Pupil Premium Strategy Statement: Springfield Community Primary School

1. Summary informatio	n				
School				RIMARY SCHOOL COOL ENGE - EMPOWER	
Academic Year	2018/19	Total PP budget	£137,280	Date of most recent PP Review	
Total number of pupils	205	Number of pupils eligible for PP	105	Date for next internal review of this strategy	November 2018

2. Current Data- Attainment/Progress/Attendance/Contextual

Results

EYFS results 2017-18

Good Level of Development- 60%

Keystage 1 2017/18

Cohort information 30 children 14 males 16 females 11 disadvantaged 7 SEN children 10 EAL	Expected Standard+	Expected Standard National	Greater Depth	Greater Depth National
Reading	77%	TBC	17%	TBC
Writing	73%	TBC	17%	TBC
Maths	73%	TBC	17%	TBC
Science	80%			
R W M combined	67%		10%	

PP children- 11 children.

Subject	Other	Below	Foundations	Towards	At	Greater	At or Greater
Reading				3 (27.3%)	6 (54.5%)	2 (18.2%)	8 (72.7%)
Writing				4 (36.4%)	5 (45.5%)	2 (18.2%)	7 (63.6%)
Mathematics				4 (36.4%)	7 (63.6%)		7 (63.6%)
Science	3 (27.3%)				8 (72.7%)		8 (72.7%)
Rdg, Wri & Mth	5 (45.5%)						6 (54.5%)

• The above table does demonstrate good progress from EYFS, in that at the end of EYFS only 40% of these PP children achieved GLD.

S. Nasim- 2018/19

- At the end of EYFS, for Reading, 60% achieved expected +, 50% achieved expected+ in Writing and 80% in Num and SSP. Although a direct comparison is not possible see above table for comparison
- For the Phonics Screening check, if the same children are considered, 54.5% of the above PP children achieved the standard.

Non PP children- 19 children

Subject	Other	Below	Foundations	Towards	At	Greater	At or Greater
Reading		1 (5.3%)	2 (10.5%)	1 (5.3%)	12 (63.2%)	3 (15.8%)	15 (78.9%)
Writing		1 (5.3%)	2 (10.5%)	1 (5.3%)	12 (63.2%)	3 (15.8%)	15 (78.9%)
Mathematics		1 (5.3%)		3 (15.8%)	10 (52.6%)	5 (26.3%)	15 (78.9%)
Science	3 (15.8%)				16 (84.2%)		16 (84.2%)
Rdg, Wri & Mth	5 (26.3%)					3 (15.8%)	14 (73.7%)

• For the above children, 63.2% achieved GLD at the end of EYFS. The above table demonstrates good progress.

Keystage 2- 2017/18

Original Once disapplied 28 pupils 25 pupils 17 boys 15 boys 11 girls 10 girls • Lower prior attainment band- 3 children • Middle prior attainment band- 15 children • Higher prior attainment band- 5 children • Higher prior attainment band- 5 children • 5 children - no previous data as they didn't sit KS1 tests • 8 children EAL • 4 children- SEN • 17 children in cohort- non-mobile • 11 children in the cohort- mobile 3 children to be disapplied, figures in this summary takes this into account. As a result, the figure for pupils to be included in progress measures changes from 82% to 92% Cohort KS1 average point score-15.6	Progress	Confidence Interval	Attainment Expected Standard+	Attainment Greater Depth	Average scaled score
Reading	-1.0	-3.4 to +1.4	60% (15)	28%	102.6
Writing	-0.7	-3.0 to +1.6	68% (17)	24%	102.2
Maths	-3.0 - statistically significant	-5.2 to -0.8	56% (14)	16%	100.0
GPS			56% (14)	20%	

Reading, Writing, Maths combined expected+ 44%, with higher standard- 16%

PP children V Non PP children 2017-18 (dis-applied not included in figures)

		PP children			Non PP children							
	Expected +	HS	Scaled Score		Expected +	HS	Scaled Score					
Reading	58%	17%	100.2	-	62%	39%	104.8					
Writing	67%	8%			72 %	39%						
Maths	50%	8%	99.0		62%	23%	100.9					
EGPS	50%	8%	100.8		62%	31%	103.5					
Combined	42%	8%			46%	23%						

PP children V Non PP children 2016-17 (dis-applied not included in figures)

		PP children		Non PP children							
	Expected +	HS	Scaled Score	Expected +	HS	Scaled Score					
Reading	33%	0%	95.7	70%	0%	99.8					
Writing	75%	0%		70%	20%						
Maths	50%	0%	95.2	60%	20%	99.0					
EGPS	50%	0%	98.2	70%	10%	101.4					
Combined	17%	0%		50%	0%						

Whole school data- Attainment- Summer 2018

EYFS DATA in detail (2017/18)

