

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

The governors of Elmhurst School have agreed that the Pupil Premium funding will prioritise disadvantaged children but wherever possible these groups will include non-pupil premium children.

1. Summary information					
School	Elmhurst School				
Academic Year	2016/17	Total PP budget	£146,000	Date of most recent PP Review	January 2017
Total number of pupils	480	Number of pupils eligible for PP	119	Date for next internal review of this strategy	March 2018

Key Stage 2 Progress measures for the 2016/17 Year 6 cohort

There were 58 pupils in the Year 6 cohort of which 50 had Key Stage 1 scores. Key Stage 1 scores are divided into three attainment bands: low, middle and high. The tables below show the total number of pupils in each prior attainment band and the number of disadvantaged pupils in each band (there were 15 disadvantaged pupils with a KS1 prior attainment score in Year 2 in 2016/17). A positive progress score means that, on average, pupils made more progress than pupils nationally with the same prior attainment at Key Stage 1. A negative progress score means that, on average, pupils made less progress than pupils nationally with the same prior attainment at Key Stage 1. The comparator national average for the progress of all pupils in each band is set at zero. The comparator national average shown for disadvantaged pupils is the average progress made by non-disadvantaged pupils. The Government expects schools to compare the performance of their disadvantaged pupils against the performance of non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.

Average progress in reading from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2

Prior attainment	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Disadvantaged	All	Disadvantaged	All	Disadvantaged
Group						
Number of pupils	11	5	33	9	6	1
Progress Score	-3.82	-4.64	-2.34	-5.50	2.53	4.52
National average	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.28
Difference	-3.82	-5.11	-2.34	-5.83	+2.53	+4.24

Average progress in writing from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2

Prior attainment	Low		Middle		High	
	All	Disadvantaged	All	Disadvantaged	All	Disadvantaged
Group						
Number of pupils	11	5	33	9	6	1
Progress Score	-2.35	-3.74	-1.83	-4.50	-2.07	-3.76
National average	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.13
Difference	-2.35	-4.21	-1.84	-4.67	-2.07	-3.89

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

Average progress in mathematics from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2

Prior attainment	Low		Middle		High	
Group	All	Disadvantaged	All	Disadvantaged	All	Disadvantaged
Number of pupils	11	5	33	9	6	1
Progress Score	-1.54	-2.58	-1.57	-2.98	-0.71	-1.72
National average	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.20
Difference	-1.54	-3.16	-1.57	-3.28	-0.71	-1.92

Commentary

Progress scores in reading, writing and mathematics for all low prior attaining pupils and disadvantaged pupils in this group were all lower than national averages. This was also the case with middle prior attaining pupils in reading, writing and mathematics.

The one high prior attaining disadvantaged pupil achieved a positive progress score in reading but not in writing or mathematics.

These progress scores were all much lower than in 2015/16 when they were all positive for both all pupils and disadvantaged pupils.

Other End of Key Stage 2 Data 2016/2017 (Cohort of 58 pupils in Year 6 of which 53 were eligible for KS2 tests, & of which 16 were eligible for Pupil Premium Funding)

Note that one pupil who was classified as disadvantaged was absent for the Key Stage 2 tests

	Disadvantaged Pupils		National (non-disadvantaged pupils)	
	% of pupils achieving expected standard	Average scaled score	% of pupils achieving expected standard	Average scaled score
Reading	25%	94.0	77%	105.3
Writing	38%		81%	
Maths	38%	97.0	80%	105.3
Grammar, Punctuation & Spelling	56%	100.9	82%	107.0
Combined Reading, Writing & Maths	13%	NA	67%	NA

Note that the Government uses a comparison between the performance of pupils for whom the school receives the Pupil Premium and all other pupils nationally for whom schools do not receive the Pupil Premium for all statutory national assessments.

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

Commentary:

The percentage of disadvantaged Year 6 pupils in 2016/2017 for whom the school received the Pupil Premium and who achieved the expected standard in reading, writing, mathematics and grammar, punctuation and spelling was below expectation and well below results for disadvantaged children in Year 6 in 2015/2016. This pattern was repeated in terms of the average scaled scores for reading, mathematics and grammar, punctuation and spelling.

