

Pupil Premium Funding Guiding Principles for 2016 2017

PUPIL PREMIUM GRANT REPORT 2016 - 2017	
Total number of pupils on role	372
Total number of pupils eligible for PPG	78
Amount PPG received per pupil	71 @ £1320 FSM/Ever 6 4 @ £300 Service Children 4@ £1900 Post LAC
Total amount of PPG received	101,200

- To continue to ensure all teaching is good or better and so ensure that Pupil Premium children make more than expected progress in order to close the gap in learning.
- To improve the percentage of pupil premium children working at ARE in reading and writing in specific year groups
- To improve the percentage of pupil premium children working at ARE in maths in specific year groups
- To increase the attendance of Pupil Premium children so that it is in line with or above National averages and reduce the number of Pupil Premium pupils who are persistently absent.
- To accelerate the progress of pupils who have SEND and who are also Pupil Premium children
- To continue to challenge learning behaviours so that specific children are more independent, resilient and motivated to learn

Objective	Action	Key Staff	Funding	Intended outcomes	Impact
To continue to improve the quality and consistency of teaching.	Teaching and Learning Leader to coach and provide support for year teams and/or teachers Book monitoring/moderation Observation of teaching across the school	Teaching and Learning Lead	£10, 386	To continue to improve the quality of teaching in writing Support for new members of staff Specific teacher support where Progress and/or attainment of PP pupils is of a concern Improve the percentages of	In the Autumn term 87% of teaching was identified as being good or better. In the Spring term:93% of teaching was identified as being good or better. In the Summer term: 100% of teaching was identified as being good or better. This is evidenced comprehensively through Year group monitoring reports conducted throughout the year and book looks, and further supported through our rigorous performance management systems and structures.

				pupils working at ARE in writing	<p>In the Autumn term, one teacher received informal support with planning, teaching and learning. Support was provided through the teaching and learning lead teacher and this teacher is now a consistently good teacher.</p> <p>In the summer term, a whole year group was supported as the progress of their pupil premium pupils was not accelerating despite interventions being put in to place. This year group was supported by the Pupil Premium Leader. One teacher within this cohort required further support from the pupil premium leader to improve rates of progress for specific pupils. Progress in the Spring term for a group of children within this class was 1.5 steps in reading, 1.3 steps in writing and 1.3 steps in maths. After the support, progress was accelerated in the summer term and resulted in these pupils making 3.6 steps of progress in reading, 4.3 steps in writing and 3 steps in maths. Their progress was significantly stronger than their peers- both PP and non PP.</p>																		
To improve the percentage of pupil premium children working at ARE in writing in specific year groups (2016 – 2017: Year 3, 4, 5 and 6)	<p>Teaching and Learning Leader to coach and provide support for year teams and/or teachers</p> <p>Year 4, 5 and Year 6 Pupil Premium Lead Teacher Intervention to support Year 4, 5 and Year 6 writing.</p> <p>Targeted interventions e.g. Accelerwrite?, 1:1 writing conferencing, key domain small group support</p>	<p>Teaching and Learning Lead</p> <p>Pupil Premium Learning Lead Teacher Year 6.</p> <p>Pupil Premium Lead Teacher Year 5</p> <p>Pupil Premium Lead Teacher Year 4</p>	Total cost for staffing: £44,402	<p>To improve the percentage of pupil premium children working at ARE in writing so that they are in line or above National Averages.</p> <p>Current ARE Percentages Summer 2 –</p> <p>Year 3 – EKS1 data: Year 4 – 73% Year 5 – 58% Year 6 – 64%</p> <p>Milestones for 2016 - 2017</p> <p>End of Autumn Term</p>	<p>Writing – Rates of Progress</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016</th> <th>Not PP</th> <th>All PP</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2017</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3</td> <td>6.8</td> <td>6.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4</td> <td>6.6</td> <td>6.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 5</td> <td>6.6</td> <td>6.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6</td> <td>6.8</td> <td>6.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rates of progress are broadly in line with non pupil premium pupils in all year groups. In Year 4 and Year 6, rates of progress are stronger than non pupil premium pupils.</p> <p>The percentages of pupils working at ARE Year 3</p> <p>Similar percentages of pupils were at ARE at the end of the summer term in writing compared to EKS1 data. This reflects the non- pupil premium picture too. The gap has</p>	2016	Not PP	All PP	2017			Year 3	6.8	6.6	Year 4	6.6	6.9	Year 5	6.6	6.5	Year 6	6.8	6.9
2016	Not PP	All PP																					
2017																							
Year 3	6.8	6.6																					
Year 4	6.6	6.9																					
Year 5	6.6	6.5																					
Year 6	6.8	6.9																					

