

Mengham Infant pupil premium strategy 2016-17 – This plan was generated in February 2017 by our newly formed SLT. We will assess impact Sept 17 but many actions will continue into the 17/18 plan.

1. Summary information					
School	Mengham Infant				
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£45,180	Date of most recent PP Review	n/a
Total number of pupils	189	Number of pupils eligible for PP	45	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Sept 17

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (Combined percentages for YR-Y2)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (2016 national average at KS1)</i>
% on track for ARE or above in reading	56%	78%
% on track for ARE or above in writing	53%	70%
% on track for ARE or above in maths	56%	77%

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.	Some children eligible for PP lack vital skills / understanding in reading, writing and maths even though they do not have SEND. This makes it hard for them to access ARE learning objectives in these core subjects.
B.	Some children eligible for PP have poor inter- and intra-personal skills. This is a problem in itself, as this lack of skills affects children's emotional wellbeing, and it also prevents children learning effectively within school.
C.	The proportion of children eligible for the PP who enter year R exceeding age-related expectations is very low. This proportion of PP children exceeding / working at greater depth increases during year R and in years 1 and 2, but is still below 'national other' figures in some subjects.
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Some children eligible for PP do not receive as much learning support at home as their peers. This is particularly noticeable in reading, and means that these children do not embed and master reading skills as quickly as their peers.
E.	Outside of school, some children eligible for PP do not take part in activities such as clubs, trips out etc. This limits their inspiration for learning, their personal development and their wider understanding of the world.
F.	Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are 94.6% (below the non-PP average of 96.3% and the school target for all children of 97%). In particular, the levels of persistent absence for PP children are 15.9%, which is significantly higher than the school and national average. This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind.
4. Desired outcomes	

	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	A greater proportion of PP children to be working at ARE	Increased percentage of PP children working at least at ARE in year R and year 1 so that by the end of year 2 the percentage is at least in line with 'national other' figure.
B.	A greater proportion of PP children to be exceeding / working at greater depth	Percentage of PP children exceeding / at greater depth to show an increase from year R baseline by end of year R and year 1, and to be at least in line with 'national other' figure by end of year 2.
C.	Improved inter- and intra-personal skills for PP identified children.	Improved Boxall / Thrive profile scores in areas identified for development.
D.	PP children have similar opportunities for enhanced learning activities across curriculum as their peers and are inspired to participate, improve and excel.	At least 40% of pupil premium children attend some form of extra-curricular provision (currently, 29.5% do). When interviewed, these children report that it is enjoyable and/or has helped them develop a skill/interest.
E.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP to less than 6.3% (in line with non-PP pupils). Overall PP attendance (for academic year 2016-17) improves to 95.5% by end of year to be on track for meeting school target for all children of 97% by following year.

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	Date to review implementation?
<p>A. A greater proportion of PP children to be working at ARE</p> <p>B. A greater proportion of PP children to be exceeding / working at greater depth</p>	Teachers provide children with modelled and clearly identified process success criteria.	In <i>Visible Learning</i> , John Hattie found that pupils having a thorough understanding of their learning needs had a very high impact on their progress. This understanding requires them to know what they are learning, what this learning 'looks like' and how to achieve success. Building models and success criteria with children are crucial parts of achieving this understanding.	All staff will receive training as part of INSET days and PDMs. The English and maths workgroups will check for evidence of impact in planning, environments and workbooks. Lesson observations by the HT and DHT will also check for impact.	Head teacher, English and maths leaders	Evidence in planning / books / classrooms reviewed by staff work groups every half term. Data reviewed Jan, Mar, Jun 17.
	Learning journeys are planned to ensure all children have the opportunity to learn key skills, practise and then apply them within a context	Teachers and pupils need to have a clear understanding of their overall goal for each medium-term unit of work and how each day's learning within the unit is related. This allows learning to build on previous learning and promotes consistent progress.	Medium-term planning will be one area of focus for HIAS support. The English and maths workgroups will check for evidence of impact in planning, environments and workbooks.	English and maths leaders	Evidence in planning / books reviewed by staff work groups every half term. Data reviewed Jan, Mar, Jun 17.
	Support staff confidently and competently scaffold learning through effective intervention and dialogue with pupils	The EEF toolkit suggests that high-quality feedback has a very high impact for very low cost. It has effects on all types of learning across all age groups. Accurate, specific feedback develops pupils' understanding of their learning needs and allows them to take ownership of their learning. In this way, feedback fits closely with the aims discussed above.	This objective will become one of the performance management targets for all LSAs. English and maths leaders will provide training to LSAs during specific LSA training time.	Deputy head	Impact of TA development project reviewed by July 17.
	Within lessons teachers effectively assess children's learning in order to adjust their teaching and provide children with feedback that moves learning on. Assessment practices and procedures evaluate pupils' knowledge and understanding on a daily basis	Approx cost- £6,500 whole staff training, HIAS support, external providers for INSET linked to Quality First Teaching for All	All staff will receive training as part of INSET days and PDMs. The English and maths workgroups will check for evidence of impact in planning, environments and workbooks. Lesson observations by the HT and DHT will also check for impact.	Head teacher	Reviewed as part of performance management cycles. Data reviewed Jan, Mar, Jun 17.

