Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

| 1. Summary information | Summary information | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|----|--|-----------|
| School Milford School | | | | | |
| Academic Year | 2018/19 | Total PP budget | | Date of most recent PP Review | Feb 2019 |
| Total number of pupils | 177 | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 16 | Date for next internal review of this strategy | July 2019 |

| 2. Current attainment – Key Stage 1 EOY outcomes | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | Pupils eligible for PP (11) | Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) | | | |
| % achieving in reading, writing and maths | 36% (4 chn) 59.1% (all chn Milford) | 65% | | | |
| % achieving in reading | 54.5% | 75% | | | |
| % achieving in writing | 45.5% | 70% | | | |
| % achieving in maths | 72.7% | 76% | | | |

| 3. B | arriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability) | |
|-------|--|---|
| In-sc | hool barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills) | |
| A. | Children with poor language skills – underdeveloped language and communication including speech dif | ficulties |
| B. | Emotional/behavioural difficulties | |
| C. | Other SEND including Occupational therapy needs, processing difficulties and specific learning difficulti | es |
| Exter | nal barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance re | ates) |
| D. | Safeguarding concerns | |
| E. | Low attendance rates (linked to culture and mobility) | |
| 4. D | esired outcomes | |
| | Desired outcomes and how they will be measured | Success criteria |
| A. | Increase the number of children achieving reading, writing, maths combined (with a specific focus on reading and writing). | Percentage increase in just PP children achieving RWM combined (no additional barriers) 2018/19 GLD 50% KS1 – 2017/18 = 36% and in 2018/19 43% Percentage increase in PP children with SEND barrier compared to all other SEND children. 0% |

| B. | Improve attendance for PP children | Attendance to be in line with school percentage target of at least 95% Current Average PP TT attendance Feb 2019 88% compared to Feb 2018 which was 92% at the same point in the school year. Average attendance for PP in July 2019 is 95%. |
|----|---|---|
| C. | Increase percentage of children meeting ARE for reading & writing | 2017/18 – KS1 Reading 54% Writing 45% Reading & Writing 36% 2018/19 – KS1 Reading 71% Writing 43% Reading & Writing 43% |

5. Planned expenditure

2018/19 Academic year

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? |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Increase number of children meeting ARE for RWM combined | QfT strategies in place in all classrooms for this group of learners. | Reduce the gap for all children including PP between Milford average 2017/18 and National. | Whole school staff training. Implementation of Milford Mindset approach. Monitor termly to ensure high expectations of PP chn. Subject Leaders prioritising QfT through action plans, staff meetings and Quality Assurance feedback to Year Groups. | A.Stear J.Fulterer | July 2019 |
| | | | | | |

Total budgeted cost £7000

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? |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Increase percentage of children meeting ARE for reading and writing | Specific interventions and targeted 1:1 including small group support. | The percentage of PP children meeting reading and writing are significantly lower than the percentage of PP children meeting ARE for mathematics and when compared to 'all other pupils' | Termly evaluations of interventions. Data produced by HT and Inclusion Manager is scrutinised. Discussion of impact during Pupil Progress Meetings. Liaising with external professionals (ie Specialist teachers) to review progress made with strategies implemented. | A.Stear J.Fulterer | Termly |
| | | | | | |
| | | | Total bud | dgeted cost | £10000 |

| iii. Other approacl | nes | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 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? |
| Attendance for PP children to increase | Regular review and monitoring of school attendance for these specific pupils. Early intervention when needed. Family support given by Inclusion Manager. Breakfast Club can be offered as funded. | Low attendance for some children eligible for FSM | Half termly review of attendance figures Letters to parents regarding attendance and repeated absentees Liaison with Educational Welfare Officer | A.Stear J Fulterer | July 2019 |
| Pupil wellbeing factors addressed so that attendance improves | ELSA. Parent workshops. Funded after-school clubs/swimming. | Pupils eligible for FSM identified with low levels of resilience and low self esteem | Evaluation of ELSA intervention Pupil progress meetings | A Stear J Fulterer | July 2019 |
| | • | • | Total bu | dgeted cost | 11,360 |

| 6. Review of expe | outcomes | eview of the previous year, so the and success criteria will be different to | | |
|--|------------------------|---|--|------|
| i. Quality of teaching for all Desired outcome Chosen action/approach | | | teria were met. Additional evidence of impact can attainment data, progress data, and case studies. | |
| | | 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 |
| ii. Targeted suppo | ort | | Lessons learned may be about impact or implementation. For approaches which did not meet their success criteria, it is to assess whether you will continue allocating funding and if s | |
| Desired outcome Chosen action/approact | | 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 |
| iii. Other approach | nes | | | |
| 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 |
| | | | | |

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