		Pupil Premium Lead teacher Year 3		<p>Year 3- Year 4-78% Year 5-65% Year 6-70%</p> <p>End of Spring Year 3- Year 4-82% Year 5-75% Year 6- 75%</p> <p>End of Summer Year 3-85% Year 4-90% Year 5-85% Year 6-85%</p>	<p>remained the same. Improving the percentage of pupils working at ARE in writing will continue to be the focus as they move in to Year 4, not just for PP pupils but for all pupils in this cohort.</p> <p>Year 4 – 86% of pupils were working at ARE in writing. This is an increase of 15% compared to Summer 2016. This means that the gap has narrowed compared to EKS1 data despite the aspirational target being missed slightly.(1 child)</p> <p>Year 5- 58% of PP pupils are currently working at ARE. Because there are fewer non PP pupils on track for ARE, the gap has narrowed from 35% to 17%. The aspirational target of 85% has not been met, however, it is important to note that there are still 12% more pupil premium pupils working at ARE compared to the EKS1 data (2b+).</p> <p>Year 6 – The percentage of pupils working at ARE according to TA is 72%. This is an improvement of 8% based on the previous academic year. Results for TA writing at PJS are 6% stronger than the Hampshire average for PP pupils. The gap between PP and non PP at PJS in writing has reduced from 26% in 2016 to 13% in 2017.</p> <p>75% of pupils are working at the expected standard in GPAS. This represents an improvement of 11% on the KS2 2016 outcomes. The gap in attainment has narrowed significantly from from 8% to 2%. Purbrook Junior school EKS2 2017 outcomes in GPAS are 12% stronger than Hampshire outcomes for pupil premium pupils.</p>
To improve the percentage of pupil premium	Teaching and Learning Leader to coach and provide support for year teams and/or teachers	Teaching and Learning Lead	See above staffing cost	To improve the percentage of pupil premium children working at ARE in reading so that they	2017 test data indicated that 64% of PP pupils are working at the expected level in reading. This represents a 28% increase on the 2016 EKS2 outcomes. The gap in