C. Improved inter- and intra-personal skills for PP identified children	The school follows the PSHE association's guidelines and planning.	The PSHE association is a reliable, evidence-based source of information. Their planning ensures that the school is providing a broad and balanced coverage while providing children opportunities to develop and deepen their PSHE skills.	PDM time will be dedicated for staff training in using the PSHE association's planning. The impact of lessons will be checked by the PSHE leader.	PSHE leader	Check PSHE coverage against planning and check evidence (including pupil interviews) during summer term 2.
Total budgeted cost					£6,500
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?
A. A greater proportion of PP children to be working at ARE	Teachers in all classes run intervention groups focussing on specific reading, writing or maths LOs.	We want to provide extra support to fill the gaps in prior knowledge and understanding that are stopping some PP children from accessing learning at ARE in their current year group. 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. These intervention groups are deliberately taken by teachers as they are the most qualified members of staff. Cost – approx. £15,000 = Quality First Teaching in intervention groups – staffing costs, training sessions	The extra teaching time is paid for out of the PP budget, not sought on a voluntary basis. The interventions have SMART objectives, which are set following progress data analysis within pupil progress meetings. Impacts are overseen by the maths and English leaders and reviewed within future pupil progress meetings. We ensure parents and pupils understand the LOs and SC of these interventions to give them ownership of their learning and allow parents to support children at home effectively.	Head teacher, deputy head	Reviewed during each round of pupil progress meetings: Jan, Mar, Jun 17.
C. Improved inter- and intra-personal skills for PP identified children.	We provide social skills and friendship groups as well as 1:1 emotional literacy support	The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues can be effective. The ELSA also works supporting families, which the EEF Toolkit recommends to increase effect size. Cost – approx. = £16,000 Staffing costs for ELSA role, related training and supervision.	We ensure good communication within the school so that the correct children are identified quickly and their needs are assessed correctly. We measure improvements in behaviour precisely and also monitor whether improvements in behaviour translate into improved attainment.	ELSA	Boxall / Thrive profile scores completed after each period of intervention. Analyses of these completed termly.
Total budgeted cost					£31,000
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?
D. PP children have similar opportunities for enhanced learning activities across curriculum as their peers and are inspired to participate, improve and excel.	We organise a breakfast club, a range of lunchtime and after school clubs and enhanced curriculum opportunities within school time such as sports festivals and trips.	The government recognise that “ <i>school trips have clear benefits for pupils ... learning outside the classroom helps to bring the curriculum to life – it provides deeper subject learning and increases self-confidence</i> ” [HSE: School Trips]. Our breakfast and lunchtime clubs offer similar benefits, alongside the wider personal and inter-personal skills they develop. Cost – approx. = £1,800 – school trip subsidies, club fees for PP children, breakfast club subsidies for PP children	The Healthy School Co-ordinator will keep a list of clubs and other provision and will ensure we offer a broad and balanced selection of these. We will assess the effectiveness of external providers through child interviews.	Healthy school co-ordinator	Pupil interviews & analysis of clubs registers conducted in Summer Term 2.
E. Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	There are regular celebrations of good attendance in assembly, both for whole classes and individuals. Children who are absent receive same-day follow up. The HT and attendance officer compile a monthly report on persistent absentees, which is also checked by governors. With Mengham Junior, the school will run a morning minibus service to pick up persistent absentees who are eligible for the PP.	Raising attendance is a crucial first step to raising attainment. Improved attendance is a target from our last OFSTED report. DfE research shows the impact of having a senior member of staff overseeing this issue, of analysing data regularly and acting on it promptly. The minibus service provides a service for children whose families cannot ensure their attendance even with other, earlier support. Cost – approx. = £3,300 – staffing and running of daily mini bus pick up.	Regular data analysis and reports will enable impact of actions to be checked and amended if necessary.	Head teacher	Individual children’s attendance monitored as part of each attendance report. Group analysis completed termly.
Total budgeted cost					£5,100

