



Pupil Premium Grant Report 2018/2019

The conditions of the Pupil Premium Grant are:

- for the purposes of the school; that is, for the educational benefit of pupils registered at that school
- for the benefit of pupils registered at other maintained schools or academies
- for community facilities; for example, services whose provision furthers any charitable purpose for the benefit of pupils at the school or their families, or people who live or work in the locality in which the school is situated

DfE will allocate PPG to schools and local authorities (who must allocate for each FTE pupil on the January 2018 school census, at each school they maintain) the following amounts:

- £1,320 per pupil for each Ever 6 FSM FTE pupil aged 4 and over in year groups reception to year 6, except where the pupil is allocated the LAC or post-LAC premium
- £935 per pupil for each Ever 6 FSM FTE in year groups 7 to 11, except where the pupil is allocated the LAC or post-LAC Premium
- £2,300 per pupil for each post-LAC in year groups reception to year 11
- £300 for each pupil aged 4 and over in year groups reception to year 11 who is either Ever 6 service child FTE or in receipt of pensions under the Armed Forces Compensation Scheme (AFCS) and the War Pensions Scheme (WPS)

For pupils recorded aged 5 and over on the school census, PPG will be allocated on the basis of sole and dual main registrations only.

Section 1 – Overview

Context	School Evidence																
The school is an average-sized / smaller than average / larger than average school.	The school is larger than the average-sized primary school. 472 pupils on roll Girls on roll 48.6% Boys on roll 51.4%																
The proportion of pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds and of those who speak English as an additional language is average / below average / above average.	Pupils whose first language is not English 2.4% - below national averages																
The proportion of pupils for whom the school receives the Pupil Premium Grant is above average/ below average / above average	Pupils eligible for free school meals at any time during the past 6 years 13% - below national averages																
<p>What is the overall number and proportion of eligible pupils in the school?</p> <p>Has this changed over the last 2/3 years?</p> <p>What factors have contributed to the changes?</p>	<p>68 pupils, which has increased from 55 pupils in 2016</p> <p>Very slight increase.</p> <p>No specific factors.</p>																
The proportion of disabled pupils and those who have special educational needs is higher than average / below average / in line with the national average.	<p>SEN Support 9.3% - below national averages</p> <p>Pupils with an SEN education, health and care plan 0.9% - below national averages</p>																
Provision for early years is provided in full time / part time nursery classes and reception class/es.	There are three classes in Reception.																
The school's outcomes at the end of KS2 in 2018 were in line with / above / well above / below / well below the national average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Average -1.1 • Writing Below average -2.2 • Maths Below average -1.7 <p>Pupils meeting expected standard in reading, writing and maths</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1003 1066 2045 1193"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>School</th> <th>Local authority average</th> <th>England average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pupils meeting expected standard in reading, writing and maths</td> <td>51%</td> <td>61%</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Pupils achieving at a higher standard in reading, writing and maths</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1003 1305 2045 1369"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>School</th> <th>Local authority average</th> <th>England average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		School	Local authority average	England average	Pupils meeting expected standard in reading, writing and maths	51%	61%	64%		School	Local authority average	England average				
	School	Local authority average	England average														
Pupils meeting expected standard in reading, writing and maths	51%	61%	64%														
	School	Local authority average	England average														

	Pupils meeting the standard in reading, writing and maths	10%	10%	10%
Other significant issues which impact on the overall effectiveness of the school (include staff turbulence & recruitment / new Headteacher / warning notice)	<p>Over the last 3 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading has remained at average when compared to national figures • Writing has moved from average to below average when compared to national figures • Maths has remained at below average when compared to national figures • The school has undergone significant building work over the past three years, which has caused a certain amount of disruption. • An IEB now replaces the Governing Body at the instigation of the Local Authority. • A LAIG is also in place following concerns relating to poor pupil outcomes, Leadership and Management and other areas identified in the last Ofsted Inspection Report. • The school currently has a Temporary Interim Headteacher in place. • The school is currently experiencing a period of staff turbulence – however staffing is in place for a settled September start. 			

Section 2 – Funding

Income and expenditure

	Annual Income FSM – Ever 6
2018 - 2019	£83,600.00

Summary of key areas of Pupil Premium Grant expenditure/activity (e.g. staff salary costs, interventions, programmes, equipment & resources, training, consultancy, extra-curricular provision, etc.)

