



Pupil Premium Spending Statement – 2017/18

1. SUMMARY INFORMATION					
School	Bexhill Academy				
Academic Year	2017/18	Total PP Budget	£219120	Date of most recent PP Review	August 2017
Total number of pupils	373 + 35 Nursery	Number of pupils eligible	145 (39%)	Date of next internal review of this strategy	January 2018

2. CURRENT ATTAINMENT		
(2017 KS2 results)	Pupils eligible for PP at EXS/GDS (School)	National Average (ALL)
% Achieving in reading, writing and maths	50% 0%	61% 5%
% Achieving in reading	60% 13%	71% 19%
% Achieving in writing	47% 13%	76% 15%
% Achieving in maths	67% 20%	75% 17%

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high prior attainment)
IN SCHOOL BARRIERS (Issues to be addressed in school)

A.	Oral language skills on entry into EYFS are lower for all pupils, especially for pupils eligible for PP. This slows reading and writing progress in subsequent years.
B.	Issues historically with rates of progress mean that pupils eligible for PP need to make accelerated progress in every year group so that more meet the expected standard at the end of KS2.
C.	The quality of teaching remains a key focus for the school as in a minority of areas it remains variable which impacts on outcomes for pupils.
D.	Attainment of pupils leaving EY and KS1 with low prior attainment. We want to continue to focus on these pupils so more meet the expected standards in reading, writing and maths by the end of KS2. Similarly, the highest attaining PP children need to leave KS2 working at greater depth.
E.	Attitudes to learning/pupil progress have improved rapidly in KS2 due to improved teaching and 121 ipad provision in Y5/6. The impact on attitudes and learning of the iPad pilot suggest it's introduction across Y3/4
EXTERNAL BARRIERS (issues which also require action outside of school)	
F.	Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP are 94.6% (compared to 95.2% for all pupils) This reduces their school hours and causes them to fall behind. These families typically fall below any thresholds for CP involvement.
G.	Attitudes to education in a small number of parents is poor; their children are frequently late, take holidays during term time etc. Children don't value education as highly as they should.

4. DESIRED OUTCOMES:		
	Desired Outcomes and how they will be measured:	Success criteria:
A.	Continue to improve outcomes for pupils in Reception, especially in CLL – speaking, listening and understanding.	Trend of good progress for all pupils continues for pupils exiting EYFS in July 2018 Improved CLL scores for pupils eligible for PP are maintained between 18-20 (taking into account cohort specifics in 2018).
B.	Higher rates of in year progress, especially in KS2 for pupils eligible for PP	In year average progress rates are 3+ steps for pupils eligible for PP in every year group. Gaps v other pupils may not close, but evidence of accelerated progress required. Progress over time rates are in line with the following: Y3: 3+, Y4: 6+, Y5: 9+, Y6: 12+

		for pupils eligible for PP.
C.	Triangulated monitoring demonstrates that more teaching is judged as consistently good or better.	Teaching profile, based on triangulated monitoring, is maintained at 100% consistently good our better.
D.	Accelerated rates of progress for low/ high prior attainment pupils eligible for PP so that more meet the expected standard in every year group and by the end of KS2.	Low/ high attaining group in every year group make better in year progress (3 steps) with more making accelerated and meeting the expected standard.
E.	Good pupil attitudes demonstrated across KS2 during all observations. Learning to learn behaviours/improved levels of independence exhibited in all pupils. Improved environment during indoor sessions improves, a indicated in pupil and staff questionnaires.	Pupils attitudes deemed at least good across each observation cycle. Behaviour monitoring sheets show reduced number of pupils Autumn exit-Summer exit. School Council/Pupil & Staff questionnaires find 'Significant' or higher outcomes in relation to iPad related questions.
F.	Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP improve resulting in academic outcomes improving.	Attendance for pupils eligible for PP was improves by 0.5% each year for next three years.
G.	Reduced lateness in identified children subject to attendance plans.	80% of families on attendance plans meet agreed targets. Persistent Absence levels in line with national or better.
G2	Wider curriculum opportunities experienced by 95% of children.	All barriers to attendance removed: free breakfast club provision, free childcare sessions for nursery age children, contribution towards costs of visits, payment plans, financial support from C&F worker all evidenced where appropriate.
H.	Accelerate the progress of the most vulnerable children across KS2 who are working significantly below age related expectations. Personalised/group provision where appropriate.	Y6 pupils make at least 'expected progress' which represents accelerated progress given their SEND identification Visible progress and individualised curriculum evident in work analysis/learning walks. Reading age/RWI phase improvements (progress not attainment) compared to other lower attaining pupils in their year groups.

