**Pupil premium strategy statement**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **School** | Christ Church Church Of England Academy | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2019 20 | **Total PP budget** | £124,080 | **Date of most recent PP Review** | September 19 |
| **Total number of pupils** | 194 | **Number of pupils eligible for PP** | 94 | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | March 2020 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Current attainment** | | |
|  | *Pupils eligible for PP (your school)* | *Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)* |
| **27% achieving in reading, writing and maths** | 21% | 65% |
| **Progress measure for reading -5.04** | -5.5 | 0 |
| **Progress measure for writing 1.04** | 0.94 | 0 |
| **Progress measure for maths -1.62** | -1.6 | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)** | | | | |
| **In-school barriers** *(issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)* | | | | |
|  | | High incidence of social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) needs impacting on pupil ability to access learning and make expected progress from KS1 – KS2 | | |
|  | | Pupil premium children attain lower outcomes in reading and progress is weak | | |
| **External barriers** *(issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)* | | | | |
| **C.** | | Attendance for our pupil premium children has risen 93.5% for 17/18 to 95.37 for 2018/19 however the national average has risen to against 97% and for our non-pupil premium pupils attendance has risen from 95.6% to 96.02%. This is one of the factors leading to lower standards of attainment and progress for our pupil premium pupils. | | |
| **D** | | Low family income leading to children not receiving an adequate breakfast and arriving at school without uniform impacting on their ability to focus on learning. Lack of variety of learning experiences in holidays and at weekends e.g. days out. | | |
| 1. **Desired outcomes** | | | |
|  | *Desired outcomes and how they will be measured* | | *Success criteria* |
|  | The needs of pupils experiencing SEMH difficulties are assessed and the appropriate intervention is identified and delivered. | | Reduced incidence of referral to outside units  Reduced incidence of fixed term and permanent exclusion  Pupils accessing provision make broadly average progress  Pupils not accessing provision maintain a calm and learning environment  Improved attendance levels. |
|  | The difference between PP and non PP pupils to diminish particularly in reading. | | The difference in progress and attainment between pp and non pp pupils is diminished |
|  | Attendance to improve | | Attendance of all pupils is closer to national levels. The difference between our pupil premium children and |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Planned expenditure** | | | | | |
| **Academic year** | **2019 2020** | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | |
| 1. **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?** |
| Improved long term memory  Pupils able to remember and apply known strategies to new learning  Teachers able to use shared language in professional dialog | Adoption of EEF metacognition and self-regulation materials as a driver for quality first teaching. | There is a strong body of research from psychology and education demonstrating the importance of metacognition and self-regulation to effective pupil learning. The Sutton Trust-EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit—which summarises international evidence—rates ‘metacognition and self-regulation’ as a high impact, low cost approach to improving the attainment of disadvantaged learners. [3 | CPD was rolled out over 2018/19 this active ingredient will be implemented and embedded over this year and the outcomes assessed. | **PF JCh JCl** | Termly review. |
| Accelerated attainment and progress for pupils in year 2 and 6. | Pupil premium intervention teaching assistant  Employment of an additional member of support staff to increase capacity in order to be able to use a member of support staff to deliver teacher planned intervention to pupil premium children in year 2 and 6 who are in danger of not achieving level 4 or not making expected progress in the national tests at the end of key stage 2. | Teaching staff in Y2 and 6 make effective use of support staff so that they are able to focus teaching at the needs of each group of pupils.  In some cases, support staff work with higher ability children in order to keep up the pace of their learning when they are working ahead of the class or they may teach lower ability children where appropriate. This allows the teacher to accelerate pupil progress.  Please see education endowment fund guidance report ‘Making best use of teaching assistants’ | Half termly monitoring of quality of teaching, planning, pupil outcomes through ‘subject on a page’ monitoring carried out by the leadership team. Reported o governors. | **LG, PF** | Monitored by HT, governors and class teachers during 6 weekly pupil progress meetings. |
| Accelerated attainment and progress for pupils in year 2 and 6. | Pixl materials in KS2 to be rolled out in year 5 and 6 and then years 3 and 4. Materials to be used to | Data presented by the pixl group evidences that adoption of their strategies improves outcomes for pupils. The materials provide a comprehensive resource of diagnostic activites and appropriate therapies to support school improvement. | Monitoring and traking progress of pupil groups. | JCh - lead  JCL  PF |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | £42,000 |
| 1. **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?** |
| **Pupils experiencing SEMH difficulties to achieve age related outcomes or progress measures across KS1 and KS2** | Provide a small group therapeutic teaching base for pupils whose SEMH needs are resulting in persistently disruptive, aggressive, or violent behaviours. This will require a specialist teacher and a teaching assistant to work full time in the Ark resource base.  A Forest school leader from e.merge also works within the provision for an afternoon each week. | Pupils SEMH needs have typically prevented them from accessing learning, leading to periods of time away from their learning base, exclusion from school. It has also created disrupted learning for other pupils in the class or teaching area.  The education endowment fund ‘Teaching and Learning Toolkit’ uses research to evaluate the impact and cost of behaviour interventions. It concludes that:  ‘Evidence suggests that, on average, behavior interventions can produce moderate improvements in academic performance along with a decrease in problematic behaviors.’ | Half termly monitoring of quality of teaching, planning, pupil outcomes through ‘subject on a page’ monitoring carried out by the leadership team with support from SEN Governor where appropriate. | Led by LG  And JM | Provision will be monitored half termly and adjusted according to findings. |