<p>children working at ARE in reading in specific year groups – 2016 – 2017 Year 6.</p> <p>(Ref. Whole School Strategic Plan)</p>	<p>Pupil Premium Lead Teacher Intervention to support Year 6</p> <p>Targeted interventions e.g. Accelerated, individual reading, book clubs etc, reading boosters</p>	<p>Pupil Premium Lead Teacher Year 6</p> <p>English Leader</p> <p>School Librarian</p>	<p>+ an additional £1590</p>	<p>are in line or above National Averages (Test and Teacher Assessment).</p> <p>Current ARE Percentages Summer 2 -</p> <p>Year 6 – 75%</p> <p>Milestones –</p> <p>Autumn:78% Spring:82% Summer:85%</p> <p>Analysis of intervention impacts shows that pupils are benefitting from the additional support/intervention which is in turn driving standards higher.</p> <p>Baseline Vernon reading data shows that a minimum of 1:2 ratio gains have been made.</p>	<p>attainment between PP and non PP pupils has narrowed significantly from 32% to 3%. Outcomes exceed the Hampshire pupil premium percentage by 2%. Vernon data shows that the progress for Year 6 was a ratio gain of 10:23 months for the one child who had a reading age below 10:10 in September 2017.</p>																									
<p>To improve the percentage of pupil premium children working at ARE in maths in specific year groups – 2016 – 2017 Year 4 and Year</p>	<p>Teaching and Learning Leader to coach and provide support for year teams and/or teachers</p> <p>Pupil Premium Lead Teacher Intervention to support Year 4 and Year 6.</p> <p>Targeted interventions e.g. 1:1</p>	<p>Teaching and Learning Lead</p> <p>Pupil Premium Lead Teacher Year 4 and Year 6</p>	<p>Included in staffing costs</p>	<p>To improve the percentage of pupil premium children working at ARE in writing so that they are in line or above National Averages.</p> <p>Current ARE Percentages Summer 2 -</p> <p>Year 4:82%</p>	<p>Maths – Rates of Progress</p> <p>Progress rates across the school are similar for PP and non PP as indicated in the table below</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1496 1169 1955 1337"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016 2017</th> <th>Not PP</th> <th>All PP</th> <th>PP SEND</th> <th>PP not SEND</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 3</td> <td>6.7</td> <td>6.7</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4</td> <td>6.5</td> <td>6.6</td> <td>7</td> <td>6.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 5</td> <td>6.4</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>5.3</td> <td>6.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6</td> <td>6.4</td> <td>6.5</td> <td>5.5</td> <td>6.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2016 2017	Not PP	All PP	PP SEND	PP not SEND	Year 3	6.7	6.7	6.2	7	Year 4	6.5	6.6	7	6.5	Year 5	6.4	6.3	5.3	6.3	Year 6	6.4	6.5	5.5	6.8
2016 2017	Not PP	All PP	PP SEND	PP not SEND																										
Year 3	6.7	6.7	6.2	7																										
Year 4	6.5	6.6	7	6.5																										
Year 5	6.4	6.3	5.3	6.3																										
Year 6	6.4	6.5	5.5	6.8																										

6.	pre-teaching, precision teaching			<p>Year 6:79%</p> <p>Milestones for 2016 - 2017</p> <p>End of Autumn Term Year 4-84% Year 6-81%</p> <p>End of Spring Year 4-86% Year 6-83%</p> <p>End of Summer Year 4-90% Year 6-85%</p>	<p>Year 4 77% of PP pupils are currently working at ARE in maths. This is broadly similar to the end of Year 3 data. The intervention First Class in Number was effective in improving rates of progress for SEND pupils. The two children who were targeted to be on track were just one step away from being assessed at ARE and will be a focus for the next academic year.</p> <p>Year 6 57% of pupils are working at the expected standard in maths according to EKS2 2017 test outcomes. This represents a 2% improvement based on the previous EKS2 outcomes in 2016. Outcomes for pupil premium pupils are broadly in line with Hampshire averages for PP pupils. The gap in attainment between PP and non PP within the school has widened by 2%, however, it is important to note that the gap is still narrower than the Hampshire gap. According to EKS2 teacher assessed level, 75% of pupils were assessed as working at the expected standard. With this considered, in the academic year 2017-2018, pupil premium pupils and their maths (in particular test skills) will need to be a key priority.</p>
To increase the attendance of Pupil Premium children so that it is in line with or above National	<p>Pupil Premium Leader (DHT) to monitor absence below 95% monthly.</p> <p>Introduce rewards system for pupils whose attendance is 98% and above.</p>	<p>DHT</p> <p>DHT</p>	<p>Included in staffing costs</p> <p>£8000</p>	<p>Attendance of PP pupils at least matches non PP pupils in all year groups.</p> <p>2015 2016 Attendance data (cumulative %)</p>	<p>The Pupil Premium Leader monitored attendance on a weekly basis and has been proactive in chasing reasons for absence.</p> <p>Over the course of the year, 22 families were invited to take part in structured conversations. The focus was primarily on targeting attendance in year 4, 5 and 6. 18</p>

