



Pupil premium strategy statement: Hollybush Primary School

1. Summary information					
School	Hollybush Primary School				
Academic Year	2018-19	Total PP budget	£67320 (indicative)	Date of most recent PP Review	July 2018
Total number of pupils	214	Number of pupils eligible for PP	57	Date for next internal review of this strategy	December 2018
2. Current attainment					
			Pupils eligible for PP	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) 2017 national figures	
% achieving in reading, writing and maths			Reception GLD: 77.8%	Reception GLD (national all including PP) 70.7%	
			Year 1 phonics: 100%	Year 1 phonics: 84%	
			Year 2 reading: 50%	Year 2 reading: 79%	
			Year 2 writing: 66.7%	Year 2 writing: 72%	
			Year 2 maths: 66.7%	Year 2 maths: 79%	
% making expected or better progress in reading			Year 6 reading: 80%	Year 6 reading: 77%	
			Year 6 writing: 80%	Year 6 writing: 81%	
			Year 6 maths: 80%	Year 6 maths: 80%	
% making expected or better progress in writing			TBC when ASP is released		

% making expected or better progress in maths	TBC when ASP is released	
---	--------------------------	--

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)		
In-school barriers <i>(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)</i>		
A.	Impoverished language on entry with poor vocabulary, immature speech patterns and limited life experiences on which to draw. This restricts children's access to texts and means that they lack stimulus for their imaginative play and writing	
B.	Limited social skills which can lead to conflict and tension in the classroom. This conflict often arises in the playground or on the estate outside of school hours.	
C.	Poor self-help skills and low expectations of their own ability which results in children failing to progress without the direct input of a teaching assistant and in them producing work which does not reflect their potential.	
External barriers <i>(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)</i>		
D.	• Erratic attendance; lack of support at home with early reading, homework etc. Children are not always in school when they should be and so do not benefit from the carefully planned sequence of lessons that teachers deliver. Their learning is not always consolidated and deepened at home. • Lack of stability in the home environment; mixed families and fluid family dynamics mean that children are sometimes anxious about what might be going on at home at so are not in the right frame of mind for learning.	
4. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	For children eligible for PP funding to have improved vocabulary and word finding skills which allow them to use imaginative play in the EYFS and access the curriculum throughout school.	All pupils eligible for PP funding make rapid progress and achieve ARE at the end of the year unless they have significant and exceptional additional needs
B.	Fewer conflicts occur involving children eligible for PP funding allowing them to focus on their learning rather than on friendship/social concerns	Fewer incidents of harmful behaviour recorded
C.	Increase attendance for children eligible for PP funding so that it is at least 96%. Reduce the rate of persistent absenteeism for children eligible for PP funding	Overall PP attendance improves from 90.35% to 96% Currently 35.4% of PP children are Persistently absent. Reduce this to less than 10% line with non-PP children
D.	For children to show greater self-help skills and to improve their expectations of themselves so that they are not satisfied with outcomes which are less than their very best	Books show editing and redrafting to improve work All PP children make accelerated progress and achieve ARE at the end of the year.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2018/19				
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?
For children to show greater self-help skills.	We have completely rewritten our Feedback and Marking Policy to emphasise quality, developmental feedback and giving children time to respond to this. Through embedding this, we intend to change the emphasis from what teachers are expected to do in term of marking to a focus on the intended impact of the feedback – which may be verbal.	Providing effective feedback is challenging. Research suggests that it should be specific, accurate and clear (e.g. “It was good because you...” rather than just “correct”); compare what a learner is doing right now with what they have done wrong before (e.g. “I can see you were focused on improving X as it is much better than last time’s Y...”); encourage and support further effort and be given sparingly so that it is meaningful; provide specific guidance on how to improve and not just tell students when they are wrong; and be supported with effective professional development for teachers. Broader research suggests that feedback should be about complex or challenging tasks or goals as this is likely to emphasise the importance of effort and perseverance as well as be more valued by the pupils. Feedback can come from peers as well as adults (see Peer tutoring). <i>EEF</i>	Teachers will work within TLTs (Teaching and Learning Teams) to analyse the impact of feedback on children’s outcomes. Teachers will observe each other to assess the impact of ongoing feedback on progress that children make within each lesson. Teachers’ appraisal meetings will assess the progress that children are making across the curriculum. The quality of feedback given and the quality of children’s response to the feedback will be evaluated during this process.	Deputy Headteacher Hannah Cracknell (TLT meetings) Headteacher Valerie Noon (appraisals)	Half termly alongside pupil progress reviews Termly appraisal reviews

