

Pupil premium strategy statement: Chadwick High School

1. Summary information					
School	Chadwick High School				
Academic Year	2016/2017	Total PP budget	£42,957.06 (April 2016 – March 2017)	Date of most recent PP Review	May 2017
Total number of pupils	75 (May 2016)	Number of pupils eligible for PP	53 (May 2016)	Date for next internal review of this strategy	Sept 2017

2. Current attainment		
	<i>Pupils eligible for PP (Chadwick High School)</i>	<i>Pupils not eligible for PP (national average)</i>
% achieving 5A* - C incl. EM (2015/16 only)		64.7%
% achieving expected progress in English / Maths (2015/16 only)		75.8% / 73.4%
Progress 8 score average (from 2016/17)		0.12
Attainment 8 score average (from 2016/17)		5

3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP including high ability)	
In-school barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills</i>)	
A.	Literacy and Numeracy skills. Many pupils who are placed on roll at Chadwick High School have missed periods of primary and/or secondary education and have therefore fallen behind in their literacy and numeracy development. Pupils often receive little or no reading support at home and may have specific unmet needs that further prevent their development. Access to the majority of subject areas in secondary education require a good level of literacy skills which can be a further challenge for these pupils.
B.	Social emotional / behavioural skills. Pupils referred to Chadwick High School have previously developed negative behaviours resulting in exclusion from their mainstream school, this also has a negative impact on their learning. Pupils present with a variety of social and emotional difficulties, such as low self-esteem, anxiety and self-harming behaviours. Other pupils may have experienced trauma subsequently developing mental health issues that affect their behaviour, concentration, mood, self-esteem and

	engagement.	
C.	Dis engagement from education. A history of negative experiences and lack of success throughout mainstream education has resulted in a lack of engagement and pupils who have become disaffected.	
External barriers (<i>issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>)		
D.	Attendance rates. Some pupils have a history of low attendance at their mainstream school leading to a lack of progress and difficulty in their continuation towards learning.	
E.	Poor home learning environments. Some pupils do not have their basic needs met and consequently struggle to make progress in their learning. The majority of pupils at Chadwick High School are at Levels 2, 3 or 4 on the Continuum of Need. Development within the home environment is often affected by other factors, such as exposure to domestic violence, resulting in difficulties managing emotions leading to negative and sometimes aggressive behaviours. Assessment may be provided by an educational Psychologist.	
4. Outcomes		
	<i>Desired outcomes and how they will be measured</i>	<i>Success criteria</i>
A.	PP pupils to make expected progress in line with baseline assessments in Literacy and Numeracy	Tracking data; GCSE and equivalent examination results
B.	PP pupils to achieve in line with non PP pupils	Tracking data; GCSE and equivalent examination results
C.	Improved engagement with education.	Improved rates of attendance
D.	Increased attendance rates for pupils eligible for PP	Improved rates of attendance in line with other pupils
E.	PP pupils to make expected progress in line with baseline assessments in Maths, English and Science.	Tracking data; GCSE and equivalent examination results

5. Planned expenditure					
Academic year		2016/2017			
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	Review of implementation (March 2017)

