

The Pupil Premium is additional funding for publicly funded schools in England to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils and close the gap between them and their peers. It is allocated to children from low-income families who are currently known to be eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) in both mainstream and non-mainstream settings, Looked after Children, children adopted from care and Service Forces children. It also includes pupils who have been eligible for FSM at any point in the last six years (known as the Ever 6 FSM measure).

Schools are free to spend the Pupil Premium as they see fit. However, they are held accountable as to how they have used these additional funds to support pupils entitled to this premium and are also required to publish this information online. This will ensure that parents and others are made fully aware of the attainment of pupils covered by Pupil Premium funding and the extra support that they receive.

Forecast for academic Year 2019-2020

Pupil premium planned expenditure:

A review has taken into account the difficulties of measuring / confirming the impact of earlier expenditure, therefore a different approach to planning and reviewing has been taken. Our FSM6 figure is around 58% so this figure is taken as an approximate benchmark for expenditure ratios, however we recognise that many of our families who are not in receipt of FSM are also functioning very close to the breadline and often suffer financial hardship. As a school we are committed to supporting these families as well as those with official PP designation.

As a school we aim to promote respect for all people regardless of gender, age, ethnicity or religious beliefs. The children's natural curiosity and love of learning is cultivated and enhanced through an engaging curriculum and academic progress and achievement is expected and celebrated. We at Kingsley Community School feel that it is important to promote a sense of community and social awareness through the teaching and modelling of British values.

Ultimately, the school aims to improve and enhance the life chances of its pupils via the education and opportunities provided by the school.



Fig 1: comparison between the school's end of KS2 profile to that of the national average

| | | I | | | 1 | |
|----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| | % of pupils | % of pupils | % of pupils | % of pupils | % of pupils | School |
| | eligible for | with SEN | with EAL | stability | from | deprivation |
| | FSM | | | | minority | indicator |
| | | | | | ethnic | |
| | | | | | groups | |
| School | 58% | 19.6 | 85 | 68 (lowest | 98 | 0.5 (highest |
| (end of | | (highest | | quintile) | | quintile) |
| KS2) | | quintile) | | | | |
| National | 25.2 | 12.1 | 20.1 | 85.7 | 31.6 | 0.24 |

Barriers to learning:

As a school we have identified potential barriers to learning. The school aims to bridge these barriers –in part- by allocating additional resources to these areas. Below are 6 key areas which have been identified:

- Poverty of language (language acquisition)
- Low baseline of attainment on entry to school
- Poverty of experience (experience/ access to different environments, resources, organisations etc.)
- Aspiration levels
- High levels of vulnerability (due to deprivation and/or personal circumstances, specific to child/children).
- Family support networks (newly arrived/ refugee, vulnerable adults, emotional disturbances etc.)

Current attainment and progress:

Considering the significant barriers to learning that the school has identified and the contrast between the school's profile (using the key indicators in fig 1.) compared to that of that of the national profile, we as a school believe that we are diminishing the difference between the school's attainment at the end of KS2 at that of the national average in most areas (as evidenced in Fig 2.). As a school we continue to recognise the need to improve attainment in reading, whilst also acknowledging the good progress the children make whilst they are with us.



Fig 2.

| End of KS 2 statutory test data 2018-2019 | Pupils eligible for pp (school) 26 children 58% | Pupils not eligible for pupil premium (school) 19 children | Overall, pupils achieving the expected standard at the end of KS2 | Pupils who achieve the expected standard nationally |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| % achieving in reading, writing and maths RWM | (10 out of 26 children) 38.4% | 57.8% (11 children out of 19) | 46.7% (21 children) | 65% |
| % at national standard in reading including those who achieved above (disaggregated % of children who achieved AARE) | 38.4% (10 out 26 PP children made the expected standard or above) | 57.8% (11 out of the 19 Non PP made the expected standard or above) | 46.7% 13% (6 children) | 73% |
| | 15.3% (4 children) | 10.5% (2 children) | | |
| % at national standard in writing(disaggregated % of children who achieved AARE) | 60% (15/ 26 children) | 70% (14/19 children) | 64.4% (30 children | 78% |
| , | 19.2% (5/ 26children) | 31% (6/ 19children) | 24.4% (11 children) | |
| % at national standard for maths (disaggregated % of children who achieved AARE) | 61.5% (16/26 children) | 78.9% (15/19 children) | 68.8% 31 children 22.2% (10 children) | 79% |
| % at national | children) | 84.2% (16/19) | 73.3% | 78% |
| standard for GPS (disaggregated % of | 73% (19/26 children) | | 33 children | 7070 |
| children who achieved AARE) | 26.9% (7 children) | 26.3% (5 children) | 26.6% (12 children) | |



Proposed spending plan 2019-2020:

| Project | Pupil | How will the | Target Group | How will | Barriers to | Review |
|---------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ref. | Premium | allocation be | and planned | this be | learning | |
| | Allocated | spent? | effect on | measured/ | being | |
| | £ | | attainment | reviewed | addressed | |
| 1. | £38,280 | 2x Learning mentor salary(approx. 58% of FTE salary) | -Incidents of stage 4/5 behaviour reduced by 20% - progress of vulnerable/ targeted pupils in line with other pupils, | Weekly behaviour sheets/ red book incident log Pupil progress meetings/ | Family support networks/ High levels of vulnerability | Less incidents of stage 5 and 4 behaviour recorded during the same period compared to the year before however due to school closure |
| | | | good progress in 85% of pupils targeted. | July target progress review | | hard to make a definitive comparison. |
| 2. | £30,000 | Vulnerable pupil officer salary | Vulnerable pupils (LAC/ CIN/ or other stage, variety of reasons. Well being of children safeguarded - Access to other agency support escalated and robust | Difficult to measure! -via data at end of year - via supervision notes - via pupil anecdotes and surveys | Family support networks/ High levels of vulnerability | Currently only 1 LAC and no CIN, however we have had 2 families who children were previously classified as LAC within their homes setting who are no longer classified as LAC, which shows the success of the wrap around support that school offers. |
| 3. | £5000 | Extended school mentor salary 20% of | Pupils with FSM accessing after school activities at least one set of sessions. | Record of pupils attending. Targeted pupils | Family support networks | All after school clubs are free and open to all relevant children in that year |





