



St Luke's use of the Pupil Premium Funding

Date Reviewed: October 2018

Date Governing Body Approved: Not Applicable

Review Period: Annually

Staff Responsibility: Stephen Hault-Allen

Date for Next Review: October 2019

1. Aims

This policy aims to:

- Provide background information about the pupil premium grant so that all members of the school community understand its purpose and which pupils are eligible
- Set out how the school will make decisions on pupil premium spending
- Summarise the roles and responsibilities of those involved in managing the pupil premium in school

2. Legislation and guidance

This policy is based on the pupil premium conditions of grant guidance (2017-18), published by the Education and Skills Funding Agency. It is also based on guidance from the Department for Education (DfE) on virtual school heads' responsibilities concerning the pupil premium, and the service premium. In addition, this policy refers to the DfE's information on what maintained schools must publish online.

3. Purpose of the grant

The pupil premium grant is additional funding allocated to publicly funded schools to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils and support pupils with parents in the armed forces.

The school will use the grant to support these groups, which comprise pupils with a range of different abilities, to narrow any achievement gaps between them and their peers.

We also recognise that not all pupils eligible for pupil premium funding will have lower attainment than their peers. In such cases, the grant will be used to help improve pupils' progress and attainment so that they can reach their full potential.

4. Use of the grant

- We consider the context of the school and the main challenges or barriers our pupils face.
- We use evidence to inform our decisions on pupil premium spending – for example, by using evidence-based research and resources and learning from what works in our school
- We address a wide range of needs, and take group and individual needs into account
- We engage with parents to take their views on the needs of their child into account

Some examples of how the school may use the grant include, but are not limited to:

- Providing extra one-to-one or small-group support
- Employing extra teaching assistants
- Running catch-up sessions for children who need extra help with maths or literacy
- Providing extra tuition where needed
- Funding educational trips and visits

We will publish our strategy on the school's use of the pupil premium in each academic year on the school website, in line the DfE's requirements on what maintained schools must publish online.

5. Eligible pupils

The pupil premium is allocated to the school based on the number of eligible pupils in Year 2 to Year 11.

Eligible pupils fall into the categories explained below.

5.1 Ever 6 free school meals

Pupils recorded in the most recent January school census who are known to have been eligible for free school meals at any point in the last 6 years (as determined by the DfE's latest conditions of grant guidance).

This includes pupils first known to be eligible for free school meals in the most recent January census.

It does not include pupils who received universal infant free school meals but would not have otherwise received free lunches.

5.2 Looked after children

Pupils who are in the care of, or provided with accommodation by, a local authority in England or Wales.

5.3 Post-looked after children

Pupils recorded in the most recent January census and alternative provision census who were looked after by an English or Welsh local authority immediately before being adopted, or who left local authority care on a special guardianship order or child arrangements order.

5.4 Ever 6 service children

Pupils:

- With a parent serving in the regular armed forces
- Who have been registered as a 'service child' in the school census at any point in the last 6 years (as determined by the DfE's latest conditions of grant guidance), including those first recorded as such in the most recent January census
- In receipt of a child pension from the Ministry of Defence because one of their parents died while serving in the armed forces

6. Roles and responsibilities

6.1 The Executive Headteacher, the Head of School and school leaders are responsible for:

- Keeping this policy up to date, and ensuring that it is implemented across the school
- Ensuring that all school staff are aware of their role in raising the attainment of disadvantaged pupils and supporting pupils with parents in the armed forces
- Planning pupil premium spending and keeping this under constant review, using an evidence-based approach and working with virtual school heads where appropriate
- Monitoring the attainment and progress of pupils eligible for the pupil premium to assess the impact of the school's use of the funding
- Reporting on the impact of pupil premium spending to the governing board on an ongoing basis
- Publishing the school's pupil premium strategy on the school website each academic year, as required by the DfE
- Providing relevant training for staff, as necessary, on supporting disadvantaged pupils and raising attainment

6.2 Governors

The governing board is responsible for:

- Holding the Executive Head and Head of School to account for the implementation of this policy
- Ensuring the school is using pupil premium funding appropriately, in line with the rules set out in the conditions of grant
- Monitoring the attainment and progress of pupils eligible for the pupil premium, in conjunction with the headteacher, to assess the impact and effectiveness of the school's use of the funding
- Monitoring whether the school is ensuring value for money in its use of the pupil premium
- Challenging the Executive Headteacher to use the pupil premium in the most effective way
- Setting the school's ethos and values around supporting disadvantaged members of the school community

6.3 Other school staff

All school staff are responsible for:

- Implementing this policy on a day-to-day basis

- Setting high expectations for all pupils, including those eligible for the pupil premium
- Identifying pupils whose attainment is not improving in response to interventions funded by the pupil premium, and highlighting these individuals to the senior leadership team
- Sharing insights into effective practice with other school staff

6.4 Virtual school heads

Virtual school heads are responsible for managing pupil premium funding for children looked after by a local authority, and allocating it to schools. Their responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying the eligible looked after children and informing the local authority
- Making sure methods for allocating and spending ensure that looked after children benefit without delay
- Working with each looked after child's educational setting to put together a personal education plan, agree how pupil premium funding will be spent to meet the need identified in this plan, and ensure the funding is spent in this way
- Demonstrating how pupil premium funding is raising the achievement of looked after children

Virtual school heads are in charge of promoting the educational achievement of all the children looked after by the local authority they work for.

7. Monitoring arrangements

This policy will be reviewed annually by the Head of School. At every review, the policy will be shared with the governing board.

Statement of Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) strategy – St Luke’s School

1. Summary information					
School	St Luke’s			Type of SEN (eg.PMLD/SLD/MLD etc.)	LD-complex SLCN, MLD,SLD,PD, VI,HI,ASC
Academic Year	2018/19	Total PPG budget	£44,055	Date of most recent PP Review	October 2018
Total number of pupils	133	Number of pupils eligible for PP	57	Date for next internal review of this strategy	July 2019

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PPG</i>	<i>Whole School</i>
% achieving targets in literacy	Academic Year 2017/18: PP % making expected progress: 87.7% PP % exceeding expected progress: 57.4%	Academic Year 2017/18: Whole School % making expected progress: 88.8% Whole School % exceeding expected progress: 58.0%
% achieving targets in numeracy	Academic Year 2017/18: PP % making expected progress: 88.2% PP % exceeding expected progress: 44.1%	Academic Year 2017/18: Whole School % making expected progress: 87.1% Whole School % exceeding expected progress: 42.0%

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PPG)	
In-school barriers	
A.	Prevalence of SEMH as a barrier for learning greater in children with PP than in the general school population (60% of PP pupils vs 40% of non-PP pupils). This affects their ability to access their learning and therefore their progress across the curriculum.
B.	Sensory needs that if not met, prevent PP pupils from full participation and engagement with lessons thus slow down academic, social and emotional progress. Increase in sensory provision is therefore required.
C.	Socio-economic disadvantage affects PP pupils’ general experience, knowledge and cognitive development and can impact on their access to learning. Therefore, in school, additional support is necessary for both social and academic progress.

External barriers

- D.** Funding for special schools does not allow for smaller class groups. Ideally we need 3 staff (1 teacher and 2 TAs) for each group of no more than 10 children. We currently have 2 adults for 13 children per group. Funding is a huge barrier to the small group learning environments that our children need.

4. Outcomes

	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	To improve provision for children with SEMH needs, to ensure they can better access learning and social skills required for rapid progress. This will be through the further development of the 9 ¾ area and pastoral support. It will require a more accurate audit of the needs of our children in order to target interventions more effectively.	Frequency of behavioural incidents will be reduced when compared to 2017/18 data. Progress of PP children will be broadly equal to or better than non-PP children across a range of subjects.
B.	To reduce behavioural issues associated with sensory needs. This will be through the further development of the 9 ¾ area and pastoral support. It will require a more accurate audit of the needs of our children in order to create bespoke programmes of support, e.g. sensory diets.	Fewer behaviour incidents, including violent incidents and RPIs recorded for these pupils when compared to 2017/18 data. Progress of PP children will be broadly equal to or better than non-PP children across a range of subjects.
C.	To support confidence, self-esteem and cognitive development by providing exposure to enrichment activities through trips and visits, including the school's Learning Outside the Classroom curriculum which runs throughout the school in all subject areas.	Evidence from STAPPS of PP pupils making broadly equal or greater progress than non-PP children in PSD, alongside other curriculum subjects.
D.	To increase the staffing throughout the school in order to create smaller group learning environments allowing for increased support and differentiation	Evidence from STAPPS of good or outstanding progress across the school, including PP children, both academically and in their personal and social development.