Year	Activity <small>Taken from past strategy documents</small>		Impact <small>Taken from past strategy documents</small>	Lessons learned going into the next year <small>Taken from past strategy documents</small>
2018 - 2019	<p>Improved speech, language and communication skills for pupils eligible for PP funding</p> <p>All pupils eligible for PP (who are not SEN) will make at least expected progress across the year and more pupils will achieve ARE in reading, writing and maths.</p> <p>The social and emotional wellbeing of vulnerable children is protected and enhanced, pupils are able to learn and make progress</p> <p>An increase in the rate of attendance for pupils eligible for PP funding</p> <p>Pupils eligible for PP across the school have the same opportunities as their peers</p> <p>Support vulnerable families in funding extra-curricular activities, e.g. residential visits,</p>	<p>Please see the screenshots below.</p>	<p>Funding was used to support a great many strategies and predictions suggest progress not to have accelerated for these pupils. It is also a concern that so much of the funding appears to contribute to provision for 'others', including SEN amongst others.</p> <p>Going forward it is recommended that a more tailored and bespoke provision is considered following a rigorous look at the specific barriers to learning for these pupils.</p> <p>A serious look at the effectiveness of the strategies themselves (funding v outcome) may also highlight which should be discontinued in favour of Quality Teaching.</p>	

day trips, music lessons, sports club, arts mark activities. etc. by subsidising these

More parents of pupils eligible for PP funding engage with school and their child's education

Expected Std 2019 Interim	Early Years						KSI					KS2						Phonics								
	Cohort	GLD	APS	All 17 Areas	Prime	Specific	Cohort	RWM	Reading	Writing	Maths	Science	Cohort	RWM	Reading	Writing	Maths	Science	GPS	Y1 Cohort	Y2 Cohort	EKS Cohort	Y1 (2019)	Y2 (2019)	EKS (2019)	
% (Cams / England)		71.6 / 71.8	34.2 / 34.5	70 / 70.7	78.3 / 79.2	71 / 71.4		62.8 / 64.9	74.1 / 74.9	67.4 / 69.2	74.8 / 75.6	82.8 / 82.3		62.4 / 64.8	0 / 73.1	75.3 / 78.4	76.4 / 78.7	82 / 82.9	76.1 / 77.9					80.2 / 81.9	54.1 / 55.9	90.8 / 91.4
% (Pboro / England)		67 / 71.8	33.8 / 34.5	64.7 / 70.7	74.9 / 79.2	65.2 / 71.4		57.2 / 64.9	66.9 / 74.9	61.8 / 69.2	69.9 / 75.6	75.7 / 82.3		54.5 / 64.8	0 / 73.1	69.8 / 78.4	71.4 / 78.7	74.3 / 82.9	70.7 / 77.9					77 / 82	56.5 / 55.9	88.8 / 91.4
All Pupils in School	67	73.1	35.3	73.1	83.6	73.1	58	44.8	82.8	46.6	79.3	81.0	74	60.8	0.0	67.6	75.7	91.9	81.1	66	5	58	84.8	0.0	91.4	
Boys / Girls	33 / 34	69.7 / 76.5	35.3 / 35.4	69.7 / 76.5	81.8 / 85.3	69.7 / 76.5	32 / 26	28.1 / 65.4	71.9 / 96.2	28.1 / 69.2	71.9 / 88.5	65.6 / 100	38 / 36	55.3 / 66.7	0 / 0	60.5 / 75	78.9 / 72.2	86.8 / 97.2	84.2 / 77.8	29 / 37	5 / 0	32 / 26	75.9 / 91.9	0 / 0	84.4 / 100	
Gap		-6.8	-0.1	-6.8	-3.5	-6.8		-37.3	-24.3	-41.1	-16.6	-34.4		-11.4	-	-14.5	6.7	-10.4	6.4				-16.0	-	-15.6	
Disadv'd / Non	11 / 56	63.6 / 75	33.5 / 35.7	63.6 / 75	81.8 / 83.9	63.6 / 75	6 / 52	50 / 44.2	83.3 / 82.7	50 / 46.2	66.7 / 80.8	66.7 / 82.7	15 / 59	6.67 / 74.6	0 / 0	13.3 / 81.4	40 / 84.7	80 / 94.9	40 / 91.5	7 / 59	1 / 4	6 / 52	42.9 / 89.8	0 / 0	83.3 / 92.3	
Gap		-11.4	-2.1	-11.4	-2.1	-11.4		5.8	0.6	3.8	-14.1	-16.0		-67.9	-	-68.0	-44.7	-14.9	-51.5				-47.0	-	-9.0	
FSM / Non-FSM	9 / 56	66.7 / 76.8	33.4 / 35.8	66.7 / 76.8	77.8 / 83.9	66.7 / 76.8	6 / 52	50 / 44.2	83.3 / 82.7	50 / 46.2	66.7 / 80.8	66.7 / 82.7	10 / 64	0 / 70.3	0 / 0	10 / 76.6	40 / 81.3	90 / 92.2	40 / 87.5	6 / 60	1 / 4	6 / 52	33.3 / 90	0 / 0	83.3 / 92.3	
Gap		-10.1	-2.3	-10.1	-6.2	-10.1		5.8	0.6	3.8	-14.1	-16.0		-	-	-66.6	-41.3	-2.2	-47.5				-56.7	-	-9.0	
FSM6 / Non-FSM6	10 / 57	60 / 75.4	33.4 / 35.6	60 / 75.4	80 / 84.2	60 / 75.4	6 / 52	50 / 44.2	83.3 / 82.7	50 / 46.2	66.7 / 80.8	66.7 / 82.7	13 / 61	0 / 73.8	0 / 0	7.69 / 80.3	38.5 / 83.6	84.6 / 93.4	38.5 / 90.2	7 / 59	1 / 4	6 / 52	42.9 / 89.8	0 / 0	83.3 / 92.3	
Gap		-15.4	-2.2	-15.4	-4.2	-15.4		5.8	0.6	3.8	-14.1	-16.0		-	-	-72.6	-45.1	-8.8	-51.7				-47.0	-	-9.0	