The school has carefully evaluated these results for 2016/17 and taken decisive actions to ensure that outcomes for disadvantaged children for whom the school receives the Pupil Premium will achieve much higher standards at the end of Key Stage 2 in 2017/18 (see detailed plans in the 2017/18 Strategy for Disadvantaged Pupils).

End of Key Stage 1 Data 2016/2017 (Cohort of 62 pupils in Year 2, of which 13 were eligible for Pupil Premium)

	All pupils (62)	Disadvantaged Pupils (13)	National (non-disadvantaged pupils)
	% pupils achieving expected standard	% pupils achieving expected standard	% of pupils achieving expected standard
Reading	68	85	78
Writing	63	69	71
Maths	66	62	78

Commentary:

The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving the expected standard in reading was above that for all pupils at Elmhurst and above that for all non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.

The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving the expected standard in writing was above that for all pupils at Elmhurst and broadly in line with that for all non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.

The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving the expected standard in mathematics was broadly in line with that for all pupils at Elmhurst and below that for all non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.

	All pupils (62)	Disadvantaged Pupils (13)	National (non-disadvantaged pupils)
	% pupils achieving greater depth	% pupils achieving greater depth	% of pupils achieving greater
Reading	21	23	28
Writing	3	0	18
Maths	21	23	23

Commentary:

The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving greater depth in reading was in line with that for all pupils at Elmhurst and a little below that for all non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.

No disadvantaged pupil achieved greater depth in writing and this was a lower percentage than that for all non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.

The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving greater depth in mathematics was broadly in line with that for all pupils at Elmhurst and for all non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

Year 1 Phonics Screening Test Data 2017 (Cohort of 59 pupils in Year 1, of which 13 were eligible for Pupil Premium)

All Pupils (59)	Disadvantaged Pupils (13)	National all pupils
% of pupils achieving expected standard	% of pupils achieving expected standard	% of pupils achieving expected standard
69	62	81

Commentary:

The proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving the expected standard in the phonics test was a little below that for all pupils at Elmhurst and below that for all pupils nationally.

Year 2 Phonics Screening Re-Test Data 2017 (Cohort of 62 pupils, of whom 13 were eligible for Pupil Premium)

All Pupils (62)	Disadvantaged Pupils (13)	National all pupils
% of pupils achieving expected standard	% of pupils achieving expected standard	% of pupils achieving expected standard
85	77	92

Commentary:

The proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving the expected standard by the end of Year 2 was a little below that for all pupils at Elmhurst and below that for all pupils nationally.

End of Early Years Foundation Stage Data 2017 (Cohort of 58 pupils in the Reception Year, of which 17 were eligible for Pupil Premium)

Good level of development by the end of the Reception Year	All Pupils (58)	Disadvantaged Pupils (17)	National all pupils
	% pupils achieving a good level of development	% of pupils achieving a good level of development	% of pupils achieving a good level of development
	66	65	70.7

Commentary:

The proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving a good level of development was in line with all pupils at Elmhurst and a little below that of all pupils nationally.

