



National Support School  
designated by  
National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

# St Patrick's Catholic Primary School

## Havering

### Pupil Premium Review

### January 2017



## Index

1. Introduction	Page 3
2. Context	Page 4
3. Key findings – commentary	Page 5
4. Recommendations	Page 10
5. Summary	Page 11
6. Pupil Premium Allocations	Page 14
7. Pupil Premium 2013-2014 & 2014-2015	Page 15
8. Pupil Premium 2015-2016	Page 16
9. Pupil Premium Number 2016-2017	Page 17
10. 2015-2016 data based on the new assessment process	Page 18
11. Y1 Phonics screening profile for PP pupils	Page 22
12. Key Stage 1 Achievement/Progress profile 2014-2015	Page 23
13. FSM Key Stage 1 APS profile 2014-2015	Page 24
14. Key Stage 2 Achievement/Progress profile 2014-2015	Page 25
15. FSM Key Stage 2 APS profile 2014-2015	Page 27
16. Exclusions & Attendance	Page 28
17. Appendix 1, 2 & 3	Page 29



National Support School  
designated by  
National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

## Introduction

St Patrick's Catholic Primary School is a larger than average primary school. It has a one-and-a-half form entry moving to two forms of entry.

A majority of the pupils are of White British heritage with an increasing number of pupils who speak English as an additional language. The number of pupils from minority ethnic groups is increasing year on year and is above national averages. The proportion of pupil's known to be eligible for free school meals is below average. The proportion of disabled pupils and those with special educational needs supported at school action plus or with a statement of special educational needs is at national averages. The two Reception classes provide for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

We are an inclusive, caring and vibrant Catholic Community with the Gospel Values that are central to the pastoral, spiritual and academic development of every child. Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural provision and the promotion of British Values are embedded in the school's mission statement. We have a coherent approach to the delivery and planning of SMSC provision which is rooted in our foundation as a faith school and evident in the curriculum, extracurricular opportunities and positive relationships between children and adults.

As a school we work to instill a sense of respect and value – of the world, for people and for self. The children have a great sense of empathy for those that have less than them, particularly for other children who are deprived or suffer through illness, war or deprivation. The whole school regularly reflects and prays together; the school prayer is recited by all. We believe in achievement for all, where every child is aspirational, thinks for themselves, has high expectations, resilience, autonomy and fosters a 'can do' attitude. Our children are encouraged to take responsibility for their actions and words at all times. Our staff and children see themselves as active learners, being part of a learning community that seeks to inspire and motivate each other to be the best that they can be.

At St Patrick's we celebrate God in all that we do.

Headteacher Olivia Paton

## Context

The Pupil Premium was introduced in April 2011. In 2012–13 schools were allocated a total of £1.25 billion funding for children from low-income families who were eligible for free school meals, looked after children and those from families with parents in the Armed Forces.

From April 2012 the Pupil Premium was extended to include children eligible for free school meals at any point in the last six years (FSM 'Ever 6'). The level of premium for 2012-13 was £488 per pupil for pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM) and for pupils in care who have been continuously looked after for six months.

The level of premium for 2013-14 was £900 per pupil for pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM) and for pupils in care who have been continuously looked after for six months. The Government confirmed that the premium for primary FSM 'Ever 6' is £1300 for 2014-15.

In April 2014 children who were looked after attracted a higher rate of funding than children from low-income families - the 'Pupil Premium Plus', which was £1,900 per pupil for 2014-15 is allocated to the 'virtual school'. This is to reflect the unique challenges they face at school where they often struggle to keep up with their peers at both primary and secondary level.

Children who have parents in the Armed Forces are supported through the service child premium which for 2014-15 was set at £300 per pupil. In 2015-16 the Pupil Premium was set at £1,320.

This review is based on all the data provided by the school. Throughout the report Pupil Premium pupils, FSM pupil's and FSM 'Ever 6' pupil's data, wherever possible, has been combined for review purposes.

Care should be taken when viewing the data as significantly small numbers of pupils can amplify the percentages. Nevertheless, this is recognised as a valid process in identifying trends and progress in pupil achievements.

## Challenge

Currently, the new assessment framework places a greater emphasis on attainment, as 65% of pupils at the end of key stage must 'pass the test'. For all schools it is going to be crucial that the progress of pupils is clearly evidenced in their books. However, raising expectations within the school resulting in higher levels of attainment will be vitally important for schools to be deemed successful under the new evolving assessment framework. In the new assessment framework the performance of disadvantaged pupils in the school is now being compared with that of other (non-disadvantaged) pupils, therefore, the progress made in narrowing the gap within school may be lost.

In addition, schools must have regard for the new "coasting schools" criteria. Such is the definition that any school, irrespective of their Ofsted grade may find themselves in a vulnerable position.



## Key Findings – Commentary

In the 2016 SAT's each PP pupil represented 33.3% as there were only 3 PP pupils in year 6. Consequently, there were only four possible outcomes in terms of assessment, 0%, 33.3%, 66.6% or 100%. Therefore, to be at national levels all the PP pupils had to achieve the standard irrespective of their starting point.

The school acknowledge that they did not fully appreciate all the changes and implications of the new SAT tests. For example they believed that the outcomes of the Reading SAT was not a true reflection on the ability of the year group as many pupils failed to complete the test paper. Had all the pupils completed the paper then there would have been a more accurate picture of the year group. This was in keeping with many schools throughout the country.

- a) The school commissioned this review following their evaluation of the outcomes of the first year of the new Key Stage 2 SAT's.
- b) As a result of this review the school is seeking to identify areas of improvement for disadvantaged pupils. In addition they are looking to refine their current practice and develop a more effective action plan.
- c) The school is currently a Voluntary Aided Catholic Primary School.
  - d) The school has identified a number of unique challenges they face:
    - 1) The changing demographics of the area.
    - 2) The growing number of EAL pupils.
    - 3) The increase in the number of Eastern Europeans.
    - 4) Attitudes amongst some parents that negatively impact on their children.
  - e) The school considers the main priorities to be:
    - 1) Raising the levels of progress and attainment in Reading.
    - 2) Developing parent's understanding of how Reading is developed.
    - 3) Raising the levels of achievement in Mathematics and Grammar.
    - 4) Facilitating a 'cultural shift' amongst parents to enable them to fully appreciate the new educational standards.
  - f) The school believes the following areas will have the greatest impact on the progress and achievements of the pupils:
    - 1) Shifting parent's attitude to their child's education.
    - 2) Equipping parents to better support their children.

