



Vernham Dean Gillum's Pupil premium strategy



1. Summary information

School	Vernham Dean Gillum's Church of England Primary School				
Academic Year	2020/21	Total PP budget	£6930 FSM=£5380 Service=£1550	Date of most recent PP Review	Sept 2019
Total number of pupils	85	Number of pupils eligible for PP	3 PP 3.5% 5 Service 5.9%	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Sept 2021

2. Current attainment

	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (your school)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (school/national average)</i>
% achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing & maths	67% 2/3- Yrs 3/5	71%-KS2
% making expected progress in reading (as measured in the school)	67% 2/3- Yrs 3/5	78%-KS2
% making expected progress in writing (as measured in the school)	67% 2/3-Yrs 3/5	62%-KS2
% making expected progress in mathematics (as measured in the school)	67% 2/3- Yrs 3/5	53%- KS2

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)

Academic barriers *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)*

A.	Metacognition/working memory skills
B.	Social/emotional issues

C.	Motivation to apply skills.
Additional/External barriers (including issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)	
D.	Mental health
E.	Parental engagement
F.	Parents who may be posted away who are in the Military.
4. Intended outcomes (specific outcomes and how they will be measured)	
Success criteria	
A.	Improved working memory skills through bespoke interventions and observed in learning walks/lesson observations/pupil conferencing/work sampling/pupil progress meetings/intervention reviews.
B.	Effective strategies used to promote social and emotional well-being in learning and across wider school. Observed in learning walks/lesson observations/work sampling/pupil conferencing/pupil progress meetings.
C.	PP children are challenged sufficiently in lessons to explain/reason/extend their vocabulary and are motivated/have the confidence to push through boundaries to the next level. Observed in learning walks/lesson observations/work sampling/pupil conferencing/pupil progress meetings.
	EP training strategies used and impact seen as documented at Pupil progress meetings.
	PP children making good progress in all areas of learning as seen by internal data.
	PP children are making good progress in their learning being challenged to move from ARE to GDS as seen by internal data.

5. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2019/20		
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Action	Intended outcome	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

HIAS support in maths on reasoning. Progress tracked by the Senior team who will measure the effect of the pupil premium through teacher assessment, pupil progress, learning walks and book scrutiny.	Pupils will attain ARE.	Yes for school overall EYFS, end of KS1 and 2 results above National levels. For PP children 50% at ARE. Significant progress made by other pupil but still some gaps identified in learning and overall progress in maths for whole school from starting point needs to continue to develop.	Children need challenge especially in maths to make progress they should form KS1 to KS2. Staff CPD on reasoning and problem solving from Maths lead has improved and now the focus needs to be on starting points and the maths learning journey.	£600
--	-------------------------	---	--	------

ii. Targeted support

Action	Intended outcome	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
LSA booster//interventions	PP children achieve expected outcomes of ARE/ARE+	Partly-50% PP children achieved ARE/ARE+. Other PP child made significant progress as evidenced by internal data but didn't achieve ARE.	Yes the interventions are successful and bespoke for PP child enabling progress to be made and there is evidence of application independently in lessons.	£1500
PCT 1 to 1 targeted emotional and where needed learning support for Service children.	Emotional well-being for service children is strong which supports a positive disposition to learning and expected outcomes.	Yes 100% Service children achieved ARE/ARE+. Positive attachments to HLTA and bespoke areas of need being addressed on a 1 to 1 basis.	This approach will continue due to effective bespoke support and the emotional implications of parents being posted.	£1500

iii. Other approaches

Action	Intended outcome	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
1 to 1 piano lessons	Raised confidence and self-esteem.	Yes. PP child enjoying lessons and making progress.	Will continue this support. PP child is gaining another skill and becoming more self-confident.	£600
Elsa training	To improve PP children's social and emotional health and well-being.	Yes- ELSA trained and identifying key strategies to support PP children.	ELSA support will be available weekly for PP children.	£500

6. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2019/20

The three headings enable you to demonstrate how you are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies

i. Quality of teaching for all

Action	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
SENDCO CPD and monitoring of interventions to support working memory/metacognition skills. Introduction of key interventions to support eg- Nessy/Spelling shed.	Staff have the tools to plan effectively for children with working memory issues that are impacting on progress and attainment.	Working memory identified as a barrier to learning by class teachers and during pupil progress meetings.	Clear interventions monitored by SENDCO and learning walks by HT/SENDCO will ensure that strategies are being applied and are having an impact.	HS-SENDCO	Analysis of interventions by HS half termly involving memory skills and monthly pupil progress meetings.
Introduction of Jigsaw whole school PSHE scheme to support emotional health and well-being.	The programme helps children to discuss their feelings and to be resilient in a variety of situations.	Ensuring that our PSHE curriculum is consistent and meets the needs of all children. Ensuring that children are taught the skills needed in life. How to stay safe, different feelings and what they mean.	Lesson observations, staff CPD and meetings, pupil conferencing, staff conferencing. Worships.	CH-HT	Half termly.
HIAS Owen Troamans- English and Jo Lees Maths to complete CPD with staff and work with subject Lead.	That PP children will be challenged and moving from ARE to GDS and the % of GDS children across the school increases from KS1 to KS2.	Ensuring there is sufficient challenge and effective opportunities to reason, explain, extend vocabulary	Learning walks, lesson observations, pupil conferencing, work sampling, staff meetings CPD, pupil progress meetings	HB/SC/HT	Half termly
Total budgeted cost					£3380

ii. Targeted support

Action	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
--------	------------------	---	---	------------	--------------------------------------

Individual piano lessons.	Raised self-esteem and confidence which will transfer to learning.	Barrier to learning identified as self-confidence by the classteacher and independence. Piano lessons will show enjoyment which will lead to a new independent skill and raised self-esteem	Regular discussions with piano teacher on progress.	HMS music teacher.	Pupil progress meetings monthly Half termly discussions with HMS.
Support financially with trips.	Children benefit from extra-curricular activities to support learning, self-esteem, social skills team building, trying new things, taking risks and being challenged.	Due to financial constraints parents feel unable to support with trips and dependent on type of trip/activity (residential) may result in the child missing out.	Effective communication with parent on funding availability.	CH	Reviewed continually with SBM on available funding.
Weekly bespoke emotional support/guidance for Service children by designated HLTA.	Service children are happy/confident in their learning, making the expected progress and attainment.	Service children's lives can often change quickly if a family member is posted.	Strong communication between HLTA, HT and parents. HLTA guided by HT as to appropriate strategies to use.	DC-HLTA CH-HT	This is reviewed weekly through discussion by HT/DC and analysing notes. Pupil progress meetings monthly with CTs focus on progress of group.
Emotional support for PP children from ELSA.	Children have strategies to support their mental health and emotional well-being.	Due to circumstance PP children may have issues arising at home and require support to be resilient.	Weekly meetings with ELSA on support being provided and effectiveness. Planning of next steps to support mental health.	CH/FN	Weekly.

Total budgeted cost £ 3550

iii. Other approaches

Action	Intended outcome	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?

Total budgeted cost £

7. Additional detail

Due to the small number of PP pupils in school it is important to keep anonymity for the children.

- The FSM, service family and Post LAC allocations will be confirmed in Autumn 2020 when the DfE release the final allocations.
- Adjustments to the Pupil Premium allocation will be made to G/L code 7694 and a revised Pupil Premium statement will be issued, if necessary.

Internal Review by Governors (Taken from Governors Toolkit 2017)

