# **Pupil premium strategy statement**

Summary information						
School	Mousehold	Infant and Nursery School				
Academic Year	2019/20	Total PP budget	£87,120 - £76,529 = £10,591	Date of most recent PP Review	Sept 2020	
Total number of pupils	280	Number of pupils eligible for PP	57	Date for next internal review of this strategy		

KS1		Y	1			Y	2		2019 National
Term	Start of Year	Aut 19	Spr 20	Sum 20	Start of Year	Aut 19	Spr 20	Sum 20	average Non- Disadvantaged (Disadvantaged)
Number of PP Pupils	14	14	15		21	21	22		
% achieving expected standard in reading, writing and maths	42.9%	42.9%	53.3%		52.4%	57.1%	60.9%		69% (50%)
% achieving expected standard in reading	42.9%	42.9%	53.3%		71.4%	71.4%	68%		78% (62%)
% achieving the expected standard in writing	42.9%	50%	60%		57.1%	61.9%	68%		73% (55%)
% achieving the expected standard in maths	42.9%	57.1%	53%		61.9%	61.9%	68%		79% (62%)
% achieving the expected phonics standard	42.9%	35.7%	33.3%		66.7%	66.7%	82.6%		Yr 1 84% (71%) Yr 2 59% (50%)
							2019 National		
Term		Aut 19		Spr 20			Sum 20		average for non-FSM Pupils (FSM Pupils)
Number of PP Pupils		15			22				
% achieving a Good Level of Development		14.3%		40.9%					74% (57%)

Term	Aut 19	Spr 20	Sum 20	2019 National 2019 National average for non-FSM Pupils (FSM Pupils)		
Attendance %	Whole School 94% Year 1 & 2 - 94.97%	Whole School 94.6%		96.6% (94.6%)		
Autumn 2019 Data Review						

See attached Data review for all vulnerable groups

2. Baı	rriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
In-sc	chool barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)	
A.	Oral language skills in Reception are lower for pupils eligible for PP than for other pupils. This slows re	eading progress in subsequent years.
B.	The percentage of pupils who are eligible for PP reaching, expected and greater depth in writing is les	s than other pupils at the end of Key Stage 1
C.	Lack of life experiences outside the local area, mean that the gap in language acquisition and experien	nces continues to widen
Exter	nal barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance	rates)
D.	Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are 94.14% (2018/19). This reduces their school hours and	causes them to fall behind on average.
E.	Parental aspirations for PP children and their own mental health need impacts on school life	
1. D	Desired outcomes	
	Desired outcomes and how they will be measured	Success criteria
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: Greater % of all pupils reach GLD Greater % of PP reach GLD
B.	The percentage of pupils who are eligible for PP reaching, expected and greater depth in writing is in line with other pupils at the end of Key Stage 1	Pupils eligible for PP make as much progress as 'other' pupils across Key Stage 1 in writing.
C.	Diminishing difference in achievement between PP and non PP pupils in all areas of the curriculum	The gap between pupils eligible for pp and non-pupil premium children is diminished. Greater % of PP pupils reach ARE by the end of the year

D.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP to 10% or below. Overall PP attendance improves from 94.14% to 96% in line with 'other' pupils.
E.	Targeted support for families via PSA and Benjamin Foundation	Engagement with relevant professionals leading to reduction of family related incidents/issues affecting the children's emotional and social well-being

# 3. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2019/20

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. Improve oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception class.	Early Talk boost Intervention Reception/ Nursery. Staff training on high quality delivery. Staff training on developing oracy for the high attaining pupils in EYFS and reception from EYFS/Reception SLE	We want to invest some of the PP in longer term change which will help all pupils. Many different evidence sources, e.g. EEF Toolkit suggest high quality intervention/feedback is an effective way to improve attainment, and it is suitable as an approach that we can embed across the school.	Systematic tracking of results on a termly basis Interventions changed on a termly basis linked to need	SENCO & EYFS lead (SLE)	Dec 2019 Training and resources £1400		
B. Improved progress for high attaining pupils	CPD on providing stretch for high attaining pupils.	High ability pupils eligible for PP are making less progress than other higher attaining pupils across Key Stage 1 in writing. 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.	Method selected using evidence of effectiveness. Use staff meeting time to deliver training. Peer observation of attendees' classes after the meeting, to embed learning (no assessment).	Writing Strand lead & English lead	Dec 2019		
		Total budgeted cost					

# Autumn 2019/20 Review of Impact of Teaching

A. Improved oral language skills in reception - 1:1 and small group provision of targeted intervention for children in Reception

67% (10/15) of our disadvantaged children attended either Talk Boost or Sound Discovery interventions.