Greater Depth 2019 Interim	Early Years						KSI					KS2							
	Cohort	GLD	APS	All 17 Areas	Prime	Specific	Cohort	RWM	Reading	Writing	Maths	Science	Cohort	RWM	Reading	Writing	Maths	Science	GPS
% (Cams / England)				1.6 / 2.5	4.14 / 5.6	2.17 / 3.2		10.3 / 11.2	25.1 / 25	13.9 / 14.8	21.4 / 21.7		0 / 10.5	0 / 26.9	16.6 / 20.2	25.8 / 26.6			33 / 35.7
% (Pboro / England)				2.41 / 2.5	7.47 / 5.6	2.78 / 3.2		7.42 / 11.2	18 / 25	11 / 14.8	17.1 / 21.7		0 / 10.5	0 / 26.9	12.1 / 20.2	21.1 / 26.6			28.1 / 35.7
All Pupils in School				0.0	1.5	1.5		1.7	12.1	1.7	17.2		0.0	0.0	14.9	31.1			41.9
Boys / Girls				0 / 0	0 / 2.94	3.03 / 0		0 / 3.85	0 / 26.9	0 / 3.85	12.5 / 23.1		0 / 0	0 / 0	7.89 / 22.2	34.2 / 27.8			36.8 / 47.2
Gap				-	-	-		-	-	-	-10.6		-	-	-14.3	6.4			-10.4
Disadv'd / Non				0 / 0	9.09 / 0	0 / 1.79		0 / 1.92	16.7 / 11.5	0 / 1.92	0 / 19.2		0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 18.6	0 / 39			6.67 / 50.8
Gap				-	-	-		-	5.1	-	-		-	-	-	-			-44.2
FSM / Non-FSM				0 / 0	11.1 / 0	0 / 1.79		0 / 1.92	16.7 / 11.5	0 / 1.92	0 / 19.2		0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 17.2	0 / 35.9			0 / 48.4
Gap				-	-	-		-	5.1	-	-		-	-	-	-			-
FSM6 / Non-FSM6				0 / 0	10 / 0	0 / 1.75		0 / 1.92	16.7 / 11.5	0 / 1.92	0 / 19.2		0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 18	0 / 37.7			0 / 50.8
Gap				-	-	-		-	5.1	-	-		-	-	-	-			-

Budget Planning for use of PPG	School Evidence
<p>Prior to budget planning is a study made of 'barriers to learning' (given that these may change annually and from cohort to cohort).</p> <p>Is credence given to the previous years' spend and a review of pupil outcomes linked to that spend?</p> <p>Is this information then used to inform future spend?</p>	<p>There is no specific collective evidence base available to demonstrate this. The school could make good use of developing a one page summary document detailing this, which would sit alongside individual pupil evidence files – which would eventually form case studies if/when required.</p> <p>Not sufficiently.</p> <p>No</p>
<p>What % of the Pupil Premium Grant contributes to salaries?</p> <p>Is this for Support Staff or Senior Leaders?</p> <p>How is this reflected in the Performance Management of these post holders?</p> <p>What happens to these post holders if the Disadvantaged Pupils within their charge do not make accelerated progress?</p>	<p>Approximately £57,000 (figure taken from Pupil Premium Strategy Statement 2018-19)</p> <p>A mix of staff roles – contribution to part salaries where staff are responsible for more than one area.</p> <p>Currently no performance management targets are set relating to Disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>Nothing</p>
<p>What % of spend is on Physical Resources?</p> <p>Are purchases based on individual pupil need or on bigger schemes/resource packs that many will benefit from?</p>	<p>Approximately £15,300 (figure taken from Pupil Premium Strategy Statement 2018-19)</p> <p>Funding is used to support a great many strategies. Going forward it is recommended that a more tailored and bespoke provision is considered following a rigorous look at the specific barriers to learning for these pupils. A serious look at the effectiveness of the strategies themselves (funding v outcome) may also highlight which should be discontinued in favour of Quality Teaching.</p>
<p>What % is spent on staff training?</p> <p>How is this cascaded to all school staff?</p>	<p>Approximately £11,400 (figure taken from Pupil Premium Strategy Statement 2018-19)</p> <p>There is a schedule of staff meetings during which some training is cascaded.</p>
<p>Do you regularly review the effectiveness of chosen strategies against spend and outcome?</p>	<p>No – see notes above.</p>

