

Pupil premium report academic year 2015/2016

Reported by Abi Lee October 2016

Objective: To raise the achievement and attainment of PPG pupils and diminish the difference between ever 6 pupils and non-ever six pupils and free school meal and non-free school meal pupils.

| Number of pupils and pupil premium grant (PPG) received. | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | September 2015- April 2016 | April 2016- August 2016 |
| | 7/12 of funding | 5/12 of funding |
| Total number of pupils on roll | 352 | 351 |
| Total number of pupils eligible for PPG | 93 | 86 |
| Total amount of PPG received | £69121 | £45904 |
| Total | £115025 | |

Process followed at St Pauls:

1. A staff meeting is held at the start of the academic year for all staff with aims of:
 - A) Recap what 'Pupil premium Grant' is.
 - B) Gain a clear picture where St Paul's are now and the impact of our work so far.
 - C) To inform staff of the updated pupil list.
 - D) Discuss best strategies that have been implemented and share success stories.
2. Team meetings held to complete provision map for pupil premium group and targets set.
3. Pen portraits of all classes created and shared with class teachers.
4. End of year data analysed and team leaders identified which pupils at risk of underachieving in preparation for performance management meetings in autumn term.
5. Teachers' and teaching assistant performance management targets linked to attainment and progress of pupil premium children (vulnerable).
6. Strategies to support pupils implemented (see provision map).
7. Termly meetings held by all teams to monitor progress of pupil premium group, if pupils not making expected progress new initiatives and approaches discussed and implemented (review of provision map).
8. A. Lee complete learning walks to monitor the pupils learning styles and feedback given to staff to raise common concerns with pupil premium group.
9. During spring term data analysed by A. Lee to monitor and identify any year groups where pupils are not achieving/progressing, teacher and team leader met to discuss provision and appropriate changes made. (see analysis)
10. Monitoring of cohort progress carried out on termly basis and cohort with concerns meetings held with team leaders to discuss where new intervention or advice is needed.
11. Pupils' achievement and progress reported to governors and parents.

The data and information below shows the impact of the work through hard data, indicating that our strategies are working; however there are many other stories to tell of individual successes that can be shown in a selection of case studies which can be discussed on request.

Data

IMPACT of the expenditure

Data: Gathered using IDS, I. track and FFT – In school difference.

Key:

Blue – positive gap

Red – Negative gap

Key stage 1 and 2

| 2015/2016 | KS1 (48 pupils 16pp, 32npp) Data I. Track & IDS | | | KS2 (45pupils, 13 PP, 32 NPP) Data I. Track , FFT & IDS | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Reading | Writing | Maths | Reading | Writing | Maths | R,W&M |
| | Achieving expected standard | Achieving expected standard | Achieving expected standard | Achieving expected standard | Achieving expected standard | Achieving expected standard | Achieving expected standard |
| NPP | 69% | 63% | 69% | 88% | 75% | 94% | 75% |
| PP | 75% | 81% | 75% | 77% | 62% | 85% | 62% |
| Difference St Paul's | 6% | 18% | 6% | 11% | 13% | 9% | 13% |
| Difference when removing EHP and SEN support. | 19% | 31% | 19% | 4% | 2% | 6% | 2% |

Analysis of data:

Attainment

Key stage 1

- The non-pupil premium pupils achieved more than pupil premium group in all 3 areas.
Of the pupil premium group of 16 pupils: 2 pupils were SEN support. If this is considered in the data the attainment results would be significantly different:
- **Reading - If SEN support removed from the data – 88% reaching ARE for Pupil premium group.**
- **Writing – if SEN support removed – 94% reaching ARE for pupil premium group.**
- **Maths – If SEN support removed from the data – 88% reaching ARE for the pupil premium group.**

Key stage 2

The non-pupil premium group achieved greater than the pupil premium group in all 3 areas. Of the pupil premium group of 13 pupils: 2 of the pupils had an EHP and 1 pupil was on SEN support. If this is considered the results would be significantly different:

- **Reading** – If EHP and SEN support removed from the group – 92.2% of the pupil premium group reached ARE which is above NPP so the difference was diminished (removed).
- **Writing** – If EHP and SEN support removed from the group – 77% of the pupil premium group reached ARE which is above NPP so the difference was diminished (removed).
- **Maths** – If EHP and SEN support removed from the group 100% of the pupil premium group reached ARE which is above NPP so the difference was diminished (removed).
- One child with EHP was removed from the data and one child with SEN support as the other child with EHP achieved ARE in all 3 areas and their data is still included.