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

2. Review of expenditure																			
Previous Academic Year 2016/17		Review of outcomes and expenditure in 2016/17																	
i. Quality of teaching for all																			
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned:	Cost															
A) Improve readiness to learn for pupils eligible for PP in EYFS.	BLT EYFS Project – Improving Outcomes Diminishing Differences The project began in February 2017. The project focused on identifying gaps and putting actions into place to narrow the gaps between PP and non-PP.	69% of PP reached GLD compared to 45% of PP in 2015-2016	Continue the principles of the project across EYFS and begin immediately in September 2017	£0															
B) PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with national non-PP children in reading, writing and mathematics.	All staff have a target for PP attainment/progress on their performance management document.	All staff have had a target for PP attainment/progress on their performance management document. This has raised the profile of PP across the school. However, the profile of PP needs to be raised even further as the end of year whole school data shows that in general the gap has widened rather than narrowed.	Staff should continue to have PP targets on their performance management documents. The profile of PP needs to be raised even further across the school so that all teachers and support staff understand the importance of PP.	£0															
	Additional LSA in Y4 to focus on pupils who are in receipt of PP but are not SEN.	<p>The Year 4 data was as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>PP</th> <th>Non-PP</th> <th>Gap</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>33.3%</td> <td>72.72%</td> <td>-39.39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>28.57%</td> <td>69.70%</td> <td>-41.13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maths</td> <td>42.85%</td> <td>72.72%</td> <td>-29.87%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>20% of the Year 4 cohort were also SEN. However, this does not significantly diminish the difference between PP and non-PP results.</p>		PP	Non-PP	Gap	Reading	33.3%	72.72%	-39.39%	Writing	28.57%	69.70%	-41.13%	Maths	42.85%	72.72%	-29.87%	Where extra adults are used to support PP children, further monitoring needs to take place to ensure that they are providing quality support and interventions to these children. In Year 5 extra support, in the form of boosters, interventions and additional Maths sets, will need to be given to PP children.
	PP	Non-PP	Gap																
Reading	33.3%	72.72%	-39.39%																
Writing	28.57%	69.70%	-41.13%																
Maths	42.85%	72.72%	-29.87%																

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

	<p>Leader designated to PP to lead PP throughout the school to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work alongside the head teacher to strategically deliver the pupil premium offer, which narrows the attainment gap for pupil premium students • Generate a tailored offer to meet individual needs informed by pupil, staff and parental input. • Uphold and continually demonstrate the vision and ethos through personalised intervention and enrichment provision. • Design, implement, monitor and evaluate the whole-school programme. • Work with/designate interventions where teachers work with individual and small groups of disadvantaged pupils, supporting and mentoring them to improve and maintain progress. • Identify and analyse current patterns of vulnerability of pupils at the school. • Be responsible for the deployment of additional resources targeted at improving outcomes for disadvantaged pupils, and to monitor and evaluate its impact • Analyse data and adapt provision where required. • Analyse the impact of PP funding in all areas. 	<p>The gap between PP and non-PP for the end of KS1 has closed. PP children achieved higher than non-PP children in reading and maths.</p> <p>The gap between PP and non-PP for the end of KS2 has widened significantly. However, 25% of the Y6 cohort are also SEN. See individual case studies for progress and support put in place throughout the year.</p>	<p>Pupil premium provision has been recorded throughout the year and data has been analysed. However, further monitoring and evaluating needs to take place to ensure that all classes are carrying out the interventions and boosters stated in an effective fashion.</p> <p>Ensure that newly purchased data system is introduced and used effectively as a way for teachers to plan and assess.</p> <p>Ensure that new purchased data system is used effectively by all leaders to monitor and drill down into vulnerable groups, disadvantaged pupils being one of these.</p>	<p>£10,000</p>
--	---	--	---	----------------

