

Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

1. Summary information					
School	St Matthew's CE Academy				
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP budget	£7,920	Date of most recent PP Review	Sept 2017
Total number of pupils	99	Number of pupils eligible for PP	7	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Jan 2018

2. Current attainment		
Very small cohort of pupils therefore averaged results over whole school	<i>Pupil Premium</i>	<i>Non Pupil Premium</i>
% achieving in reading, writing and maths		
% making progress in reading	8.33	8
% making progress in writing	8	8.85
% making progress in maths	9.67	7.67

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.	Very small number of pupils eligible for PP, therefore, low budget available.
B.	Initial starting points are lower than non-Pupil Premium.
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)	
D.	Pupils take an active part in school life and learning.

4. Desired outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Effectively use PP funding, and use of other funding to support PP learners.	Best value for money in all areas.
B.	To ensure rapid progress is made from initial starting points.	PP pupils maintain high attainment outcomes and good progression.
D.	Pupils receive equal opportunities than those of non PP.	Attendance and punctuality.

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2017-2018				
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?
Enabling pupils to move more quickly onto problems and greater depth maths problems	Staff are able to implement new White Rose maths strategies	Pupils need more experience of applying maths knowledge	Monitoring	AW +SLT	January 2017
Total budgeted cost					Main School Budget
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?
To ensure rapid progress is made from initial starting points	2hrs support each, per week x41 weeks @ £13.50 per hour.	Previous outcomes of KS2 PP pupils.	Monitoring of TA's. Allocation within class.	JM	January 2017
Total budgeted cost					£7749
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?
Pupils take an active part in school life and learning.	Transport, trips, and other contingencies can be covered with funding.	Outcomes from previous years.	Allocation of funding. Best value for money.	MW. JM. PM.	Feb 2017
Total budgeted cost					£171

6. Planned expenditure			
Academic year		2016 - 2017	
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.			
iv. Quality of teaching for all			
Desired outcome	Chosen action / approach	Outcome/ impact	
Staff are effectively trained and assessments moderated.	Staff CPD and use of external providers for moderation.	Teacher assessment is better Outcomes for pupils (see above)	
Total budgeted cost			£500
v. Targeted support			
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Outcome/ impact	
To ensure rapid progress is made from initial starting points	2hrs support each, per week x38 weeks @ £10 per hour. (Underestimated).	See outcomes above	
Total budgeted cost			£5,320
vi. Other approaches			
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach		
Pupils take an active part in school life and learning.	Transport, trips, and other contingencies can be covered with funding.	Costs covered	
	Funding for Free School Meals. (£1000)	FSM provided	
Total budgeted cost			£2900

Strengths in 2016:

- Disadvantaged KS2 pupils' progress was not significantly below average overall or for any prior attainment group in any subject.
- Disadvantaged KS2 pupils had an average scaled score equal to or above the national score for other pupils in mathematics.
- KS1 attainment of at least the expected standard in all subjects for all EYFS development groups was close to or above national figures.
- The proportion of pupils that met the expected standard in phonics was above the national figure in year 1.

Weaknesses in 2016:

- KS1 writing was well below the national figure for expected+ (E+) or greater depth (GD) for the EYFS group: exceeding (GD).