

Statement of pupil premium strategy – The Willows School

Every year the government awards extra funding for children from low-income families who are eligible for free school meals, looked after children and those from families with parents in the Armed Forces. It has been the responsibility of each organisation to spend this funding to improve attainment, improve progress and raise levels of engagement of pupils who fall under the umbrella of Pupil Premium. The school has a responsibility to monitor and report on the direct impact this funding has had on this group of pupils.

The Willows School is a school for children between the ages of 7-16 years with Moderate Learning Difficulties and additional complex needs. All of our children have a statement/EHCP of SEN and their levels upon entry to the school are significantly below the national averages. A high proportion of our children arrive by transport which is provided by the LEA, therefore the catchment covers all areas of Rotherham, with a few children who are cross authority. Every year, on average 65% of our children are eligible for Pupil Premium.

This document states the Pupil Premium Strategy which includes the key objectives for 2016-17 using the estimated funding £74000 and the evaluation for the funding received 2015-16 which was approximately £63,800. The money is approximate as the funding is awarded per financial year whereas schools run as academic years. It includes the data analysis of Maths and English data comparing Pupil Premium to non-Pupil Premium children.

1. Summary information					
School	The Willows School			Type of SEN (eg.PMLD/SLD/MLD etc.)	MLD
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£74000	Date of most recent PP Review	September 2016
Total number of pupils	108	Number of pupils eligible for PP	66 (61%)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	September 2017

2. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP)	
A.	Reading and overall literacy levels are low not allowing access to simple text, affecting engagement and restricting independency.
B.	Low levels of basic number skills restricting independency and application of numbers in real life contexts.
C.	Poor social and emotional well-being which affects behaviour, health and engagement.
D.	Parental engagement which affects attendance and then in turn impacts learning.

3. Outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	Increased reading and overall literacy levels for Pupil Premium Children.	Increased reading and overall literacy level scores.

B.	Pupil Premium children making at least equal if not better progress in Maths compared to non-Pupil Premium children.	Comparative Maths data equal or better.
C.	Increased opportunities for social interaction including extra-curricular activities, enrichment as well as bespoke interventions with the behavioural support team which will all have a positive effect on behaviour and emotional well-being.	Survey of pupils and parents will confirm positive effects emotionally. Behaviour data reflects reduction in incidences (see Behaviour database).
D.	Increased levels of interaction with parents/carers of the children who are Pupil Premium.	Increased numbers of parents/carers attending meetings and support groups.
E.	Increased attendance rates for Pupil Premium children.	Reduced numbers of persistent absentees and increased levels of attendance for Pupil Premium children comparatively equivalent or better than non-Pupil Premium children.

4. Planned expenditure

Academic year	2016-17
----------------------	----------------

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 & rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Reading and overall literacy levels increased and reduced barriers to accessing reading.	Staff training on dyslexia and the use of phonics.	Testing shows that a high proportion of Pupil Premium children have dyslexic tendencies. Addressing the barriers will increase pupil access to reading and writing.	Designated meeting times used for training staff/further training for staff. Continuous support from the Head of English and the English team with advice and team planning.	Head of English	July 2017
Progress in Maths for Pupil Premium children comparatively equal to or better than non-Pupil Premium children.	Staff training on brain damage and the effects on Mathematical learning and understanding.	Les Staves believes that understanding the effects of brain damage and the effects on Mathematical learning and understanding will help change the approach to teaching number skills and therefore learning will increase.	Designated meeting times used for training staff. Continuous support from the Head of Maths with advice and team planning.	Head of Maths	July 2017
Total budgeted cost					£100 - resources

ii. Targeted support

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence & rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
------------------------	-------------------------------	--	--	-------------------	---

Reading and overall literacy levels increased and reduced barriers to accessing reading.	Bespoke interventions with English HLTA and TA. The use of successfully trialled software.	The HLTA and TA are trained specifically for English interventions and therefore as EEF Toolkit suggests this is effective in raising attainment. The software used is for pupils specifically with dyslexic tendencies and has a high success rate as well as engaging reluctant learners.	Records of pupils individual progress will be recorded termly and the data analysed by the Head of English.	Head of English	Termly Resources £4000 Staffing £15000
Progress in Maths for Pupil Premium children comparatively equal to or better than non-Pupil Premium children.	Bespoke interventions with Maths HLTA. Applied Maths lessons and the mastery approach using active learning.	The HLTA is trained specifically for Maths interventions and therefore as EEF Toolkit suggests this is effective in raising attainment. The game based approach and life skills Maths has raised the profile in school which is documented in the Head of Maths subject SEF.	Records of pupils individual progress will be recorded termly and the data analysed by the Head of Maths.	Head of Maths	Termly Staffing £15000
Total budgeted cost					£34000

iii. Other approaches (including links to personal, social and emotional wellbeing)