For children to improve their expectations of themselves so that they are not satisfied with outcomes which are less than their very best. All teachers will have a list of non-negotiables, which will be added to throughout the year. Children will be expected to demonstrate that they have achieved these before they hand work in for feedback.	Our school Development Plan has a focus on children self and peer assessing against clear criteria so that they are able to challenge themselves to achieve ARE in every piece of work. We will not differentiate by making work easier (for example by using LOs from a previous year group) and will expect all children to access Age Expected learning with support where needed	Year 5 and 6 teachers reviewed their approach to Guided Reading in 2017-18 so that all children were expected to access Age Expected texts with varying levels of support. This approach proved very successful and 80% of PPG children achieved ARE in the end of year test.	The Year 5 teacher (now in Year 6) will work with the Deputy Headteacher to embed this approach across the school providing support for TLT 2 and 3 (which they lead) and ensuring that teachers are able to provide appropriate scaffolding through resources (eg. maths manipulatives, visual aids, word banks and phonics support, pre-teaching of vocabulary etc.) so that all children, except those with very exceptional additional needs, can access Age Expected learning.	Year 6 teachers (Ian Chandler) Hannah Cracknell	Ongoing through drop-ins and lesson observations Half termly in pupil progress meetings Termly in teachers' appraisal reviews
Total budgeted cost					£3951.36 (cover for each class for 1 day per half term – time for progress reviews with Senior Leaders)
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?

For all children, expect those with very exceptional additional needs, to achieve Age Expected Standards at the end of every year	Support staff will be allocated to TLTs so that teachers can use them flexibly to provide support for individuals/groups of children. Senior Leaders will timetable support staff	Teachers in Years 1, 5 and 6 used a flexible approach in 2017-18 whereby teaching assistants were shared across the classes allowing for intensive support where and when it was needed; for example, guided reading was planned at different times of day for each class so that all teaching assistants could be involved with each class.	TLT meetings will be used to monitor progress of PPG children throughout the year. Drop-ins and lesson observations will be used to determine whether children are able to access Age Expected Standards	Clare Stokes (Foundation Stage) Hannah Cracknell (TLT 2 – Year 1,2 and	Half termly in pupil progress meetings
	according to need and will review allocation frequently (sometimes daily) in order to ensure that needs are met. All PPG children will have at least 1.5 hours of individual or small group support every week	This meant that the children could be given support to access ARE through small group or individual input during every session, rather than weekly as would be the case in the traditional carousel model. In Year 1, 83.3% of PPG children made expected or better progress, in Year 5, 100% of PPG made expected or better progress and in Year 6, 90% of PPG children made expected or better progress (<i>based on in-year reading progress assessed internally</i>)	Teachers will work across TLTs in a peer coaching capacity to support each other to ensure that TAs are used to provide best value for money Senior Leaders will monitor the use of TAs to ensure that they are always actively engaged supporting learners and are never watching the teacher teach/preparing resources during potential learning time etc.	3) Ian Chandler (TLT3 –Year 4, 5 and 6)	
Total budgeted cost					£35,500 (1.5 hours support per child per week)
iii. Other approaches					
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?
For PPG children to participate in a broad and balanced range of extra-curricular experiences which will enrich their language, vocabulary and general knowledge	We will fund extra-curricular experiences such as day trips, visitors, residential trips and extra-curricular learning such as piano lessons and gymnastics classes We plan to dedicate a part of our school grounds to Forest School	'Overall, studies of adventure learning interventions consistently show positive benefits on academic learning. On average, pupils who participate in adventure learning interventions make approximately four additional months' progress. There is also evidence of an impact on non-cognitive outcomes such as self-confidence.'EEF 'Lewis (2004) found 41 studies that investigated the effects of these activities and the finding of the most direct relevance	Meet the teacher evening in September – teachers will talk to the parents of PPG children to ascertain their interests so that extra-curricular activities can be planned to meet these needs Class teachers will plan trips and visitors linked to the curriculum areas that they are teaching. The quality of these will be monitored within TLT groups. We will provide training for a member of staff (tbc) to lead Forest School.	Class teachers and Forest School Lead (TBC)	Termly

