

# St Mary's RC Primary School -Pupil Premium strategy 2018-19



1. Summary information					
<b>School</b>	St Mary's RC Primary School				
<b>Academic Year</b>	2018/19	<b>Total PP budget</b>	102,220	<b>Date of most recent PP Review</b>	23/05/16
<b>Total number of pupils</b>	446	<b>Number of pupils eligible for PP</b>	76	<b>Date for next internal review of this strategy</b>	June 2019

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
<b>Key Stage Two 2018</b> (10/60 pupils)		
% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths	40%	70%
% making expected progress in reading	50%	80%
% making expected progress in writing	60%	83%
% making expected progress in mathematics	50%	81%
Progress scores for reading	-0.3	6.1
Progress scores for writing	-0.68	
Progress scores for maths	-1.2	5.4
<b>Key Stage 1 2018</b> (12/60)		<i>All pupils nationally</i>

% achieving expected or above in reading, writing and maths	58%	
% achieving expected or above in reading	58%	75%
% achieving expected or above in writing	58%	70%
% achieving expected or above in maths	77%	76%
<b>Year 1 phonics check 2018</b> (6/60)		
% achieving passed screening		83%
<b>EYFS 2018</b> (6/60)		
% obtaining Good Level of Development	68%	72%

### 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)

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

<b>A.</b>	At the end of Key Stage Two attainment for pupil eligible for the Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) was considerably lower than pupils for PPG nationally in all three measurable subjects. (Reading, PPG 50%, non PPG 80%- gap -30%. Writing, PPG 60%, non PPG 83%- gap -23%. Maths, PPG 50%, non PPG 81%- gap -31%) This gap has widened from the previous year.
<b>B.</b>	At the end of Key Stage Two progress for pupil eligible for the Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) was considerably lower than pupils not eligible for PPG nationally in all three measurable subjects. (Reading, PPG -0.3, non PPG 6.1- gap -5.8. Writing, PPG -0.68, non PPG 0.0- gap -0.68%. Maths, PPG -1.2, non PPG 5.4- gap -4.2). This gap has widened from the previous year.

<b>C.</b>	<p>At the end of Key Stage One not enough pupils eligible for PPG reached the expected standard in reading and writing. (Reading, PPG 58%, non PPG 75%- gap -17%. Writing, PPG 58%, non PPG 70%- gap -12%).</p> <p><i>25% of pupils in receipt of PPG are on the SEND register</i></p>	
<b>Additional barriers</b> <i>(including issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>		
<b>D.</b>	<p>Children enter our school with speech, language and communication development well below that expected of their age. Nursery on entry data 2018-19 is 18% at age related with Communication, Language and Literacy Development (CLLD) and Reception entry 2018-19 is 55%</p>	
<b>E.</b>	<p>There are more pupils eligible for the PPG in the persistently absent (PA) from school category (missed more than 10% of school sessions). School all pupils is 96.05 PA, PPG pupils is 94.93% and national expectation is 96%</p>	
<b>F.</b>	<p>The school has 77 children at SEN support, 22 of these are PPG eligible.</p> <p>17% of our school population has special educational needs. 32% of our PPG eligible children have SEN.</p>	
<b>G.</b>	<p>Children have low confidence and self-esteem when engaging in unfamiliar social and curriculum experiences/opportunities.</p>	
<b>H</b>	<p>A significant number of children have been identified with additional social and emotional needs which affect their ability to fully engage with the curriculum.</p>	
<b>4. Intended outcomes</b>		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Achieved?</i>
<b>Barrier A</b>	<p>The gap in attainment for pupils eligible and all pupils to narrow by 20% for reading, writing and maths as shown in the end of KS2 tests.</p>	

<b>Barrier B</b>	The gap in progress for pupils eligible and all pupils will narrow to within 1.0 progress score for reading, writing and maths as shown in the end of KS2 tests.	
<b>Barrier C</b>	At the end of Key Stage One the gap between the attainment of pupils eligible for the PPG and all pupils will narrow to within 5%.	
<b>Barrier D</b>	To provide extra support around early communication and language for our youngest children to aid their ability to achieve in line with their peers nationally (72%).	
<b>Barrier E</b>	To raise PPG attendance to the national average of 96% attendance.	
<b>Barrier G</b>	To enrich the experiences of, not only our most vulnerable, but all children. It is hoped this will increase attainment and progress for all groups of children, in particular, children in receipt of PPG. Success in this area will be linked to the targets for Barrier A and B.	
<b>Barrier H</b>	To improve resilience of children throughout the school and provide our most vulnerable with the ability to identify the social and emotional needs and arm them with a toolkit of strategies to manage them.	