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

	<p>Targeted teacher support in core subjects – all PP children to have a guided session in a core subject with a qualified teacher at least x2 per week, x2 terms per year.</p>	<p>100% of PP children have received a guided session with a qualified teacher in English and Maths at least x2 per week, x2 terms per year. End of Year Data – Comparison between DP and non-DP % who were Secure+</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="786 343 1350 743"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th></th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">1</td> <td>DP 13</td> <td>53.85</td> <td>46.15</td> <td>46.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-DP 44</td> <td>67.39</td> <td>63.04</td> <td>60.87</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">2</td> <td>DP 12</td> <td>83.34</td> <td>66.67</td> <td>66.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-DP 50</td> <td>64.00</td> <td>62.00</td> <td>64.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">3</td> <td>DP 21</td> <td>61.91</td> <td>61.91</td> <td>57.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-DP 33</td> <td>69.70</td> <td>69.70</td> <td>69.69</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">4</td> <td>DP 21</td> <td>33.33</td> <td>28.57</td> <td>42.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-DP 33</td> <td>72.72</td> <td>69.70</td> <td>72.72</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">5</td> <td>DP 22</td> <td>63.64</td> <td>45.45</td> <td>45.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-DP 32</td> <td>71.88</td> <td>59.38</td> <td>62.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">6</td> <td>DP 16</td> <td>35.29</td> <td>35.29</td> <td>47.06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-DP 40</td> <td>62.50</td> <td>62.50</td> <td>72.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year		Reading	Writing	Maths	1	DP 13	53.85	46.15	46.15	Non-DP 44	67.39	63.04	60.87	2	DP 12	83.34	66.67	66.67	Non-DP 50	64.00	62.00	64.00	3	DP 21	61.91	61.91	57.15	Non-DP 33	69.70	69.70	69.69	4	DP 21	33.33	28.57	42.85	Non-DP 33	72.72	69.70	72.72	5	DP 22	63.64	45.45	45.45	Non-DP 32	71.88	59.38	62.50	6	DP 16	35.29	35.29	47.06	Non-DP 40	62.50	62.50	72.50	<p>Ensure that guided groups are taking place and are high-quality. Ongoing monitoring and training to ensure that best practise is shared. Effective use of the newly purchased data package to ensure that teaching and learning opportunities are effective and progress is made.</p>	<p>£14,000</p>
Year		Reading	Writing	Maths																																																											
1	DP 13	53.85	46.15	46.15																																																											
	Non-DP 44	67.39	63.04	60.87																																																											
2	DP 12	83.34	66.67	66.67																																																											
	Non-DP 50	64.00	62.00	64.00																																																											
3	DP 21	61.91	61.91	57.15																																																											
	Non-DP 33	69.70	69.70	69.69																																																											
4	DP 21	33.33	28.57	42.85																																																											
	Non-DP 33	72.72	69.70	72.72																																																											
5	DP 22	63.64	45.45	45.45																																																											
	Non-DP 32	71.88	59.38	62.50																																																											
6	DP 16	35.29	35.29	47.06																																																											
	Non-DP 40	62.50	62.50	72.50																																																											

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

	<p>School visit funding to subsidise residential trips. Additional funding is used to give time to the SMSC leader to support parents to make applications for the William Harding Fund. Recommendations are also made by the SMSC leader, reports written and information gathered.</p>	<p>The following trips have taken place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Energize production at Aylesbury Waterside Theatre (Y6) - Cinema trips (all year groups) (free for all children) - RAF Hendon (Y4) - Wendover Wood (Y1) - Twits Theatre Trip (Y3) - Whipsnade Zoo (Y1) - Primary Youth Leadership Conference (Y5/6) - Harry Potter (Y5) - Tower of London (Y2) - Choir Visit to Hillside Nursing Home (KS2) - Chiltern Open Air Museum (Y4) - PGL Osmington Bay (Y6) - Big Bang Science Conference (Y6) - Maths Enrichment Morning (Y5) - Caldecotte (Y4) - Variety of Sports Festivals (Y1-6) <p>Two children in Year 5 were part funded to attend school trip to Harry Potter World. This enabled them to have the experience which linked to their English work and, therefore, helped them to produce higher-quality writing. <i>See individual case study.</i></p>	<p>Parents need to be made aware that there is funding available. Parental engagement officer to target DP families and ensure they are signposted to the correct funding support.</p>	<p>£6,000</p>
--	--	---	--	---------------