- g) The school believes the following areas will have the greatest impact on the progress and achievement of disadvantaged pupils:
- 1) Improving the attendance.
  - 2) Improving lateness.
  - 3) Quality first teaching.
  - 4) Teachers having a better understanding of the needs of the pupils.
- h) Pupil Premium funding has allowed the school to:
- 1) Increase the number of pupil interventions.
  - 2) Offer more opportunities for staff training.
  - 3) Greater engagement with outside agencies and programmes in supporting the pupils, such as Achievement for All.
  - 4) Artis Drama group has been to strengthen pupil's communication and articulation skills.
- i) Funding has provided additional curriculum opportunities within school such as:
- 1) Achievement for All.
- j) Audit
- 1) Pupil Premium fund is audited as part of the schools normal auditing process.
  - 2) Funding is discussed at Finance meetings and Full Governing Body meetings.
- k) Funding has provided additional staff:
- 1) Part-time teaching assistants have been employed, equivalent to 2 full time TA's.
  - 2) A .6 teacher has been employed.
  - 3) Funding has part funded a Parent Support Worker.
  - 4) Funding has been used to finance a counsellor.
- l) Funding has been used for additional curriculum opportunities in the follow ways:
- 1) Achievement for All.
  - 2) Artis Drama.
  - 3) CPD.



- m) Educational visits, uniform and equipment.
  - 1) Funding has been used to support disadvantaged pupils on educational visits.
  - 2) Facilities are in place to support pupils with uniform or equipment.
- n) Example of funding being focussed on a specific group.
  - 1) As a result of housing issues provision was made for pupils to attend the breakfast club.
- o) Exclusions
  - 1) Funding has enable the school to keep a pupil in school who otherwise would have been excluded.
- p) The following evidence is used to identify appropriate strategies and interventions:
  - 1) Question by question analysis of outcomes.
  - 2) NFED data, yearly.
  - 3) On-going assessment.
  - 4) Books.
  - 5) Feedback from Teaching Assistants.
  - 6) Questioning pupils about their learning.
  - 7) Half termly achievement team meetings.
  - 8) Data on the Management Information System.
- q) The school has identified the main barriers to learning as:
  - 1) Attendance.
  - 2) Pupil behaviour and attitude to learning.
  - 3) Low expectation amongst the parents.
  - 4) Lack of ability amongst the parents to support their child.
  - 5) Literacy levels amongst the parents.
- r) Current strategies that are working well:
  - 1) Individual Reading strategy.
  - 2) Targeted interventions.
  - 3) Talking Maths.
  - 4) Evidence of impact is seen in the progress pupils made against the baseline at the start of the intervention/activity.

- s) Where has the school adjusted strategies:
- 1) Although the pupils enjoy the Artis Drama activities, the school feels it's not having the full impact it was intended for in developing confidence and improving articulation amongst the pupils. Therefore they are looking to adjust the activities for greater impact.
- t) Pupil Premium numbers
- 1) The three-year trend is showing that there is no significant increase or decline in numbers. Although there are year on year changes they tend to pivot around the 15% mark.
- u) Evidence and Research
- 1) The school uses evidence such as the Sutton Trust and information form action research projects.
  - 2) Depth of learning summary.
  - 3) Edukey is used to map out progress and attainment.
  - 4) 2simple is used to gather evidence.
  - 5) The school has access to LA Sims data for Year 2 and Year 6.
  - 6) Rising Stars.
- v) Long term profile of attainment:
- 1) Based on the school's evaluation the attainment of entry is stronger than in previous years.
- w) Identifying priorities
- 1) Teachers and teaching assistants discuss the areas that need development with SLT who in turn, present the findings to governors.
- x) Strategies to address the perceived barriers:
- 1) Workshops with parents are having a limited impact on addressing some of the barriers to learning.
  - 2) As a result of interventions there are signs that pupil's attitudes to learning are improving.
- y) Pupil Targets:
- 1) The school has regard for the FFT data and sets very ambitious targets.





z) Teaching

- 1) The current profile of teaching is 100% good or better.

aa) Interventions

- 1) Class action plans are differentiated to reflect the needs of the pupils in each class.
- 2) Most interventions take place within the classroom.

bb) Teaching Assistants:

- 1) Teaching assistants have a good knowledge of the pupils. A number have specialism in speech development and language development.

cc) Governors

- 1) The school has a link Governor who is responsible for disadvantaged pupils.
- 2) Governors are involved in discussions relating to disadvantaged pupils during Full Governors meetings, Finance sub meetings and via the Headteacher's report.