Date of Review: Sept 2019 to be reviewed Sept 2020

<p>1.</p>	<p>Do Governors know how much money is allocated to the school for the Pupil Premium?</p> <p>a. What percentage of Pupil Premium eligible pupils have you in your school. How does this compare with national data? b. Do governors know the breakdown between FSM, Looked After Children and Service Children? c. Do you know the breakdown of each group by academic year/ d. Do you know how many of each cohort appears in other vulnerable groups i.e. SEN(D) ?</p>	<p>Yes see TLA/FGB minutes May 2019</p> <p>a..6% well below National levels</p> <p>b. As above- See PP strategy</p> <p>c. Yes both in same class</p> <p>d. Yes- 1</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Is the Pupil Premium money identified in the school's budget planning?</p> <p>a. How much does the Pupil Premium money represent in percentage terms of the total income of the school? b. Is the Pupil Premium money likely to alter significantly over time? c. How is the delegated authority to make decisions over Pupil Premium spend decided and documented? d. Is income and expenditure reported explicitly for Pupil Premium?</p>	<p>Yes SBM and HT ensure that budget reports.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Do Governors have a clear understanding of where gaps exist, both within the school and against national performance data?</p> <p>a. Do the school's systems enable governors to have a clear picture of the progress and attainment of pupils who are eligible for the Pupil Premium in all year groups across the school and for all subjects and how this compares to non-Pupil Premium pupils? b. What is the trend of progress and attainment for each group over a 3 year period i.e. has the gap closed for each group? c. How does this compare to National data?</p>	<p>Milestone data</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Do Governors discuss in detail, including intended outcomes/impact, how Pupil Premium funding is used?</p> <p>a. Does the school have a standalone Pupil Premium strategy to</p>	

	<p>raise attainment and close the gap in all year groups?</p> <p>b. Is the Pupil Premium strategy linked to the SIP and other school policies?</p> <p>c. Have the governors considered external research and reports about what works to inform their decisions about how to spend the Pupil Premium? E.g. The Sutton Trust / Education Endowment Fund, Ofsted updates and previous Pupil Premium award winners.</p> <p>d. Are this year's Pupil Premium interventions tailored to this year's Pupil Premium eligible pupils to meet their individual and group needs?</p> <p>e. Have the governors challenged the interventions and their predicted impact and is this documented?</p> <p>f. Will interventions close the gap against predicted end of year attainment and progress?</p> <p>g. Is there a correlation between the intervention on other outcomes i.e. attendance, behaviour, punctuality?</p>	<p>Yes see strategy above shared with all Governors.</p> <p>Yes money is spent on specific needs. This is more accessible as there are so few. Funding is more bespoke.</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Do Governors regularly monitor the outcomes of Pupil Premium and know gaps are being reduced/removed?</p> <p>a. How often are Pupil Premium reports monitored by the governors?</p> <p>b. Is there a Pupil Premium governor and have they undertaken training? c. Is Pupil Premium a standing agenda item at committee or full GB?</p> <p>d. Are Pupil Premium monitoring visits scheduled and completed on a regular basis?</p> <p>e. Is Pupil Premium part of the Headteacher's report and informs governors about intervention impact across all year groups in comparison with non-Pupil Premium?</p> <p>f. Do the governing board use the Ofsted Pupil Premium and challenge toolkit?</p> <p>g. Do all governors have a broad understanding of Pupil Premium funding and its use within the school?</p>	<p>Yearly review.</p> <p>Development point- See action plan.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Is value for money (in terms of impact on pupil outcomes) regularly discussed and challenged by governors (e.g. is Pupil Premium having the impact we anticipated?).</p> <p>a. Is the income and expenditure related to Pupil Premium being monitored and how often?</p> <p>b. If money is held in reserve as a contingency, is this being monitored?</p> <p>c. Is the expenditure on the intervention proving value for money</p>	<p>This is a development point- See action plan</p>

	<p>in comparison to other interventions and the impact on attainment and progression or predicted outcomes?</p> <p>d. Are the school's interventions providing value for money when compared externally e.g. evidence of the Sutton Trust</p>	
7.	<p>Does the school's website provide parents with a clear understanding of the amount of funding, how it is spent and what difference it makes to pupil outcomes?</p> <p>a. Does the website show the amount of the school's allocation from the Pupil Premium grant in respect of the current academic year?</p> <p>b. Does the website show details of how it is intended that the allocation will be spent for this academic year including individual interventions, their costs and the predicted impact including the target groups (each academic year if appropriate)?</p> <p>c. Does the website show the details of how the previous academic year's allocation was spent by intervention and target audience (each academic year if appropriate)?</p> <p>d. Does the website show the impact of the previous year's Pupil Premium expenditure on raising attainment and closing the gap when compared with non-Pupil Premium pupils?</p>	<p>See above PP Strategy report.</p>
8.	<p>Is the above work documented to show a true audit trail of the governing board's work in relation to Pupil Premium?</p>	
9.	<p>Any further questions raised by the Governing Body during review?</p>	