Aspect	Emerging	Expected	Exceeding	Expected or Exceeding
. ♦	♦	♦	♦	. ⇔
Listening and attention	10 (33.3%)	18 (60.0%)	2 (6.7%)	20 (66.7%)
Understanding	11 (36.7%)	19 (63.3%)		19 (63.3%)
Speaking	9 (30.0%)	21 (70.0%)		21 (70.0%)
Moving and handling	10 (33.3%)	18 (60.0%)	2 (6.7%)	20 (66.7%)
Health and self-care	8 (26.7%)	22 (73.3%)		22 (73.3%)
Self-confidence and self-awareness	10 (33.3%)	19 (63.3%)	1 (3.3%)	20 (66.7%)
Managing feelings and behaviour	10 (33.3%)	19 (63.3%)	1 (3.3%)	20 (66.7%)
Making relationships	8 (26.7%)	20 (66.7%)	2 (6.7%)	22 (73.3%)
Reading	11 (36.7%)	19 (63.3%)		19 (63.3%)
Writing	11 (36.7%)	15 (50.0%)	4 (13.3%)	19 (63.3%)
Numbers	11 (36.7%)	17 (56.7%)	2 (6.7%)	19 (63.3%)
Shape, space and measures	10 (33.3%)	20 (66.7%)		20 (66.7%)
People and communities	10 (33.3%)	20 (66.7%)		20 (66.7%)
The world	10 (33.3%)	20 (66.7%)		20 (66.7%)
Technology	2 (6.7%)	28 (93.3%)		28 (93.3%)
Exploring and using media and materials	7 (23.3%)	18 (60.0%)	5 (16.7%)	23 (76.7%)
Being imaginative	4 (13.3%)	25 (83.3%)	1 (3.3%)	26 (86.7%)
Average:	8.9 (29.8%)	19.9 (66.3%)	1.2 (3.9%)	21.1 (70.2%)
		Expected or I	Exceeding in all Aspe	cts: 17 (56.7%)

Reception- PP children (11)

Aspect	Emerging	Expected	Exceeding	Expected or Exceeding
♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
Listening and attention	7 (63.6%)	3 (27.3%)	1 (9.1%)	4 (36.4%)
Understanding	7 (63.6%)	4 (36.4%)		4 (36.4%)
Speaking	5 (45.5%)	6 (54.5%)		6 (54.5%)
Moving and handling	7 (63.6%)	3 (27.3%)	1 (9.1%)	4 (36.4%)
Health and self-care	6 (54.5%)	5 (45.5%)		5 (45.5%)
Self-confidence and self-awareness	6 (54.5%)	5 (45.5%)		5 (45.5%)
Managing feelings and behaviour	6 (54.5%)	4 (36.4%)	1 (9.1%)	5 (45.5%)
Making relationships	6 (54.5%)	4 (36.4%)	1 (9.1%)	5 (45.5%)
Reading	7 (63.6%)	4 (36.4%)		4 (36.4%)
Writing	7 (63.6%)	3 (27.3%)	1 (9.1%)	4 (36.4%)
Numbers	7 (63.6%)	3 (27.3%)	1 (9.1%)	4 (36.4%)
Shape, space and measures	6 (54.5%)	5 (45.5%)		5 (45.5%)
People and communities	6 (54.5%)	5 (45.5%)		5 (45.5%)
The world	6 (54.5%)	5 (45.5%)		5 (45.5%)
Technology	1 (9.1%)	10 (90.9%)		10 (90.9%)
Exploring and using media and materials	5 (45.5%)	6 (54.5%)		6 (54.5%)
Being imaginative	2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)		9 (81.8%)
Average:	5.7 (51.9%)	4.9 (44.9%)	0.4 (3.2%)	5.3 (48.1%)
		Expected or	Exceeding in all Aspec	cts: 3 (27.3%)

Reception- Non- PP children (19)

Aspect	Emerging	Expected	Exceeding	Expected or Exceeding
\(\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc	♦	♦	♦	♦
Listening and attention	3 (15.8%)	15 (78.9%)	1 (5.3%)	16 (84.2%)
Understanding	4 (21.1%)	15 (78.9%)		15 (78.9%)
Speaking	4 (21.1%)	15 (78.9%)		15 (78.9%)
Moving and handling	3 (15.8%)	15 (78.9%)	1 (5.3%)	16 (84.2%)
Health and self-care	2 (10.5%)	17 (89.5%)		17 (89.5%)
Self-confidence and self-awareness	4 (21.1%)	14 (73.7%)	1 (5.3%)	15 (78.9%)
Managing feelings and behaviour	4 (21.1%)	15 (78.9%)		15 (78.9%)
Making relationships	2 (10.5%)	16 (84.2%)	1 (5.3%)	17 (89.5%)
Reading	4 (21.1%)	15 (78.9%)		15 (78.9%)
Writing	4 (21.1%)	12 (63.2%)	3 (15.8%)	15 (78.9%)
Numbers	4 (21.1%)	14 (73.7%)	1 (5.3%)	15 (78.9%)
Shape, space and measures	4 (21.1%)	15 (78.9%)		15 (78.9%)
People and communities	4 (21.1%)	15 (78.9%)		15 (78.9%)
The world	4 (21.1%)	15 (78.9%)		15 (78.9%)
Technology	1 (5.3%)	18 (94.7%)		18 (94.7%)
Exploring and using media and materials	2 (10.5%)	12 (63.2%)	5 (26.3%)	17 (89.5%)
Being imaginative	2 (10.5%)	16 (84.2%)	1 (5.3%)	17 (89.5%)
Average:	3.2 (17.0%)	14.9 (78.6%)	0.8 (4.3%)	15.8 (83.0%)
		Expected or	Exceeding in all Aspects	: 14 (73.7%)

Comparison PP v Non-PP in EYFS

(please note + means above and - means below)