A: PP pupils to make expected progress in line with baseline assessments in Literacy and Numeracy	Targeted 1:1 intervention	Some of the students need targeted literacy support to catch up or for greater challenge. This is a programme which has been independently evaluated and shown to be effective in other schools.	BRP through the delivery of the 'Better Reading Partnership' by English/Literacy Lead person.	SR / LH / CO / JM / AB	Unable to implement BRP and therefore ineffective.
	IDL Literacy IDL Maths Staff training re whole school Literacy Policy	A data report by Education Works highlights significant gains in the reading and comprehension of 1498 pupils following a 10 week BRP (Boosting Reading Potential) intervention programme. The Education Standards Research Team report (Nov 2012) describes early targeted 1:1 intervention with a specialist Maths teacher as being the most beneficial. These things are said to be effective in the Teacher Development Trust research review on professional development. Extended writing opportunities to be developed across the curriculum.	Timetabled whole school literacy strategies, including IDL (Indirect Dyslexia Learning) and ERIC (Everyone Reading in Class) will support this intervention. Pupil feedback through RAG rating. Specialist English and Maths teachers to plan and implement targeted 1:1 interventions. PP pupils will be prioritised to include lower ability pupils who need further support and gifted and talented pupils who need greater challenge. Consistent monitoring of interventions Pupil feedback pre- and post- the 6-10 week intervention. CO to oversee implementation of Literacy Policy. Staff sharing of marking in team meetings. Termly quality assurance carried out by SLT and both independent and County advisers and takes the form of lesson observations and work scrutiny.		IDL data: English reading assessment Pupil feedback on reading Pupil feedback pre and post intervention demonstrates improved confidence in literacy/numeracy skills (demonstrated in 100% of pupil intervention review questionnaires completed). New Literacy Lead Teacher appointed. Regular (half termly) sharing of literacy in marking has taken place in whole staff meetings. Literacy targets are evident in all pupil books and marking seen in all books is in line with the school policy. Pupils are given the opportunity to comment on staff feedback in some lessons.
B. PP Pupils to achieve in line with non PP pupils in Science	1:1 targeted Science intervention IDL cost: £60 Intervention cost: £11,113.22	Science intervention that focuses on developing independent thinking, particularly through planning, monitoring and evaluating (such as in scientific investigations) can have a high impact on pupil's learning. This is evidenced in the EEF (Education Endowment Foundation) Toolkit.	Specialist Science teachers to plan and implement targeted 1:1 interventions. To prioritise PP pupils including lower ability pupils requiring further support and gifted and talented pupils who need further challenge. Consistent monitoring of interventions Pupil feedback pre- and post- the 6-10 week intervention.	CO CM SR/ BM	Science intervention has been inconsistent and very limited due to timetable changes and lack of specialist Science Teacher availability. Assessment data (up to March 2017) shows that PP pupils are making less progress than non-PP pupils in Science (mean progress for PP/non-PP in Science: +2.4/+7.1).

C. PP Pupils to achieve in line with non PP pupils	<p>Whole school PP training.</p> <p>Staff Handbook to provide ideas and strategies.</p> <p>Termly PP focus.</p> <p>Cost: n/a</p>	<p>Increase awareness of PP pupils and possible teaching strategies to support their progress.</p> <p>Sutton Trust EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit is a summary of educational research on how to use resources to improve the attainment of disadvantaged pupils.</p>	<p>PP pupils and their individual needs highlighted on context sheets.</p> <p>Staff aware of PP pupils in their form and teaching groups.</p> <p>Through sharing of good practice and lesson observations.</p>	<p>SR/ all staff</p> <p>CM/ LH</p>	<p>Whole school INSET provided by Pupil Premium Lead Teacher in Sept 2016. Regular updates and opportunities to discuss individual pupil needs and preferences via whole staff meetings (half termly).</p> <p>All teaching staff have identified PP pupils in their forms and teaching groups. This has been demonstrated on class books/folders and within context sheets. Staff are provided with regularly updated PP lists via email.</p> <p>Assessment data (up to March 2017) shows that PP pupils are making greater progress than non-PP pupils in Maths and English (mean progress for PP/non-PP in English: +3.3/-4.9; Maths: 0/-2.9)</p>
Total budgeted cost					£11,173.22
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?

D: Increased attendance rates for PP Pupils	<p>Pupils have individual attendance target which is reviewed every two weeks</p> <p>Rewarding of achievement of attendance targets</p> <p>School absence RAG rating</p> <p>PC home visits</p> <p>High support for consistently poor attenders</p>	<p>NFER research identifies attendance as a key factor.</p> <p>We can't improve attainment for children if they aren't actually attending school. NFER briefing for school leaders identifies addressing attendance as a key step.</p>	<p>Attendance targets are displayed in form classrooms. Positive rewarding for good levels of attendance.</p> <p>Same day calls and follow-up procedures consistently implemented. Letters about attendance to parents / guardians.</p> <p>Reduced timetable integration plan to encourage regular attendance, aiming to build up to a full timetable. Key worker allocated to an individual pupil. Baseline assessments completed in Maths, English and Science to support differentiated teaching.</p> <p>Reduced timetable integration programme to ensure students attend on a regular basis, building to full timetable. High support provision from external agencies (Hawthorn Tree), this will be reviewed.</p>	PC / CM	<p>41.3% pupils showing improved attendance from Autumn to Spring term 2016/17.</p> <p>33.3% of PP pupils showing improved attendance from Autumn to Spring term 2016/17.</p> <p>44.4% of LAC pupils showing improved attendance from Autumn to Spring term 2016/17.</p>
Total budgeted cost					£31,783.84 (partial payment)
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	Review of implementation (March 2017)
				PC / SR	July 2017

