



Cramlington Village Primary School

Pupil premium strategy statement:

1. Summary information					
School	Cramlington Village Primary School				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£52,000	Date of most recent PP Review	n/a
Total number of pupils	145	Number of pupils eligible for PP	27	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2017

2. Current attainment KS1				
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP 2016 (National Average)</i>	<i>Pupils eligible for PP 2015 (National Average)</i>	<i>Pupils eligible for PP 2014 (National Average)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) 2016 results</i>
% making ARE in reading	36% (60%)	89% (84%)	57% (82%)	77%
% making ARE in writing	29% (50%)	89% (79%)	43% (77%)	68%
% making ARE in maths	29% (58%)	78% (88%)	43% (86%)	75%

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.	Oral language skills in Reception are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other pupils. This slows reading progress in subsequent years especially year 1.
B.	Writing in Year 3, 4 and 5 is lower for pupils eligible for PP who are also identified as having SEND than for pupils eligible for PP who are not identified as having SEND.
C.	High ability pupils who are eligible for PP in year 4 and 5 are making less progress than other high ability pupils in school across Key Stage 2 in reading, writing and maths
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Attendance rates – 3 pupil premium families are particularly struggling with punctuality. School has identified the benefit of one member of school staff coordinating strategies to address this, and plans to recruit an additional assistant teacher to backfill our Thrive practitioner to support these most vulnerable families, two of whom are on Early Help

Assessments. Other barriers which school addresses include lack of financial capacity for parents to support music tuition, learning expeditions and residentials, transport costs of swimming etc.

4. Desired outcomes

	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Improve oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception class.	Pupils eligible for PP in Reception class make rapid progress by the end of the year so that all pupils eligible for PP meet age related expectations.
B.	Higher rate of progress for children in specific cohorts writing for children in Years 3, 4 and 5 for PP SEND pupils	Pupils identified as PP SEND in Year 3, 4 and 5 will make as much progress as PP non SEND pupils in Year 3, 4 and 5 in writing. Measured in Year 3, 4 and 5 by teacher assessments (NFER) and moderation across North Tyneside local authority
C.	Higher rates of progress across KS2 for high attaining pupils eligible for PP in Year 4 and 5 in reading, writing and maths	Pupils eligible for PP identified as high ability will make as much progress as 'other' pupils identified as high ability in school, across Key Stage 2 in maths, reading and writing. Measured in Y4 and 5 by teacher assessments (NFER tests) Sandwell and YARC and moderation across North Tyneside local authority

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?
A. Improved oral language skills in Reception	<p>Staff training on developing oracy for pupils in reception and Y1 – lead by Northumberland LIST team (7th December 2016)</p> <p>Half termly RWI review with modified groupings based on teacher support and progress – devoted RWI manager</p> <p>Inference training – led by Think well</p>	<p>Speaking and listening has been identified as an area of weakness in the reception class across the past few years. Evidence suggests that interventions such as RWI and SALT programmes and talk boost are successful in terms of narrowing the gap</p>	<p>Course selected using evidence of effectiveness</p> <p>Use INSET/staff training days to deliver training</p> <p>Peer observation of attendees' classes after the course, to embed learning.</p> <p>Data tracking of speaking aspect of EYFS.</p>	KS1 leader	Jan 2017
B. Higher rate of progress for children in specific cohorts writing for children in Years 3, 4 and 5 for PP SEND pupils	<p>RWI Spelling programmes to be implemented in small groups.</p> <p>Further develop oracy through drama and social speaking activities.</p> <p>Introduce dyslexia strategies across KS2 in addition to already established dyslexia friendly approaches recommended by Literacy support team from NCC.</p>	<p>Issues hindering progress in PP children's writing relate to spelling and grammar, and composition skills.</p> <p>Some children who have undergone significant intervention programmes recommended from the local Literacy Support Team are still struggling to accelerate progress in writing. Some pupils who struggle most are articulate and yet still struggle with basic spelling, including reversal of letters, and weak spelling of high frequency words.</p>	<p>Catch up literacy programme is underpinned by a rigid programme of assessment and a tried and tested system of interventions. Staff have accessed training to be able to deliver it well. Staff are released across afternoons 3 times a week to implement. Quality assuring via regular learning walks and meetings with staff who are delivering.</p> <p>RWI spelling is monitored by senior staff learning walks.</p>	<p>KS2 leader (catch up literacy)</p> <p>SENCO (Dyslexia training and implementation of dyslexia toolkit)</p>	half termly across the year

