

Mengham Infant School Pupil premium strategy statement

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium for the 2023-24 2023 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	Mengham Infant School
Number of pupils in school	170
Number and proportion of pupil premium eligible pupils	39 (23%)
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers (3 year plans are recommended)	23/24, 24/25, 25/26
Date this statement was published	November 2023
Date on which it will be reviewed	September 2023
Statement authorised by	Lindsay Rebbitt
Pupil premium lead	Senior leadership team
Governor / Trustee lead	Julie Collins

Funding overview

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£ 53,625
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year	£ 5,220 (estimated)
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years (enter £0 if not applicable)	£ 0
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	£ 58,845

Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan

Statement of intent

Our vision is that Mengham Infant School will be an outstanding learning environment, within which all children feel safe, inspired and valued; a place of excellence that gives our children the foundation they need to become creative, confident, life-long learners.

We believe strongly that disadvantaged children can and should flourish in all areas of their development, and that we can minimise or eliminate any barriers that they may face to doing so.

In formulating our pupil premium strategy, we look at all the disadvantaged children within our school as individuals and identify the barriers that they face, before picking out key themes of difficulty that we can address as a school.

This strategy focuses on the developments in teaching and learning that our school can make in order to raise the attainment of children eligible for pupil premium.

Challenges

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

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	A higher proportion of children eligible for pupil premium (PP) have special educational needs or disabilities (SEND) than their peers, and this is particularly the case with regards to PP children with significant SEND. In order to make progress and achieve, these children require significantly different provision from their peers, often with substantially more teacher support.
2	On average, children eligible for PP have lower current attainment levels than their peers and the national age-related expectations (ARE). This is the case for the entry levels of the year R cohort and the levels in school for the year 1 and 2 cohorts. This lower current attainment makes it harder for these children to access learning objectives at ARE in lessons.
3	Some children eligible for PP have less-developed language skills. They find it difficult to speak in, or understanding others speaking in, longer or more complex sentences. They do not have as wide a vocabulary as the average child of their age, particularly with regards to subject-specific vocabulary. This prevents them from understanding new concepts, or the explanations of concepts, and hinders them from fully joining in discussions.

4	Some children eligible for PP do not have learning skills at the same level as their peers. There are many elements that make up effective learning skills such as the ability to concentrate, to persevere, and to work independently.
---	---

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
1	Children eligible for PP who have SEND and who are working significantly below ARE show clear progress against starting points and they are given good opportunities to meet challenging, personalised targets.	At least 90% of PP children on the SEND register have met their personal end of year targets.
2	A greater proportion of PP children meet ARE / GDS standards in KS1 and the expected standard in Early Years, so that we diminish or eliminate the difference between this and the 'national other' figure.	At least 85% of PP children have made good or better progress from their baseline starting points.
3	Children eligible for PP develop a wider vocabulary (especially with regards to academic language) and wider oral language skills, to bring them in line with their peers.	Staff are aware of PP children with poor oral language skills, and their next steps for improvement. Targeted PP children have improved language link scores. Child conferences provide evidence of PP children confidently using a wide range of technical vocabulary, at an ARE standard. Lesson observations provide evidence of PP children fully engaging in class, small group and pair discussions.
4	Class planning takes account of the differing needs of PP children who lack learning skills, so that they can still be successful and make progress in lessons. In addition, these children receive extra provision to enable them to develop improved learning skills.	Targeted PP children have improved Boxall / Thrive profile scores in areas identified for development. Lesson observations show that PP children develop , over their time with us at the school,

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: £29,903

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
<p>A</p> <p>The school improvement plan (SIP) for this year is focussed on improving core standards in teaching and learning. Many of the elements of this SIP are designed to improve our provision for PP children facing the four challenges outlined above. New school-wide systems will be introduced and teacher professional development will lead to this improved provision for PP children. In particular, the following areas will be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff expectations of what <i>all</i> children can achieve will be raised, modelled by leaders at all levels. • Lesson design and pedagogy will enable children to make better progress – especially those children with lower starting points. This improved curriculum will ensure children have mastered concepts before moving on. • Learning objectives will always be pitched correctly at children’s next steps in learning, particularly for children who are currently not at ARE. • Lower attaining children will be given tasks that they can still access mostly independently to avoid them becoming over reliant on adult support and to ensure they experience success. • The presentation of learning or tasks will not lead to cognitive overload for children. <p>Subject leaders will have release time which will allow them to ensure that these expectations are being met within their subjects.</p>	<p>The Educational Endowment Foundation (EEF) argues that quality first teaching “<i>is the most important lever schools have to improve pupil attainment ... particularly the most disadvantaged among them.</i>” The development of this quality teaching needs to be based on a clear plan of CPD which is also responsive to individual staff’s needs.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4</p>
<p>B</p> <p>The senior leadership team (SLT) will receive training and support from the Hampshire Inspection and Advisory Service around effective systems and processes for pupil</p>	<p>The Hampshire Inspection and Advisory Service is a source of reliable, expert advice, who are able to tailor</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4</p>

