



Pupil premium strategy statement 2016-17 (White Bridge Primary)

1. Summary information					
School	White Bridge Primary				
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£141,660	Percentage of children entitled to PPG	26%
Total number of pupils	414	Number of pupils eligible for PP	103 + 3 LAC	Percentage of children entitled to PPG who are also SEN	44%

Attainment at the end of 2016

2a. End of Key Stage 2 2016 (Number in Cohort 57 – 14 PPG)			
All pupils		Pupils eligible for PP (14)	Pupils not eligible for PP
% achieving in reading, writing and maths	38%	29%	42%
% achieving expected level in reading	61%	57%	63%
% achieving expected level in writing	39%	36%	40%
% achieving expected level in maths	82%	78%	84%
% achieving expected level in GPS	75%	71%	77%

2b. End of Key Stage 1 2016 (Number in Cohort 80 – PPG 17)			
All pupils		Pupils eligible for PP (17)	Pupils not eligible for PP
% achieving in reading, writing and maths	50%	29%	56%
% achieving expected level in reading	64%	35%	71%
% achieving expected level in writing	55%	29%	62%
% achieving expected level in maths	63%	29%	71%

2c. Phonics Year 1 (Number in Cohort 54 – PPG 11)			
All pupils		Pupils eligible for PP (11)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% achieving expected level in phonics	77%	75%	78%

2c. Phonics Year 2 (Number in Cohort 80 PPG 17)		
All pupils	Pupils eligible for PP (17)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% achieving expected level in phonics 86%	54%	93%

2d. EYFS (Number in Cohort 61 – PPG 9)		
All pupils	Pupils eligible for PP (7)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% achieving GLD 67%	44%	71%

3. 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.	Poor oral language from children when they join reception.	
B.	Poor parental engagement.	
C.	Children's attitudes to learning.	
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)		
D.		
2. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Improved reading, writing and maths in KS1	KS1 results will be at least in line with national averages.
B.	Improved writing at KS2.	Teacher assessment for writing will be equal to national averages.
C.	Improved reading results at KS2, particularly for the most able.	School results for reading at KS2 will be at least in line with national.
D.		

3. 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?
To improve writing across the school.	Qualified teachers used to support children in writing intervention groups across the school.	Using qualified teachers to take small groups for maths improved results historically.	SMT to monitor through lesson observations and tracking of pupil progress data to see the impact of interventions.	JW / LH	Pupil progress meetings.
To improve reading, writing and maths for all children.	Increased TA support in the class and to run intervention groups.	Increased adult support in the class will ensure that children have access to support when needed. This will also enable teachers to work with focus children while the TA undertakes routine activities.	SMT to monitor through lesson observations and tracking of pupil progress data to see the impact of interventions.	JW /LH	Pupil progress meetings.
Total budgeted cost					£104,329
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?
Improved resilience and growth mindset for children.	Butterfly project to run two groups to target children with low resilience and poor attitudes towards school.	This project has been successful improving resilience and engagement levels with children in the past.	SENCO to communicate with teachers of children that are attending Butterfly Club.	JM	
Total budgeted cost					£1640

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 pupil welfare	Contribution to the Local Delivery group.	This service has historically provided prompt access for children and families to counselling and family support.	SENCO to monitor how quickly referrals are taken up and the effectiveness of services provided.	JM	
To improve the experiences of children entitled to PPG.	Funded places for extracurricular activities.	Some children will not be able to take part in extracurricular activities so will miss out on experiences gained at these clubs.	Are children getting something out of attending the club?	JW/LH	
Total budgeted cost					£17,240 (LDG) + £470

4. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year 2015-16		£103,613		
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 continue the trend of being above National averages for Maths in both KS1 and KS2 despite the increased demands of the new curriculum. To close the gap between those children entitled to PPG and the rest of the cohort.	Qualified teachers used to take small groups across the school. 6 teaching groups for year 6 for Maths. Targeted invention groups for children entitled to PPG in both KS2. In KS1 a qualified teacher was used to support year 2 to take groups and support children in class.	At KS2 82% of all children achieved expected standards in Maths and 78% of children entitled to PPG achieved expected standards. Only 3/14 of the children entitled to PPG did not achieve expected standards and 1 of these was new into the cohort. At KS1 the results were lower than national for maths.	The support given in KS2 worked as year 6 were able to split into smaller teaching groups. This enabled children to have greater access to an adult and allowed teachers to work with focus children. There are less opportunities to split into smaller groups in KS1. Two qualified teachers were provided in KS1.	£55,959
To improve the outcomes of all children by providing targeted intervention when needed.	Targeted support in the classroom and in intervention groups. Focus across the school. Guided reading, writing, comprehension and grammar groups across the school.	Results for reading were 5% below national at KS2. Results for GPS were above national for expected and significantly higher for those children achieving a high score. Teacher assessment for writing was 39% which does not compare to the scores achieved in the grammar test.	Writing is a real focus for the whole school. Writing groups have been changed so that children take work to a writing group and improve and edit this. This gives children an opportunity to improve their work with the help from an adult. Teachers have input into group so telling children how to improve their work.	£40,786
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 improve growth mind set of targeted children.	Butterfly Club in year 5 and 6.	Teachers reported increased resilience towards tasks in class.	This had a positive effect but effectiveness would improve if this was targeted at children at a younger age.	£880
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 improve the experiences of children entitled to PPG.	Funded places at extra- curricular clubs	Children that would not be able to take part in extracurricular clubs have been given the opportunity.	This will continue as children benefit from being able to take part in extracurricular activities.	£981
Improved pupil welfare	Contribution to the Local Delivery Group	LDG provides a range of services with a clear focus on emotional wellbeing e.g. play therapy, music therapy, family support, pupil counselling and family counselling. Families and children have been able to access a range of services which have given prompt support when needed.	This will continue as the services provided have been invaluable to many families and children.	£2362

5. Additional detail

Cohort information for 2016 KS2 results: 57 children – 14 PPG

There were 14 children entitled to PPG and 6 of these children were on the SEN register. Of these 14 children, 4 of these were new into the cohort including one child that arrived in year 6 working at approximately the standards expected of a year 2 child. Seven of these children had emotional difficulties which caused a barrier to their learning and 2 of these children were on the Child Protection register which would have had an impact on their emotional well being throughout year 6.

Maths: 3/14 did not reach the expected standard and of these 3 only 1 child was with us at the end of KS1.

Reading: 6/14 did not reach the expected standard and 5 of these were also on the SEN register.

GPS: 4/14 children did not reach the expected standard.

Cohort information for 2016 KS1 results: 80 children – 17 PPG

There were 15 new children into the cohort from the start of year 1: 9 of these were on the SEN register and 3 were entitled to PPG. One child had significant behavioural difficulties. Two children were vulnerable children (CP) and had significant speech and language difficulties. Five children were new to England and spoke and understood very little English. This had a negative impact on the progress over the year group because the level of support that these children needed meant that the support that was planned at the beginning of the year was diluted to support these extra children. In particular the results for reading and writing were affected because of the new children that arrived had little phonic knowledge and struggled to write in sentences. If we look just at core children (children that were at the start of year 1) reading results increase by 9%.