	Work with the catch up literacy project (EEF funded) to support pupils identified most in need.		SENCO has attended training to be able to cascade dyslexia assessment tools and will monitor across the year.		
C. Improved progress for high attaining pupils in Year 4 and 5	CPD on providing stretch for high attaining pupils Inference training – led by Thinkwell	High ability pupils eligible for PP are making less progress than other higher attaining pupils across Key Stage 2 in reading, writing and maths. We want to ensure that PP pupils can achieve high attainment as well as simply 'meeting expected standards'. We want to train a small number of relevant teachers in practices to provide stretch and encouragement for these pupils.	Course selected using evidence of effectiveness – Great North Maths hub training, Creativity training, Inference training Use INSET days to deliver training – Inference Peer observation of attendees' classes after the course, to embed learning. Adoption of White Rose material and mastery publications from Great North Maths Hub.	KS2 leader	Jan 2017
Total budgeted cost					£20,570
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. Improved oral language skills in reception	RWI targeted interventions	Some of the pupils need targeted support to catch up. This is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.	Reception class teachers KS1 leader	Jun 2017
Total budgeted cost					£8,460
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. Increased attendance rates and punctuality.	Trainee business manager employed to monitor pupils and follow up quickly on absences.	We can't improve attainment for children if they aren't actually attending school.	Trainee business manager about existing absence issues.	Principal and Trainee	Jan 2017

	<p>First day response provision.</p> <p>Release of Thrive practitioner</p> <p>Half termly analysis and letters out to parents of children whose attendance is less than 90%</p> <p>EHA support for families in need of basic routine development at home</p> <p>persistently late children are given alarm clocks and shown how they work</p> <p>school attendance awards are only given to those who are 100% punctual AND have 100% attendance</p>	<p>NfER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step.</p>	<p>PP coordinator, head etc. will collaborate to ensure new provision and standard school processes work smoothly together.</p>	<p>business manager Thrive practitioner</p>	
Total budgeted cost					£3,600

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2015/16		
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
An increase in the percentage of children achieving age related expectations across all year groups	Providing low ratio of pupil to staff members, including at least one assistant teacher to every year group <i>Reception – 2 assistant teachers (ratio 1: x)</i> <i>Year 1 – 2 assistant teachers (ratio 1: x)</i> <i>Year 2 – 1 assistant teacher (ratio 1: x)</i> <i>Year 3 and 4 – 3 assistant teachers across year base additional senior staff released to support strong progress across Y2 supporting NQT SATs readiness.</i>	Reception: 1 child who is PP non SEND has achieved a good level of development. 2 children who are PP non SEND have not achieved age related expectations. Year 1 reading: All PP children non-SEND are working at age related expectations with one child working at greater depth expectations. 1 child in this group is a looked after child. 1 child who is PP SEND is working at age related expectations. 2 children who are PP SEND are currently been assessed against the EYFS assessment profile. Year 1 Writing: 2 children who are PP and SEND have made 3 progress since September 2015, 1 child in this group has made only 1 point progress since September 2015. 2 children who are in receipt of PP have made 3 point progress since September 1 child who is SEND and PP is in receipt of band 4 top up funding. Year 1 Maths: All children who are in receipt of PP are working at age related expectations in Maths. Children who are SEND and PP have made between 2 and 3 pints progress over academic year to date, 1 child in this group is working at age related expectations. Year 2: The average points progress for children who are identified as Non PP and children who are PP with SEND are broadly inline. Year 2: The average points progress for children who are identified as Non PP and children who are PP with SEN is broadly inline. There are no LAC children in this year group. With regards to writing, children who are non PP are making more average progress than those who are PP non-SEND (1 child) and PP with SEND. Year 3 Children who have been identified as being PP with SEND have made more average points progress than their non PP and PP non SEND peers. The same is true for reading, with PP SEND children making more average points progress than their non PP and PP non SEND peers. With regards to reading and writing, non PP children have made on average more points progress than PP non-SEND peers and PP SEND peers. In maths, all groups identified above have made the same average points progress. 1 st class at number intervention is used to target children who needs additional support in numeracy, currently PP children with SEND and PP children with non-SEND are accessing this to support their numerical ability. Year 4 Average points progress for children who are PP SEND is higher in writing than in reading and maths as compared to their non PP peers	Staff were positive that providing a low ratio of pupil to staff members has had the desired impact on raising the % of children achieving age related expectations, the use of targeted interventions delivered by T as well as AT has had a positive impact.	£16,400
ii. Targeted support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
To provide exciting opportunities for children to use a range of technology throughout the curriculum to support and enhance learning	School devices including subscription to apps and additional programmes provided for targeted pupil premium children (use of iPad)e.g. Mathletics Immersive room use KS2 use of seesaw	High engagement with online programmes from all PP children, children access Mathletics at home and this has shown also to have high levels of engagement from all PP in all classes	Tracking of data related to achievements needs to be more robust and monitored half termly	£2,970
iii. Other approaches				

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost

7. Additional detail

In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.

Our full strategy document can be found online at: www.aschool.sch.uk

Pupil premium report for academic year 2015 to 2016 completed by Ciara Murphy