Pupil premium strategy statement (primary)

1. Summary information	n				
School	Chenies				
Academic Year	2017-18	Total PP budget		Date of most recent PP Review	July 2017
Total number of pupils	85	Number of pupils eligible for PP	7	Date for next internal review of this strategy	July 2018

2. Current attainment			
This data is for all PP children at Chenies – not just KS2	Pupils eligible for PP (Chenies)	Pupils not eligible for PP (Chenies School)	Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)
% achieving in reading, writing and maths	43% (60%)	68% (80%)	61% <mark>(61%)</mark>
% making progress in year in reading (Vs Key Stage exceeding in italics)	86% (50% 25%)	86% (81% 13%)	71%
% making progress in year in writing (Vs Key Stage exceeding in italics)	100% (50% <i>50%)</i>	93% (81% <i>14%)</i>	76%
% making progress in year in maths (Vs Key Stage exceeding in italics)	100% (50% 50%)	99% (94% 19%)	75%

3. Ba	arriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP, including high ability)	
In-sch	nool barriers (issues to be addressed in school, such as poor oral language skills)	
A.		
B.		
C.		
Extern	al barriers (issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance ra	tes)
D.	Attendance and especially punctuality is below the average of the school Parental engagement and support can be lower than non-PP families	
4. De	esired outcomes	
	Desired outcomes and how they will be measured	Success criteria
A.	Writing outcomes for pupils eligible for PP in KS2 are in line with their peers	The PP pupils in KS2 will make greater than expected progress in writing in order to close the gap on their peers for writing outcomes.50% made greater than expected progress (2/4) the other 2 made expected progress. This is better than peers.
В.	That all pupils eligible for PP are in line with their peers for maths. That PP pupils all progress with their times tables and/or number bonds in order to develop their numerical fluency.	The PP pupils will make greater than expected progress in maths in order to close the gap on their peers for maths outcomes. PP pupils will move beyond the developing stage of their times tables tests (so as to

		improve numerical fluency) 90% PP pupils are at ARE+ which is the same as Non PP also at 90%. In year progress 100% PP made expected progress with 30% making better than expected. Non-PP was 93% and 23% respectively.
C.	Pupils eligible for PP continue to have attendance and punctuality rates in line with their peers.	2016-17 PP = 94.9% whole school = 95.8%. Target 2017-18 PP = 96%+ Whole school was 95.7% PP was 94.2%

5. Planned expend	liture					
Academic year	2017-18 £9,240.00					
	elow enable schools to d	emonstrate how they are using the pupi	l premium to improve classroom μ	pedagogy, pro	ovide targeted	
i. Quality of teach	ing 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?	
A The Gap between PP and non PP pupils is closed and pupils reach or exceed Bucks/national averages.	Pupil Premium meetings Monitoring and Evaluating SDP Priority Focused interventions with CT and TA	Data Local/national research	Regular progress meetings will focus on the progress of PP children. Timetabled monitoring, moderation and evaluation of PP work. Proactive support for focused interventions.(extra adult recruited for this purpose) Reactive Support (extra adults) focused and regular.	HT Class teachers PP Governors	Termly evaluations July 2018	
			Total bu	dgeted cost	£5,500	
ii. Targeted suppo	rt					
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?	

B Intervention matches accurately the needs of the pupils to develop attitude and achievement.	Teaching Assistants timetabled to plan and deliver focussed interventions. SLT Monitoring and Evaluation	Proven pedagogical success in targeted interventions (pre-teach/ reactive support/ focussed boosters)	Staff training Peer support/ Coaching/ modelling Measureable learning objectives Monitoring schedule of interventions Pre-teach and Reactive Support implemented. Extra TA training support and	HT Class teachers PP Governor	Half termly evaluations July 2018
C Parents are engaged with school culture and ethos and are actively supporting their children's learning.	Inclusion manager and SENDCo Communication Systems Parental Invites to school events Attendance levels	Building links with families, parents and the community is a proven method to remove barriers and engage home support.	To work closely with families to remove barriers and engage parents. Clear lines of communication with parents built. Parent friendly events organised and well attended. Parent workshops/evenings/events to be well attended	Inclusion Manager HT Class teachers PP Governor	Termly evaluations July 2018
			Total but	dgeted cost	£3,250
iii. Other approach	es				
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?
D Higher levels of attendance for Pupil Premium children.	SLT Monitoring and Evaluation	By supporting families, school will build healthy relationship and positive attitudes to learning for pupils.	Inclusion manager working closely with families to provide rigorous and monitored support. Investment in personal and emotional well-being through nurture groups and support with enrichment opportunities.	HT Class teachers School Office PP Governor	Termly evaluations July 2018
	•		Total bud	dgeted cost	£500

6. Review of exper	nditure					
Previous Academic Year		2016 -17 £12,460				
i. Quality of teach	ing 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		
to accelerate progress in reading (including phonics), writing and maths	Focused interventions with TA support. Greater focus on phonics teaching and management.	More PP children made greater than expected progress than non-PP children. 50% in writing and maths vs <20% for non PP	Phonics has improved with ALL KS1 children at the required standard. This will continue as it sets all children up for success further on in school. Focused interventions seem to be helping; these need to carry on and to continue evaluating.	£2,050		
ii. Targeted suppo	rt					
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		
to increase the numbers of pupils at age-related expectations	Improved teaching & learning. Focused interventions with TAs.Recruitment of TA for PP children	The previous year 13% of PP children (1/8) were at ARE for R/W/M last year was 43%	Improvements have been made as early results are encouraging. However, yet to see a full year's worth of improvement and impact. Continue with strategy and closely monitor.	£10,140		
iii. Other approach	es					
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		
to improve attendance and learning behaviour	Improved teaching and learning. More engaging and inspiring events. Close monitoring of attendance.	Attendance for PP children at 94.8%.	This has worked. We need to improve focus on one PP family which has a significant impact on PP attendance data.	£270 (other costs associated with improved learning and visits in box above)		

7. Additional detail

In this section you can a	nnex or refer to additio	nal information which y	ou have used to inforn	n the statement above.	