| **Pupils experiencing SEMH difficulties to achieve age related outcomes or progress measures across KS1 and KS2** | To run nurture provision for pupils identified as having emotional/behavioural needs through use of Boxall profiling’.  provide early intervention so that children exhibiting signs of SEMH need are provided with a safe, small group, nurturing environment in order to ensure that barriers to learning are removed and pupils make good or better progress.  Provision requires a lead practitioner and a supporting member of staff.  . | Pupils SEMH needs have typically prevented them from accessing learning, leading to periods of time away from their learning base, exclusion from school. It has also created disrupted learning for other pupils in the class or teaching area.  The education endowment fund ‘Teaching and Learning Toolkit’ uses research to evaluate the impact and cost of behaviour interventions. It concludes that:  ‘On average, Social emotional learning interventions have an identifiable and significant impact on attitudes to learning, social relationships in school, and attainment itself (four months' additional progress on average).’  ‘SEL programmes appear to benefit disadvantaged or low-attaining pupils more than other pupils, though all pupils benefit on average. Approaches have been found to be effective from nursery to secondary school.  ‘ | Half termly monitoring of quality of teaching, planning, pupil outcomes through ‘subject on a page’ monitoring carried out by the leadership team with support from SEN Governor where appropriate. | Led by LG and CH | Provision will be monitored half termly and adjusted according to findings. |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | £73,079 |
| 1. **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?** |
| To support PP families are able to access the full range of services offered by the school | Hardship funding for pupils accessing before and after school provision whose parents have been unable to meet costs. | The rationale is that working families where parent’s income is very low or there may be zero hours contracts often struggle to meet child care bills that they have accrued. Whilst they may be able to meet cost going forward, they cannot meet the debt they have incurred. For many pupils attendance at before and after school club provides a secure environment and supports working families on low incomes. | Review to ensure that funds have been allocated where needed | AA  PF | Termly review |
| To ensure that barriers to learning caused by emotional difficulties are met | Dedicated time for the learning mentor and Ark lead to deliver drawing therapy | Mental health services and CAHMS were slow to respond to pupil need. We have a significant minority of pupils who have experienced personal trauma and this was presenting barriers to their ongoing happiness, sense of safety and ability to learn within a class room environment. We employed a child therapist however due to increased cost without corresponding increases in funding this has been discontinued. To ameliorate the impact of this 2 members of staff have been trained in drawing therapy. | Monitored through weekly meetings between staff and SENCO to review provision, discuss progress and make referrals. Included n pastoral report to governors. | LG | Termly review |
| To ensure that attendance levels improve and the number of persistent absentees decreases. | Time for key staff to attend the BDAT attendance work stream and to implement strategies to support improved attendance. To fund rewards for pupils with good/improved attendance | In school data suggests that attendance of pupil premium children is below that of non pupil premium pupils.  This is linked to attainment and the attainment of pupil premium children is lower than that of non pupil premium children. | I/2 termly data review, report to governors and pupil progress meetings. | LG, RI, BM | Termly review |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | £11,408 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Previous Academic Year** | |
| **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) |
| Accelerated attainment and progress for pupil premium pupils in year 2 and 6 | Pupil premium intervention teaching assistant  Employment of an additional member of support staff to increase capacity in order to be able to use a member of support staff to deliver teacher planned intervention to pupil premium children in year 2 and 6 who are in danger of not achieving level 4 or not making expected progress in the national tests at the end of key stage 2. | Pupils in year 2 made good progress in reading and maths.  Combined greater depth at KS1 is well above national average and progress from starting points using FFT is within top 5% in the country.  Progress at the end of KS2 is broadly in line with national for writing and maths, however it is well below in reading | A focus on reading is required in KS2 in particular, in order to raise attainment in this area.  In KS 1 writing should be a particular focus. This will be addressed in next year’s improvement plans. A particular focus on vocabulary and structured teaching of vocabulary has been identified as an approach supported by research. |
| Improved long term memory  Pupils able to remember and apply known strategies to new learning  Teachers able to use shared language in professional dialog | Adoption of EEF metacognition and self-regulation materials as a driver for quality first teaching. | There is evidence in books and lesson observations that teachers and pupils are more able to identify specific strategies and how they can be learnt and applied in future  Teachers have a clear understanding of principles and shared language. | More time is needed to embed as initial preparation an CPD was a longer process than initially anticipated. |
| **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) |
| **Pupils experiencing SEMH difficulties to achieve age related outcomes or progress measures across KS1 and KS2** | Provide a small group therapeutic teaching base for pupils whose SEMH needs are resulting in persistently disruptive, aggressive, or violent behaviours. This will require a specialist teacher and a teaching assistant to work full time in the Ark resource base.  A Forest school leader from e.merge also works within the provision for an afternoon each week. | Pupils accessing the provision have been able to remain in mainstream school and the provision has allowed the school to support these pupils without exclusions. Staff Illness meant that the quality of teaching within the provision was weaker than expected. This has been resolved. | The approach is successful in terms of SEMH need there is a need to ensure strong teaching within the provision going forwards. |
| **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) |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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 |