**The pupil premium is allocated to schools for;**

* **Children of statutory school age from low income families who are known to be eligible for free school meals (FSM)**
* **Children who have been looked after continuously for more than six months**
* **Children whose parents are currently working in the armed forces**

**The level of pupil premium is £1320 per pupil.**

**The DFE offer the following guidance;**

*In most cases the Pupil Premium is allocated to schools and is clearly identifiable. It is for schools to decide how the Pupil Premium , allocated to schools per FSM pupil, is spent, since they are best placed to assess what additional provision should be made for the individual pupils within their responsibility.*

**However they also state that;**

*Schools are free to spend Pupil Premium as they see fit. However they will be held accountable for how they have used additional funding to support pupils from low income families.*

**The purpose of this statement is to effectively plan the way the pupil premium money will be spent over the year and enable us to inform parents, carers and governors of the impact it has on outcomes for pupils.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year | 2017/18 | Total PP budget | £77, 720 |
| Total number of pupils | 213 | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 58 (27%) |
| Lead member of staff | Stuart Mills | Lead governor | Sue Liddle |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **2017 Outcomes attainment (end of last academic) year)** |
|  | | *Pupils eligible for PP*  *(percentage of PP achieving standard)* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)* |
| **Year 6 - 82% achieving expected in reading, writing & maths** | | **12 (67%)** | **61%** |
| **Year 2 - 67% achieving expected in reading, writing & maths** | | **9 (63%)** | **N/A** |
| **Year 1 - 72% expected standard in phonic check** | | **5 (40%)** | **81%** |
| **EYFS - 70% GLD** | | **5 (20%)** | **69%** |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)** | | | |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)* | | | |
| 1. **Low Levels of oral skills including understanding of language.** | In 2017, only 50% of disadvantaged pupils entered reception at the age-related expectation in speaking and language (40-60months developing).  In addition, the percentage of disadvantaged pupils passing the phonics screening in 2017 dropped by 31% to 40%.  In the year 6 GPS test, the percentage of disadvantaged pupils scoring marks for the language questions was less than the national percentage. In addition, year 6 children scored less marks on the reading paper for language questions than any other question. | | |
| 1. **Children’s social and emotional needs lead to difficulties in developing relationships and impacts on their learning.** | Over the last academic year, we have seen an increase in the number of disadvantaged pupils (and families of disadvantaged pupils) accessing support from the EWB worker.  There has been an increase in fixed-term exclusions, from 0% of all pupils in 2015/16, to 0.017% in 2016/17. This was one disadvantaged, who had 2 x fixed term exclusions. | | |
| 1. **Lack of aspiration, which impacts on what they think they are able to achieve at school.** | Through numerous pupil surveys and pupil voice, it is clear that a significant number of pupils, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, have a lack of aspiration. Our work needs to focus on providing experiences where children can show their potential in a range of different ways, not just academically. This fits with our priority of really ‘championing’ our children. | | |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* | | | |
| 1. **Attendance – persistent absence** | In 2016, the level of PA for disadvantaged pupils, despite being below national and a reduction on the previous year, was still high at 12.8%. As the previous initiatives around PA has reduced our own PA of disadvantaged pupils by 5.7%, the focus still needs to be placed on this area to prevent this creeping back up again. | | |
| 1. **Participation in extra-curricular enrichment activities.** | The percentage of disadvantaged pupils taking part in extra-curricular activities is lower than that of non-disadvantaged pupils. Providing enrichment activities that appeal to disadvantaged pupils is key to addressing this. | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What is the intended outcome? | What will we do? | How much will it cost? | How many pupil premium pupils will benefit? | Who will be responsible? | Who and how will this be checked? | What was the impact? | Will we continue this next year?  Yes/No |
| 1. Quality of teaching for all | | | | | | | |
