

# Pupil premium strategy statement



1. Summary information				
School	New Penshaw Academy			
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£96,660	Date of most recent PP Review
Total number of pupils		Number of pupils eligible for PP	73	Date for next internal review of this strategy

2a. KS2 Exit Data 2015/16				
	PP	PP (National Average)	Non PP	Non PP (National Average)
% achieving Are related Expectations (ARE) in Reading, Writing and Maths (combined)	50%	60%	73%	60%
% achieving ARE in reading	79%	71%	82%	71%
% achieving ARE in writing	57%	79%	91%	79%
% achieving ARE in maths	57%	75%	82%	75%
2b. KS1 Exit Data 2015/16				
	PP	PP (National Average)	Non PP	Non PP (National Average)
% achieving Are related Expectations (ARE) in Reading, Writing and Maths (combined)	50%		65%	
% achieving ARE in reading	50%	78%	70%	78%
% achieving ARE in writing	50%	70%	70%	70%
% achieving ARE in maths	63%	77%	70%	77%
% achieving Pass in Year 1 Phonics	73%	70%	78%	83%

<b>2c. Progress from End of Reception to End of KS1 2015/16</b>				
% making expected progress in reading		100%		93%
% making expected progress in writing		100%		93%
% making expected progress in maths		100%		93%
<b>2d. Progress from End of KS1 to End of KS2 2015/16</b>				
% making expected progress in reading		93%		100%
% making expected progress in writing		50%		81%
% making expected progress in maths		57%		72%
<b>2e. EYFS Achieved Good Level of Development (GLD) 2015/16</b>				
		63%	52% 2015	79%
				69% 2015
<b>3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)</b>				
<b>In-school barriers</b> ( <i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i> )				
<b>A.</b>	Children entitled to pupil premium exited Years 2, 3, and year 5 with a higher percentage working below ARE in reading, writing and maths. Within Year 2, 50% of PP children were not working at ARE in reading and writing and 37% in maths. Within Year 3, 0% of PP children were working at ARE in reading, writing and maths. Within Year 5, 82% of PP children were not working at ARE in writing and 64% were not ARE in reading and maths. These children need to make accelerated progress in Years 3, 4 and 6 in order to close the gap.			
<b>B.</b>	Attitudes to learning are a barrier for children entitled to pupil premium currently in Year 1, Year 5 and Year 6, particularly boys. This is linked to low self-esteem and low resilience.			
<b>C.</b>	Children have a narrower range of vocabulary as they do not have a wide range of experiences at home to draw on in order to enrich their learning outcomes in school (particularly in writing).			
<b>External barriers</b> ( <i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i> )				
<b>D.</b>	A higher % of pupils entitled to PP have attendance issues than non PP children. This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind			

4. Desired outcomes ( <i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i> )		Success criteria
<b>A.</b>	100% of pupils entitled to pupil premium funding in Years 3, 4 and 6 will be working within ARE for reading, writing and maths by exit July 2017.	Pupils eligible for PP in year 3, 4 and 6 make rapid progress by the end of the year so that 100% of pupils eligible for PP meet age related expectations.
<b>B.</b>	Pupils entitled to pupil premium funding in Years 1, 5 and 6 are able to engage positively with the curriculum so that 100% of these pupils attain ARE by exit July 2017.	Pupils eligible for PP in year 1, 5 and 6 make rapid progress by the end of the year so that 100% of pupils eligible for PP meet age related
<b>C.</b>	Pupils entitled to pupil premium funding have a varied range of experiences in school to increase and widen their vocabulary in order to support them being able to produce higher quality written learning outcomes in school and support 100% of PP children exiting at ARE by July 2017.	Pupils eligible for PP will make rapid and sustained progress by the end of the year so that 100% pupils eligible for PP meet age related expectations in writing.
<b>D.</b>	Increased attendance rates for children eligible for PP so that 100% of PP children are attending school 96% or more of the time.	Reduce the number of persistent absentees among pupils eligible for PP.  Overall PP attendance for 100% of PP children improves to 96% or greater.

