



ARK Little Ridge
Primary Academy

PUPIL PREMIUM AND SPORTS
PREMIUM POLICY

Ark
● ● ● ●

| Description | Tag |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| The Principal of the academy | Lorraine Clarke |
| The academic year | 2016/17 |
| Chair of Governors | Micky Sandell |
| The academy name | Ark Little Ridge Primary Academy |

POLICY INFORMATION

Named personnel with designated responsibility for (insert)

| Academic year | Designated Senior person | Deputy Designated Senior person | Nominated Governor | Chair of Governors |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 2016/17 | Lorraine Clarke | Charlotte Phillip | | Micky Sandell |
| [ACADEMICYEAR] | | | | [GOVERNOR] |

Policy review dates (frequency of review: tbc)

| Review Date | Changes made | By whom |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| September | Policy reviewed | Lorraine Clarke |
| | | |

CONTENTS

- 1 INTRODUCTION
- 2 FUNDING
- 3 EVIDENCE OF WHAT WORKS
- 4 PUPIL PREMIUM REVIEWS
- 5 ACCOUNTABILITY
- 6 PUPIL PREMIUM REPORTING
- 7 PERFORMANCE TABLES
- 8 TEMPLATES

Introduction

The pupil premium is additional funding for publicly funded schools in England to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils of all abilities and to close the gaps between them and their peers.

Pupil premium funding is available to:

- local-authority-maintained schools, including:
 - special schools (for children with special educational needs or disabilities)
 - pupil referral units (PRUs - for children who can't go to a mainstream school)
- academies and free schools, including
 - special academies (for children with special educational needs or disabilities)
 - alternative provision (AP) academies (for children who can't go to a mainstream school)
- voluntary-sector alternative provision (AP), with local authority agreement
- non-maintained special schools (NMSS - schools for children with special educational needs that the Secretary of State for Education has approved under section 342 of the Education Act 1996)

Funding

Financial year 2016 to 2017

In the 2016 to 2017 financial year, schools will receive the following funding for each child registered as eligible for free school meals at any point in the last 6 years:

- £1,320 for pupils in reception year to year 6
- £935 for pupils in year 7 to year 11

Schools will also receive £1,900 for each pupil identified in the spring school census as having left local-authority care because of 1 of the following:

- adoption
- a special guardianship order
- a child arrangements order
- a residence order

If a pupil has been registered as eligible for free school meals and has also left local-authority care for any of the reasons above, they will attract the £1,900 rate.

Children who have been in local-authority care for 1 day or more also attract £1,900 of pupil premium funding. Funding for these pupils is managed by the virtual school head (VSH) in the local authority that looks after the child.

Evidence of what works

The Education Endowment Foundation has produced a [teaching and learning toolkit](#) to help teachers and schools effectively use the pupil premium to support disadvantaged pupils. Its [families of schools toolkit](#) helps teachers learn about effective practice from similar schools. It has also produced an [evaluation tool](#) to help schools measure the impact of the approaches they are using.

Information can be found on schools that have been recognised for their successful use of the premium on the [Pupil Premium Awards website](#). The DfE encourage all schools with excellent results to share their achievements, strengths and experience with other schools.

Pupil Premium Reviews

Ofsted will recommend that a school commissions a pupil premium review if they identify concerns with the school's provision for disadvantaged pupils.

Other bodies may also recommend a pupil premium review, including:

- the academy trust
- the [regional schools commissioner](#)
- the Department for Education

Accountability

Ofsted inspections

Ofsted's school inspections report on the attainment and progress of disadvantaged pupils who attract the pupil premium.

Online reporting

From the 1 September 2016, schools maintained by the local authority must publish their strategy for the school's use of the pupil premium on their websites. Details of the specific information you need to publish can be found in our guidance on [what must published online](#) is available from the Ark Central Team.

Pupil premium reporting

You must publish a strategy for the school's use of the [pupil premium](#). You no longer have to publish a 'pupil premium statement'.

For the current academic year, you must include:

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

For the previous academic year, you must include:

- how you spent the pupil premium allocation
- the impact of the expenditure on eligible and other pupils

Pupil premium funding is allocated for each financial year, but the information you publish online should refer to the academic year, as this is how parents understand the school system.

As you won't know allocations for the end of the academic year (April to July), you should report on the funding up to the end of the financial year and update it when you have all the figures.

