



Chandag Junior School Pupil Premium Report for 2016-2017

1. Summary information					
School	Chandag Junior School				
Academic Year	2016-17	Total PP budget	£27900	Date of most recent PP Review	February 2017
Total number of pupils	268	Number of pupils eligible for PP	19 (7%)	Date for end of year report	Sept 2017

2. Rationale	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to address the challenge of 'diminishing differences' in achievement for socially disadvantaged pupils the school will publish on www.chandag-jun.bathnes.sch.uk information specifying how we have used their Pupil Premium Grant. All activities funded by the pupil premium grants are aimed at every area of the children's development, and are targeted to accelerate progress over time, swiftly move children's attainment to their age related expectation or beyond, and rapidly reduce the possibility of those children falling behind their peers. We ensure that appropriate provision is made for pupils who belong to vulnerable groups; this includes ensuring that the needs of socially disadvantaged pupils are effectively assessed and addressed. In making provision for socially disadvantaged pupils, we recognise that not all pupils who receive free school meals will be socially disadvantaged. We also recognise that not all pupils who are socially disadvantaged are registered or qualify for free school meals. We reserve the right to allocate the Pupil Premium funding to support any pupil or groups of pupils the school has legitimately identified as being socially disadvantaged. Pupil premium funding is allocated following a needs analysis which will identify priority year groups or individual children. Limited funding and resources means that not all children receiving free school meals will be in receipt of pupil premium interventions at one time. Our pupil premium cohort is made up of children with a range of attainment; therefore interventions will take account of this range. 	

3. Attainment at end of key stage 2017 (Y6)		
	Pupils eligible for PP	Pupils not eligible for PP
% achieving ARE in reading, writing and maths	40%	59%
% making progress in reading	+5	-1
% making progress in writing	-19	-16
% making progress in maths	-21	-19

1. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)			
In-school barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)			
A.	Some inconsistency in quality first teaching and the considered approaches to deployment of TAs in class support to enable teacher opportunities to work with vulnerable pupils and not always allocate a TA to PP children.		
B.	Ensuring that all teaching and non-teaching support staff are fully aware of vulnerable/disadvantaged groups and have the highest of expectations for all.		
C.			
D.			
External barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates)			
E.	Attendance and punctuality rates are slightly lower amongst PP (average 95%) children than non-PP (average 97%); Take-up/attendance to Maths intervention and booster is poorer in PP children.		
F.	Some PP children have greater SMEH needs which seem to arise within the home setting.		
G.	Some key families do not engage with support offered within school or externally (e.g. PSA) which affects attitude to school or “undoes” the SMEH approach in school.		
2. Desired outcomes			
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>	<i>Impact measure & outcome (see detail below) (RAG; R=not achieved, A=partially achieved, G=fully achieved)</i>
A.	Attendance will have improved for PP group	End of 2016-2017 will show attendance improved and that it at least matches national attendance figures (96%) or school target of 97.5%	Effective, fully achieved
B.	By the end of KS2 any ‘differences’ will have been diminished; PP children (who have no additional SEN needs) will make the expected (or better) progress and attainment.	Progress and attainment data shows the differences diminishing in each year group and being eliminated by end of KS2 (unless additional needs contribute to inhibiting this).	Partially effective, partially achieved
C.	PP children with SMEH will feel less anxious; will be more ready to learn through accessing differing support through intervention mechanisms and/or nurture sessions.	THRIVE trained staff to better support SMEH needs; resources purchased to facilitate THRIVE strategies and activities.	Effective, fully achieved

3. Planned expenditure

Academic year

2016/17

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 and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?	End of year RAG rating <i>Impact measure & outcome</i>
B	<p>SLT driven focus on Quality First Teaching – Teaching to improve Learning.</p> <p>Clear Performance Management (PM) objectives linked to above and PP progress and attainment.</p>	<p>SLT observations along with external LA reviews demonstrated that there were inconsistencies amongst standards of teaching and learning.</p> <p>Progress and attainment of PP children takes to end of KS2 to properly “close” and more accountability must happen with KS2.</p>	<p>Individual assessment, pod peer assessment and out of pod peer assessment against criteria to be addressed – given to SLT to monitor and customise to individuals as year progresses.</p> <p>Out of school collaboration to be investigated for our teachers to extend this with other professionals.</p> <p>Interim and final PM review meetings</p>	<p>Teachers</p> <p>Tim Dunning (HT)</p>	<p>PM objectives set Term 2, mid-point review Term 4, final review Term 6.</p> <p>PPM meetings termly</p>	<p>Partially effective. Outcomes for children in two year groups were as good as, or better than, non-PP children. For example, in maths the difference was +27%. Outcomes in upper KS2 were variable with a negative difference, for example in writing the difference was -28%.</p> <p>Action: SIP 17/18 reflects identified barriers and plans to minimise difference this year.</p>

ii. Targeted support

Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?
-----------------	------------------------	---	---	------------	--------------------------------------

A	Whole school approach to supporting and challenging families with children's' lateness and punctuality.	Whole school attendance drives to get to 97.5%; focus on 'Late' attendance, especially with boys. Differences between PP and non-PP in attendance and	Frequent monitoring of attendance data to implement contact from HT or CMEO in extreme cases.	TD	Termly	Effective. No significant difference in attendance. Very small number of PP children with persistent absence. Attendance PP = 96%, non-PP 97% Action: Continue.
iii. Other approaches						
Desired outcome	Chosen action/approach	What is the evidence and rationale for this choice?	How will you ensure it is implemented well?	Staff lead	When will you review implementation?	
C	Functional Reflexology Therapy	Therapy to alleviate anxieties and facilitate greater self-positivity for increased focus in lessons.-1.1	Safeguarding measures in place; necessary checks made; weekly pupil reports post-session, Rainbow Scale and FRT questionnaire.	Jo Savory (DHT/Inclusion)	Every 10 weeks for rolling programme sessions.	Effective. Alleviated many anxieties, improved self-esteem, children engaged positively and felt more relaxed. Action: Continue with implementation of measured scale for impact on wellbeing.
C	THRIVE training secured and partially funded by LA for 2 staff to be able to more quickly address and respond to SMEH factors affecting pupils within school.	Increasingly, CJS is finding that more pupils are showing behaviours and attitudes which reflect growing SMEH needs; this is affecting attitudes to school, learning as well as behaviours impacting self and others in class.	Timetabling of sessions for pupils needing SMEH support and the THRIVE approach. Regular reviews through evaluation on THRIVE online reports. Rainbow scale scoring.	Jo Savory (DHT) Caroline Sedar (HLTA)	At scheduled THRIVE review intervals.	Effective. Two trained practitioners, timetabled sessions for children, review scores improved for all children. Ref: Thrive records. Action: Continue.
C	Payment for School meals	Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs	Meal system in school and breakfast club	SMSAs Office admin	Termly	Effective. Children prepared for learning owing to balanced meal provision. Action: Continue.

C	Enrichment (extra-curricular)	Boosts self-esteem, well-being and gives wider opportunities.	Offered to all PP families if deemed eligible or appropriate.	Jo Savory	Termly	Effective. Children engaged for learning owing to enrichment opportunities, for example music tuition. Action: Continue.
---	-------------------------------	---	---	-----------	--------	---

--	--	--

4. Additional Detail

Supporting the SMEH needs of pupils (a growing need in our school) through either 1:1/2:1/small group:1 in the following ways:

- Social skills development and understanding social situations and interactions with others
- Self-esteem and self-confidence boosting
- The Quiet Room x3 days a week