## 5. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year 2017/18

Please see report from Bury SSI Strategy & external consultant(attached pdf)



# St Mary's R.C. Primary School

## Pupil Premium Grant expenditure 2017/18

Academic Year 2017/18  
Pupil number on roll : 445

Pupil premium Grant received £99,160  
Number of Pupil Premium pupils 73

Year group	Total number of pupils in cohort	PP numbers	% of cohort	Number of PP pupils who have SEN
6	60	10	17%	3
5	60	12	20%	1
4	60	17	28%	4
3	58	11	19%	3
2	60	12	20%	2
1	59	7	12%	3
R	59	6	10%	2

### Report on the impact of Pupil Premium Grant spending for 2017-18

2018	Pupil premium pupils (school)	Non Pupil Premium pupils (school)	Comment	
Attendance	Absence for PP learners is above the overall school average in all classes except for year 2. The difference is widest in reception Y1 and Y5. The overall <b>average attendance for the school of 96.05%</b> is broadly in line with the national average, with <b>PP learners</b> being below this at <b>94.93%</b>			
Early Years Foundation Stage ~ EYFS	67% achieved Good Level of Development	78% achieved Good Level of Development	More Pupil Premium pupils achieved GLD than did PP pupils nationally	
Year 1 Phonics	29% achieved the standard	94% achieved the standard	The outcome for PP learners was below the national average for PP children	
Year 2 Phonics	33% achieved the standard when retested	100% achieved the standard when retested	The success rate for PP children was below that seen nationally	
Key Stage 1	Reading	58% met the expected standard 17% achieved Greater Depth standard	81% met the expected standard 17% achieved Greater Depth standard	Outcomes were lower for PP children at the Expected standard and for Writing and Maths at GD standard. For Reading outcomes at GD standard were the same for PP and non PP children. Outcomes for PP children were lower than national outcomes for all children
	Writing	50% met the expected standard 0% achieved Greater Depth standard	79% met the expected standard 10% achieved Greater Depth standard	
	Maths	67% met the expected standard 0% achieved Greater Depth standard	79% met the expected standard 17% achieved Greater Depth standard	
Key Stage 2	Reading	50% met the expected standard 10% achieved Greater Depth standard	82% met the expected standard 37% achieved Greater Depth standard	PP children had attainment outcomes that were below the overall national averages at the Expected and GD standards in all subjects. They also achieved less well than non PP peers in the school and nationally.  The average scaled scores for PP learners were lower than for non PP children, both in the school and in the country
	Writing	60% met the expected standard 0% achieved Greater Depth standard	77% met the expected standard 20% achieved Greater Depth standard	
	GPS	60% met the expected standard 0% achieved Greater Depth standard	80% met the expected standard 28% achieved Greater Depth standard	
	Maths	50% met the expected standard 0% achieved Greater Depth standard	75% met the expected standard 15% achieved Greater Depth standard	
	combined	50% met the expected standard 0% achieved Greater Depth standard	65% met the expected standard 10% achieved Greater Depth standard	
Progress since KS1	Reading	- 1.5 (National for PP - 0.9)	+3.7	Progress was positive for non PP learners in all subjects and negative for all subjects for PP children. Their progress was slower than for PP children nationally.
	Writing	- 0.7 (National for PP - 0.2)	+1.9	
	Maths	- 1.8 (National for PP - 1.2)	+1.1	

#### Overall Impact

The actions taken to support the achievement of disadvantaged learners have made limited improvements and increasing outcomes is a continuing priority for 2018/19. The plan will include a range of actions and provision to narrow the gap between non pupil premium children in the school and those children who are disadvantaged. However, of the children in Y6 who were entitled to pupil premium funding, the individual outcomes when compared to their predicted outcomes appear to be better. In reading, 40% exceeded the prediction based on KS1 data, 30% met it and 30% did not. In maths, 60% exceeded the predicted score, 20% met it and 20% had lower outcomes than expected.

Outcomes for PP children in other year groups mirror that non PP learners achieve better overall with the exception of Year 5.

Further data will become available after the publication of the ASP for 2018 and will be included in the report if required.