averages	<p>Introduce and conduct structured conversations for all Pupil Premium children with attendance below 95% in 2015 2016.</p> <p>Attendance will forms a key part of discussions and actions in the Team Around the Child Meeting.</p> <p>Breakfast club offer to support children with attendance below 95%</p>	<p>Time allocation from HT DHT AHT</p> <p>All staff</p>	<p>12,831.67</p> <p>£2000</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Year 3</td> <td>Year 4</td> <td>Year 5</td> <td>Year 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PP</td> <td>TBC</td> <td>94.6</td> <td>94.4</td> <td>95.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non PP</td> <td>TBC</td> <td>97.2</td> <td>97</td> <td>97.6</td> </tr> </table>		Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	PP	TBC	94.6	94.4	95.4	Non PP	TBC	97.2	97	97.6	<p>families engaged in this process. This led to 70% of pupils improving their attendance based on the previous year.</p> <p>Where appropriate, fully funded Breakfast Club places were offered to families in order to promote and improve attendance and reduce lateness. Two families accepted the offer and received a fully funded place. This child's attendance improved from 94% over the Autumn 2016 and Spring Term 2017 to 99.15% in Summer 2017. The other child whose lateness was a concern reduced the number of times late from 14 (Autumn and Spring term) to 0 (Summer).</p> <p>During these meetings, attendance information was shared with the families alongside progress and attainment data. Parents/ carers valued having the opportunity to talk about their child and their specific needs. Furthermore, conversations regarding 80% being the equivalent of 1 day off a week, was enlightening for many of our families.</p>																	
					Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6																													
PP	TBC	94.6	94.4	95.4																																	
Non PP	TBC	97.2	97	97.6																																	
<p>Pupil premium pupils average attendance is at least 97% and above by the end of the year.</p> <p>Increased parental engagement</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Year 3 2015 2016</td> <td>Year 3 2016 2017</td> <td>Year 4 2015 2016</td> <td>Year 4 2016 2017</td> <td>Year 5 2015 2016</td> <td>Year 5 2016 2017</td> <td>Year 6 2015 2016</td> <td>Year 6 2016 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PP</td> <td>TBC</td> <td>92.6</td> <td>94.6</td> <td>97.1</td> <td>94.4</td> <td>96.6</td> <td>95.4</td> <td>95.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non PP</td> <td>TBC</td> <td>97.3</td> <td>97.2</td> <td>97.6</td> <td>97</td> <td>97.5</td> <td>97.6</td> <td>97.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gap</td> <td>TBC</td> <td>4.7</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>1.8</td> </tr> </table> <p>The table above identifies that in Year 4, 5 and 6 the attendance gap between PP and non PP pupils has narrowed; significantly so in Year 4 and Year 5. Attendance in Year 4 and Year 5 for PP pupils is 97%+ and above.</p> <p>Year 3 (Year 4 in 2017 2018) will need to be a real focus as the attendance gap is wide. What is also noticeable is that</p>		Year 3 2015 2016	Year 3 2016 2017	Year 4 2015 2016	Year 4 2016 2017	Year 5 2015 2016	Year 5 2016 2017	Year 6 2015 2016	Year 6 2016 2017	PP	TBC	92.6	94.6	97.1	94.4	96.6	95.4	95.9	Non PP	TBC	97.3	97.2	97.6	97	97.5	97.6	97.7	Gap	TBC	4.7	2.6	0.5	2.6	0.9	2.2	1.8
	Year 3 2015 2016	Year 3 2016 2017	Year 4 2015 2016	Year 4 2016 2017	Year 5 2015 2016	Year 5 2016 2017	Year 6 2015 2016	Year 6 2016 2017																													
PP	TBC	92.6	94.6	97.1	94.4	96.6	95.4	95.9																													
Non PP	TBC	97.3	97.2	97.6	97	97.5	97.6	97.7																													
Gap	TBC	4.7	2.6	0.5	2.6	0.9	2.2	1.8																													

