

Pupil premium strategy statement 2017-2018 : Gig Mill Primary School

1. Summary information					
School	Gig Mill Primary				
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP budget	£143,880	Date of most recent PP Review	Governors review 29.09.17
Total number of pupils	566	Number of pupils eligible for PP	109	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2018

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving scaled score of 100 + in reading, writing and maths	52%	61%
reading progress measure	- 0.92	0
writing progress measure	- 0.40	0
maths progress measure	- 1.28	0

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
In-school barriers	
A.	Pupils achieving good level of development in EYFS. Speech and language skills on entry in Early Years are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other pupils throughout the school. This slows reading progress, and acquisition of mathematical language in subsequent years.
B.	Pupils achieving the required standard in Phonics screening test in KS1
C.	Fundamental arithmetic and number skills are less well developed for PPG than other pupils, and impacts on pupils reaching expected combined standard in Maths and English (Reading & Writing) at the end of KS1, and potentially in KS2.
D.	Pupils reaching expected standard in English (Reading & Writing) and Maths at the end of KS2 Middle ability pupils who are eligible for PP are meeting 1/3 or 2/3 of expected standards, but not all three measures in statutory assessment tests outcomes. Pupils achieving Level 2A at KS1 are converting to the new measure of EXS at KS2, though not all pupils eligible to PP meet national expectation of GDS based on prior attainment groups of 'higher prior attainment band'.
E.	Increased need for pastoral / mental health / self esteem support for individuals

External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)		
F	Whilst attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP have improved significantly over time (from 91.7% to 94.33%), this remains below the target for all children of 96%. This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind on average. Persistent absentees	
G	Home environment factors where families require Early Intervention / parenting support / budgetary support in order to access support from relevant services eg housing / health / children's centre / children's services.	
4. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Improve acquisition of language for pupils eligible for FSM in Reception class. Improve acquisition of mathematical language for FSM in Reception class.	Pupils eligible for FSM in Reception class make rapid progress by the end of the year so that all pupils eligible for PP meet age related expectations, or making accelerated progress towards age related expectations. Aim to achieve good level of development
B.	Improve phonic knowledge and experiences in EYFS and Year 1 to ensure that children meet requirements for phonic screening check in Year 1. Quality first teaching, and targeted interventions in Phonics and Reading if required for pupils eligible for PP	Pupils eligible for PP in Year 1 classes make rapid progress by the end of the year so that all pupils eligible for PP and are making accelerated progress towards or meet required standard in Phonics screening test.
C.	Improve Pupils reaching expected standard in English (Reading & Writing) and Maths at the end of KS1. Improve arithmetic and number skills for PPG compared to other pupils in EYFS and across KS1 in order to impact on percentage of pupils reaching the expected combined KS1 standard in English (Reading & Writing) and Maths	Pupils eligible for PP in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 classes make rapid progress. By the end of the year all pupils eligible for PP make accelerated progress towards to age related expectations with majority achieving the expected standard in KS1 for Reading, Writing and Maths.
D.	Improve percentage of pupils reaching combined expected standard in English (Reading & Writing) and Maths at the end of KS2 Middle ability pupils who are eligible for PP meet 2/3 or 3/3/ of expected standards. Higher rates of progress across KS2 for middle attaining pupils (2A) eligible for PP in the high prior attainment band	Middle attainers eligible for PP targeted for combined measure across Key Stage 2 in maths, reading and writing. Interventions in any of 3 areas are successful to support improved combined outcomes in KS2. Pupils eligible for PP identified as high ability make as much progress as 'other' pupils identified as high ability, across Key Stage 2 in maths, reading and writing. Measured in Y4, 5 and 6 by teacher assessments and successful moderation practices established across the SLP cluster.
E G	Access to in school support for pastoral care / mental health / self esteem. Access to Early Intervention / parenting support / through TAFs and swift signposting to relevant services eg housing / health / children's centre / children's services to support children and families.	Mentorlink, peer mentor and JASS programmes and individual school support for pastoral support are successful in supporting the school's impact on wellbeing and self-esteem. Increased parental engagement through Achievement for All EEF project
F	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP. Pupils in Year 4 improve attendance from 94.12% to more than 95%, pupils in Year 5 improve attendance from 93.65% to at least 95%,	Overall PP attendance improves from 94.3 % to 96% and more in line with 'other' pupils nationally. Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP to below 10%.

