

Pupil premium strategy statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2023 to 2024 academic year) funding to help improve the attainment of our disadvantaged pupils.

It outlines our pupil premium strategy, how we intend to spend the funding in this academic year and the effect that last year's spending of pupil premium had within our school.

School overview

Detail	Data
School name	St. John Vianney Catholic Primary School
Number of pupils in school	198
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	31
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended)	2022-23 . . . looking toward 2024-25
Date this statement was published	20/09/23
Date on which it will be reviewed	30/09/24
Statement authorised by	John Hardy
Pupil premium lead	John Hardy
Governor / Trustee lead	David Dring

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£88,755.00
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	TBC for 2023-24
One to one tuition funding (100%) allocation this academic year (of which 50% (£3,982.50) is funding)	£7,965.00
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	(£4,957)
Total budget for this academic year If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year	£101,677.00

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

We intend that all children attain above their expected trajectory; 'thrown above' their peers, a drift back to expected attainment for disadvantaged children would still mean they achieve well and are not further disadvantaged in education. This reflects one of the foundational principles at St. John Vianney School & Children's Centre: **equity**.

We have learnt that if practice is developed to 'get it right' for the most vulnerable: in learning for children with special educational needs and/or disabilities; in care for looked after children; and, in enrichment for children with limited cultural experiences, then our practice is well-suited to support children eligible for pupil premium. Therefore, the practice and programmes we have developed addresses the needs we have identified rather than any 'label' that has been attached to them.

We find that children attracting pupil premium fall into all the different groups we consider in school and as with all children, it is important to develop an individualised and personal programme, rather than follow a prescribed route. Thus, using their pupil premium entitlement, we are able to ensure the child has swift and easy access to whichever programmes may be supportive.

We also find that children entitled to pupil premium make more use of some elements of school life – maybe those ones they are not finding elsewhere - both valuing them more and accruing greater benefit than other children in the setting.

In care:

- Listening Culture: time and opportunity is built into the day, such as filtering into classrooms before lessons start in the morning, and practitioners are accessible for conversations with children.
- Family at School: all children belong to one of 30 small groups of about eight children led by the oldest a 'hoofy' (head of our family) which also includes an adult.
- Leadership: peer mediation; school council, eco-warriors . . . children take responsibility for aspects of school life.
- Gift: much effort and time is invested in finding gift in every child, by: providing opportunities that enhance the curriculum: identifying those with promise: and, encourage them with a mentored experience.
- Out of school hours care: activities and opportunities for play and relaxation in a safe and secure environment with adults already known to the children.

In learning:

- Interventions: NELI; precision teaching, phonics . . . are available to support children's learning, by intervening quickly.

- Enhanced speech & language provision: children have swift and easy access to therapeutic intervention within our setting.
- Reading comprehension: fluency building through repeated reading; fluency into comprehension, focusing on reading for purpose; leading to reciprocal reading.
- Collaborative learning: a structured approach to enable effective team problem solving.
- Behaviour: practitioners provide support and challenge to children needing more than the general behaviour policy to become self-regulating.

In enrichment:

- Wider opportunities: children in upper years learn to play instruments – glockenspiel, penny-whistle, ukulele – as part of a class ensemble.
- Out of school hours learning activities: wider ranging sports and activities are offered for children, such as gardening, reading club, craft, multi-skills, games.
- Educational visits: extra-curricular visits such as: 'canvas classroom' and outdoor adventurous activities; gallery visits; historical.
- Parental engagement: our Tapestry platform, nursery recruits, handwriting champions . . . provide opportunities to involve parents and support them to be the 'first teacher' of their child.

We find that a large proportion of Parent Support Advisor (PSA) time is devoted to parents of children attracting pupil premium. The benefit for parents seems to be that not only is the initial reason for accessing the service resolved, but also, more importantly, the resulting relationship, similar to extended family, provides a shoulder to lean-on or even just a listening ear, for the future. For some parents it is comparable to having access to a 'life-coach' – maybe a role grandmothers used to play in the community.

Thus, for us **equity** does not mean that everyone is treated the same. Following Jesus, describing the pay received by the workers in the vineyard, for us equity means that everyone receives what they need rather than what they deserve. Thus, **funding follows need**.

Challenges

This details the key challenges to achievement that we have identified among our disadvantaged pupils.

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	Presence: using 95% attendance – our school offer indicator – 7/7 in Y2; 4/6 in Y3; 7/12 in Y4; 9/15 in Y5 and 4/6 in Y6 (31/46 67% of pupils eligible for PP compared to 49% for those not PP)
2	Maths: In the end of KS2 SATs, 1/13 did not meeting expected standard in maths; in Y1-Y5, 25 (42%) of those eligible for PP did not achieve an SAS of 100 in GL (PTMaths) and 11 did not make average progress (ie. not maintaining SAS)

3	Greater depth: In the end of KS2 SATs, 1 out of 9 achieving HS for grammar was eligible for PP; 7/14 for reading; 5/12 for maths; 3/13 achieving GDS for writing; at the end of KS1, no children eligible for PP achieved HS or GDS in RWM.
4	Progress: In a return to pre-pandemic trends, children eligible for PP in comparison to those not eligible in the cohort leaving KS2 made more progress from KS1 to KS2 SATs: in reading: 4.05 compared to 3.93; and, in maths 3.32 compared to 2.98 but continue to lag in writing 3.40 compared to 7.31.
5	Early Years: 6/8 (75%) children eligible for PP achieved GLD compared to 14/21 (67%) of those not eligible.
6	Resilience: Emerging from the pandemic, we have had more children move both out of school (10, of whom 1 were eligible for PP) and into school (3, of whom all were eligible for PP). Presenting at school with unrealistic expectations: lack of services in community (4/46); waiting times for NHS (4/15); bereavement or loss (5/46)