5. PLANNED EXPENDITURE					
Academic year	2017/18				
i) QUALITY OF TEACHING FOR ALL					
Desired Outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	Evidence/rationale for this choice	How will you ensure it is implemented well	Staff lead	Review date
C	Improving the teaching of reading	Based on assessment evaluation. Involvement of school in reading strand of ELP	Staff from school leading elements of the ELP	C Robson	January 2018
C	Improve the quality of teaching of maths	Successful implementation of Inspire Maths at KS1 for PP children is being adapted for use in Y3-5	Maths lead mentoring middle leader to oversee. Y3/4 Assistant Head overseeing directly. 5 day CPD being cascaded to staff. Budget allocation for CPA resources/increased book provision.	G Hill L Carr	January 2018, March 2018, July 2018.

ii) Targeted support					
Desired Outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	Evidence/rationale for this choice	How will you ensure it is implemented well	Staff lead	Review date
A. Improved oral language skills in EY	Staff training on developing oracy for the all pupils in EYFS	We want to invest some of the PP in longer term change which will help all pupils. Many different evidence sources, e.g. Sunderland Talks project, EEF evidence etc.	School part of ELP process; school takes part in ongoing action research throughout programme	C Robson	Easter 2018
A. Improved oral language skills in Reception	Appointment of Speech and Language lead	Services in the locality are only available to the most vulnerable children. We have a significant number of children in each cohort below this threshold who would benefit from specialist planning/provision and who would otherwise receive no support.	Outcomes for these children monitored in line with assessment cycle. Regular meetings between SENCO and appointee	R Walton	Half-termly
B. Improved in-year progress for targeted pupils	Altitude/Marathon	High ability pupils eligible for PP are making less progress than other higher attaining pupils across Key Stage 2 in writing. We want to ensure that PP pupils can achieve high attainment as well as simply 'meeting expected standards'. We want to train a small number of relevant teachers in practices to provide stretch and encouragement for these pupils. Evidence base - EEF toolkit 'Early Support' +5 months	Course selected using evidence of effectiveness. Use INSET days to deliver training. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer observation of attendees' classes after the course, to embed learning (no assessment). 	English lead	Jan 2017
B Use of feedback to ensure 'accelerated	Feedback via TA's	Finance: £36 000 (Two TAs in KS2 to provide 121/small group same day AfL with emphasis on quality feedback)	Unit timetable monitoring	Assistant Heads	Termly – Standards Report

<p>progress' of targeted vulnerable pupils</p>	<p>Small group tuition</p>	<p>Following successful implementation in Y5/6, two TAs are timetabled in afternoons to provide 121 or small group AfL. Typically this consists of a short discussion with the class teacher about targeted pupils who struggled to meet the learning objective that morning. The marking/comments made by the teacher on such work is then followed up directly with the TA (who has been in that lesson in the morning) and retaught.</p> <p>The advantages are that the child(ren) don't get 'left behind' or develop gaps in their learning. It also enables the pace to be maintained for the rest of the class as fewer lessons are 'scrapped' in favour of whole class AfL based on previous day misconceptions.</p> <p>Evidence: EEF toolkit Small group tuition +4 months 121 tuition +5months</p>	<p>Work analysis</p> <p>Learning Walks</p>		
<p>H. Ensure maximum progress for most vulnerable children academically</p>	<p>Small group teaching/tuition</p> <p>Reduced class sizes</p>	<p>Finance: £94 000</p> <p>Provision of additional teacher in Y6 AM only to target disadvantaged pupils (16 children with 2 teachers)</p> <p>Teacher providing nurture provision for 9 most vulnerable pupils in KS2 – all working on IEPs, receiving personalised curriculum.</p> <p>Fourth teacher in Y5/6 to prevent Y5/6 mixed classes AM, and to allow in-house PPA cover.</p> <p>Evidence EEF: Small group tuition +4months Reducing class size +3months</p>	<p>Assessment cycle – data tracking each 8 weeks</p> <p>Pupil Progress meetings</p> <p>Work Analysis/Learning Walks</p>	<p>SENDCO</p> <p>AH's</p>	<p>Various: n line with school SSE cycle</p>