						Pu	pils	eligi	ble	for I	PP (11)												Pupi	il no	t eli	gible	e for	· PP	(19)					
	Ι	Un	SP	WH	HSC	SCSA	MFB	MR	Re	Wr	ΩΩ	SSM	PC	MΤ	Tech	EUWM	BI		Y	n	SP	МН	HSC	SCSA	MFB	MR	Re	Wr	n N	SSM	PC	ΤW	Tech	EUWW	ВІ
Expected+ (%)	36.4	36.4	54.5	36.4	45.5	45.5	45.5	45.5	36.4	36.4	36.4	45.5	45.5	45.5	6.06	54.5	81.8	0	84.7	78.9	78.9	84.2	89.5	78.9	78.9	89.5	78.9	78.9	78.9	78.9	78.9	78.9	94.7	89.5	89.5
Below Expected (%)	63.6	63.6	45.5	63.6	54.5	54.5	54.5	54.5	63.6	63.6	63.6	54.5	54.5	54.5	9.1	45.5	18.2		15.8	21.1	21.1	15.8	10.5	21.1	21.1	10.5	21.1	21.1	21.1	21.1	21.1	21.1	5.3	10.5	10.5
Difference between PP/Non-PP (%)	-47.8	-42.5	-24.4	-47.8	-33.4	-33.4	-33.4	-44	-42.5	-42.5	-42.5	-33.4	-33.4	-33.4	-3.8	-35	-7.7	į	+47.8	+42.5	+24.4	+47.8	+33.4	+33.4	+33.4	+44	+42.5	+42.5	+42.5	+33.4	+33.4	+33.4	+3.8	+35	+7.7
Number of children to = or better Non-PP	9+	+5	۴3	9+	+5	4+	+4	+5	+5	+5	+5	4+	++	++	+	+4	+																		

Y1-6- July 2018

Reading			Pupils elig	ible for PP			Pupil not eligible for PP												
	Y1(13)	Y2 (11)	Y3 (16)	Y4 (11)	Y5 (10)	Y6 (13)		Y1 (16)	Y2 (19)	Y3 (13)	Y4 (19)	Y5 (20)	Y6 (15)						
Expected+	39%	73%	50%	36%	30%	46%		88%	79%	77%	47%	60%	53%						
Below Expected	61%	27%	50%	61%	70%	56%		12%	21%	23%	53%	40%	47%						
Difference PP/Non-PP	-49%	-6%	-27%	-11%	-30%	-7%		+49%	+6%	+27%	+11%	+30%	+7%						
Number of children to = or better Non-PP	+7	+1	+5	+2	+3	+1													

Writing			Pupils elig	ible for PP				Р	upil not el	igible for P	Р	
	Y1(13)	Y2 (11)	Y3 (16)	Y4 (11)	Y5 (10)	Y6 (13)	Y1 (16)	Y2 (19)	Y3 (13)	Y4 (19)	Y5 (20)	Y6 (15)
Expected+	39%	64%	50%	36%	30%	46%	75%	79%	54%	42%	55%	53%
Below Expected	61%	36%	50%	64%	70%	54%	25%	21%	26%	58%	45%	47%
Difference PP/Non-PP	-36%	-15%	-4%	-6%	-25%	-7%	+36%	+15%	+4%	+6%	+25%	+ 7 %
Number of children to = or better Non-PP	+5	+2	+1	+1	+3	+1						

<mark>Maths</mark>			Pupils elig	ible for PP				Р	upil not el	igible for P	P	
	Y1(13)	Y2 (11)	Y3 (16)	Y4 (11)	Y5 (10)	Y6 (13)	Y1 (16)	Y2 (19)	Y3 (13)	Y4 (19)	Y5 (20)	Y6 (15)
Expected+	39	64	56	36	60	54	88	79	85	53	60	67
Below Expected	61	36	44	64	40	46	12	21	15	47	40	33
Difference PP/Non-PP	-49%	-15%	-29%	-17%	0%	-13%	+49%	+15%	+29%	+17%	0%	+13%
Number of children to = or better Non-PP	+7	+2	+5	+2	+0	+2						

Whole school data- Progress- end of Summer 2018

EYFS

						Pu	oils	eligi	ible	for l	PP (11)												Pupi	il no	t eli	gible	e for	r PP	(19)					
	Υ	Un	SP	WH	HSC	SCSA	MFB	MR	Re	Wr	n N	SSM	PC	MΤ	Tech	EUWW	ВІ		4	'n	SP	МН	HSC	SCSA	MFB	MR	Re	Wr	J N	SSM	PC	ΤW	Tech	EUWW	ВІ
Better than expected	82%	82%	91%	91%	73%	73%	73%	64%	91%	91%	73%	91%	91%	91%	73%	82%	91%		78%	78%	78%	78%	61%	78%	61%	20%	78%	%68	72%	83%	%68	83%	39%	%68	78%
Expected+ steps	82%	82%	91%	91%	82%	73%	82%	73%	91%	91%	82%	91%	91%	91%	82%	91%	91%		84%	84%	%68	%62	%62	84%	%62	84%	%68	%68	84%	84%	%68	84%	%89	86%	%68
Less than 5 steps	%6	%6	%0	%0	%6	18%	%6	18 %	%0	%0	%6	%0	%0	%6	%0	%0	%0		%9	%9	%0	11%	11%	%9	11%	%9	%0	%0	%9	%9	%0	%9	22%	%0	%0
Difference between PP/Non-PP (Expected)	-2%	-2%	+2%	+11%	+3%	-11%	+3%	-11%	+2%	+2%	-2%	*/+	+2%	+7%	+14%	+2%	+2%	ı	+2%	+2%	-2%	-11%	-3%	+11%	-3%	+11%	-2%	-2%	+2%	%/-	-2%	-7%	-14%	-2%	-2%
Difference between PP/Non-PP (better than expected)	+4	+4	+13	+13	+12	-5	+12	+14	+13	+2	+	8+	+2	+8	+34	2-	+13		-4	-4	-13	-13	-12	+2	-12	-14	-13	-2	-1	∞-	-2	8-	-34	L +	-13
Number of children to obtain equal figures	1	_				2		7			_																								