	premium children. The SLT will then cascade this training to other staff within the school.	solutions for individual school's specific needs.	
C	The intervention leader will have release time to support staff in carefully analysing and 'getting underneath' the barriers children face in their learning, so that our teaching is more effective.	The meta-analysis conducted by John Hattie's in <i>Visible Learning</i> shows that detailed formative assessment is one of strategies in school which has the highest impact for relatively low cost.	2, 3, 4
D	Senior leaders within the school will regularly moderate between data drops so that slow progress is identified and addressed quickly. The SLT will lead teacher year group teams in identifying how provision can be amended in response to assessment and/or moderation.		2
E	Higher level teaching assistant (HLTA) time will be allocated either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To conduct, or allow teachers to conduct, in-depth assessments of children's knowledge. These assessments will be focussed on phonics and maths and will allow teachers to plan future provision that meets the children's needs precisely. • To allow teachers to conduct peer-observations that support them in trialling and developing effective pedagogies. 	The Education Development Trust has found the use of peer review strategies brings about improvements in quality of teaching and learning.	2

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

Budgeted cost: £69,592 (£28,942 from PP funding, £40,650 from central budget)

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed	
F	Children who have significant SEND will receive alternative intervention provision that meets their complex individual needs. This provision will require a higher staff : child ratio than the usual classroom provision. Where children are receiving alternative provision in school, class teachers will still have full responsibility and accountability for their educational outcomes and will plan for them accordingly. These children's learning will link effectively between class and intervention settings.	The explanations and activities that children are given need to match their next steps and be appropriate for their developmental levels. In some cases, this is most effectively done in very small groups or in 1:1 contexts.	1

G	The SENDCO will have time to lead the implementation of alternative provision and evaluate its effectiveness on an ongoing basis.	DfE research ¹ has found that effective SEND provision has to be driven from by leaders throughout the school, but particularly senior leaders. It also found that support has to be carefully tailored to individuals, with robust systems for assessing and reviewing.	1
H	Teachers, TAs, and volunteer adult readers will provide extra 1:1 reading opportunities for children who are struggling. The reading leader will oversee reading and phonics training around this.	1:1 reading is a very effective intervention, but it is time intensive. TAs, volunteers and the Therapy Dog provide the capacity to provide this intervention. They also give the children another role-model of an adult who values reading.	2
I	TAs will receive CPD through the year, led by the deputy head and SENDCO. The training the TAs will receive this year will depend upon their role, and will be focussed on either (a) effective pedagogies for supporting children's learning in class or (b) supporting children with individual targets and EHCPs.	TAs benefit from professional development as much as teachers do. Paying for the release time for this to happen is an investment which is more than compensated for by the benefits of the training.	1,2
J	The emotional literacy support assistant (ELSA) will work with specific children whom the teacher has identified as lacking learning skills. The ELSA will be supported and trained through county-wide ELSA supervision. TA time will be allocated to provide 1:1 Thrive support. Thrive practitioners from PBS support staff member in school implementing these interventions.	The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues is effective. The Thrive and ELSA practitioners also work supporting families, which the EEF Toolkit recommends to increase effect size.	4
K	TA time will be used to run The Nuffield Early Language Intervention (NELI) in year R.	NELI is an evidence-based oral language intervention developed by the University of York which showed significant impact in randomised control trials. Ensuring year R children have language deficits identified and support early allows them to access the whole curriculum.	3

¹ SEN support: research evidence on effective approaches and examples of current practice in good and outstanding schools and colleges

L	HLTA time will be used to run Speech Link and Language Link interventions in KS1.	Speech Link and Language Link are widely-used diagnostic and intervention tools with proven impact. Using them allows children's needs to be identified and precisely targeted interventions put into place.	3
---	---	--	---

Total budgeted cost: £99,495

£58,845 of this cost will come from the pupil premium grant and catch up funding. The remainder will be funded from the school's central budget

Part B: Review of outcomes in the previous academic year

Pupil premium strategy outcomes

This is the impact that our pupil premium strategy had on pupils in the 2022-23 academic year.