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2018/19

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 ?
Progress of PP children is broadly equal to or greater than that of non-PP children across the curriculum.	Support for PP children through focus during progress meetings and department subject reviews lead to additional TA / targeted intervention time within the class setting.	Our review of the actions from the current academic year demonstrate that this approach has been effective in supporting PP children over the current academic year, and should be continued.	Progress meetings to be held termly, with a key focus being the progress of PP children, and the identification of strategies and support that can be put in place to meet or exceed expectations.	JC Class teachers	Termly/ annually
	Increase the staffing throughout the school in order to create smaller group learning environments allowing for increased support and differentiation.	Similarly, our analysis has shown that progress has improved this year, when compared to last year, as class sizes have become smaller.	Subject leaders and department leaders to analyse the progress of PP children within their department / subject on a termly basis and put strategies and support in place where necessary.	Department and subject leaders	
	Support children with SEMH and sensory needs to access their learning more effectively by further developing our 9 ¾ provision and pastoral support.	SEMH needs are a challenge for significantly more of our PP children (60%) than our non-PP children (40%). This creates a significant barrier for learning and it is important that provisions are in place to support this.	Conscientiously recruiting staff as the school expands to maintain class sizes of no more than 10 children where possible, with a teacher and up to 2 support staff.	JC / SHA / MS	
			Investment in resources and staffing across the 9 ¾ and pastoral provisions (£33,155 towards costs of staffing 9 ¾)	JC / SHA / MS	

	To provide each child with a minimum of three trips per year, in the categories of arts, active and PSD. Opportunities for LOTC as part of the curriculum for each child, and additional topic-based trips to be funded from class budgets on an ad-hoc basis.	Our review of the actions from the current academic year demonstrate that PP children have made marginally better progress in areas of Personal and Social Development than non-PP children. Therefore providing exposure to enrichment activities through trips and visits should continue to be put in place to support confidence, self-esteem and cognitive development.	More rigorous systems of target setting, recording and assessing the impact of Learning Outside the Classroom, including opportunities for work experience, to be implemented to measure impact more effectively.	JC, JCr Teachers	
Total budgeted cost					£33,155
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?
Progress of PP children is broadly equal to or greater than that of non-PP children across the curriculum.	Staff have access to a clear system that allows needs to be identified more accurately and interventions to be targeted more effectively.	Our review of the actions from the current academic year demonstrate a need for a clearer picture of children's needs in order for interventions to be targeted more accurately.	Audit of needs to be carried out from EHCPs by a dedicated member of staff to create an accurate school-wide provision map. Fund a dedicated member of staff to carry out the audit. (£1,700) SENCO in charge of keeping provision map up to date - clear systems put in place to ensure that any updates to information are actioned on the provision map.	TBC RA	Termly/ annually
Total budgeted cost					£1,700

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 ?
Progress of PP children is broadly equal to or greater than that of non-PP children across the curriculum.	Targeted intervention programmes in place for children with SEMH difficulties where there is an identified need.	SEMH needs are a challenge for significantly more of our PP children (60%) than our non-PP children (40%). This creates a significant barrier for learning and it is important that provisions are in place to support this.	<p>Audit of needs to be carried out from EHCPs by a dedicated member of staff to create an accurate school-wide provision map. (cost covered above)</p> <p>Progress meetings and departmental / subject progress reviews to be held termly, with a key focus being the progress of PP children, and the identification of strategies and support that can be put in place to meet or exceed expectations.</p> <p>Relevant training for staff to deliver interventions as required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal-assisted therapy (£150) • Rebound therapy (£450) <p>Employ therapist (0.4) for art-therapy, counselling etc. (£7,000)</p> <p>Employ member of staff to support development of donkey therapy (£1,600)</p>	<p>TBC RA</p> <p>JC Class teachers Department leaders Subject leaders</p>	Termly/ annually
Total budgeted cost					£9,200

