



White Bridge Community Primary School

Pupil premium strategy statement 2018-19

1. Summary information					
School	White Bridge Primary School				
Academic Year	2018-19	Total PP budget	£120,000	Percentage of children entitled to PPG	21%
Total number of pupils	433	Number of pupils eligible for PP	90	Percentage of children entitled to PPG who are also SEN	42%

2a. End of Key Stage 2 2018 (Number in Cohort 52 – 16 PPG)			
All pupils		Pupils eligible for PP (16)	Pupils not eligible for PP (36)
% achieving in reading, writing and maths	69%	56%	75%
% achieving expected level in reading	81%	75%	83%
% achieving expected level in writing	83%	63%	92%
% achieving expected level in maths	77%	63%	83%
% achieving expected level in GPS	84%	75%	86%

2b. End of Key Stage 1 2018 (Number in Cohort 60 – PPG 13)			
All pupils		Pupils eligible for PP (13)	Pupils not eligible for PP (47)
% achieving in reading, writing and maths	63%	33%	71%
% achieving expected level in reading	77%	54%	83%
% achieving expected level in writing	73%	54%	79%
% achieving expected level in maths	77%	54%	83%

2c. Phonics Year 1 (Number in Cohort 51 –PPG 6)		
All pupils	Pupils eligible for PP (6)	Pupils not eligible for PP
% achieving expected level in phonics 88%	67%	90%

2c. Phonics Year 2 (Number in Cohort 60 PPG)		
All pupils	Pupils eligible for PP (11)	Pupils not eligible for PP
% achieving expected level in phonics 90%	75%	94%

2d. EYFS (Number in Cohort 74 – PPG 8)		
All pupils	Pupils eligible for PP (4)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% achieving GLD 64%	40%	64%

3.Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)

In-school barriers (*issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills*)

A.	Poor parental engagement
B.	Children’s attitudes to learning and aspirations for their future goals.
C.	Poor oral language when they join reception.

External barriers (*issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates*)

D.	
-----------	--

2. Desired outcomes

	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Maintain standards achieved for reading, writing and numeracy for all children.	School data will be at least in line with National if not better. The gap between PPG and children not in receipt of PPG will be smaller.
B.	Improved attitudes towards learning.	All children will be engaged in their learning and have tools to get into the learning zone.
C.	Improved oral language for Reception children.	Assessment data will show that reception children have improved language skills.

D.	Improved pupil welfare	Children will have access to counsellors and families will have access to a Family Support Worker when and if they need this.
-----------	------------------------	---

3. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2018-9				
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 maintain standards achieved for reading, and numeracy for all children.	Increased TA support in the class and to run intervention groups.	Previous data has shown that splitting year 6 into smaller groups for Maths has improved standards and progress. TAs across the school are able to take small groups for maths and reading interventions.	SMT to monitor through lesson observations and tracking of pupil progress data to see the impact of interventions. All teachers have been given performance management targets linked to the progress of children entitled to PPG.	JW/ LH/ JC/ JM	Pupil progress meetings and in performance management reviews.
To maintain standards achieved for writing for all children.	Staff development across years 5 and 6 to change the way that writing is taught and assessed.	Data from 2017 has shown that increased TA support in year 6 improved standards –writing increased from 40% to 84%. Data from 2017 has shown that the changes made to year 6 in way in which writing was taught was positive. Year 6 teachers are now facilitating this in year 5.	SMT to monitor through lesson observations, work scrutiny and tracking of pupil data.	JW/ LH/ JC	Pupil progress meetings and performance management.
Total budgeted cost					££78,246
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 oral language for Reception children	Staff training in phonological awareness, Blanks questioning and extending children's vocabulary.	Initial baseline data show that most of our children start in Reception approximately 30 to 50 months beginning rather than 30-50 months. This puts all of our children at a disadvantage as it is proven that children with low language skills do not make progress with literacy skills.	Wellcome and NELI interventions to be run with all children who scored low on these assessments. Workshops on improving speech and language for parents of children in reception.	JM	End of reception – children will be reassessed using Wellcome.
Rigorous tracking of pupils who are entitled to PPG to ensure that they are on track to make at least expected progress. Improved pupil welfare for children entitled to PPG	Inclusion Manager to ensure careful monitoring of data of children entitled to PPG. Inclusion Manager to ensure swift referrals to counselling and FSW for families that are entitled to PPG.	Rigorous tracking of data has proven effective for improving standards of children entitled to PPG. Data shows that children from a deprived background are more likely to use the services of a FSW and / or counselling and mentoring services. Parent engagement is low, particularly for children entitled to PPG.	Inclusion Manager to be part of pupil progress meetings where progress of children is discussed and next steps are considered. Consideration of pupil welfare for all children at SLT meetings.	SMT	End of Key stage data
Total budgeted cost					£23,434

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 via the MAT to FaCSS. The contribution is £40 per child per year.	The mission of FaCSS is to provide schools with a service that allow children and their families greater opportunities to achieve their full potential, with a particular emphasis on improving outcomes for vulnerable groups. It aims to maximise the use of scarce resources through effective local co-ordination and collaboration, between schools in the Epping Forest Schools partnership Trust and with other agencies and services such as the Family Hubs, Essex Family Solutions, Epping Forest District	SENCo monitors how quickly referrals are taken up and the effectiveness of services provided. SENCo has been invited to sit on the panel of FaCSS to ensure that children entitled to PPG have a voice within the MAT. The panel will ensure that vulnerable children and families have a voice and are represented within the MAT and that their	JM	