| Ensure disadvantaged pupils achieve as well as other pupils nationally | Reduce class sizes in UKS2 to allow for more bespoke teaching and support for vulnerable groups. | £10 968 | 16 | Stuart Mills  (Head of School) | Pupil progress meetings  Attainment in SATs  PIRA/PUMA scores  Pupil books | Outcomes at the end of year 6 indicate that our disadvantaged pupils do as well, if not better, than other pupils nationally. Provisional results show that in reading, 91% of disadvantaged pupils achieved the expected standard, compared to 75% of all pupils nationally (+16%); in writing, 82% of disadvantaged pupils achieved the expected standard, compared to 78% of all pupils nationally (+3%) and in maths, 100% of disadvantaged pupils achieved the expected standard, compared to 76% of all pupils nationally (+24%).  This shows that our disadvantaged pupils attain well over their time at Bellfield and that, by reducing class teaching groups in Upper Key Stage 2, pupils are making more rapid progress. | YES |
|  | Targeted support for Year 1 and 2 pupils who did not achieve their ELG in reading – with a specific focus on language skills. | £11 263 | 12 | Anna Howard  (Assistant Head) | Pupil progress meetings  Book banding from ECAR  Phonics pass rate  Y2 SATs  Pupil books | There were 8 pupils in Y1 who did not achieve their ELG in reading leaving EYFS.  Through targeted support, 5 of these pupils (63%) passed their phonics check at the end of Y1, representing rapid progress.  There were 8 pupils in Y2 who did not achieve their ELG in reading leaving EYFS.  Of these pupils, 2 of them (25%) achieved the expected standard in reading at the end of Y2. Of the 7 pupils who did not pass their phonics check in Y1, 5 of them (71%) passed in Y2 even though early prediction were only at 50%. | YES |
|  | Targeted support for Y1/2 pupils who did not achieve GLD.  Non-class based teacher to provide targeted support and intervention to EYFS pupils who have low starting points – particularly boys and disadvantaged pupils. | £16 751 | 10 | Stuart Mills  (Head of School) | % of pupils at ARE at end of year  Pupil progress meetings  Pupil books | As a result of some targeted support and intervention from Miss Howard in the late Spring/Summer term, pupils across KS1 made good **progress** from their starting points as can be seen in the tables below:  Boys:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Y1** | EP | BEP | | R | 100% | 15% | | W | 100% | 15% | | M | 100% | 23% |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Y2** | EP | BEP | | R | 100% | 15% | | W | 92% | 15% | | M | 92% | 8% |   Disadvantaged:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Y1** | EP | BEP | | R | 100% | 60% | | W | 100% | 60% | | M | 100% | 80% |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Y1** | EP | BEP | | R | 100% | 29% | | W | 100% | 29% | | M | 100% | 0% | | YES |
|  | 1:1 tuition for year 6 pupils who were below age-related in year 2 but have the potential to be AR in year 6 in reading and maths.  These will be intervention sessions delivered by a qualified teacher. | £2200 | 4 | James Hartmann  (Assistant Head) | SATs scores (including practice)  Pupil progress meetings  PIRA/PUMA scores  Pupil books | Of the 4 pupils who benefitted from 1:1 targeted support in reading, 1 achieved ARE, representing 25%.  In terms of progress from starting point:  Child 1 = +5.34  Child 2 = -2.11  Child 3 = -4.93  Child 4 = +0.19 | NO |
|  | All books in current library will be replaced with more up-to-date, engaging reading material.  The library will be refurbed to include soft reading areas.  UKS2 children will be trained to become ‘librarians’ and lead this for other pupils in the school. | £2000 | 58 | Louise Massam  (Literacy Leader) | % of pupils home/school reading  % pupils taking books out of the library  ARE and above at Y2/Y6  Pupil books | Unfortunately, due to staffing issues with the library service, this project has taken much longer than has been anticipated.  We are now awaiting the return of all books, which were removed for cataloguing and the new electronic system to be installed.  The system has been purchased as per the allocated budget and we anticipate that the system and books will be ready for use by pupils from October. | NO |
| 1. Targeted support | | | | | | | |
| Increase attendance and punctuality and reduce persistent absence of disadvantaged pupils. | Whole school attendance incentive will be a cash reward for each class, ranging from £30 to £2. Highest class attendance for the week receives £30, with the lowest receiving £2. This cash amount is collected over the course of the year and, at the end of the year, the children choose what trip to spend their money on.  Children with 100% attendance for the week get their name in a box and each half-term, names are drawn out to win a prize, which could include family tickets to the cinema or bowling etc. | £4000 | 58 | Helen Ellerton  (Attendance officer) | Attendance figures at the end of each term  % of PA reducing | Overall whole school attendance for the year increased from 95.4% to 95.6%. This is still below our target of 96.1%.  Disadvantaged attendance for 2017/18 = 93.39  Disadvantaged attendance for 2016/17 = 94.6  This shows a decrease of 1.2%. Although disappointing overall, there are positive elements:  The punctuality of disadvantaged pupils was significantly better. In 16/17 disadvantaged pupils accounted for 26.5% of all lateness, whereas in 17/18, this fell to 14.4%.  Persistent absence amongst disadvantaged pupils still requires targeting next year as there was a significant increase in disadvantaged pupils being persistently absent; it rose from 7.2% in 16/17 to 18% in 17/18.  Part of this can be attributed to the fact that overall school PA reduced from 8.5% (16/17) to 6% (17/18) and therefore, each disadvantaged child will have accounted for a higher percentage. | YES  (although this will be in a different format with less money allocated) |