6. Review of expenditure and impact				
Previous Academic Year		2017/18 (£48,005)		
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
<p>Improved communication skills for PP children in lower school</p> <p>Improved communication skills in upper school</p> <p>Improved progress for non-verbal pupils</p>	<p>Staff training in PECS and Makaton</p> <p>Staff training in ELKLAN</p> <p>Staff research in pre-verbal communication strategies</p> <p>Selected group / individual work in 9 ¾</p>	<p>No training delivered for PECS. Some Makaton training delivered through links with Collett School. SENCO has completed ELKLAN course.</p> <p>Outstanding progress made in communication by PP children across the whole school (Expressive Communication - 85.7% expected, 78.6% exceeded / Receptive Communication - 88.1% expected, 73.8% exceeded).</p> <p>This is marginally better than the school population as a whole (Expressive Communication - 84.6% expected, 72.6% exceeded / Receptive Communication - 88.0% expected, 72.6% exceeded).</p> <p>Data shows outstanding progress made in social skills by PP children across the whole school (88.1% expected, 83.3% exceeded), marginally better than the school population as a whole (88.8% expected, 76.1% exceeded).</p> <p>This data is in line with wider trends of PP children making marginally better progress than non-PP children overall (PP children: 85.7% expected, 75.8 exceeding / Non-PP children: 84.5% expected, 70.0% exceeding).</p>	<p>Proposed actions (staff training) not all put in place effectively.</p> <p>Data does not demonstrate any clear impact of an increased focus on developing communication skills on the progress of PP children. PP children made outstanding progress in both expressive and receptive communication, as did non-PP children, but these figures were in line with overall trends across a range of subjects.</p>	£380 (ELKLAN)

ii. Targeted support

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	Estimated impact: Did you meet the success criteria? Include impact on pupils not eligible for PPG, if appropriate.	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Cost
Improved communication skills in middle and upper school	<p>Small communication groups in 9 ¾</p> <p>Targeted literacy support in class</p> <p>Targeted speech and language support</p>	<p>In Middle School and Upper School both PPG and non-PPG children made outstanding progress in both expressive and receptive communication over the year, although this is in line with wider trends.</p> <p>Whether targeted support was delivered in line with pupil profile needs and next step targets is difficult to assess. However, data shows that children with SLCN needs made marginally better progress than the wider school community, which suggests that such support was in place and effective.</p> <p>No evidence of use of evidence-based research from EEF toolkit. No evidence of use of PECS. Some evidence of use of Makaton within classes, although difficult to assess impact.</p> <p>SENCO has recently completed ELKLAN course in order to offer greater targeted support for children with communication needs.</p>	<p>It must be possible to assess impact more rigorously in future; objective criteria for demonstrating the effectiveness of a given strategy should be considered and identified from the outset.</p> <p>Overall trends show outstanding progress, and PP children outperforming non-PP children. Targeted interventions must continue to be in place to address the needs of the individuals who are not making expected progress, and this should be supported by greater use of the 9 ¾ provision.</p>	£30,200 (2x TA to provide targeted support)
Improved communication skills in upper school and higher attaining pupils in order to access GCSE English.	Interventions for targeted small groups / individuals	<p>No Upper School pupils identified for or able to access GCSE English. Both PPG and non-PPG children made outstanding progress in both expressive and receptive communication over the year, although this is in line with wider trends.</p> <p>Community links have allowed pupils to build confidence and develop their communication skills whilst building work-experience.</p>	<p>Children work in small groups according to ability in order to target their needs more effectively, and there is scope for this to continue to ensure that the needs of all children are met.</p> <p>Community links have provided benefits to the children who are involved, but the impact of these is difficult to quantify under the current arrangements. This could be a viable arrangement if targets were identified, worked on during placement and feedback provided by the employer through regular reviews and at the end of the placement.</p>	(included in above)

