



Merley First School – Pupil Premium Strategy Statement 2017-18



1. Summary information					
School	Merley First School				
Academic Year	2017-18	Total PP budget	£32100	Date of most recent PP Review	November 2017
Total number of pupils	301	Number of pupils eligible for PP	22 (+4 forces)	Date of next internal review of this strategy	April 2018

2. Current attainment (end of Summer Term 2017)		
<i>Expected standard = Age Related Expectation</i>	Pupils eligible for PP (MFS)	Pupils not eligible for PP (MFS)
Percentage of pupils achieving expected standard in reading	63%	89%
Percentage of pupils achieving expected standard in writing	55%	78%
Percentage of pupils achieving expected standard in mathematics	70%	85%

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)	
A.	Lack of motivation, focus and resilience for learning
B.	Poor phonic skills impacting on progress in reading and writing
C.	Poor fine motor skills and pencil control affecting handwriting
D.	Issues with social and emotional health and well-being

4. Desired outcomes (and how they will be measured)		Success criteria
A.	PP children showing greater motivation, focus and resilience as learners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observations of children in the classroom show improvements in their motivation, focus and resilience.

	<p><i>Measures: observations in the classroom, feedback from classroom staff, tracking data.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking data shows PP children making progress in line with their non-PP peers. • Tracking data shows that the gap in attainment between PP and non-PP children is closing. • Anecdotal feedback from adults working with children shows improvement.
B.	<p>Phonic knowledge and application improved and impacting on progress in reading and writing for PP children. <i>Measures: scrutiny of reading and writing, tracking data, Phonic Screening scores.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PP children (who did not pass Year 1 Phonic Screening) pass the screening in Year 2. • Tracking data shows PP children making progress in reading and writing in line with their non-PP peers. • Tracking data shows that the gap in attainment in reading and writing between PP and non-PP children is closing.
C.	<p>Fine motor skills improved leading to better pencil control and letter formation with PP children becoming more efficient writers. <i>Measures: observations of children, scrutiny of independent writing, tracking data.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutiny of children's books shows letter formation is clear and legible and PP children are able to write at greater length. • Tracking data shows PP children making progress in writing in line with their non-PP peers. • Tracking data shows gap in attainment in writing between PP and non-PP children is closing.
D.	<p>PP children develop emotional health and well-being in line with their peers and difficulties not impacting on learning. <i>Measures: feedback from ELSA and 1:1 TAs and other adults working with the children, talking to the children.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking data shows that the progress of PP children (AFC and LAC) is in line with their peers. • PP children show greater awareness and understanding of their own emotional health and well-being.

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year: 2017-18

The three headings below enable us to demonstrate how we 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 we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will we review implementation
(B) Phonic knowledge and application improved and impacting on progress in reading and writing for PP children.	Whole school training on success criteria and feedback.	EEF Toolkit shows that quality feedback leads to substantial learning gains for children and can be developed across the school to benefit all children.	Feedback to children monitored during lesson observations and book scrutiny. Use of twilight training session (INSED) and involvement of all CTs and TAs.	Deputy Head and Assistant Head	End of Spring Term 2018
	Phonics training for CTs and TAs to refresh/develop their knowledge and understanding of the approach.	EEF Toolkit shows that phonics approaches are effective in supporting younger readers to master the basics of reading.	Training delivered during CT /TA twilight session (INSED) Scrutiny of Phonics planning and lesson observation/ peer observation. Targets on PP individual plans	Deputy Head/ Pupil Premium Lead	End of Spring Term 2018
(C) Fine motor skills improved leading to better pencil control and letter formation with PP children becoming more efficient writers.	Reception teachers to share ideas/good practice in developing children's fine motor skills.	Poor fine motor skills hinder children's development in writing and last year we found that strengthening children's fingers through exercises led to better pencil control and improved letter formation and handwriting skills.	Sessions led in-house by Reception staff to share ideas and activities for developing children's fine motor skills. Scrutiny of children's writing and drawing both before and after the intervention to assess learning gains.	Pupil Premium Lead.	End of Spring Term 2018