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

	<p>Part funding of visitors in school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comic artist visit (KS2) • Space Dome (EYFS) • Pantomine (whole school) • Cycling (Upper KS2) • Childline (Upper KS2) • Artist for Roald Dahl day (KS2) • PCSO (KS1) • IMPs (Yr 6) • Young Enterprise (Yr6) • Aylesbury Grammar students running G&T interventions (Yr 5/6) • Aylesbury High School students running G&T interventions (Yr 5/6) • Chicks (EYFS) • Viking Day (LKS2) • Anglo-Saxon Day (LKS2) • MKBrass (whole school) • Aylesbury Youth Action (KS2) • Nurses (Y5/6) 	<p>The following visitors have visited school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comic artist visit (KS2) • Space Dome (EYFS) • Pantomine (whole school) • Cycling (Upper KS2) • Childline (Upper KS2) • Artist for Roald Dahl day (KS2) • PCSO (KS1) • IMPs (Yr 6) • Young Enterprise (Yr6) • Aylesbury Grammar students running G&T interventions (Yr 5/6) • Aylesbury High School students running G&T interventions (Yr 5/6) • Chicks (EYFS) • Viking Day (LKS2) • Anglo-Saxon Day (LKS2) • MKBrass (whole school) • Aylesbury Youth Action (KS2) • Nurses (Y5/6) <p>These experiences enhanced the broad and balanced curriculum that the children experience in school and gave pupils a greater life experience to draw upon when writing.</p>	<p>Visitors to the school will continue next academic year as the cost of many of these is minimal.</p>	<p>£3,000</p>						
<p>B) PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with national non-PP children in reading, writing and mathematics.</p> <p>D) Increased attendance and punctuality rates for pupils eligible for PP.</p>	<p>Learning mentor to work with children targeted by Key Stage leaders, teachers and AHT for safeguarding to address the needs of learners who require help in overcoming barriers to learning in order to achieve their full potential. Children are targeted for a set period of time, normally 1 term.</p>	<p>Learning mentor worked with 9 children, of which 7 were eligible for Pupil Premium.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="786 1026 1449 1090"> <tr> <td>Year 6</td> <td>1 pupil</td> <td>Case study M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 5</td> <td>6 pupils</td> <td>Case study L</td> </tr> </table> <p>This has had a positive impact on children's confidence, self-esteem and emotional well-being.</p> <p>See individual case studies.</p>	Year 6	1 pupil	Case study M	Year 5	6 pupils	Case study L	<p>This targeted work will continue next year for DP in the first instance.</p>	<p>£6,000</p>
Year 6	1 pupil	Case study M								
Year 5	6 pupils	Case study L								

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

B) PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with national non-PP children in reading, writing and mathematics.	Phonics intervention Y1	<p>All 13 Year 1 PP pupils were sent home phonics activities and these were completed with different levels of adult involvement. All children in the project were exposed to Phase 5 phonics, increasing their potential to read and spell at age appropriate levels. All children in the project were taught phonics by a qualified teacher, rather than a Teaching assistant. See Phonics headline data.</p> <p>8 pupils passed the phonics screening, 62%. All children who did not pass got higher scores than in the practise screening in December 2016, prior to the start of the project. 3 pupils who were working well below the expected level at the start of the year passed the screening. Of the 5 who did not pass 2 pupils scored 26 and 27, increasing from 19 and 10 respectively.</p>	Whilst this project was a success, it would have had more impact if it was started earlier in the year. Next year the children need to be baselined in September (or in the Summer Term of Reception) so that PP children not on track to pass the phonics screening test can be targeted from September.	£2,000
	Small group focus SPAG intervention for children targeted for the expected level in Y6 led by senior leader	<p>12 Year 6 PP children participated in this intervention.</p> <p><i>56% of PP achieved EXS in SPAG</i></p>	<i>56% of PP achieved EXS but the target is to improve on this outcome for 2018. 80% of DP children are being targeted to make EXS.</i>	£8,000
	<p>Small group focus reading intervention for children targeted for the expected level in Y6 led by senior leader</p> <p>Reading intervention Y6 run 1x week for 30 minutes by Y6 teachers for each Y6 class.</p>	<p>Small group focus reading interventions were run by class teachers, DHT, HT and booster teachers.</p> <p>13 PP children participated in at least one of these interventions. Of these, 5 children achieved the expected standard in reading for teacher assessment. See individual case studies for children who did not reach the expected standard. <i>25% of PP achieved EXS</i></p> <p>See individual case studies.</p> <p>One PP child attended a greater depth intervention for reading, run by the class teacher. This child achieved greater depth on teacher assessments. <i>Pupil achieved a scaled score of 115.</i></p>	Small group reading interventions to take place next year for pupils targeted for EXS and GD.	£12,000
	Small group focus maths intervention for children targeted for mastery in Y6 led by senior leader	<p>Two PP children attended a mastery maths intervention run by class teachers. One child achieved greater depth on teacher assessments.</p> <p><i>The two children achieved scale scores of 109 and 104.</i></p>	Small group maths interventions to take place next year for pupils targeted for EXS and GD.	£8,000
A) Improve readiness to learn for pupils eligible for PP in EYFS.	Nurture group YR	<p>3 PP children from Reception attended nurture group. Of these, 1 achieved a good level of development. The nurture group led to increased confidence, improved turn taking and sharing skills, and improved speaking and listening skills. Additional maths and English support was given to these children through nurture group. This improved children's readiness to learn.</p>	<p>Nurture group to continue for new Reception cohort in 2017-2018.</p> <p>Forest Schools to begin from September 2017 for YR and Y1.</p>	£5,000