PE AND SPORT PREMIUM FUNDING FOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS

If your school receives [PE \(physical education\) and sport premium funding](#), you must publish:

- how much funding you received
- a full breakdown of how you've spent the funding or will spend the funding
- the effect of the premium on pupils' PE and sport participation and attainment
- how you'll make sure these improvements are sustainable

Performance Tables

[School and college performance tables](#) also report on the performance of disadvantaged pupils compared with their peers.

Templates

The Teaching Schools Council has produced [templates](#) to help schools present their pupil premium strategy. Examples below demonstrate good practice for publishing your pupil premium strategy – there are two examples –one for primary and one for secondary. Both examples show a populated strategy

Pupil Premium Strategy Statement: Ark Little Ridge Primary Academy

| 1. Summary information | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------|---|----------|
| School | Ark Blacklands Primary Strategy | | | | |
| Academic Year | 2016/17 | Total PP budget | £77, 880 | Date of most recent PP Review | Sep 2016 |
| Total number of pupils | 418 | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 59 | Date for next internal review of this strategy | Feb 2017 |

| 2. Current attainment | | | |
|---|------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| | All Pupils | Pupils eligible for PP | Pupils not eligible for PP |
| % achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths | 60% | 33% | 78% |
| progress in reading | -0.5 | -2.8 | |
| progress in writing | -0.4 | -0.9 | |
| progress in maths | -0.2 | -3.0 | |

| 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP) | |
|--|--|
| Pupils in receipt of PP who also have significant special educational needs | |
| In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills) | |
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| External barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates) | |
| 3. | Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are 95% (below the attendance rate for non PP children of 98%). Persistent absence of PP pupils is significantly higher than non PP 16% vs 6%. |
| 4. | Lack of support with learning at home |
| 5. | Lack of engagement from parents of pupils who are most vulnerable to under-achievement |

| 4. Outcomes | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| | <i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i> | <i>Success criteria</i> |
| A. | Improve the teaching of reading for pupils eligible for PP in EYFS and KS1 | Pupils eligible for PP identified make as much progress as 'other' pupils across Key Stage 1 in reading. Measured in Y4, 5 and 6 by teacher assessments and successful moderation practices established across the multi-academy trust (MAT). |
| B. | Improve the intervention for reading, writing and maths across KS2 | Pupils eligible for PP identified make as much progress as 'other' pupils across Key Stage 2 in maths, reading and writing. Measured in Y4, 5 and 6 by teacher assessments and successful moderation practices established across the multi-academy trust (MAT). |
| C. | Improve the quality of teaching, learning & assessment for all pupils | Pupils eligible for PP identified make as much progress as 'other' pupils in all year groups in reading, writing & maths. Measured by pupil outcomes in EYFS, Y1, KS1 and end of KS2. Measured by progress in Y3, 4 & 5. |
| D. | | |

| 5. Planned expenditure | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Academic year | 2016/17 | | | | | |
| 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? | Cost |
| Improve the teaching of reading for pupils eligible for PP in EYFS and KSI | All new staff to undertake RWI training in London. | Pupils eligible for PP are making less progress than other pupils across Key Stage 1 in reading. This is leading to lower attainment for this group of pupils compared to other pupils in school. We want to ensure that PP pupils can at least meet expected standards. We want to train all teaching staff (teachers and teaching assistants) in the high quality delivery of RWI programme. | Course selected using evidence of effectiveness. Use INSET/Twilights and masterclasses to deliver training. Peer observation and support, ILT coaching to embed learning RWI tracking grids to monitor impact | RWI Lead Teacher | Dec 2016 | £3,948 |
| | RWI lead to monitor classes daily | | | | Feb 2017 | £12,767 |
| | Masterclasses to be held for staff PD | | | | | £1433 |
| | Development of reading comprehension – staff training and improved teacher/pupil resources | | | | | |
| Improve the teaching of maths for pupils eligible for PP in EYFS, KSI & Y3 | All new staff to undertake maths mastery training in London. | Pupils eligible for PP are making less progress than other pupils across Key Stage 1 in maths. This is leading to lower attainment for this group of pupils compared to other pupils in school. We want to ensure that PP pupils can at least meet expected standards. We want to train all teaching staff (teachers and teaching assistants) in the high quality delivery of Maths Mastery programme. | Course selected using evidence of effectiveness. Use INSET/Twilights and masterclasses to deliver training. Peer observation and support, ILT coaching to embed learning CCR! & KPI tracking grids to monitor impact | RWI Lead Teacher | Dec 2016 | £18,362 |
| | MML to monitor classes daily | | | | Feb 2017 | £1285 |
| | Masterclasses to be held for staff PD | | | | | £350 |
| | Development of critical thinking skills in pupils | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <p>Improve the quality of teaching in Y2 and Y6</p> | <p>Employ network instructional lead teacher to work with target year groups</p> <p>Co-planning ILT</p> | <p>We want to invest some of the PP in longer term change which will help all pupils. Many different evidence sources, e.g. Sutton Trust, suggest that tailored PD to raise the quality of QFT is the most effective way to raise attainment rather than relying solely on an intervention approach.</p> <p>This is an approach that we can embed across the school.</p> | <p>Weekly monitoring of the quality of teaching, learning & assessment over time.</p> <p>Learning walks Book Looks KIT meetings with ILT Lead and her line manager</p> | <p>Assistant Headteacher</p> | <p>Dec 2016</p> | <p>£12,000</p> |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | | <p>£50,145</p> |