**Caution is required when statistics are based on small numbers**

## 1. The effectiveness of provision for 2017-18 Impact of spending on pupil outcomes

- ● There is a strong commitment from the leadership team, teachers and teaching assistants to improve the outcomes and support the needs of the disadvantaged pupils. All staff have welcomed the journey the school has taken since September 2017 but appreciate and recognise there is further development needed. Teachers and teaching assistants are now able to identify pupil premium pupils in their classes and know how well they are progressing.
- ● Rigorous tracking and scrutiny of the data ensures the leadership team have a clear overview of the performance of the disadvantaged pupils across school. Progress meetings are held termly with teaching staff and targeted intervention identified. There will be an additional PP progress meeting taking place from January 18. Data headlines:
  - ● At the end of Key Stage 2 attainment and progress for pupil eligible for the Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) was considerably lower than pupils for PPG nationally in all three measurable subjects.
  - ● At the end of Key Stage 1 not enough pupils eligible for PPG reached the expected standard in reading and writing. 25% of pupils in receipt of PPG are on the SEND register
  - ● Children enter the school with speech, language and communication development well below that expected of their age. Nursery on entry data 2018-19 is 18% at age related with Communication, Language and Literacy Development (CLLD) and Reception on entry 2018-19 is 55%.
  - ● Over the last 18 months there have been huge developments within the curriculum. There is an assistant headteacher dedicated to non-core subjects. The school has commissioned 'Technola' to work with the children and provide CPD to the teachers in PE, Music and Computing. This has been an excellent tool for upskilling teachers and giving them confidence in specialist subjects. The school are committed to offering pupils a broad and balanced curriculum offering subjects such as Food Technology and Product Design also preparing them for transition into secondary school.
  - ● A large proportion of the PP spending has been allocated to enriching pupils experience within the curriculum. The school has invited visitors into the school to inspire and motivate pupils in their learning through presentations and workshops e.g. viking, spaceman, toy maker, poet. There are also opportunities for pupils to go on trips within their local community and further afield e.g. Salford Quays, Whitby, and London. A number of staff that we spoke to during the review commented on the impact of these experiences in terms of motivation to learning, engagement and positive behaviour particularly amongst the disadvantaged pupils.
  - ● The school have worked very hard to engage parents within the curriculum develops inviting them to assemblies each week and to the topic launch and finale each half term.
  - ● The school are in the process of developing a Forest School which will be launched in December 2018 with a targeted group of pupil premium students. The PP money has funded training for four members of staff who will deliver the curriculum.
  - ● There are four middle leaders who are responsible for English and Maths across the curriculum. A significant amount of work has gone into developing the English and Maths curriculum across school. Both departments have written a subject action plan with a specific target for improving the outcomes for the disadvantaged pupils. Maths and English leads have recently carried out a work scrutiny and have identified challenge as a development priority.

- ● The English Lead has introduced high quality texts to motivate and inspire reluctant readers. PP pupils in Year 6 have been provided with a Kindle/Audio app to allow pupils to access reading at home.
- ● Pupil intervention is strategically planned by the deputy headteacher and class teachers are expected to complete an intervention map identifying pupil targets. An 'Audit of Skills and Training' was carried out to identify which TAs will deliver specific intervention. Formal intervention are ran in the afternoon by either the TA, Teacher of SLT. During our visit, we observed the Assistant Headteacher carrying out a Maths intervention whilst the HLTA was leading the lesson. The timetable has been changed to ensure pupils are not missing the same lesson each week. Interventions are planned by the Teacher and feedback is given verbally by the teacher and TA.
- ● There were examples of marking and quality feedback and evidence that pupils respond to the feedback. On some occasions marking was not maximised to provide pupils with the appropriate direction to improve their work. The deputy headteacher was clear where improvements were needed and is in the process of reviewing the marking policy.
- ● The SENco has a good understanding of the needs and barriers of the SEN pupils in receipt of Pupil Premium and quality assures any intervention happening for these pupils.

#### Impact of spending on pupil well-being

- ● St Mary's is a very welcoming and positive environment. The positive relationships between pupils and staff was evident throughout the day
- ● Pupils are very positive about school life and feel safe, valued and happy at St Mary's. They know who they need to speak to if there is an issue or problem. Children were passionate and proud of their school.
- ● The school has established a strong Pastoral Team with excellent working relationships. The school has also employed a part time social worker to support the social and emotional needs of the most vulnerable pupils through 1:1 and small group interventions. Teaching Assistants, Teachers and SLT lead interventions with pupils identified.
- ● There are good systems in place to identify families entitled to Pupil Premium when they enter school in nursery/reception.
- ● The school works very closely with parents, and parental engagement appears really positive across the school. They have identified an effective method of communication for their parents through the Dojo app on the mobile phone. This keeps parents up to date with what their child is learning and also a vehicle for contacting parents.
- ● There are robust procedures in place to monitor the amount of food pupils are eating at lunchtime to ensure pupils are eating their lunch.