## Recommendations

1. Maintain the areas that are clearly having a positive impact on the PP pupil's progress and their levels of achievement.
2. With the small numbers of PP pupils in each year group, consider introducing IEP's (Individual Educational Plans) for PP pupils.
3. While PP numbers remain low in each year group, monitor their progress more frequently.
4. Closely monitor the progress of PP pupils, particularly, those who may not meet the standards due to their starting point. (SEN pupils) Celebrate their successes.
5. Establish a PP year group profile outlining the starting points, challenges and any areas that will impact on progress and outcomes for each year group. (Year on year variations in numbers will make it difficult to compare year on year progress)
6. Establish clear criteria for assigning interventions for PP pupils.
7. Review current strategies for monitoring attendance and lateness of PP pupils.
8. Refine the Pupil Premium Action Plan to ensure that it captures all the various strands that are currently being delivered by the school in meeting the needs of the disadvantaged pupils.
9. The Action Plan should be set within the context of,
  - a) Specific and measurable objectives
  - b) Desired outcomes/success criteria
  - c) Including an evaluation of impact, of both short term and long term objectives
  - d) Accurate financial allocation
10. Strengthen engagement with families by developing further opportunities for parents to engage in discussions about the intervention being planned for their child and how they can support their child.
11. School leaders, including governors should continue to seek ways to encourage parents and carers to apply for free school meals.
12. Governors to consider the points as set out. (Appendix 1)
13. Leaders and Governors should continue to make use of research to inform their decisions on how to spend Pupil Premium. (Appendix 2)
14. Leaders and Governors should have regard for the 'Building Blocks' as set out, to identify the appropriate allocation of funding. (Appendix 3)



## Summary

### Y1 Phonics screening profile

#### Evaluation

There was a 4% drop in the number of FSM pupils achieving the expected standard in the Y1 phonics screening when compared to the previous year, 2016. There was a 16% increase in the number of Non FSM pupils achieving the expected standard in the Y1 phonics screening when compared to the previous year, 2015.

The gap between FSM and Non FSM pupils increased by 30% from +1% in 2015 to +31% in 2016.

### Key Stage 1 Achievement/Progress profile

#### Evaluation

In Reading 97% of the pupils achieved L2B+, when compared with the previous year, a drop of 1%. 37% of the pupils achieved level 3+ compared to 51% the previous year, a drop of 14%.

In Writing 87% of the pupils achieved L2B+, when compared with the previous year a drop of 4%. 23% of the pupils achieved L3+, the same as the previous year.

In Mathematics 92% of the pupils achieved L2B+, when compared to the previous year, an increase of 2%. 38% of the pupils achieved level 3+ compared to 34% an increase of 4% when compared to the previous year.

### FSM Key Stage 1 APS profile

#### Evaluation

In Reading FSM pupils dropped 2.3 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupil's performance dropped by 0.2

APS. The gap in Reading was +2.0 compared to -0.1 the previous year, an increase of 1.9 APS.

In Writing FSM pupils dropped 1.3 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils' performance also dropped by 0.2

APS. The gap in Writing was +2.0 compared to +0.5 the previous year, an increase of 1.5 APS.

In Mathematics FSM pupils dropped 1.4 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupil's performance improved by 0.5

APS. The gap in Mathematics was +2.0 compared to +0.1 the previous year, an increase of 1.9 APS.

In all subjects the gap between FSM pupils and Non FSM pupils increased.

### **FSM Key Stage 2 Percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above, 2013-2014 & 2014-2015**

#### Evaluation

In Reading FSM pupils dropped 5% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 2%. The gap was +9% compared to +6% the previous year. An increase of 3%.

In Writing FSM pupils achieved 100%, which was the same as the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 2%. The gap in Writing was -5% compared to -3% the previous year.

In Mathematics FSM pupils improved 12% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 2%. The gap in Mathematics was -5% compared to +5% the previous year, a reduction of -10%

In SPAG FSM pupils improved 58% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils improved 7%. The gap in SPAG was -1% compared to +50% the previous year, a reduction of 51%

In Writing and Mathematics FSM pupils outperformed the Non FSM pupils. In Writing and Mathematics the FSM pupils outperformed Non FSM at National level.

### **FSM Key Stage 2 Percentage of pupils achieving level 5 or above, 2013-2014 & 2014-2015**

#### Evaluation

In Reading FSM pupils improved 70% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 15%.

The gap in Reading was -45% compared to +40% the previous year, a reduction of 85%.

In Writing FSM pupils dropped 8% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 3% compared to the previous year.

The gap in Writing was +19% compared to +14% the previous year, an increase of 5%.

In Mathematics FSM pupils dropped 8% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 6%.

The gap in Mathematics was +19% compared to +17% the previous year, an increase of 2%.

In SPAG FSM pupils dropped 13% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 20%.

The gap in SPAG was +36% compared to 43% the previous year, a drop of 7%.



### **FSM Key Stage 2 APS, 2013-2014 & 2014-2015**

#### Evaluation

In Reading FSM pupils improved 4.0 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils' performance dropped by 1.1 APS. The gap in Reading was -2.3 compared to +2.8 the previous year, a reduction of 5.1 APS.

In Writing FSM pupils dropped 0.5% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 0.5 APS.

The gap in Writing was +0.7 the same as the previous year.

In Mathematics FSM pupils improved 0.2 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM dropped 0.8 APS.

The gap in Mathematics was +1.2 compared to +2.2 the previous year, a reduction of 1.0 APS.

### **FSM Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 percentage making expected progress, 2013-2014 & 2014-2015**

#### Evaluation

In Reading 83% of FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a reduction of 5% when compared to the previous year.

In Reading 82% of the Non FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a reduction of 12% when compared to the previous year.

The gap in Reading was -1% compared to +6% the previous year, a reduction of 7%.

In Writing 100% of FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, the same as the previous year.

In Writing 97% of the Non FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a reduction of 3% when compared to the previous year. The gap in Writing was +3% compared to 0% the previous year, an increase of 3%.

In Mathematics 83% of FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a 5% reduction when compared to the previous year.

In Mathematics 90% of the Non FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a +10% reduction when compared to the previous year. The gap in Mathematics was +7% compared to +12% the previous year, a reduction of 5%.

### **Exclusions & Attendance**

#### Evaluation

PP pupil's attendance in 2015 declined 1.7% compared to the previous year. Currently, the 2016 attendance is up 2.6% when compared to the previous year.

Non-PP pupil's attendance in 2015 declined 2.2% compared to the previous year. However, the current profiles of attendance is 98.2%, 4.2% higher than the previous year.

The numbers of PP pupil's absences classified as Persistent Absentees increased in 2015 by 9.5%.

The numbers of Non PP pupil's absences classified as Persistent Absentees increased by 4.5%.

The threshold changed from 15% in 2014 to 10% in 2015.