| ii. | | iii. 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? | Cost |
| Improve the intervention for writing across KS2 | Daily small group sessions for writing for targeted pupils with experienced teaching staff, in addition to standard lessons. | We want to provide extra support to maintain high attainment. 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. | Extra teaching time and preparation time paid for out of PP budget Impact overseen by Writing Lead Teaching assistant (TA) CPD. HLTA CPD | Writing Lead | Feb 2017 | £6,745 £1,839 |
| Improve the intervention for maths across KS2 | Daily small group sessions in maths for targeted pupils with experienced teacher, in addition to standard lessons. | We want to provide extra support to maintain high attainment. 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. | Extra teaching time and preparation time paid for out of PP budget Impact overseen by maths mastery lead. Teaching assistant (TA) CPD. Engage with parents and pupils | Assistant Head | Feb 2017 | £3,548 |
| Improve the intervention for reading across KS2 | Daily small group sessions in reading for targeted pupils with experienced teacher, in addition to standard lessons. | We want to provide extra support to maintain high attainment. 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. | Extra teaching time and preparation time paid for out of PP budget Impact overseen by maths mastery lead. Teaching assistant (TA) CPD. | Assistant Head | Feb 2017 | £1,839 |

| 6. Review of expenditure | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--------|---|--------|
| Previous Academic Year | | 2015/16 | | | | |
| i. Quality of teaching for all | | | | | | |
| Desired outcome | Chosen action/approach | Impact | | | Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) | Cost |
| | | Target | Actual | | | |
| Improved attainment in maths for EYFS and KSI pupils | Maths Mastery | | PP | Non PP | This year we need to continue to invest in the associated training and salary costs for the Maths Mastery Lead. We will continue to pay for the costs of training new staff and refresher training for existing staff. We will continue to roll out the programme into Y3 and will purchase the necessary resources required. | £5,335 |
| | | 90% of all pupils to achieve GLD | 50% | 92% | | £3,840 |
| | | | 88% of all pupils achieved GLD | | | £450 |
| | | 85% of Y1 pupils to reach ARE in maths | 100% | 81% | | |
| | | | 80% of Y1 pupils achieved ARE in maths | | | |
| | | 85% of Y2 pupils to reach ARE in maths | 71% | 80% | | |
| | 78% of Y2 pupils achieved ARE in maths | | | | | |
| Improve the teaching of reading for pupils eligible for PP in EYFS, KSI | Read, write, Inc Rigby Navigator | 90% of all pupils to achieve GLD | PP | Non PP | Pupil outcomes continue to improve using this programme. We will continue to pay the salary costs for the RWI Lead teacher, plus training for staff and resources needed. We also continue to invest in RWI support assistant who led the 1:1 interventions and provide more focus on Y2 phonics retakes than in previous years. | £3,582 |
| | | | 50% | 92% | | £3,256 |
| | | | 88% of all pupils achieved GLD | | | £1,433 |
| | | 85% of Y1 pupils to reach ARE in reading | PP | Non PP | | |
| | | | 100% | 81% | | |
| | | | 80% of Y1 pupils achieved ARE in reading | | | |