<b>5. Planned expenditure</b>					
<b>Academic year</b>		<b>2016-2017</b>			
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					
<b>i. Quality of teaching for all</b>					
<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</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>
PP children in year 3, 4 and 6 will be working within ARE for reading, writing and maths.	Additional TA employment in school to enable target classes to have full time teaching assistant support.	Using PP funding to invest in the teaching assistant workforce will support the long term attainment of PP children in target year groups. Increased, skilled staff has been proven by Sutton Trust to support PP children and will be effective in raising attainment, supporting teachers to bring a greater percentage of PP children to ARE.	Trust and whole school monitoring of assessment information and data analysis, through the robust and rigorous moderation systems will clearly indicate the impact of this approach.	DHT L.Rowe	Weekly work and planning scrutiny feedback.  Half-termly pupil progress meetings.  Termly moderation as part of trust assessment cycle.
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					

Increased TA staffing  
£40,824

Total £40,824

**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?
<p>PP children in year 3, 4 and 6 will be working within ARE for reading, writing and maths.</p> <p>PP children in Years 1,5 and 6 engage positively with the curriculum so that they are able to reach ARE.</p>	<p>Training additional staff to complete Friends for Life training.</p> <p>Weekly small group nurture intervention sessions using Friends for Life and Fun Friends approach.</p> <p>Weekly intervention programmes devised as a result of high quality data analysis.</p> <p>Computer licensing for Education City.</p>	<p>The CAMHS intervention programmes have evidence based research from Australia and in the UK demonstrating clear impact on resilience. This is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.</p> <p>Some of the students need targeted support to catch up. Intervention programmes have clearly evidenced impact when based on high quality data analysis.</p> <p>Education city allows children to positively engage with the curriculum using ICT to develop basic skills.</p>	<p>Ensure specific training is accessed from CAMHS and disseminated effectively in school.</p> <p>Monitor timetables to ensure staff delivering provision have sufficient preparation and delivery time.</p> <p>Cross trust and in school moderation of intervention programmes for demonstrable impact.</p>	<p>DHT L Rowe</p>	<p>Termly review of intervention impact as part of trust assessment cycle.</p>

<b>Total budgeted cost</b>	<p><b>Increased TA staffing £9,798</b></p> <p><b>CAMHS training for Friends for Life £1000</b></p> <p><b>Weekly delivery of Friends for Life program staffing costs £2,041</b></p> <p><b>Education City licencing £1295</b></p> <p><b>Behaviour SLA £4900</b></p> <p><b>Reward incentives £2000</b></p> <p><b><u>Total £21,034</u></b></p>
----------------------------	--

### iii. Other approaches

<b>Desired outcome</b>	<b>Chosen action / approach</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>
PP children to have a varied range of experiences in school to increase and widen their vocabulary in order to produce higher quality written learning outcomes in school.	<p>Increased subsidised experiences in and out of school within school time.</p> <p>Subsidised transport to and from these experiences.</p> <p>Music tuition for all Key Stage 1 and 2 pupils</p>	<p>Cross trust moderation of the quality of writing in school supports the valued contribution of enhanced experiences in improving written outcomes for children.</p> <p>Research shows that children need to be immersed in language in order to develop a wider ranging vocabulary and that real life experiences accelerate writing progress as writing has purpose.</p>	<p>Termly scrutiny of medium term planning evidencing enhanced experiences for children.</p> <p>Weekly school scrutiny of writing outcomes for PP children.</p> <p>Cross trust and in school moderation of writing outcomes for PP children.</p>	<p>DHT L Rowe TLR 2b M Smith</p>	<p>Termly as part of medium term plan scrutiny.</p> <p>Termly moderation as part of trust assessment cycle.</p>

<p>Increased attendance rates for children eligible for PP.</p>	<p>Attendance officer in conjunction with our cluster schools to support raising attendance for pupils</p> <p>Specific motivational rewards linked to attendance and led by discussions with school council.</p>	<p>This strategy was used last year and demonstrated impact in improved attendance.</p> <p>Evidence from Hillcroft Community Primary Research Project states that a designated person to support attendance, a whole school attendance approach and rewarding pupils with 100% attendance all impact positively on the attendance, progress and attainment of PP children.</p> <p>Consultation with pupils demonstrated that they wanted a reward system modelled in this way. Increased buy in from children should impact directly on attendance figures of all children including PP.</p>	<p>TLR 2b will liaise with the attendance officer and implement an action plan for pupils entitled to PP with poor attendance.</p> <p>Class teachers to monitor at half termly pupil progress meetings.</p>		<p>Termly report by M Smith</p>
<b>Total budgeted cost</b>					<p><b>Subsidised transport £7,000</b></p> <p><b>Subsidised experiences £7,000</b></p> <p><b>Music tuition £1950</b></p> <p><b>Attendance SLA £4000*</b></p> <p><b>Attendance staffing costs in school</b></p> <p><b>3,650.40</b></p> <p><b>Attendance rewards £500</b></p> <p><b><u>Total £24,100</u></b></p>

6. Review of expenditure 2016-17				
Previous Academic Year				
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
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
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 support the sections above.