Progress of pupils in KS2 using FFT- KS2 (45pupils, 13 PP, 32 NPP) DATA: FFT

| 2015/2016 | % expected standard in RW,M. | % higher than expected in R,W,M. | % Average scaled score in R,W,M |
|------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| NPP | +11% | +5% | +3.4 |
| PP | +17% | +4% | +3.6 |
| Gap St Paul's | 6% | 1% | 0.2 |

Analysis of progress data:

KS2

- In reading, writing and maths combined there was no gap and the pupil premium group achieved greater than non-pupil premium.
- The pupil premium achieved a higher average scaled score in reading, and maths combined.
- There was a gap of 1% in % of pupils reaching higher than expected progress in reading, writing and maths.

Looking back at the difference.

Attainment at KS2

| | Reading | | | | Writing | | | | Maths | | | |
|------------|---------|-------|------|------|---------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|------|------|
| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| PP | 100% | 100% | 93% | 77% | 62.5% | 87.5% | 71% | 62% | 62.5% | 87.5% | 79% | 85% |
| NPP | 94.6% | 91.7% | 97% | 88% | 89.2% | 94.4% | 97% | 75% | 89.2% | 94.4% | 97% | 94% |
| Gap | 5.4% | 8.3% | 4% | 11% | 26.7% | 6.9% | 26% | 13% | 26.7% | 6.9% | 18% | 9% |

- In writing and maths the difference has diminished from the previous year and is gradually reducing if the spike of 2014 is removed.
- In reading the difference has grown, however the achievement of PP group against national average was greater.
- If child with EHP and SEN support were removed the PP achieved greater than NPP and would be reduced from previous year.

Attainment at KS1

| | Reading | | | | Writing | | | | Maths | | | |
|------------|---------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| PP | 56% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 67 | 81 | 71 | 81% | 78 | 88 | 71 | 75% |
| NPP | 100% | 82% | 82% | 69% | 100 | 86 | 92 | 63% | 100 | 89 | 94 | 69% |
| Gap | 44% | 7% | 35% | 6% | 33% | 5% | 21% | 18% | 22% | 1% | 23% | 6% |

- The difference has diminished in all 3 areas from the previous year as the pupil premium group achieved better than non-pupil premium group in all 3 areas.

EYFS data

| | | PP 2014: 14 pupils 2015: 7 pupils 2016: 10 pupils(3 are SEN) | Non PP | Difference |
|-----------|-------|---|--------|------------|
| June 2014 | GLD | 47% | 58% | -11% |
| | PRIME | 73% | 71% | +2% |
| June 2015 | GLD | 29% | 66% | -31% |
| | PRIME | 57% | 72% | -11% |
| June 2016 | GLD | 40% | 79% | -39% |
| | PRIME | 50% | 85% | -35% |

Analysis of differences in attainment 2016

- A significant gap in pupils receiving Pupil Premium Funding and pupils with SEN. However in progress terms this group fared well in most areas of learning specifically in Literacy, where they made good or better progress than their peers. (See analysis of progress)

Progress

Based on *Pupil Premium pupils who attended both St Paul's nursery and reception (10 pupils of which 3 are wave 3/SEN)*

| | CL | PSE | PD | Lit | MD | All 5 Areas of Learning |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|------|-------------------------|
| Expected Progress | 40% | 30% | 40% | 40% | 30% | 36% |
| Better than expected progress | 50% | 70% | 50% | 60% | 70% | 60% |
| Overall | 90% | 100% | 90% | 100% | 100% | 96% |

Analysis:

- Pupils receiving Pupil Premium Funding made slightly less progress than their peers in most areas of learning, except in **Literacy, where they made better progress than their peers (by 7%)**. This helps to demonstrate the impact of Pupil Premium Funding, which the EYFS used to provide Literacy intervention for reception pupils receiving PPF
- The PP group is made up of 10 pupils of whom 3 are wave 3/SEN. The impact of removing these pupils from the data shows that **PP pupils make much better progress than non-PP pupils. For example, better than expected progress in CL becomes 60%, PSE becomes 80%, PD becomes 60%, Lit becomes 70%, MD becomes 80%**
- 100% of PP pupils achieved the ELG in PSE

Next steps: Continue the focus on literacy and consider more support for PD. Ensure PP Funding continues to be used to support EYFS pupils.

Attendance **Using IDS data**

| | 2012/2013 | 2013/2014 | 2014/2015 | 2015/2016 |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Pupil premium | 92.773% | 93.33% | 94.36% | 96.42% |
| Non pupil premium | 96.416% | 96.82% | 96.5% | 97.4% |
| Difference | 3.643% | 3.49% | 2.14% | 1% |

The gap in attendance for pupil premium (ever6) has reduced, we now are looking at specifically the pupils on FSM and the focus will be on this group and persistent absences (PA) in 2016/2017.