Υ	1	-6
---	---	----

Reading			Pupils elig	ible for Pl	9			Pu	pil not eli	gible for I	PP	
	Y1 (13)	Y2 (11)	Y3 (16)	Y4 (11)	Y5 (10)	Y6 (13)	Y1(16)	Y2 (19)	Y3 (13)	Y4 (19)	Y5 (20)	Y6 (15)
Better than expected	31%	55%	31%	9%	70%	31%	31%	5%	39%	47%	55%	27%
Expected progress	77%	100%	71%	64%	100%	77%	100%	84%	100%	95%	100%	80%
Difference PP/Non-PP (Expected)	-23%	+16%	-29%	-31%	0%	-17%	+23%	-16%	+29%	+31%	0%	+17%
Difference PP/Non-PP (Better than expected)	0%	+50%	-8%	-38%	+15%	+4%	0%	-50%	+8%	+38%	-15%	-4%
Number of children to = or better Non-PP	+3		+5	+4		+1						

Writing			Pupils elig	ible for Pl	P			Pu	pil not eli	gible for F	PP	
	Y1 (13)	Y2 (11)	Y3 (16)	Y4 (11)	Y5 (10)	Y6 (13)	Y1(16)	Y2 (19)	Y3 (13)	Y4 (19)	Y5 (20)	Y6 (15)
Better than expected	23%	64%	25%	27%	20%	46%	18%	37%	23%	47%	35%	7%
Expected progress	69%	100%	81%	73%	90%	92%	94%	100%	85%	95%	95%	93%
Difference PP/Non-PP (Expected)	-25%	0%	-4%	-22%	-5%	-1%	+25%	0%	+4%	+22%	+5%	+1%
Difference PP/Non-PP (Better than expected)	+5%	+27%	+2%	-20%	-15%	+39%	-5%	-27%	-2%	+20%	+15%	-39%
Number of children to = or better Non-PP	+4		+1	+3	+1	+1						

Maths			Pupils elig	ible for Pl	•			Pu	pil not eli	gible for F	PP	
	Y1 (13)	Y2 (11)	Y3 (16)	Y4 (11)	Y5 (10)	Y6 (13)	Y1(16)	Y2 (19)	Y3 (13)	Y4 (19)	Y5 (20)	Y6 (15)
Better than expected	0%	36%	13%	27%	20%	46%	6%	42%	15%	63%	30%	20%
Expected progress	77%	82%	94%	82%	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%	95%	95%	80%
Difference PP/Non-PP (Expected)	-23%	-13%	-6%	-13%	+5%	+12%	+23%	+13%	+6%	+13%	-5%	-12%
Difference PP/Non-PP (Better than expected)	-6%	-6%	-2%	+12%	-10%	+26%	+6%	+6%	+2%	-12%	+10%	-26%
Number of children to = or better Non-PP	+3	+2	+1	+2								

Attendance Data 2017-18

Note the figures for PP and Non-PP will be different in some year groups as the attendance data includes all children that were on roll from 01/09/17-31/07/18. This considers all joiners at different points over the course of the year.

			Pupil	s eligible	for PP					Pupil n	ot eligible	e for PP		
	R (13)	Y1 (14)	Y2 (9)	Y3 (18)	Y4 (11)	Y5 (10)	Y6 (12)	R (20)	Y1 (17)	Y2 (22)	Y3 (15)	Y4 (22)	Y5 (22)	Y6 (18)
Attendance 2017-18	93.91	97.19	94.27	95.34	94.51	91.91	95.03	94.46	96.14	95.96	98.32	97.30	95.73	95.70
National	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Difference from National	-2.09	1.19	-1.73	-0.66	-1.49	-4.09	-0.97	-1.54	0.14	-0.04	2.32	1.3	-0.27	-0.3
Authorised absence	4.02	2.53	4.04	4.27	4.26	6.00	3.69	3.92	3.70	2.76	1.40	2.02	3.10	3.90
Difference from National (3.1)	+0.92	-0.57	+0.94	+1.17	+1.16	+2.9	+0.59	+0.82	+0.6	-0.34	-1.7	-1.08	0	+0.8
Unauthorised	2.07	0.29	1.69	0.39	1.23	2.10	1.28	1.62	0.16	1.28	0.28	0.67	1.18	0.41
absence Difference from National (0.9)	+1.17	-0.61	+1.59	-0.51	+0.33	+1.2	+0.38	+0.72	-0.74	+0.38	-0.62	-0.23	+0.28	-0.49
Difference in attendance between PP/Non-PP	-0.55	+1.05	-1.69	-2.98	-2.79	-3.82	-0.67	+0.55	-1.05	+1.69	+2.98	+2.79	+3.82	+0.67