					<p>the improvements in attendance percentages for PP from 2015 2016 to 2016 2017 exceeds the improvements made by non-pupil premium pupils.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2015 2016</td> <td>Unknown</td> <td>5/16</td> <td>14/24</td> <td>17/28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016 2017</td> <td>9/14</td> <td>3/16</td> <td>7/24</td> <td>17/28</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The table above shows the number of PP children whose attendance was below 97% in the 2015 – 2016 compared to 2016 2017. Great strides have been made in Year 4 and Year 5 in reducing the number of children whose attendance has fallen below 97%.</p>		Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	2015 2016	Unknown	5/16	14/24	17/28	2016 2017	9/14	3/16	7/24	17/28	
	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6																	
2015 2016	Unknown	5/16	14/24	17/28																	
2016 2017	9/14	3/16	7/24	17/28																	
<p>To reduce the number of Pupil Premium pupils who are persistently absent.</p>	<p>Pupil Premium Leader (DHT) to monitor absence below 95% weekly.</p> <p>Introduce rewards system for pupils whose attendance is 98% and above.</p> <p>Introduce and conduct regular structured conversations for all Pupil Premium children with attendance below 90 % in 2015 2016.</p> <p>School to take a proactive stance in persuing persistent absence through legal channels.</p> <p>Targeted support from Home School Link Worker</p> <p>Breakfast club offer to support children with attendance below</p>	<p>DHT</p> <p>DHT</p> <p>HT DHT AHT</p> <p>HT</p> <p>HSLW</p>	<p>Included in staffing costs</p> <p>£</p> <p>(identified in Breakfast Club provision)</p>	<p>Persistent absenteeism is eliminated through a rigorous and robust approach.</p>	<p>Year 4</p> <p>3 families engaged with structured conversations whose child’s attendance was below 90% in the previous academic year.(Persistent Absenteeism)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015-2016</th> <th>2016 - 2017</th> <th>Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Child A</td> <td>84.44%</td> <td>93.6%</td> <td>+9.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child B</td> <td>89.4%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>+7.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child C</td> <td>83.1%</td> <td>96%</td> <td>+12.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NB We are aware that there are still some improvements to be made so that children attend at least 97% of the time. However, great improvements have been made to improve rates of attendance for these pupils.</p> <p>There is one child whose attendance significantly affects Year 4 overall data and this child and their family will continue to be a key focus in the next academic year.</p> <p>Year 5</p> <p>2 families engaged with structured conversations whose child’s attendance was below 90% in the previous academic year.</p>		2015-2016	2016 - 2017	Impact	Child A	84.44%	93.6%	+9.2%	Child B	89.4%	97%	+7.6%	Child C	83.1%	96%	+12.9%
	2015-2016	2016 - 2017	Impact																		
Child A	84.44%	93.6%	+9.2%																		
Child B	89.4%	97%	+7.6%																		
Child C	83.1%	96%	+12.9%																		