Smaller group learning environments	Interventions for targeted PP children. This can also be done through additional whole class support	<p>Class groups rearranged during the year to create smaller class groups; two additional classes put in place to support this. This arrangement has allowed children to work in smaller groups, with work more closely matched to their ability, and has allowed the needs of all pupils to be met more precisely.</p> <p>One child has passed her Functional Skills in Maths at Level 1. Along with her classmate, who passed the same exam last year, they are both entered for the upcoming Level 2 exam. GCSE Maths not appropriate for our pupils.</p> <p>Progress has been outstanding across all subjects, both for PP children and non-PP children.</p>	Although using a different assessment system, progress this year is much improved compared to the previous year, when literacy and numeracy support was provided outside the classroom setting by specialist teachers. This evidence suggests that investing that money in getting staff in the classroom, making for smaller class/group sizes and therefore higher ratios of support, has had a positive impact on progress.	£15,125 (1x additional TA)
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	-------------------------------

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
To increase general knowledge and problem solving skills through a high level of exposure to enrichment activities including trips and visits.	<p>Increased opportunities through LOtC curriculum</p> <p>Targeted groups</p> <p>Off- site enrichment activities including residential</p>	<p>Progress of PP pupils and non-PP pupils in all areas of PSD has been outstanding over the course of the year.</p> <p>The impact in other areas, such as 'increased understanding and ability to solve problems' and 'increased experiences, risk taking activities, working collaboratively, therapeutic benefits, exposure to the wider community' are not possible to assess directly under our current assessment system, but anecdotally the Learning Outside the Classroom curriculum and off-site enrichment activities have been beneficial to a great number of our pupils.</p>	It must be possible to assess impact more rigorously in future; objective criteria for demonstrating the effectiveness of a given strategy should be considered and identified from the outset.	£2,700 (off-site visits) (residential trips)

<p>To reduce behavioural issues associated with sensory needs</p>	<p>Sensory breaks relevant to all dependent on needs</p> <p>Use Safety and Support Plans to target individual pupils</p> <p>Purchase specialist equipment</p> <p>Create a sensory room for interventions (9 ¾)</p>	<p>Improved staff training and the development of our 9 ¾ provision have allowed us to greater meet the needs of our pupils with sensory needs in a range of contexts. New specialist equipment will be in place soon. This is supported by an emphasis on outdoor learning.</p> <p>Targeting of children with individual needs has taken place through referrals from class teachers, e.g. during progress meetings.</p> <p>Data suggests that behaviour and attendance have improved over the course of the year. The number of behavioural incidents has reduced from 468 in the Autumn term to 265 in the Spring term, and 153 so far in the Summer term.</p>	<p>Improved provision to meet the sensory needs of our pupils, such as the 9 ¾ sensory base, has had a positive impact on both behaviour and attendance. This is an important area to continue to develop; new specialist equipment will be in place in the 9 ¾ suite in time for the 2018/19 academic year.</p> <p>Needs must be audited more closely to ensure that pupils can be targeted more rigorously and needs can be met more effectively.</p>	<p>£600 (cost of equipment for 9 ¾)</p>
<p>To increase the staffing throughout the school in order to create smaller group learning environments allowing for increased support and differentiation</p>	<p>Identify individual pupils and small groups</p> <p>Use Pupil Profiles and Pupil Strategies to identify groups / classes</p> <p>Review timetable /curriculum opportunities</p>	<p>No evidence of EEF case studies for use for interventions, or individual pupils / small groups identified through any means.</p> <p>Class groups rearranged during the year to create smaller class groups; two additional classes put in place to support this. This arrangement has allowed children to work in smaller groups, with work more closely matched to their ability, and has allowed the needs of all pupils to be met more precisely.</p> <p>Progress has been outstanding across all areas, both academic and in terms of personal and social development; this is true both for PP children and non-PP children.</p>	<p>Actions must be manageable and demonstrate value in terms of the impact relative to the time taken to put in place.</p> <p>Although using a different assessment system, progress this year is much improved compared to the previous year, when literacy and numeracy support was provided outside the classroom setting by specialist teachers. This evidence suggests that investing that money in getting staff in the classroom, making for smaller class/group sizes and therefore higher ratios of support, has had a positive impact on progress.</p>	<p>(included elsewhere)</p>

7. Additional detail

In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.

PPG progress is now measured through our whole-school assessment system, StAPPS, which allows us to track both academic progress and personal and social development. We are slowly building our data which is being shared with parents termly at individual tutorials, as well as at the end of the year through our end-of-year reports.

Further developments have included progress meetings with all class teachers to look at the individual classes and their cohorts including PPG children.

Jamie Caple