Section 3 – Safeguarding Data

Use of Safeguarding Data to inform decisions	School Evidence
Does the school use this information to plan strategies and target funding?	Not to date. This is an area the IEB has been attempting to address however the data presented since September (on a half termly basis) has been flawed so it has not been possible to identify true patterns and trends. This has taken some unravelling however, a meeting has now been held (18/6/19) between the IEB member with responsibility for Safeguarding Data and the School Business Manager to clarify expectations (cutting out the middle men), and data going forward should be robust. The first expected data set following this new guidance will be 'End Summer 2' half term 2019.
Do Governors challenge school leaders with questions around this data?	Yes – this can be evidenced in the IEB Minutes, particularly around Persistent Absence. There is however room for much more interrogation.
Does the school take advantage of support offered by various LA departments to tackle areas of weakness identified by the changing patterns and trends within this data? How is this evidenced?	Yes. The school works with EWOs, The Specialist Teaching Team, Social Care, Play Therapists, etc. Evidence for this however is not as robust as it should be. The SENCO files are only just developing and there is little in the way of systems and structures in place for evidencing work with Pupil Premium Pupils. Case Studies and Individual Pupil Plans are not in place for Disadvantaged Pupils, although provision is outlined on Provision Maps. Pupil and Parent Views are not sought for these pupils and is unclear whether associated parent understand that this financial entitlement is support accelerated learning in English and Maths.
Is there any correlation between increased persistence absence and Disadvantaged Pupils? If so what strategies are being employed to remedy this?	Yes The School Business Manager has undertaken meetings with her EWO and new strategies are now in place to tackle this poor attendance following LA guidelines. The Temporary Interim HT has also had meetings with specific parents, and attendance cups and certificates are now being presented in order to raise pupil awareness about the importance of being in school.
Is there any correlation between increased first aid logs and Disadvantaged Pupils? If so what strategies are being employed to remedy this?	To date data presented has been inaccurate. Going forward this will be in place so that actions can be taken should they be required.
Is there any correlation between increased child protection logs and Disadvantaged Pupils?	To date data presented has been inaccurate. Going forward this will be in place so that actions can be taken should they be required.

Section 4 – Attainment

Attainment	School Evidence
How is attainment and progress tracked?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision Mapping • Pupil Progress Meetings • A wide variety of measures (both hard and soft) linked to specific strategies. • Classroom Monitor • NFER Testing • Mock examinations • Teacher assessment • Lesson observations <p>There is nothing inappropriate about these systems however it is a concern that perhaps some staff do not fully understand how to use them or indeed what the data is telling them, thus the information is not being used well enough to inform next step planning.</p>
What specific strategies are in place for tracking the progress and attainment of disadvantaged pupils?	See notes above – other than for specific strategies (where they are used for this group) pupils are assessed in the same way as all other pupils. There are no evidential case studies in place, or indeed any specific systems and structures in place to manage the provision for these pupils.
What does the school's data analysis show in respect of gaps between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils?	Information to data shows that the difference is not diminishing and that attainment remains below that of non-disadvantaged pupils in all areas.
What does analysis of attainment by children at risk from multiple variables show? (i.e. the extent to which pupils are in several groups that may experience low or under-achievement, for example, SEND, Persistent Absence, EAL, Black and Minority Ethnic groups, etc.)	Information to data shows that the difference is not diminishing and that attainment remains below that of non-disadvantaged pupils in all areas.
How are barriers to learning identified? Academic? Social, Emotional and Mental Health?	<p>The school has available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records from pre-schools • Good information from its own EYFS provision • Records from other school following in-year transfers • Some safeguarding data around attendance, etc. • In-school data-drops • Reading ages, spelling ages, etc. • Information from in-school book scrutiny • Information from work with multi-agencies where there has been involvement. • Some parent and pupil voice. <p>There is nothing inappropriate about these systems to assist with the identification of 'barriers' however it is a</p>

concern that perhaps some staff do not fully understand how to use them or indeed what the information is telling them, thus it is not being used well enough to inform provision.