Impact: Improved oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception classes.

**B.** Improved progress for high attaining pupils

**Reading -** Year 2 PP – ARE is at 71% GDS is at 24% (Not Disadvantaged 75% ARE and 28% GDS) **Writing -** Year 2 PP – ARE is at 62% GDS is at 5% (Not Disadvantaged 78% ARE and 11% GDS)

#### Spring 2019/20 Review of Impact of Teaching

A. Improved oral language skills in reception - 1:1 and small group provision of targeted intervention for children in Reception 67% (10/15) of our disadvantaged children attended either Talk Boost or Sound Discovery interventions.

**Impact**: Improved oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception classes.

**B.** Improved progress for high attaining pupils

**Reading -** Year 2 PP – ARE is at 68% GDS is at 27% (Not Disadvantaged nationally 78%, Disadvantaged nationally 62%) **Writing -** Year 2 PP – ARE is at 68% GDS is at 4% (Not Disadvantaged Nationally 73%, Disadvantaged nationally 55%)

**Impact:** Writing is almost in line with writing for Non-disadvantaged children Nationally with a difference of 5% Reading is also almost in line with reading for Non-disadvantaged children nationally with a difference of 10% Both are higher than Disadvantaged children Nationally

# 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 review implementation?

B. The percentage of pupils who are eligible for PP reaching, expected and and greater depth in writing for pupils at the end of Key Stage 1  C. Diminishing difference in achievement between PP and non PP pupils in all areas of the curriculum  T. 1 and small group provision of targeted achievement between ween curriculum  T. 2 may be difference. The curriculum  T. 3 may be difference in academic year with EAL will reel curriculum  T. 6 may be difference. The curriculum  T. 1 and small group provision of targeted and scale microsers with as the curriculum  T. 2 may be difference in academic year with EAL will reel curriculum  T. 3 may be difference in academic year with EAL will reel curriculum  T. 3 may be difference in academic year with EAL will reel curriculum  T. 3 may be difference in academic year with EAL will reel curriculum  T. 4 may be want to combine this additional provision with some aspiration interventions such as 1:1 geodack sessions looking at next steps etc  T. 4 may be want to provide extra support to increase % meeting expected and preparation time paid for out of premium Coordinato relation to preparation time paid for out of premium Coordinato relation.  T. 4 may a supporting the sessions.  T. 4 may supporting the sessions and pupils before intervention begins to address any concerns or a determine tracking of results on a termity basis in termity basis.  T. 4 may supported and sessions.  The pupil provision of targeted intervention for EAL LyPP intervention/feedback is an effective way to improve attainment. Children jub face with us from the start of their school journey will achieve in line with their peers. A focus of this work will be developing and improving phonics knowledge in all pupils with EAL.  Total budgeted cost  Total budgeted cost	A. Improved oral language skills in reception  C. Diminishing difference in achievement between PP and non PP pupils in all areas of the curriculum	1:1 and small group provision of targeted intervention for children in Reception.	Some of the students need targeted support to catch up. See Ofsted 2013 report – highly trained support staff to deliver quality interventions	Organise timetable to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.	Reception class teachers	Dec 2019  TA's £12,236  (£16,164 - £3928  SEN Budget element)
difference in achievement between PP and non PP pupils in all areas of the curriculum    Coordinato   Children from a qualified teacher   Poor   Children joining us part way through an academic year with EAL will feel supported and settled and be confident members of the class and school.   Children with EAL who are with us from the start of their school journey will achieve in line with their peers. A focus of this work will be developing and improving phonics knowledge in all pupils with EAL   Premium Coordinato r   Premium Coordina	pupils who are eligible for PP reaching, expected and greater depth in writing is in line with other pupils at the	sessions in writing for pp children with experienced teaching staff, in addition to	increase % meeting expected and achieving higher attainment (greater depth).  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. We want to combine this additional provision with some 'aspiration' interventions such as 1:1 feedback sessions looking at next	preparation time paid for out of PP budget.  Impact overseen by writing coordinator. Teaching assistant (TA) CPD for TAs supporting the sessions.  Engage with parents and pupils before intervention begins to address any concerns or questions about the additional	Premium Coordinato	Y1 - TA's £12,236 (£16,164 - £3928 SEN Budget element) Y2 - TA £7178 (£9142 - £1964 SEN Budget
	difference in achievement between PP and non PP pupils in all areas of the	provision of targeted intervention for EAL /PP children from a qualified	intervention/feedback is an effective way to improve attainment. Children joining us part way through an academic year with EAL will feel supported and settled and be confident members of the class and school. Children with EAL who are with us from the start of their school journey will achieve in line with their peers. A focus of this work will be developing and improving phonics knowledge in all	a termly basis Interventions changed on a termly basis linked to need	Premium Coordinato r	

