

Pupil Premium

Pupil Premium funding is given to schools based on eligibility for Free School Meals over the last 6 years (excluding the infant free school meals provision). Your child will be eligible for Free School Meals (and additional Pupil Premium funding for the school to support your child) if you or your partner are receiving any of the following benefits:

- Income Support
- Income-based Jobseeker's Allowance
- Income-related Employment and Support Allowance
- Support under Part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999
- The Guarantee element of State Pension Credit
- Child Tax Credit, provided they are not entitled to Working Tax Credit and have an annual income of £16,190 or less, as assessed by Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs.

Use and impact of Pupil Premium funding during the academic year 2015/2016

For the year 2015/2016 the school received £1,320 for each child known to have been eligible for Free School meals in any of the previous 6 years, £300 for each child whose parents have been in the services in any of the previous 5 years and £1,900 for each child who is in the care of the Local Authority.

For the academic year Sept 1st 2015 to August 31st 2016 the school received £43,860

During the academic year 2015 to 2016, 2 Special needs teachers were employed on a part time basis to work with some pupil premium children individually and in small groups on work related to their Individual Education Plans or Learning Targets. This enabled pupils to make accelerated progress to address gaps in understanding.

Additional Teaching Assistant time has been purchased over and above that which would be available from the general school budget. Teaching Assistant time is directed towards supporting some pupil premium children in the classroom.

Impact

Assessments carried out in the summer of 2016 show that the Year 6 pupil premium children achieved the following standards of **attainment** compared with non-pupil premium children. In Year 6 there were 3 children in receipt of pupil premium funding and 20 children who were not in receipt of pupil premium funding.

	Minsterley Pupil Premium children	Minsterley non-pupil premium children
Reading (Expected standard or above)	67%	60%
Reading (Greater depth)	67%	5%

	Minsterley Pupil Premium children	Minsterley non-pupil premium children
Writing (Expected standard or above)	67%	70%
Writing (Greater depth)	0%	10%

	Minsterley Pupil Premium children	Minsterley non-pupil premium children
Maths (Expected standard or above)	67%	70%
Maths (Greater depth)	33%	15%

Assessments carried out in the summer of 2016 show that the Year 6 pupil premium children made the following **progress** compared with non-pupil premium children. In Year 6 there were 3 children in receipt of pupil premium funding and 20 children who were not in receipt of pupil premium funding.

	Minsterley Pupil Premium children	Minsterley non-pupil premium children
Reading (Expected standard or above)	-0.93	-5.07
Writing (Expected standard or above)	-4.21	-2.95
Maths (Expected standard or above)	-1.80	-1.89

Assessments carried out in the summer of 2016 show that the Year 2 pupil premium children achieved the following standards of **attainment** compared with non-pupil premium children. In Year 2 there were 8 children in receipt of pupil premium funding and 15 children who were not in receipt of pupil premium funding.

	Minsterley Pupil Premium children	Minsterley non-pupil premium children
Reading (Expected standard or above)	75%	47%
Reading (Greater depth)	25%	27%

	Minsterley Pupil Premium children	Minsterley non-pupil premium children
Writing (Expected standard or above)	38%	33%
Writing (Greater depth)	13%	20%

	Minsterley Pupil Premium children	Minsterley non-pupil premium children
Maths (Expected standard or above)	75%	40%
Maths (Greater depth)	13%	0%

Academic Year 2016/2017

For the year 2016/2017 the school has received £1,320 for each child known to have been eligible for Free School meals in any of the previous 6 years, £300 for each child whose parents have been in the services in any of the previous 5 years and £1,900 for each child who is in the care of the Local Authority.

For the academic year Sept 1st 2016 to August 31st 2017 the school will have received £43,860

Planned use of pupil premium 2016/17

The school has published its pupil premium strategy for 2016/17. This includes details of

- the school's pupil premium grant allocation
- a summary of the main barriers to educational achievement faced by eligible pupils at the school
- how we will spend the pupil premium to address the barriers and the reasons for that approach
- how we will measure the impact of the pupil premium
- the date of the next review of the pupil premium strategy.

Our pupil premium strategy for 2016/17 can be seen below:

Pupil premium strategy statement

1. Summary information					
School	Minsterley Primary School				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£43,860	Date of most recent PP Review	March 2017
Total number of pupils	143	Number of pupils eligible for PP	34	Date for next internal review of this strategy	July 2017

2. Current attainment Year 6 pupils in Summer 2016		
	Minsterley pupils eligible for Pupil Premium	National pupils eligible for Pupil Premium
Reading % achieving expected standard	67%	53%
Reading % achieving higher standard	67%	10%
Writing % achieving expected standard	67%	64%
Writing % achieving higher standard	0%	8%
Maths % achieving expected standard	67%	58%
Maths % achieving higher standard	33%	9%
Progress measures Reading	- 0.93	- 0.7
Progress measures Writing	- 4.21	- 0.3
Progress measures Maths	- 1.80	- 0.5

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)		
In-school barriers)		
A.	32% of Pupil Premium children are identified as needing SEND Support. 58% of Pupil Premium children are identified as needing SEND Support or have SEND concerns.	
B.	Less progress in writing than expected during Key Stage 2, leading to a lower than average percentage of pupil premium children achieving at 'greater depth.'	
External barriers		
C.	Attendance for Pupil Premium children is good: 96.5% compared with the national average of 94.8 with only 3.1% deemed 'persistent absentees' compared with the national average of 15.1%. However, of the children who have been late (after the registers close) 80% are pupil premium children with a total of 9 lates. Also of 245 lates before the registers close, 188 (77%) are by pupil premium children. (Academic year 2015/16 figures)	
4. Desired outcomes		Success criteria
A.	To reduce the number of children identified as SEND through high quality intervention to address specific difficulties in learning.	To reduce the % of children needing SEND Support to 26%. To reduce the % of children needing SEND Support or have SEND concerns to 45%.
B.	Improve attainment of more able pupil premium children in writing. Improve progress of pupil premium children in writing.	For at least 12% of pupil premium children to achieve greater depth at the end of KS2 (above 2016 national at 8%) For progress in writing for pupil premium children through KS2 to be at least in line with national (2016) at -0.3
C.	Improve the punctuality of a specific group of children.	To reduce the number of lates (before registers close) of Pupil Premium children to less than 100 during 2016/2017.