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence & rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
Increased engagement of parents/carers.	Behaviour support team to facilitate parent support groups with various themes of focus regarding having a child with SEN.	The EEF Toolkit suggests increased parental engagement has a positive effect on learning and rates of progress.	Monitoring by the behaviour support team of the parents/carers who attend and their evaluation of the support given will be collated and reported on with evidence to show positive impact.	Behaviour support team leader	July 2017 Resources £100
Increased attendance rates and reduced absentees.	Support worker to monitor attendance, liaise with EWO and work with individual families.	The EEF Toolkit suggests increased parental engagement can have a positive effect on attendance which in turn impacts learning and rates of progress.	Monitoring of attendance will be recorded in a set format and reported on to the Deputy Head on a regular basis highlighting any concerns which are then looked at with the EWO and action plans put in place.	Deputy Head	July 2017 Staffing £2000
Increased levels of positive well-being.	Increased opportunities for 1:1 behaviour interventions, extra-curricular activities, enrichment activities and holiday clubs.	The EEF Toolkit suggests that each one of these activities adds to the value of learning and rates of progress.	Monitoring by the behaviour support team will be collated and reported on with evidence to show positive impact.	Behaviour support team leader	July 2017 Resources £2800 Staffing £35000
Total budgeted cost					£39900

5. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2015-16		
i. Quality of teaching for all				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/ approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Reading and overall literacy levels increased and reduced barriers to accessing reading.	Staff training on dyslexia and the use of phonics.	Looking at the data for English 93% of Pupil Premium children made expected to outstanding progress compared to 96% of non-Pupil Premium children. There is a small difference considering the number of pupils in the Pupil Premium group was 61% of the whole school. Although the percentage was not increased from the previous year's data it is clear that they have been maintained and is dependent on needs of the cohort. (PP and nonPP both 96% 2014-15).	This was an effective use of funding and observations of English lessons and scrutiny of planning showed that strategies delivered in the training are being used. This training will continue to be used as CPD for all new staff that joins the school.	Resources: £100
Progress in Maths for Pupil Premium children comparatively equal to or better than non-Pupil Premium children.	Training for all new staff on brain damage and the effects on Mathematical learning and understanding.	Looking at the data for Maths 91% of Pupil Premium children made expected to outstanding progress compared to 84% of non-Pupil Premium children. The percentage was increased on from the previous year's data although this is dependent on the needs of the cohort. (PP 100% and nonPP 92% 2014-15).	This was an effective use of funding and observations of Maths lessons and scrutiny of planning showed that strategies delivered in the training are being used. This training will be used as CPD for all new staff who join the school.	£0
ii. Targeted support				
Desired outcome	Chosen action/ approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost

Reading and overall literacy levels increased and reduced barriers to accessing reading.	Bespoke interventions with English HLTA and TA. The use of tested software.	Looking at the data for English 93% of Pupil Premium children made expected to outstanding progress compared to 96% of non-Pupil Premium children. There is a small difference considering the number of pupils in the Pupil Premium group was 61% of the whole school. Although the percentage was not increased on from the previous year's data it is clear that they have been maintained and is dependent on needs of the cohort. (PP and nonPP both 96% 2014-15).	This was a highly effective use of the Pupil Premium funding as the data shows therefore will be used for future cohorts of pupils.	HLTA: £15000 Resources: £1000
Progress in Maths for Pupil Premium children comparatively equal to or better than non-Pupil Premium children.	Bespoke interventions with Maths HLTA. Applied Maths lessons and the mastery approach using active learning.	Looking at the data for Maths 91% of Pupil Premium children made expected to outstanding progress compared to 84% of non-Pupil Premium children. The percentage was increased on from the previous year's data although this is dependent on the needs of the cohort. (PP 100% and nonPP 92% 2014-15).	This was a highly effective use of the Pupil Premium funding as the data shows therefore will be used for future cohorts of pupils.	HLTA: £15000

iii. Other approaches (including links to personal, social and emotional wellbeing)