	Intended outcome	Success criteria	Outcomes (2022-23)																																																																
1	A greater proportion of PP children meet ARE / GDS standards in KS1 and the expected / exceeding standards in Early Years, so that we diminish or eliminate the difference between this and the 'national other' figure.	<p>End of year targets for PP children were:</p> <p>Year R:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>GLD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>58%</td> <td>58%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 1:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ARE+</td> <td>53%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GDS</td> <td>12%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 2:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ARE+</td> <td>50%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GDS</td> <td>10%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Children eligible for PP who have SEND and who are working significantly below ARE show clear progress against starting points and they are given good opportunities to meet challenging, personalised targets.</p>	Reading	Writing	Maths	GLD	58%	58%	75%	58%		Reading	Writing	Maths	ARE+	53%	47%	65%	GDS	12%	12%	18%		Reading	Writing	Maths	ARE+	50%	30%	60%	GDS	10%	0%	10%	<p>End of year outcomes for PP children were:</p> <p>Year R:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> <th>GLD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>64%</td> <td>64%</td> <td>79%</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 1:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ARE+</td> <td>33%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GDS</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 2:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Writing</th> <th>Maths</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ARE+</td> <td>30%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GDS</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In year R outcomes for PP children were above targets set and broadly in line with the national average for all children, which is a result of accelerated progress for these PP children in our school. In years 1 and 2, PP children did not make good enough progress and their outcomes were below targets set and the national average for all children. The reasons for this slow progress in KS1, and our plans to address it, are set out in this current (i.e. 23-24) pupil premium strategy.</p>	Reading	Writing	Maths	GLD	64%	64%	79%	64%		Reading	Writing	Maths	ARE+	33%	21%	40%	GDS	0%	0%	0%		Reading	Writing	Maths	ARE+	30%	10%	50%	GDS	0%	0%	10%
Reading	Writing	Maths	GLD																																																																
58%	58%	75%	58%																																																																
	Reading	Writing	Maths																																																																
ARE+	53%	47%	65%																																																																
GDS	12%	12%	18%																																																																
	Reading	Writing	Maths																																																																
ARE+	50%	30%	60%																																																																
GDS	10%	0%	10%																																																																
Reading	Writing	Maths	GLD																																																																
64%	64%	79%	64%																																																																
	Reading	Writing	Maths																																																																
ARE+	33%	21%	40%																																																																
GDS	0%	0%	0%																																																																
	Reading	Writing	Maths																																																																
ARE+	30%	10%	50%																																																																
GDS	0%	0%	10%																																																																
2	Children eligible for PP develop improved inter- and intra-personal skills.	Targeted PP children have improved Boxall / Thrive profile scores in areas identified for development. All PP children receive, on average, as many behaviour awards in school as their peers.	<p>All children with Thrive intervention made improvements in their Thrive assessment scores.</p> <p>Class reward (pet) charts show that, on average, PP children receive positive behaviour</p>																																																																

			recognition at a rate in line with their peers.
3	Children eligible for PP develop a wider vocabulary (especially with regards to academic language) and wider oral language skills, to bring them in line with their peers.	Staff are aware of PP children with poor oral language skills, and their next steps for improvement. Targeted PP children have improved language link scores. Child conferences provide evidence of PP children confidently using a wide range of technical vocabulary, at an ARE standard. Lesson observations provide evidence of PP children fully engaging in class, small group and pair discussions.	Lesson observations showed that PP children were given good opportunities for practising language within class, and that these children were able to use some of the subject-specific language within discussions. NELI language scores show that the vast majority of children targeted made good or better progress in language development (as measured by the Language Screen assessment).
4	Families of all children eligible for PP take up a wide range of opportunities to engage with school. The school encourages and supports these families to help their child learn at home. School provides extra help and motivation for PP children if families do not do so at home.	Parental engagement trackers and Seesaw use show increased levels of participation from parents/carers of PP children, so they are in line with the parents of non-PP children. Parental engagement with reading bookmarks show that PP children are read with on a 1:1 basis as frequently as their peers, either by parents/carers at home or through extra opportunities in school.	Parental engagement trackers show that parents/carers of PP children attended 67% of school sessions (e.g. parents' evenings, family learning etc.). Parents/carers of non-PP children attended 74% of sessions. This suggests that steps taken by staff to engage with all families are broadly working. In class reading trackers show that, in all classes, children receiving less support at home are being identified and given extra opportunities to read 1:1 with teaching staff at school.
5	Children eligible for PP have similar opportunities for enhanced learning activities across curriculum as their peers and are inspired to participate, improve and excel.	At least 50% of pupil premium children attend some form of extra-curricular provision. When interviewed, these children report that it is enjoyable and/or has helped them develop a skill/interest.	65% of PP children attended at least one after-school club. Child conferencing shows that the large majority of PP children attending clubs were enjoying them, and coach feedback shows that they were developing skills well over time.
6	Children eligible for PP have increased attendance rates.	Overall PP attendance is at least in line with non-PP peers. Percentage of persistent absentees among PP children remains less than the national average.	Attendance rates for 22-23: PP children: 93.8% All children: 94.6% Persistent absence for 22-23: PP children: 12.5% All children: 12.0% Attendance for PP children is in line with their peers, and above the national attendance level for

			all children (92.7%). Persistent absence is below the national average for all children (17.3%).
7	Families of children eligible for PP who need support from external agencies are signposted to this support quickly, and school plays a proactive role in being a part of this a support so that it is effective and the effects of the difficulties at home are mitigated.	Child protection monitoring shows concerns about children are followed up quickly and appropriately, with school being proactive in finding and offering sources of support. Internal monitoring documents show that families are being offered support and that where there are requirements from external agencies' plans, school is fully involved in meeting these.	Weekly monitoring of CPOMS records shows that concerns raised by teachers or families are being responded to quickly with appropriate actions, and that these actions are followed through upon. Governor and Ofsted evaluations also found that these systems were rigorous and effective.

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
Language Link	Multimedia Limited
Speech Link	Multimedia Limited
White Rose Maths	White Rose Maths
Real PE, Real Gym	Real PE
Twinkl Phonics	Twinkl
Numbots	Maths Circle
Computing curriculum resources	Kapow