5. 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?
<p>Improve attainment of more able pupil premium children in writing.</p> <p>Improve progress of pupil premium children in writing.</p>	<p>Improved assessment to identify individual weaknesses and target appropriate intervention</p> <p>Regular Book Looks to ensure effective teaching and learning is embedded throughout the school</p> <p>Effective use of new marking policy</p> <p>Focus on improving handwriting through new handwriting policy</p> <p>Teacher Performance Management objectives to include writing targets</p>	<p>Evidence of a need to improve attainment of high ability writers (pupil premium and non-pupil premium at end of KS2) – see RAISEonline</p> <p>Evidence of a need to improve progress of all writers (pupil premium and non-pupil premium at end of KS2) – see RAISEonline</p>	<p>Termly teacher assessments of writing are informing teachers of individuals' progress through iTrack and pupil Tracking analysis</p> <p>Regular Book Looks by Jo Holloway, Clive Roe and Brian Goodwin (link governor for literacy)</p> <p>Regular inclusion in staff meetings including regular moderation exercises.</p> <p>Moderation of writing with other schools.</p>	<p>Jo Holloway/Clive Roe</p>	<p>Progress of pupils based on assessments, iCan, iTrack and pupil tracking at pupil progress meetings Each term</p> <p>Book Looks each half term.</p> <p>Review of Teacher Performance Management objectives: June 2017 and October 2017</p>
Total budgeted cost					0

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?
<p>Improve attainment of more able pupil premium children in writing.</p> <p>Improve progress of pupil premium children in writing.</p> <p>To reduce the number of children identified as SEND through high quality intervention to address specific difficulties in learning.</p>	<p>1 to 1 and group support delivered by SENCo and SEND/LSAT based on regular assessments and analysis at pupil progress reviews.</p> <p>LSAT and Educational Psychologist assessments for those children who are not making expected progress despite targeted intervention</p> <p>Effective communication with parents.</p> <p>Effective Teaching Assistant support in each class to work closely with Pupil Premium children of all abilities.</p>	<p>Some pupils need targeted work to ensure that they reach their full potential – not just SEND children but high ability writers who may need intervention to achieve at greater depth.</p> <p>LSAT and E.P. reports provide the school with a thorough in depth analysis of the child's barriers to effective learning. These are shared and discussed with parents.</p> <p>Effective communication provides opportunities for parents to learn how they can best support their child.</p> <p>Teaching Assistants are able to target specific teaching needs and provide immediate and effective feedback.</p>	<p>Detailed and robust provision mapping which accurately identifies needs, strategies, staffing, timescales and review.</p> <p>Children are referred for an LSAT or E.P. assessment if decided they require one during the pupil progress meetings</p> <p>Parents are invited to termly parents' evenings. Those who do not sign up for an appointment are contacted by the school and given an appointment time.</p>	<p>SENCo/ Clive Roe</p>	<p>At pupil progress meetings and at the end of specific interventions as detailed on the provision map.</p>
Total budgeted cost					<p>M. Ward: £15,000 Z. Anderson: £5,000 LSAT: £1,000 Ed. Psych: £1,430 Teaching Assistants: £21,430 TOTAL: £43,860</p>
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?
<p>Improve the punctuality of a specific group of children.</p>	<p>Involvement of EWO. Monitoring of registers.</p>	<p>The children do not have a settled start to the day if late – even if by only 5 minutes.</p>	<p>Monitoring of attendance through analysis of registers and discussion with EWO at termly monitoring visits</p>	<p>Clive Roe</p>	<p>At the end of Spring and Summer terms.</p>
Total budgeted cost					0

6. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year

i. Quality of teaching for all

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact:	Lessons learned	Cost
Targeted support for pupils	Use of TAs to provide targeted intervention for pupils whose poor prior attainment indicates the need for them to make accelerated progress to reach ARE.	Children in receipt of pupil premium responded positively to interventions. Additional teaching assistant support enabled staff to engage in focused teaching.	Continue to maximise TA support based on individual children's needs, including higher ability children.	£21,430

ii. Targeted support

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact:	Lessons learned	Cost
Increased attainment of all pupil premium children in reading (including Y1 phonics), writing and maths	1 to 1 and small group provision with special needs teachers/SENCo: M Ward and Z Anderson	Especially positive in improving Year 1 phonic results. Year 6 SATs attainment was good for pupil premium children in comparison with our non- pupil premium children.	This is now becoming sharper due to provision mapping becoming more embedded and a sharper focus in pupil progress meetings. New assessment and tracking systems are providing much improved feedback on children's progress throughout the school.	£20,000

iii. Other approaches

Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Estimated impact:	Lessons learned	Cost
Increased attainment of all pupil premium children in reading (including Y1 phonics), writing and maths	LSAT and Educational Psychologist assessments for those children who are not making expected progress despite targeted intervention	LSAT and E.P. reports provided the school with a thorough in depth analysis of the child's barriers to effective learning. These informed teachers and TAs when planning appropriate intervention work. These were shared and discussed with parents to enable parents to understand their child's needs and provide support at home.	Reports have been more thoroughly incorporated into intervention strategies and advice included in provision mapping.	£2,430