Pupil premium strategy statement

St George's Catholic Primary School, Enfield



1. Summary information								
School St George's Catholic Primary School								
Academic Year	2016.17	Total PP budget	£77400	Date of most recent PP Review	July 16			
Total number of pupils	650	Number of pupils eligible for PP	51	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Feb 17			

2. Current attainment					
		Pupils eligible for PP (St George's)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)		
% achi	eving NE or above in reading, writing & maths	56%	70% school, 53% Nat		
progre	ss in reading	7.89	2.75 Nat		
progre	ss in writing	5.11	4.72 Nat		
progre	ss in maths	3.78	1.25 Nat		
3. B	arriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)				
In-sch	pol barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)				
A.	low EYFS outcomes				
B.	low key stage 1 scores				
Ex	tternal barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance	rates)			
C.	Some lack of parental engagement/ support				
D.	Lack of opportunity for musical/ sport participation due to financial restrictions				
4. [4. Desired outcomes (Desired outcomes and how they will be measured) Success criteria				
A.	Attainment for pupil premium pupils in line with national average for all pupils by end of key stage 2 PP attainment R,W+M= 70% expected I				
B.	More able pupil premium pupils reach their potential academically and personally High level R=19%, W=15%,M=17%				
C.	Year 1 phonics scores to improve for PP children 90% PP meet phonic standard				

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?
Improve literacy outcomes for pupils in year 6	Reduced year 6 group sizes for English	Ofsted report (p4/ p10*) highlighted advantages of small group tuition Classes organised into smaller ability	Groups taught by well-qualified, experienced teachers	Mrs McInnes	July 2017
Improve maths outcomes for pupils in year 6	Reduced year 6 group sizes for Maths	groups for English and mathematics to help underachievers to catch up with specific aspects of their learning while enabling more-able pupils to reach their potential.		Mr Archer	July 2017
Improve literacy outcomes for pupils in year 5	Reduced year 5 group sizes for English			Mrs Cunningham	June 2017
Improve maths outcomes for pupils in year 5	Reduced year 5 group sizes for Maths			Mr Archer	June 2017
	I	1	Total	hudgeted cost	£10000

Total budgeted cost | £10000

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?		
Improve outcomes in English and maths for PP pupils in year 5	One to one strategy (children receive support from their class teacher, released by qualified teacher)	Class teacher is best placed to identify barriers to learning and has most to gain from getting to know pupils on a one to one basis when planning future learning (Ofsted report p11*) Ofsted report (p4*) illustrates how reduced numbers and individual tuition can benefit underachieving pupils. Some of this time will be dedicated to feedback (previous work) and preteaching (planned work). (Sutton Trust research – high impact)	Clear timetabling which can be flexible depending on need	Mrs Angland/ Miss Fisher	April 2017		
Improve outcomes in English and maths for PP pupils in year 3	Mentoring (from qualified teacher)	Pupils in year 3 receive mentoring support and advice from qualified teacher. Research (Sutton Trust) has shown that withdrawing children for instruction has limited effect. The emphasis will therefore be on 'mentoring', securing previous learning and setting targets.	Mentoring provided by qualified teacher.	Mrs Fearnley	April 2017		
Improve reading in year 2	Reading recovery programme	Intensive individual programme providing reading lessons in addition to class lessons. Provide these in year 2 rather than 'catch up' lessons in key stage 2 (Ofsted report p9*)	Provided by qualified teacher. Previous success of programme.	Mrs O'Flaherty	June 2017		
Improve reading in year 2 and 6	Beanstalk Reading	Individual reading programme for specific children	Use of charity known for effective practice.	Mrs Burke	July 2017		

	care if required				
their potential as members of society	PP children benefit from wrap around			Mrs Moloney	July 2017
extracurricular opportunities and to enable them to reach	Fund significant educational visits	Ofsted report p4*		Mrs Moloney	July 2017
Ensure PP children have access to all	Fund musical tuition	Ofsted report p4*	Admin staff implement monitored by PO	Mrs Parente	July 2017
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?
iii. Other approache	s				
			Total	budgeted cost	£35000
	Resources		Ensure value for money, observe resources in use	Mrs Jones- Owen	June 2017
Improve numeracy in year 2	Numbers count	Intensive individual programme providing number lessons in addition to class lessons	Provided by qualified teacher. Previous success of programme.	Mrs Andrews	June 2017

6. Review of expe	enditure			
Previous Academi	c Year	2015.16		
i. Quality of teachin	g 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
Raise attainment of pupil premium children	Reduce class sizes for year 6	Despite pupil premium children not matching the attainment of their peers, their progress was exceptional (see 'current attainment' above) Very high cost	Continue to reduce class sizes and ensure expenditure is divided fairly in relation to the number of eligible pupils. In this way pupil premium income will not fund the whole cost of an additional teacher, but costs will be divided proportionately.	£33522
	Reduce class sizes in year 5		See above	£13164 £15578
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
Improve reading in year 2	Reading recovery programme	Intensive individual programme providing reading lessons in addition to class lessons. Provide these in year 2 rather than 'catch up' lessons in key stage 2 (Ofsted report p9*)	Provided by qualified teacher. Previous success of programme.	

Improve numeracy in year 2	Numbers count	Intensive individual programme providing number lessons in addition to class lessons. All children made progress in excess of expected progress (see 'group data' in pupil premium file) Average time on programme 9.4 months Average improvement 1.5 years	Provided by qualified teacher. Previous success of programme.	£26570
iii. Other approache	S			
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 enable all PP children to reach their potential as members of society	All pupil premium children to access musical tuition if desired	7 children benefitted from this strategy	Can continue as low cost	£504
	All PP children benefit from educational visits	All PP children able to take part in residential visits (years 5 and 6) (10)		£5000
	PP children benefit from wrap around care if required			£4263

7. Additional detail

* The Pupil Premium - Analysis and challenge tools for schools (Ofsted Report Jan 13)

Attainment and progress of pupil premium children July 2016

Reading	BNE	NE	ANE
year 6			
year 5	1	2	1
year 4	4	6	3
year 3	1	3	2
year 2	1	7	
year 1	2	4	1
	9	22	7
	24%	58%	18%

Reading Progress		
relative to ks1 performance		
not on track	5	24%
on track	16	76%
accelerated progress		

ANE = Above National Expectation

NE = at National Expectation

BNE = Below National Expectation

Mathematics	BNE	NE	ANE
year 6			
year 5	1	3	
year 4	3	9	1
year 3	1	3	2
year 2	3	3	2
year 1	3	4	
	11	22	5
	29%	58%	11%

maths progress		
relative to ks1 performance		
not on track	4	19%
on track	15	71%
accelerated progress	2	10%