Desired outcome	Chosen action/ approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PP, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost								
Increased attendance rates and reduced absentees.	Support worker to monitor attendance, liaise with EWO and work with identified individual families.	For 2015-16 the school won the best attendance award across the Rotherham schools as the first special school to be awarded with this title. Although the work is across both PP and nonPP children and families, the high percentage of PP children on roll means that they are directly impacted.	The work on attendance will continue next academic year as issues with attendance must be tackled relentlessly. The award won was a huge success and although we will aim towards achieving it next year we know this heavily depends on the cohort of pupils and the family's responses to the strategies put in place to address low levels of attendance.	Support worker: £2000								
Increased levels of positive well-being.	Increased opportunities for 1:1 behaviour interventions, extra-curricular activities, enrichment activities and holiday clubs.	Every child that was identified as Pupil Premium was given the opportunity to receive a 1:1 intervention and from the annual reviews and PCR's it is documented that these interventions had made a difference in the child's and their family's life. The surveys of the pupils who attended Easter and Summer schools showed 100% positive feedback (see evidence in PP file).	Although the EEF toolkit does not highly rate the interventions, after school clubs, Summer/Easter schools and extra-curricular activities as effective in terms of cost and impact but as a special school the effects are different and we have shown that they make a difference therefore we will continue with these activities using Pupil Premium funds.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>BST dedicated time</td> <td>£28,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Extra staff support for out of hours activities</td> <td>£800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transport for after school clubs</td> <td>£1000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Support for enrichment and out of hours activities</td> <td>£1000</td> </tr> </table>	BST dedicated time	£28,000	Extra staff support for out of hours activities	£800	Transport for after school clubs	£1000	Support for enrichment and out of hours activities	£1000
BST dedicated time	£28,000											
Extra staff support for out of hours activities	£800											
Transport for after school clubs	£1000											
Support for enrichment and out of hours activities	£1000											

Data analysis for English and Maths: Summer 2015- Summer 2016

The tables of data for both English and Maths uses PIVAT scores which is an assessment scheme written by Lancashire County Council and used nationally across special schools to help show progress.

The Head of English and the Head of Maths then look at pupils in the category:

0≥1 as needing immediate action/investigation

1≥3 as achieving below the target and needing an appropriate intervention

3≥4.5 as making good progress

4.5+ as making exceptional progress

Data analysis for English: Summer 2015 - Summer 2016					Data analysis for English: Summer 2014- Summer 2015					
PIVAT points	Whole school	Pupil premium	Non pupil premium	Intervention pupils	PIVAT points	Whole school	LAC	Pupil premium	Non pupil premium	Intervention pupils
0≥1	4/84 5%	3/51 6%	1/33 3%	1/25 4%	0≥1	*3/78 4%	1/6 17%	2/51 4%	1/27 4%	2/40 5%
1≥3	25/84 30%	13/51 25%	12/33 36%	10/25 40%	1≥3	12/78 15%	1/6 17%	6/51 12%	6/27 22%	5/40 13%
3≥4.5	22/84 26%	15/51 29%	7/33 21%	6/25 24%	3≥4.5	23/78 29%	0/6 0%	16/51 31%	7/27 26%	10/40 25%
4.5+	33/84 39%	20/51 39%	13/33 39%	8/25 32%	4.5+	40/78 51%	4/6 67%	27/51 53%	13/27 48%	23/40 58%

Summer 2015 – Summer 2016: The data shows a natural distribution with no obvious concerns. Comparison of data year on year is difficult because of the fluctuation of valid data due to pupil numbers and new pupils joining the school at different points. This data reflects progress of pupils on roll in Summer 2015.

On average, pupils who are pupil premium are making similar progress to non-pupil premium children. Intervention pupils are making slightly slower progress but this is expected as the pupils selected for intervention are those who need extra support to making expected progress. It is an achievement that 96% of intervention pupils have made progress this year.

Data analysis for Maths: Summer 2015- Summer 2016					Data analysis for Maths: Summer 2014- Summer 2015					
PIVAT points	Whole school	Pupil premium	Non pupil premium	Intervention pupils*	PIVAT points	Whole school	LAC	Pupil premium	Non pupil premium	Intervention pupils*
<0	**6/84 7%	3/51 6%	3/33 9%	2/21 10%	<0	0	0	0	0	0
0≥1	***4/84 5%	2/51 4%	2/33 6%	2/21 10%	0≥1	2/76 3%	0/6 0%	0/51 0%	2/25 8%	0/15 0%
1≥3	16/84 19%	10/51 20%	6/33 18%	3/21 14%	1≥3	20/76 26%	2/6 33%	16/51 31%	4/25 16%	3/15 20%
3≥4.5	19/84 23%	11/51 22%	8/33 24%	5/21 24%	3≥4.5	24/76 32%	2/6 33%	18/51 35%	6/25 24%	7/15 47%
4.5+	39/84 46%	25/51 49%	14/33 42%	9/21 43%	4.5+	30/76 39%	2/6 33%	17/51 33%	13/25 52%	5/15 33%

Summer 2015 – Summer 2016: The data shows a natural distribution with no obvious concerns. Comparison of data year on year is difficult because of the fluctuation of valid data due to pupil numbers.

*14 pupils included on intervention were Pupil Premium.

**All six pupils identified had significant changes in their Maths teaching staff from Easter 2015 to Easter 2016. Throughout the year all six students have made progress since being re-base lined.

*** Three of the four pupils identified made significant outstanding progress Summer 2014 to Summer 2015. One of the pupils identified makes progress but due to her needs and for her as an individual finds intervention distressing.