	R (8)	Y1 (9)	Y2 (4)	Y3 (8)	Y4 (6)	Y5 (5)	Y6 (7)
Attendance 2017-18	92.22	98.15	94.92	92.24	92.35	92.88	97.61
National	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Difference from National	-3.78	+2.15	-1.08	-3.76	-3.65	-3.12	+1.61
Authorised absence	4.29	1.56	3.88	7.05	6.76	6.24	1.79
Difference from National (3.1)	+1.19	-1.54	+0.78	+3.95	+3.66	+3.14	-1.31
Unauthorised	3.49	0.30	1.20	0.71	0.89	0.88	0.60
absence	3.47	0.50	1.20	0.71	0.07	0.00	0.00
Difference from National (0.9)	+2.59	-0.6	+0.3	-0.19	-0.01	-0.02	-0.3
		_				-	
Difference between PP/Non-PP boys	-1.18	2	-0.52	-5.89	-4.8	-3.69	1.95

			Pupils el	igible for	PP (girls)		
	R (5)	Y1 (5)	Y2 (5)	Y3 (10)	Y4 (5)	Y5 (5)	Y6 (5)
tendance 2017-18	95.99	95.28	93.65	97.95	96.58	90.90	91.95
National	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Difference from National	-0.01	-0.72	-2.35	+1.95	+0.58	-5.1	-4.05
Authorised	3.69	4.46	4.19	1.92	1.87	5.74	5.97
absence Difference	+0.59	+1.36	+1.09	-1.18	-1.23	+2.64	+2.87
from National (3.1)							
nauthorised	0.33	0.26	2.16	0.13	1.55	3.36	2.09
absence							
Difference from National (0.9)	-0.57	-0.64	+1.26	-0.77	+0.65	+2.46	+1.19
Difference PP boys and girls	+0.97	-0.84	-2.75	-0.51	-0.96	-3.83	-3.81

Contextual Data

Vulnerability- requiring family support

(vulnerability links to any child that falls into the following categories)

- CLA
- Children subject to Child Protection Plan
- CIN
- Children who are subject to Special Guardianship Order
- Children with SEND
- Children with mental health difficulties
- Children with Physical Health Issues
- Children in absolute poverty
- Young carers
- Children in troubled families
- Children whose parents are/have history of substance misuse
- Children whose parents have limited parental capacity
- Children who have had one or more fixed term exclusions
- Children involved with the police
- Children who have experienced childhood trauma/abuse
- Children in insecure/unstable housing

				All Pupils			
	R	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6
% of children with vulnerability	TBC- Nov 2018	47%	40%	50%	67%	57%	47%
% decrease or increase with the same cohort for the year before	N/A	-12%	-12%	-15%	-8%	-10%	-42%

			Pupils	eligible	for PP					Pupil n	ot eligible	e for PP		
	R	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	R	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6
% of children with vulnerability		70%	67%	75%	93%	88%	88%		35%	22%	41%	44%	33%	32%
Difference PP/Non-PP		+35%	+45%	+34%	+49%	+55%	+56%		-35%	-45%	-34%	-49%	-55%	-56%

3. DATA from 2017-18

- At KS1 Non- PP children did better than PP children in Reading, Writing and Maths. No PP children achieved GDS for Maths.
- At KS2 Non-PP children did better in terms of attainment than PP children across all subjects.
- Significant closing of the gap between PP and Non PP children in terms of attainment at the end of KS2. When results for these groups is compared for 2016-17 and 2017-18, PP children were seen to close the gap for Reading, EGPS and R,W, M combined. Writing gap was the same for both years. Maths between these two groups was slightly larger in 2017-18 than 2016-17.
- Greatest gap between PP children and Non-PP children was for Maths and EGPS in terms of attainment.
- Non-PP children attained better than PP children in all aspects of learning at EYFS. The gap in attainment between PP and Non-PP was the greatest in the following areas: Language, Understanding, Moving and Handling, Making Relationships, Reading, Writing and Numeracy
- Gap between PP and Non-PP children greatest in terms of attainment in Y1 for Reading, Writing and Maths as well as in Y3 for Reading and Maths. School to track these children carefully for the coming year (Y2 and Y4; Sept 2018)
- At EYFS Self-confidence and self-awareness, making relationships, Language and Understanding and Numeracy were the areas that PP children did not make as much progress when compared to Non-PP children. In all the other areas PP made better progress than Non PP children.
- PP made much more progress in Moving and Handling, The World and Technology when compared to Non-PP children
- Gap between PP and Non-PP children greatest in terms of progress in Y1 for Reading, Writing and Maths as well as Y3 for Reading and Y4 for Reading and Writing. Careful monitoring and timely interventions to be used that are in addition and different from, required for the coming year. (Y2, Y4 and Y5) Lead for this Keystage leads/SENDCo/Pupil Support Manager
- High levels of vulnerability across school. PP children much more vulnerable than Non-PP children- access to Family Support Manager, Pupil Support Manager and Learning Mentor vital
- In terms of attendance Y5 PP girls had the lowest overall attendance and the highest level of unauthorised attendance. For the coming year this to be closely monitored. (Y6 Sept 2018)
- Y1 PP children had the least levels of absence when compared with PP children in the other year groups. They had an attendance of 97.14%, which was 1.09% above national.(Y2 from Sept 2018)
- Y1 PP boys and Y6 PP boys had the highest attendance and both above national, when compared to PP boys across other year groups. (For the coming year monitor attendance of all PP boys ad Non PP boys in year groups 1 and 3 and PP boys for all year groups-see attendance action plan for further details)
- Y2 PP boys, Non PP boys and PP girls had attendance lower than National as well as high levels of unauthorised attendance. (Monitor this group of children; Y3 Sept 2018)
- When comparing PP attendance from 2017-18 to that of 2016-17 the attendance for Y2, Y5 and Y6 was lower than the previous year. All three year groups increased in % of unauthorised absences which has been largely due to families requesting holidays during term times. Another contributing factor has been around expectations around absences of our EAL families that are new to England. (close monitoring of Y3 and Y6 for Sept 2018)
- A high proportion of authorised absences across school for 2017-18 and also when compared to that of 2016-17. Data shows that a high percentage of these involving all siblings; family visits to homes suggesting living conditions/home environments being a contributory factor. EAL children also taking more days off school for illnesses that the rest of school might not take.
- Levels of vulnerability is starting to decrease in classes due to more stable families moving into school and also Family Support Manager work/pastoral team having impact. At the end of 2017-18, hence the start of 2018-19 academic year, levels of vulnerability decreased when compared to figures for the start of 2017-18.