iii) Other approaches					
Desired Outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	Evidence/rationale for this choice	How will you ensure it is implemented well	Staff lead	Review date
<p>D Accelerated rates of progress for low/high prior attainment pupils eligible for PP so that more meet the expected standard in every year group and by the end of KS2.</p> <p>E. Good pupil attitudes demonstrated across KS2 during all observations. Learning to learn behaviours/improved levels of independence exhibited in all pupils.</p> <p>Improved environment during indoor sessions improves, as indicated in pupil and staff questionnaires.</p>	<p>Digital tech/feedback iPad 121 programme</p>	<p>Finances: £54 000 (IT capital) £6 000 (CPD – feedback)</p> <p>Outcomes have improved rapidly over the last three years, most notably for disadvantaged pupils at the end of KS2 (see data outcomes). One key factor in this has been the iPad 121 trial in Y5/6. This has improved curriculum provision, enabled more effective feedback to be provided to pupils, and improved behaviour/attitudes across the unit (wet breaks for example). It also enables our pupils to be Y7 ready through their IT competency, and able to be more independent learners than would otherwise be the case.</p> <p>Apps such as showbie allow direct feedback/instruction to be given direct to pupils and further increase time children are spent engaging with feedback/AfL.</p> <p>LT have significant experience of this: ADS status in previous setting.</p> <p>Evidence base: EEF toolkit. Digital technology +4 months. Feedback +8 months.</p>	<p>ADE training termly from Spring term</p> <p>Termly Evidence via Celebrating Subjects</p> <p>Redeployment of project lead – L Carr from Y5/6 with prior experience</p> <p>CPD feedback from staff</p> <p>Pupils Questionnaire feedback</p>	<p>Headteacher</p> <p>Y3/4 AH</p>	<p>Termly</p>

<p>F. Attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP improve resulting in academic outcomes improving.</p> <p>G. Reduced lateness in identified children subject to attendance plans.</p> <p>Wider curriculum opportunities experienced by 95% of children.</p>	<p>C&F Officer</p> <p>Apprentice</p> <p>CPOMS software</p>	<p>Finance £29 000 (Child and Family Officer, Apprentice, CPOMS)</p> <p>Many of our disadvantaged pupils have additional needs; they have a disproportionate amount of Children’s Services involvement, they have families with greater day to day needs etc. We use some of our funding in this important area of safeguarding. We have a trained deputy DSL who targets many of these families, making early support referrals, attending strategy meetings, supporting the with parenting classes, leading on attendance etc.</p> <p>Evidence EEF toolkit +3months</p> <p>Finance: £15 000 allowance made in Educational Visit allocation</p> <p>Our curriculum relies greatly on enrichment activities which ‘bring the curriculum to life’. These are almost always tightly linked to curriculum topics: a WW2 evacuation/visit to Eden Camp; a visit to a gun/defence battery linked to WW1; London: residential experiences/life skills we’re introducing across KS2; the Wetlands Centre; local farms, etc etc.</p> <p>We take various approaches: we have targeted one or two pupils previously for</p>	<p>HT line management of C&F worker</p> <p>Safeguarding team of 3 created</p> <p>Fortnightly supervision meetings</p> <p>Daily use of CPOMs</p> <p>Communication monitored each half-term: use of website/social media/first day response</p> <p>Apprentice evaluation programme provided by College</p>	<p>HT</p> <p>C&F Officer</p> <p>Office Manager</p> <p>For each enrichment opportunity: Feasibility pre-visit evaluation.</p> <p>Impact evaluation following EV’s/visitors in school.</p>	<p>Ongoing/various</p>

		<p>residential and paid the cost. We make contributions in the case of a small number of families where there are other agency involvement/HT discretion. We also reduce the total cost of visits which we feel would be otherwise unaffordable, such as the WW2 evacuation, where we're contributing £6 per pupil.</p> <p>Evidence base. There is no EEF evidence for this budget commitment.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Review of 2016/17 expenditure