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

<p>B) PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with national non-PP children in reading, writing and mathematics.</p>	<p>First Class at Number intervention KS1/KS2 (10 weeks x2 per week for each Key Stage)</p>	<p>In the following progress results, the highlighted cells show PP children.</p> <p>Y3 progress results:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="786 312 1055 560"> <tr><td>+ 2 years 5 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 1 year 9 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 1 year</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 2 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 10 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 6 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 8 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 6 months</td></tr> </table> <p>Y6 progress results:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1189 312 1458 536"> <tr><td>- 2 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 6 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 6 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 1 year 11 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 2 years 2 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 4 months</td></tr> <tr><td>+ 2 years 7 months</td></tr> </table> <p>The KS1 intervention did not take place in the Autumn and Spring terms due to staffing changes. However, it was restarted in the Summer Term.</p>	+ 2 years 5 months	+ 1 year 9 months	+ 1 year	+ 2 months	+ 10 months	+ 6 months	+ 8 months	+ 6 months	- 2 months	+ 6 months	+ 6 months	+ 1 year 11 months	+ 2 years 2 months	+ 4 months	+ 2 years 7 months	<p>This intervention made a significant positive impact on targeted children, both PP and non-PP. Interventions to run for both KS1 and KS2 children in 2017-2018 for the whole year.</p>	<p>£4,000</p>	
+ 2 years 5 months																				
+ 1 year 9 months																				
+ 1 year																				
+ 2 months																				
+ 10 months																				
+ 6 months																				
+ 8 months																				
+ 6 months																				
- 2 months																				
+ 6 months																				
+ 6 months																				
+ 1 year 11 months																				
+ 2 years 2 months																				
+ 4 months																				
+ 2 years 7 months																				
<p>B) PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with national non-PP children in reading, writing and mathematics.</p>	<p>PP children are heard read by an adult in school at least 5x per week, every week.</p>	<p>In most classes, PP children have been heard read by an adult in school at least 5x per week, every week. In four classes, PP children have been heard read at least 3x per week.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="786 799 1447 1023"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">% of DP reaching EXS in Reading</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Secure+</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1</td><td>53.84</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>83.34</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>61.91</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>33.33</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>63.64</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>35.29</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	% of DP reaching EXS in Reading		Year	Secure+	1	53.84	2	83.34	3	61.91	4	33.33	5	63.64	6	35.29	<p>Ensure that all PP children are heard at least 5x per week. Whilst the majority of PP children are heard 5 times per week in school, this is not appearing to have an impact on the whole school reading data.</p> <p>Expectations for adult reading need to be restated to ensure that adults are questioning children to develop their comprehension skills as well as developed their word reading skills.</p> <p>LSAs will have regular CPD led by the SENDCo/SLT to ensure that good practise is disseminated regularly.</p>	<p>£19,600</p>
% of DP reaching EXS in Reading																				
Year	Secure+																			
1	53.84																			
2	83.34																			
3	61.91																			
4	33.33																			
5	63.64																			
6	35.29																			
	<p>Easter School Y6 - 2 x Senior leaders and Y6 teachers delivering interventions for a week during the Easter Holiday and during Saturday School prior to SATs week.</p>	<p>10 PP children attended Easter School. A further 4 children were invited but failed to attend. These were children who were not on track to reach the expected level in reading and/or maths. Of those that attended, 3 reached the expected level in reading (teacher assessment) and 6 reached the expected level in maths (teacher assessment).</p> <p>Saturday School did not take place because it was felt that this would not have a positive impact on the children and that it would be more beneficial for them to have a rest before SATs week.</p>	<p>Easter School had a positive effect on some children.</p> <p>Easter School will take place for academic year 2017/18 and will focus on targeted pupils. Attendance at this intervention will be crucial.</p>	<p>£4,000</p>																