5. Planned expenditure 2017/18

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?
Improved attainment in Reading, Writing and Maths	<p>Quality first teaching Induction of new teaching staff joining Gig Mill.</p> <p>Changes to middle leaders, including English and Maths teams.</p> <p>Specialist Maths support (MaST) coaching</p>	<p>Consistent approaches across school to ensure that good practice is embedded, and that quality first teaching is in place for all classes.</p> <p><i>EEF research shows that a collaborative approach to learning has a positive impact on standards for low cost. Mixed ability groupings contribute to learning across the curriculum, and develop their strengths as well as learning from more able peers.</i></p>	<p>Regular and rigorous monitoring – learning walks, book trawls, lesson observations, pupil progress meetings, data scrutiny.</p> <p>INSET and staff meetings to focus on pedagogy across subjects areas – eg questioning, differentiation.</p>	<p>School leaders</p> <p>Maths Team</p> <p>English Team</p>	<p>Termly</p> <p>Governors school improvement</p>
	<p>QLA Analysis of KS2 papers identifies the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading - SPAG - Maths 	<p>In order to tackle lower attainment accurate diagnosis of difficulties informs interventions.</p> <p><i>EEF research shows that providing regular personalised feedback to pupils on their next steps provides high impact on learning for a low cost.</i></p>			
<p>Improved progress for middle attaining pupils, in high prior attainment band.</p> <p>High prior attainment band pupils eligible for PP make good progress across Key Stage 2 in Reading Writing Maths</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>Staff training on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • questioning • high quality feedback • growth mindset 	<p>Investing in CPD on pedagogy which will help all pupils.</p> <p><i>Highly effective teaching has a greater impact on disadvantaged pupils. (Sutton Trust) 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.</i></p>	<p>Use INSET days and staff meetings to deliver training.</p> <p>Lessons from training embedded in school feedback policy.</p>	<p>Deputy Head Assistant Heads</p>	<p>Termly</p> <p>Governors school improvement</p> <p>October 2017</p> <p>Jan 2018</p> <p>April 2018</p>
Improved oral language skills in Reception	<p>Staff training on language development and Vygotsky approaches in Maths.</p> <p>EYFS staff in Nursery and Reception to implement approaches for EYFS pupils.</p>		<p>Course selected using evidence of effectiveness.</p> <p>Peer observation of attendees' classes during and after the course, to embed learning (no assessment).</p> <p>Use INSET days to disseminate to other EYFS staff.</p>	<p>SLE and EYFS advisor.</p> <p>EYFS Maths lead</p>	<p>September 2017</p> <p>October 2017</p> <p>February 2018</p>
Total budgeted cost					£32,920

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?
Pupils access a range of pastoral, family, and academic support as required.	Key pupil premium posts in school Assistant Head Attendance Family pastoral support	Successful whole school approaches, high expectations and strong leadership is impacting on pupil premium progress over time. EEF & Sutton Trust evidence.	Impact on pupils regularly monitored through school improvement plan priority, leadership activities, governors committee.	Head Inclusion leader Pastoral lead	Half termly
Improved attendance and punctuality of PP pupils	First day response Weekly attendance monitoring followed up by appropriate actions – letter, phone calls, meetings, referral to EIS. Liaison with EIS	Research shows that poor attendance and punctuality and or punctuality has a significant negative impact on a child's chances of succeeding at school. Good attendance will ensure that a child has every opportunity to achieve.	Revised attendance policy with advice from EIS. Weekly attendance monitoring. Tracking of individual children. Triggers for phone calls / letters / meetings from school.	Head Assistant Head Attendance & Parental liaison	Weekly Monthly Half termly
Improved attainment in reading	Research based targeted interventions ECAR: daily FFT: 3 times weekly BRP: 3 times weekly	1:1 instruction is one of the most effective interventions for struggling readers. Daily readers: school programme	Trained and experienced TAs and teacher deliver time limited programmes.	Inclusion leader ECAR teacher	
Improved attainment in Reading, Writing and Maths	The school is part of an EEF project linked to the University of Manchester Targeted support in Years 5 & 6	Programme selected using evidence of effectiveness. Achievement for all	School Champion works in collaboration with Achievement for All coach to implement action plan & recommendations	Assistant Head	
Total budgeted cost					£86,340
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 attainment in Reading and Maths Increased parental engagement.	Letterbox programme for pupils eligible for PPG in Years 1-6 £125 per pupil	Engaging parents in their child's learning by providing quality reading and Maths resources. Many of children surveyed did not have a range of books to read at home. Monthly for 6 months of the year – May to October, with children receiving 12 books.	Continuing initiative. Parents collection days. Ongoing analysis including questionnaires, pupil interviews and surveys.	Assistant Head	November 2017