E: Improved engagement with education (particularly behaviour)	Assessment of need completed every term by Form tutors / TA's	The EEF Toolkit suggests that targeted interventions matched to specific students with particular needs or behavioural issues can be effective, especially for older pupils.	Ensure identification of pupils is fair, transparent and properly recorded. Monitor behaviour but also monitor whether improvements in behaviour translate into improved attainment.	All staff	Extra-curricular activities have included football and boxing. Visits made to Manchester United Football Club, Velodrome.	
	Range of Extra-curricular activities			YPS / SR		Three aspirational visits to local Universities (Lancaster University and University of Cumbria). Positive feedback with 86% (6 out of 7) of pupils recording higher post-16 aspirations.
	Aspirational visits to a University in collaboration with YPS					
	Cost: n/a					
Total budgeted cost					£nil	
Current Academic Year			2016 - 2017			
PPG School Context:						
Total number of pupils on roll			63			
Number of pupils eligible for PPG			38			
Total PPG funding received			£42,957.06			
Total PPG funding spent			£42,957.06			
PPG balance remaining			£0: additional monies needed taken from whole school budget			
Previous Academic Year			2015 - 2016			
PPG School Context:						
Total number of pupils on roll			87			
Number of pupils eligible for PPG			54			
Total PPG funding received			£38,335.00			
Total PPG funding spent			£38,978.00			
PPG balance remaining			£0: additional monies taken from whole school budget			

Summary of PPG spending 2015-2016
Aims and objectives for PPG spending: Linked to priority 5 of the School Action Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a range of appropriately targeted support which has a positive impact on standards attained by groups and individuals.

2. Review of expenditure				
Previous Academic Year		2015 - 2016		
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
Improve attainment across the curriculum	PP Staff Handbook INSET training re strategies and evidence: EEF	PP pupils achieved better than non-PP pupils in external examinations. Success criteria: met.	PP Staff Handbook updated and provided to all staff for 2016/2017. PP INSET training increased awareness amongst staff and offered further ideas and strategies – to continue with this approach. INSET training revised and delivered September 2016.	Photocopying
ii. Targeted support				
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

Improved Literacy Improved Numeracy	<p>Nine literacy lessons and three numeracy lessons timetabled each week in which experienced teaching staff have supported targeted pupils with 1:1 tuition in literacy/numeracy to improve their progress.</p> <p>Opportunities to access IDL on a daily basis to improve literacy skills.</p>	<p>High: observed increased progress amongst participating children</p> <p>8 out of the 17 pupils (47%) receiving this intervention showed some improvement in their assessment data. At key stage 4 PPG pupils maintained assessment scores marginally above that of non-PPG pupils.</p> <p>Examination data 2016 demonstrates greater progress in PP pupils compared to non-PP pupils.</p> <p>Progress made where intervention has been consistent (36% of pupils showed improved IDL scores). Pupils who made no progress were poor attenders or refused to complete IDL sessions.</p> <p>Success criteria: partly met.</p>	<p>This seemed to be most effective when the focus area was determined by the class teachers based on their observations of the pupil. We will continue next year.</p> <p>Consistency across the whole school, to continue next year.</p>	<p>Staff for 1:1 literacy and numeracy intervention: £21,043</p> <p>IDL: £60</p>
--	--	--	---	--

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
Improved attendance	1:1 educational provision / home tutoring for pupils who would otherwise not attend.	Progress made where sessions have been attended (report from tutors). For some pupils this intervention has supported their return to school.	For the academic year (05/09/15 to 23/07/16) attendance was 49.98% for PP pupils and 57.84% for non-PP pupils. This will continue to be reviewed.	Tutor fees: £17,875
Total budgeted cost				£38,978

3. Additional detail

In this section you can annex or refer to **additional** information which you have used to inform the statement above.

PP File