			Targets on PP individual plans.		
Total budgeted cost					£1000

ii Targeted support					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will we review implementation
(B) Phonic knowledge and application improved and impacting on progress in reading and writing for PP children.	1:1 and small group interventions to plug gaps in children's phonic knowledge tailored to individual needs using Letters and Sounds approach	There is strong evidence to show that one-to-one tuition has a moderate impact on children's progress (EEF Toolkit) and is effective at closing learning gaps in reading, helping children catch-up with their peers.	Training delivered to intervention TAs during twilight session (INSED) Children's progress closely monitored and recorded on individual PP plans.	Deputy Head	Ongoing but by May 2018 prior to Phonic Screening check.
(D) PP children develop emotional health and well-being in line with their peers and difficulties not impacting on learning.	Employ an ELSA (emotional literacy support assistant) to support the needs of children with emotional health issues.	Research by the ELSA network shows 2010 " <i>Teachers were able to identify a measurable and significant improvement in the students' emotional literacy within the school after students had received ELSA support</i> ". Ofsted currently recommends that PP children who are LAC or AFC should have an emotional support target on their PP plan.	Emotional support targets on individual PP plans. Review of targets show improvement in children's emotional literacy. Observations of children in the classroom and during interventions.	ELSA/PP Lead	Termly to review impact.
Total budgeted cost					£15.5K

iii Other approaches					
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will we ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will we review implementation
(A) PP children showing greater motivation, focus and resilience as learners.	Outdoor Adventurers intervention based on The Forest schools approach. This will be led by two teachers on a peripatetic basis one afternoon a week for six weeks initially.	There is much evidence from research which shows that this approach has learning gains for children: "Improvements in the children's confidence, motivation and concentration, language and communication and physical skills were recorded by teachers and Forest School leaders."	Observation of sessions by members of SLT. Feedback from intervention leaders shows positive impact on children. Feedback from teachers regarding children's motivation, focus and resilience shows improvement. Feedback from children about what they have done and how much they enjoyed the sessions.	HT/DHT and peripatetic teachers (HS/SM).	
Total budgeted cost					£3000

6. Review of expenditure

Previous Academic Year: 2016-17

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																
PP children will achieve in line with their peers at the end of EYFS, Y2 and Y4 in reading, writing and mathematics and in Year 1 phonics and	Half termly conferencing with pupils and scrutiny of assessment data in English and maths to set pupil targets and	<p>Attainment 2016-17:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Not PP</th> <th>Read</th> <th>Write</th> <th>Maths</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rec (59)</td> <td>85%</td> <td>78%</td> <td>90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y2 (57)</td> <td>93%</td> <td>77%</td> <td>89%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y4 (60)</td> <td>88%</td> <td>83%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Not PP	Read	Write	Maths	Rec (59)	85%	78%	90%	Y2 (57)	93%	77%	89%	Y4 (60)	88%	83%	83%	The approaches chosen worked well for most of the PP children particularly in terms of their progress (and attainment in Year 4 and in mathematics in Reception). The exceptions were in Year 2	£1500
Not PP	Read	Write	Maths																	
Rec (59)	85%	78%	90%																	
Y2 (57)	93%	77%	89%																	
Y4 (60)	88%	83%	83%																	

