | | |
| **Desired outcome** | **Chosen action/approach** | **Impact**: | **Lessons learned** | Cost |
| Improve outcomes for groups of children in core subjects. | Outstanding/specialised Teacher released to target pupils across KS2 | Had a positive impact across all year groups KS2 children standards raised through intervention. Results from 2016 end of KS2 pupil achieved 60% overall attainment in line with National average.  (Raise on line Feb 2017 p17) | Continuing 2016-17 across KS1 and KS 2, one teacher to be used to have a clearer overview of whole school PP and to be used more in an advisory/monitoring role and to train a TA3 to deliver quality targeted group support to meet desired need. | £32,243 |
| 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 |
| To develop children’s social, emotional and well being. Also impacting on children’s punctuality and attendance. | Small sport group intervention | Positive impact, all children improving attitude to learning and social engagement. This had a positive impact on the children’s self esteem and well being also improved punctuality for some pupils. | To be continued 2016 – 17, sports coach to liaise more closely with PPC to target PP children to improve their self esteem, concentration and motivation. | £7,887 |