

Pupil Premium Strategy



#TransformingLives

Summary information					
Academy	Iceni Academy-Hockwold				
SLT Lead	Alicia Rickards				
Link Governor	Bob Muir				
Date of most recent PP Review:					
Date of next PP Review:					
Academic Year	2019-2020	Total PP budget £19,320	£ 19,320	Total number of pupils on roll: 101	
				Total PP: 11	
				Ever 6 PP: 8	
				EYFS PP: 1	
				LAC PP: 0	
				Refugee: 0	
				Forces: 11	

Contextual/Additional information:

Our vision for Icen Academy-Hockwold is to create a love of learning in a happy and secure environment, which inspires everyone to achieve their full potential and realise their passion for learning in whatever way suits their personal strengths and qualities.

We are developing a creative, dynamic environment that seeks to nurture our pupils academically, socially, emotionally, and physically.

We strive for a first class learning experience for all, ensuring continuity between the Primary, Secondary and Further Education stages of learning.

We are full in EYFS, having increased our PAN for this year from 20 to 25. We are also full in years 1, 2 and 3. This means that we may possibly have a separate EYFS, year 1 and year 2 Class in September 2020. We have two American air force bases nearby, so often have American children in EYFS and year 1. These children usually leave due to deployment by the end of year 1. However, due to our reputation, we have more British children from outside of catchment joining in September 2019.

For a small school, our EHCP % is higher than the national average. We currently have two children with an EHCP, and another going through the diagnosis before we apply for an EHCP. Last year, we helped parents appeal to get their child into a more suitable education provision and won. This is the third time we have been to appeal with parents, and we have had a positive outcome for each child.

The IDACI (Index of Deprivation Amongst Children Indicator) shows us in the 6th decile.

This is worked out on a scale from 1 being the most deprived and 10 being the least deprived area. Seven categories are taken into consideration when weighting the domains:

- Income Deprivation (22.5%)
- Employment Deprivation (22.5%)
- Education, Skills and Training Deprivation (13.5%)
- Health Deprivation and Disability (13.5%)
- Crime (9.3%)
- Barriers to Housing and Services (9.3%)
- Living Environment Deprivation (9.3%)

This information suggests that we are approximately in the middle of the deprivation table. For more information see:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/579151/English_Indices_of_Deprivation_2015 -
_Frequently_Asked_Questions_Dec_2016.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/579151/English_Indices_of_Deprivation_2015_-_Frequently_Asked_Questions_Dec_2016.pdf)

Current Information

	Boys	Girls	SEN+	EHCP	EAL	Armed forces	FSM
EYFS	15	10	2	1		2	1
1	6	6	0			4	1
2	9	7	1	1	1	2	1
3	5	4	1				1
4	11	5	1			2	2
5	5	5	1				1
6	2	11	2				2
Total	53	48					9

Historic Performance Indicators								
2017 cohort of 13 2018 cohort of 10	National all 2017	National all 2018	Academy 2017	Academy 2018	National PP 2017	National PP 2018	Academy PP 2017	Academy PP 2018
% achieving at or above ARE combined by the end of Y6:	61	64	39	50			1 out of 3	0 out of 1
% achieving at or above ARE in reading by the end of Y6:	71	75	69	50			1 out of 3	0 out of 1
% achieving at or above ARE in writing by the end of Y6:	76	76	77	60			1 out of 3	0 out of 1
% achieving at or above ARE in maths by the end of Y6:	75	76	54	60			1 out of 3	0 out of 1
% achieving at or above ARE in SPAG by the end of year 6	77	78	62	60			0 out of 3	0 out of 1
% achieving at or above ARE in reading by the end of Y2:	76	75	71	75			N/A	2 out of 2
% achieving at or above ARE in writing by the end of Y2:	71	70	57	75			N/A	2 out of 2
% achieving at or above ARE in maths by the end of Y2:	75	76	64	75			N/A	2 out of 2
% passing the phonics screening in Y1	81	82	83	67			1 out of 1	1 out of 2

% achieving GLD in Rec			80	81			2 out of 2	1 out of 1
Attendance			94.76%	94.74%				

Current Performance Indicators					
2019 cohort of 14	National all 2019	Academy 2019	National PP 2019	Academy PP 2019	Variation
% achieving at or above ARE combined by the end of Y6:	65	56		1 out of 1	
% achieving at or above ARE in reading by the end of Y6:	73	56		1 out of 1	
% achieving at or above ARE in writing by the end of Y6:	78	77		1 out of 1	
% achieving at or above ARE in maths by the end of Y6:	79	86		1 out of 1	
% achieving at or above progress in SPAG by the end of year 6	78	77		1 out of 1	
% achieving at or above ARE in reading by the end of Y2:	75	80		1 out of 1	
% achieving at or above ARE in writing by the end of Y2:	69	70		1 out of 1	
% achieving at or above ARE in maths by the end of Y2:	76	70		1 out of 1	
% passing the phonics screening in Y1	82	69		1 out of 2	
% achieving GLD in Rec	72	76		0 out of 1	
Attendance: 94.84%					