Mentorlink, peer mentor and JASS programmes for pastoral support are successful in supporting the school's impact on wellbeing and self-esteem.	Weekly individual or small group sessions with an experienced teacher or teaching assistant, in addition to standard lessons.	Small group interventions with highly qualified staff have been shown to be effective, as discussed in reliable evidence sources such as Visible Learning by John Hattie and the EEF Toolkit. Self esteem work – mental health & wellbeing - CSS link	Programmes selected using evidence of effectiveness through sharing good practice across local networks.	Assistant Head HLTA team	
Access to extra curricular opportunities Improved progress for high attaining pupils	Cooking club JASS - more able	Healthy eating initiative to promote healthy cooking with families. We want to provide extra support to maintain high attainment. This additional provision is combined with some 'aspiration' workshops / cultural activities. Support for extra curricular activities / residential / PE kit etc	Extra teaching time and preparation time paid for out of PP budget. Trained HLTA delivering programme. Impact overseen by inclusion leader. Meeting to engage with parents and pupils at start of interventions to address any concerns or questions about the additional sessions.	Inclusion Leader HLTA team	April 2017 November 2017 April 2018
Total budgeted cost					£24,620

6. Tracking, monitoring and Governors questions answered (From Governors Toolkit 2017) Data accurate: September 2017

1	<p>Do Governors know how much money is allocated to the school for the Pupil Premium?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What percentage of Pupil Premium eligible pupils have you in your school. How does this compare with national data? b. Do governors know the breakdown between FSM, Looked After Children and Service Children? c. Do you know the breakdown of each group by academic year ? d. Do you know how many of each cohort appears in other vulnerable groups i.e. SEN(D), BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic), Gender? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. PPG received for 111 pupils. As at September 2017 PPG is allocated for 100 children (11 were ex Year 6). Gig Mill 20% v Nat Average = 16% b. Yes, breakdown of different groups. c. No of children: Yr1-13, Yr2-14, Yr3-14, Yr4-14, Yr5-22, Yr6-23 d. 22% of PP children have a Special Educational Need
2	<p>Is the Pupil Premium money identified in the school's budget planning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How much does the Pupil Premium money represent in percentage terms of the total income of the school? b. Is the Pupil Premium money likely to alter significantly over time? c. How is the delegated authority to make decisions over Pupil Premium spend decided and documented? d. Is income and expenditure reported explicitly for Pupil Premium? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Approx 6% b. Yes. High percentage in current Y5 and Y6, lower percentages since introduction of UFSM in R & KS1 c. Decisions made with governing body. Delegated to HT who reports to School Improvement Committee d. Yes
	<p>Do Governors have a clear understanding of where gaps exist, both within the school and against national performance data?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Do the school's systems enable governors to have a clear picture of the progress and attainment of pupils who are eligible for the Pupil Premium in all year groups across the school and for all subjects and how this compares to non-Pupil Premium pupils? b. What is the trend of progress and attainment for each group over a 3 year period i.e. has the gap closed for each group? c. How does this compare to National data? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Termly data identifies and demonstrates the progress and attainment of PP children in every year group. b. Gaps have narrowed over a 3 year period. This has varied from year to year. In 2017 variability due to a large number of in year admissions in Years 5 & 6 and a high percentage of Year 6 children PP children with SEN or emotional needs. c. See summary chart in FFT Overall data v national other is below, however on data set without mobile pupils (Y5 & 6) this is much higher. No national comparative data available yet for PP and SEN children nationally
4	<p>Do Governors discuss in detail, including intended outcomes/impact, how Pupil Premium funding is used?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the school have a standalone Pupil Premium strategy to raise attainment and close the gap in all year groups? b. Is the Pupil Premium strategy linked to the SIP and other school policies? c. Have the governors considered external research and reports about what works to inform their decisions about how to spend the Pupil Premium? E.g. The Sutton Trust / Education Endowment Fund, Ofsted updates and previous Pupil Premium award winners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes. Use of Sutton Trust Guidance from 2014 onwards. School have been part of three EEF projects, two in the past academic year, and one continuing into 2017-2018. HT & AH attended pupil premium conference and HT pupil premium reviewer training.