	95%				<table border="1" data-bbox="1496 228 2013 363"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015-2016</th> <th>2016 - 2017</th> <th>Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Child A</td> <td>83.3%</td> <td>96.6%</td> <td>+13.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child B</td> <td>79.2%</td> <td>88.9%</td> <td>+9.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1496 400 2130 491">NB We are aware that 88.9% is still not acceptable, but we are pleased that the child's attendance has improved by nearly 10%.</p> <p data-bbox="1496 531 1570 555">Year 6</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1496 560 2013 730"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015-2016</th> <th>2016 - 2017</th> <th>Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Child A</td> <td>88.3%</td> <td>96.6%</td> <td>+8.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child B</td> <td>90.6%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>+4.44%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child C</td> <td>85%</td> <td>96%</td> <td>+11%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1496 767 2141 890">NB Again, we are aware that 97% and above is what we are aiming for, but we are pleased that there has been significant with some of our families – particularly where improvements are as strong as 11%.</p>		2015-2016	2016 - 2017	Impact	Child A	83.3%	96.6%	+13.3%	Child B	79.2%	88.9%	+9.7%		2015-2016	2016 - 2017	Impact	Child A	88.3%	96.6%	+8.3%	Child B	90.6%	95%	+4.44%	Child C	85%	96%	+11%
	2015-2016	2016 - 2017	Impact																														
Child A	83.3%	96.6%	+13.3%																														
Child B	79.2%	88.9%	+9.7%																														
	2015-2016	2016 - 2017	Impact																														
Child A	88.3%	96.6%	+8.3%																														
Child B	90.6%	95%	+4.44%																														
Child C	85%	96%	+11%																														
To improve targeting children's attainment in specific subjects through appropriate interventions.	<p data-bbox="387 935 748 1026">Look at domain sheets and finely tune interventions/support for these pupils</p> <p data-bbox="387 1062 748 1222">DHT to create an initial provision overview for the start of the academic year based on domain sheets and updated pupil premium passports.</p> <p data-bbox="387 1262 748 1318">Monitor provision based on the overview</p> <p data-bbox="387 1358 680 1382">Meet with year teams half</p>	All staff DHT	Included in staffing costs	(see Pupil Premium Provision plans for each year group which addresses the specific needs of the cohort and individuals)	<p data-bbox="1496 935 2130 1286">The Pupil Premium Provision map was created and implemented across the school. Provision was also recorded in each child personalised learning passport. These were written by the class teacher and updated termly. Impact statement sheets were introduced to in order to identify the intended outcomes of interventions. As the year progressed, feedback from teaching staff suggested the time spent on updating paperwork became unmanageable and ineffective. The domain sheets were not proving effective and therefore they were not used as from Spring 2017.</p> <p data-bbox="1496 1326 2130 1382">In the summer term, a trial took place in Year 5 which streamlined the systems and structures for pupil premium</p>																												