## Pupil Premium Allocations

Financial year	Amount of Pupil Premium funding
2013-14	£40,500
2014-15	£68,900
2015-16	£68,640
2016-17	£76,420

Percentage of FSM Pupils	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	15.4%	14.1%	15.8%	14.6

Performance of disadvantaged pupils						
Year 6	2013-14		2014-15		*2015-16	
	School	National	School	National	School	National
% of pupils making expected progress in Reading	88%	88%	83%	88%	-5.76 Score	0 Score
% of pupils making expected progress in Writing	100%	90%	100%	92%	2.10 Score	0 Score
% of pupils making expected progress in Maths	88%	85%	83%	86%	-2.70 Score	0 Score

\*2015-16. This is based on the new assessment process.

### 2016 Floor standard

In 2016, a school will be above the floor if:

- \* at least 65% of pupils meet the expected standard in all three subjects (English reading, English writing and mathematics); or
- \* the school achieves sufficient progress scores in all three subjects (at least -5 in English reading and -5 in mathematics and -7 in English writing).

To be above the floor, the school needs to meet either the attainment element or all parts of the progress element.



## Pupil Premium 2013-2014

Number of pupils and Pupil Premium pupils 2013-2014	
Total number of pupils on roll	345
Total number of pupils eligible for PP	15.4%
Amount of PP received per pupil	£900
<b>Total amount of PP received</b>	<b>£43,044 revised</b>

## Pupil Premium 2014-2015

Number of pupils and Pupil Premium pupils 2014-2015	
Total number of pupils on roll	362
Total number of pupils eligible for PP	14.1%
Amount of PP received per pupil	£1,300
<b>Total amount of PP received</b>	<b>£68,900 revised</b>

Summary of spending 2014-2015	
Additional teacher to support learning (50% costs)	Enrichment of reading material (e books, ipads)
Additional teacher for Year 6 – (50% costs)	Enabling Enterprise Activities
Achievement for All Programme	Football and basketball coach (10% of cost)
Extra in class support	Maths interventions

## Pupil Premium 2015-2016

Number of pupils and pupil Premium Pupils 2015-2016	
Total number of pupils on roll	374
Total number of pupils eligible for PP	15.8%
Amount of PP received per pupil	£1,320
<b>Total amount of PP received</b>	<b>£68,640 revised</b>

Summary of spending 2015-2016	
Additional full time support staff	Additional part time teachers
School Trip subsidy	Achievement for All programme
Lunchtime club	Talking Maths
ARTIS mentor	CPD
Subsidised clubs	Counsellor
Behaviour specialist	





## Pupil Premium Numbers 2016-2017

School Profile of pupils and pupil Premium Pupils 2016-2017					
Year group	Total number of pupils	Non PP pupils	PP pupils	PP boys	PP girls
Reception	60	56	4	0	4
Year 1	60	49	11	7	4
Year 2	57	52	5	3	2
Year 3	61	52	9	4	5
Year 4	60	51	9	7	2
Year 5	44	33	11	4	7
Year 6	44	36	8	3	5
Totals	388	329	57	28	29

Percentage value for calculation purposes for each PP pupil in the school:

Reception 1 pupil = 25.0%  
Year 1 1 pupil = 9.0%  
Year 2 1 pupil = 20.0%  
Year 3 1 pupil = 11.0%  
Year 4 1 pupil = 11.0%  
Year 5 1 pupil = 9.0%  
Year 6 1 pupil = 13.0%

## 2015-2016 data based on the new assessment process.

As a result of the new assessment process that was introduced in 2016 it is not possible to compare the outcomes from 2016 with the previous years.

In the new assessment framework the performance of disadvantaged pupils in the school is now being compared with that of other (non-disadvantaged) pupils nationally as it is this difference that needs to diminish collectively across the country for disadvantaged pupils nationally to do as well as others nationally.

### Key Stage 2 Reading 2016 Test

	Cohort	Reading progress score		Scaled score 100%+		High scaled score		Average score	
		School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National
All pupils	46	-3.73	66%	7%	19%	100.6	102.6		
FSM	10	-5.76	71%	0%	23%	97.4	103.8		
Non FSM	36	-3.17	71%	8%	23%	101.5	103.8		
In school difference			+44%	+8%		+4.1			

### Key Stage 2 Mathematics 2016 Test

	Cohort	Maths progress score		Scaled score 100%+		High scaled score		Average score	
		School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National
All pupils	46	-1.23	70%	11%	17%	103.2	103.0		
FSM	10	-2.70	75%	10%	20%	100.6	104.1		
Non FSM	36	-0.83	75%	11%	20%	104.0	104.1		
In school difference			+18%	+1%		+3.4			

### 2016 Floor standard

In 2016, a school will be above the floor if:

- \* at least 65% of pupils meet the expected standard in all three subjects (English reading, English writing and mathematics); or
- \* the school achieves sufficient progress scores in all three subjects (at least -5 in English reading and -5 in mathematics and -7 in English writing).



### Key Stage 2 Writing 2016 Teacher assessment

	Cohort	Writing progress score		Expected standard+		Greater depth	
		School	National	School	National	School	National
All pupils	46		1.95	89%	74%	30%	15%
FSM	10		2.10	90%	79%	20%	18%
Non FSM	36		1.91	89%	79%	33%	18%
In school difference				-1%		+13%	

### Key Stage 2 Reading, Writing and Mathematics combined 2016

	Cohort	Expected standard+		High standard	
		School	National	School	National
All pupils	46	50%	53%	0%	5%
FSM	10	10%	60%	0%	7%
Non FSM	36	61%	60%	0%	7%
In school difference		+51%		0%	

### 2016 Floor standard

In 2016, a school will be above the floor if:

- \* at least 65% of pupils meet the expected standard in all three subjects (English reading, English writing and mathematics); or
- \* the school achieves sufficient progress scores in all three subjects (at least -5 in English reading and -5 in mathematics and -7 in English writing).