# Autumn 2019/20 Review on Impact of Targeted support

A. Improved oral language skills in reception - 1:1 and small group provision of targeted intervention for children in Reception

67% (10/15) of our disadvantaged children attended either Talk Boost or Sound Discovery interventions.

**Impact:** Improved oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception classes.

B. Weekly small group sessions in writing for pp children with experienced teaching staff, in addition to standard lessons

#### Reading

Year 1 – ARE is at 43% GDS is at 7% (Not Disadvantaged 66% ARE and 8% GDS) Year 2 – ARE is at 71% GDS is at 24% (Not Disadvantaged 75% ARE and 28% GDS)

#### Writing

Year 1 – ARE is at 50% GDS is at 0% (Not Disadvantaged 62% ARE and 6% GDS) Year 2 – ARE is at 62% GDS is at 5% (Not Disadvantaged 78% ARE and 11% GDS)

#### **Maths**

Year 1 – ARE is at 57% GDS is at 0% (Not Disadvantaged 69.2% ARE and 7.7% GDS) Year 2 – ARE is at 61.9% GDS is at 9.5% (Not Disadvantaged 79.7% ARE and 20.3% GDS)

C. Diminishing difference in achievement between PP and non PP pupils in all areas of the curriculum - 1:1 and small group provision of targeted intervention for EAL /PP children from a qualified teacher

## Reading

Year 1 – 100% of PP/EAL pupils are working at age related expectations. Year 2 –100% of PP/EAL pupils are working at age related expectations

## **Writing**

Year 1 –100% of PP/EAL pupils are working at age related expectations. Year 2 –50%) of PP/EAL pupils are working at age related expectations

#### **Maths**

Year 1 – 100% of PP/EAL pupils are working at age related expectations. Year 2 100% of PP/EAL pupils are working at age related expectations

## Spring 2019/20 Review on Impact of Other Approaches

A. Improved oral language skills in reception - 1:1 and small group provision of targeted intervention for children in Reception

77% (17/22) of our disadvantaged children attended either Talk Boost or Sound Discovery interventions.

**Impact**: Improved oral language skills for pupils eligible for PP in Reception classes.

#### B. Weekly small group sessions in writing for pp children with experienced teaching staff, in addition to standard lessons

# Writing

Year 1 – ARE is at 53% GDS is at 0% (Not Disadvantaged 62% ARE and 3% GDS)
Year 2 – ARE is at 68% GDS is at 5% (Not Disadvantaged 79% ARE and 13% GDS) (Nationally Disadvantaged 55%)

#### Reading

Year 1 – ARE is at 47% GDS is at 7% (Not Disadvantaged 68% ARE and 17% GDS)
Year 2 – ARE is at 68% GDS is at 27% (Not Disadvantaged 76% ARE and 37% GDS) (Nationally Disadvantaged 62%)

#### **Maths**

Year 1 – ARE is at 53% GDS is at 0% (Not Disadvantaged 69.2% ARE and 7.7% GDS)
Year 2 – ARE is at 68% GDS is at 14% (Not Disadvantaged 79.7% ARE and 20.3% GDS) (Nationally Disadvantaged 62%)

Impact: The weekly small group work has helped to diminish the gap between disadvantaged children and non-disadvantaged children in all three areas. Across the board in year 2 Disadvantaged children are achieving higher than Disadvantaged children Nationally and significantly higher in writing.