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

	Lexia intervention KS1/KS2	<p>This was funded through the SEN budget. This money was reallocated to provide extra boosters for Y6 through the appointment of a booster teacher for the Summer Term.</p> <p>In Y6, the teacher carried out boosters for arithmetic, reasoning, reading and writing.</p> <p>All 3 children who attended arithmetic booster and all 4 children who attended reasoning booster reached expected standard on teacher assessments.</p> <p>2 children attended reading boosters and both reached expected on teacher assessments.</p> <p>Kestrels – 2 attended and reached expected on teacher assessments.</p>	Quality teaching in boosters had a positive impact on targeted children.	£2,000
--	----------------------------	---	--	--------

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure **and outcomes** for 2016/2017

ii. Other approaches				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	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
C) Increased home support, leading to greater parental engagement.	Parental engagement officer to work to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> target PP parents focusing on attendance and punctuality this year work with individual parents in the home, ensuring children have everything they need to access school and learning work with parents receiving support from the Family Resilience Team or Social Care to bridge the gap between school and home 	PP attendance for 2016-2017 was 95.03%, compared to 94.83% for non-PP. This is an increase on 93.08% PP and 93.89% non-PP in 2015-2016. Furthermore the gap has closed and PP attendance is now better than non-PP attendance. Furthermore, the percentage of unauthorised absences has decreased and the percentage for PP unauthorised absences is now in line with non-PP unauthorised absences. The percentage of those late before the register closed was 1.21% for PP and 0.85% for non-PP. The percentage of those late after the register closed was 0.12% for PP and 0.05% for non-PP. This is higher than in 2015-2016 and the gap between PP and non-PP has widened. See attendance case study. See individual case studies for parental engagement.	Further focus needs to be placed on improving punctuality for 2017-2018.	£6,000
D) Increased attendance and punctuality rates for pupils eligible for PP.	Part funding of Breakfast Club and subsidised food – 2x adult time required daily between 7:45am – 8:45am.	61% of pupils attending Breakfast Club were PP. This compares to 16% last year. These children improved punctuality due to attending Breakfast Club.	This will continue in 2017-2018.	£3,000
C) Increased home support, leading to greater parental engagement.	Part funding of reading club – adult time required daily 3:15 – 4pm.	54% of children attending Reading Club were PP. This is in line with last year. This enables children to access books and allows more parents to work.	This will continue in 2017-2018.	£1,500
C) Increased home support, leading to greater parental engagement.	Parental workshops provided and Parental Engagement Officer to target parents of PP children to ensure they are aware of the workshops available and encourage them to attend so they can support their child at home.	See individual case studies for parental engagement.	Parental engagement officer has had a positive effect on families worked with. In 2017-2018, parental engagement officer will ensure that she is working with pupil premium families with the expectation that 30% of places are taken up by DP parents.	£1,000

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure and outcomes for 2016/2017