In-sch	ool barriers- issues to be addressed in school				
Α.	On entry, historically poor speech and language skills amongst PP	children. This is impacting on children's ability to make progress.			
В.		relationships and emotional barriers amongst PP children are having a These areas also where EYFS PP children making the least amounts of progress			
C.	Limited life experiences when children join school.				
D		at EYFS and KS1 has meant that results have been inflated and children have neasures at the end of KS2 for PP children; especially in maths and with regards			
E	Increasing level of EAL children arriving in school, some with limit	ed English which is affecting data			
Extern	al barriers - issues which require outside action				
F	High levels of unauthorised absences and persistent absenteeism	amongst PP children			
G	High benefit uptake (51% children FSM Ever6), Deprivation (school in the top 20% for this) poverty and low-income families. School E/E* across the board- Socio economic indicators. Limited parental academic ability puts constraints on home support as a result less importance placed on education				
Н	Mental health issues, alcohol abuse and DV leading to anti-social b	oehaviour. Parents oversharing difficulties with children			
I	High levels of mobility across school, making tracking cohorts diff	icult. This also has an adverse effect on friendship groups			
4. De	sired outcomes				
	Desired outcomes and how they will be measured	Success criteria			
A.	Improved language skills, understanding and vocab for PP children across school	 % of PP children reaching expected for Language, Speaking and Understanding as part of CLL increases so that it is closer to National average and higher than 2017-18 Gap closes between PP and Non PP children for CLL and the individual aspects Progress made in CLL and each of the aspects of learning over the year is in line or better than that of Non PP children EGPS results improve at the end of KS2, especially for PP children. The gap closes to National average and Scaled score for PP is better than that of 2017-18 			
В.	PP children become more confident. They become more resilient to trying new things and form effective relationships and friendship groups	 % of PP children meeting expected standard for SSCA and Making Relationships increases from the year before The gap between PP children meeting the standard for SSCA and Making 			

		relationships closes when compared to that of 2017-18 • Impact report from the Learning mentor and individual case studies report progress made
C.	Provide children with enrichment events to enhance their life experiences	 Increase the levels of interest amongst children Increase levels of fascination and awe Develop personal interests, hobbies, passions and abilities Provide deeper understanding amongst children To enable further opportunities to have experiences otherwise not available to them and their families
D.	Accurate assessments across school will allow teachers to identify gaps and plug these in order to accelerate progress and improve attainment especially in Maths and EGPS	 Cluster moderation feedback from the SWAT and ELAT report accurate assessments in Y2 and EYFS School advisor moderates and accepts teacher assessments at EYFS, KS1 and KS2 % of PP children meeting the standard for Maths at EYFS, KS1 and KS2 increases given their starting points Progress at the end of KS2 for Maths is average and scaled score is above 100.0 In year data shows accelerated progress and closing of the gap between PP children and Non PP children
E.	Better integration and support for EAL children that are new to English	 Family Support Manager and Pupil Support Manager communicate expectations with regards to attendance, behaviour and importance of schooling so that attendance figures for this cohort does not decline EAL baseline assessments are carried out quickly and a EAL support package put in place EAL children continue to settle quickly into school with the help from a 'buddy' system Improvements seen in English proficiency from the starting points using the NASSEA framework
F.	Attendance rates for PP children improves so that it is closer to 96%, across school and groups as a whole and persistent absenteeism reduces	 Attendance for individual classes improves from previous years, so that overall this is 96% for PP children Individual PP children- attendance shows improvements term on term Case studies evidence support package/strategies for PA/struggling PP children % of persistent absenteeism decreases and is closer to the National figure and lower than the figure for 2017-18

G	Families readily access support services within and arranged by school. Parents more proactive in their children's learning and engage with school and adult learning to up skill themselves	 Families see school as first port of call when in need Families see school as a trusted support mechanism Higher uptake of families attending formal and informal events/sessions within and outside of school. Positive feedback from parents Increased levels of confidence amongst parents in supporting their children at home
Н	Mental Health and Wellbeing for pupils and their families is at the forefront and swift intervention is put in place	 Increased understanding amongst staff on how children with issues around mental health and wellbeing are identified and what strategies are put in place Increased staff awareness about the widespread nature of mental health problems in children Increased levels of engagement with parents/carers and families, through the pastoral team School effectively evidences positive mental health through a portfolio Staff/children can openly talk about how they are doing and what might be impacting on their mental well being Positive relationships are developed as evidenced by interviews/questionnaires
I	To ensure class sizes is at full capacity with little in term mobility	 Positive marketing/rebranding of the school School becomes much more visible in the community Attendance at community ventures Ensure that families are supported positively to ensure they access adequate housing with registered landlords Springboard 2017/18 to new houses, local nurseries and to those in the Stoneyholme area, as this is where the birth rate for the coming year is expected to increase and also at the library which engages community School manages to fill EYFS places from immediate school area and more people select Springfield as their first choice.