	<p>termly to review progress and evaluate impact of interventions</p> <p>Pupil Premium Lead teacher allocated for each year group</p> <p>Review impact and adjust accordingly.</p>				<p>provision. It provided an opportunity to look at how we can best use the resources to improve progress rates and outcomes for pupil premium pupils- particularly in Year 5. Teaching staff reported at the end of the trial that the systems were more manageable, children were more involved, interventions were more aligned to steps progress and there was greater clarity regarding the impact of specific provision/interventions.</p> <p>In this year group, rates of progress over the summer term 2017 for PP pupils were stronger than non-pupil premium. Progress rates for PP pupils in the summer term were also stronger than they were in the Spring term. As a result this trial will now be implemented across all year groups as from Autumn 2017.</p>																																			
<p>To accelerate the progress of pupils who have SEND and who are also Pupil Premium children</p>	<p>Look at domain sheets and finely tune interventions/support for these pupils.</p> <p>Half termly meetings between DHT /PPL and SENCo to discuss pupils and put in to place individualised support.</p> <p>Key domain sheets indicate impact of personalised plans put in to place. Analysis to be completed each half term.</p> <p>10hours of allocated LSA support time per week</p>	<p>DHT and SENCo</p>	<p>Included in staffing costs</p> <p>+ an additional £4531</p>	<p>% indicates percentage of pupils who are SEND and Pupil Premium</p> <p>Year 3: 46%</p> <p>Year 4: 9%</p> <p>Year 5: 11%</p> <p>Year 6: 18%</p> <p>Progress is accelerated for pupils who fall in to this group as outlined though half termly analysis.</p>	<p>Progress rates are based on Teacher assessed levels</p> <p>Reading</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1496 719 1955 884"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016 2017</th> <th>Not PP</th> <th>All PP</th> <th>PP SEND</th> <th>PP not SEND</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 3</td> <td>6.9</td> <td>6.6</td> <td>6</td> <td>6.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 4</td> <td>6.5</td> <td>6.4</td> <td>6</td> <td>6.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 5</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>6.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6</td> <td>6.4</td> <td>6.7</td> <td>6.7</td> <td>6.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Year 3 – PP SEND children (4 children) made on average 33 months gain in their reading ages over a period of 10 months.</p> <p>Year 4 – PP SEND children (1 child) made 29 months gain in reading age over a period of 10 months</p> <p>Year 5 – PP and SEND (4 children in total). 1 child had a reading age of 10:10+ and is therefore excluded from the data. The three children made on average 24 months gain over the course of a 10 month period.</p> <p>Year 6 – PP and SEND (5 children). One child was working below 10:10. This child made a gain of 23 months over a 10 month period.</p> <p>Writing</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1496 1342 1955 1396"> <thead> <tr> <th>2016 2017</th> <th>Not PP</th> <th>All PP</th> <th>PP SEND</th> <th>PP not SEND</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2016 2017	Not PP	All PP	PP SEND	PP not SEND	Year 3	6.9	6.6	6	6.9	Year 4	6.5	6.4	6	6.5	Year 5	6.3	6	4	6.3	Year 6	6.4	6.7	6.7	6.8	2016 2017	Not PP	All PP	PP SEND	PP not SEND					
2016 2017	Not PP	All PP	PP SEND	PP not SEND																																				
Year 3	6.9	6.6	6	6.9																																				
Year 4	6.5	6.4	6	6.5																																				
Year 5	6.3	6	4	6.3																																				
Year 6	6.4	6.7	6.7	6.8																																				
2016 2017	Not PP	All PP	PP SEND	PP not SEND																																				

Year 3	6.8	6.6	6	7
Year 4	6.6	6.9	8	6.8
Year 5	6.6	6.5	3.7	7
Year 6	6.8	6.9	6.5	7

The Year 5 PP and SEND pupils who made significantly less progress compared to non SEND PP have significant learning needs. The children have received a tailored curriculum based on the recommendations from the Educational Psychologist.

Maths

2016 2017	Not PP	All PP	PP SEND	PP not SEND
Year 3	6.7	6.7	6.2	7
Year 4	6.5	6.6	7	6.5
Year 5	6.4	6.3	5.3	6.3
Year 6	6.4	6.5	5.5	6.8

Year 4 implemented first class in number for PP SEND pupils. This appears to have had a significant impact as progress rates for these pupils exceeds the progress rates of PP non SEND pupils.

NB Key domains sheets were not useful in analysing progress therefore were discontinued in the Spring term 2017.

For 2017 2018, the SENCO and Pupil premium Leader will continue to work closely together so that the progress made with specific interventions e.g. improvements in reading and spelling ages, are also reflected in the progress made in terms of steps.

To continue to develop the strategic leadership of pupil premium through	DHT /PPL leadership time Support from the Local Authority Development of the Pupil	DHT LA All staff	£6447 £900	Two weekly monitoring will take place in the form of lesson/ book/ pupil trail/pupil conferencing, and a written report in place which identify key actions for pupils/teachers/year	Monitoring took place as part of the regular cycle of teaching and learning and reports were written and shared with year teams. In addition to this pupil interviews took place with hard to shift children regarding their learning and what helps them to learn best. This information as also shared with the class teacher so that the child's needs