		is the $d = .47$ effect on academic achievement...' Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analysis relating to achievement; John Hattie: 2009 In 2017 -18, all classes took part in a 6 week block of sessions at Panshanger Forest School. Feedback from this was overwhelmingly positive with a clear impact seen on independence, collaborative skills, self-help skills and confidence as well as in academic achievement, for example through increased vocabulary. Feedback from parents indicated that the impact was felt at home as well as at school.	This will be through Forest School Training and is a Nationally recognised Level 3 qualification		
To reduce Persistent Absence amongst PPG children so that it is in line with, or lower than, that of 'other' children nationally. (The same strategies will be used for children who are not PPG)	Our learning mentor will monitor attendance daily and chase the attendance of all PA children on each day of absence. She will create links with parents and implement strategies to support children with poor attendance (rewards/incentive schemes etc.) We already have a breakfast club for children with SEMH needs and this will be extended to cater to PA children. (Non PPG and PPG)	http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/2945/3/110308section3en.pdf https://schoolleaders.thekeysupport.com/pupils-and-parents/absence-and-attendance/strategies-for-managing-attendance/managing-absence-rates-case-studies/?marker=full-search-q-improving-attendance-primary-result-1 http://schools.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/schools/files/folders/folders/documents/attendanceandengagement/BestPracticeAttendance.pdf Of 189 children of statutory school age, 23 (12%) are persistently absent meaning that their attendance is 90% or less. Of these children, 14 are eligible for PPG; this means that 31.8% of all PPG children are persistently absent. Whilst the gap is closing between our PPG children and National Other, we feel that we need to address	Weekly meetings between the HT and learning mentor to monitor attendance and ensure the consistent application of strategies to improve it.	Katie Collingwood (Learning Mentor)	Weekly at first, maybe reducing once strategies are embedding and if they result in a reduction in PA.

		attendance as a matter of urgency to improve further the attainment of all children.			
For children to have self-help skills in terms of increasing confidence, self-esteem and conflict resolution so that they can always be focused on their learning rather than on ongoing disputes generated on the playground and/or out of school	Our learning mentor will conduct 1:1 sessions with children with SEMH difficulties in which they are supported to manage their behaviour/anxiety and learn conflict resolution and confidence building skills. We will train our MSAs so that are more able to engage children in productive activities rather than just supervise their play. We will train older children to be play leaders so that they can support the younger children to remain positively engaged at playtime and lunchtimes We plan to increase the amount of resources available to children during playtimes so that there are more varied activities in which they can engage (eg. nature equipment – pooters, magnifying glasses, butterfly nets, identification keys etc.; large waterproof board games; improved seating areas for reading, colouring etc)	https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/social-and-emotional-learning/ ‘On average, SEL interventions have an identifiable and valuable impact on attitudes to learning and social relationships in school. They also have an average overall impact of four months’ additional progress on attainment. Although SEL interventions are almost always perceived to improve emotional or attitudinal outcomes, not all interventions are equally effective at raising attainment. Improvements appear more likely when SEL approaches are embedded into routine educational practices and supported by professional development and training for staff.’ EEF	Behaviour records are kept by teachers daily and are analysed weekly by the Deputy Headteacher/learning mentor in line with the school’s Behaviour Policy. Through this, the impact of Behaviour Management strategies and SEMH intervention is monitored termly by the HT and reported to Governors	Katie Collingwood (Learning Mentor)	Weekly by DHT and termly by HT
Total budgeted cost					£28,000 (Partial funding of LM salary, training and resources and wrap-around care

6. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2017-2018		
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
To accelerate learning of PPG children so that their attainment is in line with ARE or above ARE – depending on prior attainment.	To employ teaching assistants to provide dedicated support to individual and groups of children so that each PPG child receives a minimum of 1.5 hours of dedicated support each week	Across the school the following PPG children made expected or better progress: Reading – 80.6%; Writing – 66.7%; Maths – 77.8%. (55.6% made better than expected progress in reading, writing and maths). Progress was greatest in Year 6 where 90% of children made better than expected progress in reading, writing and maths combined.	This approach was most successful in the classes where teachers worked effectively together to ensure that TAs were used flexible according to the changing needs of the children. This year, we will continue with the approach and extend its impact through staff training led by those members of staff who achieved the best rates of progress in 2017-18 – as detailed above.	£33, 794.00
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