| | | | | attend at least 1 after school club. | | group. Initial data from KS2 questionnaire indicates that almost all children have accessed an afterschool club at some point, with some children accessing multiple clubs. |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4 | £10,440 | Subsidy of school trips (1 trip per term) | Depth of curriculum extended, enjoyment and excellence for all, access to cultural heritage. | Log of trips attended, follow up work, website, Twitter records. | Poverty of experience | The whole school took part in a zoological/conse rvation trip to Chester Zoo |
| 5 | £5000 | Subsidy of residential visits | Opportunity for cooperation/ independence/ cultural opportunity extended to all pupils | Register of uptake. | Poverty of experience | Two residentials took place across four year groups: year 2, 3 4 and 5. All places for all children were heavily subsidised. |
| 6 | £30,933 | Targeted provision, staff salary (58% 0f 50% of salary) | Groups taken by NW/ LC Good progress made by 85% of pupils in school, these groups included. | July pupil progress meetings. Good progress measure as LA assessment pilot. | Language acquisition/ Low baseline of attainment on entry to school | Optional sats evidence and teacher assessment show that NW target group all made accelerated progress, particularly in reading. Anecdotal evidence suggests that basic skills |





| 7. | £19,333 | Councillors/ play therapist support for vulnerable pupils | Vulnerable pupils (LAC/ CIN/ or other stage, variety of reasons. Well being of children safeguarded - Access to other agency support escalated and robust | SDQ questionnai re, Children continuing in mainstrea m education | High levels of vulnerability | taught in reception were stronger last year, as reported by the year 1 teachers Children who have accessed this provision are looked to be making good academic progress and of the 5 children accessing this support, initial evidence points to all of them being more settled within this environment. At this point 40% of the children observed who had the potential for social/emotional behaviour that may disrupt learning has been reduced. SDQ questionnaire showed targeted children improved their emotional resilience and social awareness over the year. Limited data as |
|----|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8. | £30,546 | Sen 1-1 | | progress | acquisition | children are only |





| | | intervention support (58% salaries of 3 staff) | Good progress made by 85% of pupils in school, these groups included. | meetings. Good progress measure as LA assessment | | half way through the intervention programme due to covid school closures. |
|-----|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9. | £7,730 | Subsidised breakfast club places for all pupils (58% of cost) | Reduction in late attenders to school (targeted pupils by 20%) Facilitates well being and mixed age peer support | pilot. Termly late book review. | Family support networks/ High levels of vulnerability | On average between 40-60 children accessed breakfast club daily. Of these some were identified due to a specific need: attendance, emotional well- being, or poverty within the home as well as children who just wanted to access it. |
| 10. | £35,573 | Additional Nursery staff to keep key person groups small. (58% salary of 3 extra staff than ratios require across EYFS) | Increased progress across DM , based on target of 85% good progress In Reception increase in progress across prime areas to 85% good progress | ST assessment in reception Pupil Progress June 2017. Acceleratio n apparent via moderation / tracking of targeted pupils. | Low baseline of attainment on entry to school | Limited data due to early school closure due to Covid. |
| 10. | £60,320 | Additional LSOs to provide in class and small group support to | Good progress achieved across R,W M and phonics (85% of pupils in line with LA pilot | Pupil progress and st/ progress review in July 2017. | Language acquisition/l ow baseline of attainment | Data from the autumn term and teacher assessment from year 6 cohort (spring term) |





| | | target pupil | good progress | | on entry to | shows that all |
|-----------------|----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| | | progress (58% | measures) | | school | keystage 1 and 2 |
| | | salary of 1 | | | | classes were on |
| | | extra LSO per | | | | track to meet |
| | | year group) | | | | data targets set |
| | | | | | | out in apptaisal. |
| | | | | Programm | Language | Class teachers |
| | | | Children make | e has | acquisition | were able to |
| | | | accelerated | assessment | | analysis how |
| | | | progress in | embedded | | many children a |
| | | | terms of | into it. T | | week were |
| | | | reading | class | | accessing the |
| | | Reading plus | attainment | teachers | | intervention. |
| 11. | £5000 | online | | will also | | Again teacher |
| | | programme | | monitor | | assessment from |
| | | | | children's | | year 6 shows |
| | | | | progress | | that children |
| | | | | through | | |
| | | | | normal | | |
| | | | | school | | |
| | | | | practice | | |
| | | | | Children to | High levels | Children across |
| | | | | be | of | KS1 and 2 were |
| | | | | reviewed | vulnerability | identified by the |
| | | | | half | | Senco and |
| | | | | termly/ | | teachers for |
| | | | Mentored to | children | | mentor support |
| | | Targeted | have a register | should exit | | (SEMH) At least |
| | | behavioural | of children to | and enter. | | 80% observed |
| 12. | £10000 | support. | work with in | Targeted | | settle into the |
| | | Learning | class to help | children | | school day |
| | | mentor am | maintain and | should | | quicker – ready |
| | | | monitor their | have | | to access |
| | | | behaviour. | reduced | | learning. All |
| | | | | incidents of | | children who |
| | | | | stage 4 | | have accessed to |
| | | | | behaviour. | | mentor support |
| | | | | | | have an open |
| | | | | | | door policy. |
| Total allocated | £287,021 | | | | | |