New initiatives for 2015/2016 from analysis of 2014/2015

Next year's focus:

- Employment of attendance support.
- Subsidy of pupils going to Ghyll Head.
- Focus on quality first teaching and flexible learning.
- Teaching assistant performance management to be linked to disadvantaged pupils.
- Set up homework clubs for KS2.
- Focus on punctuality of pupil premium group to ensure additional learning groups and interventions not missed.
- Whole school provision map to include ALL pupil premium group.
- Fitness group for Pupil premium group as high links with deprivation and obesity.

How was the money spent ?

93 pupils eligible at maximum: £115025

| Provision | Allocated | Details |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Free school meals | £14212 | 68 (census January 2015) FSM pupils. £2.20 per day x5x38=£418 per pupil. 50% funded by PPG = £14212 Impact- ability to concentrate in class and general health. |
| TA intervention | £62748 | 1 TA at a cost of £15687. 4x = £62748 Running interventions, class support, SEN groups one per team. Impact – to increase rate of progress – see I.Track and data above, all PP receive an additional teach in KS2 – see provision map. |
| Family worker | £6755 | Supports targeted vulnerable families .The impact is that children are safer and attending better and parents are supported in helping school do this. Role includes: home visits, attendance, CAFS and support when required. Funding is the difference between general TA cost and family role. |
| Staff extra hours/target clubs | £1485 | Support in after school clubs, payment for staff to run extracurricular clubs, lunchtime clubs for target groups. These include food technology and homework club. Impact: of homework club is the pupils have support in their learning, self-esteem boosted when handing in completed work and high teacher ratio with English and Maths work. Food technology increases life experiences. |
| Purchase of sensory room | £2500 | Room cost school approximately £10000 so 25% from PPG as number of PP group using it is very high. Impact: social and emotional well-being of pupils to ensure they can access lessons after sessions. |
| Subsidised clubs | £4320 | School subsidises clubs so pupils are charged at £2 not £4 for all after school activities. Costing: £1440 per club per year, 20 pupils attending. |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | | Impact- Increase life experience, talent spot, fitness levels, vocabulary increased, a reason to come to school. |
| Sports competitions/transport | £500 | To ensure parents don't pay for their child to participate in competition. Impact: High aspirations. |
| Employment of behavior consultant. | £1296 | Support for families and strategies for staff in school (KW) Impact: attendance improved, accessing more of the curriculum. |
| Specialist teacher SpLD | £2520 | Teachers and teaching assistants trained in specialist programs to support pupils with specific learning difficulties and in reading development. Pupils worked 1on1 with teacher. Impact: See assessments of pupils involved, additional teaching is matching pupils' individual need. |
| Attendance | £3225 | One education attendance support. Families targeted, in touch days and meetings held. Impact: difference reduced in attendance. |
| Shortfall of trips | £2000 | To ensure all pupils attend all school trips. Impact: School visits impact on the broad and balanced curriculum. Children are better able to communicate, use their imagination, extend their vocabulary and improve their academic achievement in writing and other subjects. |
| Play leaders | £2958 | Lunchtime staff employed. Impact: Pupils engaged in activities at lunch and that pupils develop leadership skills. |
| Assistant head – pupil premium lead. | £1793 | 1/2 day every other week on closing the gap. |
| SENCO work | £2530 | Meetings with Pupil premium lead every other week for ½ day of week working with pupil premium families. |
| Ghyll Head | £2500 | Subsidising year 6 residential trip. 3 pupils paid for in full. Impact: Improves team skills, problem solving, independence, resilience, life skills, and enterprise skills. |
| Parental involvement | £1000 | PEN membership, events and coffee mornings, workshops. Impact: Parents increased involvement in child's learning. |
| PE specialist fitness class | £1000 | Target group of overweight pupils out of |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|
| | | PP group in 30 minute fitness session per week. Impact: Fitness levels of pupils increased, desire to come to school. |
| ICT | £1000 | IPad purchased and used to impact by hooking pupils with lack of engagement. |
| Breakfast club | £1277 | Payment to staff to run the club. Impact: Ensures a good start to the day for all children who attend. There are lots of reasons for the child to come to school. Impact is that difference in attendance has reduced over the past 3 years. |
| Counselling for families | £1000 | External support for vulnerable pupils. Impact: Pupil able to access longer session in class. |
| Interpreters for families | £1000 | For review & parents evenings. Impact- Ensures parents are able to support learning. |

Spending - £115119

Budget - £115025

Overspend of £94