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 ?
C. Diminishing difference in achievement between PP and non PP pupils in all areas of the curriculum	Nurture Group Lunchtime	Nurture Group activities will help develop resilience, social skills and confidence The provision of Nurture Groups (NGs) has been recognised as an effective early intervention for children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD). 'The high expectations of teachers in Nurture Groups can bring about amazing change' in the lives of young emotionally disturbed children (Lucas, 1999, p.14).	Boxall Profile data will show the improved confidence and social skills.	SENCO	Dec 2019  2 TAs: 1 hour a day of TA time cost: £589
C. Diminishing difference in achievement between PP and non PP pupils in all areas of the curriculum	Use of PP funding to enrich the curriculum for PP children  For pupils entitled to PP funding to have equal access of opportunity to trips, visits and clubs  After school clubs targetted at PP pupils	See Ofsted 2013 report – The full range of educational experiences – support is given to ensure that all pupils have full access to broad educational experiences, such as school trips, music lessons, subsidised uniform, free milk etc	Monitor spending on a termly basis  Systematic tracking of other area results on a termly basis PP provision mapping carried out termly  All pupils have accessed all visits. Pupils have had free access to breakfast club. Families have had support with uniform.	Pupil Premium Coordinato r	Visiting Artist- Yr 2 £250  School trips paid for £460  After school clubs £3440  Support with uniforms and book bags £500  FSM milk £1095  Samba for Y2 £2534  Ukulele for Y1

Total budgeted cost					
E. Targeted support for families via PSA and Benjamin Foundation	PSA to deliver 1-1 support for targeted pupils and families Benjamin Foundation	Engagement with relevant professionals leading to reduction of family related incidents/issues affecting the children's emotional and social well-being  Benjamin Foundation: The children who have taken part in these sessions will show increased confidence in talking about their feelings and any concerns about the child will be dealt with promptly by school staff	The number of PP families the PSA has supported and prevented further involvement from Children's Services and other agencies. This information is variable and available on request.	Head Teacher	PSA £16,019  Benjamin Foundation £3522 (£3990 - £468 SEN Budget element)
D. Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Role of the school secretary to monitor pupils and follow up quickly on absences. First day response provision.	We can't improve attainment for children if they aren't actually attending school. NfER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step.  DfE report on attendance and attainment showed strong link between attendance and attainment. Pupils with 100% attendance 4.7 times more likely to achieve than those with 85%  Funding for attendance awards on a termly and annual basis.	Thorough briefing by school secretary about existing absence issues. PP coordinator, school secretary, head etc. will collaborate to ensure new provision and standard school processes work smoothly together.	Pupil Premium Coordinato r	£2534  Forest School for YR £2600  Dec 2019

#### C. Nurture Group Lunchtime

19% (11/57) of our disadvantaged children attended Nurture group in the Autumn term.

Impact: Nurture Group activities will help develop resilience, social skills and confidence.

24% (14/59) of our disadvantaged children attended Nurture group in the Spring term.

Impact: Nurture Group activities have helped develop resilience, social skills and confidence, it has also had an impact on the children's emotional literacy.

Use of PP funding to enrich the curriculum for PP children

40% (6/15) of parents have helped at Forest School whose children receive PP funding. We do actively encourage and invite these adults along. All feedback form the parent/guardians was very positive and they commented how exciting and how lucky the children were to be able to go to the woods with a specialist teacher.

59% (13/22) of parents have helped at Forest School whose children receive PP funding. We do actively encourage and invite these adults along. All feedback form the parent/guardians was very positive and they commented how exciting and how lucky the children were to be able to go to the woods with a specialist teacher.

# After school clubs targeted at PP pupils

In the Spring Term 2019/20, 74% (37/50) of disadvantaged children attended a club,

Year 2-86% (18/21) of disadvantaged children attended a club.

Year 1- 93% (13/14) of disadvantaged children attended a club.

Reception – 49% (6/15) of disadvantaged children attended a club.

**Impact:** See Ofsted 2013 report — PP children have a full range of educational experiences. PP funding is used to ensure equal access of opportunity to trips, visits and clubs. PP children have enjoyed these clubs and have told us so when they talk about their favourite memories at Mousehold.

PSA to deliver 1-1 support for targeted pupils and families

Our PSA has supported 42% (24/57) disadvantaged families so far this year at Mousehold. This has been varied support such as advising with housing issues, financial issues, separation and divorce, bereavement and domestic violence. Our PSA has led or attended FSP (Family Support Plan) and Section 17 meetings and reviews. Our PSA also works at the feeder junior school so this provides extra stability for our families.

Our PSA has supported 44% (26/59) disadvantaged families so far this year at Mousehold. This has been varied support such as advising with housing issues, financial issues, separation and divorce, bereavement and domestic violence. Our PSA has led or attended FSP (Family Support Plan) and Section 17 meetings and reviews. Our PSA also works at the feeder junior school so this provides extra stability for our families.