regular monitoring and evaluation	<p>Premium Team meeting approach</p> <p>School Improvement Team meetings</p> <p>Staff meeting Pupil Premium Team meetings introduced to monitor and evaluate provision and attainment of pupil premium pupils.</p> <p>Governing Body Pupil Premium monitoring on half termly basis and reports written</p>	Governing Body		<p>groups.</p> <p>Increased percentage of pupils working at ARE as evidenced through outcomes.</p>	<p>could be catered for. In one particular year group, these conversations contributed to accelerated progress in the summer term. Historically progress in the Spring term for this group of children was 1.5 steps in reading, 1.3 steps in writing and 1.3 steps in maths. Following discussions. progress was accelerated in the summer term and resulted in these pupils making 3.6 steps of progress in reading, 4.3 steps in writing and 3 steps in maths.</p>
To support children to be ready to learn through ELSA support	ELSA support time provided	ELSA All Staff	£5833	<p>An increase in the percentage in the number of Pupil Premium.</p> <p>Children who are ready to learn is evidenced through Pupil Premium passports.</p> <p>Baseline assessments to be completed to assess impact.</p>	<p>12 PP pupils were supported by the ELSA in the Autumn term. The case load was then picked up by the wider pastoral team as the ELSA retired. In 2017/2018, it is planned that systems and structures will be developed and strengthened further following the induction and training of a new ELSA. This will be based on best practice identified on the ELSA Support Website.</p>
To provide financial support to access opportunities that widen children's experiences	<p>Residential funding</p> <p>School visit funding</p> <p>Clubs</p> <p>Specialist class music tuition</p> <p>Specialist languages tuition and enrichment activities – specifically for children who are at or above ARE (½ day per</p>	Allocated specialist teacher	<p>£3800</p> <p>£500</p> <p>£1000</p> <p>£8359</p> <p>£3237</p>	<p>Pupils report their enjoyment.</p> <p>Pupils are given opportunities and experiences which may not have been possible without funding.</p>	<p>12 spaces were funded or part funded for Fairthorne Manor</p> <p>45 children attended after school clubs/holiday clubs supported by the school</p> <p>1 family received support with music tuition fees</p> <p>75 trips were funded by the school</p> <p>All children received specialist music tuition provided for by the Hampshire Music service.</p> <p>The school ensures that at least one child who is pupil premium are identified to experience opportunities</p>

	week)				provided by local secondary school e.g. Junior Master Chef, more able challenges, Press Gang etc.
To continue to challenge learning behaviours so that specific children are more independent, resilient and motivated to learn	<p>Previous class teachers to identify pupils Passports identify the need in this area</p> <p>Provision map created and identifies specific children</p> <p>T and L lead complete observations of specific children/groups of children identified</p> <p>1:1/Group work on learning behaviours through T and L lead</p> <p>Support and liaison between class teacher and T and L support put in to place in order to promote learning behaviours</p>	<p>Teaching staff</p> <p>PPL</p> <p>T and L lead teacher</p> <p>Pupils and T and L lead</p> <p>Teaching staff and T and L lead</p>	<p>Funded through allocation for Teaching and Learning Lead teacher</p>	<p>Baseline assessment and intervention impact statements identify improvement in this area for all pupils</p> <p>Teaching staff report that there is an increase the percentage in the number of Pupil Premium .Children who are ready to learn and is evidenced through Pupil Premium passports.</p> <p>Increase in the percentage of pupils attaining ARE in reading, writing and maths</p>	The teaching and learning leader worked with children across the school who had been identified as needing support with their learning behaviours. End of unit assessments identified that all children had improved their attitude towards learning and were more focussed and independent. Teachers reported that there were improvements within the class too and the need to continue to work/support with some children to ensure that the positive improvements were built upon.
Staff training – whole school	Reading in light of recent developments and end of Key stage 2 outcomes – whole school training	LA – INSET Day Focussing on reading	£600	<p>Improved outcomes for pupil premium pupils so that they at least match National Averages.</p> <p>The gap in attainment between pupil premium pupils and non pupil premium pupils will be narrowed considerably in reading.</p>	The INSET Day was allocated to whole school training on Philosophy for Children.

Please note: an additional commitment of £33,364 has been allocated from the main school budget.