		Council, Children and Families Social Care, the Emotional Well Being and Mental Health Service, etc.	needs are addressed effectively and within in good time scales.		
Improved resilience and growth mind set for children.	The Zones of Regulation to be introduced across the school.	Zones of Regulation is evidence based to improve children's emotional well being aswell as provide them with a toolbox to use when they are not in the zone for optimal learning.	SENCo to run an INSET with all staff and share resources.		£17,320 + £1,000 = 18,320
Total budgeted cost					£120,000

4. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year 2017-18		127,880		
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 maintain standards achieved for reading, and numeracy for all children.	Increased TA support in class and to run intervention groups.	Reading in KS1 increased from 71% to 77%. Maths in KS1 increased from 67% to 77%. Reading in KS2 increased from 73% to 81%. Maths in KS2 had a small decline from 83% to 77% but this was still in line with national.	Use of PPG to fund TA support in class has been positive as standards have improved or maintained.	
To maintain standards achieved for writing for all children.	Increased Ta support in class and to run intervention groups.	Writing at KS1 improved from 64% to 70%. Writing at KS2 was maintained at 83%. Progress in year 5 for writing was 6.3 which is higher than we expected. Year 5 have reported that teacher assessment is easier to carry out and teachers feel it is more accurate.	Use of PPG to fund TA support in class has been positive as standards have improved or maintained.	£45,394
ii Targeted support				
	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

Improved oral language for Reception children	Staff training in phonological awareness, Blanks questioning and extending children's vocabulary.	At the end of reception (after Wellcome interventions were used) only 8 out of 74 pupils were judged to be emerging for speaking – 89% reached expected. At the start of reception 73% of the children were judged to be 30-50 months and at the end of reception 57% of these children were expected and 11% exceeding. Only 5% were emerging and these were children that had been highlighted as low in confidence when speaking.	This will be a continuing focus for the school as we realise the importance of early intervention to improve children's speech.	
Rigorous tracking of pupils who are entitled to PPG to ensure that they are on track to make at least expected progress.	Inclusion Manager to ensure careful monitoring of data of children entitled to PPG.	<p>KS2 – Reading 75% of PPG children reached expected standards. The 4 children who did not reach this standard were also SEN. 31% of PPG exceeded expectations (+110) which was higher than the whole cohort. One child progressed from p scales to working at expected standards. Writing – 75% of PPG children achieved expected standard for GPS and 44% of PPG children achieved the higher level. The 4 children who did not achieve expected were SEN. Maths – 63% of PPG reached expected standards. KS1 – 3 of the 13 children entitled to PPG were high needs SEN and were in the nurture group for the Summer term. Despite intensive intervention their needs are significant and would not have reached expected standards. If these 3 children had been removed the data for PPG would be 70%. Reading - 54% of PPG achieved the expected level. Writing – 54% of PPG were assessed at working at or greater. Maths - 54% of PPG were assessed to be working at or greater.</p>	<p>Gap for maths is 14% between all children and PPG children. This is the widest gap for KS2. Of these children 4 were SEN. One of these children faced considerable family difficulties around the time of SATs and had this not happened may have reached expected standards. In future teachers will prioritise PPG for interventions.</p> <p>Performance of PPG children is now linked to performance management objectives.</p> <p>A high percentage of children (currently 42%) entitled to PPG are also on the SEN register which must be taken into account when looking at PPG data. Many of these children had much lower starting points so we would not be expecting them to reach expected standards at the end of a key stage.</p>	£78,246
ii. 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
Improved pupil welfare	Contribution to the Local Delivery group. Inclusion Manager to ensure swift referrals to counselling and FSW for families that are entitled to PPG.	Xx pupils accessed individual counselling sessions. Xx children accessed play therapy. Xx children accessed music therapy. 8 children engaged in Compass Club activities.	Contribution to the LDG proves good value for money. School is able to access services much quicker than if we had to rely on external agencies alone. Referrals to EWMHs usually take around 6 months before children are assessed and even then if the child does not meet the threshold for support they will not be offered counselling. The LDG provides quick support usually within a few weeks of the referral.	£17,240
Improved resilience and growth mind set for children.	Butterfly Project to work with one class and to run intervention groups across the school for children with poor attitudes towards school.	Butterfly project was run in Poplar class and questionnaires show that children had improved mind set and were using the language promoted by Butterfly Project.	This project will no longer be running at the school.	

5. Additional detail

All initiatives used by White Bridge Primary School are evaluated annually. However, it is extremely difficult to isolate a single spending decision and demonstrate that this has had a specific impact on a child or a group of children. Impact is measured in the following ways:

- Tracking progression of individual pupils within key subject areas, such as Reading, Writing and mathematics.
- Tracking attendance of eligible pupils.
- Discussions at governing body meetings in regard to the use of the PPG and its ongoing impact throughout the school year.