|  | Free breakfast club for all disadvantaged pupils – this includes breakfast and activities. | £4928 | 58 | Denise Osborne  (Business manager) | Attendance numbers  % pupils punctual increasing | The punctuality of disadvantaged pupils was significantly better. In 16/17 disadvantaged pupils accounted for 26.5% of all lateness, whereas in 17/18, this fell to 14.4%. | YES |
|  | Attendance officer tracking pupil attendance.  Phone calls home for any pupil not in school with no reason.  Half-termly meetings with families of pupils whose attendance falls below 90%. | £3304 | 58 | Denise Osborne  (Business manager) | Appraisal  Publishing of attendance data and weekly report  Attendance team meetings | Overall school attendance has risen from 95.4% (16/17) to 95.6% (17/18).  This is a slight increase and still below our target of 96.1%.  The main cause of attendance being slightly below national is because of an increase in term time holidays.  In 16/17, term-time holidays amounted to 0.86% of all absence, whereas in 17/18, this had increased to 0.94% of all absence. In summary, of all absence in 17/18, 25% was down to term-time holidays.  The school made \_\_referrals to the Local Authority for fines, of which 1 was successful. | YES |
| Identify pupils with S & L difficulties early and provide timely intervention to enable them to achieve well. | Employ S&L therapist to deliver bespoke intervention to pupils identified as requiring S&L support.  S&LT to work with parents and support staff to advise on strategies to employ. | £6150 | 6 | Anna Howard  (Assistant Head) | Progress monitored by S&L therapist  Updates to SENCo at the end of each cycle | 7 children across the school received targeted S&L support from Bridge.  Of these 7, 6 were disadvantaged pupils.  All pupils made great progress from their starting points and, although this is difficult to measure on paper due to the nature of the activity/need, it is clear to teaching staff during lessons.  In addition, the families of these pupils have received ongoing support from Bridge and the school to continue to develop their child’s S&L next academic year. | YES |
| Support children and families with social and emotional difficulties so that this does not have a negative impact in their learning. | Increase hours of non-class based EWB worker to include all afternoons, where we have seen an increase in social and emotional difficulties of vulnerable pupils. | £13 651 | 58 | Anna Howard  (Assistant Head) | Bullying incidents  Behaviour logs  Half-termly safeguarding team meetings | There has been a significant improvement in behaviour for learning in afternoons due to the availability of the EWB during afternoon sessions.  Previously, SLT were being called to classes to deal with low-level disruption, which was taking away from their core role.  Now that the EWB is working full time, those pupils who need support in an afternoon are targeted by the EWB worker.  In addition, the number of families that the EWB worker is working with has increased significantly. | YES |
| 1. Other approaches | | | | | | | |
| To raise aspiration and give opportunities outside of the curriculum. | Reduce the cost of the residential visit for disadvantaged pupils by 50%. | £1120 | 16 | Stuart Mills  (Head of School) | % of disadvantaged pupils attending at reduced price  Pupil survey | This year, 75% of eligible PP children accessed the discounted price for residential.  This represents 12 out of the 16 pupils entitled to PP.  Those that did not take up the discounted offer gave reasons of their children not wanting to take part, rather than a cost implication.  Without the subsidy, it is likely that more of our PP pupils will have been unable to attend. | YES |
|  | £100 contribution for each class each term for a class visit. | £2100 | 58 | Helen Ellerton  (EVC) | Visits log  Pupil survey  Parent survey | 100% of disadvantaged pupils have taken part in at least 2 visits this year as part of their learning.  We are firmly committed to broadening our children’s experiences and feel that it is necessary to partly subsidise visits to ensure that pupils who are disadvantaged are able to access them. | YES |
|  | Food and staffing costs for a free cookery club, which all children will have access to at least once throughout the academic year. | £4134 | 58 | Susan Puckering  (EWB) | Attendance list  Pupil survey | Out of a possible 51 disadvantaged pupils eligible to attend cookery club, 44% took up the offer.  All disadvantaged pupils in classes 1-6 are invited to attend cookery at some point in the year. | YES |
|  | Free peripatetic sessions (keyboard and guitars) | £1440 | 6 | Denise Osborne  (Business manager) | Attendance at sessions  Pupil survey  Parent survey | Disappointingly, only 5 children took up the offer of free music tuition this year, of which only 1 was disadvantaged.  As a result, this will be discontinued next academic year. | NO |
|  |  | **£84 009** |  |  |  |  |  |