Intended outcomes

This explains the outcomes we are aiming for **by the end of our current strategy plan**, and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

Intended outcome	Success criteria
Improved attendance	Above 95% attendance; Reduced numbers of persistent absence to below national
Improved attainment in Maths at the end of key stage 2	Maths attainment not to limit combined SATs score for any child
Improved performance at greater depth	Greater depth performance matches that of other children
Improved performance in EY GLD	GLD performance matches that of other children
Realistic expectation of school and life	Recognition of what school can and can't provide

Activity in this academic year

This details how we intend to spend our pupil premium (and recovery premium funding) **this academic year** to address the challenges listed above.

Teaching (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £26,530

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Training, through Research School, in Metacognitive approaches to learning; cascade training (PDDay) and delivery	EEF suggest a +7 months impact	2, 3, 4
Training & delivery of Communication & language approaches	EEF suggest a +6 months impact	5
Early numeracy	EEF suggest a +6 months impact	5
Early literacy	EEF suggest a +4 months impact	5
Training on effective Feedback and its delivery	EEF suggest a +6 months impact	1, 3, 4, 5

Targeted academic support (for example, tutoring, one-to-one support structured interventions)

Budgeted cost: £53,800.00 + £9,975 [1:1 tuition funding]

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
1 st Class @ number	EEF suggest a +2 months impact	2
1:1 Tuition	EEF suggest a +5 months impact	2, 3, 4
Parental engagement	EEF suggest a +4 months impact	1, 3, 5
Phonics intervention	EEF suggest a +5 months impact	5
NELI	EEF suggest a +3 months impact	5

Wider strategies (for example, related to attendance, behaviour, wellbeing)

Budgeted cost: £6250.00

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Attendance	DfE guidance: Working together to improve school attendance	1
Parental engagement	EEF suggest a +4 months impact	6
Rainbows & sunbeams programme	Nicola Hutchings (Educational Psychologist) evaluation of impact of programme	6

Total budgeted cost: £96,555.00

Part B: Review of outcomes in the previous academic year

Pupil premium strategy outcomes

This details the impact that our pupil premium activity had on pupils in the 2022 to 2023 academic year, as the basis for our three-year strategy.

Challenge 1: Re-establishing cohortal norms, was addressed through social stories, North East Language Intervention, Collaborative learning Approaches (such as Kagan), all of which have resulted in the identified challenges seen in different age groups being reduced (eg. the identified children were successfully toileting with Nursery; children in upper years were successfully working in groups during the Summer Term)

Challenge 2: Reading for purpose, was addressed in Teaching and through targeted support, resulting at the end of key stage 1 with 60.0% of children achieving at least expected standard and by the end of key stage 2 with 88.9% of children achieving at least expected standard. In other year groups, using GL Progress Test (English) the vast majority of children eligible for PP made accelerated progress improving their Standardised Age Score (SAS) by an average of 6 points.

In addition, further targeted support included a reciprocal reading intervention was delivered in Y6, which, in the GL PTE resulted in an average improvement of 21 points. However, the efficacy of target support using fluency into comprehension could not be measured by a simple end point assessment but will be gaged through reading age profiles during the subsequent year to intervention.

Challenge 3: Improved performance in writing, was address in Teaching, using the IPEEL approach (training), resulting at the end of key stage 1 with 60.0% of children achieving at least expected standard and by the end of key stage 2 88.9% of children achieving at least expected standard.

Challenge 4: Accelerated progress in maths, was addressed in Teaching through targeted support resulting at the end of key stage 1 with 60.0% of children achieving at least expected standard and by the end of key stage 2 with 77.8% of children achieving at least expected standard. In other years groups, using the GL Progress Test (Maths), the vast majority of children eligible for PP made accelerated progress improving their Standardised Age Score (SAS) by an average of 7 points.

In addition, further targeted support was addressed using the 1st Class @ Number intervention, resulting in an average improvement in Sandwell Test scores of 22.7 points.

1:1 Tuition was used to address challenges and while some parents did not take up the offer, for those that did the impact was significant. Using class teachers as tutors,

enabled the impact of the one hour of tuition each week to affect every hour of lesson time as the relationship between learner and teacher improved. While, the GL SAS and writing score demonstrated marked improvement, they, in no way, demonstrate the impact of 1:1 Tuition. The correlation of improvement in assessment is not with subject or learning but rather in a transformation shift in their understanding of the purpose of schooling and the personal goodness it brings.

Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you purchased in the previous academic year. This will help the Department for Education identify which ones are popular in England

Programme	Provider
IPEEL	National Literacy Trust
1 st Class @ Number	Edge Hill University
Reciprocal Reading	Fischer Family Trust
Reading Fluency into Comprehension	Fischer Family Trust

Further information (optional)

National Breakfast Programme

Since this programme provides a breakfast of either bagel or cereal to every child in the school, it means that children, who might otherwise not have breakfast, receive a snack before lessons begin. While there is evidence that relieving hunger in children allows learning, anecdotally, it seems that teaching staff involving children in choosing their snack, sharing with peers, toasting bagels, laughing when the head teacher spills cereal while distributing to dishes, not getting upset over spillages or mess has a positive impact upon relationships with staff and the sense of belonging as a shared experience.