2018-2019 Review

Number of pupils and pupil premium grant (PPG) received	
Total number of pupils on roll (not including nursery)	97
Total number of pupils eligible	17 Armed Forces 17 Pupil Premium
Amount PPG received per pupil	£1,320
Amount armed forces received per pupil	£300
Amount armed forces received	£5,100
Total amount of PPG received	£22,440
Total amount of PPG spent	£27,540

Review of expenditure				
Academic Year		2018-19		
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
Children will achieve age expected at the end of the year	Teaching assistant deployed in all classes			£21,540
All children will experience a wealth of opportunities to enhance their lives	Funds to pay for trips including residentials	All including paying for 2 PP children residential and all PP children went on several school trips	Yes continue	£1,000

Access to ICT based curriculum to enhance skills learnt in class	School laptops to be used for children who do not have a computer at home, including licenses for Mathletics and Lexia to use at home and in school	Yes – all PP children had access to ICT and took logins home for extra work		£2,500
ii. Targeted Support				
	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 ensure good mental health	Pastoral support adviser to work 1:1 with children to develop strategies for emotional difficulties as needed (especially for those whose parents are deployed)	Increased TA hours to provide weekly pastoral support	Yes and we now have a mental health champion	£2,500
iii. Other approaches				
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

Barriers to future attainment and progress (for pupils eligible for PP)		
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills</i>)		
A.	2 x children with poor language skills. 1 x because of lack of self-esteem due to very poor teeth creating a speech impediment.	
B.	6 x social and emotional issues due to family breakups	
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)		
F.	3 x attendance and lateness (but this has been rectified over the last academic year)	
G.	2 x FSP required	
Desired Outcomes		
	Desired outcomes and how they will be measured	Success criteria
A		
B		

A small but growing number of schools are using their funding for disadvantaged pupils to offset budget cuts elsewhere, according to polling. The survey of 1,607 teachers, conducted by the National Foundation for Educational Research as part of their Teachers' Voice Omnibus survey, found that one in five didn't know what the main priorities for their pupil premium funding was. The most common priority for spending, identified by over a quarter of teachers (28%), was on early intervention schemes. 13% said that more 1:1 tuition was a priority and 10% said teaching assistants. However, virtually all of the senior leaders surveyed believe that the pupil premium has allowed them to target resources at raising the attainment of their poorest pupils. 98% of primary and secondary leaders and four out of five classroom teachers (79%) agreed with this statement to either a great extent, to some extent or to a little extent. <https://www.suttontrust.com/newsarchive/small-but-increasing-number-of-schools-are-using-their-pupil-premium-funding-to-offset-budget-cuts-new-sutton-trust-and-education-endowment-foundation-polling/>

Sutton Trust: Academies are not helping disadvantaged children enough: The think-tank examined the performance of disadvantaged students – those entitled to [the pupil premium](#) – in sponsored academies in 39 chains from 2013-2015. The report, *Chain Effects 2016*, it found that 8 out of 39 schools were substantially underperforming compared to the national average for disadvantaged pupils.

<http://www.publicfinance.co.uk/news/2016/07/sutton-trust-academies-are-not-helping-disadvantaged-children-enough>

<http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk> provide a teaching and learning tool kit that maps out impact vs spend, this document supports the forecasted use of funding within this document.

As such the following strategy outlines precise spending to ensure pupil premium funding is balanced and meets the needs of all pupil premium children within the academy, whilst complimenting and enriching the existing curriculum.

2019-2020 Strategy

Planned expenditure					
Academic year	2019-2020				
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 Education for all					
Desired outcome (A-H above)	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	Review Date
Where applicable, PP children make accelerated progress to close the gaps in their learning.	Teaching assistant deployed in all classes.	4 PP children are not at age related expectations.	Classroom observations, book looks, intervention programmes.	EOw ARi	End of Autumn Term
Total budgeted cost					15,820

All children continue to experience a wealth of opportunities to enhance their lives.	Funding to pay for school trips including residential	No child left out.	Trips are paid for through PP.	EOw	Autumn
Total budgeted cost					£1,000
ii. Targeted support					
Desired outcome (A-H above)	Chosen action / approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	Review Date
Children are able to access the curriculum through support given for mental health and social issues.	A trained Mental Health Champion has been appointed		EOw Principal will be overseeing structure of sessions based on the needs of the individual child as discussed with class teacher and staff involved.	STo and EOw	End of Autumn Term
Total budgeted cost					£2,500
Total budgeted					£19,320

Yr group	Subject linked to intervention	Name of intervention
EYFS	NA	NA
1	Reading Writing Maths Self esteem	Reading sight words Lexia Max's Marvellous Maths SEMH
2	English Maths	Rising Stars
3	NA	Lexia
4	NA	NA
4	R, W, M	Sentence structure Reading comp Spelling Word Wasp Rising Stars SEMH
5	Spelling	Word Wasp/Lexia
6	English and maths	Rising Stars, Lexia, Power of 2, Uplevelling sentences. Extra support in class
6	NA	NA. First child to finish BEAR project, so we purchased more books for the pupil!

All children on the PP register (who are eligible) attend at least 1 club per week)