To be above the floor, the school needs to meet either the attainment element or all parts of the progress element.

**Key Stage 2 English grammar, punctuation and spelling 2016 Test**

	Cohort	Scaled score 100%+		High scaled score		Average score	
		School	National	School	National	School	National
All pupils	46	65%	72%	17%	22%	102.1	104.0
FSM	10	40%	78%	10%	27%	98.0	105.0
Non FSM	36	72%	78 %	19%	27%	103.2	105.0
In school difference		+32%		+19%		+5.2	

**Key Stage 2 Science 2016 Teacher assessment**

	Cohort	Expected standard	
		School	National
All pupils	46	91%	81%
FSM	10	90%	86%
Non FSM	36	92%	86 %
In school difference		+2%	

**Key Stage 1 Reading 2016 Teacher assessment**

	Cohort	Expected standard+		Greater depth	
		School	National	School	National
All pupils	60	80%	74%	38%	24%
FSM	8	75%	78%	25%	27%
Non FSM	52	81%	78%	40%	27%
In school difference		+6%		+15%	



### Key Stage 1 Writing 2016 Teacher assessment

	Cohort	Expected standard+		Greater depth	
		School	National	School	National
All pupils	60	78%	65%	22%	13%
FSM	8	75%	70%	25%	16%
Non FSM	52	79%	70%	21%	16%
In school difference		+4%		-4%	

### Key Stage 1 Mathematics 2016 Teacher assessment

	Cohort	Expected standard+		Greater depth	
		School	National	School	National
All pupils	60	70%	73%	27%	18%
FSM	8	63%	77%	25%	20%
Non FSM	52	79%	77%	27%	20%
In school difference		+16%		+2%	

### Key Stage 1 Science 2016 Teacher assessment

	Cohort	Expected standard	
		School	National
All pupils	60	88%	82%
FSM	8	88%	85%
Non FSM	52	88%	85%
In school difference		0%	

## Y1 Phonics screening profile for PP pupils

### Achieving expected standard

	School			National			Cohorts		
	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016
FSM	17%	71%	67%	63%	66%	70%	6 pupils	7 pupils	3 pupils
Non FSM	80%	72%	98%	78%	80%	83%	54 pupils	53 pupils	57 pupils
Gap	+63%	+1%	+31%	+15%	+14%	+13%	60 pupils	60 pupils	60 pupils
							FSM		
							Non FSM		
							Total No		

### Evaluation

There was a 4% drop in the number of FSM pupils achieving the expected standard in the Y1 phonics screening when compared to the previous year, 2016. There was a 16% increase in the number of Non FSM pupils achieving the expected standard in the Y1 phonics screening when compared to the previous year, 2015.

The gap between FSM and Non FSM pupils increased by 30% from +1% in 2015 to +31% in 2016.



## Key Stage 1 Achievement/Progress profile

Key Stage 1 Percentage of pupils attaining or surpassing each level.

	<L1	2014	2015	L1+	2014	2015	L2C+	2014	2015	L2B+	2014	2015	L2A+	2014	2015	Lv3+	2014	2015
Reading School	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	98%	98%	100%	96%	97%	81%	80%	80%	51%	37%	37%	
National	2%	2%	2%	98%	98%	90%	90%	90%	81%	82%	57%	59%	31%	32%	32%			
	<L1			L1+			L2C+			L2B+			L2A+			Lv3+		
Writing School	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	96%	98%	91%	87%	55%	58%	23%	23%	23%			
National	2%	2%	2%	97%	98%	86%	86%	88%	70%	72%	39%	41%	16%	18%	18%			
	<L1			L1+			L2C+			L2B+			L2A+			Lv3+		
Mathematics School	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	98%	98%	94%	92%	68%	73%	34%	38%	38%			
National	1%	1%	1%	98%	98%	92%	92%	93%	80%	82%	53%	55%	24%	26%	26%			

### Evaluation

In Reading 97% of the pupils achieved L2B+, when compared with the previous year a drop of 1%. 37% of the pupils achieved level 3+ compared to 51% the previous year, a drop of 14%.

In Writing 87% of the pupils achieved L2B+, when compared with the previous year a drop of 4%. 23% of the pupils achieved L3+, the same as the previous year.

In Mathematics 92% of the pupils achieved L2B+, when compared to the previous year an increase of 2%. 38% of the pupils achieved level 3+ compared to 34% an increase of 4% when compared to the previous year.

**FSM Key Stage 1 APS profile 2013-2014 & 2014-2015**

	All subjects						Reading			Writing			Mathematics			
	School		National		School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National	School	National
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
FSM	17.4	15.8	14.6	14.8	18.6	16.3	15.0	15.2	16.3	15.0	13.7	14.0	17.4	16.0	15.0	15.2
Non FSM	17.6	17.8	16.4	16.6	18.5	18.3	17.0	17.1	16.8	17.0	15.6	15.8	17.5	18.0	16.7	16.8
Gap	+0.2	+2.0	+1.8	+1.8	-0.1	+2.0	+2.0	+1.9	+0.5	+2.0	+1.9	+1.8	+0.1	+2.0	+1.7	+1.6

Cohorts	2014	2015
FSM	9 pupils	8 pupils
Non FSM	38 pupils	52 pupils
Total No.	47 pupils	60 pupils

Evaluation

In Reading FSM pupils dropped 2.3 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupil's performance dropped by 0.2 APS. The gap in Reading is was +2.0 compared to -0.1 the previous year, an increase of 1.9 APS.  
 In Writing FSM pupils dropped 1.3 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupil's performance also dropped by 0.2 APS. The gap in Writing was +2.0 compared to +0.5 the previous year, an increase of 1.5 APS.  
 In Mathematics FSM pupils dropped 1.4 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupil's performance improved by 0.5 APS. The gap in Mathematics was +2.0 compared to +0.1 the previous year, an increase of 1.9 APS.

In all subjects the gap between FSM pupils and Non FSM pupils increased.