There is a concern that there is a 'blanket' approach to provision rather than a 'bespoke' one, and therefore that some pupils are receiving input that will not necessarily benefit them and vice versa.

What progress is made by disadvantaged pupils from their starting points?

Evidence shows that, overall, performance of disadvantaged pupils is lower than that of other pupils.

	School disadvantaged pupils	Local authority other (non-disadvantaged) pupils	England state-funded schools other (non-disadvantaged) pupils
Progress in reading (score, description and confidence intervals)	-1.1 (-4.6 to 2.4)	0.5 (0.3 to 0.7)	0.3 (0 to 0)
Progress in writing (score, description and confidence intervals)	-4.2 (-7.6 to -0.8)	-0.7 (-0.9 to -0.5)	0.2 (0 to 0)
Progress in maths (score, description and confidence intervals)	-1.9 (-5.1 to 1.3)	-0.1 (-0.3 to 0.1)	0.3 (0 to 0)
Percentage of pupils meeting the expected standard in reading, writing and maths	36%	68%	70%
Percentage of pupils achieving a high standard in reading, writing and maths	0%	11%	12%
Average score in reading	103	106	106
average score in maths	102	105	105

How quickly are attainment gaps for Disadvantaged pupils closing compared to the national average?	Not quickly enough.
Do evidence-based systems for evaluation of the impact exist?	No
Are ALL staff clear that the measurable outcomes for Pupil Premium Spend are linked to pupils' English and Maths outcomes – i.e., Each pupil entitled to PPG should be making accelerated progress in R W and M as a result of the additional money allocated to them – even if they are already at expected levels.	If asked staff may say that they do understand this however, Performance Managements Targets are not linked to Disadvantaged Outcomes for teachers or support staff, and in certain Year Groups the quality of teaching is insufficiently robust in respect of differentiation for this group. It is unclear how 'accountable' staff realise they are for the progress of all of the pupils they teach.

Summary of the school's effectiveness in closing gaps for disadvantaged pupils and its use of the Pupil Premium Grant

The school knows its patterns of eligibility, and pupils entering the school in EYFS and Reception are provided for well in terms of strategies used to overcome barriers to learning relating to social disadvantage. Relationships with feeder nurseries and playgroups, as well as with parents and other multi-agencies are strong. A range of diagnostic tools are also used to good effect to measure progress from starting points, both in terms of learning and social and emotional impact. Similarly in Years 5 and 6 leaders and staff set ambitious targets for all pupils including the disadvantaged, and good quality teaching, rigorous monitoring and good liaison ensures that this group of pupils is catching up with its peers. Concerns arise around provision for Disadvantage pupils in Year 1/2/3/4 – where teaching is not as strong and knowledge of assessment data less robust, as a result these pupils are not making enough progress which has a 'knock on effect' into YR5 and 6 where teachers must then ensure pupils catch-up even more.

Pupil Premium funding is used to provide both bespoke individual and group strategies. In some instances these are short, sharp and impactful, but all too often they do not have the desired effect and progress is insufficient. Strategies in upper KS1 and lower KS2 need to be more robust. The lack of good leadership at Phase Level is a factor here, as is the need for an overall Pupil Premium Champion with good knowledge and ambition. Some poor pupil attendance has also impacted negatively on progress data overall, and steps have recently been taken to track this more effectively, challenging parents appropriately via EWO services and school based meetings. The school is aware that, although the difference between PPG and NON-PPG pupils is beginning to close within school, this is not the case when compared with national figures.

The impact of Support Staff is variable. Some TAs have planning provided for them by Teachers, others are more experienced and do their own within the strategy being delivered. There are examples of good communication between support staff and teachers to assist with delivery, as well as with Teaching Assistants in implementing strategies and raising attainment and progress. Where 'out of lesson' interventions take place the school does not however evaluate impact well enough either through Data Tracking, Session Observations, Pupils Voice or case studies.

The quality of teaching falls between Good and RI measurements; there is evidence of some outstanding teaching. The school needs to make more effort to ensure that any Pupil Premium funding is used directly to ensure that quality teaching takes place in every classroom as a given, support effective interventions and widen opportunities. Both data and softer progress measures are also to be used to greater effect to divide the school's use of funding between activities which have a clear and direct impact on pupil progress and those which focus on meeting social/ emotional needs.