| | | 80% of Y2 pupils to reach ARE in reading | PP 57% | Non PP 78% | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|----------|
| | | | 73% of Y2 pupils achieved ARE in reading | | | |
| ii. Targeted support | | | | | | |
| Desired outcome | Chosen action/approach | Impact | | Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) | | Cost |
| Raise attainment in maths for pupils vulnerable to under-achievement | 1:1 intervention | Target | Actual | | Intervention needs to be daily. Pupils who have not met learning objectives during QFT should then receive 1:1 intervention later that day Pupils who struggle should also be targeted for pre-teaching of key learning objectives day prior to main lesson | £24, 805 |
| | | | PP | Non PP | | |
| | | 85% of Y2 pupils to reach ARE in maths | 71% | 80% | | |
| | | | 78% of Y2 pupils achieved ARE in maths | | | |
| | | 88% of Y6 pupils to reach ARE in maths | 53% | 85% | | |
| | | 77% of Y2 pupils achieved ARE in maths | | | | |
| Reduce number of fixed term and permanent exclusions | Eggtooth Project: Support for 12 Y3 pupils with SEMH needs | No exclusions | 0 | 0 | This year we have identified and trained our own staff in supporting pupils with SEMH needs through the creation of our alternative provision. This means we can support a greater number of pupils throughout the academy. | £10,000 |
| Raise attainment in reading through the teaching of phonics | 1:1 tuition Improve the intervention for phonics in Y1 | 100% of Y1 pupils to pass phonics screen | 100% | 89% | This proved very effective and so we have employed a HLTA for 0.8 FTE to provide RWI interventions for EYFS, Y1 and Y2 (for those who did not pass Y1 phonics screen last year) | £19, 000 |
| | | | 89% of pupils passed Y1 phonics screen | | | |

| iii. Other approaches | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|-------------|
| Desired outcome | Chosen action/approach | Impact | Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach) | Cost |
| Raise attainment in EYFS by providing more opportunities for outdoor learning | Create purposeful learning spaces outside each EYFS classroom | Improved outcomes for EYFS: Physical Handling: 97% achieved ELG | This provision is now in place and should only incur maintenance costs However, we will invest in training for our NQT in EYFS this year in how to plan for the best use of the outdoor learning environment | £8,000 |
| Improve attendance for dis-advantaged pupils | Counselling | For the 15 pupils targeted, no exclusions were made after counselling commenced. Attendance did not improve for all 15 pupils. | This year we have identified and trained our own staff in supporting pupils with SEMH needs through the creation of our alternative provision. This means we can support a greater number of pupils throughout the academy. | £4,500 |
| | Transport to school | 4 pupils in receipt of pupil premium had taxis paid for in order to assist their attendance at school. | This did not significantly improve attendance rates for 3 out of the four pupils and will not be continued | £3,976 |

Performance of Pupils in receipt of Pupil Premium

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| No. of pupils | 9 | 1 | 4 | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving a Good Level of Development (GLD) | 78% | 100% | 50% | | |
| % of non PP achieving a Good Level of Development (GLD) | 67% | 78% | 91% | | |

*In 2015 there were only three PP pupils in EYFS; all three were SEND with learning barrier needs

* In 2016, 11 out of 13 pupils in receipt of PP achieved a Good Level of Development

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| Number of pupils | | | 2 | | |
| % of PP pupils passing Y1 Phonics Screen | 33% | 78% | 100% | | |
| % of non PP pupils passing Y1 Phonics Screen | 65% | 90% | 89% | | |

| PERFORMANCE OF PP ELIGIBLE PUPILS AT THE END OF KSI | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| % of PP pupils achieving ARE in reading | 63% | 57% | 58% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving ARE in writing | 50% | 29% | 50% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving ARE in maths | 75% | 57% | 75% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving above ARE in reading | 13% | 0 | 25% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving above ARE in writing | 0% | 0 | 8% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving above ARE in maths | 13% | 14% | 17% | | |

| PERFORMANCE OF PP ELIGIBLE PUPILS AT THE END OF KS2 | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| % of PP pupils achieving ARE in reading | 58% | 56% | 40% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving ARE in writing | 67% | 56% | 67% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving ARE in maths | 67% | 56% | 53% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving ARE in reading, writing and maths | 58% | 44% | 33% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving above ARE in reading | | 22% | 7% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving above ARE in writing | | 11% | 0 | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving above ARE in maths | | 22% | 7% | | |
| % of PP pupils achieving above ARE in reading, writing and maths | | 0% | 0 | | |
| % of PP pupils making expected progress in reading | | 0% | -2.8 | | |
| % of PP pupils making expected progress in writing | | 77% | -0.9 | | |
| % of PP pupils making expected progress in maths | | 88% | -3.0 | | |