### FSM Key Stage 2 profile 2013-2014 & 2014-2015 Percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above

	Combined			Reading			Writing			Mathematics			SPAG	
	School	2014	2015	School	2014	2015	School	2014	2015	School	2014	2015	2014	2015
FSM	75%	83%	67%	70%	88%	83%	82%	83%	100%	100%	88%	100%	25%	83%
Non FSM	94%	90%	83%	84%	94%	92%	92%	92%	97%	95%	97%	95%	75%	82%
Gap	+19%	+7%			+6%	+9%			-3%	-5%	+5%	-5%	+50%	-1%

Cohorts	2014	2015
FSM	8 pupils	6 pupils
Non FSM	36 pupils	39 pupils
Total No.	44 pupils	45 pupils

#### Evaluation

In Reading FSM pupils dropped 5% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 2%. The gap was +9% compared to +6% the previous year. An increase of 3%.

In Writing FSM pupils achieved 100%, which was the same as the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 2%. The gap in Writing was -5% compared to -3% the previous year.

In Mathematics FSM pupils improved 12% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 2%. The gap in Mathematics was -5% compared to +5% the previous year, a reduction of -10%

In SPAG FSM pupils improved 58% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils improved 7%. The gap in SPAG was -1% compared to +50% the previous year, a reduction of 51%

In Writing and Mathematics FSM pupils outperformed the Non FSM pupils. In Writing and Mathematics the FSM pupils outperformed Non FSM at National level.

**FSM Key Stage 2 profile 2013-2014 & 2014-2015**  
**Percentage of pupils achieving level 5 or above**

	Combined						Reading						Writing						Mathematics						SPAG					
	School			National			School			National			School			National			School			National			School			National		
	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	2015	2014	2015	
FSM	13%	0%	12%	13%	13%	35%	34%	35%	17%	20%	22%	25%	17%	20%	22%	25%	17%	28%	28%	28%	13%	0%	13%	0%	13%	0%	39%	43%		
Non FSM	31%	18%	29%	29%	53%	38%	56%	55%	39%	36%	39%	39%	36%	39%	42%	42%	42%	42%	48%	47%	56%	36%	56%	36%	58%	61%				
Gap	+18%			+18%			+40%			-45%			+14%			+19%			+17%			+19%			+43%			+36%		

**Evaluation**

In Reading FSM pupils improved 70% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 15%.

The gap in Reading was -45% compared to +40% the previous year, a reduction of 85%.

In Writing FSM pupils dropped 8% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 3% compared to the previous year.

The gap in Writing was +19% compared to +14% the previous year, an increase of 5%.

In Mathematics FSM pupils dropped 8% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 6%.

The gap in Mathematics was +19% compared to +17% the previous year, an increase of 2%.

In SPAG FSM pupils dropped 13% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 20%.

The gap in SPAG was +36% compared to 43% the previous year, a drop of 7%.



## FSM Key Stage 2 APS profile 2013-2014 & 2014-2015

	Reading				Writing				Mathematics				
	School	2015	National	2014	School	2015	National	2014	School	2015	National	2014	2015
FSM	27.0	31.0	27.5	27.6	28.5	28.0	26.3	26.6	27.8	28.0	27.2	27.8	27.8
Non FSM	29.8	28.7	29.5	29.6	29.2	28.7	28.6	28.8	30.0	29.2	31.3	29.0	29.0
Gap	+2.8	-2.3			+0.7	+0.7			+2.2	+1.2			

### Evaluation

In Reading FSM pupils improved 4.0 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils' performance dropped by 1.1 APS. The gap in Reading was -2.3 compared to +2.8 the previous year, a reduction of 5.1 APS.

In Writing FSM pupils dropped 0.5% compared to the previous year. Non-FSM pupils dropped 0.5 APS.

The gap in Writing was +0.7 the same as the previous year.

In Mathematics FSM pupils improved 0.2 APS compared to the previous year. Non-FSM dropped 0.8 APS.

The gap in Mathematics was +1.2 compared to +2.2 the previous year, a reduction of 1.0 APS.

## FSM Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 percentage making expected progress

	Reading				Writing				Mathematics				
	School	2015	National	2014	School	2015	National	2014	School	2015	National	2014	2015
FSM	88%	83%	88%	88%	100%	100%	90%	92%	88%	83%	86%	86%	86%
Non FSM	94%	82%	92%	92%	100%	97%	94%	95%	100%	90%	91%	91%	91%
Gap	+6%	-1%			0%	+3%			+12%	+7%			

### Evaluation

In Reading 83% of FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a reduction of 5% when compared to the previous year.

In Reading 82% of the Non FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a reduction of 12% when compared to the previous year.

The gap in Reading was -1% compared to +6% the previous year, a reduction of 7%.

In Writing 100% of FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, the same as the previous year.

In Writing 97% of the Non FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a reduction of 3% when compared to the previous year.

The gap in Writing was +3% compared to 0% the previous year, an increase of 3%.

In Mathematics 83% of FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a 5% reduction when compared to the previous year.

In Mathematics 90% of the Non FSM pupils made the expected progress from Key Stage 1, a +10% reduction when compared to the previous year.

The gap in Mathematics was +7% compared to +12% the previous year, a reduction of 5%.

## Exclusions & Attendance

### Exclusions

Exclusions	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
Fixed Pupil Premium pupils	1	1	1
Fixed Non Pupil Premium pupils	3	0	2
Permanent Pupil Premium pupils	0	0	0
Permanent Non Pupil Premium pupils	0	0	0

### Attendance

	2014	2015	2016 current		2014	2015	2016 *
PP attendance	95.4%	93.7%	96.3%	PP pupils, now 90% and under	15%	10%	
Non PP attendance	96.2%	94.0%	98.2%	Non PP pupils, now 90% and under	5.6%	15.1%	Increase of 9.5%
					1.7%	6.2%	Increase of 4.5%

### Evaluation

PP pupil's attendance in 2015 declined 1.7% compared to the previous year. Currently, the 2016 attendance is up 2.6% when compared to the previous year. Non-PP pupil's attendance in 2015 declined 2.2% compared to the previous year. However, the current profiles of attendance is 98.2%, 4.2% higher than the previous year.

