|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Summary information** | | | | | |
| **School** | Bridgemere CE Primary School | | | | |
| **Academic Year** | 2019-20 | **Total PP budget** | £15,760  8 x £1320  2 x £2300  2 x £300 | **Date of most recent PP Review** | September 2019 |
| **Total number of children** | 76 | **Number of children eligible for PP** | 12 | **Date for next internal review of this strategy** | January 2020 and April 2020. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Current attainment end of KS2** | | |
|  | *Child eligible for PP (your school)* | *Child not eligible for PP (national average)* |
| **% achieving ARE or above in reading, writing and maths for end of KS2** | 67% |  |
| **% achieving ARE in reading** | 67% |  |
| **% achieving ARE in writing** | 67% |  |
| **% achieving ARE in maths** | 67% |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Barriers to future attainment** | |
|  | |
| **In-school barriers** | |
|  | Evident gaps in early reading, poor oral vocabulary |
|  | A lack of confidence and self esteem which impacts on learning |
| **C.** | Limited completion of supportive homework |
| **External barriers** | |
| **D.** | Many PP children do not frequently read, practise times-tables or spellings at home. |
| **E.** | Low parental aspirations, or lack of value attached to education |
| **F** | Issues within a child’s family or background |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Outcomes** | | |
|  | *Desired outcomes and how they will be measured* | *Success criteria* |
|  | All PP children have an opportunity to read and practise times-tables and spellings at school.  Measured by improved spelling as noticed during work scrutiny, enhanced times table speeds, enhanced reading age at least compatible with chronological age. | * PP children show improvements in early reading skills through phonics, or Accelerated Reader scores * Times Table Rockstar speeds increase * More accurate spellings seen in independent work. |
|  | Children in Year 1 meet the expected phonics standard | * Phonics standard for this group of pupils is at least in line with national average. |
|  | Children secure the combined measure in reading, writing and maths at the end of KS1 and KS2. | * 100% meet the R,W,M measure in both Key Stages |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Planned expenditure** | | | | | | |
| **Academic year** | **2019-20** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **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?** | **Cost** |
| To enable children to develop secure foundations for the development of early reading, thus reducing gaps as children progress through the school. | Implement a new synthetic phonics scheme with appropriate reading books which helps to develop early reading skills. | Phonics was not delivered consistently throughout the school. Reading books need to link with a child’s stage of phonics development in order to be effective and children need to develop fluency. | SLT have attended training and will work alongside a consultant throughout the year to support and embed the new scheme well.  All staff will attend training throughout the year so confidence is high and knowledge of the scheme and its implementation is secure.  All children will be screened to ensure they commence the scheme at the appropriate point for them.  All resources will be purchased to ensure the scheme can be implemented fully and effectively. | C. Middleton | The implementation will be reviewed 3 weeks after introduction and then on a half termly basis so any teething problems can be addressed. | £3062 |
| To ensure the development of writing is delivered through a quality text approach, to heighten reading for pleasure and motivation to write in a consistent approach. This in turn should improve the quality of writing throughout the school. | Implement the Read to Write Units of Work as they fit into our current process of writing. | Schools currently using the Read to Write units of work have already shown impact in their writing standards and these have been observed by the EHT. The units are driven by a quality text which encourages the children to read more widely and be exposed to new authors in some instances. The approach complements the school’s existent process of writing. | All staff will receive training on how the units of work are implemented.  The working walls in classrooms will clearly display the stage of the writing process and examples of how this can be effective. Children will use the working walls to support their writing.  SLT will scrutinise work to ensure quality is evident.  Moderation of children’s work throughout the Trust and beyond will help to track improvements and ensure standards are high. | B. Dolman  C. Middleton | The process of writing will be reviewed at the end of each half term.  Children’s books will be reviewed at the end of September and then half termly. | £2000 |
| To change the method in which Singapore Maths is delivered to be more effective in mixed year groups | To merge the content of the year groups so it can be delivered over a 2 year timeframe. Time will be spent ensuring there is progression of skills and knowledge so as not to disadvantage any child in their current learning. This will make it easier for a teacher to deliver the content and assess children’s needs consistently. | Monitoring of maths standards throughout the school has been a little inconsistent compared to academies with single year groups. Following research and discussion with other Headteachers experiencing these difficulties, it was decided to implement a new method. | Maths subject leader, Head of School and Executive Headteacher will monitor the new method closely. Staff have been guided through the changes with the rationale for change explained.  Feedback will be taken from children to gather their views and ensure the sessions are ambitious for all. Feedback will be taken from staff to establish whether the change of method is having the desired effect and making life easier in the classroom.  SLT will scrutinise work to ensure quality is evident. Lesson visits will reveal quality of the sessions.  Moderation of children’s work throughout the Trust and beyond will help to track improvements and ensure standards are high. | D. Slater  S. Torrie  B. Dolman | All aspects of Singapore Maths will be reviewed half termly. | £2000 |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | **£7062** |
| **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?** | **Cost** |
| To close existent gaps in spelling and maths | Implement the IDL online tool | This product was used last year and the results show impact through reduced gaps as evident in books. There is also an online assessment attached to the programme and every child enhanced their scores. | SENCO will deliver training to refresh staff so they are clear of its use.  Staff will train the targeted children to use the programme and time will be provided outside of the curriculum for children to use it. | A. Pike | Termly review undertaken by SENCO. | £349 |
| For all children to continue to improve the knowledge, speed and enjoyment they have for multiplication tables. | Timestables Rockstars | In accordance with the new school homework policy, maths homework has been simplified so that children can focus on learning the multiplication tables. | Class teachers will monitor children’s usage, speed and achievement using the software.  Review times tables results at the end of each term to monitor improvement. | D. Slater | December 2019  April 2020  July 2020 | £87 |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | **£436** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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?** | **Cost** |
| To improve the of children’s self-esteem, confidence and resilience to tackle the challenges of the curriculum. | Resilient Classroom, Cool Connections interventions.  Trained TA will deliver the intervention to targeted children | Having spent some funding last year upskilling a member of staff, we have moved away from using an external provider to deliver this intervention. The impact last year was very positive and the children truly valued the sessions. | Children will be reassessed termly.  Sessions will be observed and children will provide feedback at the start and end of the programme | S. Hollowood | January 2019  May 2019 | £700 |
| To support reading and sentence construction for children in KS1/EYFS. | Beanstalk 1:1 sessions | The children accessing this resource made significant progress and have closed some of the gaps. Children said they enjoyed the sessions and found them useful. | Regular benchmarking will show improvements in the children’s reading.  Observations of support sessions are planned. | C. Middleton to liaise with Beanstalk volunteer. | January 2019  May 2019 | £660 |
| To provide targeted support sessions to PP children in areas of weakness identified by teacher assessment and termly data analysis. | PP specific TA appointed - 9 hours per week | PP TA support sessions have been run in the past as additional hours. These have changed throughout the year for various reasons and this has made planning and tracking impact difficult. This approach will be more reliable and easier to manage due to changes moving forward. | Impact of the support sessions will be monitored through data analysis, observations and work scrutiny | C. Middleton | December 2018  April 2019  July 2019 | £6900 |
| **Total budgeted cost** | | | | | | **£8263** |
| **Overall Total Budget Spend** | | | | | | **£15,761** |