What has been the impact of the 2015-2016 Pupil Premium?

Amount of pupil Premium funding received 2015-2016

| Number of pupils eligible | 30 |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Amount received per pupil | 1300 |
| Total PP received | 39,600 |

Key expenditure

| Area of spend | Focus | Total allocation |
|--|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Additional TA/Teacher support in classes and for focussed intervention | English and Maths | £27061 |
| Additional learning resources (Interactive Whiteboards) | English and Maths | £8,294 |
| Funding for school trips and residential visits | Personal and Social | £245 |
| Funding for breakfast club supervision | Personal and Social | £4000 |

2014 - 2016 Sats results – progress

Closing the Gaps trend – Pupils in receipt of PP funding

| | 2014 | | | | 2015 | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------|----------|----------|------------|------------------|----------|----------|------------|--|--|--|
| | Maths, R | Reading, | Writing | | Maths, F | Reading, | Writing | | | | |
| | Cohort Number | School | National | Difference | Cohort Number | School | National | Difference | | | |
| All Subjects | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PP | 5 (33%) | 28.2 | 27.0 | +1.2 | 5 | 25.5 | 27.2 | -1.5 | | | |
| Other Pupils | 10 | 28.4 | 29.4 | -1.0 | 13 | 29.9 | 29.5 | 0.4 | | | |
| School Gap | | -0.2 | -2.4 | | | -4.4 | -2.3 | | | | |
| Reading | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PP | 5 (33%) | 29.4 | 27.5 | +1.9 | 5 | 27.0 | 27.6 | 0.6 | | | |
| Other Pupils | 10 | 28.2 | 29.7 | -1.5 | 13 | 29.8 | 29.6 | 0.2 | | | |
| School Gap | | +1.2 | -2.2 | | | -2.8 | -2.0 | | | | |
| Writing | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PP | 5 (33%) | 27.0 | 26.3 | +0.7 | 5 | 21.0 | 26.6 | -5.6 | | | |
| Other Pupils | 10 | 26.4 | 28.6 | -2.2 | 13 | 27.5 | 28.8 | -1.3 | | | |
| School Gap | | 0.6 | -2.3 | | | -6.5 | -2.2 | | | | |
| Maths | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PP | 5 (33%) | 28.2 | 27.2 | +1.0 | 5 | 27.0 | 27.3 | -0.3 | | | |
| Other Pupils | 10 | 29.4 | 29.8 | -0.4 | 13 | 31.2 | 29.8 | 1.4 | | | |
| School Gap | | -1.2 | -2.6 | | | -4.2 | -2.5 | | | | |
| SPAG | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PP | 5 (33%) | 25.8 | 26.9 | -1.1 | 5 | 27.0 | 27.5 | -0.5 | | | |
| Other Pupils | 10 | 27.0 | 29.4 | -2.4 | 13 | 30.2 | 29.8 | 0.4 | | | |
| School Gap | | -1.2 | -2.5 | | | -3.2 | -2.3 | | | | |

| | 2016 | | | |
|--------------|------------------|---|--|------------|
| Progress | Maths, 1 | Reading, Writing | | |
| J | Cohort Number | School Actual test scores divided by number of pupils | National Average score for PAG divided by number of pupils | Difference |
| All Subjects | | Combined Subjects | | |
| PP | 4 | Average pupil test score 318.71 | Average KS2 score for PAG 312.55 | +6.16 |
| Non PP | 7 | Average pupil test score 320.50 | Average KS2 score for PAG 300.25 | +20.25 |
| School Gap | | -1.79 | +12.3 | |
| Reading | | | | |
| PP | 4 | Average pupil test score 106.75 | Average KS2 score for PAG 104.57 | +2.18 |
| Non PP | 7 | Average pupil test score 109.42 | Average KS2 score for PAG 99.64 | +9.78 |
| School Gap | | -2.67 | +4.93 | |
| Writing | | | | |
| PP | 4 | Average pupil test score 103 | Average KS2 score for PAG 103.35 | -0.35 |
| Non PP | 7 | Average pupil test score 102.14 | Average KS2 score for PAG 99.01 | +3.13 |
| School Gap | | +1.21 | | |
| Maths | | | | |
| PP | 4 | Average pupil test score 110.75 | Average KS2 score for PAG 104.62 | +6.13 |
| Non PP | 7 | Average pupil test score 107.14 | Average KS2 score for PAG 100.84 | +6.3 |
| School Gap | | +3.61 | | |
| SPAG | | | | |
| PP | 4 | Average pupil test score 110 | | |
| Non PP | 7 | Average pupil test score 106.71 | | |
| School Gap | | +3.29 | | |
| | | | | |

| Y6 | | YR | | | Y1 | | | Y2 | | | Y3 | | | Y4 | | | Y5 | | | Y6 | | | SPAG | |
|------|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| 2016 | FSP | R | W | М | R | W | М | R | W | М | R | W | М | R | W | M | R | W | М | R | W | М | Score | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Yes | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2b | 1a | 2b | 3b | 2b | 3b | 4c | 3c | 3a | 4a | 4c | 4b | Above | Above | Above | GDS | EXS | GDS | 112 | GDS |
| 2 | Yes | 7 | 7 | 7 | 1b | 1b | 1a | 2b | 2b | 2b | 2a | 2a | 3c | 3b | 3b | 3a | Below | Below | At | EXS | EXS | GDS | 108 | EXS |
| 3 | | 5 | 5 | 7 | 1a | 1b | 2c | 2a | 2b | 2a | 3b | 2a | 3b | 4c | 3b | 4c | At | Below | At | EXS | EXS | EXS | 109 | EXS |
| 4 | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2c | 2c | 1a | 3с | 2a | 2b | 3a | 3b | 3c | 4c | 4c | 3b | At | Above | At | GDS | EXS | EXS | 111 | GDS |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