The numbers of PP pupil's absences classified as Persistent Absentees increased in 2015 by 9.5%.

The numbers of Non PP pupil's absences classified as Persistent Absentees increased by 4.5%.

\*The threshold changed from 15% in 2014 to 10% in 2015.



National Support School  
designated by

National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

## Appendix 1

### Governors' Knowledge and Awareness

1. How do governors know how much money is allocated to the school for the Pupil Premium?
2. What processes do the governors employ to ensure that the Pupil Premium funding is appropriately allocated?
3. Is there a clearly understood and shared rationale for how this money is spent and what it should achieve?
4. How do governors monitor the impact of Pupil Premium funding?
5. How do governors know whether leaders and managers are checking that the actions are working and are of suitable quality?
6. What improvements has the Pupil Premium allocation brought about throughout the school?
7. If this funding is combined with other resources, can governors isolate and check on the impact of the funding and ascertain the difference it is making?
8. How is the impact of Pupil Premium communicated to all stakeholders including parents?

# Sutton Trust - EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit

February 2014



Education  
Endowment  
Foundation



*The new online toolkit can be found at:  
[educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/re-sources/teaching-learning-toolkit](http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/re-sources/teaching-learning-toolkit)*

*Warren Junior School - School to School Support*

National Support S  
designated by  
National College  
Teaching & Lead





Warren Junior School - School to School Support

APPROACH	COST ESTIMATE	EVIDENCE ESTIMATE	AVERAGE IMPACT	SUMMARY
After school programmes	££££	** *	+ 2 Months	Low impact for high cost, based on limited evidence.
Arts participation	££	** ** *	+ 2 Months	Low impact for low cost, based on moderate evidence.
Aspiration interventions	£££	*	0 Months	Very low or no impact for moderate cost based on very limited evidence.
Behaviour interventions	£££	** * * *	+ 4 Months	Moderate impact for very high cost, based on extensive evidence.
Block scheduling	£	** *	0 Months	Very low or no impact for very low or no cost, based on limited evidence.
Collaborative learning	£	** * * *	+ 5 Months	Moderate impact for very low cost, based on extensive evidence.
Digital technology	££££	** * * *	+ 4 Months	Moderate impact for high cost, based on extensive evidence.
Early years intervention	£££££	** * * *	+ 6 Months	High impact for very high costs, based on extensive evidence.
Extended school time	£££	** *	+ 2 Months	Low impact for moderate cost, based on limited evidence.
Feedback	££	** * *	+ 8 Months	High impact for low cost, based on moderate evidence.
Homework (Primary)	£	** * *	+ 1 Month	Low impact for very low or no cost, based on moderate evidence.
Homework (Secondary)	£	** * *	+ 5 Months	Moderate impact for very low or no cost, based on moderate evidence.
Individualised instruction	£	** * *	+ 2 Months	Low impact for low cost, based on moderate evidence.
Learning styles	£	** * *	+ 2 Months	Low impact for very low cost, based on moderate evidence.
Mastery learning	££	** * *	+ 5 Months	Moderate impact for low cost, based on moderate evidence.
Mentoring	£££	** * *	+ 1 Month	Low impact for moderate cost, based on moderate evidence.
Meta-cognition and self-regulation	££	** * * *	+ 8 Months	High impact for low cost, based on extensive evidence.
One to one tuition	££££	** * * *	+ 5 Months	Moderate impact for high cost, based on extensive evidence.
Oral language interventions	££	** * * *	+ 5 Months	Moderate impact for low cost, based on extensive evidence.
Outdoor adventure learning	£££	** *	+ 3 Months	Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on limited evidence.
Parental involvement	£££	** * *	+ 3 Months	Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on moderate evidence.
Peer tutoring	££	** * * *	+ 6 Months	High impact for low cost, based on extensive evidence.
Performance pay	££	*	0 Months	Low or no impact for moderate cost, based on very limited evidence.
Phonics	£	** * * *	+ 4 Months	Moderate impact for very low cost, based on extensive evidence.
Physical environment	££	*	0 Months	Very low or no impact for low cost based on very limited evidence.
Reducing class size	£££££	** * *	+ 3 Months	Low impact for very high cost, based on moderate evidence.
Repeating a year	£££££	** * * *	- 4 Months	Negative impact for very high cost based on extensive evidence.
School uniform	£	*	0 Months	Very low or no impact for very low cost, based on very limited evidence.
Setting or streaming	£	** * *	- 1 Month	Negative impact for very low or no cost, based on moderate evidence.
Small group tuition	£££	** *	+ 4 Months	Moderate impact for moderate cost, based on limited evidence.
Social and emotional learning	£	** * * *	+ 4 Months	Moderate impact for very low cost, based on extensive evidence.
Sports participation	£££	** *	+ 2 Months	Moderate impact for moderate cost based on moderate evidence.
Summer schools	£££	** *	+ 3 Months	Moderate impact for moderate cost based on limited evidence.
Teaching assistants	££££	** *	+ 1 Month	Low impact for high cost, based on limited evidence.



## Introduction

The Sutton Trust-EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit is an accessible summary of educational research which provides guidance for teachers and schools on how to use their resources to improve the attainment of disadvantaged pupils.

The Toolkit currently covers 34 topics, each summarised in terms of their average impact on attainment, the strength of the evidence supporting them and their cost.

The Toolkit is a live resource which will be updated on a regular basis as findings from EEF-funded **projects** and other high-quality research become available. In addition, we would welcome suggestions for topics to be included in future editions. If you have a topic suggestion, or any other comments or questions about the Toolkit, please contact Robbie Coleman at [robbie.coleman@eefoundation.org.uk](mailto:robbie.coleman@eefoundation.org.uk).