<p>B) PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with national non-PP children in reading, writing and mathematics.</p>	<p>A range of extra-curricular clubs are to be made available for PP children. One-third of club places are reserved for children in receipt of PP. Teachers are to ensure parents of PP children are given letters the day they come out and give them the opportunity to complete immediately.</p>	<p>70% of PP children accessed an extra-curricular club, compared to 62% of non-PP children.</p> <p>However, 19% of PP children accessed a sports club, compared to 35% of non-PP children. This may have been due to the fact that all sports clubs required parental funding.</p>	<p>In 2017-2018, most sports clubs will be free of charge. Football club will be charged for at a low cost.</p>	<p>£10,000</p>
<p>B) PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with national non-PP children in reading, writing and mathematics.</p>	<p>A homework club is run each term for 45 minutes to allow PP children to attend.</p>	<p>40 PP children attended homework club compared to 53 non-PP children. This equated to 43% of those attending homework club being eligible for PP.</p>	<p>Homework clubs will continue in all three terms for Y1-6 in 2017-2018.</p>	<p>£3,000</p>
<p>B) PP children in KS1 and KS2 achieve in line with national non-PP children in reading, writing and mathematics.</p>	<p>The library is open during KS1 and KS2 lunchtimes every day to allow children to read a range of books.</p>	<p>In most classes, PP children have been heard read by an adult in school at least 5x per week, every week. In four classes, PP children have been heard read at least 3x per week. 63% of PP children read five times every week at home.</p>	<p>Whilst the majority of PP children are heard 5 times per week in school, this is not appearing to have an impact on the whole school reading data.</p> <p>Expectations for adult reading need to be restated to ensure that adults are questioning children to develop their comprehension skills as well as developed their word reading skills.</p>	<p>£6,000</p>
<p>C) Increased home support, leading to greater parental engagement.</p>	<p>Class teachers to chase children and parents if they have not read 5 times per week at home.</p>	<p>63% of PP children read five times every week at home of PP children are now reading at home. Teachers regularly communicate with parents through planners and encourage children to read at home. Rewards for reading at home have been stopped to reinforce that reading at home is an expectation.</p>	<p>Monitoring has raised questions about whether children are reading at home or just signing planners. This needs further and more robust monitoring in 2017-2018.</p>	<p>£0</p>
<p>C) Increased home support, leading to greater parental engagement.</p>	<p>Parental Engagement Officer to target parents of PP children to attend ESOL.</p>	<p>Parental engagement officer has had a positive effect on families worked with.</p> <p>See individual case studies for parental engagement officer.</p>	<p>In 2017-2018, parental engagement officer must ensure that she is working with pupil premium families as a priority.</p>	<p>£3,000</p>

Disadvantaged Pupil Strategy Statement: Elmhurst School

Review of expenditure **and outcomes** for 2016/2017

<p>D) Increased attendance and punctuality rates for pupils eligible for PP.</p>	<p>Attendance Officer to make attendance and punctuality for PP children a priority and given targeted time to ensure attendance and punctuality for disadvantaged pupils improves.</p>	<p>PP attendance for 2016-2017 was 95.03%, compared to 94.83% for non-PP. This is an increase on 93.08% PP and 93.89% non-PP in 2015-2016. Furthermore, the gap has closed and PP attendance is now better than non-PP attendance. Furthermore, the percentage of unauthorised absences has decreased and the percentage for PP unauthorised absences is now in line with non-PP unauthorised absences.</p> <p>The percentage of those late before the register closed was 1.21% for PP and 0.85% for non-PP. The percentage of those late after the register closed was 0.12% for PP and 0.05% for non-PP. This is higher than in 2015-2016 and the gap between PP and non-PP has widened. See attendance case study.</p>	<p>Continue monitoring attendance to ensure it does not decline.</p> <p>Further focus needs to be placed on improving punctuality for 2017-2018. Attendance Officer to work with individual families to improve punctuality.</p>	<p>£5,000</p>
--	---	--	--	---------------

Also see the Executive Summary on the Effectiveness of the Use of Pupil Premium funding in 2016/17