Impact Analysis 2016-17		
<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>	<i>Impact Measured</i>
A greater proportion of PP children to be working at ARE	Increased percentage of PP children working at least at ARE in year R and year 1 so that by the end of year 2 the percentage is at least in line with ‘national other’ figure.	YR = Reading ARE PP = 42% non PP = 83% Writing ARE PP = 42% non PP = 79% Number ARE PP = 58% non PP = 81% Av. age and stage band progress from starting point R = 4.1 bands Av. age and stage band progress from starting point W = 3.8 bands Av. age and stage band progress from starting point M = 4.7 bands Y1 = Reading ARE PP = 58% non PP = 71%

		<p>Writing ARE PP = 42% non PP = 71%</p> <p>Maths ARE PP = 63% non PP = 84%</p> <p>In Yr 1 50% of our FSM children are on the SEND register with other agency involvement.</p> <p>Y2 = Reading ARE PP = 75% non PP = 97%</p> <p>Writing ARE PP = 53% non PP = 64%</p> <p>Maths ARE PP = 56% non PP = 87%</p> <p>25% of Y2 PP cohort on SEND register</p> <p>Analysis shows that although our PP children make progress in line with their non PP peers, there is still an attainment gap, due to lower starting points.</p>
A greater proportion of PP children to be exceeding / working at greater depth	Percentage of PP children exceeding / at greater depth to show an increase from year R baseline by end of year R and year 1, and to be at least in line with 'national other' figure by end of year 2.	<p>End of KS1 = 13% PP children exceeding in reading (25% non PP)</p> <p>27% National 2016</p> <p>0% PP children exceeding in writing (3% non PP)</p> <p>16% National 2016</p> <p>7% PP children exceeding in Maths (15% non PP)</p> <p>20% National 2016</p> <p>Greater depth opportunities will form a key area of the SIP across the whole school for 17/18.</p>
Improved inter- and intra-personal skills for PP identified children.	Improved Boxall / Thrive profile scores in areas identified for development.	<p>All children receiving Boxall or Thrive are baseline scored at the start of any ELSA or Nurture Work.</p> <p>Out of children receiving support in this area 64% were PP.</p> <p>93% of the children's scores had improved in their development area by the end of their intervention work.</p>
PP children have similar opportunities for enhanced learning activities across curriculum as their peers and are inspired to participate, improve and excel.	At least 40% of pupil premium children attend some form of extra-curricular provision (currently, 29.5% do). When interviewed, these children report that it is enjoyable and/or has helped them develop a skill/interest.	<p><u>Based on Club Registers</u></p> <p>Drumming club = 4/18 PP</p> <p>Athletics Club = 2/18 PP</p> <p>Bat and Ball Club = 3/11 PP</p> <p>Handbells Club = 9/25 PP</p> <p>Sports Festivals across year = 50% of spaces for every sports festival are allocated to PP.</p> <p>All pupils went on every school visit available to them.</p>
Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP to less than 6.3% (in line with non-PP pupils). Overall PP attendance (for academic year 2016-17) improves to 95.5% by end of year to be on track for meeting school target for all children of 97% by following year.	<p>Overall attendance at end of year – 95.96%</p> <p>Non PP children – 96.27%</p> <p>PP Children – 95%</p> <p>Persistent absenteeism – 11% of PP were persistent absentees</p> <p>3.4% of non PP were persistent absentees</p> <p>The minibus initiative started in Feb 2017 so has not yet run for a whole school year. All PP children on the minibus saw an increase in attendance from Feb to end of school year with an average</p>

		attendance increase of 4.4%
--	--	-----------------------------