#### **Impact on attendance/ behaviour/ other relevant area**

- ● The pupils were absolutely delightful and behaviour was excellent in lessons and during unstructured times of the day. They were very enthusiastic about their learning and completely inspired by the visitors that have come into school
- ● A number of strategies are in place to improve pupil attendance, particularly focused on reducing the absence rate of disadvantaged pupils. The pastoral team follow up absences and work closely with the EWO from Bury's Attendance Team. Actions include pre-referral meetings with parents, first day absence phone calls and home visits. Rewards are also given for good attendance e.g. cake on a Friday. Despite this, attendance rates for disadvantaged pupils remain lower (94.93%).

## 6. Planned expenditure

Academic year 2018/19

The three headings enable you to demonstrate how you are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies

### i. Quality of teaching for all

Action	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Increased class and subject lead budget.	Alleviate poverty of experience.	KS1- Writing, PPG 58%, non PPG 70%- gap -12% KS2 Writing, PPG 60%, non PPG 83%- gap -23%. In a desire to increase writing outcomes we felt a broader variety of real life experiences were needed in	Writing moderation, pupil voice, evidence of writing linked to education experiences.	CJ, JH & KD	Half termly £14,000
Implementation of Forest School	Alleviate poverty of experience.	Give children the opportunity to broaden their experiences in of the great outdoors.	Train a dedicated team of 5 forest school practitioners. Assistant Head will be the forest school lead. Monitor impact.	CJ	July 20,000



Targeted intervention s.	At the end of Key Stage One the gap between the attainment of pupils eligible for the PPG and all pupils will narrow to within 5%.	Gap between PPG and non-PPG in all areas at the end of KS1 needs to reduce. We feel more targeted small group interventions will help fill gaps. In addition to this increasing one-to-one for our disadvantaged children should also aid attainment and progress.	Pupil progress meetings Regular monitoring.	JH & RG	Half termly. £28,500
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£62,500
<b>ii. Targeted support</b>					
<b>Action</b>	<b>Intended outcome</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>

<p>Additional support provided by the Deputy Head teacher across KS2 initially then focusing in on Year 6</p>	<p>The gap in attainment for pupils eligible and all pupils to narrow by 20% for reading, writing and maths as shown in the end of KS2 tests.</p> <p>The gap in progress for pupils eligible and all pupils will narrow to within 1.0 progress score for reading, writing and maths as shown in the end of KS2 tests.</p>	<p>Based on 2017/18, at the end of Key Stage Two attainment and progress for pupil eligible for the Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) was considerably lower than pupils for PPG nationally in all three measurable subjects.</p>	<p>Regular data led pupil progress meetings. Regular monitoring.</p>	<p>JH</p>	<p>Half termly. £22,000</p>
<p>Employ an attendance support officer.</p>	<p>To raise PPG attendance to the national average of 96% attendance.</p>	<p>PP attendance is currently below the national average of 96%. In improving PPG children attendance above national average should have a positive impact on outcomes.</p>	<p>Regular attendance updates from attendance officer.</p>	<p>JT &amp; EH</p>	<p>Regular updates throughout the year-final impact review at the end of the year. (£6,000)</p>
<p>Temporary TLR for a specialist project.</p>	<p>To provide extra support around early communication and language for our youngest children to aid their ability to achieve in line with their peers nationally (72%).</p>	<p>Writing outcomes for disadvantaged children are below national average. We feel this would be best achieved by improving early communication and language for our youngest children.</p>	<p>Regular meeting between assistant head (RG) and project lead (RD) Monitoring Pupil observations/interviews.</p>	<p>RG &amp; RD</p>	<p>£1,500</p>

<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£28,000
<b>iii. Other approaches</b>					
<b>Action</b>	<b>Intended outcome</b>	<b>What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?</b>	<b>How will you ensure it is implemented well?</b>	<b>Staff lead</b>	<b>When will you review implementation?</b>
Employ a Caritas social worker.	To improve resilience of children throughout the school and provide our most vulnerable with the ability to identify the social and emotional needs and arm them with a toolkit of strategies to manage them.	Many of lowest attaining children have additional emotional needs in which they need support. Children who are better supported are more equipped to deal with emotional issues and therefore can face academic challenges.	Assistant head will be in charge of our Caritas worker's caseload and will monitor the impact.	RG	Termly.
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					£22,000
<b>7. Additional detail</b>					