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2017/18

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?
Improved language skills, understanding and vocab for PP children across school	 Use of WellComm as a speech and language programme in EYFS and for children Whole school focus on teaching vocabulary SPAG.com to be used as a resource for children to access at home as online learning platform £199 	 Speech and language difficulties on entry Language and Understanding an area that PP children are not making as much progress on as they leave EYFS EGPS attainment not as high as other subjects at the end of KS2. 	 Tracking information on WellComm Analysing results from Spag.com in terms of results and levels of success. Considering termly data and progress in CLLfor children Analysing data on target tracker in terms of % children at age related and how much progress is being made. 	EH KB	Half termly
PP children become more confident. They become more resilient to trying new things and form effective relationships and	 Use of learning mentor for new reception children in forming relationships £28,221 Learning mentor delivers specific 	 At the end of EYFS for areas of learning, SSCA and MR % progress of PP children below that of Non PP children as well as attainment Time to talk reveals that most children want to talk to learning mentor about friendship groups 	 Analysis of target tracker information for EYFS children in terms of progress being made in SSCA and MR Impact report from Learning 	Pupil Support Manager AP EH	Half termly

friendship groups	bespoke programmes for children around confidence and forming effective relationships • Growth Mindset programme and TLR for member of staff along with training £1800.00 • Teachers report less reluctant to across school. I confidence of P	• Case studies evels of positive in terms	
Better integration and support for EAL children that are new to English	 TA3 with considerable EAL experience to work with EAL children (£15,283) Revisit and refine protocol around EAL children starting school Training around the NASSEA framework- staff EAL attends relevant courses to update knowledge-£500 	nool. Current no settling in lead- El 49. issues around	Termly

Accurate assessments across school will allow teachers to identify gaps and plug these in order to accelerate progress and improve attainment especially in Maths and EGPS	•	Annual Target tracker fee and training- £2000 SWAT cluster annual fee- £500 ELAT cluster annual fee- £400 Moderation opportunities with LA across the year for EYFS, KS1 and KS2 teachers- £1000 School undertakes Mastery readiness project training for two lead teachers, use of school as venue and cover- £1500 Replenish Maths	KS2 Data revealed: Progress measure for Maths -3.0 and progress of Maths across all year groups not as strong as it could be. See first section on data KS1 data revealed: Maths attainment not as strong as that of Reading. Decline when compared to the previous year.	•	Accurate assessments reported as a result of cluster meetings Accurate assessments as reported by SLT and school advisor Teachers ably identify gaps and planning demonstrates this % of children achieving the Expected + standard increases considering the children's starting points	Maths SL SLT	At Pupil Progress Meetings
	•	Toolkits to support the CPA approach (£200) Targeted pupils receive maths interventions (cost of support across school-£26050) Times table rock star resource-£50.00 Use of Power of, Plus 1, Perform with Time and Times table			Progress and scaled score at the end of KS2 is at least average, not statistically less and not less than 100.0		

	bundle resource for PP/ SEND children - £2000	
Mental Health and Wellbeing for pupils and their families is at the forefront and swift intervention is put in place	 Develop and review mental health and wellbeing action plan Continue to promote positive mental health and wellbeing through internal forms of communication such as posters, noticeboards, staff newsletters, school website letters and leaflets to parents (£500) Provide staff training around mental health and wellbeing in school (£1000) Provide a base for positive universal work around pupils and families to promote wellbeing at school and in the home Develop a sense of 	Mental health and wellbeing champion to lead WAS meetings with governors in attendance aswell Regular standing on pastoral team agenda Projects and themes across school Actions will be updated and work will continue towards achieving the Mental and Health Wellbeing award All stakeholders report they can talk about problems in a non-stigmatising way Increased understanding amongst staff on how children with issues around mental health and wellbeing are

connectedness,	identified and
focus and	what strategies
purpose amongst	are put in place
all stakeholders-	Increased staff
WAS change team	awareness about
Devise a system	the widespread
that readily	nature of mental
identifies	health problems
children with	in children
mental health	Increased levels
issues so that	of engagement
early	with
interventions can	parents/carers
be put in place	and families,
Through the	through the
pastoral team,	pastoral team
programmes are	All staff can spot
developed and	a developing
delivered that	problem
help pupils cope	effectively
with predictable	School continues
life changes and	to effectively
transitions	evidence positive
Pastoral	mental health
programmes are	through the
delivered for	website and /or
parents and	portfolio
children that	• Staff/children
focus on social	can openly talk
and emotional	about how they
development	are doing and
Set up	what might be
fundraising	impacting on
events for mental	their mental well
health charities	being
Ensure all	• Positive
stakeholders	relationships are
receive up to	developed as
date information	evidenced by
 l	

	around mental	interviews/quest	
	health and well	ionnaires	
	being		
•	Make use of the		
	CAMHS type		
	outside service as		
	a clear pathway		
	of getting early		
	support around		
	mental health		
•	Plan and deliver		
	programmes for		
	families that		
	promote positive		
	mental health		
	and wellbeing		
	(free through		
	adult learning)		
•	Provide relevant		
	training around		
	mental health		
	and wellbeing for		
	the pastoral		
	team <mark>(£1500)</mark>		
•	Access and		
	arrange for		
	outside mental		
	health advocates		
	to support		
	children in school		
•	EYFS children to		
	be assessed on		
	entry and across		
	the year using		
	The Leuven		
	Scales for		
	Wellbeing		
•	Continue with Mr		
	Brown's Boys		