For children with SEMH to be able to participate in the same learning opportunities as their peers	To employ a learning mentor to support children with their SEMH needs and remove barriers to learning.	Steps of progress made by mentored children (expected = 6) Child 1 (R): GLD; better than expected progress Child 2 (R): GLD; better than expected progress <table><tr><td></td><td>R steps progress/ ARE</td><td>W</td><td>M</td></tr><tr><td>Y2 child</td><td>6 ARE</td><td>6 ARE</td><td>6 ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y4 child</td><td>9 >ARE</td><td>10 ARE</td><td>9 >ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y4 child</td><td>8 ARE</td><td>9 ARE</td><td>8 <ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y4 child</td><td>11 ARE</td><td>11 ARE</td><td>10 ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y4 child</td><td>6 <ARE</td><td>8 <ARE</td><td>14 <ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y4 child</td><td>8 ARE</td><td>8 ARE</td><td>8 ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y5 child</td><td>7 <ARE</td><td>7 <ARE</td><td>7 <ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y5 child</td><td>8 <ARE</td><td>6<ARE</td><td>6<ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y5 child</td><td>6 <ARE</td><td>7 <ARE</td><td>4 <ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y5 child</td><td>6<ARE</td><td>4 <ARE</td><td>4 <ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y6 child</td><td>14 <ARE</td><td>17 ARE</td><td>13 ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y6 child</td><td>2 <ARE</td><td>1 <ARE</td><td>11 ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y6 child</td><td>12 <ARE</td><td>15 ARE</td><td>8 <ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y6 child</td><td>11 ARE</td><td>14 ARE</td><td>11 ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y6 child</td><td>18 <ARE</td><td>21 <ARE</td><td>14 <ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y6 child</td><td>10 ARE</td><td>10 ARE</td><td>13 ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y6 child</td><td>11 ARE</td><td>14 ARE</td><td>13 ARE</td></tr><tr><td>Y6 child</td><td>17 ARE</td><td>17 ARE</td><td>13 ARE</td></tr></table> Most children who worked with the learning mentor made better than expected progress across the curriculum. Where they did not, there are significant factors impacting on their progress, eg. child protection issues and SEND		R steps progress/ ARE	W	M	Y2 child	6 ARE	6 ARE	6 ARE	Y4 child	9 >ARE	10 ARE	9 >ARE	Y4 child	8 ARE	9 ARE	8 <ARE	Y4 child	11 ARE	11 ARE	10 ARE	Y4 child	6 <ARE	8 <ARE	14 <ARE	Y4 child	8 ARE	8 ARE	8 ARE	Y5 child	7 <ARE	7 <ARE	7 <ARE	Y5 child	8 <ARE	6<ARE	6<ARE	Y5 child	6 <ARE	7 <ARE	4 <ARE	Y5 child	6<ARE	4 <ARE	4 <ARE	Y6 child	14 <ARE	17 ARE	13 ARE	Y6 child	2 <ARE	1 <ARE	11 ARE	Y6 child	12 <ARE	15 ARE	8 <ARE	Y6 child	11 ARE	14 ARE	11 ARE	Y6 child	18 <ARE	21 <ARE	14 <ARE	Y6 child	10 ARE	10 ARE	13 ARE	Y6 child	11 ARE	14 ARE	13 ARE	Y6 child	17 ARE	17 ARE	13 ARE	It is impossible to isolate the reason for the success of most of these children to intervention from the learning mentor but it is clear that these children – for the most part – have done well in spite of SEMH needs. In 2017 – 18, we intend to extend the remit of the learning mentor to reach more children, through a significant role in improving attendance and greater early intervention as determined through the behaviour monitoring highlighted above and referenced in our Behaviour Policy.	£15,370.00 (3/5 days)
	R steps progress/ ARE	W	M																																																																													
Y2 child	6 ARE	6 ARE	6 ARE																																																																													
Y4 child	9 >ARE	10 ARE	9 >ARE																																																																													
Y4 child	8 ARE	9 ARE	8 <ARE																																																																													
Y4 child	11 ARE	11 ARE	10 ARE																																																																													
Y4 child	6 <ARE	8 <ARE	14 <ARE																																																																													
Y4 child	8 ARE	8 ARE	8 ARE																																																																													
Y5 child	7 <ARE	7 <ARE	7 <ARE																																																																													
Y5 child	8 <ARE	6<ARE	6<ARE																																																																													
Y5 child	6 <ARE	7 <ARE	4 <ARE																																																																													
Y5 child	6<ARE	4 <ARE	4 <ARE																																																																													
Y6 child	14 <ARE	17 ARE	13 ARE																																																																													
Y6 child	2 <ARE	1 <ARE	11 ARE																																																																													
Y6 child	12 <ARE	15 ARE	8 <ARE																																																																													
Y6 child	11 ARE	14 ARE	11 ARE																																																																													
Y6 child	18 <ARE	21 <ARE	14 <ARE																																																																													
Y6 child	10 ARE	10 ARE	13 ARE																																																																													
Y6 child	11 ARE	14 ARE	13 ARE																																																																													
Y6 child	17 ARE	17 ARE	13 ARE																																																																													