i) quality teaching for all																									
Desired Outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	Estimated IMPACT: Did you meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Possible cost needs moving forward																					
<p>Improve outcomes in Y2 and Y6 vs 2016</p>	<p>Reduced class sizes in KS1 and Y6 to focus on PP children</p> <p>The Academy have allocated approximately £72 500 to reduce class sizes in Key Stage 1 and Year 5/6. Statistically, PP children perform below their non-PP counterparts nationally in statutory assessment, and this is also the case at Bexhill. Therefore, we have taken the decision to reduce class sizes in these year groups. We also have a high percentage (almost double the national average) of children entitled to FSM in these year groups. The small class sizes allows us to better provide immediate feedback to children, and to ensure that rates of progress are similar between different groups. It also enables teachers to have their entitlement of PPA (Planning, Preparation and Assessment) time</p>	<p>Three year trend shows PP outcomes improving rapidly. Gap narrowed year on year between PP (Bexhill) and National (non-FSM). Scaled score in 2017 was 103.1 vs 105.3, compared to 2015 97.2 vs 103.9.</p> <p>Progress better in PP children than non (both school and national) in each of last two years. In 2017: school PP 3.1, school non-PP 1.4 national non 0.3. Sources: FFT.</p> <p>In school data:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Combined scores RWM</th> <th>Pupil Premium</th> <th>Non Pupil Premium</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y1</td> <td>61%</td> <td>81%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y2</td> <td>80%</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y3</td> <td>50%</td> <td>71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y4</td> <td>73%</td> <td>63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y5</td> <td>73%</td> <td>63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y6</td> <td>50%</td> <td>73%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In Y1, Y2 and Y4 disadvantaged pupils have out performed non PP pupils. This was due to:</p> <p>Y1: Placing extra teaching assistant in Y1 to ensure that children had an effective transition from Rec to year 1 . Extra adults also allowed the teacher to be released on a daily basis to run interventions and ensure PP children had effective 1-1 time to work on their targets. 2 terms worth of booster classes to allow the children to catch top in their phonics.</p> <p>Y2: This year group ran for the whole year with three</p>	Combined scores RWM	Pupil Premium	Non Pupil Premium	Y1	61%	81%	Y2	80%	70%	Y3	50%	71%	Y4	73%	63%	Y5	73%	63%	Y6	50%	73%	<p>Continue – clearly, given the impact it has had over three years. The school has increased it’s profile in the improved outcomes it is achieving for disadvantaged pupils.</p>	<p>£94K</p>
Combined scores RWM	Pupil Premium	Non Pupil Premium																							
Y1	61%	81%																							
Y2	80%	70%																							
Y3	50%	71%																							
Y4	73%	63%																							
Y5	73%	63%																							
Y6	50%	73%																							

	without adversely effecting your child's education.	<p>teachers. This allowed pupils to be taught in small groups, therefore allowing the pupils to be taught in ability groups to ensure they got the curriculum they needed to help them progress.</p> <p>Y4</p> <p>Last year, when looking at data this year group was particularly weak in all subjects. To ensure children caught up we used funding to place 2 extra teachers in this year group. This allowed the class sizes for literacy and numeracy to be particularly small. This allowed more focussed objectives, effective feedback and allowed our pupils to have the necessary support.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

ii) targeted support

Desired Outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	Estimated IMPACT: Did you meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Possible cost needs moving forward
Improve attainment of PP children in particular through appropriate interventions	Same day AfL through overstaffing/TA alloaction	See evidence above	Targetted support continues to be effective, but other curriculum demands make this increasingly difficult to plan. Increased pupil numbers in Y5/6 nad additional staff provision needs careful planning.	£36k

iii) other approaches

Desired Outcomes	Chosen action/ approach	Estimated IMPACT: Did you meet the success criteria?	Lessons learned (and whether you will continue with this approach)	Possible cost needs moving forward
Improve vulnerable families' attitudes to education	Our family liaison officer is well established. She speaks to children regularly and supports where necessary. Friendship work shops have been developed as well as drop in sessions for	<p>Attendance rates improved slightly in those families targeted. (see attendance info sheet) Overall attendance improved to 94.99%</p> <p>Days lost to exclusion increased slightly vs previous year from 8 to 12, but the number of children this related to</p>	<p>Informal support for families is less effective than use of formal referral procedures for attendance for example.</p> <p>Attendance of most vulnerable families who were then relocated/moved schools contributed significantly to PA (eg one child with 62%</p>	29k

	behaviour. This then allows teachers to focus on teaching rather and allows pastoral care to be managed effectively.	decreased to only two pupils, losing 3.5 and 8.5 each.	attendance and subject to CP).	
More effective monitoring of vulnerable family support/actions taken	Introduction of CPOMS	Reports for conferences were detailed and action/solutions focussed. They took much less time to complete given new system, which improved both the quality of the outcome and the workload of those completing the reports themselves.	Continue to use, and complete training for third DSL.	£29k
Poverty proofing	Remove barriers to effective learning through targeted allocation of EV funding	Curriculum experiences were strength of Celebrating Subjects monitoring. Visitors into school were tested for best value where possible and greatly enhanced specific subjects (geocaching, EV to London etc).	Need to better demonstrate the financial viability of particular EVs where there is a significant percentage of school contribution required. Continue with payment plans etc for all families in relation to residential EVs	£12k