<p>enable a few children to achieve at greater depth.</p>	<p>provide prompt, high quality feedback on learning.</p> <p>Improvement marking with high quality feedback at least once a week in English and mathematics books (in years 2-4).</p> <p>Individual Pupil Premium Plans for all PP children</p> <p>Lexia computer program for pupils in Y1-4.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="770 97 1308 252"> <tr><td>PP</td><td>Reading</td><td>Writing</td><td>Maths</td></tr> <tr><td>Rec (2)</td><td>50%</td><td>50%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>Y2 (4)</td><td>50%</td><td>25%</td><td>50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Y4 (2)</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td></tr> </table> <p>The percentages of children reaching ARE in Year R and Year 2 is consistently lower for PP children than for non PP children.</p> <p>Progress 2016-17:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="770 400 1308 555"> <tr><td>Not PP</td><td>Read</td><td>Write</td><td>Maths</td></tr> <tr><td>Rec (59)</td><td>80%</td><td>71%</td><td>69%</td></tr> <tr><td>Y2 (57)</td><td>70%</td><td>58%</td><td>65%</td></tr> <tr><td>Y4 (60)</td><td>92%</td><td>80%</td><td>90%</td></tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="770 595 1308 750"> <tr><td>PP</td><td>Read</td><td>Write</td><td>Maths</td></tr> <tr><td>Rec (2)</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>Y2 (4)</td><td>50%</td><td>50%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>Y4 (2)</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td></tr> </table> <p>The percentages of children making 3 points progress in Year R and Year 4 is consistently higher for PP children than for non PP children. In Year 2 it is less for PP children than for non PP children though 2 of those children have significant additional needs (EAL/SEN).</p> <p>Phonics Screening Summer 2017:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="770 1050 1308 1166"> <tr><td></td><td>Non PP children</td><td>PP children</td></tr> <tr><td>Y1 (8)</td><td>92%</td><td>50%</td></tr> </table> <p>8 children in Y2 were retested (inc. 3 PP) 4 passed (inc. 1 PP). A significantly higher percentage of non PP children passed the Screening than the PP children. However, 2 of the PP children who did not pass missed by only one mark. The other two both scored between 20 and</p>	PP	Reading	Writing	Maths	Rec (2)	50%	50%	100%	Y2 (4)	50%	25%	50%	Y4 (2)	100%	100%	100%	Not PP	Read	Write	Maths	Rec (59)	80%	71%	69%	Y2 (57)	70%	58%	65%	Y4 (60)	92%	80%	90%	PP	Read	Write	Maths	Rec (2)	100%	100%	100%	Y2 (4)	50%	50%	100%	Y4 (2)	100%	100%	100%		Non PP children	PP children	Y1 (8)	92%	50%	<p>where two of the four children have significant additional learning needs (one is EAL who had NO English at the start of Year 2 and the other has a regressive genetic disorder). The phonics interventions worked well and, although 50% of the PP children did not reach the required standard in the summer term, they have since closed the gap. We will continue to develop and use these approaches.</p>	
PP	Reading	Writing	Maths																																																							
Rec (2)	50%	50%	100%																																																							
Y2 (4)	50%	25%	50%																																																							
Y4 (2)	100%	100%	100%																																																							
Not PP	Read	Write	Maths																																																							
Rec (59)	80%	71%	69%																																																							
Y2 (57)	70%	58%	65%																																																							
Y4 (60)	92%	80%	90%																																																							
PP	Read	Write	Maths																																																							
Rec (2)	100%	100%	100%																																																							
Y2 (4)	50%	50%	100%																																																							
Y4 (2)	100%	100%	100%																																																							
	Non PP children	PP children																																																								
Y1 (8)	92%	50%																																																								

		30 out of 40. Retesting during the Autumn term has shown that these 4 PP children have now met the required standard. In Y2 the 2 PP children who did not pass have significant additional needs (EAL/SEN).		
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
<p>PP children will achieve in line with their peers at the end of EYFS, Y2 and Y4 in reading, writing and mathematics and Y1 phonics.</p> <p>PP children will achieve in line with their peers at the end of EYFS, Y2 and Y4 in reading, writing and mathematics and enable a few children to achieve at greater depth</p>	<p>Smaller teaching groups in Y3 and Y4 with the identification of high quality staff with proven track record of results placed in the year groups once a week for Reading and Writing.</p> <p>Smaller teaching groups in Y1 with the identification of high quality staff with proven track record of results placed in the year groups once a week for Reading and Mathematics.</p> <p>Smaller teaching groups in Y2 and 3 with the identification of high quality staff</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>Across the school, 3 PP children achieved Greater Depth in reading (Year 1 and Year 3), 3 in writing (Year 1 and Year 3) and 1 in mathematics (Year 3).</p>	See above	£16000

	<p>with proven track record of results placed in the year groups once a week for Mathematics.</p> <p>Half termly pupil progress reviews with class teachers and SLT to rigorously monitor progress of individual pupils in reading, writing and maths. Barriers to learning identified and actions agreed to subsequently overcome these. Allocation of Teaching Assistants will be evaluated and allocated based on pupil need as a result of these reviews and bespoke interventions planned to address group and individual needs. These interventions are tracked and evaluated every 6 weeks.</p> <p>ELSA interventions led by trained ELSA TA</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

iii Other approaches				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/ approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include	Lessons learned	Cost

		impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate	(and whether you will continue with this approach)	
PP children will have access opportunities that will encourage both physical and mental health.	Energize Club ELSA Listening Ear Circle of Friends	The approach did meet the success criteria but was difficult to manage due to limited resources at the time	We will continue with this approach but will employ a full-time ELSA in order to meet increasing demand and to ensure that we are able to meet the emotional needs of our PP children who are AFC or LAC.	£4500

7. Additional detail

This Pupil Premium strategy is available on the school website www.merleyfirstschool.com

Abbreviations:

PP: Pupil Premium NFER: National Foundation for Educational Research DfE: Department for Education

EEF: Education Endowment Foundation CT Class Teacher TA: Teaching Assistant SLT: Senior Leadership Team

SEN: Special Educational Needs SENCo: Special Educational Needs Coordinator EYFS: Early Years Foundation