	Club once a week- £300 for resources				
			Total bud	geted cost	£83,003
ii. Targeted su	pport				
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?
Families readily access support services within and arranged by school	 Full time Family Support Manager and Pupil Support Manager who work together as a team with parents on the following: Liaise regularly with the MASH/CART teams when families are on the cusp of Social Services Liaise with the Police CBM Liaise with Social Workers where children are subject to Child Protection Plans/CIN Instigate CAF's Chair TAF meetings Attend Child Protection Meetings, Core Group Meetings, CIN Meetings Liaise with external agencies where signposting families were an option i.e. 	High levels of vulnerability across school which has started to decline through the work of Family Support Manager Health LSIP 2016/17 shows: As a district, Burnley is significantly worse than the England average for the following: • Proportion of children in poverty has increased from 24.6 (2016) to 27.8 compared to Lancs- 19.1 and England- 20.1. Burnley has the highest district rate for this in Lancashire • Teenage pregnancies has increased from 34.2 (2016) to 41 (2017) compared to 25.1 Lancs and 20.8 England. Burnley has the highest district rate in for this • Alcohol Specific stays in hospital for under 18's has increased from 21.7 (2016) to 23.4. Burnley has the	 Monitoring of support provided and the impact this has on the individuals in school. FSM/PSM reports to governors 	Family Support Manager- JE Pupil Support Manager- AP	Ongoing monitoring as part of the pastoral team meeting

Fire Service, Young	highest district rate for this	
carers, Early Action	in Lancashire	
Police Team, Early	 Hospital stays for self-harm 	
Break, Safenet etc.	is at 294.6 compared to	
Liaise with housing	235.0 for Lancs and 196.5	
associations such as	for England. Burnley has	
Calico regarding rent	the second highest district	
arrears Anti-social	rate for this in Lancashire	
behaviour	rate for this in Earleasinic	
Assist parents whose		
children need		
medical		
appointments with		
ELCAS		
Meet with		
parents/carers to		
discuss personal issues and referrals		
to agencies		
Collect children from home and visit		
children reluctant to		
come to school		
Follow up on children		
with poor attendance		
and discuss the		
_ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Families/ Challenging		
Years		
importance with parents on why children should be in school • Support parents where their child has been excluded • Offer 1-1 parenting strategies to parents using Incredible Years/Strengthening		

offer support for online Secondary school places • Support families with poor IT skills - applying for secondary school places • Liaise with Lancs Adult Learning to deliver courses over the course of the year. • Support young parents with parenting classes/courses • Support and access support for parents who have alcohol/drug dependency (Cost-£30,756 for Family Support Manager Cost-£25, 128 for Pupil Support Manager)		Total bud	geted cost	£55,884
Desired 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?

	<u>, </u>		
Attendance rates for PP children improves so that it is closer to 96%, across school and groups as a whole and persistent absenteeism reduces	 Breakfast club- 8.00- 8.45 everyday (£10,061) Learning Mentor work around attendance Family Support Manager and Pupil Support Manager also part of this team (All staff already accounted for) Attendance lead tracking closely on a weekly basis Prizes for 100% attendance that increase in worth and value (£600) Pg girls had the lead attendance lower National as well a levels of unauthorised attendance. When comparing attendance from to that of 2016-12 attendance from to that of 2016-13 attendance for Y2 Y6 was lower that previous year. All year groups increof unauthorised a which has been lato families reques holidays during te Another contribut has been around expectations arou absences of our E 	issues on CPOMS decline from starting points Attendance improves for PP children when compared to figures from 2017-18 dance Y5 owest de and the endance. PP boys than is high rised PP 2017-18 The Ithe Ithe Ithe Ithe Ithe Ithe Ithe It	Learning Mentor Half termly followed by a more detailed report termly Family Support Manager Pupil Support Manager

			•	families that are new to England. A high proportion of authorised absences across school for 2017-18 and also when compared to that of 2016-17. Data shows that a high percentage of these absences pertain to their siblings as well; family visits to homes suggesting living conditions/home environments being a contributory factor. EAL children also taking more days off school for illnesses that the rest of school might not take.				
To ensure class sizes is at full capacity with little in term mobility	•	Springboard 2017/18 for all families and for key areas within the community (£1000) Use of minibus to transport EYFS children from Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Rd area	•	High levels of mobility which makes tracking cohorts difficult. This also affects class stability and friendship groups Classes still not at full capacity- 30 School attracts families from the immediate area, some of these do not have stable living arrangements New EYFS intake has come from out the area, who have been LA directed. School struggled to fill 30 places	•	Class numbers increase, and school moves towards 210- full (30 in each year group) Springboard ensures becomes first choice for parents from the immediate locality Mobility decreases when compared to previous years. Families choose to stay at Springfield EYFS parents	SN/MB- governor	Termly

Total cost for all actions	£172,357.83
Extra Monies from School budget	£35,077.83