In-school comparison 2016

All subjects combined – Non PP pupils outperformed PP – the difference was not significant 1.79

Reading – Non PP pupils outperformed PP – the difference was 2.67

Writing - PP pupils outperformed non PP- the difference was 1.21

Maths - PP pupils outperformed non PP- the difference was 3.61

GPS - PP pupils outperformed non PP– the difference was 3.29

Pupil Premium children in our school are performing well

Comparison with national

All subjects combined - School Ever 6 are above national Ever 6 at AS+ but below National at HS

Reading – School Ever 6 are above national Ever 6 at AS+ and HS

Writing – at expected level School Ever 6 are above National Ever 6, at GD School Ever 6 are below National Ever 6

Maths – School Ever 6 are above national Ever 6 at AS+ but below National at HS

GPS - School Ever 6 are above national Ever 6 at AS+ and HS

When comparing School Ever 6 with Non pupil premium nationally, our school performed better than national in all areas apart from Writing GD, Maths HS and RWM HS

2014 – 2016 Sats results – Attainment of pupils in receipt of PP funding

| | | 2014 | | | | | | 2015 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-------------------|----------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------|-----|-------------------|----------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|
| | | PP School 5 | PP NA | GAP | Non PP School 10 | Non PP NA | GAP | PP School 5 | PP NA | GAP | Non PP School 13 | Non PP NA | GAP |
| Level 4 + | Reading | 100 | 82 | +18 | 90 | 92 | -2 | 80 | 83 | -3 | 100 | 92 | +8 |
| | Writing | 80 | 76 | +4 | 80 | 89 | -9 | 0 | 79 | -79 | 84.6 | 90 | -5.4 |
| | Maths | 100 | 78 | +22 | 100 | 90 | +10 | 100 | 80 | +20 | 100 | 90 | +10 |
| | SPAG | 60 | 66 | -6 | 70 | 81 | -11 | 60 | 71 | +11 | 84.6 | 84 | +0.6 |
| Level 5+ | Reading | 40 | 35 | +5 | 40 | 56 | -16 | 20 | 34 | -14 | 46.2 | 55 | -8.8 |
| | Writing | 20 | 20 | -= | 20 | 39 | -19 | 0 | 22 | -22 | 23.1 | 42 | -18.9 |
| | Maths | 20 | 28 | -8 | 40 | 48 | -8 | 0 | 28 | -28 | 53.8 | 47 | +6.8 |
| | SPAG | 20 | 39 | -19 | 30 | 58 | -28 | 0 | 43 | -43 | 69.2 | 61 | +8.2 |
| Expected progress 2+L | Reading | 100 | 88 | +12 | 90 | 92 | -2 | 100 | 88 | +12 | 100 | 92 | +8 |
| | Writing | 100 | 90 | +10 | 100 | 94 | +6 | 100 | 92 | +8 | 100 | 95 | +5 |
| | Maths | 100 | 86 | +14 | 100 | 91 | +9 | 100 | 86 | +14 | 100 | 91 | +9 |
| Better than expected progress 3+L | Reading | 60 | 36 | +24 | 40 | 34 | +6 | 80 | 35 | +45 | 38 | 33 | +5 |
| | Writing | 60 | 31 | +29 | 10 | 34 | -24 | 60 | 34 | +26 | 23 | 37 | -14 |
| | Maths | 40 | 28 | +12 | 30 | 38 | -8 | 100 | 29 | +71 | 46 | 37 | +9 |

2016

| | | School | National | School | National | School | National |
|---------|-------|--------|----------|--------|----------|------------|------------|
| | | All | All | Ever 6 | Ever 6 | Not Ever 6 | Not Ever 6 |
| Reading | % AS+ | 91 | 66 | 100 | 71 | 84 | 71 |
| | % HS | 46 | 19 | 40 | 23 | 50 | 23 |

| Writing | % EXP+ | 73 | 74 | 80 | 79 | 67 | 79 |
|---------|--------|-----|----|-----|------------|-----|----|
| | % GD | 28 | 15 | 0 | 18 | 50 | 18 |
| GPS | % AS+ | 91 | 72 | 100 | 78 | 83 | 78 |
| | % HS | 46 | 23 | 40 | 27 | 50 | 27 |
| Maths | % AS+ | 100 | 70 | 100 | <i>7</i> 5 | 100 | 75 |
| | % HS | 46 | 17 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 20 |
| RWM | % AS+ | 73 | 53 | 80 | 60 | 67 | 60 |
| | % HS | 27 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 50 | 7 |

EYFS

50% of FSM children achieved a GLD compared with 75% non-FSM

Y1 Phonics

FSM children did not perform as well as non-FSM children, but FSM children performed just above FSM children nationally

Key Stage 1 Data

Non-FSM children outperformed FSM children in all subjects, but the gap is closing