To line manage Learning Mentor and implement systems to provide access to her support To coordinate work to achieve National Nurturing Schools Award To provide support for staff in understanding barriers to learning for PPG children (eg. ASD, speech and language, behavioural issues etc.)	To increase SENCO days in school to work on improving provision for wellbeing and mental health	Learning mentor work was effective as shown above. The school made good progress towards the Nurturing school's Award and this will be continued in 2018-19. We have a new SENCO starting in September 2018 who will work 3 days a week as SENCO because she will have a teaching responsibility for the other 2 days.	This approach will not be continued for the reason stated although it was effective.	£9775.33 (1/4 days)
---	--	---	---	--

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
To improve motivation and attendance as well as providing children with concrete experiences on which to base future learning (eg. in writing) To increase children's self-help skills, confidence and team work To increase children's understanding of the world around them and their place in creating a supporting a sustainable future – to increase children's sense of agency and responsibility	To provide children with quality outdoor learning through participation in Forest School and the Hollybush Young Farmers initiative	There is limited evidence to show the academic impact of the Hollybush Young Farmers Scheme although it is clear, through feedback from children and parents that they enjoyed the experience. Impact from the Forest School is stronger as evidenced through parent and teacher feedback.	We feel that the Young Farmer scheme was of limited long-term benefit because the sessions were too infrequent (half termly), and because not all children were able to participate. This year, we intend to create a Forest school within our grounds so that all children can benefit in a more sustainable way.	£3,154.00

To make sure that all children can take part in school trips and visits and that specialist visitors can enhance the curriculum in school. To ensure that all children can participate in swimming lessons to achieve 25m by the end of KS2. To allow children to participate in a residential visit which improves resilience, team work and independence. AND alternative provision for children not attending the residential visit. To provide wrap-around care through breakfast club and after-school club	Trips, visitors and residential stays were funded for PPG children.	All children had access to at least one trip and/or workshop experience. All children in Y3 and Y4 had two terms of swimming teaching Only one PPG child in Y6 did not attend the residential trip. Instead, the child took part in similar activities, accompanied by a family member and our learning mentor (dry slop skiing. Climbing wall etc.) 6 children benefitted from regular funded wrap around care. The attendance of these children was as follows: <table><tr><td>A</td><td>97.6%</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>88.1%</td></tr><tr><td>C</td><td>90.2%</td></tr><tr><td>D</td><td>98.1%</td></tr><tr><td>E</td><td>96.8%</td></tr><tr><td>F</td><td>65.3%</td></tr></table>	A	97.6%	B	88.1%	C	90.2%	D	98.1%	E	96.8%	F	65.3%	This approach, on the whole allows children to access the same experiences as their more advantages peers and is therefore a strategy that we will continue this year. We will be unable to continue supporting 2 terms of swimming because of the number of parents of non-disadvantaged children who refused to pay for their children to take part in lessons. This left the school footing a considerable bill. We strongly believe that all children must learn to swim and are in the process of planning a new strategy to achieve this. We will continue to fund wrap-around care because it supports parents in returning to work. However, it seems to have limited impact on raising attendance for children who are persistently absent and this will be addressed through other measures.	£6753.65
A	97.6%															
B	88.1%															
C	90.2%															
D	98.1%															
E	96.8%															
F	65.3%															

May 2016

7. Additional detail

In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.
Our full strategy document can be found online at: www.aschool.sch.uk