### Why is research useful?

We know that the relationship between spending and pupil outcomes is not simple. Between 1997 and 2011 per pupil spending increased by 85% but over this period improvements in pupil outcomes were marginal on most measures. At school level, it is clear that different ways of spending school budgets can have very different impacts on pupil attainment, and choosing what to prioritise is not easy. Even once a decision to implement a particular strategy has been taken there are a wide variety of factors which determine its impact. We believe that educational research can help schools get the maximum "educational bang for their buck", both in terms of making an initial choice between strategies, and in implementing a strategy as effectively as possible.

One particular spending decision which research can inform is how to spend the Pupil Premium. Introduced in 2010, the aim of the Pupil Premium is to raise achievement among disadvantaged children. It provides additional funding to schools for disadvantaged pupils to ensure they benefit from the same educational opportunities as pupils from wealthier families. In 2013-14 the Pupil Premium is worth £1,300 per eligible child in secondary schools and £900 per eligible child in secondary school. If the Pupil Premium is to succeed in achieving its ambitious goals, the choices that schools make in allocating the money are of vital importance.

### Average impact

Average impact is estimated in terms of additional months progress you might expect pupils to make as a result of an approach being used in school, taking average pupil progress over a year as a benchmark. For example, research summarised in the Toolkit shows that improving the quality feedback provided to pupils has an average impact of eight months. This means that pupils in a class where high quality feedback is provided will make on average eight months more progress over the course of a year compared to another class of pupils which were performing at the same level at the start of the year. At the end of the year the average pupil in a class of 25 pupils in the feedback group would now be equivalent to the 6th best pupil in the control class having made 20 months progress over the year, compared to an average of 12 months in the other class.

These estimations are based on 'effect sizes' reported in British and international comparative data (see table below). Effect sizes are quantitative measures of the impact of different approaches on learning. The Toolkit prioritises systematic reviews of research and quantitative syntheses of data such as meta-analyses of experimental studies.





**Warren Junior School - School to School Support**

To be included in the analysis an approach needed to have some quantifiable evidence base for comparison. For more information about the Toolkit's methodology please view the Toolkit's **Technical Appendices**.

Months' Progress	Effective Size From...	Description
0	-0.01	Very Low or no effect
1	0.02	Low
2	0.10	Low
3	0.19	Moderate
4	0.27	Moderate
5	0.36	Moderate
6	0.45	High
7	0.53	High
8	0.62	High
9	0.70	Very High
10	0.79	Very High
11	0.88	Very High
12	0.96	Very High

**Cost** estimations are based on the approximate cost of implementing an approach in a class of twenty five pupils. Where the approach does not require an additional resource, estimates are based on the cost of training or professional development which may be required. For more information about the Toolkit's methodology please view the Toolkit's **Technical Appendices**.

Cost	Description
£	Very low: up to about £2,000 per year per class of 25 pupils, or less than £80 per pupil per year.
££	Low: £2,001-£5,000 per year per class of 25 pupils, or up to about £170 per pupil per year.
£££	Moderate: £5,001 to £18,000 per year per class of 25 pupils, or up to about £700 per pupil per year.
££££	High: £18,001 to £30,000 per year per class of 25 pupils, or up to £1,200 per pupil.
£££££	Very High: over £30,000 per year per class of 25 pupils, or over £1,200 per pupil. By 2014/5, the Pupil Premium is projected to rise to approximately £1,200 per pupil.

**Evidence** estimates are based on: the availability of evidence (i.e. the number of systematic reviews or meta-analyses and the quantity of primary studies which they synthesise); the methodological quality of the primary evidence; the magnitude of the impact (in terms of effect size); and the reliability or consistency of this impact across the studies reviewed. For more information about the Toolkit's methodology please view the Toolkit's **Technical Appendices**.

Rating	Description
**	Very limited: Quantitative evidence of impact from single studies, but with effect size data reported or calculable. No systematic reviews with quantitative data or meta-analyses located.
**	Limited: At least one meta-analysis or systematic review with quantitative evidence of impact on attainment or cognitive or curriculum outcome measures.
***	Moderate: Two or more rigorous meta-analyses of experimental studies of school age students with cognitive or curriculum outcome measures.
***	Extensive: Three or more meta-analyses from well controlled experiments mainly undertaken in schools using pupil attainment data with some exploration of causes of any identified heterogeneity.
****	Very Extensive: Consistent high quality evidence from at least five robust and recent meta-analyses where the majority of the included studies have good ecological validity and where the outcome measures include curriculum measures or standardised tests in school subject areas.




# What are the most effective ways to support disadvantaged pupils' achievement?



Research undertaken by NFER has identified seven building blocks that are common in schools which are more successful in raising disadvantaged pupils' attainment.

**1. Whole-school ethos of attainment for all:** Schools have an ethos of high attainment for all pupils and avoid stereotyping disadvantaged pupils as all facing similar barriers or having less potential to succeed.




**2. Addressing behaviour and attendance:** Schools ensure effective behaviour strategies are in place, respond quickly to poor attendance and provide strong social and emotional support, including through working with families.




**4. Meeting individual learning needs:** Staff identify each pupil's challenges and interests. They seek the best strategies to help each pupil make the next step in his or her learning. Schools provide individual support for specific learning needs and group support for pupils with similar needs.



**6. Data driven and responding to evidence:** Teachers use data to identify pupils' learning needs, review progress every few weeks and address underperformance quickly. They have manageable Assessment for Learning systems, which provide clear feedback for pupils. Schools use evidence to make decisions about their support strategies.



**7. Clear, responsive leadership:** Senior leaders set ever higher aspirations and lead by example. They hold all staff accountable for raising attainment, rather than accepting low aspirations and variable performance. They share their thinking and invest in staff training.



This briefing, by Caroline Sharp, Shona MacLeod, Amy Skipp and Steve Higgins, is based on national research with primary, secondary and special schools across England. A full research report and a summary for school leaders are also available from the Department for Education and NFER websites: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-education/about/research> and [www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/PUPP01](http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/PUPP01)