6. Tracking, monitoring and Governors questions answered (From Governors Toolkit 2017) Data accurate: September 2017

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Are this year's Pupil Premium interventions tailored to this year's Pupil Premium eligible pupils to meet their individual and group needs? e. Have the governors challenged the interventions and their predicted impact and is this documented? f. Will interventions close the gap against predicted end of year attainment and progress? g. Is there a correlation between the intervention on other outcomes i.e. attendance, behaviour, punctuality? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Sutton Trust information is used across the school to influence strategies to increase rates of progress. Different approaches / interventions used in different year groups. e. Yes, governors minutes. f. Yes g. Yes Attendance is continuing to rise across the school, with families accessing pastoral / family support . Higher expectations, levels of challenge, rigorous monitoring and greater use of data to inform teaching are all having a positive impact.
5	<p>Do Governors regularly monitor the outcomes of Pupil Premium and know gaps are being reduced/removed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How often are Pupil Premium reports monitored by the governors? b. Is there a Pupil Premium governor and have they undertaken training? c. Is Pupil Premium a standing agenda item at committee or full GB? d. Are Pupil Premium monitoring visits scheduled and completed on a regular basis? e. Is Pupil Premium part of the Headteacher's report and informs governors about intervention impact across all year groups in comparison with non-Pupil Premium? f. Do the governing board use the Ofsted Pupil Premium and challenge toolkit? g. Do all governors have a broad understanding of Pupil Premium funding and its use within the school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Each governors meeting, and half termly school improvement days. b. Yes and training has been attended in a local secondary school focused on PP / bias learning to raise standards in achievement and progress in order to diminish the difference. CPD session for all governors by HT & Pupil Premium lead in school. c. Yes d. Yes – school improvement days alongside SLT e. Yes. New data program is supporting comparison of groups. f. Yes g. Yes, Information regarding criteria and funding has been shared via Governors Hub
6	<p>Is value for money (in terms of impact on pupil outcomes) regularly discussed and challenged by governors (e.g. is Pupil Premium having the impact we anticipated?).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the income and expenditure related to Pupil Premium being monitored and how often? b. If money is held in reserve as a contingency, is this being monitored? c. Is the expenditure on the intervention proving value for money in comparison to other interventions and the impact on attainment and progression or predicted outcomes? d. Are the school's interventions providing value for money when compared externally e.g. evidence of the Sutton Trust. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes. At least termly. b. No contingency. There are changes in year due to in year admissions of PP children and a funding lag linked to census points. c. Yes. See end of year report summary (on website) d. Yes, See recent progress and data analysis

6. Tracking, monitoring and Governors questions answered (From Governors Toolkit 2017) Data accurate: September 2017

7	<p>Does the school’s website provide parents with a clear understanding of the amount of funding, how it is spent and what difference it makes to pupil outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the website show the amount of the school’s allocation from the Pupil Premium grant in respect of the current academic year? b. Does the website show details of how it is intended that the allocation will be spent for this academic year including individual interventions, their costs and the predicted impact including the target groups (each academic year if appropriate)? c. Does the website show the details of how the previous academic year’s allocation was spent by intervention and target audience (each academic year if appropriate)? d. Does the website show the impact of the previous year’s Pupil Premium expenditure on raising attainment and closing the gap when compared with non-Pupil Premium pupils? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. Yes c. Yes d. Yes
8	<p>Is the above work documented to show a true audit trail of the governing board’s work in relation to Pupil Premium?</p>	<p>Yes, it is evidenced in the head teacher’s reports to governors, at school improvement committee and Full Governors Minutes.</p>